5682
J11
R5
2d Set
U. S. Congress

Appendix

The Family Farmer and the Farsighted Labor Leader Both Have an Enormous Stake — Often Unrecognized — in the Well-Being of the Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the article by University of Michigan Prof. George S. Odiorne, in Harper's magazine, April 1960, entitled "How Small Business Cuts Its Throat," holds out little hope for the continued existence of small business in the American economy. To Professor Odiorne, and perhaps to a few big businessmen, the Nation's 4½ million small business concerns are "this overpopulated and wrongly oriented segment of the economic community."

The learned professor does point out that "economic power and property are today concentrated in the hands of some 200 corporations, and the trend shows no sign of abating."

Unless significant steps are taken by the Federal Government in concert with State and local governments to help small business, the trend toward monopoly and concentration of economic power will continue, and at an accelerated rate.

The family farmer and the farsighted labor leader both have an enormous, but often unrecognized, stake in the well-being of the small businessman. Since this is so manifestly true, steps should be taken at this time by leaders of these three great groups to actively seek out those areas of cooperation and planning which will help to halt and reverse the present drift toward unlimited monopoly and concentration.

I have discussed this subject many times with George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, who agrees with me that such a step is long overdue.

There is no more eloquent and dedicated spokesman of small business in our country today than George Burger, nor one who is more highly respected by Members of the Congress of both political parties.

This fine organization of more than 155,000 small business and professional men, with members in each of the 50 States, which George Burger represents—the National Federation of Independent Business—could serve a great national purpose by seeking out those areas where small family farmers and the leaders of American labor could work together to advance our national welfare.

I have often thought that a joint planning conference of leaders from our farm areas, from labor, and from small business would be a very healthy development, and it could very properly be called by the National Federation of Independent Business. I hope definite steps toward such a conference will be taken at once.

In any event, the article by Professor Odiorne deserves much more attention than it received for it shows that such a far-reaching step as I have suggested to strengthen the democratic small business segment of the American economy is long overdue.

I include herewith a cogent reply by George J. Burger to the Harper's magazine article of Professor Odiorne:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 8, 1960.*

EDITOR, HARPER'S MAGAZINE,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have reviewed with considerable interest the April issue of Harper's and have particularly noted the article therein: "How Small Business Cuts Its Throat" edited by Mr. George S. Odiorne.

In view of the nationwide distribution of Harper's and the widespread havoc which could accrue to small business generally from the many gross misinterpretations in Mr. Odiorne's article, we, as an accredited spokesman for small business nationwide are directing this communication to you in rebuttal to the article: "How Small Business Cuts Its Throat."

To substantiate our claim that we act as accredited spokesman for small business of this Nation it will be important for you to note that the National Federation of Independent Business has now been in existence approximately 16 years, and our membership now totals in excess of 150,000, all independent business and professional men (no groups) which membership reaches into all 50 States of the Union.

No officer or group of officers is permitted to set the policy for the Federation on any legislative or economic problem, such policy being determined only after a complete nationwide poll of our entire membership, and their vote for or against then determines the stand officially taken by the Federation.

We consider as our most valuable asset the confidence Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, and in fact the heads of Government agencies themselves, have in our sincerity to do a job for the people we represent, small and independent business of this Nation.

Needless to say, we can only view with alarm such an article as "How Small Business Cuts Its Throat" written by one whose background would, to say the least, tend to indicate a more or less middle-of-the-road policy in behalf of small business.

From practical business experience confined exclusively to small business, gained through owning and operating an independent business for better than a quarter of a century, we find that in the majority of cases small business as a class is negligent in failing to avail themselves of the laws in our National Government that would protect the free enterprise system. We find in almost 99 out of 100 cases the usual answer of small business as to the reason for their failure to act is: "The Government won't do anything" or "The laws will never be enforced."

In the first part of Mr. Odiorne's article, with reference to the young businessman who was recognized by the junior chamber of commerce, whose profits, it was stated, were helped through an accelerated writeoff of his equipment for tax purposes, surely all with vision and foresight in our Nation's economy will recognize that small business to be successful must step forward with the times, and understand, Mr. Editor, in this instance that young man was shrewd enough to take advantage of the help offered him under the law. In most instances, when it comes to accelerated tax writeoffs you will find a very interesting background as to the real beneficiaries on this for the many years—giant corporations, and believe me, some writeoffs.

The article further states: "The small businessman, it would seem, is acquiring a privileged position in Washington comparable to the farmer's." I know that small business nationwide would be most interested in this statement and I am sure they would welcome the day that they got the same consideration from the Federal Government as farmers, big business and big labor get. Note the attached copy of an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Extension of remarks of Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR. It might be that the only time small business finds themselves in a favorable position—or at least recognized to some degree—is around the time of congressional or presidential elections, as "They love us in November and forget about us in May."

Further in the article it states: "In most instances the small businessman is shored up with tax money." Mr. Editor, I would like to answer that statement by presentation of a factual case pending with the Congress for 19 years on a very major tax matter. Three hundred thousand or more independent businesses in that industry carry the tax burden in advance, hoping to recapture the advance from the ultimate buyer where, on the other hand, three giant corporations each doing an annual business of around a billion dollars, whose retail outlets number about 2,000 and which retail outlets are in active daily competition with the independent retailers, have been exempt from that tax levy running into many millions of dollars until their stocks are sold to the ultimate consumer. Who is being shored up here? Not small business.

The article further states: "Dun & Bradstreet, the master scorekeeper of business failures, has found that more than 9 out of 10 small business failures were caused by lack of experience or incompetence." We would not want to go into checking the overall finding of the above, but we do know that this seems to be the usual indictment against small business, and it generally is the alibi originating with management of giant corporations when they are caught redhanded attempting to defeat small business.

We have heard that charge made repeatedly and in most instances it is unfounded. The truth of the matter is that in the majority of cases the failure of small business is not due to management or experience, but can be laid to the door of the Federal Government and many of the States in their failure to enforce the antitrust laws that were placed on the statute books to protect

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

the free enterprise system in which small business plays no minor part.

It's easy for us to make this charge but it's far better to have it coming from Government spokesmen when as late as February 1947, the then Assistant Attorney General told a Senate committee that for 35 years the administration had merely given "lip service" to the enforcement of the antitrust laws. There is your main contributing cause for the failure of small business.

In this respect we are more than pleased to state that for the first time in these many years we have seen real vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws taking place, and we are referring to the action of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice these past 6 years.

Check the records of antitrust violations and you will be startled to note the number of giant corporations who have been consistent in their action in violation of the antitrust laws—all actions tending to reduce the position of small business both at the production and distribution level.

Further in the article it states: "Nobody, for instance, has much prospect of outsmarting Sears or Macy's or IBM." We have no complaint with the shrewdness of Sears in their ability to buy right providing the buying arrangements from their suppliers are in conformity with Federal statute, and it might be interesting for you to review Federal Trade Commission Docket No. 2116, dated March 5, 1936, in the matter of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.—Sears' supplier. It may be found that this was one of the first "cost plus" contracts entered into by giant industry. In fact it may be found that the present-day success of Sears operations to a degree may be due to this most advantageous contract.

Through that contract relationship cancers were developed in the rubber tire industry which have never been corrected up to this present time. Hundreds of small tire producers indirectly were ruined through that contract relationship and the business of many thousands of competent independent tire dealer merchants was destroyed. There was no bad business management on the part of the small businesses but they could not compete because, in reality Sears was able to offer their private brand, of equal quality to the manufacturers' advertised brand, to the consumer at a price equal to or lower than the small businesses had to pay to the manufacturer, and as one member of the Senate remarked some years later on—referring to that contract relationship: "It wasn't competition—it was just suicide for small business to attempt to compete." In other words, the findings in that Government order disclosed a $41 million preferential during the life of that contract over all other Goodyear customers.

That's the pattern that has been set, and to a degree is being followed in many major industries today.

We had hoped, after the findings in that contract, and the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, that the Magna Carta for small business had actually arrived. We found to our amazement, some 34 years later that it was a hollow victory for us.

We say this because in 1939 in one of the first major actions instituted under the Robinson-Patman Act by the Federal Trade Commission, the FTC had ruled the action was a violation of the Federal statute and the Commission had so notified the Temporary National Economic Committee, which report appears in the Senate Small Business Committee print of 1942. Now we find that in similar action started by the same agency, covering the same proposition with other large factors, that on November 18, 1959, an examiner of the FTC validated the action as keeping within the framework of the law.

Small business in this industry, both at the production and distribution level, is the victim, and if failures continue in small business through that arrangement can it be charged to lack of experience and management?

Mr. Odiorne states: "With the advent of the model T (referring to the Ford) my mother joyfully waved farewell to his exorbitant prices and drove off to buy her groceries at the A. & P. 10 miles away." Efficient small business, both at the production and distribution level welcome fair competition. If they do not recognize this—then they shouldn't be in business, but the record will show—largely due to the findings of the Congress as it related to monopolistic actions of certain large grocery chains and other large factors was the principal reason for bringing into existence the Robinson-Patman Act, and it might be interesting to review that major case that took place in Danville, Ill., some few years ago as to the Court's findings and judgment as it applied to the operations of A. & P. in the Midwestern part of our Nation—certain stores deliberately run at a loss until small business in that area was eliminated. There were some other serious charges made also by the Government in that major case.

At the present time the membership of the national federation is supporting legislation titled the "Equal Pricing Bill" introduced by the Honorable ALVIN BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan. The bill, in simple words, provides that if there is to be a race then it should be an equal race, and not a price-fixing arrangement where a manufacturer is selling to independent retailers and at the same time the manufacturer owning and operating retail stores. The bill would provide that such manufacturer give an equal buying price to both establishments and that he would be prohibited from going direct to the ultimate large commercial buyer and giving a lower price than he extends to the independent retailer or his own retail stores.

This type of operation by certain large producers is extending into more and more industries in our overall economy—all tending to destroy the life of efficient independent business, both at the production and distribution level. Whether the Congress will act on this major piece of legislation—your guess is as good as ours.

If small business is to remain an important part of our economy then something must be done by the Congress to strengthen the antitrust laws. The present fine penalties ordered by the courts are meaningless as a deterrent to continual violations of the antitrust laws. However there was one most encouraging action of the Antitrust Division which recently took place in the city of Philadelphia where the Government Department refused to accept the pleas of those under indictment for violation of the antitrust laws—to use the "nolo contendere" plea. The Government now wants them to plead guilty or not guilty.

Legislation has been introduced which the Federation members are supporting by their registered vote, amending the antitrust laws, providing for removal of officers and of course plus the fines that would be levied by the courts. If top executive positions are at stake for deliberate violations of the antitrust laws it can result in a "stop, look and listen" policy before such action is authorized by giant corporations.

We are not attempting to go to the defense of inefficient small business institutions but we are trying to present a true, factual picture of the situation facing small business nationwide, and we have no other objective in directing this communication to you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

New Constitution of American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on April 27 of this year a new constitution was approved by the constitutional convention of the people of American Samoa. At the same time, the Secretary of the Interior, acting under authority granted by Executive Order 10264, dated June 29, 1951, of President Truman, ratified and approved the constitution. It becomes effective on October 17, 1960.

This document offers convincing evidence of the political growth of American Samoa. It marks a significant step toward self-government, one which gives material encouragement to our hopes, and the hopes of the people of American Samoa, that they will soon enjoy a still wider range of home rule. The example of neighboring Western Samoa, scheduled in 1961 to enjoy complete self-government under the protection of New Zealand, offers a powerful stimulus for this development in American Samoa.

The new Samoan constitution looks familiar to American eyes. It begins with a traditional bill of rights, which might as well be part of the constitutions of Virginia, New Hampshire, Kansas, or Hawaii. The basic elements of the American political system are set forth—free speech; separation of church and government; prohibitions against slavery, confiscation of property, imprisonment for debt; habeas corpus; protection against unreasonable searches and seizures; due process.

However, the Bill of Rights also contains a provision special for Samoa and its problems. Section 3 of article I states that:

> It shall be the policy of the government of American Samoa to protect persons of Samoan ancestry against alienation of their lands and the destruction of the Samoan way of life and language, contrary to their best interests.

This provision expresses an underlying principle of the new constitution, to provide for political democracy within the traditional framework of Samoan life. An important element in this framework is the Matai system—the hierarchy of chiefs who have authority over the families and villages of Samoa. The position of the Matai is maintained by requiring that members of the Samoan Senate "be the registered head of a Samoan family, who maintains his monotaga; that is, who fulfills his obligation as required by Samoan custom in the county from which he is elected." However, any U.S. national, resident of American Samoa for 5 or more years, can serve in the House of Representatives. Senators are to be elected by the county councils "in accordance with Samoan custom," while Representatives are to be chosen by secret ballot by the electorate.

In the executive branch, no qualifications are set for the offices of Governor or Secretary of American Samoa, other than that they shall be appointed in accordance with the laws of the United States.

However, the Secretary of Samoan Affairs—constitutionally head of the department of local government and also supervisor of ceremonial functions—must be appointed by the Governor from among the leading chiefs. Furthermore, before appointing a district governor, county chief, or a pulen'u—that is, village mayor—the Governor must request the recommendations of the appropriate district or county council.

I am especially interested to see in the Samoan constitution provisions similar to those adopted by Hawaii in its constitution. As in Hawaii, the voting age is set at 20. Samoa's constitution also makes it possible to get at pocket vetoes by giving the legislature an opportunity to override postsession vetoes by a two-thirds majority. If he still disapproves of a bill, enacted over his veto, the Governor must send it to the Secretary of Interior for final decision. As in the State of Hawaii, the Governor will enjoy the item veto.

The new constitution gives the Samoan Legislature substantially more power than it formerly possessed. For the first time the legislature, either house, can propose legislation. The Governor can also. If he designates a measure as "urgent," and the legislature fails to act on it to his satisfaction, the Governor can, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, promulgate the proposed legislation as law. However, he cannot use this power to amend the laws respecting the courts of Samoa, their jurisdiction, organization, or operation, without legislative approval. Furthermore, changes in the basic land laws must be approved by two-thirds vote of two successive legislatures, as well as by the Governor.

It is apparent that the new Samoan constitution provides a legal basis for a changing society—one which is trying to adapt the best practices of American democracy to its Polynesian tradition, a tradition in which it takes justifiable pride. Progress should be stimulated by the constitutional requirement for compulsory free, public education for children between 7 and 16. Local tradition is protected in its roots, the system of landholding, through the requirement of multiple passage of amending legislation, just described.

In the wider American tradition, this constitution is kept open for change to meet changing social conditions. Under article V, section 4, the Governor must appoint a new constitutional committee 5 years after the constitution becomes effective—that is, 5 years after October 17, 1960. The committee is empowered to draft amendments, or a revised constitution, as it deems necessary. The amendments or draft would then be submitted to a popularly elected constitutional convention for approval or amendment. Finally, constitutional language approved by the convention would go to the electorate for approval—to become effective when approved, in turn, by the Secretary of the Interior. It cannot be denied that opportunity for review of constitutional amendments is amply provided.

I know that the other Members of the Senate join me in congratulating the people of American Samoa on their new constitution and in the hope that they will find it a source of strength in their continuing political and economic growth.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this printing will make four pages of the RECORD at an estimated cost of $324. That the new constitution of American Samoa may be available to all the Members of Congress, and to other interested persons, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix, notwithstanding the cost of $324.

There being no objection, the constitution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in its act of February 20, 1929, provided that until the Congress shall provide for the Government of the islands of American Samoa, all civil, judicial and military powers shall be vested in such person or persons and exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct;

Whereas by Executive Order No. 10264 the President of the United States directed that the Secretary of the Interior should take such action as may be necessary and appropriate, and in harmony with applicable law, for the administration of civil government in American Samoa;

Whereas it is appropriate that, in the process of developing self-government, the people of American Samoa should enjoy certain rights and responsibilities inherent in the representative form of government; and

Whereas it is desirable that these rights and responsibilities be clearly set forth in a constitution, and the adoption of a constitution is in harmony with applicable law:

Now, therefore, this constitution, having been ratified and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and having been approved by the constitutional convention of the people of American Samoa, is established to further advance government of the people, by the people, and for the people of American Samoa.

ARTICLE I

Bill of rights

SECTION 1. Freedom of religion, speech, press, rights of assembly and petition: There shall be separation of church and government, and no law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a fedress of grievances.

SEC. 2. No deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process: No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

SEC. 3. Policy protective legislation: It shall be the policy of the Government of American Samoa to protect persons of Samoan ancestry against alienation of their lands and the destruction of the Samoan way of life and language, contrary to their best interests. Such legislation as may be necessary may be enacted to protect the lands, customs, culture, and traditional Samoan family organization of persons of Samoan ancestry, and to encourage business enterprises by such persons. No change in the law respecting the alienation or transfer of land or any interest therein, shall be effective unless the same be approved by two successive legislatures by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of each house and by the Governor.

SEC. 4. Dignity of the individual: The dignity of the individual shall be respected and every person is entitled to protection of the law against malicious and unjustifiable public attacks on the name, reputation, or honor of himself or of his family.

SEC. 5. Protection against unreasonable searches and seizures: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. Evidence obtained in violation of this section shall not be admitted in any court.

SEC. 6. Rights of an accused: No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or liberty; nor shall he be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; and the failure of the accused to testify shall not be commented upon nor taken against him. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the right to a speedy and public trial, to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to have a copy thereof; to be confronted with the witness against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. Every man is presumed innocent until he is pronounced guilty by law, and no act of severity which is not reasonably necessary to secure the arrest of an accused person shall be permitted. All persons shall be bailable by sufficient sureties except for capital offenses and rape, where proof is evident or the presumption great. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel or unusual punishments inflicted.

SEC. 7. Habeas corpus: The writ of habeas corpus shall be granted without delay and free of costs. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended except by the Governor and then only when the public safety requires it in case of war, rebellion, insurrection or invasion.

SEC. 8. Quartering of militia: No soldier or member of the militia shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner or the lawful occupant, nor in time of war, except in a manner prescribed by law. The military authority shall always be subordinate to the civil authority in time of peace.

SEC. 9. Imprisonment for debt: There shall be no imprisonment for debt except in cases of fraud.

SEC. 10. Slavery prohibited: Neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted shall exist in American Samoa.

SEC. 11. Treason: Treason against the Government of American Samoa shall consist only in levying war against it, adhering to its enemies, or giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or a confession in open court.

SEC. 12. Subversives ineligible to public office: No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of American Samoa or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the Government of American Samoa.

SEC. 13. Retroactive laws: No bill of attainder, ex post facto law, nor any law

impairing the obligation of contracts shall be passed.

SEC. 14. Special or exclusive privileges not to be granted: The power of the Government to act for the general welfare of the people of American Samoa shall never be impaired by the making of any irrevocable grant of special or exclusive privileges or immunities. Special acts conferring corporate powers shall not be enacted. Corporations may be created under general laws, but all such laws may be amended or repealed.

SEC. 15. Health, safety, morals, and general welfare: Laws may be enacted for the protection of the health, safety, morals, and general welfare, of the people of American Samoa.

SEC. 16. Education: The government shall operate a system of free and nonsectarian public education. There shall be compulsory education for all children between the ages of 7 and 16 years. The Government will encourage qualified persons of good character to acquire further education, locally and abroad, both general and technical, and thereafter to return to American Samoa to the end that the people thereof may be benefited.

SEC. 17. Child labor: The employment of children under the age of 16 years in any occupation injurious to health or morals, or hazardous to life or limb is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 18. Unspecified rights and privileges and immunities: The enumeration of certain rights in this constitution shall not be construed to impair or deny other rights retained by the people. No law shall be made or enforced which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of American Samoa.

ARTICLE II

The legislature

SECTION 1. Legislature: There shall be a legislature which shall consist of a senate and house of representatives.

The legislature shall have authority to pass legislation with respect to subjects of local application, except that:

(a) No such legislation may be inconsistent with this Constitution or the laws of the United States applicable in American Samoa;

(b) No such legislation may conflict with treaties or international agreements of the United States;

(c) The annual budget shall be as presented to the Congress of the United States subject to such allocations among departments and activities as may be made by the Governor as a result of increases or decreases in the amount of grant funds approved by the Congress, and the Governor shall inform the legislature of his actions in this regard at its next regular session.

(d) Legislation involving the expenditure of funds other than as budgeted shall include revenue measures to provide the needed funds.

The authority conferred upon the legislature by this section shall not be construed as a limitation upon the legislative power vested in the Governor by section 9 of this article.

SEC. 2. Membership: The Senate shall consist of one member from each county, provided that there shall be an additional senator from the western district. The first such additional senator shall be elected in and from Lealataua (Fofo) County in the election held in 1960; his successor in and from Leasina (Aitulagi) County; his successor in and from Tualauta County; and his successor in and from Tualatai County, and thereafter in rotation from such four counties in the order named. Such additional senator shall serve a term of 2 years.

The house of representatives shall consist of members elected on the basis of population in such ratio as may be provided by law; provided that each county shall always have at least one representative regardless of population; and provided further that the total number of members shall never exceed 24. The first house of representatives to be elected following the adoption of this constitution shall be composed of one representative from each county, except that Lealataua (Fofō) County shall have two representatives and Ma'uputasi County shall have three representatives. Representation shall be reapportioned by law at intervals of not less than 10 years.

The adult permanent residents of Swains Island may elect at an open meeting a delegate to the house of representatives who shall have all of the privileges of a member of the house except the right to vote.

SEC. 3. Qualification of members:

A senator shall—

(a) be a U.S. national;

(b) be at least 30 years of age at the time of his election;

(c) have lived in American Samoa for a total of at least 5 years and have been a bona fide resident thereof for at least 1 year next preceding his election; and

(d) be the registered head of a Samoan family, who maintains his monotaga, that is, who fulfills his obligations as required by Samoan custom in the county from which he is elected.

A representative shall—

(a) be a U.S. national;

(b) be at least 25 years of age at the time of his election; and

(c) have lived in American Samoa for a total of at least 5 years and have been a bona fide resident of the county from which he is elected for at least 1 year next preceding his election.

A delegate from Swains Island shall have the qualifications of a representative except that in lieu of residence in a county he shall have been a bona fide resident of Swains Island for at least 1 year next preceding his election.

No person who shall have been expelled from the legislature for giving or receiving a bribe or being an accessory thereto, and no person who shall have been convicted of a felony, shall sit in the legislature, unless the person so convicted shall have been pardoned and have had restored to him his civil rights.

No person holding any other public office shall be eligible during his continuance in such office for membership in the legislature.

SEC. 4. Manner of Election: A senator shall be elected in accordance with Samoan custom by the county council of the county he is to represent.

Representatives shall be chosen by secret ballot of the qualified electors of their respective counties; provided that in case a county has more than one representative such county shall be divided by law into as many divisions as it shall have representatives and one representative shall be elected from each such division by the electors thereof.

SEC. 5. Elections: Elections shall be held biennially in each even-numbered year beginning on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November and ending not later than 3 weeks thereafter.

SEC. 6. Term of office: Each senator except the additional senator from the western district shall hold office for a term of 4 years. Representatives including any delegate from Swains Island shall each hold office for a term of 2 years. The terms of all members of the legislature including any delegate from Swains Island shall commence at noon on the third day of January following their election, except as otherwise provided.

SEC. 7. Qualifications of electors: Every person of the age of 20 years or upwards, belonging to either of the following classes, who shall have lived in American Samoa for a total of at least 2 years and have been a bona fide resident of the county or division where he offers to vote for at least 1 year next preceding the election and who meets such registration requirements as may be prescribed by law shall be deemed a qualified elector at such election:

(1) U.S. nationals;

(2) Other persons of at least one-half Samoan blood who owe no allegiance to any foreign sovereign state.

No person under guardianship, non compos mentis, or insane shall be qualified to vote at any election; nor shall any person who has been convicted of a felony be qualified to vote at any election unless he has had his civil rights previously restored to him or unless he has maintained good behavior for 7 years following the date of his conviction or his release from prison, whichever is the later.

SEC. 8. Legislative sessions: There shall be a regular session of the legislature held in each year beginning on the second Monday in March and continuing for not to exceed 30 consecutive calendar days. The legislature may meet in special session at the call of the Governor, but the aggregate of such special sessions during any calendar year shall not exceed 15 calendar days.

No legislation may be considered in a special session other than that specified by the Governor in the call for the special session or in a special message to the legislature while in session. The Governor shall address a joint meeting of the senate and house at the opening of each session.

SEC. 9. Enactment of laws; vetoes: The enacting clause of all bills shall be: *"Be it enacted by the Legislature of American Samoa,"* and no law shall be enacted except by bill. Bills may originate in either House, and may be amended or altered or rejected by the other. The Governor may submit proposed legislation to the legislature for consideration by it. He may designate any such proposed legislation as urgent, if he so considers it.

Every bill, having passed both houses, shall be signed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house, and shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor for his approval. If he approves it, he shall sign it and it shall become a law, and he shall deposit it in the office of the secretary of American Samoa. But if it be not approved by him, he shall return it with his objections to the house in which it originated, which shall enter the same in their journal. Any bill not returned by the Governor within 20 days, after having been presented to him, shall become a law, whether signed by him or not, unless the legislature by adjournment prevent such return, in which case it shall not become a law unless the Governor, within 45 days after adjournment shall sign it, in which case it shall become a law in like manner as if it had been signed by him before adjournment; and the Governor shall deposit it in the office of the secretary of American Samoa.

Not later than 14 months after a bill has been vetoed by the Governor, it may be passed over his veto by a two-thirds majority of the entire membership of each house but may not be so re-passed at the same session at which originally passed.

A bill so repassed shall be re-presented to the Governor for his approval. If he does not approve it within 20 days, he shall send it together with his comment thereon to the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior approves it within 90 days after its receipt by him, it shall become a law; otherwise it shall not.

In the event that the Governor has submitted to the legislature proposed legislation which he has designated as urgent, and the legislature has failed to pass the same in its original form or an amended form acceptable to the Governor at the session in

which it was submitted, the Governor may himself, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, promulgate such proposed legislation as a law.

If any bill presented to the Governor should contain several items of appropriation of money, he may object to one or more of such items, or any part or parts thereof, portion or portions thereof, while approving the other items, parts, or portions of the bill. In such a case he shall append to the bill, at the time of signing it, a statement of the items, or parts or portions thereof, to which he objects, and the items, or parts or portions thereof, so objected to shall not take effect.

Notwithstanding the provisions in this section with respect to a bill becoming a law upon approval by the Governor or upon its approval by the secretary of the interior after its veto by the Governor or the provision permitting the Governor himself to promulgate laws under certain circumstances, changes in the laws referred to in section 3 of article III, whether by amendment, repeal, or by new statutory provision, shall not be effective unless the same shall have been enacted by the legislature and approved by the Governor and the secretary of the interior. Furthermore, nothing in this section shall be deemed to permit any change in the law respecting the alienation or transfer of land or any interest therein to be effective unless such change shall have been approved by two successive legislatures by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of each house and by the Governor as provided in section 3 of article I.

SEC. 10. Passage of bills: A majority of all the members of each house, voting in the affirmative, shall be necessary to pass any bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 11. Powers of each house: Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings and publish the same, determine its rules of procedure, punish members for disorderly behavior, and, with the consent of two-thirds of its entire membership, may expel a member, but not a second time for the same offense. Each house shall sit upon its own adjournments, but neither house shall, without the concurrence of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days, nor to any other place than that in which it may be sitting.

SEC. 12. Freedom from arrest: Senators and representatives and any delegate from Swains Island in all cases except treason, felony, or breach of the peace, shall be privileged from arrest during a session of the legislature, and in going to and returning from the same. No member of the legislature shall be held to answer before any tribunal other than the legislature itself for any speech or debate in the legislature.

SEC. 13. Vacancies: When vacancies occur in either house, the Governor, or the person exercising the functions of Governor, shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies except if such vacancy occur within 3 months of the next regular election, no special election shall be held and the Governor may fill such vacancy by appointment of the person recommended by the county chief of the county from which the vacancy arose. A person elected to fill a vacancy or appointed by the Governor to fill a vacancy shall take office upon his taking the oath of office and shall hold office during the remainder of the term of his predecessor.

SEC. 14. Public sessions: The business of each house, and of the committee of the whole, shall be transacted openly and not in secret session.

SEC. 15. Reading—passage of bills: No bill shall be passed until copies of the same with amendments thereto shall have been made available for the use of the members; nor shall a bill become a law unless the same shall have been read on two separate days in each house previous to the final vote thereon. On final passage of all bills, they shall be read at length, section by section, and the votes shall be by yeas and nays upon each bill separately, and shall be entered upon the journal. The provisions in this section respecting the reading of bills shall be subject to the exception that a bill providing for a general revision of the statutes or code of American Samoa shall be read in such manner as the legislature may prescribe.

SEC. 16. Title: Every legislative act shall embrace but one subject and matters properly connected therewith, which subject shall be expressed in the title; but if any subject shall be embraced in an act which shall not be expressed in the title, such an act shall be void only as to so much thereof as shall not be embraced in the title.

SEC. 17. Amendment and revisions by reference: No law shall be amended or revised by reference to its title only; but in such case the act, as revised, or section or subsection as amended, shall be reenacted and published at full length.

SEC. 18. Appointment to new offices: No member of the legislature shall during the term for which he was elected and for 1 year thereafter be appointed to any office which shall have been created during such term.

SEC. 19. Effective date of laws: An act of the legislature required to be approved and approved by the Governor only shall take effect no sooner than 60 days from the end of the session at which the same shall have been passed, while an act required to be approved by both the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior or by the Secretary of the Interior only after its veto by the Governor and so approved shall take effect no sooner than 40 days after its return to the Governor by the Secretary of the Interior. The foregoing is subject to the exception that in the case of an emergency the act may take effect at an earlier date stated in the act, provided that the emergency be declared in the preamble and in the body of the act. A law promulgated by the Governor with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior shall become effective at the time specified therein.

SEC. 20. Legislative counsel: A legislative counsel shall be appointed by the Governor to assist and advise the legislature and to perform such other and further duties as may be prescribed by law.

SEC. 21. Quorum: A majority of each house shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day and may compel the attendance of absent members in such manner as each house may provide.

SEC. 22. Qualifications and officers: Each house of the legislature shall be the judge of the qualifications of its members and shall choose its own officers.

SEC. 23. Adjourning legislature: In case of disagreement between the two houses with respect to the time of adjournment, the Governor shall have power to adjourn the legislature to such time as he may think proper; but no such adjournment shall be beyond the time fixed for the next general session of the legislature.

SEC. 24. Compensation of legislature: The members of the legislature including any delegate from Swains Island shall each receive for his services an annual salary of $300, payable at such times as may be provided by law; provided that the salary of any such member or delegate in office on the effective date of this constitution for the part of the year 1960 unexpired on such date shall bear the same relation to $300 as such unexpired part shall bear to 1 year, such salary for such unexpired part of 1960 to be paid on December 23, 1960.

Each member of the legislature from Tutuila including Aun'u shall be issued a pass by the Government of American Samoa good for daily round trip public transportation between his village (if no public transportation to his village then between the point nearest his village to which public transportation is available) and Fagatogo during regular and special sessions of the legislature. For his use in attending a session, whether regular or special, each member from Manu'a shall receive a pass from the Government of American Samoa good for one round trip by ship between Manu'a and Tutuila. Any delegate from Swains Island shall be paid $25 by the Government of American Samoa to cover the expense of his travel to attend a session, either regular or special. Members of the legislature including any delegate from Swains Island shall receive no compensation, perquisite, or allowance whatsoever other than that specifically provided for by this section.

SEC. 25. Limitation on compensation of employees: No employee of the legislature or of either house thereof shall be paid either directly or indirectly for a total of more than 50 days of service in connection with a regular session of the legislature or for a total of more than 30 days of service in connection with special sessions in any one calendar year. For the purposes of this section, every employee of the legislature or of either House thereof shall be deemed to be employed for service in connection with a legislative session.

ARTICLE III

Judicial branch

SECTION 1. Judicial power: The judicial power shall be vested in the high court, the district courts, and such other courts as may from time to time be created by law.

SEC. 2. Independence of the courts: The judicial branch of the government of American Samoa shall be independent of the executive and legislative branches.

SEC. 3. Continuance of laws: The laws of American Samoa respecting the courts, including their jurisdiction, organization and operation, the judicial system, and the judiciary shall continue in force until otherwise provided by law. No change in any such laws, whether by amendment, repeal, or by new statutory provision shall be effective unless the same shall have been enacted by the legislature and approved by the Governor and by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Appointment: The chief justice of American Samoa shall be appointed as provided in the laws of the United States.

ARTICLE IV

Executive branch

SECTION 1. Appointments: The Governor of American Samoa and the Secretary of American Samoa shall be appointed as provided in the laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Governor: The executive power shall be vested in the Governor of American Samoa, who shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He shall perform his duties under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Secretary: The secretary of American Samoa shall have all the powers and duties of the Governor in the case of a vacancy in the office of Governor or the disability or temporary absence of the Governor. He shall record and preserve the laws and executive orders, and transmit copies thereof to the Secretary of the Interior. He shall have and perform such other duties as may be prescribed by law or assigned to him by the Governor.

SEC. 4. Secretary of Samoan affairs: There shall be a secretary of Samoan affairs appointed by the Governor from among the leading chiefs. He shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor. The secretary of Samoan affairs shall be the head of the department of local government and be responsible for the proper administration of the district, county, and village affairs as provided by law, and shall supervise all ceremonial functions as may be provided by law.

SEC. 5. Militia and posse comitatus: The Governor may summon the posse comitatus or call out the militia to prevent or suppress violence, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion.

SEC. 6. Executive regulations: The Governor or his designated representatives shall have the power to issue executive regulations not in conflict with this constitution or any applicable law.

SEC. 7. Supervision and control by Governor, organization of executive branch: The Governor shall have supervision and control of all executive agencies and instrumentalities of the government of American Samoa. There shall be no more than eight executive departments in the Government of American Samoa. No other instrumentality shall be created, organized, or established by the Governor or the legislature, without the prior approval of the secretary of the interior, unless required by Federal law for participation in Federal programs.

SEC. 8. Annual report: The Governor shall annually make an official report of the transactions of the government of American Samoa to the secretary of the interior.

SEC. 9. Pardoning power: The Governor shall have the power to remit fines and forfeitures, commute sentences, and grant reprieves and pardons after conviction for offenses against the laws of American Samoa.

SEC. 10. Recommendation of laws: The Governor shall give the legislature information on the state of the Government and recommend for its consideration such measures as he may deem necessary and expedient. He may attend or may depute another person to represent him at the meetings of the legislature, and may give expression to his views on any matter before such body.

SEC. 11. Appointment of officials: With the exception of elective officials, those appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and those whose appointments are otherwise provided for, the officials of the government of American Samoa including district, county, and village officials shall be appointed by the Governor. Prior to appointing a district governor, a county chief, or a pulen'u, the Governor shall request the recommendation of the appropriate district council as to who shall be appointed, in the case of a district governor; of the appropriate county council and district governor, in the case of a county chief; and of the appropriate village council, district governor, and county chief in the case of a pulenuu.

SEC. 12. Removal of officers: powers and duties of officers: The Governor may appoint or remove any officer whose appointment is not otherwise provided for. All officers shall have such powers and duties as may be conferred or imposed on them by law or by executive regulation of the Governor not inconsistent with any law.

ARTICLE V

Miscellaneous

SECTION 1. Existing officers: For the public convenience and to insure continuity in the operation of the government and regardless of any other provision or provisions in this constitution, all officers of American Samoa, including district, county, and village officers in office on the effective date of this constitution, shall, subject to the right of resignation and removal as may be provided by law, continue to hold their respective offices until the expiration of the time for which they were respectively elected or appointed.

SEC. 2. Existing laws: In addition to the continuance of certain laws as provided for by section 3 of article III of this constitution, all other laws of American Samoa not inconsistent with this constitution shall continue in force until they expire by their own limitation or are altered or repealed by competent authority.

SEC. 3. Amendments: Any amendment to this constitution may be proposed in either house of the legislature, and if the same be agreed to by three-fifths of all members of each house, voting separately, such proposed amendment shall be entered on the journals, with the yeas and nays taken thereon. Such proposed amendment shall be referred to the next succeeding legislature, and if the same be agreed to by three-fifths of all members of each house, voting separately, the Governor shall be so advised by the legislature. The Governor shall then submit such proposed amendments to the voters eligible to vote for members of the house of representatives at the next general election. If a majority of such voters voting approve such amendment, the Governor shall, within 30 days after such approval shall have been officially determined, submit the same to the secretary of the interior for approval or disapproval within 4 months after its receipt.

SEC. 4. Revision of the constitution: In view of changing conditions in American Samoa, the Governor shall appoint a new constitutional committee 5 years after the effective date of this constitution to prepare amendments or a revised draft constitution to be submitted to the Governor who shall call a constitutional convention to consider the same. The delegates to the convention shall be selected by the respective county councils. The number of delegates from each county shall be the number obtained by dividing the population of the county, as shown by the last preceding Federal census, by 400, any fraction in the quotient obtained to be disregarded if such fraction be less than one-half and if such fraction shall be one-half or more it shall be considered to be one unit, provided that each county shall have at least one delegate, and provided further that Swains Island shall have one delegate selected by the adult permanent residents of the island in open meeting. If the convention approves such amendments or draft constitution either with changes made therein by the convention or without changes, the same as approved shall be submitted by the Governor to the voters eligible to vote for members of the house of representatives at the next general election; and if a majority of the voters voting approve the amendments or proposed revised constitution, the Governor shall submit the same to the secretary of the interior for his approval, and if he approves the same, then the amendments shall become part of this constitution or the proposed revised constitution shall replace this constitution, as the case may be.

SEC. 5. Local or special laws: The legislature shall pass no local or special act if a general act can be made applicable.

SEC. 6. Existing rights and liabilities: Except as otherwise provided in this constitution all existing actions, writs, suits, proceedings, civil or criminal liabilities, prosecutions, judgments, decrees, sentences, orders, appeals, causes of action, contracts, claims, demands, titles, and rights shall continue unaffected notwithstanding the taking effect of this constitution.

SEC. 7. Oaths: All officers of American Samoa including district, county, and village officers, shall, before they enter upon the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the following oath:

"I, _____, of _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, and that I will well and faithfully uphold the laws of the United States applicable in American Samoa, and the constitution and laws of American Samoa. So help me God."

SEC. 8. General power: The enumeration in this constitution of specified powers shall not be construed as limitations upon the power of the Government of American Samoa to provide for the general welfare of the people.

SEC. 9. Construction: In this constitution titles shall not be used for the purposes of construction and wherever any personal pronoun appears it shall be construed to mean either sex; also in this constitution a special or particular provision shall control a general provision should there be inconsistency between a special or particular provision and a general provision.

SEC. 10. Provisions self-executing: The provisions of this constitution shall be self-executing to the fullest extent that their respective natures permit.

SEC. 11. Seat of government: The seat of government shall be at Fagatogo.

SEC. 12. Effective date: This constitution, ratified and approved on April 27, 1960, by the secretary of the interior, acting pursuant to authority vested in him by Executive Order No. 10264, dated June 29, 1951, of the President of the United States, and approved by the constitutional convention of the people of America Samoa in its meeting in Fagatogo, American Samoa, on April 27, 1960, shall become effective on October 17, 1960.

The Difference Between Republicans and Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the questions many of us have been asked in the past and still are being asked is this: "What is the basic difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties as regards their fundamental beliefs?" In trying to answer this question when asked of me, I many times felt the party asking the question was not satisfied with the answer. We can't always find the difference between the parties when we look at RECORD rollcall votes in the Congress.

Recently I was handed a treatise on this subject by Harold Lydick, a most promising young lawyer of Dallas, Tex. He, in conjunction with others, had attempted to answer this question. I commend it to my colleagues as a fresh approach to the question asked—the difference between Republicans and Democrats.

Here is the article:

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

There has been a lot of talk lately about how much alike the Republicans and Democrats have become. To a certain extent, this is true. It is true in the sense that both parties are willing to accept more intervention in the affairs of the individual by the General Government (as the early leaders of this Republic referred to what is today popularly called the Federal Government) than either would have been willing to accept a century ago and that both parties are,

today, committed to more meddling in international affairs than many important Republican leaders would have accepted 40, or 50, or even 20 years ago. But this is not to say that there is not still a real difference between the parties in both their philosophy and the specific proposals which they set forth to meet current problems.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to illuminate those areas where there is a real difference between the two parties. We will start with their differing philosophies and then move onto specifics to show how a difference in basic attitudes is reflected in the solutions which each party would apply to concrete problems.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

In 1959 the Texas Young Republicans adopted the following statement of principles. Because it states the basic philosophy of the Republican Party both concisely and well, I am using it to illustrate the Republican philosophic position.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We of the Republican Party may be readily distinguished from others of different political beliefs because of our adherence to the following principles as the basis of governmental action.

1. We believe that the American people are capable of providing for their basic needs. We consider that Government should do for the people only those things which are beyond the capacity of the individual or of the community to perform for themselves. Government should refrain, in fact should be prohibited, from performing functions which lie within the capacity of the people to achieve if they so desire.

2. We recognize that the basic reason for the growth of this Nation has been self-reliance and initiative of our people. Continued Government encroachment will destroy such self-reliance and initiative and eventually the freedom of our citizens. We therefore repudiate the philosophy of cradle-to-grave security as an obligation or responsibility of Government. This Nation was established, not to guarantee security, but to insure opportunity and freedom for all its citizens.

3. We believe in private capitalism under the system called free enterprise.

4. We believe that the cost of Government should be shared by all citizens according to their means. We are opposed to any inequities in the tax system which place a disproportionate burden on certain segments of our society, and which have the effect of discouraging initiative and retarding economic progress.

5. We recognize that this Union is a Federal compact between sovereign States, and that the legitimate powers of the Federal Government are only those powers specifically granted to it by the Constitution of the United States. We will resist any further attempt by the Federal Government to encroach on the rights of the sovereign States. We will continue to demand a restoration to the States of those powers which have been improperly assumed by the Federal Government during the last several decades.

6. We recognize that for our republican form of government to remain strong the State government should return to the cities and counties the many duties of a strictly local nature which it has assumed during the last quarter century. If we are to remain strong and free our local governments must remain strong as they are the roots of a free government.

7. We believe that it is not only proper, but essential, for those persons charged with the conduct of foreign affairs to consider the best interests of the United States in arriving at their policy decisions.

We live by these principles because, as Republicans, we are aware that under this basic philosophy there has been reared upon this continent a nation under God providing more spiritual and material blessings to our people than any civilization recorded in the annals of history.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

I do not know of any official group within the Democratic Party which has adopted a statement of principles which would set forth the philosophic position of their party. Consequently, to find their basic attitudes we will have to study the public statements of the leaders of the Democratic Party and examine the official documents of the Democratic Party.

In studying the items listed above we find that the principal base of the Democratic political philosophy is still that of the New Deal-Fair Deal. As such, it is a philosophy which was profoundly influenced by a school of political thought which swept across England and Europe following World War I (though its European origins go back further than 1918). Among the elements of this philosophy are the following:

1. A belief in the necessity of centralized power to cope with the exigencies of the modern world and a corresponding lack of confidence in the ability of any State, provincial, or local government to deal adequately with present day problems.

2. A deep conviction that the Executive of the central authority must be dominant in order to get results. As a consequence, they are willing to subordinate the legislative and judicial branches of Government—all in the name of "efficiency."

3. A belief that private enterprise must be viewed with suspicion and should be permitted to operate only under close Government regulation and supervision.

4. A belief that adequate employment cannot come from private investment or "business." This makes it necessary for the Government to systematically spend money in order to stimulate employment. From this feeling comes the belief that the Central Government must "create a new economic order" and, with it a willingness to accept a "certain amount" of inflation, indeed calling this inflation "good" rather than "bad." Should the "good" inflation get out of hand, they believe that price, wage, and materials control is the proper and necessary counteragent.

5. A belief that labor is always at a disadvantage when dealing with management and must, therefore, have the weight of government on its side in any dispute with management. This is coupled with a tacit acceptance, in some degree, of the idea of the class struggle.

6. A deep conviction that the best solution for nearly every human problem is found through a collective or a governmental remedy and the rejection of the idea that these same problems could be solved by relying on individual and, in the case of economics, private activities.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

In examining specific problems I will compare the platform adopted by the Young Republican National Convention at Denver, Colo., on June 21, 1959, and the platform adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of America at Toledo, Ohio, on November 20, 1959. I am using the platforms adopted by the Young Republicans and the Young Democrats because they are designed as a tool with which to influence their respective party leaders and to recruit new party workers. Consequently, the real attitude on problems is brought out much more sharply than in the platforms of the two parties adopted each presidential year. These platforms, in an effort to attract all segments of the public, have become exercises in "togetherness" and are, in my opinion, the primary cause of the belief that the Republican and Democratic Parties are exactly alike.

In order to keep this pamphlet as short as possible, I will make no effort to specifically cover those elements in the YDCA platform which reflect their bias in favor of an all powerful Central Government. That would double the length of this pamphlet. Also, since our purpose is to illuminate the difference between the parties, I will quote only those sentences and paragraphs which show a difference. No attempt will be made to quote, in full, the stand taken by either party on a general subject such as agriculture, fiscal policy, foreign policy, etc.

To conserve space the following abbreviations will be used:

1. YRNFP—the Young Republican National Federation platform;

2. YDCAP—the Young Democratic Clubs of America platform.

AGRICULTURE

At no place is the difference between the parties brought out more sharply than in their statements on agriculture, the Republicans relying on the individual for a solution while the Democrats look to Washington for it.

YRNFP: "Recognizing that our agricultural industry must remain strong, we are constantly seeking the best means to that end. Just as the Romans, 2,000 years ago learned, we have found governmental controls have not satisfactorily solved our problems.

"We favor the reduction and elimination of governmental subsidies to inefficiencies in agriculture, and the subsequent reduction of rigid governmental controls thereon. The encouragement of free and independent farmers who can combat rising production costs with greater per capita productivity, lower unit cost, and greater individual income."

YDCAP: "Because we believe that the continued independence of the family farmer is a cornerstone of the American way of life, we advocate a Brannan-type farm program with 100 percent parity of income for the family farm production of all agricultural commodities through production payments direct to farmers." And they favor the "adoption and use of workable combinations of farm commodity income improvement methods such as: loans, purchase agreements, market surplus diversion purchases, parity income deficiency payments direct to farmers, stabilization operations by farmers and by governments, market agreements, and other farmer bargaining."

In considering the difference between the two statements, it would be well to remember that President Eisenhower has been able to effect only a slight change in the Federal laws on agriculture as enacted by Democratic Congresses under Presidents F. D. Roosevelt and H. S. Truman. It is under these laws that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the U.S. Department of Agriculture can forbid a man to grow food for his own animals.

FISCAL POLICY

The Young Democrats would probably agree with the following statement in the YRNF platform: "All Government expenditures must meet the test of a true contribution either to national security or national economic progress—not to special interests." But, the two parties seen to differ as to what is a "special interest."

YRNFP: "We must improve our tax system to provide more incentives for economic progress to make it fairer and widen acceptance by taxpayers. We, therefore, believe in a thoroughgoing reform of the entire individual and corporate taxation system especially in the following areas: (1) We believe that dividend credit should be raised; (2) those provisions, promulgated

by the discredited New Deal, of our graduated income tax, which are only punative and makes it hard for individuals to accumulate enough capital to start new business and create new jobs and provide little revenue."

YDCAP: We favor elimination of favoritism to corporations and big business by: (a) Restricting the use of accelerated or rapid depreciation schedules for capital investment; (b) Repeal special tax depletion allowances for the oil, gas and allied industries, replacing present schedules with standard depreciation requirements."

The YDCA platform also advocates changing the present $600 personal tax exemption to $800.

As you would expect, the YRNF platform favors a balanced budget. But, it goes further than that, advocating a budget surplus on the basis that this is essential if we are to stop the "corrosion of inflation."

The YDCA platform ignores the relation between inflation and deficit financing. It contains two statements as regards a balanced budget, one in the statement on Labor and one in the statement on Economic Policy. They are, respecively, as follows: "We believe that the material welfare of human beings is a greater need than the balancing of the Federal budget every single year whatever the economic condition of the country"; and "A balanced Federal budget in a time of national prosperity is a fine ideal, however, it must not become a shibboleth to be followed blindly nor an idol to be worshipped to the exclusion of greater national needs." These statements take on real meaning when you remember that the only balanced budgets the Federal Government has had during the past 30 years have been when you have had either a Republican Congress or a Republican President.

FOREIGN POLICY

The principal difference between the foreign policy planks in each platform is the attitude toward Red China.

The YRNF advocated that we continue to refuse to recognize the Red Chinese Government and oppose its entry into the United Nations.

YDCAP: "We believe that the only civilized way to solve international disputes is by negotiation through regularized diplomatic channels. Because of the policies of the present administration such channels are not now available for use with China. We, therefore, call for the opening of diplomatic negotiations with China for the purpose of seeking solutions to the outstanding differences existing between our two nations, including the settlement of the status of Formosa."

The YDCA statement sounds reasonable enough until you recall that the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, whose views the YDCAP reflects, that was telling us in 1947 and 1948 and 1949 that the Chinese Communists were nothing but harmless agrarian reformers." Apparently not even the Korean war was able to come between the friendship of the liberal Democrats with the Communists of China.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

YRNFP: "We support the free-enterprise system in health because of its ability to achieve its objectives. We oppose all efforts to impose government control over the medical profession and other healing arts through compulsory health insurance or other proposals that seek that end—and commend the efforts of voluntary health insurance groups together with the medical profession in finding adequate methods of providing care for our aged population and lower income families without Federal intervention and control."

YDCAP: "We urge the adoption of a program of hospital and medical benefits for our senior citizens on social security covering all illnesses including mental illness with the cost to be met by Federal funds."

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

YRNFP: "Mindful of the inevitable connection between subsidization and control, we are opposed to Federal financial aid for general public education and school construction."

YDCAP: "We recommend Federal aid to supplement local and State funds to carry out such programs in all parts of the Nation which follow the law of the land."

In the very statement where YDCAP advocates Federal aid to education, the Young Democrats are trying to control the local school. The last half of the sentence obviously refers to the U.S. Supreme Court decision on school racial segregation. Their platform statement is a repudiation of those persons within their own ranks who have vigorously insisted that Federal aid to education would exist without an attempt by the Federal Government to control the local school. It illuminates the soundness of the Republican position that Federal control of the local school will follow Federal money.

LABOR

In view of the disclosures of the McClellan committee, the YRNF recommended: "A thorough investigation of the feasible application of antitrust laws to the big, industrywide union organizations"; "Rigid enforcement of the ban on political contributions by labor unions"; and "Protection of union members from involuntary political assessment by their officers."

The YDCA take a different view. They reject "as absurd and inhumane the notion that antitrust laws should be extended to labor unions." Further, they "affirm the right of union members to contribute time, energy, and money to political activity, and we encourage them to do so." The last clause is to be expected since the major union political effort has been for the Democratic Party—but frequently with money collected from Republican union members by the use of involuntary assessments. Again, the Young Democrats have sided with the Government or collective and against the individual.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

The YRNF favored the gradual return of public power projects to private enterprise wherever that is feasible. Furthermore, they favored the restriction of public power projects and the maximum participation of individuals, local agencies, and local government in the development of water projects. They wanted Federal participation in these things only in cooperation with State and local interests. Their whole attitude is best expressed by the statement that: "We believe that private enterprise is capable of providing for our basic needs. The Government should do for the people only those things which are beyond the resources and capabilities of private enterprise to perform."

Insofar as "power" refers to water power, the YDCA six-paragraph statement could be reduced to the following: "We favor bigger and better TVA's." The mere fact that the TVA electrical production system operates at a loss, so that the other 48 States subsidize the cost of electricity in Kentucky and Tennessee through the Federal budget, doesn't seem to bother the young Democrats one bit. The young Democrats bias in favor of Government control is further shown by the statement that they favor the establishment of a federally owned national and regional grid system for the transmission of electric energy.

The young Democrats fear and hatred of private enterprise is shown even more clearly in their statement on atomic energy. "* * * Therefore, we support the following: Public ownership of all atomic power generation plants."

NATIONAL SECURITY

YRNFP: "We favor an aggressive assault on all forms of subversion, both from criminal acts and ideological warfare, to be carried on by the Un-American Activities Committee, the FBI, and arms of both State and Federal Governments."

The Young Democrats, reflecting the strange blindness to communism and Communist causes shown by most of the "liberal" leaders of the Democratic Party during the past 25 years, attacked the security regulations imposed by President Eisenhower. Also, they want the House Un-American Activities Committee to either define its purpose or be dissolved. With this attitude, we should not be surprised that they are also against the non-Communist affidavit required of all students receiving scholarships under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. If they want to get rid of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has exposed Communist spying on U.S. military secrets, we really cannot expect them to favor retention of the non-Communist affidavit. After all, these scholarships involve not the military security of the Nation, as do the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee, but merely your tax money and mine.

The foregoing quotations are examples of the views of the Republican and Democratic Parties on concrete problems. Which view is desirable is a matter of opinion. But don't ever let anyone tell you again that there is "no difference" between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Alaska Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, much concern is being expressed in the Pacific Northwest about the recent decision of the Air Force to withdraw from Alaska one of the two fighter squadrons stationed there. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial concerning this situation which recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian.

The Oregon Journal, also published in Portland, likewise had an editorial on this subject. I also ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian]

Word from Washington that almost half the fighter planes assigned to Alaskan air bases will be removed this summer has alarmed and angered residents of the new State.

"And well it may disturb residents of the other 49 States, too. To weaken the defense strength of an area hitherto regarded as a keystone of the Nation's military structure would be difficult to understand at any time. But at this time, in the wake of the U–2 incident and the collapse of summit talks, it is simply incredible.

Gen. Curtis Lemay, the cigar-chomping Deputy Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force,

told members of the Alaska congressional delegation the Pentagon doesn't regard their State as strategically important any more. He believes Alaska will be sufficiently defended by the 33 interceptors of the 317th Squadron at Elmendorf AFB, Anchorage, after the disbanding of the 449th Squadron with its 25 aircraft based at Ladd AFB, 225 miles away at Fairbanks.

Furthermore, General LeMay said he doubts the Russians would choose the Alaskan route for any bombing raid on the North American continent because the DEW line radar stations would rob them of the element of surprise. And in any case, the general concluded, long-range fighters based on the Pacific coast could knock down the intruders as well as the Alaska planes.

This appraisal of the Alaskan defense situation is a slap in the face for Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, the Alaska defense commander who last year urged the location of more offensive and defensive missile bases in that State to prevent its use as an invasion route by the Reds.

"General LeMay's views most certainly are not shared, either, by the Chief of the North American Air Defense Command, Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, whose job it is to beat off airborne intruders with the tools the Pentagon gives him. General Kuter is firmly on record against the degradation of his defenses against manned bombers, holding that these will continue to be dangerous adversaries for many years to come despite the increasing emphasis on missiles.

"What can civilians do when generals disagree on military questions? We can only follow our instincts, and ours tell us the assumption that the Reds are going out of the bomber business is overly optimistic. According to intelligence estimates the Soviet Union now has about 1,200 firstline, long-range jet bombers. Even if we can believe Nikita Khrushchev when he says he's not going to build any more bombers, our fliers figure that by cannibalizing spare parts from grounded planes and allowing a 5 percent attrition rate per year, Russia still could put into the air as late as 1975 a fleet of 700 bombers able to hit us with 1,000 megatons of nuclear weapons if unopposed. So we had best be prepared for another decade to oppose them.

"We'll make a prediction that by the time the Pentagon gets through making the agonizing postsummit reappraisal of our military situation, General LeMay will be obliged to put down his cigar and eat his words. The 449th, we'll further wager, will stay at Fairbanks. And we won't be surprised either, if there is a change of heart about the Bomarc B cutback and work is resumed on Oregon's half-finished Bomarc base."

[From the Oregon Journal]

ALASKA DEFENSE PERILOUSLY REDUCED

Alaskans are understandably concerned and confused by the recent U.S. Air Force announcement of a major cutback at the Ladd base adjoining Fairbanks. So are we.

The cutback, announced by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Force vice chief of staff, indicates a decision to remove the entire 449th Fighter Interceptor Group from Ladd, starting next August and completing the operation next January.

Removal of this closest-to-Russia jet fighter group will mean removal of some 500 officers and men plus civilian employees.

And while it was indicated the Army will take over the use of Ladd, there was no word to the effect that ground forces would be increased.

There was no announced immediate change in the status of Elmendorf air base to the south, and of Eielson, Alaska's retaliatory SAC bomber base. But members of the Alaska congressional delegation and the editor of the Daily News-Miner at Fairbanks were quick to point out that stripping of the Ladd base appears to presage drastic changes in Alaska's historic position of the Nation's first line of defense and relegation of Alaska defenses generally to secondary importance.

The only explanation General LeMay gave U.S. Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING, U.S. Representative RIVERS and Governor Egan of Alaska is his belief that Russian bombers probably wouldn't attack the United States by way of Alaska anyway.

But the Alaska delegation and Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, commander of Alaska defenses, countered by pointing out that Russia has 27 missile bases in nearby Siberia and the United States not only has no major missile base plans for Alaska but soon will have only the 33 fighters at Elieson to defend the new State and the Pacific Northwest.

Still unexplained is the fact that an additional construction appropriation for Ladd Air Force Base ($779,000) was approved the other day by the House Appropriations Committee. Apparently the Air Force hadn't taken the trouble to notify the Congress of its plans to strip Alaska's Ladd Base of its defensive interceptors.

Governor Egan calls this decision "almost unbelievable."

The News-Miner says it indicates that the Air Force considers the new Alaskan State "expendable." Senator GRUENING lashed out at what he called an obvious economy move which threatens the security of Alaska and the Nation.

In light of the recent threats of Khrushchev and the historically strategic importance of Alaska as one of the Nation's firstlines of defense, we can only add that to strip Alaska of half of its fighter-interceptors, without replacing them with missiles, and our virtual announcement to Russia that we're writing Alaska off, strategically speaking, makes no sense at all. The decision should be reversed by the President and Defense Department.

Prices Charged by Hospitals for Drugs Administered to Patients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since medical plans for the aged have been advanced, many problems have come to light. A study made 2 years ago revealed that 40 percent of our retired people have some form of health insurance. Even this is often inadequate, and it is expensive in view of the limited resources of the greater majority of our senior citizens. In the meantime, medical costs continue to rise.

I return to my district every weekend and meet with many constituents, some of whom have had the misfortune of illnesses that have run into exorbitant costs.

In recent months public attention has been glaringly focused upon the high drug prices in our country, and emphasis has been properly placed on the wide disparity between the manufacturing cost of certain drugs and their retail selling price. I have followed the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is chairman, and I have noted one aspect of this problem which has not yet been explored. This is the price charged by hospitals for drugs administered to patients. Since the patient in a hospital is a captive customer with respect to the drugs that are administered to him, I feel that this should also be an area for investigation by the subcommittee.

In reviewing the many complaints that I have received from constituents, I find that many of the statements rendered by hospitals, for the drugs administered to the patient, are not itemized. Also, in every case, it was felt that the charge for drugs was excessive.

I shall include a copy of a bill which one of my constituents received from a hospital, covering 1 week's expenses last October for one of his relatives. I was astounded when I saw the charge for drugs—$676.25. This was over half the cost of the entire hospital bill:

The following is a duplicate of this bill:

Board and room (7 days, at $21.50)	$150.50
Cardiogram	15.00
X-ray	20.00
Oxygen	78.00
Glucose	11.00
Laboratory examinations	207.00
Surgical dressings	9.08
Special medicines	676.25
Total	1,166.83

Under "Special medicines," or drugs, we find the following items:

Aqueous penicillin (190,000,000 units)	$380.00
Molar NA Lactate I.V.	21.00
Chymar	5.00
Cediland I.V.	4.00
Hydrocortisone	24.00
Solu Cortel	15.00
Vitamin B_{12}	10.00
Digalon	2.00
Streptomycin	8.00
Saline	.75
ASA suppositories	7.50
Chloromycitin	102.00
Levaphed	3.00
Sulfadiazene	12.00
Glucose	75.00
Rontine	7.00
Total	676.25

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will delve into this aspect of drug prices since it is evident that a great quantity of drugs is dispensed through the medium of our hospitals. In view of the lack of competition in this area, corrective legislation may be necessary as determined by the facts after careful exploration by this subcommittee.

New York State's Six-Pronged Public Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want today to invite attention to an

excellent speech by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller at the opening session of the 56th Annual New York State Public Health Conference at Manhattan Center. In this address, Governor Rockefeller summarizes the various New York public health programs to conquer man's most feared diseases and to provide for the health needs of the people of our State.

I do not intend today to devote attention individually to the six major prongs of New York's overall public health program. However, I certainly hope that the Members will read this very valuable address, for I am greatly impressed by the work it describes.

Mr. President, the coordination and intensification of New York's annual health research efforts, a goal which underlies the program outlined by the Governor, will not benefit New York alone. New York's research efforts will, I am certain, contribute significantly to the great battle against disease which is being waged by all of our Nation's 50 States and, in fact, by all of the major countries of the world.

I commend Governor Rockefeller and the officials of the New York State Health Department for the intensive and very worthwhile research and therapeutic work which they are doing. I know that their efforts will prove to be of great and far-reaching importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the above referred to speech by Governor Rockefeller be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, May 24.—Governor Rockefeller today reported substantial progress on six fronts in the quest for better health in New York State including "a promising clue" in the search for the causes of cancer.

The Governor addressed public health workers from New York and neighboring States at the opening general session this morning of the 56th annual New York State Public Health Conference at Manhattan Center.

Major steps reported in the Governor's talk were:

1. Mobilization of resources to attack the problem of chronic diseases including research to learn the early warning signs of heart disease.

2. A three-front assault on the problems of mental disability embracing early detection, more rapid treatment, postinstitutional care, modernized admission procedures, and broadening research including the fields of mental retardation and narcotics addiction.

3. A statewide effort to achieve a more effective deployment and use of all medical resources.

4. Development of research plans for a rehabilitation field laboratory with the goal of reaching and helping every disabled person in the State "who can be restored to employment or made more self-sufficient."

5. Providing aid in the search for equitable solutions to the pressing economic problem of payment for medical care.

6. Developing a vigorous network of environmental health services, emphasizing in particular the abatement of air and water polution and protection against the hazards of ionizing radiation.

Following are excerpts from the Governor's remarks:

"We who are present at this 56th annual health conference share a common mission—better health for the people of the Empire State.

"We are here to assess what we have done and to find out what we must do next. This will demand of us that we think in hard and disciplined terms about the kind of health services our people need, not just today, but next year and in the next decade. Any other caliber of health planning is not planning at all. It is chaos.

"There can be no real doubt about what our problems are. Chronic illnesses—chiefly, heart diseases, cancer and the acute and chronic phases of mental illness are the overwhelming health menaces of our time. All of them strike, and strike viciously, at people in their most productive years of life, as well as our growing proportion of persons over 65 years of age. They leave in their wake financial disaster, ruined hopes, and personal tragedy.

"We have been called upon, you and I and others, to think through the answers to these problems. Inevitably, we must determine which among the multitude of possible approaches are the true, the significant, the effective. This is the question to which we have addressed ourselves this past year—the executive staffs of the departments of health, mental hygiene, education, and social welfare, the planning offices of the budget division, my executive staff, committees of the legislature, citizen groups and myself.

"Today I would like to report to you some results of our joint effort. In sum, I consider them to be a well-constructed framwork for effective, long-range action to improve the physical health and mental well-being of our people. I shall discuss this program in six major phases.

I

"First, the State health department has mobilized its resources to help physicians, hospitals, and private agencies to meet the medical needs of the chronically ill.

"A new division of chronic disease services has been established in the department—and tuberculosis, an old and familiar enemy, will be among the ailments attacked with the resources of this division, because it has many characteristics of a chonic disease.

"But the two priority targets are heart disease and cancer, the big killers and disablers. Our cardiovascular health center in Albany is periodically examining 1,700 male employees of the State in a continuing effort to learn the early warning signs of coronary heart disease. Eventually, we hope through this research to be able to conduct mass screening examinations in communities, find persons with the early signs of heart disease, and refer them to their physicians. The objective would be to prevent or ameliorate the all too familiar and frequently sudden tragedies of heart attacks.

"Intensive research into the causes and treatment of cancer is being pursued at our world renowned cancer research center in Buffalo, the Roswell Park Memorial Institute. Not long ago, one of our brilliant young investigators there was able to produce malignant growths in mice with an implant of virus-like material from human tumors. This is a promising clue in the colossal search for the causes of cancer. The conviction is also growing that cancer will one day become a controllable disease if ways can be found to detect it sooner in all its forms and to treat it more effectively. Every conceivable combination of diagnostic technique and of drugs, radiation, and surgery is being developed and tried to insure the fulfillment of that goal.

II

"Second, we are attacking mental disability on three fronts—in the community, in State institutions, and in research laboratories.

"The majority of the population of the State is participating in community mental health programs. These community programs have been patterned after the county boards of health which have proved so effective in the control of communicable diseases. Both programs receive State aid on a fund-matching basis. The community services established by these boards have been doing outstanding work in the early detection of mental disability, and in helping those discharged from State hospitals to maintain the gains they have achieved.

"About one-third of our entire State purposes budget goes for the care of some 113,000 people in New York State mental hospitals—and it is estimated that at least twice that number in the State outside of institutions have some mental or emotional disorder. The department of mental hygiene, which concerned itself in the past with the institutional care of the mentally sick and retarded, is now concerned more and more with the community aspects of mental illness. While the problem is therefore of major dimensions, so is the approach to its solution.

"Our department of mental hygiene began conducting large-scale experimentation with new tranquilizing drugs in 1954. The results were so encouraging that full-scale use of the drugs began in our State institutions in 1955, about a year before they went into general use throughout the country. The department of mental hygiene has followed this up with other pioneering advances including intensive treatment of newly admitted patients. Our new therapeutic approach involves all types of hospital personnel in the treatment process. As a result, the stay of patients in New York mental hospitals has been dramatically shortened. The net population of the State's mental hospitals has also been reduced even though there is a marked increase in patients admitted. Most important of all, thousands of human beings have been given an opportunity to live happy and constructive lives.

"We have also modernized our admission procedures, recognizing mental illness for what it is—a medical problem, not a legal one. Only last month, I signed into law a bill to permit admission of patients to mental hospitals on certification of two physicians, one a psychiatrist, rather than through a court order. This enables prompter treatment—while the protection of subsequent court review of such admissions is provided.

"Our ability to pull ahead in the battle against mental illness will depend upon a sound and well-integrated program of psychiatric research. We have taken steps to ensure that with the creation of a mental health research council. This council will help to focus the overall research aims of the department of mental hygiene, stimulate the exchange of scientists engaged in various research areas, and seek ways to ensure the widest possible use of the knowledge gained by investigations.

"Further, we are preparing to establish a permanent research institute on mental retardation. The preparations take a little time because I would like to have here a first-class institution exclusively devoted to this purpose. I was shocked when I learned that about 3 of every 100 newborn children are mentally retarded. A substantial part of the increase in our mental health budget this year has been allocated to schools for the retarded.

"Additional funds have also been made available for research in narcotics addiction. I am also approving the future organization of clinical facilities in one or two of the State institutions. Joint plans have been

worked out with New York City to utilize some of the great medical centers in the metropolitan area for studying narcotics addiction among adolescents.

"All these efforts represent only a beginning, but they are a sound beginning because they are geared for the long haul. The real breakthrough against mental illness lies ahead of us, but when it comes we will all know we had a hand in hastening the day.

III

"Third, we are marshaling a statewide effort to achieve a more effective deployment and use of all our medical resources.

"An adequate network of hospitals and other medical care facilities is indispensable to the health of our people. With this in mind, I asked a special cabinet committee to study this area, and the committee's subsequent report showed a clear need for a systematic region-by-region organization, centrally directed, to plan the orderly development of medical care facilities in the State. The existing regional hospital councils have done an excellent job of advising us on the Hill-Burton program, which as you know is limited to hospital planning and construction. During the past year, however, a larger need has become apparent to me.

"I therefore took two steps recently to enlarge the scope of State activities in this area: obtaining legislative approval to transfer the existing joint hospital survey and planning commission to the State health department, and creation of State and regional hospital review and planning councils with broader functions.

"This new council will consist of 25 members representing public health, private medicine, hospital groups, industry, labor, medical educational institutions, and private citizens. With the help of regional councils, this new group will gather facts and make recommendations on the construction, services, usage, and suitability of hospitals, nursing homes, and related facilities.

IV

"Fourth, we are developing research plans for a rehabilitation field laboratory.

"This will have two goals: To see how well the needs of the disabled are actually met in a community, and to develop methods for bringing rehabilitation to more people earlier in the course of their illness.

"Early rehabilitation care achieves the most effective results There are now an estimated 200,000 disabled persons in this State. Large numbers are being added to this total each year. Our goal is to reach and help every person who can be restored to employment or made more self-sufficient. We can do no less.

V

"Fifth, we are providing aid in the search for equitable solutions to the pressing economic problem of payment for medical care.

"One of the functions of the new State hospital review and planning council which I mentioned a moment ago will be to study and recommend standards for prepayment health insurance plans as deemed necessary for the public health. And during the recent session of the legislature, an administration bill was passed to require conversion of group health insurance policies to individual policies at fair rates upon retirement—an important advance toward assuring adequate medical care for the elderly.

VI

"Sixth, we are developing a vigorous network of environmental health services, emphasizing in particular the abatement of air and water pollution and protection against the hazards of ionizing radiation.

"The air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat and our physical surroundings are becoming more contaminated as our technology advances and our population increases in metropolitan areas. Our people are also being exposed to greater amounts of ionizing radiation. Our year-long study of health needs made us realize that environmental health services have assumed more importance than ever in public health. Accordingly, the reorganization of the State Health Department provides for the establishment of a new division, the Division of Environmental Health Services. This division will be concerned with air pollution, radiological health, water resources and general sanitary engineering services.

"In air pollution control work, we have allocated funds for the department of labor to intensify its investigations of potentially harmful pollutants resulting from new industrial and commercial processes. Meanwhile, the air pollution control board attached to the State health department has divided the State into nine areas for study purposes. Air pollution exists in each. An intensive inventory of air pollution has already been made in the Elmira area, and another is under way in the Niagara frontier area. We have set up a radiological surveillance network to monitor the amounts of radioactive elements that get into air, water, milk, and food. Were we to permit any serious breach in our monitoring, we would be abdicating our clear responsibility to generations of children yet unborn in our State. I have, therefore, specifically earmarked funds for improving our monitoring network and for the development of new methods of detecting ionizing radiation in our surroundings.

"This is where we stand in our approaches to better health. We have accomplished much, but much more remains to be done. Let us not be deluded that these will be the only problems facing us in the years ahead.

"Others are already taking shape:

"While our hospitals have alleviated their shortage of beds, many metropolitan hospitals face expensive modernization problems. Most hospitals still refuse admission to persons suffering from alcoholism, an affliction affecting hundreds of thousands of New York citizens;

"While we have recognized the plight of our chronically ill aged, we have yet to overcome the serious deficiency that still exists in the provision of high quality nursing home care;

"While our researchers uncover new knowledge about the causes and treatment of diseases, a significant gap still exists between such knowledge and its widest use;

"While we have begun a systematic statewide effort to help hospitals achieve good care at economic cost, expensive new methods for the diagnosis and treatment of diseases continue to create steady upward pressure upon medical care costs.

"All these gathering forces make it clearer than ever that preventive medicine—the great deterrent—is our best hope of keeping ahead of the chronic diseases and disabilities. This makes it vital that we continue to press every development that gives promise of preventing and forestalling disease, achieving early detection and employing prompt, effective restoration of the afflicted.

"We must, in short, find ways of controlling our environment and the chronic illnesses in it before our environment and chronic illness control us. To this we dedicate our energies, our skills, our imaginations and our best combined efforts in the years ahead."

A Great Newspaperman Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, one of Chicago's really great journalists, George Wright, is going to begin a well-earned rest by retiring from the staff of the Chicago Tribune.

I have asked for permission today to pay my personal tribute to Mr. Wright, whom I have known for many years as a journalist and with whom I worked very closely while covering the criminal courts building in Chicago.

As Sunday's Tribune appropriately pointed out, George Wright is one of the last of the fabled greats of Chicago's "front page" reporters' era. I know few men in the journalism profession who have earned the unanimous respect of all of those with whom they came in contact to the extent that George Wright has won this respect. His career as a newspaperman has been an inspiration to all of his colleagues. The unequivocal respect that he has enjoyed during his entire 51 years of active service as a journalist can be a criterion to which every American journalist should aspire.

George Wright earned this respect from people in all walks of life because he never violated a confidence, never treated his assignment unfairly, never engaged in reckless and unfounded criticism; but instead, through the diligent pursuit of facts, presented to his readers a fair and detailed analysis of the story he was reporting.

While not a lawyer himself, but because of his penetrating understanding of the law, some of Chicago's most famous judges and attorneys—both those serving in the capacity of defense counsel and those serving as prosecutor—frequently sought George Wright's advice.

In retiring as the dean of the press corps in Chicago's criminal courts, George Wright can today look back confident in the knowledge that he has indeed made an indelible impression on raising the standards of our judicial process in Cook County.

I am particularly gratified to be able to add my own personal tribute to Mr. Wright for his impressive contribution to American journalism, not only as his former colleague, but also, today, as his Congressman. I am proud of the fact that I can list Mr. Wright as a constituent of the 11th Congressional District on Chicago's Northwest Side.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include in today's RECORD the story about Mr. Wright's retirement which appeared in Sunday's Chicago Tribune. I hope that the young men and women entering the journalism profession will read the story of George Wright and find in his stellar contribution a course of inspiration for their own conduct in this field. I doubt that today's journalists could find a greater reporter to emulate.

The Chicago Tribune article follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune, May 29, 1960]

GEORGE WRIGHT, A NEWSPAPER GREAT, RETIRES; SCORED SCOOPS BY THE DOZENS—CRIMINAL COURTS BEAT SEWED UP IN HIS POCKET

(By Wayne Thomis)

The Tribune's George Wright—one of the last of the fabled greats of Chicago's "Front Page" reporters' era—is retiring. On Monday he leaves the Criminal courts beat which has been his in a very special way

for more than 40 years. Formal retirement comes July 1.

There will be no replacing of George Wright for Tribune readers and, above all, for his colleagues in the Tribune's city room.

It must be said, in all deference to judges, prosecutors, investigators, and other employees in the court system at 26th Street and California Avenue, that Wright "had his beat in his pocket."

A HISTORY OF SCOOPS

Over the years he produced more complete scoops than any reporter in Tribune history—and his editors believe more than any active newspaperman. A scoop means delivery of a fully covered news account that the opposition misses entirely.

George Wright repeatedly got full, complete, accurate, colorful stories of crimes, confessions, grand jury actions, and grand jury testimony when other reporters drew blanks.

George Wright's special talents and abilities gave readers the only verbatim report of the Loeb-Leopold confessions in the 1924 murder of Bobby Franks. Police and State's attorney's agents had kept the story bottled up until Wright printed it all one morning in late August 1924.

During the trial of the murderers he helped the court stenographer decipher the confessions which had been taken in shorthand. His transcript was more readable than the stenographer's.

SCORES SCOOP ON HEIRENS

Probably his most remarkable scoop was printed August 2, 1946 in some 24 columns of questions and answers. This was the confession of William George Heirens, a sexual psychopath, in the murder of 6-year-old Suzanne Degnan, the slaying of two adult women, and a long series of assaults and burglaries.

The Tribune ran it all, with related stories. No other newspaper or wire service had either a confirmation or denial from the Cook County authorities for the next 3 weeks. Such was the universal respect for Wright's accuracy and the Tribune's integrity that Wright's report was picked up and repeated nationally.

"One of the things I was proudest of—and did more work on—was when Col. Robert R. McCormick, then Tribune editor and publisher, ordered me to clean up the criminal courts docket which was jammed with thousands of untried cases," Wright said.

This happened after a prisoner on trial for murder got a pistol and shot his way out of Criminal Court Judge Charles E. Molthrop's courtroom on July 25, 1933. The prisoner, John Scheck, 20, killed Policeman John Sevick and was wounded critically. Scheck later was electrocuted.

TOLD TO CLEAR DOCKET

"We found that the cause of the whole thing was that Scheck—and hundreds of others—were being held for months and months without trial," Wright recalled. "That's what got Scheck riled. Afterward the colonel felt it was a scandal and told me: 'Go out there and clean up that docket.'

"I told him I wasn't sure it could be done. He said: 'With the Tribune behind you and the campaign basically right anything can be done.' We did it."

Wright went to see the late John Prystalski, then chief justice of the criminal courts, and outlined the problem.

"The judge told me, 'All right my friend—you are the chief justice. Tell me what you want to do. If it is reasonable and practical we'll do it,'" Wright said.

DOCKET REDUCED

Fourteen judges were called to the criminal courts, and made it a policy to force a reluctant State's attorney's staff to trials. They took the "worst cases first", Wright recalls, and finally reduced the docket.

"By the end of the year there were fewer than 100 cases left untried," Wright remembers. "There had been at least 2,700 untried the year before."

Wright chuckles in recollection over the hours he worked. A normal day was 15, he says. Colonel McCormick and the late Edward S. Beck, Tribune managing editor, granted him almost unlimited space, and he wrote column after column, covering every case that came to trial. Finally, all the judges were vying to do "good efficient court work and to require the State's attorney's people to do the same."

Thomas E. Courtney was State's attorney. He is now a circuit court judge.

HE GETS THE NEWS

All grand jury testimony is secret, as are deliberations and actions other than those which result in true bills. This did not prevent Wright from getting his stories for the Tribune, and it has long been a mystery how he obtained them. This is how:

"I got the Loeb-Leopold confession and all the grand jury stories by agility and the use of a doctor's stethoscope," said Wright. "It started because another newspaper was being favored by a chief justice in the old criminal courts building on Dearborn Street at what is now the Chicago board of health headquarters at 54 West Hubbard Street.

"One day I was throwing my keys in the press room. They hit the ceiling and there was a hollow sound. I thought 'Maybe that ceiling is false. Maybe I could get in there.'

"The building maintenance chief said: 'Sure, George, there is a 5-foot opening above every ceiling in the building. It's like an attic. You can get into it at any floor through the airshaft."

CRAWLS ACROSS PLANK

Wright said: "I couldn't do it now—but every day for years I crawled a 20-foot plank across the buildings' airshaft with six or seven stories below. At first I was scared stiff but later got accustomed to this balancing act.

"I sat right over the grand jury room. The ceiling was plaster and I was afraid I'd fall or step through. So I got some planks and laid them out to sit on. Of course when the jurors were there or somebody was testifying I had to be quiet for hours.

"Later I drilled a very small hole in the ceiling and put a doctor's stethoscope over it to amplify what was said. I was getting stuff in the paper about the grand juries that even the chief justices weren't able to get. I drove them wild. At least one of them wanted to do something to me because of the stories, but they never learned how I got them.

"All this changed when the existing criminal courts building was erected and we moved," Wright said. "We had to get our information from people involved in these cases, or from someone close to them."

WENT TO WORK AT 15

Wright was born March 9, 1894, on Chicago's northwest side. He got his first job at the old City News bureau at Clark and Randolph Streets when he was 15. He came to the Tribune in 1925.

He only attended the college of hard knocks. Nobody ever told him about "reporting in depth" or the need for "color" in his stories. He knew these things instinctively. He learned to write at the City News bureau where he started as copy boy, became switchboard operator and obituary writer, night rewriter, and criminal courts reporter.

When he has hired at the Tribune by the late Robert M. Lee, city editor, he turned down offers from the American and the Herald-Examiner.

GAINED AN INSIGHT

Wright's knowledge of judges, lawyers, politicians, bondsmen, policemen, hangers-on, and others in the criminal courts has given him unequaled insight into law enforcement and politics.

"Strange as it may seem, judges in the criminal courts are subject to very little political or other pressure," he said.

"Even when the alcohol mobs were running wide open, there was little effort made to fix cases through the judges. Once in a while a judge may be asked by his precinct captain to do something for a prisoner. But even if a judge wants to give somebody a break he's watched constantly by the press and by the crime commission.

"As for the crime syndicate—there's little of its affairs in the criminal courts. When the syndicate murders someone the law doesn't get any of the killers to prosecute."

A VIGOROUS THINKER

At 66, Wright is vigorous and trenchant in his speech and thought.

"I wouldn't think of moving from Chicago," he said, "I have some projects to carry out around my house at 6907 Owen Avenue. Then Therese—my wife—and I will do some traveling.

"I don't mind a little inclement weather either," he said. "If it's really bad, we'll stay indoors. Our interests are right here with our daughter, Mrs. Mary Barrett, who lives in Morton Grove, and the seven grandchildren."

Relations With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we read and hear a great deal these days about the need to improve our relations with our neighbors below the border.

Neville G. Penrose, well-known businessman of Fort Worth, who is a former chairman of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission's outstanding pan-American student forum, has had a unique role in helping promote better understanding among Texans and the people of Mexico. He lived for years in Mexico, and knows well and loves the Mexican people. I commend Mr. Penrose for his interest, and share with him his desire to expand and strengthen our good-neighbor policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent speech by Mr. Penrose to Rotary International at Midland, Tex., in which he told of this important phase of the good-neighbor program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEVILLE G. PENROSE TO ROTARY INTERNATIONAL, MIDLAND, TEX., MARCH 10, 1960

I like Mexico—I like Mexicans, they can help us—we can help them. In fact, an entire new climate of understanding is unfolding in these parts. I am glad to say that the Mexicans like Texans more than they ever have in the past and as time goes on our friendship will be strengthened. Why?

Because for 15 or 20 years now Texans, particularly young people, have been taught Mexican history, culture, folklore, traditions, and above all the Spanish language. Many vehicles have been used in this project, but the most important and successful is the Pan American Student Forum, sponsored for many years by the Texas Good Neighbor Commission. Its membership consists of high school students, thousands of them all over Texas. The Pan American Student Forum holds its annual meeting in Austin March 18 and 19 and at least 1,000 delegates will attend. In a few short years these youngsters will be out of school and in time they will be running our State. When they visit Mexico they will know Mexico and they will be able to converse. In the neighborhood of two and a quarter million Texans speak Spanish. I point out again—this program has been in existence for years and its effect is being felt. Mexican youth, particularly in the larger cities of Mexico, are rapidly mastering the English language. In time the language barrier for us will largely disappear and we will be drawn more closely together, economically and socially.

Although Texas is a favorite target for critics, the cold facts are—no other State can compare with what we have done in curing a grievous racial problem. Two centuries ago this area was settled by Mexicans, Catholics, mostly sheep and goat raisers, proud, opposed to slavery with little knowledge or desire for local government. They were peaceful, contented and nonaggressive. Gradually settlers arrived from Tennessee, Kentucky, and Arkansas. A robust self-assertive people, they brought their cattle and slaves, had little time for sheepmen or Catholics and espoused States rights and local rule—add to this the language difficulties and you have a potent mixture of discord and dissension.

Then followed the Texas revolt—the Texas Republic—statehood—the Mexican War—the Civil War—border clashes—the abuse and slaughter of ex-Confederate soldiers who migrated to Mexico—the abuse and killing of Mexicans in Texas, which was so common our Governor was warned by Washington—Pancho Villa—Veracruz—the Pershing Expedition—and the opening of our border to hundreds of thousands of helpless Mexican refugees during the years of the bloody revolution in Mexico—our roundup which dumped thousands of them destitute back across the border during the depression. The seizure by Mexico of railroads—oil fields—ranches, farms and other properties owned by American citizens helped create a most unhealthy atmosphere, and no one recognized and used it to a greater advantage than Adolph Hitler, the master of propaganda, who seized the story, blew it up, distorted and colored it and spread it far and wide in all the Spanish speaking countries of the world.

World War II. Nelson Rockefeller was named director of Inter-American Affairs. Consecrated, tireless, he most ably filled a very hard job—almost immediately he was deluged with alarming reports from all over Latin America that Mexicans were abused in Texas. Mexicans could not be served in Texas restaurants—Mexican children were segregated in schools—Mexicans, even of high rank, were insulted—Mexican laborers were discriminated against—paid starvation wages—worked under terrible conditions. Hitler's agents had indeed done a good job and to add fuel to the fire Mexico placed a ban on the movement of agricultural workers to Texas. Rockefeller was on a spot—we needed agricultural workers desperately—we needed a great deal of raw material from Latin America—we needed most of all their friendship and cooperation. On the other hand Texas was a sovereign State and a rather impulsive one at that. For over a century Texas had been feuding with Mexico and had a great deal to say about depredations, raids, killings, and insults inflicted on its citizens by Mexicans. So, the present New York Governor, showing great leadership, arranged for a money grant to the University of Texas for the purpose of studying these accusations and making recommendations. Out of all this, in time, came what is now known as the Texas Good Neighbor Commission.

With the finest and constant help and cooperation from Mexico and Washington and an awakening of the Texas people to the responsibility of sharing 1,000 miles of border with another nation—we have been able in 20 years to eradicate, if not completely, at least to a large extent, hate, contempt, malice, suspicion and enmity which had been fermenting for nearly 2 centuries. Unfortunately no Hitler has spread this story all over Latin America, or for that matter, Mexico or the United States—what a pity, this is a great story.

"Texans," said Ambassador Antonio Carillo Flores in Lubbock recently, "are our best friends." Raymond Moley in Newsweek said, "Texas has shown the Nation a most sane and workable plan for improving race relations." Henry F. Holland, ex-Assistant Secretary of State, said "The commission has always had the support of the Department of State and Texas is to be congratulated on its valuable work."

Much remains to be done by the citizens of both countries, as individuals and groups. The most important neglected project—the most vital and lasting remains for educators, scholars and historians of both countries to agree on and write a history to be used by the children of both nations. If educated experienced adults cannot do this how can we expect succeeding generations to be free of suspicion and resentment?

As time passed—towns and cities all over the State formed their local good neighbor committees, solving their problems in their own way. Later on the International Good Neighbor Conference was born and is very successful. Its next meeting will be in Corpus Christi in April. The International was organized with a membership of Texas and its four sister states, Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, Coahuila and Chihuahua and was called the Five State Conference. Almost immediately other Mexican States asked to join and it has become a very effective, well organized body.

Ten years ago the Good Neighbor Foundation, a nonprofit corporation, was formed to supplement the funds appropriated by the State, thereby, making many projects feasible which would have been impossible without its patriotic individuals and corporations contributing to the foundation, which hopes to become large enough and strong enough to perpetuate some of the worthwhile projects developed through the years by the Texas Good Neighbor Commission.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Report on the Communist Economic Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, events of every day tell us in boldface type how imperative it is to our survival to understand communism, and to keep well informed on its activities.

Recently, the international relations department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States conducted its fourth oversea survey on problems facing American foreign policy.

This important survey sought to find some answers to the question "How significant to American interests is the Sino-Soviet trade and aid offensive?"

This facet of Communist activities could easily be overlooked by the more spectacular. As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce points out, however, the force and momentum of the communistic economic offensive represents a potentially grave threat to the United States and the entire free world.

I respectfully suggest that each of us should read and understand the impact of this whole report. I quote now parts of the survey to indicate the manner in which it was conducted, its scope, and general conclusions:

A questionnaire was sent directly to American business firms with foreign operations as well as to various American chambers of commerce in foreign countries. (American chambers of commerce abroad, some of which have been in operation since the early part of the century, are voluntary associations of American enterprises doing business in a given country and firms of that country interested in doing business in the United States.)

The questionnaire was designed to obtain the views of American businessmen on: (a) the nature of the Communist economic challenge overseas, and (b) the role of private American companies in helping to advance U.S. foreign policy interests while doing business abroad. This was an independent survey made by the national chamber on behalf of the entire American business community.

Response to the chamber's questionnaire was excellent. Five hundred forty-four replies were received from 77 countries and territories—in Europe, the Far East, Latin America, the Near East, south Asia, and Africa.

The questionnaire covered a wide range of specific points: How much Communist economic activity is going on? What methods does the Communist bloc use to develop trade? Do Communist trade and aid serve primarily political or economic objectives? To what extent has the Communist economic drive strengthened the influence of the Sino-Soviet bloc and undermined the position of the West? How great a danger does the offensive pose to the United States and the free world in general? What effect has Communist competition had on American business operations abroad? Is this competition growing or becoming less intense? In what ways can such competition be countered? What can American business firms abroad do to offset Communist penetration and to demonstrate the advantages and strengths of free enterprise?

The Americans who filled out the questionnaire were requested to express their views only on subjects they felt competent to report on and to skip those on which they considered themselves no better informed than if they were residing in the United States.

Four major points are emphasized in the findings:

1. The Communist economic offensive is worldwide in scope, but modest in size, though the intensity of Communist activity varies widely according to local and international conditions.

2. The offensive has had a relatively small direct impact on American business thus far, but Communist economic competition, com-

bined with political and ideological penetration, is increasing.

3. The Communist economic-political drive abroad is a growing and potentially serious threat to free-world commercial and political interests.

4. American business can help offset the threat by contributing to free-world economic progress and security through intelligent participation in the opportunities of trade and private foreign investment.

A survey of this nature does not lend itself to definitive conclusions. Its value lies primarily in reflecting some of the attitudes and opinions of American businessmen abroad, in casting some light on the character of Communist foreign economic programs, and in outlining the relationship between business and national interests in the international arena.

A number of broad impressions emerge from the survey.

For the present, the Communist bloc's trade and aid effort does not seem very large when compared to the total world movements of goods and money.

In many cases, however, Communist countries are in a position to stretch their resources far beyond their significance in world commerce.

If it so wishes, the Soviet Union, through its centralization of foreign trade, can disregard traditional trade patterns and practices to break a particular market price structure without advance notice.

Sino-Soviet foreign economic programs also tend to be highly selective in terms of target areas, frequenly concentrating on projects which lend themselves to symbolic or psychological exploitation.

The Communists, moreover, do not need large amounts of economic resources to exploit indigenous and revolutionary forces in the less developed world.

While economic motives may not play an unimportant role in Soviet aid and trade decisions, in many countries Soviet economic and political interests coincide. This harmony of interests adds flexibility to Soviet policies abroad and potency to the Communist drive for power.

In many parts of the world, therefore, Communist economic penetration cannot be divorced from political, cultural, and other activities.

The Communist offensive—economic and political—is slowly acquiring force and momentum and represents a potentially grave threat to the United States and the entire free world.

Communist competition with American business overseas is likely to grow. This competition is not restricted to economic fields. It includes a contest in ideological, political, and social spheres which is placing new demands on the American businessman operating abroad.

There are significant areas where American private and national interests overseas can be and often are mutually reinforcing.

Through an enlightened and imaginative pursuit of its own interests, American business can help buttress U.S. foreign policy interests by participating in a process of economic progress and constructive change throughout the world.

Through increased trade and through the enlistment of private managerial and technical talents in the development of less-developed countries, American business can help develop with other nations common interests and cooperative relationships based on mutual objectives.

While some countries may prevent various obstacles to profitable business ventures, American business can help improve the investment climate abroad by improving its own performance, by finding better and more creative uses of the resources already employed, and by improving the quality and sophistication of oversea management policies and practices.

A final conclusion emerging most impressively from the survey is that American corporate management engaged in oversea operations is highly conscious of its responsibility to both the stockholder and the Nation.

We, Americans, must never forget that the Communist challenge has been hurled at us in the field of every endeavor and that one of the most important is business and economics. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in making this survey and disseminating its findings has performed an invaluable public service.

Additional Support for National Voters' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the 1960's opens an era of great promise and challenge for a free country.

We, as a nation, however, face the task of stimulating greater citizen participation in government—particularly in voting—if our Government and our way of life is to benefit from majority support of the people.

As we recognize, the lifeblood of a Republic is its people—well informed, creative, forward-thinking citizens.

Tragically, barely one-half of the people in our country participate in political life, or vote at election time. The big question then is, What can we do about the situation?

Recently, I introduced a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 186, to designate a National Voters' Day. The purpose would be to coordinate a nationwide effort by Governors, mayors, industry, labor, fraternal, professional, women's and other civically oriented groups, to educate our people on the need for greater participation in our political life.

The designation of a special day, of course, would not magically do the job; however, I believe it would, in a modest way, help to coordinate efforts toward such objectives.

Recently, my colleagues will recall, I reviewed support for the idea of a National Voters' Day, by a great many Governors across the Nation. In addition, the idea has received enthusiastic endorsement from mayors and city managers, as well as such outstanding organizations as: Lions International; the Council of State Chambers of Commerce; Business and Professional Women's Clubs; the League of Women Voters; the American Council on Education; the American Legion; the American Association of University Women; the American Political Science Association, and other organizations.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following: First, an additional series of letters from Governors, mayors, and national and local organizations; and second, an article from the Milwaukee Journal reflecting upon the great power and responsibility endowed upon citizens by the right to vote.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, May 12, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for advising me of your efforts in stimulating a greater voter turnout. This is most commendable and I shall be delighted to supplement your efforts in any way you see fit.

I believe that as far as our local effort is concerned we will have a good measuring stick on May 20 when our primary will be conducted.

I trust that you will give me the benefit of your experience. If you have experiences along the way that would be helpful to giving support to the movement here in Oregon we will appreciate them greatly.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

MARK.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., May 3, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thanks for your good letter concerning National Voters' Day.

Your suggestion has considerable merit and I will be glad to cooperate in every way.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

PRICE.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, May 11, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter concerning the stimulation of greater voter participation in local, State and national elections.

I am very interested in your plan and I want to point out that we have in the past issued proclamations of a similar nature.

If I can be of service by following through again this year, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 18, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your efforts to stimulate greater voter participation are highly commendable.

It seems to me that the principal merit of a "National Voters' Day" results from the fact that it would serve to coordinate and emphasize the numerous efforts of community groups and organizations which are currently employed. I have long believed that the efforts of these groups would meet with greater success, if they were better coordinated. Good luck with your resolution.

With best regards.

Very sincerely,

CECIL H. UNDERWOOD,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, April 25, 1960.

Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of April 20 with reference to promoting interest in all citizens to exercise their right to vote on election day. I want to assure you that I will be more than happy to cooperate in any way to stimulate interest in the citizens of New Hampshire to exercise their privilege of casting their ballot election day.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
WESLEY POWELL, *Governor.*

CITY OF EAU CLAIRE,
Wisconsin, April 27, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I would like to extend to you my congratulations for the very fine proposal that a National Voters' Day be observed in November each year. The concern which you express over low voting turnouts is a problem which should worry all of us. Please be assured that the government of the city of Eau Claire will cooperate fully in any attempt to focus public attention and interest in exercising the right to vote.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
D. G. WEIFORD,
City Manager.

CITY OF SHEBOYGAN,
Sheboygan, Wis., April 29,1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with approval your suggestion for a National Voters Day in attempt to stimulate voting activity on the local, State and national level. You can count on this office to cooperate in any way possible to further the development of a good voter's participation in the November election.

Very truly yours,
JOHN BOLGERT,
Mayor.

CITY OF LANSING,
Lansing, Mich., May 4, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of April 25 relative to the need for increased public participation in exercising our right of franchise by voting for persons for public office.

Without doubt, a National Voters' Day would be beneficial as it would tend to focus public attention to the responsibility that all people have toward fostering the privilege that free people have.

Some months ago I noticed the following comment in the paper about the ballot:

It is a weapon that comes down as still as snow flakes fall upon the sod. To exercise a free man's will as lightening does the will of God, and from its force no doors or locks can shield you from the ballot box.

This little statement is quite true, so let us hope that those who direct the destiny of our country are chosen by the vast majority of our citizenry.

Yours very truly,
RALPH W. CREGO,
Mayor.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 25, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received your letter of April 23 together with a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD whereby you advocate a National Voters Day.

I think it is a very excellent idea and it certainly should stimulate voting not only in Wisconsin, but in the entire country.

I believe you are to be commended for your part in this proposal.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT G. WILKE,
Department Adjutant.

LIONS INTERNATIONAL,
Manawa, Wis., May 5, 1960.

The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your kind letter of April 23, with regard to your proposed "National Voter's Day."

I am happy to endorse this proposal with the hope that it will cause a better and more intelligent participation by American fellow citizens in their right to vote and actually go out to the polls on votng days.

I am referring this letter of yours together with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the editor of our Wisconsin Lions State magazine, our good friend Past International Director Lion Ray A. Galipeau, of Merrill, for inclusion in the next issue of our magazine. This magazine reaches not only our 10,000 members around the State, but also is mailed to their homes and is read by their families; through this method this communication of yours will reach a very large number of our Wisconsin citizens.

Thanking you again for your continued interest in these and other civic affairs and your many kindnesses and our best wishes.

Yours most truly,
SHAFEEC A. MANSOUR,
State Secretary, Multiple District 27,
Lions International.

COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS
OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of April 29 with respect to your joint resolution to designate a "National Voters' Day."

Yours is certainly a worthwhile effort to stimulate greater voter participation, and at our next council meeting we shall be happy to present your proposal to the constituent member State and regional chambers of commerce for their consideration.

With expressions of my esteem,

Sincerely,
EUGENE F. RINTA,
Executive Director.

THE WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL
WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.,
May 15, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: There is no doubt that democratic government is in danger when rule by the majority passes to rule by a minority because of indifference of the governed. Before voter interest can be awakened the reasons for voter disinterest must be determined and it is our sincere hope that your proposal will be a step in that direction.

The Wisconsin federation is concerned with the problem of voter apathy and if Congress adopts your resolution I am sure that the local clubs will be happy to cooperate in emphasizing the importance of the voting privilege.

Yours sincerely,
DOROTHY H. SAFFORD,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF JANESVILLE,
Janesville, Wis., May 25, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Indeed I am in favor of your proposal to designate a "National Voters' Day" and feel sure that the League of Women Voters of Janesville will wish to cooperate—both in securing favorable action and in making such a day, if designated, a success.

We are just embarking on a new fiscal year and I hope to call a meeting of our new board next week at which time I will bring your worthwhile proposal to the board's attention.

Sincerely yours,
Miss GRACE W. ESTES,
President.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for sending me the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your proposed joint resolution establishing a "National Voters' Day," and of your excellent supporting statement.

Certainly I am in full accord with your concern for greater citizen participation in our national elections. The low percentage of citizens exercising their voting privilege in recent elections is deplorable, and I applaud this concrete evidence of your determination to do something about the problem.

Sincerely,
ARTHUR S. ADAMS.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for sharing with me the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you outline your idea for a "National Voters' Day." If we can encourage a greater percentage of our citizens to exercise their franchise it will certainly be beneficial, and I wish you every success in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,
PAULINE TOMPKINS,
General Director.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL
SCIENCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Many thanks for your recent letter about stimulating greater voter participation in elections. This is a matter of great importance and I am very much in favor of any action that can be taken to increase voter participation. If

there is anything I can do to help at any time, please let me know.

With best wishes.

Cordially,

EVRON M. KIRKPATRICK,
Executive Director.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Apr. 5, 1960]

NOW IT'S VOTER'S TURN: A GREAT POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY

A more apt and telling name for a special day like this would be Voters' Day.

Columbus and Washington and Lincoln have their days. Labor has its and veterans have theirs, and so on. Unlike these, the act being performed on Voters' Day is one not of commemoration but of fulfillment. Each opening of the polls enthrones the voter as king for the day.

For weeks the politicians and the aspirants, from presidential to aldermanic, have held the stage. They have flown and traveled and tramped the airways, highways and byways. They have spoken to and shaken hands with and been seen by everybody they could get near. They have besieged all eyes and ears on radio and television, in billboards and advertising, on baseball schedules and matchcovers.

The prospective voter, benumbed by now, has taken it all patiently and meekly. Now it's his turn. The candidates have retired to the wings and must be silent, and can only cross their fingers and sweat out tonight's tallying. The voter has stepped front and center and is having his say.

He is judging the past weeks' performances and promises and impressions. With his secret X's he is quietly but all powerfully disposing of the hopes and claims and ambitions of all who have appealed to him. He is having the last word, and what he says goes.

So it is deeply meaningful to consider that an election day is in this sense truly voters' day. The power being wielded behind the curtains in the booths today is the ultimate power, the wellspring of all other authority. It is where our form of government begins and must ever return.

And great power is great responsibility.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, a distinguished American—James A. Farley—marked his 72d birthday anniversary. It is a happy circumstance that, with undiminished vigor, he continues his active interest in public affairs and contributes, from time to time, his perceptive comments and counsel on issues confronting his countrymen.

When he does speak out, his observations are recognized as those of a successful, civic-minded businessman who has the additional credentials of long and energetic participation in public life.

It is a privilege to salute him on this occasion and to include, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, an editorial which appeared on May 28, 1960, in the World-Telegram and Sun of New York City:

JIM FARLEY'S 72D

Besides the celebrated blizzard, any chronicle of 1888 should take note of the birth of one of the country's most astute politicians and businessmen. That would be James Aloysius Farley, who will be 72 years old on Monday.

His energy, talents, and commonsense remain undiminished. It's a pleasure to wish Jim Farley happy returns and many more productive years.

Reaffirming America's Concern for the People of the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is of the utmost importance for the American people and their diplomatic representatives to keep before the world our concern for the plight of the peoples now trapped behind the Iron Curtain. In keeping with our Nation's traditions, we must grasp every opportunity to reaffirm our dedication to freedom and self-determination for all people, particularly those who live in the captive nations.

In a recent letter to President Eisenhower, preceding the abortive summit conference, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Committee on Captive Nations Week Observance, urged that this whole issue be explored at the conference of the heads of state. In his letter, Dr. Dobriansky noted that the now-famous U–2 plane was not downed over Russian territory, in the proper sense of the word, but over land that is captive non-Russian. This is an important difference which should be carefully considered by all Americans, particularly our diplomatic spokesmen.

The National Committee on Captive Nations Week Observance includes clergymen, labor leaders, educators, civic officials, and officers of numerous nationalities organizations all over the United States. I am proud to be a member of this group, which is dedicated to promoting the annual observance of the event which was established last year by the congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week. Plans are now well underway for suitable ceremonies during the week of July 17–23.

Mr. President, although the summit conference has since collapsed, the sentiments expressed in the letter of Dr. Dobriansky to the President, to which I have referred, are of undying importance. They deserve wide attention and careful thought by all Americans who are concerned with our deep moral obligations to the noble peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a partial list of original members of the National Committee on Captive Nations Week Observance be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE
NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE.
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of your departure for the summit meeting in Paris, I wish to take this opportunity to express the one central idea which binds the rapidly growing membership of this national committee, namely that in the light of our traditions and our moral leadership among the nontotalitarian nations of the free world it is unthinkable that we should fail to press the fundamental issue of the captive nations—those within as well as those outside the Soviet Union—as a paramount subject of summit discussion. Indeed, the U–2 incident and Moscow's distorting propaganda abuse of it necessitate that at long last we face the reality of all the captive nations, not just the minority of them in Central Europe.

In accord with the written intent of Public Law 86–90 enacted last year, this committee is a natural response to the reasoned convictions and judgments of countless American citizens who properly view the captive nations issue as a subject of cold logic and national strategy, not just one of warm sentiment and humanitarian concern. The surging, nationwide support for Captive Nations Week Observance is impressive evidence that the rank and file of the American people view with abhorrence the slavery status of whole nations, the result of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism. Our American people, thank God, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Red totalitarian tyrants, nor do we regard this as their permanent condition. We thus urge you, Mr. President, to expressly convey at the summit both the spirit and the contents of the Captive Nations resolution which our Congress passed last year.

Developments of the past 3 years, highlighted by sputniks and other basically diversionary Russian performances, cannot but cause us to recall here the apt words of Karl Marx—words which still are unquotable in Khrushchev's supposedly relaxed empire:

"They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

Applied to the current scene, this is doubtlessly a strong statement and, in part, exaggerated. But when one faces the paramount fact that, in this past century, of all the major colonial empires the Russian one was not only able to survive but also, behind the legalistic mask of the U.S.S.R., now even threatens the security of the nontotalitarian world, the aptness of the statement could scarcely be denied. It is most significant that this observation was made during the reign of Czar Nicholas I with whom Khrushchev now openly compares himself, as witness his Budapest address last December. With secrecy and espionage in the air today, we can all profit by reading the illuminating chapter on "The Secret Life of Russia" in Marquis de Custine's classic "Journey for Our Time," a work written in the days of Khrushchev's present model and about whom the author says: "When I gaze upon this personage, unique in the world, from close at hand, I believe his head has two faces, like that of Janus."

The cold war techniques of Khrushchev who has clearly earned the imperial title of Nikita the Surly, are essentially those of Nicholas I, the former and equally arrogant "gendarme of Europe." Nuclear blackmail threats, exercises in Potemkin Village economics, and many other stratagems have their substantial precedents in the history of Russian empire building, written by the blood of both the oppressed Russian and non-Russian peoples. The peace-at-no-price attitude shown by Moscow toward the summit indicates in itself the manner by which it seeks to exploit this given opportunity. Its proganda machine has even gone to the length of attempting to compromise the position of Western Germany by unjust attacks upon Theodore Oberlaender, the refugee minister of our ally, in whose defense scores of witnesses in this country could be supplied. Its propaganda exploitation of the U–2 incident, which may well backfire, is more generally known. In short, Moscow's carefully calculated game of bluff and bluster has reaped for it another summit: its aim now is to exploit it fully.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the irony of the current situation lies in the overall fact that Moscow is able to advance diplomatically and propagandawise though it is really operating from basic weaknesses and multiformed necessity. Our memories are short. All evidence shows that at the time of the Hungarian revolution the Red totalitarian empire was in grave trouble. Surely the passage of 4 years has not erased the inherent weaknesses in the structure of this farflung empire. Plainly, a ruler secure in his empire would certainly not erupt as Khrushchev did upon the passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution last year. Out of necessity and the need for time to consolidate, Moscow is clearly pressing for Western accommodation to its empire under the spurious label of "peaceful coexistence," along with the hope that its calculated propaganda of bluff and bluster may twist any indication of western timidity into real concessions.

Unleashing Marx at Khrushchev, our actions should be completely guided by the historical truth that "There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." Disarmament, nuclear test bans, the misnomered topic of East-West relations, involving trade and cultural exchange, are in reality secondary issues. Khrushchev's overriding objective is Free World assent and acquiescence to his empire. His emphasis upon disarmament and other subsidiary issues is designed to deflect our attention from the basic issue. The omission of this subject in summit discussion will certainly be propagandistically exploited in the empire to mislead the captives that the free world's interest in them has waned.

This committee, therefore, strongly urges that our Government seize every opportunity to insist upon this crucial subject as a major point of summit discussion. Failure to do so would be, in effect, an accommodation to Moscow's empire and a victory for Khrushchev, far surpassing anything his unreliable multinational military forces could achieve. We would be bolstering the security of his totalitarian, colonial system and undermining one of our most powerful deterrents against overt totalitarian aggression and a hot war, namely the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union. The very implication of an assent to the status quo would make mockery of the Captive Nations Week resolution and also of the proclamation issued by you, Mr. President, last year. In terms of bargaining position, the captive nations are of enormous and strategic value to the security of the nontotaliatrian world. Any rationalization to the effect that this fundamental subject might be discussed later in a possible series of summits would not mitigate some of the above effects.

This summit is truly a ripe occasion for the expression of our initiative, diplomatic offensive, and asserted knowledgeability as concerns Moscow's empire, which includes the Soviet Union itself. At every point we could express these qualities and place Moscow on a retreating defensive. The U–2 incident has revived the open skies plan and the need for breaking through the Iron Curtain. We could also point out that most of the territory flown over by the plane is captive non-Russian and forthrightly bring into question the legitimacy of Moscow's argument on international law. A law which in truth and history is not founded upon the inalienable rights of people is hardly one commanding of dutiful observance. We earnestly hope that after all that has been sensationally revealed by this incident, our Government will manifest at the summit that power of fearless initiative without which the unending challenge of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism cannot be met.

With God's many blessings upon your historic venture and best wishes in our firm policy of justice and freedom for peace and friendship among all nations, including those in the Soviet Union, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman.
Thomas F. Connor, executive director.
Stephen J. Skubik, secretary-treasurer.

Committee members: Robert Arthur, Scranton, Pa.; Bela Bachkai, Washington, D.C.; Frank R. Barnett, New York, N.Y.; James Burnham, New York, N.Y.; Kent Courtney, New Orleans, La.; James W. Crockett, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Hon. Thos. J. Cuite, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Rev. C. S. Dunker, St. Louis, Mo.; Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Edna R. Fluegel, Washington, D.C.; Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Robert Hanson, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Frederick B. Harris, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Sidney Hook, New York, N.Y.; John Hvasta, Sommerville, N.J.; Dr. Jan Karski, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Tibor Kerekes, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Chas. J. Kersten, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dr. Chas. W. Lowry, Washington, D.C.; Very Rev. Stephen Loya, Duquesne, Pa.; Eugene Lyons, New York, N.Y.; George Mardiklan, San Francisco, Calif.; Arthur G. McDowell, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Jos. V. Miliauskas, Scranton, Pa.; Don L. Miller, Washington, D.C.; Roy H. Millenson, Bethesda, Md.; Most Rev. Cuthbert M. O'Gara, Union City, N.J.; Dr. Daniel Poling, New York, N.Y.; Very Rev. Msgr. John K. Powell, Scranton, Pa.; Joseph Prusa, Passaic, N.J.; Hon. Antoni N. Sadlak, Rockville, Conn.; W. C. Sawyer, Valley Forge, Pa.; William W. Scranton, Scranton, Pa.; George E. Sokolsky, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Robt. Strausz-Hupe, Philadelphia, Pa.; Robert N. Taylor, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Jos. F. Thorning, Frederick, Md.; Walter Trohan, Washington, D.C.; John A. Volpe, Malden, Mass.; Gen. Chas. A. Willoughby, Washington, D.C.; Joseph J. Woolfson, New York, N.Y.; M. Norvel Young, Los Angeles, Calif.

The Mutual Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. L. PILCHER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech which I made on the floor of the House a few days ago in connection with the mutual security aid bill. This speech is a summation of the findings of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives; namely, Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of which I am privileged to serve as chairman—Report No. 1386, 86th Congress, 2d session:

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, even though I disagree with his views on this bill, for giving me so much consideration, and especially for yielding me this time. He had only 2 hours and gave me 30 minutes out of that. He has not only been fair about this, but he has been fair to me at all times. He knows I am not particularly against this bill. If my vote would kill the bill this afternoon, I would not cast that vote. But I am against waste, extravagance and corruption in some places that can be proven in this program. I am still one who believes that a country has to be strong economically as well as militarily. I think it is time we looked into our own economic affairs.

Our public debt is in the neighborhood of $200 billion. That is $45 billion greater than the total national debt of the entire world, including Soviet Russia. The interest alone on our national debt is fast approaching $1 billion a month. Our farm mortgages are increasing at the rate of approximately $1 billion a year. Our interest rates are continually going up. Some of the countries that we have put back on their feet are now discounting our currency. I do not believe that we can carry the ever-increasing load of the entire world.

The mutual security program was born as the Marshall plan after World War II. We were helping people in Western Europe who had banking and commerce experience, who had industrial know-how, people who did not need anything except to have their factories repaired and they would be back in business. It started with 700 or 800 employees, and at the height of the Marshall plan there were only 2,220 people employed. Today ICA which administers the mutual security program has 42,200 people on their payroll. It has gotten so large until it is even shaping our foreign policy in some places. It is one of the largest businesses in the world, and still we change managers every year or so. I think most of our mistakes can be traced to our own people instead of the foreign governments. Since it started, we have spent over $30 billion. We are building the ego of a good many of these little dictators over the world, but we are losing the little people and the masses. Korea is a fair example of this. Cuba is another example within 90 miles of our borders.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which subcommittee I was chairman, traveled 42,000 miles and visited 22 countries on 6 continents. We rode as much as 150 miles a day in jeeps. We rode in taxicabs and helicopters and looked at good and bad projects—the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. We worked 12 or 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. The gentlewoman from Illinois has more stamina than any person I have ever known. We were up at 6 o'clock every morning, and she was the first one out. I have seen her walk up the mountains in Korea, through the fields in India, and through the factories, and she never missed a single project.

Our first stop was in Tokyo. Japan is one of the most dynamic countries I ever saw. They are 50 percent above their prewar economy today. Their factories are running 24 hours a day, with one building going up right after another. People are well dresesd. Everybody has a job. There is no unemployment. We have given Japan only $16,253,000 in economic aid, but we have given her $711,557,000 in military aid. Japan is able to carry her own load now. In fact, her economy is making it pretty tough on some of the industries in the United States at this time, and is going to continue to make it more so. The gap between the balance of trade of Japan and the United States is fast closing.

While in Japan we were told by our Embassy that in Korea, our next stop, we would have to pay our hotel bill in American money. One of the first foreign aid projects we had in Korea was to build the Bando Hotel and give it to the Republic of Korea. I advised the Ambassador that we had reams and reams of Korean money and that we were not going to pay in American money and would stay in Korea until they agreed to accept their currency. He advised me that only a week before, Secretary Dillon, while there, paid in American money. I contended that did not make any difference, that our committee was not going to pay in American money. The Embassy in Korea wired back that they would accept foreign currency in payment for the subcommittee, but that our military crew would have to pay in American money. I told him that the military people received only $12 per diem and that room rent at the Bando Hotel alone was $16 a day and we were all in one group and would not agree to anything except paying in Korean money. They agreed to accept this, and I am glad to state that they are now accepting their Korean currency for all our officials and committees.

Since this program started, through 1959, we have given Korea in economic aid $1,410,-709,000, and in military aid, $1,291,947,000. As our subcommittee report shows, they have listed over 300 different projects in Korea. After arriving there, we were told that these had been cut up and they had over 600 projects going in Korea. Anybody with any reasoning at all knows that it is physically impossible to successfully carry out this many different kinds of projects in Korea. They have 25 or 30 different agricultural projects. Yet on the night of our briefing, when the entire staff of ICA was present, including their so-called farm experts, when I began to question them, they could not even tell me the native grass of Korea. They could not tell us the type of cattle they were raising. On our way to the airport the next day, about 20 miles through an irrigation section we saw people working in the fields in groups of 50 or 60, but there was not a person who could tell me the kind of vegetables they were harvesting or what market they were sending them to.

Several years ago when Mr. Stassen was Director of ICA, he authorized the building of a fertilizer plant there at a cost of $16 million. When they got it started, they found out there was not a phosphate mine nor a sulphur mine within 5,000 miles of it; so it was changed into an Urea plant. Urea is a form of nitrogen which has been in use for years, but this particular type of plant is very rare and there are very few in operation anywhere in the world. It will require the finest chemical engineers, electrical engineers, and mechanical engineers to operate such a plant. We have already spent approximately $50 million and they have not been able to start it up yet. I do not believe they can ever start it up until lots of the machinery comes out and a different type is put in.

There are several other large plants which have been converted since the original start and some that have never operated. This is the kind of waste I am opposed to. Now some will argue that all of this money has kept Korea from falling into the hands of the Communists. This is partly true, but the ROK Army on the 38th parallel is not the only reason the North Koreans do not come down. It is the American doughboy stationed down below the ROK Army and the North Korean knowledge that we will fight. The recent revolution and overthrow of the Government is ample proof that all is not well in Korea.

We went from Korea to Taiwan. The first thing we found was another large urea plant that we did not know anything about in Taiwan, which they had been trying to start up for 2 years. There is at least 50 percent of the equipment that has to come out. The Taiwan Government is now suing a New York concern, the same one that is building the plant in Korea, for $12 million.

We then went up through the mountains to look at a project that was headed "Water Resources." They have already started a dam between two mountains that will be 512 feet high. It will have three 40,000-kilowatt turbines at the boot of it. It has 17 miles of 11-foot concrete and steel tunnels through the mountains at the top for highland irrigation. They claim it will cost $26 million. Any businessman with any knowledge of construction knows that before it is completed it will cost $150 million or more. Just realize that this project is larger than Boulder Dam. The ICA people say that we are not going to pay for much of this, that the Taiwan Government will finance it, but what difference does it make if we prime the pump in one part of the Taiwan economy in order that they can take the money out for a project like this? Are the taxpayers of America able to build such projects as this?

The small projects in most cases are doing a good job. The waste and extravagance is in the large projects. In Taiwan the Joint Committee on Rural Rehabilitation is doing a wonderful job. Some of the finest hogs I ever saw are being raised there and some of the prettiest farming I have seen anywhere in the world is being carried out in this project.

Lots of these programs have gone into the hands of big business, and I am sorry to say that some of our large colleges in this country are in the same category, with all kinds of research programs. I have never heard of as many different kinds of research. We found programs in Japan to teach the Japanese people industrial know-how, programs in Israel to teach the Jewish people business know-how. In Saigon one morning having breakfast, I counted 27 retired college presidents, teachers, retired business executives, all with briefcases under their arms, going out on some kind of a research project. Lots of these programs were such that we could have gotten the same information by mail.

From Taiwan we went to Saigon, Vietnam. Our total economic aid for Vietnam through fiscal year 1959 has been $964,638,000, with $496,265,000 in military aid. We were completely rebuffed on our arrival in Vietnam. It was because last year Mr. Colegrove, one of the Scripps-Howard reporters for the Washington News, had an article in the paper here that the foreign aid program in Vietnam was a fiasco. After that they had Ambassador Durbrow and Mr. Gardiner, director of the U.S. operations mission in Vietnam, and General Williams fly from Vietnam to Washington. We had hearings in our Far East Subcommittee, at which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] presided. Mr. ZABLOCKI tried every way humanly possible to have fair and unprejudiced hearings and get at the truth of Mr. Colegrove's statements. The ICA officials tried every way in the world to make Mr. Colegrove out a liar or hurt his reputation, but it turned out that Mr. Colegrove was one of the top reporters of the Scripps-Howard papers and had been with them for 18 years. Our study mission proved that everything Mr. Colegrove said about the highway program, the road program, and the water program was true.

Ten days before we arrived in Vietnam we had wired President Diem for an appointment. We had not gotten confirmation of this appointment when we arrived. No Vietnam officials were at the airport. Our Ambassador had a dinner for us, but President Diem refused to let any of his Cabinet or any of his executives attend the dinner. The next day, after some persuasion by General Williams and our Ambassador, he finally agreed to see the committee the last day we were there. Part of the committee went to see him. I refused to go. I said that to have to beg to see the President of any country that we had put a billion and a half dollars into was just out of my line.

Mr. Colegrove said the highway program in Vietnam was a fiasco. Thirty-two miles of this highway is equal to the Jersey Turnpike. The Saigon River Bridge is equal or superior to the Lincoln Memorial Bridge in Washington. The estimated cost of the highway is $1 million per kilometer. I give you below a completely documented history of the entire Vietnam highway program that one contractor on a cost-plus basis is doing the work on, and see if you do not agree with Mr. Colegrove:

Saigon-Bienhoa Highway: This project involves the construction of 32 kilometers of new road, two major bridges (the Saigon River Bridge, 983 meters including approach spans; the Dong Nzr River Bridge, 453 meters including approach spans, six intermediate bridge drainage structures, erosion control, and traffic control facilities. The road is asphaltic concrete surfaced, 16 meters curb to curb, in the urban section, and 7.5 meters roadway width with 3-meter stabilized shoulders in the rural section. Approximately 12.5 kilometers of this highway are in swampy terrain lying close to sea level and require a heavy sand blanket to support the roadway. Drainage structures in this area are supported by concrete piles. The estimated cost per kilometer is $1 million. Sixty-one percent of this road is completed and overall completion is anticipated by 1961.

National Route 21, Bannethuot to Ninh Hoa: This project involves the rehabilitation and the reconstruction of National Route 21, Bannethuot to Ninh Hoa, 152 kilometers, and the reconstruction of bridges, approaches, and inundated areas along National Route 1, Ninh Hoa to Nhatrang, 12 kilometers. This portion of the project includes the construction of 44 short-span bridges and the installation of some 23,000 linear feet of concrete pipe culverts. The Route 1 portion includes also the construction of 15 bridges complete with new approaches and drainage. The roadway will be 6.75 meters surfaced width and 9 meters shoulder to shoulder. Surfacing is a double bituminous surface treatment.

Route 21 and Route 1 are expected to be completed in 1961.

National Route 19, Pleiku to Qui Nhom: This project involves the rehabilitation and reconstruction of National Route 19 from Pleiku to the intersection of Routes 1 and 19, near Binh Dinh, 151 kilometers, and National Route 1 from that intersection to the dock area of Qui Nhon, 16 kilometers. The Route 19 portion of this project includes the reconstruction of the 151 kilometers of road, the construction of 36 new bridges, and the installation of approximately 39,000 linear feet of concrete pipe culverts. The Route 1 portion of this project includes the reconstruction of 16 kilometers of road, the construction of nine

new bridges, and drainage structures as required. Double bituminous surface treatment is planned for both of these routes. Overall completion is estimated for 1961.

National Route 14, Bannethout to Pleiku: This project is being carried out by the Ministry of Public Works and involves the widening and improvement of existing National Route 14 between Bannethuot and Pleiku, 196 kilometers.

Equipment: More than $13 million worth of construction equipment has been imported in support of these U.S. sponsored highway projects, and for the Ministry of Public Works. This includes, besides shops and fixed plants and their equipment, hundreds of roadbuilding machines and other pieces of movable equipment, such as tractors, power shovels, and other pieces of movable equipment. All this will be given to the Vietnam Government when the projects are completed.

Costs: The total cost of ICA dollar assistance for the highway project is presently estimated at $85 million. This figure includes the period extending to the end of fiscal year 1963 when U.S. dollar aid to the highway project is expected to be terminated. As of the end of fiscal year 1959, $48.4 million had been obligated, of which $25.1 million has been spent. Included in the $48.4 figure is $30.1 million for commodities and $17.8 million for contract services. In addition, a total of $35.6 million equivalent in counterpart funds has been obligated through fiscal year 1959.

When it was first proposed to reconstruct Route 1, a 250-mile stretch northward from Saigon, the Capital Engineering Corp. made the survey. On the basis of this survey, bids for the reconstruction of Route 1 were submitted to ICA Washington. Nine companies submitted bids with total costs ranging from $18 million to $45 million. Johnson, Drake & Piper of Minneapolis and New York was selected for a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. The company's bid for actual costs was $14,752,606, plus $2,927,394 for direct material purchases, and an additional fee of $700,000. By the terms of the contract, Johnson, Drake & Piper furnished management and training of local personnel. On the other hand, the United States agreed to pay all costs, which included material, equipment, and salaries.

Before work on Route 1 was begun the original agreement was amended and it was agreed to rebuild the highway from Saigon to Bien Hoa only, and to include the construction of Routes 19 and 21. The engineers were of the opinion that hard surfacing of Route 21 was not needed and that a surface of rock, gravel, and soil was sufficient and would hold up with the usual maintenance. However, after the base of the road was completed, it deteriorated in the wet seasons by reason of the rains and in the dry seasons by the wind and dust. This experience brought about another change in plans—another $500,000 was spent for two layers of asphalt on the road.

As a result of all these changes in the highway program, what has happened to a modest $18.3 million highway project?

The total cost of the highway project is estimated to be $85 million, and may exceed $100 million before completion.

The Johnson, Drake & Piper Co. fee is now $800,000, and they are at present negotiating for a higher fee. As a matter of information the fee is a net profit to the company and is above all costs to the project. The company undertakes no risks and makes no investments; the salaries of its employees are reimbursable by the U.S. Government, leaving a net profit of $800,000 or more for the company's dividends.

The bid of Johnson, Drake & Piper was unrealistic to begin with. Competency of the survey made by Capital Engineers for a project of this magnitude is questionable because of the fact that it, together with the report thereon to ICA, covered a period of only 60 days. Furthermore, the actual costs estimated by Capital Engineers were twice as much as the bid submitted by Johnson, Drake & Piper on the survey report. It is apparent that preliminary data to make a reasonable estimate of cost at the time of the survey was either not taken into account or was unavailable.

The study mission believes that more roads could have been built for this money. Comparison with road systems in neighboring countries provides ample proof of this fact. Furthermore, there is no traffic survey justifying the construction of this kind of road. Even if it is contended that this road system is for military use primarily, its scope and cost seems completely unrealistic.

ICA is contemplating the reconstruction of another road, not included in original and amendment plans, before the present projects have been completed. The sum of money to be expended has not been made public, but several more millions of dollars are anticipated.

Since this was written, they have acknowledged to the Appropriations Committee, including Public Law 480 funds, they have spent $129 million on the road program, besides the money we are giving the Vietnamese Army through defense support to build roads.

Mr. Colegrove said the radio program was a fiasco. When our officials were brought from Vietnam last year before our committee to discredit Mr. Colegrove's statement, they testified that the towers were up and in operation. This program was started 5 or 6 years ago and is something the Army Signal Corps could have completed in less than 6 months. At our briefing in Saigon we were informed that the towers were up and in operation. Mrs. Church and I went out to the location with Mr. Gardiner, the ICA Director, and he began to count the towers. He said, "There they are,—one, two, three, four, five, six." Then he could not find the seventh one. He said it must be behind the building, and I said, "Mr. Gardiner, that is a pretty high building." We went around and looked for the tower, but of course it was not there. He said it must be on the inside. We went inside and found a painter painting another tower. He said, "There it is." The painter said, "No, this one came in last week." Mr. Gardiner then said, "I am not a radio expert, but he is out here." We went on the outside and found a young man with an armful of blueprints, and after some questioning I said "Son, how long have you been out here as an expert on the radio program?" He said, "Three weeks." Now the administration building is as large as this Chamber of the House of Representatives. It is completely full of cables, transformers, and all kinds of electronic equipment. You name it; they have it. We did not find one single connection made, and nothing is in operation. One section of the entire staff of our ICA people in Saigon is assigned to this radio program. We have spent several million dollars on it. If it is not a fiasco, what would you call it? Our committee said it was in a state of confusion.

Mr. Colegrove said the water program was a fiasco. Here is a complete history of it given in the following paragraphs. You can read them and see what you think.

Everyone agrees Saigon badly needs a new water system, but plans have bogged down in a heated dispute between two schools of thought. On one side is the International Water Corp. of Pittsburgh which believes in deep wells. It has done business in Saigon for 30 years and has drilled most of the city's wells. On the other side is the Hydro-Technique Corp. of New York which believes in dams and pipelines.

Our foreign aid authorities gave the Hydro-Technique Corp. a $200,000 contract for a survey 2 years ago. Hydro-Technique came up with a report favoring a dam and filtration plant on Dang Nai River near Bien Hoa, 18 miles north of Saigon. From this plant a 72-inch pipeline would lead to Saigon. The International Water Corp. made several surveys, all of which showed again that deep wells are quite adequate. What is more, the International Water Corp. said they would be much cheaper and provide water much sooner. The Hydro-Technique pipeline project is estimated to cost $19.5 million to be put in by the United States. The International claims it can give Saigon all the water it needs indefinitely for $12 to $14 million. The Vietnamese seem to favor the dam and pipeline system, but the military of both Vietnam and the United States have raised the question of security. It was at Bien Hoa that two American military advisers recently were killed when Red terrorists tossed a grenade into a movie audience.

It is pointed out that the 18-mile aboveground pipeline could be sabotaged and the already hard-pressed Vietnamese Armed Forces probably would have to furnish daily patrols, as well as guards for the river plant.

In November 1959 the Development Loan Fund approved a $19.5 million loan for the water system and called for another survey. Who gets the contract for this survey and what it will cost, we do not know.

It would not be fair to criticize the highway program, the radio program and the water program, without stating that in Vietnam we found one of the finest agricultural programs I have ever seen anywhere. Up in the hill country, we visited an experiment station where several young American boys, graduates of agricultural colleges, were living in quonset huts along besides the Vietnamese. This experimental station would do credit to any station in this country. They had planted in experimental plots practically every agricultural crop, including cotton, corn, peanuts, potatoes, grains, all kinds of vegetables, and raefel. In addition to this, they were showing the hill people, who had been given 5 acres of land and a water buffalo, how to plant and cultivate in rows. These people also were doing a good job in their way and were very happy. The entire project has not cost as much money as one mile of the superhighway. This kind of program is helping the little people to buy themselves.

We went from Saigon, Vietnam, to the Philippines. Here it was evident that the death of President Magsaysay was a great blow to the Philippine people. His efforts to build the country and his dedication to the cause of good government had offered much promise for the Philippines. We arrive just before the elections and were startled and shocked to find an increase in lawlessness and corruption in the present government. The doorman at the hotel was armed, and we were advised that it would not be safe for us to go downtown at night. Right in the middle of our large Naval Base, the Philippines have a small boat repair dock. It does not cover over 2 or 3 acres of land. Three years ago they offered it to us for $1 million. Two years ago they wanted $2 million. They now want $3 million. Yet just across the Bay we are building for them some of the finest and most modern docks in the world. Why could not we have done a little horse-trading and secured the small plot of land in the middle of our large Naval Base that could some day be very important to us, according to our own Admiral Carson? Since 1950 we have spent approximately one-half billion dollars in the Philippines.

From the Philippines we went to Sydney, Australia, to visit several homes built for Dutch settlers in Sydney. The building of these homes is the result of a $3 million loan from the Development Loan Fund to the Netherlands Government at 4 percent. (Our

Government is paying 5 percent). These homes were supposed to be refugee homes, and we expected to find something similar to our low-rental housing units in the United States, but instead we found two- and three-bedroom brick homes with tile roofs and concrete runways, all with carports. These homes are being sold to Dutch settlers by cooperatives and Australian banks for 20 percent down and 27 years to pay at 5 percent. This loan does not meet the eligibility standards set up for the Development Loan Fund, requiring that loans from Development Loan Fund should be made to underdeveloped countries. The economic condition of both the Netherlands Governernment and the Australian Government is as good or better than that of the United States.

In India, I do not believe there is enough money in the world to change it overnight, on account of so many different cults and religious beliefs. In Calcutta there are 300,000 men, women, and children who sleep in the streets every night. The children have to resort to being little scavengers, picking up parcels of grain even behind the animals. A certain number die each night and are carted outside the city next morning and burned. Old Delhi is just about as bad.

(1) Grain elevator in India: The study mission had an opportunity to visit Hapur where modern grain elevators have been constructed. The total cost of constructing this modern storage of food grains, with metal building and elevators, 20 silos and a huge warehouse, is approximately $600,000, about $415,000 of which was expended by the United States.

A project agreement was signed in 1954 to assist the Government of India in exploring the advantages of new types of construction for the storage of grain. Two 10,000-ton silos, complete with grain elevators, and 50 prefabricated metal storage buildings were to be provided from U.S. project funds at two locations within the country.

In April 1956 the International Cooperation Administration obligated $4 million for the procurement of 500 additional prefabricated storage buildings, and also planned to contribute an additional $3 million in 1957. These plans were made although the project for the 50 buildings was not progressing. When this condition was recognized the sums were deobligated and the $4 million was transferred to another project.

The study mission is concerned with the magnitude of this program and the apparent lack of adequate planning. The grain elevators at Hapur are larger and better equipped than many in the United States, as well as more costly to build than many of comparable size. There was no food grain in the elevator, and there is very little prospect that there will ever be any need for such a mammoth construction. If the same amount of money had been used for constructing smaller elevators in the country, there is the likelihood that more people would be employed and more mouths fed. Large central storage elevators are not the answer for India in view of the small amount of grain grown in comparison to the population, since there is very little, if any, surplus accumulated.

Agricultural college and community development project, India: This is the project which the President visited on his trip to the Far East last fall.

Those members of the study mission who, on previous trips to the area, had found great hope and, in fact, major satisfaction in the projected expansion of the community development plan must confess to a sense of bitter disappointment over what appears to be a change in direction of the program and lack of evidence of sufficient expansion. Although time did not permit a detailed and expanded study of these projects in many sections of India, the members of the study mission feel constrained to express their concern over reports brought to them that the development of the program has not justified earlier hopes. The study mission was further discouraged by the conditions found in a "model village" chosen for their inspection as representing a community development project for the training of local employees to teach the people of the community proper health and sanitation methods. In neither agricultural expansion nor in sanitary provision did the village typify progress. In riding around the "model village," adjacent to the agricultural center, the study mission noted several torn-up tractors. Not 1 acre of tilled soil nor 1 acre of a growing crop was found nor were there any signs of recent crops. Favorable mention should be made of the small school and the native teacher, however. There was little indication that agricultural training had increased the food supply, nor was there any indication by the appearance of the people, and particularly of the children, that any agricultural improvement had led to adequate feeding or that sanitary training had produced ample results. Although the study mission realizes perfectly that it can base no cumulative judgment on one example, it seems significant that this particular village was chosen as a model to be shown to us.

Some reference was made to the fact that the community development plan had swerved away from its original purpose of helping local underdeveloped communities learn self-improvement through their own efforts, which would increase their self-respect as well as their sense of capacity; and that more emphasis had been put in recent years on rural sociology. The study mission would certainly recommend, if this be the case, as seemed indicated, that a return should be made to the more simple and more successful program of "helping little people to help themselves." At this time, the study mission would make the further observation that there seems to be inherent folly in the creation of the wide gap that will persist for years between the grandiose top level and extravagant projects, from which no benefits would dribble down to the people within their lifetime, and that sad, drab level of humanity such as witnessed in Calcutta, where life consists only of a scramble for a seed of grain to appease insatiable hunger.

In Karachi, Pakistan, we found a new Embassy Building that covered practically a city block that is still under construction even though the capital of the government, 2 years ago, was moved to Rawal Pindi, 700 miles from Karachi, where we will have to construct still another Embassy Building.

In Laos, a country where it is hard to find one with over a sixth-grade education, one member of the committee found a school which had 16 individual class booths with complete tape recording system, with a master control up in front, for teaching language. They had 16 people in these individual booths. It would take them 3 months to learn to run the equipment. The tape recorders cost about $400 each, and they had 16. The master panel was as big as a switchboard in an industrial plant and cost $10,000 or $15,000 or maybe $20,000. Probably the only three places in the United States that teach foreign languages this way are Yale, Colorado, and Georgetown. You can find waste and extravagance like this in every country we visited.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the Department's own figures, we have $4,700 million in the pipeline. This year's request is $4,175 million. In addition to this, they will have $1,500 million from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. This year this figure amounted to $1,567 million. In addition to that, the taxpayers of America contributed in 1960, to international organizations, $144,707,208. This gives them access to $10,500 million. Now in all fairness to ourselves and the other countries and to the American taxpayer, don't you think this bill could be cut at least $1½ billion?

The Texas Shrimp Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I joined in cosponsorship of a bill to establish country-by-country import quotas on shrimp and shrimp products. Such a measure has become necessary because 54 countries are now exporting shrimp to the United States, are serving 43 percent of the American market, and last year alone foreign shrimp imports to thin country increased 24 percent.

In view of this pending legislation, I believe Members of the Congress would be interested in reading a recent article in the May 1960, issue of Texas Parade magazine, by L. A. Wilke, entitled "The Little shrimp Is Big Business." This article by Mr. Wilke is an interesting and informative report on Texas' shrimp business. I ask unanimous consent to have the aforementioned article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Texas Parade magazine, May 1960]

THE LITTLE SHRIMP IS BIG BUSINESS

(By L. A. Wilke)

The fisherman who uses shrimp for bait, or the diner who smacks his lips over a shrimp cocktail, doesn't give much thought to the importance of this unusual little seagoing species to the economy of Texas.

Nevertheless, organized netting along the coastline from Port Arthur to Port Isabel each year produces some 70 million pounds. There is no way of knowing how many more are taken by hand-netters and bait-fishing trawls and not reported.

Hundreds of boats from Texas ports ply all the waters of the Gulf of Mexico in search of shrimp. The bigger they can get them the better.

There are huge basins at such places as Galveston, Freeport, Rockport, Aransas Pass, Corpus Cristi, Port Isabel, and Brownsville, where these boats unload after a few days or a week in the rough coastal waters.

When the shrimp are brought in they are mechanically unloaded into hoppers and moved into the packaging and freezing rooms to be sent out all over the United States. Huge refrigerator trucks haul them from Texas to the market centers of the Middle West.

The business is so important that the organized shrimpers maintain the offices of their Shrimpers' Association of the Americas in Brownsville, with James Barr as executive secretary. The group will hold its annual convention in Mexico City this year.

The association not only works for the good of the shrimpers but for the shrimp, too. For many years there was a great deal

of illegal netting that resulted in many shrimp beds being practically destroyed. Baby shrimp were hauled up by the tons. Some of them were sold to canners away from Texas. Others were dumped into the gulf to die.

Accordingly, members of the association set about to bring reforms in the industry and legislation to protect the shrimp. Now there is a closed season of two months in bay waters to permit the breeding of shrimp and let them grow to a catchable size. These shrimpers who operate the big boats thus realize that the only value in a baby shrimp is for it to mature.

The association also promotes the use of shrimp. It publishes recipe books in natural color, telling housewives how they can prepare shrimp in many different delicious ways. Campaigns are carried on through newspapers and magazines.

While most of us like our shrimp cocktails or a meal of shrimp in most any other way they can be prepared, we seldom think of them except as fish bait. When they come to us frozen or in cans we are not impressed with the difficulty of getting them.

Then we go to the coast to fish. At the bait stands we are told they are in short supply. They are waiting for the trawls to come in. You are offered some frozen shrimp. But you wait around and finally the shrimp come in. You pay from $4 to $6 per quart, put them in a live box and head out.

There are a number of species of shrimp along the Texas coast but only a few are actually utilized either for food or fishing. Generally Texas shrimp are known as white, red, or brown. The white shrimp is the best known in Texas waters. It spawns in the offshore waters in 10 to 15 fathoms of water. The female, which is the largest, will lay some 500,000 eggs in the summer spawning period. It usually takes a couple of weeks for them to hatch. The baby shrimp then are washed by the tides into the nursery grounds along the coastline to develop. They grow to about 3 inches long by September. By December they begin their migration back to the open water.

Next of importance is the brown shrimp whose spawning habits are somewhat the same as the white shrimp, except that they produce the year around. They can take water of higher salinity than the white shrimp, however. Few are found in bay waters during the winter months.

Trawlers operating in the Gulf, mostly in waters inside the 50-fathom curve, bring their fish aboard in huge nets that drag the bottom. The shrimp are deheaded at sea and then packed in ice until they reach port. They are then graded according to size and quality. Jumbo shrimp will average out 10 to 15 per pound. Cocktail shrimp will run about 65 to the pound. On the Texas coast, the little shrimp adds up to big business.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past three decades the face of American cities has been changing before our eyes.

The new urban complexion which has resulted is of profound importance to all who are trying to build a more perfect America.

To focus this problem for the Members of Congress, and under permission previously granted, I am beginning a series of insertions in the RECORD today on the general topic of "The Changing Face of American Cities."

The first insertions, all of which will be based on a two-part series published by Forum magazine and entitled "The New Urbanites," will deal with the nature and dimensions of the problem. The initial excerpt from the series follows:

For three decades, the biggest U.S. cities have operated like whirlwinds, drawing millions of new families in from the countryside, scattering millions more out into the suburbs. Neither group ever meets the other, for their economic and social separation is too great. The outgoing group is urban middle and upperincome white, while the incoming one is largely rural low-income black. Yet only now are the dozen largest U.S. cities beginning to realize that their character is irrevocably changed by this most massive of all population shifts, posing the biggest problems in housing, planning, rehabilitation, and assimilation ever to face the cities. The problems are so big that Forum is treating them in two parts: This month their nature and dimensions, next month the solutions to the most pressing problem, housing.

In the last decade alone, the great population shift has reached an alltime peak, as the bald statistics show:

In Chicago, whites have been leaving the city at the rate of 40,000 a year, while Negroes have been inflowing at the rate of about 18,000 a year. By 1965, Chicago, now 19 percent nonwhite, will probably be at least 26 percent Negro. In Chicago's first heavy Negro influx from the rural South following the First World War, its nonwhite population reached only 8 percent by 1940.

In Philadelphia, Negroes have moved into the central city about twice as fast as whites moved out, both migrations accelerating over the past decade. Today, Negroes make up about 27 percent of Philadelphia's population, but the future is foreshadowed in this fall's school registration, which will be an estimated 50 percent nonwhite.

In Detroit, the past decade has seen some 100,000 white families move out, while some 80,000 new families moved in, mostly nonwhite, but including white families from Kentucky's and Tennessee's hill country. Detroit's peak migrations came in the automobile-boom years of 1950–52 and 1955, and then mostly from the Deep South. Today Detroit is about 22 percent nonwhite, compared to 10 percent in 1940.

In Washington, D.C., Negroes are now in the majority, comprising probably 55 percent of the population. The city has about 11,000 Negro inmigrants a year, most of them from Georgia and the Carolinas. Washington's school population this fall will be at least three-quarters Negro.

In New York, with a nonwhite population of over 1.2 million, still only 12 percent of the total, about 10,000 Negroes enter annually. There is an additional yearly influx of some 20,000 Puerto Ricans, most of whom, though technically white, face the same adjustment problems as Negroes. In peak years, as many as 34,000 Puerto Ricans have come to the city. New York's total population is slowly declining, as whites continue to vacate the city faster than newcomers enter.

These great migrations, unlike those of the past, focus almost entirely on the city. In the first half of this century, over 73 percent of total U.S. population growth was in metropolitan areas, and that percentage climbed early in the last decade to 97 percent. At the same time, the growth of suburbia, which was only one-third again as fast as central cities, jumped up to seven times the central-city rate in the last decade. In the next 15 years an estimated 50 million additional people will live in suburbs, while central cities will absorb only 10 million more.

Pension and Profit-Sharing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that last year Congress enacted the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, Public Law 86–257.

During the first year of operation of the new law, the Department of Labor, which administers the program, has moved ahead with the monumental task of setting up machinery to handle the reporting of the welfare and pension plans.

Recently, the Department issued a report covering the extent of its progress. The Milwaukee Journal published a detailed article by Laurence C. Ecklund reviewing the operations of the Disclosure Act. To give my colleagues the benefit of details of progress, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 16, 1960]

LISTS PENSION CONTRIBUTIONS 90 PERCENT BY EMPLOYERS

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Employers or employer groups manage and contribute to the financing of 90 percent of all welfare and pension plans and bear the entire cost of 45 percent of such plans.

Frank Kuehl, a native of Fountain City, Wis., and administrator of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act in the Labor Department, said Monday a review of 128,000 plans filed with his agency revealed that more than 382,000 benefits are provided.

More than 102,000 plans provide welfare type benefits and more than 25,000 provide pension or retirement benefits, reported Kuehl, who was an assistant attorney general in Wisconsin from 1927 to 1933.

The 102,000 plans classed as welfare plans provide more than 317,000 benefits such as life insurance, accident and sickness insurance, hospitalization, surgical, medical, and dental benefits, paid sick leave, etc.

The scope of these plans, said Kuehl, varies in the number of benefits provided, ranging from a single benefit to several, with 80 percent providing multiple benefits.

Of all benefits provided, hospitalization is the most prevalent, being provided by more than 66,000 plans. Surgical and medical benefits are provided by 64,000 and 51,000 plans, respectively.

Nearly 99 percent of the pension plans provide retirement for age or service, with a smaller proportion also providing death benefits and retirement because of disability.

Nearly half of the welfare and pension plans reported cover workers engaged in manufacturing. The second largest proportion of plans—18 percent—covers workers in wholesale and retail trade, followed by services and finance, insurance, and real estate.

The Dilemma of Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable David L. Bazelon, circuit judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, delivered at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass., on March 14, 1960.

Judge Bazelon's address was reprinted in the April 1960 issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

The address follows:

THE DILEMMA OF PUNISHMENT

A number of my distinguished predecessors on this platform have assessed various aspects of the character and accomplishments of Louis D. Brandeis. An image has emerged of a brilliant intellectual technician possessing a degree of moral strength beyond the capacity of most of us. Many details of his life and work have been presented to round out this impressive image, and also to convey the range of his probing interests. Unhappily, the legal and social problems of criminal law administration were not within this range—with at least one notable exception in his prophetic dissent in the Olmstead case, an early wiretapping decision. Crime and society's treatment of the criminal were not publicly a dominant source of concern for Justice Brandeis.

Not directly, that is. For there is nevertheless an abiding connection between the Brandeis heritage—both in outlook and in method—and the outburst of modern concern with the great problems of criminal justice. Let me spell out this important connection. Above all else, Brandeis believed in fructifying the law by making it responsive to scientific developments and general intellectual advance. He felt that survival of basic social respect for the law on the part of the populace required no less—that the "living law" had to maintain its vital relation to general intellectual advance and changing social life. This, he noted, was specially difficult for the law because of its deep traditional aspect . But not thereby any the less necessary. Those of you who are lawyers will understand this remark as referring to what is undoubtedly the most profound issue in the philosophy of law—the inner mechanism of change. Brandeis' outlook thereon was clear, dramatically forward looking and established him as a creative leader and, indeed, as a prophet to later generations of lawyers. In 1916 he quoted approvingly a psychologist who had said "that a lawyer who has not studied economics and sociology is very apt to become a public enemy." Justice Brandeis was talking to us today—and, moreover, telling us something we still need to know.

It is interesting that Brandeis should have borrowed the words of a psychologist to express this strong view because it applies in our day a fortiori (as we lawyers say) to the behavioral sciences, including psychology. The phrase "public enemy" is perhaps too strong, since through special newspaper use after 1916 its has lost its traditional quality. But lawyers working in the field of the criminal law who resist or ignore the facts, the insights, the whole considerable offering of sociology, psychiatry, and allied disciplines, do a deep disservice to the public, for that public expects its experts to improve our ways of carrying on the business of society. Such a lawyer is no friend of the public, nor is he a good servant of the law. And he is not working within the Brandeis heritage. This can be asserted, I think, without reference to the current shortcomings or ultimate limits of these behavioral disciplines.

I said there is a true connection between this heritage and the current agitation in the criminal law not only with respect to outlook but also as to method. Naturally I refer to that deservedly famous event in the history of American law when Brandeis filed a 112-page brief in the case of *Muller* v. *Oregon*, which he argues before the U.S. Supreme Court in January 1908. This initiated the startling legal tradition of what came to be known as the "Brandeis brief"; as his biographer has characterized the event—"he made the law grow a hundred years in a day." A recent use of this still new, still vital form of legal argument was, as many of you know, appellant's brief in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the chief of the desegregation cases. The brief in *Muller* v. *Oregon*, which concerned the constitutionality of a State statute limiting the hours women might work in industry, amounted to a major sociological treatise. It referred in full, cogent detail to the more important scientific studies—factual, statistical, and theoretical—concerning the actual and very urgent problem of women then working in American industry. Nothing quite like that had ever been done before. The law was supposed to be concerned with something called the law, and its technique of adjustment to changing experience was lost somewhere among the higher mysteries of the law-fact dichotomy. Then Brandeis overwhelmed the highest court of the land with the full, relevant weight of modern social scientific facts. And he won his case.

I am not suggesting that the Brandeis brief has finally resolved—or that it was designed finally to resolve—the very difficult problems of both substance and procedure which center around the continuous adjustment of existing rules of law and changing circumstances. Hardly that. It is not my purpose this evening to discuss the complex theory of when and how the law properly takes cognizance of new facts and altered awareness in society, and the differing roles of the legislature and the courts in this process. I simply note that the law does change, through both instruments of government, and that the Brandeis brief remains a still vital weapon in the methodological arsenal of such change. Of course everyone—especially judges, I assure you—would rest more comfortably if administration of the law were a mechanical process, and all law was initiated by a democratic legislature after full public hearings. But our system, and life itself, is much more complex than that. The courts unavoidably have their unique role to play.

In both the Muller and the desegregation cases, scientific material was used referring to the important psychological effects of overwork on women and segregated education on Negro children. When the law welcomes science, psychological insight plays its specific and important role in depicting reality by its focus on the inner effect of circumstances on the individual and the resulting generation of healthy or distorted motive.

In the criminal law, where one might expect the assistance of the behavioral sciences and especially psychiatry to be most eagerly solicited—because most obviously relevant—the fact of the matter is that they are not. In my opinion, not nearly enough. I will not burden your patience by recounting again the century-old struggle against the exclusionary M'Naghten rules. These rules have dominated the administration of the insanity defense in England and most American jurisdictions. It should suffice to remind you of their continued vitality. The M'Naghten formula emphasis the rational capacity of the mind, and excuses from criminal responsibility only the individual who at the time of the crime "was laboring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know" what he was doing or that it was wrong. However this test might have been interpreted—volumes have been written on the possible meanings of the words—it had in fact worked to exclude medical evidence. I am almost tempted to say that under M'Naghten practice the psychiatrist appears in the proceeding at all only to testify to the irrelevancy of psychiatry—that is, to confirm the irrelevance that the law has already decided upon. It assigns to the psychiatric expert in court a sacrificial role in a ritual of condemnation. The expert is asked a question which—most leaders of the profession inform us—cannot be answered within the terms of their discipline. And unless the rules are breached—as they frequently are on the trial level—the psychiatrist is not encouraged or permitted to address himself to the clinical questions which are the only ones he is truly expert in answering.

That is the scientific expert testifying at the trial level. But on appeal, you may ask, have there been no "Brandeis briefs" setting forth the relevant facts and insights of modern scientific psychiatry? Yes, for example many psychiatric works were referred to in the appellant's brief in the Durham case, which, as many of you know, resulted in the adoption in the District of Columbia of a broadened insanity test—a rule designed to relax the rigors of M'Naghten and to welcome genuine phychiatric testimony presented in its own terms. The Durham test simply asked whether the accused was suffering from a mental disease or defect, and inquires as to the relation between any such condition and the criminal act. But the District of Columbia is only one out of a multitude of jurisdictions. A judge in another jurisdiction had this to say in rejecting the Durham rule:

"The District of Columbia Court was persuaded to this doctrine chiefly by treatises on subjects other than law to which the decision refers, by Weihoffen, Zilboorg, Deutsch, Glueck, Guttmacher, Overholser, Reik, and others doubtless learned in the field of psychiatry. I am not willing to accept their teachings and to reject completely the philosophies of such eminent jurists as Blackstone."

And so on. This judge preferred to follow what he called "guides furnished by accepted principles of the law."

In the administration of the criminal law today, we desperately need all the help we can get from modern behavioral scientists—before trial, during trial, and after trial. The law by itself, without these workers, is cast in the hopeless role of a socially isolated, traditional bulwark against the welter of personal, social and economic forces which create today's problem of crime and the so-called criminal population. And in this losing struggle, the law—by which I mean police, judges, lawyers, and prison guards—would have at its disposal a limited set of concepts honored largely by time alone. In brief, the law would have the lex talionis—the idea of retributive punishment based on absolute moral principles of purportedly universal application. By itself, the law would dispose of both the problem of crime and the criminal himself with the one idea of punishment. The "program" would be: Repress crime and all antisocial behavior by punishment alone; rehabilitate the offender by punishment alone; achieve social understanding of wrongdoing and the wrongdoer by the sole mechanical response—"Punish them—they deserve it."

If the foregoing remarks seem intemperate, that is of course because they do not describe our actual system of criminal law administration. For one thing, stern retri-

butive justice has always been tempered by mercy and forgiveness—by the ubiquitous impulse to afford the transgressor a "second chance." This happens in practice even when it is not allowed by theory. We simply find it too difficult, too nonhuman to punish, punish, punish—even though our feeling is that we are wrong when we do not. And for another thing, the behavioral scientists—along with their facts, ideas, and methodology—have as a matter of fact intervened increasingly at many stages of the administrative process. Social workers, clinicians, welfare agencies, even the police, as well as many others, attempt to deal constructively with the juvenile delinquent before he is sent to a reformatory to begin his professional training as the criminal of the future. The psychiatrist comes to court and sometimes his presence there does have something other than a ritualistic effect on the outcome of the proceeding. Again, he and his coworkers are more and more frequently consulted in the course of sentencing, probation, parole, and even—as the light of a new dawn—in the institutional rehabilitative process. Occasionally all of this activity ends up having its effect in a judicial decision, even one delivered from an appellate bench.

So clearly our criminal system is a very mixed affair—some would say a very mixed-up affair. But things are happening, there is agitation and movement, much heat and a certain amount of light. To put it simply, it is a system in transition. We are, painfully and slowly, coming to a clearer understanding of alternatives and necessities. We are also making some practical progress in working out institutional and administrative means. While much of the intellectual ferment has centered around the wording of the jury instruction when the defense of insanity has been raised, I think it is obvious that this can be compared to the peak of an iceberg that is visible above the waterline. The peak is important chiefly as an indication of the general whereabouts of the much more significant six-sevenths lurking beneath the surface. It is foolhardy to take the visible peak for the whole massive obstruction.

Well, what is this iceberg? If our system is in transition, then the question properly arises—Transition from what to what? From M'Naghten to Durham? Hardly. Certainly from M'Naghten—but not just from that ritualistic phrase, except perhaps symbolically. And Durham—even viewed as a concept, as an approach, which is the way I prefer to view it, rather than 19 words of a jury instruction—is merely one way of welcoming the psychiatrist into the courtroom. It is a beginning, not an ending—and it relates to the insanity defense, which is only that visible one-seventh of the iceberg.

I believe that the deeper part of the iceberg consists of the retributive urge to punish irrespective of effect, and the accompanying intellectual justification of this primitive urge, the so-called theory of deterrence. A deep emotion and a complicated rationalization.

But before I elaborate these speculations of mine, I want to say that they are my own opinions, which I hold as an interested citizen. While I do not stand alone with these views, not by any means, I am afraid that I cannot even vouch for the faithfulness of my presentation of borrowed ideas. If they seem original, that is probably due as much to lack of scholarship as to anything else. They should be taken merely as one man's speculative opinions.

Wherever one turns in an effort at reform in the treatment of offenders, one comes up against this need to punish and its defense by the theory of deterrence. Of course, there are many other arguments put forward at various times in justification of the present system, with its great emphasis on punishment for its own sake or punishment as the answer to all problems. For example, both Judge Learned Hand in this country and Lord Justice Denning in England—the first sadly and the latter more firmly—have referred to the public's demand that the sinner shall suffer. Judge Hand stated that he did "not share that feeling, which is a vestige * * * of very ancient primitive and irrational beliefs and emotions." Lord Justice Denning spoke more strongly by saying:

"It is a mistake to consider the objects of punishment as being deterrent or reformative or preventive, and nothing else. * * * The truth is that some crimes are so outrageous that society insists on adequate punishment, because the wrongdoer deserves it, irrespective of whether it is a deterrent or not."

I can assure you that similar views are frequently expressed from the bench in courts throughout our land—and often enough when the crime is no more "outrageous" than juvenile car theft. Sometimes the court in relieving itself of these sentiments will refer to society's demand for retribution—communicated to the court by some unknown intermediary, or perhaps so obvious as not to require communication. On other occasions a court will abandon that rhetorical flourish and speak directly, saying—"You are going to be punished good and proper because you deserve it, and because too many of you hoodlums have been getting away with it."

So it is still the need to punish that confronts us—although at times not my need, but somebody else's. All this, as Judge Hand suggests, is highly irrational. I am sure that we must recognize this irrational need as a social fact, but I cannot see that we must abandon attempts at reform because of it. After all, that public out there that needs to punish also needs to forgive—and it especially needs to be given, for its own protection and well-being, the most rationally effective administration we can devise for it. It is not getting it now. The excessive emphasis on punishment, with the consequent neglect of genuine rehabilitation, is accomplished by a disastrously high level of recidivism. In the relatively progressive Federal Prison System, for example, the rate increased between 1949 and 1958 from 61 percent to 67 percent. In this same period, the number of serious offenders who have had two or more previous commitments has grown from 39 to 46 percent. Please realize what these figures mean: In two-thirds of the cases punishment neither reforms nor deters the individual who has served one sentence. And with those who have served a second sentence, it fails again in nearly half of the cases.

Another point of view toward this problem is put forward by Harry Elmer Barnes. He says that two-thirds of the criminal population is always at large and that moreover the ones on the outside tend to be the smartest and the most dangerous of the lot. So that while he feels lack of funds and the fear of escape, rather than the urge to punish, are the greatest obstacles to needed reforms, he argues for more rehabilitation as follows:

"The public is unmindful of the fact that convicts, on the average, will serve less than 3 years in prisons and law-abiding citizens can only be protected from their depredations by successful rehabilitation during this brief term of incarceration."

From more than one point of view, then, punishment rather than rehabilitation just does not work.

This being the case, why such persistent, irrational emphasis on punishment? I think one thing is the deep childish fear that with any reduction of punishment, multitudes would run amok. It seems to me this fear must be based on exaggerated notions of the role of punishment when we were children. The reasoning is: We are good adults because we were punished when we were bad children; any adult who is bad should get some more of what we got when we were children. "They" must be punished to reconfirm our adulthood and our goodness—to distinguish us from them. But most of us who have been good for many years—or at least haven't been caught—have not maintained our high estate because of witnessing frequent public hangings and whippings or stopping to observe a malefactor being drawn-and-quartered on the corner of a busy intersection. Quite the opposite. According to the famous Warden Lawes of Sing Sing Prison, this is especially true of the prosecutors and judges who so zealously take upon themselves the rhetorical burden of carrying out society's need to punish. He sent invitations to the appropriate officers of the law to attend each of the 114 executions carried out at Sing Sing while he was warden. Not one ever found time to attend.

Perhaps one should be encouraged by the fact that the modern urge to punish is no longer so immediately personal. I suppose we should all be pleased by the recent report from Saudi Arabia announcing an important reform in criminal law administration—that hereafter a thief's hand will be cut off by an expert surgeon using anesthetics rather than by an amateur with a hatchet. An accompanying reform is that adulteresses will no longer be stoned to death, as in Biblical times. As Saudi Arabia enters the modern world, they will now be shot.

So there is something like progress in these matters. I would remind you that not half a century before the M'Naghten rules were enunciated, more than 200 crimes were punishable by death in England. It is interesting to speculate as to whether England could possibly have become the civilized place it is today if the number of capital crimes had not been reduced. But Lord Justice Denning still believes in punishment for its own sake—or still believes that society believes in it.

The belief in punishment at a distance was strikingly illustrated by a report from South Africa last April. It seems that the flogging of offenders was being carried out in a magistrates' court located near the center of Capetown. Sentences of up to 10 strokes are inflicted on malefactors beginning with 8-year-old boys. The matter became newsworthy when the public began to object to the practice. The objection, however, was not to the punishment itself, but to the uncomfortable circumstance that it was administered in the business district of the city. One citizen complained, "We can clearly hear the swish and smack of the cane and the pleadings and screams of people being beaten." It appears that this noise was upsetting women officeworkers, one of whom expressed herself as follows: "I sympathize with the police. It cannot be nice to have to deal out these beatings. But I wish we didn't have to listen to it." Not only the women were disturbed. One man said that his conversations with important clients had been interrupted by the howling of somebody being thrashed. The problem was solved by police assurances that the beatings would thereafter be administered in a basement, where they would not disturb the public.

I think we are, generally speaking, very confused about the whole subject of punishment. And it is in truth a very complicated matter, with a large admixture of deep emotions concerning views of our own childhood and the child within us, half-spoken beliefs about the nature of our daily self-control, fear of other people, complex attitudes toward authority, and so on. All this helps to indicate for me the direction at least of an explanation of the dilemma of

punishment. Because what has to be explained—and finally understood—is the really frightening scope of the irrationality of our notions and practices regarding punishment. It seems that we just do not know how to be practical about the matter. For example, most of us, I imagine, have achieved major control over our own aggressive and vindictive impulses. We would be revolted to watch a hanging or a beating, and even more to participate in one. When we are personally called upon to administer punishment or any form of serious deprivation, we take the task as a heavy duty and think very hard to make certain that we do no more and no less than we feel to be necessary and effective in the circumstances. This would be so in the disciplining of our own children or any subordinates. But when it comes to the administration of crime, we hand the whole matter over to a distant bureaucratic machine, and we want to hear no more about it. Our attitude is—let the State take care of them.

In other words, our personal resolution of the issue of vindictiveness seems to be achieved at the cost of our human capacity to identify with the offender. Isn't it strange that the criminal law tradition which not so long ago was based on the supposedly deterrent spectacle of public punishment has come full circle and now can be said to be based in effect on the distance and even the secrecy of actual punishment. I wonder how many in this audience have ever seen the inside of a prison? What you would see there can be justified only on the assumption that the prisoners are less than human, and that, therefore, the obviously dehumanizing process they are undergoing is appropriate for them. Because they have stolen property or committed acts of violence, they are outside the pale of human society, and that is the end of the matter. But of course after having further brutalized them, after having failed to deal with the causes of their behavior, and having failed to effect any serious rehabilitation, we then release them into society where they can experience their second or third or fourth opportunity to fail. As Karl Menninger has said, these people are failures first and criminals later. To be a criminal is not strictly speaking merely to have committed a crime—it is a social branding plus penitentiary training, all of which serves only to confirm the initial personal failure which led to the first antisocial act. (As I speak of crime and the criminal tonight, I should emphasize that I am thinking of the delinquent car thief, the mugger, the amateur burglar, an armed robber, the sex offender, and the man who commits assault and other crimes of violence—my attention is not directed toward the special problems represented by the criminal elite consisting of competent professionals, the organization men of the syndicates, or the whole separate area of white-collar crime.)

It is as if society cooperates with certain human beings who are social failures to create this object called the criminal. Our present system of punishment is an essential part of this process, not of any process that can be called reforming or rehabilitative. Why does society go to all the trouble and expense of creating this special class of human beings? I think chiefly because we really do not comprehend what we are doing, because we do not want to deal with the facts of social failure to begin with, and because we are not prepared to follow out the logic of our attitude and dispose of these failures outright. There results a sort of half-way house, neither disposal nor rehabilitation, but a new class of human beings to mirror society's confusion on the profound issue of failure in the educative process—and reliance on punishment to cure or cover over all such failure.

What I am suggesting is that the criminal serves as a scapegoat. And this as much as anything is impeding obvious and sorely needed reform in the treatment of offenders. I use the word "scapegoat" in the specific sense in which it has become a key term in the psychosociological analysis of prejudice. That is, a deeply held, unrealistic, projective image of a minority group indulged by members of a dominant group. The essential fact in this form of prejudiced perception is that the member of the dominant group refuses ordinary, human one-to-one identification with representatives of the minority group, sometimes for lack of opportunity, sometimes because of a deeper unwillingness. But, as the analysis of prejudice has revealed, there is a very meaningful if distorted identification nevertheless. Just as the Jew is avaricious and the Negro lazy and lascivious, so the criminal is violent and impetuous in trying to achieve his ends—he has been foolish (if caught), has lost control over himself, and has done what he wanted to do just when he wanted to do it. Don't you and I have these impulses? Doesn't the anti-Semite envy the Jew as he imagines him, and doesn't the Negrophobe believe that the Negro has more primitive pleasures in his life? First, we bestow upon them our repressed desires, then we place them outside the pale, thus neatly disposing of them and our forbidden impulses.

But of course it doesn't work. Eventually one meets and gets to know a Jew, a Negro, or a criminal, and then the trouble begins. The Jew may be poor, the Negro deprived and unhappy—and in any event, both are recognizably and disturbingly human, that is, "like us." Likewise the criminal. We can see that he would like to master his impulses, and we see that we might have responded as he did to his provocations, to his miserable social and psychological background. We identify on a one-to-one human basis—if we retain the capacity to do so—and behold: the whole complexion of the problem has changed. He is like us—only somewhat weaker, and he has failed in a primary obligation of the mature citizen. He needs help if he is going to bring out the good in himself, and restrain the bad. But first, we must stop treating him like a pariah, as a person who is entitled to punishment and only punishment, because if we treat him that way he will become that way.

Another point to be understood about punishment is that it is not a universal solvent. Different people react differently to it. This is perfectly obvious with regard to children, and needs no elaboration. Our response to punishment is like anything else we learn; some learn better than others, and some learn the same lesson differently than others. In this broad sense, the criminal is the person who has been miseducated with respect to punishment and the threat of punishment. His reeducation must consist of something in addition to just more of the same, more punishment. To conceive otherwise would be like giving harder and harder lessons in algebra to a student who has already evidence his inability to absorb the basic lessons. Only an incompetent teacher, a man of ill-will or one with very limited resources, would go about destroying a student in such a fashion. But that is just what we do with so many people who, if they had had the proper capacity to respond to punishment, would not have gotten into trouble in the first place. We do just the wrong thing by confirming all of their wrong feelings about punishment. And so we create a class of hopelessly recidivistic criminals.

I think that all I have been saying about punishment can be summed up under the headings—punishment without thinking, punishment as a mechanical and exclusive response, punishment unaccompanied by a rational view of its purpose and effect. As the late George Dession, one of the most careful, creative legal thinkers about these matters, has said—"punishment is never good in itself." That proposition is perhaps the first step toward wisdom in thinking about the criminal law system. Professor Dession, in rethinking the whole matter and attempting to devise a more rational and effective approach, preferred to use different words in describing the criminal law system so as to get away from the idea that it concerned only this special class of people called "criminals" and from the sole response of punishment. He felt that this was self-defeating both in its effect on offenders and on the public, in that it broke the crucial conduit of identifications, and limited the role of imagination. He preferred to speak of a system of sanctions having application to proscribed behavior, with the purpose of preserving public order. Punishments—called negative sanctions or deprivations—naturally have their part in this system, but it is a functional part no greater than may be necessary to do what can be done to prevent antisocial behavior, and to account for it when despite our efforts it does occur. "Accounting" for it means, again, doing what practically can be done to insure that the particular individual alters his course of behavior thereafter. Moreover, sanctions were to be recognized as "positive" as well as "negative"—rewards as well as deprivations were to be used as proper techniques for inducing proper behavior. Our moral education as youngsters was based on both techniques—and if an individual's moral upbringing was faulty, both techniques were deemed necessary in correcting it. This sounds so reasonable and so simple—but it is a never-never land compared to our present system.

This point about the utility of punishment perhaps requires some emphasis. I would not want to leave you with the impression that I am opposed to all measures of punishment, or deprivation. It seems superfluous to state that I recognize their necessity, but perhaps I had better do so because thinking in this field tends to be characterized by an either-or, all-or-nothing attitude. It is just this attitude which I object to and from which I wish to dissociate myself. Let me illustrate its unfortunate effects. When the Durham case was decided in the District of Columbia, a great hue and cry was raised that great numbers of vicious criminals would soon be roaming the streets of the city. Nothing could have been more off the mark, as subsequent events have shown. But at the time many people felt that either offenders are punished by execution of a penitentiary term, or they in effect get off scot-free—that all of them must be punished and just punished, or nothing would be done to protect society against them. Our Court of Appeals was compelled to reverse a number of cases on the ground that the jury was not properly instructed regarding the consequences of an acquittal by reason of insanity. The court now requires a positive instruction to the effect that the defendant acquitted by reason of insanity will be put in a mental institution until cured and judicially determined to be no longer a danger to himself or others. Such commitments, incidentally, may continue for a longer term than would have been served in a penitentiary for the offense charged. They are clearly a deprivation, a negative sanction—and in this sense a punishment—but with the very important difference that it is not retributive, it is no more than may be necessary, and it is punishment subordinate to the purpose of rehabilitation.

Or another point. Some people seem to feel that whenever trained workers including psychiatric therapists supplement the work of police and prison guards, or play any independent role at all, the offender will be

mollycoddled and consequently society's bulwark against crime will crumble. This is nonsense, but the attitude persists. Dr. Melitta Schmideberg of the Association for the Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders is one of the most devoted and distinguished workers in her field. I am not competent to underwrite the validity of her views, but she is a richly experienced therapist in this special and rather neglected area of treatment. She believes in a strongly directive therapy, and in the course thereof gives practical recognition to the fact that the threat of loss of liberty—of going to jail or going back to jail—plays an important part in her work with probationed offenders or repeaters. This threat is an ever-present backdrop to her efforts to help the patient get along with his probation officer, to stop breaking the law, to get a job and hold it, and so on. She feels that—"Fear of punishment and guilt keep normal people in check, but an overdose of anxiety can react in the opposite direction on criminals." She states the problem as follows: "If the therapist condemns the offender out and out, he cannot treat him; if he condones his offense, he cannot change him." This is certainly not a mollycoddling approach. On the other hand, she objects eloquently to the psychological effect on offenders of a period in the usual penitentiary. She feels one of the most imperative uses of therapy is to help the ex-convict overcome the effects of prison. Now does it strike anyone here as sensible to deny early treatment of first offenders, send them to a penitentiary where their dangerous problems will be dangerously augmented, and then end up with an infinitely more difficult problem personality to deal with later on?

Why do we do it? Why do we treat offenders this way? I trust that by this time you are aware that I do not really have a neat answer, and that any satisfactory answer will be found to lie very deep indeed—probably at the core of man's inhumanity to man, in each of us and in the history of all of us. As of today, the main problem is that the problem has been with us so long. Its insolubility has been sanctified by history. But as regards the similar and not unrelated problem of poverty, more and more people are now refusing to be stopped by this traditional historical impasse. Perhaps this revolutionary century of ours will also effect a little revolution on behalf of the fallible humans who cannot live up to even the more obvious rules of social order, without somewhat more help than most of us get or need. One doesn't have to be a wild radical to see this problem as one with which we are doing very poorly and one which calls for top-to-bottom rethinking. As Morris Cohen reminds us, "It was the conservative President Taft, later Chief Justice of the United States, who characterized our criminal law as a disgrace to civilization."

But when we transcend our emotional urge to punish, and begin to think seriously about crime and the criminal without such undue reliance on the one idea of punishment, we very shortly come right up against an intellectually much more formidable barrier. And that is the ubiquitous theory of deterrence. On the intellectual level, it turns out to be the greatest barrier to progress in the criminal law.

This theory proposes that actual malefactors be punished in order to deter potential malefactors. In its pure form, it is willing to assume arguendo that punishment may not reform and may even damage the particular individual being punished. But this unfortunate person must be sacrificed to the common good—he must be punished as an example to all, to keep all the rest of us from committing his crime. Of course, the theory is not always stated in this pure form. Indeed, there is a common confusion which you may notice in arguments based on the premise of deterrence—a confusion between deterrence of the person being punished and deterrence of all others. Now clearly the convicted prisoner was not deterred by the prior punishment of others from committing the crime which placed him in prison. And to speak of deterring him from committing another offense later takes us back to the previous discussion of the effectivenes sof punishment, and concerns rehabilitation not deterrence. So the theory, properly considered, involves only the justification of punishment because of its show effect, its supposed effect on others. I need not labor the point that the individual so used is a scapegoat, a sacrificial victim. This is an admitted feature of the theory.

Logically, of course, the more we witness the pains of punishment, the more apt they would be actually to deter us from crime. (That is, if active fear deters.) Originally, this logic was a part of the deterrence theory. But in our day it is not. To illustrate this I would like to quote from the 1953 report of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment:

"In the first half of the 19th century executions still took place in public. This indeed was thought to be an essential part of the deterrent value of the death penalty. But public executions, 'though the publicity was deterrent in intention * * * became in practice a degrading form of popular entertainment, which could serve only to deprave the minds of the spectators.' "

Parliament ended the practice in 1868. The report also suggests that the method of hanging was invented and found favor because of its advertisement value. But at the hearings before the Commission, witness after witness defended hanging because it was the most humane method of execution. The report notes this surprising inversion succinctly as follows:

"Thus a method of execution whose special merit was formerly thought to be that it was peculiarly degrading is now defended on the ground that it is uniquely humane."

So clearly the deterrence theory is not quite so logical as it used to be. (And just as well.)

I understand that what empirical studies have been made of the deterrent value of capital and other forms of punishment can properly be characterized as "inconclusive." If this is so, and as long as it is so, we are free to speculate about the problem—but I think we do have an accompanying obligation to avoid rigid formulations and dogmatic stands.

A common argument offered in support of deterrence is this: The ordinary citizen would not obey traffic signals if sanctions were not imposed on all drivers for breach of the rules. This argument, please notice, depends for its persuasiveness on a supposed identify between a traffic violation, on the one hand and murder, assault and grand theft, on the other all these being breach of the rules. Although I suppose they all do come under this category, the empirical differences are more impressive to me than the abstract similarity. But more important, because of the preconditioning of licensing, the persons to whom traffic rules are addressed are a select group to begin with: Those who are incompetent to conform to the rules, for whatever reasons, are weeded out before the sanction system is applied. And that is an important point. Although traffic rules have very little moral force behind them, the system works tolerably well just because reliance is not placed solely on sanctions, but also on the judgment of competence.

I think we all understand that the maintenance of public order must be backed up by a system of sanctions, deprivations, punishments, if you please. Neither law nor morality can sustain itself, from generation to generation, without the threat of some form of punishment. But the difficult point to be comprehended here is that the system requires the threat of punishment, not punishment itself. An internal control system generated by our mores and received beliefs keeps most of us from stealing. For those who require external controls, it is the threat of going to jail, not actual time spent there, that keeps them from stealing. Actual sanctions are needed—as far as the system is concerned—only to give substance to the threat, to keep it from being reduced to impotence. The problem really posed by the question of deterrence is, how much actual punishment—and what kind of actual punishment—is required in order to sustain the threat of punishment at an effective level? Or, stated inversely, now looking at the problem from the point of view of the individual rather than the system, how much nonpunishment, how much besides punishment, can be allowed in treatment of the individual without inviting a breakdown of the system of sanctions?

I do not propose to solve this problem, even stated in such fashion, from this platform, this evening. But I do want to conclude with a few observations about this critical and perplexing question. First of all, I believe that in the absence of decisive empirical data, we should take a developmental approach. That is, we should view the issue historically and not assume that any particular status quo is ultimate and unalterable. I will confess that I am subjectively distrustful of many ponderous proponents of deterrence who answer the question, how much punishment is necesary, with the quick reply, exactly as much as we now have. And those who use the necessity of deterrence to justify the scandal of our prison system, also earn my suspicion.

Some people have argued in favor of the M'Naghten ritual on the grounds of a deterrent effect—that the mentally ill offender should not be recognized as such and treated as such because to do so would encourage crime and perhaps even mental illness. This argument I consider beneath contempt. The M'Naghten rules were adopted 25 years before the English saw fit to do away with public hearings. As Dr. Eliot Slater has stated, "* * * the effect of the rules has been to stabilize the law at the time of 1843 into being the law of the country for all time. This is an event without equal in the history of English common law." Whether or not without equal, it is certainly rare, and certainly contrary to the modification by experience that we are told is the genius of the common law. Why, I wonder, are these rules considered still necessary to deter crime, when public hangings and capital punishment for petty offenses are not? And if M'Naghten is so necessary for this purpose, why do the same people justify it by reminding us that trial courts frequently ignore it?

To sum up briefly: Punishment has a role to play in the education and reeducation of the individual. The threat of some form of deprivation is of course essential in the functioning of any moral or legal system—and the threat must have substance. But these basic requirements of the criminal law have been used—I will say misused—to justify the present system which contains a preposterous predominance of senseless punitive elements. The theory of deterrence, as too frequently applied, results in degrading the individual for a purported social purpose—contrary to the democratic ethos and with no convincing evidence that the purpose is promoted. In doing so, in casting the individual offender in the role of a scapegoat, it begs the entire question of justice. And while no sociolegal system can reach a perfect incarnation of justice, none can survive in the hearts of the people which bypasses or does not engage the issue seriously.

If we were not so set on punishing the offender for the sake of punishment, if we did

not justify this practice by reference to its deterrent effect, we could understand that rehabilitation lies at the spiritual heart of any vital moral system. The alternative can only be destructiveness. Even the violent corporal punishments of the past were designed to rehabilitate the wrongdoer's soul, which was held to be of much greater concern than his body. In our secular age, we have lost sight of this spiritual truth. But we still punish—without hope of reformation, without belief in saving the soul by damning the earthly body. And our entire moral system necessarily suffers thereby.

Would it really be the end of the world if all jails were turned into hospitals, or rehabilitation centers? The offender would then—just as the committed mental patient is today—be deprived of his dearest possession, his personal liberty. Punishment enough, I should think—to satisfy our punitive urge and to induce a deterrent fear. The offender's purpose in such a rehabilitation center would be to change his personality, his very style of responding to life. I would like to suggest, quite seriously, that the effort, toward such a personal alteration is the greatest sanction of them all. To make this is indeed the true command of all religion and all morality. And it is the normal law-abiding person's most profound and continuous punishment. The difference between the offender or the mental patient and the rest of us happily normal citizens, is that they have a special problem and need special help in living up to society's expectations. A few of us have had special problems in the course of our lives but were lucky enough to get the help we needed, or strong enough to get by on our own. We are entitled to congratulate ourselves on the superiority of our endowment or good fortune—but not, I think, to celebrate our triumphs by degrading our less fortunate neighbors. Is it in any way necessary for our own benefit to perpetuate the shame of our penitentiaries—where a youthful offender, having been processed through the homosexual auction block, will be taught the ways of crime and perversity by a hardened expert?

I am at the end of my remarks—for this evening, at least. I have not said enough, and perhaps I have also said too much. I know that I have oversimplified, because my purpose has been to emphasize a pervasive and half-hidden factor in a highly complex matter. The ubiquitous and irrational quality of the need to punish is an essential key, I believe, to an analysis of criminal law problems—but it is of course not a substitute for that analysis itself. Among the many serious issues I have not discussed this evening, prominent mention should be made of the current and future limits of that omnibus grouping called the behavioral sciences. How much of their promise is valid hope, how much wishful thinking? We can only find out by trying—by experimenting. Take the question of psychiatric treatment, for example. It seems clear that new, more sophisticated techniques will have to be developed with more pointed relevance to the problems of offenders. But where are the experimental clinics, where are the budgets to attract competent staff, where is the administrative approach that would welcome and facilitate this urgent work? Blocked, I have suggested, by the belief in punishment. Many critics of the reforming attitude in criminal law administration fear the unknown contours of a future dominated by the experimental ideas of rehabilitation. Reformers may share some of these fears, but they are motivated even more by fear of the consequences of continuing our present practices. For example, I am deeply disturbed by the whole question of the indeterminacy of the period of incarceration, which is a very serious problem today and will undoubtedly grow in importance as reforms favoring rehabilitation are instituted. The image of one class of experts administering the lives of another class of "unfortunates" has some very disquieting aspects. I comfort myself with the thought that images of the future are frequently discomfiting, and that early surgery, for example, was probably greeted with the same disquiet. Imagine one man cutting up another. But it has worked out tolerably well.

Perhaps we can take comfort that new problems have a way of begetting new solutions and that, in this instance, solutions may be found which are consonant with our traditional concern for civil liberties. I, for one, have no intention of ushering in permanent incarceration for behavior not seriously dangerous to society.

After all this speculation of mine, I would like to leave you at least with a restored sense of reality. Crime and criminals belong very much to their particular time and place. They grow out of very specific social settings. Moreover, any system of sanctions and any system of rehabilitation applies to and within a society, it does not substitute for one. And these systems cannot be much better than the society in which they exist. On the other hand, they should not be worse. I leave you with the question whether they in fact are.

Greater Wilkes-Barre's Fine Arts Fiesta Termed Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 29, 1960, which comments upon the recently concluded Fine Arts Fiesta that was held in Wilkes-Barre:

FIESTA'S SUCCESS

After phenomenal success, and a record-breaking attendance, this year's Fine Arts Fiesta, was concluded brilliantly yesterday despite cloudy skies.

It was cited by community leaders, not only as an expression of the community's creativity in the arts, crafts and entertainments, but also as a demonstration of the new, forward-looking spirit of the community itself.

The cooperation of 35 cultural organizations and over 1,000 individuals is indeed the best sort of evidence of how a community can work together toward a common goal.

Not the smallest achievement of the Fine Arts Fiesta is its mounting renown in the national picture. Typifying the kind of national attention it is winning for Greater Wilkes-Barre is the fact it "made" the Sunday New York Times twice this month. First, the fiesta was listed on the New York Times' tourist calendar of outstanding attractions for the month of May.

Secondly, and even more impressive, in the New York Times of May 15, the fiesta under the caption "Wilkes-Barre Fiesta" was in a prominent paragraph midst other paragraphs describing tourist attractions in Scandinavia, France, Israel, South America, India and elsewhere.

This type of attention indicates that the Fine Arts Fiesta has "arrived." What is more, it indicates how much further it can go, by way of bringing national repute to the community. As such—and as a cultural asset of the community—it should have every backing and encouragement in future years.

Special community thanks are due Miss Annette Evans, fiesta president and founder, and her valiant coworkers. "The Renaissance" was indeed a fitting them for this year's event. It may well describe the entire enterprise.

Results of the Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, each year I send questionnaires to the voters of my district because the answers are of value to me, the Representative on whom these voters depend. The answers to this year's questionnaire indicate to me that there is a greater interest among the people of the second district in national and world affairs than ever before.

Although the returns have been excellent in past years, the return this year exceeded my expectations and this is gratifying to me. I mailed 92,700 questionnaires this year and received a return of 12 percent.

The returned questionnaires have been grouped into six categories, which are self-explanatory. They include labor, white collar, farmer, professional, business, and miscellaneous. The last category included unsigned questionnaires, housewives, retired persons, students and others who could not be classified easily in one of the other groups.

Mr. Speaker, the substantial thought given to the issues and problems covered by the questionnaire is encouraging. About 40 percent of those who answered took the time and the trouble to comment in detail on these matters, and these comments help me to determine how I should represent my district. I regret that time simply did not permit a detailed reply to these people for I should like to have done so.

I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in the outcome of my questionnaire, so under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the detailed results. The figures I use here represent percentages, not the number of persons who answered a particular question.

1. In order of their importance to you, number the six most important issues today.

	Labor	White collar	Farmer	Professional	Business	Miscellaneous	All
National defense	48	31	33	26	38	36	36
Peace	17	22	17	21	17	19	21
Inflation	12	20	23	14	25	20	19
Education	4	5	4	16	2	5	6
Foreign affairs	3	7	2	11	5	4	5
Budget	3	4	4	3	3	2	3
Social security	3	1	3	1	1	4	3
Civil rights	3	2	1	3	1	3	2
Missile development	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Atomic energy	1	1	1	(1)	1	1	1
Farm program	1	1	8	1	1	2	1
Disarmament	1	1	(1)	1	(1)	(1)	(1)
Flood control	(1)	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)	(1)
Space exploration	1	1	(1)	(1)	1	1	(1)
Other	1	3	2	2	2	2	2

[1] Less than 1 percent.

2. The President has estimated a surplus for fiscal 1961. Should we: (A) Spend it, (B) reduce taxes, (C) reduce the national debt.

	(A) Spend it	(B) Reduce taxes	(C) Reduce the national debt
Labor	8	32	60
White collar	6	24	70
Farmer	5	20	75
Professional	8	19	73
Business	4	27	69
Miscellaneous	7	26	67
All	7	26	67

3. Liberalization of social security will require increases in individual and employer contributions. Under such circumstances do your prefer: (a) No change in the low, (b) surgical and hospital care for beneficiaries, (c) higher ceiling on allowable earnings?

	A	B	C
Labor	23	44	33
White collar	36	28	36
Farmer	35	38	27
Professional	35	23	42
Business	39	26	35
Miscellaneous	22	51	27
All	29	39	32

4. Do you favor a series of summit conferences such as the one scheduled for Paris this spring?

	Yes	No
Labor	74	26
White collar	88	12
Farmer	78	22
Professional	85	15
Business	73	27
Miscellaneous	81	19
All	79	21

5. Do you favor continuation by the United States of its mutual security program of military and economic aid to countries outside the Soviet bloc?

	Yes	No
Labor	68	32
White collar	78	22
Farmer	73	27
Professional	87	13
Business	72	28
Miscellaneous	71	29
All	73	27

6. Do you favor recognition of Red China?

	Yes	No
Labor	26	74
White collar	27	73
Farmer	18	82
Professional	30	70
Business	24	76
Miscellaneous	25	75
All	25	75

7. Do you favor: (A) An increase in minimum wages from $1 to $1.25 an hour, (B) extension of minimum wages to cover more workers who are exempt now?

	A		B	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Labor	73	27	88	12
White collar	55	45	78	22
Farmer	42	58	66	34
Professional	52	48	71	29
Business	45	55	68	32
Miscellaneous	58	42	80	20
All	59	41	78	22

8. Do you favor repeal of the 22d amendment which limits the President to two terms?

	Yes	No
Labor	27	73
White collar	23	77
Farmer	22	78
Professional	24	76
Business	22	78
Miscellaneous	27	73
All	27	73

9. Should the Federal Government provide funds for (A) school construction, (B) teachers' salaries?

	A		B	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Labor	58	42	33	67
White collar	46	54	24	76
Farmer	41	59	22	78
Professional	57	43	42	58
Business	39	61	33	67
Miscellaneous	48	52	30	70
All	50	50	29	71

10. Do you favor so-called wilderness legislation now pending before Congress?

	Yes	No
Labor	47	53
White collar	48	52
Farmer	27	73
Professional	55	45
Business	38	62
Miscellaneous	43	57
All	44	56

11. In November 1960, whom would you like to see elected (A) President, (B) Vice President?

A

	Labor	White collar	Farmer	Professional	Business	Miscellaneous	All
Humphrey	5	1	3	1	1	2	2
Kennedy	12	8	3	5	7	8	8
Johnson	2	3	1	1	(1)	1	1
Nixon	44	60	67	62	71	63	59
Rockefeller	8	11	10	10	8	7	9
Stevenson	7	6	3	10	2	5	6
Symington	3	1	1	(1)	(1)	2	1
A Democrat	10	3	3	4	5	6	5
A Republican	5	4	4	4	4	3	4
Others	4	3	5	3	2	3	4

[1] Less than 1 percent.

B

	Labor	White collar	Farmer	Professional	Business	Miscellaneous	All
Kennedy	5	7	3	7	3	5	5
Lodge	8	9	7	11	14	13	10
Rockefeller	17	26	29	28	33	22	24
A Democrat	35	21	13	17	11	23	23
A Republican	27	30	34	29	32	30	30
Others	8	7	14	8	7	7	8

Mr. Speaker, the results show that the people of my district are concerned with national defense. The fact that peace ranked next in importance is an indication they believe that a strong defense will prevent an atomic or conventional war. I find that the fact inflation ranked third and the budget was among the top six issues indicate that the people support the President's efforts in this direction. They want a balanced budget, and if there is a surplus they want the national debt reduced.

I am pleased to note there is no dissension between the six categories. Substantially the majority of each group expressed the same viewpoint toward all major issues. This means the people of my district are solidly bound in their feelings toward what is good for the Nation.

John L. Erickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on June 1, today, my administrative assistant, John Erickson, is leaving to become a regional manager of the Ford Motor

Co.'s new political study program for employees. This decision of Mr. Erickson's is my loss and Ford's gain.

I first became acquainted with John Erickson when I was president of the University of Arkansas and he was a student. He became my administrative assistant shortly after his graduation from college and has been a dedicated and efficient employee for the past 18 years. I shall miss John Erickson's unerring ability to get to the essential root of a problem, to discern the special pleader from the legitimate advocate, and, most of all, his unyielding loyalty. He will not be easily replaced. He will be missed on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Erickson is, I believe, one of the most competent men in his field that I have ever met. I regard his leaving not only as a loss to me but also as a loss to the State of Arkansas and to our country. I congratulate the Ford Motor Co. upon their discrimination. I deplore the fact that our Government cannot afford to compete with the Ford Motor Co. in the ability to pay for superior talents.

I ask unanimous consent that a news item and editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD; as well as a release issued by the Ford Motor Co.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, May 21, 1960]

A GOOD MAN'S NEW WORK

John Erickson, a near 20-year veteran of the Washington jungle at 39, has announced his resignation as administrative assistant to Senator FULBRIGHT to become a regional manager of the Ford Motor Co.'s new political education program for employees.

As the often inadequate expression goes, Arkansas' (and, of course, Senator FULBRIGHT's) loss will be Ford's gain, just as it could have been said that it was journalism's loss and Government service's gain when "Sonny" Erickson first went to Washington in 1942 on the staff of former Third District Representative Clyde T. Ellis. Trained in journalism, and a student editor both at Rogers High School and the university, Mr. Erickson brought a lively intelligence and a solid academic background to the job of being a Congressman's "other self," an assignment which has its undeniable fascinations and rewards but one that also involves an uncommon amount of painstaking drudgery. How well he succeeded can be attested to, not only by the thousands of Senator FULBRIGHT's Arkansas constituents who have found him in a stout champion of theirs and the State's best interests, but also among the company of his peers, by whom he has long been rated as one of the really top-drawer old Washington hands.

It is true—and in instances such as this, saddening—that Government will never be able to match the material rewards which private corporations can offer to bright young men of John Erickson's caliber. But after the long hitch of direct service to the public which he now has put in, Mr. Erickson certainly has every right to go where the material reward will be greater—and the nonmaterial satisfactions not inconsiderable. For, indirectly, he still will be making a contribution to improvement of governmental standards as a key man in Ford's nonpartisan program for stimulating employee interest in an active, educated participation in the political processes, a program which already is being called a model for other public-spirited corporations.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, May 20, 1960]

FULBRIGHT ASSISTANT TO TAKE FORD MOTOR POST

WASHINGTON, May 19.—John Erickson, administrative assistant to Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and one of the State's best known contact men in Washington, is resigning to become regional manager of the civic and government affairs division for Ford Motor Co., at Kansas City, it was learned here today.

Erickson, 39, will head a seven-State area for the company, which has recently initiated a new program aimed to interest its employees in government and political affairs.

Erickson has been associated with Senator FULBRIGHT since 1943 when he came to Congress as a Representative from the Fayetteville district.

A graduate of the University of Arkansas, Erickson grew up at Rogers. He received a bachelor of arts degree in journalism in 1942, and went to work for former Representative Clyde Ellis.

RELEASE FROM FORD MOTOR CO.

Appointment of John L. Erickson, 802 Janney's Lane, Alexandria, Va., as regional civic and governmental affairs manager for Ford Motor Co. in Kansas City, Mo., was announced today by Allen W. Merrell, director of the Civic and Governmental Affairs Office.

Mr. Erickson, administrative assistant to U.S. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, will assume his new position June 1.

He will be in charge of the company's civic and governmental affairs activities in the States of Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The appointment of Mr. Erickson completes the staffing of eight regional offices, a central feature of the current extension of Ford's civic and governmental affairs program. Believed to be the first of its kind in American industry, the field organization also includes offices in Chicago, Atlanta, Cleveland, Dallas, Albany, Los Angeles, and Trenton, N.J. Each of the regional managers has been selected for his extensive background in government or political affairs in his region.

Mr. Erickson's responsibilities will include counseling with company executives on government relations matters at the Federal, State, and local levels, working with the company's community relations committees in the public affairs field and representing Ford's viewpoint on legislation affecting the company in the seven-State area.

Mr. Erickson has been on Senator FULBRIGHT's staff since 1943. In 1943 and 1944, Senator FULBRIGHT was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and in 1945, he became a Senator.

Prior to joining Senator FULBRIGHT's staff, Mr. Erickson was executive secretary to former Representative Clyde T. Ellis of Arkansas in 1942. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Arkansas.

An Editorial Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a miracle has happened. The Washington Post has taken one of my conservative proposals and given it complete approval in an editorial carried in the issue of Monday, May 30. This is so unusual and so unexpected that I feel my colleagues who know what a conservative I am should have their attention called to it. The Washington Post editorial follows:

AID TO CAMPAIGN FINANCING

By way of encouraging widespread contributions to political candidates and parties, Representative MASON has introduced a bill to exempt such gifts from the income tax, within certain limitations. We do not lightly approve any measure that would have the effect of depriving the Government of revenue, even in small amounts, but this added incentive to campaign giving would serve a basic political purpose—that of reducing the reliance of candidates on a few wealthy benefactors who may have axes to grind. This advantage is so great that it ought to dominate the debate of the measure.

The proposed exemption is limited so as to elicit moderate and small contributions and discourage excessive ones. A taxpayer could claim exemption up to only 2 percent of his adjusted gross income, and the maximum sum that he could deduct in any event would be $1,000. Fat cats would get relatively little relief from the bill; the rank and file of small contributors could give to the candidates and political committees of their choice without paying any tax on the amount donated. This notable incentive to sound campaign financing seems to us to override any objections based on the small amount of revenue that would be lost.

Bright Future Predicted for Nanticoke, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an extremely unusual and happy development took place during the past week in a city in my congressional district, Nanticoke, Pa. At the annual dinner of the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce, it was announced that the municipality had reached the happy state of being debt free. This condition, I am sure it is agreed, is indeed a most unusual development in this day and age where huge fiscal debts seem to be the rule and accepted as a part of the modern way of life. I, therefore, want to take this means and opportunity to warmly congratulate the public officials of Nanticoke for their high degree of fiscal responsibility and prudent management. It indeed speaks well for the future success and further development of that fine municipality. In line with this, I include as part of my remarks an informative newsstory which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of May 26, 1960:

MARTIN SEES BRIGHT FUTURE FOR NANTICOKE—HIGHWAY CHIEF TELLS PLANS; CITY BURNS LAST OF BOND DEBT

Enthusiasm and optimism for Nanticoke's future ran high at last night's annual dinner of the chamber of commerce in the American Legion Home. Alexander Choman, chamber of commerce president; Mayor Charles A. Makar, toastmaster; Senator An-

drew J. Sordoni, who was presented a plaque honoring his golden jubilee in business; and the principal speaker, Park H. Martin, secretary of highways, all contributed to a bright outlook for the future.

Martin was presented by Leonard Siegel, past chamber of commerce president, who reviewed the services and accomplishments of the speaker. Mr. Martin stated he was pleased to come to Nanticoke and felt he had heard real success stories both of Nanticoke's accomplishments and the growth of the Sordoni Enterprises.

He said it gave him reason to review the work done in Pittsburgh where it took 14 years to rebuild the downtown area and it is now referred to as Pittsburgh's renaissance. He directed the planning and said the hard task was accomplished because of the real stamina, perseverance and determination of the citizens led by a small group of dedicated planners.

Martin said he took the highway post reluctantly and knew it was a hard task and demanding. But, he said, the highway system and need of industrial development are related and jobs depend on good transportation.

Pennsylvania was shown with 41,700 miles of State roads as having more miles than all of New England, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware combined. This makes it a tough challenge because many of our roads are old, obsolete and need complete rebuilding to meet today's need.

Martin added there are two systems, Federal aid and interstate roads, which get 90 percent Federal aid: a primary system, which gets 50 percent Federal aid; and strictly State roads that get no outside help.

Martin said, "We in Pennsylvania have to do some long range financial planning to promote good programing. We have completed a list of projects to a total of some $3 billion that should be spent in the next 12 years. That's an average of $250 million a year, more than ever was contracted in a single year and still does not include strictly local projects."

The department anticipates twice as many cars and trucks in 15 years and these must be planned for, he said. Speeds have been increased, safety factors must be expanded, Martin said and added, "My story as I see it is your story."

He said he came to Nanticoke hopeful the Keystone Shortway will be beneficial to the area and said the department expects soon to contract for a bridge over the river near Berwick as part of this road. He added the State will relocate a State road in the Nanticoke Redevelopment area and on Friday will open bids for a new bridge over Forge Creek on West Main Street, near Alden Road.

SORDONI HONORED

Mayor Charles A. Makar, as toastmaster, drew on a fund of numerous stories to lighten spots in the program. He was serious, however, when he presented an illuminated and framed plaque to Andred J. Sordoni as a remembrance from the people of Nanticoke in honor of Sordoni's golden jubilee in business.

Senator Sordoni thanked Nanticoke for the great honor shown him and thanked some old personal friends who went through several political campaigns with him, giving him stalwart support in Nanticoke.

He said he got from working in the mines for 10 cents an hour to meeting a payroll of $50,000 a day only because he picked the right parents. He paid tribute to his mother and her honest philosophies so deeply impressed in him that he has passed on the urge to his entire organization to be sure it is the right thing and then do it. He added a tribute to Park H. Martin for his ability that led Governor Lawrence to pick a stalwart Republican to fill so important a post.

CITY BURNS BOND

Mayor Makar reviewed the problem facing the city back in 1952 when it was terribly difficult to determine where the city actually stood. Old bills and debts of some $269,000 were tabulated and then the Economy League was called in to help formulate a program to get the city out of debt.

He said today, Nanticoke is debt free, the largest city to be able to say that. Arnold in western Pennsylvania shares the same honor. The debt represented "paying for dead horses," the mayor explained, but any future debt will be sound financing for public improvement and needed equipment.

Gerald Mangan, vice president in charge of Miners Bank of Wilkes-Barre, Nanticoke Main Street Branch, presented the canceled bonds to William Dudeck, finance officer of the city, who burned a bond as evidence the city is free from debt.

President Al Choman welcomed about 300 guests and friends from other chambers. He reviewed the accomplishments of the chamber and set a target of 350 memberships in 1960. He declared a larger group is needed to get more energy back of the push to move Nanticoke forward.

Miss Irene Bavitz and Joseph Shymanski entertained with duets, accompanied by Mrs. Bertha Rule. They sang "The Desert Song," "Some Day" from "Vagabond King"; and as an encore, "Sweetheart."

Invocation was by Rev. Francis A. Dobrydnio, of Holy Trinity Church, which followed the singing of the national anthem. Benediction was by Rev. H. Jerome Leinbach, pastor of Zion Reformed Church.

Fighter Interceptors Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I speak again of the recent decision of the Air Force to inactivate the 449th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, Alaska, by August of this year, and I vigorously protest, as I have before, this untimely weakening of America's defenses against manned bombers which, according to Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of the Air Force, are still Russia's most dangerous weapons.

Much in point from the standpoint of all of us is an editorial in the May 28 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times, which I submit for the consideration of all my colleagues. The editorial follows:

OREGON SOUNDS ALARM FOR DEFENSES HERE

What Alaskans think about the defense requirements in their State, apparently makes no difference to the men in the Pentagon who makes the decisions.

Despite the repeated and persistent protests and warnings from Alaska's Representatives in Congress, there has been no change in plans to weaken the defenses here by the withdrawal of the 449th squadron at Ladd Air Force Base.

But it may make a difference what the people of the other 49 States think about it. Weakening of Alaska's defenses makes the other States targets for quick and easy Soviet aggression. The gateway through Alaska is obviously going to be left wide open and guarded only by an alarm system that tells when they are coming.

This is being discovered in the other States, as reflected in an editorial published in the Portland Oregonian this week.

The editorial follows:

"Word from Washington that almost half the fighter planes assigned to Alaskan air bases will be removed this summer has alarmed and angered residents of the new State.

"And well it may disturb residents of the other 49 States, too. To weaken the defense strength of an area hitherto regarded as a keystone of the Nation's military structure would be difficult to understand at any time. But at this time, in the wake of the U-2 incident and the collapse of summit talks, it is simply incredible.

"Gen. Curtis LeMay, the cigar-chomping Deputy Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, told members of the Alaska congressional delegation the Pentagon doesn't regard their State as strategically important any more. He believes Alaska will be sufficiently defended by the 33 interceptors of the 317th Squadron at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, after the disbanding of the 449th Squadron with its 25 aircraft based at Ladd Air Force Base, 225 miles away at Fairbanks.

"Furthermore, General LeMay said he doubts the Russians would choose the Alaskan route for any bombing raid on the North American Continent because the DEW line radar stations would rob them of the element of surprise. And in any case, the general concluded, long-range fighters based on the Pacific coast could knock down the intruders as well as the Alaska planes.

"This appraisal of the Alaskan defense situation is a slap in the face for Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, the Alaska defense commander who last year urged the location of more offensive and defensive missile bases in that State to prevent its use as an invasion route by the Reds.

"General LeMay's views most certainly are not shared, either, by the chief of the North American Air Defense Command, Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, whose job it is to beat off airborne intruders with the tools the Pentagon gives him. General Kuter is firmly on record against the degradation of his defenses against manned bombers, holding that these will continue to be dangerous adversaries for many years to come despite the increasing emphasis on missiles.

"What can civilians do when generals disagree on military questions? We can only follow our instincts, and ours tell us the assumption that the Reds are going out of the bomber business is overly optimistic. According to intelligence estimates the Soviet Union now has about 1,200 firstline, long-range jet bombers. Even if we can believe Nikita Khrushchev when he says he's not going to build any more bombers, our fliers figure that by "cannibalizing" spare parts from grounded planes and allowing a 5-percent attrition rate per year, Russia still could put into the air as late as 1975 a fleet of 700 bombers able to hit us with 1,000 megatons of nuclear weapons if unopposed. So we had best be prepared for another decade to oppose them. * * *"

Coalfield's Output Hits Record 29,401,573 Tons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled, "Coalfield's Output Hits Record 29,401,573 Tons," which appeared in the

May 26, 1960, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The article is as follows:

COALFIELD'S OUTPUT HITS RECORD 29,401,573 TONS—SHOWS GAIN IN 1959 WHILE U.S. TONNAGE DROPS

Coal production in the western Kentucky field hit an alltime high of 29,401,573 tons in 1959, while national coal output decreased about 15 percent.

This was reported today by Kentucky Coal Agency Secretary William M. Shanks in the agency's annual tonnage report, which showed a production increase of 6.19 percent in the western Kentucky field over the 1958 tonnage of 27,687,566.

The tremendous growth of the coal industry in western Kentucky in recent years is shown by the fact that the 1959 tonnage figures are more than 3½ times the production for this area only 20 years ago.

Hopkins County continued to be the leading producer in the field—and presumably in the State—despite a 3 percent dip in tonnage. Hopkins' tonnage for 1959 totaled 11,336,474 in 1959, compared to 11,687,026 in 1958.

Muhlenberg County gained 9 percent, increasing its tonnage from 1958's 8,902,872 to 10,037,026 in 1959.

Hopkins County produced 38.56 percent of the field's tonnage while Muhlenberg's output accounted for 34.25 percent.

TOPS 1956 RECORD

Jumping from fourth to third place in the field was Union County, with a 29-percent gain—2,741,048 tons in 1959 as compared to 2,084,238 the previous year.

Ohio County, despite a 6-percent gain, dropped from third to fourth place, with 2,635,077 tons, compared with 1958's mark of 2,469,966.

The previous high mark in the western Kentucky coal field tonnage was in 1956, when the area produced 29,250,781 tons.

Tonnage figures for 1959 in the other seven counties are as follows: Webster 1,244,937; Daviess 759,808; Henderson 277,791; Butler 215,082; Hancock 118,511; McLean 3,590; and Christian 1,372.

Coal tonnage carried on river barges jumped more than one-million tons during 1959, totaling 9,294,953 tons, compared to a 1958 tonnage of 8,252,484.

Truck-mine tonnage also showed a sharp upturn, from 1958's total of 1,000,984 to 1,412,313 in 1959.

Tonnage from rail-connected mines also went along with the increase, showing 18,693,707 tons in 1959 to 18,434,098 in 1958.

Production reports from the entire State have not been published yet by the Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals.

Hopkins County's tonnage for 1959, by seams, was as follows: 11th seam, 6,395,243; 9th seam, 2,651,994; 6th seam, 1,364,274; and 12th seam, 924,963.

The 10 leading producers in the county, with their 1959 tonnage figures, are:

West Kentucky Coal Co., East Diamond mine, 1,314,681.

Peabody Coal Co., White City mine, 1,219,060.

Nashville Coal, Inc., Fies mine, 1,082,925.

West Kentucky Pleasant View mine, 1,019,695.

EIGHT MILLION TONS IN 1939

Colltown Mining Co., 833,825.

Bell & Zoller Coal Co., Oriole mine, 747,313.

Pittsburg and Midway Coal Mining Co., Colonial mine, 683,721.

Ruby, Chandler & Jordan, 637,682.

Peabody Coal Co., Pond River mine, 555,960.

Norton Coal Corp., Sternberg mine, 495,445.

The two largest single producers in the field are the river-connected strip mines—Peabody's River Queen mine in Muhlenberg with 2,399,155 tons produced in 1959, and the same company's Ken mine in Ohio County, with 2,057,450 tons.

Other big producers in the field are Peabody's Vogue mine in Muhlenberg, 1,748,020 tons; Nashville Coal, Inc., Uniontown mine in Union County, 1,501,727; Gibraltar Coal Corp., Muhlenberg, 1,573,761; P & M's Paradise mine in Muhlenberg, 1,331,441; and its De Koven mine in Union County 1,155,977.

The western Kentucky coal field has had an almost unbroken record of progress in tonnage in the 21 years since the coal agency began recording statistics here. The agency's first year was 1939 and the tonnage for the field that year was only 8 million tons, less than one-third of the production for the field last year, Shanks said.

In the American Tradition—America, Still the Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to commend and offer congratulations to one of Kentucky's and, indeed, America's outstanding citizens. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a man who has become a living testimony of what a man can do with his life in America.

This man, Mr. Speaker, is Garvice D. Kincaid, of Lexington. He is one of the eight winners of the 14th annual Horatio Alger Awards of the American Schools and Colleges Association. These awards are annually conferred upon outstanding citizens who, in the rags-to-riches tradition of the fictional characters of Horatio Alger, have achieved outstanding successes from modest beginnings. By their lives, as the award notation reads, these men demonstrate and enhance, "the American tradition of overcoming obstacles to achieve success through diligence, industry, and perserverance."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the following brief remarks about this great American and fellow Kentuckian.

Mr. Kincaid has this month been singled out from 2,000 Americans with outstanding careers to take home one of the coveted 1960 Horatio Alger Awards presented to America's leaders during its 14th annual ceremony in New York at the Waldorf-Astoria.

A self-made man from humble beginnings in Tallega, Ky., this business giant heads a $200 million empire of finance and insurance companies, 16 banks, real estate companies, hotels, office buildings, newspaper, and radio stations.

He started out by selling newspapers and doing odd jobs. He knew early the importance of an education. He attended Eastern State College in Richmond; he then put himself through law school at the University of Kentucky. How Garvice Kincaid managed to pay his own way foreshadowed the financial brilliance that soon characterized his life. He borrowed $1,500 to make a down payment on three small houses to be sold at auction. Then he sold them at a profit and thus financed his law-school tuition.

Today, Mr. Kincaid controls more than 150 corporations. The story of his financial successes literally reads like one of the Horatio Alger-type legends that characterize Americans in real life who have his kind of drive.

In his second year at law school, Mr. Kincaid passed the Kentucky bar though he went on to complete his full course. Following law school, he practiced law in Lexington and "dabbled" in real estate; with profits made he began to expand his interests, bought a small finance company, and later acquired control of a bank.

During the past 20 years, with a midas touch, Mr. Kincaid has blazed a legendary financial trail. Associates say he seems to have an intuitional genius in figuring the growth potentialities of every business he purchases and as far as anyone can recall, he has never lost a cent on any of his transactions.

It is not just as a financial genius that this father of twin daughters, attending Stephens College in Columbia, Mo., is noteworthy. Philanthrophy, though he has not taken credit for a lot of it, has been a part of his way of living. True to the spirit of give and take that is a part of the American way, Mr. Kincaid has been the backbone of many of the Big Brother organizations that give direct and needful aid to many underprivileged children. The Kincaid corporations contribute $50,000 each year to the Boys Club of Lexington. A contribution of $100,000 was signed over by him to the YMCA. He has donated $25,000 toward construction of a rehabilitation home for delinquent boys. In addition, he annually underwrites 12 scholarships to the University of Kentucky. When Tallega needed a new church they found that Mr. Kincaid had donated 10 acres of land to them for this purpose. Then he donated the lumber for the building. All in all, Kincaid's charitable donations total about $200,000 each year.

When presented the Horatio Alger Award, Mr. Kincaid in a short speech said:

I feel that all of us should be ever mindful to watch what is going on not only in our country but in the countries around us—that this way of life that makes opportunities like this possible, shall not perish from the earth.

What Is Wrong With Our Approach to Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed over our inade-

quate school buildings and equipment and our shortage of competent teachers. We now have in the House Rules Committee a bill to provide some Federal aid for school construction only.

Sunday the Des Moines Register carried in its Open Forum Editor column a letter from a dedicated teacher which expressed, in a better way than I have previously seen it expressed, what is wrong with our approach to providing for the future education of our children. This letter should shock us all into a basic reevaluation of our attitudes toward this problem:

WHY CHOOSE TEACHING AS YOUR CAREER?

To the OPEN FORUM EDITOR:

Recently my neighbor and friend presented me, a teacher, with his personal problem. At first I considered it a unique affair. However, upon further consideration I wondered how many other teachers have had the same problem presented to them * * * and then later have sat down and written a letter similar to this:

Our discussion, you will recall, concerned your son. You indicated his desire to finish high school, graduate from college, and then you said, "He wants to teach." Your reaction to his preference is what bothers me.

You asked me, as a friend and as a teacher, to use all the influence I could to dissuade him—to persuade him to learn a trade, or to enter another profession in order to arm himself against the perils and insecurities of the future.

WHY CHOOSE TEACHING?

I suppose that, at the time, I should have shown offense at your implication that I had made a serious mistake by becoming a teacher and that I ought to do all that I could to prevent your son from making the same mistake.

Of all the professions that there are, why choose teaching? Discord and frustrations, a life of unending conflict, forever fighting for security with the superintendent, the school board, the public, and forever begging for more money.

Why should it be so? Surely you must agree that the future cannot and will not be any better than the youth of today will make it. And who, then, shapes this youth and, therefore, this future? Parents should and many do—but. Our churches too—our town and society in general should—but.

WHERE DOES SCHOOL FIT?

Just where does the school fit into this development of the mind, the heart and the soul? Must I repeat all the old, but valid, comments about the impact of a teacher upon the students—from Socrates, Christ, Bacon to Horace Mann? Teachers all.

And you don't want your son to join their ranks. Why? Because, by the rules of our commercial society, it doesn't pay. Then who will teach his children? Some other dodo?

May I make a suggestion? If it's the pay with which you, as a parent, are most concerned, then, why not do all that is just and necessary to make the teaching profession all that it could and should be financially?

Raise the pay and raise the standards and the status of the profession so that, should the time come when your grandson might say, "Grandpa, I think I'd like to teach," you will then react with pride and satisfaction, knowing that at least you have a grandson who has chosen an honorable profession.—Paul J. Frank, 400 Seventh Street SW., Oelwein, Iowa.

Outstanding Citizen Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., on May 23, 1960, which reports that Mr. J. Anthony Christopher was presented the outstanding Citizen award by the Hazleton Unico Club at its 10th annual "I Am An American" testimonial dinner held recently in Hazleton with the main address of the evening delivered by Judge J. Harold Flannery of the Luzerne County court and former Member of Congress representing Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District:

CHRISTOPHER GETS UNICO AWARD

J. Anthony Christopher, Unico national vice president, was awarded the Outstanding Citizen Award by the Hazleton Unico Club at its 10th annual "I Am An American" testimonial dinner at Genetti's Pennsylvania Room Saturday night. The main address was delivered by Judge J. Harold Flannery.

In making the presentation the club's past president, John B. Colombo, said "Christopher's acts of charity, his dedication to community service and his contribution to the welfare of his fellowman truly exemplifies the club's motto—"Service Above Self."

CHRISTOPHER

In his acceptance address, Christopher said, "I am well aware that my small contributions of effort and time to the civic activities of my community do not warrant such an honor, but, for as long as I live I will remember that so many of you believe that they did."

After reviewing his life, he continued, "As I matured into young manhood I was determined, through community service, to pay rent for the privilege and space I occupied in my community. I have never considered my participation in civic, community, and church activities as a duty but rather as an honor and privilege.

"In all humility I say to you that whatever I have done is not at all deserving of this honor you confer upon me. As I stand before you, I believe I do not stand here alone. There is nothing that I have done that I do not owe to my dear wife and my wonderful family. They have been most understanding when daddy had to spend so much time away from them.

"I owe a lot to my past and present employers, who have been most cooperative in granting me much actual employment time for participation activities and projects."

HELP OF OTHERS

"I honestly believe that none of us can attain any degree of success or any measure of accomplishment without the aid of hundreds of others—teachers, clergy, family, friends, acquaintances, coworkers in our industrial and social life. Everyone who has given us any encouragement or taught us something—all these people deserve your plaudits too.

"My many years of participation in community activities has taught me my greatest lesson—that of appreciation of people for what they are and not because of nationality, religion, or political affiliation. Bigotry and discrimination should have no place in our American way of life. If we are honest with ourselves, and we should be, bigotry and discrimination does exist. We are living during the most dangerous period ever recorded by man. The slightest spark may ignite the world to total destruction—God forbid. Let us then, as Americans on this 'I Am An American Day' live in harmony with each other. How can we preach friendship and peace among other nations when we cannot live in friendship and peace among ourselves. For the love of God, let us learn to live so that we will not be needing anti-discrimination organizations to protect and defend the integrity and the dignity of any American, irrespective of his nationality, race, color, or creed."

AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

"Let us stop now any discriminatory action or utterances. Let us unite solidly in only one kind of American by riding our motion picture screens, TV programs, radio shows, and the varied printed word media of the defamation of any one national extraction, religious group, or color of skin. Being American is being united. If we fail in this, we cannot win against our enemies.

"As a national officer of Unico National, I know we combat discrimination, wherever and whenever we find it. Our success in every community is testimony to this statement. Unicans recognize no barriers. We are not better Americans than any other, and no other is any better than we are.

"In closing I wish to say that I am convinced nothing happens just by itself, and so it must be with this event tonight. Some one conceived the idea and others cooperated. To all of you who are responsible for this wonderful event, to all of you who are here, to our distinguished speaker and to our national president, and to the commitee and members of Unico, to the visitors, from near and far, and to all who aided in any way, I say to you, thank you, from the bottom of my heart and may God bless each and everyone of you and all your loved ones."

FIRST CLUB MEMBER

The award is presented each year to an individual who in the minds of Unico members fulfills the club's motto. This marked the first time the award was presented to a Unico member.

The club gave Mrs. Christopher a bouquet of red roses. It was presented by the Christopher's 8-year-old daughter, Roseann, third-grade pupil at Mother of Grace School.

MAIN ADDRESS

The main address was by Judge J. Harold Flannery, Luzerne County Court of Common Pleas, who after extending congratulations to Christopher spoke briefly on the contributions of Rome and Italy to civilization.

Rome, he said, gave to the world law and order, and was the capitol of world culture at a time when England was a vast wasteland. Italy can be termed as a dowager who has served her destiny and served it well.

In turning to the present day, he said, we are at war tonight—an economic war—a social war. We have split the atom but we have not reached the human heart. We have soared to the moon—we have not reached the human conscience. We need volunteers—men of commerce, men of ability, men of discern, men dedicated to the preservation of high economic and social ideals, men of sound citizenship and leadership, men of understanding and men of charity, he said.

In closing he referred to Christopher as one of the men with "Doctor of Human Philosophy."

In addition to the presentation of the award by Unico, Christopher was given a citation from Joseph Fenstemacher on behalf of the Catholic Charities.

PROGRAM

Taking part in the program were: The Rt. Rev. Msgr. William A. Crotti, Unico national chaplain, invocation; Demo Calvani, toastmaster, and Rev. Anthony C. Marra, assistant pastor, Mother of Grace Church, benediction.

Sister Mary Joseph Angela, the former Carolyn Christopher, sister of the guest of honor, was a guest. She is with the Active Order of Carmelites, Davenport, Iowa.

In addition to the national president, the National Vice President Matthew Garfolo, Scranton, and National Treasurer Rocco D. Fescina, this city, were also present.

Delegations attended the affair from Wilkes-Barre, Dunmore, Panther Valley, Binghamton, N.Y., Chicago, Jersey City, Davenport, Iowa, and Jessup.

Brief remarks were given by local chapter President Vincent Santopoli, Mayor S. Thomas Capparell, Unico National President Barnard Torraco. Welcome address was given by Joseph A. Lucia, who was general chairman for the affair.

The U.S. Navy at Key West—U.S. Lady—The Service Family Journal Selects Key West, Fla., Post of the Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Lady is a magazine for service wives, service women and service families. Circulated in 50 countries overseas and throughout the States, it serves a vital need to our military families.

The format is diversified and interesting. One of the basic components is to tell the ladies all about one of the posts at which they may be stationed.

Recently, U.S. Lady selected as Post of the Month, the United States greatest naval base, Key West, Fla. All Floridians are honored and proud of the outstanding contribution to our country being made by the men and women at this important naval installation.

The importance of Key West to the Navy and the Nation is pointed out by Rear Adm. Lloyd M. Mustin, commander, Naval Base, Key West, and commander, Key West Force, in this statement for U.S. Lady:

The Navy in Key West—the base, and the ships, submarines, and aircraft which operate from it—is doing a job which simply must continue to be done, and done well, if we are to continue to have a U.S. Navy which can fight and win whenever the country needs it.

For the sort of work we're doing here, Key West is the absolutely ideal base, unmatched by any out of which our fleets operate in all the seven seas. Nowhere else in the world can we accomplish so much at so little cost in men and ships, time, and money. The Navy has been in Key West as long as Florida has been part of the United States (longer, if you count the interval of the War Between the States), and is going to stay here for a whole lot longer, for these very excellent reasons.

Writer Emily M. McCormick is the one who factually and interestingly tells the girls all about Post of the Month, Key West, Fla., in her well-written article of the March issue, U.S. Lady.

The Successful Launching of the Titan ICBM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on Friday, May 13, 1960, an American rocket lifted gracefully from its launch pad at Cape Canaveral, Fla. The time was 5:24 p.m., e.d.t. Thirty minutes later this rocket's nose cone reentered the atmosphere at a velocity in excess of 17,000 miles an hour and struck a point in the ocean off Ascension Island—5,000 miles from Florida. Just before the nose cone hit, it ejected a data capsule which parachuted to the water and signaled its position for recovery.

The flight I have just described was that of our mighty Titan, ICBM, a Colorado product. This performance was flawless, and delivered the nose cone to the Atlantic Missile Range splash net target with incredible accuracy.

Mr. President, this was the fourth long-range flight for the Titan. All four have been successful, and in each case the data capsule has been ejected and recovered—a record as yet unequaled by other missile programs.

I should like to bring you up to date on the record of this ICBM which has every indication of becoming fully operational ahead of time. The Titan ICBM has attempted 16 launches. On two occasions the Titan was accidentally destroyed at the moment of launch. On two other occasions, it was only partially successful due to malfunctions in the latter period of its powered flight. The remaining 12 flights have been completely successful.

Mr. President, sometime this summer the first operational Titan will be delivered to Vandenberg Air Force Base where it will be installed in its underground silo, and readied for its initial operational test. This will be an important milestone. In this, Titan will fulfill its future, as it was designed from the outset to be hardbase, simpler to operate, and capable of delivering a greater payload over intercontinental distances.

Beginning with the 7th of the proposed 14 squardons, an even more advanced version than the current Titan will join our arsenal. This will be Titan II. It will utilize storable liquid fuels and an entirely airborne inertial guidance system. It will be launched out of its silo as a shell fired from a cannon. Its propulsion system and engine alone will have one-third less parts. Its reaction time will be virtually instantaneous. It will have global range, and yet carry a greater payload. Using storable fuels, problems associated with hard to handle liquid oxygen are eliminated. The propellants can be kept in the missile at all times, ready at a moments notice, just as the gasoline in our own automobiles.

Mr. President, a highly informative series of articles upon the subject of space projects and missiles is currently being published in Skylights, a fact sheet of the National Aviation Education Council. This information is made available to school teachers and students across the Nation and provides a basis for greater understanding of the complex and awesome age upon which we have entered.

In its May issue, Skylights focuses attention upon the Titan ICBM. The story is cast along purely informative lines and provides a clear and objective story about the missile and its background, together with some basic plans for its future. So that my colleagues may share the pleasure and new knowledge I gained from this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITAN

If the ancient Greeks had had to find a name for Weapon System 107A–2, probably they, too, would have called it "Titan." To them, Titans were powerful giants with enormous strength and size—a fitting description of our newest intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

Titan is a "second generation" ICBM—an improved missile that ranges farther and carries heavier payloads than early first generation missiles such as the Atlas. While the Atlas is already operational or on duty for the defense of our country, Titan is still in the testing stages. Scientists and engineers have learned much from the well-known Atlas. Their hard won knowledge has been applied in the development of Titan.

The first Titan was flight tested in February 1959. As of May 1, 1960, 14 Titan missiles have been test fired at Cape Canaveral. Of these 14, 10 were successful, 2 were partially successful, and 2 were unintentionally destroyed by fire during launching. Armed with these facts, Under Secretary of the Air Force Joseph V. Charyk told a congressional committee that Titan's test record is the best success ratio to date.

The Titan is built by the Martin Co. at its Denver division in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. This new plant is the free world's first and only one devoted entirely to the design, construction, and testing of missiles. Here 10,000 engineers, technicians, and skilled workers make and assemble the missile's many parts and haul them up the winding roads to test stands among the canyons.

When the engines and all the missile systems have passed their static tests, the Titans are trucked to nearby Lowry Air Force Base, and are flown to Cape Canaveral in C–133A's. At the Cape they are erected on the launch pads and are prepared for their final test firing down the Atlantic Missile Range.

Titan is launched by two Aerojet engines that lift the 98-foot, 2-stage, 110-ton missile off the pad. Within 2 minutes after launch,

Titan's two first-stage engines are hurling the missile upward along a curving path at 5,300 miles per hour. The first stage drops from the missile, the second-stage engine ignites, and Titan darts forward under new power to a height of 500 miles. As Titan speeds toward its target, over 6,000 miles from the launching site, the second-stage engine shuts off. Four vernier nozzles controlled by a radio guidance system then take over, providing small amounts of thrust to set the nose cone on exact course and speed. The second stage falls away and the nose cone begins its long downward glide to the target.

Titan was designed as a military rocket to deliver a nuclear warhead on enemy targets. However, flight tests have proved its ability to perform missions in space, too. Titan's second stage is the largest, heaviest, and most powerful upper stage the United States has ever sent into space. The second-stage engine is five times more powerful than any other "space started" missile engine in the free world. It produces 80,000 pounds of thrust after the first stage has separated. When this added power comes into play, the missile is well into the upper atmosphere where fuel is used much more efficiently than at lower altitudes. This second-stage engine, operating most efficiently at extremely high altitudes, is the most important factor in Titan's outstanding performance.

Originally intended as an "ace in the hole" in case the older Atlas failed in its mission, Titan has additional advantages over other existing ICBM's. Its slender 10-foot diameter will adapt easily to a "silo" or underground launching pad, well protected from nuclear attack. Its strong aluminum alloy skin can withstand the tremendous pressures built up during silo launchings. While Titan is now fueled with liquid oxygen that can be pumped into the fuel tanks only minutes before launching, later models will be propelled with a noncorrosive fuel that can be stored in the fuel tanks without damage to them. Thus Titan will be ready for firing after a very short countdown.

Based on present Titan designs, an even more reliable Titan of tomorrow is foreseen. With the development of more powerful engines and more efficient fuels, today's Titan holds greater promises for the future than any other existing U.S. intercontinental ballistic missile.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on the achievement of his State. I only express the wish that we in Louisiana had more of the Titan program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know that a great many people all over the country have had a hand in developing it.

Consumer Protection in the Field of Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received May 23, 1960, from Mr. Wilbur Gardner. Mr. Gardner lives in Medford, Oreg., in my district. He is the father of the fight for shoe labeling. I ask my colleagues to consider giving their support.

In his letter he outlines why he believes labeling is necessary and lists the many supporters this legislation has. My bill, H.R. 1320, proposes that shoes be labeled as to content. In my recent poll of Fourth District residents I learned that Oregonians agree overwhelmingly.

The letter follows:

MEDFORD, OREG., *May 23, 1960.*

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: Could you give me some information as to how many Senators and Congressmen know about your bill H.R. 1320 to label shoes?

I feel that all who do not know, or have not read of this bill, should be informed so they could form some opinion as to the merits and support of this bill. As the one who has fought and won your support of shoe labeling I would like to again give you some idea of the reason for this effort and the need for this legislation.

THE WHY OF SHOE LABELING

First, may I say that this effort is to help the consumer, not hinder or confuse, as has been suggested by the opposition. Nothing new is being asked for every major item we wear has some buying protection in the way of a label to inform the consumer as to what the article is made of or contains. But this is not true of shoes, for no information is given the consumer by label on all shoes for informative buying.

The consumer is helped by a label to buy all other items he or she buys in the way of clothing, but shoes are still unlabeled. In the changing times and the changing of materials in shoes, the consumer now needs this information more than ever, for the intelligent choosing of footwear for health sake, and loss of money spent on materials the consumer is not told of.

Shoe manufacturers tell of the wonders of new materials, then fill shoes with the following hidden materials: Paper base heels, plastic welts, paper insoles, paper sock linings, oilcloth linings, plastic linings, paper heel counters, starched cloth liners for toe cap support, paper heel pads, and many other imitations of leather too numerous to mention.

Where has the pride of the shoe manufacturer gone? Well I will tell you. They look for a faster turnover in shoes and a faster dollar, rather than a foot health, and giving the consumer a break for his or her dollar. What are they doing to the foot health of our children, and the pocketbook of families hard put to keep within the family budget? This is hard to understand.

The accent is on style in shoes, and the shoe manufacturer of low and medium price shoes strives to get as much of the consumers money, through the manufacture of shoes that hold together only long enough for the consumer to forget when they bought them.

There is no thought given to the repairability of such shoes.

Any minor thing that happens to such shoes, such as the sole coming loose, or water entering shoe and softening paper insoles, heels falling off because the nails pulled through paper insole, will cause shoe to be discarded and another bought of the same construction because no label is used to tell good from bad.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE

And so goes the vicious circle in buying shoes without a label. Cement-on-type shoes account for a lot of this trouble, and in 1940 only 27 percent of all shoes made were cement type, while in 1960 64 percent of all shoes are cement-on-type construction.

Many shoes are using soft crepe soles cemented directly to the upper of the shoe. Children and adults kick this sole loose at the toe end; and the paper insole, upon contact with water that enters where sole comes loose, goes to pieces. The shoe is lost to further wear, and is not repairable. This happens to shoes only a week old, or at 3 weeks at the most.

GOOD SHOES HURT BY POORLY MADE SHOES

There are many good shoes on the market that will give normal wear, but the consumer has no label to tell the difference; so they buy blindly, for the good shoes look like the poor ones as far as looks is concerned, and imitations of good shoes have reached perfection by the shoe manufacturer.

A good shoe is made and sells for $15 and another manufacture will tell his designers, "I want that shoe made to sell for $3.98"; and they do it so cleverly that only an expert can tell the good one. The use of fiberboard or plain old cardboard or pressed paper has reached the point in shoe construction that it is a crime for the consumer not to be so informed when buying shoes. Only a label on shoes showing the kind of materials used will give this protection to the consumer.

CONSUMER PROTECTION SOUGHT

I do not fight for the use of any one kind of material, but rather that all good materials and the use of same in shoes. I feel that the consumer has a right to see on a label the true names of the materials used in their construction, and then, by trial in wear, buy by a label the shoes constructed of the type materials best suited for his or her needs. So that the kind of shoes made of materials they find best suited to their needs can be bought again by a label, thus eliminating the method of buying shoes without informative labeling.

To tell the truth on a label would not be hard. Some shoes have so few parts that it would be quite simple. Others that have more parts would not be as complicated as the shoe manufacturer would have you believe.

Staffmen of the Federal Trade Commission in their investigattion of paper in shoes state (quote from Leather and Shoes, Apr. 2, 1960): "If a child's shoe is made of paper, all it needs is one hole, and the water pours through it, a staffman at the FHC explained. And a sole of paper cannot stand being in the water more than a few times without going to pieces. At least, not the paper that is in some of the shoes that we have seen."

They refer to the insole in shoes.

THE HISTORY OF A FIGHT

So, in the building of the information I have just discussed, I have had a rather hard, and long time, in getting this information before Congress and the consumer. My first start came after I wrote Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, asking how to go about getting Federal legislation for the consumer in labeling shoes. He sent several letters informing me of the actions of the FTC in the past, and gave me the foundation for such action in Congress. He told me I would have to prove consumer support for this type legislation in a large part of the country; also that I would have to show support by large organizations.

Next break in this crusade came when the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger took interest in a feature article about me and my efforts. This was in the Medford Mail Tribune, Medford, Oreg. The Senator inserted this story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. John W. Gwynne, then Chairman of the FTC, saw the article in the RECORD and in part started an investigation into the shoe industry that has continued with the

present Chairman Earl W. Kintner. This investigation is in its closing stage now, and shoe manufacturers fear the outcome. May I say here that if there was nothing wrong with shoes, then this investigation by the FTC certainly shows after close to 2 years, that they sure found something wrong with the way materials are used in shoes.

My next step was to send a national petition into over 40 States, that read as follows, "For my own protection, I desire legislation which will compel the attachment of a label to shoes, indicating what materials were used in the construction of said shoes, either real leather, paper fiber or imitations of leather. I believe I could buy and would buy better shoes if they were labeled. I believe if I could choose better shoes by label, better foot health would result. I believe great savings in money would result, if I could buy good shoes by label." Consumers responded with 30,000 signatures, asking that shoes be labeleld for informative buying.

SUPPORTERS FOR SHOE LABELING

Next, I asked the American National Cattlemen's Association for their opinion. They gave support in national convention with over 200,000 consumer support. They also awarded me the blue ribbon award for distinguished service to the American National Cattlemen's Association, in support of their industry.

Next, I contacted the local Grange, who supported my crusade and endorsed this effort. They in turn submitted it to the Oregon State Grange, who in State convention endorsed this effort. The Oregon State Grange in turn submitted this endorsement to the national grange, who also in national convention endorsed this effort in principle. This added another 800,000 consumers.

I also received the support of the American Academy of Chiropodists, of West Virginia. The American Foot Health Foundation gave approval of my efforts. Good Housekeeping also commended me for this effort. The Readers Digest ask me to keep them informed, and said if shoes are as badly made as your letter indicated, an article discussing the reasons why the situation exists might well make provocative reading.

The Credit Managers Association of Central and Northern California, add their support. The National Consumers League have this effort up for consideration. The National Farmers Union has given full support to this effort, this adds many more thousands of consumers to this cause. Consumers Union is most interested, and state they will report on the hearings for this bill.

Then came your questionnaire that 18,509 consumers in the Fourth District of Oregon answered as to question No. 6. Do you approve putting labels on shoes listing the materials used? They voted as follows, 16,476 yes, 2,033 no. Or, 89 percent, yes and 11 percent, no. This is the general feeling of the consumer and this effort.

"IF THE SHOE FITS * * *"

Many famous Senators and Congressmen have expressed more than a passing interest in this effort to label shoes. Shoe manufacturers jumped as if struck with a needle when they found they had to face up to this issue of shoe labeling.

From the standpoint of foot health, this bill will give parents a better gage to buy better shoes for our children. From the standpoint of money, much lost in the buying of shoes that last only a few weeks will be saved and go toward the purchase of good shoes, and the savings of untold thousands of dollars by families who can ill afford to spend money that should go toward other family needs.

So, in reviewing the reasons and support for shoe labeling, I ask your continued support of this effort. Also, I sincerely hope that the Members of Congress will give serious consideration, and express their views of this bill that is a serious effort to give the consumer protection in the field of footwear.

As I have stated before, if this effort will bring foot health to one small child, that will be my reward.

With kindest regards.

WILBUR L. GARDNER.

Tunisia's Day of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Tunisia's Day of Independence, I wish to salute the President of the Republic of Tunisia, Mr. Habib Bourguiba, His Excellency, the Ambassador of Tunisia, Mr. Mongi Slim, and all of their fellow countrymen.

This young nation, derived of an ancient civilization, would certainly astound the most keen observer of its myriad achievements, from the viewpoint of her own history and of that of humanity in general. Dating as far back as from the middle of the fifth century B.C., Carthage became from her foundation, a metropolis of civilization and exceptional economic expansion. Tunisia has given to the world, in addition to architectural progress, a vast culture of greco-latin humanities, municipal organization and the development of literature and the arts. Her heritage is indeed a cradle of a brilliant civilization, as seen by the vestiges to be viewed in the museums of Carthage and Bardo, the ruin of the majestic temples, amphitheatres, thermal establishments and gymnasia, in sites which at one time witnessed the refined way of life of that period.

Following the conquest and destruction of Carthage, Rome ruled the country under Emperor Caligula's jurisdiction. Years later, the Arab, Moslem, and Spanish influences entered the country. Torn and crippled by her ever-changing succession of rulers, the French Republic then took advantage of Tunisia's misfortune and of the lack of authority of its rulers and occupied the country in 1881 under the treaty of Ksar Said.

Tunisia's long and persistent struggle for freedom, however, was not to continue unrewarded. A nationalist movement began 20 years later, inspired by the impact of a foreign occupation, and Tunisia's laborious fight for freedom ended when, in 1957, the Deputies of the Tunisian Nation and members of the National Constituent Assembly, "in the name of the people" and "for the edification of a democratic regime" declared the abolition of the monarchy and proclaimed Tunisia a Republican State, entrusting to Mr. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Council, the duty of "President of the Tunisian Republic."

The few years have already seen the flourishing achievements since President Habib Bourguiba's election. Indeed with him at its head, Tunisia will see the fulfillment of its dreams for it is in him whom the people see the symbol of their liberation from French protectorate and the artisan of their future.

Again, on this, their day of independence, I wish to extend my sincerest best wishes to all the people of this young and expanding nation.

Cooperstown, N.Y., Beautiful Otsego County Resort Area, Fabled in Song and Story, Is Now the Museum Capital of the Empire State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged indeed to be able to represent in this body a district which includes the famous village of Cooperstown, the original home of the great American novelist, James Fenimore Cooper, and today a lovely resort community nestled in the rolling hills of Otsega County on the shores of a lake of unparalleled beauty, Otsego Lake, the home of baseball, and location of one of the outstanding medical research centers in the country, the Mary Imogene Bassett Memorial Hospital.

To these many and varied distinctions Cooperstown had added still another—museum capital of New York State, largely as a result of a combination of generosity and hard work and community planning on the part of all of the citizens of Cooperstown.

This new development was recently noted in detail in an article that appeared in the May 28 issue of the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, and under leave to extend my remarks I include that article:

COOPERSTOWN NOW MUSEUM CAPITAL OF NEW YORK

A rare combination of museums in the picturesque village of Cooperstown makes this central New York State community a museum capital of museum-conscious America, says the New York State Department of Commerce.

BIRTHPLACE OF BASEBALL

Birthplace of the Great American game, home base for the National Baseball Museum and Hall of Fame, and scene of the annual midsummer Hall of Fame Baseball Classic at Abner Doubleday Field when teams from the two major leagues compete, Cooperstown each year is home plate for baseball fans.

The wide agrarian interests of farmers: practical, gentleman, or backyard garden variety, are pleasantly aroused and stimulated by the displays, exhibits, and demonstrations to be seen in a tour of the vast Farmers' Museum. For the husbandman

this museum is sufficient to make Cooperstown home away from home.

Both the Farmers' Museum and Fenimore House are operated by the New York State Historical Association. Headquarters of the association are in Fenimore House as is the association's museum. For the history-minded the priceless treasures at Fenimore House make the museum an attraction of great importance.

IMMORTALIZED BY COOPER

Cooperstown has much more to add to its fame as well as museums. This is the country immortalized in the writings of James Fenimore Cooper. The village lies at the southern end of Otsego Lake. There are ample facilities for visitors to enjoy fishing, swimming, and boating. A boatride over the lake is also available.

It was at Cooperstown in 1839 that Abner Doubleday invented the game of baseball. Today, on the site where the first game was played, is a modern diamond, Doubleday Field. Close by, in a red brick building of modern design, is the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum. Each year well over a hundred thousand visitors view the interesting exhibits and displays which cover the entire history of the sport. Bronze plaques commemorate the game's immortals elected to the Hall of Fame bienially and rare and priceless relics of the game are to be seen. The building is open to visitors daily from 9 a. m. to 9 p.m., from May 1 through October 1, and from 9 to 5 o'clock in other months.

The Farmer's Museum is so large and varied that it is able to present a recreated village crossroads with country school, law office, village store, rural blacksmith shop, print shop, doctor's office, druggist shop, tavern, and farmhouse and barn. New York State's most famous hoax, "The Cardiff Giant," supposed to have been a petrified man, also is to be seen at the museum.

FENIMORE HOUSE

Fenimore House is but a short distance from the Farmers' Museum. The historical museum pieces to be seen here include materials related to the Cooper family and the complete documents representing Aaron Burr's side of the famous Hamilton-Burr argument. Also displayed are 17 Browere life masks of famous early American statesmen, portraits by Gilbert Stuart and Benjamin West and one of the most important collections of American folk art to be found in the United States.

The three museums are open daily the year around. Admission is 75 cents adults and 15 cents children at Fenimore House and the Baseball Museum; $1 adults, 15 cents children at the Farmers' Museum. Two- or three-way combination tickets range from $1.30 to $2 for adults and 20 or 30 cents for children.

INDIAN ARTIFACTS

Another interesting collection is to be seen at the American Indian Museum in Cooperstown. Indian artifacts from prehistoric times, exhibits of potterymaking, dioramas of Indians making a dugout canoe, flint quarrying, hunting, tanning, and basketry are among the displays. The museum is open daily from June to September. Admissions are 50 cents adults, schoolchildren 10 cents.

A short distance outside the village limits are two other attractions which help to enrich a visitor's stay at Cooperstown. On Route 20 the Petrified Creatures Exhibit displays fossils from the Devonian period (300 million years ago). Visitors at the place are encouraged to dig for fossils. The collection displayed includes petrified wood and six life-size dinosaur restorations. The museum is open daily from May through November and admissions are adults 90 cents, children 10–15 years 30 cents. Scheduled school groups are admitted free.

Cooperstown is described in a free guide, "New York State Vacationlands," which is issued by the New York State Department of Commerce, 112 State Street, Albany, N.Y.

Salute to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 we commemorate the 14th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. I should like to take this occasion to salute the determination and industry of the Italian people, who, in 14 years, have achieved democracy, economic progress, and international status.

On June 2, 1946—a short 14 years ago—Italy faced almost insurmountable obstacles. World War II had wreaked havoc and destruction over most of the country. And 20 years of totalitarian dictatorship had left its mark upon Italian freedom. Widespread economic reconstruction was necessary, and the foundations of a new political system had to be constructed over the ruins of fascism. Both economic and political wounds had to be healed if Italy was to achieve economic recovery and partnership status in the free world.

The people of Italy, under able and inspired leadership, attacked both problems frontally and with vigor and determination. Rejecting attacks from both the right and the left, Italy established a democratic Republic through orderly democratic processes. She stands today as a bulwark of democracy, and an integral part of the free world in the fight against Communist tyranny.

Progress on the economic front has been no less inspiring. A broad plan of development, the 10-year Vanoni plan, which aims at a 5-percent increase in the gross national product by 1964, is currently in progress. As part of this program, capital investment is being increased, unemployment problems are being tackled, and foreign trade is being expanded. By efficient use of the generous aid provided by the United States, some progress has even been made in the development of the less prosperous areas, particularly in southern Italy. With sheer force of determination and effort the Italian people have managed to repair the ravages of war and rebuild their country.

Needless to say, much yet remains to be accomplished. Complicating Italy's economic problems today is the steady influx of refugees who are forced to leave Tunisia and must seek refuge in Italy. Over 10,000 refugees have already been admitted, and they continue to arrive at the rate of 200 per week. Although the Italian Government is doing its best to care for them, the task of absorbing this large number of expellees is an overwhelming one for an already overburdened economy. I am hopeful that we can relieve this situation somewhat by admitting some of the refugees to this country. I have introduced legislation to accomplish this.

Italy's progress cannot only be measured by her internal success, but must take into account also her significant participation in world affairs. As one of the "European Six," Italy is a part of the European Common Market, Euratom, and the Coal and Steel Community, and thereby contributes to the joint effort to achieve common goals through cooperation and unity. And recognition of Italy as a leader in the free world is most clearly acknowledged in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, where Italy is a vital and indispensable partner.

It is important, on this 14th anniversary of the Republic, to pause and remember just how much Italy has achieved in the short span of years since World War II. Today let us salute the Republic of Italy—a stanch defender of democracy and a leader in the free world.

Minimum Wage Law Extensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1960, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Miss Ginger Joyce, executive director of the Chamber of Commerce of Jeannette, Pa. The American system requires that free opportunity be given for all points of view to be heard. Accordingly, a letter was written to me by one of my constituents, Electa Clark, with the request that her answer be given the same opportunity to be heard as was given to the original letter. I agree that the demands of fairplay require that this letter be printed, and, accordingly, I herewith submit a copy of this letter to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KING: I am writing this letter to you, in answer to the letter that was written by Ginger Joyce, of Jeannette, Pa., and entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, by the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, Representative of Pennsylvania.

I am Electa Clark, women's activities director of the Utah State Committee on Political Education, AFL–CIO, and a member of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union Local 430, Provo, Utah.

I have not been asked by anyone to write this letter. I have written this to give you the other side of the story, concerning the minimum wage law extensions.

I shall take the city of Provo, as an average American city, with a larger population than the city mentioned in Miss Joyce's letter, but whether it be Jeannette, Pa., Provo, Utah, or any other average American city, they all are much the same. The same people, the

same kind of businesses, the same struggle for a decent standard of living.

Provo is one of the newer industrial centers of the West. Provo has such business as the Geneva Steel Mills, the Ironton-Geneva plant and Pacific States Pipe plant. We also have a modern hospital, the Brigham Young University, the Utah State Mental Hospital, a vocational school, and a good sized business area. Many people are employed daily by these business firms and industries.

I know of families who are actually hungry in this city, and it should be no different in any other city, yet the welfare departments are unable to give these people assistance, because the allotted welfare funds have been depleted, or are too overburdened now, to take additional cases.

For example, the breadwinner of the family, Mr. A is out of work because United States Steel installed automatic equipment in the plant, and there was just no other department to which Mr. A could be transferred. Mind you Mr. A is nearing 50, and it is a little late for him to start over on another kind of job.

Mrs. A has found employment in one of the department stores, but she receives only 80 cents per hour. This could feed the family, but they had to borrow money from the "P" Finance Co. to get their son out of the hospital, after an appendectomy. They already owed the "H" Finance Co. for their new furniture they bought, before they knew Mr. A was going to lose his job. Then there is the house payment that must be made. Mrs. A can't possibly make ends meet on $32 per week. She does keep the interest fees paid to the finance company in order to keep her furniture, she pays the utilities and buys only absolutely necessary clothing which they must have and by this time there is little, if anything left for food. How much can this 80 cents per hour job contribute to the purchasing power and economy of the community.

In addition to all this Mrs. A's mother is living with them. She receives her social security check. She suffers from diabetes and arthritis and it takes most of her income for medical bills.

By the way, Miss Joyce, what is your chamber of commerce stand on the Forand bill that would enable Mrs. A's mother to have her medical bills paid, and what is the chamber's stand on the Douglas bill, that would enable Mrs. A to know how much interest and other charges she must pay on her loans? It seems each month she pays a different rate on the same amount of money. What is the chamber's stand on proposed legislation for the rehabilitation of displaced persons resulting from automation? All of this legislation would enable the citizens of the communities to have more purchasing power to support local businesses and department stores. I assure Miss Joyce, the chamber of commerce takes great pride in opposing all of this kind of legislation.

If these retail workers were to receive the purposed $1.25 minimum, what would they do with it? Certainly not bank it, or put it into savings. They would spend it. It would go back into the economy of the community for some of the much needed things they have not been able to obtain on their present income. The businesses would receive this increase back sevenfold. People surely cannot buy goods and services if they do not have the money to buy them with.

We have a furniture and appliance store on our Main Street, much the same, I imagine, as Mr. L. Why should Mr. L be worried, if he is already paying the $1.25. Surely any kind of an appliance salesman isn't interested in a $1.25 minimum wage. What he is interested in, is a customer with enough money in his pocket, and a desire to purchase the product which he is selling. With the $1.25 minimum increase to the hotel and restaurant workers, the retail clerks, the laundry workers, the cannery and poultry workers, surely there would be need for businessmen like Mr. L not to discharge employees, but to hire additional help to service the increase in business.

As for sentimentality between employer and employee, I'm very sure the employee would appreciate an increase in his pay envelope far more than an endearing word from his employer.

Now we will enter one of our cafes. Everyone is aware that bulk purchasing is what Mr. B will be doing, when the sales clerks, office workers and bank clerks receive $1.25 minimum instead of the present 80 to 90 cent, because those who now pack a sandwich and apple for lunch, can afford to eat in Mr. B's cafe, and he could even cut the price of his hamburgers by 5 cents.

The minimum wage extension will not, and is not intended to, affect any wage or income of those already receiving $1.25 or more. I would like to ask Miss Joyce, How can more money put into circulation possibly contribute to less jobs? It would mean more customers, which in turn requires more people to dispense the services that this added income would demand.

Now to visit the garment industry in Provo. This industry manufactures womens apparel, slips, pajamas, nightgowns and other lingerie. The garment industry, I personally know well, having been an employee myself since 1939, when the starting wage was 25 cents per hour. I have seen these industries expand and the increase in wages grow without any loss, but with a financial gain, to the employers. Training or apprenticeship programs have been established in this and other industries, that enable the employers to hire and train, on the job, new employees at a rate far below the minimum wage. No employee in the garment industry receives even the minimum wage until he or she has earned the minimum according to the piece rate schedule. If an employee isn't able to earn his or her way, at a profit to the employer, within the training period, that employee is discharged. I have worked in some places, where the specified beginners time has been set as low as 4 hours, others as much as 120 days. All this I know from 20 years of experience.

Also, in my 20 years of experience, these same industries have not increased their wholesale prices. I can still, as an employee, purchase a bra at the wholesale price, the same price the business firms purchase these garments for, and the same price that was charged in 1939. I can purchase lingerie at the plant in Provo, for the same wholesale price as was charged in 1946 when this industry first came to our city. The wages have more than doubled in the garment industry. The wholesale prices of these garments have not been increased. The companies are operating at a profit, or they would not still be expanding their operations.

It is not the industries, or the wage earner that tend to spiral our prices, as we are so often led to believe, but the retailer, the poor businessmen, that depend upon the amount of purchasing power of their customers. Yet it is these same business people who strive to keep their customers from having more purchasing power. It is these same people who shower sentimentality upon their employees, rather than help make it possible for them to enjoy a better standard of living.

Allow our young people the opportunity to earn extra money and time to receive a higher education at a university or vocational school. Give the older people, who must work, an opportunity to achieve a fair standard of living. Leave our communities the opportunity of maintaining a modern front, without Federal assistance, that they may grow and prosper in dignity by their own efforts and of their citizens who receive a just compensation for their employment.

Sincerely,

ELECTA CLARK,
Director, Women's Activities, Utah State COPE, AFL–CIO.

Firsthand View of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful and timely editorial by Mr. Gus Brandborg, general manager of radio station KVOO, Tulsa, Okla., entitled "Firsthand View of Foreign Aid," was broadcast on May 23.

It expresses forcefully the concern many of our citizens feel about the administration of some phases of this program. This concern is shown graphically by the fact that in response to a cross-section survey I took early this year of voters in my own congressional district, sentiment ran against the current foreign aid program by some two to one.

Mr. Brandborg's editorial follows:

FIRSTHAND VIEW OF FOREIGN AID

One day last week while we were waiting for a plane at Idlewild, New York's International Airport, a Tulsan, just back from several months in Europe as representative of a Tulsa business firm, made this worried statement: "I wish something could be done about our foreign aid program. It's a mess. Everywhere I've been in recent months the United States is either laughed at or hated. Those who laugh are the black marketers and minor foreign government officials who are benefiting from our aid program. Those who hate us are the poor people of those nations for whom our aid is intended, but who are not getting it. The black marketers and doublecrossing governmental agents of those nations are getting our money and our surplus foods."

This sums up rather vividly what is happening to our well intentioned and wholly honest effort to help a backward and too often cynical world. This man, whose travels in practically all parts of the world within recent months have given him a broad and firsthand view of things, is deeply concerned not only at the waste which results from our present program, but from the dangerous after effects, and these, of course, are found in the attitudes and impressions the masses of people in foreign aid nations are now forming of our assitsance program. They say it's a farce, that we aren't giving anything we're merely selling our surplus and the majority of them are too poor to be able to buy any of it.

"It would be the smartest thing of all to stop the whole business," said this Tulsan, "And I'm speaking from a firsthand look into many lands. I've talked with a lot of people in many nations—they don't like us now, and every day that passes during which our present foreign aid mess goes on will create more disrespect and hate for us."

It ought to be evident by now, even to a politician, that America cannot buy friendship. If we stop our foreign aid program as it is presently operated, we might find ourselves more respected and at the same time

cause the "you've got to do it for me" nations to get on the ball themselves, and finally amount to something. It's worth a try, why don't we try it?

Dedication of the Interchurch Center in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to inform the House of an event of tremendous religious significance which occurred on Sunday, May 29, 1960, in the 21st Congressional District of New York City, which I have the honor to represent. It was the dedication of the Interchurch Center. It is best described by an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, May 30, 1960.

The article follows:

THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED ATTEND DEDICATION OF INTERCHURCH CENTER—100 CHURCHMEN LEAD PROCESSION FROM RIVERSIDE CHURCH RITES

(By Jo-ann Price)

The new $21 million 19-story Interchurch Center, 475 Riverside Drive, south of the Riverisde Church, was dedicated ysterday by leaders of Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches bodies.

In a ceremony in the Riverside Church, followed by a procession of 100 churchmen to the main entrance of the center, the keys of the building were given to center officials by representatives of the architects and builder.

A ribbon 40 feet long across the entrance was cut by Edmund F. Wagner, president of the board of trustees. Afterward several thousand spectators toured the center to inspect exhibits of religious art and memorabilia. They included a Gutenberg Bible, under special guard; ancient Biblical scrolls and papyri, rare icons, the manscript of "America the Beautiful," and other hymns.

THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED ATTEND

More than 3,500 persons at the dedicatory service heard Bishop Johannes Lilje, president of the Lutheran Church in Germany, describe the center as symbolic of "the willingness of the American churches to contribute on their part to the great historic mission which has befallen this country through its leading role in the Western World."

Other participants in the service included the Reverend Dr. Robert J. McCracken, minister of Riverside; Bishop William J. Walls, of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; Methodist Bishop W. Angie Smith, of Oklahoma City; Mrs. William Sale Terrell, president of the United Church Women; the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; the Reverend Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president of the National Council of Churches; and the Reverend Dr. James E. Hoffman, stated clerk of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America.

Police rerouted traffic away from a four-block area adjacent to the church and center for the procession and other exercises on Riverside Drive.

During the ceremonies a scroll of appreciation was presented to John D. Rockefeller III, son of the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who gave the one-block site and $2,650,000 toward construction of the center.

Mr. Rockefeller responded by saying that his father was a very religious man who was concerned with the inadequacy of individual churches and looked to the day when a broader protestantism would fit the needs of changing times. The center, he said, was a major step to his father's ultimate vision of "cooperation, not competition" toward unity among the churches.

KEYS PRESENTED

The keys of the building were presented to William J. Demorest, chairman of the building committee, by Stephen F. Voorhees, representing the architectural firm of Voorhees, Walker, Smith & Smith, of New York, and by F. B. Warren, representing the Turner Construction Co. The Boston architects, Collens, Willis & Beckonert, designed the building in association with the New York firm.

After the ribbon was cut by Mr. Wagner, a benediction was offered by the Reverend George Bacopoulos, representing Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America.

The cornerstone of the center, a paving block from the marketplace of Corinth, Greece, where St. Paul preached, was laid by President Eisenhower on October 12, 1958. The first of the center's 28 tenants moved in last fall.

"OFFICE" FOR 2,000

The center is "the office" for more than 2,000 churchworkers, many of whom have moved to Morningside Heights. It has a cafeteria for 1,500 persons.

It houses, on the fifth to eighth floors, the headquarters of the National Council of Churches, numbering 33 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox communions.

Other major religious bodies with offices in the center are the World Council of Churches (American headquarters), American Baptist Convention, Reformed Church in America, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Methodist Board of Missions and Methodist Information, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, the Interboard Committee for Christian Work in Japan, and the World Convention of the Churches of Christ (Disciples). The United Lutheran Church in America is one of the investing bodies but does not have offices in it.

Visitors yesterday commented approvingly on the religious art on the main floor. In addition to the exhibits, they visited its chapel, notable for rose brick walls, a pipe organ elevated at the rear, and altar table and pulpit of Salisbury granite illuminated from the left by a gigantic rear-lighted alabaster window.

The narthex to the chapel is richly appointed with a "night sky-canopy" ceiling in modern sculpture. Other features include a public lounge, treasure room, orthodox room, and the exhibit-lined hall of ministers and the hall of laymen.

No Legal Barrier for an Agreement To Exchange Chinese Newsmen for American Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, administration officials have frequently asserted their wish to arrange an exchange of American newsmen for Chinese newsmen. However, our Government refuses to make an agreement with the Chinese Communist Government but, instead, keeps insisting that individual Chinese journalists should apply for visas.

It is plain that the Red Chinese are unreasonable and are concerned with clever propaganda advantages they can achieve from this situation. However, if we are truly interested in making this exchange a reality, all we have to do is to enter into an agreement. There are no legal barriers. In my recent correspondence with the Secretary of State, which I included in the Appendix—May 27, 1960, on page A4566—the Secretary did not assert that there was any legal barrier to such an agreement.

The Secretary's position is that it is unreasonable for the Red Chinese to demand that there be an agreement of a newsman exchange with us because they have no such agreement with any other nation nor do we have any such agreement with any nation. All right, it is unreasonable.

Let us also recognize that we have nothing to lose from making such an agreement and that we will have a newsmen exchange itself to gain or, if the Chinese refuse to go through with such an agreement, then we can make important propaganda gains throughout the world by publicizing the previous statements by the Chinese Government.

The legal aspects of this are interesting and I am including hereafter, under unanimous consent, a memorandum prepared for me by John P. Earner, legislative attorney of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. The text is as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1960.

To: Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Question of the legal admissibility of Red Chinese newsmen under U.S. immigration law and procedure.

For the purposes of this memorandum it is assumed Red Chinese newsmen would be seeking entry into the United States as aliens who are nonimmigrants.

BACKGROUND CONSIDERATIONS

Before 1952 newsmen lawfully entering this country were classed as temporary visitors for business. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163, c. 477; 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101 et seq.) created a specific nonimmigrant class for representatives of foreign information media (sec. 101(a)(15)(I); 8 U.S.C. sec. 1101(a)(15)(I)):

SEC. 1101. Definitions—

(a) As used in this chapter—

* * * * *

(15) The term "immigrant" means every alien except an alien who is within one of the following classes of nonimmigrant aliens—

* * * * *

(I) upon a basis of reciprocity, an alien who is a bona fide representative of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information media, who seeks to enter the United States solely to engage in such vocation, and the spouse and children of such a representative, if accompanying or following to join him.

The purpose of Congress in creating this class was identically expressed in Senate and House reports:

This is a new class of nonimmigrants and is designed to facilitate, on a basis of reciprocity, the exchange of information among nations. It is intended that the class is to to be limited to aliens who are accredited as members of the press, radio, film, or other information media by their employer. (S. Rept. No. 1137, p. 21 and H. Rept. 1365, p. 45; 82d Cong.)

THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO RED CHINA NEWSMEN

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, a Red China national seeking entry to the United States as a newsman is presumed to be an immigrant until he establishes by legally prescribed evidence that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status under 8 U.S.C., section 1101(a)(15)(I). The burden of proof is upon him to establish that he is entitled to the nonimmigrant classification and type of nonimmigrant visa for which he is an applicant.

Since he is to be engaged in the United States in newsgathering activities between the United States and Red China, he must, if otherwise qualified, be classified as a nonimmigrant under the provision, set down above, as section 1101(a)(15)(I).

That means he must establish that he is a representative, in good faith, of the Red China press, radio, film, or other information medium having its home office in Red China, and that he will leave the United States upon the termination of that status. He must possess credentials from the employer he will represent in the United States. His admission will be on the condition that he will not change his information medium or the employer by whom he is accredited unless authorized to do so by the Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the district in which he resides in the United States.

But, having complied with every requirement and agreed to all conditions imposed by U.S. immigration law, no Red China newsman is entitled by law to the privilege of entry into the United States unless his Government grants upon a basis of reciprocity similar privileges to representatives of such a medium having home offices in the United States.

The statutory law is mandatory and impressively clear on this essential point. The legislative intent, uniformly expressed in both House and Senate, emphatically forecloses any other interpretation.

JOHN P. EARNER,
Legislative Attorney.

Defense Strategy for the Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we are all doing a great deal of self-searching analysis as a result of the unfortunate events of the past weeks. In this connection, while visting briefly in Morristown, Tenn., I was privileged to hear a most inspirational sermon by the Rev. M. O. Sommers, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of that city, which pointedly suggests similar anxieties many individuals fear today following the collapse of the summit conference.

Because I feel that this sermon will be of interest to many of my colleagues and others, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Sommers' sermon be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD. The sermon entitled "Defense Strategy for the Soul" follows:

DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR THE SOUL

(By M. O. Sommers, First Presbyterian Church, Morristown, Tenn., May 22, 1960)

(Text: Philippians iv: 6, 7—"Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.")

These are days when many minds are deeply absorbed in the study of defense strategy. The events of the week just passed have greatly intensified this whole matter. The sooting down of the U-2, the collapse of the summit conference in Paris, the blustering, raving, ranting threats of Khrushchev, the stepped-up activities in space, have all served to make us very defense conscious. Our scientists and militarists have speeded up their work in missiles and anti-missiles and rockets. They are working feverishly on radar and all sorts of electronic detecting devices. Yesterday in hundreds of Armed Forces Day parades and celebrations the whole theme of defense strategy was emphasized. We are told that Civilian Defense authorities have been literally overwhelmed in recent days by requests for information concerning the construction of bomb shelters. It has been a week to give us all the jitters. Many are suffering from a terrible malady, which some columnist has called "nuclearitis".

However, this morning we are thinking of another kind of defense strategy. We shall not pose as armchair generals or pseudo-scientists. We shall leave the devising of our military defense strategy to those who have been trained in such things. We are thinking about a defense strategy for the soul. We are much in need of such a strategy. How hard it is for our souls to face the bewildering and confusing conditions of life today without fear and anxiety. The shaky conditions of international relations, the uncertainty and insecurity of the economic structure of our world, the tense situation among the races here at home, the terrific pressure of an intensely speeded up routine of life, the ever present threat of the ravages of war with its death, destruction, disease, suffering, imprisonment, and sacrifices—these are things which try men's souls. Indeed, there is need for a defense strategy for the soul.

And that is precisely what the Apostle Paul gives us in the words of our text. He is telling us here how we can fortify our souls against anxiety and worry. He is telling us how our souls can remain calm in the midst of storms of life. He is telling us of a defense strategy which, if adopted and applied, will keep our souls steady, no matter what happens. Dr. Moffatt's translation of our text brings out this fact very clearly. This is the way his translation reads, "Never be anxious, but always make your requests known to God in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving; so shall God's peace, that surpasses all our dreams, keep guard over your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus". I want you to think with me for a few moments this morning about this defense strategy for the soul which Paul gives us.

In the first place, notice what this defense strategy is. Paul says, "Do not be anxious, do not worry, do not fear, do not lose your faith—be calm, be brave, be strong, be cool." This would be hollow mockery were it not for the fact that Paul goes on immediately to show how we can do just this. How do we do it? Why, by taking our fears and doubts, our anxieties and fretfulness to God.

Notice what Paul says, "But in everything make your requests known to God in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving." Dr. Moffatt uses the word "always." This means that we are to take everything always to God. Everything includes our worries, our doubts, our fears, our anxieties. It is a wonderful thing when we come to the realization that we can take everything in our hearts and minds to God. Prayer begins to mean something to us when we come to the understanding that it does not consist simply of repeating stereotyped and staid words, phrases, and sentences. When we realize that what God wants us to do is to take to him our worries and fears and doubts and burdens and cast them upon him, we begin to understand something about the meaning of prayer. When we understand that, just as an earthly father wants his child to share everything with him, so our Heavenly Father wants his child to do just that, we begin to understand the genius of prayer. What God wants us to do is to take everything, always to Him in prayer.

"O what peace we often forfeit,
O what needless pain we bear,
All because we do not carry
Everything to God in prayer."

Notice again that Paul says, "Always make your requests known to God in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving." We must not miss that note of thanksgiving. What Paul is saying is this, "When you are feeling low and depressed in spirit, when the way looks dark and foreboding, when your burdens seem more than you can bear, stop a moment and think of God's many blessings. Don't look only on the debit side of the ledger; consider the credit side, too." No matter how heavy our loads, no matter how lonely and desolate our pathway, no matter how deep our darkness, life is still filled with mercies and blessings. Let us not forget the beauty of the sunset, the wind in the trees, the breath of the still night air after the rain, the profusion of gorgeous colors on the mountainside in spring, the starlit heavens on a frosty night. Let us not forget the gifts of intellect and memory and hope and love and courage. Let us not forget the clasp of warm and understanding friendship, the blessings of family and home, the cheerful laughter of boys and girls at play, the gurgling noises of a chubby baby as he talks himself to sleep, the patient, quiet, uncomplaining cheerfulness of those who suffer greatly. Let us not forget the experience of our Christ's forgiveness at the cross of Calvary, the ties of Christian brotherhood, the quiet calm of the hour of worship in the church, the unseen, but surely felt, presence of God the Father.

Dr. Alexander Whyte, the great Scottish preacher, one day in his pastoral visitation, went into the home of a woman who greeted him with an outpouring of her troubles and misfortunes. For 20 minutes Dr. Whyte sat in her home and patiently listened to her tale of woe. She told him of all her sorrows, of all her disappointments, of all her losses, of all her burdens, of all her tears. Finally, when it became very apparent that he would have absolutely no opportunity to act as a spiritual adviser to the woman, Dr. Whyte picked up his hat and made for the door, throwing back over his shoulder as he went this word of admonition, "And be sure you forget not all His benefits." That is what we must do. We must be sure that we do not forget all His blessings and benefits. Even in life's darkest moments there is much for which we must thank God. "Always in prayer and supplication with thanksgiving."

In the second place, think with me of how this defense strategy for the soul works. It is when we take everything to God in prayer that we get things into their true perspective. Unless we do make our burdens and problems and sorrows and fears matters of prayer, we are never able to get far enough away from

them to see them in their true light. They are too close to us. We are too much wrapped up in them. They loom too large to us. They are all out of proportion. We cannot see them in their proper light.

Some years ago, while vacationing in a small Indiana town, I saw an oil painting hanging in the window of a corner drug store. It was a very interesting pastoral scene which, to my untrained eye, seemed to be quite well painted. I suppose it had been painted by some local artist. But the thing which attracted my attention was a card placed under the painting with this notation: "This picture may be seen in its best light by standing at the outside edge of the sidewalk." Of course, those instructions had been placed for the guidance of the passers-by who were not accustomed to looking at oil paintings. Whoever placed that picture wanted to be sure that those who looked at it would not simply look at it close up where the imperfections were so noticeable. He wanted to be sure that those who did look at it would look at it from the place where the painting would show to its best advantage.

When we make our burdens and problems, our losses and sorrows, our fears and doubts, matters of prayer, we get over to the outside edge of the sidewalk where we have the right perspective. Prayer enables us to stand back from the noise and bustle and confusion of life and view things in the quietness which comes only from God. Prayer steadies our nerves. Prayer defends our souls. Prayer brings us a sense of quiet. Prayer brings us into the presence of God. Prayer places us in a position to see things in perspective. Prayer makes us feel round about us God's everlasting arms.

Not only so, but prayer will relieve our anxiety and reinforce our souls by bringing our wills into harmony with God's will. After all, that is precisely what prayer is. It is coming into harmony with God. It is surrendering our human wills to the will of God. Our souls are restless and ill at ease simply because far too often we do not bring our wills into harmony with the will of God. I wonder if it is not true that even when we talk to God what we really do many times is to demand that God conform to our will. We go to Him and we say: "This is what I want. Thou must do this for me. I pray that this will meet with Thine approval. Thou must save my son who is in danger. If my son is not spared to me, then I shall lose all faith in Thee. Thou must prosper me in my business, or I shall turn away from Thee." Now, such an attitude is not the attitude of prayer at all. To be sure, God wants us to make our requests known to Him, but we must not make them known to Him in that manner. When we really pray to God, we take our own life and the lives of our loved ones and all of our affairs and we place them in His keeping. We put ourselves under His command. We do what Jesus did in Gethsemane. We say, "Not my will, but Thine be done." God's will for us and our loved ones may not be our will at all; but if we take ourselves and our burdens and our problems to Him in this spirit, we shall find, whatever happens, a wonderful sense of calm and assurance and peace which nothing in this world can take away from us. Then, indeed, will our souls be defended against the onslaughts of dread and worry and fear.

And that brings us to the consideration of the outcome of this defense strategy for the soul which Paul prescribes for us. Notice what Paul says will happen if we use this strategy: "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Or, as Moffatt puts it, "So shall God's peace, that surpasses all our dreams, keep guard over your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus." You see, this is a defense strategy that Paul has given us. "If you want that which will keep you calm and steady, if you want that which will quiet your nerves and strengthen and fortify and defend your souls, do this," Paul says, "and the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus."

Yes, when we make our problems and burdens and cares matters of prayer, the very peace that dwells in the heart of God himself comes to stand as a sentry to our souls. The Greek language here means literally, "will stand as a sentinel." Can you imagine any more wonderful defense for the soul? God's peace. It passeth all understanding. It surpasses all our dreams. God's peace will guard the door of our hearts. God's peace will strengthen our lives. God's peace will defend our souls. God's peace will hold the fort against every invader.

That is precisely what this strategy for the soul will do for us. Now, we must understand once and for all, that the Christian who adopts this defense strategy for the soul will not necessarily be spared difficulties and losses and sorrows and troubles. Adopting this strategy does not mean that God will give the person adopting it preferential treatment. It does not mean that he will be exempted from all of life's cares. It does not mean that if a person takes his troubles and problems to God in prayer, God is bound to give that person an easy and untroubled passage through the tangles of life. But, it means something far more wonderful than that. It means that when the sorrows and losses and disappointments come, as inevitably they must, the inner citadel of the soul will stand. It will have God's peace to defend it. It will be protected, for God's peace stands guard.

I said in the beginning that we are in need of a defense strategy for our souls in these days. It is my honest conviction that, as the days come and go, more and more we shall know the need of some sort of defense for our souls. Why not try that strategy? It will work. As a matter of fact, it is the only defense strategy for the soul that will work.

Proposed Amendments to the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., presented to the Committee on Education and Labor what, in my judgment, is a very effective statement showing how the proposed amendments to the wage-hour law would be especially crippling to independent business and small business. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, INC.

MAY 17, 1960.

Subject: Minimum wage.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR:

I am George J. Burger, vice president, legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business.

We are the largest business organization in the Nation, from the standpoint of directly supporting business and professional enterprisers. Our membership is exclusively among small, independent enterprisers. These people, who are your constituents, and they alone, set our stand on bills and issues by direct signed ballots, which they send to their congressional representatives on the House side, in our mandate polls. I mention this only to emphasize the fact that what I say here is intended to reflect their collective thinking, just as though they were here to speak for themselves.

I might mention here that the federation is the only independent business organization performing this function for smaller firms and their Congressmen.

We have polled our members on four occasions over the past 4 years on earlier bills that touch on the points at issue as presently before your committee. The results of these polls are my authority to speak before you on this subject matter.

For instance, in mandate No. 215 (September 1955) we polled our members as follows:

Bulletin 215—S. 622. Extend wage-hour law to larger retail firms: for, 42 percent; against, 54 percent; no vote, 4 percent.

Bulletin 235—H.R. 585. Extend wage-hour law to all retail-service concerns: for 28 percent; against, 67 percent; no vote, 5 percent.

Bulletin 245—H.R. 83. $1.25 minimum wage: for 30 percent; against, 66 percent; no vote, 4 percent.

The results of these polls, none of which evoked an overwhelming "for" or "against," tell us that, by and large, our members are opposed to (1) wholesale inclusion of all businesses under Federal wage-hour control; (2) expansion of this control to a limited number of larger independent firms; and (3) any further increase in the Federal minimum wage, at least to the $1.25-an-hour level.

These results are especially interesting when considered against the background of federation membership. Of course, we have all sizes and types of independent business and professional man operations among this membership. Some of them, for one reason or another, are already subject to Federal wage-and-hour control. Others are in the category of the larger independents thus far exempt from these controls. Many operate under contracts with labor unions. But, by and large, the greatest proportion are the smaller-sized independents generally proposed for continued exemption from Federal wage-hour controls.

This might explain the two-thirds vote against the proposal for wholesale inclusion of all businesses under Federal wage-hour controls. But it doesn't explain the majorities against the proposals for limited expansion and for the new $1.25 minimum hourly wage, except in the light of these important considerations: That among these smaller independents are many who fear that if their larger brethren go under control now they may be next; that they fear this is part of a trend that will in time deprive them of necessary freedom of judgment in running their own businesses; and that it amounts to another step in the direction of complete Government controls.

Frankly, I can understand these fears. The history of past years has been one of constantly expanding Federal controls. I do not mean to say that these businessmen have been deprived of their freedoms. I do mean that the controls have become more extensive, to the point where no one can be sure when they will stop spreading.

And let me say that as a former independent businessman, for 25 years the owner and operator of a retail tire firm with six or more in employ, I know what freedom of judgment can mean in the operation of a business, particularly in the field of wages. I can tell you that many times during the depression years I was faced between making across-the-board reductions or of eliminating entirely hard-to-find jobs.

Now, consider these business and professional men Federation members. From my own experience, and from observations now and then, I can safely say that most of those who opposed these earlier bills were, and are, paying at least the Federal minimum wage rate, many even more. As practical men they realize it costs money to live, to marry and to raise families. They realize that employees burdened by financial difficulties are not most efficient. They know that to attract and hold the kind of worthwhile employees a good business needs, they have to meet wage-rate competition from other firms, some bound by the Federal standards, others by union contracts. Besides this, due to their size they have to live in intimate daily contact with their employees whom they know as human beings, not as mere statistics on a weekly payroll.

Of course, I don't ignore the fact that there are some who may be paying so-called substandard wages. But I think, and I feel the facts will bear me out, that most in this category are doing so for reasons beyond their control. I know that in my own business, when sales and profits were good, our wages and bonuses were good. But once the giant automobile manufacturers stepped in and snapped up a goodly share of my customers, and once the depression struck, I had to cut, and cut all along the line. Given the opportunity I would have done better, and I think that given an opportunity they would be doing better. Denied the right to private judgment, I might have been driven to the wall. Denied this right, they could be driven to the wall.

Nevertheless, there's no denying the fact that there are, always have been, and likely always will be, a small minority of "chiselers" interested in getting the most for the very least. To the extent employees of these people need protection, it should be given them.

But these protections should not be fashioned in such manner that they act as a deterrent to, or threaten the freedom of, businessmen who are honestly doing their level best to keep afloat and pay the best wages they can.

You know, our system of justice holds that it is better, in terms of legal safeguards, for 99 wrongdoers to escape punishment than it is for 1 innocent man to be convicted unjustly.

I do think it is the sense of our members, based on the polls cited, that this is the principle that should be applied in connection with the basic issues raised in this bill. In order to convict and control the guilty we must not sacrifice, or endanger, the welfare of the innocents. Further, I think the majority of our members, as indicated in these polls, are flatly opposed to any further expansion in these Government controls.

Finally, as a further aid to this committee we wish to advise that under date of May 12, 1960, our head office at Burlingame, Calif., advised us by wire message of the results of our poll, just completed, of our nationwide membership on S. 1046, and the results of that poll showed 21 percent of the Federation membership for, 76 percent against, and 3 percent not voting.

GOP Thinks in Terms of 1860—Not 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert an article authored by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, which appeared in the Tribune publications in Massachusetts as well as numerous other newspapers throughout the Nation.

JOHN MCCORMACK is one of the greatest of the great leaders in the Democratic Party. He has served the Nation, its people, and his party with remarkable ability through the years. He speaks with the authority gained from his vast experience and from his vigorous leadership under our two outstanding Democratic Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman. I commend the following to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

GOP THINKS IN TERMS OF 1860—NOT 1960
(By JOHN W. MCCORMACK, National House majority leader)

With a united Democratic Party, and with the issues that now exist, the situation looks very optimistic for the election of a Democratic President and the continuance of a Democratic National House and Senate.

Seldom, if ever, has there been such an abundance of issues previous to a presidential campaign as there are now in evidence.

As we analyze the events which will lead into the issues of the forthcoming presidential campaign, we find that they have combined in the present administration that produced a faltering, uncertain government, both foreign and domestic. On the international level, we are threatened by loss of leadership in the world.

On the homefront, numerous unmet needs and unsolved problems have been accumulating.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration permitted these critical problems to develop. They do not want to admit they even exist.

Instead, they substitute slogans and phrases for policy and action.

The issue of foreign policy, as directed by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, will be of paramount importance. Our foreign policy, influenced by the old guard element of the GOP, has resulted in:

Nations friendly to us turning to a policy of neutralism, and this is not for our best interests.

Facts will be advanced that will show that the present administration has conceded to the Soviets in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles a superiority over us of three to one. This is a calculated risk which is not healthy.

In the field of outer space, particularly in propulsion power satellites, we are from 4 to 5 years behind the Soviet Union.

The Republican policy in this field is to "catch up." The Democratic policy is to "go ahead." If it is going to take us 4 or 5 years to catch up with the Soviet Union now, where will they be by that time?

At the present time, we have no defense at all against intercontinental ballistic missiles. The one partial defense we could develop—the Nika-Zuss—has been scrapped by the administration.

The Democratic Congress, for the present fiscal year, appropriated $137 million additional for the development of this defense of America, and the administration has refused to spend one penny—freezing the entire amount.

On the domestic level, it is very apparent that the Republican old guard on the congressional level is completely in control of the Republican Party.

They think in terms of 1860, not 1960.

They have no appreciation of the fact that the space age is here with the great technological revolution that is under way.

Further evidence of the old guard influence is shown by the strenuous GOP opposition to legislation for the hospitalization of the aged, the housing legislation, the increase in hourly minimum wage, to extend the coverage of the minimum wage, to extend the standards of unemployment compensation law, and their vigorous opposition to water pollution control, just to mention a few measures the Democratic Congress has sponsored and the old guard has opposed.

As I view the next 4 years, they will be the most important era in the history of our Nation. The next 4 years call for not only leadership of great ability, but with vision and with courage.

There is no hope of that leadership from the Republican old guard, and the Republican candidate for President, if elected, would be a prisoner of the Republican old guard.

Boris Pasternak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to my colleagues an excellent article on Boris Pasternak by Henry H. Taylor, Scripps-Howard staff writer, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 31, 1960. Mr. Taylor is believed to be the last American correspondent to have interviewed Boris Pasternak in his home near Moscow.

The article follows:

PASTERNAK HATED BEING JUDGED AS A POLITICAL THINKER
(By Henry N. Taylor)

"In every generation there has to be some fool who will speak the truth as he sees it," said Boris Pasternak, a man the Communists were calling "Judas" and the free world was calling "defiant martyr."

Outside the poet's brown board farmhouse a snowstorm was ruffling his beloved birch trees, and further off across the Iron Curtain a political hurricane was raging around this Russian whose smuggled-out novel had won a Nobel Prize he was forbidden to accept. But here in Pasternak's study there seemed to be an uncanny pocket of serenity.

"You must remember that I am a Russian and a writer," said Mr. Pasternak. "I wish to live in this land. I wish to go on writing. My heart is warm that the world outside reads 'Dr. Zhivago,' but I understand why this book cannot be read in my own country. So let us just drink tea and talk about books."

LONE DISMAY

The most striking thing about Mr. Pasternak in person was his dismay at being judged as a political thinker, not a teller of tales.

He hated the Soviet shackles which required books in his own country to help build socialism or else molder unpublished. But he was also shocked at the eagerness of overnight Pasternak experts abroad to treat his book as an anti-Communist manifesto, rather than as a novel about humans who happened to live in a dehumanizing society.

I came a stranger, floundering unannounced through hip-deep February snow, bearing messages from some poets outside Russia who did not want to embarrass or endanger Mr. Pasternak by sending their words of encouragement through the censored Russian mail.

At the kitchen door, interrupted but smiling, he welcomed me in, for Mr. Pasternak was an Old World gentleman, hospitable and

trusting until betrayed a few days later by a British visitor who took abroad a private poem by Mr. Pasternak then broke confidence by publishing it.

"I believe mightily in human beings," said Mr. Pasternak. "Only individuals seek the truth. Big groups, and governments, can only end up limiting men's individuality, and that is what 'Dr. Zhivago' was about. They charge the Nobel committee with making a political decision. But I honestly believe they were judging the work of a man's life."

Money meant nothing to Mr. Pasternak. He never even considered going to Stockholm to collect his $42,800 Nobel money. In my presence, he signed a letter to this Italian publisher giving away forever more than $100,000, in one pen-stroke.

"Here is what matters," said the author, striding to a bookshelf and running his hand along a row of volumes—all 'Dr. Zhivago,' in English and German, in Swedish and Danish and French, but not in Russian. Worldwide, this book sold more than 2 million copies, probably the biggest surprise best-seller of modern times? Yet, there were probably never more than 100 copies inside the Soviet Union—and most of these seemed to be right there in Pasternak's study.

VIEW OF LIFE

The novel's hero says, at one point, "The great majority of us are required to live a life of constant, systematic duplicity," and to some extent even Mr. Pasternak lived such a life. Warned by the Kremlin that he was in danger of losing his home, that, at 69, he might be taken out of sight of the woods and streams of his home village outside Moscow, away from the shadow of the onion-spired village church and the snow-cape beyond—Mr. Pasternak stopped short of becoming a total martyr.

He wrote both Nikita Khrushchev and the Nobel committee and asked merely to be left alone in peace.

If Mr. Pasternak feared for his safety, there was no sign of it in his house that day in 1959, although fellow writers he had known all his life were busy declaring him "a parasite," an "extraneous smudge" and a "snake from the dungwaters."

Address of Calvin Robinson, Editor, Appomatox (Va.) Times-Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, southside Virginia, and Appomattox in particular, is most fortunate in having as one of its outstanding citizens the Honorable Calvin H. Robinson. He is known far and wide in our area as "The Country Editor." He and his charming wife are co-owners and publishers of the Times-Virginian, a splendid weekly newspaper. As editor of our paper, he has contributed much to the cultural, social, and economic progress of the county of Appomattox. He has given of his time, his talent, and labor in making our area a better place in which to live. I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. and Mrs. Robinson have contributed greatly to a better understanding of the cause, effect, and historical significance of the War Between the States. Mr. Robinson has made a study of the history of the War Between the States, and all its great leaders. He is one of the outstanding authorities in Virginia on this era.

On May 30, 1960, at the Memorial Day exercises in Lynchburg, Va., Mr. Robinson made an outstanding address which I desire to include herewith:

REMARKS OF CALVIN ROBINSON, EDITOR, APPOMATOX, VA., TIMES-HERALD-VIRGINIAN, ON MAY 30, 1960, AT MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, LYNCHBURG, VA.

Madam Chairman, and gentle friends, it is indeed a precious privilege to come here from my "country editor's" desk at Old Appomattox, to meet with you and witness these impressive ceremonies.

There are times when some of us become a bit discouraged about the world in which we toil, and I share the sentiment of those who are puzzled, perplexed, and ofttimes bewildered by the pressure, the tension, and the rapid flow of events.

But, we are sustained, and we take new heart with each sunrise, because we have so many companions with us along the way, who dip the cup of memory into the fountain spring of our sacred heritage.

May I offer the comment that our patriotic organizations are so very important? From time to time, I am invited to make some remarks at meetings of chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the Daughters of the American Revolution, etc., and I salute all such chapters, their leaders and membership, as well as the C of C, SCV, SAR, American Legion, VFW, and all their auxiliaries and like patriotic groups.

These groups are motivated not only by maintaining friendships and ideals, but also in aiding us one and all in living today and facing tomorrow better prepared because we know and treasure what went on yesterday.

To me, as we face a new decade in 1960, which may become known as anything from the sentimental sixties to the sizzling sixties, I love to recall a decade 100 years ago which I look upon as the sacred sixties.

The mountaintop scaled by gallant and heroic men and women such as we honor here today if of such majesty and grandeur, I am prone to pass by and forget the petty greed of small souls, the lust for power, of those who pillaged the recess of the valleys below.

So long as we have such groups as are represented here today, we are on solid ground. This story will illustrate:

During recent weeks, certain Members of the U.S. Senate felt it necessary to discuss at some length a matter of pending legislation. It was about 3 o'clock one morning, when the beloved Senator ERVIN from North Carolina was making a masterful address. But he noted that he was almost alone, as weary fellow Senators were at rest. He said he was reminded of "Pete," a Confederate veteran who lived in Chatham County, N.C.

Pete was one of those veterans so fortunate as to survive the war, and the longer he lived the more he loved to talk about the war, and the more he talked about it, the more he glamorized it. One day one of his friends asked him if he had ever known Gen. Robert E. Lee. Pete said, "Certainly I knew General Lee. As a matter of fact, he and I were not only comrades in the army, but personal friends, and I helped him plan many of his battles." Then Pete was asked when was the last time he ever saw General Lee. He said that it was about 6 months after Appomattox. He said he heard General Lee was teaching school up in Lexington, Va., and he went up there to see his old friend once again. He said they spent the afternoon talking about old days, and then General Lee turned to him and said, "Pete, were you at Appomattox?" Pete said, "Yes, General, I was at Appomattox." And according to Pete, General Lee turned to him and said, "Pete, I am sorry to hear that. If I had only known you were there with me, I would never have surrendered."

Now, that is a story, but I do say that our way of life will never be surrendered, but will be kept sacred—and so I am led to say that my remarks on this occasion have that in mind. There are things we want to preserve. There are principles dear to us. There are memories we treasure, but beyond our remembering them, we want the world to remember, too.

And so, for a few moments I ask your patience while I chat with you about three simple points.

First. The idea of Memorial Day is historic and good.

Second. It pays tribute to great and gallant heroes.

Third. It preserves sacred principles, for which sacrifices were made.

I

Now, as to Memorial Day itself, I commend to you a perfectly splendid article by that eminent UDC historian, Ella F. Harlee, in which she details the story of Decoration Day, from its very informal beginning in Columbus, Miss., in 1862, while the war was still in its beginning. Formal Decoration Day was organized in Jackson, Miss., April 26, 1865. The story is so very interesting. News had arrived that Lee had surrendered at Appomattox, and that Joseph E. Johnson was surrounded in North Carolina. And then on April 25, 1865, couriers came into Jackson, Miss., with news that the Federal were coming in from Vicksburg, and would arrive on the 26th, to demand the surrender of the city. Immediately a stalwart southern girl, Sue Adams, later Mrs. Vaughan, seized a pencil and sent out a message for all the southern ladies to meet on the 26th at the cemetery, with flowers to place on the graves. Ah, yes, and so it was, that on April 26, the mothers, and widows, and the children came to the cemetery. The children came with their aprons filled with cowslips, bluebells, white heliotrope and rosebuds. Leading the flower girls, Miss Sue noticed that some graves were not covered with flowers. "But, they are northern graves," the children said. She replied, "I will garland them with my pink roses. Their mothers and sisters sobbed for them, too." And there was born the spirit we cherish today, as a united nation. We honor all of our gallant dead.

May 30, 1868, is said to be the background date for Memorial Day as we know it now, in most of the Nation. The wife of a northern general decorated graves in Petersburg on that date.

So far as I know, at Appomattox, the first meeting to form a Ladies Memorial Association was held May 18, 1866.

North and South Carolina observe Confederate Memorial Day on May 10. In Louisiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee, Confederate Memorial Day comes on June 3, the birthday of Jefferson Davis. Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi still observe April 26.

Most other States observe May 30 as a National Memorial Day.

And is it not true that in France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and distant corners of the world, there are cemeteries, many of them handsomely preserved by a grateful people, where lie the remains of those who were and are heroes of World Wars I and II. A friend of mine returned recently from Europe, and told me he was privileged to see the simple mound, one like all the rest, where is buried the incomparable Gen. George S. Patton. In fact, he brought me pictures he took. And on many a hill in Korea and many a sacred cemetery around the world they repose. And

at Arlington today, they are placing flowers on the grave of the Unknown Soldier.

II

And now, secondly, I wish to remark that Memorial Day pays tribute to great and gallant heroes.

It has been my privilege to make addresses on such great heroes as Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Thomas J. Jackson, and once I was asked to speak about the horses the Confederates rode. Also, I have been asked to speak about the saga of sheer glory * * * the matchless story of what the women did in wartime. In each case I have done what I could in my humble way to read and study and understand the life of some particular hero. And eacn time, it seems now, looking back, at that moment, I was ready to conclude: This one was the greatest.

It is now my judgment that no nation has been blessed more exceedingly with individual heroes than has America, and it is best for us not to forget that.

The proof is the fantastic literature, the incredible number of books and articles pouring from the printing presses. I recommend the new magazine, the Civil War Times, published in Gettysburg, as being impartial and most informative. The Atlanta Journal is issuing a weekly magazine feature, the Atlanta Century. And Lynchburg's Iron Worker came out with a wonderful presentation on the Battle of Lynchburg. Our newspapers, our radio and television people, and our book and magazine publishers are already adding to what has been building up—an incredible library of historic material. And I salute the Jones Library here in this city for its tremendous material.

As for me, I am going broke. My own library is getting out of hand, and I am not able to employ a librarian. It is amazing how many books have been written about Appomattox. I have been working on one of my own, but ere 1965, the only thing I might have left to talk about that has not already been covered might be the old white mule in Mexico that General Grant talked about for an hour after he had met General Lee in the McLean House.

I am a member of the Federal Civil War Centennial Advisory Board and have attended many meetings of Civil War round tables and such, and I am proud to report that we are striving for dignity and most proper observances. In my humble opinion, it is in itself a tribute to our forefathers that 100 years later a nation salutes its heroes and the sacred memories, all the way from Fort Sumter to Appomattox, and the spirit is that of honorable testimony.

I might mention that while my wife has been attending UDC meetings all over, I have not just been sitting at home. I have been out with a modern metal detector, on the battlefields, digging up Civil War relics. If they ever start shooting again, we will not run out of ammunition, I can personally guarantee that.

III

Ah, yes, but I must hasten on to say, that perhaps most important of all is that Memorial Day presents us with an opportunity to remember the sacred principles involved. After all, why men fought and offered their lives, and lost their lives counts in the history books and in the lessons to future generations.

Our South fought for a way of life. It was a precious way because it had been won by brave pioneers who came to these shores not running away from anything but moving toward a dream of a new world of freedom and opportunity. Of course, we believed in States rights and local self-government. Had we wanted federalization, nationalization, dictatorships, and such, there were plenty of them in the Old World. Virginia was the Ark of the Covenant of setting up the true American way of life—representative self-government, as conceived by that galaxy of scholars, orators, statesmen, and gentlemen who embellished our early days. To believe in a principle is the source of the valor which brings one to fight for it. And there would not so many have been "funeralized" had there not been the strong arm to force us to nationalize, federalize, and socialize.

Indeed, beside the great bend in the Potomac, at blessed Mount Vernon are the ashes of the one first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. And where Little Mountain raises its stately head above Albermarle, we remember the immortal Jefferson. We go to sacred shrines where Jackson rests, where Stuart sleeps, and we shed tears that they died so young. Today all over Virginia and much of the Nation, the graves are decorated with the flowers of spring. It is good that that is so. But it is not enough. It is not enough. We live in a tremendous age. To those to whom much has been given, much is expected. And there may not be much time. There was the sad story of an unfortunate fellow who was in death row. All efforts for a reprieve had failed and finally this poor fellow scribbled off a note to the Governor. He scribbled: "Dear Governor: Does you know that they is fixin' to hang me on Thursday, and here 'tis Tuesday."

The streams of time down their channels fret, and we must take our stand. I put it to you that the principles for which Americans, of all sections have fought and died are precious in our sight. God did not place just one star in the sky for us to admire and pause to marvel. He did not place just one rose in some garden for all to come to see. He poured a myriad of stars and how many roses we can love to see is up to us. So precious is history.

They say that "as the twig is bent, so is the tree inclined." Let us then, on this Memorial Day rededicate our own selves to maintain and protect, inviolate, our heritage and our way of life, and as Jefferson Davis said, transmit it "unshorn" to future generations.

I have come here from Old Appomattox Court House to memorialize the patriotism of those who observe this day as a time of sacred memory, to salute the gallantry and heroism of our forefathers as an inspiration for today and all the tomorrows, and to suggest that we not forget the principles for which they lived and died. Let us be constructive. Let us be understanding. Let us be tolerant. In that way, we will be invincible.

For one, I will strive to live in the spirit of Gen. Robert E. Lee, who from his home in nearby Lexington, left these words:

"I have fought against the North because I believe they were seeking to wrest from the South dearest rights. But I never cherished bitter or vindictative feelings, and I have never seen the day when I did not pray for them."

Memorial Day, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day last Monday, I had the distinction of sharing the 92d Memorial Day observance at the national cemetery in Keokuk, Iowa, with Mr. John Moore, State department commander of the Iowa American Legion. I was very much impressed with the remarks which Commander Moore made on this solemn occasion and under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that his address appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1960

My fellow Americans, today we are joining with people all over the Nation to observe Memorial Day. Today we pay tribute to all in our Nation who have sacrificed so much to preserve the liberties we cherish in America.

Memorial Day means much to members of the American Legion and all veterans because they know many of the hardships endured by those valiant comrades who have given so much on the Altar of Freedom.

The graves we decorate with real flowers and the flowers of memory can only in a very small way, consecrate the acts of courage performed by those whom we honor.

I do not speak to you in soft words of tribute for our beloved dead. Neither they, nor their living comrades in the American Legion, would have me do so. With their lives these immortals, whom we honor, from Valley Forge to the bloody slopes of Okinawa and Heartbreak Ridge, sanctified their faith in the democratic principles, that even as men are born with the God-given birthright of freedom, so too shall they be permitted to live in the righteousness of peace.

We can no more add to their valor than we can impart added brilliance to the sun or added beauty to the eternal stars. Rather let us rededicate ourselves to the completion of the work which they have so nobly begun and for which they gave their lives. Let us therefore, give voice to their stilled lips, and speak out unafraid in their behalf.

Would they be satisfied with the conditions we have today if they could be here?

Peace is still not a reality to most of the people of this world.

Suspicion, hatred, civil war, starvation, and greed ride the range of human misery as ruthlessly as when the war lords of Berlin and Tokyo dreamed of their "master races."

Eastern Europe is closed to Western Europe by an Iron Curtain of censorship. Communist agents throughout the world, taking their orders from Moscow, are trying to seize control of governments and make them subject to the will of the Kremlin.

Today the American people are realizing that tyranny is a monster most difficult to destroy. Other despots have risen to make known their dreams of world dominion. They do not believe in an America with peace and freedom and opportunity for all people. They dream of a Soviet empire with the hammer and sickle waving in triumph over the ashes of democracy and a commissar ruling the life of every individual in the world with an iron hand.

Of all the threats to human liberty and freedom, communism is the greatest.

Hunger, unemployment, and pestilence are stalking many lands. These victims of war have become the grist for the mills of communism. Many of these weakened nations have toppled before the force displayed by Communist Russia with its inexhaustive manpower and natural resources.

The picture of Russia's long stride from Czechoslovakia to China is too recent to have been dimmed in its ugly potentialities. In Korea it was brought to us in a most forceful and realistic way. Now again, in Indochina, Asia, and Cuba the same tactics are used.

The American people know that the only hope of preserving human freedom, or making peace secure, lies in American national strength. That means strength in the faith of American ideals, strength in American economy and finally, strength in American fighting power.

The American Legion has always championed peace and freedom through strength. Despots and tyrants have only contempt for people who are so passionately devoted to peace that they foolishly never prepare to defend their peace.

The words that may be spoken, on this Memorial Day will soon be forgotten by the average listener, but every man, woman, and child, worthy to be called an American, can never forget the sacrifices made by the heroic men and women of our land, sacrifice has been the price of all progress, from the earliest pioneer who braved the uncharted sea to the first settlers who landed on the bleak New England coast, meeting the savage resistance of Indian as well as the soul-breaking weather, to the finest young manhood that marched into the jaws of almost certain death at Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Normandy, Anzio, Africa, and Korea. We cannot, nor shall not, forget these lives, for they died that our glorious flag might wave as the symbol of truth and loyalty and freedom.

The observance of Memorial Day does not hang upon the words of any speaker, for deep down in our hearts we know the obligations that are ours in memory of the sacrifices that have been made. They who have died have written their names not upon tablets of paper or stone but in the everlasting memory of mankind.

Today is more than a Memorial Day. It is a day of rededication of ourselves to those high ideals for which the men and women of this country died. We are not entirely unaware of the faults and frailties of our human makeup, but let us not forget the great heart of our people. We are thinking today of the gallant men of the Civil War period—those whose ranks have thinned out to the point of extinction but their deeds will ever stand as the symbol of Americanism at its best. Again in 1898, our fathers answered their country's call, and paid the price of their patriotism with their blood. Similarly in 1917 and again in 1941 they withstood the tyranny of pagan demons who would have blotted out our civilization and culture, and destroyed all the sacred institutions of our people, and foisted a paganism upon us that would have desecrated all that we can call holy and sacred.

And again on the rugged terrain of Korea, our American boys joined with those of other peace-loving nations to suppress the ugly head of tyranny.

We can build no lasting memorials to those who gave their all until we treat the living in such a way that our world will be worthy of the tremendous sacrifices made.

Memorial Day should be a day in which we decide that we shall live worthy of the men and women who gave themselves for America. Memorial Day should be a day when we pledge to fight against intrenched wrong, whatever the cost.

This Memorial Day is not just another day. It is a most important day to all thinking Americans, and, to a greater degree, to all thinking veterans. It is not just a day to pay homage and respect to those who have died; it is a day of solemn rededication.

As we bow in reverence in memory of our heroes before their graves, let us pledge ourselves anew to the great task of making this world a better place for the coming generations and under the guidance of Almighty God, may we dare to give ourselves, as unselfishly as we expected them to give themselves. Then we shall truly build an America where the fruits of their great sacrifice shall ever sustain and nourish the deepest needs of the world.

This is our American way of saying, "We remember all of the brave things that you who have passed on have done. We remember and we are grateful. We, too, love this United States. We, too, are willing to do whatever is necessary to keep it great and good and strong, just as you were. We will not forget."

Thank you very much for letting me talk to you on this Memorial Day.

Is It Wrong To Tell the Truth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, since the U–2 incident has occurred, more lines have been written about this event than any that I can recall over the last decade. Political writers across the Nation have analyzed the incident and the manner in which it was handled by our President in many different ways. We have more answers and more analyses of what should have been done than the situation actually merits.

I, for one, believe in the action taken by the President of the United States. I commend him for it and feel it only follows a pattern of forthrightness that he has applied to his tremendous undertaking—the Presidency of the United States. Also, I have had unshaken faith in the Defense Establishment of this Nation of ours and as most Members of Congress, have some slight knowledge that flights such as the U–2 was engaged in were taking place. Previous to the U–2 incident, I had felt that these flights were necessary in order that we might obtain intelligence information to help safeguard the free world. I was for them then and I am for them now.

Among the many editors that have commented on this matter is a very close friend of mine, L. H. McCamic, of the Wellsburg Daily Herald in Wellsburg, W. Va., who writes a column daily entitled "Editor's Uneasy Chair." On May 25, there appeared an article entitled "Is It Wrong To Tell the Truth?" which I at this time submit for the RECORD and which I respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues:

EDITOR'S UNEASY CHAIR—IS IT WRONG TO TELL THE TRUTH?

Uneasy Chair has no patience with those people associated with the Government, or outside of it, principally those who make a living commenting on events as they happen, mispredicting what is going to happen and explaining away their wrong guesses on public, political, and other affairs, who have been emphasizing President Eisenhower's mistake in handling the U–2 airplane incident over Russia.

The President's great mistake, they point out, was in telling the truth about the incident. One writer distinguished himself by stating that the President should have used "diplomatic language," or in other words procrastinate or prevaricate, or a bit of both. With that opinion and the opinion of others who have expressed similar views, Uneasy Chair cannot agree. Most of the trouble nations get into comes through trying to understand diplomatic language. The plain unvarnished truth would be better in most circumstances.

The truth of this matter is that the United States and other nations send planes over Russia to try and keep abreast of their warlike activities. The information they get should help prevent a repetition of Pearl Harbor. In this particular case Russia shot down the plane.

Russia has spies throughout the world. Her planes are flying everywhere they think they can learn anything about the United States, Great Britain, France, Switzerland, and other countries. Two diplomatic spies of Russia were arrested in the United States and deported during the period when Premier Khrushchev was accepting the hospitality of our country. Our State Department could have exposed them and embarrassed Khrushchev no end, but this was not done. Spying seems to be a legitimate national practice and occasionally it causes embarrassment, but we do not believe the President should have lied about this case. Had he done so he would have been lying to his own people as well as Russia. Uneasy Chair believes truth is the best policy. President Eisenhower is strong enough to take any criticism that comes to him from Khrushchev or the people at home.

The Wausau Story on School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail, I received a very informative and interesting letter from the president of the board of education of the largest community in my congressional district. I believe that this letter from President F. W. Braun of Wausau, Wis., deserves the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. Mr. Braun's letter reads as follows:

WAUSAU, WIS., *May 26, 1960.*

Hon. MELVIN LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter comes to you as president of the Board of Education of Wausau.

News releases and newspaper articles have appeared in regard to the current bill in Congress for Federal subsidies for school construction and the Senate bill even goes farther than that, giving some of the money for teachers' salaries.

We fully understand and realize the terrific impact of teachers' organizations and teacher lobby in the States and their desire for money from any source. Also, many school boards and communities who do not want to realize their responsibility, trying to get money from the Federal Government for school construction.

We feel that this is absolutely unnecessary because the record of the country shows classrooms have actually been built without any Federal aid from anywhere but by community desire and intent and want and actually takes care of individual needs thus far. We realize there is a peak coming in school attendance but proper advance planning by school committees and school boards can foresee this actual need in their own community and take care of their school construction requirements accordingly.

You are familiar with the fact that Wausau has just recently secured a bond issue

of $3,500,000 to build a new junior high school on the west side as well as an addition to our present senior high. Also, we recently completed a new grade school a few years ago on our west side as well as several additions to other schools in our community.

I could go on and on with figures that you are probably more familiar with than I am and have more information on. I am not familiar with the Washington political situation and the pressures that are brought upon you and other Congressmen to vote for this bill—but actually if people want good schools and more schools, they can have them without any outside aid. Where there's a will to do something for their children, nothing would interfere with it.

Isn't there some way that this bill can be eliminated once and for all from the record?

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

F. W. BRAUN,
President, Board of Education.

United States Handicapped by Excise Tax in Compact Car Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, from the first day he came to Congress, our colleague from Michigan, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, has been aggressively engaged in a determined effort to obtain a realistic review of the inequitable "wartime" excise tax which severely handicaps our automobile industry, and those employed in it, as they seek to compete with foreign automobile manufacturers. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S untiring efforts were appropriately noted recently in an excellent editorial which appeared in the Flint (Mich.) Journal on May 24, 1960. I believe the editorial, reprinted below, is worthy of the serious attention of every Member:

TAX HINDERS AUTO INDUSTRY IN COMPACT CAR COMPETITION

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN again has called congressional attention to the damaging 10 percent Federal "wartime" automobile excise tax that he has been fighting to have removed ever since he has been in Washington.

"In keeping such a tax in peacetime, the Federal Government is cutting off its taxes to spite its revenue," he pointed out in a speech on the floor of the House.

"This tax was levied for the specific purpose of decreasing automobile production in order to divert it to war production. The purpose for which this tax was imposed no longer exists but we still permit this tax to retard sales, production and employment."

CHAMBERLAIN sounded his warning again in view of the new competition of foreign-made cars on the American market. He contends that the excise tax, adopted as a temporary tax more than 10 years ago, is dragging down the speed of the American automobile industry.

He suggested that this country's lawmakers ask themselves if it is not politically immoral to penalize an industry which is the basis for one of every seven jobs and one of every six businesses by exacting a tax not levied on other manufacturing.

The automobile long since has ceased to be recognized as a luxury. In our way of life, it unquestionably is an everyday necessity. But Congress refuses to recognize this fact. The cost of the family car is loaded up with a Federal tax that amounts to 17.3 percent of the wholesale value—or $346 on a $2,000 car.

Supporting CHAMBERLAIN'S stand is an editorial by Robert B. Powers, editor and publisher of Wards Automotive Reports, in his publication's yearbook, pointing out the peril both to the automobile industry and the Nation in the forthcoming struggle for the U.S. compact-car market. The problem can be appreciated by realizing 668,070 foreign cars were sold here last year compared with 252 in 1940.

Powers' editorial, which CHAMBERLAIN had included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made this point:

"Three European motor vehicle manufacturers who presently have the lion's share in the American market either are government-owned or government-controlled. Their sales total more than 40 percent of all imports. * * * Lower labor costs, smaller and less costly staffs of management, engineering, styling, sales and marketing offer them a flexibility in the pricing of their products that presently all we can do is envy.

"Washington policymakers, experts, and legislative committees surveying Federal tax structures can forestall possible future injury to the industry and prevent national embarrassment and harm by taking positive action now."

The situation that CHAMBERLAIN has been fighting to relieve even before the compact-car race assumed its present significance today has grown into one of our country's most serious economic problems. Unless the warning of such tax repeal advocates as CHAMBERLAIN is heeded, Congress may soon be faced with the necessity of taking drastic emergency action to protect a faltering industry.

If such a course—of having to discourage imports, for example—is followed, it may have far-reaching effects. In Powers' words, "* * * it may cost us those friends throughout the world we have worked so diligently and expensively to win and influence."

Such action can be averted if only Congress and the administration will take a realistic look at the automobile market and give the sale of U.S. products a shot in the arm by removing the excise tax choker.

Appropriation for Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks I include an article by Sylvia Porter printed in the Boston Sunday Herald of May 29, 1960, strongly urging an adequate appropriation for mutual security:

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM NEEDS WIDESPREAD BACKING

(By Sylvia Porter)

In the days since the summit collapse, surely millions of Americans the Nation over have wondered in anger frustration, "What can I do to help now?"

One crucially important thing you can do is to make clear to Congress that you want no backtracking whatsoever now on our mutual security program—and that you insist it vote all the cash necessary to back up the foreign aid program that was written into law and signed by President Eisenhower on the eve of his departure for Paris.

MESSAGE TO ALLIES

If Congress does vote this cash quickly and decisively, it will tell our allies in unmistakable terms that in this key area of our foreign policy we have a firm course and we're following it.

It will assume the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations of the globe that we recognize how desperate is their struggle for advancement and that we intend to continue to help them achieve higher living standards without sacrificing their independence.

It will smash home to Russia the message that we know she is fighting an intensifying economic war with us all over the globe and that we are ready and prepared to fight back.

It will support our critical alliances in the North Atlantic and Asia, help maintain the unity which is imperative for survival.

It will be the best "next step" we could take after Paris—one big step forward after the dismaying series of steps backward.

The mutual security program, authorizing the spending of $4 billion for foreign economic and military aid in the year starting July 1, is on our lawbooks. But, as I emphasized Friday, the authorization is meaningless unless Congress also appropriates the money to back up the authorization. Before the summit, influential Members of Congress were saying plainly that they planned to slash the appropriation 25 percent or more under the $4 billion authorized.

And while President Eisenhower in a private letter sent to around 100 top citizens of the country has just urged "a crusade" to prevent this, and while this past Monday Vice President NIXON made the unusual move of publicly asking each GOP member of the House Appropriations Committee to prevent it, it is far from sure the pleas will be heeded.

Why is the opposition so strong?

One reason is the admitted maladministration of the program in many instances. Some of the bungling has been abominable.

But the way to correct maladministration of a law is not to cripple the law to be administered. The commonsense move is to get the machinery into operation, then to act with determination to make the machinery more efficient and put more efficient men in control.

A second argument against the law is that, if we can't "afford" to spend millions to aid such depressed areas of our own as West Virginia, we can't "afford" to spend billions to aid foreign areas.

This argument is cockeyed and loaded with obvious politics. We do not further aid to our depressed areas by cutting foreign aid—and this is definitely no time to be playing politics with our foreign policy.

A third reason for the opposition is the feeling of disenchantment with the results of the program, the belief that foreign aid is not being adjusted to today's world.

Here again, it seems to me that the way to find a new program is not to sabotage the only one we have. In the past the mutual security program saved Greece from communism, Turkey from chaos, preserved a free Western Europe. Our economic aid to such lands as Laos, Jordan, Pakistan, South Vietnam, is averting Communist domination in those areas. We haven't gained as much as we hoped, but neither have the Soviets.

Imperfect as the foreign aid program is, it is at the heart of our foreign policy. The first major act to come out of Congress following the Paris debacle must not be a retreat on this program. You can help your country by making your support known now.

All 19 Scripps-Howard Newspapers Back Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 of this year, I proposed in an article in the Capitol Hill weekly newspaper Roll Call that a poll be conducted among the Senators, Representatives, and their aids on the Hill to determine who of all the present candidates is best qualified to be President of the United States. Since nearly all of the candidates are associated with Congress and are probably best known here, I thought that this would be a logical medium for a proper determination.

Roll Call accepted the proposal and undertook the poll. After a month of careful canvassing, it came up with the following results:

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON topped all other candidates by capturing 44 percent of the vote.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON was second with 20 percent of the vote.

Other leading Democratic candidates scored as follows: Senator Stuart Symington, 11 percent; Senator John F. Kennedy, 10 percent; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, 8 percent; Adlai Stevenson, 5 percent.

I stated at the time that there was no question or doubt as to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S qualifications and that a ticket headed by him would be a sure winner. As a northerner, however, I still held some reservations. By his actions and his able leadership, Senator JOHNSON is erasing these reservations one by one. His stand in a few recent instances will prove the point. It was due to his efforts that Congress passed a civil rights bill this year assuring voting rights for all citizens. He is on record in support of a health program for the aged and retired citizens, including hospitalization and medical care. He is in favor of a higher minimum wage and the extension of minimum wage coverage to include millions of people who work for substandard wages. He supported enactment of the depressed areas bill over the President's veto. These are only a few instances, there are others.

I have always felt that if Senator JOHNSON would go forth campaigning on the road as other candidates have done these past few months and would project himself to the people, there is no doubt in my mind that they would reach the same conclusion as the experts, namely, that LYNDON B. JOHNSON towers over his opponents in ability and leadership.

In the face of the recent summit failure, citizens all over the country are having second thoughts and reevaluating the candidates in terms of ability to lead our Nation in the stormy years ahead. They feel that the times demand a man of outstanding ability to lead the American people—and in that category LYNDON B. JOHNSON is in a class by himself. Many feel he is the man of the hour.

It is not surprising to learn that more and more newspapers and periodicals in all sections of the country have come to the conclusion that if the Democratic nomination for the Presidency was to be based on ability alone, Senator JOHNSON "would be a walk-in."

Today, 19 editors of the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers have announced their preference for Senator JOHNSON as "the ablest and strongest Democrat." In an editorial entitled "The Ablest Democrat: LBJ," the editors emphasize that presidential candidates should be measured by the requirements of our times and that "those requirements are stern and challenging."

Regarding these standards, there can be no question as to who should be President and who is best able to carry forward the banner of the free world against communism. Khrushchev will meet his master when he is confronted with LYNDON B. JOHNSON. He will meet a dedicated leader who knows how to handle people, good and bad. He will meet a man who works around the clock and who fully understands that the best and surest way of attaining world peace is by restoring the United States to its position as the strongest and most powerful nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that the Johnson era will be an era of responsible leadership and it will be a period in our history in which this Nation was saved from the danger of deteriorating into a second-rate power.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the editorial cited above which is published in today's issue of the Washington Daily News:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 1, 1960]

THE ABLEST DEMOCRAT: LBJ

The Scripps-Howard newspapers will support LYNDON B. JOHNSON for the Democratic presidential nomination. The 19 editors of these politically independent newspapers believe Senator JOHNSON is the ablest and strongest Democrat available. We hope he will be his party's choice.

As to our preference for the Republican nomination, we delay an announcement until a later day when, and if, a contest develops. We hope there is a Republican contest, for we believe it would be healthy for our two-party system.

After the conventions have chosen their nominees and the fall campaign has drawn the issues, we shall meet the obligation we share with all other independent voters in choosing between what the Democrats and the Republican offer.

In saying we like LYNDON JOHNSON best of all the probable Democratic candidates, we hope some of our readers will agree with us—and we know some will disagree. For your own reasons you will form your judgments, and we grant they will be just as sincere as ours.

Here are our reasons, for your consideration:

Candidates should be measured by the requirements of our times—and those requirements are stern and challenging.

The drumbeat of history quickens as 1960 opens a decade that will challenge the staying power of America and the free world.

The men who rule the Kremlin have an announced and clear purpose to dominate the world. They can be stopped only by superior strength and purpose on our side.

The times call for a man in the White House who has demonstrated qualities of leadership, who has experience and judgment, a man of vitality and courage, and patriotism that rises above partisanship.

LYNDON JOHNSON, in our opinion, has those qualities to a greater degree than any other potential nominee in his party.

He has proven his leadership in the U.S. Senate, where he has been majority leader for the last 6 years, while the executive department has been controlled by the opposition party. A petty partisan in his position could have made a shambles of a party-divided Government, but Senator JOHNSON'S leadership has been constructive and responsible.

He is a man who gets things done. He would rather settle problems than create political issues.

Some of his detractors say that LBJ is "too southern." Yet the only two civil rights bills Congress has passed since the Civil War came through under his leadership.

Some say he is too provincial. Yet at the time of the sputnik crisis, he is the one who took the lead in giving drive and direction to our own Nation's space exploration.

Some say he is not versed in foreign affairs. Yet in the hubbub over the U–2 plane incident and the collapse of the summit conference, Senator JOHNSON was the only one of the Democratic aspirants who said the right things at the right time.

While others were yapping at and second-guessing President Eisenhower, the tall Texan was unruffled in maintaining that the paramount threat was the rocket rattling of Khrushchev and Malinovsky, and that America could not be made stronger by partisan acrimony.

It was just another test where Senator JOHNSON showed his sure-footedness. And another reason why we hope he will be the Democratic nominee. For there seems to be a 50–50 chance that whoever is the Democratic nominee will be our next President, and will serve as President for all of us—Democrats, Republicans, and independents, through crucial years ahead.

Indian "Operation Bootstrap"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the May 25, 1960, issue of the Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo., on my bill entitled "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style."

The editorial is as follows:

INDIAN "OPERATION BOOTSTRAP"

Deserving serious consideration by Congress is a bill known as "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style" for the Indians of America. Pushed by Representative BERRY of South Dakota, this measure is one of the few in recent years that makes sense. It provides incentives for the establishment of industry on Indian reservation land and employing Indians.

Most Indian legislation has always fallen down because nearly all of it has involved removal of the Indian from his own people and from his known country. This would correct this procedure and in so doing

would probably make far more worthy many existing laws, particularly those concerning education on the Indian reservation.

While there is little chance of this legislation passing this Congress, we hope that it is kept alive and seriously considered in 1961.

A Call for More Democratic and Representative Government in Taiwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas B. Dodd of Hong Kong has written an eloquent letter in the Christian Science Monitor for May 5, 1960, with respect to the need for changes in the U.S. policy toward Chiang Kai-shek and the present government of Taiwan.

Mr. Dodd applauds our recent measures with respect to an attempt to restore a measure of democracy in Korea, but he notes that in the Korean elections a sizable number of Koreans did vote for Korean officials while in Taiwan only 18 Taiwanese are permitted to join with 1,400-odd Chinese "national representatives" to "elect" Chinese officials to govern Taiwan.

He also points out that these 1,400 Chinese who are allowed to vote were themselves elected to office 13 years ago in China. This means that, at best, they may claim to represent the 2 million Chinese on Taiwan. They do not represent the 8 million Taiwanese who also have an interest in the policies of those governing Taiwan.

"The Taiwanese," according to Mr. Dodd, "have fewer voting representatives in this election than has the oversea Chinese community in San Francisco."

Our policies with respect to Taiwan need prompt and careful attention.

Under unanimous consent I am including hereafter the text of Mr. Dodd's letter:

TAIWAN, TOO?

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

The official American rebuke administered the Rhee government for its handling of the recent Korean elections and the subsequent riots are to be heartily applauded.

Not only does the American attitude give hope to those who oppose authoritarian and unrepresentative government on principle, but for the first time in some years the United States has served notice on such governments that we are not irrevocably, unconditionally, or unavoidably committed to their support; that on the contrary, we believe American support for any foreign government can be effective and in the long-range American interest only so long as the government in question has the collateral support of its own people.

Only did the timing of the American action leave something to be desired. Why was it necessary to await the outbreak of riots before making clear our stand on a matter which is essentially one of principle? Have we not now perhaps established a precedent in favor or riots? Have we not told Asians in so many words: "If you are seeking our support for political reform in your country you will have to demonstrate the urgent need for such reforms through insurrection?"

If this becomes the generally accepted interpretation of the American action, then we can certainly expect more riots in this part of the world.

Taiwan, for example, presents one of the most riot-fraught spectacles in Asia if riot-potential is henceforth to be measured in terms of absence of democracy. Elections are now in progress in Taiwan for the President and Vice President of the Republic of China. But in numbers of voters participating they are demonstrably even less democratic than those which took place in Korea.

At least it can be said of the Korean elections that sizable numbers of Koreans voted for Korean officials. But this is not the case in Taiwan. In the Taiwanese elections 18 Taiwanese will be permitted to join with 1,400-odd Chinese "national representatives" to "elect" Chinese officials to an exiled Chinese Government which currently wields de facto but unwelcome sway over the island of Taiwan. (The one-party Chinese element has of course picked the candidates for President and Vice President in advance.)

Note, too, that the 1,400 Chinese voting in this election were themselves elected to office 13 years ago in China. It seems rather doubtful that they can, today, still speak with authority for the people of China. They have, of course, never pretended to speak for the people of Taiwan. At best they may claim to represent the Chinese element on Taiwan but to do so is to admit openly that the island's 2 million Chinese enjoy representation 75 times stronger that the island's 8 million Taiwanese.

By way of a final it-would-be-funny-if-it-were-not-so-sad highlight, this fact: The Taiwanese have fewer voting representatives in this election than has the oversea Chinese community in San Francisco.

In this island country where historical tradition is one of a "rising every 3 years, a rebellion every 5," news of the Korean affair and other reaction to it must be falling on rather attentive ears. The Taiwanese rose in 1947 against the same government which now sits it Taipei—at a cost of 10,000 Taiwanese lives. It would be tragic indeed were we to wait for a repetition of this massacre before calling for more democratic and representative government in Taiwan.

THOMAS B. DODD.

HONG KONG.

Geography and the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in its June 1, 1960, issue, the New York Times carries, on page C–31, a map showing the Times' version of the Southeastern States of the United States. The map is used in connection with a story on the Supreme Court decisions on the tidelands oil cases it has just decided.

This map labels my State of Alabama as "Mississippi" and "Alabama" is inscribed on what is actually the State of Mississippi. Then, compounding the error, the Times' map places the city of Birmingham in the center of that State which should be identified as Mississippi, and leaves the cities of Montgomery and Mobile located in the State which it names "Mississippi."

That a newspaper which prides itself, and accepts praise, for always being accurate should display such apparent ignorance of geography is, in my opinion, simply amazing.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, several weeks ago I presented evidence in another connection which showed that the New York Times is, in contrast to an ethereal belief held by some, far from being infallible. May I emphasize that I did not merely employ harsh epithets to indicate that the Times, in two articles which it published about Birmingham had, in my strong opinion, breached the ethics of responsible journalism. I cited facts, and I cited them, among other instances, in a four-page letter to the editor of the Times. My colleagues may be interested to know that that letter, aside from not being published, was never even acknowledged.

In any event, after the Times published a purportedly factual account of what was going on in the city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama, under the byline of Reporter Harrison Salisbury, it now turns out that the Times apparently does not even know where Birmingham and Alabama are located.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as the New York Times continues to display incredible carelessness in drawing maps and reporting the news, there is little wonder that its once fine reputation is fast diminishing.

Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith two articles written by Mr. Harry Farrell, political editor of the San Jose Mercury News, regarding the recent hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco. The article entitled "Riots at San Francisco Hearings Deliberately Planned" was printed on May 22, and "Committee Hearing Evaluated" appeared on May 23.

I submit these articles as a splendid example of objective reporting in a reputable newspaper.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, May 22, 1960]

RIOTS AT SAN FRANCISCO HEARINGS DELIBERATELY PLANNED

(By Harry Farrell)

It is high time that some of the aspects of the Un-American Activities hearings which rocked San Francisco last weekend were viewed in perspective.

In the wake of the hearings and the accompanying riot (which hospitalized a dozen persons including eight policemen), there has arisen a great uproar against "police brutality."

VIOLENCE

This writer sat all through 3 days of the hearings and was an eyewitness to the mob violence in the San Francisco City Hall rotunda, though not to the specific incident that touched it off.

One obvious circumstance, it seems to me, overrides all others in assessing the rights and wrongs of the situation.

In the eyes of any reasonable and seasoned observer, the riot and many of the disturbances which preceded and followed it—both within and without the committee room—were deliberate, planned uprising against law and order.

It is the height of naivete or insincerity to argue that the demonstration preceding the riot was merely a legitimate exercise of the rights of peaceable assembly and petition for redress of grievances.

For one thing, it was not peaceable. Chanting, shouting, singing and jeering echoed throughout the City Hall, for hours, disrupting public business.

Too many insults and shouts of ridicule came right on cue—like dialog in a play—to make any claim of spontaneity credible.

This is not to say that all the demonstrators were Communists. Most were obviously students, fired up with well-meaning zeal for civil liberties, and used shamefully by tough, seasoned agitators with no such high motivations.

Neither can it be said with certainty that the police were blameless in the way they handled the uprising.

S. F. Chief Thomas Cahill testified after the riot that it erupted when a demonstrator grabbed an officer's club and hit him on the head with it. The chief was called a liar by Vincent Hallinan, San Francisco's well-known leftwing lawyer, who counseled several committee witnesses.

As mentioned earlier, I did not see the immediate incident that triggered the violence. I have no reason to doubt Cahill, but I cannot support his testimony from personal observation.

It is entirely possible, I think, that certain individual officers got rougher than they had to be.

But certainly, if any group ever asked for rough play, it was the gang that camped outside the door of the hearing room. The mob of 200 or so goaded and taunted the police and defied every peaceful appeal before and after the violence started. Anyone not looking for trouble could have avoided it.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, May 23, 1960]

COMMITTEE HEARING EVALUATED

(By Harry Farrell)

Both the champions of the House Un-American Activities Committee and its detractors tend to get overemotional when they discuss its operation.

After watching its subcommittee for 3 days in San Francisco, this writer finds that the passionate denunciations of those who cry "witch hunters" and "Red baiters" leave him pretty cold.

On the other hand, there are aspects of the committee's procedure which could stand a lot of tightening up.

TOUGH

It is hard to differentiate between the complaints of sincere Americans who see in the committee a threat to civil liberties and the hypocritical tirades of its Red-tainted enemies.

The most disturbing complaint is that the committee might subpena a person totally uninvolved in communism and blacken his name by the mere act of calling him.

Conceivably it could. But there is evidence that it knows its people pretty well before it calls them. How else can one account for San Francisco's "fifth amendment parade" wherein witness after witness refused on grounds of self-incrimination to answer questions about Communist affiliation?

If the witnesses were called indiscriminately, it seems at least one of the 40-odd would have protested: "You've got the wrong man. I have nothing to hide."

PROSECUTOR

Yet the committee and its staff, it seemed to this writer, invite some deserved criticism.

The interrogation technique of its staff director, Richard Arens, was far from that of an objective truthsecker. His tone, manner, his phraseology were those of the prosecutor.

Arens could not seem to resist the temptation to insert little barbs into his questioning.

Once he sneered: "We have had witnesses that would make these people here look like creampuffs."

EXPERIENCE

We have had more than a little experience ourselves in tossing embarrassing questions to people. Just last week in fact, we had to ask the very question Arens asked time after time: "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

It would seem to us that a congressional investigator, in a sensitive spot like Arens', would do well to lean over backward to avoid the prosecutor's manner.

This is not to say that Arens lacks provocation. Indeed many of those at the hearings thought he demonstrated great restraint by managing to keep his temper at all in the face of vituperative personal attacks by the witnesses.

Eloy Alfaro International Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to insert the highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, on the occasion of the reception and ceremony, at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, Washington, D.C., at which an award was made to Mr. Brown by Gen. Jacob L. Devers, U.S. Army, retired. This high honor has been bestowed on such distinguished Americans as President Eisenhower, former President Truman, and Governor Rockefeller.

The invocation was delivered by the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president of Georgetown University, who also delivered the benediction.

Mr. Irving V. Gellis, deputy American provost, read a cable from the Honorable Olmedo Alfaro, secretary general of the foundation, authorizing the ceremony and conveying his personal greetings to all those assembled. Mr. Gellis then introduced Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, who outlined the background of the foundation. Dr. Bayern said, in part:

The foundation was authorized by decree of the President of the Republic of Panama on January 22, 1949, to perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, a movement which has been devoted to the task of encouraging the study and propagation of the liberal ideals and principles for which this Ecuadoran statesman and leader fought during more than a half century.

General Alfaro was a soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr; a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice, and friendship among nations that marked about one-quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellow man extended beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador. He is recognized as a leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people. General Alfaro advanced the cause of his nation by setting up the judicial system and expanded her schools and colleges and other institutions of learning.

Following additional remarks, Dr. Bayern called on General Devers, who presented Mr. Brown with the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma. In conferring the presentation, General Devers said, as follows:

SPEECH OF GEN. JACOB L. DEVERS, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED, CONFERRING THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS ON THE HONORABLE FRANCIS C. BROWN, PRESIDENT OF SCHERING CORP., ON MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

Hon. Francis C. Brown, Dr. Bayern, Mr. Gellis, guests and friends, this is a meaningful occasion. Four factors, each significant in itself, contribute to its significance. They are:

First, the life of that unforgettable man, Eloy Alfaro.

Second, the aims and activities of the international foundation which bears his name.

Third, the world situation which exists on this 16th day of May 1960.

Fourth, the selection of the Honorable Francis C. Brown as the individual in whose honor we have assembled here.

To understand the significance of the selection of Mr. Brown as recipient of the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma we must consider the first three factors.

It is said of Gen. Eloy Alfaro that his life was dedicated to two things—service to his fellow human beings, and the cause of international peace. I have said there are two things—but actually they are one—for it follows as the day the night that he whose life is dedicated to the service of his fellow human beings cannot but be dedicated to the cause of international peace.

Dr. Bayern has set forth the aims and purposes of the foundation. Translated from the the Spanish, the diploma reads: "Thus one goes to the stars"—a poetic description of the way of men whose selflessness has lifted them from the level of routine living to the heights of noble achievement.

There is an ancient story which clearly illustrates what I am trying to convey. Some 2,000 years ago a lawyer once asked a teacher how to achieve these heights—how, in the words of the foundation diploma, to "go to the stars"—and the teacher replied that the way to achieve this end was to love God and to love his neighbor. Asked to define the word "neighbor"—the teacher told the story of the good Samaritan. The central truth of this parable is that one's neighbor is anyone who stands in need of help. One goes to the stars by seeking, and by recognizing, and by fulfilling opportunities to be of service to one's fellow man. As I see it, this was General Alfaro's way of life, and the foundation seeks to perpetuate his memory and to encourage emulation of that way of life by bestowing its diploma upon those who live in

like manner. It follows, too, that he who is faithful in little things shall be given opportunity to be faithful in great things. If the details of General Alfaro's life were known, I am sure we would learn that it was early consistency in small, quiet services to his fellow men that resulted in development of service of international scope.

This brings us to our third factor of significance in today's ceremonies—the precarious position of peace in our world today—for international peace is of primary concern to those of us in this room.

Suspicion, lust for power, trickery, greed, enmity, hatred, selfishness—all these are running rife among the nations today. All of these untoward attitudes are attitudes of men—for nations are comprised of men. How then can nations' attitudes be changed except by changing the men—and how can the men be changed? We find ourselves in the position of the lawyer in the ancient story—asking a question—and the answer is the same—by loving God and loving one's neighbor.

We today signally honor a man who knows a depth of concern for his fellow men and who, because of this concern, has led an exemplary life. The Honorable Francis Cabell Brown has, in his personal and professional activities, embodied the attributes sought by the ruling body of the foundation in its quest for a recipient worthy of its highest honor. His unswerving faith in the ideals of liberty and his tireless efforts in advancement of medical services to humanity at home and abroad, richly merit the honor he receives today.

On behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, it is my privilege to confer this diploma, and the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross, upon an outstanding American, the Honorable Francis C. Brown, president of Schering Corp.

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS C. BROWN, MAY 16, 1960, ON PRESENTATION OF ELOY ALFARO AWARD

I thank the council of dignitaries of the foundation most sincerely for awarding me this unique honor. I am indeed proud to be included in the roster of distinguished people who have received the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma. However, I must say that I accept this award with humility for it represents a standard for which I must strive as well as a recognition of any accomplishment.

The distinguished man which this organization honors with its name, General Eloy Alfaro, was dedicated to the principles of freedom which he ceaselessly struggled to obtain for his people. Precious freedoms have been won for mankind, only through determined and unselfish men who were welling to lay down their lives to obtain them. These freedoms can only withstand continuous assault through equal dedication by today's leaders. Never has the world seen a more universal yearning for freedom, peace and personal dignity among its people. Yet, instead of unity we find a world of division and uncertainty. Why is this? I think the answer is seen most clearly where the rights of individuals have yielded to the rule of the state. This is the case in totalitarian states where selfishness and hunger for power and self-perpetuation leave no room for individual liberties.

If there is one freedom which is characteristic of our hemisphere, it is freedom of the person. In general the governments of the free world hold supreme the rights of the individual.

The struggle surrounding communism today is not only economic; it is a struggle to secure and preserve the dignity of man and the freedoms basic to its maintenance. These basic freedoms were dramatically depicted for us during the last World War—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. I am certain that most of us remember the dramatic posters put out by our Government during those trying years to remind us of these liberties. Today, however, we talk of them in abstract terms. I cannot help but wonder how many people, particularly among the youngsters, could name these basic rights of man and express them as simply as those posters.

We talk of communism with apprehension and we fear Communist governments because they openly threaten our institutions and individual liberty. Communism feeds on frustrated aspirations, hopelessness and want. If a man lives under a system which holds no better promise than emptiness, why shouldn't he embrace communism? Also, I believe that those whom we depict as "intellectual Communists" are led to their views by these same conditions; frustration of personal aspirations, a feeling of spiritual hopelessness, and want of true intellectual depth. It was a more material want which brought vast areas of the world into the iron grip of communism and which strongly lures many others who eagerly turn to those who promise freedom and happiness. We who have rarely felt the keen edge of want must nevertheless realize that we must compete with communism on the basis of eliminating disease and want in the world. However, we should be careful of the measures we use to accomplish our ends, and should endeavor to do more by encouraging private endeavor and less by congressional acts than we tend to do. We should stop and ask ourselves periodically how far we can move in our social dynamic without undermining the fabric of our social structure to such a degree that we may endanger our basic freedoms.

I would not be here today, I am sure, if it were not for my interest in international affairs and the people of other countries, born of my relationship to the pharmaceutical industry. Our industry is engaged in meeting one of the most crucial wants of man—the need to be free from pain and to be free from disease. In the light of my abiding interest in health, I can think of no more appropriate subject to emphasize than freedom for health and for health progress.

For the last 50 years we have made great progress in this country in combatting disease and since he last World War our emphasis on research in the field of health has come of age. While the Communists have been developing propellants for space vehicles which would enable them to probe the heavens and master their brothers, we have devoted our principal efforts to the more important and immediate job of making man healthier. Without health, and without food, other freedoms can have little meaning. Disease knows no geographic barrier nor language barrier and does not discriminate on the basis of color, sex or culture—nor does it respect political power. Men suffer equally from disease. Today, the newest of freedoms, freedom from disease, has achieved real and growing stature.

In step with our government-to-government and people-to-people programs, distribution of surplus foods, point four programs and the like, there are vitally important "industry-to-people programs" by which our research achievements in all fields of industry—but particularly in medicine and health—have been brought to the world.

Health care today is popular and prominent in the headlines. The politicians have "discovered" it and the manifestations of this discovery are evident in many ways. The research establishments of our Federal Government have mushroomed as each year larger appropriations have been made to support their programs administered by the National Institutes of Health. This is commendable where the money is being used for study the unknown causes of disease.

In my opinion, the proper climate for progress in health as well as other fields can only be found within the free enterprise system which has been traditional in the Western World. This is a system built on minimum Government interference in enterprise consistent with basic public needs and on the encouragement of initiative and progress through the offer of rewards. To people who owe it all their material gains, our system is, unfortunately, characterized in the minds of many as the profit system and the term is in danger of becoming one of opprobrium.

The people of East Germany today, while not so well off as those in West Germany, are living in a thriving economy but one where business has been socialized and individual liberties crushed under the iron heel of the Communist masters. One critical step in the postwar evaluation of the socialist state in East Germany was the gradual enslavement of business and the corporate enterprise by government. This was accomplished by a sequence of moves which initially made the government a partner in business and ended when the government, from its partnership vantagepoint, ousted the owners and emerged supreme.

No one questions the current need to protect our own people from exploitation, whether by industry or government. Yet, it is important for us to remember that the men who forged our Nation in the face of English oppression and at the price of their own blood, set forth their basic beliefs in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, that internal Government process is no less a danger to freedom than the enmity of foreign kings and empires. These men also felt it important to create incentive and stimulate innovation by providing for a patent law and copyrights, which are monopolies. Our leaders in the 19th century, drawing upon the experience of English traditions and law, took steps to secure principles of competition and protection against other and improper monopoly and illegal restraint, by writing protections into the laws of our land. Here, as always in the affairs of men, it was important to preserve a balance of power between conflicting forces in order that none would gain complete sway. Today, in the anxiety of the U.S. Congress to see disease banished and in the zeal of economic reformers to protect the public from undue exploitation, great care must be exercised lest we destroy the precious ideals we are seeking to protect by overabundance of regulations and by harsh and discouraging restraints.

Friendship follows trade and progress is made through the incentive of profit which operates to improve the products of industry just as the incentives of power, prestige, and service motivate the aspiring public servant. Those countries which have provided the incentives of patent protections, such as Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, have far outstripped in inventive progress those countries which have afforded little or no patent protection. When we hear patents criticized by our economists, we should remember that they were created to provide incentive to progress. Risks must be run with capital to make discoveries and the business disaster can be great for a misjudged step. The reward for achievement should also be reasonably good. Hope and expectation are no less driving forces for corporate achievement, invention and commerce than for the individual.

Progress in this country, not only in the field of medicine but in industry generally, has been made best under conditions of moderate competition. Cutthroat competition is praised by some impractical theorists, but it is destrucitve not only of profit but of progress and is no less dangerous than the

paralysis of monopoly. Today, in the United States, the average person lives better, eats better, and enjoys better health care than his counterparts in most nations of the world. In general, this is due to the contributions which have come from private sources; from industry operating in an atmosphere of profit incentive and reasonable competition—a condition we should do our utmost to preserve.

Free enterprise has been the most constructive force in the world for improvement of health and social standards, personal happiness, and economic well-being.

I believe it would be timely for the Congress of the United States to make a study of the current status of our basic freedoms quite apart from any specific legislative proposals and to recommend how they should be protected in every legislative endeavor in order that the concepts which gave birth to our Nation should be maintained strong and inviolate. It is time, in my opinion, for a national soul searching and appraisal, to restore traditional concepts from which we have deviated, to preserve what we have held intact and to guide our future growth by the fundamental goals of our national culture. Let us be reminded that freedom is lost by degrees. If we communize or socialize one aspect of society, we open the door to further intrusions and finally total subjugation to the philosophy of totalitarianism. The 1960's will provide opportunities for close cooperation between the American nations for continued advances from the standpoint of health and industrial progress. We of the Americas should urge our Governments to maintain and renew the strength in the Organization of the American States and a close liaison among the members of the Pan American Health Organization. This should be a total effort, based on mutual aid, cooperation, faith, and desire for common goals.

Let us, therefore, dedicate ourselves, as did General Alfaro, to protecting liberty whenever anyone's liberties are infringed; for, "there but for the grace of God go I" must be our thought when the rights of any man or organization are abused.

Electric Power: Key to Progress for the Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this past May 4, Mr. S. L. Descartes, executive director of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, in San Juan, discussed in Washington, D.C., the role he felt electric power can play in the economic development of this world's underdeveloped countries. He feels it is the key to progress.

Alex Radin, the genial and hard-working general manager of the American Public Power Association, termed Mr. Descartes' speech before the APPA, "A significant summing up of the role of public power in underdeveloped areas of the world" when I talked to him recently.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Descartes' remarks, as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER: KEY TO PROGRESS FOR THE UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

(Address by S. L. Descartes, executive director, Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, San Juan, P.R., annual convention, May 4, 1960, Shoreham Hotel Washington, D.C.)

Electric power consumption is closely related to economic development. The close relation between per capita use of electric power and industrial and economic advancement is undeniable. The clamor for more power and the well-known power shortages in many of the countries struggling against economic backwardness, corroborate the existence of this intimate relationship.

Highly industrialized countries have a high per capita consumption of electric power. For example, the annual per capita consumption in kilowatt-hours in the United States is 4,251; Western Germany, 1,819; England, 1,951; and France 1393. The consumption per person in semi-industrialized countries is much lower. Argentina has a per capita consumption of 355; Chile 630; Mexico, 285; Venezuela, 356; Cuba, 266. Puerto Rico has attained an average consumption per person of 639 kilowatt-hours.

Countries in earlier stages of economic development reveal figures such as 160 kilowatt-hours per person for Panama, 273 for Costa Rica, 41 for Guatemala, 32 for India, and 195 for the Malaya.

NOT IDLE TALK

Statements by economists and Government officials on the essentiality of a basic structure of services—without which communities cannot hope to break the vicious spiral of poverty engendering more poverty—are not idle talk. They are based on sound theory supported by proven facts in countries where the rate of economic and social progress has been faster. Electric power ranks as one of the most important components of the required basic structure of services essential to progress.

Power and light, reasonably dependable, and at reasonable cost, influence life positively in many ways. The efficiency of labor is basically the multiplication of human energy by the use of machinery. There is not a more versatile and easier way of multiplying strength than by the use of electric power. The existence of central stations ready to supply power reduces the required investment of the private entrepreneur. This may well be a decisive factor in the initiation of projects since capital scarcity is almost always present in underdeveloped economies.

But it is not only industry and commerce that are facilitated by the availability of electric power. Nor are the growth of industry and productive activity the only goals of economic development nor the means to assure a continued advancement. The basic aim of industrial and economic growth is the improvement of living conditions, the overall improvement of man to enable him to fully develop himself and the potential of his environment. The overall improvement of man is the only sound assurance of continued development. The extent to which health, and the social and intellectual life of every community are bound to electric power is so large and varied that it is difficult to conceive of our way of life without it.

LOW-COST ELECTRIC POWER STIMULATES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Electric power at reasonable cost is one of the most powerful supports of health and adequate nutrition everywhere. In tropical or semitropical regions, where many of the countries engaged in economic development programs are located, this relationship is even closer.

Man develops through education, through the formal or informal acquisition of information, attitudes, techniques, and values. A sense of participation in the affairs of his community, his country, and the world's life is essential to growth. Reading in the evening and radio—and already in semideveloped countries, television—are all greatly facilitated by widely available power at low cost.

For us, who are fortunate to live in this large and prosperous country, these arguments about the relationship between power and economic growth in developing countries in southeast Asia, Africa, or even Latin America, sound remote and theoretical.

It is hard to visualize how different, how limited as compared to our own, are conditions in those countries. For this reason, it is desirable to bring our own firsthand experience to bear on this vital subject in our international aid programs: electric power and its influence on economic and social progress.

What happened in the Tennessee Valley? What changed that relatively poor region into a strong, productive area, proud of its contribution to peacetime prosperity and to national defense in time of war or peril of aggression? It is an old story to us how industry and economic development, and the cultural and human improvement that followed, were triggered at first and sustained later by the accessibility to abundant and economical power, accompanied by other broad regional improvement plans. The course of spectacular growth in the Northwest and in many semidesert areas in the Southwest follows closely the availability of electric power resulting from the multipurpose utilization of large river systems.

ELECTRIC POWER HELPED PUERTO RICO

Now let us take a brief look at Puerto Rico. Observers of all sorts, liberal and conservative, industrialists, bankers, and professors all agree that we have in Puerto Rico one of the outstanding examples in the world of a community sustaining over many years a high rate of economic and social progress—an average yearly increase of 6 percent per year in income after allowing for changes in the price level during the decade of the fifties. Puerto Rico has been moving forward in an orderly, balanced way, on all fronts of human improvement. Our advancement is, of course, as that of the Tennessee Valley, the result of many factors. But in Puerto Rico, as in the Tennessee Valley region, it stands out that electric power has been available: dependable power, with no shortages, and allowing for differences in the basic situation, at low cost in both areas. In both areas power has been made available to the people, by the people themselves, acting through their government, in a concerted action to improve themselves.

But there is still another instance of the influence of electric power on the improvement of one sector of our society. This experience is widely diffused throughout the entire country and most of us have visible proof of it by riding a few miles away from our cities. I refer to rural electrification. The problems of keeping the agricultural sector of any economy from lagging behind the fast moving industrial and trading sectors—mostly urban—is extremely difficult in all countries. The period of the thirties, with its tragic disparity in living conditions and in productivity between the agricultural and other sectors, is still vivid in the memories of most of us.

One of the greatest farm development and welfare programs this country has ever conceived was inaugurated then: the Rural Electrification Administration and the Rural Electric Cooperatives movement. We still have a farm problem, but living conditions in our rural areas and farm productivity have advanced so much that the character of our farm problem today is quite different from what it was.

Are these next-door, familiar experiences of what has happened when power at reasonable cost has been made available in this, the most prosperous country in the world, transferable to our international aid programs to promote economic development in other countries? I hold that they are.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, that of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and of the Rural Electrification Administration are examples, among many others, that have brought about a clear-cut demonstration of the influence on economic development of making power available at low cost. Let us now search for the common elements in these examples.

First, these programs or institutions were all conceived and pushed forward by men with a firm conviction that if power at reasonable cost is made available it will promote growth. Power would tend to create its own markets, and help move forward the entire community or group. There must be equal conviction, zeal, assurance, willingness to surmount the many obstacles that always arise, and push forward to a well-defined objective in pushing this idea for the benefit of less fortunate peoples in other countries.

Direct grants to finance power supply expansion, or the creation of conditions that make possible such financing at low interest cost with long repayment terms, is another common element. Provision was made in some cases for technical and management help to the new users of power.

In all cases planning for expansion was conducted on a sound but confident basis. Power demand estimates recognized the self-growth generated by the very availability of power. The need for plant was not foolishly overstated, but estimates were neither pettily nor timidly made. The Rural Electrification Administration, for instance, has been willing to accept financing requests based on projects conceived on those bases. And, for that matter, so have the private buyers of revenue bonds done and are doing.

In brief, financing to build adequately forecasted demand, has been available in all these examples either by grant to be returned later or through loans at low interest cost, payable over a long number of years. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of these two factors in the creation of adequate electric power services. If they were needed in this country, so generously endowed with natural and human resources, isn't it logical that they are even more urgently needed in less fortunate areas?

A word of caution here. If an economic development program is successful demand estimates would tend to fall short of actual demand. This was our experience in Puerto Rico until 2 or 3 years ago when the criteria for demand planning had to be revised upward significantly. It is my understanding that this has been the experience in other places where similar situations of successful development have occurred. In most countries at the semi-industrial or intermediate stages of development the provision of power facilities must start by meeting already staggering shortages of power. This is the case in practically all Latin American countries.

THE CASE FOR PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

There has been much talk in the United States of the need for partnership arrangements. Let us first acknowledge that publicly owned electric utilities in the United States have grown in many areas under very real partnerships. The Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles and the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, as well as hundreds of other publicly owned electric utilities, which finance their growth through the sale of revenue bonds, are de facto partnerships of the private investors and the public.

They are partnerships in which the consumer-owned electric utilities retain powers of ultimate decision while the private investors retain the right to see that funds are invested as pledged and that the plant, and the required rate structure are maintained to assure legitimate creditor interests. These arangements are sound, generally accepted, respectable, and enjoy great favor in financial circles. They certainly point the way as to what to do elsewhere.

Equal instances, or even more advanced concepts of joint efforts by all sectors of the community to provide adequate power supplies are found in Latin America. A noteworthy contribution is the "mixed corporation" in which private electric utilities, private investors, private industry, the government as such directly, or the government through public financing or developmental agencies, participate in financing and in management. Huge hydroelectric developments are underway in Brazil under this institutional pattern.

We are very conscious, and this has been learned by painful experience, that publicly owned electric utilities require a climate of political discipline that allows for sound management, free from the demands of partisan political patronage. The absence of such discipline is always pointed out as a deterrent very generally found in countries undergoing development. This requirement, that we have been successful in substantially achieving in most regions in this country, is being also gradually achieved in many others. The mixed corporation pattern used in Latin America is also an institutional arrangement that contributes to the achievement of sound management. Its management policies are determined by a board in which the private sector, experienced and considered less vulnerable to partisan pressure, is represented.

There are some countries in Latin America where the foreign-owned, privately operated, generally well run electric utilities, with a trained cadre, are cooperating to provide power in the desired scale for the national welfare with the newer, enthusiastic, public agencies, with some capital, perhaps technically shorthanded, and with less management knowledge. This is happening, for example, in Costa Rica, Mexico, El Salvador, and Brazil and points to another way in which diverse organizations are complementing each other for a common good.

This cooperation requires firm but just government leadership. On the other hand, it requires that financial or aid agencies be equally firm but fair, unencumbered by inclinations toward either side. In many places, Panama at present may be an example, such a joint approach may be essential because of previous discouraging experiences with public management.

THE FINANCING FACTOR: HOW CAN IT BE DONE

It is unfair and unrealistic to expect foreign private investors to commit the large amounts of capital required in the power industry at low cost in a far away country with attendant risks. There is, therefore, a field for financial cooperation between local government capital and the United States or international financing agencies. In most of the developing countries there is more acute need for low interest rates and long repayment periods for electric power development than there ever was in our own country even during the depth of the depression of the thirties.

Privately operated foreign-owned companies can make a real contribution to power expansion in developing countries under fair arrangements, in the distribution field, or perhaps in the less advanced places through management contracts in the operation of publicly owned facilities, or in carrying out specified construction projects. In the achievement of the objective of the desirable cooperation betwen foreign-owned private electric utilities and local governments to increase power availability, contracts for the sale of power to the private companies, and workable laws regulating the electric industry, have proved successful in some countries in Latin America. A good beginning has been made in some countries but there is opportunity for great improvement in the field of simplifying and making fairer the provisions of regulatory legislation.

In this broad and vital field of power supply to foster economic development and the related aspects of management of electric utilities and regulation of the industry, men like you, who have formed your views in sound, practical operation, guided by the principle of service at the lowest possible cost for the welfare of the community, are a logical source for advisers.

You would find in many of the countries in Latin America where I have had direct experience that some of the most dedicated, outstanding public servants in Latin America are found in the publicly owned electric utilities; basically the same type of men of vision, motivated by the same ideals, as those who created the great publicly owned power systems in the United States.

PROGRESS THROUGH LOW-COST POWER

We have also found by experience that the low cost of power is a very important element in promoting its use and speeding up progress. We have found, however, that if this low-cost power is to be on a sound basis it must arise out of low-interest cost, long repayment periods, or even outright grants if possible and desired, to finance construction. Of course, sound but economical plant engineering, efficient management, and good promotional programs are also needed.

We have found also it is a folly to attempt over the long pull to maintain rate levels that do not meet operating costs and meet financial obligations. The need for adherence to a cost-of-service policy must also be conveyed to the less experienced countries.

I hold that little, if anything, new is needed, definitely no newfangled theories or ideas, to guide our national policy in helping to provide the power essential to economic and social development in less advanced countries. Time-tested principles which have been successful throughout this vast and diverse country, throughout the West, in California, in Nebraska, in the Northwest, in Puerto Rico, and throughout almost all the States in the great program of the Rural Electrification Administration and of the Rural Cooperatives movement, have equal validity elsewhere.

There are differences between people and communities—that call for differences in details of approach or in institutional forms—but let us, also, in guiding our aid programs in the electric power field remember that some of the same charges of apathy, lethargy, lack of maturity, which are used to explain so many things, were unjustly leveled against the good people in our own depressed areas. There is almost nothing about the shortcomings of any people, of the deficiencies of political institutions in any semideveloped country that I did not hear expressed at some time or another—part of it in very learned reports—about our own shortcomings in Puerto Rico.

LET'S KEEP MOVING

Our national differences on details of internal policy—such as about areas to be served, distribution of tax burden and others—as between the publicly and privately owned electric utilities have no place in our aid programs. The private versus public power controversy among us, in this fully developed country, should not influence our international aid programs. Such programs have a good enough base in our well-tried-out, generally accepted principles and tra-

ditions as to do, by whomsoever can do it effectively, a job that needs to be done. This is a part of our American heritage which will strike a responsive chord throughout the world in all areas in which men are engaged in fighting poverty.

It is my belief that the necessary and just accommodations between conflicting interests can be found by the people of the underdeveloped countries, in very similar ways to those we have found in this country. In many, this is being done already. Our experience and success in living together despite our differences, and all contributing to our well-being, transmitted with tact, wisdom and intelligence, without prejudices, as we can surely do, may even help to accelerate the achievement of this accommodation.

Summing up: In our rich experience in aiding our own regions, communities or sectors of our economy in need of help, by providing conditions favorable to the creation of electric power supply at low cost, we have both the inspiration and the sound practice of incalculable worth in fulfilling the great responsibility of helping others beyond our borders to improve themselves, that we have so wisely assumed.

Grassroots Support for Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in all of the hubbub which has been created because of the U–2 incident and the collapse of the ill-fated summit meeting, we are apt to lose our perspective and cloud the issue with political charges and wild statements which have no actual bearing on the real significance of this event.

As an indication that the people at the grassroots level are often more objective about national affairs, I would like to quote from a letter which I received from one of my constituents.

The writer of the letter is Mr. Frank Engel, of Davenport, Iowa. Mr. Engel is a recognized leader in the Democratic Party, not only in Scott County, Iowa, but across the Hawkeye State as well. He is a former member of the Iowa Legislature and has also served on the Iowa Employment Security Commission. He has every reason to be as partisan as any Democrat who wishes to read into these events a failure on the part of the administration to protect the public interest. The fact that he rose above this and stated his feelings as an American is significant and I trust that his words will have an influence on some of the members of his party who always have a tendency to put their party first.

Excerpts from Mr. Engel's letter follow:

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *May 20, 1960.*

DEAR FRED: The Paris collapse of the summit meeting has taken most of the front pages. Perhaps the United States was caught in the act of a little spying, but on the other hand the Russians have committed so many hostile actions during the past years since World War II, one wonders why they made such a great fuss. Khrushchev certainly displayed his real feelings toward the United States of America. If he was so sincerely interested in preserving world peace he would have acted differently. As a result he has revealed himself and in effect united Americans against the Russians instead. Actually, I believe we have come out ahead, because if the summit conference had come off without this plane incident, we might have been taken in by the insincere Russians with their communistic philosophy. It is their great purpose to sovietize the world into a state of international communism. Wherever and whenever they have taken command they have permitted no other point of view, no other way of life. They have established and maintained their system by the use of force, not liberty. I have always felt they understood and respected only one language—force. Therefore, how can one appeal to them on a basis of morality and human liberties? They are an immoral force in the world. We should go right ahead with our own military defenses since that is the only thing that will deter them in their efforts. It is the only thing that has deterred them up to now.

You should well remember how the propaganda was used in both World War I and II. (First that the Kaiser wanted to come over here and then that Hitler wanted to do it.) Germany wanted to get back territory that was lost. The Nazi party was not built to establish a political system for the entire world nor a philosophy of life for the United States. The strip of land dividing Germany then known as the Polish Corridor was what led to war you will recall, when Hitler invaded Poland. Now we are faced with a real threat to our way of life. For the first time. If any of the numerous hostile acts of the Russians had been committed by the Germans during the time of the second World War, we would have gone to war sooner. We have taken it from the Russians repeatedly, however. Since the realization occurs now to everyone here that a third war might bring death and destruction to our own land, the American people are not so anxious for war. It's quite different from sending the boys over to European battlefields while the rest stay at home to wave flags and make big money. Eisenhower having been a military man will not sell our defenses short in the interests of communism by listening too much to idealists who think the Communists can be wooed with homogeneity, love of humanity and other wild dreams of a convocation of orderliness, cooperation, deference, respect and smoothness.

As the President said, we can probably expect more "incidents" to occur from now on, in the Russian push to drive forward the Soviet system.

Write soon and best wishes, as ever.

FRANK L. ENGEL.

Social Progress—The Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we are now gravitating toward that period with which we are all too familiar. It starts out slowly as campaign oratory and then ascends to a peak of charges and countercharges that are generally quite irresponsible.

Social progress is, of course, a question that interests all Americans, regardless of political affiliation, and for that reason the following article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of May 31 is both timely and factual.

The record made in social progress in the last decade is one of which we can all be proud. At this time in our history it is important that we as Americans should be proud of our country and of what we have done to promote the more abundant life and social progress for the individual:

SOCIAL PROGRESS—THE RECORD

The more ardent liberals in this country have been decrying for some time now what they consider to be the lack of social progress in the last decade. We are spending too much on the good life, these people say, and we are not fulfilling our obligation to provide better schools, roads and other public facilities that the Nation needs.

Well, let's examine the charge that social progress has faltered during the last 10 years, the phrase being taken here as a synonym for promoting the general welfare.

The States and communities have built more new schools since 1950 than in any other decade in history. New schools, the liberals must concede, represent social progress.

The States have built more and better roads since 1950 than the most shining-eyed planner ever dreamed about 25 years ago. Turnpikes, parkways, and conventional highways add up to social progress.

The number of Americans now gainfully employed exceeds by millions the most optimistic goal of the liberals less than 15 years ago. These same Americans are working under better conditions, are making more money, live in better homes, and have a higher living standard generally than their counterparts in any previous period of history. Millions of them are enjoying their new family cars—the tail-fin-hating liberals notwithstanding. Ask a worker if he thinks that's social progress.

Industry is still in the process of expanding and decentralizing, with the effect of both enlarging and spreading its benefits throughout the whole country, bringing with it new opportunities for all the people. This, too, is social progress.

Scientific and social gains made since 1950 in the field of medical care are unequaled in history. There are more private health insurance plans, more community clinics and, as reported in this newspaper the other day, more State sponsored medical benefits available to more Americans than ever before.

Private insurance and company pension and profit-sharing funds permit increasing numbers of older people to face the prospect of retirement with less financial worry.

While not all citizens have been able to share fully in this great progress, there can be no question that minority groups have made significant social gains in the last decade; certainly these groups are in a far better position than they were just a generation ago.

And while moving ahead in the social and economic fields, the Nation has made important advances on a related front. Cultural advantages, long denied so many sections of this big country, have been provided for almost every American. Television, for all its twaddle, has offered Shakespeare and opera and major league baseball to people who previously knew little of these. And the problems television has brought are the problems of progress.

There is no intention here to deny that our society is far from perfect, that we need more schools, more roads, a higher standard of living in some sectors, more industrial expansion, equality under the law for all citizens, cheaper and more available medical care, and a good deal less drivel on our TV sets.

But who, looking honestly at the decade 1950–60, can say it has not given the people a greater chance to fulfill themselves, a higher hook to hang their hopes upon? So what, then, do they mean, those who say there's been a lack of social progress these past 10 years?

Actually, they do not deny the progress. What they really decry is that the progress has been made in what they consider a haphazard and unplanned way, without the Federal Government in total command. They are angry because the American people have sought a cure for social ills—and, indeed, have successfully treated many of them—without yet handing over all our troubles to Washington.

The record of the past decade shows that individuals, working with their State governments and in their local communities, can accomplish more in a more orderly fashion than by any series of dicta laid down by a distant bureaucratic complex. This record is all the more remarkable when you consider that it has been done in the face of inflation created by the Federal Government and in spite of the heavy tax burdens laid upon the people by that same Central Government.

So perhaps in those who deride our society for its ills there is as much frustration as anger. For after a decade of unprecedented social progress they can no longer mount their soapboxes and point a wrathful finger at the bread lines. They can only complain that America produces an abundance of bread without following their recipe.

This Nation, Under God, Shall Not Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Day weekend, a number of Members, including myself, made memorial addresses in our respective districts participating along with community leaders and veterans' organizations. Significantly, in this great country of ours, Memorial Day is also the subject matter of many sermons from the pulpits of all denominations in our country.

A very sincere friend of mine, the Reverend John F. Streng, of St. James Evangelican Lutheran Church of West Virginia, has always devoted a great deal of time in the preparation of his Sunday memorial address. I respectfully submit this speech for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

THIS NATION, UNDER GOD, SHALL NOT PERISH

One hundred seventy-five million Americans approach another date with destiny. Memorial Day 1960 dawns upon us in peaceful and prosperous surroundings because an all-seeing God and a vigilant Government have kept watch o'er the ramparts. From Alaska to Texas, Maine to California, all branches of the military are on the march. Their ceaseless alert reminds citizens and Communists that we shall not break faith with sleeping comrades.

FAMOUS WORDS LIVE ON

Holy principles and promises hallow this day with halos and hallmarks of freedom. A strong chain of spoken, outspoken, and unspoken warnings twines its chords about our national life.

More challenging than ever are the thoughts expressed in the immortal Gettysburg Address. Abraham Lincoln's voice still startles thousands of complacent citizens: "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished task which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

A government can rise no higher than its source or resources. No law, however strong, can make the idle industrious, the thriftless provident, the shiftless steadfast. We walk today amid death dealing sky rockets pointed toward Heaven from which cometh our help. America's journalistic nerves and radar receivers criss-cross strategically to intercept and interpret every whisper made somewhere in the world. Charges and countercharges fill spools of microfilmed documents blassified for future reference. Citizens have been subjected to minute investigation by inference, ink, identity, and ideology.

WISDOM DESERVES A HEARING

The illustrious Thomas Jefferson once said: "Liberty can never be safe but in the hands of the people themselves." George Washington is said to have given orders: "Make sure that none but Americans stand guard tonight." The people, through prudence and wisdom, righteousness, and brotherhood, must govern themselves. They make and break the law. They must establish justice and equality, keep the mountains free and valleys secure.

God has made America a rich and powerful nation. Such honor demands relentless watchfulness. Leadership demands statesmanship. We have become the world's friend and foe. Millions are either praying and paying for liberty or they are cursing the mighty American leviathan, a supposed monster monarch in sheep's clothing.

We have the duty to chart a course for generations unborn. Veterans of World War I were urged "to make the world safe for democracy." Their sons in World War II were told to save the Republic. Their sons of Korean "police action" fame were reminded to stand fast. So history carves its indelible mark of sweat and blood upon each generation.

Swords and plowshares have never mixed well. Atomic arsenals cannot be readily converted into auditoriums of peace on earth and goodwill among men. "In God we trust," say our coin to all the world. But do we? Do the people believe what they see and read daily? Then let liberty and life and the pursuit of happiness be equally important on Memorial Day with picnics, auto races, and ball games. Freedom never has been free.

LEST WE FORGET

This is the day when Gold Star mothers rekindle fading moments of agony; when paralysed veterans lie all but forgotten on hospital cots; when national cemeteries circling the globe echo to the tramping ritual of General Logan's order. No American has the right to forget its significance.

How quickly nature's wounds heal and ugly battlescars are transformed into gleaming thoroughfares of trade and glistening skyscrapers rise above the ruins of shattered cities. Political and military leaders concur that a spiritual rededication is paramount. Churches are pleading for the citizens' return to obedience to God. What chance has the Voice of Righteousness amid a babel of deafening clatter of the platters. Americans want to celebrate more than they want anything. The urge to "eat, drink, and be merry" has lost none of its charm.

There is no safety in weapons. Both freedom and slavery are built upon ideas. Neither can be annihilated with hot lead or steel or nerve gas. As leaders think so goes the Nation. Thoughts are the most potent weapons ever forged.

Three gigantic forces mold public opinion: the press, the Government, the citizen. Individually they would be hard pressed to change the course of history. But together they cast the deciding vote in the Halls of Congress. The Government is you and I. The press is what you think. The citizens are people from all walks of life.

The average American has two supreme desires: (1) security, for today and tomorrow; (2) savings, for old age. Both are noble aims. Neither is guaranteed through collective bargaining or the dole. They must be earned with sweat and blood and eternal vigilance. The best things in life, like honesty, integrity, church, liberty are free only to the extent that each of us is worthy to accept and use them.

WHO WILL WIN?

Communism is a contagious idea engulfing world thinking. Christianity is a loftier idea for it promotes brotherhood through individual rights. The two are irreconcilable. One will take over. America is still fortunate to choose. If we believe that Jesus Christ died to make men holy as He died to make men free, we have made our choice.

Our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. This precept is the last bulwark between the land of the free and the home of the slave.

The Chinese sage said: "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." One law-abiding citizen, laboring and praying for freedom is worth a thousand critics who curse government but make no constructive amends.

Citizens love rights. Citizens must assume obligations, too. Both hang in the balance. Nowhere does the Constitution provide that only patriotic and military groups are in duty bound to defend the country. Woodrow Wilson said: "The sum of the whole matter is that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by being permeated with the spirit of the Lord." He would not find unanimous agreement today.

"The finest tribute we can pay unto our hero dead today is not of speech or roses red; but living throbbing hearts instead that shall renew the pledge they sealed with us upon the battlefield: that freedom's flag shall bear no stain and freemen wear no tyrant's chain."

May all Americans again learn to sing our national anthem. May there be renewed respect for the colors passing by. May groups increase who provide generous scholarships for outstanding citizenship essays.

The Declaration of Independence states: "We hold these truths to be self-evident." That is a mandate to America to read and study and obey the Constitution.

Sapt. Joseph E. Lally, Jr., USAF, 9552d Air Reserve Squadron, Wheeling, W. Va., addressing a Rotary Club meeting, March 29, 1960, quoted Lt. Col. K. P. Kelley, USAF, writing in the Pittsburgher, March 1960: "You may remember a World War II poster which portrayed a marine charging, bayonet in hand. He was muddy, bloody, and bandaged. The poster didn't say anything about pay, opportunities for civilian career advancement, or retirement. It said simply, "Fight."

"I have just returned from a tour in a troubled oversea area. There I came to know

the enemy at firsthand. He is formidable, dedicated, and he numbers several hundred millions. His purpose, despite his great number, is singular—to take away all that we have, and to destroy all that we believe in.

"As an American, I not only have a basic faith in the best system of government which man has yet devised, but I have a basic faith in the individual himself. * * * I've found that the best prediction of future performance is past performance * * * and most of you have been there before. I believe that you are ready because you have the social consciousness, the dedication to your beliefs, the will, and the plain old guts to fight again if you're needed. And that's why I'm proud to be your center commander."

With such inspired and inspiring dedication aloft, ashore, afloat, aboard, and abroad today, those who sleep shall not have died in vain. From 13 to 50 stars—we proudly hail at the twilight's last gleaming, Old Glory. As of 1960 these colors are guaranteed not to run—not for anybody. Let's keep it that way.

Let's Swear Off Summitry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, since first coming to Congress in January 1953, I have each Congress introduced legislation for the complete disclosure of each and every commitment made at the Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam Conferences. The resolution introduced in this Congress is House Concurrent Resolution 16. No one to this day knows what agreements were made at these conferences in the name of the American people without their consent or approval. It appears obvious to me that much of our world dilemma is the result of these conferences and their farflung implications on our many policies at home and abroad. We have sadly indeed, Mr. Speaker, discovered how utterly useless are conferences when they are not based on common decency and forthright dealings, open and above board, by all participants.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the June 2, 1960, of Human Events which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

LET'S SWEAR OFF SUMMITRY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The summit that never was seems in retrospect very clearly the summit that never should have been. May 16, 1960, should be remembered as a sorry day for the dignity and prestige of the United States. The bloody clown who heads the totalitarian Soviet state should never have been given the opportunity to heap gutteranipe insults on the President of the United States and to turn what was supposed to be a serious international conference into an obscene Communist propaganda circus.

All the arguments that were trotted out for the acceptance of a top-level East-West meeting, so vigorously urged by Khrushchev, were refuted and made to look downright ridiculous—by K. himself. A summit meeting, it was alleged, would make it possible for the men in the highest positions to confer on big international issues. But K. refused to discuss any international issue, or to let the summit get off the ground. A meeting of heads of state of the most powerful countries, it was suggested, would foster better personal understanding and contribute to relaxation of tensions. It seems doubtful whether K.'s soapbox performances, in which he called President Eisenhower treacherous, an aggressor and many other abusive names, helped along the cause of good personal relations. And perhaps that much overworked phrase, relaxation of tensions, is best understood if one notices that its three initials spell rot.

In view of the monumental fiasco at Paris, almost as incredible as a violent pathological scene in a Dostoevsky novel, one would imagine that the inveterate appeaser, in the syndicated columns of American newspapers or in British public life and British publications, would be willing to confess that summitry, as a method of conducting international relations, should be relegated to the mothballs. But advocacy of summitry is a persistent disease. Let Khrushchev change his record and the same voices that pleaded for the policy that led to the debacle in Paris will be urging another trial for the top-level conference.

In intervals of temper tantrums Khrushchev himself has been chirping about a new summit, to be held in 6 or 8 months, when he hopes to have a President of the United States more to his liking. What sort of Gauleiter, ready to bow to his will, would K. like to see in the White House? Let him speak for himself.

"That is for the American people to decide. But there was one American with whom I could do business. There was one American with whom I could honestly have negotiated. That was Roosevelt. But when he died, his policy died with him."

Khrushchev would like to see a return to Roosevelt's wartime policy of appeasement. Are there Americans who, consciously or unconsciously, would fall in with this design? Well, there is Adlai Stevenson, not likely to be President (about 300 voters out of over 100,000 thought it worthwhile to write in his name in the Oregon Democratic primary), but a real potential menace as a possible appeasing Democratic Secretary of State. In a speech at Chicago, Stevenson reproached the Republicans for "having helped to make successful negotiations with the Russians—negotiations that are vital to our survival—impossible as long as they are in power." It gives your opponent a big advantage when you acknowledge in advance that you must have successful negotiations with him. Stevenson also waxed indignant, offering the hypothetical question: "How would we like it if Soviet spy planes based in Cuba were flying over Cape Canaveral and Oak Ridge?"

Some of the sting is taken out of this question if one recalls that, since 1955, we have been officially committed to the open skies policy which would have permitted mutual international aerial inspection of America and of the Soviet Union. This proposal foundered on Soviet opposition.

In the two columns which Walter Lippmann published during the week of the Paris fiasco there was just one critical reference to the Soviet part in breaking up the conference. But the rest of his articles were devoted to efforts to prove that we wrecked the conference ourselves.

Certainly there is reason for criticizing, not the high-altitude flights, which may well have been vital to U.S. security, but the manner in which the downing of the U-2 was handled. The President's insistence on a sadly misplaced George Washington candor about an intelligence operation created serious headaches for himself and for Secretary Herter.

But it is highly improbable that the downing of the plane was the cause of the torpedoing of the conference. Khrushchev had long known about these flights; he asserted in his Paris press conference that he intended to take up the subject with President Eisenhower at Camp David; but then had an intuition that there was something "fishy" about the President's friendship.

There has been much speculation, much of it very sensational and very dubious, about Khrushchev's losing political control, being buffeted about by pressures from the Red army, from Red China, from mysterious Stalinites in Russia. But there is a much simpler and more plausible explanation of his behavior. The key to the wrecking of the summit may well be in a brutally provocative and threatening speech which the Red boss delivered in Baku some time before the reconnaissance plane was brought down. In this speech he threatened that, if a settlement, on his terms, of the West Berlin issue were not reached, he would conclude a separate peace treaty with his own puppet creation, the "German Democratic Republic." (This very title consists of three lies; a regime, most of whose leaders are trained in Moscow and some of whom are Soviet citizens, is not German; a regime that permits no semblance of freedom of press, speech, assembly or election is neither democratic nor a republic.) This, according to Khrushchev, would end the right of access to West Berlin for the allied powers. So, by this very statement, issued before the plane incident occurred, the conference in Paris was faced with two alternatives, deadlock or appeasement.

The basic lesson to be drawn from the Paris breakup is that summit diplomacy is a thoroughly bad idea, in theory and in practice. About such sensationally publicized meetings there is always an aroma of appeasement or, at best, of futility. Let's look at the record.

The first summit conference of modern times was at Munich, when Hitler on September 30, 1938, exploited the fear of war in Great Britain and France to impose his own idea of how Czechoslovakia should be carved up. The defenders of Munich argued that the breakup of a heterogeneous new state like Czechoslovakia was a price worth paying for peace. So it might have been, if Hitler's ambitions had stopped there. But here one comes to the fundamental fallacy of appeasement: that a ruthless aggressor will be satisfied and cease and desist from his evil ways if he gets his demand of the moment. But this never happens. Less than a year later Britain and France were at war with Nazi Germany.

The next big summit conference (skipping Teheran, which was largely military, although it marked the first step toward the betrayal of Poland) was at Yalta in February 1945. It might have been imagined that the Western leaders of a war which was being fought largely on the assumption that appeasement does not pay would have shunned appeasement of Stalin at the expense of Poland, a loyal wartime ally.

But Yalta was a repetition of Munich, with Poland the victim instead of Czechoslovakia, with Stalin playing the role of Hitler and Roosevelt and Churchill filling in for Chamberlain and Daladier. Again the result was disillusioning. Stalin did not become more friendly to the West; he became more bellicose and aggressive. It took the Berlin airlift, the war in Korea and the build-up of American military power to convince Stalin, whom even George Kennan in a recent lecture rightly described as "a man of almost inconceivable criminality," that further aggression would not pay off.

Perhaps intoxicated by Soviet success in developing space satellites, Khrushchev followed in Stalin's footsteps when, on November 27, 1958, he demanded that the Western Powers withdraw their token garrisons from West Berlin. In retrospect it seems clear

that this insolent challenge to the existing situation should have been met head-on, with a flat, uncompromising "No." But British Prime Minister Macmillan tried to create a climate of discussion on an issue that was really not suited for discussion. His trip to Moscow was followed by the futile Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva.

Then the diplomatic ball was kept rolling by the invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States, followed by Eisenhower's agreement to take part in a summit meeting. Macmillan was the principal advocate of yielding to Khrushchev's insistence on such a conference; stouthearted Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and General de Gaulle were skeptical from the beginning.

The experiment was tried, with no advance agreement, with no serious prospect of success and Khrushchev blew it up with all the glee of a juvenile delinquent setting off a giant firecracker under the chairs of some respectable solid citizens gathered for a serious talk. The point that should now be clear is that a totalitarian dictator is psychologically incapable of carrying on negotiations as an equal among equals. He must rule or ruin; he must dictate or he won't play ball.

There was an ugly suggestion of appeasement (which may be defined as one-sided yielding in the face of force or threat of force) about the whole buildup of the Paris summit that was never reached. Had Khrushchev not made his threats about West Berlin, there would never have been a foreign ministers' conference, or the invitation to the butcher of the Ukraine, and of Budapest, to make his propaganda tour of the United States or the meeting in Paris which he utilized for unprecedented tirades of abuse against America and its President.

There may be a case for a meeting of heads of state to affix the formal signatures to agreements which have been worked out at lower levels. Even this is dangerous with a treacherous totalitarian dictator. There is no case at all for a summit meeting when there is an irreconcilable difference of position in advance.

The collapse at Paris may be of some benefit if it leads to clear recognition that the cold war is the normal state of relations between free countries and Communist dictatorships and that Khrushchev in the role of the dove of peace is strictly phony. And if it leads to a firm resolution to swear off summitry—for good.

Veterans' Pension Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to present to Congress today correspondence containing a resolution from my hometown, Jeannette Post No. 344, American Legion.

This resolution is duly signed by Philip J. Entinger, Frank Altman, Paul Malloy, and Fred Croushore, officers and members in good standing of the Legion.

I want to call to the attention of Congress the serious nature of the results of our passage of the so-called veterans' pension law, H.R. 7650, Public Law 86-211.

I questioned at the time of passage the inclusion therein of the means in determining both eligibility and amounts of benefits under this act.

I sincerely believe we will be derelict in our duties if we fail to give serious consideration to the problems of our aged veterans and to the inequities created by the terms of H.R. 7650.

I compliment my local post for its leadership in the battle for fair treatment for our distinguished, but apparently forgotten, veterans.

AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 344,
Jeannette, Pa., May 16, 1960.

Hon. PAUL R. SELECKY,
President Judge, Orphans' Court, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

DEAR JUDGE SELECKY: Written below are the two resolutions adopted by Jeannette Post No. 344 and the Westmoreland County Council:

"RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas it is the desire of the membership of Jeannette Post No. 344 and the Westmoreland County Council of the American Legion to have law H.R. 7650, Public Law 86-211 amended; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the membership of Jeannette Post No. 344 and the Westmoreland County Council of the American Legion, that the following resolution be presented for appropriate action with a view to having said law amended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That appropriate action be taken to amend law H.R. 7650, Public Law 86-211, for the purpose of eliminating variable payments; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Pennsylvania State commander of the American Legion, with full authority to act as per the sense of said resolution."

"RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas it is the desire of the membership of Jeannette Post No. 344 and the Westmoreland County Council of the American Legion, that the following resolution be presented for appropriate action with a view to having action taken: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That appropriate action be taken to eliminate social security or pension programs authorized by the Government in lieu of social security, when a veteran 65 years of age or over applies for his veterans' pension; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Pennsylvania State commander of the American Legion with full authority to act as per the sense of said resolution."

We have complied with all the regulations, we hope, in presenting our resolutions to the adjutant, Daniel W. Shaub. There has been considerable misunderstanding in the past, so let it be understood by all that we are trying to be helpful to the old veterans and to our country. We will be glad to give you a few facts. These figures are not ours; they were printed in the Pittsburgh daily papers.

In Allegheny County 93,000 are unemployed; in Westmoreland County it's about the same percentage. Many of these unemployed are young men with families. Can a young man and wife maintain the respect of their children if they must go to the city hall for food or wait for a relief check? We think not. We also are of a firm belief that the relief checks are much more of an expense to the taxpayer than the veterans' pension would be. Many of the vets have been laid off their jobs; by company policy men over 65 must go. Many more are laid off because of company and union agreement, be that as it may.

There are also many of these old vets who are holding down very good jobs. Do you agree with us it would be much better for all concerned if the old vet would retire and give the young man a chance for a better job, help him, give the young man all the know-how at his command—things he has learned by many years of hard work? Without this know-how the young man is in trouble. If the old vet is assured of decent treatment, there is no doubt he will do all he can to help. Otherwise he will keep all the know-how he has and stay on the job as long as he can—and we don't blame him.

On April 20, 1960, the Pittsburgh papers had this statement on the front page: "Pennsylvania Congressman seeking Federal money for stricken areas." We ask you, Judge Selecky, is it good policy to have the young men with families walking the streets, losing the respect of their children while the old vet goes on dragging his weary feet and tired body to work every day? These old vets are tired; they have worked hard all of their lives. It was never easy for them. When they receive decent treatment, they will be glad to quit.

At Uniontown our national commander stated that the GI bill of rights was sponsored by the American Legion and referred to it as one of many great accomplishments by the Legion. He forgot to mention the fact that the old vets in his audience were the men who fought the battle that made the GI bill of rights possible.

We sincerely hope you and your committee will not only support our resolutions, but fight for them and accept nothing less. It is high time that something decent is done for the old vets and the American Legion should be proud to support these men as they supported those who followed them.

Copies of this letter will be sent to all district commanders and to others who we feel will be interested.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. ENTINGER,
Past Commander, American Legion.

Rehabilitation as a Force in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address by Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Miss Switzer spoke on the subject, "Rehabilitation as a Force in International Relations," at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped in Washington, D.C., on May 6, 1960.

At this same meeting, my own State of Rhode Island was specifically honored in the selection of Miss Betty Murby to sing the Star Spangled Banner at the opening session. Miss Murby is a graduate of Perkins Institute and a resident of Pawtucket, R.I. She is an accomplished singer and a charming young lady who has deservedly won the admiration of all of us in Rhode Island.

The address follows:

REHABILITATION AS A FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Remarks by Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, Washington, D.C., May 6, 1960)

The interdependence of nations is one of the certainties of this age. As the world shrinks in time and distance, all of us become increasingly aware of how one part of the world depends on other parts, not only for economic well-being, but for measures that protect world health and enhance the welfare of the disabled.

It is eminently fitting that such an important organization in our national rehabilitation effort as the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped should help to point up the fact that rehabilitation has grown into a truly worldwide movement, by bringing us together at this luncheon to make us better prepared for the highly important international meetings that will take place this year, and their effect on international understanding as well as international rehabilitation.

We are on the eve of the Eighth World Congress of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, in New York City, in August. Its theme, "Rehabilitation and World Peace" is particularly appropriate. Man's greater awareness of the forces within his environment that affect his welfare is bringing to a heartening glow the regard for the disabled that, in this country, was kindled 40 years ago. Few of us who are concerned with rehabilitation can escape the feeling that the forum of 5,000 people from many countries who will exchange opinions, information, and viewpoints at the Congress, respite any differences in nationality, religion, ideology or economic status, can end with anything but accord and greater bonds of international friendship.

I was literally amazed last summer while attending the First Mediterranean Conference on Rehabilitation, in Athens, Greece, to learn of the progress that some of the eastern nations have made toward rehabilitating their disabled. They, too, are realizing the great burden of dependency that can be erased through vocational rehabilitation of the disabled. As the importance of the individual becomes more pronounced in nations that for centuries had accepted ill health and disability as a condition of existence, the health of the individual becomes of more concern.

This feeling was substantiated and extended toward most of the nations of the world by a publication since issued under the direction of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate. Under the title, "Rehabilitation of the Disabled in 37 Countries of the World," it is a highly informative contribution to the cause of international rehabilitation programs, and the needs and hopes of the future.

In January, a seminar on international rehabilitation, held here in Washington, was the means of our taking a look at the expansion of activities and interest in international rehabilitation in the past few years. It was sponsored by the National Rehabilitation Association and the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, and marked the first time that voluntary groups in the United States had met with Government agencies concerned with rehabilitation, to review the past and to explore the future of our programs with relation to international rehabilitation.

One of the subjects for seminar discussion was the use to which counterpart funds in several countries could be placed as the world moves toward acceptance of rehabilitation as a universal ideal rather than purely national activities.

The U.S. Government acquires and expends large amounts of foreign currencies in its oversea operations. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its proposed budget for 1961 has asked for $930,000 in these funds to be set aside for rehabilitation activities in nine countries. Included are India, $350,000, Israel, $100,000, Yugoslavia and Poland, $90,000 each, United Arab Republics, $80,000, Pakistan, $70,000, Brazil, $60,000, Indonesia, $50,000, and Burma, $40,000.

These funds—which, of course, have to be expended in the countries where they are accumulated—would be used for two principal purposes—eduactional activities in the need for and use of rehabilitation measures, and for support of selected research and demonstration projects. The program would be carried on through the regular grant mechanisms of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, with utilization of the resources of the various international rehabilitation organzations.

A major problem in international rehabilitation, according to the seminar, is the public attitude of governments and their people toward rehabilitation. One of the reasons for slow progress in some countries is this lack of understanding of what rehabilitation is and what it means. Possibly one of the best uses to which some of these funds could be put is to aid the efforts of strong international rehabilitation organizations in emphasizing to governments and pepole the dividends that rehabilitation of the disabled can pay.

It is considerably within our own interests that international research and demonstration projects be initiated. There are 20 million persons throughout the world, for instance, who are stricken and disfigured by Hansen's disease, or leprosy. Some are in the United States, particularly in the new State of Hawaii. New drugs and surgical procedures enable many patients to regain use of their hands. Many scars are eliminated. Total rehabilitation is becoming a reality, but more research is needed. Highly valuable work is underway in India, and, with further development of research facilities there, specialists from all over the world can learn the techniques that are helping so much to remove the effects of this dread disease.

In Burma, there exists an ideal opportunity to conduct research into the manufacture of prosthesis from native materials that are resistant to the effects of heat and humidity. The rehabilitation center in Solo has done some remarkable things along this line which could be of benefit to us and to the rest of the world, if further research and demonstrations were conducted.

A great deal of rehabilitation activity in India is among its blind, but one of the great problems there is finding employment for those who are prepared for work. This is being overcome, and the methods used to find employment in a country that is overpopulated where unemployment is widespread are worthy of study.

These are some of the trends in our thinking and illustrate some of the ways these funds could be importantly used. Other projects in relation to the specific needs of various countries are in our collective thoughts, so that international research will be speeded on its way to solution of problems common to many countries.

Rehabilitation, by its very nature, involves people closely with the verities of life—their physical or mental state, their independence, their abilities to earn and to enjoy basic satisfactions. This universal yearning of the disabled to be accepted on individual merit has met a guardian and protector in that phase of the growing people-to-people program that deals with the disabled and the handicapped.

Our co-worker and friend, Gen. Melvin Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, has most appropriately been named to head the Committee on the Physically Handicapped within the people-to-people program. Under his guidance, the committee is doing several things that add a needed human touch to international rehabilitation. On the more administrative side the committee has brought together in liaison the efforts of close to 30 organizations in the United States that are concerned with rehabilitation, and has formed lines of communication with rehabilitation groups all over the world. It has also performed a notable service in compiling a directory of international rehabilitation groups.

In more personal and intimate context, the committee promotes correspondence among disabled persons in many countries, and on the intensely practical side the committee provides a fine service for amputees over the world by acting as a clearing house for component parts of the many kinds of prosthetic devices that are in world use.

The research and demonstration program of the OVR is developing on its own account somewhat an international flavor. Though we do not have as many resources for this purpose as we would like, some of our projects do have worldwide implications. We have moved to support world organizations working in international rehabilitation, and to carry on projects that will benefit other nations as well as ourselves.

Grants have been made to the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples to aid the exchange of information that is developed on technical skills and knowledge in their Congresses, and the same was done for the American Congress of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation in Chicago this year. Another grant was to the Excerpta Medica Foundation to abstract worldwide publications on rehabilitation and publish them periodically.

In more active settings, the World Federation for Mental Health, of New York, has received a grant to study attitudes toward mental health and mental illness in diverse settings, so that there will be greater opportunity for effective community health programs to evolve. Gallaudet College has an award to help support a study and analysis of communicative patterns developed by young deaf persons, in order to improve communicative techniques for vocational rehabilitation. And, in 1958, the Industrial Home for the Blind, of Brooklyn, N.Y., completed a project that provided the first definitive steps anywhere for rehabilitation of the group whose plight arouses a most poignant desire to help the deaf-blind. It also gave impetus to a method of palm writing, developed by experts in England, Holland, and the United States, that many persons believe will become a standard way of communication for these people over the world.

An immense amount of interest in international rehabilitation has been aroused through the health for peace bill, passed by the Senate last year, and now pending in the House.

This legislation would establish a program of financial aid for international research into diseases that cripple and kill mankind, and be a means of gathering, correlating, storing, and disseminating knowledge about medical advances as they are made over the world. It has high potentialities for speeding the eradication of disease, and for lessening the incidence of disability.

The eagerness of governments and their peoples to learn about rehabilitation and to apply knowledge and methods effectively is well illustrated in the growth of activities in the International Unit of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The principal activity of the International Unit is to prepare the way for people from other countries to study and observe rehabilitation in the United States. Physicians, health and hospital administrators, and workers in related fields come to our colleges, universities, and rehabilitation centers, under arrangements made by OVR. Some are government officials, as was a recent visitor, the director of rehabilitation information activities for Yugoslavia, which has a rehabilitation program well underway. But there are physicians and technicians who come for stays of up to a year or more, under sponsorship of the United Nations or the World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, State Department, or voluntary agencies.

In 1947, as nations began to readjust their economies to a postwar world, there was a notable upsurge of interest in rehabilitation over the world. In that year eight persons from other countries visited our country to study rehabilitation under OVR guidance.

The number has increased regularly, to 42 in 1958, and we have 30 more in the first quarter of this year, to bring the total of long-term visitors to 295 since 1947. In short-term training, that is, periods of 2 months or less—the numbers are even greater. We have had 60 in the first quarter of the year, bringing this total to 769 since 1949.

The mission of rehabilitation is to mend, and not destroy; to prevent and heal the scars of disability. We have arrived at the place where all of us must blend our national aspirations for our disabled into a world viewpoint. We who work in rehabilitation should keep in mind that, whatever our task may be in working with and for the disabled, we are individual ambassadors of peace. Our efforts to restore the hopes of those who seek only adequate opportunity to live useful and satisfying lives justify our existence in rehabilitation. More than that, our cumulative efforts can mount up to becoming a powerful instrument in international affairs, one that could be profound in the establishment and maintenance of enduring peace among nations.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Not in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Monday the annual Memorial Day service sponsored by the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary, Baltimore District, Department of Maryland, was held at the Baltimore National Cemetery.

Although the day was bleak and cloudy, with rain stopping only moments before the ceremony began, the service was most successful and impressive. Approximately 4,000 persons attended the event, and they were privileged to hear an excellent address by the Honorable Dewey Short, Assistant Secretary of the Army.

In addition, there was a memorable program arranged by a committee consisting of Donald E. Miller, chairman; Mrs. Worley H. Van Camp, cochairman; Mrs. Leonard J. Huber; Walter C. Jones; Frederick C. Miller; and Mrs. Glenn G. Rowland. Mr. Short was introduced by William H. Robinson, district commander.

Because of the great depth and timeliness of Mr. Short's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT IN VAIN

It is with a distinct sense of honor and a feeling of deep humility that I join with you here at Baltimore National Cemetery to pay tribute to our fellow countrymen who gave of their lives that we might be free.

At times like this, we are given a wonderful opportunity to reappraise our own contributions to the cause for which our comrades laid down their lives, and that is why Memorial Day has become one of the most solemn, one of the most reverent, and certainly one of the most meaningful experiences for Americans throughout the Nation.

It is altogether fitting that this occasion should be sponsored by the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary, for in the great spirit of these devoted organizations lies the pulse and heartbeat of an America dedicated and strong.

Memorial Day is that day when Americans lay aside their daily tasks to pause and reflect on the memory of that body of men who died while fighting for the honor and ideals of our United States. In a way it is like Christmas and Easter when we pay tribute to One who suffered and died for all mankind. But also like Christmas and Easter, Memorial Day is not the 1 day out of 365 that the values and bravery of these men are honored; as with the ideals and teachings of Christ, they live with us every day. For what American has gone a moment without the knowledge that he is free to speak as he pleases, read as he pleases, or worship as he pleases? These are the values these men, in peaceful repose about us today, died for, and thus before God in the highest courts of ultimate judgment, may we declare that their deaths were not in vain.

In cemeteries throughout the country and the world, similar commemorative services are being held today. For some, it is a time for difficult personal memories mixed with pride and sadness. To these fall the obligation and sympathy of all Americans. But for each and every one of us it must be said that we share in the great losses suffered through the deaths of these men. Each one of their deaths marked the loss of a potential living contribution to the family that is America; each one of their deaths marked the loss of a brave and dedicated soul.

That is why in Arlington National Cemetery there are monuments to the Unknown Soldiers of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. These tombs are the symbols for all of us and for all future Americans to mourn in memory of what the heroic men of these conflicts died for. The inscription over these tombs is simple and moving. It reads: "Here Rests in Honored Glory an American Soldier Known but to God."

The fact is, it is not even known whether they are from the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force. Neither do we know their race or creed, nor does it make one iota of difference.

We do know this: they were brave, upright, loyal, devoted, and patriotic Americans. We know that as babes each nestled in a loving mother's arms. As they grew up they enjoyed the benefits of the American way of life, the privilege of complete freedom of worship, educational opportunities unsurpassed on earth, and they inhaled the fresh, clean air of freedom that imbued within them a love for America and for the ideals which to them were worth the supreme sacrifice. These fine products of our American homes serve as an inspiration to us today to strive with ever more determination to maintain the love for liberty that will provide for our children and our children's children those wonderful opportunities and privileges for which they gave up their lives.

From the windows of my office in the Pentagon I can look out onto the magnificent Washington Monument, the glistening white dome of the Jefferson Memorial and the architectural beauty of the Lincoln Memorial—all are works of art to forever acclaim the contributions these three great American Presidents have made in the building of our glorious Nation. And from that same office I can look out onto the row on row of stone markers that lace the rolling, green hills of the Arlington National Cemetery. A sight similar to that we see around us here today meets my eye. And as I gaze upon those silent headstones over our heroic dead, I am reminded of the awful price of war. It is then that I am filled with a renewed determination that this curse must be lifted from us; that somehow, by some manner there might be devised in the thoughts and actions of human beings—that from the innermost depths of our very hearts and souls—a way of solving our problems may be found without resort to the horrors of war.

It is not my intention today to restir the pangs of sorrow that came with the passing of our comrades and loved ones which we memorialize today, nor do I need to impress upon you the unspeakable horrors that are inevitable in mortal combat. At a time like this, I experience an emotion which cannot be put into words. If silence is ever golden, it must be beside the graves of those whose lives were far more significant than mere speeches. For love of country they accepted death and thus resolved any and all doubts that they possessed the highest virtues of men and citizens. They have become immortal by their patriotism and their virtue.

For the noblest man who still remains alive there yet remains a conflict. He must still withstand the tempest of the times and the vicissitudes of temptation and misfortune before which many lofty men have fallen. With these whom we honor today, the conflict has ended; their victory was won when death stamped upon them the great seal of heroic character and closed a record which the travail of the years can never blot. Their honor and their patriotism have remained unsullied with the passage of time.

I believe that no heroic effort is ever lost; that the characters of men are molded and inspired by what their fathers and their forefathers have done before them. Those of us who enjoy the kinship of such men as these can face the challenges of tomorrow and share the inspiration which was theirs as they fought on the fields of battle where, each for himself, gathered up the cherished purpose of life, its aims and its ambitions, together with those dearer affections and flung them all, with life itself, into the scale of battle.

If each grave around us had a voice to tell us what its silent tenant has to share, we here would renew with them our faith and would rededicate our efforts to a more peaceful tomorrow—but not at the price of our freedom. For, to accept the price of submission and of prostration would be to break faith with these and the multitude of our other countrymen who have died to guarantee that the flame of eternal light might never be extinguished.

We know here today that in spite of the awesome toll in blood and sorrow which war exacts, there remains abroad in the world at this very hour those who would sacrifice more blood upon the battlefield to satisfy their evil ambitions for conquest and aggression. They, who by their lust for power and for their personal greed, would plant additional markers in this and other cemeteries throughout the world. We are resolved, therefore, that we shall possess the strength necessary to defend ourselves and to deter the power-hungry force of atheistic communism. We are resolved to maintain America's strength to the extent required, taking into consideration her economic capabilities and her military potential. We are determined that all free nations of the world shall be capable of resisting aggression so that liberty everywhere shall thrive for all men.

All this we are doing because we want earnestly to avoid the ravages of war and fervently desire to achieve peace as our brave sons and forefathers knew it. If we keep this goal constantly before us; if we steadfastly and continuously pursue all efforts to attain it; if we periodically pause in our daily activities to recall the message from these sacred graves, we cannot fail. While eternal sleep enshrouds these men, it has given us a new purpose for the living. Their

deeds have provided us the inspiration and the challenge which we willingly accept.

Today the world is again divided over belief: belief in liberty, peace, and democracy as we understand the terms and belief in a godless doctrine of international communism. The Communists are truly dedicated to their belief, and they are determined to make the necessary sacrifices to see it become a reality. If we are to thwart this ambition, we must be equally dedicated and firmly convinced of our abilities as a nation and strong in our belief in the sovereignty of the individual and the integrity of man.

Those men who we so proudly honor throughout America today and wherever our beloved ones lie beneath the sod in some foreign land, like us, loved peace. But as much as they loved it, they did not forget that the fulfillment of our dream of freedom has been possible only because men were willing to struggle for it. No one desires a peace without freedom. All of the people of this great Republic recognize that in order to have the peace we desire, we must be willing, if need be, to fight for it, perhaps even to die for it, as did the millions of brave Americans who gave their lives in the wars in which our country has been engaged.

So, today as we reaffirm our faith in the righteousness of the principles upon which our Nation was founded, we pledge, with God's help, that we will keep faith with those whom we are honoring this morning. That their death be not in vain, they have passed to us the flaming torch of eternal light to keep forever bright. My good friends, that great responsibility rests with you and me today, and in this regard I would like to leave you with the stirring prayer of some nameless poet who said:

Father, God, we bow on bended knee,
Thankful for the blessings of the free;
May we always true and faithful be
To the author of our liberty.
O God, we pray that Thou
Will light the way
Give us strength and
Courage day by day.
May we earn the right for
All to be free
For now and always,
For eternity.

The Story of Chief Joseph: From Where the Sun Now Stands—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to present the second article of the story of Chief Joseph, one of our country's most famous Indian chiefs.

This story, authored by Bruce A. Wilson, editor of the Omak Chronicle in Omak, Wash., has received wide acclaim and it provides an excellent account of the last year of independence of the mighty Nez Perce Indian Tribe before they were confined to the Colville Indian Reservation, located in the Fifth Congressional District of Washington which I have the honor of representing. I will insert into the RECORD additional articles of this story during the next few successive days.

The article follows:

SUNDAY, JUNE 17, 1877

Dawn: A soft gray ribbon fringing the eastern horizon. Cursing nervously, Captain Perry's troopers lurch into their saddles. Two days of nearly steady riding have brought them to the upper reaches of White Bird Canyon which twists down to the rushing Salmon. Now, stiff muscled after a few hours' rest, they move into the ravine. As daylight breaks, barren slopes rise on either side. The advancing column finds a white woman and her child, hiding in sparse underbrush. Her husband was killed by Indians 3 days before. They give her food and pass on.

Below, the Nez Perce camp is astir. The Indians know Perry is coming and what his strength is. Many of the young braves are hot for action. But Joseph and other chiefs still hope to avoid fighting. About 65 warriors, half with repeating rifles, the rest with muzzle-loading guns or bows and arrows, ride a mile north of camp. Six continue under a white flag to meet the troopers. Two Moons, the wing bone of a crane hanging from his neck as a charm, leads others to the east. The rest follow Ollokot, Joseph's steel-muscled brother, to the west. Tension grips the canyon.

As the Indians wait, Perry's advance guard breaks over the crest of a tortuously eroded knoll. His men halt as word is sent back the Nez Perce are in sight. Arthur Chapman, a civilian scout with the advance party, has boasted he could "whip the cowardly injuns" himself. Now he snaps a shot at the slowly-advancing peace envoys. Otstotpoo, a middle-aged Nez Perce waiting with Two Moons, fires back. His lucky shot at long range slams Perry's only trumpeter out of his saddle. The battle has been joined, and the Wallowas, like a misty mirage, have drifted beyond Joseph's reach forever.

A scattering of shots rippies across the canyon as for the first time Nez Perces open fire on white soldiers. Perry has dismounted one of his two troops; the other swings abreast on his right. But almost immediately a handful of Two Moons' mounted warriors breaks onto a rocky butte where six civilian volunteers anchor Perry's left flank. Two whites are killed; the others scramble to get away. Their panic begins to spread. White Bird Canyon has exploded into a smoky turmoil stabbed by red spurts from the Indians' repeating Winchesters. Blood-splattered soldiers slump to the ground. Horses lunge out of control. The troopers, many under fire for the first time, blaze away wildly at clouds of smoke. The Nez Perces shoot cooly at dusty blue targets.

A larger group of Nez Perce horsemen sweeps up the ravine. They have no single leader. A few braves started out; others followed. Many cling to the sides of their ponies with scarcely a hand or foot visible. They slash through Perry's wavering line. His right flank collapses. Troopers begin running. The howling, naked Indians are everywhere.

Yellow Wolf, one of the finest warriors from Joseph's band, will later relate: "I ran to strike one soldier with my bow. I leaped and struck him as he put a cartridge to his gun. I grabbed the gun and shoved hard. The soldier went over backward but was not hurt. I wrenched the gun away from him. At the same time a warrior back of me killed him.

"I now jumped down a bank where was another soldier. My feet slipped and I slid in front of him. He was on one knee, pointing his rifle. The bullet passed over my shoulder. I grabbed the barrel of his gun. While we wrestled, a Nez Perce fired from the bank, and the soldier fell dead."

Turn to one Indian; another strikes from behind.

The shattered remnants of Perry's command stream back up the ravine. Lieutenant Thaller gathers 18 men as a rear guard. Fighting with high courage, they edged disastrously into a blind ravine. The Nez Perces wipe them out, leaving their bodies sprawled across a litter of empty cartridges.

The crush of battle has lasted only 10 or 15 minutes. But the exultant Nez Perces continue harrying the mauled troopers for several hours before returning to the canyon. There they collect rifles and strip clothing from the bodies of 34 whites, nearly a third of Perry's force. This is what 60 or 70 braves (others were too drunk or too far away or too busy watching the pony herd) have done to 99 soldiers and 11 volunteers. Not a single Nez Perce has been killed. Two were wounded.

Wild triumph in the Nez Perce camp presently sagged into indecision. What to do next? Anyone with a plan would be heard. Happily, Rainbow and Five Wounds had a good one. Veteran buffalo hunters who had arrived the day after the battle, they suggested the Nez Perces cross the Salmon. If General Howard did not follow, they would be safe. If he did, the Indians could recross the river and cut across Howard's supply line with ample freedom of action.

The Nez Perces made boats of buffalo hide stretched across green willow poles. Loaded with women, children, dogs, and supplies, these were towed across the swollen Salmon by braves on ponies. Then the herd, more than a thousand head, was swum across. The passage was accomplished easily—the Indians were old hands at this sort of thing.

General Howard, with a force of 225, arrived at the banks of the Salmon 10 days after the battle at White Bird Canyon. In his eyes, transporting infantry, cavalry, pack mules, cannon, foodstuffs, and munitions across this boiling, white-tipped torrent loomed as a risky and complex maneuver.

Howard knew the Nez Perces, even with their families and baggage, could travel more easily than he through rough country. Following them now meant risking battle with a raging river at his rear. Also, a few days' delay should bring reinforcements. From virtually every fort in the Northwest, troops were heading toward Lewiston. Other companies were coming from California and Arizona; the 2d Infantry had been ordered up from Georgia. Slouch-hatted volunteers were swaggering into Lapwai.

But the Nez Perce uprising had thrown all of Idaho and eastern Washington into a turmoil streaked with fear. To sit in camp while the hostiles melted into the Seven Devils country or lanced toward the Wallowas was unthinkable. After losing several rafts, Howard's engineers fastened a cable across the Salmon and attached two boats with ropes and rings. The crossing consumed 2 days. Through pouring rain the troops struggled up slopes so slippery that several pack mules lost their footing and plunged into canyons hundreds of feet below. Meanwhile the Nez Perces, as Howard feared they might, recrossed the Salmon 15 miles downstream and moved leisurely across Camas Prairie toward the South Fork of the Clearwater.

As a mobile force the Indians were highly efficient. Each morning their camp would appear to collapse into a frenetic bedlam of hastily built cooking fires, collapsing tepees, squalling children and yapping dogs with squaws rushing about and braves driving in skittish ponies. Yet half an hour later families would be falling into line as the procession moved smoothly out. Usually two or three groups of warriors were ahead scouting. One such party, led by Five Wounds

and Rainbow, wiped out a detachment of 10 Army scouts under Lt. S. M. Rains.

On the morning of July 1, near the Clearwater, bugles sounded and guns banged as cavalry and volunteers, with Capt. Stephen G. Whipple commanding, attacked a camp of Nez Perces headed by Looking Glass, a powerful young veteran of the Sioux wars who wore a small piece of mirror as a charm. Before hostilities broke out, Looking Glass had withdrawn to the reduced reservation. He wanted no trouble. Whipple's mission was to take the band into custody, because Howard believed some of Looking Glass' braves planned to join the war party. But during negotiations at the village a halfbreed volunteer fired his rifle. The nervous Indians jumped for their guns and war ponies. Again a single shot ignited a powder keg. The brief battle which followed left Whipple in possession of the camp and 750 ponies, but sent Looking Glass and his inflamed band galloping to join the nontreaty warriors.

The attack on Looking Glass' camp can be considered either a criminal assault on peace-loving Indians or a sensible but ill-fated move to deprive the hostiles of possible reinforcements. In either case it accomplished exactly the opposite of what Howard had in mind. The Nez Perces welcomed reinforcements. Their effective fighting strength was by no means as large as Howard believed it nor as many historians have subsequently guessed.

Including the Looking Glass band, some 700 Indians early in July had raised their tepees in a pasture bordering the south fork of the Clearwater River, with rough timbered slopes rising on either side. These 700 included about 195 male adults—60 from Joseph's band, 50 led by the mild, elderly White Bird, 40 contributed by the agile Looking Glass, 30 headed by Toohoolhoolzote, aging but still a remarkably powerful man, and perhaps 16 in Hahtalekin's Paloos band from southeastern Washington. Of the chiefs, only Looking Glass was also a war leader. Among the 195 males, some were too old to fight. Others were disabled or faint-hearted. Perhaps only 150 were useful warriors. At no time could all of them join the same battle, for some must watch the herds and help protect 500 Nez Perce women and children—a staggering burden for a war party heavily outnumbered by its enemy.

At the Clearwater the Indians camped, waiting to see what Howard would do next. They rested, hunted, raced their ponies along the river. Nobody bothered to keep much of a lookout.

Perspiring in the July sun, General Howard was a man with many problems. A dozen Idaho settlements demanded protection. The War Department was suggesting a decisive action would be appropriate. But these and a stultifying variety of other concerns all had been eclipsed by a single blinding awareness: the Nez Perces Howard faced were a far move powerful and determined foe than most bands of warring Indians. At White Bird Canyon their courage and amazing marksmanship had shattered two companies. Now they had slipped neatly around end, and behind an alert screen of scouts were moving casually across central Idaho. No wonder Howard concluded their best known chieftain, Joseph, was a military genius. Besides, such a halo helped to blunt outraged questions hurled by newspaper editorials even as the main command struggled back across the Salmon.

His force swollen to 500, Howard headed for the general area where the Nez Perces might be if they were not somewhere else. A few days later he was marching north along a broad ridge paralleling the Clearwater's North Fork. His scouts had no idea the Nez Perces were camped just across the river.

Statement of Secretary of Defense Before Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement delivered by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on today, June 2, 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, JUNE 2, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and I have a short statement if I may read it.

I am certain that you wish me to cover the role played by the Department of Defense in the U–2 overflight program. Elements of the Department of Defense gave technical advice to the U–2 project. No military aircraft were used for these flights nor were the pilots military personnel.

From time to time the Director of the CIA, after obtaining the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, recommended a series of programs to the President. More specifically I reviewed program proposals embracing several priority missions, one or more of which it was proposed to execute in the near future. Responsibility for the operational conduct of the program rested with the CIA.

Of paramount importance was "the take" of these flights. Information on airfields, aircraft, missiles, missile testing and training, special weapons storage, submarine production, atomic production, and air defense deployments were of the types of vital information observed. These data were considered in formulating our military programs. We obviously were the prime customer and ours is the major interest.

On a separate subject—

One incident, and one over which I assume full responsibility, is the calling of a test of the readiness of our military communications from Paris. In view of the fact that my action in this matter has been questioned by some, I would like to give you the facts.

First of all, our military forces are always on some degree of alert. So it is merely a matter of moving this degree or condition of alert up or down the scale. On Sunday night (May 15) we were already aware of the sense of the statement which Mr. Khrushchev was going to make the following morning. The conditions which he had set for his participation in the conference made it apparent even at the time that he deliberately intended to wreck the conference.

This communications alert was not an act that was either offensive or defensive in character. It did not recall Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine personnel from leave. There was no movement of forces involved. However, I want to emphasize that it did make certain that if subsequent developments made necessary a higher state of readiness, such action could be taken promptly and convincingly.

Under the circumstances it seemed most prudent to me to increase the awareness of our unified commanders. Moreover, since the command and individuals concerned in the decision process, including the President, the Secretary of State, and myself, were overseas it was important to check out our military communications. At about midnight, Paris time, Sunday night, I requested that a quiet increase in command readiness, particularly with respect to communications, be instituted without public notice, if possible.

One phase of our testing is to call no-notice exercises of our command communications. While some commands went further in executing the instructions issued by the JCS as a result of my message than I had anticipated, I consider the order proper and absolutely essential. In similar circumstances I would take exactly the same action.

Can Private Carriers Provide Medical Care for the Aged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter to the New York Times from Prof. Julian Friedman of Syracuse University and formerly of the University of California in Berkeley. An authority on the problems of medical care, Professor Friedman offers some valuable comment on the issues confronting the Congress as we consider legislation in the field of medical care for the aged. I submit his letter to be reprinted in the RECORD so that it will be available to all for consideration:

SYRACUSE, N.Y., *April 14, 1960.*

EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Square,
New York City, N.Y.

SIR: If I understand where we now are in the great debate on health insurance for the aged as aroused by the Forand bill, the voluntary health insurance enterprises, including the commercial carriers and Blue Cross organizations, propose that they be given a chance to solve the problem in lieu of the Nation's proceeding to a public program as part of social security. Surely the industry is to be heartily congratulated for this extraordinary move toward assuming this responsibility, especially when what is involved is contrary to sound principles of commercial insurance and stands little chance for success under private auspices. Permit me this space to explain what I have in mind.

From the viewpoint of insurance, health costs of the aged are not an authentic risk phenomenon; what may be properly insurable items at a modest premium barely touch the ills of persons 65 or over. Moreover, health insurance for this sector of the population entails a moral hazard; the availability of policies is in itself a major incentive to the seeking of benefits. Obviously the insurance itself does not increase morbidity, at least not significantly, but it does lead to the treatment of ailments that in the absence of insurance benefits tend to go untreated. Hence, utilization of services by the aged can be expected to follow the purchase of medical care and hospitalization policies. Finally, the advantages of the group insurance technique can be extended to the aged only if the industry ignores the fact that the aged do not constitute a true

group in insurance practice or law. If this fact is taken into account, then the policies that are marketed are bound to be cutoff benefits—very high premium or restricted benefits—relatively high premium policies, with a substantial portion of the income otherwise available for benefits siphoned off for the costs of administration, reserves, and earnings.

In offering to take on this task that the Forand bill proposes to entrust to Social Security, the insurance industry is surely acquainted with the following facts:

(a) rate of enrollment in voluntary health insurance is gradually declining because the bulk of the good risks have been sopped up, for the remaining population policies are priced beyond reach, and adaptation of the insurance mechanism to the characteristics of that population is currently stymied;

(b) "experience rating" on a group basis has generally replaced community rating, and the effect has been to discriminate so heavily in favor of the good risks that it is unlikely that the costs of health care for the aged can be spread over the community as a whole through private insurance. Experience rating has resulted in a power structure detrimental to a broad voluntary social approach to health insurance;

(c) revival of community rating, were it at all possible on a local, regional, or national scale, involves the increasing of premium or alternatively reduction of benefits, as Blue Cross plans almost everywhere are facing. In brief, it can confront the younger population with a dis-incentive to procure health insurance, particularly comprehensive coverage, and to protect dependents adequately.

(d) the level of benefits provided by voluntary health insurance currently is stabilizing with increasing premium income-benefit payment closeness but concurrently a wide benefits-health needs discrepancy. Adding the aged to the voluntary insurance rolls extends needs disproportionate to benefits available. More illness will be chasing relatively few insurance resources unless relatively more income flows to the profit-making and nonprofit carriers. If the insurance industry has a way for breaking through this impasse, more power to it.

One further observation is relevant and necessary. Whether Social Security or commercial insurance handles health insurance for the aged, someone or some group will have to work out rules, including fee schedules for the program, and enforce the rules. Hence, governing is involved, whether in public or private hands. Under a non-governmental system presumably the insurance industry and medical profession will perform these legislative and police functions together, though basically their immediate interests are conflicting. Under the Forand bill both will also perform these roles directly and indirectly but in this instance will be joined by another interested party, namely, the consumer. Where in any of the proposals for a private arrangement is there any provision for consumer representation?

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN R. FRIEDMAN.

Importance of Urban Renewal Stressed at Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in Paterson, N.J., community interest in urban redevelopment runs high. A great effort is underway to bring certain areas of that city to more modern and more efficient use.

An editorial in the May 31 edition of the Paterson Morning Call captures some of that spirit and also offers significant quotations from others who believe that much must be done to keep our cities attractive and economically healthy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANCE OF URBAN RENEWAL STRESSED AT CONFERENCE

We came across a copy of the U.S. Municipal News in which the matters discussed at the recent conference of some 1,000 mayors are highlighted.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York spoke on "Urban Renewal," a topic that is receiving priority of attention by many municipal officials, including our own.

Because we regard his views in the matter of great public interest, we bring you a salient portion of Mayor Wagner's comments:

"Why is urban redevelopment so important? There is the social answer: Poor housing is connected with social friction, disease, delinquency and crime. There is the economic, dollars-and-cents answer: Satisfactory housing is necessary to maintain our cities as desirable places to work and live, and to prevent deteriorating and obsolescence of the real estate upon which the solvency of our cities is based. There is the esthetic answer: Comfortable, attractive housing is the first requirement of the good life and the attractive community.

"We must combat urban decay with the combined zeal and skills of all levels of government and the total community. Urban renewal offers a special challenge to the mayors of our Nation's cities. I submit to you that never before in American history have local officials needed to be so creative and so imaginative as today. Never before has the future of our country rested so precariously upon the answers that we find today, not only for today's problems, but for tomorrow's. I am confident that the history of the next 20 years will record that we are meeting the challenge."

To those of us here who are striving mightily to move ahead with needed redevelopment, the words of Mayor Wagner should prove an inspiration to redouble our efforts for community advancement.

Consider these remarks of David M. Walker, Federal Chief of Urban Renewal, who also spoke before the assemblage:

"Urban renewal is real. You can see it. You can touch it. And it is here to stay. Urban renewal is also hard work. Money alone will not bring it about. Though Federal, State and local dollars are indispensable, they must be combined with knowledge and determination, skill and patience."

Sensible advice such as this must be followed if a community is to achieve its goal.

And we in Paterson should pay heed to the sound observation of John W. Rouse, president, ACTION, Inc.:

"It's almost without exception that the central business district is in decline. It's grim, ugly, disorderly, inefficient, congested, won't serve the purpose for which it was intended, can't do its job, the number of business transactions is declining. Beyond the central business district are the slums. Just beyond the slums come the middle age areas, the middle age areas which in every American city are next on the slum pipeline. Not yet in any American city have we succeeded in mounting a program that is capable of resisting the spread of slums into the area next beyond. Not yet in America have we succeeded in any American city in eliminating slums as fast as we are creating them, and furthermore, we are running out of land.

"Everyone knows dynamic things are beginning to happen, but the real story is that we have reached the point in the American city now where the job to do is obvious. It is to now undertake a total study of the city, a total plan for making the city into what it ought to be and fashioning a total program for carrying it out. There is no longer any justification in an American city for a timid project, for a piecemeal approach to the problems we face. It not only isn't the cautious and conservative thing to do, it is the reckless and irresponsible thing to do. We must develop a total study of what the city really needs to do to make itself slumless, blightless, livable, and efficient. From such a study we begin to learn over what period of years this job can be done, over what period of years can we correct the fact that we have built our cities largely without plan, over what period of years can we actually eliminate slum and blight from any individual American city.

"The reason we seem to stop short of undertaking a total plan and a total program is the notion that it can't be done. We still labor in America under the belief that the arithmetic of the city can't be made to work. We still look upon the process of redevelopment and renewal as if it were a burden, an expense in city government. This simply isn't true. It is an investment. It is the most important and dynamic investment the city can make."

The challenge has been hurled, and we have accepted it. Our investment in Paterson's future is essential if we are to forge ahead.

What are you doing about it?

Judge James P. Houlihan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorials which speak eloquently of the life of one of the great men of the State of Georgia. Judge James P. Houlihan will long be remembered for his many contributions to his city and county. It is indeed seldom that I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any comments on the passing of citizens of my district, but in this instance I feel that I would be remiss if I did not call to the attention of the Nation the greatness of this distinguished citizen who has left his imprint indelibly on the affairs of my native State.

The editorials follow:

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press editorial, May 26, 1960]

JUDGE JAMES P. HOULIHAN

The announcement this morning of the death of Judge James P. Houlihan came as a shock to this, his native city. Judge Houlihan had not been well recently and had been absent for several days from the financial scenes that knew him so well, but the countless Savannahians who were his

friends were not prepared for the sad word of his passing.

Judge Houlihan held an unexcelled place of esteem and affection in the hearts of his fellows. He was in the best sense of the expression a self-made man, rising in the banking world from a messenger to the presidency of the Georgia State Savings Bank, a Savannah institution of the highest standing and traditions. Prior to becoming head of the Georgia State he had been president of the Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., the successor of the Germania Bank, the institution with which Judge Houlihan began his financial career.

It was characteristic of Judge Houlihan that in addition to the attention he gave to major business as a banker he was always ready to listen to the needs of smaller clients, especially among young people who needed help over a household or business financial tight spot. The regard these young people formed for Judge Houlihan lasted undiminished through their adult lives.

The public service of Judge Houlihan was highlighted by many years of service on the Board of Chatham County Commissioners. He served long as chairman of the board and held that office when he retired. As in every endeavor to which he applied his talents, Judge Houlihan served the people of Chatham County with dedicated earnestness as head of their county government. The description of "progressive conservative" had been applied to Judge Houlihan and this admirably described his sound administration of county affairs.

One of the most beautiful aspects of Judge Houlihan's life was his devotion to his family and to his church. The late Mrs. Houlihan was the center of his life and Judge Houlihan never really fully recovered from the loss of his wife several years ago. A communicant of the Catholic Church, Judge Houlihan was a devout man and received from his church comfort and solace, and in recognition of his service, honors. He was a Knight of St. Gregory, the Pope having conferred on him this distinction, one of the highest given to laymen.

There will be a void in Savannah life now that Judge Houlihan is gone. But the city and the people will long enjoy, and gratefully remember, what he meant to them.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, May 27, 1960]

JAMES P. HOULIHAN

A life of devoted service to Savannah and Chatham County ended Wednesday with the passing of Judge James Patrick Houlihan.

Judge Houlihan's career as a banker and public servant was studded with many fine accomplishments, not the least of which was his guidance of the county's fiscal affairs for more than a score of years. He assumed the financial reins when the county government was hopelessly in debt, and through careful management and insistence upon balanced budgets lifted it to the excellent condition it continues to enjoy today.

Born in the Washington Square section of Savannah in 1884, Judge Houlihan started his business career as a messenger boy for the old Germania Bank in 1901. He became president of the Liberty Bank, successor to the Germania, in 1929, and at the time of his death was president of the Georgia State Savings Bank. He was elected a county commissioner in 1925. In 1937 he was chosen chairman, a post he held until he resigned in 1955.

Service on the county board would have in itself been ample contribution to his native city and county. Yet Judge Houlihan found time to join in every worthwhile move for the betterment of Savannah. His prime interests were highways and commerce. The James P. Houlihan Bridge over the Savannah River at Port Wentworth stands as a monument to his contribtuions in this field.

Judge Houlihan had served as president of the Georgia County Comissioners Association, the Hibernian Society of Savannah, and was a member of the original Georgia Ports Authority. A devout member of the Catholic Church, he was honored by the late Pope Pius XII by being named a Knight of St. Gregory.

A man of unfailing fairness and attractive personal traits, Judge Houlihan's career in the political field was marked by high votes of confidence from the people of the county. His friends were legion. In the death of Judge Houlihan, Savannah has lost a citizen of great worth, and the Morning News joins Savannahians in all walks of life in extending deepest sympathy to his son and other members of the family.

The Military Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles relating to our armed services which were published in the Army Times of May 7, 1960, and May 28, 1960, written by Monte Bourjaily, Jr. I think they are very timely and interesting.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army Times, May 28, 1960]

KIBITZER'S SEAT—THE DOLLAR IS STILL IN COMMAND

(By Monte Bourjaily, Jr.)

Released by the Army is a new regulation on activating, inactivating, and creating permanent installations for Army use. If the Army now sticks to the rules it has laid down in this regulation, it will have to close down all but 10 of the posts in the United States now housing tactical and training (for combat arms assignment) units. It will also have to close many of its technical service installations, consolidating their activities into joint depot and industrial installations.

I find it difficult to believe that the Army will stick by its own rules.

These rules, for example, require that posts housing tactical units have a division reinforced by support and logistical troops, that is, 20,000 to 25,000 men. The regulation says further that the post should not be larger than 25,000 men.

The regulation, AR 210–15, also calls for grouping activities at single posts for reasons of economy and efficiency. This could mean using an arsenal-depot complex for the activities of several different technical services.

At 20,000 men per post, the Army would require 20 posts in the United States. It has, of course, far more. There are in fact few posts at which there are 20,000 assigned. And, of course, there are not 400,000 men in CONUS assigned to tactical or basic training units.

While the above is an oversimplification of the purpose and intent of the new regulation, the regulation certainly confirms the fact that centralization continues to be the Army's policy. I wonder if it should be.

Unfortunately, there is little the Army can do to change this policy. The arguments in favor of continued centralization are persuasive these days. A single central heating plant, a single large power station, a single consolidated messhall or office building or industrial (factory) complex is cheaper to run and easier to maintain.

Control is also easier when larger numbers of men are gathered into a single area. Statistics are more meaningful when applied to large groups than to small. This makes prediction of requirements at large posts easier. And if prediction is easier, then budget planning is easier, because it depends on forecasts of requirements.

The key is, of course, budget planning.

In this Army regulation, the all-pervading control of the Bureau of the Budget is apparent. The Budget Bureau neither wrote nor approved this regulation, but the Bureau was laid down broad guidelines which say in effect, "So long as you reduce costs, what you do is good. If you can't show continued savings or if you ask for more money, we'll chop you down."

Centralization is a requirement, even though Budget never says a word about it. Saving money overrides such other considerations as:

Dispersal: For a potential attacker with lots of weapons, how nice of the Army to put its combat strength together in division-size targets. Four or five good sized bombs wipe out a division and its support and their equipment.

Community relations: "Out of sight, out of mind." The fewer posts the Army has, the fewer communities will be closely connected with the military. The fewer communities that see soldiers regularly, the fewer people who will be aware of what the Army is and what its needs are. The fewer who know the Army, the less support it will have from the general public. The less support the Army has, the less pressure there will be for money to meet modern Army needs. This balances budgets.

Centralization and the arguments for it ignore modern communications potential—ADPS, transceiver, teletype and similar means—which have made separation of units unimportant.

Also ignored is the requirement that relatively junior officers such as colonels (a major general must command a post of 20,000 to 25,000 men) are better prepared to be effective commanders if they must solve daily problems on their own. The close control that is exercised at large posts destroys initiative.

This regulation proves again that the dollar is in command. Decentralization, dispersal of units and facilities to a reasonable degree would certainly cost money, even $100 million or $200 million. This is a sum that the powers that be figure is worth saving.

But investment of this amount could pay off handsomely. The payoff, however, can't be assigned a dollar value that can be computed. So the budgeteers can't recognize it. This is too bad for the Army.

[From the Army Times, May 7, 1960]

KIBITZER'S SEAT—COST AND CONFUSION OF MISSILE PROGRAM

(By Monte Bourjaily, Jr.)

The Army at present has under development or in operation 15 missiles. Since 1943, it has worked on 19 by itself and 2 more with the Navy. Of these 21, then, 6 missile programs have been canceled. The cost of the canceled programs has been $168.7 million for the four solely Army missiles canceled and $26.9 million for the two joint Army-Navy development projects.

The Navy today has 14 guided missiles under development or in operation. Since

1943, it has done developmental work on 30 missiles, by itself plus the 2 it worked on with the Army referred to above. Cost of developing the 16 canceled missiles has been $680.4 plus the Navy share of the $26.9 million for the 2 joint missile projects.

Since 1946 (possibly earlier), the Air Force has worked on 31 different Missiles. Of these today 12 are either operational or under development. The Air Force has done no joint work with the other services, although it transferred to the Army its interest in and work on the land-based Talos. The Defense Department charges the Talos to the Air Force.

Cost of the 19 Air Force missile projects canceled is $1,451.5 million.

Total cost to the Defense Department of 41 missile projects which went into development but have not paid off in usable military weapons systems has been $2,327.5 million. Of this almost half the missiles and more than half the cost are chargeable to the Air Force.

Sources for the above information are:

Missiles operational or under development—Defense Department Fact Sheet or Guided Missiles and Rockets (no rockets are included in the above figures, by the way) dated April 4, 1960 and carrying the release number 344–60.

Missile projects which went into development and were "canceled, terminated or reorientated"—a Defense Department table appearing on page 262 of part 7 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the Appropriations committee of the House on the 1961 defense appropriations, released to the press and public on April 27.

Not included in the recitation of cancellations, etc., are such missiles and the funds spent for them as Snark and Bomarc. Snark is an operational missile. Bomarc, according to the same hearings, is partially operational, although it will not achieve operational readiness (the Air Force calls it C–2 status) for some months in its "A" or short-range version, will not achieve C–2 status for the "B" or long-range version for at least 2 years. This C–2 status, by the way, is actually less than 80 percent ready.

These figures are called to your attention because of the recent decision by the British to cancel their Blue Streak IRBM to abandon any idea of having missiles in stationary positions and to convert their forecs to fully mobile ground, sea, air, and even missile forces as the best military posture in the atomic era.

The cost, the British have found, is too great in terms of treasure to be spent and lives threatened for them to adopt the maginot line strategy of digging into fire back when attacked.

The indicated conclusions above need not suggest, even require, a detailed investigation of the Defense Department missile program and the approaches used by each of the services to missile development. Such an investigation, undertaken with the goal in mind of setting up a development agency likely to produce the most for the least expense in money and manpower, could pay off in better defense for less money. But those who sponsored such an investigation would have to be willing to be bound by the results and not let political and industrial pressures sway them.

More than $2.3 billion, plus additional sums spent on such marginal programs as Bomarc is turning out to be, could have been far better spent in other areas.

But a course leading to best use of R. & W. dollars in the future will require far stronger leadership than has been exhibited up to now. At the moment, it is hard to see where such leadership is coming from.

Student Addresses at Convocation Honoring Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Dougherty, New President of Seton Hall University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend and address a convocation last Wednesday, May 25, in honor of the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Dougherty, new president of Seton Hall University. The convocation, held in the Alexander Hamilton Hotel, Paterson, N.J., was the first to be held by Seton Hall's Paterson college.

A most interesting program included talks by Monsignor Dougherty, Msgr. Thomas J. Gilhooly, and Dean Edward Fitzgibbons. Spokesmen for the students were Miss Anne Longstreet, sophomore, whose subject was "The Contrast Between Two Revolutions," and Mr. Louis A. Gallo, a senior, who discussed "Federal Aid to Education." I am inserting these student speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN TWO REVOLUTIONS

(By Miss Anne Longstreet)

In March 1848, the people of Hungary, spurred on by events in Paris and Vienna, established a modern constitutional regime with the Austrian emperor as King of Hungary. When the Austrians refused to cooperate with the new government and incited the subject nationalities to revolt, the Hungarians bravely defended their freedom, and when all hope of agreement with Austria had disappeared, declared their independence. They were, despite their courage, defeated by the combined forces of Austria and Russia and remained subject to Austrian despotism until 1867, when the dual monarchy was created.

Again in 1956, the people of Hungary revolted against oppression, this time against Russian Communist oppression. The people of Budapest fought tanks with their bare hands and for 5 amazing days seemed to have triumphed. Hungary declared its neutrality and political freedom was restored. The dream was ended when the Russians, on the morning of November 4, attacked the city and, after several days of hard fighting, finally subdued resistance.

Surprising likenesses appear between the Hungarian revolution of 1848 against the Hapsburg monorachy and the 1956 revolt against the Communist regime. The fact that the first was a revolt against the extreme right while the second was directed against the far left is of less importance than first appearances would indicate. Totalitarian governments, whether rightist or leftist, are remarkably alike, and the two revolutions against them display many significant similarities, as well as several important differences.

The conditions in the country in prerevolutionary times are similar. Hungary was ruled by an authoritan government in each case—in one instance by the Austrian monarch and the aristocrats of Hungary, in the other by the Stalinists Rakosi and Gero and their underlings. In each case, a constitution existed—in 1848 the Golden Bull of feudal times, guaranteeing the rights of the Hungarian nobles and slightly limiting the Austrian crown, in 1956 a constitution embodying on paper the liberties usually associated with democratic governments. In each case, the constitution was violated. A legislative body without real power—in 1848 the feudal diet, in 1956 the national assembly—existed, but while the diet held many responsible leaders and provided the springboard for the 1848 revolt, the national assembly of 1956 had nothing at all to do with the revolution. This is explained by the fact that, while in 1848 the common nobility, which elected deputies to the diet's lower house, often voted for outstanding liberals, the membership of the 1956 national assembly was made up entirely of Communist puppets placed there by rigged elections.

The economic exploitation of Hungary under both regimes presents many parallels. Hungary was, in 1848, an extremely backward nation. Agriculture was primitive, roads were almost nonexistent, river transportation was poor, and the country was in bad financial shape. Austria treated Hungary as an agricultural province, forcing her to sell grain cheaply to Austria through the imposition of an export tax, while crippling industrial development by customs policies which forced the Magyars to buy manufactured items almost exclusively from Austria. This treatment compares strikingly with Russian treatment of Hungary.

The country is still backward in comparison with Western nations. Though the Russians have indeed industrialized the nation to a considerable degree, this has not always been in Hungary's best interests, for she has not the resources to support the extensive heavy industry Russia desires, and much coal and iron must be imported. Trade agreements between the two countries have been arranged to Russia's advantage and Hungary is, when possible, drained of her resources. Thus, just before the revolt broke out, the Soviets began to exploit in Russia's interest the newly discovered uranium deposits of Hungary on terms dictated to the Hungarian puppet government. Rural discontent, present in 1848 when emancipation of the serfs and land reform were so desperately needed, appeared again in 1956 in the peasants' discontent under the collective system and their willingness to disband it at the first opportunity.

The upper classes took a major part in the 1848 revolt, comprising the leadership of both conservatives and liberals. The 1956 rebel disclaimed all connection with the former aristocracy and refused to allow them any part in the uprising. But while the Communists, as a matter of course, also disclaimed any connection with an upper class, Mr. Djilas' concept of the new class under communism invites comparison of the Communist elite with the aristocratic elite of 1848. While it would be dangerous to carry the comparison too far, the similarities of the two classes shed light on the class structure of authoritarian governments.

The police state in Hungary was not an invention of the Russians. The Austrians too had their infamous prisons, notably that at Spielberg, and they had their secret police as well. Censorship was enforced, then as in 1956. The AVO, the secret police organization, refined the techniques of repression under the tutelage of the Soviets and made them a far more significant force in the daily life of the population; the mass distrust and fear existing in Communist Hungary was not found in 1848. Nonetheless, they by no means originated these techniques. It is interesting to note that a short time before each revolution, these repressive measures were somewhat relaxed. Thus in the 1840's Kossuth could publish a newspaper openly advocating liberal ideas, and in 1956 the

Petofi Circle could criticize the regime at public meetings without reprisal.

Nationalism played an impressive role in the course of both revolts. Indeed, in one sense the 1956 revolution seems almost an anachronism, a nationalist revolt against foreign dominion, carried on with 19th century gallantry and sentiment in the Atomic Age. While domestic conditions cannot be thrust aside, hatred and resentment of foreign control played a major part in each rebellion. In 1848 the nationalist movement was at its zenith. It was a time of quarrels over language and national symbols, a time when nationalist aspirations were awakened among the peoples of central Europe and were, it seemed, about to be fulfilled. Again in 1956, resurgent Hungarian nationalism, seizing as its inspiration the traditions of 1848, demanded an end to Russian hegemony and the withdrawal of Russian troops.

One element in the nationalist picture of 1848 was missing, however, in that of 1956. In 1848, nationalism, having sparked the revolt, also proved its downfall. The ambitions of the Serbs, Slovenes, and Croats, encouraged by Austria and unfairly supressed by the Magyars, divided the country at a crucial moment and forced Hungary to fight two enemies at once. Further, by the final act of nationalism, the Declaration of Independence, the Magyars lost needed support, both at home and abroad. This element of internal dissension and minority dispute was absent in 1956, partially because Hungary had since lost most of her minorities to surrounding countries, partially because of the universal hatred of communism. In 1956, the nation was united.

Each revolution was touched off by disturbances in other countries, that of 1848 by revolts in Paris and Vienna, that of 1956 by uprisings in Poland. Moreover, in their originators the two rebellions are similar. Students, writers, and other intellectuals provided the inspiration of each movement. This to a certain extent is true of all revolutions—the revolutionary student is a perennial character, as recent events demonstrate. But the part played by the writers and students of 1956 is particularly outstanding. They not only provide the intellectual ammunition of the revolt and organized demonstrations, but served as military leaders of the workers as well. The revolt of 1956 was carried on consciously in the traditions of 1848. The poems of Petofi, the words of Kossuth, the deeds of Bem, the Marseillaise, these old revolutionary symbols rallied the people. Liberal ideas of freedom provided the basis for many of the student and worker demands.

There are, however, several important differences that should be stressed. The liberal economic ideas of 1848 had no place in the 1956 programs. On the contrary, most of the rebel leaders were committed to some form of socialism. The workers, the industrialized proletariat, scarcely existed in 1848 and had no part in the revolt; in 1956 they were its backbone. Without the support of their members it could never have succeeded, even for so brief a time. This is the more significant because the regime had done so much for the "loyal workers" of Red Csepel.

The two revolutions are similar in the course of events they followed as well as in the conditions provoking them. The rebellion of 1956 compresses into a few weeks events that took over a year in 1848, yet the pattern is definitely similar. Both revolts seemed at first to succeed with almost no opposition; there followed close on initial happenings a period of quiet and apparent victory. Neither revolt is characterized by the excesses so common, for example, in France; the 1953 revolutionaries in particular labored to see that no stain should fall on their movement, and isolated lynchings of AVO men are the one understandable blot on their record. Pleas for the support of Western nations were addressed in both cases, but though sympathy for Hungary existed, no tangible help was forthcoming. In 1849, in words strangely apropos for 1956, Daniel Webster remarked, "We have had our sympathies much enlisted in the Hungarian effort for liberty. We have all wept at its failure." In both instances, however, tears were the only contribution of the nations.

Both revolts were betrayed, that of 1848 by the secret machinations of Austria and the repudiation of her promises, that of 1956 by the ruse of negotiation followed by the surprise attack on Budapest. Russian armies, sent respectively by Czar Nicholas I and Khrushchev, crushed all resistance, though it is interesting to note that the czar later recommended mercy toward the defeated Hungarians—a recommendation that the Austrians disregarded.

The 1956 revolt, because of its spontaneous nature and the rapidity of its progress, did not develop outstanding leaders, men of the stature of Kossuth, Deak, and Gorgy. Imre Nagy was a somewhat reluctant tool of the revolt, and was accepted as the best man in the circumstances, but was hardly the ideal leader. Nor did Cardinal Mindzenty, upon his release, significantly affect the course of events. The one exception was Pal Maleter, the strategist of Budapest, who accomplished marvels in the defense of the Kilian barracks. The Russians made sure of his capture before attacking the city on the morning of November 4.

Can we now venture to compare the results of the two revolutions? Hungary returned to despotism in 1848, a number of executions took place, and only in 1867 was a compromise solution worked out. Liberalism and democracy did not triumph as a result of the revolt. Again in 1956, the country returned to tyranny and despotism and reprisals were taken, and are still being taken, against the people. The final solution of this rebellion is a thing no one would dare to predict.

The similarities between these revolts have meaning for free men at this time. They prove that people are basically alike, that in 1956 as in 1848 they were concerned with personal and political liberty and economic well-being; that the Communist state has no magic power over the minds of men and that George Orwell's "1984" is no more than a nightmare. The similarity of tyrannical governments, regardless of time and place, is shown most clearly. The importance of nationalism and the danger of discounting it as a force in the world today are shown by the fact that it played as important a role in the 20th century revolution as in the one a century before. We see this in the rise of the new nations of Africa and in the disasterous consequences that have attended the attempted suppression of nationalism. Finally these similarities demonstrate that people of any age will fight for liberty—a lesson many were in danger of forgetting until the 1956 revolt proved it once again.

Federal Aid To Education

(By Louis A. Gallo)

Federal aid to education has become a most controversial issue in our time. It is not the purpose of this discourse, however, to make a stand for or against such a proposal. Instead, by giving the historical background of the subject, by stating the problems that make it an issue * * * the way to the solution may be better perceived. It would be well at this time to recall the recent words of former President Hoover who said that a nation that does not know its history will be forced to live it again.

The first major instance of assistance by our National Government occurred in 1785, 4 years before the Constitution of the United States had even been ratified. It was effected by the land ordinance of that year which provided that 1 square mile of every township be set aside "for the maintenance of public schools within said township." This policy was restated 2 years later in the ordinance of 1787 which referred to the Northwest Territory, an area represented today by the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota. article 3 of this northwest ordinance reads: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

After 1800, this education assistance policy was extended further when the Federal Government would set aside certain lands in almost every new State for educational purposes. Indirect financial assistance was realized under the Jackson administration when the Surplus Revenue Deposit Act of 1836 provided for the distribution of a $28 million surplus in Federal funds to the State governments, the major portion of which was utilized for educational purposes. During this middle period of our history, it was apparent that a healthy republic required higher education in order to produce the necessary qualities of leadership in its citizenry. Therefore, between the end of the Revolution and the beginning of the Civil War, 21 public universities were established throughout the 28 States. Although these institutions of higher learning evolved from State grants in the original Eastern States, the universities founded in the new States were largely aided by Federal grants in the form of public land.

Another example of financial assistance was achieved during the Lincoln administration when the Morrill Act was passed in 1862. Although this same bill was vetoed by President Buchanan in 1857 on the grounds that it violated States rights and set up dangerous precedents of Federal aid to education, it nevertheless received the signature of Presdent Lincoln 5 years later. By its provisions, each State was granted 30,000 acres of public land for each of its Congressmen. Upon the sale of these lands, the proceeds were to be devoted to the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. In some States where no university had yet been established, these land-grant colleges were the first examples of higher education.

After the Federal Department of Education had been created in 1867, it seemed that Federal aid in the post Civil War era would be increased. However, after the Civil War, there were several proposals for Federal aid which never left the halls of Congress. At this time the necessity of assistance was obvious because of the following factors:

1. The war had lain waste the educational facilities of the South.
2. Four million slaves had been liberated.
3. And a great desire for national unity had been stimulated.

The first attempt to enact legislation was made by Representative George F. Hoar of Massachusetts on February 25, 1870. In short, it was "to establish a national system of education". Such a proposal met opposition, not only from public opinion, but also from the professional educators of the time, led by the National Education Association. In speaking before the NEA in 1871, James P. Wickersham (superintendent of common schools of Pennsylvania) condemned the proposal on the grounds of dubious constitutionality and contrary to the views of the Founding Fathers and leading statesmen of the Nation. This bill never came to a vote in either house of Congress.

The remainder of the 1870's had two more proposals of Federal aid—the Perce bill of 1872 and the Burnside bill which was introduced in 1879, both of which contained

provisions which were similar to the Morrill Act; i.e., the land-grant system. Neither could gain the approval of both Houses of Congress.

The 1880's saw the crystallization of the varying arguments for and against Federal aid. The cause of this crystallization was the Blair bills which were constantly proposed in the Senate by Senator Henry W. Blair of New Hampshire. Basically, he proposed aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools. The only cause of defeat to be found was that the farm and labor groups of that time were too preoccupied with immediate economic problems to give extensive attention to educational matters. However, this era of 1870–1890 did have successful proposals of limited Federal aid. I refer to the Hatch Experiment Station Act of 1887, and the second Morrill Act which was passed in 1890. Both rendered direct financial assistance to higher education, particularly the land-grant colleges. Thus the 19th century came to a close within which were contained many examples of Federal aid to education.

In recent years numerous examples of Federal aid may be cited: in 1914, the Smith-Lever Act, the ultimate purpose of which was to raise the level of American rural life, was the spark which caused a $41 million expenditure through the Department of Agriculture for more cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics.

Legislation which provided for school lunches for nonpublic as well as public schools was at first a depression measure of the thirties and was made permanent by legislation in 1946 and 1948.

Federal aid to vocational education had its inception with the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 which distributed Federal funds to promote the teaching of agriculture, home economics, and the trades in secondary schools. This was bolstered by the George-Reed, George-Ellzey, and George-Deen Acts in 1929, 1934, and 1936 respectively. In 1949, vocational education received an expenditure of $27 million from the Office of Education.

The depression years contained numerous examples of Federal aid to education. To cite a few: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration were to give relief and vocational training to unemployed youths—the latter organization actually assisting students to continue their schooling and college education. The Public Works Administration gave funds for school and college building construction; and the Works Projects Administration promoted activities in adult, worker, vocational, and immigrant education.

War and defense training was the stimulus between 1940 and 1945 when approximately $500 million was spent for war work. Also during these war years, the Lanham Act gave Federal funds to aid the financing of public school buildings and services in regions that experienced undue hardships during the war-boom days.

By far the greatest expenditure to date by our Government was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, otherwise known as the GI bill of rights. This act provided tuition, subsistence, books, and supplies, equipment, and counseling services for veterans to continue their school or college education. By the deadline year of 1951, some 8 million veterans received benefits totaling $14 billion. These benefits were renewed in 1952, nonprofit colleges and universities received $300 million from the Federal Government to promote fundamental research and the training of personnel of vital importance to the general welfare.

Student exchange programs received their impetus from the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts. The Federal Government is also credited for giving well over $3 million to the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in 1949.

And more recently, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides loans to students, financial aid to strengthen instruction, fellowships, guidance counseling, language development, research in the various media of communication, area vocational education, science information service, the improvement of statistical services.

You have heard a brief sketch of the history of Federal Aid to education. It is sufficient to prove that there is ample historical precedent for it should also be perceived that every generation of Americans has been cognizant of a most important fact: That for a mature electorate, more than a basic education is a most essential ingredient in order to maintain a republic based on democratic principles. It is my contention that this same important fact is being ignored today. The issue in our time is not one of whether the Government should merely aid private as well as public education. The professor of political philosophy and historical jurisprudence in the Fordham University Graduate School, Father Joseph F. Costanzo, S.J., states the problem quite succinctly:

Summarily and cumulatively the objections which have frustrated the passage of a Federal aid bill for general education are as follows:

1. The express or effective exclusion of religious schools from the benefits of Federal aid programs or the exclusion of even auxiliary aids for parochial school children.

2. Fear of Federal control of education incident to or, if provided against by the terms of the legislation, inherently potential in the power of the purse which court intrepretation might uphold as legitimate jurisdictional supervision and direction.

3. Opposition to "creeping socialism" in Government.

4. Suspicion of Federal encroachments in a domain traditionally entrusted to local communities and the States.

5. The dread of increased taxation.

6. And, most recently, the stipulation that Federal funds be available only to such States as manifest concrete evidence of a gradual and effective cooperation with the desegregation decision.

Thus Federal aid to education has evolved into a most complex problem. The solution does not seem imminent. One can rest assured that the true solution lies in the American tradition of compromise. Such a means will require much wisdom. In his inaugural address, our own university president stated:

"If I may indulge in prophecy and run the hazards attendant to prediction, I foresee a day when the American people will have reached that measure of cultural maturity and that depth of social wisdom that will endorse Government support of private as well as public education."

Let us, therefore, educators and students alike, strive as never before to acquire this cultural maturity and social wisdom * * * in order that this problem and any others which may confront us will achieve the proper solution. It would be well to conclude with the appropriate words of former President Truman which were uttered on November 11, 1949:

"The beliefs on which we have founded our form of government are under attack. It is only the people of religious faith throughout the world who have the power to overcome the force of tyranny. Their religious concepts are the only sure foundation of the democratic ideal."

Thank you.

Merchant Marine a Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in 1933 the Congress established May 22 as National Maritime Day in commemoration of the first crossing of the Atlantic Ocean by an American-flag steamship. The name of the vessel, by the way, was the *Savannah*, also the name of this Nation's, and the world's, first nuclear-powered merchant ship launched last year.

Since the beginning of this Republic, Americans have been going down to the sea in ships because of the long coastlines and excellent harbors with which this country is blessed and because our leaders have always understood that to be a great world power a nation must be a great naval power.

On May 24 the Baltimore News-Post, which won awards for its editorials, its typography, and its news pictures in 1959, published a most persuasive editorial entitled "Merchant Marine—A Line of Defense." Its concluding sentence read:

Whatever the combined costs [of a merchant marine program], they will be billions of dollars less than the cost of losing a war—or of losing a peace.

Those are words, Mr. President, that have the ring of convincing truth. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of the Baltimore News-Post, entitled "Merchant Marine—A Line of Defense," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE A LINE OF DEFENSE

It is axiomatic that an American merchant marine is necessary for our national independence and, in time of war, for our national survival.

In peace, we must have merchant ships to transport raw materials to our industries from oversea areas, to distribute our products abroad, and to convey at least a share of our tourist travel. It has been argued that we could profitably rely on other seafaring nations for these services, but experience has proved otherwise.

In war, the Armed Forces must have a marine auxiliary. Two world wars have demonstrated that we cannot borrow nor hire one from other lands. In both wars, we had to improvise a merchant marine, at great cost, after the wars began.

The solution is a permanent merchant marine to serve our peacetime trade routes and to be immediately available for war requirements. This in turn necessitates shipyards on our own shores.

Congress has provided for our needs in a Merchant Marine Act. Under the law, the Federal Government subsidizes both the construction and operation of cargo and passenger ships. Other maritime countries do likewise, but the subsidy method is especially essential for us beacuse of lower construction and maintenance costs paid by our foreign competitors.

And the subsidy plan, over a long term of years, is far less costly to us than the emergency construction of ships during war.

The Merchant Marine Act calls for a consistent program for maintaining a merchant fleet, including replacements as vessels grow old.

Unfortunately, however, Congress has not been appropriating sufficient funds, and consequently our merchant marine is growing obsolete and even dwindling away while rival powers—including Soviet Russia—are forging ahead on the high seas.

To eliminate this danger to our security—and in observance of Maritime Day (today)—Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, is sponsoring a double legislative program, calling for increased shipbuilding and a 10-year oceanography study plan.

The oceanography work, in which we lag seriously, would require about a billion dollars in all. Merchant marine requirements would be financed on a basis of needs. Whatever the combined costs, they will be billions of dollars less than the cost of losing a war—or of losing a peace.

Federal Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, with the question of action this year on pay raises for Federal employees coming to a head, we need not go any further than an advertisement in a recent issue of the popular Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, to find a comprehensive presentation supporting such legislation.

I refer to a full back-page advertisement sponsored by WQMR, "The Radio Voice of Government People in the Nation's Capital," which was presented in the April 11 issue of Roll Call as a public service.

In a concise, hard-hitting, factual report directed to the attention of Members of Congress, the ad sets forth a most convincing case for the passage of pay raise legislation.

I fully support H.R. 9883 and am privileged to be among the sponsors of companion legislation. I have studied the various arguments pro and con on the subject and am firmly convinced of the vital need for this justifiable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the case is so well put in the advertisement by WQMR, that I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: PLEASE READ THESE FACTS CONCERNING H.R. 9883 PROVIDING MODEST SALARY INCREASES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

FACT

1. In private industry, salaries have risen in proportion to both the cost of living index and the worker's increased productivity. While more extensive statistics are available on private industry workers' increased productivity, a highly credited study on this subject in respect to Federal employees already exists. This was made by Henry D. Lytton, an economic consultant who has served both Government and industry. Mr. Lytton's study, in condensed form, appeared as a lead article in November 1959 issue of the Review of Economics and Statistics, published by Harvard University. The findings, based on 67 percent of the 1958 total of 1,182,711 nondefense Federal employees, arrive at this conclusion:

Federal employee productivity increased 17 percent in a period of 12 fiscal years, through June 30, 1958.

The above conclusion is reasonable in the light of the trend per man-hour in the private economy. Hence a Federal pay increase is justified on the basis of productivity.

FACT

2. Despite such salary increases as have been granted, classified Federal employees now have less purchasing power than provided by 1939 salaries.

Salaries in terms of purchasing power

[Based on CPI for August 1939 and January 1960]

General schedule grade	1939 salary	1960 salary		Percent increase needed to restore 1939 purchasing power
		Amount	In 1939 dollars	
5	$2,000	$4,040	$1,900	5.2
7	2,600	4,980	2,343	11.0
9	3,200	5,985	2,815	13.6
11	3,800	7,030	3,307	14.9
13	5,600	9,890	4,653	20.3

Source: Official statistics of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

FACT

3. The above-indicated loss of purchasing power, plus the disparity between Government and industry pay rates, for comparable work, has produced acute recruiting and retention problems which have certainly not increased the efficiency of Federal Government operation.

Below are two typical examples of pay rates for specific work in private industry in 10 key cities, compared with Government salaries for the same work:

	Average Government pay	Average private industry pay for same work
Senior draftsman, GS-5	$4,560	$5,504-$6,860
Tabulating machine operator, GS-3	3,814	4,225-5,321

Sumner H. Slichter, professor of economics, Harvard, offers these two significant facts in the course of a study of private industry pay:

(a) For the entire period (1948-58) the rise in compensation per man-hour was 63.3 percent.

(b) In every one of these 10 years, without exception, average hourly compensation of all employees in private industry rose more than the Consumer Price Index.

Compare Dr. Slichter's findings with the plight of a top-grade letter carrier. In 1948 such a 25-year veteran received $3,850. Today's top-grade letter carrier receives $5,175. This is but a 34-percent increase compared to Dr. Slichter's statistic of a 63.3-percent increase for workers in private industry, during the same 10-year period.

FACT

4. H.R. 9883 would raise classified Federal salaries an approximate average of 9 percent. Certainly this is a modest proposal in view of the rise in the cost of living and increased productivity. Passage of the bill would have the further advantage of reducing the cost to the taxpayer imposed by the present high rate of personnel turnover in Federal employment.

Certainly a pay increase will help reduce personnel turnover which is so costly and wasteful of Federal funds. The Government is losing a large proportion of its personnel during the first 5 to 10 years of service. As any businessman can testify, training, and retraining persons for the same job due to turnover can be an expensive process. Passage of H.R. 9883 would definitely contribute toward a reduction in personnel turnover and its accompanying high cost to the Government and ultimately to the taxpayer.

We respectfully urge your careful consideration of this bill as a means of helping to raise the earnings of the Federal worker toward the level of his counterpart in private industry and as an incentive to still greater productivity.

(Presented as a public service by WQMR, "The Radio Voice of Government People in the Nation's Capital.")

Saluting the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the Salvation Army celebrated its 80th anniversary.

For eight decades, the Army—symbolic not of destruction, but of dedication to bettering human life—has magnificently performed individual and community services for our people. These have included: family emergency relief; disaster aid; social welfare; and a wide variety of other activities—including providing houses of worship and spiritual guidance for millions of people.

The Nation, I believe, owes a real debt of gratitude to the dedicated individuals who have carried on the splendid work of the Army.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a splendid editorial reviewing the 80 years of service.

Reflecting the work of this dedicated organization in creating a better world, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, May 28, 1960]

WE SALUTE SALVATION ARMY, CELEBRATING 80 YEARS OF SERVICE IN UNITED STATES

This week has been designated National Salvation Army Week in tribute to its 80 years of service in the United States.

The Salvation Army became active in La Crosse soon after the turn of the century. During these years it has offered its spiritual guidance and way of life to those who have no church affiliation and who are in need of help. This newspaper is proud to join with others in our area in honoring it.

From a pioneer band of one man and seven women, who landed at the Battery in New York City 80 years ago, the Salvation Army has grown to a force in this country of more than 5,000 officers, assisted by 12,000 helpers.

This great organization has 1,109 corps, 165 outposts and 7,275 other centers of operation, including 6,337 extension units.

Its community services have included family emergency relief, transient assistance, disaster aid and a social store.

The Salvation Army is more than a house of worship. It is also a neighborhood center, where boys and girls, adults and senior citizens participate in constructive recreational activities and receive spiritual guidance.

In 118 centers across the country homeless men with alcoholic and other problems are returned to useful living through the Salvation Army's well-planned care and treatment program.

Underprivileged children are given weeks of health-giving activities at Salvation Army camps. All this and more make up the Salvation Army's program of selfless service.

An outstanding characteristic of the organization through the years has been its vigorous effort to alleviate the miseries of mankind.

Its approach was thought novel and while its methods have often changed through the years, it continues to feed the hungry, care for the poor, clothe the naked, befriend the friendless and strengthen man's faith in himself and his God.

For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.—II Corinthians 5: 1.

Wanda May Wood of Shamrock, Tex., Elected to Scholastic Honor Society of Gallaudet College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great personal pleasure to announce that Miss Wanda May Wood of Shamrock, Tex., has been elected to the scholastic honor society of Gallaudet College, the world's only college for the deaf. She is the first student from Texas ever to be accorded such a distinct honor.

This young lady, the daughter of Mrs. J. E. Wood of Shamrock, not only achieved membership in the Phi Alpha Pi Society of the college, but also received the Thomas S. Marr Award for outstanding academic achievement and scholarship. A senior at the college, Miss Wood will graduate this month with the highest average in her class. She was also a dean's list student during her studies.

Outstanding as they are, the accomplishments of this Texas coed have by no means been limited to the scholastic field. She just recently reigned as Sweetheart of Alpha Sigma Pi Fraternity during its 11th annual carnival held at Gallaudet. Members of the fraternity named Miss Wood their sweetheart in honor of her leadership, scholarship, and character.

Miss Wood, truly outstanding both as a scholar and as an individual, is a credit not only to the city of Shamrock and the State of Texas, but to the entire Nation as well. For her determination and many achievements, Miss Wood certainly deserves the best wishes and earnest praise of us all.

Should Service Hospitals Be Merged?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the high cost of duplicity in some branches of our Federal Government accentuated by tradition is well described in an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer.

This editorial refers in particular to Government operated and maintained hospitals for the military.

In order that the contents of this editorial may be made available for reading by other Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD SERVICE HOSPITALS BE MERGED?

Esprit de corps is a most valuable intangible which every serviceman should possess to do his best in our Armed Forces. A uniform common to all branches of the service has been discussed, with few takers. There is precious little individuality left for a man in the Armed Forces, and certainly he deserves whatever distinction his peculiar uniform gives him.

But when he is ill and in a hospital he does not wear a uniform. He wears pajamas or a hospital gown. The uniform is no longer a factor. And there is no appreciable difference between a competent Army, Navy, or Air Force physician or nurse.

Thus, we do not believe that a merger of military hospitals in the interests of economy and realistic use of bed space would harm esprit de corps in the slightest, and for this reason we are most interested in the report of Phil G. Goulding of the Plain Dealer's Washington bureau, which presents such facts as the following:

Two military hospitals in Virginia, within 6 miles of each other, have a combined capacity of 358 beds. A recent check showed they had 82 patients.

The Army hospital at Carlisle Barracks and the Olmstead Air Force Base Hospital, 30 minutes apart by automobile, have a combined capacity of 96 beds, yet only 36 were being used when the check was made.

The Air Force hospital at Denver has 350 beds and the Fitzsimons Army Hospital, 6 miles away, has 900 beds and could handle 2,078. Yet the 350-bed hospital had only 51 patients and the 900-bed hospital only 684.

In and around San Francisco the 3 services have 4 hospitals with a total capacity of 5,235 beds. Yet only 2,250 were being used.

All told, some 275 hospitals are operated by the military, two-thirds of them being in the United States, the rest overseas. Total bed capacity is around 105,000—but the average patient load is only 40,000—less than 40 percent of capacity.

Certainly, one can never be sure exactly what the hospital load will be, and sufficient hospital space should be immediately available for an emergency. But until such an emergency arises, a great deal of money could be saved if the services would double up, and temporarily close the hospitals which are not needed.

Since the staff of such a combined hospital would contain physicians and nurses from all three services, this would seem to answer the criticism that the morale of the patient is higher when he is being cared for by his own people.

Since the medical program of the Armed Forces costs taxpayers nearly half a billion dollars a year, a merger of military hospitals is certainly worth close examination.

Israel and Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this body have been deeply concerned with the campaign now being waged by the Arab countries against the independence and the survival of Israel. Egypt, in pursuit of this campaign, is carrying on even now an economic boycott against Israel.

Mr. Speaker, surely this great Nation of ours, which believes so strongly in the principles of freedom, and which played such a vital role in the original establishment of Israel as an oasis of American ideals of peace and freedom in the critical Middle East, should never in any way, either indirectly or directly, do anything to support or assist in this vicious kind of campaign.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include on that important subject a thoughtful editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of May 2, 1960. The editorial follows:

ISRAEL AND EGYPT

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, recently voted against a majority of his colleagues in their refusal to vote funds to help Egypt carry on its economic boycott against Israel, and thus put himself in a curiously contradictory position. A majority from both political parties saw no reason why the United States should continue sending mutual security funds to Egypt while the latter seeks to destroy the economy of Israel.

Senator FULBRIGHT thus sides with Nasser, Senator KEATING says the United States is weary of Nasser's use of the Suez Canal as a political pawn. The Nasser view is that: Egypt won't open the canal to Israeli shipping because a state of war exists between the two countries. Nasser has repeatedly flouted requests of the U.N. and President Eisenhower to reopen the canal.

Israel, after the war of 1956, withdrew its forces from the battle zone of Egypt. Partly upon assurance that it would have access to the canal and at a time when some military experts say its army could have pushed on to Cairo. Thus Senator FULBRIGHT, in his position, becomes a partisan in a war against a country which also receives funds from America.

No less disturbing an inconsistency is the World Bank's $56 million loan to Egypt to widen and improve the Suez, which is closed to not only Israeli ships but any ships which touch Israel's shores. The World Bank, an arm of the U.N., thus sides for a war to help one of the belligerents.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial in Monmouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, national interest in a proposed memorial to Woodrow Wilson was indicated a few months ago when many distinguished Americans gave their views on the form such a memorial could take. This interest is encouraging to all who believe that an appropriate memorial should arise in Washington, D.C., to honor the great American who spoke so eloquently on national and international purpose.

It is heartening, also, to receive indications that New Jersey citizens have a lively interest in the man who served as Governor of that State before assuming the responsibilities of the Presidency. Benjamin Boisseau Bobbitt, editor of the Monmouth American, Long Branch, N.J., expressed that interest on May 19 in an editorial which proposed that local Wilson memorial markers should be located within New Jersey.

Mr. President, during the Woodrow Wilson centennial observances of 1956 and 1957, and in the years following, Americans demonstrated that they have a lasting admiration for Wilson. Memorials in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere would give expression to that admiration.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL IN MONMOUTH

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS has been doing a nice job for a centennial memorial to Woodrow Wilson in Washington, D.C., also, might well have some memorial markers at spots which there were notable events connected with the career of the man, head of the Nation, was the sole Jerseyman to go from our statehouse to the White House.

Should not Monmouth County also have markers at several places at which the late President was a figure? The Sea Girt encampment witnessed the notification of the presidential nomination and long waiting hours during the convention battle which was climaxed by the nomination.

Press Plaza at Asbury Park, it seems, should have a marker to remind that the presidential executive offices were in the bank building next to the Press, where White House correspondents waited two nights and a day for the decision as to who had won the presidential contest of 1916.

West Long Branch should have a marker at Monmouth College, where the President conducted his campaign for reelection in 1916 and Long Branch one at the West End station site where the President was met and welcomed by Mayor Marshall Woolley and party and where delegations debarked from special trains and marched with bands and banners to Shadow Lawn, the summer White House to hear the President speak.

In September 1915, President Wilson named this committee to secure for and offer to him the place: J. Lyle Kinmonth, John W. Slocum, Benjamin B. Bobbitt, Congressman Thomas J. Scully, and Charles F. McDonald. On the Washington trip later that fall Harrison Hurley was pressed in as committee secretary and shore official invited to witness the ceremony in the White House the next morning. Isn't it worthwhile to have reminders that a President selected the Jersey shore here for his national campaign?

A Salute to the Foreign Agricultural Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1960, we will celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Foreign Agricultural Service and it is appropriate at this time to pay tribute to this all-important operation of the Department of Agriculture.

The Foreign Agricultural Service is responsible for developing plans and policies related to the administration of the foreign affairs and interests of U.S. agriculture. This responsibility covers a wide range of activities and the health and strength of our domestic agricultural programs depend in large measure on the success of the work being done by the FAS. The Service is directly concerned with the development of foreign markets with emphasis placed on proper and efficient disposition of our surplus agricultural commodities. Trade programs are analyzed as to the effect restrictive trade policies have on American farm products, and FAS also develops, directs, and coordinates basic policies for the encouragement of world trade in American agricultural products. The FAS maintains an agricultural attaché in most of our embassies and consulates, and it is the primary responsibility of these persons to report on marketing and trade activities in the country to which they are assigned. The Foreign Agricultural Service then disseminates to the American farmer the information obtained by these attachés and others which is essential to the aggressive foreign marketing of our agricultural products. This service also cooperates with ICA in the administration of the agricultural portion of the foreign assistance program. This work includes training foreign agricultural leaders and providing technical assistance to cooperating foreign countries.

Historically, our farmers produce more than domestic consumption requires, and the excess goes to foreign markets. Although our export market is relatively smaller than our domestic market, it provides us with additional agricultural income and also gives a more complete outlet for our total production. During the war and postwar years, foreign demand for our farm products was unusually high and, consequently, American agriculture expanded its production plant to a size considerably greater than it might have done had there not been a war. However, since 1952 foreign demand for our agricultural products has fallen off appreciably, and today we are faced with the very real problem of what to do with the full capacity of our agricultural plant. The present surplus commodity situation is traceable in great degree to insufficient movement to foreign markets.

For the first time in history, we must actively develop foreign markets for our farm products, and it is only recently that we have become aware of this necessity. It is essential that we acquire knowledge of what is taking place in the rest of the world as it affects our own agriculture, and that we take proper steps to overcome obstacles in marketing our farm products abroad if we are to maintain a sound and prosperous agriculture in the United States.

The many well-qualified, well-trained persons involved in the numerous activities of the Foreign Agricultural Service insure the continued effectiveness of the Service. They are loyal, dedicated employees, experts in their field, and possess the ability to cooperate fully with Foreign Service officers in our Embassies, and also with foreign agricultural officials.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is to be commended upon the outstanding work being carried on by the Foreign Agricultural Service, and it is, indeed, a pleasure to offer my personal congratulations on the fine job they are doing.

Israel's First Dozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Paterson Morning Call of May 28 contained an editorial which commented on the 12th anniversary of the State of Israel. The editorial succinctly expresses the good wishes of everyone who believes that the anniversary is a significant event in the Middle East today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S FIRST DOZEN

As the State of Israel celebrates its 12th year of independence this month, Israelis look forward to a future of both promise and challenge. In Israel, 2 million people have performed one miracle after the other in transforming their section of Palestine into a modern state.

In a land where, as a recent visitor remarked, the offer of a cup of water is still the most hospitable act toward the traveler, water is a big business. The limitation of the water supply is one of the elements of serious doubt in the Israeli future. If the country continues to grow as it has, the Negev desert must be cultivated. To do this

requires the diversion of the river Jordan, and the Arab nations have sworn this will never be permitted.

Nor is water the only thing the Arabs refuse to give Israel. They refuse to acknowledge its very existence, calling the Jewish state an anomaly which should be blotted out. Few problems are knottier than the Arab-Israeli question. But one thing surely deserves recognition—the energy and initiative of this small state in the first dozen years of existence. It has become a bright spot in the otherwise benighted Middle East.

Some Post Offices Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., on Friday, May 27, 1960:

SOME POST OFFICES PAY—MOST OTHER COUNTIES REPORT PROFITS ON POSTAL SERVICES, SOME HAVE SMALL DEFICITS

(By Donald R. Shanor)

NEW YORK.—Selling stamps and delivering letters has never made any nation rich, but a surprising number of European countries produce a net profit each year from their post offices.

And no nation in the world racks up postal deficits like those of the United States.

The U.S. deficit, which ranges from $200 million to $900 million annually, is more than the total budgets of most other postal systems.

But the postmasters general of many nations control a moneymaker that their American counterpart, Arthur Summerfield, does not have. The telephone, telegraph, and even bus systems of much of Europe are under the postal departments. Their profits often go to cover losses in the mail divisions.

Switzerland, for example lost $17 million last year in its postal services.

But the government-owned telephone and telegraph company covered the deficit and still showed a $7 million overall profit for the postal department.

FINGER IN MANY PIES

The West German Ministry of Posts' other businesses turned a $25 million mail loss into a $9,600,000 gain last year. The German post office not only runs the telephone and telegraph system but operates big yellow commuter buses, transmitters for all radio and television stations, and a multi-million-dollar banking business.

Italy's post office is engaged in the same fields, but the entire operation loses money and must be helped by a subsidy. Exact figures are not available.

Monaco, Liechtenstein, and San Marino probably earn more per citizen than any other nation from the sales of stamps. Called postage stamp republics as much for their mail business as their size, they send new issues out regularly to collectors all over the world.

Liechtenstein, which is so small that most residents are within yodeling distance of each other, earned $372,000 last year from the sale of stamps—16 percent of the state budget.

San Marino, entirely surrounded by Italy's mountains and Italy's money-losing postal system, earns similar profits selling stamps printed in Italy.

The Vatican City has its own post office and an annual income from stamp sales estimated in the millions of dollars.

Luxembourg's postal department paid for a complete modernization of the nation's telephone system and still shows a profit.

Monaco, whose Princess Grace has disappeared from movie screens and posters, still sends her picture all over the world on its postage stamps. France runs Monaco's post office but gives Prince Ranier's government its share of the profits.

Other countries which make money on their postal system include:

SOUND CONDITION

Britain, $8,400,000 last year, exclusive of telephone and telegraph revenues, and "facing the future in a sound financial condition."

France, a $10 million profit, including other business.

Denmark, $5 million earnings from all sources.

Holland and Norway, $2,300,000 and $3,600,000 respectively from the mail service alone.

Belgium put through a 20 percent rate increase and broke even last year for the first time. Japan reports expenses and revenues are balanced.

Canada nearly balances the books with annual deficits of about $3 million on income of $165 million. The taxpayers make up the difference.

But none of the nations are facing money-losing problems on the scale of the U.S. Post Office Department's, where the deficits are of such size that Summerfield warns they "weaken our economic strength."

Youth Appreciation Week Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard much within recent months about the youth of the United States. A White House Conference has explored many of the questions with affect our younger citizens. Newspapers are constantly telling us of their problems and achievements.

A new publication, distributed this week by Optimist Clubs of America, describes one dramatic effort to keep our interest in youth in the proper perspective. It describes the preparations for this year's Youth Appreciation Week from November 9 through 15.

Mr. President, an article in the publication, together with the list of Youth Appreciation Week objectives, gives all Americans much to think about. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBJECTIVES

1. To recognize the accomplishments of youth in the home, school, church, and community.

2. To promote more active participation by families in family affairs.

3. To encourage organizations and other groups to publicly show their respect for youth.

4. To encourage newspapers to devote more space to the news of the 95 percent of youth who are good citizens.

5. To encourage radio and television stations to recognize youth through special as well as regular programs.

6. To encourage national magazines to recognize the accomplishments and contributions of youth.

7. To provide the proper environment, recreation, and social activities for youth.

8. To encourage parents to rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of parenthood.

9. To illustrate the great influence religion has on the lives of youth and to encourage their active participation in religious activities.

10. To encourage a greater interchange of ideas between adults and youth, leading to a broader understanding of each other's problems.

A little more than 40 years ago, a group of men gathered in Louisville, Ky. to create an organization for reciprocal trade and friendship. They called themselves Optimists.

Shortly after the founding of this organization, the members discovered that community needs went far beyond the problems of commerce and camaraderie and the Optimists adopted the slogan, "Friend of the Delinquent Boy." A national program of boys' work was developed, and as the scope of the program expanded to include boys of all ages and backgrounds, the word "delinquent" was dropped. Optimists felt the negative connotation of a word like delinquent was not in keeping with the organization's optimistic philosophy. Throughout the ensuing years the organization has maintained this positive approach to community needs and problems.

Five years ago, a group of Optimists in Charlotte, N.C. conceived a plan to take up the banners of optimism and the positive approach with regard to our Nation's teenagers. They found, through research, that only 5 percent of our youth come in contact with the law, yet from every front we are beseiged with "delinquent," "hoodlum," and "incorrigible" as synonyms for the term "teenager." These careless accusations have caused a flood tide of public opinion against the 95 percent of our youth who are leading respectable, responsible lives. The plan these Optimists devised to turn public opinion from protest to praise for the worthy 95 percent was called Youth Appreciation Week.

A journey to the State capitol brought Governor Luther Hodges into full agreement with the idea of youth appreciation and, following his enthusiastic endorsement, newspapers, radio stations, civic and community organiations joined in the program. Youth Appreciation Week was a success in North Carolina.

Enthused with their successful venture, the Optimists of Charlotte approached Optimist International for assistance in promoting the program on an international basis. To gain more experience, it was decided to schedule the activity on a pilot project basis in 1956. In conjunction with this second celebration, Representative CHARLES R. JONAS read a résumé of the activity and a salute to the founder, T. Earl Yarborough, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The pilot projects provided enough information for Optimist International to launch the first International Youth Appreciation Week program in 1957. To our knowledge, this was the first activity of this kind ever carried out in the history of man. The results were astounding. More than 1,000 Optimist clubs throughout North

America sponsored the program. Government officials from community to national status lauded the program. Radio and TV stations devoted more than 810 hours of air time to the "Pat 'em on the Back" theme and newspaper editors joined the appreciation drive by contributing more than 308,000 column inches of newsprint.

The program continued last year on an ever-widening basis. Radio and TV air time increases 637 hours over the previous year. Expenditures increased from $73,496 (1957) to $114,671 (1958), and the youth contacted increased from 709,333 in 1957 to 17,134,547 last year.

The future of the Americas depends upon the youngsters we have labeled "delinquent." Yet it has been proven that 95 percent of these youngsters are willing to cooperate in community, home and school projects, to take a steady, intelligent look at the future and plan ahead with the bold determination to conquer. As a sponsor of Youth Appreciation Week, Optimist International invites you to join in this salute to the younger generation. Join us as we take a good look at the inherent good in our future generation of citizens. Make a conscious effort to demonstrate to these youth that "you don't have to be bad to be noticed." Stick to the positive approach of a brighter tomorrow.

The Republic of Italy—Its 14th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the last war was not only the most destructive event in known and recorded history, but it was, in many respects, the most revolutionary of all wars. In Europe its shocking and terrifying effects in many spheres of human activity will not be easily forgotten. But in certain countries there, as a result of that war, certain powerful and dictatorial regimes were overthrown and popular democratic governments were substituted. Germany and Italy are, of course, two cases in point.

The Fascist government never seemed to have had popular support in Italy. It was dictatorial pure and simple, and its inability to lead the people of Italy in war showed its bankruptcy and lack of support. When the Anglo-American forces helped the Italian people to overthrow the Fascist regime, they also encouraged the people in their task of forming a democratic government. Very early in June, 14 years ago, the people of Italy voted for a republican type of government, and thus they voluntarily established the Republic of Italy.

Since those anxious and hopeful days, in the course of a mere 14 years, the people of Italy have gone far in strengthening their publicly supported republican government, and in establishing firmly democratic institutions in Italy. As the result of their devotion of these institutions, and also as the result of the help they received from the other democracies in the West, they have made Italy a source of strength of democracy against totalitarianism, a seedbed of the arts and a home for creative thought and innovation. On this 14th anniversary celebration of Italian Independence Day I greet the proud people of Italy and join them in this celebration.

Tales of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the Voice of America has been beaming to the Far East a series of radio broadcasts about the new State of Hawaii. The latest program in the "Tales of Hawaii" series tells about the reaction of Asians who have been to Hawaii for technical training. I believe this broadcast is particularly pertinent at this time in view of the recent action of Congress to authorize the East-West Cultural and Technical Exchange Center in Hawaii.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the script, prepared by Miss Gene Sawyer of the Voice of America, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of the excellent work which the Voice of America is doing and as an illustration of how Hawaii is uniquely qualified as the site for cultural and technical training for our friends from the Far East.

Without objection, the script was ordered printed, as follows:

TALES OF HAWAII—TECHNICAL TRAINING PROGRAMS IN HAWAII

Music: "Paradise Isle."

ANNOUNCER. The music of Hawaii—introducing another program of Hawaii—to bring you interesting stories about the 50th State in the United States. Today our program is about technical training in Hawaii.

NARRATOR. You, and many others, think of Hawaii as a lush tropical island, the crossroads of the Pacific, a healthy, happy American community, a land of dreams and legends. But even more, Hawaii is a modern, energetic, expanding business community. It is concerned with steady growth and progress. Its civic, social and technological development equals that of other American cities and States. And it thrives on the same American traditions of free enterprise and democratic institutions. In recent years, thousands of Asians have come to Hawaii to participate in technological and cultural programs. Several agencies administer these programs. The University of Hawaii conducts programs for Fulbright and Smith-Mundt scholars. The International Cooperation Administration conducts programs that cover all major areas of technical training. To date, Hawaii has shared its knowledge and experience with more than 3,000 program participants.

Asians are deeply impressed by the technical know-how of the people of Hawaii. They are impressed by their hospitality, and by the sight of so many racial groups living and working together in a single friendly society.

A welfare worker from Thailand remarked:

VOICE. Hawaii has much to offer people from Asia. Asians and Westerners work together in harmony, and the organizations are small enough for visitors to understand.

NARRATOR. An extension worker from the Philippines said:

VOICE. The Hawaiian technique of farm operations is highly adaptable to the problems I face at home.

NARRATOR. An entomologist from India commented:

VOICE. I think the true spirit of the United Nations is being practiced in the Hawaiian Islands.

NARRATOR. Among these visitors there are, of course, quite a number from Indonesia. Last year, for example, some 200 Indonesians participated in technical training programs, and many others in academic and cultural programs.

Suppose we tell you about one group of five young ladies who studied for 2 weeks with the University of Hawaii Agricultural Extension Service. Are you listening, Miss Noe'aini, Miss Rochani, Miss Blantan, Miss Hadju, Miss Sianturi? And do you remember the day you arrived in Hawaii?

Do you remember flying over the vast blue Pacific; the first glimpse of the island that grew into a warm golden land; the plane touching down; the greetings of friends; the fragrant garlands of island flowers? And driving into Honolulu; the reception center; meeting hostesses and officials; and learning about Hawaii? And the next day you discussed program plans, and made arrangements at the university.

There followed 2 weeks of training with the Agricultural Extension Service at the University of Hawaii. There were seminars and group meetings on modern methods and techniques suitable in Asia; 4–H Club work under tropical conditions; educational problems in home demonstration work; lectures by home economics specialists; field trips to rural centers and farm homes. And during free time on evenings and weekends, there were new experiences such as Hawaiian food and beach picnics; island hospitality, and meeting Americans who are descendants of people who came from Asia as well as Western countries.

What were some of the impressions of the five young ladies from Indonesia? We can tell you in their own words. Miss Sianturi said:

VOICE. My visit in Hawaii was very interesting. I enjoyed their State and the way people live there. The food and markets are similar to our food and markets in Indonesia; I have many ideas to take home that will help my people.

NARRATOR. Miss Blanton said:

VOICE. Hawaii is different from other places we visited and I like the difference. The climate is like our country and plants grow the whole year. The houses are like our houses. The farmers in Hawaii are real farmers, not dairy farmers. I suggest that other students in agricultural work from Indonesia spend more time in Hawaii.

NARRATOR. Miss Rachani said:

VOICE. I like Hawaii very much because the climate, the food, and the housing are almost like in Indonesia. They use rice as a basic food, too. So studying nutrition and food preparation is more helpful to us than in the other States. I attended 4-H Club meetings and homemaking meetings. The home visits were a wonderful experience; I saw beautiful gardens and orchids that I've never seen before. There are so many good and clever ideas for home improvement and garden improvement that I saw in Hawaii.

ANNOUNCER. Friends, we have told you briefly about 5 of the more that 200 Indonesians who visited Hawaii last year to participate in training and cultural programs. For in getting acquainted with the new 50th State, this aspect is also important: That Hawaii's civic, social, and technological de-

velopment equals that of other American States, and that Hawaii is sharing its knowledge and experience with students and trainees from Asia.

And now, as they say farewell in the islands, we say to you—Aloha.

The American Woman Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation pays tribute to an important segment of our population by issuing, through the Post Office Department, a special stamp honoring the American woman. I freely admit that mine is a prejudiced position in calling this event to your attention. However I should appreciate a moment of your time to express, on behalf of American women everywhere, gratitude for the recognition this stamp represents.

Incidentally this is a 4-cent stamp—the variety employed daily in the transaction of more important bits of American business than any other single element in our national life, except, of course, the women it commemorates.

There have been many pioneers in the progress of women toward their present status since Abigail Adams first looked to new horizons. Some of these, Susan B. Anthony, Jane Addams, Clara Barton, Carrie Catt, Elizabeth Stanton, and Lucretia Mott already have been honored either individually or collectively on stamps previously issued. Certainly there are others who could symbolize the spirit of American woman. But appropriately enough this stamp features a composite image of the thousands of American women who, through continuing contribution to family, church, and country, have arrived in mid-20th century to full partnership in the development, preservation, and extension of the American way of life.

That American woman takes her partnership position seriously is reflected in her growing participation in human, public, and even corporate affairs.

It has been said that, by sheer weight of numbers, American women control a majority of the Nation's votes and a majority of its wealth. Actually, the answer to their advanced position in the politics and economy of the country is not one of statistics but of sincere and intelligent interest; of desire to fulfill the responsibilities that come with full partnership in any undertaking. If there is a preponderance of women sitting in town meetings, school meetings, or in stockholders' meetings, it is because they believe that the living strength of our Republic—in principle and in practice—requires the active, informed support of each citizen.

The advancement of American women to their present partnership status has been a cooperative effort, appreciably aided by the men and other women who have sat where you are now sitting—thoughtful citizens who gave and who continue to give enthusiastic support to the expanded role which women have proved themselves well able to assume.

This expanded role has many facets, as the commemorative stamp issued today indicates. It embraces the home, civic affairs, education, the arts and sciences, and industry. In all of these women are making major and lasting contributions—sharing responsibility on an equal basis with their associates. They recognize that equal rights and equal responsibility go hand in hand—as privilege is acquired, accountability must be assumed.

By recognizing her capabilities—by giving her the opportunity to put these capabilities to maximum use for the public good, the Nation has encouraged the American woman to develop to her full stature. In exchange, her endeavors to advance the welfare of family, community, and her Nation reflect the highest tradition of responsible citizenship.

Known But to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have, within the past few days, again remembered those men who have given their lives while in the military service of the United States. We were reminded once more that sacrifice often is the price for freedom.

Another reminder was given in an article by Edward J. Reardon, reporter for the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, which appeared on May 28. He told in that article of the constant vigilance given to the American soldiers, "known but to God," at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. President, Mr. Reardon's description of the guard at the tomb is of interest and comfort to all Americans. I ask that unanimous consent be given to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S HEROES NEVER ALONE
(By Edward J. Reardon)

WASHINGTON.—On a grassy knoll in Arlington National Cemetery, with the Potomac River and the city of Washington forming a shimmering backdrop, stands the Tomb of the Unknowns.

It is a simply designed monument of white marble, quarried in Colorado and carved in Vermont. It bears a 12-word inscription: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

The majestic shaft was first unveiled to public view on April 9, 1932. Its original occupant was an American doughboy who gave his life in the cause of freedom on a battlefield in France during World War I. On Memorial Day, May 30, 1959, he was joined by two more comrades-in-arms, unknown heroes of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Their names could be Jones or Kelly, Kwasnik, Schneider, or Kinsberg. No one knows or cares. It is enough that these honored dead have given their lives for their country. For that, they have earned our everlasting respect and gratitude.

Although unknown but to God, they are never alone. A continuous guard is maintained at their tomb by specially selected soldiers of the Third ("Old Guard") Infantry Regiment, U.S. Army, from Fort Myer, Va. Sentinels relieve one another during a simple guard-changing ceremony every hour on the hour.

PROUD RECORD OF SERVICE

The guard begins his vigil at one end of a narrow rubber mat stretching 65 feet in front of the tomb. Keeping his rifle on the shoulder away from the tomb, he marches briskly to the other end. He does a right face, looking out over Washington, stands motionless for a count of 30, then does another right face, shifting his rifle over to the opposite shoulder. He stands motionless for another count of 30, then strides to the other end of his post, faces left, and begins the cycle again.

It is appropriate that soldiers of the Old Guard should be selected for sentry duty at the tomb. For no infantry regiment has a prouder record of service. Older than the Constitution, it fought with Gen. George Washington at Valley Forge and Yorktown, and at the Battle of the Bulge in Germany in World War II. It earned its "Old Guard" designation from Gen. Winfield Scott by storming the heights of Chapultepec with fixed bayonets and participating in the capture of Mexico City in the war with Mexico in 1847.

Its 32 battle streamers attest to its magnificent record of bravery in every war in which this country has participated.

But for sentry duty assignment at the Tomb of the Unknowns, the "Old Guard" selects only the finest of the fine. The Honor Guard Company gets first choice of the soldiers arriving at Fort Myer to join the Third Infantry. These men must have certain height and weight qualifications. They must be unmarried, hold a rank no higher than corporal, and maintain an unblemished record.

FOUR THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED VISITORS EACH DAY

The Honor Guard detail is comprised of four sergeants and 12 enlisted men, headed by a master sergeant. They are assigned to the tomb detail for six months. Night and day, regardless of weather, the tomb is guarded. Throughout the 24-hour tour of duty, each sentry marches post 1 hour and rests three. Guards cannot relax a single instant while on post.

The Tomb of the Unknowns is the most visited of any of the shrines in Arlington National Cemetery. Some 4,500 persons a day come to pay homage to the sleeping heroes. Presidents, kings, queens, heads of state, ambassadors, and patriotic and service organizations have placed countless wreaths at its base.

Facing the tomb is a white-columned building called the Trophy Room. Here on display are the many decorations conferred on the Unknowns by our own and foreign governments. Among them are the Medal of Honor and Distinguished Service Cross awarded by the United States, the Croix de Guerre of Belgium, Medaile Militaire and Croix de Guerre of France, Victoria Cross of England, Czechoslovakia War Cross, the Italian Gold Medal for bravery, Virtuti Militari of Poland, and many others.

RESTING PLACE FOR 92,000

Arlington National Cemetery in which the tomb is located is comprised of some 420 acres, of which 318 acres already have been developed.

Its modest headstones, stretching row on row, mark the burial places of more than 92,000 men and women who served our country in all its wars from the Revolution to the Korean conflict. Eligible for burial there are members of the U.S. Armed Forces dying in active service, or former members whose last active service terminated honorably. Also eligible are those who served with any government allied with this country in wartime, provided he was a U.S. citizen at the time of that service and it terminated honorably.

The first Arlington funeral did not take place until 1864 when the first of the Civil War dead were buried. Since then, remains of casualties of other wars were brought to Arlington and interred. This year, funerals have averaged 20 a day.

Fort Myer, which provides the Honor Guard at the Tomb of the Unknowns, is part of the Army command charged with the responsibility of guarding the Nation's Capital and surrounding areas. The command, known as the Military District of Washington, has under its jurisdiction, besides Fort Myer, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.; Cameron Station, Alexandria, Va., and Davison U.S. Army Airfield.

In peacetime, the 3d Infantry at Fort Myer furnishes the military escort for such important functions as the Presidential inaugural, state funerals, parades, and official arrivals and departures of visiting heads of state and foreign dignataries.

PERSHING, A SIMPLE MARKER

Among its recent responsibilities, for instance, were arranging for the arrivals of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, of France, and Premier Nikita Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, and for the burial of John Foster Dulles, late Secretary of State.

Many of the Nation's most famous sons are buried in Arlington National Cemetery. One is Gen. John J. Pershing, who died in 1948. The general has the largest plot in Arlington. But he rests under a simple granite marker similar to thousands of others surrounding him. There is no shrubbery on the plot. General Pershing wanted it that way.

Another monument marks the grave of Abner Doubleday, best remembered as "the father of baseball." Few knew, perhaps, that Doubleday is credited with firing the first defense shot of the Civil War—at Fort Sumter.

Arlington Cemetery is rich in historic background. It is part of an 1,100-acre tract purchased on Christmas Day, 1778, by John Parke Custis, stepson of George Washington.

A descendant, Mary Custis, inherited the estate. She married Robert E. Lee, who later was to become the famous Confederate general of the Civil War. They moved from the estate in 1861 when General Lee assumed command of the Confederate Army. It was seized by the Government for taxes, but later won back by the Lee family through a lawsuit. George Washington Custis Lee sold it back to the Government for $150,000 on March 31, 1883. Arlington House, the Lee family mansion, was restored to its former grandeur by an act of Congress on March 4, 1925. It is now open to the public.

Memorial Day in Arlington National Cemetery wil be one to remember. Before each white headstone a blood-red poppy will nod and a small American flag will flutter in the warm May breeze. And Arlington's 60,000 trees will whisper a te deum for those three up there on the hill, beloved by an entire Nation—but known only to God.

Lyndon Johnson: The Age of the Principled Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 29, a large crowd of South Dakota citizens gathered to break ground for the construction of Big Bend Dam, the final in a chain of great multiple-purpose dams on the Missouri River projected under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The principal speaker for this historic ceremony was the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON. In sharing the platform with Senator JOHNSON, I told my fellow South Dakotans that speaking, not simply as a member of his political party but as a student of American history, I regard LYNDON JOHNSON as the most masterful Senate leader in our national history. I further stated that if events should bring Senator JOHNSON into the White House, he would go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents.

We could not have picked a more appropriate speaker for the dedication of a great new multiple-purpose dam. Senator JOHNSON has been a vigorous champion of river and resource development. He, for example, led the fight that produced Senate approval of public development of the Hells Canyon project. His concern for human as well as physical resources is evidenced by the fact that through the joint leadership of our distinguished Speaker and Senator JOHNSON, the first major civil rights legislation since the Civil War was enacted. Likewise, he paved the way for the passage of the strongest legislation to assist our schools that has ever cleared the Senate. His concern for responsible conduct by America both at home and abroad, his determination to build peace through strength—are well known.

LYNDON JOHNSON is a man of principle. It is thus appropriate that he took for his theme at the Big Bend Dam ceremony, "The Age of the Principled Man." I ask unanimous consent that this splendid address be included at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT DEDICATION OF BIG BEND DAM, PIERRE, S. DAK.

AGE OF THE PRINCIPLED MAN

Few moments are ever so inspiring as a moment such as this, when we come to dedicate the power of nature to the strength of freedom.

In the weeks and months ahead, great changes will appear on this scene we see.

But we know—and we are glad—that this work will find its ultimate worth in changes the eye cannot see: the changes for good which will be wrought in the lives and souls of America's families here—and, most especially, in the hope and promise for our young.

What we are doing here—what we are doing all along this great Missouri River and the other rivers of America—is to harness the rivers so that we may unharness the high potential of the generations who come after us.

PEOPLES' WORK

When I say, "we," I do not refer to those of us who serve in Washington, for this is not Washington's work. This is not the work of what we call our Government—this is the work of the people, all of the people, for the good of all the people.

Between the people and their Government there must never be a distinction. The purposes must always be the same—and, above all, the faith must be the same. The people of America—whether in the Dakotas or in Texas—believe in themselves. Their Government must share that belief and be, always, a Government of confidence, never a Government of doubt.

VOICES OF DOUBT

Down through the ages, we have heard again and again the loud voices of doubt and despair.

Two hundred years ago, eminent men were sounding the alarm that the human race would perish because the population would use up the nitrogen in the air.

Not long after, the cry was raised—and widely believed—that the world was doomed because the supplies of coal would be exhausted and everyone would soon die of the cold.

In our own land, within the last 100 years, men have predicted with complete assurance that our timber and our oil and many of our other basic essentials soon would be exhausted and gone.

Some even foresaw that we would run out of land. And it might have happened. If today we had to use horses and mules to meet our needs for horsepower, we would need 30 times more farmland than we now have just to raise feed for the animals.

THE ART OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

These cries of alarm are always with us—even today.

We have learned in these times much that men have not known before concerning the nature of our world and its elements—and now men are less ready to predict the end of our natural wealth and assets. But, through the years as we have learned of the world around us, we have devoted much less study to our system and our Government and our people—and, as a result, the voices of doubt today are raised to tell us what we cannot do in the realm of governing ourselves.

We hear it said that we cannot afford our future—we cannot afford our freedom—we cannot afford education for our young—we cannot afford dignity for our aged—we cannot afford to harness our rivers or conserve our soil or engage in any of these other enterprises which build the basics of our strength.

LUXURY OF WASTE

Luxuries and indulgences we can never afford and do not want to afford them, for the American people are far too realistic and practical to be enticed by such follies.

But ours is—above all else—a responsible system, a responsible system with a high and noble morality. And out of that responsibility and that morality there is one rule by which we live: America can always—and America must always—afford to root out waste.

The most offensive luxury—the most corrupting indulgence—is waste, and the toleration of waste strikes against the very foundation of a responsible system such as ours.

I say this, mindful that within our lifetimes there once was a great and stirring cry that this would be the century of the common man. There was talk of how, in this century, the common man would rise to a new dignity and a new freedom.

THE OBSOLESCENT COMMON MAN

In less than a generation, though, that term and that expression has become obsolete. We don't hear it any more because—given his freedom, given opportunity, given justice—the common man has proved himself to be capable of many uncommon things. And we no longer can think of God's children as common men.

In the years since that cry of common man was raised we in America have moved to a new level of achievement and abundance which—not to long back—voices of doubt were saying could not be attained.

We have demonstrated—to ourselves and to our neighbors in the world—what can be achieved under a system such as ours. We have exercised great leadership and dramatic leadership in the physical and tangible things. Today, I believe, the world requires—the century requires—that Americans exercise a new leadership: a leadership of goals and aspirations for the inspiration of the world.

CENTURY OF PRINCIPLES

I am not a phrasemaker, but if I were to put this into a simple statement, I would express the wish that we might set ourselves to make this remembered as the century of the principled man.

What we have done—or tried to do—throughout the course of our existence is to fashion a government of principle, rather than a government of power. Toward our own people, we expect the conduct of our Government to be principled—with honor and ethics and values and conscience. In world affairs, this, too, has been the work of the American leadership: to establish principles by which nations shall live rather than by raw power alone.

Today there is opportunity for us to lead by extending these principles—this whole concept of responsible principles—far beyond the realms of the past.

BILLIONS OF POOR

The world today is a world of billions of poor and only a few millions who live with much self-respect.

The world is a world of injustice, oppression, want, frustration—and all of these things flow from one thing: waste. Everywhere there is potential—just as there is such great potential here. But men live less well than we because the potential is allowed to waste.

If this is to be, as it ought to be, a century in which the principled man prevails against the principled men and doctrines of communism, we need to make it our work to end such waste.

Let us set our course to the task of leading the world to end the waste of resources, to end the waste of lives, to end the waste of man's opportunity to be free of poverty, disease, and ignorance.

POWER IS DUTY

We reject the concept of an America concerned only with power, for we believe, as it has been said, that "power is, to the last particle, duty."

Principled men seek duty and perform its tasks—and the power and strength of America today only places upon us all more responsibility to seek and exercise our duty.

Our duty as men of principle cannot be met alone by sending into the world America's dollars. The world little knows the difference between the American dollar and the Russian ruble. But the world will know—and the world will understand—the difference between the principles of freedom and the lack of principles of Communist doctrine and Communist leadership.

CHANGE OF APPROACH

Fundamental changes must come in America's approach to the world and America's approach to the tasks and challenges of this century.

We must—as a people—turn to the way of principle in our affairs and turn away from the old ways of power by which despots of the age have lived. We do not seek to sit down at the conference table and divide the world between West and East for, if we do this, our principles are indistinguishable from those whom we oppose.

There is work to do at the summits of diplomacy, but there is also much work for free men—principled men—to do in the valleys of the earth's great rivers. This is the work we must do—leading the world not by our power but by our principles.

SHIELD OF POWER

Power we must keep: beyond question, beyond compare, so that behind that shield, the principles we carry will have the chance to grow. But power must never be America's only work, for we have a greater task as a nation devoted to making this a world of principle in which the waste of human lives and resources is brought to an end.

I say these things here with the feeling that can come only to those who have lived their lives close to work such as we do here. I was born in Texas on the banks of the Pedernales River and knew throughout my early years the season of its flood and drought. My proudest year—and my most satisfying work—was to have the opportunity when I came into public office to lead the way in bringing to the lower Colorado rivershed the great dams which brought light and hope and opportunity to the hills where I was born. I saw the darkness of 100 years rolled away and the drudgery of the ages ended for the wives and mothers and fathers of that region.

Such work as this is—and will always be to me—the work of a principled land and it is the work of principle which must become America's basis of new leadership in the world.

The Economy of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an excellent article by Mr. Marvin W. Melton appears in the spring issue of the Arkansas Economist, a publication of the University of Arkansas. Mr. Melton is the president of the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce, and is now engaged in an extensive campaign to build up the economy of Arkansas. He has stimulated the imagination of citizens throughout the State as to the tremendous potential for progress in the State.

I am proud to call Marvin Melton my friend, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate him on the excellent job he is doing in stimulating greater interest in what can be done to build a better Arkansas. The article by him appearing in the Arkansas Economist is only one example of his imaginative approach to solving Arkansas' economic problems. His comments concerning the need for supplying the missing links in the farm-to-consumer chain are sound and I hope that they will result in increased activity within the State to supply the missing links. I commend this article to my colleagues from States which are faced with similar problems. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PRODUCT PROCESSING: SOME NEW DIRECTIONS

(By Marvin W. Melton)

Arkansas has made rapid industrial progress in the past 5 years, and I am confident that this trend will continue in the years immediately ahead. Yet, I am concerned that our agricultural incomes are not keeping pace with the gains in other sectors of the economy. I believe our farm incomes will continue to lag unless we shift our emphasis to placing a higher finish on farm products. This additional feeding or processing in Arkansas of Arkansas farm products can be the key to higher agricultural income.

In my experience as an Arkansas farmer and as an officer of various farm and business organizations, I have had an opportunity to observe the Arkansas farm scene from many viewpoints. Much progress has been made in farming techniques and many adjustments have been made to national market conditions. Still the problems are great, and great tasks lie ahead of us if we are to keep abreast of our changing economy.

I am concerned that business leaders, as well as farm leaders, give adequate attention to the adjustments that we face. For unless we make further adjustments in our thinking and our emphasis, low farm incomes will continue to be a drag upon the State's progress in the future.

ARKAKSAS: A FARM STATE

Historically, Arkansas' economy has been based primarily on farming and secondarily on timber and mineral resources. Only recently have all nonfarm jobs together even equaled farm employment in the State.

I am heartily in favor of getting all the new manufacturing plants that we can attract or build. We need the additional jobs to employ young people and to absorb those no longer employed in farming.

But I am also in favor of making the most of what we have. We must utilize to the highest degree the agricultural and physical resources already at the base of our economy. The land, the forests, the minerals—these are our basic sources of wealth. Another asset is our people, especially their ingenuity and resourcefulness. Utilized fully, these spell advancement for Arkansas.

Progress and problems

Arkansas has come a long way in recent years in improving farming methods. For example, the average yield per acre for rice was 2,192 pounds in the 1941–50 decade. For the past 3 years the average has been 3,217 pounds—an increase of about 50 percent. The same holds true for soybeans, 16 bushels then against 24 bushels now. The average yield for cotton was 339 pounds per acre; now it is closer to 475 pounds—a 40 percent increase.

But success on the farm has brought many new problems—problems that require further adjustments in old patterns of our production and marketing. Take our higher yields, for example. The rising capacity to produce on farms nationwide has outrun the rising consumer demands for farm products. The near-bursting bins of surplus farm products purchased by the U.S. Government artificially to support farm prices are silent reminders of a problem created by our own success.

Or, take our success in mechanization, which has raised the productivity of farm workers faster than the rise in productivity of factory workers. By reducing the need for farm workers, this has contributed to our loss of population in Arkansas' rural counties. Workers unable to find sufficient

work on farms tend to move to cities, frequently cities outside of the State. Our success has created a people surplus as well as a product surplus.

On the other hand, who benefits most from this success? Not the farmers as a group. With a surplus of farm products to sell on the market, the farmer tends to be faced with declining prices, so that the benefits of our farm success have tended to be passed on to the nonfarm sectors of the economy. Likewise, with a surplus of farmworkers, wages in rural areas tend to lag behind rises elsewhere.

Cost-price squeeze

But the farmer is not allowed to stand still. He must run ever harder to keep up with a cost-price squeeze, a squeeze intensified by his very success. To offset declining prices, the individual farmer tries to increase the quantity he sells. His efforts to increase yields—mechanization, fertilization, insect control, improved feeds, etc.—all bring about added costs. Furthermore, competing demands for labor and materials elsewhere in the economy bring rising prices for the things farmers must buy. Wages, machinery prices, and other costs are rising.

Because grocery-store prices have remained high, the consumer today gets the misleading impression that, economically speaking, the farmer is well off. He assumes that these ever-increasing dollars which he spends for food go to the farmer. But the truth is that the farmer often gets little or none of the increased dollars which the consumer spends for food.

The farmer's share of the retail price of food actually is declining. For example, during 1947–49, the farmer received 67 cents of the consumer's dollar spent for meat products, in 1959, he received only 52 cents. For dairy products he received 45 cents, a 9-cent drop; poultry and eggs, 58 cents, an 11-cent drop; cereal products, 17 cents, a 12-cent drop; and fruits and vegetables, 29 cents, a 4-cent drop.

Where does this money go? The increase in retail price goes to the food processers, handlers, and merchandisers. A lot of it goes to the Government in the form of taxes. To a large extent the consumer simply is demanding a higher quality of food, more processing more precooking, more packaging, and more services and variety of all kinds.

New directions: Processing

It appears, then, that further technological improvements in our ability to produce ever greater quantities will not solve our farm income problem. What further adjustments, then, must the Arkansas farmer and farm-businessman make? It seems to me that we must capture a higher percentage of the consumer dollar. We must make all manner of adjustments that will enable us to provide the new services and quality that the consumer is now demanding and is willing to pay for. We must coordinate our production and marketing patterns to meet these changing demands.

One direction of adjustment that this suggests is that we must put a higher finish on farm products before they are finally shipped from Arkansas. Unfortunately, we now bring back into the State as finished products many of the very same products we ship out as raw materials. If we only look around us at what we have at hand we find many opportunities and challenges for processing and manufacturing more food and agricultural products in the State. To do, this would mean large farm market receipts and more nonfarm payrolls in small rural communities.

The broiler industry offers a good example of what can be done. Not many years ago broilers were raised in Arkansas and the live birds were shipped to other States for processing. Modern refrigeration made possible processing closer to the farm. Soon Arkansas processing plants created more jobs and incomes for Arkansas people. Furthermore, since these processing plants tended to cluster around those sections where broilers were raised, the new industries afforded opportunities for the farmer and the members of his family to increase their own incomes by working either full-time or part-time in the processing plants.

While the broiler industry is an example of past experiences, feeds, livestock, vegetables, cotton, and cottonseed offer opportunities for the future.

For instance, during the period July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959, Arkansas consumed 884,943 tons of poultry feeds of all kinds.[1] Of this amount, 445,768 tons were produced in Arkansas and 439,175 tons were produced outside the State. These 439,175 tons which were produced outside the State represent a lost opportunity by feed growers to put a higher finish on their product.

The same holds true for many other feed grains. During the same 1958–59 year, 1,350,886 tons of feeds were used in Arkansas. Of this amount, 647,940 tons came from sources within the State; 702,946 tons were produced outside of Arkansas and shipped in.

Two changes

The two significant changes which have occurred in livestock production in the past 30 years have affected feed production to a great extent. One is the great increase in the number of broilers produced. The other is the decrease in the number of horses and mules kept on farms.

Since 1925, grain-consuming livestock has been replacing roughage-consuming livestock. This has necessitated greater feed grain production in the State and importation of what Arkansas didn't or couldn't supply.

Each year livestock producers have come to depend on out-of-State sources for a larger portion of their grain supply. This is not necessarily bad because in many instances grains can be imported more cheaply than they can be secured in Arkansas. But there are still many instances where imported grains could have been home produced—and being home produced they could have contributed more to the State's economy.

A great opportunity in the feed producing segment of Arkansas agriculture lies in the expansion of the soybean meal industry so that a greater finish can be placed on soybeans within Arkansas' borders. From a small beginning in 1925, soybeans have moved into second position as a field crop. One new soybean processing mill was recently constructed at Stuttgart. Opportunities exist for others.

Improved cattle feeding

The problem of putting a higher finish on feeds is largely one of balancing the crops which can be grown in Arkansas at low cost with the livestock for which it is best suited. In this respect a better finish could be put on many feeds through improved feeder calf operations.

The 2 million acres of land which were once required to support over half a million horses and mules in Arkansas 35 years ago is now available for other purposes because the horse and mule population is now less than 100,000 Much of this land has been put to crops, but some is now idle or unimproved pasture going to waste because it is not utilized as it could be. And as wasteland it is not earning dollars for the farmer.

There is little doubt that the feed which could be grown on these lands could spell success for more feeder calf operations through increased yields and quality of hay which could be produced on these acres. They could be restored to proper use through invention of ways to overcome the inherent disadvantages and through increased skill in farm management.

The University of Arkansas is undertaking much needed research along this line at the Marianna Branch Experiment Station. It is hoped that they will find the answers to how homegrown feedstuffs can be used profitably to feed Arkansas calves so that the requirements of Arkansas consumers for beef can be filled.

The livestock chain

Several missing links exist in the farm-to-consumer chain of livestock growing in Arkansas. One is created by uneven rain distribution. In certain seasons of abundant rainfall we have luxuriant pastures—in some instances more than can be utilized. Then the rains diminish and in the late summer and fall there is a shortage of good pastures. To cope with this problem the present practice is to reduce cow numbers seasonally, and oftentimes these underfed drought cattle sell at very low prices and at a loss to the producers. Of necessity cattle must be sold out of the State and then brought back as finished beef for local consumption.

Current research and developments in preservation of forage should aid in the establishment of a satisfactory farm-to-feedlot-to-processor-to-consumer chain which is needed so badly to put a higher finish on feeds and livestock.

Encouraging developments are the recent announcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of the discovery of a new antioxidant which preserves the vitamin A and E content in alfalfa meal for as long as 6 months, and the recent announcement by the University of Arkansas that steers can be fed profitably by using selected grain ration with pellets containing alfalfa meal spread over it, or finely ground alfalfa pellets mixed in with it.

Tremendous improvement is being made in the quality and resultant feed conversion efficiency of Arkansas forage growths by using hay conditioners or stem crushers. There are reports that pellet machines are being adapted to small factory and even field operations. This should help Arkansas farmers save high-quality hay and forage for dry periods by reducing the time required to prepare them for safe storage. The risk of spoilage from rain or storing too green would be almost eliminated.

Supplying missing links to the farm-to-consumer chain would allow the establishment of feeder lots in the State and this would alter the traditional pattern of shipping calves out of the State and then buying back the finished beef for local consumption.

Cotton: Another area

Another raw agricultural material which could be processed in Arkansas to advantage for the economy is cotton and cottonseed. Arkansas ranks third or fourth among cotton-producing States and usually produces about 10 percent of the U.S. crop. Yet very little actual processing of cotton fiber or cottonseed is found in the State. There is only one small cotton yarn plant in the State. Arkansas crushes cottonseed, but ships most of the product out of the State for further finish.

Meanwhile, the development of wash-and-wear fabrics has boosted the consumption of cotton by more than 800,000 bales per year and other new developments are likely to raise the figure still higher—possibly to 1 million bales. And the opportunity for Arkansans to put a finish on their cotton crop in slipping away.

In recent months many industrial plants have found it desirable to move to Arkansas. This would indicate that Arkansas does offer something to the manufacturer and any

[1] Arkansas State Plant Board, Miscellaneous Feed Bulletin 24.

new plant designed to finish agricultural products to a higher degree would have a good chance for survival. Nevertheless, Arkansas plants will be competing with similar plants in other States, many of them well established; so each plant should be given every encouragement. We should be on guard that our taxes, labor regulations, and business climate do not place undue burdens which might add to the risks that might discourage new investment.

New directions: Products

The development of new crops provides another avenue for the farmer in his efforts to push apart the jaws of the cost-price squeeze. Some new crops which may offer opportunities for the Arkansas farmer are cape-marigold seeds, safflowers, carrot seeds, mustard plants, and others.

Dr. George O. Kohler, crop research director at the U.S. Department of Agriculture western regional laboratories located at Albany, Calif., heads some interesting work on cape-marigold seeds. The oil derived from these seeds is different from any heretofore known. It adapts with other chemicals in such a way that it is extremely valuable in the production of plastic items.

The safflower is a thistlelike plant which has been grown in the dry areas of Asia, Africa, and Europe for centuries. Its seeds produce a rich oil which can be used in paints and varnishes. In 1960 there will be some 300,000 acres planted to this crop, up 50 percent from 1959.

Carrot seeds have been used to produce an oil which can be used in making nylon and detergents. Further experiments are proceeding to find possibilities in seeds of the plants of the mustard family as well as other wild and domestic plants.

These are but a few examples of new product opportunities that might be investigated. Here is an area in which we might use ingenuity and enterprise to raise incomes in the vital farm sector of our State economy.

Put a higher finish on agricultural products within Arkansas and develop new crops: these offer opportunities for the Arkansas farmer. Coupled with a steady and dependable supply of agricultural products, a good business climate, and encouragement to new undertakings so that they might realize their full potential, Arkansas can prosper.

For farm incomes to keep pace with the rest of the economy in the future, the State must capture a larger share of the consumer's dollar. To do this, our farm and business leaders need to work together to increase the processing of agricultural products in Arkansas, to improve quality, and to diversify our products.

Our Antiquated Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that one of my alma maters, Snead College, at Boaz, Ala., has instituted an annual Albert Rains Speech Award and that participation in this contest has directed student interest to the subject of "Our Antiquated Electoral College."

The speeches were presented on May 19. The three winners were Billy Stamps, of Boaz, first place; Ronald Gray, of Fyffe, second place; and Richard Land, of Rainsville, third place.

These young men devoted considerable study and effort to these speeches and I believe that their conclusions merit the consideration of the Congress. They represent the new generation's thinking on a subject of great importance to us all.

Following are the speeches of the winners of the Albert Rains Speech Award at Snead College, Boaz, Ala.:

THE ANTIQUATED ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Billy Stamps)

It is testimony to traditionalism that so much difficulty is encountered in attempting to revamp the archaic system of the electoral college. The system used today for selecting the President and Vice President is obsolete, needlessly complex, and totally inadequate for present conditions. As it operates now, it is a bad fitting fifth wheel to the coach of democracy.

Under the system presently used in the United States, the President and Vice President are elected by electoral votes. These votes are divided among the States with each State having as many electoral votes as it has Representatives and Senators in the U.S. Congress.

Each electoral vote is delegated to an elector, a person who is chosen by the people in a manner prescribed by the State. In December of each Presidential election year, the victorious electors meet in some part of the State and vote for a candidate for President and a candidate for Vice President. These votes are then sent to Washington by mail, and at the opening of the new session of Congress in January, the Senate and the House meet in joint session to count the votes. If one person receives a majority of the votes cast, he is declared President. If not, the House votes on the top three candidates with each State getting one vote. The same method applies in the case of a tie for Vice President, except the Senate selects him with each Senator allowed one vote.

This antiquated and complicated system of electing the highest officers of our country was devised by the Founding Fathers at the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The members of the convention felt a distrust toward the discretion of the people in choosing their own leaders. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, said that, "The people would never be sufficiently informed of the character of the men to vote intelligently for the canadidates that might be presented."

The theory of the electoral college was that the electors, chosen for superior talents, emancipated from the subtle intrigue of party, should make in Olympian serenity a choice based solely on merit. This plan failed utterly and miserably within 12 years after it was put into effect.

The first dispute under the electoral system arose in the election of 1800. Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr, both supported by the Democratic-Republicans, received a tie vote. This threw the election into the House of Representatives. Although Jefferson was the party's choice for President, he was almost defeated by forces in the House. The furor that arose brought about the 12th amendment to the Constitution. This provided for designation of candidates as either presidential candidates or vice presidential candidates and required that separate ballots be used.

In the turbulent election of 1876 Samuel Tilden outran Rutherford B. Hayes by a popular vote of 258,000. The electoral vote was close with the outcome hinging on 21 disputed electoral votes from three Southern States. Each State had sent in double returns; one set for Tilden and one set for Hayes. Not knowing exactly what to do, Congress provided for an Electoral Commission of 15 members. Congress tried to balance the Commission politically, but when unable to select an independent, they appointed a Republican. By a strict party vote of 8 to 7 the Commission gave Hayes all 21 votes, thus making him President by an electoral vote of 185 to 184. Ten years later Congress passed the Electoral Count Act which provided that each State should determine its correct electoral votes.

One of the major points of attack against the electoral college is the possibility of electing another President by a minority of the people. This occurred in 1876, 1884, 1888, and to a lesser degree in other elections. The election of 1876 when Tilden with a 250,000 vote majority, was defeated by Hayes, has already been pointed out. In 1888 Grover Cleveland led Benjamin Harrison by 90,000 popular votes. Despite this lead, Harrison won the election by an electoral vote of 233 to 168. This discrepancy in the electoral college has not been corrected. It is possible for another minority President to be elected.

The founders of our Constitution either did not foresee the rise of political parties, or failed to realize the control they could and would have over the election of President. By overlooking this fact, they left the way open for the nullification and complete change of the electoral system they had incorporated into the Constitution.

This change was not long in coming. By the election of 1800 the parties had already gained a strong hold on the Nation. In this election the electors merely registered the results of the popular vote. The succeeding elections followed this pattern and with Andrew Jackson's election in 1828 the subserviency of the electoral machinery to popular control was finally established. By this method the electoral college was divested of its original functions without any change in the letter of the law.

As could be expected, the change in the electoral system and the control by political parties brought about changes in the States in respect to the electors and the electoral votes. With the electors running on a party ticket or with announced intentions of the candidate for whom they would vote, the people ceased to be interested in the elector as an individual. The people voted by party or candidate, merely selecting the electors pledged to a particular candidate. This meant that in a one-party State, the stronger party could count on all of that State's votes without a hard campaign.

The effect in States where no party dominated was exactly opposite. It caused the parties to campaign heavily in these States and gave these States a more influential voice in party policies.

These are but a few of the many reasons why the present system is antiquated and no longer able to perform its function. The needed reform of the system is twofold: abolition of the electoral college, and some provision for making the Federal count a simple process in addition.

The electoral college has outlived its usefulness. Modern methods of communication and rapid tabulation of votes have given a definite advantage to the importance of letting the public see and know that the vote that they have cast has counted directly for the candidate of their choice. The electoral college as it now functions, serves as a millstone about the neck of democracy, defeating the will of the people and depreciating the individual's vote.

THE ANTIQUATED ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Ronald Gray)

Last week this headline appeared in the newspapers, "Khrushchev Threatens Rockets Within the First Few Minutes." This is the threat that Russia's leader offered to the

United States if she should start a war. Also it is a typical example of one of America's external dangers. However, America has other difficulties that are much nearer home. One of these is in her system of electing her highest officers, the President and the Vice President.

When the framers of the Constitution of the United States met to decide by what method a President and Vice President could be elected, they had a difficult task to accomplish. They did not wish to give full control of the election to the people, because, in that age, the people were not well enough informed. On the other hand, they did not want Congress to elect the President, since that would have violated the principle of separation of powers. Consequently, they adopted after much debate, an indirect method of election, which was an entirely new system compared to any means of election used beforehand. This indirect method was to be accomplished through a so-called electoral college.

The electoral college is made up of a number of presidential electors from every State, the method of election of these electors being determined by the individual States. However, in all of the States today the popular election of the electors is used. This is held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of every fourth year. At these elections the people as a whole vote for presidential electors. Then on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December of the same year, the electors meet in their respective States and cast their votes separately for President and Vice President. After the electors cast their votes, the ballots are then sealed and sent to Washington, D.C., where they are opened in the presence of both Houses of Congress by the President of the Senate, and counted.

The candidate receiving the majority of electoral votes for President is then named President. The candidate receiving the majority of electoral votes for Vice President is named Vice President. In the event that no one has a majority of votes, the House of Representatives selects a President from the candidates, not exceeding three, who have the highest number of electoral votes. If there is no majority of votes for Vice President, the Senate appoints him from the two candidates for Vice President who have the largest number of electoral votes. Under this system the President and Vice President of the United States are elected to office.

Upon hearing this description of the electoral system of voting, one would without careful consideration think that a system such as this would have few weak points. However, this is not true, as can be determined by a careful analysis.

In the first place, the constitutional makers devised what they thought would be a nonpolitical scheme for the choosing of a President and Vice President, when they set up the electoral college. Under this nonpartisan system, it was thought that the people would elect a President and Vice President, who would be the choice of the majority of the Nation. Too, it was thought that the State legislatures would select methods of appointing presidential electors which would enable the people to choose the most capable men for the job, and this proved to be so in the first and second presidential elections, in which Washington received every electoral vote. However, by 1800 two political parties were distinctly in evidence, because all of the electors in that election either voted for Jefferson and Burr or for Adams and Pinckney.

This rise in political parties was unforeseen by the framers of the Constitution and the original purpose of the electoral college, which was to reduce politics to a minimum, was already defeated.

In order to be sure of controlling the Government, a political party had to control the office of President and in order to be certain of that, it had to gain the upper hand in the electoral college. This was a ridiculously easy task, since all that was necessary was to put up slates of candidates for presidential electors, who were pledged in advance to vote for the party's candidates, and then to help get them elected. Consequently, a party with votes enough to carry the legislature of a State could always succeed in doing this, and thus gain control of their respective State's electoral votes. Too, this very act is one of the main defects of the electoral system. It is a defect which is based primarily on the law, which Congress passed in 1887, when the electoral vote of one of the States was disputed. Under this law all of a State's electoral votes go to the political party that has a plurality of the State's popular vote. In this way, a State which is about equally made up of members of two parties, may be swayed in favor of one party or the other just because of a few hundred popular votes. Thus during a presidential campaign the political parties only concentrate their efforts in thase States where their political party is weak, knowing that they can carry the States where they already have a plurality. Therefore, in the period of time which has elapsed since the electoral college was founded, it has become an entirely politically controlled organ of the Government. It could not withstand the pressure of organized politics.

Secondly, under the present electoral system, a President may be selected who has a minority of the Nation's popular vote. Out of the last 16 Presidents elected, only 10 have been chosen by a majority vote. Six of these 16 were appointed Presidents with a minority of the electoral votes, because no one person had a majority. Consequently they, receiving a minority of the electoral votes, received a minority of the people's vote in the whole Nation. When situations such as this occur, the electoral college is criticized as being undemocratic and not abiding by the principle of "the majority rule."

The electoral system has one more main weakness. This weakness is the inability to determine equally throughout the United States exactly who the people's choice for President is. Moreover, this handicap is due to the fact that the States with the larger populations have a larger electoral vote, since the electoral vote is determined according to the population of a State. Thus the more densely populated States like New York, which has 47 electoral votes, will definitely have greater weight in a presidential election than would Alabama, which has only 11 electoral votes. Consequently, the electoral system offers an unequal basis for the election of a President in respect to the whole Nation.

These are some of the reasons why the electoral college as it exists today has become outdated. It has been perverted from its original purpose and transmuted into a strictly political mechanism.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

(By Richard Land)

"Constitutions are not made but grow." Our electoral college procedure of electing the President and Vice President was originated in 1789, 171 years ago. Yet it has been altered to a limited extent and has come to mean right opposite to the way it was meant to function.

I would like to begin in the year 1789, and relate to you the history of the electoral college procedure and point out the falicies it contains, up to the present time.

When Alexander Hamilton in 1789 proposed the method of using the electoral college for electing the President and Vice President, he never visioned the effect it would have years later. It seemed then to be the necessary proposal. After the electors were chosen they were to meet and each cast a ballot for two persons, at least one of whom must be a resident of a different State. The votes from all the States were assembled and counted, the persons receiving the largest and second largest numbers, if in each case a majority, should be declared President and Vice President. If no one received a majority, or if there was a tie, the President was to be elected by the House, each State delegation having one vote. The people, it was assumed, would conscientiously weigh the qualifications of persons available for the Presidency and having made up their minds, would cast their ballots as absolutely free agents.

For a short time the plan worked as its authors had intended. In 1789, and again in 1792, every elector wrote the name of Washington on his ballot, but the second votes were scattered according to individual preference. In 1796, 13 men received votes, betokening as yet a great deal of independence on the part of the electors. But in 1800 every elector except one wrote the names of either Jefferson and Burr or Adams and Pinckney. The reason was that by this time two distinct political parties had come into the field, and each had taken steps in advance of the popular election to designate its candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency and also put before the voters of several States lists of men who, it was understood, would, if chosen by the people, cast their ballots in all cases for the recognized candidates of the party to which the given electors belonged.

The effect, of course, was to defeat the main purpose for which the electoral college existed. Instead of exercising independent judgment, based on a superior knowledge, the electors now became merely a body to register in a formal and perfunctory way the will of the voters who had chosen them.

The rise of political parties, entirely unforeseen by the constitutionmakers, thus wrought a silent revolution within a decade; without a change in a letter of the fundamental law, indirect popular election became, to all intents and purposes, direct election.

The election of 1800 brought a new situation in still another respect. Jefferson and Burr received not only the largest number of votes, but the same number, and the House was called upon to break the tie. This precipitated a political crisis of wholly unlooked-for proportions, for the Federalists were with difficulty restrained from deliberately frustrating the will of their opponents by throwing the election to Burr. The effect was that before another election came around, the Constitution was amended so as to provide that the electors should in all cases name in their ballots the person voted for as President and, in district ballots, the person voted for as Vice President to be members of different parties.

A national law of 1845 requires that the presidential electors be chosen in all States on the Tuesday following the first Monday in November. As for the method of choice, the Constitution has only a simple provision that it shall be determined in each State legislature thereof. At the outset, the legislature itself elected in a majority of States and the people took no direct part at all, but as democratic sentiment grew, however, popular election was substituted in one State after another with the result that from 1832 onward the legislature elected no longer.

It is quite possible for a candidate to be elected by a minority of the popular vote. I will explain. A majority in the electoral college is necessary to a victory unless it is achieved through the House. But if a candidate's support is so distributed as to yield him a majority in the right combination of States, he may roll up an electoral majority without polling as many popular votes as an opponent whose strength is not so favorably concentrated, as a result we have had several minority presidents. Lincoln in 1860 ob-

tained only a plurality, not a majority of the popular vote. Wilson in 1912 received 2 million more popular votes than the nearest competitor, Roosevelt; yet he lacked a majority. In both of these cases, the opposition was unusually divided, but the same thing can happen if there are only two tickets in the field. Hayes was elected over Tilden in 1876, although his popular vote was smaller. Harrison triumphed over Cleveland in 1888 although he had fewer votes.

The fact that the entire electoral vote of a State falls to the candidate who polls a mere plurality of the popular vote leads the parties to concentrate their campaign efforts upon doubtful States especially those which have a large electoral vote. New York is such a State and party managers are not likely to forget that in 1884 fewer than 600 popular votes swung that State's 36 electoral votes to Grover Cleveland. It was these votes that made him victor over the Republican candidate. The intensification of party activity in pivotal States is unfortunate in that it presents a special temptation to party workers to resort to vote buying and other corrupt or dubious practices.

Proposals for altering the method of electing the President and Vice President have been discussed from time to time through our entire national history. The 12th amendment remedied certain defects, and various statutes, the Electoral Count Act dealt with others. But the chief anomaly remains, namely the electoral college, and the question is often asked why not abolish this institution and permit people to choose the President in form as well as in fact.

The suggestion is plausible, yet it raises a question of some difficulty. Should the people of a country as a whole without reference to State or other interior lines elect by simple plurality of majority vote? Or should they vote by States or districts? The proposal to throw the whole into one grand constituency and elect by a majority or a plurality of the total vote has met with small favor. If any change is ever made it is likely to preserve to the States as such, some definite role in the electoral process. Two main possibilities suggest themselves; (1) direct popular election for the President and Vice President, voting to be by perhaps a popular plurality in a majority of States, (2) direct popular vote to be converted automatically without the intermediation of the present electors into an electoral vote and election to be by a majority or a plurality of the electoral vote. The first plan is objectionable because it would enable a number of the smaller States to swing the election by means of only a minority of the total popular vote; although it is not to be forgotten that we have minority Presidents under the existing system.

Furthermore, the second plan offers no assured gain, except under one condition: If the electoral vote of the State were to be determined on a district basis rather than on a general ticket basis, a way would be open for some degree of proportional representation, and it would not happen, as it does now, that an entire State's electoral vote would go to a given candidate notwithstanding that the popular vote was almost evenly divided. Considerations of State pride and party advantage which originally caused the district system to be abandoned are, however, no less potent in our time than formally. Only by a constitutional amendment could the plan be put into uniform use throughout the country; and not withstanding its manifest advantages over the present system, its advocates can hardly hope for its adoption. The one obvious disadvantage would be the increased temptation to party majorities in the several States to gerrymander the electoral districts.

In conclusion, I would like to say that from the standpoint of the present day, a more cumbersome procedure could hardly be imagined or consciously devised for electing the President and Vice President of the United States. The electoral college system is frequently condemned, seldom praised, yet it made good sense to our Founding Fathers and to so astute political scientists as Alexander Hamilton it appeared to be "at least excellent" if not "perfect." Designed originally to bear an awesome political burden, the electoral college procedure has been amended by usage into a meaningless anachronism and preserved by the inertia that surrounds all things constitutional. Its only function now is to perform the essentially simple administrative duty of translating popular votes into electoral vote. Thus it remains as one more instance of the profundity of Burke's observation that "Constitutions are not made, but grow."

Assistance to a Million Migrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein the full text of an article by Mr. Marcus Daly, Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, printed in the May-June 1960 issue of the Migration News published by the International Catholic Migration Committee in Geneva, Switzerland:

ASSISTANCE TO A MILLION MIGRANTS

(By Marcus Daly)

One million emigrants. It is not so easy to picture to oneself the amount of work represented by this figure. One million is the total population of French-speaking Switzerland—four times the population of the Canton of Geneva—the whole population of cities like Copenhagen, Naples, Munich, or Montreal.

One million emigrants, this is the product of the work accomplished by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) in little more than 8 years at a cost of $250 million contributed by 29 member States.

Let us cast our minds back to November 1951 when the Belgian Government, in response to a United States request invited a certain number of countries particularly concerned with migration to meet in Brussels. What was the picture at that time?

The International Refugee Organization (IRO) was about to come to an end, after moving 1 million refugees overseas in the space of 5 years.

Now, not only were there still many refugees left in the European camps, but in addition a new problem was thrusting itself with increasing urgency upon the attention of the Western governments; that of a surplus population in various European countries wishful but unable to emigrate, whereas numerous countries overseas were in sore need of manpower for the development of their economy.

As early as May 13, 1959, when they met in London, the Foreign Ministers of the three great Western Powers, Mr. Dean Acheson, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Mr. Robert Schuman, had published a joint statement saying:

"The surplus population in several European countries is one of the main factors in the difficult and unbalanced state of world affairs. A systematic study of emigration possibilities can greatly contribute to the solution of this problem."

This systematic study was undertaken simultaneously by various international organizations and by several governments. It became plain that although comments and conclusions might vary, all the experts agreed that the number of surplus persons in Europe amounted to about 5 million.

The committee of experts dealing with the problem of refugees and surplus populations within the Council of Europe stressed the importance of restoring the normal flow of European emigration toward Western oversea countries—a flow which had been practically cut off since the First World War—and pointed out that the absorptive capacity of these countries exceeded the possibilities of European emigration and would continue to do so unless means could be procured to promote the latter by providing financial aid for emigrant transport.

THE SETTING UP OF PICMME

On December 5, 1951, at the Brussels Conference in which 27 states took part, the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe (PICMME) was created. The Committee was set up for a trial period of 1 year.

The final resolution of the Brussels Conference stressed the fact that "the problem of economic development is closely connected with that of immigration." It pointed out that "international financing of European emigration will not only help to solve the demographic problem in Europe, but will likewise promote new economic activity in countries that are short of manpower."

The dual task of the new committee was to relieve the pressure of surplus populations in Europe and of manpower shortage overseas. For the first time in the history of international organizations, it was to attempt, through intergovernmental cooperation, to assist those demographic and manpower movements which for centuries past had been taking place more or less freely between Europe and the other continents.

PICMME started its work on February 1, 1952, having set up its office in Geneva on the premises of the former International Refugee Organization the day after the latter ceased to operate, and took over the chartering of part of the IRO fleet and a sum of $2,737,096 for the transport of 12,000 refugees still covered by the IRO mandate. It retained some of the IRO staff and had the benefit of their experience in the carrying out of numerous operations connected with the organization of mass emigration.

In June 1952, the representatives of the member states of the Migration Committee (as PICMME was usually called) elected as director of the organization Mr. Hugh Gibson, former U.S. Ambassador to Belgium and Brazil, who had been one of President Herbert Hoover's close collaborators in the work of European aid after the devastations of World War I. During the German occupation of Belgium in 1914, Gibson, as a neutral diplomant, distinguished himself by his courageous attempts to save the life of Edith Cavell, a martyr for the sake of her duty as a nurse.

The new director enjoyed the full confidence of the United States and he brought with him to the Migration Committee his wide experience of Latin America and Europe and a broad view of the problems, which proved to be in perfect harmony with that of his deputy, Pierre Jacobsen, which was based on outstanding practical experience.

At the close of the 12-month-trial period, PICMME's work had convinced most of the governments concerned of the irreplaceable value of an international institution, founded on the multilateral principle of a triangle the base of which is formed by two governments bound by common though

opposing interests—those of the emigration and the immigration areas—and the apex is an imparital administrative body devoted to the cause of both parties and at pains to find a common denominator in all matters concerning them.

THE SETTING UP OF ICEM, A TEMPORARY ORGANIZATION

At the Committee's fourth session, which took place from October 13 to 21, 1952, it was decided to continue the work for a further year. However, the word "Provisional" was to be deleted from the name of the organization and likewise the original stress on "movements." In other words the member states had become aware that there were other problems at least as important as those of transportation, and that longer term planning was essential.

So PICMME was replaced by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, or ICEM. At the same time, work began on the drafting of the new organization's constitution. The draft constitution was completed in 1953 and the text was submitted to the governments concerned for ratification.

On November 30, 1954, the 16th ratification of the constitution, that of Norway, was received in Geneva. A two-thirds majority of the member states (there were 24 at the time and there are now 29), representing more than 75 percent of the contributions to ICEM's administrative budget, having thereby ratified it, the constitution came into force and the assembly of delegates, in accordance with the new constitution, became the Council of Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

On December 12, 1954, Ambassador Hugh Gibson died suddenly at his post. The member states unanimously elected in his stead the former U.S. Ambassador Harold H. Tittmann. Like his predecessor, Mr. Tittmann had wide experience in Latin America and Europe and was intimately acquainted with American diplomatic practice.

On July 1, 1957, Deputy Director Pierre Jacobsen met his death in a motoring accident. He was replaced by Mr. Barthélemy G. Epinat, of France, in October 1957.

On May 13, 1958, Mr. Harold H. Tittmann went into well-earned retirement. On May 14, 1958, the council entrusted the directorship of ICEM to the writer.

THE MACHINERY OF ICEM

Under the provisions of the Constitution, the purposes and functions of ICEM are as follows:

"(a) to make arrangements for the transport of migrants for whom existing facilities are inadequate and who could not otherwise be moved, from European countries having surplus population to countries overseas which offer opportunities for orderly immigration.

"(b) to promote the increase of the volume of migration from Europe by providing, at the request of and in agreement with the Governments concerned, services in the processing, reception, first placement and settlement of migrants which other international organizations are not in a position to supply, and such other assistance to this purpose as is in accord with the aims of the Committee.

After defining the organization's competence—in accordance with the interests and policy of each member government, the constitution then lays down the conditions for membership. It is not enough for governments to be interested in the principle of free movement of people in theory; proof of practical concern must be provided.

Paragraph (b) of the second article establishes ICEM as a purely Western international organization, emanating from the free world, and thereby guarantees its working efficiency and creates a barrier to its incorporation in the system of the United Nations organization with its universal basis. This means that ICEM can have only a limited number of members—and therefore its active members must be prepared to met heavier financial obligations—but it can do practical work and progress dynamically without fear of friction, or sabotage, or distortion for the sake of propaganda or agitation, or, above all, the swamping of its aims in a flood of words and criticism and inquiries and commissions such as has been known to frustrate the efforts of so many international agencies whose interests are not safeguarded in this manner.

In short, the Migration Committee is the perfect example of an intergovernmental operational organization wherein the sovereign rights of the members are carefully preserved against any attempt or temptation to impose upon them supranational doctrines, but wherein likewise the desired field of action is clearly defined and the number of members to be admitted is strictly limited.

ICEM's program and achievements vary from year to year according to circumstances.

From 77,600 in 1952, the annual total of movements rose to 87,500 in 1953, then settled at about 120,000 in 1954 and 1955. The Hungarian exodus after the suppression of the Budapest revolution, and the Suez crisis, sent the figures up to 172,200 in 1956 and even 194,200 in 1957. A return to more normal times brought us back to 94,300 in 1958 and 105,900 in 1959.

One million emigrants. This total, which was marked by a white stone at the ICEM conference held in Naples, in May 1960, can be analyzed as follows:

	Total	Of which refugees
Countries of immigration:		
Argentina	104,000	3,000
Australia	290,000	74,000
Brazil	84,000	14,000
Canada	152,000	75,000
Chile	6,000	2,000
Colombia	2,000	1,000
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	6,000	
Israel	59,000	58,000
New Zealand	9,000	2,000
Union of South Africa	10,000	2,000
United States of America	179,000	165,000
Uruguay	10,000	
Venezuela	46,000	3,000
Others	43,000	42,000
	1,000,000	441,000
Areas of emigration:		
Austria	150,000	130,000
Germany	214,000	126,000
Greece	66,000	10,000
Italy	278,000	41,000
Netherlands	82,000	1,000
Spain	38,000	
Hong Kong	15,000	15,000
Others	157,000	118,000
Total	1,000,000	441,000

Having come thus far, ICEM's administration continues confidently on the road to the second million.

This confidence is based not only on the conviction that the work of ICEM is highly valuable to the peace of the world, but also on the knowledge that ICEM can rely on the close cooperation of other international organizations—the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in particular—and, above all, on the voluntary organizations whose admirable devotion can never be sufficiently stressed.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD I began a series of insertions pinpointing the new urban complexion of American cities, based on a two-part survey in Forum magazine entitled "The New Urbanites."

Except No. 2 from the survey follows:

In the last 2 years migration from rural areas has noticeably slackened. William Wheaton of the University of Pennsylvania estimates that in-migration to Philadelphia has dropped 50 percent, because sources are beginning to dry up. Irene Taeuber of the office of population research, Princeton University, confirms this: "The great reservoirs of Negroes in southern agriculture are so reduced that they can furnish only a fraction of the migrants of the future." Hence the tide has probably passed its peak.

But even if rural sources were to dry up completely tomorrow, cities would still have the gigantic problem of assimilating the nearly 2 million persons, largely low-income Negroes, who have moved into northern cities in the past two decades.

MICHIGAN WATER

Many factors impelled the great migration. A folk song favored by Negro pianist "Jelly-Roll" Morton runs:

"Mississippi water tastes like turpentine—
But Michigan water tastes jes' like sherry wine."

And to the sharecroppers in the collapsing farm economy of the South, Michigan water has indeed looked like sherry wine, though once in Detroit or some other industrial metropolis, that old turpentine taste may return. A great magnet to the dispossessed was the wartime and postwar prosperity in the great industrial cities of the North and Midwest, where the southern Negro found a measure of economic security he has not known since he was forced off the plantation. Here also, though it weighed less than economic factors, was a chance for a greater degree of social acceptance than the South would ever afford. Though many migrants are aware that not all northern white society will accept them as brothers, at least there is the chance for some measure of equality. More important, there is a first fumbling step toward freedom.

The background of these new urbanites is vital to an understanding of the challenge they pose for cities. Like any large mass of people, they form a heterogeneous group. As Robert Weaver, consultant to the Ford Foundation and member of New York's Housing and Redevelopment Board, points out: "Some are new arrivals; some have urban backgrounds; some are financially secure; many are low income; many are in the process of economic, social, and educational mobility. Census figures on migration, valuable as they are, do not tell the whole story. Dependence upon such restricted data is bound to give a distorted picture and blind us to the elements which offer the most promising avenues to solution." The largest problem lies in the vast majority of new-

comers, white and nonwhite, who have no familiarity with city life and are frequently unwilling to bend to its inexorable demands.

East of the Mississippi, the new urbanites come from two groups: (1) the Negro sharecroppers, mostly from Georgia, the Carolinas, and the Deep South; and (2) white, low-income families from the hill country of Tennessee and Kentucky. On the west coast—where Los Angeles' nonwhite population has been increasing twice as fast as its white in the past decade—the great source of migrants is the Middle South and border States. California still draws a large influx of Mexicans from the Southwest.

White or colored, the new urbanites are usually young (a majority are in the 15-to-29 age group) and generally have several children. They are rural or smalltown oriented, with social life centered on the family. They are often incredibly impoverished, by urban standards. Their values frequently lead to difficult adjustment. Housing is likely to be less important to them than other things. Saving means little to them, for they have long been used to living from hand to mouth on an uncertain future. Thus, they are easy prey for the dollar-a-week installment sellers who load them up with the glittering toys of urban society—television, automatic dishwashers, hi-fi phonographs, and automobiles. In their original homes, religion was generally wrapped in a revival meeting atmosphere, and the decorous, quiet nature of urban religious experience is likely to seem tame by comparison. White or colored, the new urbanites are, as Ely Aaron, chairman of Chicago's Mayor's Committee on New Residents, says, "proud, clannish, sensitive about their lack of education. They are suspicious and they don't know this business of working with other people."

The Status of Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much interested in the situation in Berlin and the entire country of Germany. The Soviet attitude should be studied very carefully.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Dr. Walter Becher, a member of the Bavarian Landtag, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

THE STATUS OF BERLIN—MOSCOW'S ATTEMPTED CHANGE MUST BE REJECTED

Soviet argumentation centers on the claim that the entire city belongs to the territory of the so-called "DDR" (German Democratic Republic). Inasmuch as Berlin's original four power administration has long ceased to exist, it is asserted that the western powers, 15 years after the end of the war, have forfeited the right to stay in their Berlin sectors.

Aside from the fact that the Soviet representative has prevented the Allied commanders from continuing their work, and the communist SED (Soviet Zone German Communist Party) has split Greater Berlin's administrative unity by unilateral arbitrary action, life in the whole of Berlin is determined by the four power status of the city still today.

Without that status, solemnly agreed upon by all partners at the New York conference of May 1949 after cessation of the blockade, partitioned Berlin during the past 12 years would most probably have developed internal conditions quite similar to those now existing in partitioned Germany. However, whereas the Iron Curtain has changed our country politically and in almost all other aspects into two separate spheres, Berlin despite its administrative division remained that organic unity, the prerequisites and consequences of which have so far manifestly been respected by the Soviet partner.

The sector boundary, though splitting the city in half, has remained up to now a demarcation line; it has not become an Iron Curtain, still less a state frontier. As always, the subway and elevated traffic system connects all parts of Greater Berlin. The inhabitants of both city segments cross the sector boundary daily by the tens of thousands, normally without any particular difficulties. Many Berlin citizens still are living in the east sector and working in the west sector or vice versa. Annually many east sector residents participate in cultural affairs taking place in the other part of the city.

A too little observed political consequence of the four power status, still valid for Greater Berlin, is the circumstance that the SPD (Social Democratic Party of Germany), despite some hindrances, is legally permitted to operate in the city's east sector. In the west sector the Communist SED enjoys the freedom of action denied to the SPD in East Berlin. The situation in Berlin is a singular one in Germany characterizing the city as a special territory conditioned solely by the four power status.

The Soviet attempt to divert attention from this fact and to revamp only West Berlin's status must be rejected. It amounts to a basic change of the realities as still existing in the whole of Berlin today. If materialized, the design would bring about a new division of the city, turn the sector boundary into a state boundary and create an internationally founded jurisdictional pretext for making the east sector, though still under special law, a legal part of the Soviet Zone. Such a development would also mean for the more than 1 million east sector residents, and their liberty to move within the whole city, a factor that could only lead to an aggravation of the situation.

H.R. 870, To Abolish Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast by Washington Station WTOP on May 27, 1960:

Congressman MULTER's bill to abolish the death sentence for most Federal crimes appears to have virtually no chance of passage because of opposition from several quarters, including District commissioners.

Yet the legislation will serve a most valuable purpose, if only to touch off informed debate on the subject of capital punishment and related issues.

This station is not yet wholly persuaded that capital punishment in the District should be ended permanently. We do believe, however, that a moratorium, perhaps for 5 years, would provide information as to whether permanent abolition would harm or benefit the public welfare.

We are led to this position by a variety of evidence, much of which is summed up by the Reverend Peter Raible in an article in the Unitarian Register.

Reverend Raible points out that statistics appear to show that capital punishment is no deterrent to murder; that the few States without the death sentence have no more homicides than those which retain it.

Furthermore, as he writes, the very great majority of those put to death are the "poor, the berefts, the ne'er-do-wells of society." He charges that "in no place in our society do we discriminate more forcefully against the outcast than in earmarking men for death at the hands of the State."

Why, then, does capital punishment retain so much support?

Reverend Raible offers the explanation that—in his words—"the real reason for capital punishment exists within ourselves"; and he quotes Clarence Darrow's famous plea in the Loeb-Leopold trial when he said, "I am pleading for a time when hatred and cruelty will not control the hearts of men, when we can learn by reason and judgment and understanding and faith that all life is worth saving."

Sentiments like these will be dismissed by some as soft-headed; and perhaps there are more prosaic arguments both for and against capital punishment. But the fact remains that many of those who know most about the subject—including the warden of the prison where Caryl Chessman was executed—believe the death sentence is wrong. We think Congress—and the District—should pay attention to their arguments.

The Port Authority and the Lemon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the New Jersey-New York area there has been increasing interest in the vital question of providing and maintaining adequate transportation. Some feel that the Port of New York Authority has not been assuming sufficient responsibility in this area.

In this connection, I should like to include the following editorial from the May 31 edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

THE PORT AUTHORITY AND THE LEMON

As everybody who has been around New York very long knows, the port authority is highly selective of the projects it undertakes. This, of course, is why the port authority has been so successful.

It tackles only that which will pay its own way or shows reasonable prospects thereof. The profits from one enterprise go on to the next, and so on. Thus, we have port development, airports, bridges, tunnels, all part of the regional well-being. And undoubtedly the New York-New Jersey community couldn't have become what it is without the nonpolitical efficiency of the public authority.

But in the current Harper's magazine Mr. Edward T. Chase, whose avocation is mass transportation, whacks the port au-

thority (and the Triborough as well) for this policy of economic selectivity.

There ought to be, he says, an integrated, comprehensive approach to the transportation problem. But for all its desirability, this is blocked by "self-righteous rigidity," which is the mark of "an almost transcendental sense of obligation" to authority bondholders.

Mr. Chase complains that this isn't true responsibility. Why? Because an integrated system, recognizing the importance of railroads and subways as well as the automobile, would be good.

Obviously, though, you can't integrate transportation without pooling revenues, and here the moneymaking facilities are the port authority fief. And if more automobiles require more facilities and produce more congestion, with other transport systems declining in the squeeze, well, who is to be blamed?

Well, it seems to us that the authorities are not entirely guiltless. True, they can and do say—and quite properly—that first-line credit must not be impaired for fear of wrecking all their good works for the future. Yet the criterion that progress comes only where profit can be shown is also a deprivation of the public interest.

Surely the mission of the authorities—and particularly in the case of such a vast complex of activities as the port authority—is to serve public necessity.

It's silly, of course, to suggest that the busted railroads and red-ink subways ought to be dumped into the port authority's lap. But we do believe that it should take a more comprehensive and cooperative view of what's needed in mass transportation. That's what the port authority is for—to solve the tough problems.

As Julius Henry Cohen, one of its guiding geniuses in the early days, said, "Handed a lemon, we'll make lemonade out of it."

Can Dief Tell Ike Some Hard Truths?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I did not say what appears following my few remarks.

In fact, I doubt if any American could say it without getting his political block knocked off editorially.

However, it is nice to know someone can say what so many are thinking. This is from the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada:

CAN DIEF TELL IKE SOME HARD TRUTHS?

"We're ready to go, boy."

Those were the actual words used recently by Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. And they are typical of the kind of language coming from the Pentagon these days.

The "tough talk" boys and the McCarthyities have been revitalized by the summit failure and the cold war freeze-up. President Eisenhower and the U.S. public are listening much more now to the loudmouthed generals; to scientists like Dr. Edward Teller who prides himself on being "the father of the H-bomb," and to Atomic Energy Commission Chairman John McCone, who wants to resume nuclear weapons testing.

In this bully-boy atmosphere now sweeping the United States, a lucky and golden opportunity has been given to Prime Minister Diefenbaker. The question is: Will he take it?

Next week Mr. Diefenbaker meets with President Eisenhower in Washington. Certainly they'll talk about our mutual economic problems and about our joint defense problems.

But perhaps the biggest service Mr. Diefenbaker can do for Canadians—and for the rest of the world—is to put some of the ugly facts of cold war life directly to Mr. Eisenhower—facts from which he is sheltered by his mother hen staff.

The official U.S. attitude right now is to brush off any criticism of American diplomacy and the spy flights either as dirty politics by the Democrats or as Communist and fellow-traveling propaganda. Prime Minister Diefenbaker could not be so dismissed.

In any event, Mr. Diefenbaker should take Ike aside and tell him to get off his high horse, stem the rising tide of anti-Russian feeling in the United States (which only encourages the equally itchy fingered Kremlin Stalinists) and start all over again to melt some of that cold war ice.

The President has heard little but sirupy claptrap about the injured honor of the United States since his well-organized welcome home a week ago. He simply does not know that the world out there beyond the U.S. border does not necessarily take Washington's word as all wise and all gospel.

If Mr. Diefenbaker would only gently tell him so, and if he would plead for an intensification of the tension-easing policies of Secretary of State Herter and a knock in the head for the reviving hard-nose Dulles line (either John Foster or Allen), the Canadian PM would be making a major contribution toward insuring that we will not soon be all blasted off this earth.

Liquor on Airliners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Larry Collins, Sr., indicates why Congress should take action to ban the serving of liquor on airliners:

LIQUOR ON PLANES

(By Larry Collins, Sr.)

A brawling drunk is a menace wherever he is located. But when he is on an airplane he can be a catastrophe. Often the mildest type of citizen when sober becomes a slugging maniac when he has a few drinks. On the ground he may beat up a few people, break some furniture, and assault a policeman. But in a jetplane his truculence could cause the death of all passengers and the crew.

There have recently been several incidents reported where a drunken passenger had to be subdued. The most recent case was when eight passengers were arrested in Montreal, Canada. They were charged with creating a drunken brawl abroad a plane bound from New York to Montreal. The pilot had radioed ahead that there was trouble on board.

The question is raised as to service by the airlines of liquor on their planes. It is difficult to restrict drinking in excess when it is served with meals. One drink is enough to unbalance one person whereas many may not affect the attitude of another. Drinks affect people differently at changed altitudes—and drinks affect the same person differently according to their physical and mental condition at different times.

With the many hazards of air transportation this is one that should be eliminated. With the rapid speed of air travel there are few times when a passenger is in the air more than 5 hours. No one is going to be greatly inconvenienced if deprived of drinks for this period. It may take away some of the glamour for some. But it would be a safeguard for all. The one or two drinks served by the airline may be just the added amount that changed an individual into a brawling menace.

We realize these are controversial views. But when we read of the great concentration needed by members of the crew when landing or navigating through storms, fog and sometimes mechanical failure we realize the danger of any disruptive influences that might occur on the plane. A drunken passenger insisting he wanted to get in the cockpit would probably be subdued. But during the period of subduing him everyone on the plan has his life endangered.

A recent book, "The Cone of Silence," is one of the most dramatic portrayals of what goes on in the cockpit of a jet liner we have ever read. It makes one appreciate how great is the responsibility of the pilot and crew in taking off, landing, and handling of a plane in bad weather. All the passengers and crews safety is dependent on split-second timing ability and knowledge of the man at the controls. Any disturbance such as drunken passengers should be guarded against. This writer is not a prohibitionist and is not critical of people taking their drinks at home or in bars on the ground. But he is concerned about the repeated incidents of brawling drunks on planes where so many lives are involved.

The Crisis of the Commuter Railroads—No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting in New York City yesterday, Boyd T. Barnard, president of the Urban Land Institute, made a noteworthy comment on metropolitan population declines indicated by preliminary 1960 census data. He asserted that big cities are losing population because of traffic strangulation and that this will continue until the cities develop integrated mass transportation systems. I concur in the opinion. This is good, solid evidence that the time has come to do something about the need for mass transportation improvements in urban areas. Under permission previously granted, I include an article from this morning's New York Times which describes the meeting in New York City. The article:

LOSSES IN CENSUS LINKED TO TRAFFIC—EXPERTS ASSERT CITIES MUST ACT ON TRANSIT PROBLEMS TO END STRANGULATION—JOINT PROGRAMS URGED—SOLUTION SEEN IN PROJECTS ON METROPOLITAN SCALE—CUT IN CAR USE ASKED

(By Charles Grutzner)

The loss of population in several cities was viewed yesterday as a warning of decay that

might ruin the cores of metropolitan areas that fail to end traffic strangulation.

Boyd T. Barnard, president of the Urban Land Institute, who sounded the warning, said, however, that some shrinkage of population in large central cities might not be a bad thing if it aroused cities to solve their problems of mass rapid transit. In that event, he said, it would be a question of how the cities redeveloped the spaces deserted by the migrants to suburbia.

Mr. Barnard expressed these views in commenting on early results of the 1960 census. The reports so far show population losses in Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Newark, Rochester, and other cities, especially in the Eastern States. New York City also has been losing population in recent years.

SOLUTIONS PROPOSED

Mr. Barnard and Fred J. Borch, vice president of General Electric Co., offered approaches to the metropolitan transportation problem at a press interview in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The session was arranged by General Electric, which in 1954 helped organize Action, Inc., a national council for good cities.

Mr. Barnard described public transportation as the No. 1 problem of big cities. He said it could be solved only with coordinated programs for entire metropolitan areas, entailing use of the family car only to drive to the suburban station and the use of rapid transit the rest of the way. But the major difficulty, he said, was in getting coordinated action by local governmental bodies. Progress is being made in some metropolitan areas to set up authorities that overlap political boundaries, he explained.

The development of coordinated rapid transit systems, he observed, would require some city or State subsidies for mass transportation and would probably bring pressure from some quarters for Federal subsidies.

SUBSIDY HELD ONLY WAY

"We are already subsidizing the motorist," he said, "and the total subsidy on a coordinated transportation system is likely to be no more than our present subsidy cost. There is no alternative. Private automobiles on public highways can never carry the people.

"While it is unpopular to mention anything about our 'cold war' adversary, Soviet Russia, I am impressed with the Moscow subway system, which makes it possible for every citizen of that city to reach a subway station within 15 minutes' walk from his living quarters."

As hopeful signs at home, Mr. Barnard said, San Francisco will vote soon on financing a regional transit system and Los Angeles is "considering how it can get back its commuter lines which have been abandoned."

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, several of the States have enacted legislation against discrimination in hiring employees by reason of age. This kind of discrimination has been found senseless and uneconomic by study after study. Yet it continues to persist, largely because of lack of information relative to the merits of hiring older workers. A model bill for consideration of State legislatures which have not yet acted on this important subject has been distributed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles as part of its campaign against job discrimination on account of age.

The model bill is as follows:

A BILL TO PROHIBIT UNJUST DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF AGE

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "—Against Age Discrimination in Employment".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Legislature hereby finds that the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their age is contrary to American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, deprives the State of ——— of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and endangers the general welfare.

(b) Hiring bias generally against workers over forty-five years of age deprives the State of ——— of its most important resource of experienced employees, adds to the number of persons receiving public assistance, and deprives older people of the dignity and status of self-support.

(c) The right to employment otherwise lawful without discrimination because of age, where the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction, is hereby recognized as and declared to be a right of all the people of the State of ——— which should be protected as provided herein.

(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the State of ——— to protect the right recognized and declared in subdivision (c) hereof and to eliminate all such discrimination to the fullest extent permitted. This Act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations or corporations.

(b) The term "employer" means a person in this State having in his employ one or more individuals; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization of employees which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, terms, or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 4. This Act shall not apply to any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for private profit, other than labor organizations. Nothing herein shall affect the retirement policy or system of any employer where such policy or system is not merely a subterfuge to evade the purposes of that Act.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, otherwise lawful, because of such individual's age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction; and,

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment otherwise lawful, any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which so discriminates against such individuals because of their age.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to so discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of otherwise lawful employment opportunities, or would limit such employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as such an employee or as such an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's age.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he opposed any unlawful employment practice specified in this Act or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

SEC. 6. (a) The ——— shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the legislature and to the Governor under this Act concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in his employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(b) The ——— may by such duly authorized representative as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to his functions in any part of the State.

(c) The ——— shall have power—

(1) to appoint such agents and employees as he deems necessary to assist him in the performance of his functions under this Act,

(2) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the ——— or any of its duly authorized representatives the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the State of ———,

(3) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder,

(4) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action,

(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a duly authorized representative of the ——— that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice defined in this Act, the ——— shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

(b) If the ——— fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act or in advance there of if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the ———, or before its duly authorized representative, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such charge.

(c) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(e) The ——— or its duly authorized representative conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(f) Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within one year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(g) At the conclusion of a hearing before a duly authorized representative of the ——— the entire record thereof shall be transferred to the ——— to hear on such record the parties at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

(h) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken the ——— shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the ——— shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the Act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken the ——— shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the ——— shall state his findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(i) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the ——— may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The ——— shall have power to petition the circuit court for the district wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the ———.

(b) Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the ———.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the ——— or his duly authorized representative shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the ——— or its duly authorized representative, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the ——— or its duly authorized representative and to be made a part of the transcript.

(e) The ——— may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the State of ———.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the ——— may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court for the district wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the ——— be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the ——— and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the ———, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the ———. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of a application by the ——— under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioner or the ——— such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the ———.

(h) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the ——— order.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the ——— deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this Act, the ——— or his duly authorized representative shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the ——— or its duly authorized representative conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) The ——— or its duly authorized representative for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the State of any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, any circuit court for the district in which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides upon application by the ——— shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the ——— or its duly authorized representative, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The ——— shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE ADMINISTRATOR OR HIS DULY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

SEC. 11. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with a duly authorized representative of the ——— while engaged in the performance of duties under this Act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall become effective sixty days after enactment.

Experience in the State of New York after enactment of a similar law was described in the following article from the Schenectady Gazette for August 3, 1959:

BIAS DUE TO AGE REPORTED ON DECLINE; STATE PLACING MORE WORKERS OVER 45

Dramatic changes in the attitudes of employers toward the employment of older workers appear to have occurred since the enactment of the provision of the law against discrimination barring discrimination because of age, Elmer A. Carter, chairman of State commission against discrimination, has reported.

His report was a summing up of a year's operation of this section of the law which became effective on July 1, 1958.

A review of the operations of the State employment service showed that the placement of workers over 45 rose from 21 percent of the total in the first 6 months of 1958, to 29 percent in the same period in 1958 and to 30 percent in the first 6 months of 1959.

The report pointed out that New York State, through its employment service, continued to find employment for a larger number of older workers than any other State in the Nation.

Carter said one of the many effects of the law had been the virtual disappearance of employment advertising in which age qualifications were specified.

SCAD received 148 complaints based upon discrimination because of age on the first year of the law, Carter reported. These complaints constitute nearly 16 percent of the total number of complaints—928—involving employment received by SCAD during the period. The complainants ranged in age from 22 to 86.

Carter said as a further index to effectiveness of the law the State employment service reported that in June 1959 it had received only 210 job orders containing age specifications at all of its offices.

A spot check of the Hempstead, Long Island, office of the employment service revealed even more impressive changes. From 1955 to 1956 nearly every fourth order contained an age specification, but in the 1958–59 period such requests occurred in only 3 out of every 1,000 job orders.

SCAD had closed 54 of the 148 complaints received involving age at the end of the first year's operations, the report said. Charges of discrimination were sustained in nine of the cases. Twenty-eight were dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, 2 were withdrawn by

the complainants and no evidence of discrimination was found in the remaining 15.

Eighty-two percent of the complaints came from the New York City area. Employers were charged with discrimination in 73 percent of the cases, employment agencies in 17 percent, and labor unions in 10 percent.

Nearly two of every three complaints related to professional, sales, and kindred positions, while only 13 percent involved craftsmen.

A Tribute to Thomas S. Gates, Our Dedicated Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority whip, the Honorable LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois, is also the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives. Those of our Members who serve on that committee are well aware of his deep and continuing interest in national security matters, and his many contributions toward a stronger national defense.

While his continuing efforts and knowledge of national defense problems are well recognized both in the committee and in Congress as a whole, it is particularly pleasant to note that LES ARENDS' ability and authoritative opinion in defense matters have been widely recognized by the public and in the press.

One of the more recent tributes to our distinguished colleague appeared in the San Diego Union of Saturday, May 14, 1960. On that occasion, the Union's editorial referred to Representative ARENDS' recent comments as to the importance of Secretary of Defense Gates' policy of personally meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I unreservedly endorse the observations of the editorial in complimenting Secretary Gates for his Joint Chiefs of Staff policy, and I invite the attention of the House to complimentary references in the editorial to the distinguished minority whip, LES ARENDS.

I recommend the editorial to the attention of the Members of this House:

NEW POLICY PAYS

There are critics of U.S. defense policy who would abandon the Joint Chiefs of Staff and supplant this concept with some version of a supreme high command. Representative LESLIE ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, House minority whip, has submitted to Congress a refutation of all the arguments in favor of the latter and against junking a system which worked so well during the last two wars in which the United States was involved.

As Representative ARENDS pointed out to Congress, Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr.'s new policy of sitting down with the JCS when they disagree "demonstrates the truism that there is very little in governmental organization problems that intelligence, determination, hard work, and leadership will not cure."

Representative ARENDS is a veteran member of the House Armed Services Committee, which has subscribed to continuation of the JCS concept and rejected the supreme command idea.

The organization charts which blueprint the JCS never will take the place of a defense secretary who helps make the system function. This Secretary Gates has done since he took over direction of the Defense Department. And the success of his efforts have undercut the critics of JCS.

William S. Peterson Wins American Public Power Association Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William S. Peterson, a resident of the congressional district I represent, recently won the Distinguished Service Award presented by the American Public Power Association.

The award was given to Mr. Peterson "in recognition of his long and outstanding public service, devotion to duty, and contribution to the welfare of his community and the Nation, exemplifying the highest ideals and finest traditions in management of a municipal electric utility."

Mr. Peterson is general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. He received this honor at the association's 17th annual convention held recently in Washington, D.C.

It is interesting to note that a previous winner of the APPA Distinguished Service Award was Mr. Samuel B. Morris, former general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Mr. Morris is also a resident of the congressional district I represent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 19, 1960 Los Angeles Herald and Express, complimenting Mr. Peterson on receiving this honor, and also a copy of the nomination which won the award for Mr. Peterson:

[From the Los Angeles Herald & Express, May 19, 1960]

FOR A JOB WELL DONE

William S. Peterson, general manager and chief engineer of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, has received the highest award of achievement from the American Public Power Association, that body's annual distinguished service award.

Mr. Peterson, who will retire in December after more than 35 years of service with the Los Angeles department, is especially well known for his designing of the 287,500-volt Boulder transmission line, which brings power to Los Angeles over a distance of more than 300 miles from Hoover Dam.

It also is notable that Mr. Peterson became the sixth public power leader to be so honored during the association's long history. Also exceptional is the fact that two officials of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power have received awards in the list of six men. The other was Samuel B. Morris, former general manager and chief engineer.

We congratulate Mr. Peterson on his honor received and we commend the local department in its wise selection of top engineers and managers of the department.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD—WILLIAM S. PETERSON, GENERAL MANAGER AND CHIEF ENGINEER, DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. Peterson is a past president of the American Public Power Association and has made many significant contributions to the work of the association.

A distinguished enginer, Mr. Peterson is well known for his work in connection with the design of the 287,500-volt Boulder transmission line, which brings power from Hoover Dam to Los Angeles, a distance of almost 300 miles. From 1926 through completion in 1940 of the third circuit of the three-circuit line, he was engaged in technical research work on high voltage, conductor vibration, and line stability problems, as well as general transmission line design.

Following completion of the Boulder transmission line, Mr. Peterson was assigned the duties of technical administrative assistant to the chief electrical engineer of the department of water and power and represented the Department in Washington, D.C., during the early years of World War II on priority matters and large power contracts. He also was power consultant without compensation to the War Production Board.

In December 1943, Mr. Peterson was appointed to head the power system's design and construction division, and in 1945 he became assistant chief electrical engineer of the department. While in this position he served as an occasional consultant to the National Security Resources Board. On November 9, 1951, he was appointed chief electrical engineer and assistant manager, and on April 1, 1953, he became assistant general manager and chief engineer of the department of water and power. He was appointed to his present position on October 1, 1955.

In addition to his responsibilities with the Nation's largest municipally owned electric utility, Mr. Peterson served as consultant on the early stages of design of the Tennessee Valley Authority system and as consultant to the Federal Government in the Southwest power pooling operation. Early in his career, he served as technical aide to the late E. F. Scattergood, of the Los Angeles department, in the development of many of the presentations made by Mr. Scattergood at the World Power Conference, before congressional committees, and in connection with the organization and development of the American Public Power Association, of which Mr. Scattergood was a founder.

He has contributed numerous papers which advanced the art and understanding of system stability and high-voltage transmission. As a member of the CIGRE Committee and as the U.S. representative on the Towers and Conductors Subcommittee, he has contributed over a number of years to the international development of high-voltage transmission.

In his own right, Mr. Peterson has made many presentations to legislative committees on water and power development, and has made a number of such presentation in behalf of APPA.

Under Mr. Peterson's leadership, the Department of Water and Power is moving ahead in the atomic energy field, both through staff studies and through development of a proposal for an atomic energy installation in the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Peterson has served as president of the Los Angeles Engineering Council, as

chairman of the Los Angeles Section of the American Institute of Electric Engineers, and on the National Committee of CIGRE. He is a member of Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi, and Eta Kappa Nu.

Memorial Day, Larchmont, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of Commander Ben McGrath of Larchmont, N.Y., Memorial Day for a number of years in that community has been a very unusual and memorable occasion.

Through careful planning, meticulous attention to details and much civic cooperation, Commander McGrath was able to evoke an attendance at the 1960 Memorial Day service which is entirely out of keeping with the size of the community.

It seems literally as though all of Larchmont turns out to hear the speeches and see the parade. The police and fire department cooperate thoroughly, as do the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and the Cubs and Brownies, and the parade is an unusually splendid affair.

It has been my privilege to talk before the Larchmont Memorial Day gathering for several years, and my remarks given on this past May 30 follow:

Once again I stand before my neighbors and friends on this important day to speak a message—a message primarily in tribute to those who were once among us, but who were swept away by an irresistible tide of arms. Their passing brought deep sorrow to their parents, their spouses, and their children. A number of those among us know the pangs that service-connected losses brough them through personal bereavement.

We know only this—that as civilized human beings it is proper and fitting that we honor our departed comrades here today. And that in their memory we pause to take inventory of the heritage they left us. That the world—our world—was better when they left it cannot be denied.

There was not the sword of Damocles hanging over all of us in the form of the nuclear bomb, threatening us with fiery extinction in one dreadful moment of scorching flame. There was not the rash of rioting on the international scene, in Korea, Turkey, South America, and the Antilles—rioting which bespeaks terrifying impatience with the status quo and indicates a pressing need for social and political change in farflung areas.

There was not the phenomena of oppressed people everywhere rising in forceful numbers to overthrow ancient systems of tyranny and colonialism.

There was not in the bright days of our departed comrades the multitude of juvenile delinquency crimes—which cry out loudly that something is amiss with our social patterns. And there was not, I truly believe, the frightful emphasis on inconsequential things which today are given importance entirely inconsistent with their pragmatic value.

These are the disappointing facts of our inventory.

What is there on the hopeful side? Much indeed.

People—our people and other people—today are shattering the impediments that have long stood in the way of man's progress. The interchange of scientific knowledge on an international scale has made it possible for nations to provide the power, the industrial knowledge, and the resources, to give their peoples the necessities of life, the jobs, the homes, and the necessary raiment.

Disease is gradually yielding its enigmas to the penetrating explorations of the electric microscope. Ignorance and illiteracy are being wiped out. Food and shelter will soon be available to a world which for centuries saw a large percentage of its inhabitants in dire want and painful penury.

What, may I ask, is the stumbling block to achieving these world goals, to world progress, to peace and prosperity, which would permit man to attack the social problems that beset us?

The answer is Russia.

If we did not have to spend $40 billion on arms to give us deterrent military strength, to give us a voice at the international bargaining table, we could do much for the sick, the mentally ill, the poorly housed, the oppressed.

Russia, however, prefers to pursue its course of attempted world domination, to spread its evil doctrine of communism by every devious means available to it.

Its record is one of deceit and infamy.

Russia has repudiated every agreement she has made with her former allies.

She has seized and impounded behind the Iron Curtain, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Armenia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and a host of other smaller national entities.

But of this we can be certain—politically, Russia is a giant with feet of clay. Of the 200 million people in the Soviet's immediate orbit, 56 percent are not dedicated by conditioning or heritage to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

There are, in fact, only 96 million Russians compared with 114 million non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. Idel-Ural has 15 million, Uzbek has 8 million, the Ukraine has 42 million, and the other segments of the Soviet Union have 35 million non-Russians.

I mention these facts to show that instead of a tightly knit coalition of states, Russia is a loosely formed composite of divergent nations, each proud of its own heritage and chafing under Communist domination.

So much for Russia—which, we must not forget, for all its inherent problems, still has intercontinental missile opeartional capabilities sufficient to destroy us.

I think that on the brighter side of life today is the widespread awakening on the part of our citizens to the importance of the part government plays in the life of our people.

More than ever our citizens are beginning to appreciate that it is not how much a man earns for himself that is the criterion of his true worth so much as it is the contribution he is making to the welfare of others, to his community, and to his country.

All over this land of ours businessmen are learning the rudiments of politics. They are finally realizing that it is important to them that they have a voice in the legislative processes of our country. It is they who should help make the laws which govern them, rather than leave it to a few self-appointed professional policymakers.

Let us in memory of our departed comrades determine now that henceforth we will make every effort to prove that this is not a world governed by the anarchy of chance, but rather a purposeful, God-fearing world of order and law, and one which we cherish and endeavor to improve.

Let us keep faith with the dead who died gallantly and with the conviction that those who had the gift of life would not fail them nor their children, nor their children's children.

As Father Keller, the founder of the Christophers, said so eloquently and humbly, "Better to light a candle than curse the darkness."

Mistaken Identity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, a constituent of mine, Mr. Charles E. Hutsler, wage administrator, International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, made a phone call to the Board of Parole, Department of Justice, in behalf of someone else to find out the procedure to be followed for hearings under section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. The act prohibits a person from holding certain positions in a labor union if they have been convicted or indicted for certain crimes. It further provides exemption from its provisions after a hearing before the Board of Parole. Mr. Hutsler requested the staff director to send to him the regulations governing these hearings. The staff director replied that the regulations had not been written at that time and that he would send them upon their completion. The name of the person on whose behalf the call was made was not divulged at that time because it was felt it was not necessary to do so.

Later, the attention of Mr. Hutsler was called to page AA-4 of the Daily Labor Reporter of February 6, 1960, published by the Bureau of National Affairs. In that article it was stated that additional cases before the Board on which no hearings had been scheduled involved Mr. Hutsler and several others. When the Bureau of National Affairs was advised of the circumstances which actually existed, they immediately printed a 2½ page explanation and clarification of the matter.

The memorandum which started the events which led up to the news item being published in the Bureau of National Affairs publication was filed with the Congress, apparently to justify a request for funds to implement the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. It was entered into the record of the hearing by the subcommittee, and when it was called to their attention later, the record of the hearings had been closed and no correction was possible. I am therefore taking this only remaining opportunity in an attempt to clear the record of this damaging testimony.

It appears from the correspondence available to me that there is, to say the least, an inconsistency in the statements made by the Staff Director of the Board of Parole and the Chairman of the Board. The Chairman, in a letter dated April 26, 1960, addressed to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman, Subcom-

mittee on Deficiencies Appropriations, House of Representatives, states that—

I am informed by a member of the Board's staff that Mr. Hutsler called the Board and discussed at some length, without identifying himself, the prohibitive clauses of the new Labor Act as relates to an employee of the Iron Workers of America. This staff member informs me that he had no reason to know that Mr. Hutsler was an attorney or that he was calling for information regarding a second party. At that time Mr. Hutsler identified no one else.

The Staff Director for the Board, in a letter dated March 4, 1960, addressed to Mr. Charles E. Hutsler, wage administrator, International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers, stated that—

The only name our records showed was your name. We did not in our records show you, however, as the person who might be barred from employment pursuant to the Labor-Management Act, but merely as the person with whom the case could be identified.

Mr. Reed's letter of April 26, 1960, to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS tends to leave the impression that they had reason to believe that Mr. Hutsler was actually involved, whereas the letter of March 4, 1960, from the Staff Director clearly indicates that they were merely using Mr. Hutsler's name as the person with whom the case could be identified. In other words, it was clear to the Department of Justice that Mr. Hutsler was not involved in a case before the Board of Parole, although such a conclusion was drawn by the Bureau of National Affairs, based upon the memorandum of February 12, 1960, mentioned above.

If the Bureau of National Affairs had read the testimony in connection with the memorandum in the record, it is my belief they would not have published the news item as they did. It is also my belief that the Department of Justice would not have written the memorandum of February 12, 1960, in the manner in which it appeared in the record if they had suspected the repercussions which actually resulted from the memorandum.

This is a regrettable situation which could have been avoided by more precise consideration by both the Department of Justice and the Bureau of National Affairs. It is my sincere wish that this matter will encourage more thoughtful and precise memorandums by the Department of Justice in substantiating their request for appropriations and more accurate and factual reporting by national publications when a person's reputation and integrity are involved.

A Prayer for the Middle Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the chaplain who participated in the Memorial Day parade in the Germantown section of my district, Rev. W. Hamilton Aulenbach, of Christ Church and St. Michael's distributed a prayer memorandum, which is very interesting. I have attached it to my remarks, because I believe it may have some value for the Members in their daily activities:

A PRAYER FOR THE MIDDLE AGED

Lord Thou knowest better than I know myself that I am growing older and will some day be old. Keep me from the fatal habit of thinking I must say something on every subject and on every occasion. Release me from craving to straighten out everybody's affairs. Make me thoughtful but not moody; helpful but not bossy. With my vast store of wisdom, it seems a pity not to use it all, but Thou knowest, Lord, that I want a few friends at the end.

Keep my mind free from the recital of endless details; give me wings to get to the point. Seal my lips on my aches and pains. They are increasing and love of rehearsing them is becoming sweeter as the years go by. I dare not ask for grace enough to enjoy the tales of others' pains but help me to endure them with patience.

I dare not ask for improved memory, but for a growing humility and a lessening cocksureness when my memory seems to clash with the memories of others. Teach me the glorious lesson that occasionally I may be mistaken.

Keep me reasonably sweet; I do not want to be a saint—some of them are so hard to live with—but a sour old person is one of the crowning works of the Devil. Give me the ability to see good things in unexpected places and talents in unexpected people. Give me the grace to tell them so. Amen.

Surrogate John J. Dillon Honored—Conference of Christians and Jews Presents Award to One of Westchester's Leading Jurists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, John J. Dillon, surrogate of Westchester County, N.Y., one of the most beloved and respected men in the community, and Regent Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., of Purchase, N.Y., and Dr. Clara M. Tead, of Briarcliff Manor, president of Briarcliff College, were honored recently by the National Conference of Christians and Jews for the advancement of brotherhood.

The awards were presented at a dinner attended by 300 at the Pines Ridge Golf Club, Ossining, N.Y., a dinner which contributed greatly toward the eventual chapter of the national conference in Westchester County.

NOT "FACELESS THEOLOGY"

Keynote speaker was Robert Greene, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1783, with offices in White Plains. He said:

"Interfaith is not a sort of superreligion, with a faceless theology. It is rather the recognition on the part of those who have remained steadfast in their faith, that underlying their own particular beliefs there is that historical common preamble of faith. Interfaith does not mean to bury convictions; it rather means to bury the hatchet. It does not mean to demolish boundaries; it rather means to remove barriers and to establish a sort of intellectual free trade between religions."

Greene noted that the "cornerstone of the free American labor movement was built and continues to flourish on the basic premise of brotherhood. This was recognized right in the beginning by men like Samuel Gompers, Philip Murray, and William Green, who were only by coincidence a Jew, a Catholic, and a Protestant."

RECIPIENTS PRAISED

Greene called Dr. Tead a "distinguished personality in the academic world and a renowned educator," Pforzheimer "the distinguished son of a most distinguished father, richly endowed with rare humanitarian instinct," and Dillon "an eminent jurist in America."

In accepting the award—a framed scroll—Dr. Tead said:

"Frankly, I don't feel that I merit this award. Because I have never really worked for better Christian-Jewish relationships—I have simply believed in them, lived them, and enjoyed them."

She said that folks working together toward a common goal develop a sense of unity. "My work at Briarcliff—with girls selected from many racial backgrounds, from many religious groups, has reenforced this belief."

PFORZHEIMER FLATTERED

Her award was presented by Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of the national conference. He called the activity of his unit in Westchester as a great new beginning. He praised Dr. Tead, stating: "Liberal education has no meaning unless you are concerned with the destiny of man."

Pforzheimer, an investment banker, said he was deeply flattered. "Upon reflection I realize that in reality this honor is for something not only in which I have always believed, but, more strikingly, for an approach to living which was an integral part of the early training and educational background which both my wife and I were fortunate to enjoy." He added: "* * * I feel that this occasion helped me to bring into sharper focus some of the basic reasons why I have had such joy and keen stimulation while working with various groups in and out of business."

Pforzheimer noted that the New York State Board of Regents has and is composed of persons of every major religious belief. "The Board of Regents is proud to be a governmental body whose deliberations and policies informed citizens accept as color-blind, race-blind and religion-blind."

UNPURCHASABLE GIFT

He was given the award by fellow Regent Everett J. Penny of White Plains who hailed Pforzheimer for his sense of responsibility, desire to be a good neighbor and to improve his community.

Dillon said: "I am very grateful I am conscious again tonight that both the good Lord and my fellow men have been good to me. He noted that when he first came to Westchester "I met so many people who held out to me the unpurchasable gift of friendship and I see so many of them here tonight." He called the conference one of the vital movements of our times.

Dillon suggested that there was much work to be done. "It's a melancholy fact that we've seen in the 20th century an organized attempt to exterminate races" and an attempt to supress whole religions. There are parts of the world today, he declared "where the lights of Judaism and Christianity are very nearly out."

On a personal note, Dillon alluded to last summer when a son was stricken with polio. He said it warmed our hearts when prayers were said for his son in his church but it even warmed his heart more when the same petitions to the same God were raised in other sanctuaries. That to my mind was brotherhood.

PRAYERS OFFERED

His presentation was by Justice Elbert T. Gallagher who said Dillon exalts those concepts upon which this National Conference is founded. He cited Dillon for his profound faith in God.

Prayers were offered by Msgr. Joseph C. Krug of White Plains, Rabbi Irving Koslowe of Mamaroneck, and the Reverend Junius W. Cofield of Ossining.

Lester J. Bradshaw of White Plains was dinner chairman and master of ceremonies. Among those introduced was Mrs. Richard Schwarz of Briarcliff Manor, Westchester director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Soviet Espionage Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a summary of various Soviet espionage activities. The summary was prepared by the Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, and was furnished to me at my request.

I believe that this information will be of interest to the membership of the House in connection with the U–2 incident since it serves to further highlight the deadly nature of the Communist zeal for world domination as it describes Soviet worldwide espionage activities which are dedicated to furthering this grim mission.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES

I. ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

The Soviet Union has carried out espionage against the United States since the early days of the regime. Considering both direct Soviet spies and persons recruited in this country, the roster of individuals revealed as Soviet agents is long. Soviet efforts to procure information on American atomic research during the war and postwar period are well known. Given below are two selected cases, those of Colonel Abel and Julius and Ethel Rosenberg—one where a Soviet spy is the main agent, the other where American nationals committed acts of espionage for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

The Abel case

Col. Rudolph Abel, 55, of Soviet intelligence was convicted by a Federal jury in New York on October 25, 1957, for conspiring to steal U.S. defense secrets for the Soviet Union.

He was found guilty on a three-count indictment charging: (1) conspiracy to transmit U.S. defense and atomic secrets to the U.S.S.R., (2) conspiracy to gather the secrets, and (3) failure to register as a foreign agent. On November 15, 1957, he was sentenced to 30 years in prison and a fine of $3,000. His sentence was confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court on March 28, 1960.

The chief witness against Abel was ex-Lt. Col. Reino Hayhanen, 37, confessed ex-Soviet spy who identified him as the U.S.S.R.'s resident officer for espionage" in the United States. Hayhanen testified that he and Abel had been ordered by Moscow to give $10,000 in two payments to Mrs. Helen Sobell, wife of Morton Sobell, who was serving a 30-year sentence for his conviction in the Rosenberg atomic spy case, and to recruit Mrs. Sobell as an agent. Hayhanen indicated that he had not fulfilled this assignment.

The Rosenberg case

Julius Rosenberg, of New York, was a devoted Communist. A member of a cell of Communist engineers reporting to Jacob Golos, he first engaged in industrial espionage and was later elevated to political and atomic intelligence. With the help of his wife Ethel, he recruited his brother-in-law, David Greenglass, who was working at Los Alamos on highly confidential matters. Greenglass, shortly before the first atom bomb test explosion, transmitted a highly important report to the Soviet agents. It was not until the confessions of Fuchs in England and Harry Gold in the United States that Greenglass was pointed out, and he in turn pointed to the Rosenbergs.

Rosenberg and his wife were arrested in the summer of 1950. At the time of their arrest, Abraham Brothman, Miriam Koskowitz, and Morton Sobell were also uncovered, arrested, and tried. The Rosenbergs were sentenced to death; Gold and Sobell were sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment, David Greenglass to 15, Abraham Brothman to 7, and Miriam Moskowitz to 2.

Along with Harry Gold, two other persons were indicted—"John Doe," alias "John," actually Anatoli Yakovlev, and "Richard Roe," alias "Sam," actually Semion Semionov—both professional Soviet intelligence agents. The indictment of the two Soviet chiefs was purely a formality, since they had long since left American soil.

Soviet diplomatic espionage

In the last 10 years a substantial number of officers of the Soviet Embassy in Washington have been expelled by the U.S. Government for espionage activities and a number of members of the Soviet mission to the United Nations and employees of the United Nations Secretariat have also been expelled.

In 1950, Valentin Gubitchev, a United Nations Secretariat employee, was expelled for having received classified documents from Judith Coplon. In 1953 Yuri Novikov, a Second Secretary of the Soviet Embassy at Washington, was declared persona non grata for having conspired with two American citizens to procure and transmit Army, Air Force, and aircraft plant data to the Soviet Union. In 1954 Igor A. Amosov and Leonid E. Pivnev, assistant naval attachés, and Alexander P. Kovalev, a secretary of the Soviet United Nations delegation, were expelled for espionage.

In 1956, Col. Ivan A. Bubchikov, a Soviet assistant military attaché, was expelled for espionage. During the same year, Boris F. Gladkov, a member of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, and Viktor I. Petrov, a United Nations Secretariat employee, were expelled for espionage.

In 1957, Yuri P. Krylov, an assistant military attaché at the Soviet Embassy, was declared persona non grata for having improperly purchased quantities of electronic equipment through American intermediaries and having attempted to purchase classified military information. In the same year, Vasili M. Molev, an employee of the Soviet Embassy at Washington, was expelled after having been implicated in espionage activities for which Jack Soble, Myra Soble, and Jacob Albam were convicted in 1957.

In 1958, Nikolai I. Kurochkin, a third secretary of the Soviet Embassy at Washington, was expelled for having paid hundreds of dollars to an American citizen for the improper procurement of U.S. army manuals and other materials.

In 1959, Vadim Kirilyuk, a Soviet employee of the United Nations attempted to have a U.S. citizen furnish him with classified information. When his efforts were brought to the attention of his employers at the United Nations, he was asked to resign and leave the country. He left in January 1960.

II. SOVIET ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES ELSEWHERE IN THE FREE WORLD

The existence of Soviet secret police and intelligence-gathering organizations in foreign countries is well known from the accounts of numerous defecting agents and from trials of Soviet agents were were caught. The activities of these organizations range from pure espionage to acts of terrorism, including kidnapping and murder.

(*a*) *Selected espionage cases*

Gouzenko in Canada

The admissions of Igor Gouzenko, the cipher clerk in the Soviet Embassy in Canada, who took home from the office of the Soviet military attaché eloquent letters and documents relating to Fred Rose and his spy services and the exchange of secret messages between the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Ambassador in Moscow (available through the services of Emma Woikin, Soviet spy in that Canadian Department) led in 1945 to the establishment of a Royal Commission and the documented exposure of the Soviet spy network in Canada.

Petrov in Australia

The admissions of Vladimir Petrov, a Soviet diplomat who defected in Canberra in 1954, similarly led to the creation of an Australian Royal Commission and the exposure of Soviet spy activities in that country.

Espionage in Sweden

The trial of Ernst Hilding Andersson, a petty officer in the Swedish Navy, showed the extent of a Soviet Embassy's active participation in the direction of espionage activities. Andersson, a Communist since 1929, was communicated with by Vinogradov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Stockholm, and instructed to procure and supply information on the Swedish Navy, coastal defense installation, secret waterlanes, and suitable invasion areas along the coast of northern Sweden. He was convicted by a Swedish court on November 14, 1951, for espionage.

Rastvorov in Japan

Under cover of his position as second secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Japan from 1950 to 1954, Yuri A. Rastvorov, on his own admission, served as a Soviet military intelligence operative in the Far East. Rastvorov has resided in the United States since his defection in 1954.

Walter G. Krivitsky

Before the war, one of the U.S.S.R.'s foremost intelligence officers was Krivitsky—alias Samuel Ginsberg. Krivitsky worked for Soviet military intelligence and later for the Soviet state security apparatus in Western Europe during the twenties and thirties, and finally as chief of Soviet military intelligence in Western Europe, with headquarters at The Hague. Krivitsky defected in 1937 and published a full account of his activities as an agent.

(*b*) *Terroristic activities*

Murder in Germany

The employment of the Soviet Union's secret police organization as an instrument for carrying out terroristic acts in foreign countries was convincingly documented by MVD Capt. Nikolai Khokhlov, who defected

to the West while on a murder mission in Germany.

In October 1953 Khokhlov, a veteran of 13 years' service in the NKVD and MVD, received the assignment of murdering Georgi Okolovich, chief of the anti-Communist Russian refugees NTS (the Solidarists). Khokhlov and two agents, Kurt Weber and Hans Kikowitch, who accompanied him, were equipped by the MVD laboratories with specially designed murder weapons smuggled into Germany hidden in an automobile battery. Concealed in cigarette cases, the electrically operated assassination weapons fired poison dumdum bullets and were fitted with unique silencers. Refusing to participate in the murder of an innocent man, Khokhlov called Okolovich on February 18, 1954, at the latter's apartment in Frankfurt and revealed the plot.

Kidnaping: The Linse Case in Berlin

Dr. Walter Linse, an official of the Investigating Committee of Free Jurists, was kidnaped on the morning of July 8, 1952, by agents of the East German State Security Service. The kidnaping occurred on a main street in West Berlin during the morning rush hour, only a short distance from Dr. Linse's home. He was attacked by two agents, knocked down with a sack of sand and thrown into a waiting car. Dr. Linse was shot in the leg during this brief scuffle, which was witnessed by a number of persons. A delivery truck attempted to follow the kidnapers, but the agents in the escape car tossed out nails and iron claws in its path and shot at its tires. In response to a sharp allied protest, the Soviet authorities in East Berlin stated that they knew nothing about the affair and that Dr. Linse was not in their custody. Later, however, it became known that Linse had been turned over to the Soviet Union several days after the kidnaping; he was held in Soviet military prisons in Berlin until sometime during the summer of 1953, then sentenced to 25 years' penal servitude and transported to the Soviet Union. Nothing more is known of his fate with any certainty, although returning German prisoners of war reported meeting him in the Vorkuta area.

Kidnaping: The Trushnovich Case in Berlin

Dr. A. R. Trushnovich, head of the Russian Rescue Committee in West Berlin, was kidnaped by Soviet agents on April 13, 1954. When his wife and daughter returned from a theater to find their apartment wrecked, neighbors reported seeing several men carrying another man down the stairs and being told the man was sick and being taken to the hospital. The following day the East Berlin radio claimed that Trushnovich had voluntarily defected. Nothing has been heard of him since.

Suppressing the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, shocking as it may seem, I am advised that some savings and loan associations are pooling their efforts to suppress the truth.

On May 19, 1960, under the heading "False Confidence in Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation," I exposed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the incompetent management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its far reaching disastrous effect upon the public welfare.

Instead of the savings and loan associations pooling their resources to correct this evil, a group is combining to suppress the facts. Is it because this group fears intimidation by the crushing autocratic powers of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, including the power of seizure under the false guise of an "emergency," just as they seized the sound and solvent Long Beach Savings & Loan Association?

These Associations borrow huge sums from the Federal Home Loan Bank System, as their annual reports show, and are therefore subject to immediate economic reprisals. This may account for their efforts to suppress the truth and their hesitancy to stand forthright for the principles of justice and clean up the management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

In any event the public welfare must be considered first, and it is imperative that an immediate cleanup of the incompetent management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation be undertaken. Now is not the time for the savings and loan associations to say all is well.

The truth is that all is not well.

As Congressman, I have found it necessary before to investigate corrupt governmental bureaus. With my committee and staff, we exposed the laxity, malfeasance, and corruption that infested that vital governmental agency—the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

As a direct result of such investigation, the entire Federal system of tax administration was completely overhauled.

The committee's job was done in spite of the threats, intimidations, delaying tactics, and the frantic behind-the-scenes maneuvering of men in high places, and the pooling of efforts of racketeers from all parts of the Nation.

Among those taking part in hindering and impeding the work of this committee were paid agents of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, an arm of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the alter ego of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

These facts are documented in the congressional committee records.

In recent court proceedings it was disclosed that the Home Loan Bank Board refused to give receipts for much of the $114 million in cash, U.S. bonds, notes, and other assets it seized from the Long Beach Association. The refusal of receipts is an utter disregard for the law, and in fact a direct violation of the law.

Evidence disclosed that before an inventory was made more than 74 Board agents and personnel from competing savings associations had access, over a period of weeks, to books, records, documents and assets of the seized Long Beach Association.

Further evidence of the incompetent management of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was revealed in sworn testimony in the U.S. district court at Los Angeles.

At the court hearings, one of the witnesses called was Home Loan Bank Board examiner, Robert T. Keith, who, under interrogation, stated that the inventory of the Long Beach Association's assets since the seizure, had been prepared under his supervision. When asked whether the inventory included a trust deed for $7,980,000, which was among the association's documents seized by Mr. Ault, the supervisory authority, he stated, "to my knowledge it is not included in the inventory." He added, "he didn't know the reason for the omission."

Then the association's attorney wondered about 44 documents listed in the inventory as missing. Documents which were alleged to total in value $863,212. The Home Loan Bank Board's examiner said, "he didn't recall whether he had asked deposed association officials where the documents were." He was then asked if he had reported them to the bonding company, and the examiner said, "No." On being questioned further, he was asked if he had told Mr. Ault, the supervisory authority, of the missing documents, he stated, "I don't believe so. It was in the inventory."

Further questions were posed:

Question. Who do you think you should report anything missing to?

Answer. I don't know.

Question. Do you know the difference between a mortgage and a trust deed?

Answer. I don't think I could explain it.

Question. Do you know what a collateral pledge agreement is as used by the association?

Answer. No, I don't.

This is an example of the incompetency of the individuals that the bureaucratic Home Loan Bank Board has placed in charge of the seized Long Beach Association, and yet one of the charges against the Long Beach Association was incompetent management. The deposed management had built the association from $7,500 to $114 million.

It is interesting to note that the Home Loan Bank Board has enacted its own regulations, one of which provides the following:

Such Board may declare its own emergency, seize an association, place their agent in charge, refuse receipts or an accounting to the shareholders and their elected management. Such seizure places all rights and powers of the association officers, directors, and shareholders in the hands of the Board's agent.

Thus, without any judicial process of law, and without the consent of the shareholders, the control of their savings is transferred to this incompetent management.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has repeatedly told the U.S. courts that the courts have no jurisdiction. This leaves the citizen without recourse or protection against the unrestrained power of this bureaucratic Board.

Like the European totalitarian "isms," the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has set up its own administrative hearings, to adjudicate before itself its own mis-

conduct, a process of whitewashing its own incompetency and deceit.

Attempts at justice by this so-called administrative process, reminds one of a confessed felon being permitted to place himself as judge and thereby adjudicate his own misconduct.

How any savings and loan association manager can face the public and assure the investor that the conduct of the management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is a safeguard to their savings is beyond my comprehension.

The savings and loan associations as individual institutions have been a remarkably fine example of honest, capable management, and as such have rendered valuable and able service to their respective communities.

The time is here to clean up the management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its alter ego the Home Loan Bank Board, before the citizens lose confidence in this great and important industry.

The Evidence Mounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times this morning there was a report of another clash in Poland over a religious issue. As in the case of similar conflict in the past, the latest incident furnishes evidence that the faith of the Polish people will continue to withstand suppression. The report that the Communist Party officials took a serious view of the situation, however, may well indicate that there will be increased pressure on the peoples of Poland by their dictatorial overlords. I believe we have the evidence to feel confident that the Polish peoples will not permit their faith and ideals to be crushed by the Communists, but it is my fervent hope as with all of us that moral support from us will help them bear their suffering. Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include the article:

POLES RIOT ANEW ON CHURCH ISSUE—REINFORCED POLICE USE GAS TO QUIET WESTERN TOWN

WARSAW, June 1.—The police used tear gas and nightsticks Monday to disperse a crowd of about 5,000 demonstrating at Zielona Gora in Western Poland over a religious issue, usually reliable sources here reported tonight.

Police reinforcements were summoned from Poznan, more than 60 miles away, to quell the crowd. The police and the demonstrators were involved in a fierce street clash and an unknown number of arrests were made, the report said.

The demonstrators burned two police cars the sources said. The crowd tried to storm the police headquarters of the textile-manufacturing city of Lower Silesia.

This was the second time in a little more than a month that a religious dispute has erupted into a serious street demonstration.

The first came April 27 at Nowa Huta, a model steel town in southern Poland, a crowd of 2,000 to 3,000 persons fought a pitched battle in the streets with the police there after the municipal authorities had ordered the removal of the cross.

According to incomplete reports from Zielona Gora available here tonight, the trouble flared up following the failure of the Roman Catholic and the municipal authorities to agree over the status of a building the church had used for parish purposes since World War II.

The sources said the building formerly belonged to the German Evangelical Church—church and state in Poland are disputing ownership of such property. In many instances, the Roman Catholic Church has taken over the property of both the German Catholic and Evangelical churches in former German territories.

(Zielona Gora is the former German town of Gruenberg, prewar population about 26,000.)

The Zielona Gora authorities wanted to use the disputed building for concerts. The sources said that when a truckload of workmen arrived Monday morning to begin removing furniture and other goods, they were expelled by a group of angry Catholic women.

Policemen were sent to the scene. By this time word of the trouble had spread and a large crowd began to gather. The police, greatly outnumbered withdrew.

The growing crowd then marched down to the local police headquarters and hurled stones at it and shouted insults.

The police reinforcements were called from Poznan. On their arrival toward nightfall, the real clash began.

A police official, answering a telephone inquiry from Warsaw tonight, refused to give any information other than that "all is quiet now."

Exactly how serious was Monday's clash was not clear, but sources in Warsaw said Communist Party authorities took a serious view of it, especially following the Nowa Huta trouble.

Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor visited Florida recently for 2 days of hearings and 1 day of field trips to farms and workers' camps in the southern area of the State.

The subcommittee's distinguished chairman, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and the subcommittee staff members were welcome guests. As the Senator said in his opening statement, the subcommittee did not go to Florida with preconceived solutions to problems of migratory labor; the subcommittee went there to receive advice and information from persons directly affected by the difficulties posed by the unresolved problems facing the migrants and those whose lives are affected by the migrant farmworker system.

The subcommittee received much valuable testimony. As one of the sponsors of a bill to improve migratory worker housing, I was particularly impressed by the almost unanimously favorable reaction given to that bill.

Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of Florida offered many accounts of the subcommittee's visit. I should like to have printed in the RECORD for the information of the many persons who are concerned about this problem, the following articles:

[From the Miami News, May 17, 1960]

SENATE PROBE PRAISES DADE

(By Howard Van Smith)

The head of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor today praised Dade Countians for their support of proposed migrant reform bills.

"What we heard from the witnesses at Homestead was the most positive and favorable testimony that has come before the subcommittee," said Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS and his staff today toured the migrant camps around Lake Okeechobee and at Immokalee. A final hearing will be held tomorrow at Clewiston.

Previously, the group had held 10 meetings in northern farming areas and in Washington. The one here was the first in the South.

NO DOUBT

Senator WILLIAMS said the Dade hearing left no doubt that Federal aid in housing and education of migrant children was strongly favored, as was the abolition of child labor. But repeated suggestings were made by grower interests and others to drop the age when a migrant child may work from 16 to 12.

Senator WILLIAMS said he believed Federal legislation on the registration of crew leaders will go before them this session of Congress for a vote.

HE ATTACKED

Grower interests attacked the crew leader bill as being unrealistic. Others suggested changes which would simplify the measure.

Senator WILLIAMS praised the Reverend Isaac Henderson, Negro minister and representative of the Christian Ministry to Migrants at the South Dade labor camp, who was the sole witness favoring all the bills.

The main attack on the legislation was made by Kenneth R. Morefield of Orlando, spokesman for the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.

He said the setting of a minimum wage would benefit only the poor workers and guarantee them more money whether on a piece basis or a time basis of working. He also attacked crew leader registration.

THE BEST

The Reverend Paul Cassen, director of the Florida Christian Ministry to Migrants, and the Reverend Bryan O. Walsh of Homestead, representing the Catholic Welfare Bureau of Miami, agreed the child labor bill should be amended to allow children to work at a younger age, especially in summer and after school.

Senator WILLIAMS, though unable to make a full tour of Dade migrant camps, said those he saw were some of the best in the United States.

[From the Miami Herald, May 17, 1960]

REACTION MIXED ON SENATOR'S MIGRANT PLAN—IMPROVED HOUSING SUPPORTED

(By Juanita Greene)

A Senator with some ideas about how to solve the farm migrants' plight threw them up for challenge in Homestead Monday. He got some resounding reaction.

Almost all the witnesses rushed to the support of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' plans for better education and housing.

But he ran into opposition from farmers and even some State officials on a third major issue—regulation of the crew leader. The crew leaders are middlemen between the farmers and the workers.

Here to learn more about the situation and sentiment in south Florida, the Democratic Senator from New Jersey spent the day in a drafty recreation hall listening to government officials, social workers, and ministers in summer suits and farmers in shirtsleeves.

Only one builder, George Winston, opposed WILLIAMS' bill which would provide Government backing to public bodies or farmers for building migrant housing. He wanted the backing extended to other groups.

Everyone spoke favorably of the proposals to give extra money to school systems overloaded with migrant children.

And there was outright enthusiasm for another education plan because it deals with very basic adult education. The workers and their families would be taught such things as the rudimentary elements of sanitation.

Many witnesses, including health department experts, testified that an education program must go hand in hand with any housing program or the new quarters would soon become slums.

There was strong opposition from the farm groups against bringing migrants under the minimum wage and child labor laws. WILLIAMS' committee is hearing testimony on these laws, but he did not propose them.

In their fight against the regulation of crew leaders, the farmers were joined by the State's own chief of the farm labor department.

Monday's hearing established that the crew leader is a vital part of the migrant picture.

Ralph Moss, of the State labor department, testified that the proposed law regulating them was too stiff. He predicted it would eliminate at least 75 percent of the crew leaders who customarily lead a work force out of Florida each spring."

This, he said, would lead to confusion.

But Moss is not happy with the status quo.

"Certainly," he said, "there are known abuses to workers and employers under the crew leader system."

Vigorously in support of that measure, and all others, was the Reverend Paul M. Cassen, director of the Florida Christian Ministry to Migrants; the Reverend Bryan O. Walsh of the Catholic Welfare Bureau; Isaac Henderson, who has done church work with the migrants for 13 years, and Wendell Rollason of the Inter-American Affairs Commission of Miami.

The farmers' position was explained by J. Abney Cox, South Dade vegetable grower, and John Frederick of the Dade County Farm Bureau.

Putting the migrant under the minimum wage, said Cox, would "work an injustice on the growers" because they can't control agricultural prices.

Frederick defended the system of paying by piecework. Under it, he said, the industrious workers make more than the minimum wage.

As for children, said Cox, the farmers feel they are sufficiently protected under present laws.

State and county health representatives hammered away at the need for better housing and education. They noted that Dade County has made a lot of progress. In this, Senator WILLIAMS agreed. His subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has held hearings all along the eastern seaboard.

Senator WILLIAMS and his staff will tour the Lake Okeechobee region today and hold its last hearing in Clewiston Wednesday.

School Construction Assistance Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10128) to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting comfortably in my seat all through this great debate. I have listened with rapt attention to my good friends in opposition to this bill so fervently trying to argue their way out of picking up part of the check for educating the Nation's children, and I have been thinking of my grandfather.

My grandfather as a young man taught school in Wisconsin all year. They didn't have many school books in those days. My grandfather managed to dig up a few, and if they didn't have school books on certain subjects he improvised the lessons and in long hand wrote them out for distribution to his pupils. They had no pretentious school houses, and it was my grandfather's job to find some farmer friend of education to loan the use of his barn, if it was cold in winter, or his orchard of it was spring or summer.

My grandfather put in a year of 12 months just teaching school and when his brother, who made an honest living by farming, heard that he had accepted $50 for doing nothing but teaching school for a year he felt disgraced in the community, the proud name of O'Hara despoiled, his very own brother cheating the taxpayers by taking $50 of their money for a year of teaching school.

I calculate, Mr. Chairman, that people do not change very much. When I listened to my good friends trying to orate themselves out of picking up part of the check for educating the Nation's children I could not escape the suspicion that there are some prototypes of my grandfather's brother right here among us in this historic Chamber.

MADDEN HITS BULL'S EYE

The distinguished statesman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], with his clarity in expression we have come so much to admire, presented the issue in its right light. As usual, he hit the target square in the heart. It is a matter of being for or against universal popular education. The issue is just as simple as that.

Doubtless some of my colleagues honestly believe that education should be limited and restricted to those whose families have the money and to those who by the circumstance of birth happen to grow up in richer communities. They honestly believe, as did the early Americans who grouped behind Alexander Hamilton, that participation in government should be confined to those of property and of education and, needless to say, those without property could not have the means of acquiring education. If that is the philosophy of some of my colleagues they will be true to themselves and to their philosophy by voting against the bill we have under consideration.

I know of no better way for them to slit the throat of popular education.

FIGHT OF THREE DECADES AGO

I have been a long time in the fight to preserve, protect, and strengthen popular education because my faith is that the hope of mankind is in democratic government and democracy cannot endure in a climate of ignorance.

During the great depression of the late 1920's, when there was little money and the schoolteachers of Chicago remained at their posts of duty for months unpaid, there was a very serious effort made to reduce popular education to the elvel of the teaching only of reading, writing, and arithmetic, all this in the name of economy. There were at that time, as there are today, some persons who wish to maintain a working class and who fear that as young men and women are given the advantage of a broad education they will not be content to do the hard work.

So there was a great drive on during the depression in the late 1920's, all in the name of economy, to destroy the very structure of popular education upon which our country had been built to greatness.

It was my privilege at that time to lead the people of Chicago in a fight to save popular education. The climax of that fight was reached when the gentleman from Illinois with John Fewkes, now the distinguished head of the Chicago Teachers Union, led through the Loop of Chicago the largest parade of men and women and children in the history of Chicago. That was some three decades ago.

POPPYCOCK AS CAMOUFLAGE

Today popular education again is under attack. Let no one be deceived as to the nature of hidden motivations. All this talk about State and local control, all this talk about the obligation being upon local taxpayers, all this talk about the danger of Federal control over curriculums, is poppycock used as a camouflage.

Everyone who takes the trouble to look around, everyone who is not a slave to status quo, knows that this is a changed world. This is not the United States of the horse and buggy era, when people lived in the communities where they were born and very seldom got any farther from home than a horse and buggy would carry them on a day's drive. People then pretty much lived and died in the community where they were born. In that period, considering their means, they made great sacrifices to furnish the best schools and teachers they could to give to their children that which they themselves had been denied.

FROM ARKANSAS TO MICHIGAN

Today all this is changed. I could cite one instance of many that now come to mind. In Berrien County in Mich-

igan, where I was born and raised and in the district now represented by my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, we had a community pretty closely knit. People lived together and never got any farther away than an occasional long journey to Chicago across the lake. Some years ago, in this modern world of ours there came to Berrien County, I am told, several thousand families from Arkansas. Here was an instance where it was of vital concern to Berrien County in Michigan that the newcomers from Arkansas had had the same educational advantages enjoyed by those born in Berrien County and with whom henceforth they were to be fellow workers and neighbors.

In my own city of Chicago we have had great migrations of men and women from the Southern States. It is important to us that the people coming from other States to become henceforth our fellow workers and our neighbors should have had the same educational advantages enjoyed by our own people.

It also is true that annually many thousands of persons leave Chicago to find employment in other States, and it is important to these other States that when Chicagoans go there they should have enjoyed the same educational advantages that the children of the States to which they have migrated. I trust I have made by these illustrations my point that education has changed from a local to a national base.

Mr. Chairman, this is a changed world and we in the Congress of the United States cannot make laws for this new and changed world on the pattern of the laws we made for the horse and buggy days.

FAITH IN EDUCATION SURVIVES

In those days we believed in popular education, it was the faith of our democratic heritage. We provided for popular education willingly and at a sacrifice and on the local level because everything in that period was on a local level. Today the great majority of our people believe in popular education. They do not wish the public schools limited to the teaching of the rudiments. They wish every American child to have an equal opportunity for a broad and an enriching education.

We are now engaged in a fight for economic if not indeed physical survival with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has accepted education as a natinoal responsibility. It is going very much further than we ever contemplated in the support of education as a national responsibility.

Education that we owe our children has passed the capability of local taxpayers. More and more it will become the responsibility of the Federal Government, and more and more we will realize that wherever in the United States is one child without a school to attend and without a good teacher, is a spot of weakness that, multiplied, will bring about the downfall of our democracy.

Memorial Day in the Village of Mamaroneck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day in the village of Mamaroneck, N.Y., is a special occasion. The dignitaries of the community, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, the fire department members, and persons from other organizations turn out for a huge parade which is paced by the high school band. Much preparation and thought goes into the arrangements and the entire line of march gathers, together with other citizens, at the beautiful Village Hall where speeches are made and the dead are remembered.

It was my privilege to address the gathering this year on May 30, and my remarks follow:

Mr. Chairman, as your congressional representative, I take pride in participating in this memorial service here today—standing as I do among neighbors and friends.

This year, it seems to me, Memorial Day has a special significance. Honoring as it does all those who have died to keep America a free and undivided Nation, I see it as a symbol of the liberty we still enjoy as part of the free world.

We all know that today there is a threat to that liberty—a threat greater than ever before. Only because we are strong is the world outside the Iron Curtain still unconquered. Only because our military muscles are flexed and our heart undaunted is communism contained within the borders of the Russian-dominated half of the world.

On this day, therefore, let us give thanks to God that this is so, and let us pray for continued strength and courage that those whom we honor will not have died needlessly.

Memorial Day was established to honor those who died in the War Between the States, but today it is an occasion upon which we revere the dead of all our wars.

It is a day when a humble and grateful people gather across America for simple programs of reverence and patriotism; a day when we bow our heads and ask divine help to keep ours "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

And it is a day when "liberty" and "freedom" are spoken openly and unashamedly; when good old-fashioned patriotism wells up inside us and sometimes overflows. It is a day when we recapture the courage and determination that steeled our wills through times of bitter internal strife and fierce international struggle.

It is a day, too, when bands play and bright flags whip in the breeze and we boast to each other, perhaps, of the victories America has won. But it is a day also when "Taps" and the staccato crack of rifle fire give solemnity to our national mood, as they blend in echo across the graves of those who gave their lives for their country.

On this day, the epic voices of the past live again.

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace." So spoke George Washington, Father of our Country.

How apt are these words today. How alive. How true. We should thank God that our leaders in the Nation's Capital have not forgotten those words of advice and warning.

"We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth." Those are the words of Abraham Lincoln, defining the issue of his time. They might, indeed, have been spoken today as Mr. Khrushchev rattles his atomic weapons and blows his propaganda trumpet.

"Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead." These words of Admiral Farragut in Mobile Bay have given dramatic substance to the determination of all Americans who prefer liberty to death.

"Speak softly and carry a big stick," warned Teddy Roosevelt, paraphrasing George Washington's original advice.

I think those words must be echoing today in the heart of President Eisenhower as he lets the bellicose Khrushchev rant, rave, and make menacing gestures. For our President knows just how big an atomic stick we carry. He does not have to bluff and shout in the Russian manner to make his international points. He carries his big stick with quiet dignity. There is no need for him to brandish it and roar defiance.

In closing, let me quote some of Ike's own words. In a few short sentences, they clarify today's great issues for all the world to see and understand:

"We march in the noblest cause of all—human freedom. If we make ourselves worthy of America's ideals, if we do not forget that our Nation was founded on the premise that all men are creatures of God's making, the world will come to know that it is free men who carry forward the true promise of human progress and dignity."

Let us then on this Memorial Day rededicate ourselves individually and as a nation to "march in the noblest cause of all—human freedom."

Let us not be ashamed of showing our patriotism, our love of country—God's country, as it has been called. Let us show the world that we believe deeply and sincerely that it is the finest, the happiest, the freest of all the world's nations and that no sacrifice will be too great for Americans to keep it so.

Senate Look at Summit Mistakes Gives No Aid to the Adversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, Columnist Walter Lippmann points out that Senator FULBRIGHT's committee inquiry into the U–2 affair and the breakdown of the summit conference shows that "it is possible in this democracy to conduct an inquiry into the causes of a national fiasco without giving aid and comfort to the adversary." Mr. Lippmann's further analysis of the committee's findings is important and I submit the article in its entirety for the RECORD:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE FULBRIGHT INQUIRY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Senate inquiry into the U–2 affair has now done its main work. Thanks to the highmindedness, and experience and the sagacity of the committee's chairman, Sena-

tor FULBRIGHT, the work has been well done. It has brought out the relevant facts and the Senator has pointed out their significance.

The inquiry has shown that the Nervous Nellies among us were wrong. It is possible in this democracy to conduct an inquiry into the causes of a national fiasco without giving aid and comfort to the adversary. We have been spared the humiliation of distrusting ourselves so much that we dared not inquire into our own mistakes.

In digesting the results, we must begin with the fact that the inquiry dealt with a question which has never before been investigated in this country, or in any other country. The question was the competence of the President and his principal advisers in dealing with an entirely illegal and inherently clandestine operation which is, nevertheless, necessary to the security of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT defined the question accurately and sharply by declaring after Mr. Dulles had testified in executive session that in this affair the issue was not the clandestine work of the CIA but the overt decisions of the President and his advisers who make the policy which governs both the CIA and our diplomacy.

The inquiry has established the responsibility of the President and his advisers for the timing of the flight. They did not order the flight on May 1. But they had failed to cancel their orders, given previously, which authorized the flight that did take place on May 1. This flight was, as General de Gaulle said in his television address on Tuesday, "certainly and at the least ill timed."

The inquiry has established, too, that the critical period was the weekend from Friday afternoon, May 6, to Monday, May 9. During this weekend the administration issued two statements. One was on Saturday admitting that the U–2 was a spy plane but saying that "insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned, there was no authorization of any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev." The second statement was on Monday saying that such flights were done under Presidential order, and implying—as all the world understood it—that they would be continued.

This was the lost weekend. These were the days when the U.S. Government not only avowed responsibility for spying, which was indubitably a violation of international law, but proclaimed that spying was a national policy which, so it was universally understood, would be adhered to. These two statements combined were not only altogether unprecedented in the history of international relations but they were altogether untenable, as is shown by the fact that the President had to renounce the policy publicly in the presence of Mr. Khrushchev at the tragic meeting in Paris.

It is important to take note of the human circumstances of this calamitous weekend. Secretary Herter had returned to Washington on Friday evening after 10 days of conferences in Iran, Turkey, and Greece. The U–2 affair was already in a very considerable mess when he returned, owing to the false cover statements issued by press agents who did not know what was going on.

Having returned on Friday evening, Mr. Herter had to deal with the mess on Saturday. Younger and stronger men than he who have been on long transatlantic air flights are not in prime condition the next morning.

Moreover, as the Secretary of State was returning to Washington, the President was leaving it. He was leaving for a weekend in Gettysburg. The two men did not meet face to face until the President returned to Washington on Sunday. The momentous decision to avow that the overflights were a national policy was taken after talks on the telephone to Gettysburg. Thus a Secretary of State, inevitably tired and rushed by events which happened in his absence, had to deal with a President who was absent in Gettysburg, and in no position to hear the whole argument which preceded the recommendation from Washington.

This is, I think, the crux of what the inquiry has established. The practical lessons of it are clear enough. On the bad timing of the flight, the President and the Secretary of State allowed the CIA too much leeway and thus forced upon it a responsibility which it was not competent to exercise. If we were going to go to the summit, there should have been no more flights, once the date of the conference was fixed. To be sure, there were a lot of things we would like to have known during the suspension of the flights. But now we have no summit meeting and also we have no flights.

On the handling of the accident, the first lesson is that all publicity and all cover statements and the like should always be retained rigorously in the hands of high officials who know what is going on. Spying is deception. But you cannot use dupes to deceive others and not risk bad results.

The second lesson is that the high officials should have been thoroughly indoctrinated long ago in the conventions and the practices which have always surrounded the black art of espionage. Manifestly the high officials, beginning with the President himself, were not indoctrinated. They were caught off balance and they improvised in a panic.

It will now be important to see whether or not various candidates show that they have learned something from this very expensive fiasco.

The Forand Bill and Its Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman of New York, the distinguished former Senator and devoted public servant of many years.

His remarks on the subject of "The Forand Bill and Its Enemies" are most cogent and timely.

I hope my colleagues will find time to read these words of one of the great men of our time on one of the issues most desperately and vitally affecting the aged of this country:

THE FORAND BILL AND ITS ENEMIES

(Remarks of Herbert H. Lehman at Senior Citizens Rally sponsored by Senior Citizens Golden Ring Club, Madison Square Garden, May 18, 1960)

I am glad to be here today. I thought I was going to be talking to my contemporaries, but relatively speaking, I see that this is a meeting of the younger fellows. I am probably the most senior of the senior citizens here.

But age is truly a relative thing. When I was 78 and a Member of the U.S. Senate, the majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, used to come to me on days when there was going to be a late night or an all-night session, and say, "Herbert, I would like you to stay on the floor tonight, so that we can let the older fellows go home and get a little sleep."

Yes, age is a relative matter. But the question we have gathered to discuss today—the need for the Forand bill—is not a relative matter. It is an absolute need—one that the lawmakers in Washington and the politicians in both political parties must consider now, and must act upon. This issue must not be dodged or ducked any longer.

The Forand bill has been before the Congress for quite a few years now, but because of the opposition of the American Medical Association and other reactionary forces, there has been no action.

Meanwhile year by year, almost month by month, the cost of medical care has risen, astronomically. This cost has gone up faster and higher than any other cost in the category of the people's needs.

The group on whom this cost increase rests most heavily and unbearably are the older people, who need medical care the most, but who, of all the groups in the population, are the most completely straitjacketed by fixed income.

Workers organized in labor unions can strike for higher wages, professional men can raise their fees, and business men their prices, but older people living on pensions, savings and remittances are up against the wall when confronted by the problem of rising costs.

This is the intolerable paradox of the situation: that those who need medical care the most can least afford it. I should add that the cost of medical care for prolonged illness is beyond almost anybody's capacity to pay.

The Forand bill is a desirable step in the right direction. It is not a perfect piece of legislation, by any means. It could be strengthened. It should, in my opinion, contain some provision for establishing standards for hospital care, so as to prevent the exploitation of this program, as the GI educational program was exploited by shoddy establishments already in existence and fly-by-night institutions set up to catch the windfall of hospital care payments from the Federal Government.

But I suppose I am wasting my breath talking about the need for strengthening the Forand bill. The problem now isn't how to strengthen it, but how to save it. Its enemies are and have been hot for its total destruction or, in the case of the administration, its total dilution.

This must not be allowed to happen. You can and must prevent it from happening. This year—in this election year—the lawmakers and the political leaders will listen to you. I am not so sure how carefully they will listen next year, after the election is over. Of course they are listening to the American Medical Association this year too. The sources of the greatest danger to this legislation are the governing body of the AMA, and the Eisenhower administration.

Yes, these prime defenders of so-called private enterprise and the balanced budget will do their best to see to it that the Forand bill does not pass in recognizable and workable form. It is up to groups like this one, and rallies like this one, to see that it does pass in effective form, so that it does the job it is supposed to do.

The AMA has used its powerful weight to block this legislation for these many years; and to block any legislation aimed at resolving the problem of the high and mounting cost of medical care.

Has the AMA come up with any alternative solutions to this problem? No, in all the dozen years since the Murray-Dingell bill for national health insurance was shelved, the AMA has come up with nothing in the way of an answer to the underlying problem. The only answer given has been opposition to any step in the direction of an answer.

Against the background of this record, I believe that the AMA has just about forfeited

its moral right to be listened to with any respect on this issue.

In 1949, when I first ran for the Senate, I said, in the course of my campaign, that I was opposed to compulsory national health insurance; I said that other methods of meeting the problem must be explored and followed. Eleven years have gone by since then. During 8 of those years, I served in the U.S. Senate, and most of that time I was chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee. I drafted and introduced scores of bills designed to follow alternative approaches to the goal of providing better medical care at costs people can afford to pay.

The AMA and the other reactionary forces opposed every one of those bills just as hard as they opposed national health insurance, and just as hard as they are opposing the Forand bill today.

And so none of the major measures I proposed were passed.

I must tell you today—and this is the first time I have ever said this publicly—that if I knew in 1949 what I know today, I would not have made those campaign speeches against national health insurance in 1949. Of course, I never had a chance actually to consider or vote on the legislation. It was dead—deader than the proverbial doornail—by the time I first took my seat in the U.S. Senate.

The background of the legislative struggle involving the Forand bill presents an almost unbelievable paradox.

The progress of medical science has been spectacular, and in no respect more so than in increasing the average lifespan. But here is the AMA opposing legislation to place the benefits of medical science within the practical reach of those who need those benefits the most.

I can't understand it. It is almost as if the Carpenters Union were to oppose Federal housing legislation on the foolish ground that for the Government to help people acquire housing will result eventually in socializing the carpenter trade.

The Forand bill must pass, this year. If you, and the millions like you—like us, I should say—will stand up on our hind legs and demand this legislation, which is so important for the welfare not just of the older people but of our entire country, the Forand bill will surely pass.

Need for Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the communication printed herewith is a vivid illustration of the problem facing the Midwest farmers. Written by a respected farmer who is in position to see the situation first hand, it is further testimony that we need agricultural legislation now:

JOHN KYL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I own 350 acres in Wayne County and have farmed all my life, having farmed in Wapello County until coming here in 1940. I started farming in 1930 and went through the depression and know what it means to sell hogs at $2.50 to $4 and cows at $35, eggs at 10 cents, etc. I bought my first new tractor in 1936 for $925. I bought my last new tractor in 1955 for $3,200 and, if I bought my tractor today, it would cost me $5,000. When I moved to Wayne County my taxes on 170 acres was $90 a year. Now my taxes on 350 acres plus my personal is over $850. When I moved to Wayne County help was $1.50 to $2 per day. Now the cheapest labor is $1 per hour. In the thirties we had no light bill. Our telephone cost $5 per year, but today we spend $300 per year for electricity and $80 for telephone.

Statistics will prove that we are worse off today than we were in the worst of the thirties. The only reason I can see that the farmer can even start to pay his bills is the fact that he is using up any surplus he may have had. We need a farm program to give the farmer cost of production plus a reasonable profit, whatever it is—whether it be subsidy, crop controls, two-price system, or what have you.

We are certainly at the crossroads and something will have to be done or corporation farming will take over and then the consumer will pay by the nose. I am a member of the FHA committee in our county and have first-hand information on the financial condition of a number of farmers in the county. It is certainly pathetic and unless something is done, I believe one-fourth of the farmers will be gone within another year.

Just what kind of a Government program it will take, I cannot say, but one thing I am sure, the farmer is not getting his fair share of the economy.

The farmer is willing to pay his share of the taxes, but he has to have an income to do it.

Catholic Bishop's Statement on Freedom and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a statement on "Freedom and Peace" was issued by the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States last November at the close of their annual meeting in Washington.

The Congress was not then in session, and it has not been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as timely and stimulating today as it was when issued, and should be brought to the attention of Members and others.

Indeed it is especially pertinent right now because of the strong support which it gives to mutual security, notably in the passage which states:

The social and economic problems of the world, and particularly those of Asia, Africa, and some areas in Latin America pose a twofold challenge that can be met. In the first place, our Christian sense of justice and mercy impels us to do all that we can to help those who suffer from avoidable poverty, ignorance, and disease. Secondly, we know that tensions engendered by these conditions tend to foment, both militant nationalism and Communist infiltration. Hungry and desperate people may grasp at short-range solutions in the effort to compress within a few decades a progress that elsewhere took centuries.

Programs of education, technical assistance, and developmental aid, now being carried out both by individual governments and by international bodies, can do much to build the foundations for prosperity and peace in nations suffering from poverty and hunger.

The statement is an inspiring one in other respects. One of the signers is an esteemed constituent, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston. I include it as part of my remarks:

TEXT OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS' STATEMENT ON "FREEDOM AND PEACE"

All the world craves peace. Without freedom under God for every man and for every nation there can be no peace.

On his recent visit to our country the Communist spokesman took every opportunity to compare unfavorably, capitalism with communism in their economic aspects. This is not the basic issue. The choice that men and nations must make today is between freedom and coercion.

Such words as "democracy," "republic," "peace," and "friendship" are words to which the Western World is long accustomed. These words have been taken into their current vocabulary by the proponents of communism. But while we may use the same words, we are not speaking the same language. By "peace" the Communist means submission to his program. By "friendship" he means the acceptance on the part of others of his formula for coexistence.

Freedom is not the product of any political or social system; it is man's natural birthright, and in the words of Pope Leo XIII, "the highest of man's natural endowments."

This freedom under God permits man to use his faculties for his own just benefit and for the service of his fellow man in accordance with law of God. Furthermore, to protect the freedom and rights of its citizens, each nation has the right to be free.

FREEDOM—THE AMERICAN IDEAL

Our country was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This recognition of the dignity of every citizen, endowed with inalienable rights that are God-given is indelibly woven into the origin and history of the American Republic.

Ours is a tradition of freedom under God with justice and charity for all. It seems opportune to emphasize the importance of this heritage of freedom. In it lies the moral strength that makes the contribution of America to the world's rebuilding unique and distinctive.

Above and beyond the material aid that we distribute so generously around the globe to those in need, we should be equally concerned in sharing our ideals of liberty and justice. Proper standards of living and material prosperity are not enough. These are but means to an end and not in themselves the goal we would attain, if world peace is, as it should be, the aim of all our efforts.

PRESENT OBSTACLES TO PEACE AND FREEDOM

We would recognize that the chief obstacles to peace are the obstacles to real freedom. First among the main obstacles to peace and freedom in our present world is obviously world communism. Communists do indeed preach peace and freedom and preach it incessantly; their actions, however, belie their word. They stir up hatred and mistrust. They reopen the old wounds of people who had real grievances in the days when they were subject to alien rule. While they themselves enslave whole nations over whom they have no shadow of claim, they seize, wherever possible, upon economic and racial injustice to incite class warfare and violent revolution.

Thus the Communist world poses a twofold threat to peace: First, that of military aggression of which the more recent instances continue to exemplify both ruthlessness and perfidy; secondly, the wide-

spread sowing of the seed of hatred within nations and among nations. To meet this constant threat to peace is the free world's greatest problem.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF PEACE

Peace, as demonstrated by our Nation's experience, rests on disciplined freedom with its attendant virtues. True peace for nations as well as for individuals comes from justice, from charity, from the faithful observance of the moral law. The might of arms can do no more for peace than to discourage aggressors that are belligerent. Pacts and treaties can bring at best an uneasy truce, restraining an open hostility without achieving friendship or understanding. Not even international organizations and international law, essential as they are for order in the world, can bring about world peace. Fundamentally, that peace depends on the acceptance by men and nations of a fixed, unchangeable, universal moral law.

There is no need to retell the noble efforts that have been made in behalf of peace since the dawn of the present century. Nor is there need to retell the disappointments that have laid low the hopes of men. The two most destructive wars in history have left their indelible mark on the first half of our century. Now, well into the second half, men live under the threat of a third world war that would be immeasurably more destructive.

NATIONALISM IS CITED

A second obstacle to peace and freedom, personal and national, is the spirit of excessive nationalism. The worldwide movement toward independence is in itself good and laudable, and we rejoice that many nations formerly subjected to external control now guide their own destinies. But all too often a morbid preoccupation with past grievances arouses a spirit of revenge that defrauds certain minorities of freedom and obstructs the clear vision of the constructive and peaceful paths that lead to national greatness.

A third obstacle to freedom and peace is found in the inhuman conditions that prevail among so many millions of the world's population. Poverty, hunger, disease, and the bitterness engendered by social injustice is their common lot. Embittered by the contrast between their own wretchedness and the wealth of the rich and powerful in their own lands, and between the nations, they are ripe for exploitation by both the Communists and the extreme nationalists.

Nor can we be unmindful of the plight of the millions of refugees whose present status is a challenge to all who believe in freedom and peace. Victims of totalitarian tyranny, deprived of family, of homeland, of liberty itself, they pose no threat to the peace and security of any land that may be their haven. But continued apathy to the problem of their resettlement is a reproach to the conscience of the free world.

OBSTACLES TO PEACE—AT HOME

We must also recognize that conditions at home which threaten our moral integrity seriously threaten the cause of freedom and peace.

Our attention is directed to the subversive and evil forces that may undermine the moral strength of the Nation. Chief among these currently are racial injustice, laxity in home life and discipline, preoccupation with sensual, selfishness and self-seeking in economic life, and the excessive desire for wealth and ease.

The forces of religion in this country face no problem more pressing than the restoration within our people of respect for the moral law as God's law, and the inculcation of those virtues on which the soundness of family and civic life depends. Reverence for God's law, the keeping of His Commandments, the practice of self-restraint, of justice and clarity will contribute beyond measure to the strength and unity of our country, which are so essential for effective leadership in the cause of freedom and of peace.

ROADS TO PEACE AND FREEDOM

Although communism is the overriding danger to peace and freedom, our preoccupation with communism should not deter us from seeking to solve other problems that may endanger peace and freedom. The social and economic problems of the world, and particularly those of Asia, Africa, and some areas in Latin America pose a twofold challenge that can be met. In the first place, our Christian sense of justice and mercy impels us to do all that we can to help those who suffer from avoidable poverty, ignorance, and disease. Secondly, we know that tensions engendered by these conditions tend to foment, both militant nationalism and Communist infiltration. Hungry and desperate people may grasp at short-range solutions in the effort to compress within a few decades a progress that elsewhere took centuries.

Our people have been generous in responding to the appeals of the afflicted victims of war and famine. But the needs of the world will not be met by charitable aid alone. The greater charity is to help people to help themsives. Programs of education, technical assistance, and developmental aid, now being carried out both by individual governments and by international bodies, can do much to build the foundations for prosperity and peace in nations suffering from poverty and hunger.

In the long run, at least, the cause of peace and freeedom so intimately connected with the independence of nations would be better served if we could rely less upon programs of governmental aid and more on private investment and international trade adequately regulated for the good of all nations. In view of such serious problems as the pressure of population in some areas upon resources, the world needs every element of cooperation and good will to step up production and distribution of food and fibers. The potential abundance made possible by modern technology should be made a reality, as a result of programs inspired by our love of our fellow man and the quest for peace and freedom.

In regard to communism, our goal is nothing less than the conversion of the Communist world. Our moral judgment is absolute: Communism is godless, it is aggressive and belligerant, it is unbelievably cruel. Witness the commune system in China. Hungary and Tibet are but the more recent manifestations of its total disregard for human rights and human dignity. Nevertheless, conscious of Christ's example and the infinite power of grace, we pray for the Red persecutors and for the persecuted. We wish no conquest except that of the spirit. We wish those who constructed the Iron Curtain to tear down the barbed wire and the machinegun posts and to join us in the enjoyment of God's freedom and peace.

Even today there are signs that the tyranny of communism is not the same in every nation under its sway. There are indications that the spirit of man will not stay crushed. We should storm Heaven with prayer and penace, knowing that what to man seems impossible. God will grant to those who pray to Him with humble hearts, free of hatred and a spirit of revenge. As the early Christians converted their persecutors, we can seek to move those whose hearts seem hardened by blasphemous contempt for God and inhuman disregard for their fellow men.

A rule of law

In this spirit, statesmen of the world must continue their often disheartening quest for peace, reductions in armament, and the introduction of the rule of law into the society of nations. They must be firm in upholding principle and justice, knowing that appeasement in such matters leads only to the peace of the conquered. It is a delusion to place hope in seeking real understanding when the true problem is a conflict of essential principles, not lack of understanding.

While negotiating unceasingly for better relations with the Communist regimes, we must never forget that their system and ours are as basically different as slavery and freedom. To palliate the difference is to subvert the cause of freedom and peace. Recently the Communists have been cleverly veiling the sharp differences between the systems, as witnessed by the statement of a member of the Russian press group, "our systems are different but there is not a single obstacle which would deny us peace of friendship or corporation." In other words, Red slavery is only different, not opposed to our system of peace and freedom under God.

Ultimately, the problem of communism as a threat to peace and freedom will be met only when we exemplify the principles that we proclaim as Christian members of a nation dedicated to God's law. There must be a searching reappraisal of our devotion to the principles we proclaim. We cannot live as materialists and expect to convert others to our system of freedom and peace under God.

Materialism decried

Instead of upholding bodily the principles of peace and freedom under God we have emphasized the material fruits of our freedom, material wealth from industrialization and education. Instead of proclaiming freedom under God as we did in a more robust time in our history, we have so praised a program of supplying machines and calories and pleasure that these fruits of freedom and peace are made its substitutes. Today throughout the world, too often it is thought that when we speak of our American way of life we are speaking only of a high standard of living.

We have often acted in our international relations as if the products of industry and methods of production were our only contribution to the welfare of our neighbors. We have given the impression that material progress is our sovereign if not our exclusive concern. In particular, we have fostered industrialization and education as the ends and not the means of elevating nations. Insofar as we have done this, we have tacitly accepted the materialistic philosophy of communism as our way of life. We have aimed our efforts at satisfying the body, and, paradoxically, have allowed the Communists to capture the minds of men.

We must convince the world that our industry, our education, our technology are made not only to serve the body but the free spirit of man, that the grandeur of our heritage and extent of our contribution to the world is not measured in dollars and machines, but in the spirit of God's freedom and the dignity of the human person. Our motive in gladly pouring out our resources is not simply a natural pity for the misery of our fellow man or a damper to conflict, but recognition of his dignity as an equal son of God endowed with freedom.

To accomplish this we must be totally dedicated to our beliefs in God, the source of freedom and peace. We must be ready to give our country's principles the same unlimited measure of devotion that led to the birth of our Nation. Mankind will follow only those who give it a higher cause and the leadership of their dedication. It is up to us to give that leadership to mankind in the cause of God's freedom and peace.

Signed by members of the administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the name of the bishops of the United

States: Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York; James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles; John Cardinal O'Hara, archbishop of Philadelphia; Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston; Alois Muench, cardinal designate, bishop of Fargo, N. Dak.; Albert Meyer, cardinal designate, archbishop of Chicago; Karl J. Alter, archbishop of Cincinnati; William O. Brady, archbishop of St. Paul; Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington; Leo Binz, archbishop of Dubuque; Emmet M. Walsh, bishop of Youngstown; Joseph M. Gilmore, bishop of Helena; Albert R. Zuroweste, bishop of Belleville; Joseph T. McGucken, bishop of Sacramento; Allen J. Babcock, bishop of Grand Rapids; and Lawrence J. Shehan, bishop of Bridgeport.

A Sane Nuclear Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an addressed delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon entitled "A Sane Nuclear Policy" which was delivered at a meeting in Madison Square Garden, New York, on May 19, 1960.

I heartly recommend that all Members of Congress take a moment and read Mr. Landon's remarks:

A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

I want to try, tonight, to make some sense out of something where sense has been strangely lacking. I want to try to find a quiet and careful way toward the commonsensical and truthful heart of the crazy dilemma we find ourselves in.

Here is our problem.

There is confusion and division in the determinattion of our crucial and vital nuclear policy in many influential places.

It exists within the Pentagon; within the Congress; within other Government circles; among scientists. The American people, as a whole, I am afraid are confused and divided on this issue.

Out of what does the confusion grow?

There is complete agreement about these things:

Atomic tests produce radioactive byproducts. It is agreed that these are not particularly good for human beings. Nobody has claimed that they serve a useful or a healthy function.

In addition, there is complete agreement that radiation can cause marked physical deformation, sterility, various forms of cancer and God only knows what other undiscovered consequences.

The only possible area of disagreement involves: How much? How much radiation can mankind stand and how can you prove it with absolute assurance?

The truth of the matter, in fact, is that no living scientist knows the exact amount of radiation mankind can stand—and what's more it will take more than one generation to find out. By that time it will be too late.

We start with the sure knowledge that we run the risk of producing deformed or sterile grandchildren and generations of grandchildren.

Then why should there be any problem?

For years now we have been faced by the problem of an avowed and implacable enemy. The Government has been rightfully concerned with a continuing and unrelenting program for our defense. The Pentagon, as a consequence, developed and properly emphasizes retaliatory power.

Out of this has grown the first nuclear, and the most destructive arms race in all history.

In that race, America, for its own survival and that of the free world, must not be second. As long as that race continues it means unlimited atomic tests. And that in turn means unlimited horrors for future generations—come peace or war. May I emphasize this last point again—come peace or war.

Here it is. This is our real problem. There must be no letdown in keeping our great and beloved Republic in the strongest military position until satisfactory international treaties are signed on disarmament. But that—as I say—can eventually poison humanity in the continuing atomic testing required by all nations in the race to keep ahead of other nations in the development of nuclear power.

Just look at the dilemma. The more nations that get into the act—the more chances for blowing up the world by blundering into a nuclear war—or—and this is the irony—more radiation to ruin humanity—from mere preparation to fight a war that might never occur. Without a nuclear war—civilization could survive. But the impact of radiation poisoning on children yet to be born would make it a nightmare.

But the dangers are further compounded. In a world cluttered with nuclear weapons—atomic tests and dictators—a struggle of intensity can be turned into a world holocaust—by one hair triggered dictator—or—for that matter—by one jittery free world soldier. Therefore, we not only have to be alert about the enemy—but about what might happen on our own side. Despite all the precautions we have taken to avoid a ghastly mistake by some free world general—we are not immune from his misinterpretation of a tactical situation.

Now assume the worst—if you can—atomic war.

These are the clear facts.

There is no adequate way of surviving an atomic war.

Underground shelters—"fraid holes" to westerners—afford security in a twister. But they are woefully inadequate for national survival in an atomic war. Neither do land mass and population density furnish national security.

If Chou En Lai believes that a country of 600 million people can survive a nuclear war when a country of 180 million people cannot—he is making the same mistake as those who think underground shelters are a means of national survival.

The sands of the deserts and the growth of the jungles cover civilizations lost by war.

The Old Testament records the complete obliteration of Jericho:

"And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword."

There is nothing new in the blotting out of populations by war—except the ease—the quickness—and the astounding magnitude of the destructive force of atomic weapons.

But, as I have already indicated, there is something new under the sun—despite all the old saws to the contrary.

That is the real possibility of mass mutilation of coming generations as a result of the present generation's military preparations for an atomic war that is never fought.

In short—the world may well be becoming a chamber of horrors for future generations merely by preparing for nuclear war by atomic testing—and that in an ever-expanding number of nations.

I have tried to state the problem as simply, as directly, as truthfully as possible.

Now, under existing circumstances, which are not simple, what is the answer and what is the way out?

There is no way out for civilization except one—to seek and agree upon a realistic nuclear policy relationship between nations by definite treaties controlling atomic tests and the employment of nuclear energy as a blessing instead of a curse to mankind.

Let me get a little more technical for a moment and make what I just said crystal clear.

The United States—for itself and the free world—must not and cannot weaken its defenses. If change is to come and hope, it must be in the form of a specific treaty. And all other nations are in the same position.

We must not delude ourselves. The fateful need for a universal sound nuclear policy agreement is as plain as black and white. Its solution is not. Public opinion must be aroused to the dire necessity for solving that problem. But we must not create the impression that America will not fight to defend herself if need be.

Unilateral action by the United States would be the height of folly. Multilateral action with questionable controls would be absurd. Equally ridiculous is the thinking that if the free world alone lays down its atomic weapons—others will automatically do likewise. In the pursuit of a workable world nuclear policy peoples must be both persistent and patient.

Our urgent, our historical, our critical task is to find the way for universal banning of atomic testing. That calls for a complete reexamination of our international relations and foreign policies.

We Americans must face what is really going on in the world. To do that—we must keep our eyes on any weasel wording the proposals that are projected and rejected by the heads of state—both the negative as well as the positive.

Apparently negotiations over a satisfactory disarmament agreement are going to continue for a while and we cannot in the meantime permit ourselves to accept the fatalistic thinking that world war is inevitable—or because there can be no victor in a nuclear war—that war will never occur—or that new defenses will checkmate new weapons.

Such meetings as this tonight are not merely tinkling cymbals and sounding brass amid crashing changes in scientific concepts and accomplishments.

Such discussions as these serve the highly useful purpose of focusing the attention of all peoples on the dire necessity of reaching a speedy and constructive decision on a sane nuclear policy if a high standard of civilization is to be maintained.

We have raised and discussed the heart of the problem. I wish I could now provide the elaborated and final answer. But I do not have the expert knowledge required for a discussion of the details of a disarmament agreement that would at the same time be the basis of a boon to all mankind—and protect mankind's freedom to work out the solution of the climactic, economic, and political explosive forces now yeasting throughout the world.

Nor do I know—as our Secretary of State does—how if you pull one string it specifically affects other strings of America's interest and the free world's interests in world affairs.

But I do know that the disarmament question must be constantly raised and steadily pressed on heads of states by aroused public opinion aware of the wide areas of massed destruction developed by science in the past decade—that are being constantly increased and expanded by new discoveries.

Now, I am afraid I must make a small comment on the obvious developments in the last 72 hours and their relation to our problem.

I, for one, am neither as fatalistic as some about the crucial failure of the heads of government meeting at Paris, nor as optimistic as some, that it was simply Khrushchev's tactics maneuvering to get world public opinion on the Soviet's side. That remains to be seen.

I did not expect any dramatic achievement and agreement at the Paris summit meeting by the participating countries.

I felt about that meeting as I do when I stake a location for a wildcat oil well. I hope for a gusher, but am prepared for a duster. But I did not expect that meeting of the Big Four to end on such a fateful note.

Now, more than ever, world opinion must be aroused to demand that the attempts to ban atomic tests continue in energetic good faith and that sufficient progress be made toward reaching a definite settlement to warrant further moratoria on atomic testing while the negotiations continue.

Mr. Khrushchev is a cagey dictator and a hard trader. He is quick to take advantage of any opening we give him. But even so, as a dedicated Communist, he has political pressures to contend with, both abroad and at home. Furthermore, he is proud of the new factories, dams, schools built in the U.S.S.R. in the past 10 years at great human cost. He would not happily see them destroyed overnight. I am also sure that even Khrushchev, or at least Mrs. Khrushchev, would recoil at the thought of deformed or sterile great-grandchildren.

The Soviet Premier can either be a second Sampson, and pull down the temple of civilization, or he can light the whole world with the peaceful uses of these new magic elements of nature by agreeing to a reasonable treaty of control and inspection of atomic tests.

Another summit meeting in the near future of the heads of France, England, Russia, and the United States is the place for decision. Their combined efforts and clearheaded serious discussion and constructive solutions of controlling atomic tests will build either for greater enjoyment or for mutilation of coming generations.

The Berlin Question: An American View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Berlin is the beacon of the free world. It must not be allowed to go out either through indifference by the West or intransigence by the East. In a recent article in the Free World Forum, a bimonthly journal on foreign affairs, Christopher Emmet discusses "The Berlin Question: An American View." I believe Mr. Emmet's concluding paragraph to be particularly applicable in these days when there is so much talk about accommodating the Soviets:

If we stand absolutely firm against the Communist threat we will not only check Russian advances, but gain a great political and psychological victory which could change the trend of recent history. Nothing would so advance the cause of really inspected disarmament as to prove to the U.S.S.R. that its military threats cannot frighten us, even in the exposed outpost of Berlin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled, "The Berlin Question: An American View," by Christopher Emmet, in the April-May issue of the Free World Forum, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BERLIN QUESTION: AN AMERICAN VIEW

(By Christopher Emmet)

Since the first announcement of Mr. Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum in November 1958 American policy toward Berlin has been both ambivalent and ambiguous.

On the one hand, President Eisenhower has firmly rejected the Soviet Union's claim that Western rights in Berlin could be abrogated by a peace treaty of the U.S.S.R. with the so-called German Democratic Republic, and stated firmly that we would neither yield nor negotiate under the threat of force. On the other hand, the President and his Secretaries of State have evaded this latter promise by cooperating with Mr. Khrushchev in pretending that his ultimatum has been withdrawn. To save the President's face Premier Khrushchev asserted blandly that there had never been any ultimatum on appropriate occasions. The most recent repetitions occurred in Indonesia 2 months ago and on April 25, 1960 at Baku. There he said:

"If, despite all our efforts, the Western Powers refuse to seek jointly with the Soviet Union a concerted solution of the problem of the peace treaty * * * we, of course, will go our own way and sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

"It is common knowledge that the signing of a peace treaty puts an end to all terms stemming from the surrender of a country. Therefore, when a peace treaty is signed with the German Democratic Republic, the terms stemming from the surrender will lose their force on the entire territory controlled by the government of that state. Consequently, the rights which the Western Powers obtained as a result of the surrender of Hitler Germany, including the right for further preservation of the occupation status in West Berlin, will also lose their force with regard to this territory.

"Therefore, if the Western Powers refuse to sign a peace treaty with the German Republic * * * they naturally will forfeit the right of access to West Berlin by land, water, and air."

In this same speech Khrushchev also specifically threatened the use of force if the West should attempt to break a blockade imposed by his East German allies; and though the threat was couched in Aesopian language, its meaning was brutally clear. President Eisenhower's response to this reassertion of Premier Khrushchev's threat was equally typical. At his April 27, 1960 press conference he said he was positive that Mr. Khrushchev does not intend to repeat his ultimatum at Baku, but that if Mr. Khrushchev means to threaten the use of force to get us out of Berlin, then the President will not attend the summit conference. This kind of interchange has been going on ever since Mr. Khrushchev's first threat 18 months ago.

It is true that he made one concession. After their meeting at Camp David he permitted the President to announce that there was no time limit on the Berlin negotiations. In other words, Premier Khrushchev promised not to use force in Berlin as long as negotiations continued. But at the same time he warned that these negotiations could not be indefinitely prolonged. Thus the threat to force the West from Berlin has been postponed, but not withdrawn, and the only real concession has been to lift the original deadline of May 1959—and he exacted a high price for that.

It should be noted that before Premier Khrushchev made this relatively minor concession on Berlin, the President had first made two major concessions which he had long sought from us. First, was the invitation to visit America; second, the President's promise to attend a summit conference and to visit the Soviet Union. In short, Premier Khrushchev only withdrew the time limit on his Berlin ultimatum at Camp David in exchange for the President's promise to go to the summit and negotiate about Berlin.

In view of all this, it seems clear that the West has been negotiating under the threat of the ultimatum and will be doing so at the summit conference itself. In fact, we negotiated about Berlin for 3 months at Geneva last year before Premier Khrushchev had even made his Camp David promise.

The basic weakness of the President's policy in the face of the Berlin ultimatum was further illustrated by his famous press conference last summer, where he said, in effect, that we could not defend our rights in Berlin except by launching a nuclear war, and that such a war was "unthinkable." The defeatist implications of this remark were clear to the German press and to Chancellor Adenauer, and we may be sure they were equally clear to Premier Khrushchev.

WHAT WERE THE PRESIDENT'S MOTIVES?

In fairness to the President it must be pointed out that these and subsequent concessions described in this article were probably not based on American fear of the Soviet Russian ultimatum but rather on its effect in Britain. The approaching British elections, and the uneasy prospect of Nye Bevan as British Foreign Minister if the Labor Party won, made the President and Secretary Dulles peculiarly sensitive to British opinion at that time. It was thought that concessions to Premier Khrushchev would help Mr. Macmillan but, as it turned out, that help proved unnecessary. However, if the President's original weakness on the Berlin issue was mainly due to his fear of the results of the British elections, it would appear that his more recent retreats have been at least partly (and perhaps unconsciously) motivated by the interests of his own party in the American elections. Once having embarked on a policy of visits and negotiations the electoral fortunes of the President's party were tied to this policy's success—real or apparent. As Premier Khrushchev is a tough bargainer, it was necessary to make some concessions to keep the negotiations going—or else openly confess failure and face a new showdown on Berlin. In this sense he has been able to exercise a kind of electoral blackmail both in Britain and in America, in addition to the brutal physical blackmail of his original Berlin ultimatum.

So much for our agreement to negotiate on Berlin under Russian guns. To make matters worse, there were similar immediate concessions on the terms of the negotiations. The first of these changes was announced by Mr. Dulles himself before he was incapacitated by his tragic illness, by his press conference statement that the West might be willing to treat with the East German puppets as Soviet "agents." This suggested a degree of de facto recognition of the Pankow Government which aroused consternation in Germany.

Next Mr. Dulles said that the West no longer insisted on free elections in the early stages of German unification, though they would ultimately have to take place. The third concession came in the arrangements for the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference itself, after Mr. Herter became Acting Secretary, when it was agreed that the East German puppet government should partici-

pate in the negotiations on the same basis as the West German Government, though neither would have the status of major parties in the conference. Taken together, these three changes in the Western position involved a very substantial retreat.

But this was not all. At Geneva the West broke up its original package proposal despite the announcement that this would not be done. The package consisted of a temporary interim settlement of the Berlin problem, as part of a complicated step-by-step process which would lead to German unification by free elections, after a maximum delay of 3 years. When the U.S.S.R. rejected this proposal the West made a new offer at the second Geneva Conference for a special interim settlement on Berlin alone, divorced from German unification.

This last offer hinted at slight reductions in the already tiny West Berlin garrison, promised not to reenforce the Berlin garrison or to strengthen its armaments in any way, and proposed to reduce allied propaganda and intelligence activities in West Berlin, in return for a similar promise on the Communist side in regard to East Berlin. Fortunately for the West the U.S.S.R. rejected this offer.

Both Mayor Willy Brandt of Berlin and Chancellor Adenauer had grave misgivings about this offer, and since then Chancellor Adenauer has made strenuous efforts to get the American and British Governments to promise to withdraw it and go back to the original Geneva package plan when negotiations are resumed at the summit. With General De Gaulle's support, the Chancellor succeeded in getting an agreement at Paris last December that the Western position at the summit would start with the package plan and not with the Berlin interim proposal. However, the British have always made it clear that if the U.S.S.R. rejects the package then the West must renew its offer of the interim agreement.

All the news available both on and off the record indicates that the President and the British have pledged Chancellor Adenauer not to go beyond the terms of this interim agreement offer, which Lord Mayor Willy Brandt has described as the extreme limit of the possible, if the freedom of Berlin is to survive. The reasons for the fears of Mayor Brandt and the Chancellor are clear. Since Berlin has no army of its own and no West German troops can be stationed there, its defense depends on the allied garrison alone. This garrison of only 10,000 men must protect a vast sprawling city of 2 million people from invasion by organized East German mobs or other subversive devices, plus any military threats which the East German Army involves. And East German troops are already present in East Berlin.

Just as serious as the question of the size of the garrisons is the question of the proposed restrictions on propaganda and intelligence activities. For the West, Berlin is the only listening post behind the Iron Curtain. Radio RIAS is the only Western radio station whose broadcasts cannot be jammed. On the other hand, the Soviets through their Communist Parties in every country, have propaganda and espionage agents throughout the free world and none of their broadcasts is jammed by our side. Hence, Berlin is indispensable for Western propaganda and intelligence while the similar Communist activities from East Berlin are not indispensable at all. The allied interim offer, therefore, would amount to a very real surrender, in fact if not in name, to Premier Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum.

INDIRECT RESULTS OF THE BERLIN ULTIMATUM

However, much more is involved than Berlin alone. In an article published by the New Leader on April 10, 1959, the writer warned that there was grave danger that the West might eventually make concessions to that ultimatum, not perhaps in Berlin itself but in apparently remote areas. The questions of disarmament and atomic test inspection were mentioned among the areas where such concessions should be looked for, and resisted, by American public opinion.

Unfortunately, this prediction has been fulfilled. We have already mentioned the invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit the United States, which immensely increased his prestige behind the Iron Curtain and in neutral capitals. Before the Berlin ultimatum Mr. Dulles, with the backing of the President, had always opposed such an invitation, just as they had both opposed a summit conference unless real progress were first made at lower level negotiations. But now the leaders are about to meet at the summit with no progress from the Western point of view anywhere except a softening of the terms of Premier Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum itself. In other words, by making a threat and then partially withdrawing it, he pressured the President into the summit.

Perhaps even more serious among the indirect concessions to the ultimatum has been in the field of nuclear tests, the field which was forecast in the New Leader article as the most likely area for such retreats.

It has escaped notice that the U.S.S.R.'s Berlin ultimatum in November 1958 was immediately followed by the ending of all U.S. atomic tests. This, too, has long been one of Premier Khrushchev's priority objectives. Only a few months before the President had written Prime Minister Nehru of India and Prime Minister Kishi of Japan that further tests were essential to develop the cleaner and more flexible atomic weapons which were essential to the defense of the free world and Chinese ground troops. But after the Berlin ultimatum the President agreed to suspend all American testing negotiations on inspection at Geneva.

Even after the discussions at Geneva began in January 1959, the President still maintained that any test ban agreement must be tied in with definite progress toward an agreement for inspected disarmament, because ending tests does not involve either disarmament or the destruction of a single nuclear weapon. But in April 1959 the President abandoned this position by agreeing to seek a test ban in isolation from disarmament, just as later we agreed to seek an interim solution for Berlin isolated from the problem of German reunification.

A third American concession in this area soon followed. The original American and British position had been that any test ban inspection must obviously involve the right of international inspection teams to investigate any suspicious event immediately and wherever it occurred. But on his visit to Russia Premier Macmillan, without consulting the United States, proposed to Khrushchev that there might be only a fixed number of such on-the-spot inspections. In other words, there would be a political decision that only so and so many inspections could be made, regardless of how many suspicious events might occur. Late in the spring of 1959 the President also agreed to this principle.

It is true that the U.S.S.R. and the Western Allies have not yet agreed on the actual number of on-the-spot inspections. Nevertheless, agreement to any fixed quota is in itself a departure from a fundamental principle of disarmament inspection.

However, the President's greatest concession in the nuclear testing field took place at his meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan at Camp David. Before Mr. Macmillan came here the U.S.S.R. had agreed, in principle but not in detail, to accept the Western terms for inspection of aboveground tests, provided the West would agree to a voluntary ban on small underground tests, which at present cannot be detected or identified by inspection. These are tests which the U.S. defense forces are most anxious to continue in order to perfect the small defensive nuclear weapons which could pinpoint military targets, avoid the slaughter of civilian populations and help to neutralize the vast Sino-Soviet preponderance in manpower. Such continued underground testing offers the only hope of developing a Western deterrent against small wars, or Soviet Russian attacks on the ground in Germany or elsewhere, without resorting to the suicidal use of massive retaliation. In short, the military dilemma which the President mentioned in his press conference about Berlin can only be solved by the increase of NATO ground forces plus the continuation of nuclear testing. Moreover, underground tests are wholly free from fallout, so that the fear of fallout which produced the worldwide clamor for ending tests, does not apply to underground testing. Thus the only valid excuse for American failure to continue such tests would be the conclusion of a satisfactory disarmament agreement, which would make the improvement of our defensive nuclear weapons unnecessary.

Yet the President has yielded on this issue also. At Camp David Mr. Macmillan and he agreed to continue the present voluntary test ban, including underground tests, pending the invention of new inspection techniques which might make underground tests detectable. The only proviso is that the Soviet Union eventually agrees to the inspection of aboveground tests, which are no longer essential or important.

What this really amounts to is an agreement to ban further underground testing without inspection as long as the U.S.S.R. is willing to negotiate. And why should they not negotiate when they are getting what they want—an uninspected test ban which they are free to violate with impunity, and with the absolute certainty that the West will honorably keep its agreement. For even if the Western Governments were willing to break their pledges it would be impossible to conceal the violation in a free country with a free press.

The test ban has already lasted 18 months. The negotiations will certainly continue throughout President Eisenhower's term, which will extend the ban to 27 months by next January. And all the presidential candidates have offered to continue any agreement the President makes beyond the 1st of next January.

Even if an agreement on inspection of aboveground tests is reached, and even if new methods of inspecting underground tests could be invented by next January, which scientists believe to be impossible, it is estimated that it will take a minimum of 2 years and probably much longer to set up the international inspection machinery.

Secretary Herter has said that while the Chinese would not be brought into the original test-ban agreement they would have to be brought in at some stage or it would not work. Thus, beyond the minimum 2 years from the date when a test agreement is signed, the moratorium on testing would be indefinitely prolonged while trying to reach an agreement with the Chinese.

The prospects, therefore, are that on top of the present period of 18 months there will be a minimum of 3 years more of an uninspected test ban, even if agreement should finally be reached, making a total of 4½ years during which the Communists can take advantage of the voluntary test suspension.

This will not only be more than enough time to wreck the continuity and to break up all the scientific teams involved in the development of U.S. nuclear weapons by testing. It will also be more than enough time for the U.S.S.R. to overtake and surpass our persent superiority in the scope and flexibility of nuclear weapons, and for this

Khrushchev can largely thank the effectiveness of his Berlin ultimatum, regardless of what happens in Berlin itself.

Let me close by outlining what I believe the Western policy on Berlin at the summit should be and still could be.

WHAT AMERICA CAN DO IN BERLIN

Returning to Berlin itself, this must be remembered: despite the long series of minor concessions noted, nothing fundamental has yet been given away and there is still time to turn the Russian Berlin ultimatum into another victory for freedom as in 1948. Berlin is prosperous now in contrast to the austerity that preceded the airlift, but that has not undermined the spirit of the people; it has only given Berlin a far greater physical reserve with which to withstand new pressures or blockades. Another difference is that Berliners now have even more to lose by a Communist victory.

Defeatists in the West talk about the vulnerability of Berlin's position, and, of course, it is physically vulnerable. However, if war comes today it will be nuclear war, so Berlin is basically no more vulnerable than New York, Paris, London, or Moscow. So long as we convince the Soviet Union that the ultimate price they must pay for Berlin is nuclear war, Berlin is as safe as any other city, for the U.S.S.R. has no more interest in going to war than we. It hopes to conquer the West without war and Berlin could be the West's greatest asset in defeating those hopes.

For it is more than just another free city. It is a refuge and a citadel of freedom deep in Communist territory—a symbol of hope for the ultimate triumph of liberty in eastern Europe. It was the scene of the West's greatest political victory in the cold war during the airlift and it is the showcase of the West's economic triumph. It is the only place where the free world and the slave world can be compared face to face; where, like Hamlet, people can "look on this picture and on that." No wonder Premier Khrushchev told Senator HUMPHREY that the city was a thorn in his side.

Premier Khrushchev is not acting in Berlin from strength as he pretends. He is acting from weakness as the tremendous new flow of refugees, over 7,000 in 1 week, indicates. That explains the violence of his new Baku ultimatum. As long as West Berlin is free, East Germany and all of eastern Europe remain political time bombs which could explode at any moment. This spirit of resistance along Russian lines of communication in Eastern Europe would be bound to flare up as it did in Hungary and Poland in 1956, if Khrushchev went to war; and Communist fear of this resistance is one of the greatest deterrents against aggression, in the opinion of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

The Kremlin knows it cannot trust either the captive people or their satellite armies as long as hope for eventual freedom remains alive; but if West Berlin were turned over to the East German puppet regime, the one gap in the Iron Curtain would be closed, the tottering Pankow government would achieve legitimacy and hence stability, and the people of eastern Europe might lose all hope. That is why Berlin is so important to Khrushchev and to us, and why present negotiations constitute a supreme test for the Western alliance. We should welcome that test for it could not come at a place where our rights are clearer, our moral position stronger, our honor and national interest more deeply involved.

For all these reasons the Communists may be willing to go to the very brink of war over Berlin in the hope that we will yield something fundamental, either there or elsewhere. Our system of alliances with more than 40 nations is based on faith in the strength, honor, and courage of the United States. That faith will not survive a Berlin surrender even if it is disguised or delayed and carried out on the installment plan. To resist Soviet Russians probings we have to be willing to fight somewhere, if we must, and if we do not convince them in advance that we are willing to fight somewhere, we may have to fight everywhere. What better place can we find to make this clear, before it is too late, than in the city of Berlin?

If we stand absolutely firm against the Communist threat we will not only check Russian advances, but gain a great political and psychological victory which could change the trend of recent history. Nothing would so advance the cause of really inspected disarmament as to prove to the U.S.S.R. that its military threats cannot frighten us, even in the exposed outpost of Berlin.

Citizenship in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege and pleasure last night to attend the 50th anniversary commemorative dinner of the Boy Scouts of America. The President was there and did a grand job of ad-libbing. There was a pageant highlighting 50 years of scouting contribution to the Nation. The scouts themselves put that on and they did a grand job.

Ellsworth H. Augustus, president of the Boy Scouts of America, presided, and the U.S. Marine Corps orchestra rendered some very beautiful music.

The Secretary of Commerce, Frederick H. Mueller, delivered a very wonderful 50th anniversary talk. The title of the speech was "Citizenship in a Free Society." I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP IN A FREE SOCIETY

(Text of address by Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller, prepared for delivery at the 50th anniversary commemorative dinner, Boy Scouts of America, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1960)

Mr. President, President Augustus, members of the diplomatic corps, friends and supporters of the Boy Scouts of America, it is an honor and an inspiration to have been privileged to participate in these ceremonies.

In paying tribute to a half century of distinguished service by the Boy Scouts of America we are also wishing them continuing success in the years to come.

For we shall have even greater need of the principles of the Boy Scout movement as the demands upon citizenship in a free society become even broader.

An associate of mine, hearing that I was to address this meeting, asked the highly flattering question as to whether I had been a Boy Scout.

My answer was that I graduated from high school the year the Boy Scouts of America was founded—just 50 years ago this month. Can you think of a better reason for not having been a member?

I did have an exceptional opportunity as a youngster to have the friendship and inspiration of a man who, after the founding of the Boy Scout organization, became very active in its work.

I refer to Capt. Charles Belknap, a Civil War captain at the age of 20, who was the grandfather of one of my boyhood friends.

He spent much of his time teaching us the lore of the woods, especially Indian lore, on which he was an expert and instilled in us the same basic appreciation of the principles and activity later embodied in the Boy Scout movement.

Needless to say, however, that I have maintained an active interest in an organization which has been such a powerful force for good—not only for its generations of individual members and leaders, but also for the communities fortunate enough to have Scout troops and councils.

In this audience, and all over America, are dedicated men who deserve special tribute tonight.

I refer to members of Boy Scout councils and troop committees, to Scoutmasters and their adult assistants, and to other business and professional men who devote so many hours to active guidance of this magnificent Scout movement.

I know that they have had their reward many times over.

But all of us, in or out of scouting, are the beneficiaries of one of the greatest and most successful experiments in youth development in world history.

The principles upon which the Boy Scout movement was founded, and which have been responsible for its growth, are derived from the finest of American traditions.

Its emphasis on physical, mental, moral and spiritual development, its teaching of fairplay and self-reliance in every endeavor—these are the ingredients which have made this Nation great, and assure the future of our free democratic society.

Each year, since 1951, there has been awarded by the President of the United States, pursuant to an act of Congress, the Young American Medal for Bravery.

It is awarded to one who has exhibited exceptional courage in an effort to save—or has successfully saved—the life of a person in actual and imminent danger.

It is most significant that, of the eight such awards made to date, six of the recipients were Boy Scouts at the time of their act of heroism and a seventh had been a member of the Scouts.

There is another fact about the Scouts which is of particular significance to law enforcement officers.

Attorney General Rogers, whose place I am honored to take tonight, informs me that those best informed in the Federal prison system—the Director, wardens, and the people working at the National Training School for Boys and other youth correction centers—have stated that, of all the men and boys who are received in our various detention facilities, less than one in a thousand has ever had any connection with the Boy Scouts of America.

The facts should not surprise anyone familiar with the Scout oath and the Scout law.

For our legal system and the legal systems of the entire free world have a moral basis.

Lenin described the Communist ideal when he said, "All is moral that serves to strengthen the Soviet system."

How different is the constantly expressed determination—throughout the Cub Scout promise, the Boy Scout oath, and the explorer code—to do one's best to serve God in the spirit of good will and fairness to all men everywhere.

I recently had occasion to write a message for Fitness In Action, the publication of the President's Council on Youth Fitness.

I there stated that fitness must always be defined in terms of its purpose.

The kind of fitness which we seek is the development of free and responsible indi-

viduals for life and service in a free society.

Our strength grows out of our high dedication to opportunities for every individual to realize his best potential and highest destiny.

Thus we do not seek mere survival, but the enlargement of the dignity and moral worth of humanity.

To preserve and extend these basic traditions and ideals, we shall require the best will—and the greatest variety of talents, intelligence, and judgment—which a free people can muster.

This is why the program of the Boy Scouts of America, and of their fellow Scouts all over the world, is so basic to our common task.

That task is to realize the joy and fulfillment which freedom alone can win for a troubled world.

Scouting is an ideal workshop for voluntary citizenship in a worldwide community dedicated to freedom for all.

Scouts learn the lesson inscribed on the Department of Justice building: "Justice in the life and conduct of the State is possible only as first it resides in the hearts and souls of the citizens."

Scouts learn that freedom and justice are inseparable, and that justice involves respect for the rights of others.

Scouting breeds not only the will to cooperate, but also the will to think for one's self.

In providing constructive outlets for the restless and surging energies of youth, Scouting builds character through practical experience in living, learning, playing and working with others.

Scouting makes another basic contribution to the way of life of a free society and the broadest requirements of citizenship.

I refer to experience in leadership.

We adults have had occasion to witness many perversions of that word "leadership."

It has been used to cover a multitude of sins.

In a strictly scientific and objective sense, the qualities making for leadership are amoral.

They can exist regardless of how they are used.

A man is a leader to the extent that he can successfully rationalize the sentiments, attitudes, aspirations—or even the fears and hatreds—of a group.

Thus the leader may or may not lead in a sound or healthy direction.

Leadership can exploit the worst or bring out the best in a whole people.

But this vital point is often overlooked: the quality of the leader is conditioned and determined by the quality of those he leads.

In this sense people get the kind of leaders they want—and deserve.

There is leadership by default, when the rank and file are indifferent and willing—as we say—to "let George do it."

There is leadership by force when opposition to the ruling clique is discouraged or even coerced until it is no longer vocal and effective.

There is leadership by personal ambition where there is rivalry based upon prestige and personality factors regardless of the needs of the group.

And finally there is responsible leadership, which emerges when the group is made up of responsible and interested people free to express ways of accomplishing common objectives.

Here leadership does not come by default, force, or personal ambition.

It is won through the character and capacity to achieve acceptance in the free market of ideas.

The Boy Scouts produce that kind of leaders because they produce that kind of boys who grow into that kind of men.

And behind the whole process is a set of ideals, principles, goals which set in motion a chain reaction between leaders and led which preserves, strengthens, and motivates the whole group.

As Secretary of Commerce, I have achieved new insight into what has made American free enterprise so strong and productive.

In industry, as in Government, he profits most who best serves the long-run interests of the people.

Freemen, as citizens or as customers, can't be pushed around.

They must be persuaded.

And persuasion requires three qualities with which the Boy Scouts of America have been enriching our land for a half century—to be respected as a person; to have a sense of direction; and to make that direction the highest of human aspirations.

Citizenship in a free society is thus based, in the final analysis, upon more than knowledge.

Science and technology have opened new vistas to a better life of which our forefathers could only dream.

But we are all too aware that such knowledge can destroy us.

We may have reached the turning point, the moment of truth.

The coming decade will test our faith in God and man.

But we in America can face that future with great confidence in knowing that since 1910 over 35 million men and boys have taken that beautiful Scout oath:

"On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country."

Competitive Private Enterprise in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as an aftermath to Russia's launching of Sputnik I, much has been said and written on the ability of a free society—with its divergent views and directives—to meet the pact set by a regimented state.

Speaking at Los Angeles on May 4, Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., reviewed the challenge inherent in the two systems as they compete for supremacy in the exploration and economic development of space. Perhaps of special interest to us as Members of Congress are his recommendations for changes in existing laws which would encourage the maximum contribution of competitive private enterprise. Mr. Cordiner's address was one of a series of 12 sponsored by the University of California on "Peacetime Uses of Space." It was my privilege to address the same group on April 13.

Mr. Speaker, since, in my opinion, all of us can benefit from Mr. Cordiner's very able analysis of space-age developments as viewed from the standpoint of private industry, I am presenting the text of his address for inclusion in the RECORD:

COMPETITIVE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN SPACE

(By Ralph J. Cordiner)

There are two basic forms of human organization: The free societies, such as the United States, and the regimented societies, such as the Soviet Union. In free societies, the government is the servant of the people. In regimented societies, the people are the servants of the government.

No society is completely free or completely regimented, but the distinction is real, and it is profoundly important to the quality of human life. The two systems are now engaged in a protracted struggle for the future of the world. They are competing in every field of human endeavor, including the field of economic development.

A distinguishing feature of the free societies, as opposed to Communist and other socialist systems, is the use of competitive private enterprise as the primary means of economic development. The citizens of the United States have both philosophical and practical reasons for preferring business enterprise to government enterprise. Philosophically, the competitive private-enterprise approach is more appropriate to a free society than government-owned or government-controlled industry, which is one of the characteristic features of a regimented society. And practically speaking, the system of competitive private enterprise has enabled this country to produce a level of living that is unmatched anywhere, anytime.

Even the rulers of Russia and China cannot think of a more effective incentive for their regimented people than the hope that someday they may attain the standards of the people of the United States. Communism and socialism may claim to be the revolutionary systems of our times, but for almost every human being outside the free world, the most successful imaginable revolution would be one that would enable him to live like the average U.S. citizen.

SPACE RAISES QUESTIONS

Now, the two contending systems are beginning to compete in a new area: in the exploration and economic development of space. This will be a vast and expensive undertaking, and is poses some fundamental questions for the citizens of the United States.

How can we utilize our dynamic system of competitive private enterprise in space, as on earth, to make newly discovered resources useful to man?

How can private enterprise and private capital make their maximum contribution? What projects will necessarily require Government chairmanship and support for their execution?

What must be done to preserve a free society while competing in an international race for space? How can we assure that when the space frontier is developed, it will be an area of freedom rather than regimentation?

My assignment in this series of lectures is to discuss some of these questions. Specifically, here is my objective:

First, I will submit for your consideration some deeply important impacts of the space challenge on this country's free society and its system of competitive private enterprise. Many will be highly beneficial. Others have chilling implications. And some are ambiguous at present. All of them will affect the life of the individual citizen and his children, and are therefore worthy of his informed interest and concern.

Next, we will examine some of the underlying principles of the U.S. political and economic system—principles that must be recognized in the formulation of national space policy.

On this basis of principles, I will then suggest the specific roles of industry and Government in the exploration and economic development of space.

Then finally, I will suggest some changes in the legal framework that would encourage the maximum contribution of competitive private enterprise.

Let us begin by looking at the future impact of space activities on the free society and private enterprise.

There will be many effects that are primarily beneficial.

A NEW FRONTIER

The advanced industrial nations can now send objects off the planet into space. This new capability opens a whole new frontier to human exploration, development, and use. At this stage, the new frontier does not look very promising to the profit-minded businessman, or to the tax-minded citizen. But then, so it must have seemed to the Greeks, when Jason returned from his exploratory trip into the Black Sea; or to the Phoenicians, when their first explorers returned from the wild and savage shores of the western Mediterranean. Most of the Greek and Phoenican traders, in 1000 B.C., probably preferred to invest their money in a good safe cargo of grain or wine, shipped over familiar sea lanes to familiar markets. But apparently a few traders, and later colonists, had the vision to see possibilities where other men saw nothing, because in a few centuries the Black Sea and the western Mediterranean became familiar and profitable regions, enlarging the resources available to civilized man.

Every new frontier presents the same problem of vision and risk. According to Herodotus, the Pharaoh Necho of Egypt sent a crew sailing around the continent of Africa about 600 B.C. If Egypt had followed through with further exploration and economic development, Africa today might be a highly developed continent. But the vision was lacking, and no civilized man again saw South Africa for 2,000 years. Leif Ericson discovered America 500 years before Columbus, but apparently the Vikings did not have the vision to see anything worthwhile on that vast, empty continent, and so history waited for another half millenium.

Even our own Western frontier seemed so unpromising just 157 years ago that the Emperor Napoleon, hard pressed for money, sold all the land from the Mississippi River to the Continental Divide to the young United States for only $23 million, including interest. With that one purchase of the unknown Louisiana Territory, President Jefferson doubled the size of the United States and changed the course of history. Thomas Jefferson did not know what he bought, but he sent Lewis and Clark to find out, and private traders, homesteaders, and businessmen followed in their path to turn the empty wilderness into the heartland of a great nation.

Even in our own time, we have had prominent men who stated that airplanes would never fly faster than sound, that intercontinental missiles could not be developed, and that space flight is nothing more than a comic-strip fantasy.

I am reciting this ancient and recent history to be sure that we have the right perspective. When a new frontier is opened, the new territory always looks vast, empty, hostile, and unrewarding. It is always dangerous to go there, and almost impossible to live there in loneliness and peril. The technological capacities of the time are always taxed to the utmost in dealing with the new environment. The explorations require huge investments of both public and private funds, and the returns are always hazardous at first. A few enterprises succeed fabulously, but many fail through inadequate planning or bad timing. The organization, capital, and equipment required for the first exploratory efforts are so large that people tend at first to think only in terms of governmental and military action; and only later do they conceive the new territory as simply an extension of their present territory and their present economy.

It takes an immense effort of imagination for the citizens to see beyond these initial difficulties of opening a new frontier. No one would pretend to foresee all the economic, political, social, and cultural changes that will follow in the wake of the first exploratory shots into space, any more than the people in the days of Columbus could foresee the 20th century world. But such an effort at prophetic imagination is what is required of us as citizens, so that we will not, like Leif Ericson, leave the making of the future to others.

The most important long-term impact of the new space capabilities, therefore, is that they open up a new frontier for exploration and economic development. From the businessman's viewpoint, this spells risk and opportunity. But there will be other effects on the Nation's business life.

ACCELERATING TECHNICAL PROGRESS

The effort to explore space, and to keep from falling behind other nations in this area, will accelerate the progress of many present-day industrial technologies. The discoveries made in the race for space will have many applications outside the space program. At the same time we must remember that the space technologies are not being made out of whole cloth; they are for the most part extensions of industrial technologies developed for commercial and military purposes.

Electronics, for example, is a technology that has been under constant development and use for four or five decades; but the needs of the space program have put extra pressure on the drive for miniaturization. This will be valuable in such important commercial fields as communications, data processing, automation, and even home appliances.

The space program will also help to accelerate the development of new or unusual power sources, such as the fuel cell, thermionic converters, the MHD (magnetohydrodynamic) process, and vastly improved nuclear power sources. It will undoubtedly help to overcome some of the limitations in materials that are now hindering progress in many industries, by forcing the development of high-temperature, high-strength materials.

The work on rocket engines is bringing in new knowledge about chemistry and combustion. Cryogenics, the study of what happens to matter and energy under conditions of extreme cold, will unquestionably move more rapidly because of the space program. Medical and biological research are being accelerated by the need to know how to sustain life in the airless, weightless, cold, and hostile conditions of space. This listing of the various technologies that will benefit from the space effort could go on for a long time. But the examples I have cited show that many early and practical gains will be made by putting to work in industry the knowledge gained in space-oriented research.

In Philadelphia, General Electric conducts two different businesses. One of them is the development and production of switchgear for the electric utilities and industrial customers. The other is the missile and space vehicle department. The two would seem to be unrelated, but in some instances they are mutually supporting operations. In the switchgear laboratory we have costly special facilities for producing very large electric arcs. The missile and space vehicle department arranged to use this same equipment to generate the plasma conditions that are necessary to test nose cones and other reentry vehicles. In the course of their work on reentry vehicles, the scientists of the missile and space vehicle department have come up with some rather unorthodox approaches to the control and use of arc phenomena—which is at the very heart of electric power control technology. Thus space research and industrial research mutually support each other.

IMPACT ON BUSINESS THINKING

Another beneficial impact of the space adventure will be its impact on the habits of thought in business and elsewhere. It will encourage bold, systematic planning of a long-range nature by forcing men to envision the means of coping with a completely new and hostile environment. It will likewise force long-range speculation and planning in the political, economic, military, technological, and social areas to anticipate future applications and effects of space technologies. Already we are seeing the growth of novel planning organizations made up of physical and social scientists, engineers, financial experts, and professional managers. Their whole output consists of ideas, forecasts, and evaluations of future possibilities. Such planning organizations are already in being in other companies besides General Electric.

The space frontier will inevitably increase the scale of thinking and risk taking by business. When we are dealing with space, we are dealing with a technology that requires a planetary scale to stage it; decades of time to develop it; and much bigger investments to get across the threshold of economic return than is customary in business today. Business must now think in international terms, and in terms of the next business generation. It must step up to the big risks with the same vision that enabled an earlier generation of builders to push railroad tracks out across the wilderness and lay the foundations of our modern economy.

Another beneficial impact of the space adventure, already visible, is that it is encouraging the creation of more businesses of all sizes. To those who insist that small business is declining, I only ask that you leaf through the advertisements in the technical magazines to see how many thousands of new businesses have sprung up to handle the requirements of modern technology. Most of them are suppliers of specialty equipment for the larger concerns that have responsibility for major components and systems. For, in addition to more small businesses, the space adventure also creates the need for much larger enterprises than are in existence today, with financial and technical resources commensurate with the tasks ahead.

Unquestionably, this need for much bigger companies and groups of companies will run head on into the prejudice of those who cherish an irriational suspicion of any business larger than a family grocery store. But such prejudice will not survive very long in the space age. The space challenge will, in fact, force government and business to reassess their relationships, in view of their inevitable partnerships in a lengthy enterprise. This is good, because it will force us to face the need for new relationships in a new world.

Thus far I have dwelt on the effects that will be primarily beneficial. But the venture into space has its negative side, too, and all of us as citizens should be aware of it.

A DANGER: GOVERNMENT DOMINATION OF INDUSTRY

It appears that the exploration of space is going to depend, for many years, primarily on Government financing and hence Government direction and control. That will be true because the exploration of space offers relatively little commercial opportunity for private business, in the years immediately ahead.

If the space effort were only a minor activity, the dependence on Government financing and control would have less economic impact. But the fact is that the military and peaceful needs of the space program are already employing a significant percentage of the industrial work force, and will make up an even larger proportion of total em-

ployment and production of the country as the years go by. The aircraft industry, for example, is broadening its scope to include missile and space technologies. Much of the electronics industry is devoted to missile and space needs. The communications, chemical, and metallurgical industries are increasingly involved. These industries are already among the largest employers in the United States, and they are the major employers of the Nation's technical manpower. Hence we are not speaking of a minor element in the national economy, but of its leading growth industries. These industries are subject to ever-increasing Government influence by way of Government contracts. And the space age is only beginning.

Research and development are also drifting under Government control. For reasons of defense and space exploration, the Federal Government has become the Nation's primary sponsor of research and development in practically all of the new technologies. The area of independent research and development by private industry and private universities is becoming proportionately smaller. This means that the pace and direction of progress in most of the leading technologies are substantially under the control of Government agencies.

The situation is made worse by the fact that, under the National Space Act, any inventions first applied in connection with a Federal space project, regardless of how they were developed, automatically become the exclusive property of the Government. This greatly reduces the incentive for the company that made the invention to develop it for the benefit of consumers and industrial customers. It does not take a prophet to see the long-term effect of this situation on the future independence of the universities and the future vitality of private enterprise.

The patent provisions of the National Space Act are based on the unusual patent provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. But it is important to realize the vast difference between the development and production of nuclear material and that involved in the exploration of space. The development of nuclear material is a relatively clearly defined, closely integrated area of technology. On the other hand, space exploration involves the utilization of nearly every field of science and technology known to man. In the case of atomic energy it has been possible to erect certain reasonable boundaries around the Government's research and development activities, while in the area of the so-called space sciences, this is totally impossible. It is the confusion of these two types of technologies which has led to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration patent clause, which is so unworkable and poses such a threat to the independence of private enterprise.

GOVERNMENT FACILITIES EXPANDING

An even more disturbing effect of the growth of Government-sponsored research and development is the temptation for the Federal Government to build its own facilities and personnel in the technical fields, or to establish so-called nonprofit organizations which are totally dependent on Government contracts. However generous their motives, these nonprofit organizations are usurping a field traditionally served by private consulting firms and producer companies, and hence are little more than a blind for nationalized industry competing directly with private enterprise—on a subsidized, nontax-paying basis. Since the space effort will, for a long time, be primarily a research and development effort, this tendency could lead to an unexpected, and perhaps undesirable, buildup of Government-controlled facilities. Looking to the future, when the space frontier has been explored and is ready for economic development, we might well find the area preempted by the Government, which would then have most of the personnel and facilities available. This would leave the Nation almost no choice except to settle for nationalized industry in space.

Please understand me. I am not saying that the people who work in Government arsenals and laboratories or nonprofit organizations are any less competent or dedicated than those who work in private industry. I am not saying that Government laboratories should be dismantled, because many of them serve a useful function. The Government needs a certain number of experienced technical men to help make realistic choices as to future missions, to set high standards of performance, and to provide technically sound policy guidance. That cannot be done by men who are not actively engaged in space research and development. Hence a certain percentage—perhaps as much as 5 percent—of the technical work of the space program is best done in Government laboratories. They should be well staffed and well financed.

But we must recognize that there are growth tendencies in these Government agencies that could overexpand under the pressures of the space program, unless proper safeguards are established. As we step up our activities on the space frontier, many companies, universities, and individual citizens will become increasingly dependent on the political whims and necessities of the Federal Government. And if that drift continues without check, the United States may find itself becoming the very kind of society that it is struggling against—a regimented society whose people and institutions are dominated by a central government.

To some of you, and perhaps most of you, this may appear to be an alarmist position. In my preparations for this lecture, I was surprised to learn how many people have simply taken for granted that space is a natural domain of the Government. Almost no one had looked forward to the time when space has been explored, to ask whether its development shall be under our traditional competitive enterprise system, or whether—unlike the rest of the economy—space shall be preempted for Government enterprise. And practically no one saw the relationship of these assumptions to the world struggle between free societies and those that are government-controlled.

PRINCIPLES OF A FREE SOCIETY

It is important, as we undertake this long and expensive race into space, that we as citizens bear in mind the kind of society we wish to maintain and develop. As I stated at the beginning of this lecture, we in the United States have a political and economic system that, in spite of its imperfections, is the most productive and admired system in the world. It not only preserves, but utilizes human freedom as the key to social and economic progress. We want to maintain this free society in a world where many factors are pushing the nations toward statist systems.

One of the basic principles of the American system is the principle of decentralized power. This country has what is known as a pluralistic society. There is not just one basic source of initiative and decision here, as in the government-controlled societies. Rather, in the United States, there are many competing points of initiative, risk, and decision—and that is the secret of this Nation's drive and creativity.

There are millions of private institutions—colleges, churches, business firms, and associations of all kinds—who do not report to a common center of decision, but operate independently and competitively, trying to excel in their own limited areas of interest. In the government area, there are many governmental units at State and local levels that do not report in a chain of command up to the Federal executive, but rather have their own limited areas of authority. Even our National Government is a government of limited constitutional powers, which, for further protection of the individual, is divided into separate executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

And in our society, final authority for nearly all decisions rests with the individual citizens. Through the political system, citizens elect and remove their government representatives. Through the market system, individuals make personal economic decisions as to what to buy, where to work, how much to save, and where to invest. By this intricate system of decentralized personal decisions, the people direct—with a precision that no centralized system could ever hope to match—the course of the economy, the allocation of resources, and the character of national life in accordance with their own personal wishes. The people, not some self-selected government elite, decide the course of the Nation. This decentralization of power is the strength of the free society, and it must be preserved.

THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

In the economic sphere, the principle of decentralized power expresses itself in the system of competitive private enterprise, operating in a basically free market. The competitive system offers many advantages that are not available to centrally controlled economies—and these advantages should be utilized in the space effort and the defense program, as well as the rest of the economy.

The competitive system, with its profit-and-loss disciples, puts men and companies to the test as no other system does. It rewards the creative and the efficient. It penalizes the unimaginative and the inefficient. It provides an incentive for risk not only on the obvious ideas, but also on the long shots. It provides a natural and effective system for the elimination of failure, complacency, and delay. At its best, the competitive economy has a vigor, diversity, creativity, and efficiency that no controlled economy can match.

What is the proper role of the Government in relation to the economy? Basically, it should provide an orderly political setting that encourages individual initiative and competitive private enterprise. It should provide the regulation necessary to keep the economic system competitive—as it does through vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws and other trade regulations. Government should do for the citizens, at their expense, only those things that the citizens cannot do for themselves through their private institutions. Thus, governments provide certain community services—locally, if possible; federally, if necessary.

National defense is necessarily one of the services provided by government, but in an age when military power depends less on standing armies than on technological maneuver, the role of private industry is vital. The exploration of space is a project that proceeds from a mixture of strategic motives, including military, political, economic, and ideological. It, like the national defense, will necessarily require a close partnership between the Federal Government and private industry. Each of these partners must perform its appropriate role and the problems and delays occur where government tries to do the managerial and technical work for which industry is best qualified, or industry tries to take on the functions of government.

MEETING THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

The rapid progress of the Soviet Union in missile and space technology demonstrates how a controlled economy can ruthlessly concentrate major resources in a particular field of technology, and achieve rapid results—while neglecting other fields and keeping the population at a low level of living. Some have taken this to mean that the

United States, in order to move out ahead of the Soviet Union in space technology, must adopt something like the Soviet method of strict Government control of that technology. In my opinion, such an imitative procedure is doomed to fail.

The United States has its own more effective way of concentrating efficient effort on a technical project of importance to the national security. And that is for the people, through Government, to determine the objectives to be attained, and then to turn most of the technical work of achieving those objectives over to the private firms that have the managerial and technical capacity to get the work done—using competition and profit-or-loss incentives to the maximum.

It has become the fashion, since the launching of the first sputniks, to exaggerate the Soviet achievements in space technology. Admittedly, the United States got off to a late start, particularly in the drive for high-thrust rockets. But once we were aroused to the potentialities of space, and recovered from the panic that produced the first series of propaganda failures, the true resources of the United States began to tell. The acceleration of the Atlas and Polaris programs astonished even ourselves, and showed that short lead times are not a Russian monopoly. The United States—even without high-thrust rockets—already has more scientific satellites in orbit, sending back more useful information, than the Soviet Union. When the national need is clear, the partnership of Government and industry in the United States can work technical miracles.

But we have no reason to feel complacent. Our present system of defense and space activities still suffers from half-hearted incentives and excessive bureaucracy. This country can surpass the Soviet Union in any technology it selects—if it will use, rather than suppress, its basic strength.

Therefore, it is my view that national economic and military progress will be faster and more solid, and the freedoms we cherish will be preserved, if competitive private enterprise does just as much of the Nation's scientific and technical work as possible—and Government provides the legal and policy framework to stimulate outstanding technical performance.

THREE STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE SPACE FRONTIER

On the basis of these principles, let us now attempt to foresee the general outlines of the venture into space, and try to determine the specific roles of the Government and private enterprise.

The exploration and use of space, like any other exploitation of a new frontier, will probably proceed in three main stages: the stage of exploration; the stage of economic development; and the stage of mature economic operation.

I do not mean that these will be entirely separate periods, or that after—say—40 years, exploration will end and economic development will begin. Rather, it will be an expanding picture.

First, the area of space near the earth will be explored until it becomes sufficiently familiar, and apparatus becomes sufficiently reliable, for such first industries as satellite communication to be established. We are already well into this phase, and several companies—including General Electric—are already exploring the feasibility of establishing a commercial satellite system for long-distance communications.

Exploration does not stop but moves outward to the inner solar system, which includes the Moon and the nearby planets, Mars, Venus, and Mercury. Economic development follows in the wake of exploration.

Before long there may be three phases operating simultaneously. The major area of exploration by that time, will probably be in the outer solar system, including the less dense planets Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. Preliminary economic development may be starting in the area of the Moon and the nearby planets. And space immediately around the earth—where most of the present satellites are in orbit—will be entering into mature, systematic economic operation with such commercial industries as long-distance communication on a large scale, private weather forecasting and modification, and terrestrial rocket transport.

Generally speaking, the exploratory stage is likely to be Government-directed, with substantial industry participation; the stage of economic development will be marked by Government phasing out and commercial industry phasing in; and the stage of mature economic operation will—if private enterprise is to survive in the space industries—be primarily based on private ownership and operation under suitable Government regulation, including some form of international law or agreements.

Now let us look at each of these three stages in some detail.

STAGE 1: EXPLORATION

The first era, already launched, is the exploratory period of sending out satellites and other space vehicles, at first unmanned, then manned, to see what is in space. Basically this is the stage of scientific research, bringing back as much scientific data as possible. It will not offer many opportunities for commercial (as opposed to governmental) business for private firms.

The scale and character of this exploratory space activity is indicated in the 10-year program recently submitted to the Congress by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This program envisions the launching of 263 exploratory space vehicles in the next decade, at a cost of about $15 billion. That is the estimated launching cost, and it is not clear whether the estimate includes expenditures for constructing and equipping laboratories and bases, for manning such facilities, and for research and development costs of newer space vehicles and propulsion systems in preparation for the following decade. It appears that the annual budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, approaching a billion dollars in fiscal 1961, could in a very few years run over $3 billion a year if its program is approved.

The scale of this exploratory work, the cost of it, the lack of any financial return for a long time, and the extra expense of hurrying because of international power politics, almost necessarily makes the exploration of space primarily a Government-sponsored and Government-financed operation. It is useful to remember that the voyages of exploration in the 15th and 16th centuries, opening up the Americas and the Orient to European development, were also government-sponsored. But the successful economic development was done in the follow-through period by private traders and colonists—at first with direct government support and sponsorship, and later with the governments serving only to maintain order and provide military and naval protection. On the space frontier, the scientific voyages of exploration will also be government-sponsored and financed.

However, the management and operation of these exploratory operations should be done primarily through Government contract by private firms, with competitive incentives for superior performance and penalties for failure. Private firms and private universities should design and produce most of the apparatus required to get there and do the exploratory work.

This approach will not only utilize the most experienced scientific and technical organizations in the country, but will also accomplish the objective faster and more economically, and will help prepare the companies for the day when commercial business can be conducted utilizing space technologies.

PRIVATE SPACE FACILITIES?

Even in the exploratory phase, must we necessarily assume that all the major facilities should be Government owned? As the years pass by, and space apparatus becomes more reliable, and the work of obtaining scientific data from space acquires a more routine character—certainly many of the necessary operating facilities could be put on a self-liquidating, private industry basis.

Probably the first opportunities for private investment will come in the commercial use of satellites. I have already indicated the interest of private companies in the development of a satellite communication system.

Looking even farther into the future of space exploration, perhaps there would be economic justification for a privately owned launching service that would put objects into space for the peaceful purposes of friendly governments, international agencies, industry, and the universities. The private company would put so many pounds of payload into such-and-such an orbit, at an agreed price. At present, the idea has little appeal, since the Government's Scout program will for a time offer this service free to other nations. But as the number and variety of scientific space launchings increases, and other nations no longer wish to be dependent on the U.S. Government, the possibility may be worth exploring. Perhaps the other nations will not wish to invest in duplicate facilities for what is, after all, an operation of planetary scientific significance. This commercially operated launching service would, of course, be strictly for nonmilitary purposes.

It might be objected that foreign governments would feel uneasy about centering their peaceful space programs around launching facilities owned by an American company, for reasons of national pride and national security. But that question could easily be resolved by having the service owned and operated by an international group of companies—including companies from most of the countries likely to use its services.

The base itself, from which the commercial launching service would operate, might be modeled after a port authority. Such a nonmilitary, international space port could develop as a center for many private enterprises related to space operations. These might include service and maintenance facilities, data-processing services, space communication centers, laboratory facilities, standardized equipment for satellites and other space vehicles, fuel supplies, medical services, biological services, and general supplies.

Moving away from the idea of a commercial space port, must all future tracking stations, observatories, and data-processing stations be Government owned? How about experimental stations for the simulation of space environments? How about laboratories and stations actually constructed in space? Or will privately owned facilities one day offer these services on an international basis to governments, industries, universities, and international agencies?

In a preliminary way, General Electric and other companies are indicating their answers. General Electric in 1960 will build a new space technology center near Valley Forge, Pa. It will be built entirely with private funds. These facilities will be expanded as the needs become apparent. Even before the laboratory is built, for example, the company is studying the feasibility of constructing a space environment simulator, duplicating in one 30-foot sphere many of the

conditions of extreme cold, vacuum, and radiation that will be encountered in space. The need for a number of such space simulation facilities is not only predictable, but increasingly urgent. There is no reason why the taxpayers should have to build all of them if private industry is willing to make an investment, and the Government is willing to use private facilities as the major customer in the years immediately ahead.

The Valley Forge facilities, although they will cost several millions, are only a small investment compared with the space facilities and launching services I was suggesting as possibilities a few moments ago. But they are a start in the direction of private investment in the economic development of space.

THE MONOPOLY QUESTION

One of the standard criticisms of the entry of private business into fields requiring such high capital investments, and depending so much in the beginning on Government business, is that the Government may actually be helping to establish a private monopoly. For example, some years from now there may be enough business for one commercially operated launching service, but not for several competing facilities. In this case, it is argued, you do not get the advantages of competition, so why not establish a Government facility in the first place?

There are three good answers to this argument. One is that the private facility, even if it is temporarily a monopoly, still has to meet the discipline of earning a profit and avoiding a loss, and hence would be more efficient than a Government facility; two, the Government would in effect regulate this monopoly because it would be the major customer for some time; three, the monopoly would only be temporary. It would serve the important function of laying the groundwork for competitive private enterprise in the particular field, and keep it from being pre-empted by Government enterprise.

The story of transoceanic air transportation is an illuminating example. In the early 1930's, there were no transoceanic airlines. But it was obvious, technologically, that scheduled transatlantic and transpacific air traffic would someday be possible. To assure leadership for the United States in this important field, Pan American Airways explored the routes and established scheduled transoceanic service. At that time there was no American flag competition in transoceanic air travel, and Government airmail contracts were granted to help make the business possible in the early years. This proved to be a wise policy, because U.S. leadership in international air transportation is now a fact. And Pan American has long since ceased to be the only transoceanic service. International air travel is now a vigorously competitive business, providing reliable, low-cost service for millions of passengers every year.

Surely this instructive example shows how industry and Government can cooperate to assure that U.S. leadership will be established in the peaceful uses of space, on the competitive private enterprise basis that assures efficient low-cost service for the public.

The challenge, of course, is primarily to industry itself. Private enterprise must have the vision and courage to encompass its emerging opportunities, invest the capital, and work for the legal and policy changes essential for success.

STAGE 2: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

As the exploration of space pushes farther and farther out, the "inner space" near the earth becomes sufficiently familiar for the next stage to begin: the stage of economic development.

This stage is a prelude to the time when space will be as familiar as land, and mature commercial businesses can be conducted. The developmental period will be a period of infant industries and expensive risks.

Most likely the first businesses suitable for commercial operation, using space technologies, will be worldwide communication by satellite, private weather forecasting, and high-speed earth transport by rocket. Each of these possibilities is being discussed in detail by other lecturers, and therefore I will not describe them here. Instead, I will suggest the appropriate roles of Government and private enterprise in their development.

Businessmen who believe in the competitive private enterprise system are generally opposed to subsidies, with two classical exceptions: defense industries and infant industries of national importance. Most of the early space businesses will qualify on both counts.

Here, in my opinion, are the appropriate roles of Government and private enterprise in starting these early commercial businesses in space.

The preponderance of the research and developmental work and special facilities should at first be financed by Government, because of the national interest in establishing U.S. leadership. But the companies concerned—in their own interests—should also invest in appropriate facilities and manpower to conduct research and development. As an area of space becomes familiar, Government-financed research and development should be shifted outward or to other projects of national interest, and private capital should complete the developmental work.

In these areas with commercial potential, the Government should avoid the temptation to build operating facilities (under the guise of demonstration units) that will tend to preempt the field for tax-subsidized Government enterprise, and prevent the establishment of private facilities. For example, if in the 1930's the United States had established a nationalized airline instead of helping Pan American to lay the groundwork for international air travel, it is likely that international air travel, would still be a Government monopoly as far as the United States is concerned. The public then would not have the advantage of many private airlines competing for their transoceanic business.

Private industry should move as fast as possible to establish these early space businesses, so that the Government can shift its efforts to the many other areas of exploratory work.

STAGE 3: MATURE ECONOMIC OPERATION

Finally, we come to the stage of mature economic operations in space. As areas of space become familiar, and businesses become established, the Government should phase itself out of this area of economic and technical work, and do all it can to encourage the growth of a vigorous competitive private enterprise economy utilizing space resources.

What these commercial businesses in space may be, no one really can say because we know so little about the potentials. Usually one of the first commercial operations in a new frontier area is to bring back raw materials not available in the homeland. It is entirely possible—although many experts now think otherwise—that new or rare minerals and chemicals will be found on the moon and planets, and among the asteroids, that will be unexpectedly useful here on earth. As space transportation becomes more reliable and less costly, and the means of sustaining life in space are developed, it may become economically feasible to mine and bring back these rare metals and chemicals, just as it was worthwhile to haul incense and silk halfway around the world in slow sailing ships 500 years ago. Some have suggested that, as techniques advance, it might be possible to mount rockets on an asteroid of pure iron or pure nickel—if such exist—and orbit the huge mass of metal down to earth. With high-grade earth sources of metal becoming scarcer with each passing decade, the idea of bringing in a new Mesabi from outer space may be less fantastic in 30 or 40 years than it is now. Perhaps the radiant energy of space can somehow be controlled and made useful. Perhaps new medical resources, or new food resources, can be found on other planets. It does not seem probable, but who is to say? Space travel itself, at first for research and then for commercial purposes, may well develop into an economically profitable competitive business. No one can predict how, or even whether, outer space will offer resources that are useful to man; but some very unpromising frontiers in the past have ultimately been tamed.

As the economic resources of space are developed, we must realize that our private enterprises will be competing with the state-operated systems of other nations. But that competition between Socialist and Capitalist economies already exists here on earth. By the time a mature economy has evolved in space, wholly new forms of economic organization may have evolved on earth—hopefully in a free rather than a regimented context. International laws and treaties with respect to space will be developed at the same time, and we must see that they are compatible with the efficient operation of competitive private enterprise in space.

LEGAL AND POLICY CHANGES

Now finally, your chairman suggested that I outline what changes should be made in the Government's legal and policy framework, to enable private enterprise to make its maximum contribution in the space venture. I am not, of course, prepared with a comprehensive legislative program for the space age. In fact, one important principle is that we must not regard space as a completely different area that will require a major break from our established legal and political traditions. The space program must not be used as an excuse for debasing, distorting, or fundamentally changing the Nation's distinctive political and economic institutions; as a means, for example, of breaking down the patent system, or of building up a nationalized industry, or of increasing political control over economic life. Instead, we must recognize that the existing system of business regulations and traditions provides a sound basis for the extension of our economy into space for the benefit of all the citizens, as it has already been extended into the atmosphere by way of airlines, broadcasting, communications, and other industries.

To accelerate that proper extension of our economy into space, and also realize the military and ideological advantages of leadership in space, there are some legal changes that should be made.

NASA PATENT PROVISIONS

The patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 may prove to be a substantial deterrent to progress in space. Furthermore, they could weaken and ultimately destroy the long-established patent system which has proved to be a key factor in the growth of the Nation's economy.

The present provisions of the Space Act, like the patent provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, depart radically from the patent policies of the Defense Department and of industry generally by requiring that the Government receive title to all contractor inventions, subject only to a possible waiver at the discretion of the administrative authorities. From our own experience in General Electric we know that such hasty decisions that violate well-tested practices to meet alleged emergencies or special circumstances usually end up doing more harm than good.

Testimony before Congress indicates that under the policy of uncertain patent protection, companies have been hesitant even to accept contracts for space projects that have interesting commercial possibilities. The witnesses made this point: If a company has invested much of its time and money in developing a certain technology, is it realistic to expect the company to liquidate this investment by turning its knowledge over to its competitors by way of the space agency?

As it is, only the most readily adaptable inventions made under space agency contracts will be developed for consumer and industrial use. Many other inventions requiring greater pioneering effort will lie undeveloped because the inventor company has no incentive to invest in the development of a commercial market; his competitors could easily put a copy on the market just by getting a free license from the Government.

We must ask ourselves: can this country accept the loss of the historic patent incentive and yet win the space race?

Fortunately, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has recognized the problem, and has developed what appears to be a sensible legal and administrative solution. The Congress should correct the situation as quickly as possible.

INCENTIVES FOR PERFORMANCE

Since so much of the intial work in the exploration of space must be done under Government contract, the Government should realistically offer economic as well as patriotic incentives for outstanding performance in the public interest. Under the Government's customary cost-plus-fixed-fee approach, outstanding performance or economy offers little immediate reward. For highly complicated research and development projects, competitive bidding on a straight price basis does not provide the answer. Too often, a contractor would be tempted to submit a very low price and then devote himself to doing the minimum necessary to fufill the contract. Instead, contracts must be negotiated that offer exciting incentives for exceeding agreed standards of performance, economy, and speed—and sizable reductions in fees in case of failure.

For example, General Electric's Missile and Space Vehicle Department has a contract with the AMC Ballistic Missiles Center that moves in the right direction. It is a contract to come up with the next generation of nose cones, a 2-year research and development contract. The target fee for performing the work was negotiated with incentive provisions that provide a substantial increase in fee for exceeding certain measured performance standards, time schedules, and cost targets. And its fee can be reduced by the same amount by failure to meet these standards. Thus General Electric has a real incentive for technically bold, high-quality performance.

Contracts like this will gradually separate the efficient from the inefficient among the contractors. This is real competition. Such profit incentives will not replace, but supplement the motives of duty that encourage leading companies to accept contracts and invest in their own research and development facilities.

INDEMNITY PROBLEMS

The Congress must also accept the indemnity problems that may be too big for private companies to carry, on some future projects. For example, space vehicles propelled by nuclear power are a future possibility. There is an extremely remote possibility that one of these might fall in a city and do widespread damage to life and property. The ensuing liability suits could wipe out or profoundly cripple any private company that was in some way legally liable for such an accident, even though it could do nothing to prevent it. The Government will have to develop some system to limit the private liabilities in the case of these highly improbable accidents, or companies will be unwilling to risk their entire existence by taking such contracts and the public would have no real way to recover damages. The Congress has already recognized the indemnity problem in the atomic energy area and in connection with international air travel.

ANTITRUST LIMITATIONS

The antitrust laws are a vital bulwark of the competitive system, and must be vigorously enforced. At the same time, the large and expensive projects that will win space leadership for the United States will require much larger companies, or even teams of companies, perhaps on an international scale, to carry them out successfully. The law should encourage, rather than inhibit, such large-scale undertakings. Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 already allows exemptions from the antitrust laws for certain voluntary agreements and programs among companies in furthering the national defense. This points the way toward recognizing the need for larger financial and technical aggregations in the space age.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Any frontier must be subject to law and order. Earth boundaries obviously mean very little in space, and hence a structure of international law and treaties must be developed. The maintenance of order in space will have to be the function of an international agency—most likely the United Nations.

REGULATION AND LICENSING

Because of the international and defense complications, it will probably be necessary to have a system of regulation and licensing for private uses of space. The duties of the regulatory agency should be clearly defined, to be sure that the regulatory powers will be used only to assure public safety and necessary technical standards. Such regulatory powers should not be so broad that they can be used to control and shape industry in accordance with the personal preconceptions of the staff of the agency.

POLICY DIRECTION

The need for speed and efficiency in the exploration of space requires more coherent policy direction from the Federal Government. The individuals who hold responsibility in the various agencies appear to be doing their best to bring order out of chaos, but their efforts in some areas of the space program seem to be frustrated by a confused and top-heavy administrative arrangement.

I have not studied the organization in detail. I would only suggest that the number of reviewing committees be kept to a minimum because they can become devices for evading responsibility and postponing decisions; that responsibility and authority for decisions rest clearly with the men held accountable for results; and that any incentives to build empires among the agencies be removed by relying primarily on private laboratories for technical work.

CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF INTENT

Finally, to assure that the public and the Government agencies involved have no misconceptions of national policy, it would be worthwhile to have a congressional statement of intent to use competitive private enterprise to the maximum in the management and execution of Government technical projects; and to encourage private investment in space-oriented technologies and businesses wherever possible.

OUR CHILDREN'S WORLD

To sum up, then, the world is extending its boundaries out from the planet into space; a tremendous enlargement of the area in which man will find resources for living. To explore and tame the new space frontier will require a great technological effort. The very effort will force many new inventions that will not only be useful to us in space, but can greatly advance industrial productivity and levels of living in the United States and the rest of the world.

Yet the ultimate question that faces the citizens at the threshold of the space age is not whether the technical achievements will be made, but how they will affect human life. Will the drive for space push mankind into a steel trap of regimentation, or will it open up new vistas of creativity and freedom? Will the new, larger world of the future, with its boundaries moving out to the other planets and beyond, be a free world or a regimented world?

The answer to this question, the heritage we leave our children, will be determined to a large degree by how the United States—the world's leading industrial nation—goes about the exploration and development of space. If we go at it by the route of regimentation and government enterprise, if we allow the Communist powers to establish our course, patterns will be set that will be almost impossible to break. On the other hand, if we use the strength of competitive private enterprise, we will not only advance faster, but will help to assure that the world of our children will be a free world, honoring the dignity and creativity of man.

The Awesome Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the Honorable David L. Bazelon, circuit judge, U.S. court of appeals.

As a member of the U.S. court of appeals in Washington, D.C., since 1949, the Honorable David L. Bazelon has written more than 25 opinions on the insanity defense in criminal cases, highlighted by his formulation of a broadened test of criminal responsibility in Durham against United States in 1954. For these opinions, which have evoked worldwide discussion, the American Psychiatric Association awarded him a certificate of commendation, proclaiming that "he has removed massive barriers between the psychiatric and legal professions and opened pathways wherein together they may search for better ways of reconciling human values with social safety." Dr. Karl Menninger of the famed Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kans., describes the Durham decision as "more revolutionary in its total effect than the Supreme Court decision regarding segregation."

Judge Bazelon's article, as it appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of January 23, 1960, follows:

THE AWESOME DECISION

(By David L. Bazelon, circuit judge, U.S. court of appeals)

The administration of criminal justice and the extent of individual moral responsibility are among the crucial problems of a civilized society. They are indissolubly linked, and together they involve our deepest

personal emotions. We often find it hard to forgive ourselves for our own moral failures. All of us, at some time or other, have faced the painful dilemma of when to punish and when to forgive those we love—our children, our friends. How much harder it is, then, to deal with the stranger who transgresses.

Few of us view punishment realistically. Whether applied to criminals or to our own flesh and blood, we are profoundly confused about punishment. We waver between feeling "he deserves it" and "it will do him good." The first reaction is our immediate emotional response, the second our rationalization after the fact. "It will do him good" can be proved or disproved; it lies within an area of practicality. "He deserves it" is unprovable, a proposition derived from absolutist morality. The latter reflects the retributive theory of justice, whereby appropriate penalties are necessary if only to uphold the moral law. But many people cannot accept this view. They argue that, though punishment may not be defensible in all cases, it cannot be dispensed with because social balance requires the gratification of the need for vengeance. Or they assert that we must punish to deter potential criminals.

Nowhere is the social attitude toward individual moral responsibility more sharply focused and more dramatic than in a criminal court. Here, in the whole process of justice—symbolized by the trial—the full weight of society's official force, moral and physical, is arrayed against a single human being. More often than not, this defendant is one of life's failures—part of the human debris of civilization. Thus, the considerations which govern the determination of his responsibility are a measure of man's humanity to man, or lack of it.

We pride ourselves, and in many respects justly so, on our efforts to insure a fair trial, and so manifest the advanced state of our civilization. Yet in an essential aspect of criminal justice we remain backward. We remain backward in the way we deal with the question of responsibility as it relates to mental disease, personality disorganization, and the nature of antisocial behavior. Our criminal courts do not generally welcome the psychiatrist with his greatly expanded knowledge of unconscious motivations and environmental conditioning. Instead they cling doggedly to an age-old rule of criminal responsibility which makes modern science irrelevant to the critical question of the defendant's psychic state. In effect, our courts still ask a 19th-century question and insist on a 19th-century answer.

I refer to the famous formulation of the insanity defense which resulted from the trial of Daniel McNaghten in 1843. This rule—the prevailing law both here and in England for more than a century—requires a jury to consider only whether the defendant knew what he was doing or knew that it was wrong. In relying exclusively on the rational capacity of the mind, this so-called right-wrong test reveals its ancient lineage. It is based on the prescientific view of the human psyche and behavior, wherein the whole story is the eternal conflict between reason and passion. As long as any capacity to know or to reason remains intact, so the theory goes, failure to use it to control the passions constitutes choice, and is therefore culpable. The accused should be punished because he chose to do wrong.

But today we know that a choice of behavior involves the whole functioning human, not just reason alone. We are all painfully familiar with examples of behavior in which the accompanying thought process is only rationalization. Psychiatrists continually come across mentally sick patients who retain substantial reasoning powers. Indeed, one of the commonest symptoms of serious mental disorder is such a dissociation between the rational top of the mind and the emotional underpinnings of the personality.

On January 20, 1843, Daniel McNaghten, a Scottish wood turner, fatally shot Edward Drummond, secretary to the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel, as Drummond was entering a government office in London. The assassin had mistaken the secretary for the Premier. "The Tories in my native city have compelled me to do this," he explained later. "They follow and persecute me wherever I go and have entirely destroyed my peace of mind."

The sole issue of McNaghten's trial was insanity. His counsel, Alexander Cockburn, called nine physicians and surgeons to the stand. All testified that the accused was insane. The prosecution entering no medical testimony in opposition, the presiding Lord Chief Justice Tindal directed a verdict of not guilty, on the ground of insanity. McNaghten spent the rest of his life in mental institutions.

The public reaction was indignant; many people ascribed the shooting to a political plot. Queen Victoria herself protested the verdict. As a result, the House of Lords put several questions to the 15 judges of England. Their answers have governed the insanity defense ever since throughout most of the English-speaking world. Lord Chief Justice Tindal set forth the McNaghten rules as follows:

"The jurors ought to be told in all cases * * * that to establish a defense on the ground of insanity, it must be clearly proved that, at the time of the committing of the act, the party accused was laboring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing; or, if he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what was wrong."

The insanity defense had a long history prior to Tindal's formulation. As early as the 13th century, British law recognized that "a madman does not know what he is doing." In 1724 Judge Tracy held that insanity was exculpatory if the defendant "doth not know what he is doing, no more than * * * a wild beast." Thirty-six years later the "wild beast test" was abandoned in favor of the defendant's capacity to distinguish between "right and wrong"—the precursor of the McNaghten rules.

The insanity defense reflects a concept that has pervaded the entire history of the criminal law. We call it the doctrine of mens rea, sometimes described as "guilty mind," or "evil intent." It can be traced back to Deuteronomy 19: 4–6, "Whoso killeth his neighbor ignorantly, whom he hated not in time past * * * shall * * * live." Mens rea is a capsule phrase used, in connection with most crimes, to describe a state of mind which makes the offender blameworthy and so subject to criminal sanctions. Whether this state of mind is a deliberate intent to commit the prohibited act, or some form of negligence, it usually involves ability to anticipate consequences and guard against them. The insanity defense is designed to relieve from criminal liability pefsons who are incapable of such a state of mind.

The concept of insanity—conceived by lawyers, not by doctors—is rooted in this requirement. Originally the insane defendant was thought of as one so obviously bereft of reason that, on the basis of common experience alone, all men could agree that he was incapable of entertaining an evil intent. Through early legal history only total insanity was recognized as a defense, probably because no scientific knowledge existed to differentiate the shadings and gradations of mental disease.

It is ironical that at the very time when psychiatry was beginning to emerge as a distinct medical discipline, antiquated, nonmedical ideas about insanity were frozen into the McNaghten rules. The law closed the door in psychiatry's face.

It was in 1838 that the American psychiatrist, Dr. Isaac Ray, published his classic "Treatise on the Medical Jurisprudence of Insanity," attacking the concepts upon which, 5 years later, the rules were based. In fact, McNaghten's counsel cited Dr. Ray. Other psychiatrists soon joined Dr. Ray in the attack. In this century the chorus of protest has become deafening. Some of the world's leading psychiatrists have refused to testify in court under the distorting limitations of the McNaghten rules. In a poll taken a few years ago, 80 percent of 300 American psychiatrists pronounced those rules unsatisfactory, and numerous jurists have agreed .Justice Cardozo flatly stated, "Everyone concedes that the present definition of insanity has little relation to the truths of mental life."

The main criticisms of the right-wrong test are fourfold: First, it misses the point entirely, because whatever "insanity" means, the term refers to abnormal conditions of mind that cannot all be gathered together under the rubrics "know" and "wrong." Second, the test is based on an outmoded theory of faculty psychology—derived from phrenology—that divided the topography of the mind into separate compartments. Modern psychology views a man as an integrated personality, and reason as only one element of that personality and not the sole determinant of conduct. Third, the test poses to the expert an ultimate question involving legal and moral as well as medical issues. Fourth, the test has so straitjacketed psychiatric testimony that insanity is defined exclusively in terms of extreme psychosis and patent organic deterioration.

What arguments favor the right-wrong test? Chiefly that it reflects traditional morality governing the conduct of normal persons, that it persists historically, that alternative tests are inadequate and, perhaps most important, that many courts ignore the test as often as they apply it. From the juridical point of view, what all this controversy adds up to practically is whether we are to have more and freer psychiatric testimony. With it stated this way, I myself have no hesitance in taking a position solidly in favor of freer and fuller expert testimony.

This is exactly what we did in the District of Columbia 5 years ago when the U.S. court of appeals adopted the Durham rule. Under this new, more liberal rule, a modern and comprehensive body of law governing the administration of the insanity defense is being slowly built up on the basis of continuing experience. At the same time the community's fears that great numbers of dangerous persons would be freed to attack again are being put to rest. Nothing of this sort has happened. Defendants acquitted under the Durham rule have been sent to mental hospitals, many of them for longer periods than they would have served in prison. And they appear to get into less trouble after release than prison convicts.

Although no other court has yet adopted the District of Columbia precedent, it is not an eccentric backwash of American jurisprudence. For one thing, it is an adaptation of a broadened test that the Supreme Court of New Hampshire adopted in 1870. This test, which allowed the insanity plea if the unlawful act arose from mental disease, was fashioned largely under the influence of Dr. Isaac Ray. For another, the Durham rule reflects a widespread movement among the legal, psychiatric and allied professions to work out alternatives to the rigid spirit of the McNaghten rules. For example, in 1955 a new test designed to liberalize McNaghten was proposed by the American Law Institute, a leading body of distinguished lawyers, judges, and scholars.

To recount the Durham case, on July 13, 1951, 23-year-old Monte Durham broke into

a Georgetown home and was caught pilfering clothes. Since the age of 16, Durham had been charged with passing bad checks, embezzlement, parole violation, car theft, and attempted suicide. Three times he had been committed to mental institutions. Psychiatrists had variously diagnosed him as "psychotic with psychopathic personality" and, oddly, "without mental disorder but with a psychopathic personality."

Following his indictment for housebreaking, he was adjudged of unsound mind and again sent to a mental hospital. Sixteen months later the hospital's superintendent certified that "prolonged psychiatric study has established that [Durham] suffers from psychological illness, but is mentally competent to stand trial."

As in the McNaghten trial, the sole issue was the mental condition of the defendant. The only medical witness was the Government psychiatrist who had originally found Durham incompetent to stand trial, and his testimony "was unequivocal that Durham was of unsound mind at the time of the crime." The trial judge, who heard the case without a jury, strictly applied the McNaghten test and rejected the psychiatric testimony because the Government doctor declined to answer categorically the ultimate question—did Durham know the difference between right and wrong?

On appeal, Judges Henry W. Edgerton, George T. Washington, and I held this was error and, in reversing the conviction, we announced a broader test to be applied in all subsequent cases. We stated that the new rule "is simply that an accused is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of mental disease or mental defect." Under this test the question would be "whether the accused acted because of a mental disorder, and not whether he displayed particular symptoms which medical science has long recognized do not necessarily, or even typically, accompany even the most serious mental disorder."

Our underlying purpose was to unfreeze the expanding knowledge of psychiatry, as it could be applied to the law, in order to free the psychiatrist from having to make the moral and legal determinations required by the right-wrong test for which he has no special qualifications, and to allow him to address himself to the problems of mental disease and defect, for which he is qualified.

Finally, it was our purpose to restore to the jury its traditional function of applying "our inherited ideas of moral responsibility to individuals prosecuted for crime" under the historically sanctioned precept that "our collective conscience does not allow punishment where it cannot impose blame." But in making the awesome decision as to criminal responsibility, the jury "will be guided by wider horizons of knowledge concerning mental life."

According to the opponents of the new rule, it creates more problems than it solves. If this statement be amended to read "uncovers" instead of "creates," I would agree. I think that any realistic revision of the insanity formula is bound to reveal difficult problems which have been ignored or suppressed under the McNaghten test. Many psychiatrists, for example, who admit their inability to answer the right-wrong question, follow the mechanical practice of testifying that a psychotic cannot distinguish right from wrong, while an individual suffering from a nonpsychotic mental illness can. They so testify even though such an artificial demarcation has neither a medical nor a legal basis. Under Durham, or any broader test, there will not be the same compulsion to dispose of the issue by means so deviously mechanical—a practice that also wrongly relieves the jury of its duty to decide the case.

I agree with one of the more widespread criticisms of the Durham rule, that the term "mental disease" cannot be rigidly defined. But that is because it is a dynamic concept undergoing continual redefinition in the course of clinical experience. It is strange logic, however, to conclude from this fact that the complexities behind the term should therefore be ignored or that lawyers should arrive at a definition a priori. We must instead seek out the best current scientific explanations.

Another frequent criticism of the Durham test holds that any serious investigation of the nature of mental illness and its effect on criminal conduct will lead to the conclusion that all criminals are mentally ill. If that is so, then it is high time we found it out. I am flabbergasted that some of the most dogmatic defenders of McNaghten actually believe that all criminals are ill. If true, would this not require a complete reconstruction of our criminal law? At the very least, it would require us to abandon the special defense of insanity and the corollary concept of mens rea, thereby overturning our historic system.

A third objection to the new rule is that the resources of psychiatry are not up to the task. This may or may not be valid, but we do know psychiatry has more to give than the law now receives. Until we accept what it has to offer, we cannot discover the actual limitations of psychiatry.

The fourth objection to the Durham formulation is that it is difficult to determine whether a criminal act is the product of mental illness. This is true, but I think unavoidable. Other formulations involve the same difficulties—the American Law Institute proposal uses the phrase "as a result of." Moreover, juries solve a similarly difficult problem of causation every day when they decide in personal-injury cases whether it was the defendant's negligence that caused the plaintiff's injury.

But the overriding objection to Durham undoubtedly derives from our deepest feelings about punishment. In the traditional mode of thinking we, the good citizens, feel that they, the criminals, should be punished. So, the argument proceeds, it is just as well that only "slobbering idiots" should be excused, as under the McNaghten rules. A broader rule is bad just because more criminals would get off.

This objection, based on the felt need to punish, brings us to an issue that transcends legalisms and all merely professional considerations—an issue embracing the whole of society. Here are involved the mutual demands of society and the individual upon each other. Here, within the democratic framework, lies the grand context of criminal responsibility.

Practically speaking, the legal term "insanity" can be defined by the consequences of its use. When pronounced "not insane," the accused is sentenced to prison as a punishment. When held insane, he goes to a mental institution for treatment. This is the practical aspect, what all the theoretical discussion boils down to—punishment or treatment.

Prisons and mental hospitals fulfill a similar function to the extent that both segregate undesirable persons from society. In this sense, both protect society. According to ideal penological theory, punishment reforms; after release the prisoner will behave acceptably, and society will be protected. But in reality the rate of recidivism is high—more than 60 percent among Federal convicts. Now, it is majestically simple that, since punishment so often fails of its purpose, something else is needed. And this something else is treatment.

Punishment as such, remember, is supposed to fit the crime, not the criminal. When the sentence has been served, the warden of the penitentiary signs a certificate to that effect, and the prisoner rejoins society—even though it may be obvious that the punishment has worked no cure and indeed may have intensified the prisoner's criminal impulses. On the other hand, an inmate of a mental hospital is released only when certified by the staff as cured, or at least not dangerous to himself or others. No psychiatrist, to be sure, is infallible. He may err in his prognosis and recommend release prematurely, with disastrous results to the community. Many State hospitals, moreover, are too overcrowded and understaffed to provide optimum care. But at least the effort is made, to exercise responsible medical judgment, whereas the prison warden is called upon to enter no judgment at all except as to parole. Is it not evident that treatment rather than punitive incarceration offers society better protection? So much for the practical aspects.

But as I have pointed out, society tends to waver between the ideas, "he deserves it" and "it will do him good." A somewhat more sophisticated attitude is reflected by the so-called deterrence theory which attempts to merge "he deserves it" and "it will do him good" under the synthetic proposition, "it will do us all good." This theory not only underlies the usual learned arguments against broadening the insanity defense but forms the central theoretical problem of the entire criminal law.

The deterrence theory, like its less sophisticated antecedents, seeks to justify the existing amount of punishment meted out as a means of preserving public order. By imprisoning the criminal, it is contended, we deter others from committing crimes. The prisoner thus becomes a scapegoat. In a free society such use of an individual cannot be justified except by a survival of the "he deserves it" feeling as well as the sanguine belief that his incarceration both serves as a beneficial example to all and does the prisoner good. Thus, the ancient views of retribution persist in the deterrence theory.

It seems to me that this theory begs the entire question of justice for the individual. Unlike the retributive theory, it assumes that, though punishment may not be right, may be purposeless, or downright destructive to the individual, yet it protects society, and so is justified. Hence, even the mentally ill and hopelessly psychopathic recidivist are sacrificed for the purported social benefit. Thus, the individual is degraded—contrary to our democratic ethos.

Unarguably, the maintenance of public order must be backed up by a system of sanctions. Neither law nor morality can sustain itself from generation to generation without the threat of some penalties. Many of us do not steal, not because of a fear imposed from without, but because of an internal control system generated by our mores and traditional beliefs. For most of those who require external controls it is the threat of going to jail, not actual time spent there, that keeps them from stealing. We need sanctions to give substance to the threat. How much actual punishment is required in order to sustain the threat of punishment at an effective level? That is the real problem posed by the deterrence theory. Many of its supporters seem to answer, "Exactly as much as we now have." This strikes me as both too easy and antihistorical. After all, it was not so long ago that whippings and executions, carried out as public spectacles, were considered essential to the preservation of order.

In our society the essential aim of the criminal law should not be to induce mass fear of punishment, but to reaffirm the value of each individual by due process in his conviction and purposeful treatment thereafter. Too often, in our eagerness to protect society, we forget that society is composed of individuals. In a democracy, society or the state is no more than the sum of its individual components. The state exists for

the benefit of the individual, not vice versa, as in Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia. Consequently, repressive law can be justified only as an accommodation of the mutual liberties of two or more individuals. The real difference is not always apparent, and at times we may favor one group of individuals over another in the interests of those liberties. But the basic theory does not change. It remains transcendently important. It is perhaps the central thread of continuity in our law.

If we now consider the issue of criminal responsibility on spiritual rather than practical or ideological grounds, we discover an ancient philosophical conflict at the heart of the problem—free will versus determinism. I am not equipped to deal with this great problem as a philosopher or theologian would, but I want to venture one or two observations.

If the question is whether we make real choices, two things are clear—we obviously seem to do so, and some people seem to have a wider choice of action than others. Intellectual, physical, and emotional capacity, wealth, social status, all extend or limit the area of choice. Yet, in the eyes of the law, for example, the poor and the rich face the same responsibility to resist the temptation to steal, even though the poor may be overwhelmingly tempted and the rich not at all.

Surprisingly, this freewill-determinism issue is seldom discussed in the practical context of actual choice, but usually on the level of abstract theory. On that level the argument often revolves around the old issue of science versus religion. Freudianism has carried the banner of scientific determinism into the inner sanctum of theology—the human soul. Darwin placed the human animal in nature, and Freud attempted to explain what had occurred inside this human animal. His success has been substantial. Freud's concept of the unconscious as a source of motivation, as part of the great revolution it is working in modern thought, has compelled us to reconsider the question of criminal responsibility.

As a result, an expanded category of disease has supplemented or displaced the diminished category of "evil." Evil is not a scientific word. Madmen were once thought to be possessed by evil spirits, and the means of exorcising the devil included torture. If we are not yet prepared to view every juvenile car thief as ill, many of us do feel that his social and economic background may be out of joint and may itself be "ill." The notion of a perfectly personal evil no longer suffices to explain all the events in a human career.

Evil, of course, can only be punished or forgiven. But illness is supposed to be ameliorated or cured. Thus the name we put to our failures makes a difference. We all tend to believe in free will when we entertain hopes for the future, but switch to determinism when recalling our past failures. I suggest we extend the same consideration to the failures of others.

As Hollingshead and Redlich suggested in their study, "Social Class and Mental Illness," neurosis is something of a class privilege. It is less common in the lower social strata. There the number of psychotics and psychopaths appears to be greater. According to the Hollingshead-Redlich findings, the neurotic containment of conflict requires certain amenities of life, especially the possession of social values to be preserved. The mentally ill of the poor classes, including many criminals, lack the leisure for inner neurotic torture, and have less to lose by "acting out" their conflicts. Though no conclusive scientific proof exists, the indications are strong that a good deal of criminal behavior should be viewed as a pathological function of marginal socioeconomic status. Some 90 percent of the criminal cases which come before our U.S. court of appeals involving the insanity plea concern indigent defendants. For many people it takes certain minimum advantages in life to learn how to be good. With those who have clearly failed to learn, it may be that part of the burden of social responsibility shifts from them to us, calling for something better than punishment.

The law is neither a scientific instrument nor an adjunct to any absolute moral doctrine. Our legal system is the way we conduct our business of mediating conflicts, preserving the peace, and furthering orderly social development. It thus stands between all opposing forces or conflicting ideologies. In the criminal law and in the administration of the insanity defense the wisdom of the past, including the free-will postulate, meets modern scientific views, including the postulate of causal determinism. The legal process differs from religion in that, being concerned with factual decisions, it cannot utter moral imperatives. It differs from science in that it cannot choose its experimental subject matter, it cannot plead ignorance and it cannot select its hypotheses freely. A court must resolve all conflicts presented to it, with or without adequate knowledge.

The chief inhabitants in the house of the law are the members of the jury. This much maligned body carries the final burden of redressing the social balance. In shouldering the awful responsibility of assessing the degree of another person's responsibility under the law, the jury—that sample of all of us—needs all the help available. When considering the insanity defense, obviously it needs the help of psychiatric and other scientific experts, given fully and freely. Only then, on the basis of all possible relevant facts and scientific insight, can the jury make its moral judgment, its awesome decision.

In the Durham case we said, "The legal and moral traditions of the western world require that those who, of their own free will and with evil intent * * * commit acts which violate the law, shall be criminally responsible for those acts. Our traditions also require that where such acts stem from and are the product of mental disease or defect * * * moral blame shall not attach, and hence there will not be criminal responsibility."

Thus, within our traditions, the case goes to the jury.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park. Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Nikita Khrushchev: Master Architect of Blueprints for Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recent world events lead us to believe, with unequivocal firmness, that the Dictator of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev—a practitioner of a philosophy characterized by a basic attitude of uncompromising hostility to all noncommunistic societies and the ideas held in them—is indeed a master architect in drawing up blueprints for destruction.

It is no secret that our Government has advocated an open-skies policy with the Russian people since the summit meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1955, in order to prove to the Soviets that we—here in America—will do anything within reason to avert an international incident which would cancel out world peace.

As a result, and backed up with the record of over 40 years of historically documented brutality, subversion, subjugation and ruthless, godless oppression illustrated in communism's insatiable and unquenchable thirst to crush freedom and human dignity in a relentless, never-curving road to world domination without detours, our Government has found it necessary to carry on top secret intelligence operations such as the recent U–2 plane flight which will prevent another Pearl Harbor; another Korea. In this modern atomic and hydrogen age, we could not take the risk of carnage and national devastation which could all too realistically include the destruction of every American city and hamlet. We could not take the risk of consequences which would follow a similar attack as happened at Pearl Harbor and as happened at the 38th parallel in Korea; an attack that could come across the Russian borders.

And since the Russian Government consistently continues to refuse to cooperate in our efforts to establish permanent peace, we have had no other recourse than to undertake highly dangerous, but much needed, intelligence work in order to protect our Nation and our people through the age-old methods of defense so long in use by the Communists themselves, lest we do not wake up one day from our failure to know in time what our opponents in lasting freedom had been planning against us.

Thus, the latest demonstration of the Soviet's failure to cooperate in maintaining world peace took place at the Paris summit conference some weeks ago. It is no secret any longer that Mr. Khrushchev used the U–2 plane incident only as a well-timed and calculated pretext to wreck the high-level discussions of our world leaders at that meeting. For many months, Mr. Khrushchev has been talking, agitating and propagandizing for a summit conference. Finally, when it did come about, what did he do but wreck it? I believe, as do many of my other fellow Americans believe, that this was a well-timed, well-planned and organized move on the Soviet part to foster their greedy desires of world domination.

It has been encouraging to me, Mr. President, as it has to many of us, to note the way our American citizens and the rest of the free world—with the exception of the usual number of misguided who are always disgruntled and have nothing to offer except to brag how they would handle things—are 100 percent behind our President and his actions in Paris.

In anger, our people resent the statements made by Khrushchev in Paris, along with his latest comment that he believes President Eisenhower desires peace, but the "road to hell is paved with good intentions and he will really get there."

President Eisenhower's welcome-home demonstration here in our Nation's Capital at which literally thousands and thousands of Americans from all walks of life waited and stood along the streets and street corners to greet him, proved to me that for the most part, the American citizen resents these remarks against his leaders and that he is behind the international policy of our administration and our country.

I am pleased to note also, from my own conversations with the good folks back in South Dakota, that they, too, are among those millions who are strongly backing the President on his actions at the summit. They have reacted like the rest of us who did not condone nor appreciate the bigoted approach used by the Soviet Union at those ill-fated talks. Nor do they believe in appeasement with Soviet Russia in order to maintain world peace. Nor do they believe in those individuals who are trying desperately to make the summit breakdown a case for petty partisan political debate and open criticism of the President and the present administration.

In effect, it appears to me that as a cold war maneuver, Khrushchev's performance in Paris may have done more to unite the free world against Communist aggression than anything since the most unfortunate bloody and brutal attack on the freedom-loving citizens of Hungary.

I have noted from one of the leading newspapers in western South Dakota that Mr. Andrei A. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, has charged that the United States is an enemy of peace, is dedicated to aggravating world tensions, is not to be trusted in diplomatic negotiations, and that U.S. spy efforts proved the United States is planning an aggressive war against Russia.

At this point, Mr. President, it would only be just to remind the men who turn tensions on and off like they cork and uncork a bottle of vodka, that more than 65 Russian spy cases have been recorded in our American archives since 1946. Significantly, the day Mr. Khrushchev shattered the summit meetings, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed and upheld the conviction and sentencing of Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, colonel in the Russian Intelligence Corps, for his spy activities in New York City.

Mr. President, one of my very fine friends, my fellow colleague from the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, has prepared and distributed an outstanding report on these latest world and national problems which I believe pretty well sums up the opinion of most Americans. I thereby ask unanimous consent to have Representative BERRY'S letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1960.

DEAR FRIEND: The reception of a returning hero was awarded President Eisenhower upon his return from the Paris summit meeting. The leaders of both political parties and tens of thousands of just plain "Americans" not only met him at the airport, but thronged both sides of the streets from the airport to the White House.

It was an American demonstration of support for their President, after Khrushchev had wrecked the conference by using the U–2 reconnaissance plane incident as an excuse to do what he would have done anyway under some other guise, had this incident not occurred. The incident simply provided the big bully with an opportunity to rant and roar and to pick up his marbles and go home like the spoiled kid from across the street who has always had his own way.

RECONNAISSANCE

Ever since sputnik, people in this country have been demanding, "What's the matter with our intelligence?" Allen Dulles of CIA indicated that we know a bit more than we are credited with knowing, but his reply had to be most guarded. CIA must be and is highly secret. Even the office wastepaper is classified, bagged, and burned under surveillance. The question is now answered. Not only have we been patrolling the edge of the Iron Curtain with every delicate instrument known to science, but for 4 years our U–2 planes have been flying Russian skies taking pictures. We have not been asleep.

The incident proved to Mr. Khrushchev's consternation and the surprise of his people that our alleged "scientific lag" does not extend to photography. We have shots of

launching pads and bases taken from 70,000 feet, and when blown up show every detail including telephone poles and clothing on the wash line.

It should be comforting to Americans to now know that Smithsonian's satellite tracking station has relayed pictures of small objects taken 1,200 miles above the earth. This is equal to photographing a golf ball in San Francisco from the airbase at Rapid City. Incidentally, spy planes are probably nearing the end of their usefulness. Two of our satellites will soon be doing the job—Midas, an infrared missile attack warning system, and Samos, a picture-taking surveillance satellite whose photo from 300 miles up will look like it was taken at 100 feet.

To those who wonder why Mr. Khrushchev put on his "storm and stampede" act, I would suggest that so long as he could keep his people convinced that their borders were invincible, that their weapons could detect and destroy any craft or missile destined for that country, he gave his people a feeling of security and superiority. With that sense of security, and from an understandable sense of pride, they tolerated and probably enjoyed his boasts of world domination and influence.

With this announcement, however, and the certain knowledge even in Russia with its strict censorship of news that a one-man, unarmed espionage plane has penetrated 1,400 miles into their country and perhaps made an emergency landing, they undoubtedly must become insistent that at least some of the cold war controversies be resolved.

Khrushchev was on a spot before his people. He was forced to do something and he did the thing that is entirely normal for all human beings when their failures are discovered. We remember the story of Adam, the first man. When his sins were discovered and the Lord sought him out, Adam hid behind a tree and then confessed, "I heard Thy voice in the Garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; and I hid myself."

Khrushchev found himself exposed and naked before his own people. He was afraid. He hid himself behind the tree he had set up for himself—the bluster of his own pent-up wrath.

Certainly the incident is regrettable, but we must not permit ourselves to shrink from it. We know that our country and its military installations can be observed from a seat in almost any commercial airliner. This being true, we must be vigilant, and we must take some serious risks to prevent, if possible, a surprise attack such as Pearl Harbor or the crossing of the 38th parallel in Korea.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

It is difficult for us to remember that communism is not Russia—it is an international conspiracy which breeds easily in socialist states and which now controls the U.S.S.R. and several other so-called Iron Curtain countries.

People have accepted it on the theory that it is an ideology which has for its purpose the improvement of man's existence, the distribution of wealth, and the giving to each according to his need.

The fact is, communism is a godless program for the ruthless enslavement of the entire world. Its purpose is to concentrate all wealth and all power in the hands of the state. When this is accomplished, ruthless dictatorship follows as the day follows the night. Enslavement under Communist tyranny means the complete destruction of liberty and all human dignity.

It should be kept clearly in mind that the enemy is not the U.S.S.R. but international communism. It should also be remembered that communism is not contained on the other side of the so-called Iron Curtain. There are literally thousands of Communists, fellow travelers, and members of the Communist front organizations in America today who are patiently working to gain control of Government here.

The fear of every thinking American must be the serious truth that each step we take toward socialism and every action we take which would further destroy the value of our currency or in any way weaken our economic and financial strength takes us one step closer to the destruction of our way of life and enslavement through their way of life.

They know that it cannot be done in a day. They have plenty of time. Mr. Khrushchev told the world last week that there is no great hurry—he could wait for the next President of the United States or the next one after that. Of course, he was talking about a summit conference, but in the back of his mind was something more important.

As long as we remain so strong militarily that to strike us would mean their own immediate destruction, the Kremlin can wait until we destroy ourselves economically. That time may not be too far distant unless the voters of America decide to continue responsible Government in the White House and send a responsible majority to Congress. As Vice President NIXON said, we can win the horse race with the Soviet Union, providing we don't try to ride their horse.

BIG GOVERNMENT ADVOCATES

The history of the big government advocates in this country during the past 30 years has been coupled with big government spending. First, it was to defeat the depression. Then it was to win the war. Next, to beat the recession. Now it is to make sure we are ahead of Russia in everything.

Their current argument is the most seductive of all. Since strong central Government stepped up our economic pace during World War II, they say we can do it again by empowering the Federal Government to run the economy. They say we can tell industry what to produce and where they should move to produce it; control agricultural production, prices and output; control the mineral resources and power output of the Nation; control the educational system through financing education from Washington; finance housing, health, hospitalization, and everything at public expense, even though to do so means adding the cost onto the national debt which in turn means adding fuel on the fires of inflation.

The following excerpt from U.S. News & World Report should be carefully studied by any American who thinks there is no limit to U.S. spending and the inflation it causes: "Prices no longer can be raised without adding to the flood of imports. Goods from abroad everywhere are becoming a challenge to the U.S. wage rises in United States, as a result, where those rises add to costs, cannot be made without (1) squeezing profits, or (2) reducing markets and jobs.

"The meaning? * * * Simply this: United States has lost some of the freedom of action it has had since the war. Unions will go on forcing a wage-price spiral only at the cost of a recession in business activity and employment * * * Foreign goods are penetrating U.S. markets more and more deeply. Foreign capacity to produce at prices below U.S. prices will go on growing fast. * * * There's more to it than that. Dollars owned abroad total $19 billion. Inflation threats, evidences of policies affecting the dollar value—and foreign owners can demand gold for their dollars. A run from the dollar, potentially, will remain something to consider.

"Inflation, in other words, has to be resisted. Government finances have to be kept in order. A sound dollar is the alternative to new problems."

With my kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

Maine Needs Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the school construction bill last week, the House recognized for the first time that direct Federal aid to education is a major national problem. This represents progress to some extent. I am concerned, however, that our action may be and, in my opinion, definitely is too little. I sincerely hope that it is not too late.

Education always has been and always will be the cornerstone of the progress and survival of our Nation. Too little and too late implementation of the educational requirements of our free society can only mean a second-rate America. In the face of increasing challenges from the regimented societies of the world, we must do more, not less, if we are to compete and, yes, to survive.

In my own State of Maine the crying need for Federal aid to education, far beyond what the House enacted last week, becomes obvious when we note the local and State tax burden which Maine residents bear in relation to the other States of the country. Maine taxpayers per family of $5,000 income pay more in local and State taxes than do similar citizens of 46 other States.

In direct relationship to this fact which should have great significance for those in Maine who oppose Federal aid to education it is pertinent to note that the personal per capita income of Maine in 1958 was $350 below the national per capita income average. The economic squeeze on our citizens is obvious.

It is also pertinent to note, once again, that the Committee for Economic Development, sponsored by several of the big business interests of the Nation, found that Maine is included as 1 of the 11 poorer States of the country which needs and merits Federal aid to education.

The facts of Maine's taxload and Maine's per capita income, certainly support this finding. Those leading citizens of Maine who are opposing Federal aid to education are doing a great disservice to the educational needs of our State.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks an editorial published in the May 29 issue of the Portland Sunday Telegram and a newspaper article which appeared in the May 23 issue of the Portland Press Herald:

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, May 29, 1960]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—NOT WHETHER BUT HOW AND WHEN

To hear some people talk you'd think that the condition of the Nation's public schools system was not a matter of national interest.

Typical of this position, if not its most frequent advocate, is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. For example, in the March issue of its magazine, Nation's

Business, an article called "The Real Crisis in Our Schools—Federal Domination," consistently speaks in terms of "intervention" or "influence" as the object, or at least the certain result, of greater Federal financial participation in the solution of school problems.

The argument runs that supervision and control of public education is constitutionally reserved to the States which in turn confer on communities, or combinations of communities, much of the operating responsibility. This, of course, is exactly the case.

But it does not follow that the Federal Government has no business in the field. In our view if a problem is a national problem the Federal interest is considerable although we agree that under the American system it cannot be, and ought not to be, paramount in the instance of schools. Yet Americans think of themselves as citizens of the United States before they think of themselves as citizens of a State and it is not likely they can be convinced that it is bad to use the broad taxing power of the Federal establishment to solve problems which threaten the political entity to which they give their highest loyalty.

"Intervention," then, is a poor word, chosen because it implies interference, something unwanted. A better one is "cooperation." As for the Federal influence that might flow from Federal financial support of schools, it is conceded to be a danger if in fact it were contemplated or inevitable. We do not think anyone likely to be listened to seriously contemplates writing Federal influence into law.

Nor is influence necessarily inherent in the concept of Federal cooperation. The problem is not one of standards, which is where influence is applied. Most school systems have high ones, although all cannot attain them at present. The problem is one of money and the fact, first, that the supply of it is distributed with disturbing inequality as between States and even regions and, second, that the local and State tax base is generally at or near the end of the line. A system of Federal help which granted no-strings assistance to iron out inequalities which threaten to become greater could eliminate, or at least acceptably minimize, the bugaboo of influence.

With respect to raising the money the question is not at all well illustrated by the oversimplification, taken as holy writ by the opponents of Federal aid, that such a scheme merely takes dollars out of a State, processes them in Washington, and returns them bureaucratically and severly bobtailed to the point of origin. It is true that some States, Maine among them, must do more for themselves before they come knocking on the door of the Federal Treasury. But it is not true that by itself a State like Maine can ever expect to provide its school population with education equivalent to that afforded, say, to young Californians.

The actual heart of the matter was recently skillfully exposed in Augusta at a meeting of the legislatively sponsored Maine Advisory Committee on Education. Said William McLin, an official of the National Education Association: "The property tax, upon which support of schools so largely rests, is borne in great measure by people with incomes of less than $5,000—a group which bears only a small portion of the Federal tax." Yet, he added, only a small part of the property tax is borne by those with incomes over $10,000, but they do bear the greatest share of Federal taxes. Thus did the NEA official pinpoint the actual cause of opposition to Federal aid to education.

The clincher, however, is in the fact that States are cut off from 70 percent of tax revenues by the preemption of these revenues to the Federal Government. Yet, as Mr. McLin said, the Federal Government's share of educational costs is now no more than 4 percent of their total. And this share, to a large extent, is earmarked for special programs, like the Defense Education Act, rather than for general use by States in accordance with State determination of prime needs.

What all this comes to, in our opinion, is that the question is not whether there shall be Federal aid to education but how it shall be provided and, most importantly, when.

[From the Portland Press Herald, May 23, 1960]

BOWDOIN PROFESSOR SAYS STATE ECONOMIC GAINS NOT KEEPING PACE WITH AVERAGE

BRUNSWICK.—A Bowdoin economics teacher told members of the Industrial Development Council of Maine, Monday, that while the State has made gains economically, it has not been keeping pace with average national growth.

Assistant professor, Giulio Pontecorvo, using per capita income as a measure, said that in 1958 the personal per capita income in Maine was $350 below the national average.

Maine's economy in a large measure depends upon military installations that may or not be permanent, Professor Pontecorvo said.

In 1958 the Federal Government spent $155 million in Maine directly related to the military, he said, including payroll, construction, prime contracts, school assistance, and medicare. These figures do not include Federal aid for highways, institutional care, or other such programs.

These expenditures, Pontecorvo pointed out, are one-and-a-half times the State's own budget which approximates $100 million.

Such Federal expenditures, Pontecorvo stated, "create an economy that is vulnerable to any shifts in military policy and strategy."

He pointed to Brunswick as an example of a community which would find it difficult to handle the surplus of classrooms and housing were anything to happen to its Naval or Air Force installations.

Pontecorvo said the State, as well as the individual communities, is neglecting Maine's potentially largest industry, its tourist business.

They must work harder, he said, at providing those facilities which the tourist now expects and has a right to demand. He said he believed more should be done to preserve the State's forests and to make availale additional recreational areas. Communities can do their part by establishing more parks and encouraging the development of better tourist facilities, he added.

Other important economic resources which are being neglected, he said, are our fisheries and our agriculture. By and large they receive little attention, he charged.

Some 30 members of the council attended the morning session at the Stowe's House.

Much of the morning was devoted to reports by various communities on progress they have made in attracting new industries.

A discussion of tax concessions as a means of drawing industry, found the gathering in agreement that most industrialists are fair and desire to carry their share of the community tax load.

Sam Michael, Lewiston's industrial agent, pointed out communities can provide services for a new industry such as roads, water and sewage services as a legitimate expenditure. He said such utilities being built for the Raytheon Co.'s new $2.5 million plant, will not only help that industry, but will open up the entire area for further development.

Communities were warned against attempting to solve their tax problems by laying it on industry.

Eugene S. Martin, of Portland, presided.

The session was attended by representatives of various State agencies as well as industrial agents, chamber of commerce officials and utilities representatives.

National Policy Machinery Subcommittee of Senate Committee on Government Operations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine of May 29 carried an excellent article by the distinguished reporter Cabell Phillips on the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The article is entitled "Subtle Spectacular on Capitol Hill," and it accurately describes the excellent work being performed by that subcommittee under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

This article is particularly timely because the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee is conducting one of the two present inquiries into the events surrounding the U–2 incident and the collapse of the summit conference. The objective manner in which this subcommittee conducts its vital business is detailed in this article, and none who read this article could have any fears of irresponsible or partisan investigation.

I think this article should be read by as many Americans as possible and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBTLE SPECTACULAR ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Cabell Phillips)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional investigations are usually of two kinds. They either overwhelm the spectator with their gaudy dramatics, or lull him to sleep with dullness. Currently, there is one in progress that bridges these extremes—it is a subtle spectacular being played before an almost nonexistent audience in on out-of-the-way hearing room by the improbably titled Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. By the script, this should be pretty soporific stuff, but its impact is such as to keep a good many people in high places awake and on the edge of their seats.

The stated mandate of this small band of inquisitors is innocuous enough—to look into ways of improving the machinery through which high policy for the cold war is made. But inevitably it is being drawn into an examination of policy itself: of the decisions this administration has made, and is following, in the sensitive field of national security. No prerogative lies closer to the heart of the soldier-President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, than this, and no issue has more explosive potential in this political year than the question of whether all that needs to be done is being done to win the cold war.

Frightening urgency has been given to such questions as these by the U–2 espionage

incident and the debacle of the summit conference in Paris only 2 weeks ago. For here, most competent observers believe, was an obvious failure of planning and coordination at a most critical juncture of the cold war. As a consequence, the subcommittee is looking into the whole U–2 affair as a "timely case study." Under its mandate it will be concerned with what went wrong rather than with who did wrong, but it may be impossible to separate the two in the public hearings.

Sparks of controversy were struck at the first open hearing several weeks ago. What had been planned as a rather academic walkthrough of the policy-planning mechanism at the White House level veered off into a chilling indictment of complacency in the face of the mounting Communist offensive. The testimony—restrained but direct to the bull's-eye—came from Robert A. Lovett, financier and former Secretary of Defense; Robert C. Sprague, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, and Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the International Business Machines Corp.

What these men from the world of finance said was later reinforced by witnesses from the world of science, among them Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corporation and a member of the 1957 Gaither commission; Dr. James B. Fisk, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and vice-chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, and Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics at Princeton.

These are men whose experience and knowledge and motives are beyond any challenge of pettiness or partisanship, and an ominous consensus has emerged from their testimony. It is that the mechanics of policy planning at the highest level have been made obsolete by the speed of a technology that has welded political, economic, and military considerations into a single imperative—national survival; that vital policy decisions are often extemporized, or based on inadequate information, or constricted by habits of thought that have been outmoded; and finally, that there is a failure at the top policy level to sense either the magnitude of the threat facing the country or the immensity of the effort needed to combat it.

As Mr. Lovett put it: "I feel that we are doing something short of our best. * * * If [Khrushchev's] statement, 'We will bury you,' does not carry the message to us, then words have lost their meaning. If we are not prepared after that statement to admit that we are in a struggle for survival, then we have truly succumbed to the hard sell of the soft attitude."

And Dr. Perkins, appearing a few weeks later, was even more specific. "Somebody would have to prove to me," he said, "that we have not given up important capabilities in the field of air defense and limited war, and maybe even in our deterrent program, as the price for getting all our requirements within a stable military budget."

The genesis of this significant inquiry lies in one man's worry, for a long period of time, over the provocative question: How can a free society organize to outthink, outplan and outperform totalitarianism and achieve security in freedom?

The worrier was Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington Democrat and a leading member of both the Armed Services and Joint Atomic Energy Committees. Last summer, he proposed to the Senate, and the Senate approved, a study of the whole policy-making apparatus relating to national security.

He promised a scholarly, nonpolitical approach and said that the subcommittee's report would not be released until after the election. He also sought the blessing of the White House, since he would have to delve deeply into its inner workings, and particularly into its central policymaking organ, the National Security Council. After a good deal of skeptical deliberation, this was granted, but with a number of caveats attached—that any probing into the substantive operations of the National Security Council should be offlimits, that a White House representative should be on hand for all discussions of the National Security Council, and that the subcommittee should describe its mission as an inquiry and not an investigation.

"We took this," JACKSON said, "in order to avoid fights over prerogatives. Moreover, we really aren't out to 'get' the White House or the Security Council or anybody else. This is something that has to do with national survival, and we need the cooperation of everybody concerned."

Serving on the subcommittee with him are Democrats HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota, and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine, and Republicans KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, and JACOB K. JAVITS, New York. But the subcommittee is pretty much JACKSON's baby, and he has had a free hand in running it.

For staff he turned first to Dorothy Fosdick, who was a member of Dean Acheson's policy-planning staff when he was Secretary of State, and to J. K. Mansfield, a former teacher of international relations at Yale and an in-and-outer in many high level consultative posts with the Government. The chief consultant is Robert Tufts, professor of economics at Oberlin College and former policy-planning staffer at the Department of State. In all, there are 10 staff members and part-time consultants.

For 6 months this staff read, talked, thought, and wrote memos to itself. The members interviewed the chiefs and other members of all the important Government agencies in town, and they fanned out to the major universities, foundations, and laboratories across the country. They asked:

What was thought about the planning operation as it now exists?

What happens to ideas on their way up the bureaucratic pipeline from incubation level to action level?

What is the effect of compartmentalization among military, economic, and political sectors of planning?

Should administrators be depended on for primary planning?

What are the weaknesses of the present operation, and how can they be corrected?

Out of more than 500 separate interviews the subcommittee has accumulated a vast file of factual data and personal opinion. It has staked out as major areas for attention these matters: the roles of the President and the National Security Council, the roles of the State and Defense Departments, budgetmaking and problems of economic growth, science, and technology, and finally, the part individuals play in relation to the whole planning process. It has already begun to shape its ideas about how the planning machinery can be improved, and these ideas are being reinforced and modified by the expert witnesses who testify before the committee.

Inevitably, the subcommittee's public performance partakes more of the graduate seminar than of the congressional inquisition, except when it is unexpectedly enlivened by a sharply revealing or critical comment from one of the witnesses. Such sallies bring promp ripostes from the subcommittee's alert minority counsel, Edward Pendleton, who by questions and elucidation attempts to dull or deflect these stray missiles.

"Throughout this discussion," he reminded one witness recently, "you have referred to the President. Do you mean by 'the President' any particular occupant of that position?"

"I was talking about the Presidency," the other responded.

"And not the present incumbent in particular?"

"No, sir."

The high quotient of sensitivity arises from the fact that there is here an implicit invasion by the legislative branch of the jealousy guarded precincts of the Executive. Such an inquiry in the hands of a biased or an imperceptive Senator could create serious frictions and hamper rather than help the policymaking process.

Fortunately, this is unlikely to happen. The guiding genius of the subcommittee, Senator JACKSON, is a quiet, hard working, mild mannered, youngish-looking bachelor with gentle gray eyes and guileless demeanor, who is more noted among his colleagues for plodding earnestness than for crusading zeal. He approaches his present mission as a student seriously intent on finding the answer to a knotty problem of government.

JACKSON was born in Everett, Wash., of Norwegian immigrant parents, on May 31, 1912. He waited on table to pay his way through the University of Washington, where he got his law degree in 1935, and 5 years later, at the age of 28, was elected to the House of Representatives. For a politician with a career singularly free of color or controversy, he has achieved a remarkable string of electoral successes. He moved up to the Senate in the Republican landslide year of 1952 by polling 30,000 more votes in his State than Mr. Eisenhower.

"I don't know how to explain him as a politician," a longtime friend recently said, "except by the fact that he's just a hell of a nice guy with a hop on the ball and who is always up on his homework."

His addiction to homework has much to do with his standing in the Senate. Early in his congressional career he became absorbed in the twin problems of nuclear energy and national defense and set about learning everything he could in these fields. Today, his knowledge and his opinions command the highest respect not only in the Senate but in the Pentagon and in Government scientific circles as well.

For the past several years he has hammered at the question of whether this Nation's defenses are adequate. He has been skeptical of the bland assurances offered by high military and civilian officials, and he often has pinned them down with his own superior knowledge. He was primarily responsible for "rescuing" Capt.—now Vice Adm.—Hyman Rickover from Navy Department obscurity and getting him a go-ahead for the development of the nuclear submarine. And he won a 2-year battle with the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission on stepping up the output of weapon-producing plutonium.

In a lecture at the National War College a year ago the Senator summarized his views in these words:

"What seems most to be missing is a coherent and purposeful national program that sets forth in simple terms what we have to do to survive, and why. In wartime there is a basic strategy to defeat the enemy. Our leaders know, and our people know, what they are trying to do and what is demanded of them. * * * We have no comparable strategy for the cold war. * * *"

Inevitably, the Jackson subcommittee's work has come to focus—for the present, at least—on the National Security Council, the Government's highest strategy-planning board.

The NSC was created under the National Security Act of 1947 as a part of the Executive Office of the President. Its statutory membership is limited to the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Director of Civil Defense and Mobilization, with a professional staff to help. However, President Eisenhower has expanded the NSC by adding other top Gov-

ernment officials as regular or occasional members. In theory it acts as a funnel to put before the President all the essential information he must have to formulate policy in any area affecting national security.

There has never been much of a quarrel about the basic concept of the NSC. It was born out of the shock of Pearl Harbor and the war that followed. Its major assignment soon became the masterminding of the cold war, and it nurtured such innovations in U.S. policy as foreign aid, the "containment" of Communist imperialism, and the doctrine of collective security.

But with the proliferation of cold war threats and crises and with the birth of the age of space, many feel that the Security Council is no longer capable of meeting the demands put upon it. This complaint goes primarily to the question of its structure, but it also embraces the manner of its use. Such disquieting fears have been expressed by many responsible individuals who have had a look behind the curtain of secrecy that surrounds the agency.

The substance of what is being said in the subcommittee hearings is that the Security Council has become too big, too diffuse, that it has lost its sense of purpose. Instead of serving as a sharp, unambiguous focus on basic policy problems, it has, according to its critics, become little more than a paper mill.

"If I were to make a general judgment about the NSC," Dr. Perkins told the committee, "it is that the President has not received from the normal NSC routine the kind of sharp debate, the clear differences of opinion, the new ideas that would require major modifications of program."

Some witnesses have questioned the recent tendency to make policy decisions within a predetermined budget ceiling. "The budget officer," Mr. Lovett told the committee, "should be a consultant and a participant, but not a decision-maker." Others have deplored the lack of proper coordination of policies between the Departments of State and Defense.

But inevitably such discussions of the process of planning become involved with the product of planning, and this leads into sensitive appraisals of the personal judgment that goes into the making of policy decisions. Thus, Mr. Sprague told the committee he thought the President was the only man who could awaken the country to the need for a greater effort to secure our survival, adding, "I believe that the danger is more serious than the President has expressed, himself, to the American public."

JACKSON and his staff do not try to stifle such spontaneous and pointed observations, but neither do they openly encourage them. They are realists enough, however, to know that they help draw public attention to their work, and, as one member explained, "We aren't likely to get any meaningful results out of all this unless the public becomes interested in what we're doing."

The end result the committee seeks is to have ready for whoever the next occupant of the White House may be a blueprint for a refurbished policy-planning mechanism that will, in JACKSON's words, "not only improve the planning process itself but help the new President to identify the areas in which fresh and imaginative planning has become essential."

What this may mean is not yet known, but it seems likely that an extensive overhaul of the NSC will be high among the committee's eventual recommendations. The aim will be, probably, to reconstitute it as a more compact forum for the debate of basic policy questions unencumbered by bureaucratic handicaps. This might involve better staffing, better coordination between planning functions of the State and Defense Departments and, possibly, legislation to put appropriations for certain national security operations, such as foreign aid and defense, on a long-term instead of a 1-year basis. Another idea taking form is the creation of a science advisory council for the President which would have a status comparable to that of the present council of economic advisers.

A persistent question the committee faces is this: Are we geared to put the best minds available to work on vast problems of policy and strategy? Out of this have come the beginnings of an idea that perhaps provision should be made for some sort of elite corps of thinkers—scholars and experts who, free of administrative responsibility and attachment to particular services or departments, would have no other function than to cerebrate about basic problems.

Most such ideas, JACKSON notes, are still in the germinal state at this point. A long period of study will be necessary after the hearings are concluded before concrete proposals begin to take shape. It will then be necessary to get the authority from Congress to put them into effect or, where legislation is not required, to persuade the new administration to adopt them.

But the important thing, he feels, is to bring some new light and fresh ideas to the task of creating Government policy to meet the challenge of the 1960's.

"When you realize," he says, "that there has been no serious congressional review of the policy-planning process for 13 years, it is reasonable to think there may be some room for improvement."

The Kidjel Ratio—A New Age in Applied Mathematics and Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii's wealth in human resources has once again proved to be unlimited. The ingenuity and pioneering spirit of its citizens have given to the world a new and practical system of solving a multitude of problems in the important fields of applied mathematics, art, and design.

The Kidjel ratio system is now being used to great advantage in more than 40 related activities in the world of architecture, engineering, mathematics, fine arts and industrial arts. Our schools, technical colleges and other educational institutions are now teaching the use of this fascinating system in addition to their regular curriculum.

In short, the Kidjel ratio of 5.33/1 is a universal geometric ratio which applies to all phases of life. This useful ratio also answers two of the most baffling problems which confront students as well as professionals in the entire world of art and design. It provides a fast and accurate system of determining the correct and most pleasingly beautiful proportion for any given design or layout. It also provides a fast and accurate method of determining pleasing spatial harmony in any given composition or design.

Specifically speaking, the Kidjel ratio system can:

First. Quickly and accurately lay out buildings and residences in beautiful and harmonious proportions.

Second. Quickly and accurately lay out pentagons and other prime sided regular polygons from 7 through 17 sides—no protractor required.

Third. Quickly and accurately lay out other beautifully proportioned classical graphic designs.

Fourth. Quickly and accurately locate various design elements in pleasing composition.

Fifth. Quickly and accurately lay out beautiful spirals.

Sixth. Quickly and accurately lay out male and female human figures in ideal classical proportions.

Seventh. Quickly and accurately determine the proportionate size of lettering in poster and magazine layout—plus an unlimited number of other valuable applications.

The Kidjel ratio system is based on the apex of creation and design—the ideal classical proportions of the human figure which in turn is based on the wonders of Greek geometry. This new academic and practical concept is thoroughly explained and illustrated in the text called "The 2 Hours That Shook the Mathematical World." This fascinating volume was written by Maurice Kidjel, the dean of Hawaii's portrait artists in collaboration with Kenneth W. K. Young, versatile Honolulu business executive. A specially designed instrument called the Kidjel ratio calipers was also invented by Mr. Kidjel to apply the system.

The Kidjel ratio system and calipers were discovered, developed, and now being manufactured in Hawaii for worldwide distribution—thus creating an entirely new industry for the newest State in the Union.

Academically speaking, the Kidjel ratio also led the author to the subsequent discovery of the solutions to the three famous 2,500-year-old so-called impossible problems in Greek geometry, popularly known as:

First. Trisecting the angle—dividing an angle into three equal parts.

Second. Squaring the circle—constructing a square equivalent in area to a given circle.

Third. Doubling the cube—constructing a cube, double in volume to that of a given cube with the use of compass and unmarked ruler only.

Mr. Kidjel and Mr. Young presented public lecture-demonstrations on the three impossibles and the Kidjel ratio system in Honolulu, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Washington, D.C. Their presentation in San Francisco aroused such an interest that KPIX-TV — Westinghouse — produced the "Riddle of the Ages," a special documentary release showing one of the three Kidjel solutions. In Chicago, the Kidjel solutions captured top awards at the 1959 Chicago district Catholic high school science fair and later again at the Illinois State high school science fair sponsored by the Illinois Academy of

Science. The Kidjel solutions are also now being taught in hundreds of schools and colleges throughout Hawaii, the United States, and Canada.

The Kidjel ratio system textbook, the Kidjel Ratio Calipers and the Kidjel solutions to the "three impossible problems" in Greek geometry are on display at my office for the inspection of my colleagues and members of their staffs, should they be interested.

An Injury to One Is an Injury to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Labor Press entitled "An Injury to One Is An Injury to All."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Apr. 1, 1960]

AN INJURY TO ONE IS AN INJURY TO ALL

(This editorial is reprinted from the current issue of the Guild Reporter, national publication of the American Newspaper Guild.)

It has become clear that the stake in the newspaper strike at Portland is nothing less than union survival. The heads of the five international unions primarily affected indicated full awareness of that fact when they met last week at Phoenix, Ariz.

That meeting developed into a war council. The conferees stressed the gravity of the attack on the newspaper unions in Portland, reached agreement on united resistance to it, and paved the way to future close cooperation in other areas of union activity.

They agreed, too, that the Portland strike is not a struggle involving only their own unions. Should the Portland pattern succeed in crushing newspaper union organization in Oregon's largest city, there is every likelihood of its adoption and adaptation elsewhere not only in the newspaper field but in other large segments of organized labor as well. The meeting therefore invoked the interested aid of all organized labor since the threat is a universal one.

There are unmistakable nationwide aspects of the Portland situation which differ from the ordinary local union dispute.

In financial control of the larger of the two struck dailies is S. I. Newhouse, of New York, owner of the third largest daily newspaper chain. His personal fortune, in large part earned for him by members of the same unions he now wants to destroy, is reported at $150 million.

Were he the sole union antagonist, he would be formidable. Losses in his strike situation can become tax exemptions credited to his other enterprises. He could, if necessary, stand alone.

But behind Newhouse, and by all indications deeply interested in his union-busting campaign at Portland, is the American Newspaper Publishers Association, corporate body of this country's press. Newhouse and some 400 other members of the ANPA subscribe to the association's strike insurance plan. Like all insurance, the ANPA scheme is supported by premium payments, investment of which furnishes benefit payments to struck policyholders.

Newhouse has twice within the past year drawn heavily on the fund for benefits. It is in the use to which Newhouse has put his indemnities in Portland that every member of the ANPA becomes inescapably involved in the strike.

For in Portland some of the premium dollars paid by ANPA members found their way into the pockets of imported strikebreakers who swarmed into Portland at the outset of the strike, openly boastful of their high wages and living-expense tabs. More recently, premium dollars have been used to pay apprentices in training at the idled Journal plant, all nonunion personnel by careful selection.

In the Portland strike situation the ANPA is clearly involved, both through its sponsorship of strike insurance and its admitted use of a commercial strikebreaking agency operated by one Bloor Schleppey, of Indiana, whose crews rushed into Portland last November.

Portland, in short, is the perfect example of the self-evident trade union truth that an injury to one is an inqury to all; that an injury by one is an inqury by all.

The labor union movement has an opportunity, in this crisis, to demonstrate that organized people are more than a match for organized money.

The President's Forthcoming Visit to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is about to undertake another goodwill trip, this time to southeast Asia and Japan. I am particularly happy that his visit will be to the Philippines, a close ally and tried and true friend.

He accepted the invitation extended to him by President Carlos P. Garcia, a statesman and patriot, who is a stalwart champion in Asia of the ideals of democracy and freedom. He was elected in a clean, honest, and free election as the acknowledged leader of a truly free people. It is fitting that he should receive President Eisenhower as his official guest in the same manner that he was received here at the White House by our Government 2 years ago.

We still remember his stirring address delivered before Congress and I am sure that President Eisenhower will be delighted as are all friends of the Philippines with its progress as an independent sovereign government.

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, in an article written for the Associated Press and published extensively all over the world, writes perceptively of the significance of the President's visit to the Philippines.

I ask for unanimous consent to include General Romulo's article in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States)

On behalf of President Carlos P. Garcia, I extended to President Eisenhower an invitation for him to make a state visit to the Philippines. The invitation was accepted.

Needless to say this news will be received with rejoicing by my people. I never doubted that President Eisenhower would make such a decision. Not only because of the historic ties of friendship and partnership that have joined our two countries together for more than half a century but also because he lived with us for several years, helped us write our first National Defense Act, and has long standing Philippine friendship, that I was sure he could not have decided otherwise and that he needed no persuasion to make it.

To the Filipino people, President Eisenhower's visit at this time has a particular significance. It will help to allay the growing misgiving in certain sectors of our Philippine public opinion that America is taking us for granted. I am happy to note also that the President will pay us the deference of visiting us first before he goes to the other countries in his schedule, flying directly from the United States to Manila and setting aside 5 days to be on Philippine soil.

The last time he visited the Philippines was soon after the Second World War and he saw a country in ruins. So shocked was he at the extent of the devastation that he said of all the destroyed cities that he had seen, Warsaw and Manila suffered the worst.

He will now see a people that have risen from the ravages of war, their cities rebuilt, their economy restored, their democratic government functioning efficiently, peace and order secure. Last year the Philippines achieved a favorable balance of trade, we now produce more rice than we consume, we have established 800 new industries since the war, our international reserves have risen to an encouraging level, and because of improved economic conditions, partial decontrol of trade restrictions has been recently established by our government.

President Garcia has undertaken a vigorous campaign against graft and corruption in the government with such positive results as: total number of administrative cases—17,579, showing an increase of 5,346 cases from October 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960; number of cases decided, 12,202; convictions, 8,669; dismissed, 3,533. This is a record unequaled by any of the previous Philippine administrations.

President Eisenhower will renew his acquaintance with President Garcia who was his guest in Washington 2 years ago, an avowed anti-Communist who signed the law outlawing the Communist Party from the Philippines, and whose confidence in the United States he reaffirmed recently when he invited the American Government to make the Philippines a base for its missiles. In a section of the world where neutralism is followed by many countries, the Filipino people have taken a forthright stand for democracy and freedom and President Eisenhower in visiting them will regird their confidence in their alliance with the United States.

As is normal between two closely allied countries such as the Philippines and the United States, there are unsolved problems such as the war damage claims, the Filipino veterans' benefits, increase in our sugar quota, the few remaining unsettled questions regarding the U.S. military bases, which the Presidential visit will help to place in their proper perspective and thus bring about a better understanding between our two peoples.

After the collapse of the summit conference, President Eisenhower's visit will also project America's true image in southeast Asia, an image so disfigured and distorted by Communist propaganda that it is important that one with the personality and prestige of the President should set it aright in the minds of the Asian people.

He will be received in the Philippines with an unequaled warmth that precisely at this time should be known by the outside world. Undoubtedly it will be gratifying to him personally to be accorded a welcome that I dare predict will be second to none in his recent travels. Such affectionate warmth and cordiality will be a tonic to a harassed world of rising nationalism and increasing antagonisms everywhere, when a people, once under America, can give such a spontaneous demonstration of good will, gratitude and friendship for the leader of a Nation that to them at one time represented alien rule.

Foreign Aid Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, an excellent analysis of the fallacies inherent in the philosophy of the present foreign aid program is contained in the May 16, 1960, issue of Life Lines, the publication of the Life Line Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Foreign Aid Folly," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID FOLLY

Does your family have a hundred dollars that you would like to donate as a gift to a man who constantly goes around telling the neighbors that you are no good, your wife is a meddlesome gossip, and your son and daughter are the most destructive children in the neighborhood?

No, of course not. You would consider such a thing absurd.

The cost of the foreign aid program per next year being talked about in Washington would amount to just about $100 for each family in the United States. And the effect of this program will be just about the same as if you gave a hundred dollars to the man who has shown quite clearly that he is no friend of your family.

Our foreign aid program has been going on ever since the war. Our position in the world is worse now than it was when we started handing out money to all comers. It has been claimed, and is still being claimed, that foreign aid giveaways will improve living conditions in the less developed countries of the world and create new markets for American products. It has been claimed, and is still being claimed, that Washington's handouts of our money will win friends and hold allies for our country in the struggle against the international Communist conspiracy. The facts show that these claims have little or no justification.

NATIONAL SUICIDE

If the entire national income of the United States were spent to improve the living conditions of the hundreds of millions of people in underdeveloped areas, their living standard would not be raised as same would not be lasting because of the fast-growing populations of these countries.

Under the foreign aid program, American products and services are bought with our tax dollars and then given away to foreign countries. How can trade be promoted that way? The only way to build new markets is the way we have traditionally done it—the businesslike method of sound private enterprise and investments. This method is the only one that actually increases productivity, and in doing so, enables the less developed countries to get the means to support themselves and build up their own capital.

Can foreign aid buy trustworthy friends and allies? The answer has to be "No." Friendship is not obtained by bribery. A man—or a nation—getting something for nothing places on it the value of precisely nothing. In fact, as a former Prime Minister of France once said, "The Americans manage to create something very near to hatred by the way they give their aid."

The greatest myth of all is that communism can be weakened and defeated by the American foreign aid program. As a matter of fact, it is part of the Communist doctrine that productive workers shall support the incompetent and the lazy. Isn't that exactly what we have been doing on an international scale with our foreign aid program? In fact, we have turned great sums of money over to the outright Communist governments of such countries as Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Since the end of the war, we have spent for foreign aid the equivalent of about $1,800 for every family in America. But international communism has not grown weaker during that period. It has grown stronger and has swallowed up hundreds of millions more people in the world.

Why does foreign aid go on—endlessly—year after year? Who favors such squandering of our resources on this program? There are several groups. One group is made up of unrealistic sentimentalists who persist in believing, against all evidence to the contrary, that we can buy international friendship. Another group includes those who hope to sell their products to the agency directing the program. And still another group, the most dangerous of all, is made up of the mistaken—those who, for whatever reasons, are enemies of freedom and who see in this giant giveaway program a means of weakening this Nation where freedom is the keynote of our governmental and economic systems.

Foreign aid has been called a design for national suicide. The term is not too strong. There are those, and we must never forget it, who would welcome death of God-given freedom in America. And the foreign aid program is one of the weapons they use. A bankrupt America means freedom in the world is bankrupt, too.

South Dakota "My True Security" Winning Oration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, each year, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. cosponsor an oratory contest on the subject of security.

This year's winner of the State competition in South Dakota is Mr. Michael A. Jackley of Sturgis, S. Dak.

I include at this point in the RECORD Michael's winning oration:

MY TRUE SECURITY THE AMERICAN WAY
(By Michael Jackley)

What is security? Webster defines it as a feeling of safety and freedom from anxiety.

When can I, or for that matter any person, have a feeling of real security?

When can we feel that we are completely free from any danger or worry? The answer to this question can only be never. A situation without worry or danger would be a utopia, a dream.

On this earth no one can really have a completely true security. We can, however, approach this utopia, and for all practical purposes we can consider this true security.

Again we run into another paradox. The way a human being thinks cannot be considered an exact science. Every human thinks differently, every human being would have a different definition for his true security. Some find their security in wealth or social position, others in power, many in religion, still others in a feeling of safety. A complete list of these various things would cover a multitude of items.

For me to have a feeling of true security, I must have a number of these things.

First and most important, a firm belief in God and a life hereafter. For me life could hold no meaning, no security, without this.

The rest of the necessities for my security can be placed on as equal plane.

I would have to have confidence in myself. A confidence backed up by experience, practical knowledge, and education. I would have to feel that I was capable of meeting any situation with which I might be confronted. With this feeling of self-confidence would come independence. When a person is confident in himself, he does not have to and will not depend on anything or anyone else for the things he wants or needs. Not so independent, however, as to not need the next necessity, a family and friends, people I know, love, and can trust, people that know, love, and can trust me.

I want to be financially secure, not necessarily wealthy. I want to have enough financial security so that I can always depend on my own resources and not the Government or anyone else.

Lastly, I want safety, freedom from danger and fear. This is supplied by a government and the ideals behind it, whether it is national, State, or local. A person can be reasonably secure if he lives in a nation where there are a set of laws to protect his safety and freedoms, and the means to enforce these laws.

These then are the things which would give me, and probably only me, a feeling of true security, or rather a feeling approaching that of true security.

Mississippi and Wyoming Join in Being Proud of Dr. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, ties between the South and the West go back generations; they span the decades of our country's history, and will, I am sure, extend far into the future.

Large numbers of the early settlers—the pioneers of the West—came from Southern States. Seeking new lands, new opportunities, and new challenges they settled in the Western States and territories, making important contributions to the history of the West and of the Nation. Their contributions were not limited to the fields of commerce, ag-

riculture, industry, and Government. They also had a major part and were leaders in shaping the culture of this vast and important region of our country—in the arts and in education at all levels.

As Americans, we owe more to those who spend their creative and productive years in training our youth than to any other secular group. Certainly, to all of them we owe recognition and honor, and additional recognition and honor when they carry the added burden of administration and leadership in the field of higher education.

A highly creditable and an outstanding example of a career of such worthwhile achievement is that of a native Mississippian, who has earned fame and recognition at home as well as beyond our borders, Dr. G. D. Humphrey, president of the University of Wyoming.

This was recently recognized in a double editorial, one from the Wyoming State Tribune, quoted and included in another from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger. It is with pride that I join wholeheartedly in the sentiments of both editorials.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the May 27, 1960, Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI AND WYOMING JOIN IN BEING PROUD OF DR. HUMPHREY

Dr. George Duke Humphrey, native Mississippian and former president of Mississippi State University, has been for 15 years president of the University of Wyoming, and has been claimed as a prominent citizen by his adopted State.

Mississippi continues to claim him, however, and we hope to reclaim him, as it were, when the time comes for him to retire and come "home."

The Wyoming State Tribune, oldest newspaper in that commonwealth, recently praised Dr. Humphrey for the latest honor that has come to this outstanding educator. Said the Tribune:

"Singular honor has come to Wyoming in the election of Dr. G. D. Humphrey, president of the University of Wyoming, to the presidency of the National Association of State Universities.

"Extant is a circumstance in which imposing tribute and recognition literally tumble on Dr. Humphrey, and through him, on the State's only 4-year institution of higher learning.

"He rose to the presidency of the NASU from the vice president's chair; he has just completed a term as president of the Association of American Colleges, of which he is also a former vice president and director.

"Additionally—he was chairman of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education in 1954 and 1955 and, since 1951, has been a member of the National Science Foundation Board.

"It is also significant that the Wyoming Society of North American Newcomen, when it decided to resume honors activity (it had been inactive in the State since 1944), did so by spotlighting Dr. Humphrey and the UW. (This was at a glittering Cheyenne dinner last week.)

"The educator came to Wyoming in 1945, from Mississippi State, and has since administered the UW through the period of its greatest growth, including enrollment as well as university services and capital improvement.

"The Wyoming public interest has been profoundly served in the situation in which Dr. Humphrey has chosen to remain at the U.W., which has involved turning his back on calls to eminent service elsewhere.

"Although born to Mississippi, he meets all the qualifications in what we mean in the term Wyomingite. He knows Wyoming, its people and its needs. He labors ceaselessly, and effectively, for Wyoming and higher public education.

"He is esteemed with the best. How warm it is to add: He's from Wyoming."

Mr. McGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, it was a quite surprising and delightful coincidence that I happened to be occupying the chair of the Presiding Officer at the moment when the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was paying tribute to a very distinguished American educator, Dr. George Duke Humphrey, president of the University of Wyoming.

I served not only as a colleague but also as an employee of Dr. Humphrey for 13 years while I was a professor at the University of Wyoming. I wish to associate myself in every respect with the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, and to assure him that there could have been no finer example of the ties between the West and the South than in the personality which we are discussing at this particular moment.

The selection of Dr. Humphrey to be president of the American Association of Universities at the present time comes both as an honor to his former State and as an honor to his present State. I would only hope that the wishes of the Mississippi editor, who was calling him back home, might not be borne out, for the reason that Dr. Humphrey has made his place in Wyoming and with the university. While he may perhaps be approaching retirement age, he has many contributions yet to make. Again, I join in the tribute to Dr. G. D. Humphrey.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from Wyoming make the statement he has made in connection with the remarks I made about Dr. Humphrey. I am delighted, too, that he was in the Chamber, where he usually is to be found. I looked around but did not see him a moment ago. However, as has been the case with many of us, I discovered later that the Senator from Wyoming was presiding at the time I spoke. Therefore, he was on double posts of duty.

I appreciate his reference to my State. I share with him his great pride in the accomplishments of not only Dr. Humphrey, but also the University of Wyoming.

One of my memorable experiences was to be shown through the university and its grounds, even thought it was nighttime, the only time available. It is a university of a great State and of a great people of the West.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, even at night, the University of Wyoming looms large. It is the highest institution of learning in the United States. It is located at 7,200 feet above sea level. We are very proud to be able to make that claim.

Dr. Humphrey has been responsible for the architectural advances on the campus. The University of Wyoming has a tremendously impressive building program now in progress. It has been going on for almost 12 years. We think it is one of the finest educational plants, on the higher educational level, in the country. We have God-given, built-in air conditioning to go with it. This likewise becomes an asset to the university itself.

Surplus Property for Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 the Congress enacted Public Law 61 which I introduced to enable our struggling education and health institutions to obtain useful and needed property which was being sold by the Defense agencies for a few cents on the dollar.

Since that time personal property valued at approximately $1,400 million has been made available for these education, health, and civil defense purposes.

I enclose herewith a report made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicates that surplus property which cost $91,190,147 was made available to the States during the first quarter of calendar year 1960. The Secretary's report indicates that each of the 50 States received surplus personal property as did the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, while the evidence is conclusive that the proper organization of the agencies of the Department of Defense under existing legislation would prevent the generation of much of the surplus property it is gratifying to know that the taxpayers are getting a dividend in the form of this property which can be put to such meritorious purposes.

The report follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid $91,190,847 was made available to the States for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes during January, February, and March 1960, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for $4,164,203 and personal property for $87,026,644.

Secretary Arthur S. Flemming announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health

and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transfererd to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.—Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1960, in accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$87,026,644	$4,164,203	$91,190,847
Alabama	2,089,641	24,472	2,114,113
Alaska	272,027	920,812	1,192,839
Arizona	623,182	12,693	635,875
Arkansas	1,221,953	854,410	2,076,363
California	14,711,735	31,358	14,743,093
Colorado	876,089	81,977	958,066
Connecticut	1,276,863		1,276,863
Delaware	253,719		253,719
Florida	4,127,511	28,105	4,155,616
Georgia	2,007,451		2,007,451
Hawaii	376,125		376,125
Idaho	477,086	47,752	524,838
Illinois	2,391,369	99,230	2,490,599
Indiana	2,945,696		2,945,696
Iowa	914,938		914,938
Kansas	539,829		539,829
Kentucky	1,263,942	88,649	1,352,591
Louisiana	1,040,508	342,789	1,383,387
Maine	449,186		449,186
Maryland	2,000,124	5,800	2,005,924
Massachusetts	1,914,705		1,914,705
Michigan	3,522,380		3,522,380
Minnesota	2,028,679	250	2,028,929
Mississippi	1,434,868	87,220	1,522,088
Missouri	1,181,061	2,340	1,183,401
Montana	394,420		394,420
Nebraska	589,367		589,367
Nevada	236,804		236,804
New Hampshire	167,237		167,237
New Jersey	1,318,444		1,318,444
New Mexico	745,798	76,553	822,351
New York	5,790,602	24,081	5,814,683
North Carolina	1,559,532	12,992	1,572,524
North Dakota	223,420		223,420
Ohio	3,784,643		3,784,643
Oklahoma	1,422,049	496,511	1,918,560
Oregon	1,633,298		1,633,298
Pennsylvania	2,604,605	32,286	2,636,891
Rhode Island	300,954		300,954
South Carolina	1,498,408		1,498,408
South Dakota	469,266		469,266
Tennessee	2,015,744	75,090	2,090,834
Texas	4,254,906	743,385	4,998,291
Utah	1,137,417		1,137,417
Vermont	296,905		296,905
Virginia	1,818,441	6,198	1,824,639
Washington	1,902,252	8,777	1,911,029
West Virginia	638,800		638,800
Wisconsin	1,394,835	22,625	1,417,460
Wyoming	192,870	18,600	211,470
District of Columbia	151,800		151,800
Puerto Rico	546,100	19,248	565,348
Virgin Islands			

Proclamation of New York State Dairy Month by Governor Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the importance of the dairy industry to the physical health and to the agricultural prosperity of our Nation cannot be overemphasized. The State of New York looks upon this industry as one of the prime and indispensable factors in the economy of the State and in the well-being of its citizens. In recognition of the outstanding contribution of the dairy industry, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, has proclaimed the month of June 1960 as Dairy Month throughout the State.

In view of the significance of this proclamation, both in terms of the welfare and prosperity of New York State and of the Nation, I ask that the text of Governor Rockefeller's proclamation of Dairy Month be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

Nearly 50,000 dairy farms in New York State are producing 4,353 million quarts of milk annually. This vast supply is the third largest of any State in the Nation.

Aside from constituting approximately one-half of all agricultural income in New York, the dairy industry provides livelihood for thousands of persons in the processing, manufacturing, and delivery of milk and dairy products.

June is the traditional month of large milk supply. It is also the season when milk commends itself in all its delicious forms—hot, cold, fluid, solid, for meals, for snacks, for icebox raids, by young and old alike. Since it is the perfect food, the more milk we consume, the healthier we shall be.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim June 1960 as Dairy Month in New York State and urge people of all ages to partake of this superb product of nature.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 20th day of May in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took the floor to direct attention of the House to bidding procedures in the Defense Department which appear designed to direct a $42 million production contract to one particular bidder, the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., of San Jose, Calif. The procedures involved were discriminatory and prejudicial to the cause of economy and to the use of a Government-owned plant in Cleveland.

The preparation of these prejudicial and costly specifications was contrary to the recommendations of the Army Ordnance Corps, the Department of the Army, and the findings of an independent survey conducted by engineers of the Ford Motor Co. under contract.

It seems to me that Congress should give a very "hard look" at what is going on in the Pentagon. From all I can gather certain companies are simply "figured in" for defense production, while other capable competition is "figured out." In the proposals for bids on the M–113 armored vehicles the "rigging" of specifications is a documentary fact.

I cannot believe that Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., or Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker are fully aware of what is going on.

Following is a letter which I have today forwarded to Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates:

JUNE 2, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Today I took the floor of the House to question bidding procedurs under which Army Ordnance procurement of the M–113 armored personnel carriers are currently being evaluated by your Department.

The work evaluated is used advisedly, because my examination of the facts indicate that under the extraordinary ground rules established for bidding, this contract can only be awarded to one prospective bidder, namely, the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., of San Jose, Calif. I was startled to learn of the intricate devices which are being used to figure in the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. and figure out any other prospective bidder. My enclosed statement explains this in detail.

I have since learned that at least one of the five prospective bidders who attended a bidders' conference on this contract in Detroit on December 17, 1959, was told that it was futile to bid because the Pentagon had "indicated there already was a source for this material." This could only mean that the Defense Department had already made up its mind to award this $42 million contract to the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. regardless of the cost involved.

This procedure makes a sham of the alleged bidding—I might say, a costly one to the taxpayer. In addition to the increased cost of this procurement, if it is produced in the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. plant at San Jose, the military has incurred wasteful and unnecessary expense in first obtaining a costly independent survey by the Ford Motor Co. to determine where this production could most economically take place—both from the standpoint of current production needs and an adequate mobilization base.

Mr. Secretary, this survey flatly recommended that this production work be done in the Government-owned Cleveland Ordnance Tank plant now standing idle at a cost to the taxpayer of over $2,000 each day for maintenance alone.

Compounding the waste of the survey, the Defense Department staff ordered a real estate appraisal, made by the Cleveland Real Estate Board, to determine the rental value of the Cleveland Ordnance plant which never was expected or intended to be used in the first place. This bidding procedure is so irregular and so definitely contrary to the declared intent of Congress on the economic use of Government plants when they are available that I am certain these questionable practices could not have been within your knowledge.

I respectfully submit this letter with the urgent request that you personally look into this matter at the earliest possible moment. A bid decision under these highly questionable ground rules is imminent.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

Heroism Is Only One of Sharon Boero's Virtues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate yesterday wisely, I believe, approved Senate Joint Resolution 181—which I was privileged to cosponsor—for observing the second week in November as Youth Appreciation Week.

Across the Nation, the vast majority of youth are playing a significant role in community affairs, strengthening homelife and carrying on constructive activities not only to build better communities today but to equip themselves for the great responsibility of leadership tomorrow.

The establishment of Youth Appreciation Week will provide an opportunity to pay well-deserved recognition to the youth of the country who, in this way, hold the key to a better life in America.

As we know, the nearly 2,000 Optimist Clubs in the country have sponsored such appreciation weeks in the past. The objectives of the Optimist Clubs' program have been as follows:

1. To recognize the accomplishments of youth in the home, school, church, and community.
2. To promote more active participation by families in family affairs.
3. To encourage organizations and other groups to publicly show their respect for youth.
4. To encourage newspapers to devote more space to the news of the 95 percent of youth who are good citizens.
5. To encourage radio and television stations to recognize youth through special as well as regular programs.
6. To encourage national magazines to recognize the accomplishments and contributions of youth.
7. To provide the proper environment, recreation, and social activities for youth.
8. To encourage parents to rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of parenthood.
9. To illustrate the great influence religion has on the lives of youth and to encourage their active participation in religious activities.
10. To encourage a greater interchange of ideas between adults and youth, leading to a broader understanding of each other's problems.

In addition to paying warranted tribute to the positive role of the 95 percent of our youth, the designation of Youth Appreciation Week will serve to provide an antidote to the "sensationalisms" often accompanying the 5 percent of individuals "out of step" with society, who have contributed to delinquency.

Recently, Miss Sharon Boero, of Independence, Wis., received from President Eisenhower, the Young American Medal for Heroism. The presentation was made in recognition of her heroic effort to rescue five children from a burning building. Although, physically, Sharon will bear the scars of her heroism throughout her life, the significance of her act of heroism will leave a far greater positive mark not only on her own life and the lives of the involved children, but on the history of heroic acts by youth to serve their fellow men.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published an article by Ruth Rogers, entitled "Heroism Is Only One of Sharon Boero's Virtues." Reflecting courageous action by youth—in keeping with the youth appreciation idea—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I JUST DID IT AUTOMATICALLY—HEROISM IS ONLY ONE OF SHARON BOERO'S VIRTUES

(By Ruth Rogers)

INDEPENDENCE, WIS.—Possessed of extraordinary courage, Sharon Boero, who is 18 today, is also an extraordinary person.

Sharon is the girl who on February 9, 1958, saved three children from almost certain death in a fire at Chimney Rock.

But Sharon takes no credit, particularly. She says that whatever she did she did it automatically. We should have more such "automatic" people.

Baby-sitting for the Robert Everson family, who operated the Chimney Rock store on Highway 93 about 10 miles north of Independence, Sharon was awakened by smoke shortly after midnight on February 9. She first tried to call the Independence fire department, but could get no response.

Sharon then returned upstairs and got Ellen Everson, 3, and Peggy, 7, carrying the baby and leading Ellen, and the three went downstairs and outside to safety. Perhaps it should be qualified as "relatively" safe: the temperature was 17 degrees below zero, and the children were barefooted and clad only in pajamas.

Sharon told the children not to try to get in the building and then returned upstairs. She took Virginia, 5, in her arms and told Ronnie and Marie Arneson (Sharon's half sister) to follow. By this time the stairway was enveloped in flame and Sharon's hands were badly burned on her second trip.

Unknown to Sharon, Ronnie and Marie failed to follow her. Marie attempted to get Ronnie out, but he went back to bed as though to seek safety there. Marie, who is 11, then broke a window overlooking a porch and dropped to the porch roof and crawled down from there. She cut her hand in breaking the window.

A few minutes later, Bernard Colby and his wife came along on their way home. Marie screamed at them that Ronnie was "in the fire, upstairs."

Colby got a ladder from his nearby farm and was able to enter the bedroom where Ronnie lay. On his first attempt, Colby could not find the boy, but after emerging from the building and getting a lungful of pure air he tried again, and this time he found Ronnie and carried him down the ladder.

The Colbys found Sharon rubbing her hands in the snow, and not until Mrs. Colby asked about it did Sharon realize: she had put one shoe on before leaving the bedroom. She never found the other one.

All five children were treated at the Whitehall Community Hospital. Ronnie's lungs were smoke filled and Virginia had her hair singed and her feet slightly burned.

But Sharon will bear burn scars on the top of her right hand the rest of her life. Plastic surgery failed to obscure completely the scarred flesh.

For her heroism, Sharon received the Carnegie Medal and $250, and earlier this month she received the Young America Medal for Heroism from the hand of President Eisenhower, in Washington, D.C. It was, Sharon says, "almost overwhelming."

The President, when he made the presentation at the White House, said, "I'm sure my son and daughter-in-law would like to have you as their babysitter."

For his part in the rescue, Colby also received the Carnegie Medal.

Sharon is a typical teenager in that she likes most things teenage girls like, but Sharon is more than typical in her interests. She loves hunting and is equally adept with rifle and bow and arrow. She has two dogs, one a black hunter, the other a big white one of indefinite breed, and she likes to call them "Salt" and "Pepper."

She likes dancing and dance music and recently bought a new stereophonograph. Sharon can take over the household duties with the ease of one long used to it, as, indeed, she recently has. Her mother, Mrs. Ernest Jacobson, is taking a beauty culture course in Eau Claire, and so Sharon is the housekeeper on the modest Jacobson farm.

She cooks well, she sews and can darn a sock with the best of them, and she likes nothing better than helping with the routine farm chores.

During the haying and harvesting season, Sharon runs the tractor and helps hoist the hay into the barn loft. She's an expert milker and gathering eggs is one of her duties, as well as feeding the calves.

Sharon was in the upper third of her senior class at Independence High School, and found time to take part in just about every extracurricular activity the school had to offer. She played the flute in the band and sang both in the chorus and glee club. She was a member of the Pep Club and was a lusty cheerleader. Sharon was a member of the Girls Athletic Association and the Future Homemakers.

A boy friend?

"Sure," says Sharon, "in my spare time."

Her ambition, though, is to be an X-ray technician, and plans to take it up in college. Her Carnegie Fund money will help, and she need not worry about tuition because her father, Louis Boero, was lost when his destroyer-escort was sunk at Linguyan in the Gulf of Luzon.

As a result, Sharon is eligible for Veterans' Administration aid.

The Boeros were living in Kenosha when Boero enlisted in May 1944. He was killed January 10, 1945.

Sharon's sister, Barbara, has trained as an airline stewardess and is employed in Washington, D.C., while she awaits a stewardess assignment.

Her stepfather, Ernest Jacobson, is vice president of the Trempealeau County Farmers Union, and secretary-treasurer of the Unity Chimney Rock unit of the FU.

Needless to say, Jacobson is just as proud of his stepdaughter as her mother.

Mrs. Jacobson started a 9-month beauty culture course in Eau Claire March 1, and after a 2-year apprenticeship she plans, tentatively, to open a beauty shop at home.

Sharon recently won the Trempealeau County 4-H speaking contest, and will receive an expense-paid trip to State Club Week at Madison June 13–16, and will also attend the State 4-H Camp at Upham Woods near Wisconsin Dells.

The subject of her prize-winning talk was "Fire Safety in the Home."

The Federal City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the June 1, 1960, issue of Roll Call which is not only timely but logical:

THE FEDERAL CITY

There is only one Washington, D.C., in the entire world.

It is superfluous, then, to add that this is a unique area, honored to be the Capital City of the United States of America.

This is not an industrial city, a city of commerce, a shipyard city. It is the Federal City and stands alone as such.

It is a city which has grown in beauty, prestige, attractiveness, wealth and power because the Federal Government is centered here.

When the Founding Fathers established Washington as the Federal City they properly bestowed the exclusive powers for governing the city in the hands of the United States Congress. So definite were they in their belief that this power was the rightful province of the Congress, that they wrote the power into the Constitution in specific and definite language.

True, there have been great changes since the Nation's Capital was conceived. But nothing has occurred to give Congress reason for quitting its duty and responsibility to maintain legislative jurisdiction over the Nation's Federal City.

True, the permanent residents among the 800 thousand citizens are deprived of voting privileges by reason of their residence in the District of Columbia.

Granting of a franchise to vote for President and Vice President and even National Representatives to the Congress can well be accomplished without the necessity of the Congress turning over one of its important functions—the responsibility for the Federal city of which it is the foundation—to a vocal group of citizens privileged to reside in the Federal city.

There is no question of civil rights in the demand that Congress relinquish its duties as set forth in the Constitution. There is not a question of congressional power obstructing the growth, economy, and attractiveness of the Federal city. On the contrary, all that Washington is may be directly attributable to the devotion and interest lavished on the District by the Congress.

The Congress once bowed to pressures and granted territorial home rule to the District. It soon became apparent that the move was not a wise one. Congress abolished the setup as a dismal failure in 1874.

We are not concerned with what the make-up of a home-rule government would be. We believe that the District of Columbia should be maintained in the historic tradition set by the Founding Fathers and we believe each Member of Congress should search his conscience before he decides to be a part of relinquishing the congressional responsibility to the city that belongs not to the 800-odd thousand District residents, but to the 180 million Americans throughout the Nation.

We believe each Congressman should ask himself whether he has the right to delegate his responsibilities to local politicians.

We have read hundreds of arguments both for and against home rule. One of the most prevalent "for" arguments states that Congressmen are too busy with national and international affairs to be bothered with the problems of the District.

We hope we will never see the day when Members of Congress are too busy to be bothered with the welfare of America's national city.

Congress and Washington are synonymous in the minds of Americans everywhere. Millions of visitors each year pilgrimage to Washington not to savor the dubious attractions of just another metropolis—they come to see and revere, to be inspired in their seat of government.

To them Washington is not the cupola on the city hall. It is the power, strength, and beauty of the Capitol dome.

We are with the residents of the District in their quest for the right to vote. But we hope Congress will not now or in the future arbitrarily pass unto others its responsibility for the conduct and preservation of our Federal City.

GAO Finds Gross Mismanagement of DOD Major Electronic and Equipment Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 I made an investigation into some of the inefficiencies involved in the multi-billion-dollar SAGE program wherein the Air Force was improperly employing an obscure proviso of law to justify a 10-year negotiated contract for services amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. As a result of that study I have become interested in various aspects of communications and related electronic supplies and equipment and their management in the Department of Defense.

On January 30, 1959, I asked the Comptroller General of the United States if it might be possible for the GAO to investigate all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the DOD and see what might be done pursuant to the McCormack amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

I am now in receipt of a report made by the GAO and a letter of transmittal from the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, wherein he indicates great losses to the taxpayers because of inefficiencies in the execution of the supply management functions affecting major electronic equipment and components.

My letter of January 30, 1959, and the Comptroller's letter of May 31, 1960, follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am in receipt of your report (B–133036) relating to examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. This and the other reports which you have furnished to me are of great value and, as you know, relate directly to the so-called McCormack amendment (sec. 3(6)) (Public Law 85–599).

I note from your letter of transmittal and from the report itself that this one Signal Supply Center has failed to properly discharge its supply-control responsibility in regard to determining requirements. As a result of this failure the Government was placed in a position of buying millions of dollars worth of unneeded stocks.

I also note on page 1 of the report itself: "We did not make an overall appraisal of the activity or its administration. Our work and the related report devote major attention to the identification of deficient areas and the corrective actions taken by the agency in those areas."

It occurs to me that the findings and conclusions of your excellent report at one supply center indicate a deficiency in the supply system itself in the Signal Corps with respect to requirements determination, procurement, overall inspection and review, and inventory control methods and procedures.

Nor can I help but wonder as to the adequacy of the overall Department of Defense supply-demand control system. For example, your report indicates a failure at the one Signal Supply Center in the supply management function involving one item—dry batteries. What is the situation with respect to dry batteries within the Department of Defense? Does anyone relate overall inventory with requirements before procurements are made? Is there concurrent buying and selling?

I am enclosing for your use a copy of the Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report issued by the House Government Operations Committee. In analyzing the inventories in the supply systems of the Department of Defense it is noted that communications and signal equipment total hundreds of millions of dollars. It is to be noted also from the distribution of the reported stocks that a large percentage falls into categories that are either designated as being excessive or could reasonably be so considered. Also that each of the major services carries similar categories of stocks which undoubtedly include identical items.

The McCormack amendment to which I referred earlier reads as follows:

"(6) Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function' within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof."

Would it be possible for your agency to etxend the scope of its investigation to all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense? This would mean a study as to the adequacy of the requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock, and disposal of excess or surplus property.

I should also appreciate recommendations which you may be able to make for improvement of supply management across the board in the Department of Defense as contemplated by the legislation to which I refer.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 31, 1960.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In view of your expressed interest in electronics supply management, we are inclosing a copy of our report to the Congress on review of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense.

Our review disclosed that inadequate coordination of electronics supply management activities among and between the military departments is resulting in significant additional costs to the Government and is

adversely affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of supply operations. Unnecessary purchases and inadequate supply support are resulting from the failure to consider and obtain needed items available and in long supply in other services; excessive costs and inefficient supply support are resulting from the failure to coordinate the various repair and overhaul activities of each service; and there is a costly duplication and overlap of electronic-supply management functions and organizations.

We identified major electronic equipment and components valued at about $20 million which were required by the individual services to satisfy current needs and were available for transfer from the other services. We appraised appropriate officials, and as a result transfers of over $16 million were initiated or accomplished. These transfers resulted in the cancellation or suspension of procurement actions valued in excess of $3 million.

Our review disclosed that electronic equipment valued at over $2.5 million was being, or was programed to be, repaired unnecessarily at estimated costs exceeding $680,000, when usuable items were available and in long supply in the other services. We also noted that the services were not considered maintenance facilities and maintenance personnel, not being fully utilized in the other services, to overcome their repair backlogs.

We also found that unnecessary administrative costs are being incurred because there are six independent organizations performing the same or similar stock-management functions. Combining of the organizations and functions could be expected to effect significant reductions in the present administrative costs which exceed $25 million annually.

The existence of these deficiencies indicates that present efforts by the Department of Defense to coordinate electronic supply activities of the individual military services are inadequate. Accordingly, we are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that consideration be given to assigning the management of electronic supplies to an organization within the Department of Defense that will be given the necessary authority and responsibility to centrally manage all electronic equipment and supplies. The responsibilities and authorities assigned to the organization managing electronics should include (1) authority to monitor the entry of new equipment into the supply system, (2) responsibility for reviewing, coordinating, and consolidating requirements, (3) responsibility for all procurement, (4) responsibility for determining the depth and range of initial supporting spare parts for new items, (5) ownership of all wholesale stocks including mobilization and production reserve stocks, (6) control and management of maintenance programs, (7) storing and distributing supplies and equipment, and (8) disposing of materiel excess to the needs of the Department of Defense.

In commenting on our findings, the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) advised us in a letter dated April 29, 1960, that a study of the management of electrical/electronic materiel had been initiated in January 1960. He stated that it would be premature and inappropriate to comment on our recommendation for centralizing the management of electronic supplies until the results of the study, scheduled for completion in November 1960, are known.

In view of the significant potential for increasing the utilization of electronic supplies and equipment on hand within the Department of Defense as demonstrated by the results of our review, and in view of the extended period of time which will elapse until the results of the Department of Defense study are determined and corrective action is taken, we are suggesting to the Secretary of Defense that immediate interim measures be taken to obtain maximum utilization of electronic materiel under existing conditions. This course of action could be in the form of establishing a temporary staff within the Department of Defense to monitor electronic supply actions of each service and direct interservice transfers where appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Ninety-third Annual Memorial Day Exercises, May 30, 1960, Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 30, 1960, the 93d annual Memorial Day exercises were conducted at the Antietam National Cemetery, Sharpsburg, Md. This annual event is unique in Maryland and possibly in the United States. The formal program is preceded by a parade of civic, fraternal, patriotic, and military units. Numerous bands participate. An airdrop of flowers is made over the cemetery. The spirit of the occasion is in keeping with the old fashioned but ever new purpose of Memorial Day.

The Antietam National Cemetery was created by an act of the Maryland General Assembly in 1865. It was dedicated on September 17, 1867, the fifth anniversary of the battle of Antietam. Consisting of 11.35 acres, the cemetery is located within the confines of the Antietam National Battlefield Site. On March 13, 1878, Maryland ceded the cemetery to the Federal Government. It is the final resting place of 4,773 Union troops who fought in the Battles of Antietam and South Mountain. Of this total number, 1,800 are listed as unknown.

Servicemen who fought in the Spanish American War, World Wars I and II, and the Korean war have their graves in the cemetery. The last burial took place in 1953.

In keeping with the spirit and purpose of Memorial Day, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of John A. Matthews, commander, American Legion, Department of Maryland, presented during the exercises Memorial Day, 1960:

My fellow Americans, today is a day of reverent memories.

On this occasion we once again pay tribute to the valiant American dead who gave their lives in the defense of freedom and democracy. On this, the 30th day of May, as nature strives to bring to life all sleeping things, we gather to pay homage of respect and love to our honored dead, resting in cemeteries here at home and overseas in foreign lands.

It is not a sudden impulse of sentiment that prompts us to bow our heads in prayerful reverence. We do so because we, as a free people, wish to recall and honor the legacy of freedom and equality of opportunity bequeathed to us by those who gave their lives for freedom.

With deep gratitude and humility, we recognize the sacrifices of these men and women and the sacrifices of their families. It is fitting that we set aside this day to decorate with flags and flowers the graves of our dead comrades and of our families and friends. The placing of spring flowers and the rites being observed here today bear evidence of our respect and love for them.

We, the living, cannot exist entirely in the present. From time to time it is appropriate that we view the various aspects of our country's history, recall the unselfish patriotism of our men-in-arms, and consider the sacrifices they made to make our Nation great.

For in the pages of history we find the spiritual wealth of our Nation, and from the past we inherit our national traditions, our American heritage, our love of God and country.

The birth of Memorial Day came about at the close of the Civil War in 1866 in the small town of Columbus, Miss. The war's end brought no joy to this small town, which had stood in the path of many bloody campaigns of the Civil War.

Of the hundreds of men who marched away from Columbus, only a few had returned. The town's cemetery held hundreds of Confederate soldiers, as well as some 40 men who had worn the Blue. The women of Columbus, grieving for their dead, decorated with flowers the graves of their loved ones. In a spirit of generosity, they also placed flowers on the bare and forlorn graves of the Union soldiers buried there. The idea of a day of memorial caught the public imagination and spread from town to town.

In May 1868, Gen. John A. Logan, Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued an official order that every post of the GAR hold suitable exercises and decorate the graves of their dead comrades.

In part, General Logan's proclamation read:

"The 30th of May, 1868, is designated for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country. We should guard their graves with sacred vigilance. Let no wanton foot tread rudely on such hallowed grounds. Let no vandalism of avarice or neglect, no ravages of time, testify to the present or to the coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided Republic.

"If other eyes grow dull and other hands slack, and other hearts cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well as long as the light and warmth of life remains to us.

"Let us then at the time appointed, gather around their sacred remains and garland the passionless mounds above them with the choicest flowers of springtime."

Nearly a century after that first Memorial Day, we are stirred by much the same feelings expressed by General Logan. Once again we are reminded of our heroic dead who have emblazoned the pages of history with such names as Valley Forge, the Battle of New Orleans, of the Alamo and Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, of the Marne and the Argonne, of Bataan, Corregidor, and Iwo Jima, of Porkchop Hill, and Heartbreak Ridge.

And, too, it is not easy to forget December 7, 1941, when Pearl Harbor was attacked and our Pacific Fleet crippled. On that day we should have learned the cruel lesson of unpreparedness. Battleships, light cruisers and destroyers were sunk and damaged. But of much greater importance, 2,117 lives were lost on that day.

THE COST OF WAR IN HUMAN SACRIFICE IS STAGGERING

Battle and nonbattle deaths during World War I claimed over 116,000 lives. The figures become even more staggering when we

look at World War II. Battle deaths alone totaled more than 292,000, while deaths from other causes almost equaled the combined total of World War I.

More than 21,000 white crosses fill 50 acres in the U.S. Military Cemetery at Margraten, Holland. Row upon row, each cross marking the final resting place of an American soldier.

Today, as we once again pay tribute to our war dead, we wonder if we have come very close to the goals for which they gave their lives. Scarcely a day passes that we do not read in our newspapers or see on television of the strife in other nations—of masses of people who have not tasted the benefits of freedom and of their struggle to break the chains that keep them in bondage.

The dangers which confront our Nation and the world today are massive. The problems complex and trying. Our theory of democracy is being challenged in a cold war with communism, a designed plan for world revolution that would strip man of his belief in God.

In his book, "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover warns us that today, "Communism is the major menace of our time and threatens the very existence of our Western civilization." Mr. Hoover continues: "I have deep faith in the American people and in our American way of life. But I know what communism could do to us. Not because it is stronger than we are; it is not. Not because it has something better to offer; it has not. But we may not learn until it is too late to recognize who the Communists are, what they are doing and what we ourselves, therefore, must do to defeat them."

Much indisputable evidence has been presented to the world and to the American people, warning us of the great dangers of communism. But there seems to be complete apathy on the part of most Americans, on this subversive "ism" which threatens and gnaws away at the very foundation of the free world.

It is timely, in this period of dismal uncertainty, that we pause to take stock of ourselves. We should decide now whether we are on the right track and headed in the right direction—or just racing down a blind alley.

The cause of freedom is never won completely, and the course of freedom has never been a steady or smooth one. Since the beginning of our Nation, the course has been rugged.

With each new dawn the flag must be raised.

Those whose memories we keep green each Memorial Day, raised Old Glory and kept it flying during the dark days of war. It remains for us the living to guarantee that the cause for which they gave their lives shall not be forgotten, that the very cornerstone of our way of life—liberty, human dignity and respect for the rights of our fellowmen—shall continue firm.

Once again, Memorial Day services are being reenacted in thousands of cemeteries throughout our land where men and women of many wars lie silent.

On this day, the American Legion pays solmn and grateful tribute to the memory of those who sacrificed everything in order that our Government and its blessings • • • and our many freedoms shall be perpetuated.

Over the silent chambers of these honored dead we wreathe garland of flowers, symbols of our love and devotion, sacred testimony that their memory lives within our hearts, our pledge that the Nation for which they fought died, shall always live.

Even before the first Memorial Day was observed, an American of towering stature gave to the Nation the finest expression of its meaning and its purpose. May these words of the tragic Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg be etched in our minds and hearts:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have thus far so nobly carried on. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion."

The Free World in the World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at Windsor, Ontario, Canada, Louis G. Feldmann, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States had the honor of addressing members of the Canadian Legion at the 25th annual convention of that great organization of war veteran sons of our friendly neighbor and ally to the north.

During the course of his remarks, the leader of the more than 1,300,000-member VFW, who recently completed a 10-week, 21-nation, round-the-world goodwill mission under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and President Eisenhower's people-to-people program, pointed out some significant facts to the present world crisis due to Communist Party Chairman Khrushchev's duplicity and what the free world should do to retain the friendship of the more than 700 million still free Asian peoples.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of VFW Commander in Chief Feldmann to the Canadian Legion on June 1, 1960:

ADDRESS OF LOUIS G. FELDMAN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, THE CANADIAN LEGION, WINDSOR, CANADA, JUNE 1, 1960

Comrades, it is good to be in Canada; to have the honor of being the guest of war veterans of your great Commonwealth of vast forests, of towering snow-clad mountains, and of plains that meet the sky; of deep and cascading rivers and blue, mirror-lakes; of enormous industry and abundant agriculture, in a land from sea to sea populated by some of the most hospitable people on earth.

If I had not seen your beautiful national emblem that I salute in reverence for what it symbolizes to you and to me, it would be difficult indeed to be aware that I had crossed an unguarded, invisible frontier.

Undeniably, we have many differences of opinion and beliefs. We are dissimilar in many respects. Yet, paradoxically, we are quite similar. We live in friendship by design, in sincere mutual admiration and understanding that does not exist between other people under flags of different nationalities.

How happy would be the world's people if they would live as do we Canadians and Americans; peaceably instead of contentiously; friendly instead of acrimoniously, and neighborly instead of belligerently. We live as we do because we know this is the correct way to live in the sight of our fellow men and in the universal eyes of God.

Your comrades in the United States, the more than 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, have not, or ever will forget the sacrifices of Canadians, or Canada's great role in two World Wars and in Korea. Many comrades of the Canadian Legion remember Americans beside them in the lines, in your ships, and in your aircraft formations.

Canadian aptitudes and fearless airmanship made your country a training center for airmen of all the Commonwealths in World War II. Hundreds of these intrepid young men emulated your incomparable ace of World War I, Billy Bishop, whom I am sure now flies the best aircraft in heaven.

Your navy is a working navy, instead of a glamorous service. Your brave officers and men helped save the free world from tragic disaster by distinguishing themselves in the hard, wet, dirty, antisubmarine warfare and convoy duty.

In peacetime we are each other's best customers. Our trade volume in dollars is greater than that of all Western Europe and more than that with all Latin America. It may come as a surprise to many, but Chicago's trade alone with Canada is equal to that of all West Germany with Canada.

What is equally surprising to many is the fact that Canada has an elaborate mutual aid program with foreign countries. On a population basis, with Canada having by census only a 10th of the population of the United States, your program is 16 percent greater than the U.S.'s foreign aid program. You are to be commended for aiding under the Colombo plan; helping your West Indies trading patrners, and for your enterprise with the emerging, new nations of Africa.

You are experiencing a natural population growth that attests to your youth, vitality, and the strength of your great Commonwealth.

We saw you accept by selective processes 2 million immigrants since World War II, and take to your nation's bosom a great number of Hungarian victims of Communist hatred of human freedom.

Americans learned much from Canada's pioneering all other nations in the care of veterans through your civil reestablishment program following World War I. We admire your generous veterans educational program.

You also have another distinction: That of being the only nation whose units in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are professional soldiers. By that I mean, all are volunteers.

Because of the enormous importance of NATO in our freedom, we must exert our energies toward all-embracing land, sea and airpower, particularly now since NATO was one of the prime targets of the Communist Party's chairman Khrushchev. He would like to see this free world shield weakened and then disintegrate. We now know how protective NATO is because of Khrushchev's determination to destroy it.

Recently, the Khrushchev of consummate deceit who poses as a good family man; who countenances the destruction of all religions and who tried to deceive the vast majority of our people, who are religious, by piously imploring: "As God is my witness, my hands are clean and my heart is pure." Pilate, too, after the crucifixion, washed his hands and protested they were clean. How hypocritical can even a deceitful man be?

This is the same Khrushchev who helped make possible the genocide in Tibet; who blithely goes from capital to capital threatening war and simultaneously offering his peculiar brand of peace.

Kremlin leaders with Khrushchev in the forefront, look into a dormant volcano's crater; bend over, shout a torrent of Herculean vituperation into the abyss against the

West, particularly the United States; listen to the echo of their defiant Promethean speeches and are obviously pleased by their association with Mars based on their supposed Atlas strength. They commit these villifying acts against persons and nations who, under normal conditions would be their friends. Then, when the venomous traducers again meet the maligned, act as though nothing abnormal transpired to disfigure the friendship.

This is the hypocrisy of Khrushchev in trying to frighten the free world into surrender without a struggle. He reminds us of another uncontrollable national leader who destroyed himself in his bomb shelter.

So long as we war veterans have strength and breath we shall not give up our heritage of freedom to the international conspiracy that was shocked by a single plane over the Soviet Union while they have thousands of spies on the ground, in our governmental offices and defense plants. The Communists have produced their electronic Trojan Horse in the transmitter-gift to the American Embassy at Moscow, concealed in a carved great seal of the United States.

The former wide gap between the Soviet Union's vaunted missile lead is rapidly closing and with it the Communist's opportunity to attack us without warning is disappearing. The 9,000-mile missile shot from Cape Canaveral to south of the Cape of Good Hope should give the Communists pause.

Within a short time, I am told, many American vehicles will be in the skies, capable of detecting the launching of a missile anywhere. In addition, we of the free world will also have fantastic cameras in orbit that will photograph clearly missile sites. Instead of the present 15-minute warning period provided by the Midas satellites that will detect by infrared sensors a missile engine's heat waves, we will also soon have the Samos satellite to photograph any single missile or concentration of missiles on the ground.

This will give us on this side of the Atlantic and Pacific 30-minutes warning time to retaliate. England and France will also have a doubled warning period.

Thus, the initial advantage of the Soviet Union that devotes virtually its entire scientific strength and industrial plant to war against the free world will have been lost.

Instead of Khrushchev driving a wedge between the free world partners in defense, I am sure that consultation between Canada and the United States on the official level has never been greater. There is the frankest kind of diplomatic exchanges completely devoid of deceit and deception; unmarked by duplicity, unquestioned integrity, and certainly none of the violence and ill manners that marked the recent unpleasant events at Paris.

There, the free world stood in solid unity in the highest tradition of freemen threatened. We learned a lesson and I feel certain we will be less anxious to sit at a summit meeting without previous absolute guarantees that real peace, instead of a false peace, is possible.

In the meanwhile, let us get on with the greater business of assuring ourselves of the kind of peace we desire. Let us use every honorable means to keep on our side the 700 million free peoples of south and southeast Asia.

It is distressing to contemplate how Communists have succeeded in transforming and destroying the Western meaning of democracy; republic, freedom and equality, and turned them to their advantage.

The feeling is equally deep when we remind ourselves that we in North America, were first to translate all these noble words into the electrifying hope of mankind that would gratify the slumbering Greeks and Romans who strove to give positive meaning to the dignity of man that is totally ignored by the Communists.

We cannot come in second in this grim race to capture the domestic revolutions now in progress in south and southeast Asia. There will be no second.

We disagree with those who say we are in Asia on borrowed time. We dispute claims the area is lost to democracy. We violently disagree with those who say we lost it by default. This is the propaganda Communists want us to believe.

It is, however, undeniable that with the clock running out, we are locked in a titanic struggle for the more than 700 million still free Asian peoples who can change the earth's face politically and economically, if they fall victims of communism.

The same belief holds true with respect to the millions of people in the Middle East. These nations are young, vigorous, serious, and proud. They have every human right to be proud and free.

All these people, those in south and southeast Asia and in the Middle East, want to be and will be and remain our friends if we are their friends; if we prove we share sympathetically their interests, hopes, and aspirations, and will continue to help them toward these goals which are humanity's right.

We are not prepared to admit we are poor salesmen of ideas. Our history proves otherwise. But it is evident we have an anti-Communist selling job to do in those parts of the world.

We must convince these peoples we genuinely desire to help them and prove the Communists are not their friends.

We must prove we have the best political and economic product to sell and that the Communists do not.

We must prove to them we really have freedom and an economic paradise in the bargain, that is possible for them to achieve, and that the Communists do not.

We must prove all our arguments in freedom's name are invincible and that the Communists are not.

We as war veterans can be enormously helpful in fulfilling our destiny by fighting, unscrupulously if necessary, this evil of communism we can see; that we can feel, can reach, and can destroy.

There was no need for us to win two world wars and the battles of Korea, if we are to lose the peace. We cannot forget we owe allegiance to the cause of our comrades who were killed in World War I; or ignore our solemn obligation to our fathers and brothers who died for freedom's sake in World War II; or deny our unpayable debt to the Canadian and American youth who perished from this earth in Korea. We cannot abandon the memory of our comrades; we must serve them in their silence as faithfully as they served to protect our freedoms. This is our duty to them and to ourselves in this time of crisis.

Our countries have an obligation solemnly engrossed in the Manila Pact and the Southeast Asia Collective Defensive Treaty, and the Colombo Plan. These are instruments of trust and reliance we will honor.

But, should these people's governments perish, we too will be in grave jeopardy. Not by arms, for we have the strength and the courage and the indomitable will to win. But, we can lose through economic pressures forced upon them by our common enemy.

Docile as they are and possessing friendly innocence, some peoples in south and southeast Asia and the Middle East, are easy victims of communism. Their poverty is appalling. How they exist in squalor tests the imagination. Their sickness and disease are constant scourges. They are hungry from morning until night, and again the following morning and the next. Their minds become twisted by hunger. They wonder if their distress will continue forever.

Despite their pathetic condition they trust the free world and look upon us to come to their aid with every possible means before they are compelled by their circumstances to accept the only alternative and vanish beyond rescue.

We war veterans, members of the Canadian Legion and of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, cannot be insensible to the fact that, as that great Englishman and political benefactor of my own country, Edmund Burke, said, "Evil will triumph if good men do nothing."

With Canada our steadfast ally and trusted friend at our side, the free world will predominate in this cold war over the evil forces of communism and all of us can go forward in peace together.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, two analyses by the U.S. Employment Service throw light on the problem of obtaining equal employment opportunities for workers over 40. The first, entitled "Why Do Older Workers Have Job Search Problems?" reads as follows:

WHY DO OLDER WORKERS HAVE JOB SEARCH PROBLEMS?

Mature employees are an important part of our work force and their contribution to our expanding economy is recognized. If they become unemployed, their skill and judgment do not evaporate. The facts, just listed, about middle-aged and older jobseekers point to their being desirable candidates for job openings. Yet, the individual older worker has difficulty in getting another job. Why?

1. EMPLOYERS CLING TO INVALID ASSUMPTIONS

Some employers allege that older persons lack physical stamina and are less productive than the other workers. Some generalize that older jobseekers are inflexible, that they cannot learn new tasks, that they will not fit in with younger employees, and that they will not consider work at a lower skill level or at a lower pay rate. Other employers assume that older persons are absent from work more and that they are accident prone.

2. HIRING POLICIES PENALIZE THE OLDER JOBSEEKER

Restrictive physical examinations bar many able-bodied older jobseekers. Since some employers assign their aging employees to lighter jobs, they maintain that they cannot hire older persons. Higher pension and insurance costs are cited by other employers as their reasons for maximum age limits on new hires. Long seniority with one employer may hurt an older jobseeker who needs to look for another position. Some employers assume that younger persons must be hired so that they can be trained to assume greater and greater responsibilities and can be promoted to better jobs.

3. OLDER WORKERS ARE DISPLACED ALONG WITH OLD MACHINES

New processes and new machines often affect the number of workers and the type of skills required by an industry. Older employees are laid off rather than being trained

for the newer processes. If a plant or whole industries shift to other localities, older employees who may not be invited to transfer are left in areas with little need for their skills. To magnify their problems they are labeled as miners, as textile workers, or as steam locomotive workers, and are not considered for other types of job openings.

4. THE COMMUNITY CONSIDERS HIM A WELFARE PROBLEM

Although the community is vaguely aware that a problem exists and that something should be done about it, there is a disproportionate emphasis on the social aspects of the older worker's problems. Unless persons are individually involved, there is a belief that there is no real problem, that a good worker can always find a job.

The second USES analysis under title "Why Are We So Concerned About the Older Worker" brings out these answers:

WHY ARE WE SO CONCERNED ABOUT THE OLDER WORKER?

We must be concerned with the problems faced by the older worker, for his sake, for the sake of the economy as a whole, and in our own self-interest. The plight of the person "too old" for current job openings and too young to retire is one we cannot afford to ignore.

1. THE OLDER WORKER HAS MORE TROUBLE IN GETTING A JOB

A glance at any "help wanted" column will show that the mature jobseeker is having problems. A study of local office job orders reveals that generally more than half of all job openings specify upper-age restrictions. About a fifth of the orders specify 35 years of age or under, and twice as many list age limits at 45 or under. Local office placements for older applicants reflect these restrictions, since they represent only about a fifth of all placements, while older persons represent about one-third of all applicants. Age barriers on new hires lead to a higher rate of unemployment for jobseekers age 45 and over than for those in the 25–44 age group and also to longer average duration of unemployment. After age 55, the problem of finding a job intensifies and becomes severe after 65.

2. POPULATION AND LABOR FORCE TRENDS INDICATE THAT THERE WILL BE MORE OLDER WORKERS

People are living longer, and longevity will increase with medical advances in early diagnosis, and treatment of chronic diseases common in middleaged and later life. The population 45 and over is increasing more rapidly than total population. For example, during the first half of the century, total population doubled but the number 45 to 64 tripled, and the number 65 and over quadrupled. This growth in our older population is expected to continue during the next two decades at a rate double that for the 25–44 group. Our major population increases will be in the older and younger groups. The applicant load in our local officers will reflect this shift in our potential labor force. Not only will more jobs be needed every year, but age restrictions in hiring will need to be modified to keep pace with our increasing population.

3. OUR EXPANDING ECONOMY WILL REQUIRE MORE WORKERS

If we assume that our population and the demand for goods and services will continue to grow at a rate comparable to that in the past, our gross national product will have to increase from $391 billion in 1955 to $560 billion in 1965 to provide for our 25 million more people. Hours of work will probably continue to be reduced gradually as well. This means that we will need 10 million more workers by 1965 to keep pace with the demand for goods and services. The 25–44 age group can be counted upon for only a nominal increase, and the younger group must be encouraged to get as much education and training as possible. More than half of the labor force increase will have to come from the 45 and over age group.

In order to face up to the growing problem of the older jobseeker, first of all we must have knowledge of the extent of the problem locally and of the qualifications and attributes of the older jobseekers. What barriers are older applicants meeting in the local labor market? For which skills among older jobseeker is there little or no demand among local employers and why? What other potentials and qualifications do these applicants have? How can these skills and potentials be adapted to local needs?

Armed with knowledge of the extent of the problem, the qualifications and favorable attributes of older workers, and the industrial and labor situation in the community, we can effectively employ techniques developed to overcome employer objections and to facilitate the employment of older applicants.

She Fought Her Way Back to Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following article which appeared in the May 29, 1960, issue of Parade magazine, written by Sid Ross. It is the inspiring story of a courageous mother residing in my congressional district who is living evidence of what good results are being realized from rehabilitation centers.

We in Peoria are exceptionally proud of the work being carried on by the Forest Park Home. The Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation is supported by the Forest Park Foundation, run by local Peorians who, as Sid Ross says, "have allowed nothing to prevent their dream of a model rehab center from becoming a reality."

The article follows:

SHE FOUGHT HER WAY BACK TO HEALTH

(By Sid Ross)

PEORIA, ILL.—A little more than a year ago, Margaret Duffield, 33, of nearby Ladd, suffered a paralyzing stroke. Had she been like thousands of stroke victims before her, life afterwards would have been a creeping, almost meaningless existence.

But today Margaret Duffield is busily caring for her husband and four children. Helped by a modern medical wonder, she has finally transformed pain and anguish into happiness and satisfaction.

In recording her case for almost 2 years, Parade has charted the exciting story of modern rehabilitation — "come-back-to-life care," it might be called—which has swept the United States since the end of World War II.

Today, hundreds of thousands of Americans from infancy to age 100, suffering from heart trouble, arthritis, injuries, polio, and a dozen and one other disorders, are being helped to live once again by treatment in the Nation's "rehab" facilities.

In October, 1958, after giving birth to her fourth son, Mrs. Duffield suffered a stroke, a rare aftermath resulting from a blood clot or a burst blood vessel in the brain.

After emerging from a month-long period of coma, she was admitted to the Forest Park Home, where physiotherapy was begun in the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation here in Peoria. Examination showed she could hardly talk or hear. Paralyzed on her right side, she teetered at the edge of life.

Under the direction of the attending physician and the physical medicine specialist, her rehabilitation program swung into action. This included speech therapy, braces to correct deformity, massages and exercises to prevent muscle tightness—all this before Mrs. Duffield would try to walk again.

The institute is able to provide such intensive therapy because of the all-out support it receives from a unique local philanthropy, the Forest Park Foundation. This is run by local Peorians who have allowed nothing to prevent their dream of a model rehab center from becoming a reality.

HER FIRST STEP

On the day Mrs. Duffield took her first step, Parade was on hand.

"I was quite frightened," she admits candidly. "I was afraid of being hurt. But I guess deep down I never gave up—and I won't ever."

It did hurt when she tried to walk, and there were tears. But she kept at it tenaciously, doggedly.

As she gained confidence and stamina, her activities were increased. There was her wheelchair, with a lapboard to keep her in an erect sitting position, splints on her right hand and leg. Then she teeter-tottered on a tilt table to stimulate reflexes. Every day, over and over, there were exercises, baths, little tasks to perform to reeducate the muscles on her right side so they might work again. And there were little tasks for her left hand—combing hair, eating, drawing—to get it accustomed to added duties.

Progress was slow but sure, as often is the case in rehab. And perseverance and drive won out for Margaret Duffield.

Since last June she has been at home with her machinist husband, Lloyd, and their four youngsters. Mrs. Duffield still has some disability on her right side but she can do her own housework, cook, make beds, dust, feed the baby and fix dinner. For some of these chores, she needs help.

Gradually strength is returning to her right side although at times she still uses her wheelchair and arm and leg braces.

But more important, Margaret Duffield is at home with her loved ones, performing many tasks of a wife and mother.

She returns periodically to the Institute for checkups. "I look forward to continued improvement," she says, "although I don't think I'll ever be perfectly well.

"So I'll learn to live with this thing. There's lots to live for."

From a point close to death to renewed hope and vigor—that is the story of rehabilitation in America today. And it is Margaret Duffield's story, too.

Fourth Year Allocation to States Under H.R. 10128

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, the House passed H.R. 10128, a bill authorizing Federal assistance to the States for school construction.

During the course of House action, the bill was amended to extend its duration from 3 to 4 years.

The report from the Committee on Education and Labor, House Report No. 1426, on page 9, contains a table showing a calculation of allotments to States during the first, second, and third years of operation of the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. So that Members may have complete data on allocations to the States, I have had prepared a table giving the calculated allotments during the fourth year.

The table follows:

Allotment of $325 million under provisions of H.R. 10128 during fourth year (1963–64)

Aggregate, United States	$325,000,000
Alabama	6,208,000
Alaska	455,000
Arizona	2,470,000
Arkansas	3,120,000
California	26,910,000
Colorado	3,348,000
Connecticut	3,998,000
Delaware	845,000
District of Columbia	1,202,000
Florida	8,352,000
Georgia	7,702,000
Hawaii	1,235,000
Idaho	1,300,000
Illinois	17,128,000
Indiana	8,645,000
Iowa	4,940,000
Kansas	3,900,000
Kentucky	5,752,000
Louisiana	6,500,000
Maine	1,658,000
Maryland	5,688,000
Massachusetts	7,735,000
Michigan	15,438,000
Minnesota	6,305,000
Mississippi	4,355,000
Missouri	7,215,000
Montana	1,332,000
Nebraska	2,600,000
Nevada	552,000
New Hampshire	975,000
New Jersey	9,880,000
New Mexico	1,885,000
New York	26,325,000
North Carolina	8,970,000
North Dakota	1,268,000
Ohio	17,518,000
Oklahoma	3,868,000
Oregon	3,282,000
Pennsylvania	18,622,000
Rhode Island	1,398,000
South Carolinia	5,135,000
South Dakota	1,332,000
Tennessee	6,468,000
Texas	19,045,000
Utah	1,918,000
Vermont	650,000
Virginia	7,442,000
Washington	5,200,000
West Virginia	3,575,000
Wisconsin	7,248,000
Wyoming	650,000
American Samoa	32,000
Guam	130,000
Puerto Rico	5,232,000
Virgin Islands	65,000

Post Office Policy Reduces Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has maintained that its airlift of 4-cent letter mail—which has been extended to include other classes of mail in recent weeks—will have little or no effect on the Nation's railroads.

I submit the following information which clearly refutes that statement and shows that the removal of postal cars has caused a discontinuance of main line service in the northwestern part of this country, a condition which can be expected to occur time and time again across the country if the Congress does not stop the Post Office Department from its unauthorized extension of the airlift of mail on which air mail postage has not been paid.

Example 1. The Northern Pacific Railroad retired two trains running between Seattle and Spokane, Washington on March 31 due to the removal of postal cars. The removal of the postal revenue cut $145,000 from the receipts of these trains; thus all service on these 2-day trains was ended.

Example 2. Postal changes on the Great Northern run from Seattle, Wash., to Vancouver, British Columbia, resulted in the removal of the evening run of the famous "Internationals." The removal of mail from these runs cut revenue $90,000 a year according to Great Northern's announcement.

My bill H.R. 9488 and companion bills would put an end to this unauthorized airlift of 4-cent letter mail, and thus prevent the Post Office Department from causing the discontinuance of train service.

World Tension Worries Teenager With Dreams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a teenager, Miss Judith Webb, of Hurricane, W. Va., which was written to the editor of the Charleston Gazette, May 27, 1960:

EDITOR, THE GAZETTE.

I am a teenager and as most teenagers I deam about my future. I dream of someday going to college to study to be a journalist and I dream of getting married and rearing a family. But in the situation the world is in today it seems as though my dreams will never come true.

If the tension between Russia and the United States keeps mounting I believe we will have another war, only this one much larger than we can handle.

Don't the leaders of the various countries realize what will happen if we become involved in another war? Is it so important to prove which is the stronger and more powerful nation? Why can't we live peacefully and trust one another?

With all the atomic weapons we have today a simple click of a button could end everything. I don't want this to happen. I want to grow up and enjoy life without fear of death. But since I am young and have no voice in Government affairs all I can do is pray that God will help our countries and our leaders to realize the terrible consequences of a war.

I love my family and my friends. I love my country and my life. I want lasting freedom and lasting security to be mine always.

JUDITH WEBB.

HURRICANE.

Martin J. Gillen's Boyhood Reminiscences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the last quarterly issue of the Wisconsin Magazine of History released for the winter of 1959–60, there is included a feature story entitled "Martin J. Gillen's Boyhood Reminiscences." This historical article summarizes the life's work of one of the Nation's outstanding men who served the Government, along with statesmen like Bernard M. Baruch, during World War I.

In his later life, Martin J. Gillen was a resident of the 12th Congressional District in Michigan which I represent. His reminiscences were edited and prepared by two historical writers from this area. Dr. George S. May, a native of Ironwood, Mich., is a noted author and presently the research archivist of the Michigan Historical Commission, Lansing, Mich. Mr. Victor F. Lemmer, also of Ironwood, is a graduate of the Univertity of Notre Dame, a former associate of Martin J. Gillen, past president of the Historical Society of Michigan, and agent of the University of Notre Dame du Lac Gillen Foundation.

The sketch of Mr. Gillen's life is based on original sources collected by Mr. Lemmer over a period of years. The following is from the article which appeared in the Wisconsin Magazine of History written by Dr. George S. May:

In 1926, Martin J. Gillen, a native of Racine, Wis., set down some recollections of his boyhood years. Perhaps as never before this wealthy and astute lawyer, financial expert, and public servant must have realized how far he had come since his birth in 1872, and especially since receiving his law degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1898.

After practicing law, mostly corporation work, in Racine for 14 years, Gillen in 1912 took over management of the Mitchell Wagon, Mitchell Motor, and Racine Rubber Companies. Within 3 years he had placed these companies, representing assets worth $15 million, on their feet and returned a profit to their stockholders. In 1916 he sold the Mitchell Motor Co., and later liquidated the Mitchell Wagon Co. for New York and Chicago bankers.

With the outbreak of World War I Martin Gillen turned increasingly to work connected with the national interest. He prepared and distributed at his own expense, an industrial mobilization plan which was adopted with success by Bernard M. Baruch in 1917 as the basis for much of the program of the War Industries Board.

(NOTE.—Gillen was throughout his life a respected friend of Baruch. According to the most recent biography of Baruch, it was

Gillen who mentioned him to President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a Presidential adviser. Baruch is later quoted as telling Gillen that it would perhaps have been better if he had not done this. Margaret L. Coit, "Mr. Baruch" (New York, 1958), 487.)

When America entered the war Gillen authored a plan for local councils of defense which was adopted by communities throughout the country. In collaboration with Dr. Charles McCarthy he set up a State council of defense for Wisconsin which was copied by over three-fourths of the States. On the first liberty loan campaign in Wisconsin he was the sole speaker on a special train that stopped at 131 cities in 30 days, and he led Wisconsin to first place in its district in subscriptions during the first three loan drives.

From September 1918 to January 1, 1919, Gillen was an assistant to Baruch in the War Industries Board, and later in October 1919 became executive assistant to the Chairman of the U.S. Shipping Board, John Barton Payne, and settled contracts and claims involving some $3 billion. Subsequently Gillen was offered an appointment as Commissioner on the Board but declined because of other interests.

Returning in October 1920 to his Broadway offices in New York, Gillen's services as an adviser and consultant were in constant demand, particularly by steamship lines and such banking institutions as the National City Bank of New York and the First National Bank of New York. He continued to devote much time to governmental studies, and is credited with spurring the Commerce and Agriculture Departments to adopt new methods of gathering and publishing international economic data. After 1930 he spent more and more time on his vast wilderness estate, "Tenderfoot," on the border of northern Wisconsin and Michigan, which he turned over to Notre Dame University during his lifetime for scientific and educational purposes. Here he relaxed, supervised various construction projects on his property, and worked on the studies which occupied his interest up to his death in 1943.

A gruff, strongwilled bachelor, Martin Gillen sometimes alienated people by his tactics, but he won the undying and loyal support and friendship of many more. Typical of these acquaintances was the theatrical producer, John Golden, with whom Gillen had been associated in the Lambs Club. A decade after Gillen's death Golden wrote, "He was a kind, thoughtful, and wise gentleman. I wish I had known him better."

(NOTE.—As chairman of the club's financial committee, Gillen succeeded in removing the heavy burden of debt with which this theatrical group had been saddled.)

The following reminiscences of Martin J. Gillen, as condensed for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are reprinted from a typed copy in the possession of Victor F. Lemmer. Internal evidence indicates that Mr. Gillen wrote or dictated this sketch, which is abridged, sometime in 1926 when he was 54 years of age:

I was born on October 1, 1872, on the west shore of Lake Michigan, at Racine, Wis., and resided there until September 1918. There, good, hard winters began in November and ended about St. Patrick's Day. In the summer the heat ranged from 70° to 100°, depending on the lake breezes.

My father, Edward Gillen, was born at Chillicothe, Ohio; was three-quarters Irish and one-quarter Scotch blood. He entered the Northern Army at 17 years of age, was one of the advance guards to enter Atlanta with Sherman, was in Libby Prison for a long period. He was a marine contractor and had scows, tugs, dredges, and piledrivers working from Waukegan, Ill., on the south to St. Ignace, Mich., on the north, a range of some 900 miles, at one time or another constructing large works in every principal port on the east and west coasts of Lake Michigan.

My mother was an Irish immigrant girl who came to this country when 2 years of age, an orphan. There were 11 children; I was the fifth.

I entered at the age of 5 an Irish Catholic parochial school, where I remained for 6 years, until I was 11. During this period, all the children of our family were subject to strict but kindly discipline on the part of my mother.

During the first 6 years of my schoolwork, I was affected by a great influence. It came from Sister M. Corona of the Dominican Order and of Irish descent, in the last 2 years of these 6 years. Sister Corona compelled boys and girls to know reading, writing, the meaning of words, and mental arithmetic. At 11 years of age, when I went to the Fourth Ward School, standing on my feet at the blackboard, I could multiply, divide, subtract, and add with almost lightninglike speed.

In 1884, when 11 years of age, I went to the fourth ward public school. My mother died in December, 1884, and we had housekeepers who were not kind to us. Then a second woman came into my life, Katie Cary, an Irish school teacher and the niece of our old parish priest. She was as great a woman as Sister Corona and even a better teacher.

I have spoken of two women and now I come to my mother. Her influence was always with me and is to this day—the most just and honorable mind I ever knew.

When I entered the high school, I became well acquainted with a silent, shy, studious boy and his sister. Both were remarkable students, with brilliant minds who had behind them a pioneer mother in thought, in woman sufferage, with great force of character. She was the influence in their making. The boy was Parker Willis, who did such fine work in the creation of the Federal Reserve.

The summer vacation before I entered the high school, my father put me on as a water boy on contract work for the 10 weeks vacation. Every summer after that, including the Easter vacation, I worked on Government and municipal contract work, building wharves, piers, breakwaters, lighthouse foundations, bridges, and building docks, scows, dredges, and pile drivers. Too, for 8 weeks one summer I was cook on a tug for a crew of seven men. I worked at Waukegan, Ill., Kenosha, Racine, Milwaukee, Two Rivers, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Kewaunee, Green Bay, and Sturgeon Bay, Wis., and at St. Joe and Grand Haven, Mich. I worked as water boy, then boatman; on crosscut saw; as pile sharpener; fireman on pile driver, tug, and dredge; linesman on pile driver; winchman on pile driver; unloading limestone rock by hand, sometimes on the waterfront, other times from 1 to 4 miles out in the lake; laborer, foreman, and at last superintendent.

Thus, from the time I left the grammer school until I finished the law school at the university, I had no vacation. The money I earned during the summer vacation, my father took. He paid for my board, clothes, and allowed me $1 a week spending money. I never smoked or touched a drop of liquor until I was 28 years of age. During these 10 summer vacations, I was placed and worked with the roughest sort of men that are known and generally slept in a boarding house or in a bunk in a scow or temporary house to be able to be near my work, and lived with men one meets in the roughest place in America. Thus, mind you, was spent my vacation time for the 4 years at the high school and the 6 years at the university. It was hard, rough work and as I look back I enjoyed the work. I was known as a hustler at whatever I was doing. It gave me a fine experience with the white man's burden of daily toil and it built a strong body for my life's journey. I never regretted a single moment of it. Never do I remember of having suffered with self-pity as to my lot.

The last two summers of the years I was at the university, before I started to practice law, I largely had charge of 1,700 feet of breakwater 2 miles east of the city of Milwaukee, working in 32 feet of water with a large floating equipment employing some 300 men. We had to fight the storms there always. When sinking cribs, we started at 4 a.m. and finished at 11 p.m.

The industrial activities at Racine, during my university period, were based on 8 months' operation of the factories which generally began operations about December 1 and ran to August 1. Ninety-five percent of the people owned their own homes. Two men who visited Racine come to my mind: James E. Blaine, in his campaign. I heard him speak, and later when I graduated from the high school my graduation oration was "Reciprocity." Then I well-remember Alexander Bell displaying at the high school a rough little machine to which he attached an ordinary tin horn and producing talking from a machine.

I entered the University of Wisconsin 1 month late, in 1892, at 19 years of age. I was delayed because my father could not spare me from the contract I was on. Fortunately for me, my high school had been more or less a failure, my home life was unhappy. The hard sledging on contract work warned me that physical labor was not mind-or soul-satisfying and I started on my university work with a vengeance. I placed a little card upon my dresser on which I wrote: "Remember Sister Corona; remember Katie Cary; remember your Mother." And I started in. I was bidden to a number of fraternities, but I stayed with the nonfrat crowd. I joined "Athenae," a literary and debating society—the society from which Bob La Follette came. I was a member of it for 4 years and never missed a Friday night meeting during that period. It was the greatest single influence of my work at the university. It was run under the strictest rules and no man could join it if he belonged to a fraternity and no man could stay in it if he did not do his work. One had to be on a debate every 2 weeks. In turn, he had to be a critic, a presiding officer, and deliver an oration. There were 60 members in it and one-half the members had to perform every second week. The society met at 7 o'clock p.m. and adjourned at 12 p.m. The preparation for debate required a great deal of research work and of course it gave character and courage and vision to the men who belonged to that society. Too, it made them progressive, in the true sense of the word. You fought for your life in that society in debate and, too, no nonsense or sharp practice was permitted, for a senior sat as presiding officer and another as chairman on the jury and a senior critic reviewed the work of each debater at the close of the debate after the decision was given. These seniors were stern men. Oh, Athenae. What a jealous, knowing, Spartan mother.

In 4 years of Athenae I participated in or heard debated every public question of moment—past, present, and future—such as: the Civil War question of rights of succession versus the Union; public ownership of railroads, street railroads, electric lighting and power companies, telephone and telegraph; parcel post versus express companies; Behring Sea controversy; Monroe Doctrine; Australian ballot system; rights involved in Homestead strike; gold standard versus free silver; national divorce law; tariff in all phases; Panama Canal; war versus pacifism; socialism as a cure-all; subsidy for a mer-

chant marine; right of future generations in the natural resources of the Nation versus the right of personal discovery and occupation; taxation—inheritance and income law and tax burdens; manifest destiny of United States to seize Mexico and Canada; right of State to tax for higher education; commission form of government for municipalities; formation of State commissions to curb and check public corporations, and the like.

The magnificent university library was the storehouse for information and authority. It became our workshop.

Robert La Follette and his great battle aides, such as Francis P. McGovern and Henry Corgens, were leaders in Athenae in their day. Its alumni were scattered all over the State of Wisconsin and they were clear thinkers and forcible public speakers. The La Follette legislation and the legislative reference library came from Old Athenae. I firmly believe Athenae profoundly influenced La Follettism in Wisconsin, and thus the Nation, more than did any single factor in the reform and checking of corporate abuses in the United States, in my day. The La Follette doctrine spread west and northwest from Wisconsin and made possible Theodore Roosevelt, courageous, as a worthwhile President. La Follette knew how to dig up the data, knew how to interpret and construct it, knew how to dramatize it to the public and, too, his training as a public speaker was had wholly within Athenae's halls. Joseph E. Davies received his training as an orator there. I write the above impartially as I never belonged to Bob's party, though much he did I supported. He possessed a supreme courage. He drove straight ahead to his objective with the hammering, bulldog tenacity of a Grant. He had the Athenean method of "prepare well and then dare."

(NOTE.—Although Gillen, a longtime Republican, may have been referring here to the Progressive Party, under whose banner La Follette ran for President in 1924, it is more likely that he means that he never supported the La Follette faction of the Republican Party with which the great Wisconsin Senator was associated, at least in name, throughout the rest of his career.)

Across the hall from Athenae was its worthy rival, "Hesperia," from whence came William F. Vilas and John C. Spooner; yet in the yearly joint debate between these societies, Athenae largely won, and, too, she gave to and led Wisconsin in the great reform movement in which the progressive alumni of Hesperia did fine service. No man who came out of Athenae lacked in the spirit of service, service, service—to man and his country.

My allowance at the University of Wisconsin, including tuition and clothes, was $550 a year and I lived on it. There, too, it was a simple university life, with no distractions, excepting collegiate or literary contests. No student owned horses, and motor cars were unknown. Few of the boys had boats and a few, canoes, but no student owned a little steamer or gasoline launch. And there was no drinking or carousing among the students.

Among my professors at college who impressed were Dr. Edward A. Birge in biology, later president of the university; Prof. John C. Freeman, in poetry and prose—had been general in Civil War, Ambassador to France; Prof. Charles R. Van Hise in geology, later president of the university; Prof. William A. Scott in economics; Prof. George C. Comstock in astronomy; Prof. Frederick Jackson Turner in American history, all topped off by Charles Kendall Adams, the distinguished university president. These men were serious-minded teachers and carried their burden with high regard for the students and generally the students accepted the authority of these men. The University of Wisconsin went to its high water under their guidance. These men were our classroom professors. The students of today, in all the American colleges, are taught by subprofessors and in large classes. We had a wonderful opportunity.

My course was civic-historic and I took hygiene, biology, physiology, bacteriology, laboratory work, history, and economics. Study of hygiene and the premedical courses gave me a great fund of knowledge as to the care of health and body that has been of inestimable value to me. At 54 years of age, I can truthfully say I have never known a sick day since childhood.

My pastime was athletics. There were two great parties in the university at my time—the fraternity men on one hand and the nonfraternity on the other. With considerable pride I recall the fact that I belonged to the nonfrats, or the poor boys group and they gave me every athletic and class honor that a man could receive. In a word, they made me a leader. I ran the mile and a half mile for my college and then moved into managerial work of athletics. In turn was manager of the track team, manager of the football team, director of the Athletic Association, director of Midwinter Athletics; representative for 4 years for Wisconsin to the Western Intercollegiate Amateur Athletic Association.

(NOTE.—In the 1890's the faculties and administrations of the member universities had not yet taken over the dominant role in running the athletic affairs of the Western Conference and converted it into the high-powered "Big 10.")

In my senior year, the boys gave me the class presidency which carried with it the president's address on commencement day, farewell address to the faculty, and one of the four orators of the day, which meant three addresses during commencement week. This all came out of "Old Athenae."

Probe Spurs Highway Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the June 2 edition of the Engineering News-Record contains a very interesting and revealing article concerning the highly desirable results already being felt in the Nation's highway program as result of the investigations of the special select committee on the Federal aid highway program.

This is a magazine written expressly for the engineering trade, and it is widely circulated among engineers and public officials engaged in various public works activities.

The article points out the findings of the committee have already forced road officials to take a new look at some important administrative deficiencies, and that as result of these hearings and the facts they have divulged, the Bureau of Public Roads has begun to tighten its project controls.

It speculates further than studies underway by the American Association of State Highway Officials as result of the House committee's roads investigation will probably result in new procedures designed to protect the taxpayers' funds in a better and more efficient manner.

Under leave to include extraneous matter, I am inserting this article at this point in the RECORD in the belief that it will be of interest to the membership:

PROBE SPURS HIGHWAY REFORMS

The Blatnik committee findings have forced road officials to take a new look at some important administrative deficiencies.

BPR has already tightened its project controls; and AASHO studies now under way will probably result in new procedures.

The Bureau of Public Roads and State highway officials are busily tightening nuts and bolts in their administrative machinery.

They are well aware that the Blatnik committee is filing away fodder for hearings perhaps just as embarrassing as those that uncovered the irregularities on the Skelly Bypass in Tulsa, Okla. (ENR, May 12, p. 21).

But they are determined to correct whatever irregularities remain and to work out procedures to insure against their recurrence.

An extensive reshaping of construction contract supervision began last week when key members of the American Association of State Highway Officials met with BPR Commissioner Ellis L. Armstrong and Deputy Commissioner Frank C. Turner.

That was the third meeting of road men in recent weeks—all of them spurred by the scandals, all of them aimed at heading off new ones.

The first was held early this month at LaSalle, Ill. There AASHO Chairman David H. Stevens of Maine set up a special committee on project procedures charged with setting guidelines for insuring effective supervision of all phases of construction in road projects (ENR May 19, p. 31).

The committee is working out a system for cross checking such things as sampling and testing results, materials quantity and quality and workmanship. Five subcommittees have been organized to go into such subjects as paving type determination and documentation, grading, and minor structures, flexible pavements, rigid pavements, and channels of project supervision.

Another AASHO committee is checking into current procedures for handling right-of-way purchases.

A first draft of proposals from these AASHO task forces should be ready by the end of this month, and a final version will be ready in time for the annual AASHO meeting in Detroit in December.

If new procedures are formally adopted by the full AASHO membership BPR may well make them a part of all Federal-aid road-building procedures, just as AASHO construction standards now form the basis of BPR regulations in that area.

Meanwhile, with the Blatnik investigators breathing down their necks, state highway departments aren't waiting for these new regulations to put their own houses in order. Many have already begun overhauling their construction administration practices.

From States like Arizona, Maine, Texas, Missouri, Oregon, Virginia, and others come reports of 1 and 2-day skull sessions between road officials and their engineers on how to close loopholes.

Reviews are underway in almost all States to make sure that inspection systems which look good on paper are actually working as planned.

Typical of the sloppy administration they're trying to get at is the deterioration of the spot-checking system in one State. There, the central laboratory, which was supposed to make the spot checks, did not actually go into a project unless specifically requested to do so. Over one 10-year span the laboratory received not a single request.

As far as BPR is concerned, it just doesn't have the manpower to do the inspection job necessary for the approximately 10,000 highway projects under construction.

It has 500 area engineers spread across the country. BPR says it needs twice that number.

BPR's workload has tripled since 1956, when Congress voted the $50 billion Federal-aid highway program. Personnel to handle the program has increased only 20 percent. BPR requested 150 more men, mainly area engineers for the coming year. That was whittled to 100 in the budget request, then snipped to 50 by Congress.

That is not to say that BPR offers its lack of personnel as a blanket excuse for inadequate inspection. It sought, 3 days before the Blatnik hearings began, to tighten Federal control of the roadbuilding program with this 3-point edict to its field offices:

In addition to the presently prescribed responsibility of the division engineer or his representative to inspect material test reports during his visits to projects, he will report for the Bureau's permanent project records the findings from such reviews and any actions taken regarding the materials and workmanship being incorporated into the job. Payments will be held back on States that don't have on file, when the BRP representative makes an inspection, material test reports and other reports that show a project is being constructed according to approved plans and specifications.

Bureau inspectors must submit in writing the results of thickness, lineal, and other measurements taken during the inspection of a project. The BPR inspector will select random points for samples to be taken on project work. These samples must then be sent by the project engineer to the State central laboratory for testing with results reported to the Bureau of Public Roads' division engineer. Location of the points where samples have been ordered will be included in the inspector's reports.

Beginning this week, before the final acceptance of a project, States must take samples on a project as selected by the Bureau's division engineer. A Bureau representative will observe both the sample taking and testing. States must also certify that the project meets all governing plans and specifications, including workmanship and materials, before the Bureau will pay for the project.

Address by Lt. Gov. Wilson W. Wyatt: "A Three-Point Program for the Appalachian Region"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of May I had the privilege of inserting in the RECORD an address by the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland, on the occasion of the convening of the Governors' Conference on the Appalachian Region at Annapolis. As the Congressman from western Maryland, I am vitally concerned with the economic and social problems of our citizens residing in these mountain areas. I think this body recognized these problems and the consequent need for immediate and comprehensive Federal help by passing the area redevelopment bill. To those of us who live with this pernicious economic ailment, the President's veto was indeed an act of tragic indifference.

Lt. Gov. Wilson W. Wyatt of Kentucky delivered a clear, succinct, and meaningful address on May 20, 1960, at Whitesburg High School in Letcher County of his native State, in which he proposed a three-point program for the Appalachian region. By his remarks, the Lieutenant Governor indicates an understanding and feeling for the aspirations of the industrious and energetic citizens of the entire area. I ask permission to insert his speech in the RECORD and recommend it as must reading for Members who have more than a passing interest in the region as well as the puzzling problems of persistent hardship common to so many areas of our country.

A THREE-POINT PROGRAM FOR THE APPALACHIAN REGION

(By Lt. Gov. Wilson W. Wyatt, Whitesburg High School, Letcher County, May 20, 1960)

This is your commencement night—you have completed your course and you are commencing a new one. Here in Whitesburg, in Letcher County, in the heart of the Appalachian region, you are commencing the next phase of your career. You, and all others in this area, love the Appalachian region—its Pine Mountain, the Breaks of the Sandy, the rivers and streams, the wooded mountainsides. It is here that you would like to make your future with your family, your friends, and your loved ones. There is no area in the United States that has greater natural beauty or greater scenic attraction. With proper development this can be the mecca for millions of tourists every year. With proper development this area can boast forests among the finest in the country. With proper development woodusing industries can be brought into this area. With proper development electricity generated from the great coal deposits of this region can turn the wheels of commerce and thousands of new jobs can be created.

And, yet, realistically, we know that the problems of eastern Kentucky are great ones. But just as you are graduating tonight and commencing a new phase of life in times that are without precedent and in a world in which the population explosion, the scientific revolution, and the battle for the minds of men have combined to produce crises and opportunities which can be met only by solutions which have never been tried before, so, also, the problems of eastern Kentucky can be solved by an approach that is bold and new and practical. Let's talk for a moment about what that approach may be.

It is understandable that those who live in areas of high employment and prosperity find it difficult to comprehend the problems of depression, the pockets of poverty, which exist in certain areas of our land. But it is not understandable that these problems should be left unsolved. Just recently the depressed areas bill passed both Houses of Congress of the United States but at the White House the bill was vetoed. I share with hundreds of thousands of people in this region the deep regret that the depressed areas bill should have been vetoed by the President. The entire Appalachian region would have benefited had this bill been permitted to become law.

Instead of regretting the past and shedding a tear for what might have been, let's work for and look to the future—the immediate future—to see what still may be. I am convinced that the unprecedented problems of the Appalachian region can be met successfully only by an unprecedented solution. There is no area in the country where the people hold their heads higher in self-respect or will work any harder to help themselves and meet their own problems. But there are fundamental things that should be done and must be done to make it possible for the people of the Appalachian region to improve their lot and make their own way. Governor Combs and I are anxious to do everything we can to help create the basis for new opportunity and a new economy in eastern Kentucky.

When I talk of this area I am referring to the entire Appalachian region which includes part of southern Pennsylvania, the western part of Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland, and the eastern area of North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The economic problem of the area may vary in degree but the causes are the same and the result is the same. And the cause is one for which there is a solution. It ill becomes the richest nation of the world to suffer so large an area, with so great a population—people of rugged pride and native ability—to continue to be looked upon as a problem area when there are solutions which we can plainly afford. I would restate that phrase—there are solutions which we can not afford to be without.

Back in the acute depression days, relief funds were spent at the rate of $30 million a year in the valley of the Big Sandy, and in lesser sums for a further period. More than $100 million was spent as handouts because of the depressed conditions. At that time this sum of money would have been sufficient to improve and develop the Big Sandy River.

Or, let's take another approach. Last year, the year 1959, the State of Kentucky and the Federal Government together spent more than $80 million in Federal and State subsistence and in unemployment compensation payments to Kentuckians. A disproportionately large share of this huge sum was spent in eastern Kentucky.

The last thing wanted in eastern Kentucky, and this I know from traveling to every county seat in the entire region—not once but many times—the last thing wanted in eastern Kentucky is a handout. What eastern Kentucky wants, and what all the Appalachian region wants, is the chance to be self-sufficient; the chance to help itself; the chance to be self-reliant.

On the occasion of this commencement, let me suggest the commencement of an entirely new program—one that is bold, one that is simple, one that is practical. It is based on the fundamental fact that in the Appalachian region the roads are bad and the creeks and rivers are unstable. It contains three points:

1. Roads: I have said many times that the greatest need of eastern Kentucky could be stated in one syllable—roads. The standard formula for determining Federal assistance in the building of roads is the traffic count. The money is spent where the traffic is heaviest and where the count is greatest. But that means that in the Appalachian region where there are almost no major roads, there can be no major traffic. It seems clear enough to me that you cannot count the automobiles on roads that don't exist. Or, more accurately, on roads that do not invite modern traffic. Therefore, since major roads have not been built, interstate highways, under the present formula, cannot be built. It is a downward spiral. For lack of roads in the past and at present, it is impossible to get proper Federal participation in building roads for the future. I do not quarrel with the standard formula for determining Federal participation, with this exception: a constructive approach to the depressed areas of the Appalachian region would be to restate the formula for Federal

participation so as to make the 9-to-1 matching Federal funds available for construction of major highways through the Appalachian region of America. This would require no new program, no new agency, no relief. It would require merely the realistic recognition of the simple fact that this area of the United States is entitled to a constructive solution. The railroads received special subsidies to help them span the continent; the airlines receive special subsidies to help create the great modern network of transportation by air; the steamship lines have received and still receive subsidies in order that we can sail the oceans. The principle of special treatment of special problems in order to bring about special results is nothing new in this country. Let's take that proven method and apply it as a constructive solution in the Appalachian region. Governor Combs has already announced—and before the fall the dirt will fly—a major road from central Kentucky to Whitesburg and to Pikeville. But this road, and other roads like it, could be greatly accelerated if full 9-to-1 matching funds were available from the Federal Government. And they should be.

2. Water: A second fundamental need for eastern Kentucky—and for the entire Appalachian region—is the control of water—the elimination of flash floods through the construction of reservoirs and flood impoundments, and the damming of the streams in order to make navigation possible. Eastern Kentucky has plenty of water if only it could be brought under control. Flash floods prevent many new employers from bringing their businesses to the region. At the same time that flash floods could be controlled through impoundment, industrial water and vacation meccas would be made available, but again a Federal formula stands in the way. Impoundments can be built and dams can be constructed provided something known as the "economic feasibility test" is adequately met. Once again, I do not quarrel with the justness and propriety of the formula for all other national purposes. It is a just one and a sound one. What I suggest as a commencement of a new approach to the problems—and let me say also, to the opportunities—of eastern Kentucky, is that in the Appalachian region—and any other such depressed region in the country—there should be applied a special rule of feasibility that will recognize the special problem. Until the water of this region is brought under control the richness of the region cannot be reflected in a formula of economic feasibility. Again we have the downward spiral. The values are not there because the water is not under control; and since the water is not under control, the values do not Appalachian region, impoundments could be built that would make this area one of the great tourist meccas of the world, and industrial water would be provided for great economic development. Here, again, is a constructive approach to spending dollars for a solution rather than for relief.

3. Special work projects: People in prosperous areas—and that means people in most areas of the United States—prefer not to think back on the times of the depression when the country found it not only necessary, but desirable, to have special work projects in order to give employment rather than relief to self-respecting people. Let us recognize frankly that in the Appalachian region we have just as great a need today for special work projects as the country had need for them generally during the period of the depression. As a matter of fact, these special work projects could, to a very large extent, be a definite part of the special Federal program for roads and the special Federal program for water impoundment and stream improvement. In addition, they could include the worthwhile projects of taking the silt from streams, stopping erosion, and reforesting great areas. This would be work which would maintain the self-respect of the individuals, contribute to the wealth of the region, and help bring about the fundamental change that would open a new future for eastern Kentucky and the rest of the Appalachian region.

This three-point program would be a constructive program. It would start at once to bring about the solution. It would lay the foundation for the great and promising long-range development of the area.

Kentucky has two Senators and eight Congressmen. Seven of the Congressmen are Democrats and one is Republican. Both of the Senators are Republicans. But in the problem of the Appalachian region, there is no party line. I feel confident that Republicans and Democrats alike in the Kentucky delegation and in the delegations of the other affected States, would be willing to support a constructive program for the sound solution of what has been called a problem area. This would be a new approach—different from any of the depressed area bills which have been considered by either party. Perhaps this could be the beginning of a new joint effort for the solution of the problem and the realization of the opportunities that lie in that great area known as the Appalachian region.

To join hands in this project I invite the Senators and the Congressmen from the seven States in this region—to join hands in a great regional effort to initiate and carry forward a program that will bring not just temporary relief, but a real, long-range, and fundamental solution.

Should the Interest-Rate Ceiling Be Removed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from Tax Review entitled "Should the Interest-Rate Ceiling Be Removed?" by Charles E Walker, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Walker points out the urgent need for action by Congress to remove the statutory limitation on interest rates on long-term Government bonds.

The arbitrary ceiling, Mr. Walker says, contributes to a further shortening of a marketable debt that is already much too short in maturity; that excessive reliance on short-term issues in debt management exerts strong inflationary pressures; that the confinement of Government financing to short-term securities distort credit markets, harming consumer, small business, and farmer borrowers of short-term money; and that the interest ceiling has increased the cost to the Treasury for debt servicing by from $200 million to $400 million.

Mr. Walker warns that "the problem of the interest-rate ceiling is not a short-run transitory problem, nor should it be approached on a partisan basis. The ceiling, if not removed, can continue to obstruct debt management through many administrations in the future."

The article follows:

SHOULD THE INTEREST RATE CEILING BE REMOVED?

(By Charles E. Walker, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury)

Treasury debt management today is the weakest weapon in the Federal Government's arsenal of financial policies to promote sustainable economic growth, and the Federal debt grows shorter and shorter in maturity. The facts behind this situation are these. A 4¼-percent interest-rate ceiling on new issues of marketable Treasury bonds, established in 1918 in connection with a particular financing operation of World War I, has effectively prevented the Treasury from selling more than a token amount of long-term securities for almost a year. Through no choice of its own, the Treasury has had to rely almost completely on new issues of notes, certificates, and bills—securities that mature in 5 years or less and on which no interest rate ceiling applies.

There are four major arguments for removal of the ceiling. In the first place, forced reliance on short-term financing contributes to further shortening of a marketable debt that is already much too short in maturity. Today, almost 80 percent of the marketable debt matures within 5 years; this figure contrasts with 50 percent in 1946 and 67 percent at the end of 1952. Most of the shortening in the debt during the postwar period occurred between 1946 and the end of 1952, during which time the Treasury sold only $5.2 billion of marketable issues of more than 5 years' maturity. Since the end of 1952, $49½ billion of over 5-year securities have been marketed. But, despite these determined efforts during the past 7 years, the passage of time has moved more and more securities closer to maturity. Moreover, if the marketable debt does not change and no securities of more than 5 years' maturity are issued, the under-5-year debt will swell to 87 percent of the total by the end of 1964.

Debt-lengthening must, therefore, continue to be a high priority goal of Treasury debt management. Otherwise, the average length of the debt will grow shorter and shorter, and Treasury refunding operations will occur more frequently and in larger amounts. This will not only tend to disrupt the Government securities market, but will also complicate the flexible administration of Federal Reserve credit policy. The relentless shortening in the public debt cannot be viewed with complacency.

Progressive shortening in the maturity of the public debt has another important implication, which leads to the second major argument for removal of the ceiling. It is universally agreed the unbridled creation of new money to finance Government deficits or to pay off maturing issues would result in disastrous inflation. But apparently too few people realize that excessive reliance on short-term issues in debt management can also exert strong inflationary pressures. This is because the shorter the term of a Government security, the more like money it is. A 25-year Treasury bond is a true investment instrument, but a Government security maturing within a few days is almost the same as cash. Similarly, a security maturing within a few weeks, a few months, or even a year or two automatically turns into cash within a relatively short period of time. Thus, a large build-up in short-dated Government securities increases the inflationary potential embodied in the Government debt; holders can easily liquidate short-term securities to obtain cash for spending for goods and services, either by selling the securities or by simply letting them run off at maturity.

Federal fiscal and monetary policies have been used effectively in recent months to contain the inflationary pressures that, although sometimes dormant, are always present in a prosperous economy. But because

of the interest rate ceiling, Treasury debt management has actually contributed to the inflationary potential in the economy.

A third major argument for removing the interest rate ceiling arises from the distortions in credit markets that result from confining Government financing to short-term securities. Even though the Government is now operating with a balanced budget, the Treasury must turn over $70 to $80 billion of marketable securities each year. The confinement of so huge an amount of financing to securities of less than 5 years' maturity—and this will be the inevitable result if interest rates do not decline significantly from present levels and the ceiling is not removed—may add unduly to pressure on the short-term market. Thus, short-term interest rates would be higher than otherwise would be the case, and the availability of credit to private short-term borrowers—particularly consumers, small businesses, and farmers, all of whom rely heavily on short-term credit—would be curtailed. Moreover, experience last autumn indicated clearly that such distortions can contribute to severe drain on savings institutions, as customers withdraw money to buy high-yielding securities. This in turn may unduly restrict the flow of savings into home construction and other long-term projects.

Finally, experience during the past year indicates that the interest rate ceiling has caused interest on the public debt to be higher. Knowledgeable market observers estimate that the arbitrary confinement of Treasury financing to short-term securities has caused short-term interest rates to average one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent higher than if the Treasury had been free to spread its borrowing over a wider range. This additional interest, when applied to the $70 to $80 billion of securities that must be turned over each year, increases Government spending by some $200 to $400 million.

CEILING PRESCRIBES MARKET'S AREA

What are the arguments that have been presented by those who oppose removal of the ceiling? The first and most familiar argument is that removal of the ceiling would cause interest rates in general to rise. But if the ceiling were truly effective in holding down rates, it would be logical to expect rates on outstanding Government bonds to remain below the ceiling. During most of the past year, however, such yields have exceeded 4¼ percent.

The fact is, of course, no Government-decreed interest rate ceiling can prevent forces of demand and supply from exerting their effects so long as credit markets are free. Quotations on outstanding Government securities that are the product of each day's free market trading among thousands of holders of Government securities cannot be repealed by Treasury or congressional fiat. If interest rates are to be controlled then the actions of lenders, borrowers, and all market participants must be controlled. But so long as the basic freedom or the marketplace is maintained and direct controls are not used, interest rates—or the price of borrowed money—will continue to reflect changes in the basic forces of demand and supply, including the impact of flexible monetary policies.

Rather than preventing interest rates from responding to market forces, the real effect of the ceiling is to prescribe the area of the market in which the Treasury can borrow. President Eisenhower put the matter succinctly in a special message to Congress last summer. He said: "To prohibit the Treasury from paying the market price for long-term money is just as impracticable as telling the Defense Department that it cannot pay the fair market price for a piece of equipment. The result would be the same in either case: the Government could not get what it needs."

NO GUARANTEE OF BENEFITS TO BANKS

As a corollary to this argument, some of those who oppose removal of the ceiling argue that such action would only serve to enrich the large financial institutions of the Nation. This view is basically in error because interest rates, as noted above, are not determined by Government edict but by forces of demand and supply; in and of itself, removal of the ceiling would not cause interest rates to rise. But even when interest rates do increase, it does not follow that the financial institutions themselves receive all of the benefit. Many of the large lending institutions in this country are mutual in nature, and a substantial portion of the rise in interest rates has been passed on to the saver.

Although commercial banks are not mutual institutions, it is important to understand that their current earnings would tend to fall rather than rise if the ceiling is removed. This is because the vast preponderance of commercial bank loans and investments are of relatively short maturity; for example, the average bank loan is estimated to mature in about 2 years and the Government securities banks hold have an average maturity of only 3½ years. A principal effect of the interest rate ceiling is to force short-term interest rates to higher levels than would otherwise prevail, since the Treasury must arbitrarily confine its financing to the less than 5-year maturity range. As short-term rates rise, including rates on banks loans and short-term Government securities, the current earnings of banks also expand. But if the Treasury could prudently spread its borrowing over a wider maturity range, pressure on short-term rates would be eased, and bank current earnings would tend to be less than would otherwise be the case.

A second argument sometimes made against removal of the interest rate ceiling is that, in so doing, Congress would in effect be relinquishing its historic right to determine the general terms of long-term bonds issued by the Treasury.

To determine general terms of new issues is one thing, but to lock the Treasury firmly into the short-term market is another. Rather than determining the general terms of new bond issues, Congress, in failing to remove the ceiling, is in effect flatly prohibiting any significant debt-lengthening through sale of longterm issues. The Treasury is responsible for the management of our $290 billion public debt; that is precisely where the responsibility should rest. But by insisting on retention of the interest rate ceiling, the Congress is denying the Treasury the essential tools for sound, noninflationary debt management.

REFORMS WOULDN'T HELP

According to a third argument, the interest rate ceiling should indeed be removed, but only if the Treasury first agrees to instituting some so-called reforms in its debt management operations. Such reforms include abolition of the committees of commercial bankers, investment bankers, and others that commonly advise the Treasury with respect to financings; sale of intermediate- and long-term securities at public auction; issuance of bonds with relatively early call provisions; and a signification of the intent of the Treasury to market long-term securities only when interest rates are relatively low. The proponents of these first three reforms maintain that their inauguration would probably permit the Treasury to sell bonds at lower interest rates than now prevail and, as a result, the removal of the ceiling would not be necessary.

The Treasury believes that just the reverse is true. If, for example, the Treasury's periodic consultations with advisory committees were discontinued—a practice, incidentally, that was started by Secretary Morgenthau in 1942—the Treasury would be foregoing the opportunity of obtaining firsthand and expert information on the Government securities market. Its only alternative, therefore, would be to price securities more liberally—to offer somewhat higher interest rates than otherwise—in order to make certain that a particular financing did not fail. This void of information could not be filled by increasing the Treasury's debt management staff; the type of information that is obtained from the advisory committees can only be provided by individuals who operate daily in the Government securities market. By consulting with these committees, the Treasury obtains accurate and firsthand reports on the attitudes of the thousands of potential buyers of Government securities.

Moreover, it is important to emphasize that Treasury officials, in approaching a financing decision, talk to scores of individuals all over the country; in fact, these contacts are maintained on a more or less continuous basis. The Treasury also engages in intensive studies and analysis on its own. By the time the advisory committees are called in, responsible Treasury officials have already carefully considered the many alternatives involved. And in every case, all that the Treasury obtains from the committees, and other contacts, is advice. The final decision is made solely by the responsible Treasury officials.

RATE MOVEMENTS UNPREDICTABLE

Similarly, it is the Treasury's judgment that extension of the auction technique to securities other than Treasury bills in the near future would result in higher, rather than lower, interest rates on Government securities. This is primarily because the market for new long-term securities would be significantly narrowed, inasmuch as many long-term investors would be reluctant to incur the risk of submitting bids in auctions, but would prefer to purchase the securities later in the market.

The case is even stronger that the use of relatively early call features on Treasury bonds would result in higher initial interest costs to the Treasury. An investor will be willing to purchase a new 25-year Treasury bond, callable, say, in 5 years, only if the initial interest rate is sufficiently high to warrant his taking the risk of an early call. Still, call features, if properly constructed, may save interest costs for the Government over the long run. It is primarily for this reason that the most recently offered Treasury bond—the 25-year, 4¼-percent issue sold last month—included a 15-year call feature. By extending the call feature to 15 years—several years longer than prevails with respect to corporate issues—the Treasury believed that the initial attractiveness of the security was not affected.

Although the suggestion that the Treasury market long-term bonds only when interest rates are low appears, on the surface, to have considerable merit, it is important to understand that this suggestion is tantamount to recommending that the Treasury ignore the state of the economy in its debt management decisions. This is because long-term interest rates usually fall to their lowest levels during business recessions. If the Treasury sold large amounts of long-term bonds during such periods, it would run the serious risk of absorbing long-term funds that would otherwise be used to finance homebuilding, State and local government projects, and business capital expenditures. Such a policy would, of course, impede recovery and might even intensify recessionary pressures. Minimization of interest rates, therefore, cannot be accepted as the overriding goal of Treasury debt management.

The decline in interest rates earlier this year—which has since been reversed at least

temporarily by market forces of demand and supply—apparently convinced some people that there was no longer any reason for removal of the ceiling. This view is and was wholly unwarranted. The very decline in interest rates earlier in the year, in contrast to widely held expectations to the contrary, is convincing evidence that interest rate movements are quite unpredictable. The Treasury has no way of knowing which direction interest rates will move in the future, simply because it cannot accurately predict the outcome of the millions of individual decisions which, in a free economy, actually determine interest rates. Interest rates may stay close to present levels, they may go up, or they may go down. Unless they decline considerably from present levels, the Treasury will continue to be locked into the less than 5-year sector of the market.

The problem of the interest-rate ceiling is not a short-run, transitory problem, nor should it be approached on a partisan basis. The ceiling, if not removed, can continue to obstruct debt management through many administrations in the future. In the interest of sound debt management—which means in the public interest—the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling should be removed permanently and as soon as possible.

"Urban Renewal—The Viewpoint From City Hall"—Address by Mayor Ben West, of Nashville, Tenn., 26th National Planning Conference of American Society of Planning Officials, May 22–26, 1960, Miami Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent address by the Honorable Ben West, mayor of Nashville, Tenn., delivered at the 26th National Planning Conference of the American Society of Planning Officials held at Miami Beach, Fla., May 22 to 26, 1960.

Few Americans speak with as much authority as Mayor West on the subject of urban renewal and the other problems facing our cities today. I believe Members of Congress will find particularly valuable Mayor West's comments on the relationship of the Federal Government to the problems of urban areas.

The address follows:

URBAN RENEWAL—THE VIEWPOINT FROM CITY HALL

(Address by Mayor Ben West, Nashville, Tenn.)

If the rocket scientists were called upon to locate city hall in the governmental orbit, they would place it at the perigee—and correctly so. This is the point nearest the earth and, therefore, nearest the people. Being at the low point in the governmental scheme of things permits city hall only two vistas when observing any subject No mayor can afford to look backward, so he can look horizontally around him and thus evaluate his position, or he can look upward. When he looks up he automatically assumes a prayerful position whether his problem be governmental or spiritual.

Municipal governments, or local governments, are the test tubes for State and national programs. They constitute the last resting place for the "buck" as it is passed along. Here is the arena where the action occurs—the crucible which turns paper into pavement, conversation into concrete, debate into deeds, remarks into results, and complaint into compliance. The prime reason for this is that municipal government is the form best suited and equipped to render the basic, essential services, without which the modern urban complex could not exist.

Then there are the people and the social trends they are creating around metropolitan areas. To delve into these elements of 1960 society with an audience of planners is bringing coal to Newcastle, yet one proposition should not be forgotten. Two out of three Americans live in cities now; soon, four out of five will be born, educated, work, play, live and die, some within cities proper, some within the suburbs of cities, but all within urban surroundings. They will be there because they will want the ease and convenience of life which only the availability of municipal type services will give them. Demands for urban type services crawl ever upward on the graph. There will be no leveling off or downward dips in the foreseeable future, only a continuously mounting line toward the top of the graph page.

The wealth of America, expressed in terms of educational and cultural seats, industrial and manufacturing centers, wholesale and retail distribution centers, lies in its cities, the golden egg of the national treasure; but the gold is becoming tarnished and insecure for every American city is engaged in a struggle to save itself. No matter which road you take, or in which direction you seek to move, the way leads always to a great big dollar sign.

Increasing requirements of the Federal Government for purposes of national and international security, income taxes to support the national defense and to service the national debt, State sales taxes to support education and welfare services, gas taxes to finance highways, have left cities dependent on the traditional, overworked property tax, supplemented by a variety of makeshift revenues generated by the compulsion of rising municipal costs and a diminishing tax base. Ben Franklin said, "Death and taxes are inevitable." Mayors sometimes prefer them in that order.

Not too long ago I made a speech before the Nashville Chamber of Commerce which featured a series of colored slides. I prefaced the flashing of one of those slides on the screen with the comment that I wanted to show them one of the most expensive pieces of property in the city of Nashville. Those who expected to see some grand edifice were disappointed because the picture was of a tumbledown shack in a slum neighborhood. I told these businessmen that this property cost them more in fire and police protection; in the generation of crime and disease; in welfare expenditures; in human misery, suffering, and degeneration. I said that these slums cost so much Nashville simply could not afford them—no other city could. On the other hand, neither could Nashville afford to do much about them without financial assistance from the Federal Government.

PLANNING NEEDED TO COORDINATE RENEWAL

Something is being done but it isn't enough. Nashville has a large urban renewal program underway right now—reputedly, the second largest in area in the country. We have 2,256 acres in the eastern section of Nashville involved. Four hundred and sixty acres will be cleared and 126 of them used as rights-of-way for the Federal Interstate Highway System. Five thousand seven hundred and fifty structures containing 8,617 dwelling units are scheduled for either elimination or rehabilitation. This is a 5-year program costing some $20 million. It is a beginning, but only that. If we do not get other programs started in other sections of the city which need them just as badly, if not worse, before this one is completed, we will not have made much progress in our battle against slums and blight. This is the same piecemeal approach which has been used so often in the past. For many years we have tried various methods to meet the needs of urban populations. We have seen the housing industry expand with tremendous force through one form of Federal assistance to meet the needs of one segment of our population, while cities were at the same time building decent housing for the low-income groups to some extent through publicly assisted programs. We had the airport development programs, just about ended now; water pollution programs; highway programs, the daddy of them all; and many others, all aimed at meeting new urban problems which seemed to materialize as rapidly as the old ones were solved, or more so. This era saw the emergence of the planner in the public's eye from the tenant of the ivory tower to a full-fledged lusty partner in municipal government. The planning profession and the city planning commissions have reached a maturity which bids well for the future development controls of our cities. But, I believe that planners are still publicly feared in some ways. Perhaps the public mind and the planners themselves have not been conditioned for much more than the routine problems of city growth. Some planning solutions have been large scale and bold to a degree, but somehow there seems a lack of public and governmental planning confidence, and perhaps self-assurance, too, on the part of planners in America which does not enable them to carry out bold new experiments in city design and development as is evident in Holland, Sweden, and the British Isles. Some day the curve of necessity will cross the curve of planning ability and the old shackles of archaic forms of municipal government and systems of taxation will be loosed from the shoulders of city officials and we will see accomplishments more daring in concept and more realistic in execution than we have heretofore entrusted ourselves to undertake.

Some cities have done well in meeting traffic needs, and in providing accommodations for other modes of transportation, in recreation, and health, but nearly all of this has been done in piecemeal fashion. Urban renewal—not urban replacement—seemed to give us the long awaited opportunity for comprehensive planning and a completely integrated program for meeting most, if not all, of the physical needs of our cities. This creation of the current administration in Washington, which brought such great promise with it, does not now seem to be well regarded by the very ones who created it and its administration has fallen into limited routine despite the fact that many cities have worked wonders with their urban renewal programs, bounded as they were. We have been learning for 10 years, and when one is learning it is best not to assume too big a job. But now we must broaden our concept in both planning and undertaking our urban renewal programs if we ever intend to remove blight and obsolescence from our cities and restore them to their rightful place as the vigorous, efficient, service-producing cores of our metropolitan areas.

In 10 years I think we have progressed nicely insofar as methods of practically ap-

plying urban renewal are concerned, and administrative liaison between the different levels of government has been good. It is encouraging to see programs of planning assistance available to smaller cities, who cannot afford a regular planning staff but whose problems are just as acute as the larger ones, from the State planning commissions, and some monetary help from the Federal Government in this respect. Highways and urban renewal are two of the most important programs in America at the present. Their application will have a durable and profound effect on the lives of nearly every living American and yet, so far as I know, there is not even an exchange of information between the two programs at Washington, much less any sort of combined action.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED

To use a cliche—there isn't a great deal wrong with urban renewal that money wouldn't cure. There are a few sore spots in selling and administration which time and more local effort should take care of but local governments cannot supply the money. That is a financial impossibility.

In his state of the Union message, the President indicated that cities should not look for Federal assistance in meeting their urban problems although he recognized them as "staggering." He said: "The overall guiding goal of this budget is national need—not response to specific group, local or political insistence."

This was the same pattern followed in his 1959 message which had the result of making these subsequent allocations in the budget. In a $77 billion budget, there were urban renewal provisions of a 6-year program beginning at $250 million and going down. Actual cash appropriation was $145 million.

I do not want to appear to be antagonistic to farmers. I have naught but good will for them. We probably need them a great deal more than they need us. Although slum dwellers outnumber farmers by a million, I wanted to make some budget comparisons because their numbers, as groups, are so nearly approximate.

In the same budget there was $490 million for stabilization of farm prices and income under a program also termed "unsuitable" by the President. Rural electrification and telephones got $335 million; research and other agricultural services were given $301 million; financing farm ownership and operation, $196 million; conservation and development of agricultural land and other related resources received $675 million. In all, $6 billion is the cash expenditure for agriculture in 1960 against $145 million for slum clearance. I am not questioning the value or the amount of any of these specific programs because I am not in position to evaluate them. I might add here that there are also many other nondefense functions which get much more out of this "economy" budget than slum clearance.

This type of budget asks that every American contribute $34 per capita for farm programs and 83 cents per capita for slum clearance. Put another way, as Thomas R. Reid, civic and governmental affairs manager for the Ford Motor Co., says it, Federal per capita expenditures on farm families is $3,000 annually against only $84 per slum family. Bear in mind that this allocation is made to the 65 percent of people who live in the cities where is paid slightly over 75 percent of the total Federal tax take.

NEED FOR FEDERAL AID FOR OUR CITIES

The representatives of the big cities in Congress have in the main favored the Marshall plan and the point 4 program. Perhaps it is time we recognized that the 22 million Americans who live in slum ridden cities have a need for Federal aid which is just as great and pressing as any country in Europe and Asia. Nearly everyone accepts and understands the need for foreign aid. Wouldn't it be wonderful if everyone had the same understanding of urban renewal and its objectives? Herein lies the biggest local failure but it is difficult to put your finger on just how we failed to educate our people and arouse their interest. We did everything we could think of in Nashville by way of explanation and education on urban renewal. We visited other cities, held public meetings on both large and small scales and are still doing it. The news media were all very kind. Council passed all legislation without a dissenting vote. We are in actual clearance work on our project but I still have my doubts at times whether the public actually understands what we are trying to do.

The low interest rate and the small profit margin are not attractive to lenders and contractors. Relocation problems are many. You hear these comments often: "I own my little home. It isn't much but it's good enough for me, and it's paid for. You won't give me but three or four thousand dollars for it. Now, where could I get any other place for money like that except in another degenerating neighborhood. I have been buying my home for years and have owned it now for several. I don't want to rent or live in a housing project." These arguments are hard to refute, even though they are not new.

Another lightly considered adjunct of urban renewal is zoning where local governments must accept deficiency responsibility. Municipal land use as it now exists is a jungle of diversification, partly inherited, mostly created. It is a hodgepodge of classifications ranging from the all-inclusive industrial uses where slaughter houses and funeral parlors rest blandly alongside each other to the location of densely populated factories on the most narrow streets. At the other end are the suburban esates where it seems one must have registered nostrils to breathe. Old properties are inhabited generally by only the ghosts of legal restrictions found in deeds and wills. The restrictive trust is often the bitterest enemy of progress. Old properties, not subject to subsequently enacted zoning laws, and heir nonconforming uses, are frequently the cause of liptwiddling among city officials and planners. Zoning, the champion of proper land-use, has become a conglomeration of political pressure, false sentiment, personal interests, and intergovernmental bickering, while common sense sits on the sidelines—and laughs. Just imagine an upstart, socialistic planner telling the landed gentry and the nobility how they can or cannot use their land.

NEED FOR SOUND PLANNING EMPHASIZED

Urban renewal emphasizes the need for sound, imaginative but realistic planning and coordination at every level of government. Today's slums touch the lives and the pocketbooks of suburbanites and other noncity dwellers but lightly. Not so the slums of tomorrow, because they are being created right now in the unplanned, haphazard growth of the subdivisions mushrooming on the municipal borders, without sewers, parks, libraries, or other recreational facilities, and little thought of traffic generators and transportation. If present trends continue, there will be more than 40 million Americans living in slums by 1975. To ignore the plight of cities further now is going to cost taxpayers of every description an astronomical amount by then. Everybody will be talking about slums then—and everybody will be paying a much higher price for them.

Cities are not great because they are big—or because they are wealthy. Only people can make a city great. A city achieves greatness by recognizing and being concerned with the inherent human values of its people, one for the other. Widespread citizen support and understanding are vital to the success of any program. The creative energies of alerted individuals are the most powerful forces for good which could possibly be released in any community. Our cities can be what we want to make them and certainly a decent place to live is one of those inherent human values of which we just spoke. Urban renewal can provide America with many more of these inherent human values to the ultimate benefit of us all, if it doesn't die of a starvation monetary diet first.

To kill a man is murder; to kill a city is economy.

Task Not Insurmountable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial concerning a much-needed pension for veterans of World War I, which appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes on June 2, 1960:

TASK NOT INSURMOUNTABLE

In the May 26 issue of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes we published verbatim a report rendered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to Chairman OLIN TEAGUE of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on H.R. 9336, which is the pension bill supported by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

It will be recalled that Veterans' Administrator Sumner Whittier outlined in detail the proposals set forth in H.R. 9336, gave an estimate on the cost of the legislation for the 4 years following passage of such a bill, and then went on to say in these words, "Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee and that enactment of the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President."

Whittier, himself, in the report stated, "For the reasons indicated, in my opinion, enactment of H.R. 9336 would not be in the best interests of the Nation as a whole or veterans and their dependents in particular. Accordingly, I recommend that the bill be not favorably considered."

From the foregoing it now seems apparent that the Veterans of World War I, perhaps for the first time, have discovered just exactly where and who their antagonists are. It is readily seen that the White House, backed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration, is adamant in its opposition to any liberalization or extension of pension benefits to the aging veterans of 1917–18.

Even though the House Veterans' Affairs Committee might, as it well could, disregard the recommendations of the VA Administrator and approve in their entirety the provisions of H.R. 9336 and secure passage of the measure in the House of Representatives and if approval is given in the U.S. Senate, it would take a two-thirds vote in each House to override a certain Presidential veto.

Thus it can be seen that the main opposition lies in the executive agencies and it appears to us that the adverse report might well have a detrimental effect upon any possible change of the legislation being enacted during the present session of Congress. Even those Members of Congress, who have introduced similar bills to H.R.

9336 (over 100) now realize that final enactment can only be secured by the mustering of a sufficient majority to override a Presidential veto.

This, of course, is a hazardous proceeding as Members of the President's own party are loath to join the opposition party in overriding a veto. Therefore, it can be expected that many of the Members of the administration party will be more or less lukewarm in their support of the pension bill. The situation presents a real problem to the Veterans of World War I and their leaders. Members of the organization know the tremendous task now confronting them and it is incumbent upon them to broaden the scope of their endeavor.

They must, it seems to us, secure the cooperation and assistance of other veterans' organizations. Further, they must place greater emphasis on membership. We recall last year that one prominent Senator made the statement that "the Veterans of World War I do not want a pension; otherwise they would have built their membership to one-half million."

The present situation also calls for long-range planning, for more cooperation between members of the organization and a spirit of harmony which from our observation has not always been present.

The task ahead is a formidable one but not insurmountable. We want the veterans of 1917 and 1918 to remember that they have the confidence and support of this newspaper as we feel their cause is a just one.

Atom-Powered Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Atom-Powered Plane," which appeared in the May 28, 1960, issue of the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat:

ATOM-POWERED PLANE

A nuclear airplane, once thought of as an impractical project, a gamble not worth the $73 million it might cost, has come into new importance with the sudden tensions developed by the summit conference failure.

So much so, that a House committee, for psychological reasons, has approved the administration's request for the sum. Only $58 million of it will be spent in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

Behind closed doors, the House Appropriations Committee concluded that, in light of the summit failure, a refusal to exploit all possible defense measures would produce a bad psychological reaction throughout the country.

Expert opinion has been divided on the merits of costly research on nuclear-powered airplanes, or whether such a plane ever would be practical. The most serious problem is reducing the size of the nuclear reactor engine to fit into a plane, and protecting crewmembers from radiation.

That such a plane could remain in the air indefinitely, and thus be able to reach any spot on earth without concern for refueling sources, was proven to a relative degree by the recent 83-day around-the-world trip of the atomic submarine *Triton*.

Much research has been done already on possible atom-powered space rocket flights. Through such funds as the House has appropriated could come a major breakthrough in producing atomic-powered bombers, transport planes, and even fighters.

The Cold War: Espionage Is Not for Amateur Gentlemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a former intelligence officer in the U.S. Army is now publisher of the Middletown Bulletin in Middletown, Conn. He has written an article on the U-2 incident which deserves the attention of the Members of this body. His extensive background in the field of intelligence, and his constant attention to world affairs, makes his article most instructive:

THE COLD WAR: ESPIONAGE IS NOT FOR AMATEUR GENTLEMEN
(By Max Corvo)

In order to eliminate many elements of risk, it is almost elementary that in the business of espionage the spy must be provided with suitable prearranged cover. Failure to provide such cover exposes the agent to unnecessary risks which may result not only in apprehension, but also in the blow up of chains and cells already successfully operating in the area.

The case of Pilot Powers is somewhat different than the average espionage case. His was a technical intelligence mission which was conducted at subsonic speed from a very high altitude. Obviously, CIA could not concoct a cover for him, for it would have meant that the individual in question must speak fluent Russian and must be provided with a point of contact on the ground. His mission was a mission of desperation, which relied completely on the perfect functioning of all mechanical instruments and the lack of ability on the part of the Russians to shoot down his plane. In the event of either failure, CIA should have provided for the complete destruction of the plane and not have left the choice of life or death to the pilot.

The Powers' case arouses the suspicion that CIA has not been too successful in utilizing shoe-leather intelligence to do a proper job in Russia and has had to resort to aerial intelligence in order to fill in the tremendous gaps in the Soviet intelligence picture. What other impelling reason would there have been to expose American prestige to Russian ridicule and worldwide suspicion by mounting such a mission?

Living as we do in an era when a single plane can inflict untold damage to a nation by the use of atomic or hydrogen bombs, did CIA assess the possibility of Russia taking deterred action against the United States or its allies in the event such aircraft were detected violating Russian airspace, and was the intelligence gathered worth the risk of a third world holocaust?

Again this seems to bear out the sense of urgency and lack of ground intelligence which must exist in our national files, for to risk war for the simple purpose of photographing the installations of an opponent is hardly justifiable on any moral grounds.

The Powers flight over Russia or any other flights which may have been made in the past or will be made in the future can hardly be labeled as intelligence operations, for they expose not only this Nation, but the entire world to the possibility of a push-button retaliatory war; a war of misjudgment by either one of the antagonists involved, for surely if Russian planes are sent on reconnaissance over Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, or any other American industrial center our very policy of deterrance will be put to a serious test.

Espionage, too, has its own unwritten code.

The spy who under cover, is capable of gathering vital millitary or political secrets or of worming his way into the confidence of the enemy is risking his own life and that of those who are immediately associated with him. If he is captured he is readily repudiated and easily commiserated • • • if he is successful only his immediate superiors are aware of his exploits.

That type of a spy must be an intelligent creature, able to survive partially by instinct and partially by his wits. He is provided with adequate cover, adequate financing and is armed with a patriotic or political motive which often transcends all personal considerations. It is this spy who down through the centuries has performed the most valuable work and who has proved to be the most successful instrument for the implementation of sub-rosa policies.

The success which the Reds have enjoyed thus far in this specific field can be traced directly to the secretive nature of Russian communism; its rise to power by clandestine operations; and the quasi-religious nature of its political philosophy. These qualities have been instilled in the Communist people for the past four decades and they serve as national assets in offensive and defensive intelligence operations.

On the other side of the ledger the average American is a good natured and trusting individual who believes in sportsmanship and who by upbringing is always ready to give the benefit of doubt to an adversary. He has been trained from youth in sports and other lighter pastimes and his political ideologies in our democratic form of government are seldom so deep rooted that they can obstruct his broad views of any given situation.

This is the type of individual, many of them recently out of college, that the CIA has endeavored to indoctrinate in the most complex and ofttimes field of international espionage, and this is the primary reason why CIA operations, even in friendly countries, have often failed and have become the subject of local ridicule.

Positions of responsibility as desk chiefs are often given out on the basis of family connection rather than on the basis of knowledge of national psychology, language, and ability to properly plan, supervise and execute delicate missions in the area involved.

Thus while there is an impelling necessity for technological intelligence there is also a crying need for the traditional type of intelligence agent who penetrates a forbidden area not only to look and see, but also to talk to the people, assess their moods and win the confidence of persons in high places. This type of intelligence cannot be provided by long-range infrared cameras or radar, it must be provided by individuals ready and willing to risk their lives for the cause of democracy.

Unquestionably the lack of this particular type of intelligence is emphasized by the recent collapse of the summit conference in Paris which has left American officials wondering why Khrushchev acted as he did and which has led to a good deal of pure speculation as to why he really torpedoed the conference.

All of the cameras and technological gadgets in the world will not help us to correctly analyze the internal bickering that goes on behind the scenes in the Kremlin

and until such time as we are able to penetrate this particular curtain of secrecy which is the brain center of international communism, our Government will be operating with a blindfold and will continue to make serious blunders.

General de Gaulle Outlines the Principles of France's Foreign Policy Following the Failure of the Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following outline of policy given in an address by General de Gaulle, President of the French Republic, is one which will be of vital interest to all Americans.

The hope that the French President holds out of a United States of Europe is one that we all would like to see fulfilled in our time.

This ideal was first put into words by a Frenchman, Victor Hugo, almost 100 years ago, and it is therefore most proper that France should be the leader in this move today, when it can be so vital to the West and to the world.

We in the United States, while we may not agree with all of General de Gaulle's pronouncements, admire his courage and his idealism, and hail him as the one who has raised his country so that today she is a very phenix rising from the ashes, and the leader of Western Europe.

The address follows:

GENERAL DE GAULLE OUTLINES THE PRINCIPLES OF FRANCE'S FOREIGN POLICY FOLLOWING THE FAILURE OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Man limited by his nature is infinite in his desires. The world is thus full of opposing forces. Of course, human wisdom has often succeeded in preventing these rivalries from degenerating into murderous conflicts. But the competition of efforts is the condition of life. Our country finds itself confronted today with this law of the species, as it has been for 2,000 years.

The division of the peoples that inhabit Europe and North America is the main fact and the worst evil of our time. Two camps are set up, face to face, under conditions such that it depends solely on Moscow or Washington whether or not a large part of humanity is wiped out in a few hours.

In the face of such a situation, France deems that there is no territorial disagreement or ideological dispute that has any importance by comparison with the necessity of exercising this monstrous peril. In France's view, this situation implies three conditions.

The first is a détente, in other words, the bettering of international relations, putting a stop to provocative actions and speeches and increasing trade, cultural exchanges and the visits of tourists in order that a more peaceful atmosphere might be created; failing this, the dizziness of desperation would afflict discouraged men, to such an extent that one day and all of a sudden, for any reason at all, the world would find itself at war, as it was, twice in my lifetime, because the Archduke was dead or because someone wanted Danzig.

The second condition is a specific degree of controlled disarmament preferably aimed at the devices capable of carrying bombs to strategic distances, in order that the possibility—and, at the same time—the temptation suddenly to provoke general destruction might vanish.

The third condition is a beginning of organized cooperation between East and West devoted to the service of man, either by helping in the progress of underdeveloped peoples or by collaborating in the great projects of scientific research, on which depends the future of all.

France is all the more disposed toward this détente, this disarmament and this cooperation in that no direct dispute sets her in opposition to Russia, in that she feels a traditional attraction for the people of that country, in that she hopes to see the Iron Curtain lifted which separates her from the nations of central Europe and of the Balkans, of which she is the neutral friend and ally. She believes, moreover, that by virtue of the modern rate of activity, the condition of men tends to become alike everywhere and that the virulent opposition of the various regimes is destined to diminish.

Now, it seemed recently that certain prospects were about to open up. In the East, as in the West, it was recognized that nuclear war would, in any case, spell disaster for the whole world, since the risk would be that after the conflict, on both sides, there would no longer be any constituted authorities, or laws, or cities, or cultures, or cradles, or graves. It was then that in Soviet Russia a new tune was heard. A statesman, who had reached the top, proclaimed the necessity of peaceful coexistence, declared that the competition between the Communist system and the capitalist system should have as its goal men's standard of living, affirmed that the ambition of his country was to insure its own development and let it be understood that the meeting of those in the positions of supreme responsibility in the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, and France would open the way to peace.

Doubtless Mr. Khrushchev was laying down a condition contradictory to the détente, in claiming that a treaty called a peace treaty, were it to be concluded by him alone, would consecrate forever the present division of Germany, and would establish in West Berlin such a status that this city, which is free and intends to remain so, would be doomed, sooner or later, to submit to the totalitarian yoke. But later, this demand seemed to be accompanied, in the mind of its author, by certain delays and compromises. On the other hand, the trips that the Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers made to the United States, and then to France, seemed to be the preludes of a new orientation. Beginning then, it seemed that a summit conference could offer an opportunity for improving the international atmosphere. For my part, having the Premier and the Minister of Foreign Affairs at my side, I was ready and willing.

Everyone knows what happened. I will not review again the reasons which succeeded in preventing the conference from being held. But I must state that if the overflight of Soviet territory by an American photography plane, 2 weeks before the meeting, was certainly and at the least ill-timed, as the President of the United States recognized in short when he ordered that no further flights of this nature were to take place—I must state that this was not sufficient reason for refusing to open the discussion of the affairs of the world at the summit.

In an age when the sky is streaked with satellites, missiles, and planes equipped for taking pictures of any region of the globe and of firing projectiles capable of terrible destruction, what must be done is to organize reciprocal control of these devices, as France has proposed and as the four Chiefs of State or of Government could have dicided. At the very moment when Moscow had launched a new space vehicle passing over the West 18 times a day, it seemed excessive to require public apologies and reparations from Washington because a single-engine plane, equipped with a camera, had attempted to cross Soviet territory, considering that the plane which had been shot down and its films were being held, and that the guarantee that the act would not be repeated had been received. Finally, if the Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers intended to set as a condition for the opening of the Conference that the incident of May 1 be settled as he wished, would it not have been better for him to have stayed in his capital until this previous matter was settled definitely in one way or another?

In any case, France took note of this outcome with composure. But, in her eyes, what was necessary yesterday will still be necessary tomorrow. The détente, the controlled disarmament of strategic weapons, the cooperation of well-provided states in the development of those which are not, remain as much as ever, the goals that the other world powers owe it to themselves and to the universe to accomplish together. As for ourselves, we are disposed to return to this course. But also, we believe that in order to follow this course, methodical steps of diplomacy are worth more than tumultuous exchanges of public speeches or than the passionate debates of the delegates in the United Nations, which, alas, are not united. On the basis, which a reasonable preparation will enable us perhaps to lay down, France could, when the time comes, consider the reopening of this Paris Conference which we had decided to hold and which could not take place.

Yet, until we achieve an organized peace, if that is at all possible, France intends, as far as she is concerned, to be ready to defend herself. This means, first of all, that she shall remain an integral part of the Atlantic Alliance. Moreover, the recent trial has shown the deep-seated soldarity which exists among Western powers. Of course, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Macmillan, and I each have our own problems and our own temperament. But, when faced with recent events, we three, in view of the friendship which unites us, did not have much trouble in reaching agreement, in wisdom and in firmness. Our alliance appeared a living reality. In order that it become even more so, France must have her own role in it, and her own personality. This implies that she too must acquire a nuclear armament, since others have one; that she must be sole mistress of her resources and her territory; in short, that her destiny, although associated with that of her allies, must remain in her own hands. It goes without saying that such an autonomy must be coupled with an ever closer coordination among the Western world powers, regarding their policy and their strategy.

But if the Atlantic Alliance is necessary at present for the security of France and of the other free peoples of our old continent, they must, behind this shield, organize to achieve their joint power and development. The trials they have gone through showed them how much their divisions and conflicts had cost them. Neither the Rhine, nor the Low Countries, nor the Alps, nor the Pyrenees, nor the English Channel, nor the Mediterranean, for which they fought so long and so bitterly, any longer set them one against the other. No feeling of hatred remains between them. On the contrary, the nostalgia inspired in each of these lands by its relative downfall in relation to the great new empires, has drawn them closer in the feeling that together they would regain this grandeur for which past centuries had given them the talent and the habit.

To this must be added the fact that they constitute an incomparable whole, precisely when our time, which abolishes distances and obstacles, demands large ensembles.

To contribute to build Western Europe into a political, economic, cultural, and human group, organized for action, progress and defense—that is what France wants to work toward. Already West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg are cooperating directly with her in several fields. In particular, the Common Market of the Six will, on December 31, become a practical reality. Of course, the participants do not want this organization to injure the other countries of Europe, and we must expect a way to be found of accommodating interests. Also of course, the nations which are becoming associated must not cease to be themselves, and the path to be followed must be that of organized cooperation between states, while waiting to achieve, perhaps, an imposing confederation. But France, as far as she is concerned, has recognized the necessity of this Western Europe, which in former times was the dream of the wise and the ambition of the powerful and which appears today as the indispensable condition of the equilibrium of the world.

Now, in the last analysis and as always, it is only in equilibrium that the world will find peace. On our old continent, the organization of a Western group, at the very least equivalent to that which exists in the east, may one day, without risk to the independence and the freedom of each nation and taking into account the probable evolution of political regimes, establish a European entente from the Atlantic to the Urals. Then Europe, no longer split in two by ambitious and ideologies become out of date, would again be the heart of civilization. The accession to progress of the masses of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would certainly be hastened and facilitated. But also, the cohesion of this great and strong European community would lead vast countries in other continents, which are advancing toward power, also to take the way of cooperation, rather than to yield to the temptation of war.

Yes, international life, like life in general, is a battle. The battle which our country is waging tends to unite and not to divide, to honor and not to debase, to liberate and not to dominate. Thus it is faithful to its mission, which always was and which remains human and universal. The purpose is great. The task is hard. But in the midst of world alarms you can see, women and men of France, what weight France's will can have again.

The Dollar as a Reserve Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past year we have heard much about dollar discrimination and balance of payments. I believe the Members would be interested to read an intelligent and informative discussion of our currency. The following address was given by Walter B. Wriston, senior vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, at the 38th annual meeting of the Bankers' Association of Foreign Trade at French Lick, Ind., on May 2, 1960:

THE DOLLAR AS A RESERVE CURRENCY
(By Walter B. Wriston)

The recent outflow of gold which appeared in substantial amounts in 1958 and 1959 suddenly focused attention on the position of the American dollar in world finance. The balance of payments of the United States had not been a bothersome issue for so long that its appearance as a serious problem caused many of our friends abroad to reexamine the strength of the dollar as a reserve currency. We tended to regard balance of payments problems as something that plagued other nations but could not happen here. The United States has, it is true, run a balance of payments deficit every year for the past decade with the exception of 1957 but, until 2 years ago, the amount was not alarming. It was only when the deficits assumed huge proportions and gold began to move out in substantial amounts that balance of payments became a familiar term in American financial life.

In thinking about the dollar as a reserve currency, it is well to remember that it is also a relatively new currency. Some 70 years after our Constitution was signed, foreign coins still circulated as legal tender in the United States. In the middle 1800's, paper dollars were issued not only by many banks but also by business concerns, and sometimes circulated at heavy discounts because they were redeemable only at point of issue, and often by banks lacking more than a local reputation. In those days it was necessary to subscribe to a journal called "Picknells Counterfeit Detector and Bank Note List," one issue of which listed 54 banks whose notes still circulated, 20 entirely fictitious institutions, to say nothing of over 1,300 counterfeit notes. Indeed, it was not until 1863 that the National Bank Act and subsequent legislation forced out of circulation all notes excepting those issued by national banks.

The dollar then has only recently arrived on the scene as a currency to be reckoned with, and its entry as a reserve currency dates only from the late 1920's. By 1929 foreign holdings of dollars were in the order of $2,500 million, but in the early 1930's these balances were used up for payments to the United States or were withdrawn, and at the beginning of 1933 they amounted to only some $700 million. In the late 1930's, principally because of the inflow of money seeking refuge from abroad, the balances were rebuilt and when the war started in September 1939 foreigners held short-term dollar assets of $3 billion. The real importance of the dollar as a reserve currency was, in some respects, a direct product of the war. When the conflict ended, the products of the American economy flowed out to world markets almost unopposed as the shattered economies of Europe and the Far East struggled to regain their internal balance. We had a tremendous outpouring of goods and services which, after foreign gold and dollar reserves had been substantially drawn down, were financed basically by U.S. Government aid of all kinds. This aid was a new concept in human history which was sparked by Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard when he launched the then novel concept: "Our policy," he said, "is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

During the past decade the United States has furnished the rest of the world, by means of imports, investments, loans, and economic grants, with $16 billion more than foreign nations spent here. Out of this $16 billion the rest of the world took $5 billion in gold and added $11 billion to its short-term assets which stood at somewhat over $16 billion in February of this year. Central banks around the world used the dollars which we furnished to rebuild their monetary reserves. The official short-term dollar holdings quadrupled and the private holdings more than doubled during these past 10 years.

Private banks in America played a major role as bankers to the world and, indeed, at the end of last year held short-term dollar assets of foreigners of more than twice the amount lodged with our Federal Reserve System. Although the figure was large, the concentration of those that held these funds was relatively narrow. Germany, Italy, Canada and Japan hold almost half of all short-term dollar assets owned by foreign nationals. If you added to these four nations the United Kingdom, Switzerland and France, it is possible to account for about three-fifths of the total. That so many reserves are held in dollars reflects confidence in the dollar, and this confidence helps make it a leading reserve currency of the world.

The fact that the dollar is tied to gold at a fixed price has become the peg upon which our present international monetary system hangs. This dollar exchange standard really achieves a substantial stretching of the world's gold by augmenting it through the holdings of convertible currencies. The security of the dollar exchange standard is of tremendous importance to the stability of the world financial position and I suggest that its security rests upon more than a narrow statistical basis. Recently there have been many calculations made to show the relationship between the American gold stock and our external liabilities, and statistical tables have been assembled which are designed to prove that the ratio of world reserves to imports has declined alarmingly in the last 10 years. The United Kingdom, which has operated for many decades on a slim margin of reserves, has demonstrated conclusively again and again that the arithmetic delineating the ratios between reserves and imports, and reserves and liabilities, can be highly elastic provided that the intention of the Government to defend its currency is clear. Basically, the usefulness of the dollar as a reserve currency rests upon the distributive judgment around the world that the government which controls that currency will act decisively to protect its integrity.

The statistical position of the dollar, by any measure, is still strong. In 1913, we held one-fifth of the world's gold stock; in 1928—two-fifths; reached a high in 1949 with two-thirds; and today hold slightly less than one-half of the world's monetary gold. Sometimes the elementary principles of banking are forgotten and far-reaching deductions are drawn from the fact that out of our gold stock of $19 billion the law requires that we set aside $12 billion to back our currency, thus leaving only $7 billion to cover our short-term liabilities to foreigners of $16 billion. Any one of you whose bank had its deposits 44 percent covered by gold would feel in justice that you conducted your institution on a sound and liquid basis. The United States, as banker to the world, maintains this technical ratio. Any bank would become insolvent if every depositor wanted all of his money on the same day. In addition, of the $16 billion of liabilities, only $9 billion are held by foreign governments and central banks and therefore presently eligible for conversion into gold. The remaining $7 billion held by commercial banks, businesses, and individuals could be converted into gold only if they were sold to central banks who, in turn, made the conversion. Despite this fact, an articulate minority have suggested that since the United States does not cover its total short-term deposits 100 percent by "free" gold,

we might be forced to restrict gold convertibility and ultimately devalue the dollar.

From these facts I think you will agree that on a banking basis the United States maintains a sound technical position, but the balance sheet is only one factor in assessing the soundness of the dollar. The basic factor in all credit appraisal is an assessment of management, and in the case of the dollar as a reserve currency, it is basically an evaluation of public management. Although we do not print the phrase on our dollar bill, as we do on some other obligations, the full faith and credit of the United States is involved in its fullest sense.

In discussing the worthiness of the dollar to remain the principal reserve currency of the world, its detractors have speculated adversely about the ability of the United States to conduct its fiscal affairs in a sound fashion or whether inflation would be allowed to run unchecked. It has been suggested that we are pricing ourselves out of world markets and that perhaps, since our balance of payments deficit last year represents less than 1 percent of our gross national product, its leverage is so small as to exert little or no effective pressure upon public policy.

We all tend to make decisions on yesterday's facts and much of the concern about the dollar was based on very recent history and not, as projections must be, upon a changing world pattern. It is perhaps not an overstatement to say that an entirely new situation is slowly emerging in world finance. This financial phenomenon is being shaped by some fundamental changes. Firstly, the dividend on the Marshall plan is a strong and prosperous Europe where not only has the dollar gap disappeared but some nations are actually slightly embarrassed by their own balance of payments surpluses. These dollar surpluses can remain abroad so long as the world does not incur new deficits with us. Foreign nations acquiring dollars from us have many choices available to them: they may use their dollars to purchase our exports, they can merely allow their reserves to increase, or they can redeem them in gold. Even if the United States were to achieve a perfect balance of payments, the world would probably have adequate dollars to transact its business.

Secondly, while nations abroad have decried the complex tariff structure of America, they themselves have discriminated often to the point of absolute prohibition against American goods through devices of exchange controls, quotas, and tariffs. With the advent of convertibility in Europe, the technical reason which could prevent the purchase of goods for dollars has disappeared, and we are now witnessing the gradual dismantling of dollar discrimination which, as it gathers momentum, will have an effect upon our exports which cannot yet be accurately calculated.

Thirdly, many American firms have run their export departments with their left hands. They were a useful appendage. If goods could not be sold domestically in days of recession, some firms allocated the surplus for sale abroad, providing that they got a confirmed sight credit from a first-class bank. This pattern is changing rapidly. There is a growing awareness among business managements of the need to put the same muscle and intelligence, and to measure the risks as carefully in the export trade as in the domestic trade. The use of foreign markets is being carefully assessed by many firms, not formerly interested in anything but domestic sales. I cannot help but feel that the momentum of this program will make itself felt in our export figures. As more and more companies interest themselves in making the export market a vital factor in their corporate planning, the cumulative effect should be to remove the United States from the category of a marginal supplier. To the extent that we overcome the tendency to become a marginal supplier, we will also be moving in the direction of cushioning our internal booms and recessions which tend to be accentuated in a nation which does not command steady access to foreign markets. Throughout the period when we have been losing gold so rapidly, the United States nevertheless had an absolute favorable balance of trade. While Adam Smith's ancient theory of the international division of labor still operates, some categories of goods will always be produced more economically abroad, but these categories are changing almost daily and will shift tremendously with the advent of technological progress so that what we may lose in one area we gain in another. It is the fact, for instance, that we ship American coal to Newcastle and that one of the biggest percentage increases in British exports to Germany last year was toys. Trade is a two-way street and, at the very moment when the United States is importing half of its barbed wire from abroad, we are exporting steel plate to a German automobile manufacturer. In the general discussion about pricing ourselves out of the market, it is often forgotten that goods are sold on more than price. Recently, a large shipment of hats was sent to London because of style advantages. Any one of you who is married would probably be prepared to admit that in selecting a new dress your wife is interested in more than the cost of the material and the hourly wages of the seamstress.

To date American exporters have not enjoyed the same credit facilities as have been made available to our competitors around the world through Government guarantees and political risk insurance. This pattern is also changing. Of course, selling our exports on credit does not directly help our balance of payments because the increased receipts are offset by increased payments in the form of private capital outflow; but there are secondary effects which may be helpful.

Fourthly, if we look below the line of our international balance sheet we find that the United States is a net long-term creditor to the extent of perhaps $40 billion and the return on this investment, flowing back to our country, is growing more and more substantial. In 1959 the income on our private investments abroad exceeded the outflow of private capital by some $900 million. It can be said therefore, in fairness, that while our short term position has suffered severely our total international posture has improved.

On a Government level it is becoming more and more apparent that the United States should no longer be required to carry alone the great burden of the underdeveloped countries. The nations of Western Europe can well afford to take a more active role with their new earned riches and distribute more equitably the burden among the nations of the free world.

It is abundantly clear that the leverage our balance of payments exerts on our domestic economy in absolute terms is relatively negligible in comparison with other nations. The size of our market is staggering and, although we are the world's largest importer, our imports, nonetheless, represent barely 4 percent of our national income. When you contrast this with some of the trading nations whose imports reach as high as 50 percent of national income, it is immediately apparent that our response to the balance-of-payments problem must necessarily be slower than that of a country whose very livelihood depends upon prompt and adequate response to a balance-of-payment deficit. The balance-of-payments discipline is accepted most quickly where the need for it is most readily understood. Despite the relatively small part that our external trade plays in our overall economy, the recognition of the need to subject ourselves to the balance-of-payments discipline is growing daily. Of the total value of goods produced in the United States, our exports account for some 8 to 10 percent and the Department of Labor estimates 4,500,000 persons, or 7 percent of the civilian labor force, gain their livelihood directly or indirectly from the export trade and the domestic distribution of imports. The impact on our economic life is greater in some industries than in others, but geographically all regions of the United States now have a growing stake in foreign trade.

To a certain extent, and over a long period of time, the law of compensating forces is always at work. Balance of payments deficits tend to set in train the forces leading to their own correction. Sometimes the laws of compensating forces are temporarily frustrated. The imposition of artificial exchange controls, capital controls and tariffs, quotas and all the other paraphernalia which have been built so laboriously to insulate nations from the facts of international economic life tend to thwart, at least temporarily, some aspects of the law of compensating forces. With the return of convertibility many of the artificial barriers which tended to delay the work of the law of compensating forces are over, and our payments deficit is now, in effect, transferring purchasing power from the United States to countries acquiring surpluses. In the normal course of events some of these surpluses will be used to purchase goods and services in our country. On the other side of the coin, the pressure of imports on our domestic price level tends to hold down our costs while the building of reserves abroad tends to increase foreign costs. Indeed, wages, wholesale prices and consumer prices in the United States have tended to increase rather more slowly in recent years than in Britain and France, and at about the same rate as in Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The return of orthodox economics to the world scene also plays its part in the law of compensating forces. As nation after nation has taken Per Jacobsson's effective medicine and their economies have responded to stabilization programs, they have tended to accumulate reserves, principally at our expense. These stabilization programs, although varying from nation to nation, have a common denominator in that they aim at a better control of the money supply. Reserves tend to flow toward nations which discipline their creation of money and away from those which do not.

In saying all this, I do not suggest that we do not have a serious balance of payments problem because we do, but what I do suggest is that the alarm about the dollar which was widespread in Europe last year was considerably overdone. The professional undertakers of currencies overlooked the fact that we are well able to defend the dollar. The real question is whether we will do it in a way to cause the least problems around the world or through the imposition of quotas, tariffs, and other restrictive measures. There is a real awareness that we must redress our balance of payments, and more and more people have come to realize that the conduct of our internal affairs has a profound influence upon the attitude of the world toward the dollar as a reserve currency. In projecting our sentiments abroad, the actions which we take at home have a great deal more force than the statements which may be issued. Sentiment abroad has changed about the dollar, and this change can probably be dated from the President's announcement of a new budget showing a surplus in excess of $4 billion. This determination to keep the dollar sound by applying conservative budgetary measures which supplement the monetary policy pursued by the Federal Reserve System gives promise of the Government's determination to pursue the kind of policies which maintain respect for our currency. The prob-

lems which we face are large and they will require continuous efforts to hold them in check, but our capacity to meet these problems will, I believe, prove adequate to the task.

Highways Can Be Happier Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 18, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished Governor of my State, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, is nationally known for Connecticut's successful campaign to reduce highway fatalities. His fellow Governors have named him chairman of the Committee on Roads and Highway Safety of the National Governors' Conference. In 1958 Governor Ribicoff proved that a strict enforcement of traffic laws was, among other things, a political asset, and he was reelected Governor of Connecticut by the greatest vote margin any Connecticut Governor has ever received.

Under his leadership, Connecticut last year won the National Safety Council's highest award for its total traffic safety program. In an article in the June issue of the Journal of American Insurance, Governor Ribicoff explains that there is no magic formula for highway safety. He points out, however, that the three E's of enforcement, education, and engineering, if applied on a nationwide basis, could save 20,000 lives a year. I call his article, which follows, to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues:

HIGHWAYS CAN BE HAPPIER WAYS

(By Abraham Ribicoff, Governor, State of Connecticut)

To a nation accustomed to having hundreds of lives snuffer out on the highways every holiday weekend, an annual traffic toll of 324 for one State might not seem so bad.

We Americans are statistic happy, and we're callous.

But when we in Connecticut saw 324 lives lost on our highways in 1955, we were appalled. At that our traffic death rate was fourth lowest in the Nation. But to accept fourth place on any such tragic list would be the height of social and moral irresponsibility.

So we have been working hard over the past 4½ years to cut our highway toll, and we have succeeded. It has been reduced each year, a total of more than 22 percent. Today we have the lowest traffic death rate of any State in the Union—2.5 per 100 million vehicle miles of travel. And, at the suggestion of the Journal of American Insurance, we have some ideas to offer other States that might help them cut their traffic death tolls too.

We don't say we have all the answers to highway safety. Unfortunately nobody does. We don't say we're doing a good enough job; we still had 248 fatalities last year, and we can never be satisfied until we've cut that number right down to zero.

We do have this to say to our fellow workers for safety in the other 49 States:

If you can do what Connecticut has done—and certainly every State can—you can save this country 20,000 lives a year. If you can beat Connecticut's record, more power to you; the saving of lives will be that much greater.

Nationally we killed 5.4 persons per 100 million vehicles miles last year—more than twice Connecticut's rate. We lost 37,800 persons, injured more than 1½ million, suffered an economic loss of $5 billion from highway accidents—a waste that no humane people can tolerate and no economy, no matter how strong, can afford.

If the United States could cut its traffic death rate down to Connecticut's size, that toll would be 17,500 fatalities instead of 37,800. It would still be 17,500 too many lives needlessly lost—but there would be 20,300 more people alive this year, and every year.

How can it be done? There may be some ideas for others in these efforts of ours.

Stepped-up law enforcement, in particular a crackdown on speed, was our first step. It was obvious there is a direct relationship between traffic speed and traffic deaths; the problem was how to make drivers go slower. We decided to try an experiment based on the ironic proposition that a driver who will not slow down to save his life will slow down to save his license.

Suspension of licenses of all motorists convicted of speeding was begun. There are no exceptions to this policy. For a first offense, the speeder must walk, or ride with someone else, for 30 days. For a second offense, 60 days; for a third, suspension is indefinite.

In 1955 the Motor Vehicles Department had suspended 372 licenses for speeding. In 1956 the number jumped to 10,055. And early in 1956 traffic deaths began to drop. From 324 in 1955 they fell to 288 in 1956, 283 in 1957, 251 in 1958, 248 last year. Preliminary figures for the first months of this year showed Connecticut with a 22 percent drop in fatalities over the same period last year.

YOUNG DRIVERS ARE EDUCATED, CONTROLLED

Speeding isn't the only offense resulting in suspension of a motorist's license. We also do not believe in leniency for the reckless or the drunken driver. Reckless drivers get a 30-day suspension for a first offense, 90 days for a second. A drunken driver incurs a 1-year suspension for the first offense, 5 years for the second, and outright revocation of his license for a third offense. There also is a long list of other offenses calling for automatic suspension.

The operator who drives while under suspension has a year added to the original suspension period, 5 years for a second such offense.

Stiff fines also are imposed for all these offenses, of course, and at the discretion of the court jail sentences may be added.

There is evidence that our license suspension policy, though opposed by many at first, is serving a desirable educational as well as a punitive function. Many drivers write in to say they are grateful for the lesson it tought them. One teenage boy write me: "At the time, I was mad at the whole world because my license was suspended * * * (but) this was the best thing that could have happened to me, for two reasons. One: It made me stop and think how easy it would have been to get killed or to kill someone else. Two: It taught me respect for the law. For all I know, it may have added 20 years to my life."

This is the kind of thinking we are trying to create, and I believe we are succeeding. Sober driving, moderate speed, and obedience of the traffic laws are becoming part of the mores of the people of Connecticut. I am convinced the large majority of them are proud of the fact that their State is one that gets tough with traffic violators. And our safety record gets better as each citizen acquires a feeling of individual responsibility to help maintain it.

Besides the deterrent effect of strict, persistent enforcement, here is where education enters the picture—the second of the three big E's of traffic safety.

NO LENIENCY GRANTED TO DANGEROUS DRIVERS

We start with the young people, who satistics show are involved in a disproportionately large number of traffic accidents. Connecticut was one of the first two States to require that before they can be examined for a driver's license, all boys and girls under 18 must pass a State-approved driver-training course. The minimum requirement is 20 hours of classroom instruction and 6 hours of behind-the-wheel training. This training also enables young drivers to get lower, preferred-risk rates on their auto insurance.

Control over young drivers is aided, too, by a statute providing that all licenses issued to persons under 21 be provisional, subject to indefinite suspension should the driver show evidence of irresponsibility.

Driving attitudes are harder to control, but we are doing our best to help cultivate mature, healthy ones among both youth and adults. Hundreds of talks on this subject are given before various groups. The State safety commission is very active, and the press, radio, and TV keep the subject of safety in the public eye. Another important ally in our efforts is the insurance industry, one of the strongest links in Connecticut's economy. Individually, through the State insurance information office and through the National Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the insurance companies are pushing more and more into a position of energetic leadership in the safety effort.

(Insurance, incidentally, is one place where safe driving is starting to pay off in cash as well as in lives in Connecticut. Under the new 1960 rates, effective March 31, an estimated 82 percent of our motorists will pay up to 15 percent less for their auto insurance this year than last.)

STATE'S PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM WINS AWARD

Pedestrian safety is stressed by schools and police departments. Educational programs, stepped-up enforcement against hitchhiking and other pedestrian violations, and increased use of pedestrian control devices all helped Connecticut win the American Automobile Association grand award for its pedestrian protection program.

The third big E in Connecticut's safety program, engineering, is especially important because of our disproportionately large traffic volume. Ours is the third smallest of the 50 States—only 100 miles long and 50 miles wide—but it is the gateway to New England, the funnel through which pours all the traffic between New York and most of the rest of the country to the west and south and the other five New England States to the north and east. During peak traffic periods on weekends and holidays as many as 6,000 cars an hour pass through a toll station on the New York-Boston route.

The modern, safe Connecticut Turnpike, built at a cost of $464 million and opened January 2, 1958, is our principal answer to this problem. Last year more than 40 million vehicles used it, 80 percent more than in its first year. We have tried to modernize our other streets and highways for safety too, and the last session of the State legislature authorized an accelerated highway construction program which, including Federal grants, will involve the expenditure of more than half a billion dollars.

Supports from the courts is a fourth essential element in any effective highway safety program. Connecticut has had a hodgepodge of local courts, many part-time or run by justices of the peace. Of course, there was little uniformity in penalties, and therefore inequities. The last legislature abolished these courts, effective December 31, 1960. They will be replaced by a circuit court of 44 full-time judges, with tenure. They will hear all traffic cases, and although this was by no means the sole consideration,

I feel sure the creation of the circuit court will mean a long step toward even greater highway safety in Connecticut.

There are numerous other aspects of our program, many of them developing to meet new needs. We used unmarked patrol cars, radar (pioneered by Connecticut, incidentally, in 1947), and spot checks on secondary roads at night for better enforcement. We have trained a volunteer, nonpaid auxiliary police force of 1,000 men to help our 450-man State police force handle heavy holiday and weekend traffic, and we recommend such a program to other States. We established a municipal police training committee which will see that all Connecticut policemen receive adequate training through the State Police Academy.

MORE ACTION PLANNED ON OTHER PROBLEMS

Proposed laws permitting chemical tests for intoxication, an absolute maximum speed limit, uniform traffic tickets, and accident report forms were rejected by the last legislature, but I intend to press for them again in 1961.

A study to determine if there is a relationship between the physical health of motorists and accidents was begun recently in Connecticut by the U.S. Public Health Service, which will screen up to 25,000 drivers in a mobile health examination center. Findings should have great interest for driver-license-standard setters everywhere, and a big impact on the overall safety picture.

These are just some of the things that might stimulate others in highway safety efforts. There is no magic formula, obviously. It takes hard work and unceasing attention. But surely no amount of either is too great to save 20,000 lives a year—or even one.

Mr. K.'s Temper Tantrums and Our Hope for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have read many editorials and observations on the U–2 incident and the summit conference. One of the more perceptive and well-reasoned comments that I have seen was a frontpage editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Bayside Times, a weekly newspaper in my district. In forceful, well-considered language the editorial points out how Mr. Khrushchev failed all men by his intemperate conduct. With the passage of weeks its phrases assume more and more pertinency. Under unanimous consent I insert this excellent editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Bayside Times, May 19, 1960]

MR. K.'S TEMPER TANTRUMS AND OUR HOPE FOR PEACE

The horrible weapons with the power to destroy life on earth are still poised skyward. Their very existence has made every summit conference the focal point in mankind's longing for peace. This time, Paris has been made a shambles by Mr. Khrushchev's deliberate and premeditated crude conduct and insults to our President.

The Soviet leader had every opportunity in the past 2 weeks to cancel our President's invitation to Moscow, to demand an apology for the U–2 plane incident, and to ask for punishment of those responsible. However, he waited until Monday to tongue-lash Mr. Eisenhower and present him with an ultimatum which could not be satisfied. Our decision to terminate similar flights was not enough.

Khrushchev waited for the world's attention. He knew that every human being with a wish for peace would be hoping for success at the summit. But, the Soviet spokesman opened his bitter barrage and destroyed even a hope for negotiation on the critical issues that becloud the future.

Americans, regardless of political persuasion, should renounce such incivility and demand that our President not be a party to Mr. K.'s temper tantrums. Bringing Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Macmillan, and President de Gaulle to Paris as whipping boys for a propaganda blast is absolutely unjustifiable.

Man-to-man diplomacy is today's method of solving East-West disputes, and if there is to be a future generation at all, it must succeed. But back-alley tactics at a summit conference will never bring about a meeting of minds.

Khrushchev obviously is reflecting his country's indignation over the U–2 flight, but his "holier-than-thou" attitude over the existence of espionage and counterintelligence in all nations is merely an excuse to make propaganda jabs against the West. It is no reason to wreck a summit parley, and dash the hopes of peace-loving people the world over.

Khrushchev came to Paris prepared to destroy the summit conference. In falsely accusing us of aggression, insulting our President, magnifying the U–2 flight out of all perspective, and crushing the hopes of millions hoping for peace, the Soviet strongman has failed all men.

Additional Support for H.R. 9488

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a resolution supporting H.R. 9488 which was passed by the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board during a recent conference.

The board represents 3,800 members residing in Iowa, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, and Oregon.

The resolution of support for H.R. 9488 coincides with the recommendations of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which is responsbile for the Post Office Department appropriation and is headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. The resolution follows:

Whereas several bills similar to H.R. 9488 are pending in Congress; and

Whereas various proposals exist concerning the carriage of mail by air instead of rail: Be it

Resolved, That the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board go on record as favoring H.R. 9488 and action of Congress to set the policy for mail movements and not leave the decision to the Postmaster General; and be it further

Resolved, That pending the establishment of that policy by Congress no expansion of air services be initiated.

Rickover Scores U.S. Weapons Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. Hyman C. Rickover is best known for his historic development of the nuclear-powered submarine which he built in the face of bitter and unimaginative service opposition. More recently, the indefatigable admiral has directed his attention to the military red tape which has been stifling creative men engaged in missile and weapons development. As he knows, this is a task much more formidable than building an atomic submarine, because this time he is trying to cut through the maze of an archaic Pentagon organiaztional structure which will resist change with a vengeance. But if we are to compete successfully with the Soviet Union, this stifling military redtape must somehow be slashed.

Admiral Rickover is a man who given the authority could slash through this redtape. Several months ago, I urged the Secretary of Defense to place all missile research and development under Rickover. This recommendation was not favorably considered. The truth is that Admiral Rickover will be retired from the Navy shortly unless we decide to make him the first four-star admiral promoted by Congress.

Philip Benjamin in the New York Times of Wednesday, June 1, 1960, recounts Admiral Rickover's views on military redtape. I am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1960]

RICKOVER SCORES U.S. WEAPONS LAG—TELLS FORUM AT COLUMBIA THAT REDTAPE SLOWS ADVANCES AS RUSSIANS SPEED

(By Philip Benjamin)

Vice Adm. Hyman C. Rickover said yesterday that the United States was floundering in military redtape while the Russians were forging ahead with new weapons.

Present practices, he said, are resulting in "ever longer lead times, while the Russians keep on cutting theirs."

The reason for this, the admiral declared, is "the unwillingness of the military to make room for the men who can produce new weapons—the technical professionals."

Admiral Rickover, who developed the nuclear-powered submarine in the face of strong opposition, spoke at a panel discussion in the Low Memorial Library of Columbia University. The discussion was entitled, "Intellect and Democracy: A House Divided?"

The admiral, as blunt and outspoken as ever, outlined the present system of directing complex technical projects for new weapons systems.

ROTATION OF POSTS CITED

"The actual productive work is performed by qualified technical experts, but the direction is by officers who rarely possess the necessary technical knowledge to understand the work," he said.

"Moreover, they are rotated in and out of assignments for short periods of duty. * * * Officers thus exercise management control without having the requisite technical com-

petence which today can only be acquired by a long and arduous professional education."

A more ineffectual system could not have been devised, he asserted, "had we deliberately set out to do so."

At least two-thirds of his time and that of other scientists in his group is wasted by administrative fiat.

A short time ago, he related, "every senior technical man was doing paper work ordered from above; we had difficulty releasing one of them from his writing chores to deal with an urgent technical problem."

"We were scribbling instead of building ships. The Russians were forging ahead with new weapons, widening the leadtimes between the two countries."

Among the solutions Admiral Rickover suggested were making authority coincide with competence and responsibility, and recognizing that freedom from routines for creative workers was essential and did not constitute "a pampering of eggheads."

Dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing one of the Nation's largest coal-producing areas. We are proud of the great contribution southern Illinois is making to the Nation and the world through the production of this great mineral called coal. Like all other industries we have felt the hardship created through automation by loss of jobs. Therefore, we all rejoice when a new mine is opened.

On June 14, in southern Illinois, an event will take place that may well become a milestone in the industrial progress of the United States. That event is the dedication of Old Ben Coal Corp. Mine No. 21 at Sesser, Ill. The new mine is a deep-shaft coal mine, the largest in the Midwest devoted to the production of metallurgical coal.

The significance of this new mine to national progress is best explained in the light of the relationship of coal and steel, as well as by the great changes that have been taking place in the coal-steel economy of this country.

America is the world's greatest steel producer, due largely to the abundance of iron ore in this country. Yet without an equally abundant supply of coal, the iron ore might well remain unused. For without coal and the coke made from it, there would be no practical, low-cost way to convert iron ore into steel.

From its earliest beginnings in this country and elsewhere, the steel industry has considered the availability of metallurgical coal to be of prime importance, and has located its mills close to this coal. For nearly a hundred years, the Appalachian region has been the major source of coking coal for steelmaking, and has accounted for the growth of Pittsburgh and other eastern cities as world-renowned steel-producing centers.

At the turn of the century, certain industry leaders realized that, if America were to continue satisfying the ever-increasing demands for steel, provision would have to be made for the day when eastern coal reserves would no longer be sufficient, and when steel production itself would move westward.

Thus it was that in 1918, the Old Ben Coal Corp. of Chicago purchased a reserve of 100 million tons of metallurgical coal in Franklin County, Ill., to be held against the day when the steel industry in the Midwest would match or exceed production elsewhere in the Nation.

This day has now come to pass. For several years now, steel production of the Chicago-Gary area has outstripped the East, and there are many indications that the Midwest will grow in importance as a steel region. Briefly, these indications are:

First, the central location of the area with respect to geography and population, an important consideration in market accessibility and shipping costs.

Second, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the availability of the many fine water routes of the Mississippi Valley States, which make it economical to ship iron ore from new fields in Labrador and Venezuela directly to the mills.

Third, the availability of vast reserves of low sulfur metallurgical coal in Illinois for iron ore reduction.

It is interesting to note that even though steel production has made great progress in the Midwest, the mills have up to now continued to utilize eastern coal. This has resulted partially from past practice, partially from unfamiliarity with midwestern metallurgical coal.

In deciding that now is the time to open mine No. 21 and tap its metallurgical coal reserve, Old Ben officials believe that the steel industry is ready to begin buying Illinois metallurgical coal in ever increasing quantities. By 1962, much of mine No. 21's output of 3 million tons annually is expected to be going for steel production.

The dedication of this new mine is signal in Illinois history. It marks the first time a coal producer in the State has opened a mine designed specifically for metallurgical coal production. It also marks the tapping of the largest commercially available tonnage of metallurgical coal remaining in the State.

By making this pioneering move, Old Ben, which has 86 years of history behind it, is setting the stage for further development of the Midwest as a steel and coal producing center.

The anticipated benefits of this development are remarkable to contemplate. In the Chicago area alone, metallurgical consumption amounts to 18,250,000 tons yearly, which is now largely being met by coal from eastern fields. Much of this market is expected to be developed by Illinois coal producers.

For the steel industry, utilization of nearby coal means important freight savings, in some cases $1.50 per ton differential between coal shipped from the East and coal shipped from southern Illinois. At the same time, the railroads of the Midwest can look forward to more metallurgical coal traffic.

There is also the matter of many new jobs in mining and coal hauling for the people of southern Illinois, and for the hundreds of industries and businesses which supply the living needs of these workers. Increased industrial development of the area should contribute to its stability and economic health.

Finally, by contributing to the further development of the steel industry, mine No. 21 is providing new strength for our consumer economy and our national defense.

The foresight of company officials in obtaining the coal reserve, and their patience in waiting for the proper moment in the evolution of steel industry logistics to open the mine, are worthy of note. Their action will be of immense benefit to an industry, to a State, and to the Nation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Electric Business Is a Public Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Dr. Paul J. Raver, superintendent of Seattle City Light and president of the American Public Power Association, has made an outstanding statement on the public responsibility of the electric power industry, privately and publicly owned. His statement was in the form of the president's message to the APPA convention in Washington, D.C., May 3. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELECTRIC BUSINESS IS A PUBLIC BUSINESS—PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 3, 1960

(By Dr. Paul J. Raver, superintendent, Seattle City Light)

The theme of this convention is "Public Power—Democracy at Work." It is appropriate that this theme be discussed at our 17th annual convention in Washington, D.C.—a city which is the symbol of democracy to the entire world.

It is time that we who work for publicly owned electric systems show the world how and why a free people in the United States have chosen in many communities to furnish themselves with this essential of modern life and how well they have served themselves.

The local public power system has been part of the American scene for about 80 years, since the first days of central station service.* * *

Today, the almost 2,000 local publicly owned systems serve approximately 23 million people in 48 States and Puerto Rico. When one adds the 16 million people served by rural electric cooperatives, we see that almost 40 million Americans provide their own electric service through their own consumer-owned utilities.

The many local public power agencies do indeed represent "democracy at work." Organized, owned, and controlled by the local consumers, they are providing their communities with an essential service at reasonable rates—often well below those of the privately owned utilities.

Propaganda notwithstanding, the fact is that these local public power systems in addition make payments and contributions to their communities which on the average exceed the local tax payments made by privately owned power companies, when measured as percentage of gross revenues.

We can be proud of the fact that these local public systems, many of them small, nevertheless frequently undersell the much larger private companies in their areas, and in addition furnish good service, and pay the equivalent of local taxes or more—all on a self-supporting basis.

In addition to our primary function of serving our own communities, our local public power agencies benefit virtually all power consumers in the United States. Wherever they exist, these local consumer-owned systems provide an example of good service and low rates which often is far more effective than regulation in stimulating the private companies to keep rates down.

It is safe to say that if there were no local public power, all or most American consumers would be paying far more for their electricity and using far less of it than they are today. Our public power systems have led the way in selling "more power at lower cost," demonstrating to the Nation that this policy is of great public benefit and also a paying proposition for the utility—any utility.

In order to set the tone to this theme of "Public Power—Democracy at Work" let us take a brief look at some of the problems facing us. For background let us first consider the basic principles underlying the reason local public power systems have an important place in the power industry.

Public power is a public business—because the power industry itself is a public business, whether it is owned and operated by a public agency or a private agency.

Why is this so?

It is so because electricity is essential to public health, life and economic survival and because this commodity is sold under monopoly conditions. When these two factors, necessity and monopoly, are predominant, we have "business affected with a public interest" and the business itself is public and not private. If it is operated by a private monopoly, it is only because the private monopoly acts with the consent of and as the agent of the State under a franchise grant and State regulation. Competition is the regulator of private "free enterprise" business but in a public business rendered by a private concern, government regulation is set up to act as a substitute for competition. In short, in this country the entire electric power industry is either publicly regulated or publicly owned. But it is public business regardless of ownership.

As responsible managers we need constantly to keep in mind the basic principle that we are managers of a public business—and so are the managers of the so-called free enterprise privately owned electric companies. This is so regardless of all of the high-powered propaganda of the Madison Avenue boys directed to misleading the public into thinking that privately owned public utilities are part and parcel of the free enterprise system, the same as the corner grocery store, the country doctor, the filling station, the baker and the candlestick maker, none of whose services are rendered under monopoly conditions. The consumer has a choice of grocers, bakers, and druggists. If he is dissatisfied with the service or prices of one, he can go to a competitor on the next corner. Our business, on the other hand, is a monopoly rendering an essential service. The customer has no choice. He must have our service to live and he must pay our price regardless of whether the ownership is public or private.

Furthermore, all publicly owned utilities which raise their capital requirements by the sale of revenue bonds in the open market—and all of our municipally owned and public utility districts do so, so far as I am aware—have the same basic credit problems that the private utilities must meet. We are not supported by taxation; we do not have the credit of the municipality back of us and we must show a net income—or profit in order to float our bonds.

The only difference here is in the use of the net income. Private management may plow a portion of the profit back into the property but primarily the profit is paid to stockholders in dividends. This is required in order to attract capital—particularly risk capital. Public management, on the other hand, may plow all of its net income back into property or use it to retire a debt or—if the credit position will stand it, pay a part or all of the net income to the customers in the form of a rate reduction. In other words, all of the net income accrues to the benefit of the customers and stays in the community.

We both use the same standard accounting principles and we must both earn a net income in order to have a sound credit position to raise new capital. We must both use that net income in a manner to maintain a sound credit position.

Consequently this segment of the public power business is just as much a part of the capitalistic system as the private power segment. But neither we nor they are free enterprize in the sense of competitive private business because we are both monopolies, we are both public enterprises, we are both creatures of the state, and we both operate subject to the will of the public. It would be helpful in getting along with our public business if private managers and their paid propagandists would recognize this basic economic fact. It would at least reduce the area of conflict over basic public policies in the overall power field if they would do so.

So much for the economic reasons in answer to the question: Why is this a public business and not a private business?

The same answer is also written into our law—the common law, Supreme Court decisions, legislative law, and regulatory commission decisions. * * *

* * * * *

From this basic public character of our business flows a whole line of basic public policies developed over the years.

The whole regulatory system of privately owned utilities is based on this public business concept. The right of the public to own and operate these businesses themselves is based on this public business concept. The right of eminent domain is based on this concept.

The great TVA development and the Bonneville Power Administration grid system are based on laws flowing from this basic concept.

Full and comprehensive development of our river systems is based on this concept.

The recent policy of BPA to wheel non-Federal power over its grid system and to build facilities to do it—the common carrier principle—is based on this basic concept. Incidentally, the "partnership" policy of the Federal Government would not work in the Pacific Northwest without this policy of wheeling non-Federal power over Government transmission lines.

The tax-free status of municipal corporation bonds is based on this concept that "the

function performed is that of the State." The lower interest costs resulting should therefore accrue to the public and not be diverted to nonutility uses.

The public financing of atomic power development is consistent with this basic public principle.

A host of present controversies, such as the proposed downstream benefits bill, the middle Snake River development fight, regional transmission interties, the Bonneville Power Corporation bill, territorial disputes between both public and private power agencies, the proper development of the Potomac River here in the Washington, D.C., area, and many others must be resolved on the basis that this is all public business affected with a public interest and that this interest must be protected regardless of the form of ownership. * * *

The fact that the power industry is vested with a public interest means that a private power corporation has no inherent right to serve a community, that it engages in the business only by permission of the public, and that the people reserve the right to provide themselves with electricity through their public agencies wherever and whenever they choose.

This concept means competition for the privately owned utilities. Because they dislike this, and would prefer an undisturbed and nationwide monopoly status, with complete control over the resources as well as the markets, the private power companies have unleased a great propaganda drive to undermine this basic principle in the minds of the public, our legislators and our own local boards of directors.

If the private companies are having problems, they will not solve them by pretending they are like the little grocery store on the corner.

The solution is in a recognition by the private power managers themselves that they are operating a public business and that this business must be operated for the benefit of the public and not for the primary benefit of themselves and their stockholders.

First and foremost, this concept means that as responsible managers our first concern is the customer—the public.

That is why we in public power stress low rates as a prime consideration in the service we render. Statements are being circulated—some coming from academic circles—that the cost of electricity is really not very important to the economy. Low rates are important to the economic well-being of the people of a community for two important reasons:

(1) Electricity is a socially desirable as well as a necessary commodity. It has countless uses, in the home, on the farm, in the factory. Those uses have been developed as the cost of electricity has gone down. Ample supply of low-cost power has been and is one of the most important factors in maintaining and improving the productivity of labor. Our expanding standard of living—the envy of the whole world—could not have been accomplished without it. We are now spending billions of dollars in aid to the underdeveloped countries in a stupendous effort to partially satisfy the demands of underprivileged peoples to enjoy the comforts and conveniences, industrial development, and job opportunities which low-cost electricity has brought to us, until such time as they can attain these advantages unassisted. No small percentage of these financial aids are for hydroelectric dams and electric transmission and distribution systems.

No community, no region, no nation can raise its standards of living and be economically strong without an adequate, expandable, and low-cost energy base—coal, oil, waterpower, atomic energy. The lower the cost, the better the economic advantage. Indeed, the world struggle is for control over natural resources—and one of the greatest of these is a cheap energy base which can be converted to electricity.

This is a public business of the first order in world politics—as well as in local affairs.

Low rates are important to the economic health and well-being of a community for a second reason:

(2) Electricity is a commodity which has a high elasticity of demand. This economic term simply means that the demand increases as the price is reduced. New uses are developed. If the price is halved, the use will double. In Seattle, the average price per kilowatt-hour for residential use in 1959 was slightly less than 1 cent. The average use per residence per year was 8,660 kilowatt-hours. For the United States the average price was about 2.6 cents per kilowatt-hour. The average use was 3,577 kilowatt-hours per year. Our price was 39 percent of the national average. Our average use per residence was about 2½ times the national average. As a result of our low rates, we have more electric ranges and electric water heaters in Seattle than any other city of the United States—regardless of size. Nine out of 10 cook electrically and over 3 out of 4 heat water electrically; 157,000 of our 208,509 residential accounts are all-electric, meaning that they have electric ranges and automatic hot water heaters. This has been accomplished in spite of gas competition. The change to natural gas in our area in 1956 has failed to halt this demand for all-electric living.

It can be said that our rates in Seattle are low because we have cheap hydro, which many other areas do not. This is true, but we could double our selling price, which should be enough to cover this difference, plus the power company Federal income taxes and their expenditures for propaganda advertising and public relations, and we would still be selling it for less than the price charged by some of the largest privately owned utilities in the country—with all of their mass production advantages.

Why is this? I assure you that it is not for the reasons alleged in the power company propaganda. It is because we pursue an aggressive high-use low-rate, anti-inflationary sales policy; it is because we run an efficient and business-like operation; it is because our board of elected officials do not try to "milk" us for nonutility purposes; it is because we run our utility in the interest of our consumers and for the welfare of our community.

In short it is because we recognize the economic fact that electricity has a high elasticity of demand and use increases as price is dropped. Also, it is just as important to note—use will decline as the price goes up.

* * * * *

What do we need to do to keep our rates low?

First, we need to recognize that ours is a business of decreasing unit costs. The greater the use of power, the greater the use made of existing capital investments and the lower the cost per kilowatt-hour of our commodity. Second, the lower the cost per kilowatt-hour, the higher the use by the people of our community and the better the economic health of our city, State and Nation.

* * * * *

This poses one of the major problems facing the locally owned utility now and in the decade ahead.

How can a locally owned utility—operating within the confines of a city—participate in the cost-saving techniques of a large, integrated mass-production system and assure its people of a continued supply of power at low cost?

Integration of electric systems by high-voltage transmission is becoming more and more essential. The advantages are numerous. Markets are broadened, justifying the installation of larger power-production units at lower unit costs. Reserve capacity needs are reduced and system load factors are improved. The lowest-cost producers are used on base loads. A better utilization of water supplies is secured in hydro systems. All of these and many other advantages from integration bring lower costs per kilowatt-hour—providing a utility is permitted to engage in such mass-production arrangements.

* * * * *

I cite the TVA and Pacific Northwest experience to emphasize the economies which can be attained through large, regional wholesale power supply systems and because, in the case of TVA, as our largest steam-hydro system, its cost experience is the most striking. With equally competent management, a privately owned and operated regional system should be able to achieve similar results. By interconnection and integration, local public power utilities and rural cooperatives also can realize the advantages of larger wholesale power supply systems.

The American people in many areas still do not enjoy the benefits of low-cost wholesale power supply but there are no technical or engineering reasons why they should not. * * *

The power industry historically has been a rapidly expanding one and public power's rate of growth has exceeded that of the privately-owned companies—because of our policy of "more power at lower cost." According to Federal Power Commission statistics, the power sales to consumers of local public power systems in 1958 were 3.2 times as large as in 1946, while the sales of private systems in 1958 were only 2.7 times their 1946 level.

If we assume this same growth rate, the local public systems by 1980 will have total sales of about 350 billion kilowatt-hours, 7.5 times the 1958 level.

Another measure of the job ahead is the additional investment required. In 1958, total investment by local public systems in electric utility plant was estimated at $5.3 billion. Assuming the growth rate of the past 10 years, our local systems will need to have by 1980 a total plant investment of about $40 billion, 7.5 times the 1958 level. This is exclusive of Federal utility investments.

Although the rate of expansion will be uneven over the country, every local public power system will share in this rapid growth over the next 20 years. We all must recognize that this great expansion in sales will present not only a great responsibility but a great opportunity, if we will but seize it. * * *

Beyond the integrated systems developed by groups of local consumer-owned utilities, we must look to the development of regional heavy transmission grids and low-cost wholesale power supply for each region of the country. I am not suggesting that these all should or need to be publicly owned. I am saying only that from an engineering standpoint they are needed, they are feasible and, in my opinion, they are going to develop. In this connection, it seems to me most necessary that the common carrier principle come to apply to certain transmission lines under reasonable rules and regulations if we are to have a reasonably efficient electric power industry in this country.

* * * * *

We also must continue to advocate and support Federal multipurpose development of our hydro resources whenever Federal development will result in the most comprehensive and beneficial use of these resources. For the country as a whole, Federal Power Commission estimates indicate that less than one-fourth of our hydro potential has been developed even though this represents our only feasible source of renewable energy.

Throughout the country, the future of electric power supply and service offers both opportunity and challenge.

As managers of public business—as agents of the state—let us try in every way to join forces through our legislatures and our Congress to promote the economic health of our communities, our States and our Nation. Let us seek legislation which will enable us to better provide adequate quantities of low-cost power for industrial expansion and development, for commercial expansion and development, and for wider use in the home and on the farm. Fighting for these basic principles is a winning fight because it is for the customer—for the public—for the community which we serve. This is the ball on which responsible management keeps its eye. Enlightened private management will join with us in our effort to bring the benefits of mass production to all customers, theirs as well as ours. They and we should recognize anew and emphasize by our actions that we are managers of a public business, that we are acting for the state—that we are the stewards of a public trust. Recognition of this basic public business concept by the managers of private as well as public power could usher in a new era of cooperation, giving added stimulation to the economic growth and development of our country.

In the words of our convention theme, public power is "democracy at work," but in a very real sense the development of our power resources goes beyond questions of electric power policy to the very heart of our national democracy. How adequately and efficiently we provide for our electric power needs can be one of the important factors in determining how our Nation and our way of life fare in the strange, exciting, and sometimes frightening world of tomorrow.

Views on Improving the Patent Section of the Space Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the following communication is an excellent illustration of the manner in which businessmen and the legal profession view the efforts of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to improve the patent section of the Space Act of 1958.

It is typical of the wide approval which is being given to this proposed change in the law:

AMERICAN MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.,
New York, March 17, 1960.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a vice president of the American Machine & Foundry Co. who is concerned with the company's patent affairs, I am writing to you about a matter which is of a great deal of concern to AMF as well as to me.

As you undoubtedly know as a result of your chairmanship of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Space Administration Act contains patent provisions which give a great deal of concern to those in industry who have to do with patents. The general effect of these provisions of the Space Act is to give the Government full title to inventions made by contractors with the Government, ignoring the satisfactory experience resulting from the principles worked out over a great many years under the Armed Forces Procurement Regulations. Under these regulations the Government gets all the rights it needs; namely, a royalty-free, nonexclusive license for all Government purposes and the contractor retains title for all private commercial purposes.

The reasoning back of the Armed Forces Procurement Regulations is that the contractor who has made the invention and is in best position to make it commercially useful should retain the patent incentive to invest capital and manpower in developing, manufacturing and marketing it. Once full title is in the hands of the Government, it, in effect, becomes without an interested owner so that no one has an interest in making the invention commercially available.

Long experience with the Armed Forces Procurement Act has shown that ownership of commercial rights in the contractor under whom the invention was made gives the maximum benefit to the public through inducing the owner to risk his money and time in endeavoring to make these inventions attractive and available to the public. It is this sort of self-interest, energy and enterprise that gets these inventions into commercial use and makes our industry dynamic and progressive.

The March 8 recommendations of this subcommittee of the Science and Astronautics Committee, under Congressman MITCHELL, are generally in accord with these principles so vital to the economic development of our country and would go a considerable distance toward remedying the unfortunate provisions of the present Space Act. I therefore strongly recommend that you support the proposed new provision recommended by the Mitchell subcommittee as a part of the Brooks bill (H.R. 9675).

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. HASTINGS.

Lewis G. Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the life and works of a longtime friend, a great public servant, and a dedicated American, Mr. Lewis G. Castle.

As my colleagues know, he passed away on Saturday, June 4.

During a 70-year lifetime, Lew's work reflected the kind of devotion to duty and meticulousness in doing a good job that has helped to make this a great country. For those of us who knew and respected him as a worker in the public service—establishing a record of soundness, integrity, and courage—realize how well his efforts merit the Scriptural passage, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

During recent years Lew had been administrator of the U.S. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. As a cosponsor of the seaway law authorizing U.S. participation in the project, I naturally had opportunity to work closely with him on the complex problems of this job of great magnitude. Always I found him efficient, capable, and tireless and unstinting in his efforts to carry forward this great project and serve the public interest.

To his son and two daughters I wish to extend warmest sympathy and deepest condolences. As one who knew Lew as a great friend, I can understand their sorrow. In such dark days it is often difficult to see any sunshine; however, I believe his son and daughters—as well as many friends in Congress and throughout the country—can take heart and be deeply grateful that we knew and loved Lew Castle, who well served his country and fellow man.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Sunday Star, reviewing the life and work of Lew Castle, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star, June 5, 1960]

LEWIS G. CASTLE, HEADED U.S. PORTION OF SEAWAY

MASSENA, N.Y., June 4.—Lewis G. Castle, who had supervised the U.S. portion of the giant St. Lawrence Seaway since construction started in 1954, died today in a hospital. He was 70.

Mr. Castle entered Massena Memorial Hospital a week ago for treatment of an acute stomach ailment and pleurisy.

Mr. Castle had been a banker in Duluth, Minn., for 34 years before becoming the first administrator of the U.S. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

As head of the Corporation, Mr. Castle directed construction and operation of the U.S. portions of the $400-million waterway connecting the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean.

The seaway opened in the spring of 1959.

Mr. Castle had resided here since 1958, when the Corporation established its headquarters in this northern New York community.

Mr. Castle was born at Portage, Wis., and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1913.

He was associated with the Northern Minnesota National Bank at Duluth from 1920 to 1954 and was its president for the 7 years prior to taking the Seaway position.

Mr. Castle, a lifelong Republican, was appointed by President Eisenhower, after whom one of the American seaway locks was named.

Mr. Castle is survived by a son and two daughters. His wife died in 1939.

Babel—A.D. 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. J. Dover, consultant, public affairs planning, General Electric Co., New York City, addressed the seventh annual meeting of the American Society of Technical Writers and Editors, and the Technical Publishing Society, last April 22 at the Hotel Drake in Chicago.

His trenchant and well-considered remarks merit wide attention. Mr. Dover's speech follows:

BABEL—A.D. 1960

(An address by C. J. Dover, consultant, public affairs planning, General Electric Co., New York City; seventh annual meeting American Society of Technical Writers and Editors and the Technical Publishing Society, Drake Hotel, Chicago, April 22, 1960)

History abundantly confirms that progress in the art of human communication has been badly outdistanced by the rapid and spectacular scientific advances in communications technology.

In the near future—as soon as space satellites can be placed in orbit to act as relay stations—we will have the means for achieving almost instantaneous communication, visual and aural, between any two points on earth.

This development will climax more than a century of almost incredible progress in communications technology—a communications revolution which spawned the telephone, motion pictures, radio, television, and other significant scientific advances.

Scientific progress has tended to obsure the fact, however, that the art of human communication has failed to keep pace. Lagging far behind have been advances in man's ability to communicate effectively his intentions, ideas, and opinions to the masses of his fellow men.

I hope that those of you with engineering or technical backgrounds won't think me impertinent when I suggest that many of today's problems of human communication might well be blamed on a mistake in strategy made several thousand years ago by some of history's earliest engineers.

You may have learned about the Tower of Babel in Sunday school and, as I did, promptly forgot about it. But there is a certain significance to that story which struck me as most appropriate to the topic we're discussing. The Towel of Babel, after all, was an engineering project—possibly the most ambitious the human mind has ever conceived. It was planned that the great tower would reach to the very gates of Heaven, and substantial progress was indeed being made.

But the engineers and other technicians had made one fatal error in their planning. They had neglected to consider the sociological implications of their grandiose technological plan. Or, to put it another way, they did not equate the human factor into their calculations. And what happened? The God of man, in His infinite wisdom, determined that society was unprepared, emotionally or intellectually, for such a miracle of engineering. So He stopped the project. But how did He stop it? Until that time, all men spoke the same language, and the Lord, in the words of the Bible, "confounded the language" of the people—took away from the workers their ability to communicate with each other.

Since that time, ladies and gentlemen, effective communication has been mankind's toughest problem. This is the legacy left us by our early engineering brethren. And today, as we share that curious mixture of uneasiness, awe, and wonder at the implications of atomic energy, intercontinental ballistics, earth satellites, electronic computers, and space travel, it is perhaps appropriate for us to remember that all the technological skills and engineering know-how which went into the building of the Tower of Babel were useless when the power of effective communication ceased to exist. It is perhaps well for us to reflect that, unless we learn much more about communication and other facets of human behavior, we may again come to that point of disaster where society is intellectually and emotionally incapable of assimilating the miracles of technological progress.

I think we can categorically assert that we still live in our own special kind of Babel in this year of our Lord A.D. 1960.

You can see it in the face of a beatnik from Boston, or on the screen of a horror from Hollywood. You can hear it in the beep-beep of a sputnik, in the rush-hour dissonance of Times Square or Chicago's Loop, or in the wailing of a billion babies born in a world of political and economic uncertainty. You can sense it during a U.N. debate on nuclear disarmament, or when a man dies in South Africa because he was born black.

You can be pessimistic, and point out that, in spite of the dedicated efforts of many who have proposed an international language, the multiplicity of tongues continues to impede progress—and that cultural conflicts—political, social, and economic—continue to block mutual trust and understanding, at both national and international levels.

You can be optimistic, and point out that we have assembled the greatest array of communication channels and techniques in history—magazines, newspapers, technical journals, posters, letters, telephone and telegraph, bulletin boards, radio, TV, intercoms and public address systems, newsletters, special bulletins, billboards, round-table conferences and individual and mass meetings—and that out of this sea of paper, avalanche of words, and thunderroll of sound something of value simply must flow.

Or you can be simply cynical and sum up the total situation, as did one observer, as follows:

"We have not succeeded in answering all our problems—indeed we sometimes feel we have not completely answered any of them. The answers we have found have only served to raise a whole set of new questions. In some ways we feel that we are as confused as ever, but we think we are confused on a higher level, and about more important things."

But whether we laugh at it or ignore it, curse at it or cry for it, the fact is indisputable that we live today in a modern Babel.

It is certain that many of society's biggest problems and most dismal failures are caused essentially by ineptness in the art of human communication.

The dimensions of our communication failure touch every facet of our life, but let's look briefly at two examples—(1) our Nation's relationships with the rest of the world, and (2) business management's relationships with employees and the general public.

World events have dramatized the problem of U.S. relationships with the rest of the world. In recent months we have seen how our President found it necessary, during visits to supposedly friendly nations, to be so closely flanked by police and military vehicles that the newsreel cameras could scarcely record the event. In recent months we have seen the victorious revolutionary, Fidel Castro, figuratively thumb his nose at us across a very few miles of ocean water—and publicly brand U.S. people with the familiar Latin hate-word "Gringos."

And, not too long ago, in the city of Caracas, a mob attacked a car carrying the Vice President of the United States, and spat in his face; in the city of Tripoli, the public library of the U.S. Information Service was sacked and burned; in the city of Lima, the U.S. flag was burned on the streets while thousands cheered.

Why?

Do things like this happen because the deeds of the United States in its relations with foreign nations have been selfish, evil, or unsound in recent years? These are the explanations we sometimes hear, but those who say so usually are political partisans, grinding an axe for one party or the other.

But if we lay political partisanship aside, most of us would agree that during the past two decades and under three different presidents, the international behavior of the United States in general has been generous, ethical, and honorable.

We have given billions for foreign aid, and we have championed the cause of freedom. Certainly, we have made some mistakes. But, taken at face value, our actions should have generated understanding, rather than hatred. But substantial evidence points to the fact that we have made new enemies, and alienated many of our friends.

Why? When our intentions have been honest and our deeds in general have been good, why do we as a nation rate so relatively low in the esteem of many of our good neighbors in foreign lands?

We must conclude, ladies and gentlemen, that though there are many factors involved, a major reason for these failures on the international scene has been ineptness in human communication. Our international propaganda program has suffered from unimaginative and ineffective implementation. We've been outthought and outmaneuvered by our ideological competition. We've said the wrong things to the wrong people at the wrong time and through the wrong channels. We have failed to interpret properly our good deeds, and we have failed to persuade others that our intentions toward them are sound and honest.

Behind these inadequacies in international communication are many factors. Our Congress has too often displayed indifference to the oversea information effort; we have not staffed the U.S. Information Service with a sufficient number of professionally qualified people; those responsible have too often failed to apply even the most elementary principles of propaganda and persuasion; too many of our representatives abroad have failed to become bilingual; too many have been blinded by ethnocentrism, and oblivious to cultural differentials in the country of their residence. The list of specifics would be long, but the overriding consideration remains; namely, that inadequacies in our total communication effort must bear a major share of the blame for the deterioration of our Nation's international status.

But now let's compare the striking similarity of these international problems and failures to the problems and failures of business management's relationships with employees and the general public. Just as our Nation's record of deeds on the international front is a good one, so business management's overall record of accomplishment and public-interest operation is visible on the record.

Internal reforms, both voluntary and as a result of public pressures, have made the industrial "robber baron" a memento of faded history. "The public be served" has replaced "the public be damned" as the characteristic attitude of the business community.

These managers have been able to generate and to apply technological improvements which have been so astounding in terms of innovation and improved living standards that they have been able to change literally the face of the world and the course of history.

But business management, like the United States itself, has failed to reap the measure of understanding and support which is justified by its overall performance.

Indications of this failure by management are abundant, but four, in particular, stand out:

1. The fact that it is precisely those companies which provide the best material re-

wards for employees, and the best product-quality-price mix for customers, which so often are most severely censured by their own employees and the public;

2. The continuing low level of general public awareness of the good intentions and significant accomplishments of large business enterprises; public opinion polls often make this fact painfully obvious;

3. The frequent failure of management to win its deserved share of employee loyalty, as indicated by the pushbutton control in the hands of some top union officials—control which enables them to assert life-or-death power over many business enterprises;

4. The failure by management to tap substantially the sharply greater individual productivity which awaits solutions of the complex problems of human motivation and communication.

These failures of management—like the failures of Government on the international scene—are often caused by ineptness in communication. Business management, too, has failed to interpret properly its good deeds, or to persuade others that its intentions toward them are ethical and sincere.

Management certainly cannot blame these failures on quantitative deficiencies. It spends about $1 billion per year just on the oral, visual, and written techniques of employee communication. This includes the sponsorship of 8,000 employee publications which reach an estimated 75 million readers. Many of these publications, it may be added, are exercises in futility of truly epic proportions.

* * * * *

The problems of U.S. management and of the U.S. Information Service are by no means the only examples of the unfortunate consequences of failures in communication.

Even the greatest issues of our times—the issues of war, peace, and survival—will be determined to a great degree (perhaps solely) by the degree of acceleration in our knowledge of the processes of human communication. One does not have to be a prophet to sense that, if people could learn to communicate with people, without misunderstanding—and had the opportunity to do so—there probably would be little need for armies, armaments, or wars. The very core of the power of every dictator and every demagogue in history has been his ability to manipulate the media of communication, and thus to prevent the effective flow of people-to-people communication. This is the reason the so-called Iron Curtain exists. We are all familiar with the bipolarization of political power today in the United States and Russia. The ultimate winner of the cold war between the East and West may well be the side which wins the continuing communication contest which has so often been termed the "battle for men's minds."

What then are the dimensions of our progress? Because we see everywhere evidence of a 20th century Babel, should we join the gloom-doom fraternity and retreat to the fallout shelters?

It seems to me there are, on the contrary, good reasons to be hopeful. It is true that the art of communication today is only approximately at the place the physical sciences had attained prior to Newton's identification of the laws of motion. But this should not cause thinking men to behave like Chicken Little, and rush about in panic shouting "the sky has fallen."

For there are some highly promising developments in communication and related fields. These developments promise to bring order out of chaos, to make our special kind of Babel more meaningful, and to increase the degree of rational exchange of meaning between human beings.

I would like to review briefly just three of these areas of increasing significance and promise. They are (1) greater institutional sophistication about the role of communication in society, (2) better understanding about the ethics of persuasion, and (3) the acceleration of progress in the social sciences.

I. GREATER INSTITUTIONAL SOPHISTICATION ABOUT THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATION IN SOCIETY

Business organizations, government bureaus, and most other institutional-type entities are beginning to be more sophisticated about the role of communication with respect to their own needs and opportunities in society.

They are learning through observation, and through trial and error, that the realities of modern society require a conscious effort by the institution to interpret its actions. They are learning that deserved public recognition does not necessarily accrue on the basis of actions alone.

There is perhaps a pertinent analogy in the field of product marketing. It was once believed that the world would "beat a path to the door of the man who builds a better mousetrap." This concept, of course, is dead—a casualty of the modern-day Babel we are discussing. Successful marketing today demands not only a good product, but effective advertising and selling; it demands the implementation of a formula which may be stated as follows:

Good products plus aggressive merchandising equal customer acceptance.

Similarly, it is no longer sufficient for today's institution merely to make positive contributions in the best interests of society. The idea that "actions speak louder than words" is still impeccable logic for an individual—but it has serious shortcomings for an impersonal institution.

As we saw in the examples of U.S. industry and the U.S. Information Service, it is absurd to expect that good deeds alone are sufficient. Thus, the basic marketing formula can easily be borrowed for institution purposes, and stated as follows:

Good actions plus effective communication equal public approval.

Institutional communication, in the sense used here, thus becomes primarily interpretative and persuasive in nature—and in the process makes a solid contribution to better understanding by all concerned.

An increasing awareness of the need for institutional communication in this frame of reference offers solid hope that we may attain higher levels of cohesiveness in our group-studded society.

II. BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ETHICS OF PERSUASION

The second of these three encouraging developments is better understanding of the ethics of persuasion. This, of course, is a need which goes in tandem with the emerging pattern of interpretative and persuasive communication by institutions.

Emotions tend to run at high tide on the subject of persuasion. Many people traditionally have felt that there's something sinister about persuasion—that it is a by-product of evil, manipulative intent, and dishonest juggling of the facts.

But a better perspective on persuasion is beginning to emerge. People are increasingly conscious that others continuously and beneficially exert persuasive influence on our actions and our ideas. We are persuaded by ministers, parents and the mass media to observe moral and ethical standards. We are persuaded to choose one automobile or one refrigerator over a competing brand. We are persuaded to support a given issue, or a given political party.

So we are coming to understand that we should not condemn persuasion, pe se. We should simply insist that persuasive communication meets proper ethical standards. Ethical persuasion requires that the communicator's purpose must be honest, that his message must reflect sound judgment, and that his position is based on well-documented facts.

The intellectual underpinning—indeed the very essence of a free society—is that conflicting viewpoints are subjected to public scrutiny. Our own Republic has matured under the principle of free expression. But we have too often been exposed to the notion that conflict in itself is immoral or degrading.

Regarding harmony as an end in itself—more important than any laws or any principles—is a view which has spawned, in our generation, the policy of appeasement, the cult of conformity, and the insidious notion that the group is more creative, collectively, than the sum of its individual members.

But it is a hopeful sign that a growing number of thinking citizens recognize that, while we have an obligation to avoid needless physical conflict, in a free society the conflict of ideas is the axis of our intellectual world; that when all conflict ends, when we all conform to one single set of values and ideas, when pure harmony is nowhere disturbed by the voice of a maverick—we will be, in full measure, in the age of faceless humans, the time when freedom will wither and die, the period of decay and destruction.

III. THE ACCELERATION OF PROGRESS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The third encouraging development is an observable acceleration of progress in the social sciences—and particularly with respect to the process of communication.

The Shannon-Weaver "Mathematical Theory of Communication" and the social-science oriented paradigm of Dr. Harold Lasswell, have provided us with workable theoretical frameworks.

A mass of research in psychology, anthropology, semantics, sociology, and other related fields have brought us important new knowledge in such areas as attention, perception, motivation, learning, attitude formation and change, group interaction, and mass behavior. Specific communication theory is being tested and retested as a part of pioneering communication research at Michigan, Ohio State, Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, MIT, and many other universities.

Professional organizations such as the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Management Association, and the Society for Advancement for Management are also sponsoring communication research and study projects—as are several independent companies. A flood of books and articles on the subject are contributing to the establishment of a formidable bibliography.

Social scientists like Carl Hovland, Wilbur Schramm, Irving Lee, Leonard Doob, S. I. Hayakawa, Bernard Berelson, Paul Lazarsfeld, Joseph Klapper, Hadley Cantril, Robert Merton, and many others are making frequent and highly constructive contributions to our pool of knowledge. Their work offers great possibilities for real progress in the art of human communication.

Sparked by men like Dr. Ralph Nichols, of the University of Minnesota, important new breakthroughs may be imminent in listening—that greatly neglected fourth communication skill which we do so much of, but know so little about.

Think of the billions of dollars we Americans have spent on laboratory research into what materials will do under temperature, stress, and other conditions. Such research in the physical sciences has been tremendously rewarding to the material well-being of people everywhere. What we have spent on research on human behavior has been, by comparison, a mere pittance. But many thoughtful Americans are beginning to suspect that research in communication and other facets of the social sciences may be

just as rewarding for all concerned as the more orthodox physical research of the past.

So let us pay tribute to the pioneering, unheralded research that is being done by the social scientists and other students of communication. Their work may be the best hope our Western civilization has in meeting the challenges which Toynbee has reminded us must be met as a primary condition of survival.

In conclusion let me restate my belief that, in spite of the considerable evidence that we live in Babel—A.D. 1960, there remains great and reasonable hope for progress.

While our collective study of the communication process is still in its infancy, what we have learned stirs the imagination. It points the way to exciting new frontiers of greater harmony between individuals, institutions, and nations—and in the last analysis, a lessening of the entire range of human conflicts and tensions.

A Real Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Noble C. Caudill, the vice president and treasurer of Genesco, Inc., of Nashville, Tenn., one of the Nation's largest footwear and apparel producers, is a dear friend of mine, and I feel he is one of the Nation's outstanding executives and humanitarians. In addition to all his good qualities, he takes active interest in government, politics, and religious causes. It is certainly encouraging that people like Noble Caudill interest themselves in public affairs and are willing to do so actively.

The May 15, 1960, edition of the well-known magazine, Finance, carried a brief story of the life and accomplishments of this outstanding citizen. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Noble Chesteen Caudill, 53, is vice president and treasurer of Genesco, Inc., of Nashville, Tenn. In the diversified framework of the footwear and apparel producers, Caudill wears a haberdashery full of hats as head of the complex financial setup.

The treasurer is required to be expert in the many fields Genesco is involved in. This variety of Genesco interests led last year to a $318 million total volume of business and earned the firm a new high of $8.6 million.

Genesco (formerly General Shoe Corp.) is an important producer of shoes (Delman, I. Miller, Mademoiselle, Johnston & Murphy, Jarman, Flagg) as well as apparel (Formfit, Fenn-Feinstein, Greif), and through its holdings in Manhattan's Hoving Corp. has a controlling interest in famed jeweler Tiffany and the Bonwit Teller stores. Thus Caudill must concern himself not only with such fiscal duties as checking on the usage and allocation of funds to Genesco's 60 operating divisions, supervising investment of the company's liberal retirement fund and making recommendations on dividends, but is day by day, desk-deep in matters relating to Genesco's own particular specialty—shoes.

He must, for instance, oversee the financial needs and operation of Genesco's leather tanning facilities, see to the state of the company's inventories of such vital raw materials as chemicals and hides, and all the while function as a student of the hide market. Says Genesco chairman, W. Maxey Jarman: "Noble's one of the best informed men in the industry."

One technical matter of particular concern to Caudill is the state of Genesco's inventories of raw materials. Because it takes fully 6 months to produce top-quality sole leather from hides, Caudill must see to it that Genesco's tanneries have a good supply of hides and that the company does not get caught in any squeeze as the result of wildly fluctuating hide future prices. Since hides are a byproduct of meatpacking, and future prices are largely based on an estimate of how much meat the Nation is likely to consume in the near future, this require a good deal of sharp skill and finely honed judgment.

No less skilled is Caudill's long-term capital planning. "I'm really the treasurer of 60 companies," he says with a smile. "I have over 800 bank accounts, and my job is getting money into all of them." Caudill's latest efforts in that direction reached fruition only last month when the company completed the sale of 500,000 shares of Genesco common stock to the public.

Object of the public offering was to pay off notes and replenish Caudill's treasury inasmuch as Genesco had only recently spent a sizable sum to acquire Baltimore's L. Greif & Bro., Inc. For shoemaking Genesco, the acquisition of Greif, a manufacturer of men's clothing (which includes the English-American tailoring company, Roger Kent), means several strides forward in the company's march to become a comprehensive footwear and apparel manufacturer.

A Genesco career man (27 years), Noble Caudill is a native of Franklin, Ky., where he graduated from Franklin High, went on to take his degree in business administration at Bowling Green University. His first postgraduate job was as a bank mail boy and messenger, rising quickly to become manager of the bank's transit department.

But in 1933, Caudill joined Genesco (then known as General Shoe Corp.) as a clerk in the purchasing department, at a time when General Shoe had precisely one manufacturing plant on Nashville's Main Street and 600 employees (today it has 57 plants throughout the country and a personnel roster numbering 25,000). Concentrating on purchasing, Caudill won swift promotion; became a buyer, assistant secretary, and was awarded his vice presidency (along with the title of treasurer and a seat on the board) in 1947.

A conscientious citizen as well as an able business executive, Caudill and his family (wife, Venorice; son, Noble Christopher) live on a 100-acre farm on Old Hickory Lake about a mile north of Hendersonville, Tenn., where Caudill likes to hunt, fish, and boat, even raises white-faced cattle. More than that, his greatest interests lie in helping new churches in the community get started, and in serving as unofficial aid, confidante, and volunteer worker for his friend, Tennessee's Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

The surprising thing is that Noble Caudill somehow finds time for all this in the face of his demanding Genesco duties. Last year, for example, Caudill logged 9,000 miles of travel within a period of 8 days, barnstorming about the country and addressing local societies of security analysts on Genesco's growth.

That is one subject which Noble Caudill never tires of discussing. "This company," he declares, "is on its way to becoming one of the greatest merchandising outfits in the United States." But Caudill also draws as much satisfaction from bringing along promising young Genesco talent. As he puts it: "If you can break a fellow in to do your job better than you can, you're a good executive."

How To Amortize the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a Honolulu tax consultant, Mr. Louis C. Silva, has long worked on a plan for amortizing the national debt. He describes it as a painless way to restore the value of the dollar and, at the same time, save the country millions it now spends for interest on the debt.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for inclusion in the RECORD Mr. Silva's efforts in this respect for my colleagues' study and consideration:

HOW TO AMORTIZE THE NATIONAL DEBT
(By Louis C. Silva)

It is common knowledge that the maintenance of a form of government such as ours depends almost entirely for its lifeblood from taxes imposed upon the people. These revenues are used to serve our Nation in many different ways. Besides revenues received from taxation the Government derives substantial benefits from moneys voluntarily contributed for the support of certain institutions devoted to public purposes. This automatically relieves the Government from the necessity of levying taxes to the extent of these contributions.

The continued maintenance of the functions of Government under adverse conditions usually results in deficit financing. This generally occurs during periods of depression, preparation for the defense of our country or under actual war conditions. Such large sums of money are expended during these short periods that it becomes impossible to collect sufficient revenues to meet these expenditures upon a pay-as-you-go basis. To offset this the Government reverts to borrowing money through the issuance of bonds and other instruments of indebtedness.

The aggregate of these borrowings have attained astronomical figures. And the hit-or-miss policy of the past and present does not seem to indicate any definite plan of repayment. Instead of our national debt being lowered during prosperous times, it has, for one reason or another, actually continued its upward spiral almost without interruption.

Although it may require many years for the accomplishment of the dish my plan does offer a definite method of amortizing the national debt. What is more it will be accomplished without causing hardship to anyone as participation in the plan is strictly voluntary.

Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code presently allow the taxpayer a maximum deduction of 30 percent of his adjusted gross income for contributions voluntarily made to any one or more of a long list of public institutions. My plan advocates an additional allowable deduction for voluntary contributions for support of the greatest of all

our institutions, the United States of America.

Rendering contributions to certain institutions a voluntary act constitutes the basic reason for the success this activity has attained. Many billions of dollars have been contributed and continue to be contributed to these public institutions. Affording taxpayers the opportunity to help build a better and stronger America through the medium of gradually lowering and eventually abolishing our national debt should serve as an incentive not presently obtainable in helping to support some of her institutions.

Generally speaking, voluntary contributions for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes are rendered exempt from income taxes. There are also other institutions included in these tax-exempt categories, such as veterans' organizations, etc. The U.S. Government itself may presently accept voluntary contributions which become tax exempt to the donor when such are used for public purposes such as a gift of land for a public park. My plan proposes that the law be amended to include contributions for amortization of the national debt.

It is suggested that contributions made toward amortization of the national debt be limited to 10 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income. So that institutions now benefiting by voluntary contributions may not suffer, it is urged that the total amount of contributions be increased from the present 30 percent of adjusted gross income to 40 percent. In the event the maximum amount of contribution is taken, not more than 25 percent of it shall be contributed toward amortization of the national debt.

The taxpayer shall retain the right to specify what portion of his contribution, if any, shall be applied toward amortization of the national debt and what portion, if any, shall be applied to other institutions. At no time, however, shall more than 10 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income be applied to the national debt.

The total amount contributed toward amortization of the national debt shall first be deducted from the taxpayer's adjusted gross income before any other deductions are taken, either actual or standard. The remaining taxable income shall then be used for all other purposes presently applicable under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, with the exception that the taxpayer shall be given the privilege of still taking the standard deduction, if he so chooses, after the deduction of voluntary contributions, whether for institutions or to amortize the national debt, or both.

Example: John Doe, a married man, contributes 25 percent of his adjusted gross income of $100,000 toward amortization of the national debt and other institutions of his choosing. His adjusted gross income for tax purposes now becomes $75,000. If the remaining actual deductions which he may take amount to only $500 he shall be given the privilege of using the maximum $1,000 standard deduction instead.

Taxes saved by contributing toward amortization of the national debt shall first be ascertained before ariving at the taxes saved by contributions to other institutions. Based upon the 1959 schedule of tax rates the tax savings to John Doe, a married man, for lowering the national debt by the sum of $10,000 would be $7,200. His cost of contributing therefore would be $2,800. Under provisions of the law as presently applicable none of the actual cost to the taxpayer for contributing to institutions is reimbursable.

My plan proposes that the taxpayer be reimbursed the full amount of his cost through the medium of a negotiable certificate redeemable at the end of a specific period of time. These negotiable certificates shall be tax-free, either during their tenure or upon redemption. They shall serve as a medium of exchange and over the period of a few years would run into billions of dollars in daily circulation. While waiting for the date of redemption the holders of these certificates may use them for many purposes, such as security on loans, etc., and even discounting them.

Using the foregoing case as an example, John Doe would be given a negotiable certificate for $2,800. Assuming an average interest rate upon the national debt outstanding of 3 percent per annum, means an annual savings of $300 to the Government upon the $10,000 redeemed by John Doe's contribution. These savings shall be accrued until the amount of the certificate shall have been accumulated at which time it shall be redeemed at its face value of $2,800. At the rate of $300 per annum this certificate would be redeemable at the end of 9 years and 4 months. Thereafter the annual savings of $300 would be used to amortize additional amounts of the national debt.

My plan envisions amortization of the national debt presently outstanding through application of the interest now being paid upon it. Because interest requirements must be met no additional funds need be appropriated to realize my idea.

Each billion dollars in national debt obligations redeemed would mean annual interest savings of $30 million. These savings, after redemption of the certificates, would be used to amortize additional outstanding obligations. And so on until the entire debt has been liquidated. Please remember that the savings in interest presently payable which would be used to redeem outstanding indebtedness would be in addition to the larger amounts to be amortized through the medium of voluntary contributions.

The 3 percent annual interest saved upon contributions made by the lower income strata would not help too materially in decreasing the national debt outstanding and it seems a certainty that the lower income earners may not be too anxious to take part. The fact remains however that they may if they want to as the plan bars no one from participating.

The higher the income bracket of the contributing taxpayer the greater the benefits to be derived by the Government in the form of a lower national debt outstanding. Think of a contributor with an adjusted gross income of a $1 million contributing 10 percent or $100,000 toward amortization of the debt. He would affect an annual interest savings to the Government of $3,000 or 3 percent of the amount of debt redeemed.

His tax savings would amount to $91,000 and his cost of contributing toward the national debt, $9,000. The annual interest savings of $3,000 would make his negotiable certificate of $9,000 redeemable at the end of 3 years. Thereafter the $3,000 annual savings in interest payable would be used by the Government to lower the national debt by this amount each year.

In view of the fact that the plan proposes to amortize the national debt through the use of a part of the interest being appropriated, it is suggested that the appropriations to cover interest requirements upon the national debt presently outstanding be pegged at its present level, until the debt has been appreciably lowered or entirely retired. Any overages in appropriations to cover interest requirements shall be used to apply against the remaining obligation outstanding.

The sum total of our national debt has been attained through the medium of debits and credits. Very little actual cash has been used in the purchase of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness. It is my contention that this process can be reversed and the same medium of debits and credits used to lower and eventually abolish the national debt.

My plan of amortizing the national debt visualizes participation by many income groups, from all walks of life. Helping to pay off our national debt can be made attractive. Preserving our own freedom and helping to keep America the most powerful nation upon the face of the earth would guarantee the same rights to other freedom-loving nations of the world.

It is quite obvious that my proposal will derive a large part of its benefits from what would otherwise have to be paid in taxes. So far as the possible loss in tax revenues is concerned it has definitely been established that the medium of making voluntary contributions toward support of certain public institutions has proven very successful. Even during World War II when tremendous sums of money were required to prosecute the war, the practice of allowing tax deductions upon voluntary contributions to public institutions was maintained.

If the underlying principle of voluntarily contributing toward amortization of the national debt is the same as the principle covering voluntary contributions toward the support of certain public institutions, then the results should be the same.

The slack from purported losses in tax revenues should be more than offset by the many beneficial results which should follow in the wake of amortization of the national debt. The most important of these would be its contribution in winning the battle upon the homefront, the battle against inflation.

The problem of amortizing our national debt is one of grave import. It requires the thinking of many minds, particularly those of our national representatives in Washington. May I hope that the message I am trying to convey will serve to bring forth other ideas which will help to remove a cancer that plagues America today.

Address by the Honorable Buford Ellington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have just returned from a memorable occasion in my State of Tennessee—the birth of a newly incorporated city. Oak Ridge, the seat of atomic research and production which had been, since its inception, an adjunct of the Federal Government, is now a city on its own.

In the course of the ceremonies during which Oak Ridge was formally turned over to its citizens, the Governor of my State, the Honorable Buford Ellington, was the principal speaker. His remarks on this occasion were well-chosen and significant to the moment. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. BUFORD ELLINGTON BEFORE THE OAK RIDGE INDEPENDENCE DAY, OAK RIDGE, TENN., BLAKENSHIP FIELD HIGH SCHOOL, JUNE 4, 1960

Mayor Bissell, City Manager Weisbrod, members of the council, and friends, ladies, and gentlemen, it was but a few days ago

that Oak Ridge became Tennessee's newest incorporated city.

My sincere congratulations to Mayor Bissell, City Manager Weisbrod, members of the council, other officials gathered here, and the citizens who make up this world-known municipality.

What a beautiful setting for a city.

Nestled in the cradle between the Great Smokies and the Cumberlands, this is a valley of lush green flooring.

Within this boundary, which just a few short years ago heard only the sound of a plow turning a furrow, or a lonely cow bell breaking the silence, we now and have been hearing the sounds of tremendous progress.

This once quiet, peaceful valley was changed completely.

It has grown up and is looked upon today, and in recent years, as the "cradle of the atomic development world."

In Oak Ridge, a city of some 27,000 with the world's largest concentration and widest variety of atomic research and production facilities, many pieces of Government-owned realty have been sold, leading to your status as an independent municipality.

It is a real pleasure to join you people in the celebration of Oak Ridge independence day.

At first thought, independence day sounded to me somewhat like our forefathers throwing off English shackles back in 1776.

I have, however, been officially informed by your good Mayor A. K. Bissell, that this has not been the case. In fact Al tells me that the relationship between the city of Oak Ridge and the Atomic Energy Commission has been most friendly.

I am further told that Oak Ridge citizens voted 14 to 1 for incorporation back on May 5, 1959, and then proceeded to elect a city council which took office on June 16.

This new council, along with the city manager and several effective citizens' committees, worked faithfully for many long days, and nights also, to prepare for the eventual takeover of municipal functions.

This transfer of functions and associated facilities was carried out on Wednesday of this particular week.

Thus, we can this evening celebrate both the first anniversary of the incorporation decision and the real beginning of self-government.

I extend my sincere congratulations to you for the way in which you have progressed with your plans.

Today as I drove through the streets of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and visited with you, my friends, I could not help being reminded of the summer back in 1942.

At that time, I knew this section of east Tennessee as rolling farmland, as I mentioned a few moments ago, dotted with three small villages.

Work was started late in that year and early 1943 that was destined to transform this 95 square-mile area into an industrial complex which was to bring an end to World War II and eventually spread the beneficial uses of atomic energy around the entire world.

During the intervening 17 years there has grown here an internationally known center of science and technology.

You have developed an industrial complex with an investment of more than a billion dollars.

You have built up a pool of scientific knowledge that is unsurpassed anywhere in the free world today.

At the same time, you have been able to devote your energies to the development of a new city that is taking its distinguished place in our great State of Tennessee.

The work that you carry out here in developing the benign uses of atomic energy is lending greater impetus to an effort now underway throughout the South to bring the tremendous force of the atom to full fruition.

As you are no doubt aware, the southern Governors' conference at its meeting in 1955, by unanimous action, decided to launch a regionwide effort to study the feasibility of united action for industrial opportunities in the South through nuclear energy, research and other ways.

The result of the decision was a study, carried out with the help of the southern regional education board, to determine the possible action that could be taken, both by the region on a coordinated basis and by the individual States, to further their economic growth and develop more fully the resources of the South through atomic energy.

Subsequent studies have shown the advisability of proceeding with a concerted plan of action which would embody a compact among the Southern States.

The compact as approved by the southern Governor's conference last year has now been offered to the prospective member States for ratification.

Kentucky became the first State to enact the compact into law in March of this year.

Other Southern States are making ready enabling acts for consideration by their respective legislative bodies next year.

Utilization of nuclear energy for our industrial growth is, however, only a part of the general effort on the part of Tennessee to develop its entire resources for the benefit of each of its many citizens in the application to industry, agriculture, and medical research.

In this southern region, we have two of the largest Atomic Energy Commission installations in the United States—the Savannah River plant and our own Oak Ridge facilities.

I am sure you are aware of the important work being performed here, both for production and in connection with research.

The gaseous diffusion plant has supplied enriched U-235 for weapons and fuel applications in reactors of all types.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory furnishes 85 percent of all radioactive istopes used in this country.

The University of Tennessee conducts an agricultural research program which is revealing nutritional information on stock feeds and the genetic effects of radiation on plants.

The entire agricultural industry of this country and, probably much of the rest of the world, will be indebted very much to these important activities.

The Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies benefits from the participation of 37 southern universities. Its range of activities extends to the special training of scientists and medical doctors from literally every part of this entire world.

It is apparent that international understanding and good will are being advanced by this program.

Nuclear reactor technology is being investigated through many approaches at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Construction is currently underway on a 25,000 kilowatt air-cooled reactor which will offer facilities for research and development even during high output operation.

The foregoing outline points up only a few of the features of the Oak Ridge atomic story, but should be impressive enough to explain the close interest of the southern regional board.

You can be sure, too, that our State agencies will look to the industrial possibilities relating to Oak Ridge activities.

Our industrial and agricultural development commission, under the capable leadership of Commissioner George Benedict, has met with considerable success in bringing plants and factories of a wide diversity to the State of Tennessee.

Some measure of this achievement is underlined by the fact that during 1959, $420,781,000 was spent on public and private construction in our State of Tennessee. This was exactly a 100 percent increase over such expenditure in 1958, and in rate of gain was the greatest achieved by any State in the Union. I repeat, was the greatest achieved by any State in the Union. These figures were reported in a recent issue of the Engineering News-Record.

It is my opinion, however, that we have just begun to realize the tremendous industrial potentialities of the State of Tennessee.

I can assure you that there will be no letup in our efforts to make Tennessee fairly blossom out with new enterprises all over the great volunteer State.

Industrial development is a favorite subject of mine—modern industrial development in Tennessee.

A total of $243,500,000 in new money was invested in Tennessee industry during the year 1959.

Yes, we are indeed quite happy over this achievement—but we are not satisfied. We are proposing to exceed that total investment in these "stirring sixties" that are now squarely upon us.

A total of 17,300 new jobs came into being as the result of the pouring of millions of dollars into Tennessee industry. Doesn't that sound to you like a boost to Tennessee labor? And for helping to terminate the out-migration of our people?

A total of 146 new manufacturing plants came to the State of Tennessee last year, and we were particularly happy and delighted to see 187 existing industries in the State make an expansion.

You immediately recognize the latter figure as being particularly significant because an industry that goes into expansion where it is obviously pleased is unquestionably profiting by its location.

Most naturally we like to hear people say that in Tennessee there is a State government that is trying all the time, as best it can and as best it knows how, to do as you do—and that is to run its business in a businesslike way, just as you are doing in Oak Ridge.

Every dollar that we are investing in industrial development is paying handsome returns.

I think it is a well recognized fact that the economic growth of this area and of Tennessee as a whole will be in direct ratio to the energy and interest shown by the people themselves.

Government at the local and the State level can clear the way statutorily—but the basic actions and decisions must come from the level of the people themselves.

I have always believed that it is better to expand opportunities than to expand government.

We have definite expansion goals in Tennessee, because we are not a careless people, but a cohesive and determined group, in our municipalities and our counties and in the State as a whole.

Of course we want a more abundant life. That's but a natural feeling of the free man.

We want full employment for our people.

We want good and fair returns for our work.

We want a great new outpouring of industry.

We want a prosperous agriculture still clinging to its traditional independence and self-reliance.

We want maximum educational instruction and facilities for our children.

We want the health of our people protected from infancy to old age.

We want a housing program in line with our social and economic expansion.

We want urban improvement and development.

We want a vast new system of highways—and we want to be able to travel safely on them.

We want an enlightened relationship among all our people who make up this Government of ours.

Yet we want these things to be accomplished as far as possible on the lowest levels, with a minimum of higher concentration of governmental power.

In so doing, we need a vast new alinement of local communities, cities, and counties, as well as private individuals and corporations, with the State and then only so far as necessary and advisable with the Federal Government.

Above all we want every tax dollar spent wisely, cautiously, and frugally. Without those safeguards on expenditures, the threat of new taxation would always be upon us.

Yet Tennessee is an example today of how a State government can operate all essential services at an efficient pace without resorting to new taxation.

Reorganization of State government, and a tight hour-by-hour control of your tax dollar, have made this possible.

Two years ago, as a candidate for Governor, and a little more than a year ago when I delivered my first message to the legislature, I said that there would be no new taxes levied.

We have kept that promise.

There is no change in my attitude as another session of the legislature approaches. We have had the help and the enthusiastic support of the people in this stand against new taxation.

Whether the tax dollar is spent by local government, the State government of ours, or the Federal Treasury in Washington it comes from, as do the mighty rivers, one small source only—the taxpayers' pocketbook.

It is his dollar—and he has the right to protest loudly about any misuse of it.

It's his "tax right," just as the States have always been in a fight to protect that States right.

I have been greatly gratified to see Melton Hill Dam become a reality.

This project with all of its ramifications will be of tremendous benefit to the east Tennessee section. I can well imagine what a factor it will be for drawing new industry and attracting tourists.

Here again you will find our State agencies such as the planning commission and the various tourists bureaus anxious to help you in realizing the full advantage of this vast project.

As I have considered the notable features of your community, you must be just as convinced as I am that Oak Ridge will grow and prosper. However it will not thrive automatically and without your earnest and concerted efforts, any more than some other well-endowed areas.

Your citizens as a unified body must plan and work with foresight and vigor.

Your civil clubs and chamber of commerce and other community-minded groups must have high purpose and persuasive enthusiasm.

The city of Oak Ridge is starting off with certain advantages unusual for Tennessee and most other States in the Union. You have municipal facilities which are adequate or superior, with no burden of bonded indebtedness.

In addition, your city officials have organized a government which is not saddled with many of those unfortunate attributes which so often evolve after years of partisan politics.

As Governor of Tennessee, I want to sincerely commend you people of Oak Ridge for your new position as a full-fledged member of the family of Tennessee's growing cities.

I know you will find your new status more productive and better tuned to the democratic principles of this great country. What you accomplish for yourselves and by your own efforts will be more meaningful to you.

There can now be, also, a more genuine sharing of burdens and rewards between your city and your State.

As your Governor, I can promise you that the State will not shirk its responsibility to you in this wonderful new relationship.

Thank you and good night.

Observation on Our Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter I have just received from one of our great men here in the Nation's Capital. I am referring to my longtime friend, James L. Dixon, Washington, D.C. Jimmy Dixon, as we call him, some other friends and I spent several hours Saturday talking about our problems here in Washington. He made some very good suggestions and I asked Mr. Dixon if he would write them down for me, because I agreed with him on almost everything he said; many things that are not in this letter.

Anyway, this is a good letter and whenever I get anything good, I like to either take it in the First District of Alabama, where they have everything, or give it to my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States—here, Mr. Speaker, where the men who are listening to me now represent every human in the United States.

I had another letter that I wanted to put in along with this one, but I left it at home this morning. It was a letter I had from Texas, about our great leader in the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. I thought LYNDON JOHNSON, like James L. Dixon, did well, so well, in taking up for our President. So many other men—and I was surprised and disappointed in them—have criticized our President. It is no trouble for us to make a date and see the President and talk to him about things, or we can certainly write him. I have done both, and so have you, many times. President Eisenhower usually answers the letters the same day he receives them, and while I know he is not perfect, we do have a man that we know is honest, who has a brilliant mind, that he has served the people of the United States, all of the people of this Nation and the world, practically all of his life, and I think he has done a splendid job. Of course, he has made some mistakes, but our Christ made a mistake in just selecting His 12 disciples. He did select one bad one, as you know.

Well, I am glad to get this letter; I am glad to pass it along; and I am going to send President Dwight D. Eisenhower a copy by special messenger to the White House today; but I wanted it to go in the RECORD where not only our Representatives on both sides of the Capitol could read it, but where all of the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD could know what Jimmy Dixon had to say about Nikita Khrushchev.

I cabled the President at the summit conference that I thought this would happen. I also told him that I believed this man was the devil turned loose on earth again; that Khrushchev was another Hitler or another Mussolini; but thank God, we have so many wonderful, good men, and if we will just stay with them and back them up, even when we do make some mistakes, I thoroughly agree with the President that we have nothing to hide. You can buy a map for $1 that will show this entire Nation and others which show every one of our military installations; they will show everything from right on the earth clear to the heavens.

The President has been absolutely right in saying we should have the same privileges in Russia as we give them here, and I for one am behind him, not a hundred percent, but a thousand percent and more; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all right thinking men will agree with us that we must get closer together here in our own beloved homeland and back up our leaders—such leaders as you, Mr. Speaker, the great SAM RAYBURN of Texas, who has been the Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any living man, even longer than the great Henry Clay. Mr. Speaker, when I told a group of children this the other day—110 of them—when I was in your office, that you would be the President of the United States, if anything should happen to our President or Vice President, it seemed they did not know that.

Well, there are a lot of things that so many of us do not know, but we do know that you are doing a good job, and we do know that LYNDON JOHNSON and his great group over there are doing their dead level best, and with you two great men—you in the House, LYNDON JOHNSON on the Senate side, and the rest of your great group—we will stand by our President, and we will stand by the next President, and Mr. Khrushchev and all of his insults will not divide us, whether we are Democrats or Republicans. We are Americans—true Americans—and all right thinking men will applaud you and LYNDON JOHNSON for standing by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the elected President of the United States.

The letter follows:

JAMES L. DIXON & CO.,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1960.

The Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOYKIN: In line with our very pleasant discussions of yesterday,

Saturday, it is my humble opinion that one of the finest things to happen to this country since the signing of the Declaration of Independence was the collapse of the recent summit meeting held in Paris, France, May 1960. Whether the collapse of said summit meeting was preplanned by the men in the Kremlin or brought about as a result of the widely publicized U–2 incident is unimportant now. What is important is the fact that we now know for sure that we can no longer continue to live in a fool's paradise. Personally I am very pleased that our President did not apologize to Mr. Khrushchev at the summit meeting. However, I very much regret that the President promised to discontinue spying from the sky. The men of U.S.S.R. are the inventors of the spy system and we must never back off at beating them at their own game.

In November 1933, the brilliant Russian statesman Maxim Litvinov, with the help of his English-born wife, convinced Franklin Delano Roosevelt that the then down-and-out Russia should be recognized to the community of Nations. In so doing, Maxim Litvinov did more for the U.S.S.R. and the Russian people than any Russian before him or since him. With a sincere hope that this was another step toward an everlasting world peace, F.D.R. recommended this to Congress and the Congress approved. We have been living in a fool's paradise ever since. How long should it take for us to be convinced (now 27 years) that we, or any other country, cannot live peacefully with the Russians?

Every treaty and/or agreement made between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. during the last 27 years has been broken by the men in the Kremlin. Their signature is not worth the paper it is written on. In fact, their wanton disregard of international agreements is a vile mockery to all respected nations and, with particularity, the United States of America.

When I was a very young man my grandfather said to me: "Son, whenever you find yourself in a game with men of evil intentions, protect yourself and don't fumble." And that's where the U.S.A. stands today as far as the U.S.S.R. and the men in the Kremlin are concerned. These men in the Kremlin have, over the past 27 years, proven themselves to be nothing less than international gangsters on the face of this earth, and must be dealt with accordingly. The time has come when the U.S.A., and all member nations of the free world must take their respective heads out of the proverbial sand and face the stark realities of life as it exists on this earth today. When our own J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of our FBI, writes a book on communism (recently), title—"Masters of Deceit"—that's good enough for me. What else do we need? J. Edgar Hoover learned a long time ago that you cannot even molly-coddle our own local gangsters, much less international gangsters. Or, can it be (God forbid) that some of our illustrious servants on Capitol Hill think that they themselves possess the magic touch to tame these "masters of deceit"?

From my own point of view, Mr. Congressman, here's another important point: When in November 1933 the U.S.A. recognized the U.S.S.R. as a respected member to the community of nations, this was done strictly on a basis of good faith of one nation to another. In extending the hand of friendship in this way to the Russian people, all that we, the people of the U.S.A. asked for, or even expected, was the hand of friendship in return. After 27 years, however, the record shows conclusively that said good faith has been shattered to shreds by the violation of every treaty, and/or agreement between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. My point is this, Mr. Congressman: Had we known in November 1933, that the U.S.S.R. would violate her commitments, as the record now shows, it stands to reason that F.D.R. would not have recommended acceptance of the U.S.S.R. to the Congress, and the Congress would certainly not have approved said recommendation—had we known then what we know now. If this is true, and I would hate to think it would have been otherwise at the time, then why, after 27 years of glaring evidence of the breaching of the trust and the good faith we reposed in the U.S.S.R., do we not now at this time derecognize the U.S.S.R.? To prove my point, Mr. Congressman, I will herewith make a small wager that if the U.S.S.R. was not now recognized by the U.S.A., and with all the evidence of the referred-to 27 years of bitter experience now in the hands of the Congress, she would not now be recognized by the U.S.A., or even accepted as a member of the United Nations at any point in the foreseeable future. If this be true, then this proves my point. Further, it is my contention that to derecognize the U.S.S.R. at this time would do more to immediately reduce world tensions than most people think, including the Russians.

It is further my opinion Mr. Congressman—that the abuse this Nation takes from any other nation—up to a reasonable point—indicates our strength. However, the abuse we take beyond that point—will indicate our weakness.

Another thing that the collapse of the recent summit meeting proved is this; that the two term limit of the presidency of the United States is completely wrong and should be reversed immediately. On the local political level we, here in the United States, understand and have learned to live with the meaning of a lame duck Congressman, or a lame duck Senator. This can rightfully be classified as an internal political affair and something to be settled within our own borders. However, on the international level—an outgoing President of the United States, be he Democrat or Republican, who, now by law, cannot run for reelection, not only becomes a lame duck President, but moreover, from the embarrassing events of the last summit meeting, obviously, becomes a sitting duck president for all heads of other governments to shoot at, knowing full well that his tenure in office is not only limited, but also is not to be renewed, and that his influence in the community of nations diminishes each day from the starting date of his second term in office. This observation applies particularly to his last 6 or 8 months in office, as witness—recent summit meeting events.

No President of the United States in our history has ever been subjected to the indignities heaped upon our now President by the head of a foreign government as was done at the recent summit meeting, and subsequent thereto. There should be no doubt in the minds of men on Capitol Hill but that the two term limit of the presidency of the United States contributed much too much to the unwarranted insults hurled at our President by the head of the U.S.S.R. However, if the events of the recently collapsed summit meeting serve to bring about a reversal of the two term limit of the presidency of the United States then, and in that event, the collapsed summit meeting will not have collapsed in vain.

It is further my opinion, Mr. Congressman—that summit meetings, so called, should be abolished forever. As a taxpayer I would like to ask you the pointed question, "For what purpose was the United Nations established if not to resolve problems between nations? Is it not, at least in theory, a violation of the charter of the United Nations for heads of State to meet outside of the United Nations for the purpose of trying to resolve international problems?" The pages of history already record that the results of all previous summit meetings has contributed largely to increased trouble and additional misunderstandings between members of the United Nations. Summit meetings have proven one thing for sure, and that is, there should be no more summit meetings.

Summarizing: It should not be too surprising to any of us that Mr. Khrushchev revoked the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the U.S.S.R. All of us know that Mr. Khrushchev insulted our own Vice President last year. Why should we be so gullible and naive to think that Mr. Khrushchev would be any different this year? He insulted Prime Minister Macmillan in Moscow, and now accuses Chancellor Adenauer of Germany of being an idiot. Any further accusations by Mr. Khrushchev against the United States should, in my opinion, be responded to by stony silence. We should no longer dignify Mr. Khrushchev, or any other man in the Kremlin, by association, or communication.

The recent rantings of Mr. Khrushchev, reminiscent of mad man Hitler, and Benito Mussolini, are clearly indicative of fear of loss. That's why he revoked the President's invitation to visit Russia—fear of loss of face and prestige with his own people. And on this particular subject—this writer learned a long time ago that those who are afraid to lose, Mr. Congressman—lose. It could be a bloody mess before it's all over but the outcome in favor of men of the free world, under God, can never be in doubt. Make no mistake about it however, Khrushchev is runnin' scared and is therefore a very dangerous man.

I wish to thank you for taking the time to read this letter, and in conclusion permit me to say that while it took brains to write the Declaration of Independence, it took gutttts—Mr. Congressman—to sign it.

Our next President—Mr. Congressman—must have both.

Remaining,

Very cordially yours,

JAMES L. DIXON.

Saving Part of "God's Great Outdoors"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Americans are slowly realizing that urban and suburban areas do not have a limitless supply of open land for recreation and other purposes. A sharp warning on this matter was given recently by Carleton E. Heritage, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau. An editorial in the May 31 issue of the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News comments on the issue and on Mr. Heritage's remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING PART OF GOD'S GREAT OUTDOORS

The president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, Carleton E. Heritage, in a recent speech joined in the growing demand for setting aside open space in our State before it is too late.

Mr. Heritage spoke before a group which is particularly interested in preserving part of the State's original heritage of forest and

stream, the New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Mr. Heritage took a realistic view. "No sensible attitude would admit for a moment that we must stand in the way of progress," he said. "Homes and factories will rise. Highways must cut through our great woodlands, take hundreds of acres of our richest farmlands. That is our life pattern. But let us plan to preserve some part of God's great outdoors."

The point that needs emphasizing is that these plans must be made and carried out quickly, because in a relatively few years, it will be too late. The expected population increase of New Jersey to 10 million by the year 2000 will convert most of the northern part of the State into one huge suburb. Already, Mr. Heritage said, New Jersey's population density is greater than tiny Rhode Island's. Time is running out more quickly than we realize.

Dedication Ceremonies of the Dubois-Jefferson County Airport of Dubois, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, after being rained out on May 30, 1960 the dedication ceremony of the Du Bois-Jefferson County Airport was held on Sunday June 5, 1960 in the presence of some 5,000 persons, various types of military aircraft and several hundred private planes.

The new airport has been the goal of the residents of the Du Bois area for many years and now that it is a reality, we are all proud of the accomplishments of the Du Bois Municipal Airport Authority which was made possible by the splendid cooperation of area residents.

It was my privilage to deliver the following dedicatory address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE DUBOIS-JEFFERSON COUNTY AIRPORT, DUBOIS, PA., JUNE 5, 1960

It is a real pleasure to participate in the dedication ceremony of the Dubois-Jefferson County Airport and to congratulate the businessmen of Dubois and the residents of the area on the fulfillment of the long-cherished dream of modern airport facilities for this region of Pennsylvania.

This accomplishment reflects great credit on various residents of Dubois who have been actively striving for a modern airport since the close of World War II.

It is pleasing to commend especially the members of the Dubois Airport Authority who since 1952, regardless of many obstacles, remained steadfast in their determination to achieve the goal of a modern airport.

These men, dedicated to advancing the best interests of Dubois and surrounding communities, could not have succeeded in their mission were it not for the wholehearted and generous financial supoprt from area residents who share in the credit for the success of the drive to obtain financial contributions necessary to match Federal and State funds.

Since the close of World War II when I returned to Congress from military service, the need for modern airport facilities in the Dubois area has received my constant and painstaking attention.

Many will recall that as pioneers in the movement to improve the Du Bois Airport, in 1950 we were successful in having the Civil Aeronautics Authority make an allocation of $150,000 in Federal funds for the purpose of modernizing the then existing airport facilities.

Because of difficulties regarding a suitable site, the city of Du Bois reluctantly had to let the Federal appropriation lapse because of the lack of perfected plans for providing a modern airport.

It was a bitter disappointment to all of us—when the Civil Aeronautics Authority informed us in 1951 that since the city of Du Bois could not use the funds it was necessary to allocate them elsewhere, since many other communities that had qualified for Federal assistance were still on the waiting list.

In 1952 with the creation of an airport authority, a renewed and vigorous effort was launched by a dedicated group of citizens who had but one objective in mind—a modern airport for the Du Bois area.

Today we are viewing the success of the determined effort to acquire a suitable site and the sponsor's share of funds necessary to match Federal and State allocations.

Waxing historical for the moment, when the request was made in 1952 for reinstatement of the $150,000 Federal aid for development of the Du Bois Municipal Airport, it was denied on the grounds that no sponsor funds for the proposed project were on hand.

Therefore, the allocation of Federal funds made in 1950 could not be reinstated.

In other words, we had to begin all over again to satisfy site requirements, and above all, provide assurance that local funds were available as the sponsor's share of the project.

The period from 1952 to 1956 represents 4 years of frustrating efforts in trying to select a suitable site and finally, due to the persistent efforts of a determined group of men functioning as the Du Bois Airport Authority, the site question was settled.

As a result, in June 1956, it was possible for me to convince the then Secretary of Commerce the Honorable Sinclair Weeks that the community of Du Bois should be included in the Civil Aeronautics Authority's airport program for that year.

Believe me this was not an easy task because airport funds had already been allocated.

In a spirit of cooperation and being assured of the determined effort by members of the Du Bois Airport Authority as well as the need of the Du Bois area for a modern airport, Secretary Weeks in 1956 "gathered together," as he termed it, the initial appropriation of $76,000 in Federal funds from other airport allocations.

In so doing, Secretary Weeks made possible the beginning of this much-needed airport which is being dedicated here today.

Since 1956 additional Federal as well as State and sponsor's funds have been made available to cover the cost of the construction of this million dollar airport.

The financial contributions by the Federal and State governments and which cover 75 percent of the cost of this airport are expressions of confidence by the Federal and State governments in the future of the Du Bois area.

As the Representative in Congress from this district it was a pleasure to have had a part in working with residents of Du Bois and vicinity, and especially the members of the Airport Authority, in bringing this airport project to the point of completion.

Therefore, today as we dedicate this fine airport—the Du Bois area is being linked with the airways of the Nation—yes, of the world, and in addition this new airport is truly a symbol of the progress being made in the field of transportation.

When we glance at commercial aviation today, it is hard to realize that we are examining such a young industry.

The record of its development since December 17, 1903, when Orville and Wilbur Wright made their flights at Kitty Hawk, is filled with a long list of achievements.

Fifty years ago, for instance, air transportation had already progressed beyond these initial flights.

In 1910 a solo flight was made by the first American woman pilot, and the first American flying meet was held in California.

In that year a record was established by Glenn H. Curtiss who took only 2 hours and 50 minutes to fly from Albany to New York.

Yes, the air age was on its way 50 years ago, but in those early days of aviation, air transportation was left to the adventurous.

It was a sport for the young and daring pilot who was characterized as a barnstormer.

The usefulness of aviation first became apparent during World War I.

In July 1917 an appropriation of $640 million was made for military aviation, and during the course of World War I our military aviation shot down 781 planes and 73 balloons.

As a result of these activities, in World War I, the possibilities of peacetime aviation began to emerge.

The Post Office Department, for an illustration, was among the early groups to recognize the potentialities of air transportation.

On May 15, 1918, an experimental airmail flight was made between Washington and New York, and in 1921 the first transcontinental airmail service became a reality.

The Post Office Department also pioneered night flying, and many of us remember the emergency landing fields in this area made necessary because this section of Pennsylvania was called "the graveyard of the Alleghenies."

Before aviation achieved commercial importance, it was essential that it become safe and dependable enough for the general public.

By the 1920's aeronautics had advanced to the point where the use of airplanes as common carriers became possible.

This development plus the interest generated by the 1927 Lindbergh flight across the Atlantic ushered in commercial aviation.

During the past 30 years commercial aviation has grown by leaps and bounds.

Let us not forget, however, that commercial air transportation is only one part of aviation.

It was the use of the airplane during World War I which first showed its potentialities and performance.

After World War II the importance of military aviation was recognized by creation of the U.S. Air Force.

In the Korean War 1,020 Communist aircraft were destroyed by the U.S. Far East Air Force.

Although in the 1950's much of the talk of our air preparedness has centered on missiles, it appears that military aviation will continue to be with us for some time. Both for the transport of military personnel and equipment and for combat duty.

In addition to commercial and military aviation, general aviation has become important on the American scene.

As of January 1, 1959, there were more than 67,000 active aircraft engaged in general aviation in the United States, and ap-

proximately 2,500 of the aircraft were located in our State of Pennsylvania.

This then is a brief description of aviation as it has developed in the Nation.

Now that the city of Dubois has achieved a long cherished dream let us dwell briefly on this question:

How important is the service that this new airport is bringing to this area. And is it worth the effort?

Well it is impossible, of course, for anyone to give you a final answer to this question, for the answer lies in the future.

And yet we can draw on the experience of other places and other years to arrive at the best possible answer.

In my mind the answer seems quite an obvious one because it is my firm belief that your decision to build this airport was sound and wise.

Therefore, the future of this region should be much better because of it.

The basic reason for my conclusion is the fact that good transportation is essential for the well being and development of any community.

As we all know one of the reasons this area is aware of the importance of transportation is because so many of you are employed in the transportation field.

In this connection the Bureau of the Census found that in 1950 almost 10 percent of the persons employed in Clearfield County worked in the field of transportation, communication, and other public utilities.

In addition, there are others who are members of the families of those transportation workers.

It is an accepted fact that transportation has become an important segment of American industry and yet sometimes perhaps we forget to relate this transportation to a particular community.

It is transportation, together with communication, which has permitted regions some distance from large urban centers to participate in their economic development.

It is transportation which has removed isolation and largely erased the distance gap between regions.

In the first place, there is the transportation of goods and secondly of more interest to us today, there is the transportation of persons.

This has meaning for all of us, because manufacturing firms hesitate to locate in completely isolated regions.

Therefore, a community without adequate facilities for the transportation of persons is bound to lag behind the Nation's economic development.

It is for this reason that the Du Bois-Jefferson County Airport is so important to this region.

As we all know, this area was rapidly becoming an isolated one.

In the past few years we have seen a nationwide decline in railroad passenger service, and this decline has been felt in this part of Pennsylvania.

Furthermore, although we have good highways in this region, as we all know, there are times during the winter when driving is hazardous and difficult.

Even though you were able to use the Black Moshannon Airport near Philipsburg, many of its advantages were lessened by the time which had to be spent in traveling to it.

Speaking frankly, an airport in a neighboring community is not the same as an airport at home and for that reason this new airport should do much to relieve this isolation.

Ladies and gentlemen, a commercial airport means that a community is accessible, that visitors can come to that area, and that economic development is stimulated.

Therefore, it is this kind of benefit that this new airport should provide, since it will be served by Allegheny Airlines, and will bring commercial air transportation to the residents of this part of Pennsylvania.

And so, after working side by side the past several years with airminded citizens of Dubois, including Gene Noon, Bill Korb, Don Kield, Bill Schneider, A. C. Nelson, John Groves, George Yohe, James Gleason, John Cherry, F. L. Brubaker, D. L. Sheesley, and their associates, I feel quite honored to participate with you today in the dedication of this airport.

I have similar feelings for the progressive-minded leaders of Brookville, Reynoldsville, Sykesville, Brockway, and Punxsutawney who blended their efforts together for a united necessity of dire importance to the entire overall area.

Therefore, as I close I extend to all of you hearty congratulations on the groundwork you have laid, and you have my best wishes that the flights originating and terminating at this airport may bring to this area the prosperity which is so richly deserves.

Random Thoughts on Spies and Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently, Walter Winchell devoted a column to the general subject of spies and espionage. The article goes back into the early history of this country, and is very interesting, indeed. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, under the title, "Random Thoughts on Spies and Espionage."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRONIES OF HISTORY

(By Walter Winchell)

Allen Dulles must be pondering the ironies of history this week. Gen. George Washington sent in a spy once, a fellow named Nathan Hale, who got himself caught and was hanged as a result. The general reaction of the Americans is reflected in a couple of monuments to both Washington and Hale. The cheap appeasers now hollering for Allen Dulles' scalp want to reverse the process. If their logic is correct, they should be demanding that the statues of Washington and Hale be removed on the ground that all the foreign diplomats now at the United Nations might get the idea that this country approves of George Washington and his methods.

In one sense, George Washington had it comparatively easy: No one suggested that he should be pilloried because one of his people got caught. The fact is, in spite of the politicians, that most Americans stay along with the old idea: Allen Dulles deserves a plaque, if not a monument, for going 90,000 feet high and 7,000 miles out of his way just to be sure about what our little playmates over the fence might be cooking up.

The same fuss and feathers were raised in 1928 when it was discovered that the State Department had a code-breaking black chamber. A lot of childish people protested the opening of other nations' secrets, as if they weren't opening ours. So for a long time the United States simply didn't know what was going on. When we had the code-breaking we knew we could limit the Jap Fleet. How many American lives that saved is impossible to estimate, but it saved many. If peeking over the fence is illegal, why shouldn't we completely suspend our other activities? After all, all we were able to do because of intelligence was win the battle of Midway and defeat Rommel in Africa.

President George Washington also had an interesting answer when the House of Representatives asked to see his correspondence in the John Jay treaties. His interesting answer was that it was none of their business. After thinking it over, a vice not particularly prevalent among Congressmen, they decided he was right. So while Allen Dulles can't expect, like Washington and Hale, to get a monument out of this, he most certainly can and should point out to Congress the beauties of the Potomac River and tell the more inquisitive ones to go jump in it.

He could do no greater harm to this country than by yielding any information whatsoever on our intelligence system. Millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are willing to take their lives in their hands to help us. To expose how they work and who they are is to issue a death warrant against them. Even the possibility of exposure is enough to paralyze the passage of invaluable information to our country. The suggestion that it be openly debated is preposterous. If the administration furnishes even the slightest clues to the identity and methods of operation, it will not only have violated civilized law; it will have done what even the worst gangster will not do: Put a friend on a spot.

What puzzles many people is the question: Hod good is a handshake? The Democratic leaders went out to the airport to shake the President's hand, assuring him of their support, and before the applause had died, teed off on him. Adlai Stevenson, at—of all things—a fundraising rally, took the lead in the assault. The outrage is not free from an inference that the next $100 a plate Democratic dinner will be a sellout, at the expense of national unity.

In one of the most hilarious ads in American history a committee for Stevenson took full pages in metropolitan newspapers to advance the candidacy of the former Illinois Governor. All were solemnly assured that Governor Stevenson hadn't the slightest knowledge that they were doing this, surprise, surprise. It is time Adlai Stevenson quit kidding himself that he is kidding the American public. No man can sneak into the Presidency. If he wants the job, he should stand up and say so. If he doesn't—and he says he doesn't—he need merely point to General Sherman's statement, adopt it as his own, and the undignified pseudodraft will be over. At this time he is an embarrassment to the Nation and a millstone around his own party's neck. There is no public service he could render which could possibly match an apology by him to the President and the American people, followed by a sour-grape declaration that he would not accept a nomination, nor would he serve if elected. Millions now living and tens of millions yet unborn would carefully respect his well-earned oblivion.

Senator FULBRIGHT, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would do well to suspend public exhibition of his ignorance of the law. An exercise of Faubustry is about all the Kremlin needs these days to refuel its propaganda gas tanks. Senator FULBRIGHT's disastrous friendly investigation of the stock market should be reminder enough to him that his delicate touch often results in a monkey wrench in the machinery.

This country once exhibited its general staff plans in the General MacArthur hearings. If it exhibits its intelligence setup, it will be similar to a giant blinding himself. Without CIA we cannot see and without foreign agents CIA cannot see * * * The principal danger to the country, right now, is not that CIA can see into the Soviet, but the politicians who can't see beyond-the-end-of-their-nose jobs.

If there is to be a Senate investigation, one of the first and most important persons who should be invited is Robert Bouley, the Paris newsman who reported that Adlai Stevenson told him that the United States should make heavy concessions to the Reds—which interview, in all fairness, Mr. Stevenson repudiates. A repudiated interview, however, is not necessarily a denial that the statements were uttered. It would contribute much to the national unity if Mr. Stevenson and the French reporter were to confront each other. It would also clarify matters if Mr. Stevenson stated whether or not he repudiates statements of his indicating that he favors the admission of Red China to the United Nations. If so, the country ought to know about it and the Democratic Party should decide once and for all if it wants it in the platform.

In any event, the confusion of the President's opposition is a marvel to behold. * * * At the very same time that Senator FULBRIGHT announced he intended to get the facts, Chairman Paul Butler issued a statement bitterly criticizing Vice President NIXON for revealing that two Red spies had been caught in Massachusetts. * * * The Democratic Advisory Committee sustained Adlai Stevenson's Chicago outburst; the New York Democratic leaders either repudiated it or said it was ill timed.

The fact is that in its gallop to make hay out of the U–2 incident, the Democratic donkey is making an ass of itself.

H.R. 9597—World War I Pension Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL HOGAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, a motion to discharge the Veterans' Affairs Committee from further consideration of H.R. 9575, the World War I Pension Act of 1960, has been filed with the Clerk. Petition No. 7 is now on the Speaker's desk for signature.

Convinced that the time is overdue for consideration of a pension for our World War I veterans, I wish to call your attention to the proposition—this profound moral issue that perpetually confronts the Congress of the United States—the issue that goes to the very roots of American history, American tradition, American principle.

We must decide if our whole concept, our philosophy, of the consideration for the veteran is right or wrong. If he is just another citizen, then our parades, our memorials, our past considerations are wrong—then the very principle of veterans' benefits, dating back to the Plymouth Colony and 1636 is wrong. We have mistakenly carried out for three centuries the institution of just compensation and public gratitude for the veteran on this soil—here in America—if we feel that he is just another citizen.

There are those who would force this concept upon us today. There are those who feel that the veteran is a nonentity. They feel that the veteran should be given the same consideration as any other citizen and no more. That, basically, was the idea of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions which made its report to President Eisenhower in April 1956.

I charge that we need a reevaluation of what the veteran really is, what his role has been in the past, and what his considerations have been in order to focus our sights properly on the proposition of benefits.

Actually veterans' benefits in some form go back to the days of Caesar, to the wars of the Greek city-states, and to just about any civilization that used the soldier's life and his limbs to make sure of its own survival. Napoleon who used soldiers ruthlessly nevertheless had a regard for them and saw to their needs long after their usefulness as soldiers had been exhausted. The same was of course true of the Duke of Marlborough. The ancients apportioned land and loot to their returning soldier heroes.

Today, for some reason, we have, here in America borrowed General MacArthur's much quoted line that "old soldiers never die; they just fade away." Statistics tell a different story, however, for World War I soldiers are dying at the rate of something like an average of 9,000 a month. Now, the 9,000 or so that are gone this month are gone forever. We shall not have to worry about giving them any decent regard for the services they performed on the Nation's behalf. The same is true of all the dead that have gone before. There will be more than 9,000 in the months to come as the veteran population gets older and older, just as there were less than 9,000 a month in the years before when the World War I population was relatively younger.

If we are going to do anything about the veterans of World War I the time to do it is right now.

Of course, we can wait. Then all we shall have to do for the veteran is what we do for a dead veteran. We will blow taps over his grave and go home. That way we shall have escaped any necessity for giving him a pension. We shall, at the same time have put in the appearance of having honored him—at least when he is dead. The only cost will be our trip to the cemetery.

A grave picture? Yes, but it cost nothing, made no dent in the budget and passes as honoring the war dead. The Bureau of the Budget is pleased.

The Congress has improved and liberalized benefits to our veterans of all wars. This is good. The widow and the orphaned survivor has had some consideration also. This is just.

But, what has the Congress and our Nation done beyond the cases of utter need and elementary hardship? What are we willing to do for the World War I veterans?

I propose a five-pronged program for the Congress to consider and the veteran to champion:

First. Fight for the right of the veteran to be a person of dignity, an individual of standing in the country and not a problem.

Second. Fight to make certain that nothing is done to erase or dilute the veteran as a person with a distinctive status in the community. A veteran is not just another citizen; he is a veteran.

Third. Remain vigilant to see to it that the war injured, the maimed, the widow and the orphan, the veteran who has come upon hard times, be given high priority—the highest—on the legislative calendar of the Congress of the United States.

Fourth. Reexamine veteran legislation already passed, reviewing it, from year to year, reevaluate it in accordance with existing economic conditions, and make sure that the value for the recipient has not been diminished. Thus we see to it that legislation on the books is modified to keep level with changed conditions.

Fifth. See to it that particularly and especially the veterans of World War I, who are now the dean of veterans, be accorded the recognition due them. This means that in the light of the age factor, some legislation be devised that is arithmetically sound; that is suited to the economy of the country, and that can be absorbed without too much undesirable impact on the Federal budget. I frankly believe, gentlemen, that H.R. 9575, is that legislation. It is the answer we need to make to a great moral issue of today. It is an honest answer that is morally imperative. It would follow along the lines of the precedent set for the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Certainly there is nothing in this proposition that I make to you that is extreme nor beyond solution. According to figures from the Veterans' Administration, there were some 2,694,000 living veterans of World War I, as of March 1960. A month before, that is, February 1960, there were 2,704,000 veterans of World War I. That means that just about 10,000 World War I veterans died in that 1-month interim—I was deliberately being conservative when I earlier mentioned 9,000 World War I veterans deaths each month. If we had an across-the-board $100 a month pension for them, that would cost the county about $3,196 million. This is of course, a pronounced addition to what is totally a budget of about $77 billion for all Government expenditures. The 1960 budget for veterans' services and benefits is about $5,088 million, and this $3 billion would be in addition or a total of over $8 billion for our Federal veteran program.

I hasten to point out, however, that by 1965 the World War I veterans will have thinned out to $2,090,000 costing the country, if $100 pensions across the board were adopted, two and a half billion dollars. This will be further diminished by 1970 when 1,483,000 World War I veterans will cost $1,780 million if the $100 pension is legislated.

By 1980 there will only be 452,000 World War I veterans costing the Government under the proposed $100 pension $542 million. And by 1990—just 30 years from now—your World War I veteran population will be down to 44,000 costing the Government for the remaining $100 pensions something like less than $53 million. In the succeeding decade or before the year 2000—there will not be any World War I veterans left to pay pensions to.

In terms of arithmetic, that is the story.

Our national duty will have been done—our debt paid.

Resolutions Adopted at Annual Session of Wisconsin Congregational-Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in this space-age era, our Nation—and the world—faces the task of making decisions relating to human rights and race relations, the population explosion, the plight of world refugees, the plight of atomic destruction and a variety of other challenges of worldwide significances.

In endeavoring to deal effectively with such broad-scope problems, we need not only wise leadership, but also the benefit of grassroots thinking on these and other difficulties.

We recognize that in a world—shrunken by science and technology so that travel time between distant places around the globe has been reduced to hours and minutes—the interrelations resulting from such closeness needs to awaken new perspective among our people.

More and more, I am encouraged and gratified by the way that people across the country are attempting to understand and form constructive recommendations for dealing with problems of international scope.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a set of resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Congressional Conference reflecting upon a wide variety of world problems.

Representing the kind of grassroots thinking which we need more of, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

* * * * * *

RESOLUTION 3—A RESOLUTION ON THE PLIGHT OF WORLD REFUGEES ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE AT EAU CLAIRE, WIS., MAY 10–12, 1960

RESETTLEMENT OF REFUGEES

Be it—

Resolved, That we commend the Waukesha and Oconomowoc churches for their activities in sponsoring the resettlement of three refugee families; be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our resolution of 1959 and again urge the churches and members of our conference to provide sponsorship for the resettlement of refugees in our communities; be it

Resolved, That we support the proposals of the President of the United States for liberalization of our national immigration laws, especially as they pertain to the resettlement of refugees; be it

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States to allocate a more substantial portion of his discretionary funds for the relief and resettlement of refugees.

RESOLUTION 4—A RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, RELATING TO INTERRACIAL RELATIONS, ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE AT EAU CLAIRE, WIS., MAY 10–12, 1960

A RESOLUTION OF CONCERN

The Wisconsin Congregational Conference meeting in Eau Claire, Wis., May 10–12, cannot escape a feeling of great concern at distressing information published daily about the violent occurrences in South Africa and about indignities which have been, and continue to be, visited upon American Negroes in our own country. With respect to the latter, we have learned with deep and sympathetic interest of the many groups of young people, colored and white, who have been engaging in what appear to be dignified, orderly demonstrations in an attempt to focus attention upon the positive necessity for the people of the United States to purge themselves of discriminatory and degrading racial practices in churches, education, business, industry, and government.

In registering our concern with regard to such happenings at home and abroad we are mindful of the responsibility resting upon our churches, associations, and conferences, on our ministers and lay people as individuals, to be forward, not backward, in eliminating all barriers imposing racial discrimination in and on organizational life and conduct, and also to be sources of strength and centers of power for all the people of their communities, especially the young people, during these days of emotional tension accompanying the cultural shift in which we are all involved.

In expressing our concern, we are assuring all our people further, of our remembrance of them in our prayers that they may have wisdom, strength, and courage in bearing their witness in the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(Adapted from a statement by the executive council of the United Church of Christ meeting in St. Louis, April 21–22, 1960.)

* * * *

RESOLUTION 6—A RESOLUTION ON THE THREAT OF ATOMIC DESTRUCTION, ADOPTED BY THE WISCONSIN CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE AT EAU CLAIRE, WIS., MAY 10–12, 1960

Whereas we are informed by reliable authorities that the United States and Soviet Russia have more than enough nuclear bombs to destroy the cities of both countries; and

Whereas we are aware of the terrible health dangers to present and future generations of people from radio-active fallout caused by atomic explosions; and

Whereas the New York Times has reported that the Military Appropriations Committee has attempted to persuade Congress to pass legislation permitting "preemptive war"—that is, war in which, when we think we have reason—often unreliable military intelligence—to believe an enemy may be about to attack us or our allies, we attack first, without overt provocation; be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Government, in its legislative, executive, diplomatic and military branches to turn away from the mass destruction of atomic extinction.

That we call upon all branches of our Government to renounce "preemptive war."

That we encourage our President and his negotiators at the coming summit conference, in view of the intolerable risks in the continued production of atomic weapons, to venture the lesser and more rational risk of their discontinuance;

That we urge the Atomic Energy Commission to develop further atomic resources for constructive purposes only, and to terminate nuclear weapons.

That we offer to negotiate with any government anywhere in the world toward agreements by which we may eliminate the use of atomic power as a means of waging war against each other.

That we call upon all nations in this crisis of calamity before mankind to turn back from the "morals of extermination";

That we call upon congregations to pray and our ministers to preach against the irrational and immoral forces among us that can end in nothing but destruction; and

That we cry to God for deliverance out of the hand of judgment which so darkly overshadows us, in hope and faith that He will yet show His rainbow of promise and remember His covenants of old to deliver us out of the hand of violence, even when in our own hands, and to redeem us into the City of Peace in the name of One who came not to destroy humanity but that through Him humanity might be saved.

Chicago: Cultural Giant Born of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article written by Clay Gowran about the city of Chicago, which appeared in the June 4 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There is little I could add to this fine analysis of the city which is destined to become the greatest metropolis in the world. I am happy that I can call this article to the attention of my colleagues, and I believe Mr. Gowran is to be congratulated for capturing the real spirit of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, June 4, 1960]

CHICAGO: CULTURAL GIANT BORN OF PROGRESS—THOUSANDS FIND COMMERCE CENTER ALSO HUB OF STUDY

(By Clay Gowran)

One might say the city was built by giants and for giants.

Henryk Sienkiewicz of Poland, later to win a Nobel Prize for literature, wrote these words in the 1870's. They summed up his feelings for a city which had captured his imagination and his heart.

The city was Chicago, and the words are as true today as when the author wrote them almost a century ago, although such a statement is bound to bring sneers from some critics.

Sadly, it seems to have become "fashionable" or "intellectual" among many Chicagoans to picture their city as crime ridden, slum filled, and culturally barren. To hear them, it is a tired, congested metropolis to which good citizens come only by day to earn a living, fleeing at night to the suburbs.

Sure, Chicago has scars and smears—gangsters, murders, slums, and scandals. This does not make it unique among cities, past or present.

Eighteenth century London is revered as the inspired home of Samuel Johnson, David Garrick, William Pitt, and a bustling empire. Who bothers to remember its brothels, stomach turning decay, agencies where children were rented to beggars to aid their alms seeking, and the interesting fact that it had a police scandal even before it had a police force?

Two hundred years before the recent mess in Chicago's Summerdale police district broke in the headlines, London discovered its watchmen were taking fees from housebreakers to look the other way while burglaries were committed on their beats.

Sienkiewicz's city "built by giants and for giants" lives up to his description in many ways. Not the least of them are intellectual.

ART INSTITUTE RANKS HIGH

Those who deride Chicago as an artistic wasteland probably have never passed between the bronze lions at Michigan Avenue and Adams Street. They guard the entrance to the Art Institute of Chicago, which ranks among the foremost art centers of the world.

Only the National Gallery of Washington, the New York Metropolitan, and the Art Museum of Boston are in a class with it in this Nation, and in balance of qualities—the test of an art center—none surpasses it.

In four ways, the Art Institute is outstanding. Its collection of paintings of the French impressionist school of 1840 to 1920 is, for completeness and variety, probably the world's best. Its collection of art objects of the Far East, especially of Chinese bronzes and Japanese prints, is fantastically rich.

Thirdly, the institute houses an enormous number of prints by all the great names in art. Finally, and unique among museums, it has the Thorne rooms. On permanent exhibit, these are a collection of miniature interiors of living rooms, both American and foreign, through history. They were assembled with enormous attention to detail by Mrs. James Ward Thorne, and their like exists nowhere else in the world.

But these are only the high points of a wonderland of art. Allan McNab, director of the institute, dislikes even to guess at the monetary value of the institute's treasures but, if pressed, grudgingly places the total at something around $200 million.

Last year, 1,039,000 persons visited the Art Institute. But visitors alone do not measure its good for the city and the world. It has a school which last year attracted students from 38 States and 17 foreign nations. McNab proudly points out that 9.4 percent of all persons listed in "Who's Who in American Art" either graduated from or were students of the school—a record enjoyed by no other institution in the country.

The Art Institute also owns and operates the Goodman Theater and School of Drama, with approximately 200 students and a faculty of 16.

Far south of the Loop on the campus of the University of Chicago, is a gothic hall which houses a fabulous blending of art and history. This is the university's oriental institute, one of the world's foremost centers for study of the beginnings of culture in man, and possessor of an unequaled collection of treasures from the period 4500 B.C. to A.D. 500.

TRAVEL THROUGH EONS OF TIME

To walk into its muted exhibit rooms is to walk back through eons of time. Here is the collossal statute of Tutankhamen, carved in 1350 B.C., found in 1929 by institute scientists. Here is the 40-ton, human-headed Assyrian bull which in 700 B.C. guarded the mighty palace of Sargon in what is now northern Iraq.

Another famous institution skillfully blending art, history, and science is the Chicago Natural History Museum at Lake Shore Drive and Roosevelt Road. Ranked by specialists as one of the four greatest of its kind in the world, it is the only one which represents all branches of natural history—geology, zoology, botany, and anthropology.

This is no dead museum, as some like it tend to be. Its more than 12-floor acres of public exhibits constantly are being improved to tell the story of man and his world to more than 1 million visitors each year. In closed sections of the museum, scientists pore over new data brought back by expeditions sent out year after year to all parts of the world.

Chicago has three libraries of which any city could be proud. First, there is the Chicago public library, an $8 million a year institution with 59 branches in addition to its huge building at Michigan Avenue and Washington Street.

Catering to the general reader, the library has more than 800,000 cardholders, 2½ million books plus recordings, motion picture films and slides, and tens of thousands of pamphlets. Last year, it purchased 321,000 volumes—an average acquisition to replace wornout books and keep abreast of new publications.

"More Chicagoans are reading today, and reading more purposeful books," said Miss Gertrude Gscheidle, librarian. "Twenty years ago, 65 percent of the books circulating to our adult readers consisted of fiction. Today the figure is just about reversed, with fiction making up only 35 percent of the volumes taken by adults."

At Walton Place and Dearborn Street, overlooking the tiny park known as Bughouse Square because of the wild orators who used to gather there, is one of the great scholarly libraries of the world. It is Newberry Library, founded in 1887 through the generosity of Walter Loomis Newberry, Chicago merchant and financier.

Its Edward G. Ayer collection of 80,000 volumes on the Indians of America, worth $20 to $30 million is unequaled. Since the destruction of Manila in World War II, Newberry probably has the world's best library of printed books on the Philippines. No collection in the world tops Newberry's on calligraphy, elegant writing of decorative style.

SCHOLARS COME FROM EVERYWHERE

"Our main objective is to cater to scholars," said Dr. Stanley Pargellis, librarian. "They come here from everywhere, some spending weeks and months in research. Many is the book which has been written as the result of such research here."

Finally, there is the John Crerar Library, which occupies 10 floors at 86 East Randolph Street and is one of the Nation's most important centers for scientific and technological publications. Here is a collection of 1 million pieces of scientific literature.

The library operates a research information service which in the last 12 months performed research work for 55 companies and 30 Government departments or trade associations. Its photoduplication service provided a third of a million copies of material from the library wanted by buyers all over the world. Its translation center provided 40,000 translations of foreign scientific papers to interested clients.

At Lake Shore Drive and 57th Street in Jackson Park is a huge, graceful building which houses the greatest institution of its kind in the world—the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry.

To this giant museum last year came 2,547,231 visitors from all over the world. They stayed an average of 3 hours and 12 minutes, or about three times as long as visitors normally remain in any of the world's great museums. There is good reason for the difference.

The science museum seeks to impart learning to its visitors, and its staff has long realized this objective cannot be accomplished unless the visitor's attention and interest can be captured. So, the science museum follows a "do-it-yourself" philosophy in which its guests learn while actively engaged in pushing buttons, turning wheels, and pulling levers to make exhibits work.

"The museum provides visitors with opportunities to see themselves on color television, test their hearing, hear their voices, see their voices on an oscilloscope, and test themselves for color blindness," said Daniel M. MacMaster, director.

FEATURE ATOMIC AGE EXHIBITS

"We produce manmade rubber, rain, snowstorms, and lightning bolts. Visitors may walk through a 24-foot-diameter reproduction of a human cell or contemplate the interior of the human heart inside an 18-foot-high reproduction.

"They can ride a moving rubber sidewalk, or a train in a coal mine. They can walk down a gas lit main street of yesterday and stop in a nickelodeon to see silent movies of long ago, or they can operate and participate in atomic age scientific exhibits—the nuclear fuel cycle first shown at Geneva, Switzerland, last year is one."

The museum, in effect, is a fitting monument to the enormous progress Chicago has made in science, industry, and education since its beginning.

Today, Metropolitan Chicago is a bustling business and industrial complex with 145,000 firms and 14,000 manufacturers. Its factories produced almost $23 billion worth of goods last year, and employed about 1 million workers.

It is the largest steel center in the world, with a 1960 capacity of 27,248,400 tons. It has nine industries in the billion dollar a year or better class.

In 1959, in value of manufacturers' sales, the city's top position was taken by manufactured food products, which amounted to $3,810 million, an increase of 0.8 percent over 1958. Manufacture of primary metals was second with sales of $3,530 million. Third place went to nonelectrical machinery, in which sales totaled $2.6 billion and fabricated metals was fourth with sales of $2.19 billion.

Expansion is continuing in virtually all fields. During 1959, investments for industrial land and building construction amounted to $335 million, compared with $198.9 million in such plant investments for 1958. Housing construction in the metropolitan area added an estimated 47,000 dwelling units in 1959, or 16 percent more than in the preceding year.

Construction contracts for commercial building totaled $140 million in the first 10 months of 1959, against $116 million in the similar 1958 period.

Chicago is the world's leading center of rail, air, and motor transportation. Twenty trunk line railroads serve the city. In 1959, there were 661,762 plane operations [landings or departures] at Midway Airport [the busiest in the world] and at O'Hare International Airport.

WORLD'S BIGGEST TRUCK CENTER

An estimated 500 trucking companies provide direct service between Chicago and 34,000 points, while 2,000 local trucking companies operate in the six-county metropolitan area. During 1958, the latest year for which final figures are available, waterborne commerce totaled 64,660,869 tons here, and was exceeded only by New York-New Jersey ports and Delaware River ports.

In 1959—first year in which the St. Lawrence Seaway operated—552 ships arrived

here from foreign ports to signal a new phase of the city's growth. In 1958, when the St. Lawrence facilities were limited to a 14-foot draft, only 365 small, ocean-going vessels reached the city from foreign waters.

Chicago is the home of Loyola, De Paul, and Roosevelt Universities; the medical, dental, and law schools of Northwestern University, and the professional colleges of the University of Illinois. It has the Illinois Institute of Technology, and the University of Chicago, one of the world's foremost centers of learning.

It was at the University of Chicago, in 1942, that physicists achieved the first nuclear chain reaction to usher in the doubtful blessings of the atomic age, and today the university is among the world's leaders in atomic research.

It operates and staffs the Argonne Cancer Research Hospital, the first institution built to use atomic tools in research and treatment of cancer. It also operates the Argonne National Laboratory near Lemont, southwest of Chicago, one of the Nation's most important centers for nuclear research.

The city's hospitals rank among the finest in the world. Its parks and magnificent lake front, the wooded forest preserves on its periphery, and its tall skyscrapers and stately homes are added sinews of Chicago, this giant built by and for giants.

Pampering Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, with foreign relations, so-called, and all the turmoil connected with this phase of our Government filling the air around us, some light on the subject has been thrown on this currently vital subject by the senior Republican Member of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Don't Pamper Other Nations," written by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, and printed in the June 9, 1960, issue of Human Events, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all Senators may have the benefit of the timely advice the article contains.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T PAMPER OTHER NATIONS—A PLEA FOR A NEW U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(By the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, senior Republican in the U.S. Senate)

The essence of good government is the ability to foresee. For our future welfare the United States at this time must examine its position in the world community and reevaluate the wisdom of many of our economic and political programs.

To a large degree many of our activities such as Lend-Lease, the Marshall Plan, Point 4, and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements have been based upon the theory that internationalism was replacing national sovereignty. To promote the economic development, national security, education, and social welfare of foreign nations, the American taxpayer has expended over $70 billion since 1945.

No rational person believes that the United States can afford to put a fence around this country and live in splendid isolation. The question we must now examine is whether our country can long continue to be the only internationally-minded nation in a world rampant with nationalism.

The facts indicate that instead of moving toward a harmonious concert among all nations the free world is more and more being divided into separate, autonomous, and violently nationalistic units.

Of course the Communists believe in internationalism, but to them this merely means domination, control, and the establishment of Soviet communism.

In Europe, France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain are in the throes of a nationalistic revival. In the Middle East and North Africa the trend is more severe. In the Far East from India to Japan the resurgent nationalism is apparent. Africa seethes with the emergence of new nations—each seeking a place in the sun.

In our own hemisphere from Argentina to Cuba national sovereignty is the order of the day.

Despite our wishful thinking, therefore, the facts demonstrate that the world today is more nationalistic than at any time in modern history. This unpleasant conclusion suggests grave and serious implications for the United States and necessitates an immediate reappraisal of many of our present programs.

The effect of nationalism on the United States can be seen by an examination of the European Common Market.

Today Western Europe is a major industrial competitor of the United States. The war-raved economies have not only been restored, but actually are now growing at a faster rate than the United States.

Our annual growth, for example, is calculated at 3 percent, whereas West Germany is over 8 percent, France almost 6 percent, and Italy over 5½ percent. Significantly, the dollar reserves and the gold of Europe have increased from around $6 billion in 1949 to over $17½ billion in 1958; whereas during the same years, the gold stocks of the United States were reduced from approximately $24 billion to $20 billion.

Discriminatory tariffs and currency policies are in force against the United States as well as against the fringe countries such as Great Britain and Scandinavia, which do not belong to the Common Market.

Considering that Western Europe has a population almost equal to the United States and at the present time is producing almost half as much industrial goods as this country, it seems obvious that we should reappraise the wisdom of continued economic assistance.

We have a substantial deficit trade balance; Europe has a surplus; and yet we allow the discriminatory practices to continue, while at the same time we continue with military and economic aid.

In addition to these considerations, it must be emphasized that, although Western Europe has 60 percent as much capital available as does the United States, that area is keeping most of it at home and exporting only about $1.5 billion annually in comparison to our $3.75 billion.

Because of discriminatory practices against American products, we have seen a tremendous flight of American business into foreign countries. It is rather incongruous to observe one American automobile company build factories in Britain and then ship the product (which numbered around 70,000 units in 1959) to compete with American cars in our own domestic market.

Unfortunately, because of subsidies, favorable antitrust laws, cheaper labor, etc., foreign investments are appearing more and more attractive to American capital.

Add to this Western Europe's high tariffs, the currency exchange restrictions and quota systems, and the out-and-out prohibitions against the entry of American goods in some countries, and it becomes apparent that the situation, unless rectified, may eventually be intolerable for this Nation.

The impact upon our economy has certainly been felt already. Segments of the steel industry are undersold in their own manufacturing area. The same is true of pottery, textiles, plywood, tuna, sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, automobiles, appliances, and others.

Though the European Common Market offers the best example, it is obvious that various other areas of the world have every intention of adopting similar procedures.

Both in Central America and in South America, organizational plans are now underway for the establishment of similar market agreements. Ironically enough, it appears that American capital is expected to finance these ventures.

The economic impact of these nationalistic trade policies upon the United States is in itself a serious problem for our consideration. Nevertheless, there are other ominous implications. Nationalism by nature is always associated with antiforeign sentiment. As nationalism flourishes throughout the world, the United States has become the natural target for such antiforeign sentiments.

Anti-American propaganda throughout the world has reached an alltime high.

These statements are serious but they can be completely documented by the facts.

Americans who are concerned with the future of our Nation must attempt to project into the future the effect of programs which we witness today.

In my opinion, despite outpourings of propaganda to the contrary, the growth of nationalism throughout the world will become more intense. As the economies of the various free nations become more developed, it appears as though more discriminatory practices will be aimed at the United States.

I anticipate that unless changes are made, foreign industrial competition will greatly increase, not only in the world markets, but even more important, in our own domestic market.

We are in the midst of an economic war with the Soviet Union. In the days ahead this economic struggle will become more intense. As the economy of the Soviets becomes more capable of producing consumer goods, it is my anticipation that such materials will be dumped, regardless of the cost of them, in whatever areas such dumping will injure us to the greatest extent.

The present situation is serious, but not hopeless. No solution to these problems can be found by advocating a return to isolationism in this country. If for no other reason, our national defense requirements would make such a proposition absurd.

Obviously, however, more inflation, fiscal insolvency or severe depression will lead us to eventual bankruptcy and economic collapse.

It appears to me that the time has come to cease deluding ourselves as to the facts of life.

We are not living in an international-minded world. We are trying to be an internationally oriented nation in a world rampant with nationalism.

We are not taking care of our own self-interests. Unless we begin to do so, the day may come when we will have no interests left.

There are some very definite things which in my opinion should be done as soon as possible.

First, we must put our fiscal house in order, balance our budget, eliminate waste, stop inflation, and begin to make annual, periodic payments on our national debt.

Second, we must insist that those nations of the free world whose economies have now been restored assume a fair share of their responsibilities toward the underdeveloped nations. This activity is not one which can be carried exclusively by the American taxpayer.

Third, we must reevaluate and revise our reciprocal trade programs to make them truly reciprocal instead of the one-way street which now exists. If discriminated against by our friends, we must institute appropriate countermeasures.

Fourth, we must adopt tax reforms and other incentives which will reduce the outflow of American business capital. American labor unions have a tremendous responsibility to reduce inefficiency, prevent unnecessary work stoppages, increase productivity (both in quantity and in quality), and restore the industrial reputation our Nation formerly enjoyed throughout the world.

Fifth, we must bring the wage-price spiral under control. This consistently upward trend is helping to price us out of our foreign markets, and even places our domestic markets in jeopardy.

It is a hopeful sign that for the first time American labor leaders in the textile, shoe, electronic, and other industries are expressing concern about the trend toward foreign imports and the export or loss of American jobs.

Basically, it is my belief that many of the problems which we now face have been brought about by well-meaning but misguided people who have sincerely desired to spread the benefits of our civilization throughout the world. In their zeal to help, they have unwittingly, in many instances, led foreigners to believe that our resources are endless, that our bounty is not voluntary, but instead is our duty, and that as a Nation we have none of the problems with which they are concerned.

As a consequence of all the foregoing, we seem impractical and unrealistic to other nations, and we have inspired very little confidence.

The time has come, therefore, for use to institute some changes. We should treat the other free nations of the world as partners, not as children to be pampered and financed.

We should be willing to accept our share of world responsibilities, but only in proportion to that which is equally shared by other nations.

Perhaps the entire situation can be best condensed by saying that we should be willing to be a friend and partner, but we must stop being dupes.

We cannot and should not try to return to isolationism, but we must safeguard our own self-interest by insisting that international programs be supported by the entire free world, not by us alone.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, continuing my series of insertions in the RECORD on "The Changing Face of American Cities," I would like to introduce the following additional excerpt from Forum magazine's two-part survey on "The New Urbanites."

The excerpt:

THE CHANGING CITY PATTERN

Some observers maintain that this latest immigration will surely be absorbed by the cities, as others have been absorbed in the past. But this tends to deemphasize the most important single fact of the latest migration—color. Says Irene Taeuber: "The barriers of color make assimilation for Americans who speak English more difficult than it once was for those whose languages, religions, and cultures were alien, but whose skin color was white."

The new urbanite comes initially with hope of a better job, and it is the sort of job he gets that largely determines his living pattern. As most new urbanites are unskilled, they frequently wind up in the lowest categories of the "service industries"—as busboys, dishwashers, messengers or at the bottom of the construction trades. Even for those who have skills—and there are many who do, though their percentage is small—bias prevents them from joining unions to practice their skills or secure top wages.

In Washington, D.C., for example, Negroes are largely excluded from the building trades. Only last month, the National Urban League asked Vice President NIXON to act against the exclusion of Negro electricians from Government construction projects in Washington. In New York, where Negroes generally have a better chance for employment than elsewhere, Negro longshoremen are still kept from working the luxury-liner piers where tips are juciest. Overall statistics reflect the painfully slow progress of the Negro. In 1955, 42 percent of all white workers were in professional, managerial, or white-collar occupations, while only 12 percent of working nonwhites were in that category. Negroes complain that even as doctors and lawyers in northern cities they are frequently prevented from attaining the same professional status as whites. Negro doctors, for instance, are generally excluded from practicing in most voluntary hospitals.

"By and large," says Raymond Vernon in his "Anatomy of a Metropolis," "the distribution of jobs influences the distribution of population far more than the other way around." The jobs that are open to the new urbanite are most often found in center city or on its fringes in so-called "gray areas." The newcomer is restricted not only to jobs which his limited skills and the community's bias dictate, but also to jobs reached easily and cheaply by public transportation.

Economic insecurity causes the new urbanites to see advantages in living at the congested center of the labor market, and social insecurity causes them to huddle together in groups of their own kind in the cheapest possible housing. Poor housing is no deterrent to a sharecropper family that has lived six or seven to a crumbling wooden shack with no sanitary facilities whatever. And, if the price of urban slum housing seems outrageously expensive (as much as $28 a week for a two-room apartment), the new urbanite manages to afford it, particularly if his wife works also. A majority do, contributing to the family's income, and also to the family's instability, a major dilemma.

The confluence of new urbanites by the thousands in the fifties has set off a massive explosion of slums and devastating congestion in the worst, most obsolescent housing in center cities. The trickle-down theory of housing has worked to the extent that in most northern cities well-to-do Negro families (usually at least second-generation city dwellers) move into marginal areas previously occupied by lower income white families. But these families and areas in turn are constantly pressed by the daily influx of newcomers, who start through the same cycle: living first with friends or relatives, then in rooming houses, then moving to converted tenements divided into more pieces than a Swedish wedding cake. The only people who profit from this pattern are the slumlords and unscrupulous real estate dealers who help break down previously white neighborhoods to get housing prices considerably higher (25 to 30 percent higher in some cities) than those that white home buyers will pay.

FORCED SCHOOL SEGREGATION

The pattern of residential segregation in turn sets a pattern of school segregation that works every bit as effectively in the North as in the Deep South. Because new urbanities are usually compressed in the oldest parts of central cities, they must send their children to the oldest, most obsolescent schools. Their children, instead of being made a part of the diversity of peoples that converts a city into a fundamental instrument of democracy, are shut off from the vitality of other races and cultures. This kind of segregation is one of the most oppressive shackles on the development of a strong, new urban society, and it cannot be broken by anything less than complete freedom to choose living and educational accommodations. New York's experiment in transporting a few schoolchildren out of the ghetto long distances in an effort to bypass residential segregation is not working, and many school authorities doubt that it will work.

The problem of school segregation is further intensified by the many teachers who commute from the suburbs, with no vital interest in the long-term welfare of the community in which they teach. In such circumstances teachers become, as Dr. Dan Dodson of New York University has observed, "trained bureaucrats who are not essentially different from those trained by colonial powers for service in their undeveloped possessions." If schools are thus neutralized in their traditional role as assimilators of new citizens, there is little hope that other institutions can take up the slack.

Most big cities have made serious efforts to build a school system to solve the problems. New York, of course, has had the most difficult time, for many of its newcomers are Puerto Ricans, 50 percent of whom on disembarkation do not even speak English. The city has hired large numbers of Spanish-speaking teachers, set up special school curriculums for slow learners (a majority in some schools), and made a concerted effort to cut down the number of "drop-outs" from junior high and high schools. Yet schools in new urbanite neighborhoods are generally far inferior to those in other areas. In Baltimore, the Citizens Housing & Planning Council, a private group, has been coordinating its work with the schools in recent years, as the primary step to helping new urbanites acquire urban living techniques, and believes that the effort has been highly rewarding. And in Washington, a policy of assigning or promoting teachers based on a merit system has been termed instrumental in raising the level of public school education since schools were fully integrated in 1954.

The Supreme Court's 1954 decision barring educational segregation made it clear that "separate but equal" facilities were, in fact, unequal. Yet most northern cities so far have not advanced much further than many southern cities in this respect. New York, which is as advanced as any, is still being strangled by fiscal attitudes which have, to quote Dr. Dan Dodson again, the effect of relegating new urbanites to a status of "permanent, uneducated, unskilled and exploited cheap industrial-type occupations." The only conscionable solution to the key problem of equal education is to develop a completely free environment, total rejection of residential segregation.

Cultural Exchange Possesses Potential as Substitute for Summit Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for more than a decade the people of the world have found themselves alternately involved in hot and cold wars because of the activity of a small minority of hard-core Communists. Although we know that these Communists actually comprise only about 4 to 6 percent of the population in the Soviet Union, and only about 2 percent of the people of Red China, yet almost 1 billion human beings in the world today are in the iron grip of their control.

As Americans, it is our firm belief that the political-economic system of dictatorship advocated by communism is contrary to the yearning and will for freedom of the great majority of mankind. Since such a comparatively small group of Communists continue to keep us literally on the brink of war, I believe it to be highly essential that the United States and the free world exert greater efforts to put across the "story of freedom" to the dominated people of the world. And, because of the methods displayed by Mr. Khrushchev in deliberately scuttling the potentially constructive summit conference, I believe that efforts should be made to go over the heads of the Communist leaders in order to acquaint these people with the dedicated attempts by non-Communist people and nations to promote a real peace—based upon justice and order.

My colleagues may recall that, during the last session, I introduced the bill S. 2188 for just such a purpose. If enacted, it would establish a citizens freedom council which would help to increase public awareness of the Communist ideological challenge and of our efforts to counter the Soviet offensive in the important battle for men's minds. Toward this end the council would utilize the ingenious mass media developed by our free enterprise system—translated into language easily understood by people of other lands—in order to spread a foundation of free ideas upon which to build a better world. As I have previously pointed out, I am happy to say that the idea of this freedom council has been endorsed by many outstanding individuals well qualified to evaluate the need in this field.

Mr. President, we are all aware of the great contribution toward the betterment of relations between the people of the Soviet Union and the United States, and the lessening of international tensions, brought about in recent years by the exchanges in the cultural, technical, and educational fields. We know that the cordial receptions given our visiting American artists by the Russian people have dramatized, in warm, human terms, the basic philosophy of this program. We believe that American artists, scientists and technicians visiting the Soviet Union show the Russians the true image of the American people—of the progress here in science, technology, and culture—and of the United States desire for peace. We know that the mutual exchange of information, ideas, and culture presents the most direct method for going directly to the hearts of the Soviet people; and offers one of the greatest potentials for promoting international understanding and good will. This field, indeed, represents an area—perhaps the only one—in which there is a common language between the world's two great rival powers.

Last week, there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor an article written by that paper's special correspondent in Moscow, Edmund Stevens. Entitled "Soviets Still Mob American Artists—Culture Escapes Chill," this interesting report emphasized that—despite the propaganda blasts from Mr. Khrushchev at, and following, the collapsed summit conference—our visiting American artists are greeted with continued warmth and enthusiasm. In fact, as one great American artist pointed out, the primary popular reaction was one of widespread concern lest this signify the abrupt termination of cultural and other contacts and a return to the former isolation of the Russian people from the rest of the world. Believing that it presents a graphic illustration of the fruitful potential in going over the heads of Communist leaders—direct to the hearts of the Russian people, themselves—I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 1, 1960]

SOVIETS STILL "MOB" AMERICAN ARTISTS—CULTURE ESCAPES CHILL

(By Edmund Stevens)

Two week after the summit that was no summit the best news from Moscow is no news.

American correspondents stationed in the Soviet Union who were in Paris for the dramatic debacle returned to their posts with mixed feelings and some trepidation.

How would the sudden unseasonal change in the international climate affect their professional and personal environment?

CANCELLATION REJECTED

Would the icy fallout from the summit blast frost-kill the carefully nurtured cultural exchange program in which most members of Moscow's small American colony have a personal stake?

Would their personal contacts and associations so painstakingly developed be blighted and they themselves confined to an icy quarantine?

These were questions that occurred to this writer and others as we booked our reservations.

My first pleasant surprise came just as I had settled myself in my seat aboard a Sabena Boeing 707 before takeoff.

Greeted by familiar voices, I saw Sol Hurok and Van Cliburn coming down the aisle. Both were fresh out of New York.

Mr. Cliburn was on his way to fulfill a 6-week concert tour of the Soviet Union. Mr. Hurok, his impresario, was going to Moscow to meet the newly appointed Minister of Culture, Mrs. Ekaterina Furtseva, who doubles as the sole woman member of the Communist Party Presidium.

Mr. Hurok acknowledged that under the direct impact of the U–2 incident and summit collapse he had considered canceling his trip but said he had been urged by Moscow to keep his schedule.

Mr. Cliburn hadn't the slightest qualm and was elated by the prospect of reunion with the many friends and countless fans he had acquired 2 years ago when he won first prize in the Tchaikovsky competition. Moreover, he breathed confidence that all would be for the best in the best of all possible worlds. "The main thing," he remarked with wisdom beyond his years, "is to concentrate on right thoughts."

From Brussels to Moscow by Boeing is barely 3 hours, and by the time we had finished a leisurely three-course lunch, it was time to fasten our seat belts for a landing. As the plane taxied to a standstill before the air terminal, a throng of several hundred waving, gesticulating bobby-soxers burst the barriers and surged out onto the airport apron. It was strictly against the rules, but no guard tried to hold them back.

While Messrs. Cliburn and Hurok surveyed the scene through the porthole, I descended the ramp and braved the human sea that parted to let me through. But it closed in immediately behind me, and that was the last I saw of the lanky Texan and his distinguished elderly traveling companion.

The bobby-soxers, who ranged in age from 16 to 60, behaved exactly like their counterparts in other lands, brandishing bouquets and autograph books, squealing and shouting: "Nash Van, Nash Van."

NO ISOLATION

In town one of the first persons I encountered was American violinist Isaac Stern, who was just concluding an extended tour. Asked whether the customary warmth of Soviet audiences had cooled perceptibly since the summit setback, Mr. Stern entered an emphatic denial.

He had been on the road when the adverse news started to break, first in Leningrad, then in Vilnius, and Rega. The only popular reaction he noted was one of widespread concern lest this signify truncation of cultural and other contacts and a return to the former isolation.

Coloratura soprano Roberta Peters, from the "Met," had a similar story to tell.

After a series of standing ovations in Moscow and Leningrad she declared, "What can I say of the Soviet public? Wonderful people; excellent listeners. They reacted to every number with amazing warmth and great enthusiasm." And she concluded, "It seems to me our two peoples should do everything to promote cultural contacts."

WARM RECEPTION

All three musicians—Mr. Cliburn, Mr. Stern, and Miss Peters—are Hurok "properties." The day after his arrival the boss himself was received by Mrs. Furtseva. He later reported he found her far more sympathetic and easier to get along with than her predecessor as Minister of Culture and willing—in fact eager—for bigger and better cultural exchanges.

The American "My Fair Lady" company has continued its nightly performances of that musical hit with unwavering success, first in Moscow, then in Leningrad, and currently in Kiev.

REASONS SIFTED

How to account for this apparent ambivalence?

One answer seems to be that, contrary to worst expectations, no shift has taken place in Soviet policy as regards contacts with the West, including the United States, and that hostile criticism, harsh as it is, is beamed at

the American Government and not at Americans as such.

Bad as relations appear to be, for the moment they have not yet sunk to the rock-bottom of the Hungarian uprising aftermath or the summer of 1958, following the landing of marines in Lebanon, when demonstrators pelted the American Embassy.

Despite the bitter words, the Soviet Government does not seem to be contemplating a basic realinement of its policy toward the United States. Instead, its intention appears to be to sit out the presidential election, keeping all outstanding issues on ice till then, apparently convinced that time is on the Soviet side and that the next President may prove more amenable.

Mr. Khrushchev on the Rampage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of June 4, 1960, there is a splendid editorial entitled "Mr. Khrushchev on the Rampage" which interprets the so-called disarmament plan recently announced by Mr. Khrushchev. As the editorial well says:

In short, it would start disarmament by shattering the free world's whole defense structure. For it would deprive the West of the nuclear armament that is its best defense against mass armies and the best guarantee of world peace, before any reduction took place of these mass armies—reserved for the second stage—if there ever be one.

The editorial also properly calls our attention to the fact that this proposal would also eliminate all mutual security bases and force the withdrawal of all allied troops abroad, therewith crippling free world alliances and wrecking the whole NATO setup.

In my extension of remarks I include the above editorial:

MR. KHRUSHCHEV ON THE RAMPAGE

With his attempt to drive the West out of Berlin wrecked on the rock of Western unity and firmness, Premier Khrushchev has apparently abandoned the path of peaceful negotiations for the present and instead launched a massive propaganda campaign against the free world, and especially against the United States. This campaign, in which he mingles blandishments with threats and outright lies, is so blatant as to betray the Soviet ruler's open contempt for free world intelligence. But his purposes are obvious.

These purposes are to divide the West, break up the free world alliances, disarm the West, intimidate some of the weaker allies, isolate the United States and denigrate President Eisenhower both as leader in the free world and as head of the U.S. Government in the hope of electing a more compliant President.

As part of this effort Mr. Khrushchev has reshuffled his plan for total disarmament in 4 years to include some features of the Western plans, in particular President de Gaulle's plan for first abolishing all nuclear weapons carriers, some form of "open sky" surveillance after total disarmament and even an international police force to keep peace in a disarmed world. This new presentation is just specific and persuasive enough to call for further detailed study. But the possible traps are evident at the very start.

During a first stage of 18 months the plan calls for the destruction of all possible nuclear weapons carriers, including rockets, planes, warships, submarines and artillery systems, and for the elimination of all nuclear weapons and a cessation of their manufacture, under controls limited to these fields. Furthermore, as part of any first step, it calls for the abandonment of all bases abroad and the withdrawal of all foreign troops to their own borders.

In short, it would start disarmament by shattering the free world's whole defense structure. For it would deprive the West of the nuclear armament that is its best defense against mass armies and the best guarantee of world peace, before any reduction took place of these mass armies—reserved for the second stage—if there should ever be one. It would also eliminate all mutual security bases and force the withdrawal of all allied troops abroad, therewith crippling free world alliances and wrecking the whole NATO setup. And it would do this under controls which would not only be inadequate in themselves but would enable the Soviets to conceal already manufactured nuclear arms now impossible to detect.

The National Conference To Stabilize Migratory Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor is considering legislation intended to end hardship and injustice facing the migrant worker in the United States today. The proposed legislation must, of necessity, deal with existing conditions. It must change conditions where such changes are possible, which means that in many ways the subcommittee seeks to make repairs on an existing system. The results of such legislation may serve very essential purposes for only a limited number of decades or years.

As we on the subcommittee study the immediate future, the National Catholic Council on Working Life is taking aim on a goal which was expressed at the National Conference To Stabilize Migratory Labor in Chicago last November. The recently issued report on that conference sums up that goal when it says that: "The only way we can truly help the migrant is to convince him to cease to be a migrant. Only when he settles some place can he gain any stability in employment, income, or family life."

The conference also made it clear that its goal is a long range one. The final paragraph of the report says: "Of course, not all delegates * * * were of one mind. * * * But as they searched together for ways of providing regular employment, steady income, and stable family life for migrants and an adequate labor supply for farmers, most delegates left for home persuaded that the goal was not utopian; in fact, that it was attainable in their lifetime."

The delegates to the conference included State and Federal officials, citizen groups, and growers, working to find a common ground for cooperative action. The much needed and mature deliberations and conclusions are typical of the untiring efforts in this field by the Catholic Council on Working Life.

Mr. President, I would prefer to have the entire report printed in the RECORD, but I shall limit this insertion to the last half of the report, which describes the council recommendations for future action. Prof. Varden Fuller, professor of agricultural economies at the University of California, is quoted at some length.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IV

The major goal of any national policy aimed at stabilizing migrant labor should be, in the words of Professor Fuller, "the establishment and maintenance of an employment environment that offers positive inducements to a resident core labor force that will have attachment to and identification with seasonal agriculture, and that will constitute an employment category in which workers will have a reasonably good chance of making a living."

Not a commodity

In the typical case the farm migrant is merely a hand. He has none of the status, none of the rights and privileges of an employee, as that concept now operates in industry.

"The man who picks or chops cotton or does similar work in fruits and vegetables typically enjoys none of the features that stabilize employment relations or give the worker any sense of identification with the employer, with the industry, or with the work force," said Professor Fuller.

"Very frequently, seasonal farm workers do not know the names of the farmers on whose places they have worked; not always do they know the real name of the labor contractor who brought them there. The worker frequently does not know whether the farmer of the labor contractor is the actual employer. With the work being done at piece rates, neither the farmer nor the contractor is much concerned whether a hundred boxes of tomatoes are picked by 2 workers or by 10, so long as they get picked. In a similar way, there is little concern whether those who pick today are the same as those who picked yesterday or last week or last year, so long as there are enough hands to get today's job done on time."

By establishing an employer-employee relationship between grower and migrant, the human dignity of migrants would be acknowledged. Migrants would have the rights and responsibilities of employees; growers, the rights and duties of employers. The result would be a resident reserve of experienced, skilled, and available farmworkers.

Joint planning

In setting such a national goal, the delegates to the Chicago conference realized that the attainment of a stabilized farm labor population would require joint planning by growers and representatives of farmworkers, the cooperation of local communities, a virgin appraisal of the role of collective bargaining in agriculture, and the resumption by Government, at all levels, of neglected responsibilities.

By himself, the individual farmer and grower would find this an almost impossible objective. "Their difficulty," Professor Ful-

ler stated, "is greatly diminished if the labor needs of farmers in a district are pooled and approached as an aggregate. The pooling of the labor needs of individual farms makes it impossible to employ workers more fully and effectively. There are very few areas in the United States that are so highly specialized to a particular crop (cotton, for example) and in which the seasonal labor demands of all farms occur simultaneously.

"Generally, throughout the United States, you have got enough diversification within a 50 mile or so radius that by pooling work you could have a longer work season and a more effective use of the work force if you had a stabilized set of employer-worker relations. This type of arrangement should appeal to workers who live in the many villages that are spotted through the farming areas. These families try to maintain fixed domiciles and to obtain work within the commuting periphery of their homes."

Diversification

What Professor Fuller advocated is already established practice in many farm areas throughout the land, notably in southcentral Minnesota. What is being done near Benton Harbor, Mich., was described by Catherine Daly, manager of the 1,000-acre farm.

"Work in the fruit-growing industry in southwestern Michigan is considered seasonal. This is true of harvesting, but when we look at the overall job we will find that the cultivation, replacement of trees and plants, and the care of equipment covers the entire year. Few of our growers are engaged in one-crop farming. This diversification extends the harvest season from May until November. On our farm this means asparagus to apples. When extra workers are needed during the peak harvest season, the families of full-time workers supply the extra help needed. The men or heads of households often continue in the cultivation of later crops rather than work in the harvest itself.

"There are gaps on every farm between harvests or because of weather conditions," said Miss Daly, who is a former social worker and college teacher. "Very satisfactory schedules can be worked out by the growers to provide steady employment. For instance, in the asparagus season growers cut asparagus on alternate days or have alternate morning and afternoon schedules. In this way workers have full-time work. On our farm we have a gap between asparagus and blackberries. Our neighbors employ our extra workers in the strawberry and gooseberry harvest. In blackberry time we absorb the workers who for some reason cannot work in the cherry harvest. (Those for example, who cannot climb ladders, the fat lady, children, or someone who gets dizzy.) Throughout an entire season a family can live on the same farm and have full-time employment, barring very adverse weather conditions, and work within a radius of several miles."

Cooperation

A plea for diversification through cooperation among growers also came from the Stockton, Calif., grower, Frederick S. Van Dyke: "It is almost incredible to me that my neighbor should plant 50 acres of new peaches while the man across the road is pulling out his trees because he cannot make a living on the price he receives for peaches. That happened this year. It cannot be permitted to continue to happen. Planning is going to have to govern the plantings within each area. I hope this planning is done by growers themselves, rather than by someone in a bureau in Sacramento or in Washington, D.C.

"Growers consider themselves stanch friends of the free enterprise system, but nothing is more destructive to this system than anarchy of the type which prevails in California agriculture. One of the most needed changes in current planting practices is greater diversification. This would stabilize the farm labor force to a very great extent. It would also stabilize the entire farm economy within each region.

"At the present time, an area which specializes heavily in one or two crops is at the mercy of market fluctuations, particularly if the crop in question is a luxury item, such as asparagus in my home county. With diversification, an area would be protected from boom and bust cycles to a large extent, since it is unlikely that a sharp downward trend would affect all crops at once."

Making migrants welcome

Helped by the insistent prodding of farmer organizations, urban centers of farm regions have made a double contribution toward stabilizing the labor supply. In the first place, new residents, whether from Texas or Tennessee, have been welcomed and made part of the community. In this integration, the church, the school board, the chamber of commerce, builders, unions, and public and private employment agencies play their parts.

Secondly, should supplementary farm help still be needed in peak seasons, the neighboring community mobilizes local residents to help in the harvesting—high school and college students during the summer vacation and adults during the school year.

While supporting such a program, a warning against "crop vacations" was strongly made by Mary M. Condon, of the rural education department of the National Education Association.

In one way or another, efforts to involve local residents are being made in scattered local communities throughout the Nation. But it is not, by any means, a nationwide pattern.

A plea for community support came from John Zuckerman, a Stockton, Calif., grower: "Our migrants today, excluding foreign contract workers are, for the most part, the least talented, least capable, least employable members of our society. These people are driven to migrant work because you and your fellow citizens in the communities in which you reside have not permitted them to be educated and motivated to become an integral part of the permanent industrial or agricultural work force.

"You—or perhaps I should say we—have not taken the necessary action, even where education and motivation prevail, to provide gainful, vocational opportunities that will permit these people to sink their roots in the community of their choice, to realize the ideal and goal of every American—a permanent home, a place in the community for themselves and their family."

Self-organization

In many branches of industry the self-organization of workers into unions and the resulting collective bargaining contract have enabled city workers to achieve a measure of human dignity, providing them with economic stability and a voice in determining conditions of employment.

Except for occasional pockets of union organization, migrant workers are unorganized. John Livingston, director of organization for the AFL–CIO, pointed out some of the reasons: literacy and language barriers, short-term employment, high mobility, fierce opposition of farmers, the competition of braceros, and a potential membership composed of rootless and marginal workers. In addition, he pointed out that there has been "no legal affirmation of their natural right to organize" by the Federal or by the State governments (though State labor relations acts in Kansas, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico may be broad enough to protect agricultural workers).

Such obstacles, at most, are only half the problem. The organization of farmworkers would also require reorganization of the present system of recruitment, hiring, and tenure. Unless the union becomes a hiring hall, to which would come employees in search of work and employers seeking workers, collective bargaining will remain a lonely and ineffectual institution in agriculture. In other seasonal industries, logging, maritime, and construction, for example, the hiring hall became the cornerstone upon which workers firmly established their unions.

Hiring halls

Two rare examples of how the hiring hall had already operated were cited at the Chicago conference. A California rancher described how he went to the headquarters of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in September and October to obtain a crew of experienced grape cutters to harvest his 90-acre crop. He was furnished the workers he needed and paid a minimum of $1.25 an hour and a bonus of $1 a ton.

William L. Batt, Jr., secretary of labor and industry for Pennsylvania, told how Pennsylvania growers had brought in trained field workers from Arkansas. Their crew leader was a representative of the National Agricultural Workers Union. The contract with the growers provided for a minmum wage of not less than 75 cents an hour and a guarantee of regular work for 160 hours in each 4-week period.

Some obstacles

But to extend the hiring hall to most of the factory farms in the Nation will be no simple task. It might be a project as monumental as the peaceful harnessing of atomic energy for industrial purposes. Under the present system, some or most of the functions of a union hiring hall are being performed—but by three other institutions.

Many farm employer organizations, which in prewar years had devoted most of their time to resisting unionization, simply shifted their energies to obtaining imported foreign laborers.

The crew leader is also an important cog in present hiring system. He provides the necessary transportation. He recruits workers. He persuades farmers to advance money to cover expenses of bringing migrants to the farm. He may serve as business agent, personnel director, paymaster, foreman, and all-around middleman between the grower and worker. Trying to represent both the grower and migrant, crew leaders develop real conflicts of interest. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that there are about 10,000 migrant crew leaders of various kinds in the United States. They have become an important part of the hiring and recruitment system in agriculture.

Government action

Considerably more important is the function performed by Federal and State Governments which operate their own "hiring hall" staffed by more than 1,500 paid farm placement representatives whose job it is to find workers for farmers and work for migrants.

That is not all. In areas where there is no local public employment service office, a volunteer corps of 3,000 unpaid farm placement representatives working in 25 States, together filled nearly 150,000 farm job openings in 1958. To succeed, unions would not just have to organize farm employees; they would have to reorganize the present system of hiring.

Quasi monopoly

Thus, major decisions concerning union and government policy are required. Should the State and Federal Governments continue their quasi monopoly over the placement of farm employees or should farm workers be encouraged to establish their own unions and thus their own hiring halls?

Are unions able and, if able, willing to provide the tremendous amount of money and manpower needed to staff a string of hiring halls in those areas where large-scale farm employers hire large numbers of workers?

Is some compromise arrangement possible between the present tax-supported placement agency and a worker-operated hiring hall?

Is some other form of contract feasible, for example, one similar to the agreement under which Puerto Ricans come to work on the mainland, or to a growers' association contract which provides some employment guarantee?

Government action conducive to a stabilized force of farm employees has its paradoxical side. In some areas it may have to draw back, as in the bracero program under Public Law 78 and in the broad range of responsibilities now exercised by United States and State employment agencies. In other areas it will have to advance by the stricter enforcement of existing social legislation where it now applies to farm migrants and by its extension to migrants where it now does not.

Tighter reins by the Federal Government in the administration of the bracero program would give growers some inducement to become more self-reliant and to revamp present hiring practices. As long as growers can get migrant help from Mexico simply by calling a Government placement officer, they will have little incentive to cooperate for the purpose of creating a core group of resident farmworkers.

Under present laws

Toward this end the Federal Government could take further measures—

(1) to prevent Mexicans from being employed in skilled occupations and the year around—contrary to the original intent of the legislation;

(2) to confine Mexicans only to necessary crops and not allow them to work on olives, mushrooms, avocados, cut flowers, etc.;

(3) to make certain that farm employers actually attempt to recruit U.S. workers at wages no less than those paid Mexicans, thus preventing use of foreign workers to depress wages in any locality and relieving local unemployment among farmworkers;

(4) to restrict the use of the services of Federal and State employment offices to growers who meet certain minimum standards in wages, transportation, housing, and conditions of work; and

(5) to double check compliance with the provisions of Federal old-age, survivors and disability insurance so that all workers who earn $150 from a single employer have premiums paid on their behalf (thus ending the scandalous buckpassing between growers and crew leaders as to the actual employer).

Farm labor contractors

Furthermore, most State governments could help regularize the employer-employee relationship of grower and migrant by requiring farm labor contractors to observe the provisions of State laws regulating private employment agencies.

When Congress in 1955 widened the provisions of the social security law to reach some farmworkers, it took the first step to give farmworkers parity with industrial employees. Many other steps will need to be taken.

The U.S. Department of Labor is now studying ways and means of extending the Federal minimum wage law to agricultural employment and has announced it will make recommendations during the present session of Congress.

Although workmen's compensation legislation was the first type of social insurance to be widely adopted in the United States, most employees in agriculture, the Nation's third most hazardous occupation, are not protected.

Only a few State workmen's compensation laws (California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Ohio, and Vermont) protect farmworkers in the same fashion as other workers.

As already noted, the rights of farm employees to join a union and bargain collectively are not yet guaranteed under Federal law.

Federal protection

While the application of unemployment insurance benefits to migrant workers would be exceedingly difficult, their haphazard employment only serves to underline the urgency of finding some way to protect them.

Of course, not all delegates to the Chicago conference were of one mind on these proposals. But as they searched together for ways of providing regular employment, steady income, and stable family life for migrants and an adequate labor supply for farmers, most delegates left for home persuaded that the goal was not utopian; in fact, that it was attainable in their lifetime.

Timely and Significant Article by Miss Frances Knight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to cite an excellent article which appeared on Sunday June 5, in the weekly magazine Parade. The title of this article is "Don't Be An Ugly American" and it was written by Miss Frances Knight, Director of the U.S. Passport Office. Miss Knight's message is particularly timely since it comes as many thousands of Americans prepare for summer travel to foreign nations. In a very real sense, these travelers carry with them the image of America, and it is of paramount importance that their attitude and conduct while abroad reflect credit upon themselves and upon the United States of America.

In her article, Miss Knight has provided such travelers with many excellent points of advice that will enable them to avoid the mistakes that so often in the past have colored unfavorably the image of our Nation in the minds of foreigners. It is my feeling that Miss Knight is to be commended warmly for her imagination and initiative in thus helping to forestall unfortunate misconceptions of America.

This is but another instance of the outstandingly fine performance that has marked her tenure as Director of the U.S. Passport Office. This charming lady has assumed a most onerous and taxing assignment, yet she has fulfilled her difficult role in a manner that has earned her the praise and respect of all who are aware of her achievements.

Mr. President, in view of the timely significance of the article in question, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Parade magazine, June 5, 1960]

DON'T BE AN "UGLY AMERICAN"

(By Frances Knight, Director, U.S. Passport Office)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Two years ago an American woman tourist strolled through the narrow alleys of a Middle East bazaar wearing only a halter, shorts, and sandals. She knew that a local religious sect considered it sinful for a woman to display her face and figure to any male except her husband. And she also knew that if any man looked at her, according to members of the sect, he, too, had committed a sin.

As she passed a sacred relic, a man who had been kneeling in prayer sprang to his feet and stabbed her several times. She was rescued; her life was saved. But so great was the resentment against her that she was forced to leave the country.

I cite her as an example—an almost tragic one—of the peril of rejecting the sagest advice ever offered to travelers: "When in Rome, do as the Romans do."

More than 2 million Americans are going overseas this year, many for the first time. The average American tourist will have close contact with at least 5, more likely 10, foreign nationals during his trip abroad. This means 10 to 20 million foreigners are exposed to American behavior, ideas and views in a year. It is a tremendous opportunity for our tourists to make friends—or to create ill will.

Most American tourists are well behaved and well liked. Yet each tourist season produces a crop of unpleasant incidents created by the brash, the thoughtless, the bad-mannered. Let me cite two recent typical examples:

A young American pasted devalued foreign money all over his suitcase—"just for kicks." His bad manners, making a joke of a proud people's poverty, caused plenty of anti-American feeling.

Three American visitors chatted noisily through a performance of the Vienna Opera. When asked politely to be quiet, they declared how glad they would be "to get back home where there is freedom of speech." Who could blame their music-loving Viennese neighbors for greeting the next American tourist with scowls instead of smiles?

What bad manners especially irritate our friends in other lands? Let's start with the great American passion for collecting souvenirs. Any large foreign hotel will tell you stories of Americans who help themselves to towels, sheets, blankets, cutlery, china, in fact anything that isn't nailed down.

Then there is the matter of dress. Americans tend to be informal; other people may not be. Along the sun-drenched beaches of Spain's Costa Brava, where women still live in genteel seclusion, there are strict rules about bathing suits. To appear in a bikini means being marched off by a patrolman.

WHAT NOT TO WEAR

Some European towns have found it necessary to post orders about the degree of undress that will be permitted in public places. Many restaurants exclude patrons wearing shorts. Some will not permit women in slacks, or men without ties, shirts and jackets. Worshippers do not care to see women tourists sauntering around cathedrals in shorts. Nor is it pleasant in restaurants or theaters to sit next to a man in a sweatshirt.

Ostentatious dressing can be just as distasteful as underdressing. Going to a fisherman's wharf or a farmers' inn swathed in mink and loaded with diamonds makes sturdy, independent people feel you are "slumming."

A word about litterbugs. Frankly, Americans are not as tidy as many Europeans. The American's carefree habit of letting somebody else clean up after him is taken by foreigners as a sign of contempt.

Bad manners in buses, trains, planes and ships are another cause of anti-American feeling. In other countries, travel comforts may often be more restricted than here. The only way to get along is to stick to the local rules—without grumbling. Treat the washroom of a train as you would treat your own washroom. Why must lipstick be tested on mirrors or towels? Why do some people

fail to drain the basin? Why are cigarettes often stamped out on the floor or ground into tables?

Most Europeans are both baffled and angered by Americans who smoke in a nonsmoking car or who smoke a cigar when only cigarettes are permited. They also dislike loud arguments, complaints, boisterousness, shouted demands for service. So, of course, do most Americans.

Finally, there are the more obvious offenses: getting drunk, engaging in street brawls, destroying private property, leaving a trail of bad checks and unpaid bills, dabbling in black markets. This last—black marketeering—is probably the most frequent and damaging charge brought against American citizens traveling abroad.

All countries have their shady characters, far more worldly wise than you in illegal dealings. They will offer "bargains" hard to resist. But resist them. By breaking some other country's laws, you may bring trouble not only on yourself but on Uncle Sam as well.

Good manners start with our parents and teachers. They cannot be learned from an official pamphlet or a last-minute briefing before embarkation. They are developed by daily example and personal experience. But remember: Wherever you go, at home or abroad, your manners are showing.

TIPS FOR TOURISTS

1. If you trip is worth taking, it is worth planning for. Take time to get background information on the countries you are going to visit—their history, customs, and current problems.

2. Don't throw your dollars around or give excessive tips. Learn the exchange rates in the countries you are visiting.

3. Don't sneer at somebody else's money. The coin you dismiss as almost valueless might buy a loaf of bread for some poor family.

4. Listen, learn, and think for yourself. Off-the-cuff opinions rarely make friends or influence people. Nobody likes listening to a 2-day expert on international affairs.

5. Don't go around boasting, "I only speak American." Other people are also proud of their languages. They don't expect you to speak fluently, but they will be flattered if you have taken the trouble to learn a few simple words in their language like "please" and "thank you."

6. Don't collect or mutilate private or public property. If you want souvenirs, buy them.

7. Be considerate of those you meet. Courtesy is understood around the world.

8. A boast about how much better things are at home only causes resentment.

9. Keep track of your belongings.

10. Show respect for the laws and customs of other countries. Remember: You are a guest. Besides, failure to do so may land you in jail. And that is no place to spend a holiday.

Moral From Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1960, the President asked Congress to appropriate the sum of $8.3 million to launch the recently authorized "Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West" in Hawaii.

When we stop to consider that our Nation and the free world stand to benefit from the allegiance of the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa, the $32 million requested by those close to the needs of such a center is but a drop in the bucket as compared to the sums being spent for defense purposes, and as further compared to the expanded program proposed by the Russians for their own center. Hawaii's appropriateness for administering and promulgating the purposes of the East-West Center should be matched with a realistic appropriation in order for it to become a really effective instrument in the cold war.

The woeful inadequacy of the President's recommendation is vividly pointed out in an editorial appearing in the June 2, 1960, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith, for the RECORD, said editorial:

MORAL FROM MOROCCO

A young man in Morocco who not long ago attended the Afro-Asian Student Seminar in Honolulu has written a friend at the University of Hawaii he would like to study further in the United States.

The student said he'd borrow money to pay his transportation if some sort of scholarship at an American university—any university—could be arranged, together with a part-time job for living expenses.

The friend is seeing what he can do.

This doesn't seem too remarkable—except that the same student has been offered a 5-year, all-expense scholarship in advanced physics at the University of Moscow. But the Moroccan would rather come to the United States.

Premier Khrushchev's invitation to him was part of the accelerated Soviet program to indoctrinate young people around the world. This program is patterned, in some respects, after the East-West Center to be opened here.

But where Khrushchev's program is making a jet-assisted takeoff—with a goal of 5,000 students this year—the center here seems to be in the 1903 biplane stage as far as the U.S. administration is concerned.

President Eisenhower yesterday asked Congress for $8.3 million for the East-West Center. University of Hawaii officials say to do the job right, $32 million is needed.

The difference is simply this:

With the $8.3 million grant recommended by Ike, the center would start with 125 students the first year and grow to 500 students in 3 years.

With the $32 million asked by the university, the center also would start with 125 students—but would mushroom rapidly to 2,000 in 3 years.

Compare that with Khrushchev's 5,000 students, which may eventually swell to 10,000.

We're talking about the struggle for the minds of men—men who today are students but who tomorrow will help guide their nations, shape the decisions between communism and freedom.

This is one more battle in the cold war, and the President's $8.3 million is small ammunition for such a battle and such a war.

The administration has spoken favorably of the center but has not matched its deeds to its words.

We look now to Congress where key leaders, including Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, have a more realistic understanding of the center's potential in the cold war—and what it must have to do the job.

Need for Greater National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, this is a presidential election year.

In 1960, particularly, we face the need for individually responsible, politically constructive and national- and world-oriented politicking.

Why? First of all, the great complex challenges of our times themselves require high integrity, broad perspective and thoughtful judgment—as we attempt to carry forward programs—as well as find solutions for problems—relating to local, State, national and international progress and security.

In normal times, the tasks—for both voter and candidate—are difficult enough.

Today, however, we have a new factor to deal with—that is, the attempt by Mr. Khrushchev to extend a long arm of interference into our internal politics.

The Soviet Premier, establishing a new low in international affairs, has engaged in an intemperate, unjustified, irresponsible effort to cast unfavorable reflections upon President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON; no one knows who will be next on this black-tongued list of attempted villification of U.S. leadership by the Kremlin with a voice that echoes around the world.

The American people, of course, need pay no heed to this voice of trouble in internal affairs. To the contrary, extreme caution must be taken to assure that it does not interfere in our decisions on domestic issues. However, we might as well recognize that the Kremlin—probably as never before—will use the campaign material from our internal elections for anti-U.S. propaganda all over the globe. Consequently, I believe that campaigners—particularly candidates themselves—must be extremely watchful, careful and responsible in public utterances.

Although there are differences of opinion on a wide variety of issues, these internal differences must stop at the water's edge. Recently, I was privileged to discuss a range of issues which, among others, will be involved in the upcoming campaign, over radio station WGN in Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES GREATER NATIONAL UNITY; SAYS INTERNAL CONFLICTS SHOULD CEASE AT THE "WATER'S EDGE"; OUTLINES ISSUES OF 1960 CAMPAIGN; SAYS NATION MUST INCREASE RATE OF VOTING AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT IF UNITED STATES TO REMAIN STRONG AND HEALTHY

(Excerpts of address prepared for delivery by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY over radio station WGN, Chicago, June 5, 1960)

As citizens of a great country, we, in the 1960's, face difficult, though not insurmount-

able, challenges of local, national and international significance.

Globally, our survival, and peace, continue to be threatened by international communism. Following the Paris meeting, torpedoed by Khrushchev, the ghosts of the cold war are again afoot. As yet, it's not possible to determine whether or not, or just how, these may be transformed into additional real life threats to peace.

We recall, however, images of the past, reflecting communism's deceitful tactics, including: A string of broken treaties—37 out of 40; diplomatic deception at the Paris conference, plummeting world hopes for progress toward peace; military threats and missile-waving, recently demonstrated by Khrushchev, Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky and others; constantly carrying on efforts to distort U.S. ideals and policies, and destroy our prestige; global espionage, sabotage, subversion and "aggression by propaganda" around the world.

In the face of these international efforts to undermine the U.S. position in the world, as well as to forward Communist aims—we must, I believe: Muster our resources; increase our vigilance; and, of extreme importance, present a united front to the world.

We recognize, of course, that 1960 is a campaign year. Politically motivated candidates will be searching high and low, at home and abroad, for issues upon which to capitalize.

The challenges, and dangers, of our time, however, require, I believe, responsible action by candidates of all parties.

Our internal differences should stop at the water's edge. Frankly, I believe, however, that there is plenty of room—and plenty of topics—for public discussion on issues upon which the major parties differ. These include:

First of all, the design of fiscal policy. That is, do we balance the budget, or don't we? If the budget is to be balanced, what happens to the surplus—tax reduction or debt reduction? If the budget is unbalanced, do we increase taxes to provide the revenue? Or do we transfer the burden to future generations by further increasing the national debt.

Secondly, how far do we extend our housing, urban renewal, anti-pollution, conservations, development of natural resources, and other programs? In these fields, as many others, the Democratic and Republican parties differ—not so much on whether we need such endeavors—but rather to what degree should the burden be on Uncle Sam.

Third, what about agriculture? Are there alternatives to present programs—that would resolve the dilemma both in the interests of the farmer and the Nation? Or will we continue to discuss the farm problem—like the weather—with lots of criticism, yet doing nothing about it?

Fourth, are we planning adequately to provide schools and teachers for the fast-increasing enrollments, expected to expand to about 76 million young Americans of school and college age by 1976.

Fifth, which party can deal most effectively with the task of protecting civil rights for all citizens, regardless of race, creed or national origin—with all its sociological and economic reflections in our society.

These, of course, are only a few of the major issues that, I believe, can and should be debated in the upcoming campaign.

POLITICAL FEATURES OF FOREIGN POLICY

Now, what about foreign policy?

What aspects of our international programs—to provide for our security, and promote peace in the world—are subjects for political debates?

In exploring this field, we recognize that we must tread carefully. Candidates can damage—rather than improve—our international prestige by irresponsible action in this field.

Mr. Khrushchev would like to sow the seeds of division in this country—as he is attempting to do elsewhere in the world. No responsible candidates, I believe, are going to help him do the job.

Now, what are some of the major features of U.S. programs aimed at improving security and promoting peace upon which discussion can shed light? These include:

First, are we maintaining an adequate defense? And is our timetable of planning for the future able to provide us with the jet-missile-nuclear-space defense of tomorrow.

You will recall that almost all of our defense experts agree that we have an adequate deterrent now; in addition, I, personally, feel that we are planning realistically; and effectively for the future.

Second, to what degree should we cooperate with other nations: To block communism; and to assist less-developed countries in promoting economic progress, to enable them to wipe out poverty, disease, illiteracy; and to create higher plateaus of living for their people.

Third, to what degree can, or should we participate in international organizations and blocs for military political, economic, ideological, and humanitarian purposes?

Fourth, what percentage of our national wealth—now at a peak gross national product of over $500 billion annually—should be earmarked for programs related to national security and promoting peace? And,

Fifth, how effectively are we stopping the Communists? And are there better ways of doing the job and of achieving world peace?

These, I believe, are legitimate questions of U.S. policy upon which constructive debate could further enlighten the American people of our responsibility in international affairs:

NEEDED: GREATER CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN U.S. POLITICAL LIFE

In these times—as never before—the Nation requires the understanding, support—and, yes, the unique contribution which each citizen can bring to his country by participating in its political life.

In our battle for survival against communism—supported by dedicated, almost fanatical Reds—one of the drags on our efforts is popularly, and regrettably, known as apathy.

The lifeblood of our Republic is its people—well informed, creative-thinking citizens. Tragically, barely one-half of the people in the country are voting, or participating in political affairs—as evidenced at the polls. Consequently, our national life suffers—to that degree—from the lack of support, strength, and creativeness which dutiful forward-thinking citizen participation can bring to Government.

Now, how can we improve the situation?

Frankly, I believe it is high time that we undertook a strenuous effort to conquer the epidemic of apathy—resulting in a stay-at-home—let-the-other-fellow-do-it attitude among our people.

To encourage more of our citizens to vote, for example, I recently proposed the designation of a National Voters' Day. The purpose would be to coordinate national efforts to carry on public education programs, including: The issues in a political campaign; the candidates and their qualifications; informing eligible voters of—and encouraging them to meet—registration requirements; educating potential voters on the processes of Government—and the value of citizen support, participation in—and, if deemed advisable, constructive opposition; and finally, launching a counterattack against the apathy which, regrettably, is allowing to go unheard the voice of millions of people.

Incidentally, the idea has been approved by a great many Governors, mayors, and civicly oriented organizations across the country. The Governors endorsing the idea include Gov. William G. Stratton, right here in Illinois; Michael V. DiSalle of Ohio; Herschel C. Loveless, of Iowa; and a great many others in the Midwest and elsewhere in the Nation.

The designation of a National Voters' Day would not, of course, magically accomplish the purposes of complete voter participation in government and elections. However, I believe it would, in a modest way, help to coordinate national efforts to encourage greater participation in our political life.

If you feel sympathetic to such a proposal, you might want to drop a note expressing your interest to your Congressman or Senator in Washington.

CONCLUSION

As we face the complex, difficult times ahead, we must not underestimate the scope of the challenge or minimize the force and will of the Communist conspiracy dedicated to overthrowing our Government and subjugating freedom.

At the same time, however, we can feel confident in our system, its ideals, and its ability to successfully meet the challenges. In addition, our strength is vastly supplemented by the alliance of free nations and the will for freedom of all people, including those imprisoned behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

If we continue—and further strengthen—our vigilance, dedication, and willingness to face realistically the Communist threat confronting us—as well as to meet the humanitarian need for providing a better life for people here in this country as well as abroad—I am confident that we will write a bright page in world history.

Memorial Day Address of the Honorable Mose Lindau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of Congress will find the Memorial Day address given by Judge Mose Lindau of Aberdeen, S. Dak., a most interesting document.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

On June 16, 1858, addressing the State Republican convention in the house chamber of the old State capitol, now the Sagamon County Courthouse, at Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln electrified the United States with these words of wisdom and prophecy:

"'A house divided against itself cannot stand.'

"I believe this Government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free.

"I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

"It will become all one thing, or all the other."

In the 102 years that have passed since these words were uttered, our world in a jet-atomic age has become even smaller than the United States was then. One can travel to Europe, Asia, or South America in much less time than it would have taken Lincoln in his day to journey from his Illinois home to New York City or Washington, D.C. In

the space of time limited only by the speed of sound, one can hear a voice or speech in those faraway places as clearly as you can hear me now.

With these marvelous communications, the message of liberty, freedom, and equality has spread to all parts of the earth. As the Negro of 1858 prayed for freedom, subject and enslaved peoples in Africa, Asia, Latin America and other parts of the world seek freedom for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These people are not Communists, but they are rebels and revolutionaries in the same sense that our forebears of 1776 were rebels and revolutionaries. They bear the same torch and are entitled to our sympathy, our understanding, and support.

The quality which distinguishes man from the other species of the animal kingdom is his dignity. Deprive a human of his dignity and he becomes little better than an animal. So, in addition to liberty and freedom, the subject and enslaved people of this world desire to be included in the doctrine "All men are created equal." Our Negro fellow citizens, who have enjoyed less than a century of freedom, seek something more than second-class citizenship, something more than "separate but equal" treatment. They are—under all of the principles which we hold dear, for which those whom we remember today gave their lives—entitled to integration and to equality in the fullest sense of that word.

Because the world has become smaller, it is more important that we be sincere, understanding good neighbors—not only to those people who live in areas contiguous to our country, but to all the peoples of the world. When we seek to help them we should do so for themselves, and not because we fear that the Communists will take them over. We must help other peoples with that some goodwill which we expect in return—with the same goodwill with which Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and the nations who sent them aided our revolutionary forebears in their quest. In our giving of aid, we must recognize the brotherhood of man as a verity. In this spirit only can we hope to achieve peace.

However, men cry "Peace, peace, but there is no peace." When the Communist cries "Peace," as he does continually, he does not mean what we think of as peace. He means peace on his terms. He means peace for his aggrandizement and enrichment. He means peace through the enslavement and at the expense of the liberties of free peoples. He means peace without God or religion.

It is my view that our Vice President's visit to the Soviet Union and his subsequent experiences there were a mistake. Likewise the action of President Eisenhower in inviting Premier Khrushchev to the United States was a mistake. The Congress apparently felt the same way, for it adjourned and scattered before the Premier arrived in this country.

In seeking those things which are best for the peoples of the world, for our beloved country and ourselves, we must never lose sight of the fact that:

We cannot compromise with evil. We cannot compromise with godlessness.

To do so is to take unto ourselves a portion of that evil and godlessness, because compromise is a give-and-take proposition. We must face the fact that there is no difference between fascism or communism. There is no difference between a National Socialist Government or a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. They mean the loss of freedom, the imposition of a dictatorship by demagogues without God or humanitarian principles.

Let us not despair over the failure of the so-called summit conference. The Communists would not have yielded anything of value to the free world, and whatever concessions they might have made in the way of time or relaxing tensions would have been obtained at the cost of vital concessions on the part of the United States and its allies.

If recent history has taught us nothing else, it has taught us that the Khrushchevs, Stalins, Hitlers, and Mussolinis, and their kind regard anything in the way of a concession on our part as a confession of weakness. They would follow up concessions with more unreasonable demands—with more world tensions. Appeasement and concession can never satisfy their insatiable craving for the domination of more free peoples.

Let us rather heed the advice of Washington: "To prepare for war is the best means for promoting peace." The phenomenon of the past 6 or 7 years has been the substantial reduction in both our regular and reserve armed forces. Military doctrine tells us that a regular Defense Establishment may be reduced only at the expense of increasing the strength of the reserve defense forces. Let us hope that the Government will reverse this dangerous policy.

Theodore Roosevelt told us to "Walk softly, but carry a big stick." It is sad to note that in recent years we have been treading very loudly, talking of "massive retaliation" and going "to the brink of war", and while doing so have been carrying a small twig.

In the memory of those who have laid down their lives that the Nation might live, we have the duty and responsibility of making ourselves strong, both individually and collectively. We must continue to work, not only for a stronger, more effective national defense, but for the better mental and physical health of our people and the peoples of the world, for better and more adequate educational and recreational facilities for all. Let us seek to be better neighbors to all the peoples of the earth, both through our Government and through the facilities of the United Nations, thus working for a genuine, lasting peace.

On this day of solemn remembrance, let us renew our faith and our hopes for the future in the imperishable words of Abraham Lincoln:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

Interest in West Virginia and Her Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

In recent weeks there has been a heartening display of interest in West Virginia and her economic problems. People with whom I have talked in Washington show a genuine concern over the lack of job opportunities, and a desire to be as helpful as they possibly can. It is this interest, I believe, which prompted the passage by the House of the area redevelopment bill which was designed to cope with economic problems such as exist in West Virginia.

This sincere interest on the part of people throughout the country can be a great asset in efforts to build a bigger and better West Virginia.

There is no question but that West Virginia is endowed with great natural resources. Our labor supply is unequalled. Our people are as productive and as capable as any in the Nation. Proof of this is found in the fact that West Virginians, unable to find jobs at home, are welcomed in industrial centers throughout the Nation.

Our great coal industry, with vast reserves still untouched, provides a base upon which the future can be built.

With all of its assets, there is no reason why West Virginia cannot enjoy a tremendous growth and development in the years ahead. The great task we face is to put our natural resources and assets to work, to create jobs for the men and women of West Virginia so they will not have to look elsewhere for employment. The area redevelopment legislation, which President Eisenhower has unfortunately vetoed on two occasions, would have provided the means whereby we could have gotten such a program started.

I hope that the people of West Virginia will not be too discouraged by this turn of events. A new administration which takes office next January will no doubt look with favor upon Federal cooperation to help solve the economic problems of distressed areas.

In the meantime, it is encouraging to note that groups and organizations within West Virginia are continuing their efforts to attract new industries of all kinds. We need diversified industry. The coal producing areas can support many new and varied plants. The men who no longer can find jobs in the mines will be able to work in these new plants.

Recently I was interested to read an article written about 4 years ago by Mr. Andrew W. McLaughlin, a Lewisburg, W. Va., businessman. In this article he proposed the creation of a $15 million commission which would finance the establishment of new industries and the expansion of promising small businesses which are encountering difficult times.

It was Mr. McLaughlin's contention then, as it is now, that West Virginia itself must take the lead in creating new job opportunities. The migration of our young people to other areas can be stopped only if we create jobs for them at home.

The proposal made 4 years ago by Mr. McLaughlin is valuable because it shows the people of the State are thinking seriously about our problems and are determined to do something about it. I am sure that in the months ahead we are going to hear many more interesting proposals for positive action—for ways of meeting the serious problem which our section faces.

AMERICANS COME TO THE HELP OF CHILE

The spontaneous outpouring of help for the people of Chile is typical of the American people. They did not wait for the Government to ask them to contribute money to help the homeless people of Chile. Instead, the people themselves took the lead.

Reports from Chile agree that the people, left destitute by a series of earthquakes, are deeply grateful to the people of the United States. I am sure that people-to-people help will create more lasting good will than all the Government action we might undertake. After all, people help each other out of the goodness of their hearts. Governments are often suspected of having an ulterior motive.

I wish more and more of our help to other people could be channeled through church and charitable organizations. In this way we would avoid many of the mistakes which have plagued the foreign aid program.

An Address by Col. William H. McIntyre, Society of American Legion Founders, Staten Island, June 5, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Col. William H. McIntyre of 316 West 79th Street, New York City, a past president of the Society of American Legion Founders, Ltd., has won many distinctions in the course of his busy and constructive life, but one accomplishment in particular is most unique and praiseworthy even though virtually everything he has done both as a military man and a citizen merits commendation.

Colonel McIntyre has met all the dead of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict who arrived at the Port of New York on their way to final interment. In fair weather and foul, at all hours of the day or night, he was on hand to pay his respects to the gallant members of our military who were swept away in the irresistible tide of arms. The dead from World War I who came into New York Harbor numbered 44,243, from World War II 159,267, and from the Korean conflict 21,197.

For his faithful and dedicated attention to a cause above and beyond his duties as a military man, Colonel McIntyre received a citation from Frank Pace, the Secretary of War, Henry Anderson, the Secretary of the Navy, and also from the mayor of New York City. His devotion to burial services at the Army base in New York City caused the Secretary of the Army to invite him to attend the ceremonies at Arlington Cemetery in 1958.

Colonel McIntyre's brother last an eye in the Pacific hostilities while serving in World War II with the 69th of New York, and his son Bill served with the 1st, 2d, and 6th Marine Divisions in World War II.

Colonel McIntyre is the only man who has attended every national convention of the American Legion since its inception. For 55 years he has been connected with the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. in New York City, but is now retired.

On June 5 Colonel McIntyre delivered an address before an American Legion Post on Staten Island, N.Y. His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY COL. WILLIAM H. MCINTYRE, SOCIETY OF AMERICAN LEGION FOUNDERS, STATEN ISLAND, JUNE 5, 1960

Mr. Chairman, dear friends and fellow Americans, I am not a stranger to this county. I have been here many times early in the forenoon and late in the afternoon, meeting the war dead that came from Europe or Africa. It will be 6 years ago tomorrow that I represented the national commander, Art Connell, at the 10th anniversary of the landing of our boys on D-Day on the Normandy beaches after which I visited all American cemeteries in Europe.

However, it does seem strange to come down from Manhattan when you have so many competent speakers in this district. Since I have received the invitation, I am pleased to be present on this occasion.

The American Legion has built soundly over four decades for the future good citizenship of America. The world's largest veterans' organization was born in Paris, France, in March 1919; the babe was taken out of the cradle in St. Louis, Mo., May 1919, and trotted out to march in the snow at Minneapolis, Minn., in November 1919. I was a part of all these gatherings. The youngsters grew and changed just as the American Legion, too, has changed. Forty-one years of dramatic service to God and country now lie behind the American Legion. What a beautiful story from the founding dates—you have given freely of your time and funds and can point with pride to the many activities of our organization which is now a household word throughout our great country.

The march of time has changed the entire world; we are living in a fantastic period that we call space age—but it has not dimmed our patriotic, civil, and social activities. The American Legion still uses its strength to promote the interest of the defenders of America.

It has championed adequate care of disabled veterans and the protection of war widows and orphans. It is my opinion that even a greater chapter of the American Legion history remains to be written, since after all we are only 41 years young. Today we are celebrating the dedication of a new building Cespino-Russo Post, a post well known in the great department of New York. Over the years its accomplishments in community service is history. The great future destiny of the American Legion does not lie in nationwide concepts, it rests upon the vision of Legionnaires everywhere, and what they can do locally as enthusiastic individuals and as organized groups for their hometowns. The key to this vision is the spirit of community service, for building good and constantly improved local neighborhoods is the most solid foundation for strong States and an invincible Nation. Community service actually includes everything the American Legion does—child welfare is community service, because through this activity we seek to enrich the child life of our hometown. Rehabilitation is community service, because it is designed to improve the veteran lives of the community. "Americanism." What is Americanism? It is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag; and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.

National security. Junior baseball, housing, employment, musical organizations—they are all community serving programs—each designed to improve some phase of hometown life. Your post has engaged in some of this work. In the spirit of community service lies the great promise of tomorrow for our membership. In fulfilling that promise, the American Legion can make its proud past a mere prelude to an immeasurably grander future. In the stirring days ahead there will be greater calls on the services of the American Legion and its loyal courage and realism. The Red "fifth columns" are still working underground. Time will not permit me to say here all that I have in mind. My presence here as a speaker is but incidental. We are participants in a special day of dedication, a rallying day—to rededicate ourselves to keep alive the memories of our comrades who gave all. Therefore, we should build American strength, and perpetuate our liberty and the last best hope for freedom for all the world.

In Support of Youth Appreciation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just passed a joint resolution, soon to be considered by this body, which would establish an annual Youth Appreciation Week.

I am very much in favor of this resolution and believe firmly this would provide a means whereby appropriate tribute can be paid to the vast majority of our young people.

I happen to be one of those who thinks that our juvenile delinquency problems stem from a small minority among our youth.

In support of this belief, I would like to enter into the RECORD as sort of proof positive, that, given a chance, the achievements of American youth are many, the following news story about a teenage dance band from Bridgeport, Conn., which this month will go abroad to entertain U.S. servicemen under Defense Department sponsorship.

The article follows:

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., May 21.—A Cinderella story—and a true one—of what American youth can achieve if given a chance will unfold next month when a teenage dance band from Bridgeport goes abroad to entertain U.S. servicemen.

St. Raphael's Band is well known to Bridgeport area residents who've danced to its tunes in ballrooms, parties, and public events.

The trip to Europe, sponsored by the Department of Defense, will give youngsters and adults of other lands a chance to learn the band's remarkable history.

An ensemble of 17 musicians and a vocalist, aged 14 to 19, the band was actually created as the result of trouble and a young priest's conviction about young people.

It was about 3 years ago in Bridgeport's north-end section, where St. Raphael's Church serves a predominantly Catholic population, that Rev. Louis A. DeProfio took a long, hard look at what was happening to teenagers of the parish.

The north end had no adequate recreation facilities or programs and teenagers had little to do but loiter in leisure time. St. Raphael's had no school and could offer only a meager program.

Shortcomings of the section were noted elsewhere in the city. Juvenile court records contained a growing number of delinquency cases.

As assistant pastor of the church and executive director of its Catholic Youth Organization, Father DeProfio knew the time had come for a real test of a personal conviction—that youngsters are, by nature, religious and not bad.

"They were getting into mischief and worse," he recalled recently. "And we were losing them from the church. I believed we could change things by offering them a constructive program."

His program was a dance band, not a big one and not one comprised of just the best teenage musicians but one in which the youngsters could improve themselves while jointly becoming better as a group.

Father DeProfio enlisted a well-known local musician, Daniel DeMarco, as teacher and director and called a rehearsal.

"It wasn't much to start with," he laughed. "Just one boy with a trumpet, one with a trombone, and one with a saxophone. But I got parents to help and in 3 months we had 17 players."

Under the baton of DeMarco, who teaches instrumental music at the University of Bridgeport, the youngsters become good—good enough to play at neighborhood dances.

They got better. And demand for their services—they specialized in ballroom dance music—began coming in to St. Raphael's. They even played during Bridgeport's annual Barnum Festival. They played at local ballrooms, clubs, parties.

The band was good but Father DeProfio and DeMarco shared a single question: "Why stop here?"

To improve meant study and there was no better place for study locally than at the university. Who ever heard of sending teenagers to college? That didn't bother the priest and the band's director. They enrolled the youngsters in a summer course at the university.

Prof. Earl Sauerwein of the university's music department taught the youngsters music theory for 2 hours twice a week and DeMarco taught them for an hour a week.

"They did excellently and the band was greatly improved," Father DeProfio said. During the summer of 1959, the band played again at the Barnum Festival, most of its members also played with the university's community orchestra and concert band. They appeared at high school and college dances. "Every single member has become a soloist in his instrument in his respective high school band."

All the time, other programs of St. Raphael's CYO were growing and the delinquency rate in the area was sharply dropping.

The young priest and the band's director were no ones to limit horizons, however.

"We read about Louis Armstrong and all those other adult bands going overseas as musical ambassadors and we wondered if we might arrange to go on a tour during the summer," said Father DeProfio.

Early efforts met with redtape and reluctance, even though the young band could serve a dual function of showing foreigners what American youth can do as well as bringing good will.

Father DeProfio contacted his Congressman, Representative DONALD J. IRWIN. It took time. It took letters. It took telephone calls. It took a taped audition of the band.

The audition tape, incidentally, was made by Robert Blake of Rowayton, Conn., a close personal friend of Mr. IRWIN and a professional in the field.

Father DeProfio gives much of the credit for the success of the audition tape to Mr. Blake, who handled the taping as a personal favor to the Congressman.

"When Congressman IRWIN called us and told us he had received word that the Defense Department would sponsor a 4-week tour, it was a dream come true," the young priest said.

The Department had agreed to take the 17 bandsmen, vocalist, and Demarco and his wife to American installations for 4 weeks, starting about June 26.

"We had teenage trouble here and now we don't," Father DeProfio said. "Maybe we can show others here and in Europe that if you give teenagers a chance they'll surprise you with what they can do just like our teenagers did."

Wisconsin: Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Wisconsin—a Badger State of plenty, of great people, of opportunity—has a bright future.

Blessed with fertile soil, rich resources and a strong, creative citizenry, the Badger State holds great promise for economic progress and a better life for our people now and for the generations of the future.

Justifiably, Wisconsin has traditionally been known as America's dairyland, as the No. 1 milk producer in the Nation, with an almost 18-billion-pound output of fluid milk annually. Wisconsin also runs first in the production of cheese, providing about 50 percent of the Nation's production, or more than 615 million pounds annually.

Abounding in natural beauty, Wisconsin also has a tremendous out-of-door heritage. This includes unique glacial moraines, 10,000 miles of trout streams, 8,500 lakes abounding in sturgeon, muskie, pike, bass, perch, and other fish, opportunity for hunting, recreational areas, including 312 parks, 7 State forests, and over 1.4 million acres of national forest lands and many other historical and scenic sites.

As a land of opportunity, our State also contains: A strong economy; a healthy program of industrial expansion; good transportational facilities; a bright outlook for expanded trade and commerce—particularly as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway; a splendid educational program, including, among other fine institutions, the world-famous University of Wisconsin; and a wide vavariety of other marks of progress and "open doors" of opportunity in this land of promise.

Recently, the New York Times published a special section of its Sunday paper entitled, "On Wisconsin: A State of Power and Plenty." The edition is sponsored and prepared by the Wisconsin Departments of Resource Development, Conservation and Agriculture.

Overall, the special Wisconsin issue is a splendid review of Wisconsin as America's dairyland and agricultural giant, an industrial land of opportunity.

Reflecting the way in which the State's motto "Forward," is realized—in its outstanding programs—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following articles:

First. "Wisconsin Prides Itself on Title of 'America's Dairyland.' "

Second. "Resource and Industrial Development," by David Carley, director Wisconsin Department of Resource Development.

Third. "St. Lawrence Seaway: Gateway to the World."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN PRIDES ITSELF ON TITLE OF "AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND"

Visitors to Wisconsin are always intrigued by the "America's Dairyland" license plate on cars they see driven by citizens of the Badger State.

This public pride in being the dairyland of the Nation is well justified—especially when one looks into the record in dairying that Wisconsin has attained during the years.

MANY FIRSTS

Wisconsin's list of firsts in this vital field of helping to feed the world is an impressive one. Wisconsin ranks first in the Nation's milk production, producing almost 18 billion pounds of the fluid that is so vital to life itself. Wisconsin ranks first in the Nation in the production of cheese, providing some 50 percent of the Nation's cheese in the staggering output of more than 615 million pounds annually. That's seven times more cheese than produced by the next closest State. In fact, Wisconsin makes over 100 varieties and 18 main types of cheese, and leads the Nation in the production of such individual types as Cheddar, brick and munster and Italian.

Moving along to other dairy products, Wisconsin also leads the Nation in the production of condensed skim milk (both sweetened and unsweetened), condensed whole milk (sweetened), powdered whole milk for human consumption, powdered whole milk and powdered whey. In butter Wisconsin produces some 270 billion pounds annually, or 21 percent of the Nation's supply.

Dairying in Wisconsin has many "natural" reasons for success. Natural advantages of climate and the fertile rolling land produce conditions ideal for forage crops and good grazing land for dairy cows. The highly developed skills and techniques of producing Wisconsin cheese are attained by generations of cheesemakers having passing these talents down through the years.

Wisconsin, as noted earlier, produces a wide variety of cheeses. This specialization by variety has been developed to the maximum.

OLD WORLD FLAVOR

For example, in Wisconsin can be found replicas of almost every Old World community. The Swiss settlements produce Swiss cheese, with the production in the hands of descendants of Switzerland. Likewise with Italian, German and Dutch types. This specialization results in flavorful, high-quality cheese with the same wonderful characteristics that were found in the cheese first made in the countries of their origin.

Another vital factor in the dairying success of Wisconsin is the modern, up-to-date animal health program which has maintained high standards among the cattle in the State along with rigid dairy and milk handling techniques and other factors which assure the continued supply of pure milk from which Wisconsin cheese is made.

Wisconsin's 100,000 dairy farms produce almost 18 billion pounds of milk annually. Of this output, 29 percent is used in making butter; 27 percent goes into American cheese, and 37 percent is used in all of the other cheese in the State.

THE WISCONSIN STORY: RESOURCE AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(By David Carley, Director, Wisconsin Department of Resource Development)

On, Wisconsin! The words in the title of a famous "fight" song of a Big 10 University are also part of the heritage of a great State. To us, On Wisconsin! also means an unrelenting effort to develop, to the utmost potential, those resources which we have so bountifully. It is with this in mind that this special section is so entitled.

SOMETHING DIFFERENT

There is something different about this Wisconsin supplement in The New York Times. Although its basic appeal is directed toward these industrialists seeking an outstanding site for a new or expanding industry, these additional observations should be made.

First, this section is sponsored by 3 of Wisconsin's departments of State government; the department of resource development, including divisions of Industrial development, state planning, and research; the department of conservation and the department of agriculture. This kind of sponsorship indicates the interest the whole State government of Wisconsin has in promoting the advancement of the State.

Secondly, many of Wisconsin's local communities, some very large, and a few quite small, are represented here. Wisconsin has a long history of close cooperation between the local communities and the State itself. The "balance" among those advertising in this special section—industries, financial institutions, newspapers, utilities, local communities and the State itself—is representative of the relationship that prevails in the Badger State.

Thirdly, and we believe uniquely, Wisconsin, in the description of its resources, gives great weight to its unsurpassed educational system. The world-famous University of Wisconsin with its outstanding extension divisions in adult education and agriculture is an integral part of that which makes this State an outstanding one as a choice in which to locate a new manufacturing plant or to bring up a family. Our vocational school system enjoys an outstanding reputation as well. That story, too, is included.

We think that you will enjoy this special supplement on Wisconsin. It is the largest and the most comprehensive section published to date by The New York Times for any State in the North Central area. We are proud to offer to the Nation our story of resource development.

WISCONSIN, A STATE OF INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

In 1959, 68 new manufacturing firms were established in Wisconsin. In this same period over $300 million was committed for permanent capital expenditures. More impressive even than the number of new firms is the rate of expansion of present Wisconsin firms. Two hundred and thirty firms completed, have been under construction or announced expansion in 1959 alone. New plant construction exceeded 7 million square feet in this same period. These are impressive indications that industry is looking to Wisconsin as a State prepared for great industrial and commercial growth in the decade ahead.

Wisconsin has been known as America's Dairyland for many years. We are justifiably proud of the title. And food production is big business in Wisconsin, surpassed only by machinery manufacturing. However, the transition from a basically agricultural economy to one of manufacturing, with great support from the recreational and agricultural segments, has been made and Wisconsin now ranks as one of the Nation's larger industrial States. The State's high per capita income, plus its geographic location in the world's greatest industrial complex, the Midwest, has made it a choice site for market-oriented industry. With new technological advancements in raw material and finished-product transportation facilities, Wisconsin is competing most favorably with other States that may have more abundant natural resources but less superior labor supply and capital resources.

The department of resource development

The State of Wisconsin, in 1955, created a division of industrial development to assist in the development of the economy of the State and its local communities. The 1959 legislature, in creating the department of resource development, alined with industrial development division with the State Planning Division. The purpose was to bring the plant location, economic research and industrial promotional activities of the State directly in line with the planning goals of the State and its regions. The integration of an action agency on the one hand with a staff agency on the other has brought outstanding results already, we believe. Our planning and research staff has been able to assist local communities with industrial development problems that had their beginnings in poor planning. In other instances, working with industrial park developers we have been able to show adequately the needs of potential industry so as to preclude planning problems before they arise.

The development of good industrial zoning principles and practices in local communities is a very important part of the work of our staff. Again, the close cooperation of our planning specialists with our plant location engineers makes a difference in assisting a community to prepare for industial location.

The important concept of regional planning, so long neglected in many of our States, is making headway in Wisconsin. Industrial needs such as adequate labor supply, superior transportation routes, closer markets, recreational facilities for employees and general livability are all provided better under a concept of regional planning. Wisconsin, recognizing its capacity for potential economic development, is taking the lead in turning from restrictive and merely local planning to regional and statewide planning.

Research facilities

The private and public research facilities in Wisconsin, always available to industry, are second to none in performance. The Badger State has long been famed for its historic research in economics, biochemistry, and medicine. Now extensive research investigations undertaken by private industry in electronics, machine testing and foods complement older research institutions. Public research facilities such as those in the industrial commission, the department of resource development, the University of Wisconsin and the taxation department are regarded highly and are prepared to serve industrial and commercial research needs in every manner necessary.

Community programs for industrial development

Wisconsin communities are prepared to assist in new or expanding industrial development projects immediately. We have over 200 local industrial development corporations, more than any other State, we believe, and indicative of local initiative and desire for industrial growth. Most of them are prepared to meet a good part of the financial needs of the new or relocating industralists with which they come in contact. All of them have made intensive surveys of labor supply, raw materials, sites, utility facilities, and, in many cases, markets for those industries wishing to have first-hand information. Many of our local chambers of commerce or industrial development groups have purchased and carefully laid out industrial sites completely ready for prospective industrial building.

ON, WISCONSIN

We hope it is apparent by now that living, working and playing in Wisconsin is the best there is. The job of the department of resource development is just what its name implies. We are here to assist in the maximum development of the many resources of a great State. Resources to us mean people, their jobs, their education, their welfare and their communities. Our department staff will be most happy to assist any industrialist who seeks a location where good markets abound, where labor is of the highest integrity and where community attitudes are conducive to business growth and prosperity.

An executive of Wisconsin's largest employer, American Motors Corp., said this about Wisconsin:

"And certainly we enjoy the kind of people we work with in Wisconsin. Americans are pretty good people in every part of the country but there is an attractive wholesomeness to the Wisconsin human atmosphere that is not surpassed anywhere. The education level is high, and the dash of cold in your winter tends to keep the South Sea beachcomber spirit in check."

ROY D. CHAPIN, Jr.,
Executive Vice President and General Manager, American Motors Corp., Governor's Conference on Industrial Development.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: GATEWAY TO THE WORLD

The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 helped move Wisconsin manufacturers and agriculture even closer to world markets.

Seaway cargo was handled by five of Wisconsin's many commercial ports and harbors on Lakes Michigan and Superior.

Some Wisconsin ports had been planning and building for the St. Lawrence Seaway long before the seaway became a reality. Foreign ship captains praised the efficient cargo handling at Wisconsin's ports resulting from careful planning and experience in handling overseas commerce over the old St. Lawrence Waterway.

In addition to its seaway ports, other Wisconsin port cities handle large tonnages of Great Lakes bulk movements such as coal and petroleum for industrial uses.

FOURTEEN KEY PORTS

Wisconsin's 14 lake ports lie at the western end of the Great Lakes waterway system which was opened to deep-draft world shipping by the seaway. Oceangoing ships, carrying cargo to and from all parts of the world, bring to Wisconsin all the advantages of water transportation, despite the State's position 2,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean.

The major ports serve as convenient transfer points for a vast and rapidly developing region extending 1,000 miles to the West, a region that includes all or part of 15 States and 3 provinces of Canada.

Because the seaway makes railroad transportation doubly important, it is vital that Wisconsin have ready access to rails. Twelve railroads, operating a total of 39,000 miles of right-of-way, connect the 14 Wisconsin port cities with lines that lead to the West. All told, trunkline railroads operate about 6,200 miles of right-of-way within Wisconsin.

Linking Wisconsin ports with Michigan cities are three other railroad companies which cross Lake Michigan with their car ferries. There vessels, which carry whole trains of freight cars, connect such Wisconsin cities as Kewaunee, Manitowoc, Marinette, and Milwaukee with Michigan's lower peninsula. Many Wisconsin railroads also have developed "piggyback" services, an operation by which highway trailers are carried on railroad flatcars. The use of this new concept in transportation has proven economical in many instances, especially over a long-distance route.

To handle the increased trucking that has come with the emergence of the St. Lawrence Seaway is a 2,200-mile arterial system of most used highways, including 482 miles on the National Interstate and Defense Highway System.

Freight is carried to Wisconsin port cities by nearly 100 common carrier truck lines. In addition, many more contract carriers and local cartage companies have highway cargo equipment available at these cities.

TOP ROAD SYSTEM

To assure top conditions of these vital roads, the Wisconsin State Highway Commission spend as much as $100 million a year in State funds, raised entirely by road-user fees and taxes. As much as $65 million in Federal highway aids also goes into Wisconsin highways annually. Equally important is the system of Wisconsin county trunk highways, acknowledged as one of the best in the Nation.

Because shipment by air has become extremely important to manufacturers. Wisconsin can pride itself on excellent air service in and out of the State. Wisconsin now has 71 public airports, used by more than 200 Wisconsin businessmen who operate their own aircraft.

Five of the fourteen Wisconsin lake port cities have regularly scheduled airline passenger service, while the others are within an hour's driving time of scheduled service airports. Milwaukee is served by seven airlines which provide fast and frequent connections to points all over the world. In addition, Wisconsin is the focal point of the Nation's largest local service airline, which links the smaller communities with points throughout the United States and overseas.

Truly, with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, it can be said that "the world is coming to Wisconsin."

Salary Increases for Our Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with pending legislation to provide salary increases for our postal employees, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Iowa Chapter, National Association of Postmasters of the United States at its annual convention in Burlington, Iowa, on May 15, 16, and 17, 1960:

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT—REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, ANNUAL CONVENTION, IOWA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, MEETING IN BURLINGTON, IOWA, MAY 15, 16, AND 17, 1960

RESOLUTION 6

Resolved, That the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters desires to express our appreciation to the Congress of the United States for their cooperation with the national officers of the National Association of Postmasters.

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the 2½-percent increase in salary to postmasters in level 7 and above was voted as a temporary increase for a 3-year period: Be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States urge the enactment by Congress of a law making this temporary increase a permanent measure; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Iowa Chapter be directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Postmaster General Summerfield, and to the Iowa congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the 10-percent increase in salary for all postmasters, including all levels as well as postmasters of the fourth class, as urged by President Wehking in his appearance before the various congressional committees, has the support of the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters: Be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States urge the enactment by Congress of a law granting this increase in salary; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Iowa Chapter be directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Postmaster General Summerfield, and to the Iowa Members of the Congress of the United States.

Following our previous precedent, we are happy to continue to support the real needs of our postal workers.

Nixon: A Promising Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON, without campaigning at all, has made an impressive showing in the Republican presidential primaries. Indeed, the totals he has rolled up in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Oregon and other States have done much to dispel the oft-repeated statement that he is unpopular with the rank-and-file voters—that he cannot win. Unopposed in most of these primaries, with no contest to bring out the Republican vote, Mr. NIXON, whose name was not on the ballot in Nebraska, has exceeded the primary votes given President Eisenhower in 1956 in many States as indicated in the statistics which I include in my remarks.

The complete returns from the Oregon primary have not been released as yet and therefore are not included in the primary preferential vote tabulations which follow. However, with 75 precincts to report in Oregon, NIXON's total closely approaches the 231,000 figure obtained by President Eisenhower in 1956 as compared to only 142,000 for Senator KENNEDY. Following the vote totals, I insert two editorials from the Peoria Journal to emphasize the point I made above:

The primary preferential vote

[In thousands]

		NIXON	KENNEDY
Mar. 8	New Hampshire	65	43
Apr. 5	Wisconsin	340	476
12	Illinois	783	[1] 35
26	Massachusetts	54	96
26	Pennsylvania	954	[1] 175
May 3	Indiana	402	352
10	West Virginia		219
10	Nebraska	[1] 71	78
	Total	2,669	1,474

[1] Write-in votes.

The Nixon record (Democrats) from Apr. 12 to May 10, 1960

		Humphrey	Johnson	Kennedy	Stevenson	Symington
Illinois	Apr. 12	4,283	442	[1] 34,332	8,029	5,744
Pennsylvania	Apr. 26	[1] 14,000	[1] 3,000	[1] 175,000	[1] 28,000	[1] 6,000
Massachusetts	do	[1] 946	[1] 296	[1] 95,914	[1] 4,505	[1] 414
Indiana	May 3			352,048		
Nebraska	May 10	[1] 2,140	[1] 611	78,300	687	[1] 3,196
Total		21,369	4,349	736,594	41,221	15,354

[1] Write-in votes.

The Nixon record (Republican) from Apr. 12 to May 10, 1960

		Goldwater	Rockefeller	Nixon	1956, Eisenhower
Illinois	Apr. 12		[1] 442	782,840	781,710
Pennsylvania	Apr. 26		[1] 11,005	954,205	951,932
Massachusetts	do		4,200	54,201	
Indiana	May 3			401,884	351,903
Nebraska	May 10	[1] 916	[1] 1,564	[1] 71,463	102,576
Total		916	13,191	2,264,553	2,188,121

[1] Write-in votes.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, May 24, 1960]

NIXON: A PROMISING START

RICHARD NIXON hit the campaign trail in earnest last week, and there were plenty of signs he knows what he's up to.

NIXON speaking for NIXON instead of for Eisenhower produced more sparks than a lot of political sages had anticipated. There were no indications that the Vice President loses his platfrom impact when he speaks for himself instead of for the President.

In general, reaction was so good it appears that the policitians—and the Nation—may have been underestimating NIXON's campaign capabilities as a candidate in his own right.

A Christian Science Monitor writer, birddogging the Vice President through New York State, went so far as to call the response there "a ground swell of approval for Mr. NIXON."

This may be a bit extreme, but there seems little doubt that NIXON made political hay in the Empire State and probably buried deeper what chances remain for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller to the the Republican presidential nominee.

Speaking before varied groups, NIXON appeared calmer, more relaxed and more assured. He gave an impression of warmth,

and obviously is working to overcome the image of coldness and gruffness which his opponents exploit in such slogans as "Tricky Dick Nixon."

The Vice President even succeeded in charming the women, an ability not many had foreseen for him. And the machinery that accompanies him showed signs of careful tuning and oiling. Mrs. Nixon played well the role of the perfect candidate's wife, and his aids were alert and efficient without being obtrusive.

It's true that events of NIXON's first week of intensive campaigning broke in a manner to benefit him. Yet to a degree he made his own breaks.

The Paris crisis insured that NIXON's platform words would be listened to carefully. But it was his own analysis of the situation, his decision of what to emphasize and how to say it, that made his words good listening. And good politics.

One week doesn't make a campaign, and it remains to be seen how the Vice President's platform-and-picnic personality stands up in the rough weeks ahead.

NIXON faces another situation this week right here in Illinois. He'll be in Melvin for "Les Arends Day", honoring the 17th district's longtime Congressman. (See below.) Let's see how the candidate fares in the Midwest.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, May 29, 1960]

NIXONS MAKE PERSONAL TOUCH PAY ON VISIT TO ILLINOIS

(By Robert J. Nelson)

MELVIN, ILL.—When Dick and Pat Nixon enter the political marketplace, they spend the coin of the realm. And they get value received.

As campaigners, they shape up as pros who have learned well the lesson that in securing votes, you can't beat the exchange rate of the personal, sincere touch.

There seems little doubt but what they made a good impression at "Les Arends Day" here Friday.

They flashed no new tricks, but those who saw them agreed they use the old ones well.

Even though bad weather hurt the turnout, the Vice President's first foray into Illinois in the new, intensified phase of his campaign can probably be called a pretty good success.

It was obviously a friendly crowd, being in the strongly Republican 17th District. People came prepared to like the Nixons. But some acted like they liked them better than they had planned.

You can't help noticing how many people came away with something more than a handshake or a hello.

Dale Moore, Woodford County school superintendent from Eureka, is an example.

He found himself walking besides Mrs. Nixon as the crowd moved from the high school to the Arends home. They talked about schools.

"She made the same remarks he did in his speech," Moore said, "She said if things go wrong this fall, she may be back teaching school. Said she'd contact me about a job."

This is the kind of conversation voters remember.

Or take David Davis, State senator from Bloomington.

"My reaction couldn't help being good," he said "LES ARENDS introduced us, and the Vice President said, "Say, didn't your grandfather sit on the Supreme Court?"

As an onlooker observed—and Davis readily admitted—the Vice President's personal intelligence is working better than the country's.

A handful of Bradley University students were among a group of "Illinois College Youth for NIXON" who got close enough to talk to the NIXONS.

"He talked about Bradley basketball," reported Phil Reed, president of the BU Republican Club. "And reminded us that he holds an honorary degree from Bradley."

And at NIXON'S press conference, when a reporter identified himself as being from Minonk, the Vice President took time to point out that he probably was one of the few people in Washington who had been in Minonk and knew where it was. He was there as a Congressman.

The overall effect of all this is impressive. Even those who look upon it purely as politics admire the Nixons for their skill at it. And they like the air of sincerity.

This is something you could hear again and again about the Nixons at Melvin—"They're so sincere" or "They're so genuline." As one man put it, "They seem to be plain folks, just like the rest of us."

This is especially interesting because just before he came to Illinois, during the time he was beginning to stump in earnest through New York State, some political analysts were saying the Vice President was working hard to create an impression of warmth and friendliness; trying to overcome an image of coldness and brusqueness which some seemed to feel was dogging him.

If he truly is working in this direction, he gave signs in Melvin of succeeding.

The Vice President seemed relaxed and jovial. He joked and kidded and looked at least part of the time as though he was really having fun. He went immediately to a first-name basis with Gov. William Stratton and other officials who were there.

He quipped that he, Stratton, and ARENDS had "all married above ourselves—at least in looks."

The only time he showed signs of being less than enthusiastic about campaigning in Melvin, Ill., was in the reception line. But anybody would find it hard to keep smiling when several hundred persons shake your hand in an hour.

Mrs. Nixon didn't try to keep smiling all the time. She looked, by turns, amused, bantering, mildly astonished, quizzical, and filled with wonder. This variety wore well.

National Chiropractic Profession Sponsors Chiropractic Day, September 18, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a special observance to take place in September of this year. The chiropractic profession, which is the Nation's second largest profession dedicated to healing, will observe its annual Chiropractic Day.

Because the chiropractic profession deals with one of the most important things to each of us—sound and good health—I think the value of this annual observance should not be overlooked.

On September 18 of this year, chiropractors throughout the United States, Canada, and a number of other countries will observe the 65th anniversary of the discovery of chiropractic by the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer.

As one example of the impressive impact that the value and importance of chiropractic has made in our society over the years, I call to the attention of my colleagues the services established by the Sordoni Enterprises of my congressional district that employs no fewer than 14 doctors of chiropractic to administer to the medical needs of its thousands of employees. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, such an arrangement as this truly reflects the immense value of chiropractic in the modern-day industrial and business world and, what is more, aids greatly in the establishment of a pleasant relationship between employer and employee, upon which success is really based.

In connection with this observance, I wish to submit for the RECORD a statement by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations, National Chiropractic Association, Washington, D.C., immediately following which I include a pamphlet entitled, "Chiropractic in Industry," published by the Honorable Andrew J. Sordoni, president and founder of the Sordoni Enterprises, with main offices in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

STATEMENT BY DR. EMMETT J. MURPHY

Throught the Nation and world, chiropractors will hold observance of Chiropractic Day on September 18, with the fullest understanding that because of the freedoms enjoyed in the Western World, a new profession can gain public acceptance on its merits as has the profession of chiropractic in a short 65 years.

A fresh concept in the art of healing based upon the neurological, physical, and mechanical approach; was given to the world 65 years ago. For it was in 1895 that Dr. Palmer brought to the modern world the benefits of chiropractic principles.

After exhaustive research, Dr. Palmer in 1895 introduced to our world these principles which have been carried on by chiropractors who are devoted to the prevention and treatment of disease and to the promotion of public health and welfare.

The progress of chiropractic was forcefully illustrated a few years ago when the profession became the subject of an objective factfinding study conducted by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D.C., a nationally known nonprofit research organization.

This study has been compiled under the title of "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic" and it represents the latest facts of the profession as gathered by the competent institute staff under the direction of Dr. Dewey Anderson (A. B., M. A., Ph. D., Leland Stanford University).

I think that a statement from this scientific study of our profession is particularly pertinent as an explanation of our contribution to the general health and welfare of all Americans. This is the statement from The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic:

"In these modern days of our high-speed nerve-exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health."

Regarding the scientific study itself, Science Sidelights comments that "since every profession is built upon a body of knowledge which has developed over a period of years. Dr. Anderson correctly appraises chiropractic in the light of certain concepts which are regarded as well accepted by the public at large."

A well-known national news column, Washington Window, reports that "the fastest growing of the healing arts in the profession of chiropractic which is making a major contribution to the health of a constantly increasing number of patients and their families."

This rapid growth of chiropractic—and its far-reaching effects on our national well being—is dramatized by Dr. Anderson himself. In one phase of his study of chiropractic, he said:

"From a handful of patients somewhat more than a half a century ago who came to Dr. Daniel David Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer) and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public."

The rapid acceptance of this science of healing in the past 65 years leads us to inquire of the standards in use today. And extremely exacting standards they are found to be.

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended. Up to 2 years of professional (college) education is required by 26 State chiropractic laws of licensure.

The following salient facts concerning public acceptance of chiropractic need to be considered:

1. Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as one of the four major healing professions, along with medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

2. Five hundred and twenty-five insurance companies recognize claims for services rendered by the chiropractors.

3. The U.S. Civil Service Commission recognizes certificates of illness for leave purposes signed by doctors of chiropractic, which means that all Federal agencies are directed to recognize such certificates.

4. Chiropractic care for veterans has been endorsed by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans.

5. Major unions of Federal employees have endorsed legislation to widen the use of chiropractic in Federal compensation work.

6. Scores of employers provide regular chiropractic treatment for their employees.

7. The Railroad Retirement Board accepts statements of sickness signed by chiropractors.

Chiropractic Day—on September 18, 1960—will bring to national attention the present record and the future plans of our profession. In conclusion, a word from the Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic should be mentioned here:

"The profession itself is so ardent about its future that nothing can stop doctors of chiropractic from being devoted public servants and becoming better ones with the passage of time."

The remarkable effectiveness of chiropractic methods in health care has won for chiropractic a permanent place in the family of health sciences, and in the hearts and homes of suffering humanity.

CHIROPRACTIC IN INDUSTRY

Each year, many inquiries reach me concerning my personal experience with chiropractic therapy as I have employed its practice within the 14 organizations comprising the Sordoni Enterprises. To answer some of the questions most frequently asked, I have prepared this pamphlet.

Twenty-six years ago I was introduced to the effectiveness of chiropractic when I became desperately ill—so seriously, in fact, that few held any hope for my recovery. Only two doctors refused to despair, one, a medical doctor, the other, a chiropractor. Through their combined efforts, my recovery was effected. Such was my introduction to chiropractic, and no lesson could have been more dramatically presented.

Since then, my study of chiropractic's benefits has been most thorough. Not only have I been able to retain my good health and that of my immediate family through chiropractic treatments but also, in introducing chiropractic to my employees, have given them good health, the primary component of happiness and productivity. I saw how regular chiropractic treatments made corrective adjustments before effects of mal-positioned vertebrae could grow to serious proportions.

Enlightened industry generally attempts to see that its employees are given good medical services. Indeed, our organizations take very good care to see that our employees get the best medical care available. But, I feel that I would be very remiss in my duty to my employees—to those for whom I hold so grave a responsibility—if, knowing what I do about chiropractic, I failed to provide its benefits for them so far as possible and practicable.

Accordingly, in the same manner as preventive maintenance is employed on the thousands of pieces of our organizations' equipment, so too was Chiropractic made a form of "preventive maintenance" among our personnel. Certainly a piece of equipment may be replaced but not a man's loyalty, friendship, skill, health, or his life.

With the introduction of chiropractic in our industries, treating rooms and facilities were installed in most of our enterprises and our employees were encouraged to avail themselves of treatments provided by 14 practitioners, twice weekly, during working hours. These 14 doctors are, of course, established in the various areas where we operate. If necessary, additional treatments are provided at the doctors' offices after working hours. No charge is made to the employee for this service.

The Sordoni Enterprises are aggressive, busy organizations. Our construction company has dozens of contracting jobs throughout the East; our Sterling Hotels System comprises six hotels; the others include a telephone company, an electric light company, a manufacturing plant, a grassland dairy farm, a tree surgeon company, and a charitable foundation. We employ teamsters, linemen, laborers, steel workers, concrete workers, dairymen, managers, secretaries, waitresses, chefs, bakers, dishwashers, and many other skilled and unskilled workers.

Our payroll reaches as much as $50,000 per day and from $10 to $20 million per year. You can readily appreciate that, with so many employees, we have our share of industrial accidents and sickness. Because of the number and diversity of our employees we feel well qualified to form a fair appraisal of the value of chiropractic in industry.

The cost of chiropractic treatments in our Sordoni Enterprises has been paid for time and again simply through increased employee efficiency, mental and physical. We had achieved a form of preventive maintenance; absenteeism due to illness was considerably lowered and efficiency was greatly increased. Employees who formerly were easy cold victims found that the common cold could be pretty well prevented by availing themselves of regular chiropractic adjustments. With business competition as keen as it is, man-hours lost in unproductive sickness are a most important factor in our equation of business production.

Chiropractic overcame many instances of serious illnesses. For example, an employee suffered severe migraine headaches for several years. After a series of chiropractic adjustments, the recurring headaches were a thing of the past. Again, its marvelous cures were presented in the case of one of our shovel operators who developed severe pains in his arms which very shortly resulted in a complete paralysis of both arms. Adjustments over a time effected his complete recovery and use of his arms. Today, he is back on the job as good as ever, grateful to chiropractic and to the company for making the treatments available to him. Everyone else had given his case up as hopeless.

The schedule of fees is generally a negotiated percentage of the chiropractors' customary charge based on the volume of adjustments involved at specified and periodic times. The chiropractors are able to widen their acquaintances and gain thereby a broadened practice.

Based on my experience, I firmly believe that chiropractic is the best method of coping with certain health and accident problems in industry. Many insurance companies are recognizing the benefits of chiropractic treatment and are paying for them. This is most significant as is the fact that State workmen's compensation acts are more and more recognizing the need for chiropractic services. These bodies form their decisions and base their policies on statistics, not on sentiment. Through chiropractic, they've realized tremendous savings.

As thoroughly as I am sold on chiropractic, I am as deeply convinced of the value of the other healing sciences. In each area of our operations we also have on call at least two medical doctors and, in no way, do these sciences conflict, but rather, supplement each other.

Medical doctors, surgeons, and chiropractors all have their specific attributes. Each must work hand in hand with the other. Coordination and cooperation between the health sciences is an absolute necessity. Only a correlation of the various health sciences and lay understanding of the jurisdiction and limitation of each will raise the ceiling of our present-day national health standard.

For a number of years I have been president of a medical hospital in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and take an active part in its management. As a result, I have had unusual opportunities to study all sides of questions pertaining to the healing arts and their methods. Each has its well deserved place in the sun.

Chiropractic definitely has proven its position among the healing arts. I personally have experienced its marvelous benefits and have seen the magnificent role it can play within industry. I have seen it save suffering, needless loss of time, money, and health. Chiropractic in industry will continue to win an ever widening recognition for it makes the lives of all those it touches happier, more productive, and more meaningful.

ANDREW J. SORDONI.

Does Climbing or Riding on Moving Stairs Produce Stronger People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following stimulating article by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, from his column, Spires of the Spirit, appearing weekly in the Washington Star:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—MOVING STAIRS

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

One of the most fascinating inventions of the modern day is what we call an escalator, or a moving stairway. It does away with all effort on the part of the one who desires to be lifted to higher levels. It takes all transit responsibility from the individual. It outdoes the elevator in eliminating all thought with regard to locomotion. Alone you step on—alone you step off. The whole contraption of continuous motion is a marvel of convenience.

But life itself is not a moving stairway. If it is thought of in those terms it will do terrible things to people by robbing them of a sturdy independence and of a personal initiative which develops latent powers and character.

It is the moving stairway idea which a keen observer of modern trends was deploring when he recently declared: "The raging passion of half our people is to build barns and bigger barns, or corporations and bigger corporations. And the raging passion of the other half of our people is to get more and more wages for less and less work." The motto of the middle 20th century, with too many people, is not "Make me," but "Give me." The process now going on where the social system is considered as but a moving stairway is one of leveling down instead of leveling up. It tends to the glorification of mediocrity. If, through the removal of incentive, fortunes cease to be made legitimately as a result of toil and ability, then the power which makes the stairway move for those who need to be carried will be drastically diminished. The goose which lays the golden egg cannot be strangled to death with the cord of taxation and the basket be filled with golden eggs.

The voice which from the famous City Temple pulpit in London—that of Dr. Leslie Weatherhead—probably reaches more people than that of any other churchman. Watching the moving stairway policies of the welfare state, he makes this significant statement: "What is so often forgotten is that if you give amenities endlessly to people who are at heart grabbing and selfish you will bring the life of the community to chaos. In this very serious hour human motives are being poisoned with a drug that is seeping away the moral grandeur and stamina of the whole land. We might label the drug thus: How can I do less and gain more?" This is the philosophy of the moving stairs.

Personal responsibility is the central theme of Christianity and it stems out of the root conception and revelation of the dignity of the individual person. Any system of politics which seeks to provide substitutes for this personal accountability is arresting instead of stimulating the spiritual growth of mankind. The acid test of all so-called welfare legislation is, What will be its final effect on individual capacity and development?

In this tragic and confused world, with so many physical needs crying out for relief, individualism seems to be breaking down and collectivism is in the ascendancy. A keen student of the trends and tendencies of our times has uttered a word which needs to be shouted from the housetops on both sides of the so-called Iron Curtain. It is this: "We are tempted to think of collectivism as new and progressive. But it is one of the oldest things in the world. That's where human society started. Primitive tribal life was absolutely collective; the individual was nothing. There was massed control by custom and taboo; no individual rights, no individual conscience, no individual religion." Yes, to be sure, that is exactly where humanity started. The crowning glory of all the centuries has been the emergence of the individual, his intellect, his conscience, his will, his freedom to choose and to create.

In regimented totalitarian regimes we see collectivism gone mad. Individuals are told to forget about their personal importance and to realize that each person is but a cog in a machine. Theirs not to reason why; theirs not to make reply, but only to obey and conform. They are told, just step on the moving stairs and you will be taken care of. But in a true democracy the individual is encouraged to be himself, to climb stairs in his own strength, to stand on his own feet, to use his own brain. That, of course, makes the individual the crucial factor in any situation.

The quality of our socialism is determined by our individualism. What a man is determines what he has to give. Our contribution grows out of our cultivation. That is why any system which takes away from a man the lure of accomplishment by the exercise of his own prowess and power is tampering with something very precious—his self-respect.

The symbol of all that has made our American democracy great, and mighty enough now, in this desperate day, to save the whole world from the horror of regimented communism, is not the moving stairs upon which people ride, but the stairway of opportunity up which people climb.

Birmingham Observes 80th Birthday of Helen Keller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the 27th of this month, one of the greatest ladies of America and one of the most admirable persons of our times will celebrate her 80th birthday. She is Helen Keller, beloved daughter of the State of Alabama and inspiring friend of all those who have suffered unfortunate physical handicaps.

Because the story of the life of Helen Keller is so well known throughout the world and, certainly, here in the Congress, I need not recount at length biographical details about her. Suffice it to mention that when, as a tiny child in Tuscumbia, Ala., she suffered an attack of scarlet fever so serious that she lost her sight, hearing, and power of speech, it was feared that a full life had been lost to the world. But from that point where there was such little hope, there has emerged the figure of a woman so remarkable as to have earned the endearment and respect of the peoples everywhere.

Faith and perserverance, it seems to me, are the greatest forces behind Helen Keller's astounding accomplishments. These characteristics were no doubt inspired in Miss Keller as a little girl by that faith of her father who searched unceasingly for some medical indication that his child could be helped and finally received such encouragement from Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, and from that perserverance of her first teacher, Anne M. Sullivan Macy, who devoted much of her life to a task which, almost unbeliveably, was rewarded with rich success. Surely, it was faith and perservance that made it possible, for example, for Helen Keller to graduate from Radcliffe College in the usual 4 years' time.

I have taken special note of these two character traits which Helen Keller possesses to an admirable degree, because I believe that in them lies the most meaningful message of this marvelous life for all of us, whether our handicaps be serious or only small, permanent throughout our lives or only fleeting annoyances. America, and our age, are grateful for this indication of the way toward greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is natural that we Alabamians are especially proud of Helen Keller. That we are indeed proud of her and love her is being demonstrated at the present time in my district of Birmingham where a celebration in her honor is being held from June 5 through June 26. Chairman of this birthday observance program is Mrs. Gordon Hardenbergh, who is also, incidentally, president of the Alabama Federation of the Blind, and cochairman is Dr. John E. Bryan, executive director of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce.

I am delighted that citizens and officials of our community are helping to again remind the world by this celebration of the meaning of the Helen Keller story. I join with them, and with all Americans, in extending to Miss Keller, this month, an expression of warm appreciation for her inspiring deeds and example in living and in wishing her many happy birthdays to come.

A Well-Deserved Tribute for Les Arends of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I take pride, as I am sure all of my Republican colleagues do, in the tremendous tribute that was paid to our minority whip by his fellow townsmen and GOP leaders throughout the State of Illinois recently. In the same vein of pride, I place in the RECORD the following editorial in connection with Les Arends Day which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on Tuesday, May 24, it concisely sums up the feelings of Representative ARENDS' constituents and colleagues:

Melvin, Ill., is throwing a "day" Friday for one of its sons, LES ARENDS, and Vice President NIXON is going to be on hand.

Which goes to show how much not only the 17th Congressional District but the Nation as a whole thinks of this silver-haired, fast-walking legislator.

About all we can say is, the Congressman deserves his day.

Representative ARENDS has been a good Representative. And he's got a lot of friends. These two accomplishments are not always compatible.

Representative ARENDS has been Republican whip in the House of Representatives since 1944. The length of time itself is impressive. But even more significant is the fact that he has weathered power struggles between factions. JOE MARTIN came and went as party leader in the House, but LES ARENDS is still around as whip. They like him in Washington.

The Melvin farmer and banker serves a tremendous district. It runs from central Illinois to the Indiana line, and takes in Woodford, Livingston, McLean, Ford, Iroquois, Kankakee, and Vermillion Counties. And he's been serving it ever since the 74th Congress. He's in his 13th consecutive term.

So Representative ARENDS is certainly a veteran with experience to draw on. It's a role which balances nicely against that of another good downstate Representative, the 18th District's ROBERT MICHEL. By comparison, Representative MICHEL is a youngster in terms of service, but there's virtue in such a fresh viewpoint, too.

Together, they share—and serve—a common goal: Doing a job in Washington for the people they're elected to represent.

The Story of Chief Joseph: From Where the Sun Now Stands—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to present the third article of the story of Chief Joseph, one of the most famous Indian chiefs of this country.

This story was authored by Bruce A. Wilson, editor of the Omak Chronicle in Omak, Wash., located in the Fifth Congressional District of Washington which I have the honor of representing. The additional articles of this story will follow in the next few days.

The third article follows:

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1877

Noon: A blistering sun bakes the parched rye grass on a bench above the Clearwater. Drenched with sweat, Howard's command like a sluggish serpent coils away from pointed ravines jutting up from the Clearwater's canyon, edging back to the crest whenever it can.

A horseman leaves the slowly moving column to approach a barren point overlooking the defile. He is Lt. R. H. Fletcher, one of Howard's aides. Dully he reins up to survey the hazy blue mountains across the canyon and the twisting green river below. Incredibly, Fletcher finds himself staring at a handful of braves racing ponies along the river bank. The lieutenant jerks his horse around and hammers back to Howard. "The Indians are down there, sir. I'm sure it's the Nez Perce. Plenty of ponies grazing."

Howard shouts orders. A howitzer and two gatling guns wheel into position and start banging into the river bottom. The Indians disappear upstream. Howard's force, snapped out of its lethargy, reverses its march. The vanguard already has passed 2 miles beyond the likely location of the Indian village.

Below, confusion sweeps through the Nez Perce camp. An immediate attack is expected. Some of the braves start driving cattle and ponies down the canyon. Two parties of about 60 each move north and south of camp. Twenty-four warriors follow one of the chiefs, Toohoolhoolzote, across the river and up the embankment. Their splendid ponies swiftly carry them to the summit. Determined to slow Howard's advance, they dismount and open fire from behind rocks.

Howard is a capable soldier. He commanded Sherman's right wing on the march to the sea. But like many men faced with the unknown, he becomes overly cautious. The troops are halted, deployed in a twisting semicircle 2 miles long. Encouraged by Howard's inaction, more Indians scrambled up the slope. However, the most amazing aspect of the battle already has occcurred: no more than 25 Nez Perces have forced 500 soldiers into a defensive position.

A cluster of mounted warriors erupts from the head of a canyon. Firing and yelling, they close in on Howard's pack train at the rear of his column. Two packers and several loaded mules go down. But a troop of cavalry arrives just in time. The Nez Perces wheel back, having come within 50 yards of 7 mules carrying most of Howard's ammunition.

The battle settles down virtually to trench warfare, the soldiers digging with trowel bayonets, the Nez Perces piling up rocks. Who were these red-skinned demons that would hold a fixed position like a Confederate regiment? Elderly Howwallits (Mean Man), his creased face bleeding from chipped rocks thrown by bullets. Hugely-built Toohoolhoolzote, the boom of his muzzle-loader splashing blood across a dismounted cavalryman's face. Yellow Wolf: "I looked for an officer. I fired. He did not get up." A warrior rides the length of the battle line, within easy range of the whites, to earn himself a brave name. Just as he turns down the slope, a bullet slams through his shoulder. He washes the wound in the river and returns to fight: Kipkip Owyeen (Wounded Breast), a brave name. The wiry Lelooskin, sharpshooting from behind a boulder less than 50 yards from Howard's line, until finally he is killed.

Swarms of bullets hum through the air, most of them harmlessly. Firing slightly uphill, the Nez Perces tend to sight too high. The soldiers have seldom been issued ammunition for practice (two rounds a month, according to one report). Their marksmanship is incredibly poor. Smoke like a forest fire drifts across the battlefield. Slipping behind rocks and scrub pines, the Indians gradually force in Howard's flanks until his line forms almost a complete circle. In the center are 300 mules and horses and a stack of saddles sheltering the general's command post.

At dusk the firing slackens. Many Nez Perces return to the village. Two or three squaws are wailing over their dead. Occasionally shrill war cries burst from exultant warriors. The dull drumming of medicine men rises and falls. These sounds are heard by the soldiers. Their mouths are caked with dust. The Indians hold the only spring.

In the gray dawn of the second day, General Howard is determined to bring the source of water within his lines. A howitzer shells the area and Rodney's company charges. Nez Perce sharpshooters attempt a stand. Overwhelmed, they break and run. Soon coffee is boiling. Spirits pick up. The firing grows more intense, but without the continual roar of yesterday. The Indian lines are much thinner. Many warriors have stayed in camp. They disapprove of attacking soldiers in entrenchments, especially when the village seems momentarily safe. Some braves sit before their tepees, smoking. This disgusts others. Arguments rattle about. For the Nez Perce strength lies in the individual abilities of their fighting men; they lack the cohesion of a disciplined army. Just as membership in a peaceful band is entirely voluntary, so in war no one can be ordered to do anything. Leaders are followed only when their plans seem good. Many Indians begin breaking camp. Directing this is Joseph. He had fought on the line yesterday, as he fought at White Bird Canyon. But his main task is to safeguard the women and children. He knows the end of resistance in this battle is near.

On the bluff above, a distant stream of dust signals the approach of a supply train from Lapwai. Captain Miller's artillerymen, used as infantry, break through the Indian encirclement to escort the train. Returning, the gunners suddenly wheel toward the scanty line on Nez Perces still besieging the troops. A few defend their positions desperately. But Rodney's company crashes into their flank. All down the line, whites spring forward. Warriors leave their rockpiles to scramble downhill. The body of Nez Perces already has abandoned the camp below to move out of sight up a flanking ravine.

Howard finds food still cooking as he occupies what is left of the village. Deciding against an immediate pursuit, he counts his losses: 13 killed, 27 wounded. The Indian casualties, despite the clouds of bullets: 4 dead, 6 wounded. The Nez Perces have fought 4-to-1 odds to a standstill until they lost their incentive.

A few days later (now with plenty of scouts left behind to keep an eye on Howard) the Nez Perce chiefs and leading warriors held a council in their camp at Weippe. With the war a month old, they still had developed no plan to bring it to a successful conclusion. Their strategy was limited to escaping capture. It seemed evident Howard was continuing his pursuit. Some course of action had to be agreed upon.

Several chiefs felt the Nez Perces should double back into the Snake River country. Joseph went further. Beyond everything else, he hoped to return to his beautiful Wallowas. He suggested it might be worthwhile talking peace with a general who had accomplished nothing during a hard, costly campaign. More aggressive leaders refused to listen. Looking Glass and others proposed crossing the Lolo trail (from Idaho to Montana) into buffalo country. The Crows would greet them as allies, it was alleged. Some speakers suggested joining Sitting Bull in Canada. Few had the slightest conception they were fighting the U.S. Government. They believed their enemy was Howard. Once they passed outside his department into Montana, they could live in peace.

This thought carried the day. Trail leadership was assumed by Looking Glass, who had spoken most loudly of joining his brothers, the Crows. Joseph was bitterly disappointed. The decision meant abandoning his home forever.

The Battle of the Clearwater had lightened Howard's burdens. He had occupied the Indian camp and in his reports easily painted the indecisive struggle as a substantial victory. This interpretation quieted rumors he was about to be relieved of his command. Moreover, it seemed to him the Nez Perces had no choice but to head for Montana. So the long-suffering Idaho settlements now could relax. Howard left his field base at Kamiah to head off the Indian retreat. But soon a scout reported the hostiles already had disappeared into the rocky wilderness of the Bitterroots.

Maj. Edwin L. Mason was dispatched with a small force to follow the Indians for two marches, to make sure they were taking the Lolo trail. Mason accomplished his mission in one march by stumbling into an ambush sprung by the Nez Perce rearguard. Howard

returned to Kamiah to await reinforcements. They were preceded by stinging reprimands concerning the delay in his pursuit.

But the engrossed commander at least had pressed into service the single weapon his enemies knew nothing about, and one which eventually would contribute much to their downfall. Singing telegraph wires, strung across the vast western plains, carried a message to Chicago for relay to Col. John Gibbon at Helena, Mont.: "All reports seem to indicate the hostile Indians have escaped by the Lolo trail. * * * If you simply keep them back until I can close in, their destruction or surrender will be sure."

While Howard reluctantly prepared to follow them, about 700 Nez Perces with more than a thousand head of loose ponies were struggling across a mountain trail which was not a trail at all, but merely a route Indians had used occasionally because it was a little less rigorous than any other way across the Bitteroots. Thickets of lodgepole were choked with jumbled windfalls. Ponies were dragged over boulders, whipped through stinging underbrush, forced up staggering grades, and left behind with broken legs. Squaws kept the refugees alive by digging bitteroots and camas. They found a shoulder-high shrubbery growing in marshland which boiled into excellent tea. Braves hunted deer and elk when they could. Some nights rain fell in torrents. Next morning the ponies slithered in glistening mud.

After 12 days of this painful toil the Nez Perces reached the mouth of a canyon opening into Montana to find a crude log barricade thrown across their way. Uneasily occupying the "fort" were 35 regulars and about 100 volunteers under Capt. Charles C. Rawn. Stationed at Missoula, he had been ordered to impede the hostiles' progress until Howard caught up from behind or Gibbon could arrive from Helena. (But Howard was 3 days from even starting over the Lolo trail while Gibbon was just leaving for Fort Missoula.)

The Nez Perces were surprised; the only army they knew of was Howard's, far behind. They decided to parley. Rawn said the great white father wanted them to lay down their arms. Looking Glass replied nonsense, but if the garrison would refrain from attacking, the Nez Perces would harm no settlers as they passed through the Bitterroot valley. This sounded excellent to the volunteers, who began deserting in droves. Reduced to a handful of troops, Rawns was left wondering what kind of report he might write as the hostiles, with a few flankers whooping and shooting, nonchalantly bypassed the barricade.

Most of the Nez Perces were convinced that, with Howard left behind and peace made with the settlers, their fighting days were ended. In fact, they were now joined by six tepees of Bitterroot Valley Nez Perces under Lean Elk (known as Poker Joe for his devotion to cardplaying) entirely on the assumption that the war was over. So another council was held. White Bird, Toohoolhoolzote, and others proposed turning north through Flathead country to get closer to Canada—just in case. Looking Glass insisted on a southeasterly route toward Wyoming and the Crows. His oratory won again. Joseph took no part in the debate. He was unfamiliar with the country in either direction, and still wanted to return to Idaho.

So the colorful procession of Nez Perces turned away from Canada instead of toward it and moved leisurely up the Bitterroot Valley, buying supplies and trading stock with the relieved settlers. Early in August the Indians crossed the Continental Divide and camped in the Big Hole Basin for a few days to replenish their inventory of tepee poles before striking into treeless plains to visit the Crows. Increasingly nervous, some of the warriors were criticizing Looking Glass for his slow pace, 10 or 11 miles a day, and the lack of scouting. "Death may now be following on our trail," orated Lone Bird. But he may as well have talked to the winds.

Colonel Gibbon, the hero of South Mountain in the Civil War, was wasting no time. He had assembled 150 troopers, including Rawn's frustrated detachment, and 30 or 35 volunteers who were promised whatever Indian horses they could capture. With his infantry riding in supply wagons when the roads permitted, Gibbon swirled down the Bitterroot and into the mountains at twice the Nez Perce pace.

A small advance party located the unsuspecting Big Hole camp in a grassy clearing fringed by jackpine. The electrifying word was rushed back to Gibbon, already past the summit. He left his wagons and howitzer, issued 1 day's rations and 90 rounds of ammunition, and hurried forward over a bad trail. At sundown the men stopped for a few hours' rest. About 10 p.m., under a star-filled sky, they started down again.

Another pause, very close to the camp. The troops could hear baying dogs and the cry of a fretful child. A cold dawn revealed the silent silhouettes of nearly a hundred tepees. Occasionally a squaw would emerge briefly to throw fuel on a fire. Grazing nearby were four or five hundred ponies, untended. Gibbon sensed a quick, crushing victory over the vaunted Nez Perces.

Within 500 feet of the camp, just across the meandering Big Hole river, he deployed his forces to sweep through the entire length of the village, driving the hostiles away from their ponies and into the plain beyond. Behind scattered pines and clumps of willows bordering the river, the white men crouched, their rifles ready, waiting for just a little more light.

Legion Auxiliary Awards Prizes on Freedom Essays by Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Auxiliary is one of our great patriotic organizations which contributes daily to the appreciation of Americanism and does as much as any group to my knowledge to advance good citizenship.

The auxiliary unit in Redwood Falls, Minn., does a magnificent job with the young people of that area and I was happy to receive from Mrs. S. F. Ceplecha, chairman of the Americanism Commission, copies of the winning essays written by two local students.

"Our Growing Field of Freedom" was the theme this year, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I am including a clipping from the Redwood Gazette which printed in their entirety the prize-winning essays of Marian Wohnoutka of North Redwood, Minn., and Mark TerSteeg of Redwood Falls, Minn.

LEGION AUXILIARY AWARDS PRIZES ON FREEDOM ESSAYS BY STUDENTS

Winners in an essay contest sponsored by Redwood Falls American Legion auxiliary were announced today.

Writing about "Our Growing Field of Freedom," Mark TerSteeg, son of Mr. and Mrs. Paul TerSteeg, was first place winner, and Marion Wohnoutka, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Wohnoutka of North Redwood, was runnerup.

Their papers, published below, will be entered in district competition. They will receive cash awards of $10 and $5, and a book, "The Key To Peace" by Dean Manion, from the auxiliary.

The contest involved 103 junior students in English classes taught by Roy Dobie and Mrs. Gordon Valle.

(By Marion Wohnoutka)

We of America are so used to our freedoms that we take them for granted, like the air we breath. It is difficult for us to realize that these freedoms are the result of many centuries of trial and endeavor. The political and personal freedoms we cherish today were never won easily and often only after long bitter struggles.

Under the earliest form of government the people had no freedom because they were under absolute rule. Slowly, however, leaders in the fight for freedom appeared and devised documents which gave the people a little more freedom. People in many countries revolted against their rulers and set up their own government because they wanted to possess more liberty. In the United States this was accomplished by the Revolutionary War and the people received "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," under the Declaration of Independence. This declaration is perhaps one of the greatest documents in history.

Although we are correct in saying that we have freedom, we do not possess absolute freedom—we do not have complete freedom of the press, full freedom of speech, or invariable rights of assembly. In order for a country to enjoy freedom, there must be a certain amount of restraint on each person's part. If every person practiced complete freedom and did anything he wanted there soon would be little freedom and no one would enjoy this. One thing that we must remember is that freedom involves other people. In order for each person to receive his share of freedom, he must also give his share.

Freedom of religion is perhaps one of our most important freedoms. It was in order to obtain this freedom that many people emigrated from Europe to the United States. This freedom gives the right to each person to worship according to his own belief. This means that a person could worship God or any gods or no god, in whatever way he considered to be right. However, to a degree, we cannot have complete freedom of religion. For example some religions may lead people to do things which the state considers undesirable and dangerous. In these cases, the state probably will take action to see that these things are not done.

Freedom of speech is another important freedom. It is the right of each person to say what he thinks. But, like the other freedoms, it is not an absolute right. It is limited in a number of ways. For example, no one can use language that offends the public sense of decency, or words that would be a danger to the country. Another restriction would be that a person could not say anything harmful about another person, just because he sincerely believes it to be true. The person would have to have proof to back up his accusation.

Freedom of the press is one freedom which brings forth many problems. The press has a great effect on the public mind. If misused it can mislead and confuse the people. But if the press were under control of the Government, they would probably only want things to be printed which would be suitable to their policies. So at the present time there is no method that would fully protect the right of the people to clear, accurate information.

These freedoms of religion, speech, and the press are perhaps the most important to

us. However, there are also many more freedoms that greatly affect our lives. Some of these are: the right to vote, the right to have a trial by jury, the right to choose our own vocation, the right to own property, and the right to belong to unions.

We should be proud to be Americans because we have more rights and liberties than most other people in the world. But we must use them wisely and unselfishly. For unless they are used properly, they cease to be freedoms. The responsibility rests on the shoulders of every citizen of a free country to see that they are honored and protected.

Today one of the worst enemies of freedom is communism, which must be combated in order to defend our liberties. The struggle to attain freedom is hard but it is even harder to retain it. Every citizen now and for generations to come has the responsibility to see that the ideal of freedom works more fully, more completely, and more consistently from generation to generation.

(By Mark TerSteeg)

In this world of growing freedom, America has served as the prime example of the freedom that is the desire of every man. Our example has been a searchlight showing the path away from the yokes of oppression that hold so many people in bondage. It is the job of America and its people to lead all the world's people to complete freedom and democracy. Freedom is America's trademark. From the days of America's first settlement to the present time America's traditions have been based on freedom and democracy, a unique, and wonderful heritage, one that we must protect with the fiber of our souls if we are to stay a really free people.

However, it has become a subject of increasing fear that after all these years of liberty our freedom is in grave danger of its very existence. These fears have been based on a number of very different problems. The military forces of the communistic bloc are constantly aimed at the United States with a variety of superweapons such as thermonuclear bombs and the aircraft and rockets to carry them to the heart of America. Russia is also attacking America from within with spies and saboteurs and propagandists and agent provacateurs. There is also the danger of criminals and corrupt politicians from within. But the greatest danger to American freedom is from the American people themselves.

The easiest way for a nation like ours to lose its freedom is from the developing attitude of American people to censure people who harbor opinions different from the majority's. To compound this problem is the growing conformity of Americans; a trend which can be stopped with sound philosophy. The convictions of Americans has been based on freedom and competition, but now attitudes toward these have been frozen into one mold. The belief is growing that in a democracy everyone should be equal in everything; in intelligence, wealth, and ability—an obvious falsehood. This belief is an emotional one and no amount of logic can disperse it. It is based on the natural desire to be accepted by other people and is only an overdevelopment of it.

It is my fervent belief, however, that this condition, like so many aberrations before it, must fall to determined men. The very fact that this problem of "hyperdemocracy" has been noticed is a sign that many people have not fallen into this trap of unthinking conformity. In such a culture of conformity, a few men will be driven to use their inherent freedom of thought, the only freedom that all men have and the only inalienable right. These men will form a breakdown in the pattern of conformity just as now conformity is breaking down individualism. We shall have, I hope soon, a renaissance of the competitive spirit and individualism that so characterized colonial times, and even beyond these to the greatest heights in all history.

In the future I foresee the greatest freedom of all, the real freedom of thought. A rebellion from conformity would clear away the cobwebs of the mind that have developed from the beginning, and give man a real view and understanding of the people he lives with and the universe he lives in. While this renaissance will not be a panacea or a Utopia, it should bring a new era that would surpass all the ages of the past.

It is the duty of every American, in fact, every man in the world to fight off this onslaught of conformity, to become the thinkers of a new age, the Socrates, Platos, Newtons, and Eisteins that will free the world. We must make real freedom the wave of the future.

What Is the Leadership Role of the Personnel Officer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent agreement, I am including herewith an interesting and important address delivered by the Honorable Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, at the annual conference of the Society for Personnel Administration on June 3, 1960.

I am sure Members of the House will want to read Mr. Jones' statement:

WHAT IS THE LEADERSHIP ROLE OF THE PERSONNEL OFFICER?

(Address by Chairman Roger W. Jones, U.S. Civil Service Commission, at the annual conference of the Society for Personnel Administration, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., on June 3, 1960)

One sultry morning in the summer of 1940 I was sitting in the office of William H. McReynolds. You will remember that he was the first formally designated adviser on personnel management to the President. It was unusual for Mr. McReynolds to be out of sorts, but this day he was—in his own gentle, almost sad way. He summed up his complaint this way. "I guess," he said, "that Noah was the first personnel officer. He had to choose two of every kind for a limited number of vacancies. Everyone except the Lord and the chosen were dissatisfied, and things haven't changed one bit since." I am sure that all of you have felt a similar discouragement at times.

Today, I am going out on a limb and suggest that things aren't really so bad, and that the personnel officer in Government has a continuing opportunity to play a useful leadership role. He is not limited to selecting appointees from civil service registers. Mr. McReynolds to the contrary notwithstanding, how many of you remember just how recent an arrival on the scene the modern personnel office to the Federal Government really is? On June 4, 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 7916, which required each department and agency to establish a division of personnel supervision and management, headed by a director of personnel. Of course, for years there had been personnel offices of sorts and personnel officers with a variety of duties, but not in the mold of those which rapidly developed after the Executive order was issued.

Unfortunately, the momentum of the early days was somewhat lost when World War II broke around our heads. All of its frantic necessities for cutting corners, delaying long-term improvements, and "making do," involved personnel programs and offices as well as the rest of the Federal structure. Once the war was over, however, it became possible to settle down into the development of working relationships between personnel officers and the central personnel agencies (the President's Adviser on Personnel Management and the Civil Service Commission) on the one hand, and between the personnel staff and line program managers on the other hand. There were organizational shifts and developments of greater or lesser moment, but the direction of the effort was clear. It had become national policy to foster and encourage more latitude, more discretion, and more power of decision in personnel matters, first in the agency itself and secondly in the personnel officer and his staff.

The personnel system was increasingly decentralized as time went on. There was hesitation and handwringing, but the agencies did accept the challenge. The personnel officer emerged with status and stature, which was increased as the agency heads redelegated appropriate authority to their personnel officers and, at the same time, strengthened their directives and their expectation that personnel officers would serve as respected staff advisers to program executives up and down the line. The final step in firm establishment of the relationship role of the personnel officer as we now see it came with the substitution of inspection of personnel activities after the fact. This was in lieu of the old, aggravatingly rigid and cumbersome system of requiring prior approval of the Civil Service Commission for personnel actions even of the most trivial kind.

It is important for the personnel officer to understand how much authority in personnel matters the agency has, as well as what his own responsibilities are. Without this understanding it is doubtful whether he or his agency can make maximum use of the flexibility which now exists in our personnel management system. Recognition of responsibility often opens the door to bolder and more imaginative action. That is what I ask on the part of all personnel officers who are concerned with our Federal merit system.

I could make a long and detailed description of all kinds of things which I think the personnel officers should do to advance their leadership role. That, however, would be an imposition on your good nature and on time reserved for other matters. I shall limit myself to a partial catalog consisting of seven suggestions for demonstration of as much leadership by personnel people as their individual capabilities permit them to exercise. It makes little difference in what order these seven points are mentioned. I advocate no priorities among them. Move in whenever opportunity offers or you can make it.

1. Personnel officers should take an active and personal role in recruitment. More than this, they should also do everything in their power to convince both political officers and senior career officers to participate in the recruiting process. I find it anomalous to see on every side increasing evidence of the importance which senoir officers of our industrial and business firms attach to their personal participation in recruiting, particularly in our colleges, but to see little evidence of a similar feeling on the part of policy officers of Federal organizations. True, they are glad to participate in interviews of candidates brought to them, and they make

occasional visits to some of our educational institutions. But there is not built into their sense of job responsibility regular, recurring, enthusiastic salesmanship of Federal careers to college men and women. The personnel officer more than anyone else can move to correct this situation.

2. Advance forecasts of our manpower needs in the Federal Government can take on nothing more than a rags-and-tatters appearance unless the personnel officer cuts the cloth and performs the tailoring on a new suit. The Civil Service Commission can view with alarm, and the agency heads can respond with intelligent vigor to the President's directive to undertake programs of executive development, but it remains for the personnel officer to do a realistic job of forward planning of personnel requirements and the time schedule under which they must be met. Only in recent months have we in the Civil Service Commission found agencies showing ongoing concern about such things as the average age of their program and staff leaders; the probable dates of retirement of key staff employees; the lack of strength in depth; the effect, if any, World War II and the Korean war have had on their structure; and the kinds of changing aptitudes, experience, and training required in personnel to be recruited over the next 10 years. In performing his leadership role in such activities, the personnel officer must show sophistication, no small amount of forecasting ability, and above all, an articulate faith in the destiny of his agency. In the past personnel people have usually tried to hide such notable characteristics. How much do you really know about where your activity ought to be personnelwise next year, the year after, or 5 or 10 years from now? In the personnel business of Government today we cannot afford to accept the Biblical injunction that "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

3. There is a leadership role for the personnel officer in improving the whole area of executive communications and executive development through better communications. I have talked about this to personnel audiences before, but I want to repeat it today.

Personnel officers of my acquaintance seldom admit that communications in any sense of that word are their responsibility. Once a few mechanics of office routine or legal requirements have been fulfilled, the personnel officer tends to think he is through. I disagree. Where the executive communications and executive development are concerned, the personnel officer can be an important mentor, and his operations can be an equally important communications tool. Aldous Huxley in "Brave New World Revisited" refers to man's "almost infinite appetite for distraction." In this thought lies the key to the job of personnel people in trying to produce good communications up, down, and sideways, to and from the executive. It is their job to prevent many stultifying distractions.

The personnel officer can remove much temptation to take bad communications for granted, and to turn his bosses and his coworkers aside from distraction in four areas where good communications do most for effective personnel administration at the executive level. First, he can and should be constantly on the alert to see to it that both the personnel system and the management chain of command produce what the executive needs to know about the people through whom statutory policies and his decisions must be carried out. The mechanistic device of periodic evaluation of staff is not enough, and it never yet assured that the backflow of reaction from the boss was translated first into communication and then into concrete results.

Second, I suggest that the personnel officer should make it his business to know what the attainable dreams and aspirations of the executive are. And in a quiet way he should help to bring about the personal equations which will forward those dreams and aspirations. Don't tell me this is impossible. It can be worked at in the same way that the personnel people now work in a negative way to protect the executive from the consequences of his own prejudices and shortcomings. Here, we in government differ widely from the business world. We have a great and enduring obligation to do all we can to prevent our top executives from failure through their own shortcomings. In the administrative jungle of our institutionalized Government, some small success on this front of communications will do as much as anything I can think of to give the political executive confidence in his organization (as well as in himself).

Third, I believe that one of the most rewarding goals to be won in personnel administration at the executive level is promotion of greater job satisfaction and success among the middle-level executives—helping them to live up to their potential, and seeing that they get the breaks they deserve. Here again the institutionalism of the Federal Government is choked by a failure to communicate—overgrown with distractions and a special kind of bureaucratic chickweed that should be hoed out. Obviously, the personnel officer cannot assume sole responsibility for executive development. But in concert with his colleagues, with the support of his superiors, and with some degree of candor and boldness of his own he can provide better opportunities to advance and more executive personnel exchanges with other organizations.

We in government have come to believe, almost to the exclusion of common sense, the folktales that men must make their own breaks and that availability for transfer grows out of only two conditions, lack of ability or dissatisfaction with salary or program leadership. Generally, we have tended for far too long a time to favor the former as the prime reason when a man seeks other work or his agency tries to outplace him. These are old and silly beliefs, and they should be cast aside forever, as any good personnel man can testify. I urge you to combine to find out what new ways of life, what new satisfactions of career, what new curiosities about personal development exists among our middle-level executives. Then, do something about your findings. This is a matter of communications again, and highly privileged communications at that. But, discreetly handled, the information gained can do much to keep alive the greatest of all stimulants to executive development: the incentive to try the new and the challenging. I do not suggest that this be limited to interagency transfers. Time and time again in the last 25 years I have sat in on discussions of proposed internal transfers. Rarely, very rarely, have I heard either executive or personnel officer say, "What about John Smith? He would like to try this kind of job, and here are his reasons."

The last of my communications points is to state my belief that much of the bureaucratic ineffectiveness of endless and highly distracting concern with procedural matters should be removed from the jobs of the Federal executive at all levels of responsibility. This can be peculiarly a job of personnel officers. As our laws, procedures, and administrative customs have become more complex and far reaching, they have become more susceptible of permitting overlaps in personal responsibilities and agency programs to be created. Personnel administration, as well as management, has done little to prevent this growth of confusion, particularly in terms of clear job descriptions and lines of control. This is a communications failure of serious proportions. It is time, I believe, to speak out against continuing proliferation of new levels or kinds of supervision. It is also time to reject new procedures and incentives designed primarily to assure that "our empire will be protected" and that "our man" will not suffer from any failure of personnel people to write full job sheets.

4. The fourth major suggestion for greater leadership on the part of the personnel officer concerns the development of means for performing two simple but closely interrelated jobs. The first of these is separation of the mechanics of our personnel system from misidentification, in the minds of our political officers, with a bureaucratic straitjacket which has been created by personnel officers to thwart them in obtaining their program goals. I get downright mad when I hear of personnel people who dump the Federal Personnel Manual on their boss' desk with a triumphant: "Here's the reason you can't do it." I say no more. The second is closely related although it is an error of omission rather than commission. Don't be secretive about personnel knowledge that will help others. It is not yours exclusively, and it is not a difficult job to be sure that intermediate managerial levels understand the mechanics of the personnel system. They should know enough about them to use them for what they are—precise tools with sharp edges. Let me again ask a representative question which you may answer for yourselves. When did you last show a division or a section head how classification can be used to help him do his job better?

Personnel officers should not be either apparent detractors or passive protectors of their profession. Of course, they must not seek to transfer an improper degree of responsibility for their functions to line managers, but neither should they sit back and take the attitude that line interest in (or even curiosity about) personnel techniques should be ignored, testily dismissed, or actively resisted.

5. The fifth leadership role for the personnel officer goes far beyond the borders of his own organization. I am convinced that if we ever are to make the most effective use of the Government Employees Training Act of 1958, personnel officers have got to band together to define general training needs as well as the specialized needs of their own agencies and programs within agencies. There is a vast welter of uncoordinated, undigested information lying in neglect in almost every Government office in the country with respect to what our real training needs are. I beg you to make the most of this opportunity not only to define but to become vigorous advocates for a consistent, integrated training structure throughout the Federal Government. We have in our agencies extraordinary pools of talents for training those who come after us. We must not try to pass the buck to our colleges, universities, and specialized training institutions. As a capstone for this entire pyramid of training there should be a Federal civilian staff college. It is sufficient for the moment to urge your support and to express my faith that, with your support, such an institution will come into being and that it will have as honored and as accepted a place in the Federal structure as that of the National War College. I believe that our managers of the future will not have to learn everything in the hard school of experience with all of its attendant losses, delays, and temporary inefficiencies.

6. The personnel officer should become a leader in civilian career planning. As I look back over the more than 26 years of my own Federal career I find at least four periods in which the availability of even rudimentary career planning on the part of my agencies would have been worthwhile for them, and for me. At least it would have greatly shortened periods of indecisive wheelspinning which were ended by sheer accidents of external affairs. The civilian personnel officer has a great deal to learn from the system of

career planning and career development now used by all of our armed services with such telling success. May I give you one example of our shortcomings in this respect? I doubt whether, until very recently, any agency with oversea responsibilities has done much planning of personal careers to meet those responsibilities.

7. The seventh and final leadership role which I ask personnel officers to fulfill is to lend the weight of their personal efforts in the development of a better system of employer-employee relations in the broadest sense of that term. The main direction of my thinking involves four parts of an employer-employee relations system. The first is our merit promotion program. I hope we have not oversold its virtues or expect to find in it the solution to all promotion problems. It is a beginning and it is a good one, but there are many stumbling blocks which will not be reduced to nothingness simply by a title. Statesmanship as well as leadership will be needed in developing a sound program which does not trip itself up on such issues as proper weighting for seniority, frequency of promotion examinations, the breadth of competitive areas for promotion, problems of interagency transfers, and problems of lateral entry in lieu of promotions from within.

The second aspect has to do with incentive awards. In recognizing and in doing something about our 175-year-old official neglect of the positive values to be obtained from incentive awards, we have, perhaps, gone pretty far down the road of setting up a system in which we could choke ourselves with trivia. The personnel officer can be in the vanguard of the defenders against any such eventuality.

Third, within a new and enlightened system of employer-employee relations we must give more intensive attention to the way in which we handle disciplinary matters, grievances, and discharges. I am not satisfied with our appeals system, and I do not think that any personnel officer should be. It is overgrown with procedural gimmicks, lack of simplicity, and built-in opportunities for delay which it will take positive and constructive leadership to correct. Unfortunately, full correction will also take some statutory changes, which may be slow in coming. For example, if I may repeat what I have said many times in my 15 months at the Civil Service Commission, I see no justification, little equity, and no sense from the administrative point of view in having a different system of appeals for veterans from that which prevails for nonveterans.

Finally, we must arrive at a satisfactory long-term definition of the role of the employee organization. The personnel officer can and should be a leader in this effort. Too much of the initiative for defining that role has been left to the employee groups themselves. We know too little about the potential strengths and weaknesses of employee organizations either to turn our backs on them or to go all out by giving them statutory status and a mandatory assignment in personnel management.

I have attempted to illustrate what the leadership role of the Federal personnel officer can be, why it is important, and how adequately the stage has been set for him to fulfill that role. I have not, of course, covered the entire subject. I have no doubt that perhaps each of you in this room could say that I have overlooked something important and stressed something which is incidental. This may well be. But let me remind you again of what I said at the beginning. My purpose in presenting this catalog is to show you how far we have come from a negative personnel system of central controls and veto powers to decentralized responsibility and opportunity for positive and constructive leadership in handling the chief element of success in all Government enterprise—the management of its civilian employees.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 4, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas)

The search for issues, the shortage of time until Congress adjourns (or recesses—who knows?) and the impending political campaigns of all elected officials (except two-thirds of the Senators) is making a curious concoction of the daily affairs on Capitol Hill. The workaday controversial issues—medical care for the aged (Federal, that is), aid for education, housing and other business subsidies, increased minimum wage by Federal direction—are now joined by others—foreign affairs following the summit, Congressmen's traveling expenses, and home rule for Washington, D.C. The hope of objective, dispassionate reasoning in this boiling cauldron of conflicting interests and ambitions is faint indeed. Desperately campaigning Presidential aspirants from the Senate make statesmanlike legislative effort this session an improbability.

Against this background of confusion and false reasoning, there comes a commonsense, refreshing viewpoint like a fresh breath of air. BARRY GOLDWATER's "Conscience of a Conservative" is a simple statement of honest conviction that like any great truth is startling in its simplicity. In this age where false guidelines and the maze of bureaucratic regimentation and paperwork too often dominate, the principles he outlines as the role of Federal Government in our lives are as straightforward and easily understood as the force of gravity. The central, all-important focal point of GOLDWATER's thesis is the human being—who is to be served, not mastered, by Government. It is my hope that a majority of our people can be exposed to the timeless truths of this simple, traditional philosophy which originally was considered to be embodied in our Constitution.

Disarmament and nuclear test bans are additional opportunities for the Soviets to attempt to make the other nations dance to their tune. We cannot trust them, so how can we expect to contract any agreement with them in good faith, until and unless they demonstrate through overt action their willingness to cooperate and keep their promises? One of these days our people will recognize the wisdom of Senator GOLDWATER's assertion that we should withdraw recognition of Russia and conduct our foreign policy offensively, not defensively.

The abuse of expenses charged to the Government by Members of Congress exposed in various publications has raised a furor around the Capitol, as well it should. In this political year I'm certain there will be charges and countercharges flying as the indiscretions of a few are revealed, and perhaps magnified, to reflect discredit on even the most conscientious legislators. Still, full revelation to the public and public censure can force correction of any abuses. There should be such correction.

Recalling the emergency housing act when the Democrat leadership was declaring our Nation to be in a serious housing slump, revised figures show that the Government's 1959 estimate of new housing starts was roughly 175,000 too low. The correct figure should have been 1,533,100 starts—a record year. Depression? Slump? Well, the House voted $1 billion in emergency subsidy just the same.

Medical care for the aged is a part of a 166-page book of social security amendments, all designed to "sweeten the pot" for voters just before election time. We still in the Ways and Means Committee haven't troubled to get information on the largest area of medical aid—the private, local and State efforts outside the Federal programs. One of these days, people are going to wake up and crack down on this political demagoguery. At least, I'm hoping so.

Another boost in the minimum wage rate (plus a considerable extension of the jobs covered by it) was voted by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee this week. A similar bill is ready for Senate consideration so some action on raising the minimum wage during this session is fairly certain. While few would argue that for most occupations, anyway, the amount of the "minimum" presently stipulated is in any way excessive, I simply do not believe that the setting of wages or prices (and whether the stipulated rate be a minimum or ceiling doesn't matter) should be any prerogative or function of the Federal Government. That "sweatshops" may still exist in some areas is undeniable, but does the existence of every problem in our society demand enactment of a Federal law? There are many social problems which cannot be properly handled and, under our "federal" system, should not be handled by the National Government.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on the general subject of what needs to be done about the problem, breaking down the employment-age barrier, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in an excellent brochure entitled "Breaking Through the Age Barrier," specifies what older workers themselves, employers, unions, and communities can specifically accomplish as follows:

BY OLDER WORKERS

1. If employed, start preparing now for retirement. The local library will have much reading material that should prove helpful. Make sure to know about prospective income from old-age benefits and company pension plans. Keep in good physical condition and have periodic checkups.

2. If unemployed, take stock. List activities that interest you. List your knowledge and skills. Make a realistic appraisal of what you can do and then forget about any handicaps you might have.

3. Go to the nearest State employment service office for assistance in obtaining work. They know about job opportunities and they can advise you on how to get a job.

4. Let your friends know that you are looking for employment. Go to your union or professional association. Watch for newspaper ads. Go to former employers. Check the classified section of the phone book for the names of companies which hire workers with your experience.

5. Don't overinflate yourself. If you have formerly held big jobs, you may find it hard to adjust to jobs of lesser importance, but it is essential that you do so if you no longer can stand the pace of the top positions.

6. Don't underestimate yourself. You have experience and maturity. Employers are always eager for reliable, experienced employees. Watch your appearance. Be poised, prompt and businesslike.

7. Don't be afraid to try something new, if you have to. You are never too old to learn. Employers prize cheerful, adaptable workers.

8. If unable to work full-time, look about for part-time or casual jobs. Perhaps you can help organize a casual job agency in connection with your retired workers' club or golden age club. Committees of older workers can call on employers for part-time or casual jobs. Your employment service local office may be able to suggest possibilities and to help.

BY EMPLOYERS

1. Make sure that the company's hiring policy is the traditional American policy of hiring on the basis of ability, not some arbitrary age.

2. Make sure that top management's policy is understood and followed by those responsible for hiring and supervising personnel in every department.

3. Analyze jobs to make sure that unrealistic physical requirements are not denying the company a chance to compete for valuable older workers.

4. Eliminate compulsory retirement.

5. Provide adequate retirement plans and help employees to prepare for retirement.

6. Revise age restrictive clauses in pension plans, if these affect hiring policy.

7. Reassign older employees to most situable work.

8. Study possibility of consolidating jobs with physical demands so as to make possible new jobs without demanding physical requirements.

9. Provide for periodic physical examinations.

10. Study possibility of "part-time" retirement, casual jobs for older workers, and other methods of using older worker skills.

BY UNIONS

1. Make sure union policy on contracts does not result in discrimination against older workers.

2. Provides preretirement counseling for union members.

3. Provide counseling and other services to older union members in need of employment.

4. Join in community efforts to promote more employment for older workers.

5. Work with employers on job analysis and job engineering to provide more opportunities for older workers.

BY COMMUNITIES

1. Organize a communitywide effort to remove age barriers to employment. Either organize a new committee or establish a subcommittee under some already existing committee.

2. Provide for the following community activities in connection with an older worker program.

(a) List opportunities available for older workers.

(b) Call upon employers to explain program.

(c) Organize institutes and forums.

(d) Publicize through articles, radio and television programs, essay and poster contests, and the like.

(e) Provide counseling services for older workers, particularly group counseling for those too hesitant to seek individual help.

(f) Organize employment exchanges for part-time and casual employment for older workers.

(g) Promote demonstration projects where selected older workers are employed in certain occupations hitherto denied to them.

(h) Work with private employment agencies to make sure that older workers are not discriminated against.

(i) Provide awards and recognition to employers who cooperate in older worker program.

The basic responsibility for breaking through age barriers to employment rests with local communities. Older workers reside in local communities. It is the local communities who are responsible for their welfare when they are unable to take care of themselves. It is in the local communities where they must find employment. State and Federal agencies can provide some assistance. But older worker programs will succeed in direct proportion to the interest and support evidenced by the local community.

The age barrier to employment is not a problem for only one or two groups within a community. It concerns business; it concerns labor; it concerns civic groups, churches and synagogues and educational institutions. In fact it concerns everybody.

Do You Happen To Know This Man?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker. I am certain many Members will enjoy and find a lesson in the following comment on modern American society:

DO YOU HAPPEN TO KNOW THIS MAN?

The Rotary Graph, a publication of the Weslaco Rotary Club, has passed along this little story, source unknown. It is almost as funny as it is tragic:

A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free schoolbus, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army, then upon discharge retained his national service insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capitol to supplement his GI education check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an FHA loan and then obtained an RFC loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of the veterans' land program and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments soon paid out his farm and ranch. His father and mother lived very comfortably on the ranch on their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity. The Government helped clear his land.

The county agent showed him how to terrace it; then the Government built him a fishpond and stocked it with many fish. The Government guaranteed him a sale for his farm products at highest prices.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free school buses, played in public parks, swam in public pools, and joined the FFA. The man owned an automobile so he favored the Federal highway program.

He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new post office and Federal building, and went to Washington with a group to ask the Government to build a great dam costing millions so that the area could get "cheap electricity."

He petitioned the Government to give the local air base to the county. He was also a leader in the movement to get his specific type of farming special tax writeoffs and exemptions. Of course, he belonged to several farmers' organizations, but denied that they were pressure groups.

Then, one day, he wrote his Congressman: "I wish to protest these excessive governmental expenditures and attendant high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people shauld stand on their own two feet without expecting handouts.

I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution and the policies of States rights."

Patrick Henry, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the famous quotation from Patrick Henry's original speech—followed by a version modernized to suit the wishful thinking of those who think it possible for the lamb to get along safely with a wolf which periodically puts on sheep's clothing. The article is from the periodical USA for May 6, 1960:

PATRICK HENRY, 1960

(By Don Knowlton)

"It is vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, 'Peace, peace, peace'—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

At a session of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, after a Soviet speech compounded of insults, threats, exaggerations, pleas for universality, and protestation of love of peace, the delegate of an Asian country said, "Coexistence is like going to bed with a woman whom you know may strangle you before morning."

It is amazing how many people in the United States and abroad have been cowed into acceptance of propaganda for coexistence. The argument goes like this: "Is it necessary that we keep on opposing the Soviet Union? Why can't our countries learn to live together, even though our systems are different? I think we ought to soften our attitude, compromise, yield, if we have to, on some points. Let's try to learn to get along with the Soviets, not argue with them all the time. If we keep on bucking them, the result will be war. If there is a war, with today's weapons, half of us may be killed. I don't want to be blown to smithereens. I don't want my children to die. Anything would be better than war—even giving in to the Soviets. After all, if we

have to, we can live under communism. That would be better than being dead."

Is not that a logical and sensible premise? Any man of true cowardice, any man who puts self-preservation above principle, any man with instincts of servility, any man who values his life above his country, and all else, would agree.

So, therefore, let us revise and modernize a bit of history, a voice from the past. Patrick Henry is speaking. This is what he says:

"It is vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, 'Peace, peace, peace'—but there is no peace. The next gale that sweeps from the East may bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Is that what the gentleman would have? God forbid. Let us risk our all, rather than fight a war.

"Besides, gentlemen, is there any reason why it should come to that? Is there any certainty that the Soviets really intend to subjugate us by force of arms? Are we sure that Premier Khrushchev will not eventually consider our petitions, if we persevere? Let us negotiate, let us parley, let us seek areas of agreement.

"We must learn to live with the Soviets, even if it should mean the extinction of our liberties.

"For the alternative is war—death and destruction. Anything is preferable to that. Is not life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be worth purchasing even at the price of chains and slavery?

"I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me coexistence or give me communism."

Sweden—Land of Peace and Freedom and Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in this age of search for peace and freedom for mankind we do well to pay tribute to Sweden on her Constitution and Flag Day.

Sweden has ever been renowned among the nations of the world for her efforts to keep the peace. Also it has been justly famous for the freedom of its individuals and concern for their well-being.

The peaceful ways of the Swedish people have came from their own harmonious way of life down a path of neutrality through two world wars. Not untouched were they but uniquely apart from the frightful imbroglio of those two holocausts. The ways of peace have led Sweden to the pinnacle of the United Nations. The respected and impressive figure who currently leads that organization for the promotion of peace among nations is Dag Hammarskjold, a son of Sweden and a product of her culture.

Not only does the Swedish harmony with men at home and abroad bespeak their love of peace. It denotes also their people's freedom-loving spirit, which has produced democracy at home and a respect for the rights of freemen everywhere. The constitutional monarchy of Sweden has long been the leader of a truly and eminently democratic country. Since the 17th century, when the status of free farmers was spectacularly recreated, Sweden has moved progressively toward a society of self-governing men free from the restraints imposed by monarchy, nobility, guilds, or other factions of society.

Particularly since the early 19th century has Sweden's peaceful progress toward the betterment of her people been notable. Her rulers and the populace have joined in the promotion of the nation's material, mental, and spiritual welfare. In the fields of education, labor, and the social services Sweden's record has been outstanding. Indeed, we legislators in the United States have studied Sweden's successful methods along these lines in preparing patterns for our own society.

The bonds of sympathy and friendship between our two countries are many. It is significant that Sweden was the first country to formally recognize the United States as a nation.

We today heartily return, and in large measure, the respect and honor due Sweden on her Constitution and Flag Day.

Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include House Concurrent Resolution 40, introduced in the Louisiana State Legislature by the Honorable C. M. Poston, State senator, and the Honorable Bert A. Adams, State representative. This resolution is of interest to all of us who are concerned with the problems of our elder citizens and I commend it for the careful consideration of the Members of Congress:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Whereas the old-age assistance grants are not sufficient for the economic well-being and happiness of our older citizenry; and

Whereas these older citizens need additional funds to meet the bare necessities of life; and

Whereas present limitations on the earning power of old age recipients are unrealistic: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the Senate concurring), That the U.S. Congress is hereby urged and requested to enact legislation permitting old age recipients to earn up to five hundred dollars ($500) a year without having their benefits reduced or terminated; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the two Houses of the U.S. Congress and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the U.S. Congress.

THOMAS J. JEWELL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Sanford H. Bolz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include statements made at the farewell luncheon for Mr. and Mrs. Sanford H. Bolz, Tuesday, May 3, 1960, at the National Press Club, under the auspices of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. This luncheon was given on the occasion of the departure of Mr. and Mrs. Bolz for Salinas, Calf., where Mr. Bolz will enter a law partnership, after having served as Washington counsel for the American Jewish Congress. The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, friends of Sandy, Sandy and Joy, it is a distinct pleasure to have this opportunity to express publicly my affection and regard for Sanford Bolz, known, of course, to all of us as Sandy.

Sandy is not a "nice" guy. Sandy never agrees for the sake of being agreeable. Sandy never lets the dust lie lest he be called impolite. In short, Sandy is a fighter—a fighter for all of those causes which are an integral part of his being. I've seen Sandy light up with the flames of indignation at the knowledge of any injustice done. He has taken time out from his practice of law to represent the interests of all minority groups—the preservation and extension of the Bill of Rights is a personal passion with him. I have known Sandy, as a representative of the American Jewish Congress, since 1948, but I also have known Sandy, in his own person, as a man of the keenest integrity and untarnished ideals.

Today, Sandy is 45 years old, and it is a happy coincidence, indeed, that this luncheon, in his honor, take place on his birthday. These 45 years of his are rich with friendships, are rich with doing battle for the oppressed and needy. Few men of 45 can say as he can, that the world is a better place for his having covered that span of years.

I shall sorely miss the good counsel and judgment of Sandy Bolz—more particularly when the issue of civil rights legislation arises again as it inevitable must, and, indeed on all legislation dealing with human rights and needs.

I wish you Godspeed, much happiness, and much success in your new venture, Sandy. I am sure, however, that this is not goodby and that you will continue, if not in person, then by any other means at your disposal, to continue to give us the support and the encouragement whenever the good fight is being fought.

STATEMENT BY ISAAC FRANCK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF GREATER WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman, Sandy and Joe, Congressman CELLER, ladies and gentlemen, for whatever the reasons may be, the chairman advises me that, unlike the speakers who preceded me, I am not bound by the 2-minute rule, and it is therefore my privilege to make some more extended remarks as part of our saying farewell to Sandy and Joy. I shall not utilize this occasion to unloose upon Sandy an avalanche of encomiums, for two reasons. First, this is no time for a

eulogy. Eulogies will be in order many, many years from now, when Sandy will have been gathered to his forefathers, at a ripe old age, sated with years, and having bequeathed to posterity a lifetime of accomplishments. Secondly, I am aware of the admonition given by the 10th century Biblical commentator, Rashi, to the effect that one is supposed to tell only part of mani's praise in his presence, and full praise only in his absence.

It seems to me more appropriate, on this occasion, to reflect together upon the issues and causes which Sandy espoused, and upon which he lavished his talents and his energy. This seems to me worth doing, not so much because he was active in these areas, and on behalf of these causes, not in order to highlight what he did, but rather for the purpose of reviewing for ourselves Sandy's impact upon us, his influence on our community's thinking, the stamp he has left on our community's policies.

Sandy has been a champion of civil rights, civil rights not only for Jews, but for all human beings. He was one of the chief architects of the amicus curiae briefs in the Thompson Restaurant case, as the case progressed from the lowest court to the U.S. Supreme Court, and thus helped make a signal contribution to the desegregation of restaurants in Washington. He was also one of the architects of the amicus curiae brief submitted to the Supreme Court in the District of Columbia public school segregation case. When we recall that one of these briefs was signed by 18 community organizations of all descriptions, and the other brief had on it the names of 22 religious, civic, and community organizations, the extent of Sandy's impact on our collective thought is made abundantly clear.

Sandy has been a defender of religious freedom and of the American principle of the separation of church and state. This has meant dealing with problems of religion and the public school, and other manifestations of the threatened erosion of the separation principle. In this complex and sensitive area, Sandy's leadership has provided clarity, diplomatic persuasiveness, and steadfast courage and good judgment. I remember very clearly our appearance before one of the suburban boards of education, about 9 years ago, in opposition to a proposal that public school machinery be utilized for the distribution of Bibles to public school pupils. A Congregationalist, Methodist, and a Seventh Day Adventist leader were among those in the delegation, and Sandy Bolz was our sopkesman. The quiet dignity, the persuasiveness, and the legal scholarship displayed by Sandy on that occasion, brought honor not only upon him, but upon all of us.

Civil liberties, personal freedoms, freedom of ideas and freedom of speech, are among the ideals espoused by Sandy, and their safeguarding has been among the objectives pursued by our Jewish community council under his stimulation and guidance. And Sandy has been as concerned about the freedom of ideas repugnant to us, as he has about freedom for the ideas we hold dear. He has drummed into us the understanding that the surest way of safeguarding freedom for the ideas we are committed to is the safeguarding of freedom for the ideas which in our view are most reprehensible.

Outstanding in the council's work has been Sandy's devotion to the needs of Israel, and to the interpretation of Israel's great significance in the life Judaism. For in the rebirth of Israel Sandy sees not only the establishment of a home for the driven and persecuted of our people, not only a means of restoring freedom and dignity to human beings, but also the erection of a laboratory for Jewish ideals of social justice and cooperative living, and a citadel of Jewish spiritual and intellectual creativity which can help enrich the spiritual life of Jewish communities everywhere.

And finally, Sandy has been a champion of democracy in the Jewish community. And let me assure you that this is not an easy or unhazardous task. It is much easier to espouse democracy in and for the political organization of a state. which has the authority to govern people's lives. In a voluntary association, which is what the Jewish community is, the champion of democracy faces many dangers from the powers that be and that would be inclined to perpetuate their dominance and control.

Sandy has done these things, and pursued these goals in our midst, for three reasons. First, because he is the kind of person he is. Second, because he takes seriously his citizen responsibility, and wishes to lead others toward similar seriousness about their citizen responsibilities. However, it seems to me that there is a third reason, and this is Sandy's taking seriously the matter of his being a Jew. Sandy has been trying to work out for himself, and to help all of us think through and work out what it means to be a Jew in mid-20th century America. He echoes the question of the ancient Hebrew prophet, "What does God require of you?" What does it mean to be a Jew, not only in the sanctuary, but out in the community, in the marketplace, in the give-and-take of our daily relations with people. Of course, he has not been indifferent to the ritual requirements of Judaism, or to the Judaism of the sanctuary. I recall a minor episode some 4 or 5 years ago, when Sandy lost his father. Sandy and someone else were at my house, probably for a meeting on some Jewish community council matters. During a break in the discussion, Sandy asked us whether we would suspend the meeting for a few moments and recite with him the memorial prayer for the dead, the Kaddish. Having been raised in a home where traditional Jewish observances were the norm, and in which it was assumed that the mourner's Kaddish is recited only by the actual mourner, and only as part of the regular religious service in which at least a quorum of 10 men participate, I found this a strange experience. None the less we rose, faced the east and together with Sandy recited the mourner's Kaddish. I remember this minor episode because that moment was an experience in holiness, and my home became truly a miniature sanctuary.

In espousing these causes, and in furnishing leadership on their behalf in our midst, Sandy succeeded in teaching us an important lesson in the strategies of community relations, and of his type of social engineering generally. He taught us that most often the best strategy is adherence to principle. At least he taught me that. If we adhere to principle, then, in any negotiations which may require compromise, our compromises would be a retreat from principle, but a retreat of only a certain distance. Contrariwise, if we do not adhere to principle, but negotiate in terms of compromises, then much more compromising is bound to be forced upon us than should be the case either ideally or pragmatically.

Let me add one final comment. I think I should say, in all candor, that in working in our midst on all these issues and principles, Sandy has not always been easy to live with. Indeed, he has often been quite difficult to live with. He has often been inflexible, obstinate. And this brings to mind an interesting linguistic observation made by Bertrand Russell in one of his philosophical papers. Russell points out that the verb "to be firm" has a rather unusual conjugation. In the English language the verb "to be firm" is conjugated as follows: "I am firm. You are stubborn. He is pig-headed." Now, I would not go to the extreme of saying that Sandy has been pigheaded, but he has been obstinate, rigid, inflexible, difficult. However, I must confess, in equal candor, that there is another being, another entity, in my life that displays these same irritating qualities, and that is my conscience, my moral conscience. My conscience too is obstinate, rigid, inflexible, and often very difficult to live with. But I would find it much more difficult to live without my conscience than to live with it. Similarly, I am sure that we shall all find it much more difficult to live without Sandy than we have to live with him. For, Sandy has been part of our collective moral conscience, and in his going to California part of our conscience is being wrenched away from us.

It seems to me that the best farewell gift we can offer to Sandy and Joy is our solemn promise that, after they leave our community, we shall not settle down to a smug, comfortable, self-satisfied existence; that we shall find in our midst new resources, new forces of conscience, which will keep us restless and unhappy unless we diligently continue the pursuit of those social and religious ideals to which he so unselfishly dedicated himself in our midst.

RESPONSE OF SANFORD H. BOLZ

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, all my good friends, my heart is full to overflowing—much too full to let me say all that I would like to say on this occasion. But I know that you would never believe me if I told you I was at a loss for words—so I shall try to respond, but briefly, as I would not for the world want to spoil the shining image that has been drawn of me today.

First, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for this marvelous and memorable occasion. You have done me—and my family—great honor, and we shall remember this day as long as we live. I must say it is the most wonderful antidote any man could have to becoming 45. You know, as I sat here listening to these tributes, with what I hope was becoming modesty—even if you may have noticed now and then a shameless flash of agreement steal across my face—I could not help thinking of two remarks. One is attributed to a famous British diplomat, but I first learned it from a famous Israeli diplomat, my good friend Mike Arnon, who used it on an occasion when he was introduced to an audience in very glowing terms. It goes like this: "Compliments are like perfume—pleasant to inhale but dangerous to swallow." So you may have noticed that during the speeches I was inhaling mightily, but swallowing very little.

The second remark relates to the fact that this is a most unaccustomed position for me to be in. You know, I never thought I'd ever have a testimonial—I always thought I was much too young for that. You usually get them when you are either old or rich—and I was sure I would never be either. But I have attended many of these affairs, and usually I have sat out where you are, watching some other poor devil undergo this ordeal by tribute. (But I have loved every bit of it—and I would have it no other way). And it reminded me of the fellow who was being tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail, who remarked that "If it weren't for the honor of the thing, I think I'd rather walk."

So much for jest. As I stand here, I can't help reflecting on how very much I owe to Cornell. If Albany gave me birth, surely Cornell nurtured the seeds which I hope have grown to maturity here in Washington. For Cornell gave me, first of all, a friend like Al Arent, whose leadership and dedication to good causes I always admired, and in whose footsteps in those causes I have somehow managed to follow pretty well, ever

since the days when I was a lowly freshman and he was the most respected senior on the campus.

Second, it gave me during law school the friendship of Jack Abramson, whose warm and generous call to me to share his fine practice in California is one of the rare things that would ever lead us to leave this wonderful town and all the warm hearts and good heads that we number among our friends here.

Third, it gave me, first as teacher and then as friend, a very great man, who has been an ideal and an inspiration to me throughout my career—and ever will be—and who has come to be with us today to do me honor. I mean, of course, my warm good friend, Judge Henry Edgerton.

And finally, Cornell gave me the greatest treasure that any man could have—my wife—for her price is far above rubies. She has been my constant companion, support, help, and balance wheel now for almost 20 years—and I think God never made a more wonderful woman. All of you who have worked with me in community affairs I am sure must know that I could never have done whatever I have been able to do without her steady support and understanding and willingness to accept whatever adversity—as well as honor—might come to us out of my dedication to such causes. And I would be less than deserving of the tributes you have paid me today if I were not sensible of the fact that this tribute is intended as much for her as it is for me. And I think I speak for you as well as for myself when I say that this comunity will miss her sweetness, her beauty, her never-failing good nature, and her deep, true goodness. And thank God, I shall have all of them with me, because I don't know what I would ever do without them.

There is much more that I would like to say, but there are neither words nor time. We shall never forget this moment—this day. To leave Washington, as you have shown us today we do, with the respect and affection of this community is reward enough for any man. I shall ask for no greater riches. And if there is one thought that I could leave with you by which you might, perhaps, remember me, I would make this my valedictory: That it matters little what vaulting temples and structure you may build in this community. And it matters little what riches you may contribute to our fellow Jews and our fellow men. It matters only that, through dedication to the finest tradition of Judaism, you keep burning always at white heat the living fire of fortitude and the bright flame of justice. For if they go out, the rest shall be without meaning and as if it had never been.

If you will remember this of me at times when there may be temptation to fail or flag in keeping these fires constantly rekindled, then I know that I shall not be forgotten here. Thank you all again from the bottom of our hearts—come see us in California—goodby and God bless you all.

Easthampton, Mass., Celebrates 175th Anniversary and Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker the beautiful town of Easthampton in Hampshire County, Mass., nestled picturesquely between the foothills of the Berkshire Mountains and the Mount Tom Range, and just to the west of the Connecticut River which washes her eastern limits, proudly celebrated her 175th anniversary over this last weekend.

The gala observance was also the occasion of a homecoming for Easthampton's sons and daughters who are now living in all sections of this great United States and American outposts throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, geologists say that Easthampton is now located in what was once the bottom of Lake Hadley; that at another period in prehistoric eras the town was covered by the great icecap; and still in another age Easthampton was inhabited by dinosaurs whose footprints are still being found today.

Purchased from the Indians in 1653, the area was originally part of a tract of land called Nonotuck, and the first inhabitant was John Webb, who was granted a piece of land on which to build his home in 1644. In 1674, a sawmill was erected near the Manhan River, and the community began to take shape and grow until it was incorporated as a district of 400 population in 1785. Now, 175 years later, the population exceeds 12,000.

The first church was organized in 1785 with Rev. Aaron Walworth as preacher. When he declined to settle in Easthampton Rev. Payson Williston was ordained in 1789. Samuel Williston, eldest son of the first pastor, founded Williston Academy in 1841 as Williston Seminary. In 1863 a group of Methodists began holding prayer meetings in Bosworth's Hall, and in 1868 the first Roman Catholic church, dedicated to the Immaculate Conception, was built in Easthampton. In January 1871 a group of Episcopalians started as a mission, holding services in the lower townhall, while the first German Lutheran services were held in July 1890 in Knipfer's Hall on Briggs Street. In 1918 the First Church united with the Payson Church and formed the Easthampton Congregational Church. During Easthampton's 175 years of history the churches have grown in proportion to the growth of the community.

One of the earliest industries, that of buttonmaking, was established by Mr. Williston in 1827, and by 1865 this was a flourishing business, a stock company having been formed with a capital of $150,000. During 1848 and 1849 Mr. Williston had erected a building beside his button factory for the manufacture of suspender webbing. In 1852 he sold out to a joint stock company which assumed the name of the Nashawannuck Manufacturing Co., which was the direct forerunner of the present United Elastic Corp. in Easthampton. Other well-known industries located in the town are the Hampton Mills, Inc., the National Felt Co., Easthampton News industrial job printing plant, Enterprise Printing Co., Philipp Manufacturing Co., Paragon Rubber Co., Spring Action Electric Corp., Rhoades Rubber Co., Lesnow Manufacturing Co., Hampden Specialties Products Corp., Nicad Division, Gould National Batteries Inc., Easthampton Maintenance Co., Easthampton Warehouse Co., Inc., M. & L. Plastics Corp., Tubed Chemicals Corp., Stanley Home Products, Inc., Easthampton Foundry, Inc., Norma Lee Candy Co., the October Co., and the Sadlowski Manufacturing Co.

The history of public schools in Easthampton dates back to the pre-Revolutionary period. In 1739 Northampton supported a school at Pascommuck and in 1784 Northampton helped establish two schools in the village. Soon after Easthampton was incorporated in 1785, the sum of £15 was raised for schools. The district schools were built and continued to meet the educational needs of the community for nearly a century. There were 12 district schools besides the high school by 1867. The high school, now Memorial Hall, built in 1865, was the first two-story brick school building in Easthampton. As the community grew and prospered, so did its schools. However, progress of school construction is only one phase in the growth of education in Easthampton. The curriculum was developed and improved to meet the needs of the pupils in the community and education in Easthampton has kept abreast with State and National trends.

In addition to the public schools and Williston Academy, Easthampton also benefits from the Roman Catholic parochial educational system. Hundreds of the young Catholic boys and girls of the community are educated in the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Conception, and Notre Dame Schools.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the town of Easthampton exemplifies those qualities that constitute our American heritage.

I ask at this time to have included with my remarks the names of committee members who worked so hard to make Easthampton's 175th anniversary and homecoming the success that it was, and a story from the Springfield Daily News of June 2 relating the history of the town:

Executive committee for the 175th anniversary of the town of Easthampton: Horace J. Hatch, treasurer; Mrs. Orman Curtis, cosecretary; Miss Katharine M. Root, cochairman; Mrs. William L. Robinson, cosecretary; Roy V. Bouchard, cochairman.

Chairmen of the general committees: Mrs. Godfrey Dragon, Mrs. Clarence Dougherty, cochairmen, concert; Mrs. Carl Lux, advertising in historical book; Mrs. Arnold Wild, telephone; Miss Julia Skrzyniarz, pageant; Mrs. Ellsworth Greenwood, queen; Henry F. Mitowski, ways and means; Homer Perkins, cochairman, steering; Horace J. Hatch, treasurer; Rev. Benson H. Harvey, church; George Evans, historical; Russell Ulm, regatta; Frank Janik, publicity; Simon Brin, grounds; Frank Skrzyniarz, traffic; Archie Forbes, Jr., industrial exhibit; Robert Ulm, safety; Henry Labbee, parade; Mrs. Clifton Magliola, Mrs. Arthur Thouin, cochairmen, dress revue; Bernard Fleury, Jr., public relations; Mrs. David J. Strong, historian; Mrs. Hazel Clair, art exhibit; John E. Kitson, invitations. Absent when both pictures were taken: Harold Bailey, steering cochairman; Ernest Willard, fireworks; John Bugieda, sports; Kenneth Dolloff, song contest.

EASTHAMPTON 175TH ANNIVERSARY AND HOMECOMING COMMITTEES

Executive: Katharine M. Root, cochairman; Roy V. Bouchard, cochairman; Mrs. Orman Curtis, Mrs. William L. Robinson.

Steering: Harold Bailey, cochairman; Homer G. Perkins, cochairman; John Lagowski, George Gadomski, Robert Partridge, Archie Forbes, Jr., Mrs. William N. Craven, Mrs. Herman Nichols, Mrs. Lorraine St. Martin.

Financial: Horace J. Hatch, treasurer; Mrs. Mary Brewer, Lucien LaPrade.

Telephone: Mrs. Arnold Wild, Miss Wladyslawa Zmaczynski, Leo J. Perras, Mrs. Nellie Proffitt, Mrs. Eva Healy, Mrs. Thomas McTurk, Mrs. Helen Usher.

Publicity: Frank Janik, Roy V. Bouchard, Russel Flanagan, Warren Craig, Mrs. Neil Martel, Mrs. William Vachon.

Public relations: Bernard Fleury, Jr., Edmund Czelusniak, Mrs. Philip Bond, John Craig, Mrs. Sophie Janik.

Invitations: John E. Kitson, Anthony Kendrew, Kenfred A. Root, Mrs. Kenfred Root, Arthur J. Pepin, Mrs. Frank Rabideau.

Historical: Mrs. David Strong, George Evans, Mrs. Frank Merrick, Mrs. Joseph Brown, Richard Barcomb.

Ways and Means: Henry F. Mitowski, Mrs. George F. Lapan, Mrs. Carl Lux, Walter Fedorkowicz, Thomas Scanlon, Robert Sjodahl, Frank Anderson.

Advertisements: Mrs. Carl Lux, Mrs. James H. Misner, Jr., Roy V. Bouchard, Katharine M. Root.

Queen: Mrs. Ellsworth Greenwood, Mrs. Frank Miller, Mrs. James Stone, Ellsworth Greenwood.

Churches: Rev. Benson H. Harvey, Father John Chwalek, Rev. Walter Rueger, Mrs. Samuel Micka, Mrs. Avelina Southiere.

Parade: Henry Labbee, Winfield Kelsey, Frank Skrzyniarz, Robert Ulm, John Dorman, Kenneth Dolloff, Simon Brin, Mrs. Leroy Bauer, Miss Beatrice Lyman, Wallace Bull.

Easthampton official song: Kenneth Dolloff, Miss Alice Butterfield, Henry Teller.

Dress revenue: Mrs. Arthur Thouin; Mrs. Clifton Magliola, Mrs. George Lapan, Mrs. E. E. Williams, Mrs. Francis Mutter, Mrs. Viola Bergeron, Mrs. Ernest Cooney.

Regatta: Russell Ulm, Stanley Popielarczyk, Forbes Synder, Ernest Drexel, Frederick Jayes, Joseph Acus, Robert Oborne, Albert Cartledge.

Industrial exhibit committee: Archie Forbes, chairman; Walter Szary, Donald Gauger, Clarence Dougherty.

Art exhibit: Mrs. Hazel Clare, Albert Kiesling, Mrs. F. L. C. McGowan, Mrs. Merritt Loomis III, Robert E. Frennier, Raymond Ewing, Frank Rabideau.

Hobbies committee: Mrs. John Behaylo, cochairman; Mrs. Archie Forbes, cochairman; Mrs. Ronald Pepin, Mrs. Donald Lamoureux, Mrs. Kenneth Knight.

Hole-in-one golf: Henry Mitowski, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Lux, Carl (Speed) Lux, Robert Sjodahl, Katharine M. Root.

Fireworks: Ernest Willard, Walter Marek, Oscar Gunsolus.

Historical exhibit: Richard Barcomb, Anthony Kendrew, James Campbell, Miss Irene Soja, Paul Barcomb.

Barbecue: Mr. and Mrs. A. Forbes, Jr., Katharine M. Root, Roy V. Bouchard, Fred Kaezynski, Charles McDonald, Ronald Pepin, Frank Anderson, Mrs. Charles McDonald, Donald Lamoureux, Richard Press, Mrs. Helen Wilby, Mrs. Helen Connery, Wallace Bull, Walter Marek, Miss Shirley Thouin, Mrs. Frances Brisson, Mrs. Henry Jones, Mrs. Martha Neidel, John Hardy, Robert Partridge, Albert F. Roy, Donald Slattery, Clifford Thayer, Mrs. Donald Lamoureux, Mrs. Charles Stuart, Mrs. Daniel Bolduc, Mrs. Patrick O'Connor, Mrs. Ronald Pepin, Mrs. Francis Plourd, Mrs. Anthony Pombal, Mrs. Edward Wagner, Harold Bailey, Henry Mathieu, Anthony Pombal, Bernard Fleury, Jr., Mrs. Edwin Kaeppel, Mrs. Louise Brooks, Mrs. Ethel Bartlett.

Pancake booth three-county fair: Katharine M. Moot, Mrs. Anthony Banach, Mrs. Chester Banach, Mrs. Myrtis Billieux, Mrs. Daniel Bolduc, Mrs. George Gadomski, Eli Bourgault, Mrs. Mary T. Brewer, Mrs. Orman Curtis, James Campbell, Mrs. Olive Dragon, Mrs. Henry Jones, Mrs. Evan Johnston, Mrs. William Konopka, John Lagowski, Mrs. Donald Lamoureux, Mrs. George LaPan, Mrs. Viola Bergeron, Henry Mathieu, Mrs. Frank Miller, Mrs. Stella Mitchell, Henry Mitowski, Mrs. Martha Neidel, Mrs. Patrick O'Connor, Mrs. Ronald Pepin, Mrs. Edwin Place, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Plourd, Mrs. Anthony Pombal, Lester Richardson, Mrs. Leo Small, Thomas Scanlon, Mrs. Charles Stuart, Mrs. Edward Wagner, Mrs. Blanch Welch, Donat Fournier.

Gymkana: John Dorman, Mr. and Mrs. P. Tautznik, and Edward P. Egan.

Sports: John Bogieda, Miss Irene Soja, and Thomas Carrol.

Cosponsors of soap box derby: Henry Labbee, and Flaherty.

Queen's float: Mr. and Mrs. G. Coyle, Sr., Mr. and Mrs. Warren Wilds, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Lucia, Bruce Lucia, and Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Tanner.

Soap box derby: Sigmund Wonderlich, John Lagowski, William Symancyk, Frank Skrzyniarz, Robert Ulm, Kenneth Provoncha, Roy Bouchard, and Mark Supple.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, June 2, 1960]

Samuel Williston Founded Academy and Industries—Philanthropist Became First Citizen of Little Village That Grew to Town of 12,000

Easthampton.—As Easthampton prepares to celebrate its 175th anniversary and homecoming on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, the early history of the town will be recalled to the minds of the residents by means of historical exhibits, a pageant, symbolic floats in the anniversary parade and by the retelling of the high lights in the town's growth and development.

Purchased from the Indians in 1653, the area was originally part of a tract of land called Nonotuck, and the first inhabitant was John Webb, who was granted a piece of land on which to build a home in 1664. In 1674, a sawmill, the first building other than a house, was erected near the Manhan River, and little by little various sections of the area were settled until, in 1785, when it was incorporated as a district, the population numbered 400. Now, 175 years later, the population exceeds 12,000.

The first church was organized in 1785 with Rev. Aaron Walworth as preacher. When he declined to settle here as pastor Rev. Payson Williston was ordained as pastor in 1789.

Industry in 1827

Samuel Williston, oldest son of the first pastor, founded Williston Academy in 1841, as Williston Seminary. One of the earliest industries, that of button making, was established by Mr. Williston in 1827, and by 1865 this was a flourishing business and a stock company was formed with a capital of $150,000. During 1848 and 1849, Mr. Williston had erected a building beside his button factory for the manufacture of suspender webbing. In 1852 he sold out to a joint stock company which assumed the name of the Nashawannuck Manufacturing Co. Through many transactions, building construction, partnerships, and acquisition of other companies, this became the forerunner of the present United Elastic Corp.

In addition to his benefactions to Williston Seminary, he made large donations to Amherst College, contributed largely to the rebuilding of Payson Church after it had twice been destroyed by fire, and built the Hampshire and Hampden Railroad, thus extending the Canal Railroad and connecting Northhampton with New Haven.

The first school of which there is any record was in the Pascommuck section, in 1739. In 1797 the town divided into four school districts with management of each school entirely in the hands of the individual districts. Town control of schools dates from 1864 when it was voted to establish a high school, now Memorial Hall. The Easthampton Library was built in 1881.

Switch to New Campus

By 1886, the old campus of Williston Academy was completed, with classrooms, dormitories, a laboratory and a gymnasium. The Mansion House, a former inn and stagecoach stop, across the street from the main campus, was acquired by Williston and known as Payson Hall. During the past two decades, however, a gradual expansion has seen the center of activity moved from its Main Street site to the new campus on Park Street, and the final abandonment and sale of the old buildings to make room for new construction. Payson Hall was also sold, and is now an apartment house. New dormitories were erected in the Park Street area, a former mill was acquired and renovated for an administration and classroom building, a library and infirmary were added, many homes in the area were acquired and converted to the use of the faculty, and the latest of new construction, a science building and auditorium have completed the integration of the campus around the old Williston homestead which now serves to house the headmaster of the academy and his family.

There are now four public elementary schools and a high school, housing nearly 1,900 pupils, in addition to three parochial schools. The eight churches include Easthampton Congregational, Providence Methodist, St. Philip's Episcopal, Trinity Lutheran, Christ Evangelical Lutheran, Immaculate Conception, Sacred Heart, and Notre Dame du Bon Conseil.

Economic Growth

Easthampton remains primarily one of manufacturing. The removal of the West Boylston Co. in the early 1930's left a large gap in the economic structure of the town, but local officials soon were able to attract other industries to the vacated buildings which now house several firms of varied interests. The coming of Stanley Home Products, Inc., in the early 1940's gave employment to many local residents, and Hampton Mills continues to be one of the largest industries, along with the United Elastic Corp. Many other smaller manufacturing companies occupy buildings, mainly in the Pleasant Street section, and turn out a variety of products of rubber, plastic, textiles, metal and chemicals.

The building of homes in the postwar years has created several new neighborhoods and the resulting increase in population has necessitated an increase in mercantile establishments. A sewage disposal plant is nearing completion, and the artesian well water system is being improved and augmented by new wells.

A 30-unit development for housing the elderly was opened last year, and 2 years ago, financed by public subscription and gifts from industry and local organizations, the community swimming pool was opened,

adding much to the already popular facilities of Nonotuck Park and Daley Field.

Within a few weeks a special town meeting will be called for the purpose of voting a new high school.

Within the past few years, the town's three banks have been forced to seek larger quarters, two of them constructing new buildings on the site of the former Williston campus, and all reporting an alltime high in prosperity during the past year.

Visitors to Easthampton on Sunday, entering through the residential sections and taking up stations along the route of the anniversary parade which will pass mainly through the industrial and business areas, will surely see 175 years of progress on every side.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Largest Junior Chamber of Commerce Chapter Organized This Year in the United States Given Charter at Grafton, W. Va.; Maj. Joseph Tolbert and Senator Jennings Randolph Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Grafton, W. Va., a railroad center which has suffered economic difficulties mainly as a consequence of rapid technological change, is a city which nevertheless looks toward the future with resolution and optimism.

The citizens of Grafton have organized an economic development program aimed at attracting and developing new industries and making their community a more desirable and hopeful place in which to live.

Playing an important role in this cooperative effort will be the Grafton Junior Chamber of Commerce, which is the largest Jaycee chapter to have been organized in the United States this year. The 50 charter members who were presented their chapter's charter during a banquet ceremony in which I was privileged to participate, June 6, 1960, are: Calvin C. Smith, president; Herbert C. Ball and James C. Fawcett, vice presidents; Charles E. Walls, secretary; Maynard D. Slaven, treasurer; Nelson L. Blankenship, Manfred K. Bahmann, Glenn H. Bartlett, Earl R. Carrothers, Floyd George Cozard, William L. Dempsey, Robert L. Duckworth, Jack Edward Ellis, Frank M. Faulkner, Frederick D. Ford, Mark Freeman, Kenneth F. Fortney, Harold R. Gillespie, Don R. Harman, Teddy Lee Haddix, Bill Joe Hill, Jeremial Hines, William B. Hawkins, Charles Richard Isner, Jr., Jasper A. Kalo, Elbert G. Knotts, Darl Robert Laulis, J. N. Liller, Donal Lee Matthews, William Arthur Matthews, Otis Max Murphy, Delbert R. Moats, Charles Lowell Mason, George Perko, Derald Floyd Poling, Donald F. Poling, Cecil W. Phillips, Jr., Captaim James E. Pappas, James M. Robinson, Paul Hansen Resitrup, Wilfred L. Stead, Carman L. McKinney, Jack W. McDougal, Donald J. Tansill, James Tingler, Warren A. Turner, John J. Uveges, Tony Joe Veltri, Dorsey Wayne Weaver, and Robert M. Wyckoff.

As guest speaker for the charter banquet, we heard Maj. Joseph Tolbert of the Strategic Air Command on the importance of SAC to our national defense. His illustrated presentation was effective and highly informative.

The charter was presented by Jack Stillman of Charleston, W. Va., immediate past president of the Junior Chambers of Commerce of West Virginia, who made an excellent talk on the value of the Jaycee organization in the State and Nation.

Dr. Robert F. Gerkin was the clever master of ceremonies, Phil Lux of Fairmont, W. Va., represented the sponsoring chapter from that neighboring city.

"Building a Better West Virginia" was the theme of my brief remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from my speech.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech by the senior Senator from West Virginia were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A BETTER WEST VIRGINIA

(Speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH at charter banquet, Grafton Junior Chamber of Commerce, Grafton, W. Va., June 6, 1960)

You are now officially a part of one of the most distinguished State organizations of the junior chamber of commerce in our country. The record of accomplishment of the West Virginia Jaycees is a notable one—a fact which was rightfully acknowledged at the national convention in Buffalo last year. It is a proud record, and one in which an example has been set for all of us in the State in carrying out the theme of "Building a Better West Virginia."

The job of going on from here—the task of building a better West Virginia—rests with you gentlemen who are the business, industrial, and professional leaders of the coming generation.

Yours is the generation which must plow the new ground, and break down the barriers as our own Chuck Yeager, of West Virginia, broke the sound barrier.

And yours is the generation most fitted for the task. Unemcumbered by the preconceptions that often increase with the years, you are free to search for new solutions—as did Alexander Graham Bell, when he invented the telephone at the age of 28; as did Henry Ford, when he produced his first motor car at 29; as did Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, when he was appointed president of the University of Chicago at 30.

These men found youth a time of invention and initiative. The history of the arts, of science, of industry and of politics records the names of many others—Aeschylus, Galileo, David Hume, Francis Bacon, William Wordsworth, Alexander Hamilton—all men who completed some of their greatest work before reaching the age of 30.

This is an age in life when you are preeminently suited for searching out new solutions and penetrating established barriers. One of these barriers opposing our economic development has been our tradidition reliance in West Virginia on the basic manufacturing and extractive industries and the rail industry which serves them. These industries, with their heavy rate of capitalization per worker, are the leaders in the process of automation.

Therefore, we must search beyond the basic extraction and processing of our natural resources to the secondary stage of fabrication and manufacture of consumer goods. It is in these fields that opportunities abound for the development of locally owned, independent small businesses.

In this respect it is worth noting that 94 percent of all commercial and industrial establishments employ fewer than 20 persons, while a total of 97 percent of all concerns employ not more than 50 persons.

Firms with 50 or fewer employees provide jobs for 72 percent of all workers and account for 78 percent of the Nation's total sales dollar volume in the retail, wholesale, and service fields.

Thus, it is in the fields of the service and fabricating industries which offer opportunities for the development of small businesses that we must look for the long-range development of much of our economy.

In this respect it is gratifying to note that members of the West Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce have been among the leaders in the development of a small business investment corporation under the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This is a significant step toward the realization of many of our goals.

I have little fear as to West Virginia's future while several thousand young men are guided by the Jaycees in providing creative and courageous leadership in the fields of industry and business, community development, and constructive participation in public affairs.

Religious Organizations in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the anchors of democracy in the Pacific and in the world is the Republic of the Philippines. This small nation which understands both the East and the West, has made invaluable contributions to democracy and to understanding through such eloquent spokesmen as President Garcia and Ambassador Romulo. No nation, large or small, has a better understanding through bitter experience in the ways and the menaces of communism than do our friends in the Philippines.

We all know that many of the sources of democracy in the Republic of the Philippines were the religious organizations of all faiths through their churches, schools, hospitals, and welfare establishments.

During the last great war, many of these institutions were severely damaged as a result of the war. These institutions also provided invaluable relief to American soldiers and civilians. It is a matter of deep satisfaction and pride to

know that our country has seen fit to recompense these worthy institutions and has awarded claims which in substantial part, at least, permit the restoration of their facilities and reimburses them for services rendered to our soldiers and civilians.

These awards have been made through a series of congressional acts in which I have been proud to play a leading part, beginning with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, Public Law 303 of the 82d Congress; Public Law 211, 83d Congress; Public Law 997, 84th Congress, and finally by Public Law 884 of the 85th Congress which provided for the transfer of $3,750,000 to the War Claims Fund to pay remaining awards by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, 1958, a list of the religious claims paid as of that time, and a list of unpaid pending claims.

I am advised that the unpaid claims were all certified to the Treasury on October 29, 1958 and have now been paid. It is a great satisfaction and pleasure to me, therefore, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a final statement with respect to the claims of the religious groups and organizations, and to these acts of justice and equity by our Government to our Philippine friends and allies of all faiths and denominations.

A breakdown of the amounts paid to the several religious groups is as follows:

Catholic	$24,629,934.70
Protestant	4,062,718.02
Jewish	113,129.58

The list of claimants to whom amounts have been paid is as follows:

CLAIMS PAID

ROMAN CATHOLIC

	Amount of award
The Roman Catholic bishop of Lingayen	$79,839.71
Institute of the Daughters of Jesus	53,129.56
The Roman Catholic bishop of Leyte	75,063.56
Immaculate Conception Anglo-Chinese Academy	30,734.37
Cong. de Religiosas Dominicas de Sta. Cat. de Sena	622,780.75
The Roman Catholic archbishop of Manila	1,245,323.30
Hospital de San Juan de Dios	931,921.12
Community of the Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres	1,250,263.23
The Roman Catholic bishop of San Fernando	6,773.32
Cong. de Religiosas Misioneras de Santo Domingo	134,423.83
Congregation of the Religious of the Virgin Mary	684,646.03
Franciscan Sisters of the Immaculate Conception	39,919.39
Instituto de Hermanas Augustinas Terciarias de Filipinas	108,880.06
Roman Catholic Prelature "Nullius" of Iba	28,322.62
Beaterio del Santisimo Rosario	137,663.15
Foreign Mission Sisters of St. Dominic, Inc	194,174.64
Foreign Mission Sisters of St. Dominic (St. Paul's Hospital)	1,315,523.15
Madres Siervas del Espiritu Santo de la Ador, Perpetua	$500.00
Corporacion de PP Augustinos	1,113,774.30
Society of St. Columban	107,551.91
Sisters of the Good Shepherd	304,789.55
Community of Benedictine Sisters	803,605.68
Servants of the Holy Ghost	161,790.33
Maison de la Salle College	304,469.02
Christian Brothers	148,998.92
Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul	1,667,507.07
Society of the Divine Word	518,798.38
Assumption Convent, Inc	554,038.61
Ateneo de Cagayan	482,559.18
Missionary Canonesses of St. Augustine	1,033,597.81
Franciscan Missionaries of Mary	204,960.83
The Belgian Catholic Missionaries	60,179.54
Ateneo de Manila	1,954,860.95
Colegio de San Jose	331,418.22
Isabelle Cultural Corporation	935,229.10
Corp. de Padres Dominicos de Fil. and Univ. of Sto. Tomas	1,292,575.12
San Beda College	73,979.60
Knights of Columbus	115,874.55
Catholic Vicar Apostolic of Mt. Province	287,667.64
El Colegio de San Juan de Letran	583,016.54
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cagayan	205,541.23
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Zamboanga	391,500.75
El Observatorio de Manila	365,324.98
Ateneo de Naga	73,882.07
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Jaro	455,825.59
Corp. de Padres Dominicos de Filipinas	109,726.70
Congregation of Mission of St. Vincent de Paul	229,581.93
Oblates of Mary Immaculate	8,814.37
The Roman Catholic archbishop of Cebu	372,318.19
The Roman Catholic bishop of Lipa	556,675.59
The Roman Catholic bishop of Surigao	131,019.68
The Roman Catholic archbishop of Nueva Caceres	215,657.95
The Roman Catholic bishop of Nueva Segovia	300,485.52
La Provincia de San Nicolas de Tolentino de las Islas Filipinas de la Orden de Padres Agustinos Recoletos	153,609.17
The Roman Catholic bishop of Tuguegarao	270,891.92
The Roman Catholic bishop of Lucena	208,213.19
Catholic Women's League of the Philippines, Inc	21,450.00
Agustinian Recollect Missionaries of the Philippines	47,523.91
Colegio de Santa Rosa de Manila, Inc	530,767.31
Total	24,629,934.70

PROTESTANT

	Amount of award
Ilog Baptist Church	20,362.01
Seaside Baptist Church	3,371.00
Cosmopolitan Student Church	36,912.98
Domestic and Foreign Mission Society of Protestant Episcopalians	218,277.91
St. Luke's Hospital	20,908.32
Mary Johnston Hospital	12,482.50
Young Men's Christian Association of the Philippines	637,723.43
General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists	$384,816.98
Young Women's Christian Association of Manila	24,892.40
Bishop Mission District of Protestant Episcopalian Church in United States of America	227,926.14
Silliman University and Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America	365,860.43
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America	57,558.31
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America	5,363.46
Board of Foreign Mission of Presbyterian Church in United States of America	297,740.34
American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions	139,910.62
American Baptist Foreign Mission Society	589,191.00
St. Stephen's Chinese Girl's School	23,275.11
Women's Division of Christian Service of Board of Foreign Missions and Church Extension Methodist Church	440,478.32
Board of Foreign Missions of Presbyterian Church in United States of America	30,477.82
Central Philippine College	105,408.50
Philippine Union Mission Corp. of Seventh-day Adventists	25,121.92
Nabulao Baptist Church	3,025.00
Union Theological Seminary	56,313.52
The Church of Jesus Christ "New Jerusalem"	810.00
Philippine Annual Conference of Methodist Church	200,000.00
Northwest Philippines Annual Conference of the Methodist Church	42,500.00
Northern Philippines Annual Conference of the Methodist Church	57,500.00
Union Church of Manila	27,500.00
Philippine Mission Churches of Christ	5,000.00
Hinoba-an Baptist Church	1,485.00
Dinalupihan Methodist Church	525.00
Total	4,062,718.02

(In addition, there have been in claims and paid total amount of $2,332.50 to some individuals.)

JEWISH

National Jewish Welfare Board	$95,147.26
Jewish Community of the Philippines	17,982.32
Total	113,129.58

New Sources of Water Supply Through Utilization and Management—Address by Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, last week Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of

the Bureau of Reclamation, spoke at the Fourth Congress of the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage in Madrid, Spain, on the subject of new sources of water supply through improved utilization and management. His remarks set forth many of the ideas with respect to opportunities and needs for improving the utilization of our water resources that are emerging from the studies of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources which have been carried on during the past year. The statement, which I am inserting at the conclusion of my remarks, points out the future need and importance of making the most beneficial use of every drop of water in order that the requirements of expanding population and industry can be met. Among other matters, Mr. Dominy points up opportunities of reducing water losses due to evaporation, evapotranspiration, and seepage. He discusses weather modification, improved runoff management, demineralization, and reuse of water as being of importance in extending our supplies to meet future needs. The importance of improved water management on watersheds, on irrigation projects and on the farm, is stressed. I commend Mr. Dominy's talk to all who are interested in finding solutions to our problems of meeting water resources needs in the future.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that this address will make 2½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $202.50. I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the cost that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SOURCES OF WATER SUPPLY THROUGH IMPROVED UTILIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

(By Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, presented at the fourth congress, International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, Madrid, Spain, May 30, 1960)

INTRODUCTION

At mid-20th century, we who are engaged in water resource development face critical decisions. Despite the staggering proportions of our present water use and demands, the estimates of future needs are even greater. In many countries of the world, the problem of providing adequate water supplies is already acute. As the demand for water increases in direct proportion to the explosive increase of population and the rapid expansion of industrialization, the problem will soon become crucial.

The vital urgency of this situation and its implications on water resource undertakings can be emphasized by a few statistics. In 1650, the world population was about 600 million. During the next 300 years, this population more than quadrupled, until, by 1950, the world population was estimated at 2,689 million. Some experts foresee another quadrupling within the next hundred years. There may well be 9 billion people in the world by the year 2050.

This demographic yardstick may be applied another way. Every 24 hours, the world population increases by more than 120,000 people. In just 4 years, its population will increase by about 175 million, the equivalent of the present population of the United States.

This unparalleled rate of increase in population places a progressively greater demand on irrigated agriculture, because irrigated lands now produce food for perhaps 10 to 15 percent of the world's population. To maintain or improve standards of living these lands must produce much more food and fiber in the future. Similarly, the extraordinary industrial growth in many countries of the world with its accompanying increase in volume, variety, and complexity of associated water problems has brought great challenge to those who must develop and maintain reliable water supplies.

To meet these tremendous and intensive needs around this shrinking world of ours, there must be continuous progress toward the ultimate goal of making the most beneficial use of every drop of water. In the field of irrigation and drainage, there is an immediate need to reexamine our present technology to assure more efficient use of water supplies already developed. There is a particular need to evaluate promising techniques of obtaining additional water supplies through improved utilization and management. The time never was more propitious for such reexamination and evaluation.

This paper summarizes the broad aspects of several areas of research and development for increasing water supplies. These include reduction of reservoir evaporation, reduction of nonbeneficial evapotranspiration, reduction of seepage losses, control of precipitation, runoff management, reuse of water supplies, demineralization of water, improvement of land management and watershed techniques, and improvement of irrigation practices. In some of these areas, we have made considerable progress. In other areas we are only at the threshold of development.

I present this summary to the administrators, engineers, and other irrigation and drainage specialists of the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage in the sober conviction of urgency and with the hope that the countries of the world will utilize their technical skills and energies toward fuller utilization of present water supplies as well as the development of new supplies.

Reduction of losses

One opportunity to conserve water lies in possible manipulation and control of the hydrologic cycle. Three phases of the natural hydrologic cycle result in losses of water for man's use. These are evaporation, evapotranspiration, and seepage or infiltration. These losses all take place in the hydrologic cycle under natural conditions. In some cases, they can be reduced under the natural conditions to make more water available. Additional opportunities may occur for reducing water losses by imposing artificial changes in the natural hydrologic cycle.

Evaporation

Each year in the 17 western States of the United States 25 million acre-feet of water evaporate from exposed fresh water areas. Water resource development engineers have, for many years, given thought to or put into practice a number of methods for reducing evaporation loss from reservoirs. Among these are the following:

(a) Construction of reservoirs for holdover storage at the highest practicable altitude.

(b) Selection of reservoir sites to keep exposed water surface to a minimum.

(c) Operation of reservoirs, to the extent possible so they will be full during the time of year when evaporation losses are least.

(d) Use of roofs and enclosures.

(e) Diking off shallow areas.

(f) Protecting the reservoir with shelterbelt plantings and windbreaks.

(g) Where natural conditions and legal restrictions will permit, use of ground-water reservoirs for holdover storage.

To these methods we have recently added another—the use of a surface cover of the monomolecular type. This method gives great promise of effecting substantial reductions in evaporation loss from open water surfaces. Certain organic compounds have shown the ability to reduce evaporation loss when applied to a water surface as a compressed layer just one molecule thick. The Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with other Federal and local agencies has recently completed a full-scale test of this method. The results of this study justify further intensive work in perfecting the process.

In an extensive field trial a monomolecular layer of hexadecanol was applied to 2,500-acre Lake Hefner, a municipal water supply reservoir for Oklahoma City, Okla. The hydrologic evaluation based on water budget and energy budget measurements showed that during the period of treatment from July 7 through October 1, 1958, an overall reduction in evaporation of about 9 percent was achieved. The 9-percent savings was about one-fourth of the potential reduction which would have been attained at the water temperature experienced had all other circumstances been ideal.

This field test demonstrated for the first time that it is possible to apply and maintain for extensive periods a compressed monomolecular layer over large areas of a free water surface. However, the film is rapidly disrupted if wind velocities exceed 20 miles per hour for any length of time. The equipment used to spread the hexadecanol in this test was relatively crude. A marked reduction in the cost of application can be expected with better equipment. If a large market for hexadecanol develops for this purpose, the cost of materials will also be substantially less.

Evaporation reduction by this technique can be economically justified even if the alternative cost of water is considerably less than at Lake Hefner. The technical details of this study are discussed in another communication to this Congress.

Evapotranspiration

Evapotranspiration, sometimes called consumptive use, has been defined as the sum of the volumes of water used by the vegetative growth of a given area in transpiration and building of plant tissue, and that evaporated from the adjacent soil, snow, or intercepted precipitation. The basic purpose of irrigation is to supplement precipitation in supplying these water requirements.

The water used in the growth processes of plants having no economic or esthetic value is wasted and the loss may be of considerable importance in areas with limited water supplies. It is so important, in fact, that much attention is being given to the control of uneconomic plants in irrigated areas. The principal offender is the group of plants known as phreatophytes, which obtain their water supply from the zone of saturation either directly or through the capillary fringe. It is estimated that phreatophytes consume as much as 25 million acre-feet of water annually in the 17 Western States. Phreatophytes thrive along both natural and manmade water courses, in bottom lands, and on deltas built up by sediment deposition at the upper end of reservoirs. Conditions for the growth of phreatophytes are especially favorable where conveyance channels meander through bottom lands and marshy areas. Phreatophyte growths are reduced in these areas wherever feasible by straightening and rerouting channels. The usual methods of controlling phreatophytes to reduce evapotranspiration include chemicals and mechanical equipment.

Seepage

A large percentage of the irrigation water diverted from streams and reservoirs does not actually reach the farms even though the water may not be lost to the river basin. Tens of thousands of miles of irrigation canals and laterals suffer seepage and other losses up to as much as one-half of the amount of water diverted. An added eco-

nomic loss is that percolation of seepage water often produces drainage problems which are costly to alleviate.

Ponding tests are the chief method used to measure leakage from canals. These tests are quite expensive and require taking the canal out of service during the test. The Bureau of Reclamation is experimenting with a method of estimating seepage loss by continuous electrical logging. The results of these tests are only preliminary; however, this new method has promise of being effective in indicating leaky zones in canals.

The obvious method of controlling or eliminating seepage losses is to convey the water in lined canals or in pipe systems. Although not economically feasible in most areas pipe systems are used on many projects in the United States to distribute water. In many cases, this is done in order to supply water under pressure; however, substantial water savings also result.

For many years the Bureau of Reclamation through its lower-cost canal-lining program has investigated means of providing economical linings for canals and laterals. A variety of impervious linings have been field tested in an effort to find an economical method of reducing seepage losses. Through 1958, the Bureau had placed about 42 million square yards of lining in 1,660 miles of canals and laterals. We roughly estimate that the water saved is about 1 million acre-feet annually. The cost of these linings is fully justified by the value of the water conserved.

Excessive weed growth in canals increases losses from seepage and evapotranspiration. Experiments with herbicidal oils led to development of a plant poison that is toxic to aquatic plants in canals but is not significantly toxic when it reaches crop plants. The problem is to kill weeds without killing desirable plants.

Control of precipitation

Another phase of the hydrologic cycle over which man is seeking to exert some control is precipitation. Within the last 12 years the scientific and physical means of modifying weather have been demonstrated.

Weather modification is made through a process commonly referred to as cloud seeding. The fundamental principles underlying this process have been definitely established. The discussion of the method now centers around the questions "how well does it work?" "what are the specific conditions under which it works best?" and "what is the effect, if any, on nearby areas?" Continued research and application are necessary to answer these questions correctly.

Runoff management

Control of the runoff phase of the hydrologic cycle has been practiced for centuries by extensive use, throughout the world, of reservoirs to store and conserve natural runoff. There are many opportunities, however, to make better use of these reservoirs if we know just how much runoff will occur and when it will occur.

Improved hydrologic techniques and more comprehensive hydrologic and meteorologic data will permit more effective use of our water supplies. Likewise, improved methods of forecasting runoff from rainfall and snowmelt and the installation of additional observation and recording stations, plus the accumulation of records covering longer periods, will pay off in terms of more accurate planning and more efficient operation of water-control structures. The result will be better operation of multiple-purpose projects for maximum protection from floods and greater output of hydroelectric energy and, at the same time, will conserve the maximum amount of water for beneficial consumptive uses.

The radio-reporting rain gage network recently installed by the Bureau of Reclamation on uncontrolled tributaries of the Sacramento River below Shasta Dam in California, illustrates the benefits of an expanded meteorologic network combined with new techniques. These are "on-call" stations, from which increments of precipitation can be determined at any time. During heavy storms, data from these stations are coordinated with data from radio-reporting stream gages operated by the State and with data from stations of the Weather Bureau and Corps of Engineers. The operating office uses all these coordinated results in determining what reduction should be made in outflow from Shasta Lake to hold flood flows on Sacramento River to allowable amounts and to conserve water in Shasta Lake which would otherwise flow unused to the Pacific Ocean.

Reuse of water

Reuse of return flows in irrigated agriculture has been practiced for a very long time. Water subject to reuse often requires improvement in quality. The techniques for improvement vary according to whether the water is for municipal, industrial, or agricultural use. Industry frequently uses its waste water by recirculation. Reuse of water in industry does not reduce the consumptive use but greatly reduces the withdrawal use. Ordinarily, such reuse requires little or no treatment. Many industrial water requirements, particularly those for cooling, can be adequately fulfilled by salt water, although at a higher cost for equipment to resist the chemical reaction from the water.

Demineralization of water

Demineralization of water is not a new process. The seafaring Phoenicians knew about distillation of sea water and were able in their far-reaching ocean journeys to obtain sufficient water for their personal needs. Recent developments, however, have shown that it is possible through advanced chemical, physical, and thermodynamic technology to demineralize water in volumes unthought of a few years ago.

The Office of Saline Water of the U.S. Department of the Interior, organized in 1952, has in the few years of its existence contributed extensively to the knowledge of demineralization. In the course of the extensive investigations carried out under sponsorship of the Office of Saline Water, a great many physically sound methods of demineralization have been investigated. The Congress of the United States has authorized the expenditure of $10 million for construction of pilot or demonstration plants to expand and supplement research and development in this field.

There are two general approaches to demineralization of water; one is to take the water away from the salt and the other is to take the salt away from the water. The common practice of demineralization is to take the water away from the salt. Freezing is an example of this method. It is based on the principle known to inhabitants of arctic regions that the first ice crystals to form in saline water consist of pure water. There are many variations to this basic process.

A recent series of improvements in a method known for decades separates the salt from the water by the electrodialysis process. Here semipermeable membranes assist in demineralization of saline water when the solution is subjected to the passage of a direct current. This process offers greatest promise of economic success in brackish water areas.

The present cost of sea water demineralization is not much above the amount which thirsty residential communities in the United States are willing to pay for municipal water. The cost of converting inland waters of lower salinity is proportionately less. A community of 6,000 people in California, has recently constructed a saline water demineralization plant to obviate hauling in water by tank car.

It may be many years before demineralization is economically feasible for providing irrigation water. However, use of these processes to provide municipal and industrial water supplies shows promise of increasing application.

Management of water use

As we await the fruition of research to increase our water supplies through demineralization and evaporation control, steady, and important progress is being made in other important fields of water conservation. These include improved practices on the farm and increased water yield through watershed management programs. The developments in this area of water conservation complement the overall conservation of the irrigated land resources. We can no longer tolerate the belief, unfortunately widely held, that permanent high productivity is not to be expected from irrigated land. What, then, is needed to insure sustained high productivity on lands now irrigated and to provide additional new water supplies?

Foremost in any such action is more accurate local and regional evaluation of the water resources. Planning multiple-purpose resouces projects requires establishment of a balance between the competitive needs for water. Water must be allocated to fulfill the need for the essential uses in an area; without such allocation the most efficient use of water cannot be achieved. Such allocations must foresee, and should be predicated upon, the premise of conservation use by each water-using entity. We now have within our means the techniques that must be applied.

Watershed management

Management of watersheds to increase water supply and maintain water yields holds promise of augmenting the dwindling supply. Techniques involved in obtaining increased runoff from forests are being advanced by U.S. Forest Service studies in Colorado. Other studies in California have shown that in some cases increases in runoff have exceeded an equivalent of 1 to 2 inches of depth over the entire watershed. This result has been obtained by programs of vegetation management involving the conversion of brush to desirable forage species. Programs such as these pursued in areas devoted to livestock production provide a dual benefit through improvement of ranges and increased water yields. Substitution of grasses for the more deeply rooted brush species limits water use to the upper portion of the soil profile. The removal of the brush canopy associated with such species prevents high interception. Thus, a grass cover makes more water available for runoff.

Not only should the watershed programs be aimed at increasing yield, but they must also contribute to the reduction of the sediment load. The reservoir site should be regarded as a nonrenewable resource.

Water management in the irrigation project

On the farm a measure of water conservation is provided by the farm irrigation efficiency. This efficiency, defined as the ratio of irrigation consumptive use to the total farm delivery varies from 5 to 95 percent. Reasonable efficiencies for the irrigation art as it now exists, may be in a range of 55 to 70 percent. For many areas and conditions present efficiencies are not good enough; the art must be coupled with science and engineering to raise them. Over the years many methods of irrigation have been developed, all of which fall into the categories of surface, subsurface, and sprinkler irrigation. But regardless of the method, the aim should be the same—uniform water application over the field without harm to crop or soil, with the water, labor, and other inputs balanced to provide a maximum economic gain.

Maximum economic gains can be obtained by prudent farm managers if those responsible for development of irrigation projects construct distribution systems that are integrated with the onfarm requirements for water. A prerequisite for efficient water use on the farm is a distribution system that delivers enough water so the farmer can apply the correct amount to the proper depth at required time intervals.

Management of water on the farm

As we plan new irrigation developments, water savings can be realized by a careful process of allocating water to the land. Fundamental in any such process is a careful evaluation of the land through land classification. Higher efficiencies can be attained only if the available land resource is suitable for irrigation. Efficient use of water is difficult to realize when the infiltration rate of the soil is less than 0.1 or greater than 5 inches per hour. Since water is generally the limiting resource, its use should be reserved for those lands which can return the highest net production. The Bureau of Reclamation has developed a method of land classification that defines both the economic and physical factors essential in selecting lands suitable for irrigation. Its proper application insures more efficient use of water long before the irrigation farmer picks up his shovel or turns a valve.

In the United States, it is possible that tomorrow's engineers will be more concerned with water management than with water development projects. Adequate control and accurate measurement of flows throughout the conveyance system are necessary for successful management of an irrigation project. An equitable distribution of water to the farmlands, a minimum of wastage, and general conservation of the available water supply can result only from control and measurement. Accurate measurements of flows are difficult to obtain under field conditions. For a number of years, the Bureau of Reclamation through its water measurement program has investigated and improved means of obtaining accurate measurements in the projects, particularly at the farm turnout. An education program is carried on continually to improve measurement practices.

The advent of heavy earthmoving equipment provides control over the irrigated land surface not heretofore possible. Land preparation to allow comparatively large heads of water to be applied in short time intervals makes possible high irrigation efficiencies. Examples are new land preparation techniques involving contour benches and level basins. With these techniques, applied to fields having an original slope in a range of 1 to 3 percent, a farm irrigation efficiency of 55 percent may reasonably be expected to increase to 80 percent.

While irrigation efficiency is a useful convention for engineering purposes, it does not provide the full measure of our interest. Viewed in its broadest aspect, we must ultimately consider irrigation efficiency in terms of unit yield per unit of water. If crops are being grown to provide protein, then a useful measure of irrigation efficiency would be the amount of protein produced per unit of water on a given area.

Water conservation viewed in this light presents another group of farm practices that result in water savings. The principle here is that adequate fertility is essential for the efficient use of soil moisture. An outstanding example is reported by the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, where corn receiving fertilizer yielded 79 bushels per acre and required 16 inches of water. Corn grown without fertilizer produced 18 bushels and required about 14 inches of water. Research at Yuma, Ariz., conducted by the agricultural research service in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation, also showed this relationship between water efficiency and fertility level. Here it was found that water use varied nearly 100 percent between different levels of phosphorous fertilization. When 800 pounds of P205 per acre was applied over a 3-year period a ton of alfalfa was produced from 7.08 acre-inches of water. It required 14.2 acre-inches of water to produce a ton of alfalfa when only 100 pounds of P205 per acre was applied. When practices such as this are supplemented with the giant strides being made through the chemical control of weeds and insects, more efficient use of water now available will be accomplished.

A continuous education program is necessary to attain efficient use of water on the farm. This is important in the United States, and I am sure it is no less important in other countries. The best research program and the best experimental farms will not increase a country's crop production unless the results of the research are actually applied by the farmers. As previously stated, studies have shown that, if more water is applied to crops which formerly received insufficient water, there may be little increase in production unless more fertilizer is also applied. Similarly, if maximum returns from high rates of fertilizer application are to be obtained, there must be a sufficient number of plants to utilize efficiently the fertilizer applied. The results of these studies will not increase national crop production unless the information is passed on to the farmer who actually uses it in his farming practices.

Large reservoirs, long canals, and extensive distribution systems are fine monuments to the engineer and the engineering profession. What the world needs, however, is more food, not more monuments. Therefore, I urge a balanced program. Let us continue to build well-designed and soundly constructed water facilities. But let us also instruct our farmers how to use efficiently the water made available by these facilities. The value of this educational program cannot be overemphasized.

CONCLUSION

This brief discussion of the broad aspects of several areas of research and development for increasing our water supplies points out some of the problems and opportunities ahead. The need for maximum use of our water is commanding and real teamwork is essential between chemists, geologists, engineers, economists, and agricultural specialists. Research, planning, and construction must proceed at an increasing rate to make the promise of today the actuality of tomorrow. There is much to be done, and we should set ourselves to the task of doing it promptly, cooperatively, and vigorously.

SUMMARY

At mid-20th century, those who are engaged in water resource development face critical decisions. Despite the staggering proportions of present water use and demands, the estimates of future world needs are even greater. In many countries of the world, the problem of providing adequate water supplies is already acute. As the demand for water increases in direct proportion to the explosive increase of population and the rapid expansion of industry, the problem will become crucial. To meet these tremendous and intensive needs around the world, there must be continuous progress toward the ultimate goal of making the most beneficial use of every drop of water. In the field of irrigation and drainage, there is particular need to reexamine present technology to assure more efficient use of water supplies already developed. This paper summarizes briefly the broad aspects of several areas of research and development for increasing water supplies. These areas include reduction of reservoir evaporation, reduction of nonbeneficial evapotranspiration, reduction of seepage losses, control of precipitation, runoff management, reuse of water supplies, demineralization of water, improvement of land management and watershed techniques, and improvement of irrigation practices.

Independent Bankers Elect, Honor DuBois at Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the many Members of the House who are friends of Ben DuBois will want to join in congratulating him on his reelection as secretary of the Independent Bankers Association and on the celebration of his 75th birthday.

His reelection marks the 27th term he has served in the 30 years since the organization was founded. Members of the House know him as an able and vigorous spokesman for his organization and as a personal friend.

Under unanimous consent I include a story from the Sauk Centre (Minn.) Herald, published on June 2:

INDEPENDENT BANKERS ELECT, HONOR DUBOIS AT CONVENTION

Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, was elected to his 27th term as secretary of Independent Banker's Association at the 27th annual convention of the association in Denver, Colo., last week.

Howard Bell, also of Sauk Centre, was elected assistant secretary.

The convention marked the 30th anniversary of the IBA, which was begun at Glenwood in 1930 with 28 members. Today, the organization has 5,800 members in 39 States.

Three Minnesota bankers, surviving founders of the association, were presented with diamond-studded pins at the annual banquet. They are Edward S. Olson, president of the First National Bank at Starbuck; Norman H. Tallakson, chairman of the board of the Bank of Willmar; and DuBois.

O. D. Hansen, president of the Bank of Union County, Elk Point, S. Dak., was elected president of the association for the coming year.

Special tribute was paid to DuBois and his wife, Cecile, at the banquet. The convention gave them a rising ovation for their efforts in building the association and they were presented with 30 $100 savings bonds, one for each year of the IBA's existence.

DuBois also celebrated his 75th birthday at the convention on May 22.

A wide range of speakers discussed the economic, agricultural international and political prospects for the coming decade.

Included in the speakers were Roswell Garst of Coon Rapids, Iowa.

Garst told the convention that by 1970, American farmers will be giving 215 million people in the United States a better diet even though they farm less land and use less labor to do it.

Garst is the Iowa farmer who is a seed corn producer and who was host to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev last fall.

The increased farm production will be due to increasing use of nitrogen fertilizers and more mechanization, Garst said. Through

the period of expansion, farmers will call more and more upon bankers for credit, he said and he urged bankers to study the farmer's problems carefully in order to make wise allocations of credit.

Tribute to the Late Jane Addams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on March 23 of this year our former greatly respected colleague, Dr. Frank P. Graham, paid a tribute to the late Miss Jane Addams at a dinner sponsored by the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom. I ask unanimous consent that this fine address by Dr. Graham be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JANE ADDAMS

(By Dr. Frank P. Graham)

Jane Addams, one of the noblest spirits of western history, was founder of Hull House and one of the founders and first president of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. If alive today Jane Addams would be calling the women of the world for ending the downward drift toward universal annihilation. In a peoples-to-peoples movement she would muster the women in the upward struggle for more effective international cooperation in a more adequate United Nations for the more inclusive collective security of freedom, justice, compassion, and peace on the earth.

She would remind us that in this world of the precarious peace of deterrent terror the panicked press of a button could end the human race as the global winds would carry the hydrogen fallout to the remnants of people as they would make their last huddle on remotest islands and in farthest igloos. Without appeasement of injustice and tyranny and against fearful and haphazard drift, the call of this late hour is for nothing less than the survival of the human race.

Jane Addams was born in 1860 in Cedarville, Ill., a village in which she developed a sense of neighborhood and brotherhood which was to widen across the great city of Chicago, the spreading continent of America and the shrinking planet of the expanding family of man, inclusive of all races, colors, classes, and nationalities. The early motherless daughter and lively companion of her adoring father, John Addams, she was both daughter and son to him who was a Hicksite Quaker, a prosperous businessman, State legislator, and militant friend of Abraham Lincoln. The spiritual concerns and the executive ability of the father carried on in the daughter.

In her youth she was moved both by the moral indignation of the Hebrew prophets against injustice and by their dreams of a warless world. She became steeped in the original Greek of the Gospels and had communion with the nonviolent teachings and spirit of Jesus for carrying far and near the joy of service and the sacrificial compassion of the cross with its call to heroism in the sharing and giving of life.

As honor student and representative of Rockford College in a statewide oratorical contest she was a runner-up to none other than the youthful and eloquent William Jennings Bryan, whose centennial year is also 1960. The subject of her oration cast forward the shadows, the lights, the fights, and the substance of things to come as she championed the rights of women in our lopsided society.

Such was her rootage in the soil of Illinois from which was to grow in holiness of dedication, joy of service and valor of life one of the great humane pioneers of these hundred years, the very efflorescence of the world's womanhood.

Jane Addams, in response to her inner concerns, reminds us of the heroic spirit of Joan of Arc, who, while burning at the stake refused to renounce her inner voices; and of Florence Nightingale, who challenged vested political bureaucracy and military redtape to bring a woman's healing aid and hope to youth lying wounded and neglected on the world's battlefields. In our day their example and Jane Addams' spirit carry on in America's Eleanor Roosevelt, who has infused a later generation of youth with valorous compassion, whether down in a West Virginia coal mine or up in a plane on the way to a youthful forum in a southern community or contending in the sessions of the United Nations for the universal declaration of human rights.

Jane Addams was concerned with everything which affected the freedom, dignity, and welfare of human being, whether the garbage of the west side tenement of Chicago, the low wages and long hours of women and children in sweatshops, the plight of Negroes, unorganized workers, voiceless immigrants, playless children, and voteless women, in a society too much based on human exploitation in a world to much given to war and inhuman desolation.

One does not have to agree with all her approaches to the complex problems of war and peace to have unbounded admiration for the integrity of her spirit and the courage of her dedication to the cause of peace. Despite their deep antagonisms and fears, and the posture of their struggle, if the nations at war in 1915 could and would have surmounted their realism with her idealism and responded to the resolutions of the women gathered at The Hague, it is not too much to conjecture that there might have been no Hitler and no Stalin but a cooperation of nations through the earlier formulation and more adequate fulfillment of Wilson's 14 points for the self-determination of peoples, cultural interchange, reciprocal trade, economic development of underdeveloped areas, and international organization of justice and peace in the world.

Deeply resourced in the compassionate understanding and love of people, unmoved by the vicious attacks of vested privilege and undaunted by the storms of fear and prejudice which beat about her devoted head, Jane Addams gave a new content and direction to social work in America and a deeper and wider sense of the responsibility of women for human dignity, freedom, and peace in the world.

The life and struggles of Jane Addams in another generation moves us to say that in this generation she would stand against the wasteful extravagance and damaging pleasures of a private prosperity and the short-visioned public poverty of a falsely "affluent society" in peril for its very existence. She would stand for a bolder allocation to the national income for basic, scientific, industrial, agricultural, social, and humane research; for schools, health, hospitals, decent housing, playgrounds, and the fine arts; and the conservation of soils, forests, water, and rivers for multiple service of the people. She would stand today against racketeering and violence by any union and for the equal rights of collective bargaining in all the States.

She would stand for Federal aid to the States for schools now urgently necessary for the equal educational opportunity of all children in all the States, who, in our dynamically free and mobile national society, are to become citizens of the Nation as well as citizens of the States. She would organize the destructive youthful gangs on the city streets into youthful clubs for play and wholesomely creative activities, exemplified both by her Hull House Clubs and by the nationally promoted 4-H Clubs of rural youth with their high morale for youthful production and all-round development.

In this time of national crisis she would stand, as a matter of moral right in the Nation, and moral power in the world, for obedience to the law of the land, in the widening interpretation of the Supreme Court of the meaning of freedom in the old Bill of Rights, and the meaning of the equal protection of the laws in the new Bill of Rights, outlawing discrimination on account of race in the use of public facilities in education, transportation, recreation, and suffrage. She would stand today with the college youth, colored and white, north and south, east and west, who, with the Bible or the Constitution in their hands, prayers in their hearts, and the national anthem on their lips, petition in lawful nonviolence, that the stores, which sell to the public, provide for the same price, the same quantity, and quality of services to all people.

She would stand in Illinois and in United States for the inclusion in the American heritage and hope, the agricultural workers now excluded from the scope of much Federal legislation, and the migrant workers who wander from State to State, season to season, crop to crop, rootless, homeless, too often defenseless and sometimes hopeless in the land of the Pilgrim's hopes.

She would stand with Martin Luther King, who receives his inspiration from Jesus, his techniques from Gandhi, and his guidance from his noble and wise preceptors, Benjamin Mays of Georgia and Channing Tobias of Alabama and New York, as he preaches the gospel of love and understanding for meeting the forces of prejudice and fear. In ultimate faith, the cross, warm with the blood of human brotherhood, will triumph over all the crosses lighted with the hot oil of fear, prejudice, and power.

In this time of crisis in the world she would, I believe, stand for effective universal disarmament, a standby international peace force, long-range technical assistance and economic development programs, self-determination of people, emphasis on the moral power of recommendations made by seven members of the Security Council and two-thirds majority of the General Assembly of the United Nations in the three fields of disarmament, membership, and the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the establishment of the jurisdiction of the United Nations over the international problems of the polar regions and outer space.

As the roads of human destiny fatefully cross in the alternative between universal annihilation of people and more effective cooperation of nations through the United Nations, may this commemoration of the centennial of Jane Addams mean the rededication of us all to equal justice under law and human brotherhood under God in this time of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Excerpts From Life Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following articles taken from a recent issue of Life Lines, a great American publication:

URBAN RENEWAL

Public housing is one of the favorite programs of the big spenders who, with deliberate intent, are changing the traditional constitutional Government of America. A new aspect of Federal housing has come to the forefront recently. This is what is called the urban renewal program.

Urban renewal, simply stated, is a federally financed program of city planning under which municipal governments are authorized to seize homes and other private property and resell them, at below cost, to other private citizens, who agree to develop the area in accordance with the plan of the municipal urban renewal commission.

The tremendous power of eminent domain is vested in a city's urban renewal commission. Eminent domain is the right of government to take private property for necessary public use after making a reasonable payment to the owner.

Eminent domain can be a very dangerous power. In extending the power to take private property for necessary public use, the meaning of "necessary public use" clearly must be limited very strictly, or no one can consider his property safe from seizure. We have to recognize that when government reaches for more power in order to do things that are said to be in the public interest, there are always special interests and individuals who stand to profit from the proposed government activity.

THE FEDERAL GIVEAWAY

The promoters of urban renewal insist that there will be no Federal control or meddling in local affairs. The propaganda line on this is that the people of any given community might just as well get their share of the Federal giveaway because they will have to help pay for it anyway. This is, as you will see at once, a mistaken line of thinking. Freedome is being destroyed in America under the fallacious idea that Government has something to give to the people. Actually, Government has nothing except what it receives from the people.

The big Government planners are set on increasing Federal controls, never lessening them. Before a city gets its so-called Federal aid for an urban renewal project, it has to submit a workable program to the Federal authorities. Naturally, the Federal powers determine what constitutes a workable program. Federal control always accompanies Federal aid.

At present the Federal Government is engaged in more than 40 different housing programs. The total sum provided in money or credit for housing subsidies since 1933 amounts to approximately $2,300 for every family now living in the United States. It is hardly surprising that the General Accounting Office has uncovered widespread irregularities in the Federal slum clearance and urban renewal programs.

In addition to its cost to the taxpayers, this forcible Government grab of private property hurts many innocent people. Poor families, who have paid for very modest, but decent and livable, homes are uprooted and told to move elsewhere. Well-established small business concerns are wrecked. One study of this problem showed that storekeepers evicted to make way for development projects face a 5-to-1 likelihood of being finished as self-sustaining businessmen. It is not easy to rebuild a business in a new location.

There is no escaping the fact that the urban renewal program, no matter what else may be said about it, represents a further encroachment by big Government on the rights of American citizens. If America is to retain any part of its freedom, somewhere a halt will have to be called to the spread of the welfare State idea.

Let us remember, and never forget, that liberty does not come from Government. The history of liberty in the world is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. The mistaken, enemies of freedom, put forth tremendous efforts to obscure this simple fact. But it neverthelees remains a fact and one we can ignore only at our peril.

MISTAKEN PLOTTERS

If we are to avoid complacency and all the grave dangers resulting from it, we need to be reminded from time to time that the mistaken enemies of all individual freedom are constantly at work. One public official who periodically jars us to the realization that the international plot to destroy our way of life is not imaginary is J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Just recently Mr. Hoover—who is thoroughly familiar with the machinations in the U.S. Communist Party—warned that "blindness and lethargy" regarding subversive organizations have reached dangerous proportions within the last year. He noted that pro-Soviet elements have a tight grip on the U.S. party's reins and that among those in high places in the mistaken conspiracy is an ex-convict who had openly testified that he prefers a Soviet America.

In numbers there are few card-carrying American Communists. There are thousands more dupes than actual members. But whether they work wittingly or unwittingly for the conspiracy, they are an ever-present danger. And let us remember this: Though few in numbers, the domestic Communist is just as dedicated to the mistaken cause as a Russian or a Chinese Communist.

Mr. Hoover does well to warn us against "blindness and lethargy." We will do well to heed his warning.

FOR AMERICAN BUSINESS

This is a time when American businessmen must be skillful at more—much more—than business operation.

The aim of the personal enterprise system is to serve the common good by meeting basic needs and supplying the extra human satisfactions desired by man. The ability of American business to meet this standard depends in the final analysis on the climate in which business is conducted. And the business climate depends in turn, to a great extent, on the understanding and action based on understanding of people engaged in business.

This means understanding of the personal enterprise system. It means understanding of the basic economics and morals of our freedom and well-being. It means understanding of current issues affecting the usefulness of business to all the public. And it means understanding the duty of the individual as a citizen to work today and every day for the maintenance of freedom in America.

This kind of understanding needs to be gained by the American businessman. And then it needs to be disseminated by him. This is not a time when the work of spreading such understanding can be considered an extracurricular activity. For if American business does not throw its full strength into the effort to maintain freedom, then the day will surely come when there will be no personal enterprise system and no private business based on that system.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Job for the Voters," published in the Arizona Republic, of April 20, 1960, concerning the present farm situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB FOR THE VOTERS

The farm problem isn't getting much attention in Congress, possibly because most lawmakers are frankly uncertain about public opinion on this explosive issue. For a good many years, the politically minded Congressman was safe in simply voting for bigger and better farm subsidies. But those days are gone, and the public is beginning to realize that Congress had better do something more sensible than pile one crop surplus on top of another.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has just released the following facts about existing farm programs, based on records in the Department of Agriculture:

1. Since the price support programs began in the 1930's, the loss to the taxpayers has been more than $15 billion.

2. For several years, the Commodity Credit Corporation, administering laws passed by Congress, has been losing more than $1 billion annually.

3. The Government is spending more than $1 billion a year simply to store surpluses.

4. By July 1, the Government will have more than $10 billion invested in price-supported commodities. If no wheat at all were grown next year, we could meet all domestic and export needs and have 350 million bushels left on July 1, 1961.

5. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has pointed out that farm programs are "costing the taxpayers the most money ever paid out by any government to subsidize agriculture."

On February 9, President Eisenhower sent his annual farm message to Congress. He was conciliatory in tone, saying it was up to Congress to decide whether there would be farm legislation this year. He repeated some previously suggested proposals, including junking the outmoded parity formula, reducing price supports, and eliminating wheat acreage and marketing quotas beginning in 1961.

These are faltering steps in the right direction. As The Republic pointed out in a recent series, the best way to help the farmer is to set him free of all Government controls and restrictions. It is no coincidence that the farm situation is worst in those commodities which have price supports. Secretary Benson was right when he said, "Four-fifths of our agriculture is free of controls—and doing pretty well. The commodities that are now in the most trouble, and that have been for years, are those that looked to Government supports and Government controls for their pros-

perity—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts."

And yet Congress, because it fears the voter reaction in the farm belt, continues to treat the farm problem as a sacred cow. The vote in November should jolt Congressmen back to their senses. The voters should overwhelmingly reject all candidates who believe that the only way to help the farmer is to increase his dependence on the Government. Price supports, subsidies, and acreage restrictions must be ended if the national farm program scandal is to be prevented from growing out of all proportions.

Sewer System for Dulles International Airport

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12063) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I note with great pleasure that this body has unanimously acted favorably on the bill H.R. 12063. This bill, which was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is entitled, "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system."

I am highly gratified with the thorough and expeditious manner in which the District of Columbia Committee, chaired by the distinguishted gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], acted to bring to the floor this highly important piece of legislation which not only affects Dulles Airport and the District of Columbia but also a wide area of northern Virginia and part of Maryland.

The Senate District Committee has acted just as expeditiously as the House committee in reporting an equivalent bill to the other body, which I am certain will act just as favorably on this important measure.

We are all cognizant of the ever-increasing need for Dulles International Airport due for the most part to the rapid replacement of conventional aircraft by jet-powered planes combined with the ever-increasing air traffic which the other nearby airfield will soon find impossible to handle. The jets are barred from the use of the nearby National Airport for a variety of practical reasons, the main one being limited landing area.

An important problem that came up in the construction plans for the Dulles Airport was how to get rid of sewage without polluting the District of Columbia water supply. This bill, H.R. 12063, solves this vital problem. The bill also allows for the usage of the sewage system by the ever-expanding suburban areas touching on the District.

The other day, I flew over the construction site of the marvelous Dulles Airport in a single-motored plane. To me it was a beautiful picture. On the highways, the trip to the new airport from the Nation's Capital should not take more than 20 to 30 minutes. The airport will service jets coming and going to and from all points of the globe. Needless to say, at present we must travel the distance to Baltimore's Friendship Airport for jet travel.

I think it is wonderful that we had this concept of a fine airport to effectively service the Nation's Capital and I commend Mr. BROYHILL, and the other gentleman from Virginia and Maryland, on their exhaustive efforts in behalf of this highly beneficial project.

Texans Lead at the Naval Academy and the Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate, each of my able and distinguished colleagues, has a rightful pride in his native State. But it is with more than normal pride that today I call attention to a signal honor that has come to Texas.

At the U.S. Naval Academy and at the U.S. Military Academy, outstanding young Texans ranked first in each of their respective graduating classes.

Cadet Charles P. Ostott will be graduated tomorrow as the No. 1 man in his class—both academically and militarily. This is an unusual distinction held by only eight other graduates since 1871.

Tomorrow, at Annapolis, another outstanding young Texan, Midshipman Alton K. Thompson, will graduate at the head of his 798-man class.

Interestingly, both of these young men are graduates of the same high school—Highland Park High School at Dallas. Their achievements give that school a clean sweep of honors at both of these great American institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that two news dispatches concerning graduation ceremonies at West Point and Annapolis—one from the Washington Star of June 5, 1960, and the other from the New York Times of the same date—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1960]

TEXAN IS TOP GRADUATE OF ANNAPOLIS

ANNAPOLIS, MD., June 4.—Midshipman Alton K. Thompson, of Dallas, Tex., will be graduated at the head of the Naval Academy's 798-man class next Wednesday.

The Academy announced today that the 21-year-old midshipman, who also commands the 3,600-man brigade at the Academy, led his class scholastically with an average of 3.74 of a possible 4.0 for his 4 years.

His position as honor man gives Highland Park High School in Dallas a sweep of top honors at the Naval and Military Academies. Midshipman Thompson's former schoolmate in Dallas, Cadet Charles Paddock Otstott, will be graduated at the head of West Point's senior class.

Midshipman Tracy C. Tucker, of Sheridan, N.Y., finished second at Annapolis with an average of 3.72. Midshipman Robert M. Walters, of Madison, N.J., was third with 3.70.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 5, 1960]

ODDS FAVOR NO. 1 CADET MAKING GENERAL

WEST POINT, N.Y.—Cadet Charles P. Otstott has a better than average chance of rising to the rank of general—if past records mean anything.

Cadet Otstott, 23, of Dallas, Tex., will be graduated first in his class at the U.S. Military Academy next Wednesday. He is No. 1 man academically and militarily, an unusual distinction held by only eight other graduates since 1871, the Academy said today.

Of the eight, at least four won their general stars—including General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, class of 1903.

The others: Smith Leach, class of 1875; Maj. Gen. James A. Woodruff, 1899; Edward N. Johnston, 1901; Brig. Gen. Frederick S. Strong, Jr., 1910; Col. Charles J. Barrett, 1922; Brig. Gen. Kenneth E. Fields, 1933, and Lee D. Olvey, 1955.

AMA Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of May 22, 1960, entitled "AMA Statesmanship":

AMA STATESMANSHIP

The American Medical Association deserves credit for its statesmanship in staging its conference in Chicago on health insurance plans. Few current national issues are more important, and to more people, than protection from the economic hazards of illness, and few have been more bedeviled by bitter controversy—to which the AMA has contributed its share in the past. But at Chicago a supreme, and successful, effort was made to get all those involved in health insurance on an even keel, with mutual understanding as to the course to steer by.

By invitation of the AMA—and for the first time in history—leaders of organized medicine, labor, industry, voluntary health insurance plans, and the insurance companies spent 2 days in a remarkably amicable discussion of how protection is now being given and how those that give it could do a better job. Opposing economic theories and present political issues were, by common consent, ruled out and, except for outside speakers, with good effect. And the widely held conviction that, if privately provided protection fails to meet the public need and demand, the Government would take over, gave the meetings a sense of urgency.

The whole affair was an impressive demonstration that the medical profession has come to realize that, apart from therapy itself, doctors should not have a monopoly in the field of medical care. There was a welcome professional interest in, and tolerance of, diversity and experiment in the administration and economics of medical care—and a recognition of the part which its consumers can and should take in these new directions. There should be more such meetings and it is good news that the AMA's council on medical service will recommend a program for them to the association's convention at Miami Beach next month.

Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Competition," published in the Burlington Free Press of June 2, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN COMPETITION

No one, whether he be business manager, labor leader, employee, or consumer, cain fail to be concerned these days with the future of the American economy, so far as it relates to foreign competition.

The flood of foreign goods—goods marketed at half the price we can make them for, continues to inundate U.S. ports. And if we are to face up to the matter objectively we must acknowledge that many of these are better in quality and performance than our own.

The list is not limited as it once was to a few specialized items like watches but is becoming increasingly varied and increasingly embarrassing to domestic manufacturers. Steel, wool, toys, electrical products, oil, tools, leather—the long list gets longer every day. The more we buy from Europe or the East in relation to what foreign countries buy from us, the greater the outflow of gold from own own reserves.

Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, recently declared that America's prosperity, hence its security, depended upon a continued and substantial export surplus. He said that we have never been faced with such intensive competition and that we had better cut costs by increasing efficiency or we would be priced out of the world markets. Economists in predicting that the alarming outflow of gold from this country in 1959 would be checked in 1960, are keeping their fingers crossed.

The Commerce Department estimated that in March of this year our foreign purchases amounted to well over one and a third billion dollars, which was a 5-percent increase over February. While the value of exports (chiefly farm products and jetliners) was higher than that of imports during March, and higher than the same month last year by 20 percent, they were not as high as predicted.

The year-to-year trend of American exports has been down. The United States' share of the total of the world's trade in manufactured goods has been slipping, while that of Germany, France, Japan, Italy, and the Netherlands has gained dramatically. The ironic part of the picture is that our heaviest competitors are countries which we helped set up in business with Marshall plan dollars and machines after the war.

While it seems doubtful under present conditions that we can reverse the downward trend of our exports except temporarily, the level of imports obviously has not yet reached its peak. The American automobile manufacturers, for example, felt confident that when they put their compact cars on the market they could stem the tide from Europe, but such has not yet been the case. Right now imports of the two largest selling foreign cars are larger than last year.

American manufacturers, beset by high operating costs and burdensome taxes, and attracted by opportunities in Europe, are establishing plants abroad at a record pace. During the last 18 months more than 100 U.S. corporations have established oversea headquarters in Switzerland.

The export-import balance shifts from month to month, so forecasts even of the immediate future are difficult to make, depending as they do upon a variety of factors. But one thing is clear; the future is not going to be as kind to American exports as has the past, since more and more foreign countries are becoming industrialized—many with our foreign aid dollars.

There is plenty of business to go around in prosperous times, but in the event of a recession, with domestic and foreign manufacturers competing vigorously for the available business, imports might become critically burdensome. Curiously enough, labor probably stands to suffer as much or more than any other group at such a time. It is America's auto workers, for example, not the retailers of cars, who suffer from foreign competition. Filling in their own lines with products from subsidiaries abroad, American manufacturers can always supply cars to their dealers, whether foreign or domestic. But whether U.S. assembly lines and the men standing before them are idle or busy will depend to an increasingly large extent upon the burgeoning volume of cars from overseas.

Labor leaders in this country believe that the rise in wage levels in Europe will close the gap between hourly rates there and in the United States. This will not happen overnight, and may be wishful thinking if our rates continue to go up in proportion.

Meanwhile, if either labor or management gets badly caught in the squeeze of foreign competition it would not be at all surprising to hear cries for tariffs raised on every side. If tariffs were raised our allies would retaliate by raising theirs and the hard work that has been accomplished to bind the western countries into an economic and political entity would be undone.

The most obvious solution to the problem is to keep our goods competitive in price and quality with those of Europe. This would mean, first, a stable dollar, which in turn would mean a careful policing of Government expenditures. Politics and deficit budgets being what they are these days this remedy is not going to be easy to apply. Then, of course, there are the economies affected by automation, but automation, too, is having to thread its way through heavy interference.

When and if the shoe of competition really begins to pinch, the United States will, by these or other stratagems, either meet competition or fail to meet it. It is a matter of the survival of the fittest. If we do not remain competitive we must be prepared to yield our economic supremacy to other nations.—R.N.H.

Recognition of Communist China Would Be Grave Error—Dubious Benefits and Certain Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing so useful for dispelling illusions or doctrinaire positions as a firsthand look at facts. It is too bad that so few who are writing about American policy in Asia have visited recently the countries holding the line for freedom around Communist China. Such a study on the ground would soon make clear what the inevitable effect on those countries would be if the United States were to grant recognition to Red China. It would give vastly increased prestige and influence and power to their enemy and inevitably shake their confidence in us. Mr. Melvin Whiteleather of the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia is one writer who is personally checking on those points in the Far East and his clear and frank appraisal of the situation follows:

[From the Evening Bulletin, May 31, 1960]

ONLY POWER OF UNITED STATES DETERS MAO'S EXPANSIONISM IN ASIA

(By Melvin K. Whiteleather)

HONG KONG.—To all believers in recognition of Communist China, greetings.

But you're on the wrong track.

In the Far East, around China's rim, our China policy looks considerably different than it does at home.

What happens to the Chinese Nationalists is of little or no concern here, but there is great concern over the mass of Chinese on the mainland.

Saving Chiang Kai-shek and Taiwan are not principal objectives. They are important only insofar as they are useful in helping to keep Peiping from breaking loose.

The issue is not Communists versus Nationalists, or Communists versus anything else.

The issue is China versus the rest of Asia. Communism as an ideology enters only as it helps to propel Chinese expansionism.

OUR CHINA POLICY

From conversations in high places, one is led to believe that there is much more of this viewpoint in the admixture of U.S. policy than the administration has been, or still is, prepared to admit.

Candor sometimes is folly. Chiang Kai-shek and his generals can't possibly believe they are going back to reclaim the mainland, but they keep up the pretense publicly.

It is perfectly clear out here that if the United States withdrew from its present positions, if it lost interest and failed to keep pressing, the Chinese Reds would devour, directly or indirectly, a large part of Asia.

POPULATION FIGURES

Is there any important segment of thinking people in our country who believe that this is none of our business?

Peiping is on the march with a highly regimented nation that has leaped beyond the 600 million population mark and is growing at the rate of 15 million a year, as much as the entire population of Poland.

Mao Tse-tung, in a combined nationalistic-ideological dictum, has scorned population control; there can't be too many Chinese to him. This adds to the nervousness of China's neighbors.

How are these people to be fed, in spite of China's great size? Can the Communists really whip China's famine problem?

Neighbors watch and expect that land for this burgeoning mass will be sought outside present boundaries. And there isn't anyone out here who doesn't think the Russians are fools if they don't keep a close watch, too. Some cognoscenti believe the Soviets do have their eyes at least partially open.

DESIRE TO EXPAND

But population demands are not the sole cause for concern. The men in Peiping are power drunk; their urge is to satisfy their tastes regardless. They have a deep sense of the East's emerging from a long period of dark humiliation and they are trying to peddle that sense to the rest of Asia. The east wind is prevailing, says Mao.

But around the rim the little people are suspicious, as they would be of Chiang Kai-shek or any other Chinese.

The Peoples' army is estimated to be 3 million strong, but it is backed up by a militia of 7,500,000. The Peoples' navy is regarded as the best in Asia and includes long-range submarines. The air force has 1,900 jets, mostly Russian Mig 15's and 19's. So far as is known, China does not yet have atomic capability, as the expression goes. But it is expected to acquire it in the not-too-distant future. They are producing heavy weapons and aiming at freeing themselves from dependence on Russia.

MILITARY IMPROVEMENTS

Defects that showed up during the Korean war and the 1958 fight over Quemoy and Matsu Islands—the so-called off-shore islands—are believed to have been corrected.

Weapons have been standardized, officer training improved and conscript requirements slanted toward the ideological. Pilot training has been stepped up since the Taiwan Straits affair where the Nationalist pilots proved their superiority.

This is a military force that could overrun any Asian country except Russia.

The only deterrent is the power of the United States.

There is wider recognition today in Asia of the this fact than ever before. The neutrals have had a shock. Tibet, the Burmese and Indian border disputes, the tough talk to Indonesia, the probing in Laos—all make up a pattern that Premier Chou En-lai's appeals for an Asian consciousness opposed to Western imperialism.

PROPAGANDA ATTACKS

Peiping's chief concern is to get rid of U.S. power on and around Asian mainland. Hence the violence of propaganda attacking us.

Every indication of weakness on our part is carefully noted in Asian capitals. The refusal to budge in the Taiwan Straits in 1958 was perhaps a turning point in Asian assessment of U.S. intentions in the Pacific.

As China grows stronger—and it is growing stronger but not at the pace its inflated figures would have the world believe—a time may eventually arrive when the regime will feel capable of challenging our strength.

Even now, in keeps probing at intervals to find out if we are faltering. But this time lies in the future and will have to take care of itself.

Today's diplomacy has to deal with the present and the near future.

VITAL DECISION

A decision of great importance was recently taken that looks to the period when the Chinese Communists might get it into their heads that they could challenge us successfully.

That is the decision to concentrate our resources on building up India, further assisting Taiwan to demonstrate what non-Communist Chinese can accomplish and encouraging Japan to think more about defending itself.

A rounded course of action is emerging that ought to put to rest discussion of U.S. recognition of Commuist China.

Two of the main arguments in favor of recognition have been that it is folly to try to stick our heads in the sand and ignore a country as powerful as China and, without recognition, there is no hope that China would agree to any disarmament terms that might be negotiated among the major powers.

MORE THAN RECOGNITION

The first argument assumes that recognition is entirely a matter of our own will. Diplomatic talks with the Chinese first in Geneva and now in Warsaw, however, have made it quite clear that they would toss recognition back into our face unless accompanied by complete withdrawal from Asia and the western Pacific.

Taiwan and the Nationalists are not the only stumbling blocks. Peiping knows that what it asks for is an impossibility. It is unwilling to negotiate anything but withdrawal.

Mainland China, moreover, has not been ignored. Quite the contrary. However inchoate our policy may have been at times, it was not the result of closing eyes to China's existence. The overall policy now emerging comes to grips with a powerful China.

DISARMAMENT TALKS

Any degree of disarmament, nuclear or otherwise, not participated in by China would be a farce, but Peiping has never said it would not go along with such an agreement if acceptable to Russia. Peiping undoubtedly would require that it participate in some phase of the negotiations.

That is not an objectionable requirement. Except for a possible nuclear test-ban accord, consideration of what China might or might not do with respect to disarmament is academic. In spite of the formal discussions and pronouncements of public officials, no one really expects anything important to come from the disarmament talks.

Even if something vital did develop in disarmament, nonrecognition of China would not be a barrier. We have talked and negotiated with Peiping in the past without formal recognition. That is not an insoluble problem.

INVITING TROUBLE

The conclusion I am obliged to draw from my contacts around the borders of China is that recognition of the Chinese Communists regime at this time would be a blunder of the first water.

It would open the flood gates. Talk of it in the United States should be allowed to die off quietly while the new policy of concentrating increased strength at definite points around the Asian periphery is tested.

Johnston Historical Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, citizens of New Brunswick, N.J., have often expressed pride in the fact that the national headquarters of the Boy Scouts of America is within the boundaries of that municipality.

An editorial in the June 5 issue of the New Brunswick Sunday Home News has expressed additional appreciation to their neighbors, the Boy Scout administrators. The editorial discusses the opening of the Johnston Historical Museum on the grounds of the national headquarters.

Mr. President, the museum calls national attention in still another way to the purposes and principles of the Boy Scouts of America. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSEUM IS VALUABLE CULTURAL ACQUISITION

Yesterday's opening of the Johnston Historical Museum on the grounds of the Boy Scouts of America national headquarters in North Brunswick focused local attention once more upon the fine community asset we have in the headquarters and its staff.

The Scout headquarters brings the area continuing nationwide publicity. It furnishes substantial employment at good pay to large numbers of local people. It brings visitors from all over the Nation.

And the museum which opend yesterday is a noteworthy addition to the growing cultural accumulation of the area. Surrounding the museum is a large tract of land which will be used as a conservation area, as a nature hike area and for outdoor classes and exhibits. The entire project, when completed, will be unique in this country.

The opening of the museum is an appropriate time for us to convey to the Boy Scouts once more our appreciation of them as a good neighbor here.

Tideland Moneys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 21, of the Louisiana Legislature, introduced by Senator Laurence Eustis, Jr. This resolution calls upon the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps to have the funds now held in escrow placed in banks in the State of Louisiana. I wish to call this to the attention of the Members, and the resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21

Concurrent resolution relative to requesting those Departments of the United States having jurisdiction and authority to do so, to deposit in banks in the State of Louisiana those moneys now or which may hereafter be held and maintained or deposited in the Treasury of the United States which was or will be received for bonuses and rentals on mineral leases of lands and water bottoms in the tidelands area off of and part of the coasts of the State of Louisiana

Whereas there is presently held in escrow in the Treasury of the United States large sums of money exceeding $300 million received from bids and from adjudications for

bonuses and rentals on mineral leases of lands and water bottoms in the tideland and water bottoms off of and part of the coasts of the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas these moneys are being held pending the final disposition by the Supreme Court of the United States of the litigation fixing the boundaries of the coastlines of the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas these moneys are presently held in depositories of the Treasury Department of the United States outside of the State of Louisiana where they probably should be on deposit in banks of this State by the Treasury Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and all other officers of the United States having jurisdiction and authority in respect thereto, be requested to deposit in banks in the State of Louisiana those moneys now held in escrow or which might hereafter be received and held in escrow which have been received as bonuses and rentals on mineral leases of lands and water bottoms in the tideland area off of and a part of the coasts of the State of Louisiana pending the final disposition by the Supreme Court of the United States of the litigation fixing the boundaries of the coastlines of the State of Louisiana; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished by the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives to the Senators and the Members of the Congress from the State of Louisiana for their information and use.

———, *Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*

———, *Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

Life Begins at 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the legend that older Americans are problems and have little to contribute to their society and community still hangs on, but is rapidly vanishing in the face of the facts. The findings of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging reveal that older Americans have the ability, the drive, and the enthusiasm to participate in the mainstream of American life and are increasingly doing so. The expected role of older persons is no longer a passive one, but active and creative. Given the economic and health conditions for dignified, self-respecting living, America's senior citizens can provide, in their retirement, a reservoir of important manpower for community efforts of many kinds.

A timely and penetrating statement of this trend was made recently by Mr. Clark Tibbitts, Chief of Program Planning of the Special Staff on Aging of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In a recently published interview with Mr. Robert P. Goldman, Mr. Tibbitts contends that age 50 is the midpoint in life "when as many productive adult years lie ahead as behind." He presents heartening evidence of the increasing recognition by younger age groups of the potential inherent in the great reservoir of skills and abilities to be found among our senior citizens.

The article closes with this commendable thought: "Life today does begin at 50. But it begins only for those with courage enough to take up the challenge, who refuse to write themselves off and who continue to learn and do."

The validity of this reasoning is clear. However, we should also emphasize the fact that millions of our aged citizens need help in order to be able to take up the cudgels and accept the challenge. They need an income which permits respectability, a decent place to live, equality of opportunity to maintain sound physical and mental health, and an equal chance to contribute to society. The subcommittee report contains 12 recommendations for legislative action needed to provide the social, economic, and health base which will make it possible for the aged to achieve their full potential. As a Nation, we have much to profit from such a course of action, for our senior citizens, with their wisdom, skills, and experience gained from years of living, can be a powerful and important national resource.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Tibbitt's article, "Life Begins at 50," which appeared in the May 16, 1960, issue of Parade printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE BEGINS AT 50

(By Clark Tibbitts, as told to Robert P. Goldman)

Who are the aged? What is middle age? We puzzle over such questions today because the boundaries of age classifications have begun to break down. The chart shows how the life cycle has changed in 60 years, according to calculations by Clark Tibbitts, author of the article below. A pioneer in the mushrooming field of aging research, he is Chief of Program Planning, Special Staff on Aging, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Previously he was director of the Institute for Human Adjustment at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He is editor or coeditor of several major books in the field: "Aging in the Modern World," "The New Frontiers of Aging," and "Growing in the Older Years."

Stages of life	1900	1960
Childhood	0-13	0-13
Adolescence	13-21	13-21
Early adulthood	21-35	21-50
Middle age	35-50	50-65
Later maturity	50-60	65-80
Old age	60+	80+

Nearly 30 years ago, author Walter B. Pitkind wrote a book called "Life Begins at 40." With sales in the millions, the book became an inspiration to a whole generation. Its title is a catch-phrase still heard today.

But in 1960 that slogan is hopelessly out of date. Today life begins at 50. And the evidence is clear that tomorrow it may begin even later.

Modern science and modern society have added new years and brought new opportunities to everyone's life. A dynamic Nation has banished many of the old fears, lifted many of the old burdens.

Look at what science and philosophy tell us about the 50-year-old in America today:

Studies at the University of Chicago show that "maximum satisfaction and gratification in life" come just before 50. The high point of maturity actually is reached around 50, according to other studies at the University of Minnesota.

Anne Morrow Lindbergh declares that middle age, much like adolescence, brings on new interests and spurs new desires to grow.

I believe that 50 now is the mid-point in life, when as many productive adult years lie ahead as lie behind. But they are vastly different years. Up to 50 is the period of establishment; after 50 is the time to capitalize on the experience, skills, and knowledge stockpiled earlier.

Thirty years ago, a man—or woman—of 50 was considered on the long, slow road of decline. He anticipated poor health, fewer job opportunities, shrinking income and continuing responsibilities. The world scorned him as "too old" and barred him from progress with the sentence, "You can't teach an old dog new tricks."

Today a 50-year-old can look ahead to longer life, better health, more jobs, steady income and fewer responsibilities. Changing industry increasingly wants his experience instead of a younger man's brawn. New scientific evidence proves that he can learn new tricks as well as a younger man.

Today a 50-year-old can do what many Americans always have longed to do. He can "start all over knowing what I know now." Free of the trivia that cluttered his youth, he can focus on his true interests and on richer, fuller living that really means something.

These are the changes that have given him that opportunity:

LONGER LIFE

In the 1930's, a man of 50 could expect to live 21 more years; his wife, 22. Today a man of 50 can expect to live 23 more years. His wife can expect to live 27.

This gift is the result of giant strides in modern medicine. Two great killers of the past, pneumonia and tuberculosis, have decreased sharply. Several others, such as infectious heart disease, have lost their sting. And medicine is closing in on some of today's menaces, such as cancer and heart disease.

BETTER HEALTH

A generation ago, a man in the middle years fell victim to periodic prolonged bouts of illness. He was not health-conscious, and he often failed to seek adequate medical care. A sizable proportion of the over-50 population was chronically ill.

Today's 50-year-old is healthy—healthier than ever before and healthier than most persons realize. Eighty-seven percent of Americans between 45 and 54 are completely free of physical ailments that cause limitation of activity, according to the National Health Survey. So are 78 percent of those between 55 and 64, and 63 percent of those between 65 and 75.

A 50-year-old loses a few more workdays due to illness and spends a trifle more on medical care ($129 against $108 a year) than a younger man, according to the Health Information Foundation. But the difference is negligible—and nowhere near so striking as it was in the past.

MORE JOBS

Because of alleged poor health and waning energy, men and women 50 yesterday were considered washed up in the working world. Heavy work required youth and physical stamina. One in 10 men was at the end of the line at 50. Four of five women did not hold jobs.

The legend that older workers are undesirable workers dies hard, but it definitely is dying. Current figures show almost every able-bodied man between 45 and 64 working. Forty-eight percent of women between 45 and 54 are employed—the highest percentage of any age group of women in the United States. Even between 55 and 64, one-third of women hold jobs.

A new value has been placed on experience and wisdom, which only older persons have. Not long ago, I asked a 34-year-old surgeon what special qualities were required for success in his profession. "The first qualification is 25 years of experience," he replied.

One reason for this gradual turnabout is that the old notion of declining intelligence with age has been debunked. Studies show now that intelligence reaches a peak at 50 and that the capacity to learn continues for years.

A researcher at Columbia University found that students past 50 made fewer mistakes in Russian language tests than students much younger. Another series of tests has shown that older persons, when properly motivated, learn equally fast and retain their knowledge better than the younger group.

We can expect the trend toward employment of older workers to continue. Employers have learned that older people are reliable and not inclined to job-jump. As automation becomes more prevalent in industry, there will be less premium on brawn and more on brains. The beneficiaries will be the 50-plus age group.

STEADIER INCOME

Coupled with the difficulty of finding jobs past 50 in the past was a sharp downturn in income.

Today, there still is a downturn between 45 and 54—but the gap is closing. Both men and women in this age bracket earn only $100 a year less than they did at their earning peak. The latest median is $5,034 for men, $3,069 for women. Even past 55, women earn only $250 less than women in their twenties; a man's income has dropped only a little over $500.

FEWER RESPONSIBILITIES

Yesterday a couple still was tied down at the age of 50. The average wife was 55 when her last child left home; the average husband 59. Half the households in America were broken by death before the last child married.

Today the average husband and wife are on their own at 50 and 48. They can look forward to many years of married life—just with each other. Most couples today live together 43 years before death interrupts.

One man wrote me, "Only after we were in our 50's did my wife and I have the opportunity to do what we wanted—alone—just as we did as newlyweds. The only difference is that as newlyweds we didn't have the money. Now we do."

Decreasing responsibility also affects the job world. One Philadelphia businessman has written that in his 50's, he felt for the first time that "if you don't like a man, you can tell him to go to blazes and never see him again. If you do like him, you can enjoy his friendship without serious question on either side of motives or possible personal gain."

Longer life, better health, more jobs, steadier income, fewer responsibilities—these are the gifts of the modern world to today's 50-year-old. All around us is evidence of persons who have seized these gifts to begin life anew in the middle years. You can have the same opportunity.

Says Dr. John E. Anderson of the University of Minnesota: "In the life pattern, there is a gradual change from breadth of interest to intensity and depth of interest." Dr. Anderson adds that in the fifties you can finally pursue the interests that were shunted aside while you were trying to find yourself.

One Portland, Oreg., couple provides a good example. After their children left home, the wife helped launch a movement to improve nursing homes. The husband became president of the local school board. Before their fifties, the couple simply had not had time for community activities.

From 50 on, you become more concerned with art, cultural and civic affairs. Studies of newspaper reading show that men and women over 50 are more avid followers of news analysis columns and editorials.

Can you seize the gift of full years from 50 on? You will need your own courage. For many plus-fifties still are numbed by fears that have little meaning in modern life. They fear that age 50 means sickness and being tossed on employment's scrap heap. Both fears become less and less meaningful day by day.

Today 31 million Americans are between ages 50 and 70. In 5 years the number will be 34 million; 5 years later, 37 million. For these vast multitudes, as Walter Pitkin said in 1932, "there is a career for each decade, determined chiefly by the energy demanded."

We recognize the wisdom of his words. Persons in middle life and beyond are more active than ever, more articulate than ever in social and political matters. They are using the tools shaped by 50 years of living to fashion new lives the way they always wanted to live them.

Life today does begin at 50. But it begins only for those with courage enough to take up the challenge, who refuse to write themselves off and who continue to learn and do.

Senator Symington Speaks on Equal Rights and Opportunities for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, at the Third and Fourth Congressional District Democratic dinner, held in Kalamazoo, Mich., on April 27, 1960. Senator SYMINGTON's statement, among the daily releases by press, individuals, and organizations of numerous analyses of the civil rights issue, is one of the most penetrating into the fundamentals and scope of the subject. He forthrightly concretizes these facts: that the civil rights issue is not a Negro problem; it is an issue which, without regard to age, race, color, creed, or national origin, extends to and affects the opportunities and economic well-being of all individuals and the stature and justice accorded them as the people of the Nation. Senator SYMINGTON focuses the fact that the struggle for civil rights is man's pursuit of human dignity, the explosive worldwide issue of the 20th century.

Senator SYMINGTON's address follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By Senator STUART SYMINGTON)

Upon announcing my candidacy I said that I would emphasize the importance of policies and programs which guaranteed to every citizen equal rights and equal opportunity.

We in this country have great pride in our Statue of Liberty—the promises held forth in that uplifted torch.

To most of us, nurtured in the basic doctrine of our Constitution, that torch is dedicated to equal opportunity for all citizens. The Statue of Liberty is also a statue of dignity.

For over 300 years, from the time of the pilgrims to the present, millions of new citizens have come to America.

They came because they believed that here was a land where one could achieve a better life.

And in the main they found it.

Under the protection of law, operating in a virgin land where all were declared to be equal, they created for themselves and their Nation a prosperity and a position never before attained in all history.

In our country today, most men believe they can go just as far as knowledge and their skills can take them.

We must, however, be sure that we plan to develop and use all our human resources to their maximum capabilities.

This is not only essential to our position at home, but also to our position abroad.

We are faced with a determined antagonist, totalitarian communism.

This antagonist exploits our every weakness, in order to achieve the goal to which it has been dedicated for so many years—world conquest.

America is the last real power capable of standing between the Communists and world domination; and it is becoming increasingly clear that unless we decide to guarantee opportunity for all people, we may well lose it for all people.

Much is read and heard these day about growing unrest and brutality in Africa.

In that great continent, larger than the United States, China, and India combined, the people passionately desire human dignity—and they do not intend to be stopped.

Recently I visited Africa and the Middle East.

Believe me, our own failures in this regard are hurting us in these crucial countries.

In those lands the problem—centered in a citizen's unqualified right to vote—is now being pointed up for all to see.

The same is true in America. The world is asking for the views of the wealthiest and most powerful nation of the free world.

In my view, equal opportunity goes far beyond the bounds of race or creed.

A man capable of doing a particular job refused that job because he is too old, is as much a victim of discrimination as a man turned back because of the color of his skin.

The child too poor to go to college is as effectively segregated from educational opportunity as a child in a separate school.

The barriers to equal opportunity are not confined to one section of the country.

They sap the strength of all our States, and of our Nation, and of every nation.

If we could change this course, and unleash the full energies and ability of all our people, America's economic strength would break all records.

Here is one example:

If the average income of Negro workers equalled that of white workers, $14 billion per year would be added to consumer purchasing power.

And equal opportunity for able and capable workers aged 60 to 65 would add many billions more.

Surely these are worthwhile goals—and to attain them I make the following proposals in three main areas:

First: Equal opportunity for employment.

We should establish a cooperative program between the State and the Federal Governments for vocational training and retraining. That training should be available to those older workers who need new skills, as well as to people displaced by automation.

The Department of Labor should work more closely with State employment boards, so as to provide special job counseling for older workers. At the present time this service is sadly lacking in almost all States.

There should be an end to racial discrimination in Federal employment. Any project on which the citizens' tax money is expended cannot be a vehicle for perpetuating bias.

Second: There should be equal opportunity in housing.

Slums have no place in a modern America.

These slums can be abolished through an intelligent program of public housing and urban renewal. Lower interest rates on homebuilding would also help a great deal.

Then there is the great question of equal and adequate opportunity in education. Surely all of us want to see an America where every child who desires an education and is willing to work for it should have the opportunity.

The criteria for school and college educations should be brains, not money.

This principle was recognized by the National Defense Education Act, and I would hope to see this act eventually broadened into a program of competitive Federal scholarships.

The public education of our children—a principle conceived and carried out in our land before our Federal Constitution—should conform to the established law of our land.

The rights in our Constitution should belong to all Americans.

Every person in the United States should have the right to vote; the right to assert the principles of collective bargaining in practical fashion; the right to air any grievance; and, of course, the right to police protection against any and all violence.

In this testing time of history, the only real hope of the American people is to become and remain a united people.

And there is no surer road to national unity than equal rights and equal opportunity for all.

A first-class Nation should have no second-class citizens.

You and I remember the poem on the base of the Statue of Liberty.

That poem ends, "I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

But what good does it do to keep the lamp lit in the doorway if we snuff out the lights in the house?

Let us dedicate ourselves to a goal which would truly represent the power and glory of the American dream.

To that end, let ours be a land where all feel welcome, and where all share the same hospitality of laws and customs and care.

This is the way to really use our liberty.

This is the kind of house you and I believe in.

That is the house we want our children to live in.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, increased international tensions have dominated the news of late and, of course, have greatly influenced the activities and objectives of the Congress. One of the most important types of legislation affected by these pressures is mutual security.

Having passed a $4.1 billion authorization, we are now entering upon the most critical stage of our annual consideration of the mutual security program. In the past, the most vigorous efforts to whittle down our oversea aid funds have been in connection with the mutual security appropriation.

Mr. President, certainly with the international situation as it is, we must be even more vigilant this year in seeing to it that our mutual security program is maintained at a level as close as possible to the $4.175 requested by the President. The reasons for this are altogether obvious. In the relatively short span of time in which this program has been in operation, it has worked wonders in strengthening the free world's defenses and in improving the economic status of less developed countries. Of course, in a program of this scope some waste and mismanagement is inevitable—and we must constantly strive to eliminate such practices. However, these shortcomings must not blind us to the importance of mutual security assistance in forging the free world's shield against communism.

I want to call attention today to an excellent editorial which appeared last Sunday in the New York Herald Tribune. This editorial, entitled "No Time To Skimp on Foreign Aid," contains a well thought out statement of the argument against making any further cuts in our mutual security program. I hope this fine editorial will be studied with care by every member of Congress. It is as succinct and penetrating an analysis of the need for the Mutual Security program as I have seen in a long time. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME TO SKIMP ON FOREIGN AID

As regularly as the plowing and the reaping, as the melting of the snow and the flights of the swallow, comes the annual battle over foreign aid. Again the fight is on and the sides are drawn. Yet as our competition with the Soviets enters its newest phase, the cries of those who would still have us deny the pleas of an urgently needy world ring even more hollow.

Congress has passed a $4.1 billion foreign-aid authorization bill, only slightly less than the President asked. But a tough fight is threatened on the actual appropriations, with opponents of aid reportedly hoping to whack a billion or more dollars out of the total.

The present international climate makes this hardly an auspicious time to start chopping away at military-aid funds, which go largely to make possible the continued strength of our most exposed allies. Some $2 billion of the $4.1 billion total is earmarked for military aid, another $675 million for defense support.

Nor is it an auspicious time to slacken our development aid efforts.

The day is past when this Nation could live in economic isolation. Hoarding our wealth while millions go hungry is a luxury we cannot afford, as is pressing forward the phenomenal development of our own technology while leaving desperately striving backward nations to shift for themselves. The world is too small, the limits of neighborliness and human responsibility too broad. And the security of our own Nation is too intimately bound up with the economic progress of the underdeveloped. Building the collective strength of the free world demands a rapid buttressing of the economic strength of its economically weaker members.

There have been examples galore of waste and incompetence in the administration of the foreign-aid program. But there have been more examples of great, of immeasurable good. And though waste in the military is legendary, we don't for that reason scrap our defenses. By all means let us encourage sound administration of foreign aid. But let us also support it, generously and wholeheartedly. The world needs it, and we are part of that world.

Textile Import Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extention of remarks I include a memorandum sent to me by Edwin Wilkinson of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, which memorandum was prepared by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, the Northern Textile Association, and the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in relation to the imminent international negotiations on the wool-cloth duties under GATT that will affect the future of the woolen and worsted industry in the United States.

The members of this association are fine Americans and outstanding businessmen. The views of these associations and members are worthy of most serious consideration.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM ON TEXTILE IMPORT PROBLEMS

(Submitted by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, National Association of Wool Manufacturers, Northern Textile Association, May 5, 1960)

I. WOVEN WOOL CLOTH DUTIES

A matter of urgency

Imminent international negotiations on the wool cloth duties under GATT will affect

the future of the woolen and worsted industry in the United States.

Specifically, the duties to be renegotiated are the 1947 concession rates of tariff law paragraphs 1108 and 1109(a) including the tariff rate quota authorized under the reservation attached thereto.

The Government's position for these negotiations is being developed under regular trade agreement procedures required by the Trade Agreements Act and Executive orders. Public hearings were held last December by both the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This March the Commission filed with the President its peril point report. Announcement of negotiations is expected at any time.

Industry position

A comprehensive system of quotas should be established to prevent further injury to the domestic industry and permit orderly and stabilized marketing of imports.

An overall quota should be fixed annually on a square-yard basis at an amount not in excess of 5 percent of the average annual domestic production of apparel cloths, wholly or chiefly by weight of wool, exclusive of production for Government, for the 3 preceding years.

The quota should be divided into subquotas and applied on a country-by-country basis and on the basis of categories of fabrics.

Absolute quotas in fixed amounts would be the most effective method and should be used. If tariff rate quotas are considered, both the base rate and the higher rate should be increased to realistic levels such as would hold imports within the 5 percent principle above.

Limitations or quotas on other wool textile goods including apparel and made-up items must also be adopted.

II. COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS AND THE SECTION 22 CASE

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act authorizes the use of tariffs and quotas to control the importation of articles manufactured from a price-supported agricultural commodity. The National Cotton Council, supported by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and the Northern Textile Association, has asked for action under this section. Hearings before the Tariff Commission have been completed.

It is to be hoped that the Tariff Commission will recommend meaningful import relief for the cotton manufacturing industry, and the President should be urged to approve any such recommendation by the Commission. More cotton cloth and cotton wearing apparel was imported into the United States in 1959 than in any previous year, and so far in 1960 the rate of imports is increasing sharply.

III. NEW GATT TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS

Beginning in January 1961, there will be extensive tariff negotiations in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Following the procedure laid down in the Trade Agreements Act, our Government will shortly issue a list of items to be considered for possible tariff reductions at that time. This list will form the basis for hearings by the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission, probably in June.

The textile industry, already bearing a more than proportionate share—through rising imports—of the burden of U.S. foreign trade policy, should not be made the subject of additional tariff reductions. It is highly significant that large volumes of imports manufactured from all fibers are currently coming into this market under existing tariff rates.

This situation ought to be brought forcefully and immediately to the attention of the President and the Secretary of State with the recommendation that no textile items be included on the forthcoming GATT list.

IV. SUBSIDIZED IMPORTS

Many different subsidy devices are being used by oversea countries to circumvent our tariffs. Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 directs the Secretary of the Treasury to impose countervailing duties in such circumstances. The Secretary should be urged to enforce section 303 promptly and effectively in all such instances.

New Jersey Academy of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. CASE or New Jersey. Mr. President, I have recently received some material describing the objectives and activities of the New Jersey Academy of Science. Robert K. Zuck, chairman of the Department of Botany at Drew University in Madison, N.J., is president of the Academy. The work of his organization is highly important, and its value in encouraging a widespread interest in the sciences is enormous.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a description of the New Jersey Academy of Science and two resolutions which were adopted at its recent annual meeting.

There being no objection, the description and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT THE NEW JERSEY ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND STATE ACADEMIES OF SCIENCE

Interest in science in the New World extends back to the Colonial Period and the early days of the United States, when Benjamin Franklin founded the American Philosophical Society in 1743 and John Adams helped establish the American Academy of Arts and Science in Boston in 1780. The Maryland Academy of Science, the first of the strictly State academies, 1797, thrives to the present day; but the early academies in Kentucky, Virginia, and New Jersey failed to survive. The present New Jersey Academy of Science was founded in 1954 at a meeting held in the Town Hall at Chester. Six annual meetings have been held, with the most recent one, March 25, at the Newark College of Engineering at which 40 papers based on original research were presented. The others have been held at Drew University, Fairleigh Dickenson University, Rutgers University, and the Newark Public Library.

The State academies of science are devoted to the promotion and diffusion of scientific knowledge through meetings, publications, museums, natural preserves, and financial aid. Interestingly, shortly after the gold rush to California, the California Academy of Science was founded in 1853. This organization has had a profound influence on the course of scientific development in that State. The C.A.S. maintains a museum and public library, both of the originals of which were destroyed in the earthquake of 1906. Members of this academy were the guiding force in preserving the California Redwoods and have been active in other conservation matters.

At the sixth annual meeting of the New Jersey Academy of Science held in conjunction with the 75th anniversary celebration of the Newark College of Engineering, two resolutions were passed. One which has been under discussion for over a year, establishes the New Jersey Junior Academy of Science, the other advocates the preservation of the New Jersey Pine Barrens and the Great Swamp areas as well as active participation with other groups and individuals interested in the conservation of natural resources.

Membership in the New Jersey Academy of Science is open to all interested in science, including college students. The New Jersey Junior Academy of Science, when it is put in operation, will be for students of high schools.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Whereas the population of the State of New Jersey is increasing rapidly with consequent pressure on our natural resources, the New Jersey Academy of Science resolves that:

1. The New Jersey Academy of Science should encourage individuals and groups in conserving these natural resources.

2. The New Jersey Academy of Science determine areas of activity in conservation where it may best function, and study groups be organized for that purpose.

3. The preservation of the Pine Barrens and Great Swamp areas are now the most immediate concern and that these areas can best serve the people if maintained in their present natural condition.

Passed at the annual meeting of the New Jersey Academy of Science, March 25, 1960.

ROBERT K. ZUCK,
President, New Jersey Academy of Science, Professor and Chairman, Department of Botany, Drew University, Madison, N.J.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, MARCH 25, 1960

Whereas the New Jersey Academy of Science desires to encourage and stimulate original research in the sciences and mathematics by secondary students, to whom new and wider horizons will be opened by close association with the New Jersey Academy of Science and through that body with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, be it resolved that:

1. The New Jersey Academy of Science, in cooperation with the New Jersey Science Teachers' Association, established the New Jersey Junior Academy of Science.

2. The purpose of the Junior Academy shall be to encourage and stimulate original research in the sciences and mathematics by secondary school student sand provide meetings and publications for presentation of such research.

3. The president of the New Jersey Academy of Science, with the approval of the executive committee, shall appoint a director who shall act as coordinator of all chapters of the Junior Academy. The director may appoint such persons as he may deem fit to assist him.

4. The Junior Academy shall consist of chapters established in the secondary schools of New Jersey. A chapter may comprise one or more affiliate science groups. An affiliate science group is any official school science or mathematics club.

5. Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the following organizations:

New Jersey Science Teachers' Association.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Statement of Dr. C. C. Furnas Before the Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD, a statement before the Committee on Science and Astronautics made by Dr. C. C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, on June 3, 1960.

Dr. Furnas is a member of the committee's panel on science and technology and participated in the recent round-table discussions held by the committee and the panel on June 2 and 3. The discussions centered around various scientific and technological problems of interest to the Congress and the Nation.

Dr. Furnas, in addition to being an eminent educator, is also well known in the field of chemical engineering. His paper is a learned discussion of scientific research and its application to technology which I call to the attention of my colleagues.

Dr. Furnas' statement follows:

It is an honor and a great opportunity to appear before this panel and committee to present some thoughts on the problems and progress of science and technology. To many it must seem that the body of scientifiv research and its application to technology is appalling in extent and stupefying in complexity. I think all of us must admit that there are times when this seems to be the situation. This makes it ever more important to have discussions with bodies such as this in order to arrive, if possible, at understanding and perhaps even afford some appropriate guidance.

Though I have for many years and am still quite substantially involved in military research and development, I shall not dwell on those problems and activities. They are very much before the public eye and there is a spate of discussion and debate in this area at all times. Neither shall I, glamorous though it may be, give consideration to space research or to interplanetary travel. As compared with those dramatic subjects, what I have to say will probably seem rather dull and perhaps uninteresting.

One of the stark facts of life at the present time is that the world population is growing at an explosive rate. Tomorrow morning there will be over one hundred thousand more mouths to be fed and bodies to be clothed and housed than there were this morning. Total world population at the present time is approaching 3 billion. One might say that these persons are divided into three camps. About 1 billion are in the more-or-less democratic world, about one billion under Communist influence and about one billion are the so-called uncommitted peoples. Everyone recognizes the importance of convincing the uncommitted billion people that the democratic way of life as exemplified by Western Civilization is the better course. So far, America's attempts to bring about such conviction have not been covered with glory.

At least one-half of the persons of the world exist in the most miserable imaginable circumstances. This is due to the lack of the rudimentary goods and services necessary to provide a decent standard of living. It is extremely important that science and technology provide the means for remedying this sad situation. It is not merely a matter of humanitarianism; it is a matter of political stability for the democratic way of life. America should be in a position to contribute most significantly, particularly by suplying new research knowledge.

If the situation as far as human existence for at least half the world is already sad and miserable, the prospects are that it may become much worse. Because of the rate of population increase, it is inevitable that by the end of this century there will be approximately 5 billion people on the earth. Valid predictions are that by the year 2050 the number will be 10 billion. Eventually, of course, there will be a leveling off in this population density but the beginning of that trend is not yet in sight and probably will not occur for another generation or two. It is evident then that if we are short of material goods and services at the present time, the world as a whole will be in a truly desperate situation when the population is doubled, unless something new is brought into the picture. I wish to discuss the type of research and development which will be necessary to take care of this critical problem.

Providing the requisite goods and services will depend not only upon scientific and technological knowledge, but also upon the supply of natural resources. Outside of agricultural land, our principal natural resources are: energy, minerals and water. I will discuss each of them in turn.

Industrial productivity in terms of goods and services is almost directly proportional to the amount of energy which is readily available. It is utterly impossible to provide the wherewithal for the lives of many billions of people by the old pattern of subsistence agriculture alone. We must depend upon industry, which means that we must have ever-increasing amounts of energy available. As is well known, our principal energy supply at the present time is in the form of the fossil fuels: coal, oil and gas. Despite the fact that new oil and gas fields are being discovered in various parts of the world, we are depleting this tremendous natural resource with extreme rapidity. As far as petroleum is concerned, in America we are already over the peak. The wells have to be drilled deeper and deeper and the output per day becomes less and less. Hence, our increasing reliance upon foreign sources with occasional international political complications. No one can predict with exactness when the shortage of petroleum supplies throughout the world will become serious but everyone recognizes that the supply is finite and the day of serious depletion probably lies within the foreseeable future.

The history of civilization will probably show that it was fortunate that the atomic bomb was devised and used at about the middle of the 20th century. Although military use came first, it did open up the door for the peaceful application of nuclear energy, that is, supplying controllable energy through the fission of uranium or thorium atoms. Uranium nuclear powerplants, as you know, are under development and a few are in use in this country, as well as in Western Europe and in Russia. I anticipate that in certain parts of this country the use of nuclear power will become economically feasible in competition with coal and petroleum within the next 5 to 10 years. This will have a very important and beneficial impact for the supply of energy in certain forms (electrical energy and sensible heat at the source) in all parts of the world for a long time to come, but it is only a partial remedy.

If the intriguing and significant research on the controlled fusion (hydrogen bomb) reaction which is going on in many laboratories in this country as well as abroad, is successful a great new source of energy will be opened up. It is too early to make predictions but this may come about within the next generation.

It is not yet time to become complacent about the matter of energy supply. With our present devices and economies, we will apparently always need liquid fuels. We are also faced with the fact that conventional agricultural methods will probably not be able to supply all the necessary food energy for the population of the world in years to come. This means that we need to find out more about that great natural process known as photosynthesis, whereby plants take the energy of the sun and a few simple chemical compounds and build up the substance of plant materials, which is the basis for all plant and animal life on the face of the earth. It can also be the source of liquid fuels such as the gasoline which we use in our cars. Despite the extreme importance of this knowledge, we do not yet know how nature carries out the photosynthetic process. In other words, we do not yet know the answer to that important, much-booted-about question, "What makes the grass green?" When we do find out this secret of nature, we will, in all probability, be able to improve upon the processes and carry out, on a feasible and economical scale, artificial photosynthesis which will assure us of an adequate supply of liquid fuels, as well as certain basic synthetic foods, for all time to come. The energy which falls on the earth from sunlight is thousands of times greater than the human race utilizes and the sun will certainly be shining as long as there is a human race. Important fundamental research is going in various laboratories upon the minute molecular reactions which form the process of photosynthesis but in the national scheme, this type of research is still of minor importance. I feel that it should be greatly enlarged and emphasized.

The next natural resource which is essential to human industrial existence is made up of those materials classed as minerals. In this country and many others we have already skimmed the cream off our supply of metals and other natural minerals but the demand for them is growing even faster than the population. This is also true of the other industrial countries of the world. After we have depleted the mineral deposits which are economically workable with our present technology, where will we find these raw materials for civilization? We must learn to get more and more from less and less. Undoubtedly we can make small-step improvements in our technology for winning the minerals from the natural ores, but we need to make a major advance. There will be no single solution so we need to explore all possibilities.

There is one source of mineral substances which is practically infinite in extent even though the desirable materials are there in only very small proportions. I speak of the oceans of the world. If we could devise practical means for mining the oceans for the some 20 valuable minerals those waters contain, it would be of direct benefit to almost every nation. The answer, usually when you pose this question, is that such an approach is impossible because the minerals are there in such dilute concentration. However, there are certain low forms of life that do not know this and they go ahead and concentrate and use these minerals for their own benefit. I summarize this problem by posing the question, "How does the oyster get its copper?" Although the oyster is obviously a very stupid fellow, he is smarter than we are in the sense that he can take copper from the very dilute concentrations in sea water where it is present to less than one part per million and concentrate it by a thousandfold in its own body fluid. The slimy sea cucumber concentrates the element vanadium by a millionfold in its respiratory

tract. Almost every form of plant and animal life has the ability to select and concentrate particular chemical elements, as a part of the living process.

How do they do it? Our knowledge is very fragmentary but it is obvious that highly selective reactions are involved—which I call pickpocket chemistry—and about which we should know a great deal more. If we understood the real fundamentals of these selective reactions, we could undoubtedly improve on nature and would probably be able to carry out the processes, using nonbiological materials, on a large and economical scale. One can visualize such an industrial process where the input material would be sea water and the output would be several concentrated and well-separated minerals such as copper, zinc, phosphorus, boron, vanadium, columbium, and even gold. This would by no means solve all the mineral problems, but it could help substantially.

Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that two elements, bromine and magnesium, are presently being recovered from sea water on an economical basis. These two, however, are present in relatively large concentrations and are being recovered by conventional and well-known chemical processes. They represent about the limit of practical application of present knowledge.

Even though the sea might become important as a source of minerals if we understood nature's tricks of selective chemistry, the knowledge gained might be even more important in developing new methods of winning the minerals from very low-grade ores. Simple leaching processes might be devised which would be economical and feasible. One example will indicate the possibilities.

Average granite, which makes up a large proportion of the earth's surface, contains small traces of uranium and thorium, about 4 parts per million and 12 parts per million, respectively. If this uranium and this thorium could be effectively extracted and used in a nuclear power reactor, then that uranium and that thorium from a single ton of granite could produce energy equivalent to burning 50 tons of coal. The crust of the earth will always serve civilization well when we learn how to use it.

I treated the problems and possibilities of this new type of chemistry in more detail in an address entitled "One Molecule in a Million"[1] before the American Iron and Steel Institute 2 years ago. I am submitting a reprint of this address for the RECORD.

In my opinion, the third great question in the natural resources problem is, "What makes it rain?" Many of the wilder and bloodier stories of the early West centered around the battle of the old waterhole. Particularly in our own Southwest, this situation still holds and is getting even worse, although we ordinarily do not any more carry on the battle with guns. By means of dams, wells, irrigation ditches, and even feeble attempts at rainmaking, we try to solve our water problem. We are losing ground steadily as more and more people move into that region, bringing increased industrial and agricultural demands. The situation in other parts of the world where millions and millions of destitute and hungry people live is even worse. Yet while we are continually starving for water in many important parts of the world, the shores of almost every nation are lapped by the infinite supply of the ocean. Unfortunately, the ocean contains salt and such water does not fulfill the needs of most modern industrial civilization. How can we get fresh water from salt water?

[1] Yearbook, American Iron and Steel Institute, 1958, p. 19.

Our Department of the Interior has a multifaceted development program to devise processes for getting fresh water from salt or brackish water but it is based upon old knowledge and old technology. One can say that the program is proceeding satisfactorily but results indicate that the processes are not now and will not be economical in the true sense of the word unless some new factors are added. At the present time, the cost of fresh water produced by these methods will be 5 to 10 times of that which can be practical, except under the most unusual economic circumstances.

Parallel with this, there have been several empirical approaches to rainmaking by seeding clouds with dry ice or by using silver iodide generators on the ground. Success with these experiments has been quite indifferent and there is no prospect of very much improvement as long as we confine ourselves to this purely empirical approach.

While we are struggling with these empirical methods based upon past knowledge, we still do not have the answer to the question, "What makes it rain?" Stated another way, we do not yet understand the minute physical forces that are involved when two fog droplets coalesce and then coalesce with some other droplets, finally to form a drop of rain. We know the overall conditions for the formation of rain droplets under severe temperature gradients such as occur in a thunder cloud, but this is only one of the special cases of the rainmaking process. If we did know exactly how nature causes the fog droplets to coalesce, I feel certain it would help tremendously in developing new and economical industrial processes for recovering fresh water from the sea and brackish waters. It might also point the way to really effective local control of weather. Yet there is almost no research going on in this important field of the physics of surfaces involved in droplet formation.

In summary then, because of the absolute necessity for us, as well as the other nations of the world, to solve the problems of maintaining an adequate supply of the natural resources: energy, minerals, and water, I feel we should have increased emphasis in our national research program upon the search for the answers to those three questions: What makes the grass green? How does the oyster get its copper? What makes it rain? The problems themselves, of course, would be phrased in much more erudite titles but I do feel that those questions point up the problem. Perhaps there are other questions that are even more important, but those are typical of our area of ignorance.

I have a suggestion to make and it involves The National Science Foundation. That Foundation, as you know, has over the past several years been carrying on magnificent work in encouraging and supporting basic scientific research in the physical sciences as well as in scientific education. In the research area, as a matter of policy, it lays great stress on the fact that it does not dictate or guide research programs or areas of research. The Foundation gives objective consideration to proposals which scientists submit for support of particular research projects which they want to undertake. In the field of the physical sciences, there are not many limitations of subject matter. The theory back of this policy is that you cannot direct basic research. You can only give the research man the opportunity, through support, to follow his own individual interests and propensities. Of course, nearly all of our scientific knowledge of the past was developed from this random approach. It is virtuous but is it sufficient?

Without attempting to direct individual projects, and certainly without attempting to dictate the individual research man's program, I feel that a small shift in the policy of the National Science Foundation might aid very materially in arriving at early answers to those three important questions. If a certain proportion of the funds available to the National Science Foundation were earmarked for the support of research in those or similar carefully selected areas, and if it were made known that money would be available for those but that those particular dollars would not be available for other projects, I think we would find a number of scientists who would be willing to come forth with some really potent ideas which might quite rapidly lead to worthwhile results. Indirectly, of course, this would be lending direction to the lines of research but it would not be direction in detail and it certainly would not be dictation. (I call it "vectoring" rather than "directing" research.) It would not be necessary to set up any new organization to handle that sort of problem, and I doubt if it would take very much more money, in proportion to the national expenditures. But I feel that the problem is serious and worthy of whatever effort and expenditure may be called for. I greatly fear that the random approach, as contrasted to such a lightly directed approach as I suggest, will not provide the answers to our basic natural resources problems in time to avoid serious international mishaps.

There are those who contend that such problems should be dealt with only by industry because, obviously, successful results will lead to production, which in turn will lead to profits. However, our basic knowledge is so sparse that immediate application cannot be guaranteed and industry, quite rightly, in my opinion, is not justified in spending any large number of dollars on this type of research at this early stage. I feel that it is a national problem which calls for a national approach at this time. Industry should pick up the applied research and development at a somewhat later date.

In order to point up the importance of solving these problems as rapidly as we can, I would like to quote from Dr. Harrison Brown of the California Institute of Technology in a paper of his, "Resources of the World," in 1956:

"As our dependence shifts to such resources as low-grade ores, rock, sea water, and the sun, the conversion of energy into useful work will require ever more intricate technical activity, which would be impossible in the absence of a variety of complex machines and their products—all of which is the result of our intricate industrial civilization and which would be impossible without it. Thus, if a machine civilization were to stop functioning as the result of some future catastrophe, it is difficult to see how man would again be able to start along the path to industrialization with the resources that would then be available to him. We are rapidly approaching such a 'point of no return.'"

The Uses of Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the country, our conservationists continue to wage a courageous battle against the destruction of our natural, out-of-door heritage.

In the face of a fast expanding population, as well as an expanding indus-

trial-urban complex, overflowing into the countrysides, the fight is a difficult one.

Fundamentally, the conservation programs are aimed at preserving our soil, water, forest, and other natural resources. Other endeavors are directed at preserving fish and wildlife, as well as areas of unspoiled scenic, out-of-door wilderness and landscapes.

In addition to preservation of natural resources, these natural lands are providing opportunities for recreation and health and spiritual revitalization for our people. In 1960, for example, about 60 million citizens are expected to visit the areas administered by the National Park Service.

Recently, the New York Times published an informative article entitled "The Uses of Conservation." The article was written by John B. Oakes and reflects the creative way in which our out-of-door areas are being utilized, as well as the need for constructive programs to preserve these significant lands. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE USES OF CONSERVATION—HOLIDAYERS TODAY REAP BENEFITS OF EARLIER PROGRAMS

(By John B. Oakes)

Henry David Thoreau, whose Walden is pictured on this page and whose legacy to the world is the Walden ideal, wrote more than a century ago: "Why should we not * * * have our national preserves, in which the bear and the panther * * * may still exist, and not be civilized off the face of the earth—our forests * * * for inspiration and our own true recreation? Or shall we, like villains, grub them all up, poaching on our own national domains?"

In the century since Thoreau's "Maine Woods" appeared, we Americans have been grubbing up and poaching upon our own national domains with a carelessness born of prodigious wealth, but suddenly we have found that we are no longer so wealthy as we had thought in unspoiled natural resources, and we are beginning to take seriously the need for their conservation. Even Walden Pond itself was grubbed up and poached upon, until some outraged citizens of Massachusetts finally took up the arms of the law. Only a few weeks ago they won a ruling from the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth requiring that Walden not only be protected from further despoliation but also be restored by the officials entrusted with its preservation to the "natural aspect and character" that the original donors of the property to the county had expected would be maintained forever.

CONSERVATION CAN WIN

This decision of the Massachusetts court, though affecting only a few acres of land, does illustrate the principle that conservationists can succeed in their objectives if they are willing to fight hard enough to achieve them. But the history of American conservation is the history of rearguard actions, of desperate measures to save a little scenery, a little forest, a little land in its original state before it has been entirely "improved," developed or bulldozed away by the march of urban, industrial, or agricultural civilization.

As millions of Americans rush out of their cities this summer looking for a breath of "nature," let them remember that conservation is a very practical thing; it is the force that if successful will insure preservation of a minute fraction of the natural heritage of our country unspoiled for future generations. If unsuccessful, and no one can doubt that the economic and political pressures against conservation are formidable, there will literally be within a very few decades, no worthwhile natural preserve left for the public to enjoy.

The 60 million people who are expected to visit the areas administered by the National Park Service this summer, not to mention the uncounted millions more who will be visiting State and local preserves, might well pause for a moment in their enjoyment of the unclutered scenery, the naturalness of their surroundings, the proximity of wildlife, the space and (for those who get away from the road) the silence, to think how all this happens to be there awaiting their pleasure. It was the conservationists of the past whose foresight insured the protection of this much of their country's beauty for today.

The more than 3 million people who visited the Great Smoky Mountains National Park last year had the privilege of experiencing, if they wished, a unique tract of half a million acres of primitive forested America, most of it looking very much the way it did three centuries ago, when the first settlers, some of whose descendants are still there, hacked their way into that wilderness. This great park, the most popular in the country, owes its origin to the generosity of one man, the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr. He also was responsible for the protection of other national parks, including Grand Teton in Wyoming and Acadia in Maine.

If he had not acted, and if the people through Congress and their legislatures had not responded, sometimes after terrific struggles, these great areas would have been given over to the usual run of lumbermen, grazers, or other exploiters, and their unique quality would have been destroyed forever.

The story has been the same since conservationists first began to work for the creation of the national park system.

Every time an effort is made to set aside, on behalf of the public, an area of unique natural beauty, some vested interests are sure to be adversely affected. They may be lumber interests, or grazing interests, or mining interests, or bureaucratic interests, or simply shortsighted, if well-meaning citizens who think that no interest is superior to that of the Federal Treasury.

When the bill to create Glacier National Park was introduced 50 years ago by Representative Charles Nelson Pray, he was told by his colleagues that there was no need for another park in Montana because Yellowstone already existed on the State's southern borders, and if this bill were enacted it would create a perpetual drain on the Federal Treasury for which they did not care to become responsible. Last year the nearly three-quarters of a million visitors to Glacier are estimated to have spent some $18 million in the State of Montana.

BASIC VALUES

The real value of the national park and wilderness system has nothing to do with cost or returns. The real value consists in the inherent worth of permanently preserving the best remnants of our country's natural scenic beauty for the spiritual, aesthetic and physical enjoyment of the American people for all time to come. Until a few years ago, it was possible, although it was never desirable, to approach this objective in leisurely fashion. But spectacularly rapid urbanization, industrialization and mechanization have created an immediate emergency in the long slow process of enlarging the protected domain that is to be handed over intact to succeeding generations.

The case of the shorelines is a good example. Just a quarter-century ago, in 1935, the National Park Service made a survey of potential seashore areas suitable for public acquisition. It recommended purchase of 12 major areas, totaling 437 miles of superb beach, leaving plenty of others, only a little less desirable, suitable for State and other reserves.

What has happened to these beaches? Only 1 of the 12 was acquired at the time as a national seashore. Ten of the remaining eleven have, to quote a National Park Service survey, "long since gone into private and commercial developments." One such area, 30 miles long, could have been purchased in 1935 at the rate of $9,000 a mile. Today, only 9 of its original 30 miles are undeveloped, and they would cost $110,000 a mile if the funds could be found to purchase them.

As a result of the lack of foresight on the part of the American public—park officials knew all about the needs even then, but the money was lacking—there is an acute shortage today of shoreline areas suitable for permanent preservation for public use and enjoyment. The vacationists who will go this summer to the Oregon Dunes on the Pacific, or to Padre Island on the Texas coast, or to Cape Cod on the North Atlantic, will be visiting three of the best remaining sites for potential national shoreline parks. If they are not soon acquired, they will without the slightest doubt be spoiled within a very few years beyond all recognition.

TIME RUNNING OUT

Time is rapidly running out on these and the relatively few other first-class coastal areas that are still available—areas such as Cumberland Island, Ga.; Point Reyes, Calif.; and a number of ideal sites on our Fourth Shore along the Great Lakes, including the Indiana Dunes, which are imminently threatened by industial development, and Huron Mountains, Pictured Rocks and Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan. Conservationists throughout the country are fighting to save these and similar areas. If they are not supported by an insistent demand from the wide public that will enjoy these places once they become parks, Congress is not likely to rise to the occasion.

Even some of the Government agencies that were established to protect our national resources have in one guise or another joined the exploitative procession. For example, the United States Forest Service, with a brilliant record of intelligent timber management behind it, is now fighting with all the bureaucratic skill it can command against ceding to the National Park System even one square foot of the most scenic lands. So long as these lands remain within the Forest Service, they are always subject to commercial exploitation by mere administrative fiat. Similarly, the Park Service itself occasionally has been tempted away from the business of preservation and protection, for which it was set up, into the conflicting field of mass recreation. This process has fortunately not gone far, but borderline evidence of it has aroused some concern.

With the increase of population, of leisure time, of transport facilities and of disposable income, the pressures from tourists and travelers on America's remaining natural areas are going to go steadily upward, while the supply of such areas is going rapidly downward.

LEGISLATIVE GOAL

What can be done about it? The most immediate goal is passage of legislation that would give permanent, statutory protection to existing wild areas already in the Federal Government's possession. The instrument with which to do this is the pending wilderness bill, now blocked in the Senate by spokesmen for some of the special interests already mentioned. The next, or concurrent, action is to acquire more of such lands before their prime scenic assets disappear.

In addition to the coastal areas, which deserve first priority, there are many important inland tracts such as the Northern Cas-

cades wilderness area in the State of Washington, the Great Basin area in Nevada, the Ozark Rivers strip in Missouri, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal along the Potomac, and the Allagash woods-and-water wilderness in Maine. Each of these is worthy of permanent preservation under Federal auspices. There are considerable areas of perhaps lesser significance or smaller size that require State action of the type Governor Rockefeller has recently set in motion in New York with his proposal for a $75 million bond issue to enlarge the State and local park systems.

Travelers to many of the best-known scenic spots in America this summer have the conservationists of the past to thank for the fact that what they see is still relatively unspoiled. But, as Secretary of the Interior Seaton recently wrote, "The next 5 or 10 years constitute critical years if we are to add what we need to our heritage of scenic, historic and cultural treasures for the use and enjoyment of the greater, and largely urbanized, population of the future."

Timely Articles From Life Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include three articles taken from a recent issue of Life Lines, a great American publication. These articles should make us stop, look, and listen. They are all filled with commonsense.

The articles follow:

OUR DOLLARS FLY AWAY

How would you like to have $218 lopped off your income tax this year? Of course that is not going to happen—but it could happen if we had some way of getting back money that Congress has appropriated for foreign aid but which has not yet been spent.

Yes, it is true that even as we are being bombarded with propaganda in favor of still more and still larger appropriations for foreign aid, the amount of appropriated but as yet unspent money for this purpose is the equivalent of $218 for every American family. We are indebted for this information to the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures. This committee is headed by Senator BYRD of Virginia, who is a thoughtful and persistent critic of governmental extravagance. The committee points out that foreign aid funds appropriated by Congress and not yet spent amounts to about 2 years of heavy appropriations for this giant giveaway program.

But even with this huge amount of unspent money on hand, the drums are being beaten now, as they have been beaten every year since the end of the war, to drown out the anguished cries of American taxpayers against sending more billions overseas. And if the United States eventually goes bankrupt as a result—well, that is the last thing the big spenders worry about.

Of one thing we may be quite certain: We are not going to get back that $218 per family that has not yet been spent. We might as well kiss it goodbye, for it will be spent.

Spent for what purpose? The only way we can judge the future is to study the past—and the past history of foreign aid spending does not make a pleasant or reassuring picture.

ELEPHANTIASIS

Elephantiasis, according to the dictionary, is a disease in which the affected part becomes enormously enlarged. So it is fair to say that the United States today is suffering from governmental elephantiasis.

Consider this informed statement by the late Rowland Hughes, who, at the time he made it, was Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

"The Federal Government is, among other things, the largest electric power producer in the country, the largest insurer, the largest lender and the largest borrower, the largest landlord and the largest holder of grazing land, the largest holder of timberland and the largest owner of grain, the largest shipowner, and the largest truck fleet operator. For a nation which is the citadel and the world's principal exponent of private enterprise and the individual initiative, this is an amazing list."

There are other amazing facts about the size of the Federal Government. Many of them were brought to light in the reports of the Hoover Commission. These, for instance:

In 1910 the Central Government cost the average American family $38 per year. This year the cost per family totals approximately $2,000. During this same period the national debt increased from the equivalent of less than $50 per family to more than $7,000 per family. The number of civilian employees of the Federal Government grew sevenfold. The Federal budget was multiplied 127 times.

This is what happens when government becomes afflicted with elephantiasis. The question is, Can anything be done to halt the spread of the disease and bring about a cure?

The answer has to be "Yes" if we hope to continue to live as a free nation. The mistaken do not, of course, want the disease to be cured. They see unbridled governmental growth and unchecked governmental spending as ways to hurl the United States into bankruptcy and to create a condition of chaos that would bring them closer to their antifreedom goals.

THERE IS A CURE

The first step toward curing governmental elephantiasis is an informed public. We need to learn—and we need then to tell others—how the size and cost of government can be reduced.

There are plenty of places to cut down. If we stopped the great giveaway known as foreign aid, the saving this year would amount to at least $100 for every family in the United States. If we made just a reasonable reduction of 10 percent in the civilian payroll of the Federal Government, that alone would amount to a saving of over $30 for every family.

NO COMMON MEN

When someone does a lot of talking about the virtues of the "common man"—look out. He wants something from you and hopes to get it by proving his own humility. The fewer common men we have in America, the better off we are. The men who have shaped our Nation, politically and economically, have been uncommon men. They may have been humble in origin, but that was not the source of their greatness. No one who knows of their accomplishments would accuse such men as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln or Thomas Edison of being common men.

America's need is for the leadership of the uncommon men and women—patriotic Americans who cannot be intimidated and who are not afraid of being controversial.

Resolution Adopted by Long Island Zionist Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently, in Spring Valley, N.Y., the Long Island Zionist Region held its 26th annual convention. Chairman David Oppenheim has been kind enough to send me a copy of the concise and well-thought-out resolution adopted by the convention.

Because of the importance of this organization and its comments, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas Israel was established as a result of a number of emerging and converging factors, including the ancient and historic attachment of a people to their land, and the recognition by the world powers of their responsibilities toward this people, particularly after the decimation of its numbers as a result of the Hitler madness; and

Whereas despite all efforts made in good faith by the leaders of Israel for it to live in peace and harmony with its Arab neighbors, tensions still exist; and

Whereas our Government has time and again reiterated its readiness to assist in the establishment of peace in the Middle East: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Long Island Zionist Region, assembled at its 26th annual convention in Spring Valley, N.Y., May 27–30, 1960, That it:

1. Thanks our Government for its continued and most valuable assistance to the State of Israel.

2. Expresses its deep appreciation for the good will toward Israel indicated in our Government's statements.

3. Urges continued U.S. economic assistance to Israel and also to the Arab peoples conditioned upon its use for internal improvement rather than for external adventures.

4. Suggests that serious consideration be given to the idea of complete disarmament of the Middle East, or failing that, to the preservation of an arms balance in that region.

5. Assumes adherence by our Government to its oft expressed policy to preserve the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East.

6. Trusts that there will be no compromise with, or silent acceptance of, boycotts, blockades, and other act of economic warfare against nations who are members of the United Nations on the part of other nations.

7. Urges settlement of the problem of the Arab refugees by their integration in their Arab host countries, with compensation from Israel for the abandoned property agreed upon through direct negotiation: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all our Representatives in the House and Senate, and to the Secretary of State and to the President of the United States.

LONG ISLAND ZIONIST REGION.
SPRING VALLEY, N.Y., *May 29, 1960.*

Gigantic Shelter Under Boston Common

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting article written by Ronald A. Wysocki in relation to civilian defense, appearing in the Boston Globe of May 30, 1960. The article sets forth the constructive views and opinions of Mr. George Lewis Brady, chairman of the Massachusetts Parking Authority, Boston, Mass., which authority is in the process of constructing a large public garage, and the views of Mr. Brady as to how this garage could be used for civilian defense purposes in Boston. I have always felt that the Federal Government should interest itself in construction throughout our country and the use of such construction as could be utilized for civilian defense and, in the case of nuclear attack, to protect and save lives of human beings. I have felt for years that the Federal Government should contribute the extra cost that is necessary for this purpose. The opinion of Mr. Brady is not only constructive but far seeing:

GIGANTIC SHELTER UNDER BOSTON COMMON—ROOM FOR 22,000 PERSONS IF A-BLAST SHOULD HIT

(By Ronald A. Wysocki)

A giant nuclear bomb shelter—first of its kind in the Nation—will be built beneath the Boston Common within 2 years.

The unique structure will provide protection for 22,000 persons from atomic radiation.

Absence of water beneath the Common, discovered in excavation for the Boston Common underground garage, made plans for such a shelter possible.

The shelter and second half of the 3,000-car garage—construction of which is scheduled to start next July—will be one and the same.

"In these days, such protection from atomic fallout is necessary," said George L. Brady, chairman of the Massachusetts Parking Authority which controls the garage.

Several architects' plans for the unique garage-bomb shelter are currently being studied by the authority.

The 6-acre, 3-level parking facility, housing 1,500 cars, can be converted into a shelter at a moment's notice in case of attack, Brady said.

Its features include:

A special arched roof, 10 times stronger than a level top.

A cellar, separated from the rest of the structure by a 3-foot cement floor, for storage and equipment use.

Canned and dehydrated foods to feed 22,000 persons for 2 weeks.

An artesian well drilled into the Common floor.

Dormitories and an infirmary.

Medical supplies.

Independent oxygen and ventilating systems to prevent air contamination.

Its own electrical plant and generators.

Airtight lead doors, operated automatically, to prevent seepage of harmful radiation.

No additional cost to the $15 million garage project is anticipated by Brady as a result of the incorporation of the shelter.

"The garage is being constructed in two parts, each costing an estimated $7½ million," Brady said.

Work on the shelter-garage is expected to start before or immediately upon completion of the first half, scheduled July 1961.

Its site is on the Boylston Street side of Charles Street, just below the Common Burying Ground, and adjacent to its complementing half.

A Common entrance and exit off Charles Street will serve both sides.

Bids on construction of the new facility will be advertised in January, Brady said.

An unusual method of construction will probably be employed for the shelter, Brady said, with a vaulted roof, comprising a series of arches, being laid first.

In a plan proposed by Maccabee, Campbell & Associates of Chicago, pioneer consulting engineers in the design of bomb shelters, a shallow excavation would be dug and a form made of earth upon which the roof would be set.

Work would then continue beneath the prepared roof, with supports added as progress was made. Paper, plastic, or wood would be placed against the earthen walls until cement supports were installed.

According to Brady, the shelter will extend 48 feet into the ground as opposed to 42 feet for the original half.

A 3- to 6-foot layer of dirt will cover the extra strong vaulted roof, Brady said.

He considered the conventional part of the underground structure enough protection for a blast 15 miles away but inadequate to the radiation danger.

"Those inside have to drink and eat," said Brady. "It has been proven that the radiation is responsible for more injury and death than the explosion."

In the opinion of Brady, this country is unprotected from the effects of nuclear explosions. He cited the fact that Sweden has built shelters to shield 65 percent of its population and Switzerland 70 percent.

"Most European countries have nuclear shelters," he said. "The Boston Common shelter will serve as a model for similar means of protection in this country."

The authority has proposed legislation enabling it to construct similar installations in other municipalities in the Commonwealth, subject to approval by local officials.

Brady expects enactment of the proposals momentarily. Once passed, the authority would undertake building of such shelter-garages in other cities and towns.

"We would have to have the approval of local officials before we moved into any municipality," he said. "Federal help from a fund already provided would be forthcoming to help finance such projects."

It was estimated that inclusion of a fallout shelter in a garage plan would amount to 30 percent of the cost. He suggested the Federal Government contribute that amount.

The rest could be amortized as a parking facility with its revenue going to pay the rest of the expenditure, he said.

The consulting firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis has been employed by the authority to conduct a survey of the State as to areas especially in need of bomb shelters.

Brady revealed that Worcester Common, three places in Somerville and Harvard Square were being considered for sites.

He pinpointed Worcester as being a critical area in terms of needed bomb protection. "It is surrounded by hills which would act as bouncing boards for radiation blast waves," he said, "causing a doubly violent effect of an atomic blast on the city."

Boston was named by Brady as a primary target of any aggressor because of the heavy concentration of strategic military, scientific, and industrial installations located here.

"The underground shelter will not have all the comforts of home," Brady said. "The people will eat C-rations, live in cramped quarters and discomfort.

"What we are interested in is survival. It is impossible to provide safety for everyone, but every life saved is important."

Dr. DeBakey, Famed Heart Surgeon, Named to Health Plan Advisory Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the Nation's foremost heart surgeons, Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of Houston, has accepted appointment as chairman of the Democratic advisory council's newly formed committee on health policy.

Appointment of Dr. DeBakey and other members of his committee, and their willingness to take the time and effort to help formulate a "decent medical care program for all," is a significant step. It is particularly important when a surgeon of such brilliant record and outstanding ability heads the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story concerning Dr. DeBakey's appointment that was published in the Houston Chronicle of May 29, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. DEBAKEY, FAMED LOCAL HEART SURGEON, NAMED TO DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL

Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, famed Houston heart surgeon, is in politics.

His job is to carve out and sew up a health policy for the Democratic Party.

DeBakey's appointment as chairman of the Democratic advisory council's new advisory committee on health policy was announced Saturday by Paul M. Butler, Democratic national chairman.

Butler said DeBakey's group also will be asked to prepare planks to be recommended to the party platform committee at the July Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles.

DeBakey told the Chronicle:

"CARE FOR ALL

"The formation (of the committee) is tremendously heartening to all of us in the field of medicine. As the party of the people, the Democratic Party is responding to the increased demands of our people for decent medical care for all.

"Good medical care is today beyond the reach of millions of American families. It is our job, through expanded health insurance, through increasing the supply of medical personnel and through acceleration of our medical research efforts, to bring the benefits of modern medical care to every American family."

HEADS SURGERY UNIT

DeBakey is chairman of the department of surgery at Baylor University College of Medicine.

In 1959 DeBakey received the American Medical Association's Distinguished Service Medal for a brilliant 6-year project which demonstrated conclusively that many kinds of strokes can be treated surgically.

DeBakey has demonstrated in countries throughout the world a surgical technique for treating stroke victims.

A native of Lake Charles, La., he received his medical degree from Tulane University in 1932.

CONSULTANT TO MANY

DeBakey has been a consultant to numerous medical and research study organizations. After 4 years of wartime service he was a member of the Medical Adivsory Committee to the Secretary of Defense from 1948 to 1950, chairman of the Committee on Surgery of the National Research Council in 1953 and a member of the Committee on Medical Services of the first Hoover Commission.

He is a member of the Advisory Council to the National Heart Institute and was most recently a consultant on medical research to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

DeBakey was awarded the Legion of Merit in 1946, the Rudolph Matas Award in 1954, and the International Society for Surgery Distinguished Service Award in 1957, and others.

The Old Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was my proud privilege on Sunday afternoon, the 29th of May, to participate in a ceremony at Fort Myer that was inspiring to me—and to the other participants and spectators as well. The occasion was a retreat review in which the Active Army honored the National Guard Association and the Reserve Officers' Association—and through them, one could feel, the Active Army was honoring the hundreds of thousands of citizen soldiers who have sprung to the defense of their country in time of peril.

Those of us privileged to attend saw lined up before us the troops of the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry—The Old Guard—resplendent in their dress blue uniforms, and a composite platoon on the 3d Battle Group, 3d Infantry, United States Army Reserve. This platoon, representing seven infantry companies and six towns in southern Minnesota, had journeyed hundred of miles to participate in the ceremony.

The 3d Infantry has a long and proud history which mirrors the growth of the United States as a Nation. Its regimental colors have flown valiantly in virtually every war the Nation has waged. Its 32 well-earned Battle Streamers attest to its magnificent record of bravery in action. Older than the Constitution, the 3d Infantry has borne on its roll the names of men who fought with Washington at Valley Forge and Yorktown. It is our oldest Active Army Infantry unit.

Today, the Old Guard as it has been known and honored throughout the Army since the War with Mexico, has the vital and sensitive role of guarding the heart of our land, the Nation's Capital. At the same time, the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry, is the Army's official ceremonial unit in the Washington area. It has the coveted honor of acting as personal escort to Presidents of the United States in inaugural parades. Its honor guard company is entrusted with the singular honor of providing a detail of sentinels to maintain an eternal vigil at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery.

At the review, the colors of both battle groups were in the center of the formation. There were the distinctive uniforms of the Colonial Color Guard of the 1st Battle Group, the original uniforms of the 3d Infantry. Their blue and white uniforms are the exact copies of those worn by the enlisted men of the 3d Infantry Regiment when it was organized in 1784. And there was the color guard of the 3d Battle Group, 3d Infantry, USAR, all the way from Minnesota, wearing the Army sun tan duty uniform.

It seemed particularly appropriate that these two battle groups should join together for the ceremony. Fort Snelling, the present headquarters of the Reserve's 3d Battle Group, 3d Infantry, was for many years the home station of the Regular Army's 3d Infantry, whose present-day standard bearer is the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry—The Old Guard.

There is a high resolve and a common determination to achieve a new spirit of unity throughout the components of the Army. Regulars and Reserves, civilian and military, infantry and engineers, active and retired—all have closed ranks in their common objective of unity of effort, of purpose, and of spirit to weld the Army team into the most effective fighting force for America's defense.

As I listened to the inspiring message of the Honorable Dewey Short, a former Member of Congress and now the Assistant Secretary of the Army, I could truly appreciate the "oneness" of the Army. Later as I talked to the men of the Army Reserve's 3d Battle Group, 3d Infantry, from Minnesota, I could feel they, too, shared this spirit. It was thrilling and satisfying. I felt honored and humble to be a part of this public expression of unity.

The Army is to be commended for its continuing efforts to unify and weld its components into an ever increasingly effective force and under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to present to my colleagues the text of the speech made by the Honorable Mr. Short at this memorable ceremony:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DEWEY SHORT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (M.P. & R.F.), RETREAT CEREMONY, HONORING RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 29, 1960

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests and fellow Americans, it is a distinct privilege to have the opportunity of participating in this ceremony honoring two great patriotic and dedicated organizations—the Reserve Officers Association and the National Guard Association.

At the outset, I would also like to mention especially the members of the Army Congressional Command and Operations Group who are here today. Col. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, organizer and founder of this group, shares the reviewing stand with us this afternoon. The Congressional Command and Operations Group, composed of Members of Congress and congressional staff assistants who are in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve are men devoted to the service of our country. Despite their busy congressional calendar, they still find time to participate actively in Reserve activities and we are indeed honored to have them with us today.

Over the past few years in my official capacity, I have dealt with matters directly and indirectly concerning the National Guard and the Reserves, and I realize—and I say this with all humility—perhaps better than most how tirelessly and unselfishly the officers and men of the National Guard and the Reserves throughout the Nation contribute of their time and effort to the common cause of our Nation's defense.

Although our security demands that we be thoroughly prepared to deal effectively with any attack that might be made upon us, the maintenance of a standing armed force of sufficient size to offset the power of the millions who bear Communist arms would place a dangerous if not an insupportable burden upon our economy. The only solution is to maintain strong, well trained, and fully equipped forces in reserve, ready for instant action in the event of another emergency. Such forces are an essential part, not only of our indispensable power to win any war that might be thrust upon us, but equally if not more important, of our power to prevent war, our primary purpose. Thus do the National Guard and Reserves constitute a power for peace the Communists well understand. Such splendid organizations as the Reserve Officers and the National Guard Associations, through their strong support of our defense effort, are helping to insure that our military posture is prepared to meet instantly any challenge of aggression thrust upon us.

Today's National Guard and Reserve Forces are based on a concept of American citizenship that goes back to our colonial beginnings. The idea itself is so logical that we often forget how truly revolutionary it was for the world of that day.

George Washington expressed it best in a letter to Congress in 1783: "It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property but even his personal services to the defense of it." The Father of our County strongly recommended that "* * * the citizens of America * * * from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice." It is easy now to recognize the great wisdom of Washington's advice.

American citizens, whether as members of the Armed Forces or as civilians, stand shoulder to shoulder for world peace. In this effort, each American has a role, more dynamic, more vital, and more challenging than any other. It is the responsibility of every citizen to help assure that in the United States is found a Nation economically and spiritually strong, a Nation which with confidence reaffirms the values of democracy and freedom. If in our own lives we exemplify the highest level of devotion to moral law, our country may show to all the peoples of the world the freedom and human dignity which characterize life in a democratic country. Our great tradition is that

of the rule of law rather than the rule of men. Let us show to all the world how strong and vigorous a nation can be which lives under the rule of freedom, justice, and mercy.

David M. Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following items concerning David M. Hall, late a Representative from the 12th North Carolina District, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

First. A poem entitled "And Peace at Last," written by the Reverend Robert G. Tuttle.

Second. A resolution adopted by the Western North Carolina Associated Communities.

Third. An article concerning a memorial service, which appeared in the Asheville Citizen for May 24, 1960.

There being no objections, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND PEACE AT LAST—DAVID HALL
(By Robert G. Tuttle)

Washington, the affairs of state, the lure of space
Had claimed his mind and strength—
Disease and pain had plagued
But never crushed his will to be and do.

His spirit stood
When limbs could not—
His mind was firm,
His vision clear.

He served his people,
Then his nation and the world—
But body could not stand
The pace his spirit set.

A hundred battles fought and won
Invisible toll had taken—
The last was waged
Beyond the strength of man.

Now home to rest—
His earthly form is laid in quiet
Amidst his mountains keeping watch
O'er home and family in the vale.

When heads were bowed
By plot of beauty on the hill—
Through silence a cow in reverence lowed
And distant dogs echoed the music of the hills.

But, 'spite of death, his life renewed—
His restless quest with God rejoined—
He paused and smiled, well pleased to see
His earthbound loved ones gathered near.

RESOLUTION—WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATED COMMUNITIES

Whereas members of Western North Carolina Associated Communities heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable David McKee Hall of Sylva, N.C., on Friday, January 29, 1960; and

Whereas the late Honorable David M. Hall was known as a man of indomitable courage, who, despite physical impairment necessitating confinement to a wheelchair since childhood, had distinguished himself as a successful practicing attorney and a useful citizen dedicated to the welfare of the people, especially interested in the physically handicapped, both the young and the aged; and

Whereas at the time of his departure from this life, he was serving as the duly elected Representative of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina, and was rendering outstanding service as a Member of the 86th Congress of the United States; and, for many years prior thereto, he had contributed valuable service to the upbuilding of the community as well as to the development of human and natural resources within the mountain countries; and, by virtue of appointive and elective offices held in regional organizations and State government, he had advocated and participated in progressive improvements which resulted in economic, educational, and other benefits to the people, the region of the State of North Carolina as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That members of Western North Carolina Associated Communities, in regular meeting assembled, on February 23, 1960, at Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, N.C., express sincere sympathy to the family of the late Honorable David M. Hall; and, further express, in devoted tribute to his memory, deep appreciation of his courageous efforts and valuable service contributed throughout the years to the people of Western North Carolina.

H. BUECK,
President, Franklin, N.C.
M. B. MORRILL,
Secretary, Cullowhee, N.C.

[From the Asheville Citizen, May 24, 1960]

MEMORIAL SERVICE HELD FOR LATE DAVID M. HALL

(By Dorothy Parris)

SYLVA.—In a courtroom crowded to overflowing with family, friends, and neighbors, a memorial service was held here Monday for the late U.S. Representative David M. Hall, of Sylva.

At the service, marking the opening of the Jackson County Superior Court term, Marcellus Buchanan, a Sylva attorney, presented a framed photograph of the Congressman, given by members of the courthouse staff, which was hung in the courtroom.

In his tribute, Buchanan spoke of Hall's career as county attorney, State senator, a member of the State water commission and the first Member of Congress west of Balsam Mountain.

LAW LICENSE

"I would like to think," Buchanan said, "that the greatest source of pride to Dave was the receipt of his law license, the right to pursue the career he loved so well and to which he was so dedicated.

"He was one of the great attorneys, learned in the law, fearless in his devotion to his client, fearsome as an adversary, firm in his conviction, yet the epitomy of fairness and trust.

"Dave Hall carried these attributes into every endeavor of his life.

"As a Member of Congress," Buchanan continued, "the 12th Congressional District was secure in the realization that it would be well and ably represented. To this task Dave bent his mind and strength.

"DEVOTION

"His utter devotion to his district, and to the State and to the Nation proved too great for his physical endurance. If ever it could be said that a man sacrificed himself for his neighbors, it could be said in the case of our late friend and comrade, Dave Hall."

Jennings A. Bryson, county commissioner of finance, accepted the portrait on behalf of the county with a tribute to Hall as "the most courageous man I have ever known."

Mrs. Hall, the Congressman's widow, said "I can think of no more fitting place for this portrait to hang, than in this place he loved so well, among the people whom he loved."

Judge J. Will Pless, Jr., of Marion, presiding over the court term, also praised Hall's courage and ability. Other attorneys who spoke were District Solicitor Glenn W. Brown, of Waynesville, and Kent Coward, of Sylva. Coward read a tribute from his brother, Orville Coward, whose illness made it impossible for him to attend.

Lacy Thornburg, Hall's law partner, and Henry Fisher, an Asheville attorney and a longtime personal friend of Hall, also paid tribute to the Congressman. Mrs. Margaret Hensen, clerk of superior court, presided at the ceremony, and the invocation and benediction were given by the Reverend A. L. Maxwell.

Among the members of Hall's family who attended, in addition to his widow, were his mother, Mrs. David M. Hall, Sr.; daughters, Anne, Allison, and Hannah; his brother, Robert C. Hall, of Asheville; and his sister, Mrs. C. N. Dowdle, of Asheville.

Many Mourn the Sad Passing of Rowell A. Billups, One of the Outstanding Business Leaders and Philanthropists in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the sad passing of Rowell A. Billups, the South lost one of its most distinguished and outstanding businessmen, beloved and respected by people in all walks of life.

His accomplishments were many. In being able to start off from the bottom and by sheer determination and ability develop and bring about one of the biggest businesses in the Nation, which operates in over 14 States, and yet lived a life of an honorable, kind, and lovable man. He did so many acts of kindness and his generosity seemed unending.

People in all walks of life, leading businessmen, bankers, Governors, Congressmen, Lieutenant Governors, sheriffs, and notables from many States, were among his mourners at his funeral. And yet, with all of these important men and women, there were people in most modest circumstances who bowed their heads and shed tears for a man whom they had known, loved, and respected.

Mr. Billups, 61, was the founder of Billups Eastern Petroleum Co. and Billups Western Petroleum Co., which own and operate a chain of service stations in 14 States along the eastern seaboard and throughout the South.

He was a native of Carroll County and was the son of William A. Billups and the late Lillie McKenzie Billups of Carroll County. He was an alumnus of the University of Mississippi and served in the U.S. Marine Corp during World War I.

Mr. Billups moved to Greenwood 30 years ago and opened his first service station here around 1932. Since that time the company has grown until today it is recognized as one of the largest

chains in the southern half of the country.

He was known throughout Mississippi and Louisiana for his active civic undertakings and his philanthropic activities. A keen businessman and a widely read student of economics he never lost touch with the economic pulse of the business world.

He was a member of the Elks Club and was recently elected president of the Mississippi Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. He was elevated to this position at the State meeting here in March from his former office as vice president of the State society. He was serving his second consecutive year as chairman of the Salvation Army advisory board.

He was the organizer and a past president of the Leflore County Heart Association and was a member of the board of directors of the Mississippi Heart Association.

Mr. Billups was also very active in the Delta Area Council of the Boy Scouts. He headed a drive to rehabilitate and expand the facilities of Camp Tally-Ha in 1956 and has been a member of the executive board for a number of years. He was also a member of the advisory board for Mississippi Vocational College for a number of years and was recently elected to board of directors of the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce.

A generous contributor to civic and charitable causes, he endowed a heart research laboratory at Tulane University known as Billups Foundation. He also contributed equipment to the eye research division of Tulane University.

Mr. Billups had extensive farming interest in Leflore, Carroll, and Sunflower counties. At the time of his death he had announced plans to expand his business activities and erect a large bowling establishment here.

He was an avid sports fan and very active in the University of Mississippi Alumni Association.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Grace Ricketts Billups, one daughter, Mrs. Charles D. Saunders; two brothers, Guy C. Billups, all of Greenwood, and W. L. "Buddy" Billups of Hammond, La.; one sister, Miss Irene Billups, also of Greenwood, and his father, W. A. Billups of Carrollton and two grandchildren, Charlot, and Rowell Billups Saunders.

Few men in our time ever achieved what Rowell A. Billups achieved. He did not live for next week, next month, next year, for life was every day and he made it a point in his daily life to make this a better world for all as a place to live.

Seldom did a day pass that he did not go far afield in trying to help and assist some person in unfortunate circumstances. With all his achievements in the business world, he had a deep love and affection for his relatives and his friends, and he made it a point to be with them every possible moment. He was loved, respected, and he will be missed by thousands of people in all walks of life.

May his soul rest in peace.

West Virginia Is a Colorful and Appealing Vacationland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the May-June issue of the attractive magazine published for employees of eastern Trailways bus companies contains a delightful story on West Virginia, which is appropriately described as "one of the most colorful, paradoxical, wondrous—and misunderstood States in the Union."

After reading this article, I am sure many of my colleagues as well as the residents of the Capital City will want to escape the Washington heat this summer and absorb some of the breathtaking scenery in neighboring West Virginia. The Trailways magazine writer correctly points out that "West Virginia is a colorful and thoroughly appealing vacationland."

This informative material will provide you with a thumbnail sketch of our great State, which I think will help make your visit a more pleasant and meaningful one.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article, entitled "What About West Virginia?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The political primary is over now, but the acrid smoke of battle still hangs heavy over West Virginia's hills. The focus of national attention—and criticism—has shifted to other States and most West Virginians are glad to be out of the spotlight, feeling as they do that Americans have been given once again a distorted picture of what is one of the most colorful, paradoxical, wondrous—and misunderstood States in the Union.

Surprisingly little has been written about this American Switzerland. What has appeared has been generally unfavorable. Even today some Americans associate the State with drabness and consider it a blighted offshoot of Virginia peopled by scrawny mountaineers who never shave, carry pitchforks, and live in some weird comic-book world.

The truth of the matter is that West Virginia is a riotously colorful place with breathtaking scenery (Jefferson once described the view from Harpers Ferry as "worth crossing the Atlantic to see"), thriving industry (particularly in the northern section of the State), hospitable people and a network of parks and forests that offer excellent fishing, hunting, and camping. The State ranks first in the Union as a producer of soft coal, second as a producer of glass and fourth in total natural resources.

But West Virginia does have its liabilities. A prisoner to some of the most irregular boundaries ever devised by man, it looks on a map something like a defenseless pork chop with one end gone astray. Perhaps it's because of these boundaries that few people think of the State as a geographic entity. After all, its northernmost city of Chester is further north than Pittsburgh; its southernmost city of Bluefield is further south than Richmond; its easternmost village of Harpers Ferry is further east than Tampa and its westernmost city of Kenova is further west than Port Huron, Mich. All this in a State encompassing only 24,000 square miles.

It would't be so bad if the land were flat between these points. But it's not—and the roller-coaster roads that crisscross the State like an angry cat chasing her tail twist around, through and between 115 mountain peaks higher than 4,000 feet and 381 others that top 2,000 feet.

A BOON—AND A BURDEN

These hills are both a boon and a burden to residents who jokingly suggest that the only flat surfaces you're likely to find are along the barrels of mountaineer shotguns. Says one West Virginian: "this State is a wonderful place to work;. if you ever get tired all you have to do is lean up against it for a while and rest."

Sandwiched in between the mountains are such modern and progressive cities as Bluefield, Charleston, Fairmont, Huntington, Logan, and Wheeling. But these are not the towns the average traveler hears about, human nature being what it is, for what other State could direct you to villages with the improbable names of "Crum," "War," "Shock," and "Hurricane"? And where else would a chamber of commerce set up shop in Pax, Ethel, Gip, or Big Isaac?

The names of these towns are symbolic of West Virginian independence. It won't take you long to discover that mountaineers are a strongwilled bunch. If they think a town should be named Hurricane, then, by golly, that's just what they'll name it—and anyone who doesn't like it can live elsewhere.

Independence, though, has always been a West Virginia characteristic—ever since that muggy day in June of 1863 when the people decided to break away from Confederate Virginia and cast their lot with the divided Union. The decision wasn't popular in all sections. Ironically, but then perhaps typically, southern sentiment was strongest in the eastern panhandle, a narrow strip of land that rolls in a gentle arc toward Washington. Union support was heaviest in the coal-mining region of southern West Virginia (an area served extensively today by Trailways through-liners), only a hoot and a holler from Roanoke. That division of attitude still exists.

History has not always been kind to West Virginia. Famous events have happened here, but they've somehow been tragic in nature and almost always a little violent. It was at Harpers Ferry in 1859 that John Brown staged his ill-advised raid to free the slaves (he was soon captured by then Col. Robert E. Lee and later hanged at Charles Town) and it was at Phillipi that one of the first major land battles of the Civil War was fought. Both Harpers Ferry and Charleston were deeply scarred by the conflict and the little town of Romney changed hands 56 times before it was all over.

ANOTHER KIND OF BATTLE

Twenty years later another kind of battle was fought in West Virginia. Today, at Logan, at the southwestern part of the State, you can see a lonely memorial to that battle—a statue of Capt. Anderson Hatfield, the "Devil Anse" of the famed Hatfield-McCoy feuds that scarred the State for several years and later gave rise to countless cartoons. Old "Devil Anse" passed away more peacefully than John Brown—from pneumonia at the age of 82—but it was a while after that before any McCoy from Kentucky would venture across the streets of Logan by himself.

Feuding, fighting, and fussing have long since passed their heyday as West Virginia hobbies, and the fiercest opposition today's vacationer will find is apt to come from the finny creatures that lurk in great numbers along the State's well-stocked rivers and streams.

For a State with some of the greenest, most plentiful, and breathtaking scenery, together with some of the best fishing, hunting, and camping potential in America, West Virginia has not always done everything it could to attract visitors. Up until a few years ago, tourist accommodations were rare and vacation facilities hard to find.

All this has changed, however, and visitors today can take their pick of 29 State-operated parks and forests—ranging in size and location from Blackwater Falls, near the town of Davis, to the smaller Droop Mountain Battlefield State Park, near Marlington. At Cacapon Park, near Berkeley Springs, visitors can picnic, swim, fish, and even ride horseback along well-marked trails with scenic vistas. Watoga State Park, near Huntersville, has its own swimming pool and is the location for the Brooks Memorial Arboretum, a place of study for those interested in trees, shrubs, mosses, and wild flowers.

Possibly the most famous resort in all of West Virginia is the Greenbrier Hotel at White Sulphur Springs. A meeting place for the captains of business and industry, it sports famous fairways, Sam Snead, a healthy climate—and high prices.

All in all, West Virginia is a colorful and thoroughly appealing vacationland that somehow attracts too much negative attention to its economic problems (automation has caused some unemployment) and not enough positive attention to its obvious merits.

"We've got our troubles," says one mountaineer, "but I guess you'd have to say the State's doing all right—for the shape it's in."

Who Will Remember?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by James A. Sheehan which appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes on May 26, 1960:

WHO WILL REMEMBER?

Next Monday, May 30, is Memorial Day. To some it is a day of solemn remembrance of the dead of all our wars. To some, particularly, this year, it promises only a 3-day holiday when the cares of the day will be laid aside and the vast majority of our people will take themselves off to the seaside, the mountains or just laze around in the late spring sunshine, taking life easy.

Quite naturally there are those who do not forget the reason for which Memorial Day was instituted. These are the folks who have lost sons, husbands, and daughters in the service of their country in time of war.

These will remember and pay silent tribute to their own loved ones while including all the rest who now lie in National, State, and local cemeteries where they have found their final resting place, having proven, in time of need, their willingness to serve their country.

Others, too, will remember. These are the patriotic organizations which have emerged from all our wars. Members of these organizations will make their quiet way to the gravesides of their fallen comrades and there pay tribute to our war dead.

We might expect those who have lost loved ones who served their country and those who served with them to remember Memorial Day. Those who have suffered loss and those who served with the men and women who have now passed to their final reward can never forget what Memorial Day means.

Yes, we shall see processions, small and large, wending their way slowly to the graves of our veterans, there to lay flowers or place small American flags to show that some of us have not forgotten. It may well be, that in that last bivouac of the dead those who are so remembered and so honored will smile wanly at each other, nodding in approval of this gesture of recognition.

But what of the rest of us? What will they be doing? There are now approximately 180 million people living in the United States and we venture to say that except for the families of the departed and the patriotic groups who know what Memorial Day really means, the vast majority of our citizens will be pursuing their own pleasures, taking advantage of the 3-day lull in the ordinary affairs of life. That this should be true is a pity, indeed.

Despite the example of our patriotic organizations, the great majority of our citizens will go about the business of the holiday without ever a thought of why this respite from the toil of the day is given them. They have other things to do.

Those who do remember do so because they are ever mindful of the reason why these men and women died. In our preoccupation with the struggle for position and financial security, far too many of us have forgotten—no, not forgotten but are unmindful of the sacrifices these gallant dead have made for them.

Somewhere, in the minds of this unthinking group there must exist at this time a great uncertainty as to the future insofar as the preservation of our country and the ideals upon which it was founded is concerned. If only these thoughtless citizens could keep enshrined in their minds and their hearts the real reason for Memorial Day, then the sacrifices would not have been made in vain.

If Memorial Day is to be observed fittingly it should be done so by all Americans who should find in this day a renewed recollection of why it is celebrated and a remembrance of the fact that were it not for those honored on May 30 they who are now alive might not be enjoying all the privileges and rights which the dead have struggled to preserve.

This should be a day for all our citizens—not just a few—to reaffirm their beliefs in the country they are so proud to call their own and in the realization that those who are honored were responsible for the continuance of the United States of America as a Nation.

It should be a day on which all Americans should renew our pledge of allegiance to our country's principles and an acknowledgment that were it not for those honored dead these principles would long since have been lost.

If the renewal of such a pledge of this kind on Memorial Day could bring to the hearts of all of us the principles of loyalty and courage our dead have bequeathed to us, then Memorial Day would not only be a day of recollection of past wars but also a day of inspiration so that everything which all true Americans hold dear might continue because each and every one of us would remember the past and find in it the spiritual will to follow in the footsteps of those who have gone before.

It has been written: "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead." This is indeed true, and in giving a silent thought to our war dead we should gather strength for the days to come, fortified by the example of the fallen who now rest in honored peace.

And while we are exhorting all our citizens to recall our war dead may we also put forth the thought that these same citizens—of high or low degree—also remember the living who served them in time of war and see to it that these survivors are properly cared for—particularly the older veterans—so that before the time comes to strew flowers over their graves, they may be provided for adequately and thus permitted to enjoy their last days in decency.

Parish Priest of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the Right Reverend Monsignor LeRoy E. McWilliams of Jersey City, N.J., has been named "Parish Priest of the Year" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc. Monsignor McWilliams has served as the beloved pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in Jersey City for 42 years. More than 1,000 families in his parish are members of St. Michael's. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a resolution congratulating Monsignor McWilliams which was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey earlier this year.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Right Reverend Monsignor LeRoy E. McWilliams, pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church of 252 Ninth Street, Jersey City, N.J., has been proclaimed "parish priest of the year" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., of which M. Martin Turpanjian is president and Mrs. Conrad Lyons, editor of Spotlight, is chairman of the board of directors; and

Whereas Monsignor McWilliams has proven to be an energetic, magnetic, civic-conscious spiritual leader; and

Whereas Monsignor McWilliams in his religious ideals and social contacts, has maintained a policy of rigid tolerance and a sense of civic understanding that is truly commendable and inspiring; and

Whereas Monsignor McWilliams has served as OPA administrator on a most effective and equitable basis; he has been head of the United Fund for years; has been active in Red Cross and cancer fund-raising drives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey hereby extend to Monsignor McWilliams, its sincere congratulations upon this occasion and hope that he will enjoy many years of health and happiness; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the speaker and attested by the clerk, be sent to Monsignor McWilliams.

MAURICE V. BRADY,
Speaker of the General Assembly.

Attest:

MAURICE KAIP,
Clerk of the General Assembly.

A Long Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed legislation ratifying the interstate transit regulatory compact which is aimed at unification of metropolitan Washington, D.C., mass transit service and in doing so has taken a long step forward toward solving our mass transportation problems. Simultaneously, the action, in my opinion, may be construed as an indication that the Congress is at long last giving serious recognition to what is one of our Nation's most swiftly mounting problems, and that it is willing to do something about them. For months I have been studying the problem of mass transportation in Fairfield County, Conn., which is confronted with faltering rail commuter service on one hand but a lack of alternative means of mass transportation on the other. I have introduced legislation designed to help remedy this situation and similar problems in other areas. Passage of the compact ratification measure, you may be sure, brought me enormous relief and satisfaction. Indeed, I may now feel that we are getting somewhere. The task before us is monumental and will take time but I am confident that we are progressing already. Pursuant to permission previously granted I include an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday which makes notable comments on what has been done:

PROGRESS ON TRANSIT

Congress is acting with commendable dispatch and with unusual insight in dealing with the complex but vital proposals to improve the transportation facilities of Metropolitan Washington. Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, and his colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee performed skillfully in obtaining House passage of the measure to ratify an interstate transit regulatory compact, designed to put the region's transit service under a unified supervision. Senate approval seems likely to follow swiftly, and the way would thus be paved for steps to coordinate and improve bus service throughout the area.

The Joint House-Senate Committee on Metropolitan Washington Problems, meanwhile, has agreed on another measure aimed primarily at providing the Washington region with genuine rapid transit. Under this measure, a new National Capital Transportation Agency would make detailed plans for subway and surface rail lines and other transit facilities, reconsider streetcar abandonment, and report to Congress before starting any actual land buying or construction. It would also seek to foster the creation of an interstate compact agency to carry out the plans and operate rapid transit. The proposal would not insure the Federal financial support recommended by the administration pending a further congressional look at detailed plans—but the more limited approach is perhaps all that it would be realistic to expect from Congress at this early stage of the venture.

It is difficult to appraise the special restriction which the joint committee proposes to ban construction of the Wisconsin Avenue corridor extension of Interstate Route 70–S pending development of detailed transit plans. The ban also would extend to the proposed Glover-Archbold Parkway. There was little prospect that any extension of 70–S into the city would have been started in the next 2 or 3 years in any case, so no actual delay need result.

It is worth remembering that the mass transportation survey recommended both rapid transit and a major freeway for the northwest Washington sector. It would be surprising if a new study showed that transit alone would suffice. But if the study is carried out free of the local interest pressures which have been generated against the Wisconsin corridor and with regard for the metropolitan area's total transportation needs, there can be little valid objection to another review.

The prospects for final congressional and White House approval of these two major steps toward improved transit service for Washington are excellent. All citizens of the area may rejoice that Congress and the administration have faced up to the seriousness of the problem.

Canadian-United States Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Canadian-United States Friendship Enduring as Geography," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 6.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP ENDURING AS GEOGRAPHY

(By Max Freedman)

(Mr. Freedman, a native of Canada, is Washington correspondent for the Manchester Guardian. The following was written by Mr. Freedman for the Herald Tribune's series on Canadian-United States relations.)

WASHINGTON.—I have just returned from Canada where I have found a mood of anxiety tempered by responsibility as the Canadian people survey the sad wreckage of the summit conference. But no contagion of fear has blown from Paris across Canada. There is instead a new commitment to Canada's partnership with the United States and a new loyalty to our covenant with NATO.

No friendly neighbor's fence stands in the Arctic, and we can always forgive the mistakes of Washington as we remember the arrogance of Moscow. In the past few weeks there has been much to forgive; an inglorious sequence of blunder and mischance has blemished the record of American diplomacy; and these errors have invited and received their just portion of criticism and indignation. But this fretful interlude has lasted long enough, and the time has come to concentrate on the shared tasks of an inscrutable future rather than to prolong the humiliating inventory of a friend's mistakes. This mixture of compassion and resolution certainly is visible in the thinking of Canadian leaders in Ottawa. It is equally present in the comment of responsible Canadian opinion throughout the country.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker's visit with President Eisenhower, just concluded, should not be judged as a mere exercise in courtesy or as an heroic effort to resolve disputes that have resisted solution by the more patient methods of diplomacy. The Canadian Embassy in Washington, under the thoughtful and experienced leadership of Ambassador Arnold Heeney, has privileged access to the State Department and indeed to all branches of the government in a way which is not surpassed by even the British and French representatives.

Nor do Canada's relations with the United States depend very much on changes in Ottawa or Washington. The meaning of this relationship cannot be found in the fever chart of political controversy. It is as enduring as geography, as noble as the history of the two countries, and as spacious and indestructible as their valiant hopes. Out of this communion of memory and faith has come this unique and invulnerable partnership; and it is this association which has enabled Mr. Eisenhower to speak to Mr. Diefenbaker with an intimacy and mutual trust not possible in discussions with the leader of any other country.

The problems which trouble the two countries have their origins in the changes produced by the Second World War. By 1945 it was evident to many Canadians that the old easy relationship could no longer be expected to continue. England, with her gallant wounds, needed a merciful interlude to regain her strength, spent with such unhesitating courage in the service of freedom. Her role of leadership had to be filled by the United States moving in an unexampled transition from the status of a hermit to the position of the keeper of the world's hopes for peace. This abrupt transfer of power from London to Washington was enough in itself to provoke a sense of strain in Ottawa.

Economic problems soon added their weight of injury to the disturbed scales of political interest. Canada was under imperious necessity of basing most of her trade on the American market. Thus, when Canada was vibrant with a surging sense of national pride, when our voice ranged with new power in world affairs, when we seemed at last to have discovered the vocation for greatness that had for so long eluded our grasp, we learned in an unexpected and uncomfortable paradox that we had drifted into a closer and perhaps more perilous dependence on the United States. It is this fundamental fact, rather than the capricious decision of politics or economics, that explains the enduring anxiety.

Some of the problems that receive such fatiguing emphasis and iteration are essentially Canadian rather than American. It is always open to Canada, for example, to restrain the amount of American investment if it is also willing at the same time, to accept smaller opportunities for employment and a more sedate pace of economic growth. In logic, Canadians cannot be grateful for expansion while they complain of encroachment; but national sentiment and national grievance never honor the precise axioms of cautious prudence. At all events, this particular problem can always be solved by Canadians, whenever they consent to pay the price of slower national development.

It is vastly different, however, with the problem of defense. The controversy over the Bomarc is an irritating detail which points to a larger difficulty. The Canadian people have always shunned the ignominious role of a hitchhiker on the road to security. Their records in two world wars, in Korea, and in NATO entitles them to no ignoble status as sentinels on the world's endangered frontiers. But what can Canada do today to carry her appropriate burden when

the ultimate contribution must of necessity come from the United States?

The process of consultation between Canadian and American officials must surely be described as methodical and detailed beyond all precedent; but consultation is no substitute for overwhelming power. Many Canadians are disturbed by the uneasy surmise that the existing system of continental defense, built with ingenuity and great cost, no longer meets the challenge of the age of missiles and rockets. What is the real security of North America? The deterrent, and the deterrent is primarily a weapon in resolute American hands. Canadians see no escape from this dilemma. They resent a situation in which they are dependent for their security to such a large degree upon the United States; and they know in their own hearts that under the rough conditions of world affairs no early change in this relationship can be anticipated.

But you have very few allies like Canada. We want to do more, not less, in defending our joint heritage of peace with justice. How many of your other allies can pass this exacting test? Even in a world of power Canada often has the power of ideas. Its advice on the commanding themes of diplomacy is worth some attention. It is always unwise for the United States to force Canada to make painful decisions which a more supple and patient policy could avoid; courtesy sometimes is more important than speed. Has the hour not yet arrived for greater defense production in Canada for the United States and for the agreed and cooperative development of Canada's economic resources, as they are directly related to defense, for the common enrichment of our mutual security? These tasks already gather on the horizon with their glint of promise and their shadow of controversy.

Canadians believe, with Emerson, that our civilization still stands at the cock-crow and the morning star. It is the supreme tragedy of our time that the world has narrowed into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood. Across the darkening years, in the journey toward peace, the American people will always have Canadians at their side while freedom remains the inspiration of the United States and justice its splendid sanction.

Easthampton Ends 175th Anniversary Celebration With Gala Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the town of Easthampton in Hampshire County, Mass., wound up its 3-day celebration of its 175th anniversary and homecoming with a gala parade on Sunday. This historical event was related in a news story in the Springfield Union on Monday, and under unanimous consent I include the story in the Appendix so it will be a permanent part of the record of Easthampton's great anniversary:

PARADE CLOSES EASTHAMPTON CELEBRATION—ESTIMATED 50,000 WATCH EVENT NOTING 175TH ANNIVERSARY

EASTHAMPTON.—This town was saluted on its 175th anniversary Sunday with a 3½-hour-long parade which culminated a weekend program of events and was viewed by an estimated 50,000 persons.

Cochairmen for the celebration were Miss Katharine M. Root and Rev. V. Bouchard. Edward M. O'Brien, representing Gov. Foster Furcolo, bestowed the greetings of the Commonwealth from the reviewing stand in a preparade address.

FLOATS SELECTED

Parade judges Stephen G. Mainiatty of Deerfield, Herbert R. Pitts, of Pelham and Edwin M. Podolak, county commissioner of Hadley, selected the float that carried the queen and her court from St. Anthony's Society of Sacred Heart Church as the most beautifully decorated. The second choice was a large float bearing the expression, "Comfort Through Prayer," bearing a shrine and a cross and decorated in blue with orange and white trimming, entered by Immaculate Conception Church. Third place was the Notre Dame float which bore a nun and an altar boy in mediation.

Prize for the most original float went to Westhampton which depicted a colonial setting complete with costumed citizens and an oldtime organ being played along the parade route. The Pulaski Club of Easthampton took second place with its float portraying "Heroes in American History." Third place went to the James M. Lincoln Marine Corps League for a float that carried several fighting Marines entrenched in a simulated battleground setting.

NOT MUCH DOUBT

There was not much doubt in anyone's mind about the top float in the most humorous category, with Lucchesi's moonshiners drawing gales of laughter all along the parade route with their antics. The float carried a lopsided log cabin, complete with a backhouse, inhabited by bearded mountaineers firing old shotguns as they scrambled on and off the float. The second funniest award went to the radio station WHMP circus wagon complete with clowns, and the third award in the humorous field went to Eddy Wallin who brought up the rear of the parade with his donkey-pulled sleigh saying, "To Siberia." Wallin wore a typical Russian outfit even to the fur coat and hat, and carried two reindeer in his sleigh.

The float entered by the Holy Rosary of Hadley which bore the emblem "Pray to Our Lady for Peace," was judged the best in the historical category. The Easthampton Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Jaycee-ettes combined talents to produce the second best float in this category, one that depicted a little red schoolhouse and a proposed modern high school, still in the planning stage by this town. The float carried the saying, "Past and Future Schools." The South Hadley Polish American Citizens Club float that bore three smartly attributed West Point cadets was third place.

In addition to the floats mentioned there were 50 other beautifully decorated floats entered from each of the surrounding communities and twice as many bands and marching units. Visiting dignitaries from Ware, Belchertown, Chesterfield, Granby, Southampton, Hadley, and the city of Springfield were on hand to greet townspeople who lined the parade route. There were entries from numerous oganizations as well as several snappy fife and drum corps units.

FIREFIGHTING APPARATUS

Firemen from the area combined to represent firefighting apparatus from the year 1785 (the bucket brigade) through the 1810 hose brigade, 1825, horsedrawn water pumper from Williamsburg, 1845 hand pumper from South Hadley, 1860 Amherst pump, 1885 horse wagon, 1873 Lenox steamer, 1909 Lenox chain-driven pumper, 1925 fire engine from Whately, and a modern fire engine carrying Smokey, the fire prevention bear.

In addition to the many vehicles, floats, and tractors entered, there were several groups on horseback.

A tremendous ovation was given Miss Easthampton, Arlene Dion, and her court as they rode atop a beautifully decorated purple and pink jewelbox float. The queen was seated within the opened jewelbox surrounded by her court.

The parade moved along at a steady pace, without any delay, due in part to the efforts of the Easthampton Police Department, auxiliary police and patrolmen from surrounding areas, who patroled the route, keeping the roads clear for paraders.

Inquiry in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there is a continuing need on the part of the Congress and individual Members of the Congress to exercise in the public interest inquiries into the responsibilities of the regulatory bodies of the Federal Government to determine how well those responsibilities are functioning. Because of that belief I was gratified to note that two Indiana papers have recognized the useful role played by Senator VANCE HARTKE in his inquiry into the unfortunate circumstances of the crashes of the Electra aircraft earlier this year.

Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Evansville Press of April 27 and the Elkhart Truth of May 16 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, May 16, 1960]

HARTKE'S CONCERN WAS JUSTIFIED

Tracing of the two Lockheed Electra plane crashes to violent wing flutter largely vindicates Indiana Senator VANCE HARTKE'S concern as expressed last month.

At that time, HARTKE had criticized E. R. Quesada, Federal Aviation Administrator, for rejecting a recommendation by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) that all uninspected Electras be grounded.

HARTKE had said that both he himself and investigators were convinced that a structural defect was the apparent cause of the crash.

At that time, the Lockheed board chairman was quoted as saying that "in our considered opinion, the Electra is fully safe and airworthy."

But now following exhaustive study by the company itself, the company attributes the crashes to a combination of damage which apparently occurred in the engine area of the wings, plus the wing flutter.

The company says that tests show that the lower speed at which Electras are flying today prevents a repetition.

Nevertheless, the firm said it will submit design changes to the Federal aviation agency within a few weeks. The modifications are expected to cost about $25 million.

So whether or not the company rates the trouble as resulting at least in part from a "defect," it is apparent that the company

sees a way whereby the structure can be improved.

As told elsewhere on this page today, American's air safety record in general is better than perhaps some may believe as the result of some spectacular and tragic crashes.

Nevertheless, it is a good thing to have not only companies but Government officials straining every effort to make sure that planes are made as safe as possible.

HARTKE rates a a salute for pushing the inquiry.

[From the Evansville Press, Apr. 27, 1960]

HARTKE AND THE ELECTRAS

After 11 days of official silence it is welcome news that all the Electra turboprop airliners in service have been inspected and are considered safe under present speed restrictions.

Thus ends a period of uneasiness on the part of the public. It also ends what we consider some unnecessary secrecy on the part of Washington officialdom, starting when Gen. Elwood R. Quesada of the Federal Aviation Agency refused to go along with a Civil Aeronautics Board recommendation to ground the planes until they had been inspected.

It is well at this time, we believe, to say something about the part in all this of our junior U.S. Senator from Indiana, VANCE HARTKE. Senator HARTKE has been insisting that General Quesada give the reasons for his action and make public the details of the CAB recommendation. In doing so he has drawn severe criticism from some of his colleagues in the Senate, and others.

We believe that the Senator was correct. He did not challenge the authority or judgment of General Quesada. What he did insist on was the public's right to know the facts.

In this he was within his rights and rendering a service to the people who fly in airplanes, and their families.

We have confidence in General Quesada. We believe he knows his job and is doing it well. We are glad that he was able to make the announcement that he did.

But in matters involving their Government and their safety the public always has the right to know what is going on and shouldn't have to wait for a Member of Congress to smoke the information out. The sooner everybody in Washington learns this, the better.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been endeavoring to bring to the attention of Congress the facts about the changing face of our American cities.

I have been doing this by entering in the RECORD excerpts from a two-part series from Forum magazine entitled "The New Urbanites."

Today's excerpt follows:

NEEDED: ORDER AND PURPOSE

"The genuine problems of social disorder in which Negroes and Puerto Ricans are involved," says Oscar Handlin, historian and author of "The Newcomers," "can best be solved through the development of communal institutions under responsible leadership, that will give order and purpose to their lives." The development of such "communal institutions" and "responsible leadership" has been painfully slow. For one thing, the exodus of middle-income families to the suburbs has sapped many cities of their vitality and deprived political leadership of the background of a well-educated, fairly prosperous electorate that breeds responsibility.

A tragically small number of large northern cities have made dramatic efforts to strike to the heart of the total problem. One of these is Philadelphia, where housing standards for Negroes have been rising rapidly, a comparatively free housing market has developed within the city (Negro homeownership has risen 90 percent in 6 years), and job opportunities have been increasing for all, regardless of color. Industry has been moving back toward the city, particularly in search of skilled labor. This not only is providing opportunities for many skilled nonwhites, but is reducing the attraction of unskilled newcomers to the city. Much of the credit for this salutary turn of events goes to a progressive city administration, which has battled strongly against residential segregation and has taken many actions to equalize job and housing opportunities. The city's Human Relations Commission recently urged Negroes to buy homes in all-white neighborhoods, with inevitable criticism from the Board of Realtors. Commission Chairman John R. Carroll replied simply that the advice "is based on our conviction that racial segregation is a major threat to the economic stability and health and welfare of our city."

Many observers blame Negroes themselves for a lack of support in city efforts toward equalization, and there appears to be a Negro power vacuum in most cities. In New York, which has more Negroes than any other city, no Negro political leader has yet appeared who has worked independently of Tammany Hall, with the exception of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who has done almost nothing to ease directly the problems of urban life for his district's citizens. And the recent court troubles of POWELL (for income tax evasion) and Manhattan Borough President Hulan Jack (on conspiracy charges) have done great damage to future leadership, according to several Negro intellectuals. As Edward Holmgren of Chicago's Urban League says: "Negro politicians get their patronage and influence in the ward and keep quiet about civil rights, housing, and employment, and do not press for integration."

The lack of political leadership hits the new urbanites particularly hard, for they are by and large the most oppressed of an oppressed minority. Yet in most northern cities middle-class Negroes themselves shun the newcomers. Edward Holmgren maintains that "middle-class Negroes have an absolute abhorrence for lower class Negroes. They feel that the lower classes bring them into disrepute and opprobrium." This schism not only creates tension among Negroes, but makes it more difficult for the new urbanites to assimilate socially and culturally within their own communities.

NOT YET A FULL RESPONSE

So far, no political device has been concocted that insures a completely free housing market. This failure includes such city laws as New York's, which forbids discrimination in the sale or rental of private housing. Urban renewal was largely devised to end the growing imbalance of urban populations, which was much less apparent in 1949 than it is today. Yet that program has intensified residential segregation and speeded more white families to the suburbs than it has attracted back to the city. Morton Grodzins, of the University of Chicago, contends that the renewal program is too small, and cannot do the whole job. "Anything less than a massive program may have admirable local effects for particular population factions, but does not attack the basic problem of bifurcation of races on urban-suburban lines." And Robert Weaver believes that "in the wake of new slums and blight created by the relocation incident to urban renewal, more pressure has been placed upon middle-income white families to leave the city."

The new urbanities will some day become as valuable citizens as the migrants who flooded into New York, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, and other great cities in the late 19th century. Neither the cities themselves, nor their private citizens, have fully responded as yet to the latest challenge, nor have they met the problem of basic injustice which overshadows it. Says Oscar Handlin: "The experience of the past offers a solid foundation for the belief that the newest immigrants will come to play as useful a role as any of their predecessors. They themselves need only show the will and energy and their neighbors the tolerance to make it possible."

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Brillion, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 22 and 23, the fine community of Brillion, Wis., celebrates its 75th anniversary.

For the event, Brillion's Chamber of Commerce is planning special promotion activities.

Historically, this splendid community—small in size, though of great importance, particularly to its own citizens—has represented the kind of community spirit and environment which have formed a foundation upon which to build a great country. Upon the 75th anniversary of Brillion, I welcome the opportunity to extend heartiest congratulations to the city upon its progress, as well as upon the strong, civic-minded efforts of its residents to continue to make it an ever-better place in which to live.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have an article, entitled "Chamber of Commerce Planning Sales Promotion in Honor of City's 75th Anniversary," which was published in the Brillion News, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PLANNING SALES PROMOTION IN HONOR OF CITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

BRILLION.—While no plans at the moment are in progress for celebration of Brillion's 75th anniversary, the Brillion Chamber of Commerce is making plans to recognize the event with a superduper retail promotion on July 22-23.

The special committee composed of Otto G. Arndt, chairman of the retail trade committee, Walter Kielgas, Harwood Hendricks, Louis Propp, Mel Koch, Percy Lindner, Robert Ambrosius, and Earl Behnke, ex-official

member as president of the chamber of commerce, met last week for initial conversations on the project.

Tentatively, the project has developed a special sales event throughout community stores for both days, Friday and Saturday. In keeping with the occasion, the committee is proposing the presentation of a diamond ring to some lucky person. The 2-day event is proposed as "Krazy Daze."

The committee is meeting again this week to delve further into details of the 2-day event.

Watch the columns of the News for further details.

Brillion's anniversary date actually is March 3, 1885, when a circuit court order signed by Judge George W. Burnell at Oshkosh made the village's incorporation an actual fact.

A referendum submitted to the residents of the proposed village was held March 28, when by the predominant vote of 120 to 130 the incorporation was approved.

On April 20, the village's first election was held resulting as follows: President, Matt Thomsen 82; trustees, Peter Werner 82; George M. Beach 82, Charles Behnke 82, Chas. Tesch 82, I. N. McComb 82, Seth Sumner 63; clerk, Peter Reuther 81; treasurer, Chas. Petty; supervisor, P. C. Enders 44; police justice, Peter Reuther 80; justice of the peace, W. V. McMullen 82; marshal, Fred Richter 82; constable, Wm. Schneidewendt, 81.

The population count of the time of incorporation is recorded at 520.

Congressman Bowles Sees U.S. Lethargy Ending; Hails Student Involvement in Issues in 82d Smith College Commencement Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, delivered the 82d commencement address at Smith College in Northampton, Mass. His daughter, Miss Sarah Bowles, was one of the graduates. I am sure that Members of the House will be interested in the address of the former Governor of Connecticut and Ambassador to India and Nepal, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHESTER BOWLES

President Mendenhall, members of the board of trustees, honored guests, alumnae, parents, and, most especially, members of the graduating class, it is a very real pleasure to join you here in Northampton for this last official occasion of your college careers.

Since your first assembly here in the fall of 1956, I have come to know many of you and to feel personally involved with interest, affection, and pride in much that you have done.

When President Mendenhall asked me to speak to you today, I was well aware of the traditional requirements of commencement speakers: To view current affairs with proper concern; to worry modestly about the inheritance you are being handed by our own generation (so powerfully represented on commencement occasions by trustees, parents, and alumnae); to stress that this particular class is at a crossroads in history, that old habits have become quite obsolete, and that new and imaginative ways of doing things must be developed; and, finally, to call upon the graduating seniors, whose thoughts are properly concerned with new jobs, summer trips, and husbands, to step up to save the world before it is too late.

This year speakers from the University of Maine to the University of Southern California can be expected to sound an additional note. They will be saying from hundreds of platforms such as this that our moral values are not what they should be, and if anything, that they are slightly worse than they were last year.

I wish I could promise something dramatically different from all of this in what I am about to say. But, in fact, the commonplace outline I have given you represents some profound truths along with the cliches.

It is undeniably true that in most walks of our national life we have not been doing nearly as well as we should. It is also true that our complex and explosive world is in urgent need of your fresh energy and vision.

If some of what I have to say appears disturbing, let me also stress my deep convictions that in future years our potential for good far outweighs the formidable dangers we face, that you are very fortunate indeed to be starting your adult lives in this period, that the problems we face, although vast, and unfamiliar, can be mastered, and that the process of accomplishment can be one of the most exciting and worthwhile tasks any generation has ever tackled.

I

Although pessimism has always been distinctly un-American, and I think properly so, everyone knows that we are facing profound changes and that the course of events has never been less clear. Views, assumptions, hopes, and expectations which succeeding generations of Americans have taken for granted are being jolted abruptly.

This situation is not unique in American history. Indeed, my generation faced something similar in the early thirties when the sudden collapse of our economy shocked us out of our easy assumptions that money, at least for the fortunate few, grew on trees.

But the present challenge involves far more than jobs, pay increases, and material comforts. Now for the first time in our history, our destiny is tied to that of hundreds of millions of other human beings whose objectives, hopes, and fears appear different from our own, but who, like ourselves, are contending with new forces of massive strength and uncertain direction.

The situation we face is new and formidable. But what gives me the cautious conviction that we will learn to deal with it effectively are precisely those qualities in the American character which have enabled us to cope with lesser challenges in the past.

Throughout America a major reexamination is now underway in earnest. I have felt it not only in college campuses like this one, but in the crossroads and byways around the Nation, in buses, and in supermarkets, in grocery stores as well as at Capital cocktail parties.

This reexamination strikes me as particularly hopeful, because this time more and more thoughtful Americans are digging deeper into the true nature of the challenges which we face. The vastly over simplified views of the world struggle which most of us had accepted without serious question are now giving way to a much more sophisticated and realistic consideration of what we are up against.

II

Let us review briefly the stages of American thinking about world affairs which succeeded one another in the 1950's.

Ten years ago this month the North Korean army, armed and directed by the Kremlin, struck without warning across the southern border. Suddenly we found ourselves face to face with the hard, aggressive nature of world communism.

Before the Korean invasion, we had comfortably assumed that Soviet military power, although great, was not likely to be used. As a result, our military forces had been reduced below the danger point.

In our hurry to redress this error, we adopted a narrowly militaristic interpretation of the challenge which confronted us. Constructive, creative programs such as the Marshall plan and point 4 were downgraded. The new emphasis was on military force, military alliances, and military thinking. This in itself set the national mood.

By definition, military problems, being highly specialized and shrouded in secrecy, largely belong to generals, admirals, and heads of government. Since the challenge of world communism was accepted as a military challenge, there was very little that the ordinary citizen could do except pay his taxes cheerfully and hope that the military experts really knew their jobs.

With Stalin's death we gradually moved toward a much broader interpretation of the world contest. As Mr. Khrushchev, threatened to "bury" us economically rather than militarily, we became less concerned with the previously assumed inevitability of a military struggle, and more and more alarmed over the Soviet rate of growth.

Our newspapers outdid one another graphically in portraying the burgeoning Soviet economy and editorially in worrying over how we could stay ahead.

Although this broader view of the challenge was a long step toward reality, it still left the American citizen in the role of an anxious, but not yet directly involved, bystander. Economic problems, like military problems, appear infinitely complex. They seem to belong to the great corporations, the great labor unions, and to the distant Federal Government.

So the world contest remained remote and impersonal to most Americans.

Unless I am sadly mistaken we are now rapidly developing a broader view. We are beginning to suspect that the future may not be settled by the nations which can set off the most rockets or produce the most bathtubs.

We are beginning to understand that the contest goes beyond both guns and butter to the fundamental issue of the relative worth of our society compared with others around the world.

In its broadest and most realistic sense it is between two widely varying interpretations of the meaning of life; one which believes in the inherent dignity of the human individual, the other which believes that man was born to serve the state.

Consequently, our attention is shifting from the question of how our society can survive, to what we Americans have to offer. Without neglecting the mechanics of survival, the pertinent question is not simply how, but why.

III

As we consider the new frame of reference in which national policy will increasingly be considered, we have, I believe, grounds for a cautious optimism. The pertinent questions which we must ask ourselves concern the role of the individual in American society, and our history gives us grounds for considerable confidence in what the individual can accomplish once he is alive to what faces him.

In this regard, I think it is proper for me to suggest that history will probably be more tolerant toward your parents' generation than many of you have been.

After all, we were totally untrained, your parents and I, for the kind of world we have had to live in and even help manage.

With all due respect to Yale University, I can remember little that I or my fellow students learned there that was relevant to the world in which we were to live our adult lives. Nor was there anything in the roaring twenties into which most of us graduated to prepare us for the economic collapse and social dislocations of the thirties, or for world involvement again in the forties.

But in spite of our unreadiness in terms of what history required of us, I think our record will stand up well under scrutiny.

My generation broke with 130 years of tradition to put isolationism behind us in world affairs. My generation took action, born of economic and social distress, to give new depth and meaning to our national unity. My generation pioneered in the postwar world with the bold, creative concepts of the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4, and the mutual security program.

Indeed, some of our more economically timid members view some of our technological achievements with considerable alarm. Our cows, they say, give too much milk, and our new machines produce too much steel.

Unquestionably we have been inadequate to many of the tasks which demanded attention, including the rather obvious one of putting the world's hungry children in touch with the extra milk.

Nevertheless, on behalf of your parents and the rest of our generation, I hope you will not be too severe on us. We rose, unevenly and fitfully it is true, but we rose to tasks which were historic, and let us hope we continue to have the will and capacity to rise to additional tasks in the years ahead.

IV

Yet let's face it: In perhaps the most crucial area of all, our performance has been dangerously weak. In our efforts to deal with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we have neglected the cultivation of those very human values which are basic to the health and vigor of our American society.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator. In a backhanded sort of way, we have glorified them. Indeed, we have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipulation to explain some of our most admirable actions. It is as though we have felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not as decent as they might seem.

Thus we argue that the time has come to grant our Negro citizens first-class citizenship, not because they have been waiting for 180 years since the Declaration of Independence asserted that all men are created equal, but because the colored majority of mankind is said to be breathing down our necks.

In order to win public support for urgently needed scholarships for our colleges and universities, we call the legislation the National Defense Education Act and fit it out with anti-Communist disclaimers and loyalty oaths.

Instead of proudly presenting our foreign aid program for what it is—an earnest effort to help new nations ease poverty, illiteracy, and disease so that they can remain free within their own cultures—we explain that our real purpose is to buy friends and supporters in the United Nations, or to keep restless people from asking hard questions, or to fill empty bellies on the cynical assumption that well-fed foreigners will more easily tolerate the injustices and harassments of the feudal societies in which they live and thus join us in support of the status quo.

Even if we set out to do the wrong thing in world affairs—like hiking the tariffs on British bicycles or foreign clothespins—we explain that we are taking these actions in the interests of national defense.

Through our fears and frustrations of this disorderly New World, we have come to act as though our chief national purpose is not to maintain and extend our basic American commitment to human dignity, but to thwart the Russians in whatever they decide to do.

And while we strive to outfox the Communists abroad, we concentrate on keeping up with the Joneses at home.

Politicians, journalists, businessmen—even college professors—increasingly give the most cynical reasons for their most high minded activities.

We smile with a knowing self-assurance when we are told that scandals in high places and the misuse of positions of national trust simply go to prove that politics is politics.

Office seekers who deeply favor guaranteeing Negro Americans the right to vote, assure their fellow politicians from another section of the country that they vote as they do only because of the political pressures back home.

Businessmen contributing to boys summer camp funds and hospital building drives rush to cover up their decent motivations by pointing out that it is good business to do what they are doing.

We nod our heads in understanding when Charles van Doren tells us that he continued his fraudulent TV presentation because the whole academic teaching profession had such a stake in his continuing his brilliant performance that he did not want to let his fellow teachers down.

We shrug our shoulders when 600 of Mr. van Doren's students at Columbia take the pains to state that they would have done the same thing, that they admire him for his slick performance, and that they cannot for the life of them see how it effects his usefulness as a teacher of liberal arts.

In our effort to appear sophisticated, we suppress our initial shock over our official mishandling of the U–2 flights and conclude that it is right to spy, and wrong only to be caught; right to lie, and wrong only to admit it. After all, weren't the Russians just as bad?

V

This brings me to my central point: At the very moment in history when the true nature of the world contest is coming into focus, we find ourselves faced with a crisis in values in which the standards we teach our children are increasingly irrelevant to a world of official spying and lying, of payola and quiz scandals, of tax evasion and false expense accounts, of fake advertisement, the thumb on the scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem to be suckers, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are realists who do not go off half-cocked, we have developed a moral gap between beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance.

This moral gap in its own way may become as dangerous to our survival as a free, dynamic society as the missile gap itself.

This is particularly true if the cold war continues indefinitely. I am deeply concerned whether an open society like ours, which a college like Smith so effectively reflects and sustains, can endure indefinitely against the military, technological, and psychological requirements of 20th century nuclear terror.

At some point—maybe in the year 1980, maybe 1975, maybe 1970, maybe even sooner—the point will be reached where the continuation of America as an open society under the relentless pressures of the cold war may become impossible.

Already there are many among us who are happier under the simple terror of the cold war than under the prospect of any relaxation in tensions.

Such people seem determined to prove again and again the prophecy of William Butler Yeats: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity."

This kind of mind is unhappy about complexities, about shades of gray, about difficult choices, about the necessity to pursue various alternative policies at once, about the requirements in the modern world for balance, dexterity, and nerve.

It is always simpler to march off in a straight line in one direction even if the obvious destination is Armageddon. However, those who think in such terms are good people to keep out of the control rooms in the age of pushbuttom war. In the good old days of bayonets and machineguns, they were dangerous enough; in today's nuclear world, they have the cataclysmic touch.

So much for the formidable challenge that we face. How best can we cope with it?

VI

Let us start with the fact that we live in an open society and must strive not only for survival but to maintain the right of future generations to continue to live in open societies.

The point about an open society is that it is an open society, not a vacant one. It is open for inventiveness in statecraft as well as in science, for controversy in public as well as in private, for competition in ideas as well as in goods, for incentive for leadership as well as for leisure.

An open society faces obvious disadvantages in a world where it coexists with closed societies, particularly so when those closed societies may wish to demolish it. But an open society is the kind of society we want and if we are to keep it, we must see that our individual, family, college, and professional lives are freer, more constructive, and more active than the lives we might lead if we lived in a closed society.

For people do manage to live in closed societies. Long before the Soviet Union and Communist China, hundreds of millions of people had lived their full span of years in closed societies. Unhappily, such societies have been the rule, not the exception.

The risks are enormous in a closed society for no one knows when the police in a police state will come to life themselves to snuff out other lives in a sudden burst of terror. We may marvel at their ability to do so, but the fact remains that millions of people manage somehow to live lives under conditions which appear to us suffocating.

If we were free to ask them, and they were free to tell us, what differences would there be which both we and they would recognize?

Three meals a day, hard physical work, the bare essentials of life, uncritically believing what the newspapers say, avoiding controversy, sticking resolutely to safe thoughts and simple comments, concentrating on the safe and the unspectacular, never probing, arguing, writing, speaking—these we might agree are the common lot of most of the 800 million people who live under Communist rule.

Now how can we, as members of an open society, successfully compete with a closed society of this kind? Only by living by significantly different values and for significantly different goals.

We must learn to make use of the freedom that our open society provides to do the things others cannot do because of their closed one.

We must accentuate the use of that marginal element in our lives which really is different from theirs—that goes beyond the essentials of eating, sleeping, and keeping alive, to the individual, distinguishing element that enables us to be different.

We must concentrate as free individuals in making use of our margin for living free lives, the margin which the threat of fear, eavesdropping, secret police, and regimentation stifles in the closed society.

VII

What is the outlook? Much, of course, depends on the cold war which, as I have suggested, encourages the negative forces in our own society. Yet I am heartened because I think that our temptations toward lethargy, apathy, and a cynical retreat into simple pleasures have once again nearly run their course.

For one thing, my informants here at Smith and elsewhere tell me that our campuses are wakening up again. They think that the first stirrings occurred in your freshman year with the bitter news that 32,000 young Hungarians had died in the streets of Budapest in an effort to achieve the kind of open society which we take for granted.

Another surge of campus involvement in the world came when stories reached us of brave young Tibetans fighting to remain free from the Communist grip.

Even more recently, many of you have demonstrated your sympathy and support for the sit-in movements in our own American South, knowing that what is morally right and deeply established in the very fabric of American democracy must win out in the end.

Although many of my generation may not agree, I suggest that such actions are part and parcel of what keeps an open society alive and free. For this is a major distinction between a closed society and an open one: the closed society makes no pretense of relating its private to its public morals; the open, democratic society must do so continually.

Most impressive of all, the call for a new dedication of American young people, seems to be coming from the students themselves. An editorial in your own Smith newspaper, the Sophian, has been widely quoted. It even found its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You may remember what it said:

"So sometimes we write home to mummy and daddy about the world situation, and occasionally we mention it to dear ol' Joe. Dear Joe smiles and asks us to dance.

"We think of the money America spends on beer and cigarettes and we worry about the economy, and democracy, and things, when we see another TV antenna go up across the street. We remember 'The News of the Week in Review' as we reread Vogue. We frown about our culture and its values as we tip the Negro waiters, and we promise we'll talk about the image of America sometime to somebody when we tour Europe this summer.

"We're the very picture of American youth. We gaze at the wide horizons of the world before us, with a questioning mind, filled with faith, hope and charity. We forget that challenge, like charity, begins at home."

Home—whether the homes from whence you came, or in those which you will found—is a place where American women have a special role. In this sense, women today have an opportunity for creativity and allegiance to enduring values which is temporarily greater than that of men.

The men's world, and the women's too—to the increasing degree that you share in it—are caught up in all the pressures we have described. I have never been in favor of the sheltered housewife, nor of the isolation of the home from the world. But I freely admit, and encourage you to consider making the best use of, the relative freedom from false values which the home still is in a position to preserve.

Unless America's national purpose is to disappear altogether, we must begin to rebuild our shaken world. And any attempt to do so must start in the American home and school and church where the American woman is the vitalizing element.

Essential to the process of rebuilding is a clear understanding of the revolutionary changes which are taking place in the world beyond our own shores, and a vigorous communication of this understanding to our children. They must be helped to see that their future cannot be left completely to the generals, admirals, politicians, and so-called experts.

For the conflict between the closed Communist societies and our own open one is now far more than a conflict between rival defense establishments, rival economies, rival espionage systems, and rival summit negotiators. It is a conflict that touches directly the lives, the energy, the sense of purpose, and the faith of each one of us.

The task of working the world out of its cold war impasse may, of course, prove to be beyond human capacity. At best, much of it depends on influences and events beyond our control.

Yet the capacity of all of us Americans, Brazilians, Indians, Russians, and Chinese to achieve a meaningful existence rests squarely on the basic and elemental human forces inside both closed and open societies and on their capacity to generate sufficient power to assert themselves constructively.

Is it possible that behind the ruthless, totalitarian leadership of Communist China, humanistic sparks may still be smoldering and that out of the ashes may again arise the creative genius which made possible the long miracle of Chinese civilization?

Can the Kremlin open the laboratories of the Soviet Union to the inquiring young minds necessary for scientific achievement while still denying the right to think about, and absorb, the great truths of human history?

But whatever we do, let us not become so preoccupied with the forces and counterforces within China and Russia, that we neglect to do the great and good things we are able to do among the majority of mankind for whom communism is still an unappealing foreign ideology.

All of the major civilizations of the non-Communist world have been built on the proposition that man is more than a chemical accident. We are all commited to the concept that man is surrounded by belief and lives for a purpose.

This is the promising kind of world into which my generation was born—a world where, on three continents, Ghandi, Wilson, and Sun Yat-sen represented triumphant moving forces of wider freedom and more significant life. In your parents' and my lifetime, this world has been put on the defensive by two World Wars and the revolutionary forces which have accompanied them.

Today two-thirds of the people of the world are in the throes of the greatest revolution of all time: A revolution of rising expectations, expectations of new dignity and expanding economic opportunities for men and women once doomed to endless poverty, misery, and disease.

America is now challenged to understand the nature of this revolutionary world to explore the forces at work in Communist societies, and to put itself in touch with the aspirations of the people in between—the men and women and children of Asia, Africa and Latin American who see our planet as more than an arena for an increasingly reckless and increasingly futile Soviet-American conflict.

If we can meet this challenge, we will be well on the road to recovering the vision that we were born to a nobler destiny than that of a commonplace cold war participant.

As Woodrow Wilson once told the graduating class at Annapolis: "There have been other nations as rich as we; there have been other nations as powerful; there have been other nations as spirited; but I hope we shall never forget that we created this Nation, not to serve ourselves, but to serve mankind. * * * No other nation was ever born into the world with the purpose of serving the rest of the world just as much as it served itself."

And it is the recapture of that vision, at all levels of American society, which will help restore to us today the quite wisdom of that ancient faith which has come down to us through the ages in Romans 5: 3–4: "We glory in tribulations; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope."

Dr. Alfred T. Hill of Council for Advancement of Small Colleges Delivers Significant Address at 72d Annual Commencement of Salem (W. Va.) College; Receives Honorary Degree With Other Distinguished Men; President Hurley Is Commended

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when Salem College at Salem, W. Va., held its 72d annual commencement on May 27, 1960, four distinguished gentlemen were awarded honorary degrees during the same ceremonies which honored the 1960 graduating class.

Dr. George D. Heaton, minister in industry, Charlotte, N.C., received the degree of doctor of humanics; Dr. Frank V. Langfitt, a Clarksburg, W. Va., physician and surgeon and former president of the West Virginia State Medical Association, received the degree of doctor of humanities; Philip H. Willkie, of Rushville, Ind., chairman of the board of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, received the degree of doctor of laws; and Dr. Alfred T. Hill, of Washington, D.C., executive secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, received the degree of doctor of pedagogy.

As a graduate and director of Salem College, situated in the community in which I was born and reared, and as a member of the advisory council of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, I felt especially privileged to have presented Dr. Hill for his honorary degree, which was conferred upon him by Dr. K. Duane Hurley, energetic and youthful president of both Salem College and the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks in presenting Dr. Hill.

There being no objection, the remarks of the senior Senator from West Virginia

were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, PRESENTING FOR A DEGREE DR. ALFRED T. HILL AT THE COMMENCEMENT SERVICES OF SALEM COLLEGE, SALEM, W. VA., MAY 27, 1960

President Hurley, members of the board, faculty members, ladies and gentlemen, and students, returning to Salem College, particularly at commencement time, always brings with it the warm reflections of other times. The four wonderful and eventful years spent here furnished me with a deep reservoir of memories and happy associations. Therefore, it gives me an especially keen pleasure to present for a deserved honor a new friend to this community in which I was born and reared and have loved so well.

A person in public life is called upon to offer many presentations and introductions, some of which are merely part of the ritual of American life. A few are genuinely meaningful experiences. Seldom have I been given the opportunity, however, to present a citizen who brings such uniquely appropriate qualifications to the occasion as in this instance.

Most of Dr. Hill's adult life has been in the service of education, either as a teacher or administrator, in preparatory schools and small colleges. And as a graduate of Brown University, with postgraduate degrees from Harvard and Columbia, the recipient of this recognition is thus widely experienced in the field of learning, at every level, and in virtually every kind of private institution.

Yet his energies for many years have been devoted laregly to the welfare and improvement of small private undergraduate colleges such as Salem. Such a liberal arts college is a uniquely American experiment in education, and judging from the results, it is an experiment which has long since verified its worth.

It is no accident that these colleges have found in Dr. Hill an energetic and effective champion. And it was a timely period, indeed, when Dr. Hill was enlisted in this cause. The larger private institutions receive a proportionately ever greater share of the private voluntary contributions, and with the public institutions advancing at such a rapid pace, our small colleges will face difficult times ahead—as, of course, they have in the past.

As executive director during the past 4 years of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, this gentle and scholarly man has worked diligently and devotedly to increase the support for small colleges and to help individual institutions to achieve regional accreditation. As a product of his experience in this field, especially during recent years, Dr. Hill published last year his authoritative book on the problems and potentialities of small colleges, "The Small College Meets the Challenge."

Among Dr. Hill's rarer qualities is one that is virtually unique in the world today. He is a man diligently trying to work himself out of a job. For the aim of the council is to possess accreditation for all of its members and thus be dissolved in 5 years.

I present one who represents the best of combinations in the academic world, a gentleman equally effective as teacher, administrator, and scholar, Dr. Alfred T. Hill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the commencement address was delivered by Dr. Hill, and his challenging remarks were timely and appropriate—"The College and the Community."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the inspiring speech, including the well-deserved testimonial to President Hurley, in the form of a resolution adopted by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and read by Dr. Hill in the introductory portion of his address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLLEGE AND THE COMMUNITY—SALEM (W. VA.) COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY ALFRED T. HILL, MAY 27, 1960

INTRODUCTION

President Hurley, members of the board of trustees, faculty, distinguished guests, friends, and members of the graduating class, I bring you the greetings of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. With these greetings I present to you the following resolution:

"DEAR PRESIDENT HURLEY: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges has asked me to transmit through you to Salem College the following resolution. This resolution was adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the council in regular session at the meeting held on May 18, 1960:

" 'Whereas Dr. K. Duane Hurley has served faithfully as the president of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges for 4 years;

" 'Whereas his wisdom, leadership, and unselfish efforts have been largely responsible for the success of the council to date in service to its members;

" 'Whereas Salem College has contributed generously to the welfare of all members of the council through the sacrifice of making the time and energies of its president available in the interests of a group of small but significant colleges: Be it

" '*Resolved*, That the council hereby acknowledge a large debt of gratitude to Dr. K. Duane Hurley and to Salem College and herewith present to Salem College in token of its appreciation a complimentary membership in the council from July 1, 1960 through June 30, 1962.'

"Cordially yours,

"JOHN Z. MARTIN,
"Vice President, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges."

THE COMMUNITY OF OUTER SPACE

In my first draft of this talk to you this morning, I started by apologizing for the fact that I could not think of any way in which to relate a small college in West Virginia to the community of the universe in an age of outer space. I felt hopelessly out of date because frankly I could see no relation between Salem College and the various sputniks, muttniks, luniks and other manmade satellites racing crazily around in space these days, to say nothing of Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and a multitude of other well-known characters in the sky.

However, only a short time ago I visited a small college campus where one of the feature attractions was an astronomical observatory used as an official "moonwatch station" to track these artificial satellites. The young astronomy professor who demonstrated this piece of equipment to a group of visitors said, "You are now looking into outer space." He rather scoffed at the idea that there was anything new or worthwhile on the far side of the moon. And he said, "The first man to go up in a spaceship will be very much disappointed. He will be able to observe the universe only through a tiny 6 by 6 window, whereas here on this hilltop we are observing the universe around a horizon of 360° and through an arc overhead of 180°. In fact, we are traveling this minute on the best spaceship ever invented and we have been all our lives. All we have to do is to look up to see infinitely into the community of outer space." That it was—the community of outer space. As I looked around me, I realized that the 50 or 60 other observers were not the local neighbors and farmers I had supposed them to be. They had taken on a new dignity and a new stature. They were all 10 feet tall. They were spacemen. In just a few words this young professor had related the people of his rural community to the community of outer space and he had done it through the agency of a little old-fashioned telescope in a small church-related college. But he was a young man with a liberal arts education. Although he knew a great deal about the distance, movements, and composition of the stars, he was not so much concerned about these trivialities as he was about the meaning and purpose of the universe. He was a living example of what President Sills of Bowdoin once said, "Excellent teaching in wooden halls is better than wooden teaching in marble halls." So I have crossed out the apology in my first draft for not being able to see how a small college could relate itself to the community of outer space.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

In my earlier draft of these remarks I also apologized for the fact that I could not define community in terms of the world in the international sense. However, after my recent visit I had to cross out that apology, too. In the evening I attended a concert in which a chorus of 300 students, alumni, and teachers were on the stage. The performance was being broadcast and listened to by a radio audience of 1,000 people within a radius of 50 miles; but, in addition to this, it was being taped and the tapes were being sent to 135 radio stations all across the country and all over the world. On a tour of the campus I visited the language laboratory where students with the latest electronic equipment were being instructed in French, German, Spanish, and Italian. That evening the president showed me his pictures taken during a 3-month trip around the world—not just a sightseeing tour—but a trip visiting educational, religious, and medical centers in which alumni of his college were serving in important posts. And so, you see, it became dramatically clear to me that even a very small college because of its influence and active participation, could realistically claim citizenship as a member of the world community.

THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY

Now that I am getting down from the sky and back from the international scene, I am beginning to feel more at home as I describe the small college in relation to a much smaller community—the Nation. Let me describe the picture for you briefly. There are about 2,000 colleges of all types in the United States today. Some 200 of these have fewer than 500 students. American colleges range in age from Harvard founded 324 years ago to the University of South Florida, which has a president, half a dozen deans, a faculty, and some buildings—but no students. This college has been in the making for over 2 years. It expects to open next fall with 1,500 students and have an enrollment of 10,000 by 1970. Today there are slightly over 3 million students in college; this number will double by 1970. Today there are 7.5 million degree holders in the United States—2 million more than there were 10 years ago. Today the total plant value of higher education is $17.5 billion and the total operating cost is $5 billion. Between 1956 and 1970 the Government estimates we will have to spend over $17 billion on plant and facilities in order to meet the demands of higher education. In 1900 4 percent of the college age population attended college; by 1956 this percentage had increased nearly nine times to 35 percent; by 1970 it is estimated that 50 percent of all college age youth will be in college.

This raises the question of why young people want to go to college at all. I am

reminded of the pretty freshman co-ed in a small women's private southern college. She appeared in the dean's office one day in tears. "What's the matter?" asked the dear, kind old dean. "Don't you like your roommate?" "Oh, yes," sobbed the child. "She's w-w-wonderful." "Well then," said the dean, "perhaps you don't like the food." "Oh no," wailed the child. "It's delicious." "Well now let me see," said the dean. "Are you failing in any of your courses?" "No, no," weeped the girl. "I'm getting all A's." "Then what in the world is the matter?" asked the dean. "The trouble is," said the little darling, "I came here to be went with but I ain't."

Now you can see that young lady had the wrong idea about going to college in the first place. In fact, her case was almost as pitiful as that of the football hero whom the coach found sitting on the chapel steps on the morning of commencement day in the unmanly act of crying his heart out. "Why, Joe," said the coach, "what in the world is the matter with you, aren't you happy?" "N-n-no," sobbed the hero, "I'm not." "Well, why not?" said the coach. "Look at you. You were captain of the football team in your senior year. You were president of the senior class. Today you will be graduating with honors. Your family and friends are here to celebrate your achievement, and all year you've been dating the prettiest girl on campus. What on earth do you have to feel sad about?" "Oh, I know; that's all true," wailed the boy, "but here it is commencement day, and Oh, Coach, if I had only learned to write my name." Now, you see, he had the wrong idea about going to college too.

A lot of people go to college these days because the word is around that at age 30 a college graduate earns twice as much money as a noncollege graduate and at age 40 he earns three times as much. As far back as 1952, 84 percent of the top corporation jobs went to college graduates, and the percentage certainly must be even higher today.

Now against this broad background what is happening to the private colleges and particularly to the small college? The figures tell the story. In 1900, 61 percent of all student enrollment was in private colleges; in 1958, 42 percent of the students attended private colleges; in 1970, the estimate is 35 percent in the private colleges. In other words, in the short span of about three generations the enrollment picture will have been completely reversed so far as the ratio of public and private education is concerned in the United States. And what does this do to the small private college? It puts it at the crossroads. Will it gradually dwindle in importance as well as in enrollment and money? A hundred years from now will it be an insignificant feature of higher education? Or will the small college define a new role, clarify its public image, and increase the effectiveness and importance of its service to society?

And what is the place of Salem in the national community? You have had a long history. Your alumni include Governors, Senators, clergymen, educational leaders, influential people in all walks of life. However, you may not realize that in the last 4 years Salem—largely through the leadership of its president—has come onto the national scene in higher education. It was President Hurley, who first pointed to the role of what he described as "the forgotten college," and called this institution and scores of others like it to the attention of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, the Ford Foundation, the United States Steel Corp., the General Electric Co., and the influential educational associations across the country. It was because of his inspiration and leadership that CASC was formed. And it was through CASC that the story of Salem and its sister colleges was told to over 3 million readers last fall through the publication of a special supplement in the New York Times and the publication of a book on small colleges. It was the organization which your president leads which 2 weeks ago called a national conference on "The Small College in the Sixties." On this occasion Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was the luncheon speaker on "The National Interest in the Small College." Two of your outstanding alumni on this platform, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Gov. Cecil H. Underwood participated in the program. Philip H. Willkie, the national chairman of CASC, whom you have just honored, bestowed a special citation upon Vice President NIXON and named him "The Small College Man of the Year." If this does not reflect the influence of a small college upon the national scene, I can think of no better illustration.

President Hurley, because of the improvement in the Salem College program and in recognition of the points I have just made, I have the honor to deliver to you this check for $1,000 from the United States Steel Foundation. This is a token of their recognition of the achievements of Salem College and a gesture of encouragement for the continuation of the good work. You will note that this is transmitted to you with the good wishes of the Association of American Colleges.

THE TOWN OR LOCAL COMMUNITY

Let us turn from the role of the college in the national community to the role of the college in its local community. In order to illustrate the importance of the college to a small town, let me describe the difference between two situations. Suppose, on the one hand, you have a State with a university of 20,000 students. In this case you have a great concentration of brainpower and wealth all in one spot. You have drained the best students, the best professors, and the most money from all over the State. Perhaps 500 or 1,000 small communities have contributed their talent to this central enterprise and are individually that much poorer for their sacrifice. Now suppose, on the other hand, you have 20 colleges with 1,000 students each. This is distribution and decentralization. You now have 20 small cultural centers all over the State. This keeps the best students, the best professors, and the money at home. It provides for 20 different units of leadership. In this case you no longer have a huge cultural oasis in the midst of an intellectual desert; you have instead a fertile land nourished with a multitude of local springs each one of which is capable of expanding, decreasing, adjusting, or changing its course in response to local needs. Furthermore, in these days of easy transportation and communication your 20 small colleges have a potentiality for cooperation and pooling of resources which in effect make them a sort of network of culture or in a rather loose sense a university spread all over the State. This is the way to preserve freedom, promote diversity, and develop initiative. This is the way to keep higher education where it belongs—in the hands of the people and away from the control of the self-styled professionals and free from the redtape of colossal bureaucracy.

Let's take a look at two sides of the same picture from a little different angle now: the cash value of a college to its community and the cash value of a community to its college.

About 2 years ago George Fox College in Oregon—a CASC college with about 150 students—estimated that its total local spending by staff, faculty, and students contributed $125,000 annually to its small town. A conservative estimate among other Oregon colleges indicated that the value of a college to its community was about $1,000 per student annually. I understand that Salem has conducted a study indicating that it brings about $850,000 a year to this area. Furthermore, a college of this sort is a stable industry. It is hard to kill. Salem is 72 years old. It has survived two world wars and several minor ones, to say nothing of one major and several minor economic depressions. And still furthermore, it is bound to grow in size, quality, and importance in the future.

Now the reverse side of this picture shows that a city in Iowa with a population of 5,000 raised $73,000 for its college; a city in Wisconsin with a population of 4,500 raised $120,000; and a city in Indiana with 40,000 people raised $380,000 for its college. I know that this community is doing a lot for Salem, too, and I mention these figures merely to show you that you are in good company all over the country.

However, President Hurley, a local community sometimes can stand a little encouragement from the outside and leadership from the national level. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to present to you at this time a check from the Kennecott Copper Co. in the amount of $5,000:

"DEAR MR. HILL: For a number of years this company, in addition to its program of scholarships and fellowships, has offered a measure of support to liberal arts colleges because of the importance of liberal arts training to our educational system and to American industry.

"This support consists of a total of $30,000 appropriated yearly, divided into six parts of $5,000 each which are awarded on a nonrepetitive basis to six selected liberal arts colleges. Various criteria are used in the selection, including scholastic standing, geographical location, and excellence of the job being done.

"In each year among the colleges selected there has been one that has been nonaccredited. This year the nonaccerdited school is Salem College, Salem, W. Va.

"We take pleasure in transmitting herewith a check for $5,000 as an unrestricted gift to Salem, for transmittal by you to K. Duane Hurley, president of Salem with best wishes for the fine work he is doing.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN D. EAST."

Although the money itself is important, the symbol of interest and encouragement from a major corporation to the people of your community should give them greatly increased incentive to try harder and do more for Salem and thereby help themselves both financially and culturally.

THE CAMPUS OR COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS

Now let us consider the campus as a community of scholars. What is a college campus? Is it an area of so many acres of land? Is it a collection of buildings designed for different purposes? It is both of these things, but even more important it is a group of people, young and old, assembled for one main purpose: To combat ignorance. I recently heard a speaker say that it was a mistake for a college president to address his student body in an assembly with these words: "The college is here to serve you." This smacks too much of the Madison Avenue approach. Perhaps the corner drugstore, or the Hilton Hotel chain, or the Broadway Theater is here to serve you; but that is not the main purpose of a college. The purpose of a college is to transmit the best elements of the heritage of our past to succeeding generations and to advance the frontiers of knowledge through research and experimentation. The trustees, faculty, and administration are all dedicated to these ends. They are the trained and experienced leaders of a campus community, and the students are invited to join them in a fellowship of learning. In this sense the entire group be-

comes the servant of society. This is the proper function of a college.

In the words of Dr. Thomas E. Jones, former president of Earlham College, "The role of the president is that of head of the community. Be he young or old, he and his wife become the parents of the college family. It is his responsibility to lead the community beyond the legal and philosophical relationships. He must help it both intellectually and spiritually. Through the types of atmosphere developed he must help education to be caught rather than taught. Such education enkindles the imagination, maintains an openness of mind, inspires a sense of vocation, creates compassion, and invigorates the will. It makes possible "a society of learning and pioneering that continues to be a community of understanding whatever the prejudices and confusion of the world about it may be.'"

And while I am talking about the campus as a community, I wish to underscore the importance of the role the graduates of a college can play in creating a community of support for their alma mater. In order to drive home this point to your graduating class, and indeed, to all of your alumni, I have sent a letter to each of the 65 living honorary alumni of Salem College inviting them to join me in a matching and incentive gift program. In 1959 Salem had about 10,000 alumni; the college solicited one-quarter of them—2,500; one-fifth (20 percent) of those solicited made a donation; the size of the average donation was $25; the total was $13,600. I personally will pledge to Salem College $1 for every point of increase in percentages of effectiveness of solicitation you achieve among your regular alumni for the year July 1, 1960 through June 30, 1961. If you should achieve the impossible and go up by 80 percent, I would owe you $80. I invited all the other honorary alumni to join me in this same way, and I am now pleased to report my results: I have three checks and pledges totaling approximately $500 to present to you as a challenge gift.

THE COMMUNITY OF INNER SPACE

When Dr. Hurley asks me to do a job, I try to be thorough. Therefore, having started you off in outer space and brought you by easy stages down to earth, then to your country, then to your local community, and then to your campus, I feel it is now only fair for me to conclude my remarks by relating the college to the community of inner space, namely, you, the members of the graduating class.

Your 4 years at Salem have given you a better understanding of your own heart, and mind and soul. Thus the college has become related to the community of inner space. It has helped you to clarify your goals and appraise your strengths and weaknesses. It has helped you to decide what things you will stand for and what things you will not stand for. It has helped you to acquire information, develop skills, refine your tastes, and sharpen your critical and creative powers. In this way the college has helped you to explore the far reaches of inner space which are just as vast and just as important as the universe of outer space.

You have attended a great college. A college is great not because of the size of its campus or the magnificence of its buildings, but because of the substance of its academic program. A college is not great because of the salaries of its professors, but because of the scholarship, character and dedication of its faculty. A college is not great because of the number of courses in its catalogue but because of the traditions of patriotism, scholarship, religion, and public service it has upheld. A college is not great because of the achievements of its famous alumni or trustees, but because of the intellectual and moral content of its program. These things are the seeds of greatness. The aim of all education is the pursuit of goodness and wisdom. Or to put it another way it is the pursuit of truth, beauty, and goodness—not in terms of Plato's slave state of 2,500 years ago, but in terms of American democracy today. The worth of a college must be measured by the degree to which it helps the individual and society to a maturity in the realm of ideas and ideals. This is what I mean when I say you have attended a great college.

And now as your chart and compass to guide you through the communities of both inner and outer space which lie ahead of you, I leave you with the words of St. Paul:

"Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things * * * and the God of peace shall be with you."

B'nai B'rith Dates Back to 1843

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, columnist Ralph McGill devoted his column to a description of B'nai B'rith, the 117-year-old organization which has dedicated its efforts since its inception to the spiritual and human welfare of Jews and of the country in which they reside. In the long upward struggle for human dignity and decency, for freedom and equality, B'nai B'rith has consistently played a leading role. "Benevolence, brotherly love, and harmony" has been its motto. Charity has been its watchword.

Today there are B'nai B'rith lodges in 38 nations, each active in the field of youth work and adult education, as being aspects of the basic objective, human and spiritual welfare.

Mr. McGill's tribute to this outstanding organization is indeed well merited. I commend him on his fine article and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

B'NAI B'RITH DATES BACK TO 1843—FOUNDERS WERE HUMANITARIANS; BOTH SIDES AIDED IN CIVIL WAR

(By Ralph McGill)

Because it takes a firm public stand on the side of social justice and law, B'nai B'rith (sons of the covenant) is a favorite whipping boy of ignorance, maliciousness, and hate. Most of the Citizens Councils attack it with hysterical and irrelevant charges because B'nai B'rith has declared the Supreme Court orders must be recognized as law lest anarchy replace judicial procedures. The professional anti-Semitics rant and rage against it. The various KKK community cancers or klaverns, also join in the slanders.

If one examines into the weird pamphlet product of the various mentally disturbed persons and groups, one makes a significant discovery. None of them has the vaguest idea that B'nai B'rith also had as its major purpose the bringing together of the various Jewish groups which were coming to this country and were, too often, separated by their orthodoxy, or lack of it, and by their cultural backgrounds.

The first meeting was held in 1843 in New York. Twelve men, two more than necessary for a quorum of prayers, met in a small, poor room to form an organization to cope with the problems they saw about them.

The founders wrote out their objective. It purported to unite all Jews "in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity." This goal has remained unaltered. The organization devotes itself to the spiritual and human welfare of the Jewish race and of the country in which they reside. The start was difficult. There were various interpretations of orthodoxy. Languages were a barrier. There were Zionists and non-Zionists. But each had the rich heritage of the Jew—of the law and tradition. B'nai B'rith advocated no doctrine and espoused no political controversy. It never has.

German Jewish immigrants were the founders. They first chose the name "Bundes-Brueder," a German-Yiddish term for "Band of Brothers." Later "Independent Order of B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant)" was chosen. It has been shortened to the last two words. A motto was selected. It has remained unchanged. "Benevolence, Brotherly Love, and Harmony." Charity was and is a major activity.

By 1850 the first community center had been opened in New York. In 1860, when President Lincoln's call for volunteers was made, B'nai B'rith recruited and equipped with rifles and uniforms an entire company of Jewish soldiers. (The Confederate Army also had a number of Jews who distinguished themselves in the army and government.) The first citation by our Government to a civilian organization for patriotic war service was to B'nai B'rith.

B'nai B'rith also earned other citations for its charity and relief work given to all distressed persons in the disasters of the San Francisco earthquake, the Baltimore fire, and other emergencies in the United States. It was so engaged 13 years before the Red Cross was established. The order maintains two nationally known hospitals, both nonsectarian. One, in Denver, is for tuberculosis. The second, the Leo Levi Memorial, is in Hot Springs, Ark.

In 1913 B'nai B'rith set up the Anti-Defamation League to combat organized anti-Semiticism in this country. Similarly, U.S. Roman Catholics founded an organization to combat anti-Catholic propaganda. Both have done splendid educational jobs. These, in particular, anger the hate groups.

There are today B'nai B'rith lodges in 38 countries. They are active in the field of youth work and adult education as being aspects of the basic objective—human and spiritual welfare.

Statement by Dr. Richard J. Russell Before Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a statement delivered before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on June

2 of this year by Dr. Richard J. Russell, director of the Coastal Studies Institute of Louisiana State University and dean of the graduate school.

Dr. Russell is a member of the committee's panel on science and technology and participated in the recent roundtable discussion on scientific and technological problems held by the committee and the panel June 2 and 3. He is an eminent geographer and the paper which he presented before our committee on the earth and its geologic makeup will, I am sure, be of interest to many.

Dr. Russell's statement follows:

We know very little about the crust of the earth. We await better knowledge of the shape of the earth to know where oversea places actually are located. In North America we need repeated geodetic surveys, better knowledge of the distribution of gravitational forces, many refined tiltmeter observations, and other geophysical data to know how and at what rates the earth's crust is being deformed. Coastal California creeps northward at a rate of some inches per year in comparison with the Sierra Nevada, parts of the northeastern United States rise appreciably in comparison with regions some distance away, and we roughly know many other cases of crustal movement at rates sufficient to justify a continuing inventory.

The composition of the outer part of the earth's crust is only imperfectly known. We need a chemical-balance sheet and much more exact knowledge of both distribution and volumetric abundance of elements, minerals, and rocks. We lag far behind the Russians here. For many years they have been drilling, in geometric pattern, holes to the basement rock in all parts of the Soviet Union. Our own ideas are based on mine shafts and wells drilled in search of petroleum. Practically all of our information comes from exceptional places so that we have only distorted information, in comparison with that which would be obtained by spacing holes geometrically, without regard to known economic goals, so as to get informative, random sampling.

The water content of the earth's crust is insufficiently known. We are woefully ignorant about permeability and porosity of rock at depth, and hence about rates of water movement. Even at shallow depth, where ground water is one of our most essential resources we are acutely ignorant about abundance, flow characteristics, and rates of flow. In most places we seek ground water for its purity, but in a few for its impurity, for salts of commercial value. We are now contaminating both surface and subsurface water at rates that may threaten continuing habitation of some densely populated areas. But, this readily available supply of water is only part of waters in the earth's crust. Within recent years it is becoming apparent that crustal deformation is related to water at greater depth. Volcanic phenomena, frequency of earthquakes, regional tilting and subsidence, and many other crustal phenomena will be more adequately understood only after our knowledge of water in the crust is improved. With these investigations will come better understanding of movements of fluids and gases that will greatly enhance our knowledge of ores and ability to locate essential mineral resources.

Heat transfer values are poorly known. We have only crude data concerning the conductivity of rocks. It is amazing to find that the value of the vertical temperature gradient in the crust most commonly cited in texts and tables is one determined in Paris, shortly after Fahrenheit invented the thermometer. In considering questions such as widespread use of the earth's internal heat as a source of power, we have little basis today for estimating depletion rates.

This short list of areas of fundamental ignorance is by no means exhaustive. It points up our need for inventories, for gathering facts that are readily obtainable, provided that we supply necessary effort.

After observation we come to matters of interpretation in the development and application of any science. Observations must pass from emphasis on qualitative to quantitative fact. Abilities to interpret are at hand but the interpreters badly need something like a handbook of geological constants that can be compiled only after our observations are much more adequate. We are quite illiterate today about questions as simple as how an unconsolidated sediment becomes a hard rock. The basic mechanics of rock deformation await more adequate understanding of elastic and plastic properties of rock at depth.

It is commonly said that observation and interpretation mean little until one has a theory to test. Geologists have been fertile in providing theories, but have lacked adequate means for testing them. It is high time that we make more meaningful efforts.

For more than a century geologists have been mapping actively the distributional pattern of various rocks and structures. More recently, as a parallel activity, geophysicists have been observing many things, such as currents of electricity in the rocks, distribution of magnetic fields, residual magnetism in geologically ancient minerals, characteristics of travel of various types of waves in the crust, and the force of gravity at various places. Both geologists and geophysicists formulate theories concerning the crust and its deformation. One group rather commonly disputes the conclusions of the other and both have advanced to the point where a showdown is necessary. A few areas that have been mapped in extreme detail by geologists should be subjected to a variety of sophisticated geophysical tests to discover areas of agreement and find where conclusions may be faulty, on the basis of more refined observations and interpretations.

Have I wasted the time of the Committee and Panel in listing some areas of ignorance among earth scientists? I think not. I will attempt now to outline briefly some practical results, with emphasis on what I believe are matters of public impact, should some of our deficiencies be remedied.

Relationships between geology and public health are rapidly looming in significance. Correlations between fluorine content of water and tooth decay, limestone and incidence of goiter, or the presence of supplies of deadly ground water in certain areas have long been known. An association between minute amounts of selenium and sterility appears to be real. High incidence of cancer has been related to polluted water supplies, and possibly to natural radioactivity of rocks. A penetrating study in the State of New York by a geologist, statistician, and epidemiologist distinctly relates incidence of maldeformations at birth to the geologic map. With increasing pollution of ground water and increase in abundance of dangerous isotopes that did not exist before we began dealing with fissionable materials in a modern way, our needs for more detailed knowledge have become acute. While the public is alert to the dangers of atmospheric fallout, and possibly over-alarmed, it is now blissfully ignorant of what may be far more serious problems arising from pollution of both ground water and soil. We may expect the rate of production of substances such as strontium 90 to double every 12 years, in keeping with our increasing need for energy. We must know how to dispose of these dangerous products in the safest possible way.

Geologists traditionally have been finders of mineral fuels. With coal, problems were relatively simple and our deposits are quite well known. Petroleum and natural gas passed more rapidly through an evolution from easy to hard-to-find reserves; from production in domes and anticlines to requirements for locating shoestring sands and pinchouts. The discovery of new reserves has been so successful that we have developed unwarranted complacency about future supplies. Though executives of several oil companies have expressed highly optimistic views, most experts agree that the peak U.S. production will come within a decade, and possibly within 5 years. It will not only be necessary to improve methods of recovery, as was pointed out to the Committee at our last meeting, but also to test every possible chance of locating reserves in places that are now considered as unfavorable.

Fissionable materials provide some electricity now and there is every reason to believe that they will do so in rapidly increasing amounts within the near future. For most of the United States at present the block is economic. Costs appear to be on the order of twice those of processes employing conventional fuels. This is most fortunate for the reason that it is providing time for the discovery of methods of safely disposing of associated high-level waste. But the tomorrow is probably not far away when technological breakthroughs occur that will lower costs and promote a mad rush toward utilization of fissionable materials as fuel and a terrific public demand for much cheaper electricity. Geologists will not only be active in disposing of wastes but also may be seeking new mineral fuel sources as intensively as people with Geiger counters were searching for uranium a few years ago.

A new element in the mineral resources picture is the fact that many rare minerals of no known commercial value suddenly become highly necessary resources when new technological demands arise. The Russians have several large institutions engaged in finding new uses for minerals. We lag pitifully, but we have done fairly well in finding new techniques for the discovery of metals. It has been found that certain minerals act as scavengers for picking up minute amounts of metallic trace elements and that the quantities they contain are highly variable from place to place. Here appears to be a key for placing mineral prospecting on a new, highly scientific basis. Most mining camps are located in places where rock is widely exposed at the surface, as in mountains, deserts, or arctic regions. Trace element techniques in all probability will lead to discoveries in types of areas that heretofore have defied prospectors, as below thick overburdens of soil or "soft" rock. The leadtime between discovery of techniques and realization of practical results in matters such as ore discovery could be shortened tremendously if the scientists concerned were more favorably supported. The invention of the transistor and development of other electronic equipment, discoveries in metallurgy, and other technological advances create heavy demands for substances that were not long ago regarded as worthless. We have little idea about the most urgent mineral needs of the future, but they are certain to change rapidly, and there is no question about the necessity for training people capable of solving each new demand as it arises.

What point is there in bringing questions of this type before your committee? I presume it needs background information. And I also presume that the Congress will from time to time become involved in matters such as I am attempting to bring into focus. Various governmental agencies are engaged in fostering the development of solid earth sciences, and probably most of them could accelerate their programs effectively if given the opportunity.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey, Geological Survey, Bureau of Standards, and various

other agencies are well established and are capable of increasing their efforts. The National Science Foundation, Office of Naval Research, some other defense agencies, and have keen interests in specific parts of any program designed to increase our knowledge about the earth and capabilities for using its resources.

Many of our most fundamental discoveries are being made by organizations such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington and Rockefeller Institute for the reason that they have keen appreciation of the value of basic research. It has been proposed that institutes be established for services such as providing chemical analyses of rocks and minerals, age determinations of rocks, discovering new uses for minerals and rocks, and for collecting data on magnetism, radioactivity, gravitational forces, and rock deformation. A special standards institute is needed for providing reference samples of rocks and minerals with known analytical, radioactivity, and spectroscopic properties. It should be equipped with instruments so highly specialized and costly that they are out of reach of universities and comparable research institutions. The National Science Foundation and Office of Naval Research could serve as sponsors of these institutes, as might the Geological Survey or probably several other governmental agencies.

It is essential in meeting public needs that more satisfactory methods be devised for continuing financing of important research activities, with less emphasis on fiscal years, so that projects may be carried out more effectively and more economically. Better methods are needed for cooperation with universities, the traditional source of new ideas and mainstay for supplying to government, industry, and themselves capable and highly trained personnel. The idea should never be minimized, however, that if research institutes, governmental and private research agencies, and industry provide opportunities so attractive that universities are no longer able to retain their most talented people and provide adequate support for basic research, the entire program of national development and survival will short-circuit and fail. Several of the proposed research institutes should be located in universities but be supported nationally for the reason that their services are primarily national in scope.

While it is highly desirable from many angles to raise the educational level of the masses, it must be realized that the most pressing questions of development and survival are not related to broad, general programs of education. For its own protection, what the public needs most is scientific and technological advances that will result from the efforts of a comparatively small number of extremely talented individuals. These must have highly specialized training such as will be available only in a small number of institutes and universities, each of which must be provided with intellectual and material resources that it would be unwise, indeed impossible, to duplicate at many places.

Why Send Economic Aid to Trujillo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have objected to military assistance being sent to dictators, especially those like Batista who used our resources to kill and maim his own people. However, I have not been against the giving of economic assistance because I felt that the conditions of misery and ignorance which helped totalitarian governments should be mitigated as much as possible and as soon as possible.

However, I made it clear that I did not favor economic assistance that allowed a dictator to identify his corruption and cruelty with the program and hence made it look as though the United States was friendly to him.

Recently the United States cut off about $150,000 worth of economic aid to Cuba. In my opinion, this is aid to the Cuban people, not to Castro. You can as well ask, "Why continue to give economic aid to Trujillo?"

If the economic aid in the Dominican Republic is used to make some of the Dominicans believe that the United States has any respect, much less affection, for Trujillo, then that program is self-defeating and should be ended.

For fiscal 1961 we have $280,000 obligated for economic assistance in the Dominican Republic. If the administration is going to be consistent, they must end the economic assistance program to Trujillo, now that they have ended the program to Castro.

Otherwise, they must resume the program with Cuba, make certain that it is not associated with Castro, and go ahead with the attempt to use our resources to assist the Cuban people.

The people of Puerto Rico are almost unanimous in their disgust with Trujillo and his government. Under unanimous consent I am including hereafter a translation of an article that appeared in the San Juan El Mundo, on March 29, which contains interesting references to my constituent Gerry Murphy and to Professor Galindez:

OTILIO MENDEZ AQUINO DESCRIBES "TORTURES" TO WHICH PRISONERS HAD BEEN SUBMITTED IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC[1]

(By Bienvenido Ortiz Otero)

A series of tortures, to which the prisoners of the revolutionary uprising in the Dominican Republic in June 1959 had been submitted, was revealed yesterday afternoon by ex-Capt. Otilio Méndez Aquino.

Mr. Méndez Aquino had deserted from the Dominican Military Air Force and flown to Puerto Rico. He is living in Santurce, with his sister, Odina Méndez de Montes de Oca.

He also referred to the disappearance of the Basque Prof. Jesús de Galíndez and the death of the North American pilot, Murphy, and to the man who was accused of having murdered him.

Méndez Aquino alleged that there had been "massacres of prisoners" in the Dominican Republic. He said that "the worst of it was that, before killing them or letting them bleed to death, the officers of the armed forces submitted them to tortures, using stilettos (or bayonets, or ice picks) and lighted cigarettes, and then threw them into the dungeons to die."

He said that he had learned about the majority of those incidents from the officers themselves, who had been talking about the tortures as though they were normal events; and he stated that he had been an eye witness to one of those cases.

[1] Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian, Apr. 27, 1960.

THE LARANCUEN CASE

Later the ex-officer told about the "torture and death" of the radio announcer Larancuen, who had lived at Aguadilla for several years. He said that, "Larancuen was taken, as were all the prisoners, to the San Isidro Airbase and stabbed several times with a stiletto (bayonet or ice pick). The announcer died hours later."

He stated that he had heard various officers tell what they had done to other prisoners, whom they had placed aboard planes, "with their hands and feet tied together and practically turned into a ball." He stated that those prisoners "were dumped down on the pavement from the door of the plane, and that some of them died instantly of a broken neck or of skull fractures."

He said that all those tortures had been ordered by Gen. Rafael (Ramfis) Trujillo and a group of high-ranking officers; and, immediately thereafter, he said that Ramfis had been present at most of the tortures and executions.

"The faces of some of the officers registered satisfaction when they spoke of their evil deeds," he said, "but others showed repulsion. Almost all of the prisoners whom they had taken, after being tortured at the San Isidro Air Base, those who had not died, were taken to the academy of the base where, by order of the command, they were shot to death, one by one, in the presence of those who were awaiting the same end."

He stated that the shooting was done by the cadets of the academy by orders of the high officers. "Those cadets are between 17 and 22 years of age, and it seemed that they were obliged to carry out those executions so as to inure them to the system of the regime, or to compromise them."

EXECUTED NEPHEW

Méndez Aquino revealed the case of an officer who was forced to execute his own nephew. The officer was a member of the corps of military aides. "When they ordered him to shoot the boy, the officer cocked his gun, ready to fire, and then his nephew said to him: 'Well, I don't believe that you are going to shoot me,' and the officer trembled and turned white. He again cocked the gun, pulled the trigger, and shot his nephew in front of Ramfis and the other officers."

Méndez Aquino said that in the outskirts of the city "there are houses which apparently are private homes but which are in reality torture centers, in which there are electric chairs to make the prisoners talk." "Some of those villas are owned by Ramfis," he said, "and many prisoners have died of electric shock, and others have become mentally deranged. The villas are being used by the military intelligence service."

"One of those villas is about 7 kilometers from Ciudad Trujillo, on the road which leads from that capital to the town of San Pedro de Macoris. That, I know, is owned by Ramfis. There is another one close to Avenida Tiradentes,.on [or in] San Juan de la Maguana. That villa is owned by Capt. Ney Lluveras, who killed Gen. Ludovino Fernández, but was afterwards murdered by General Fernández's chauffeur."

He also revealed that, as the soldiers did not seem very happy with the slaying of the insurgents, Trujillo ordered them liquidated by the foreign legion which is composed of Germans, Greeks, Hungarians, and Italians. "Those who were hard to capture were given to understand by Trujillo that several members of the Organization of American States were in Ciudad Trujillo and were studying their case," Méndez Aquino said; and added that, "when they were taken to San Isidro and asked where the OAS members were, they were told that what was here was the FUS, which meant to say that they would be shot to death."

GALÍNDEZ

Relative to the Galíndez case, he said that he had heard the army officers tell that he had been kidnaped upon leaving Columbia University in New York, and that he had been taken by members of the Dominican Intelligence Service, in an ambulance, to a plane piloted by Murphy.

"They said that in the ambulance they had given him an anesthetic so that he would not cause any problems. He was then taken to the Dominican Republic and brought before Trujillo. The dictator told Galíndez, when he had recovered from the effects of the drugs: 'Keep on writing.' Afterward he ordered the professor tortured and executed," acording to what he had heard the officers say.

"I also heard tell that Murphy was murdered and that the ex-air force captain, Octavio de la Massa, was to be made to confess the murder; but as he did not confess, they tortured him and liquidated him."

ARE UNITED

On the impression that he had when he arrived in Puerto Rico, ex-officer Méndez Aquino said that he was surprised to find that the Dominican exiles on the island had formed different groups, with different leaders, and that they were totally disunited. "In the Dominican Republic all anti-Trujillistas are united," he indicated.

"I find it hard to believe that after all those years that the exiles have been in Puerto Rico they should not yet have understood that union is an absolute necessity in order to be able to achieve the prompt overthrow of the dictator Trujillo. I think that the opposition in the Dominican Republic is better organized than here, in spite of the fact that there the danger is much greater."

Source: El Mundo (San Juan, P.R.), Mar. 29, 1960.

Research Fundamental to the Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a statement presented to the Committee on Science and Astronautics on June 2 by Dr. Fred L. Whipple, Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and professor of astronomy at Harvard College Observatory.

Dr. Whipple is a member of the committee's panel on science and technology and was a participant in the recent roundtable discussion held by the committee and the panel on June 2 and 3 on scientific and technological problems.

Dr. Whipple is very well known in his field, and the paper he delivered before our committee will, I am confident, prove interesting and instructive to many who did not have the opportunity to attend our public sessions.

Dr. Whipple's statement follows:

RESEARCH FUNDAMENTAL TO THE SPACE PROGRAM

Chairman BROOKS, members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, ladies and gentlemen, at our first meeting I presented bashfully a germ of thought concerning certain types of essential research programs that tend to be neglected in our present national system of scientific support. At that time my ideas were not clearly enough formulated for a proper presentation. Now I can expand the picture a bit in the directions where my own experience and observation may be of significance.

The type of research or research engineering that I have in mind will generally be a cross-discipline type of activity. It will rarely fall entirely within any of the known major disciplines and rarely will an individual scientist or engineer have sufficient breadth to plan or conduct the research alone. Frequently, too, the nature of the research will be such as to fall between the purviews of recognized sources of appreciable research funds. To particularize the discussion, I shall now choose an example, which may or may not be entirely representative of the various factors I have just mentioned. Nevertheless, the problem of the nature of the lunar surface, both the point of view of lunar science and the engineering point of view for lunar landing is significant and illustrative. No one on the planet knows (of course, I think I do) whether the moon surface is covered with a considerable thickness of dust or is a fairly rigid, hard surface suitable for supporting substantial structures. Nor will a few hard or soft landings with limited equipment necessarily give us a general answer to this question. Obviously the question is of the greatest importance theoretically and practically. I believe that this problem can be answered in the laboratory at about 1 percent the cost of a rather simple lunar probe and with adequate certainty for the engineering requirements.

We know, at least within limits, the physical environment that affects the moon's surface. We can vary our experimental conditions and assumed chemical composition over an adequate range to cover all of the likely and most of the possible situations that may obtain there. The time scale can be speeded up by an enormous factor so that the experiment need not stretch out unduly. To my knowledge no adequate experiment of this sort is underway, although it is possible that I am not informed.

Our space program has demonstrated a rapidly growing tendency of modern times, namely, that real progress can be made only when the "purest" of scientists and the "most practical" of engineers work shoulder to shoulder along with men of all intervening degrees of theoretical and practical experience. The moon-surface experiment illustrates in a limited fashion this need. The experiment is not one truly in astrophysics, in geology, in chemistry or in physics but it embraces all of these subjects as well as demanding laboratory skill in high vacuum techniques, in "conrosive" ion propulsion, in electrostatic control, and in various techniques for handling pulverized material. There are a considerable number of laboratories over the country where all of these skills and sciences could be brought to bear upon the problem. Also, I believe that there are a sufficient number of research men who would be interested in conducting the experiment if they were encouraged by the promise of proper support. But who would give the support? The project is too large for a university and for all but the greatest foundations to support. It hardly rates as an experiment essential to defense, although it certainly bears upon it. It is not exactly a problem in basic research for the support of the National Science Foundation. Possibly if an investigator pushed hard enough, he might find a committee somewhere that would approve a limited grant for a "study" of the problem. Perhaps it falls closest to the purview of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and perhaps, indeed, NASA is doing something about it. The latter, however, is suffering from financial malnutrition because of the expected-unexpected increase in cost of conducting the experiments to which it is committed.

My guess is that the moon-surface experiment will be carried out inadequately, that rather large expenditures will be made to answer the question mostly from the moon itself, and in the end we will, by good luck, come out with an answer that is close enough to the truth, engineeringwise, that no disaster will occur.

I mention another example not in the field of my own specialty. This is related to the first example and concerns studies of the planets, including the moon, by seismic methods, moonquakes. Here is an old field of research on the earth and of the earth, which has received only a modicum of support, except in a few specialized problems such as oil prospecting. Seismology received a mild "shot in the arm" because of the International Geophysical Year. Yet, at enormous expense, we will place simple recording seismographs on the moon and planets. Our purpose is to learn about these bodies and certainly something will be learned from exceedingly simple experiments. When we consider the cost of the space science experiments compared to the backup research in seismology on the earth, we find that the ratio is like the ratio of value to earnings for a modern electronic stock. The basic research in seismology has been conducted by a handful of faithful devotees for a number of decades and the support is so small as to keep progress at a highly efficient but actually at a low level. Our lack of knowledge in this field has proved highly embarrassing internationally with regard to the detection of atom bomb tests. Note that we still cannot predict earthquakes, e.g., Chile. I put the question that was presented to me by one of our most able seismologists: "Do we know enough about seismology and the interior of the planet Earth to plan a proper experiment for the Moon, Mars, or Venus?" I do not know the answer to this question, but I am certain that a much more positive answer would be forthcoming should we find a way actively to support the backup seismological research that is obviously needed.

At our last meeting Sverre Petterssen discussed the brilliant possible future of meteorology on this planet and on others and pointed out the fact that "since the end of the last World War meteorology has been a neglected scientific field." Clearly the remarkably successful Tiros experiment has demonstrated that future meteorological satellites can provide a "completely new horizon" in meteorology and atmospheric sciences and in the practical matter of weather forecasting. A number of leading meteorologists have been pressing for the organization of a National Institute of Aeronautical Sciences. The creation of such an institute would be a milestone in the progress of meteorology and, among its other important contributions, would provide the essential backup to our space science program, both for the meteorological satellites about the earth and for our meteorological experiments above and in the atmospheres of other planets. Metecrology, I believe, embraces all of the physical sciences and perhaps some of the biological. Until the active research workers in the major subsections of meteorology are brought together "under one roof" and given an opportunity to interact scientifically, I do not believe that we will attain the degree of progress that is abundantly promised and urgently needed in the near future. Only with such an organization can our enormous expenditure in meteorological satellites and planetary atmospheric research be able to reach its full potential. At the moment I do not know whether or how the National Institute

for Aeronautical Sciences is to be financed, but my impression over the last year or two is that its future is highly uncertain.

In the highest part of the atmosphere and in space sciences one of the least expensive and valuable backups to the space program is the high altitude balloon. I will not elaborate on the problems here except to say that the scientific balloon program is essentially a homeless orphan except for the limited but highly effective support given particularly by the Office of Naval Research and to some extent by the Air Force. This matter of responsibility for the potentially precious balloon program should be settled at the earliest possible moment and supported adequately. Dollar for dollar it should pay off at somewhere between 10 and 100 to 1 over satellites and space probes in terms of space science results. Furthermore, the balloon program involves generally a much smaller and less rigid scientific effort than the space program, with much simpler problems of coordination, guidance, tracking, etc. Hence, it is much better suited for the university researcher than is the satellite program. This is very important as it still seems to be true that most of the major scientific progress comes from within the universities and research organizations closely associated with universities. Incidentally, the tendency of our present space program away from the university impresses me as a step in the wrong direction.

I should enjoy expanding on problems in the field of my own specialty; viz, meteoritics, but will spare you the details of this effort except to attach as a possible appendix to this discussion a paper I wrote for the National Academy of Sciences on this subject about a year ago. I will summarize the paper by saying that the ground based activity to back up our space engineers in the field of meteoritics is still operating at a snail's pace compared to its proper rate. By saving a few hundred thousand dollars a year in meteoritic research, we may lose hundreds of millions of dollars in our space program.

There are other aspects to the problem. One concerns a backup program that is extremely powerful, radio astronomy. This field is covered extremely well in this country except for the division of radio meteors. Nevertheless, there are some extremely serious problems in keeping the critical radio lanes open for radio astronomy. Even the satellites impinge upon these bands sometimes and it is possible that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics can assist in protecting the very excellent effort which is now underway in radio astronomy.

Without going into detail I will mention another area in which I am certain ground-based developmental engineering could be extremely important to our space program, that of the remote-controlled robot. The idea is that a robot in space can do everything that a man can, at far less expense, weight and emotional concern, if there is television contact with and controlled by a man on the ground. A major problem in space is reliability of equipment. Once the remote-controlled robots are multiplied and are sufficiently subtle in their operation to repair each other as well as the equipment, the problem of reliability will have been essentially solved, at least to distances where communication by television is practicable.

I will not attempt to make a listing of other neglected fields of research that fall into the category of my discussion. Generally speaking, as an astronmer, I am embarrased by the large number of reasonable questions about the moon, planets and interplanetary space that astronomy cannot answer. In defense of the astronomer, however, I can point out that the total cost of launching and tracking one earth satellite is adequate to build the observatory with the greatest telescope on earth, the 200-inch Palomar reflector. In answer to the criticism that even with proper funds there are not enough astronomers to expand the astronomical frontier adequately to provide a proper foundation for lunar, planetary and space science, I can only say that the astronomers have always welcomed other scientists as colleagues and have depended upon the engineers to help us with our most important equipment. Also we are training young men rapidly and have facilities to train many more than are available. Various programs of the National Science Foundation are of great assistance in this matter.

Indeed, until very recently astronomical financing has been at an unbelievably low level. I grant that astronomers have not been aggressive enough in their demands for adequate support. Within the decade I sat in a formal discussion where three of the leading astronomers in the country argued that a million dollars a year was an excessive amount of Government support for proper astronomical progress. Astronomers, I may point out, are a bit more ambitious today. Nevertheless, I consider the funding of astronomical research to back up the space science program as broadly inadequate except in the field of radio astronomy (and there barring radio meteor astronomy).

To generalize, it is my thesis that much of our national space program is inadequately backed up by fundamental research and development essential to its proper growth and execution. Probably this neglect of background research results from the fact that no organization within this land having sufficient funds for this backup research has the authority and the assigned mission of supporting it. Now I do not wish to imply that a space experiment or project executed on a crash basis with inadequate foundation studies, is necessarily bad. We all realize the enormous importance of early experience and research to our national welfare and future, so that an expensive, calculated risk can oftentimes be justified as a better investment than a less expensive but delayed result. Oftentimes, too, the intuitive judgment of an inspired scientist or engineer may surpass a conservative development by a mediocre "research group." I am not criticizing those who have worked tirelessly to develop quickly much needed experimental equipment, rocket propulsion systems or other techniques essential to our early mastery of space. My plea is for the proper support of the space programs that are now envisaged, for which we have time, by acting quickly, to improve the end result markedly without great cost, measured either in dollars or in delay of fulfillment.

The problem is not to be solved simply by adding more funds in total, but rather by guaranteeing that a modest fraction of the research and development funds be made available for the basic work that needs to be done. The problem is similar to that of protecting research funds when they are combined with research and development funds. As is well known, and happens yearly throughout our R. & D. budgets, a squeeze or reduction in the budget never strikes the small 10 percent item of research at the same fractional level that it strikes the large item of development. In practice, the cuts are taken more or less equally from both, until the research funds are largely eliminated. In some cases, a frantic scrambling recovers some of the research money so that its research support does not die completely. This background support for the space program bears a similar relationship to the heavy engineering expenses of propulsion units, launching fields, tracking systems and other large expenses which inevitably are underestimated because they themselves are new developments in unproven territory.

As a concrete concept to spur our thinking, I suggest that an individual or group with a separated protected budget be set up, possibly in NASA or in NSF, with the mission (a) to study the problem of backup research for the space program, (b) to encourage research in critical backward areas, and (c) to fund research programs as required when they do not fall easily in the normal disciplines or categories of funds. Clearly a heavy responsibility in scientific and technical vision would lie on the shoulders of such an individual or group. Staffing would be a most critical problem.

Perhaps some other type of solution would lead to a better result. I mention this one simply to try to "start the ball rolling." The problem is real and urgent.

Thank you, gentlemen, for this opportunity. I hope that you will, with your much broader understanding of governmental and financial aspects, be able to find a solution to this real and urgent problem.

Award of Contract to Mitsubishi Co., of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1960, I requested the Secretary of Labor to conduct an official investigation into the matter of unemployment in two of the counties in my district, namely Richland and Ashland. I asked for this survey in connection with my efforts to secure for the Plymouth Locomotive Works the defense contract to supply some 39 locomotives to the Panama Canal at a cost of some $4 million. I regret to say that the contract was awarded to the Mitsubishi Co., of Japan on May 12.

The Department of Labor has just advised my office that Richland and Ashland Counties, aforementioned, on the basis of its investigation are labor surplus areas.

Mr. Speaker, I have this day written to the Honorable Wilber Brucker, Secretary of the Army, as follows:

With regard to the recent award of the towing locomotive contract for the Panama Canal to Mitsubishi, I am of the firm opinion that the present strong feeling in Japan against a mutual security treaty with the United States indicates the need for a complete reappraisal of this contract award.

We cannot overlook the gravity of the present anti-American feeling in Japan if we are to insure the timely availability and delivery of this equipment so vital to the canal's operation. This situation, in my opinion, clearly makes it mandatory that the low domestic bidder, the Plymouth Locomotive Works, be called on to supply all, or certainly a significant portion of this essential equipment.

On June 6, 1960, I received a report from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Statistics, which indicates that a serious condition of labor surplus now exists in the Plymouth area. In the case of the Plymouth Locomotive Works, this concern so essential to national security, has already been forced by foreign competition and other factors to cut back to a 4-day week, in addition to laying off 10 percent of its working force during recent weeks.

The recent deterioration in world political conditions, and our own economic con-

ditions at home, dictate that steps be taken before the situation becomes untenable to insure the continuing operation of this vital canal facility.

Mr. Speaker, had the Panama Canal contract been awarded to Plymouth, it would have meant some 3 years of employment or about 1,117,200 man-hours of work.

And as I have contended repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, while the Japanese bid on paper was $913,000 lower than the Plymouth bid, the Government actually lost money by awarding the contract to Mitsubishi. In addition to the $500,000 which would have been paid to Uncle Sam in taxes by Plymouth Locomotive, the Government would have collected some $438,000 in the form of income taxes from employees of our domestic firm. We could also add to this the taxes and man-hours lost to U.S. suppliers and their employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if American industry and our standard of living are to survive against the onslaught of foreign competition, we must reexamine the definition of fair and free competition, which our Government says is the basis upon which foreign imports are received and foreign bids accepted, in the light of such acts as the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healy Public Contracts Act, neither of which applies to such countries as Japan. How can domestic industry possibly prevail if conditions that represent burdensome production costs are imposed by law upon one competitor and not upon another?

Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed by the slow-down in our industrial plant, especially in such basics as steel. As important as good international relations are, current trade policies to win friends and influence people abroad is placing several domestic industries and the security of our workers in jeopardy. I am satisfied that this situation will deteriorate further unless we eliminate current policies which are entirely contrary to the intent and purpose of the Buy American Act, and to restore trade programs which are adequate to deal with present day circumstances.

The American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting but pathetic aspects of the Communist menace, which appears to surround us on all sides at times, is the concept of the state family as practiced in the Soviet Union. Unlike American parents, who take for granted the joy of raising their own children, many Soviet parents find the raising of their children a state-controlled function including prescribed courses of education accented with political indoctrination, all of which is to perpetuate the communist line.

With such awesome prospects to contemplate it is refreshing to be reminded of the individual freedoms which Americans enjoy, not the least of which is the right to raise one's own children in a manner thought best by the child's parents.

The American family unit is the bedrock upon which our great Nation is built. Watching one's children grow and mature into fine upstanding adults with all the attending joys, sorrows, frustrations and rewards is an intimate part of every family. No family is immune, nor upon thoughtful reflection would any want to be. I recently received an article entitled "The American Family" which is an amusing reminder of what many parents will recall from firsthand experience. As a contrast to the Soviet state family I commend it to the Members of this body. Pursuant to unanimous consent I insert this article herewith:

THE AMERICAN FAMILY

(By Mrs. Thomas P. Swift)

"Four boys is such a nice family," people comment. I thought so, too, when I was an innocent bystander and not an active participant.

Tommy 13, David 10, Craig 4, and Brian 9 months are the names I have dutifully recorded in the family Bible. At my last entry, I noted with interest that one page is completely filled and I have no compulsions about filling the second. If I did, I am sure it would read something like this—Bill, Jim, Joe, and Tim. As much as I would like to see the little deductions, I am realistic enough to know I would not have the time to make the entries nor the 19 cents to buy the ink. I call the children deductions because I find them quite taxing.

People also comment: "You must feel like a queen among so many males." If a queen feeds the hungry males, keeps peace among the subjects and washes the dirty linen, then I might say "yes"—I live like a queen (a queen that would frequently like to abdicate).

My husband goes to work 6 days a week and to Scout meetings for relaxation. This should continue for another 15 years at which time he will be nearing 60, but a cane will come in handy on 15-mile hikes.

System is essential to a well-run household. Five days a week after seeing the two oldest boys off to school, it is a time for decision. Which should I do first—beds, dishes, or diapers? I find the most profitable attack on this point is a third cup of coffee.

Having a husband and being a mother of four boys has its occupational hazard. From keen observation (never in time), I note that the john seats are always up. If I can live to a ripe old age without a broken spine, I will feel that though outnumbered, I have at least won the Battle of the Bath.

On occasions, I have fancied myself doctor, seamstress, chef, psychiatrist, secretary, chauffeur, teacher, mechanic, veterinarian, and interior decorator. (Our furniture is early childhood.) Mostly, I just feel like a girl with bedroom eyes who grew into a woman with dishpan hands.

Being early starters and late stoppers in the game of propagation, our childrens ages are spaced. We laughingly call this planned parenthood. At any rate, it takes real talent to mentally switch to the various age levels. In the course of an hour I frequently switch from lullabys to nursery rhymes to answering questions on space travel to junior high homework. The transition is strenuous, and to think that an Academy Award was won for portraying only "Three Faces of Eve."

The regular grocery list for the week includes baby food, fish food, hamster food, dog food, bird food, and chicken food. The last is for a blue Easter chick now grown up which no one seems to know what to do with. Craig, 4, used to like to walk around with Chick on his shoulder but being a fastidious child, now resents Chick not being toilet trained.

Tommy, 13, owns a snake which we don't buy food for. Snake eats an occasional live frog after which he cannot be disturbed for a week. Life Scout Tommy knows all about such things and he says that Snake will "urp it up." I used to not like snakes but now I have been told that people who dislike snakes are simply ignorant, so I am crazy about snakes.

Cub Scout David, 10, is a real TV fan and fiend. He tells time by saying it is 10 minutes before "Topper" or 15 minutes past "Gunsmoke." His real passion is the big give-away programs. If he won a million dollars, he says that he would buy a swimming pool, a Cadillac, a helicopter, and that he would save the rest for something he really wanted. It is gratifying to see that I have instilled in him a thrift to save.

Brian is still too young to have made any contribution to posterity. He has raised the grocery bill $5 per week and the humidity seems higher.

Four children can just about murder one's social life. With one child we were acceptable in most circles even with the child since he was half way civilized. We never found it hard for two adults to subdue one small child. With two children we could still make the rounds if we picked couples whose children were congenial with ours. With three children the invitations were for about 8:30 on the assumption we would leave the offspring with a baby sitter. With four children, I haven't had any dinner invitations to repay.

Having four children of the same sex has many advantages. The bicycles can be handed down and so can clothes. Also I pick friends who have a child just older than one of mine and let it be known I am not too proud to accept outgrown clothes.

If one child had been a girl, we would need another bedroom but another set of bunks and beds will be much more economical. Every silver lining must have a cloud and the most noticeable of these is the diminishing enthusiasms and flood of gifts that appear after each child. No. 1 was duly showered and No. 2 did almost as well. With No. 3 the gifts came to me. There was candy, gowns, flowers, and though no actual cards of condolence, the air reeked with it. No. 4 was practically ignored, especially by relatives who probably wondered if this trip was really necessary.

According to the old saying, I have made my bed and now I should have to lie in it. As a matter of fact, I can't find the time to make my bed, much less lie in it.

People about 80 say: "My dear, they will be grown before you know it." As I see it, after 35,000 meals, scores of sleepless nights, at least one major crisis a day, and after belonging to the PTA for 26 years, they won't grow up before I know it.

Second U.S. Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Army Reserve program is

quietly at work in this Nation, providing the training we must have if we are to be assured of an adequate number of trained "civilian soldiers" in terms of emergency.

An article in the July 1960 Army Information Digest discusses the operations at Headquarters, Second U.S. Army Corps, at Camp Kilmer, N.J. This installation, known to millions of Americans who stayed there briefly during World War II, now has an important mission, and this mission is described in the article written by Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Curtis.

The final paragraphs give details on the community relations activities of the Second U.S. Army Corps in New Jersey and elsewhere. Many New Jersey residents have been, I am sure, impressed by Operation Youth at Camp Kilmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the article to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

II U.S. ARMY CORPS—WHERE RESERVISTS PREPARE FOR M-DAY MISSIONS

Camp Kilmer, located just outside New Brunswick, N.J., is perhaps best known as the center where, between 1942 and 1945, some 5 million troops were processed en route to or returning from oversea duty. Today that same installation—now designated an inactive post—houses Headquarters, II U.S. Army Corps. As such, it is undoubtedly the most active "inactive" post in the Nation.

The II Corps is numerically one of the largest U.S. Army Corps in the country, comprising an area where roughly one-eighth of the Nation's populace lives and works. The corps is the heart of a vast and diversified operation in the Army Reserve program. In structure and function, it is representative of the 14 Army Corps, which are assigned responsibilities for the Army Reserve and ROTC within continental United States.

Fundamentally, the mission of the Army Reserve is to establish and maintain a strong and ready force that can be rapidly mobilized and expanded when and if war should come. The aim of II Corps is to have a force of dedicated, well-trained "civilian soldiers" who are capable of fulfilling their responsibility on a moment's notice.

In civilian life these reservists follow a range of pursuits that reflect a cross-section of community life. One night a week they don their uniforms for training, and supplement this by weekend exercises and 2 weeks of annual active duty for training. In effect, they constitute a force of well-trained 20th century minutemen—citizen soldiers whose heritage goes back to Revolutionary War days.

ORGANIZATION

Created in 1958 by merger of the Military District of New York and New Jersey, II U.S. Army Corps now supervises the training, supply, and administration of an Army Reserve population of 32,871 officers and 258,226 enlisted members organized into 614 units. Its Ready Reserve strength is 21,505 officers and 104,114 enlisted men. Of these, 5,522 officers and 34,439 enlisted men are assigned to troop program units; all others are members of either nontroop program units, Ready Reserve, Standby, or retired control groups.

The Corps also provides direction and supervision to approximately 16,000 students enrolled in Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs in New York and New Jersey.

With the establishment of II Corps, a direct line of authority was created from Department of the Army through Continental Army Command, First U.S. Army to II Corps. The commanding general, II U.S. Army Corps has direct command of ROTC instructor groups and U.S. Army Reserve advisors in the two-State area. Also under his direct command are geographical sector commands, which direct the Reserve program through subsector commands; and nine major commands, each with its own subordinate units.

ROTC ACTIVITIES

Reflecting the importance of ROTC affairs, an office of Deputy Corps Commander for ROTC Affairs was established in II Corps in October 1959.

Currently II Corps ROTC activities extend to 20 senior ROTC units in colleges and universities, 4 military schools, 1 junior ROTC school and 7 National Defense Cadet Corps units.

Purpose of the senior ROTC program is to procure and train college students so that they may qualify upon graduation as commissioned officers in the U.S. Army. A typical ROTC unit at one university has an enrollment of approximately 800 students, supervised by a lieutenant colonel of the Active Army with the status of professor of military science and tactics.

The military science course taught by the ROTC instructor staff includes such subjects as American military history, marksmanship, drill, map reading, small-unit tactics, troop movement, communications and leadership. In addition certain colleges offer branch material programs which include practical work with the major items of equipment authorized that branch. Also available is a flight training course for qualified seniors preparing for entry into the Army aviation program.

The ROTC program includes frequent inspections, a fall review, an annual field day and a ceremony for award of Regular Army commissions to outstanding cadets.

Besides providing invaluable leadership experience for civilian as well as military pursuits, ROTC training fosters team spirit that is most important in athletic participation and campus life. In one university 84 percent of all campus leadership positions competitively available to male students are filled by ROTC cadets.

SECTOR COMMANDS

Under the commanding general, II U.S. Army Corps are three sectors—northern New York, southern New York, and New Jersey—each of which directs the operations of Army Reserve activities within its area. Sector commanders through subsector commands, supervise the activities of U.S. Army Reserve centers, including preparation of USAR units for the 2-week annual active duty for training period.

Center facilities are leased or donated, Government-owned, or constructed. Those built according to standard plans and specifications vary in size from one unit modified (100 man) to five unit (1,000 man). With a few exceptions, such centers include classrooms, administrative space, unit storage space, locker rooms, showers, rifle ranges, kitchen, dayroom, assembly hall, maintenance shop, parking area.

USAR CENTERS

Reserve centers have staffs of 5 to 35 officers and noncommissioned officers who advise and assist units with their training, both at the center and in the field.

As an example of complex function, the SFC Nelson V. Brittin USAR Center, Camden, N.J., administers a Reserve program that encompasses both rural and urban sections. Within its area are more than 1,100 farms and 600 industries whose products range from fountain pens to atomic submarines. Approximately 1,000 Reservists employed in farming, shipbuilding, manufacturing, teaching and civil service use its facilities.

Through reserve duty training assemblies and annual active duty for training, the units of this center—as all in II Corps—are concentrating on training programs which will permit units to initiate appropriate basic or advanced unit training after mobilization. At the same time these units are developing administrative self-sufficiency for peacetime operations. Key personnel, in addition to their regular responsibilities, attend Army service schools and participate in Army extension courses and other military education programs.

MAJOR USAR COMMANDS

Besides its three sectors, II Corps encompasses nine major or General Officers USAR Commands. While the programs of these commands generally parallel those of other units within the sector commands, their scope and size are far greater. For example, the 77th Infantry Division, with headquarters in New York City, is one of the 10 Army Reserve combat divisions in the country. Its 10,000-man membership is drawn from an area extending from Poughkeepsie in the north to Staten Island in the south and Hempstead, Long Island, to the east.

The necessities of medical training and supervision give the 818th Hospital Center, New York City, a structure distinct from the other major commands in the II Corps. In direct command of all 34 nondivisional medical units within the two States, the Hospital Center supervises the activities of 4,224 reservists. Units receive training at Reserve Centers in their communities, but their training programs, based on II Corps directives are developed and directed by the 818th Hospital Center. The Hospital Center also conducts periodic inspections of hospital units at Reserve Centers and active duty training sites.

As an example of the realistic training received, the 364th Army General Hospital, Albany, N.Y., cared for the sick and injured accrued from more than 17,000 National Guard, Army Reserve, and Regular Army personnel present during the unit's 2-week annual active duty for training at Camp Drum last summer.

The 818th Hospital Center is developing a specialized training program to broaden the medical experience of its personnel. Dentists will be given instruction in first aid, resuscitation, anesthesia and minor surgery, and nurses will receive training in treatment of mass casualties and in assisting medical and surgical teams. One major objective is to train all enlisted personnel in basic medical subjects, regardless of duty assignments.

A unit unique in the major commands and the Reserve troop lists of the U.S. Army is the 410th Engineer Command (Amphibious Support), with headquarters in New York City and with organic elements located from Long Island to upper New York. Its mission is to perform combat and combat-support operations in offensive and defensive actions on beaches and along shorelines. With amphibious training facilities at Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., and Camp Drum, N.Y., this unit currently is preparing for a combined operation with the U.S. Navy in August.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Since Army Reservists take part in all phases of community life, it is natural that community relations form a vital part of the program of II U.S. Army Corps.

Civic organizations throughout New York and New Jersey regularly meet at Reserve installations when the Centers are not being used for Reserve activities. Boy Scouts meet at Reserve drill halls, and community gun clubs engage in firing practice at Reserve indoor ranges. Reserve units frequently

provide speakers at civic functions, take part in local parades, and give demonstrations before youth clubs, parent-teacher associations and other community groups.

In addition, reservists participate in fundraising drives and blood donations. The 310th Field Hospital in Poughkeepsie has given demonstrations of first aid survival techniques, and the unit adviser of the 464th Engineer Unit in Schenectady has instructed the New York State Police in the use of mine detector equipment.

Staff members of various Reserve units and centers often hold public service positions in the community. The commander of the southern New York sector, for example, is honorary chairman of the New York City Cancer Committee of the American Cancer Society; the commander of the James W. Wadsworth USAR Center, Rochester, N.Y., is a member of the National Defense Committee of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce.

Some centers sponsor annual community projects. The 1st Lt. James McConnell USAR Center, Syracuse, N.Y., sponsors an orphanage Christmas party each year and sends orphans to camp during the summer. The Elihu Root USAR Center, Utica, N.Y., adopts two needy families each Christmas season and provides them with food, clothing, and toys.

As the home of the II U.S. Army Corps, Camp Kilmer is vitally concerned with community relations. Each summer its doors are thrown open to children in Operation Youth. Last summer 10,000 children, sponsored by approved organizations, enjoyed outdoor activities and recreational facilities at Camp Kilmer, and even more are expected this year.

FINANCING II CORPS

In terms of dollars, II Corps is big business. With an annual operating budget of approximately $11,250,000, II Corps pays $2,100,000 a year in salaries to its 480 civilian employees. Annual costs for leased space and maintenance of constructed facilities total another $1,200,000. An additional $7,427,893 are allocated for annual active duty for training pay of Army reservists in New York and New Jersey. These funds find their way into almost every civilian community throughout the two States.

As an example, the James W. Wadsworth Center, Rochester, N.Y., and its subcenters, are used by 28 Reserve units comprising approximately 2,000 reservists. It has a staff of 6 officers, 10 sergeant advisers and 16 civilians. Initial cost of the center itself was $576,700, and annual maintenance runs approximately $23,000. Clothing and equipment issued to units and individuals at the Wadsworth Center and its subcenters totals $328,000. The annual payroll for reservists, Active Army and civilian personnel approximates $708,000.

The dedicated spirit and readiness of II Corps Reserve units has earned the respect of local communities—a feeling that is reflected in articles, editorials and statements appearing in newspapers and magazines throughout the area.

THE PUBLIC AND THE RESERVE

The U.S. Army is a reflection of the entire Nation which it serves and from which it springs. As Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker has emphasized, the Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve are elements of a dynamic One Army team, each member an indispensable link in our national defense structure.

In II U.S. Army Corps and elsewhere throughout the Nation, reservists, with their individual skills and collective unity, form a most important part of America's visible deterrent strength. Drawn from every community, these 20th Century Minutemen are dedicated to the establishment of a firm, enduring world peace—a peace based on honor, freedom, justice, and the dignity of man, and safeguarded by unceasing vigilance.

The Story of Chief Joseph: From Where the Sun Now Stands—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to present the fourth article of the story of Chief Joseph, leader of the great Nez Perce Indian tribe.

This story, written by Mr. Bruce A. Wilson, editor of the Omak Chronicle in Omak, Wash., located in the Fifth Congressional District of Washington which I have the honor of representing, has received wide acclaim and I will insert additional articles of this story in the next few days.

The fourth article follows:

THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1877

Natalekin, an elderly Nez Perce, emerges from his tepee into the faint dawn. For a moment he warms his hands at a fire. Then, grunting, he throws himself astride a large iron-gray horse staked nearby and rides slowly toward the pony herd on the hillside. Natalekin's eyes are failing. He leans forward on the horse, trying to make out what is before him. The world explodes in his face as three volunteers a few feet ahead fire at him simultaneously. Natalekin lurches crazily to the ground. Somebody shouts, "Hit them hard." An ear-splitting volley crashes into the sleeping camp. Yelling and shooting, soldiers splash across the river. Dogs bark. Crazed horses jerk loose their tethers. Squaws scream as they run with papooses. Naked warriors burst out of tepees, some with rifles, others forgetting everything in their dazed compulsion to get away.

Clouds of bullets rip through the tepees. To 9-year-old White Bird, a nephew of the great war chief, they seem to patter like raindrops as they rip through buffalo skin walls just above his head. His mother takes him by the hand to run. A shot tears off the squaw's middle finger and the young boy's thumb. The barrage reminds the warrior Two Moons of a summer hail. With the poles of his tepee splintering about him, he finally reaches his rifle and runs outside. Pahit Pakit, 12 years old, huddles under his blanket as a soldier leans inside the tepee to fire at the boy's yapping dog.

Wahlitits, whose desire to avenge his father's murder had sparked the war in Idaho, throws himself behind a rotten log. Here Capt. William Logan's company is advancing. Wahlitits shoots a soldier. Logan fires. Wahlitits rolls dead. The warrior's wife, already wounded, seizes his rifle and triggers a shot that kills Logan. Seconds later she also is killed. The troops have reached the village and are firing in every direction. Braves, shrieking squaws and children slump to the ground. In the dim gray light, every moving thing becomes a target.

Many Indians, gasping with fear, plunge into the willow thickets bordering the same river crossed a few minutes before by the soldiers. They offer the only cover within reach. From the willows Rainbow, Wahchumyus, Elotoht, and other proven warriors, most of them naked except for ammunition belts thrown over their shoulders, begin shooting back. Husis Owyeen fires; a soldier drops. Next moment a bullet chips Owyeen's skull. He recovers to continue fighting, unaware that his 2-year-old baby, toddling through the melee, has been shot through the hip and his wife, snatching up the child, shot through the back.

Squaws and children wade hip deep into the river, ducking under the water when fighting explodes near them. Rainbow, one of the greatest Nez Perce warriors, nearly collides with a soldier in the willows. Both throw up their rifles. Rainbow is quickest but his gun clicks. The soldier's bullet splatters blood across Rainbow's chest.

The eastern sky brightens to disclose a swirling turmoil of soldiers and Indians half hidden by rolling clouds of crimson-stabbed smoke. A group of volunteers, sent to drive off the pony herd, is turned back by a desperate outburst of firing. Nez Perces including barefooted Chief Joseph, wearing only a shirt and blanket, succeed in moving the herd outside the battle area. Twenty minutes have passed since the attack began. Gibbon's men occupy two-thirds of the corpse-strewn camp. Already troops are trying to set fire to tepees. But the buffalo skins and canvas are too damp, and burn only fitfully.

Whenever before white soldiers have surprised an Indian camp at dawn, resistance swiftly collapsed in panic and confusion. This time it does not. The high courage and superlative fighting abilities of individual Nez Perces begin to make themselves felt. Fortunately for the hostiles, part of Gibbon's plan has misfired. His left wing, disorganized when it stumbled through the willows, lost heart when Lt. James H. Bradley was killed, and drifted toward the center.

Now a solid core of resistance develops in the lower part of the camp still controlled by the Nez Perces. Where this area fuses into the occupied portion, battle-crazed men fire pointblank into each others' bodies, swing rifles to crush skulls, roll on the ground wrestling for throats. The soldiers also find themselves exposed to a blistering fire from the river brush. Gibbon's losses mount steadily. He decides to seek cover.

Carrying their wounded, the troops abandon the camp, stumbling heavily through the brush and across the stream. Nez Perce sharpshooters melt off to the flanks of this scrambling retreat, maintaining a heavy fire. The troops struggle up a slope into heavier timber and dig in. Like hornets the Nez Perce surround them, shooting uproariously. One brave wildly charges the embattled whites. He is Five Wounds, Rainbow's warmate. These two great warriors had sworn to die on the same day as their fathers coincidentally had before them. Now Five Wounds, having grieved over his friend's body, is shattered by half-a-dozen bullets.

Shrieks drift through the blue smoke of battle as other Nez Perces reoccupy their camp to discover the bodies of more than 50 of their men, women, and children sprawled about. Under the steady Joseph's guidance, the Indians pull down smoke-singed tepees, gather scattered supplies, and after burying their dead in shallow graves move off downstream.

Half-a-mile upstream, a separate action breaks out. Gibbon's only piece of artillery, left behind when he struck out to surprise the village, is just arriving, with six mules in harness and a seventh carrying rifle ammunition. About 30 Nez Perces kill or drive off 6 soldiers accompanying the piece. None of the Indians can operate a howitzer, so they roll the trunnion wheels down a gully and make off with 2,000 rounds of .45 caliber ammunition sorely needed by Gibbon's besieged command.

All afternoon and into the night, the Nez Perces fire sporadically into the grimy huddle of whites. A searing thirst adds to the soldiers' misery. Hunger, cold, and fear touch their vitals. Some can be heard sobbing. But many of the warriors, their families now safe, leave the battlefield to ride after the caravan. Near dawn only a hand-

ful are left under the leadership of Ollokot. When they hear the shouted where-are-you's of someone approaching (an advance scout for Howard, who after crossing the Lolo Trail is trying to catch up with Gibbon), the Nez Perces guess reinforcements are at hand and wearily depart. They can feel no triumph in the sickness of their losses.

In the battle of the Big Hole, the Nez Perces almost unbelievably had rallied in the face of a surprise dawn attack to drive their enemy out of the village and to the brink of annihilation. Despite this, for the Indians it was the beginning of the end. For the first time they had suffered considerable losses, between 70 and 90. About 30 of these were warriors including Rainbow, Five Wounds, and others who would be sorely missed in later battles. Other braves had lost their heart for fighting because of squaws and children who now were dead.

It was a grim and far less confident cavalcade which a few days later recrossed the Continental Divide to retreat southeasterly through Idaho toward Yellowstone Park. While 33 of Gibbon's command had been killed and 40 wounded, some critically, the Nez Perces knew their old enemy Howard again was close behind.

Leadership now had passed from Looking Glass, whose dawdling set the stage for the Big Hole disaster, to Poker Joe, an undersized halfbreed with a booming voice. Poker Joe pushed the caravan along, sometimes traveling from two in the morning until ten at night. With the wounded dragged on travois poles, though, it was slow going. The drive was punctuated by savage attacks on several farmhouses and wagon trains. Since Big Hole, when some of the Bitterroot valley settlers who had made peace with the Nez Perces appeared as volunteers to attack their camp, all whites were considered enemies.

General Howard had arrived at Big Hole 2 days after the battle. He was disgusted with his Bannock scouts for digging up Nez Perce corpses to scalp them and about as irritated, though not so outspokenly, with Gibbon for having let victory melt into defeat. Howard resumed the pursuit. As usual, he was beseiged by problems. What if the Nez Perces should double back into central Idaho? And the flow of messages, increasingly caustic, from the War Department. Howard continued to express hope that someone for a change might effectively block off the Nez Perces until he could close with them. But he received such advice as, "General Sheridan in all kindness asks me to suggest to you to be less dependent on what others, at a distance, may or may not do, and rely more on your own force and your own plans."

Pushing on, Howard at last evolved a plan. Reports from terrified settlers pretty well indicated the Nez Perces were heading for Thacher's pass (now the western entrance to Yellowstone Park). On August 17, Howard dispatched Lt. G. R. Bacon with 40 cavalrymen by a more direct route to block off the hostiles' retreat by occupying the pass. Two nights later the main command went into camp at Camas meadows, a grassy pasture offering vast relief from the mottled green sagebrush and volcanic rock desert the troops had been passing through. Howard cautiously posted two circles of pickets around the camp and the grazing area for 200 pack mules and cavalry mounts.

Fifteen miles beyond, the Nez Perces suddenly devised their only positive strategy of the campaign. The inspiration was typically Indian. A wounded warrior, Black Hair, had a dream or vision in which General Howard's horses were captured. Hearing of it, Poker Joe proposed a raid on Howard's camp just before dawn. Twenty-eight fighting men rode slowly toward Camas meadows, arguing about whether the attack should be made on horseback or foot. Presently Ollokot pointed out dawn was about to break and headed for the camp. Others followed. Some, dismounting, slipped between the sentries and began cutting picket ropes.

This lark was interrupted by a gunshot. One of the Indians had fired too soon. Had a white commander been in charge, he probably would have called off the raid to convene a court martial. But the Nez Perce way of thinking was different. One exclaimed, in effect, "Who the hell did that?" Others laughed at the culprit and began kidding him.

The shot must have lifted the slumbering troopers a foot out of their blankets. There was a wild scramble for clothing and guns. In the midst of this the mounted Nez Perces whooped through the herd, driving everything loose ahead of them. Soldiers boiled out of their tents, firing at shadows. Finally the shaken Howard managed to get three companies of cavalry off in pursuit.

The Nez Perces, clattering into the red volcanic rock, soon had enough light to see they had stolen only a few horses but were chasing along about 170 mules, nearly all of Howard's baggage train. As the whites approached, the raiders found ideal cover behind jagged lava ridges. Splattered by bullets, two of the dismounted cavalry companies were forced to withdraw. This placed the third under a wicked crossfire. Pursuit was abandoned. With 10 casualties (the Nez Perces had none) and only 20 recovered mules, the cavalry returned to camp, whereupon Howard's cup of despair generously overflowed.

Lieutenant Baker arrived from Thatcher's Pass having seen no sign of Nez Perces. Howard's main command lurched frantically toward the critical defile only to learn from scouts the hostiles had crossed into Yellowstone soon after Baker's departure. The general camped near Henry Lake to rest his troops while he rode to Virginia City for supplies and horses. In a despondent wire he reminded General of the Army William T. Sherman that some of his cavalry had been campaigning continuously for 1100 miles. From the East, Sherman replied: "If you are tired, give the command to some young energetic officer." His Presbyterian blood boiling, Howard resumed the chase.

Surely no tourists have ever been more astonished than seven men and two young women from Radersburg, Mont., who in late August of 1877 were fishing for trout and viewing geysers in Yellowstone (only 5 years after the sprawling wilderness had been declared a national park). Cooking breakfast, they looked up to find a party of painted, heavily armed Indians staring stonily at their camp. The horrified tourists were escorted to the main body of Nez Perces. After some indecision, their supplies were taken but the visitors were released.

Inexplicably, a few Nez Perces opened fire. One of the campers, George Cowan, was wounded in the thigh and shot across the head to finish him off. A few hours later he regained consciousness just in time to be shot in the shoulder by a passing Nez Perce horseman. After three days of crawling through the park on hands and knees, the indestructible Cowan was rescued by two of Howard's scouts who had come to bury him.

Traveling slowly through rugged, unfamiliar country, the tiring Nez Perces were about 2 weeks in Yellowstone Park before emerging from the northern boundary into Montana near the present site of Billings. The Military Division of the Missouri knew the hostiles were coming and Colonel S. D. Sturgis with eight troops of the 7th Cavalry—Custer's old command—had rushed into the area from his post on the Tongue River. But Sturgis was handicapped because he did not know where General Howard was and he did not know where the Nez Perces were.

The Indians were now methodically shooting all the travelers they came across for fear some might be scouts or messengers (at least two of their victims were carrying dispatches from Howard to Sturgis). Consequently Sturgis learned nothing for sure until he came across a 100-yard-wide trail made by hoofprints and travois poles, indicating the hostiles intentionally or by accident had slipped past him along Clark's fork of the Yellowstone River.

After wrestling his wagon train over a 9,000-foot divide, Howard emerged from the mountains in high hopes the Nez Perces were trapped between him and Sturgis. Instead Sturgis ruefully joined Howard the night of September 11. Again the enemy had escaped. Sturgis' boiling oaths mingled with Howard's exasperated sighs in the biting night air of early autumn.

Next day Sturgis resumed the chase, adding 50 of Howard's cavalry and two howitzers to his own command. Howard, pausing to rest his troops, did something even more important. He wrote a letter to Col. Nelson A. Miles at Fort Keogh, 150 miles east, suggesting there was an outside chance Miles still might cut off the wily Nez Perces.

Northward through the rolling tableland of central Montana, broken by rocky bluffs and gashed by twisting dry water courses, the Indian caravan pushed towards Canada. After Big Hole, the Nez Perces realized armies would attack them as long as they remained in the United States. They continued to spare no whites, killing two loggers one day, three prospectors another, even capturing a stagecoach and treating themselves to a ride with their war ponies tied behind.

The Nez Perces crossed the Yellowstone River and started up a dry streambed (Canyon Creek) which rose to a narrow canyon about 10 miles north. Here Sturgis caught up. He sent a mounted battalion to seize the canyon but Nez Perces firing from bluffs beat them off. Sturgis still felt the hostiles could be forced into a pitched battle. So he dismounted the rest of his troops. This cost him his chance. Most of the Indians remained mounted, hurrying their pack train through the canyon while a few sharpshooters, ducking behind broken rocks, kept the command at bay. The loudest noises at Canyon Creek were made not by Sturgis' howitzers (one fired a single shot) but by the heavy caliber Sharps rifle, a 15-pound buffalo gun Poker Joe had been packing along. Each shot was accompanied by a cannonlike boom and a huge cloud of black smoke. Poker Joe used the last of his cartridges there and buried the gun a night later.

As the last of the hostiles' rear guard disappeared into the canyon, the troops gathered their casualties—3 killed and 11 wounded. About a hundred worn Indian ponies had been captured. Sturgis chased the Nez Perces fruitlessly for 2 days, then waited for Howard at the Musselshell. Their cavalry mounts were played out. Several had been eaten because of short supplies. Neither officer believed there was a ghost of a chance of catching the Nez Perces, who now were far ahead with only 150 miles of open country between them and Canada.

Nez Perce casualties at Canyon Creek had been limited to three wounded. This seemed to hurt less than a discovery that Crow Indians—"They are like brothers to me," Looking Glass had said—were fighting under Sturgis' command. It seemed like the whole world, whites and Indians, had turned against the Nez Perces. Crows continued raiding the Nez Perce herd for 2 or 3 days. But the caravan shook them off.

On September 23 the Nez Perces crossed the Missouri, helping themselves to generous portions of coffee, bacon, flour, beans and sugar from a lightly-guarded army supply depot. By now, many of the Indians

were beginning to unwind. Howard was at least 2 days behind, Canada only a few marches ahead. Instead of continuing to force the pace, why not camp early, depart later, restore strength, shoot a few buffalo for the winter's food supply? So argued disgruntled Looking Glass. Poker Joe gave in—"I think we will be caught and killed"—and Looking Glass, with a vast majority in grateful agreement, restored the 8-hour day.

Traveling leisurely, the Nez Perces halted at noon September 29 to make camp in a small barren valley cradled in the northern foothills of the Bear Paw Mountains. Brush was scanty, but plenty of buffalo chips promised good hunting and warm fires to fend off the frosty night air. A crescent-shaped cutbank about 25 feet high faced one side of the valley. Steep coulees interlaced the ground. Squaws threw up the few tepees salvaged from the Big Hole attack. Braves drove the ponies to pasture about 2,000 yards north. The Nez Perces planned to move on next morning. They were within 2 days' easy travel of Canada.

Twelve days earlier a fagged rider had loped into Fort Keogh, where the Tongue River empties into the Yellowstone, and presented Colonel Miles with Howard's umteenth request for aid. Ardently desiring a brigadiership, Miles figured a slim chance for glory was better than none at all. Next morning he led a fresh army into the northwest—383 cavalry, mounted infantry and Cheyenne and Sioux scouts with 30 days' supplies and two cannon. After 6 days of whirlwind travel Miles reached the Missouri. He still hoped to nail the Nez Perces before they crossed the big river. So he dismissed a small steamer he happened to meet and prepared to follow the south bank.

Just then three wild-eyed whites appeared in a rowboat. They had seen the hostiles across the Missouri 60 miles to the west several days earlier. Miles took one look at the steamer disappearing around a bend and ordered his Napoleon gun swung into firing position. Several shells slammed into an embankment downstream. The steamer took the hint and returned. Swiftly Miles ferried his command across. A pack train was organized so wagons could be left behind. Without losing a minute Miles resumed his diagonal route to the northwest, throwing scouts far ahead and forbidding his men to fire a single shot at the abundant game for fear of alerting the hostiles.

For 4 days the command rode from early-dawn to late-evening, following the eastern flanks of the Little Rockies (the Nez Perce route was just west of the same range). When the Little Rockies dwindled into foothills, Miles swung westward. Early in the morning of September 30, a cold, overcast day, he came across the wide swath of the Indian trail. By 8 a.m. Cheyenne scouts had spotted their village.

Miles ordered an immediate frontal attack by his battalion of 7th Cavalry with infantry in support. The 2d Cavalry would slip around to capture the pony herd, depriving the Nez Perces of their only chance to escape. Miles' forced march had paid off. He was certain the last hour of the war was at hand.

Iowa Employment Security Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Employment Security Commission has experienced extreme difficulty in meeting during fiscal year 1960 the costs of administering the State's employment security program. There are several reasons why these difficulties have been encountered, and they have been explained fully to the Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. These difficulties can be briefly enumerated as follows:

First. Enactment of an amended Iowa employment security law, which complicated the workload for the Iowa agency in this fiscal year.

Second. Significant rise in Iowa's unemployment rate during January-March period.

Third. All State of Iowa employees, including employees of the Iowa Employment Security Commission, participated in a general salary increase, which increased administrative costs $157,000. (Approved by the Bureau of Employment Security, Washington, D.C.)

Fourth. The Iowa agency estimated that it would process 333,600 continued claims. Because of heavy unemployment, by June 30 it will have processed approximately 450,000 claims.

Fifth. Installation of electronic data processing necessitated training people in the new procedures which made it possible to meet the target date of April 1, 1960, for putting contributions work on the computer.

In spite of these reasonable and valid explanations for the need of a supplemental budget of $51,978 to meet the increased cost of administering the amended benefits law, the agency's request was reduced to $7,520.

I would like to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Bureau of Employment Security, Washington, D.C., on the "Funds Granted by the Federal Government for the Administration of the Iowa Employment Security Commission," and a "Refutation of that Statement by the Iowa Bureau of Employment Security:"

FUNDS GRANTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE IOWA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION

1. Several questions have recently been raised concerning the funds granted by the Federal Government to the Iowa Employment Security Commission for the administration of the State's employment security program.

2. The Federal Government provides all the funds for the administration of the employment security programs of all the States. The Congress makes a lump sum appropriation to the U.S. Department of Labor for this purpose. The Department is responsible for determining and granting the amount needed by each State for the proper and efficient administration of its employment security program.

3. For fiscal year 1960, the President requested $328,684,000 and the Congress appropriated $315,819,000.

4. The amount of the grant to each of the State employment security agencies is based on the workloads performed and the time required to perform such workloads. Recognition is also given to differences in administrative costs resulting from differences in the number of workers and employers covered by the State's unemployment insurance law, differences in State salary scales, and the like. This system of budgeting is designed to provide each State, within the limits of the total appropriation made by the Congress, with the funds needed to do its job properly and efficiently and to achieve the greatest possible equity among the States.

5. There is no requirement in Federal law, nor does Federal law contemplate, that the amount of the grant to any State should bear a relationship to the Federal unemployment taxes paid by employers in the State. Proposals have been made to return to each State 100 percent of the Federal unemployment taxes paid by its employers, but no such proposal has been enacted by the Congress.

6. One more aspect of the budget system for State grants should be mentioned. Each State is provided with a "base" budget which will finance a specific workload level. If benefit workloads exceed that level, the additional workloads are financed from a "contingency fund" provided in the appropriation. This contingency fund is also used to pay for the administrative costs of State law changes which are made during the year and for salary increases of general application.

7. During the current fiscal year workloads in most States, including Iowa, have been somewhat higher than was anticipated, and, the contingency funds available are not sufficient to pay in full for these added workloads. State agencies were advised of this development by the Bureau of Employment Security in a letter dated January 28, 1960. The shortage amounted to about $5,300,000 or 1.7 percent of the total appropriation. After careful consideration and after consultation with representatives of the State agencies, it was decided that the shortage was small enough that it could be absorbed and that a supplemental appropriation should not be requested.

8. A uniform method of making the needed downward adjustment in the total budget of each of the State agencies was developed. It was found, however, that the application of the uniform downward adjustment hit a few States harder than the other States. Consequently, smaller downward adjustments were made in these States. In two States, of which Iowa was one, no downward adjustment whatever was made. This gave the Iowa agency about $52,000 more than it would have received if it had been treated like most other States.

9. After these adjustments, each State was notified on March 7, 1960, of its final budget for the current fiscal year and that it would have to adjust its operations so as to keep within its funds.

10. The Iowa agency has been granted $2,869,978 for fiscal year 1960, which is $131,000 more than it was granted for fiscal year 1959. The 1960 grant was based in part upon an estimate that 333,600 continued claims for unemployment insurance benefits would be filed in Iowa as compared to the 1959 experience of 369,000. Iowa's grant was determined under the same uniform rules applied to all State requests. Moreover, as pointed out earlier, Iowa's grant was exempted from the downward adjustment made in most State grants.

11. Despite this preferential treatment, the Iowa Employment Security Commission indicated that it would have a fiscal year 1960 deficit of $43,000. (Since then an additional allocation of $7,520 has been approved and recommendations for savings of $11,400 have been made to the Commission.) The deficit is primarily the result of overstaffing in the July-October 1959 period.

12. The Bureau of Employment Security has been advised that there are presently about 450 employees in the Iowa agency and that to stay within available funds this number would have to be reduced to about 415 for the April-June quarter.

13. The grants to the Iowa agency for fiscal 1960 would support, on an average, 482 positions. Since in June of 1959 the agency

reported using 502 positions, it was necessary to reduce employment by 20 positions to be within the average for the year.

14. A further reduction in the number of positions was actually called for because the agency installed new operating methods utilizing electronic data processing equipment. In securing approval for the installation of this equipment, the agency submitted a plan for reducing the number of employees by 35 by April 1, 1960 because the work formerly done by these people would now be done by machines.

15. If the agency had made the reduction of 55 positions explained above, it could have financed an average of 447 positions for the April-June 1960 quarter. However, staff was not adjusted commensurate with workload in the July-October 1959 period, as indicated above, so that this overspending remains to be balanced. For example, the Iowa agency could normally expect to have 16 percent of its yearly claims filed in the July-September quarter. Therefore, its staff in that period should be below the average for the year. It might reasonably have been expected that staff in that quarter would have averaged about 450 positions. However, actual experience was the reverse of what might have been expected. The agency used an average of 488 positions for the quarter or about 38 positions more than could be justified by the anticipated workload. This overstaffing of 38 positions created a deficit of about $41,600.

Furthermore, the agency did not even experience the workload anticipated for the quarter. If 16 percent of the budgeted workload had fallen in the first quarter of the year, there would have been about 55,500 continued claims filed. In fact, less than 48,000 such claims were filed, about 86.5 percent of what was expected.

16. The regional office of the Bureau of Employment Security at Kansas City, Mo., has made intensive efforts to influence the Iowa agency to recognize its problems and to adjust its 1960 spending plans to avoid a deficit. These efforts began on June 23, 1959, and have continued at frequent intervals to date. The regional office emphasized to the Iowa agency that if the staff adjustments were made early in the year the number of people laid off could be kept to a minimum.

17. In July 1959, the regional office was assured that the deficit would be made up by not filling positions as they became vacant. Yet, between July 1 and October 15, 1959, the agency filled 49 of the 54 positions which were vacated. This occurred in a period when its workload was at a low level.

18. On December 1, 1959 the agency submitted an operating plan for avoiding a deficit. This plan called for reducing staff from 471 in December to 413 in the April-June 1960 quarter. The regional office again pointed out the desirability of earlier action so that the smallest number of people would be affected, but the agency insisted on acceptance of its plan.

19. The Iowa Employment Security Commission in a letter dated March 23, 1960, has now advised the Bureau of Employment Security that it will not reduce its staff below the 450 presently employed. It has also advised that if its budgetary deficiencies cannot be resolved, all employees will be given a 1-week, nonpaid budgetary furlough.

20. This year the Bureau of Employment Security initiated an intensified program to get the States to do a better job of financial management. A Bureau letter dated July 31, 1959 advised all States: "No upward adjustment in the allocations will be made at the close of the year unless an agency has taken all steps within its power to avoid deficit spending." State employment security agencies, generally, support this position.

THE IOWA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION'S REFUTATION OF THE BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY'S ARTICLE: FUNDS GRANTED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE IOWA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION

Paragraphs 1–4 (paragraph numbers refer to Bureau of Employment Security's statement attached): The first four paragraphs restate the Bureau's budgetary principles. The Iowa Employment Security Commission has no quarrel with these principles. Had they been followed, we would not be in trouble. They make no particular mention of the fact that in fiscal year 1960 they did not follow these principles. In our answer to paragraph 6 we will point out one of the ways in which these principles have been ignored.

The Iowa agency believes that during the current fiscal year the Bureau has not given proper recognition to workloads performed by the Iowa agency nor to the increased time which was needed to perform our workloads under the amended Iowa employment security law.

The Iowa agency recognizes that the Department of Labor is responsible for granting the amount of money needed by each State. Our agency has made every effort to secure economy of operation by introducing revised procedures such as mail claims, group benefit rights, interviews, and selective application procedures. Our agency has made every effort to apprise the Bureau of the problems we encountered in administering the amended Iowa Employment Security Law. The agency does not feel that the Bureau has given proper consideration to the complexity of the amended law.

In our correspondence with the Bureau on April 29, 1960, the Iowa agency asked for $51,978 for increased cost for the amended benefit law. We were advised that our asking was reduced to $7,520. In our letter of April 29 we asked several questions regarding the Bureau's method of computation. By letter dated May 13 the Iowa agency was advised that:

"Substantially all of the questions have been answered, either in discussion or correspondence. For that reason, and for the additional reason that our Bureau headquarters has asked us to emphasize that no additional allocation will be forthcoming this year, we are not, at this time replying to your several questions."

We do not feel that these questions have been answered satisfactorily. We sense a reluctance on the Bureau's part to answer them in writing.

Paragraph 5: We do not know if the Federal law contemplated " * * * that the amount of the grant to any State should bear a relationship to the Federal unemployment taxes paid by employers in the State." The Iowa agency does know, however, that the employers in the State of Iowa did not contemplate that their tax payments would be used to meet increased administrative costs of other States and at the same time not be allowed for increased administrative costs of their own employment security law.

Paragraph 6: The base budget requested by the Iowa agency for fiscal year 1960 was $2,900,727. The base budget approved by the Bureau was $2,584,206. (This reduction represented a disagreement on the part of the Bureau with our workload estimates, plus an additional arbitrary reduction of $80,672 which they called a horizontal budget cut.) Had the Bureau paid us according to the standard contingency workload rules, this disagreement on estimates would not have mattered and we could have finished the year without financial trouble, because the contingency payments are meant to reimburse if estimates are exceeded.

The Iowa agency feels that the Bureau abrogated their own contingency rules in Fiscal Letter No. 438. By the terms of this letter, contingency earnings for fiscal 1960 were paid at a reduced rate on an estimate not an actual workload in January of 1960. We exceeded our estimates in every category because Iowa's unemployment rate rose significantly during the January-March period.

Paragraph 7: Representatives of the Iowa agency were not consulted regarding our need for continguency earnings prior to being advised on March 8 that its contingency earnings had been reduced. The January 28 letter referred to merely asked for an estimate of contingency earnings without indicating that the Bureau was abandoning payment on actual workload. The consultation with State agencies referred to took place in an Interstate Conference Committee on grants meeting but individual States were not polled on this point.

Paragraphs 8 and 9: Special treatment or not, this $52,000 is some $70,000 less than the $112,000 we compute as our earnings under the Bureau's former contingency rules. This does not take into account the requests we felt justified in making for changes in the law.

Paragraph 10: The Bureau makes much of the fact that Iowa received $131,000 more than in fiscal 1959. Effective July 1, 1959, the employees of the Iowa Employment Security Commission participated in a general salary increase for all State of Iowa employees. This increase, approved by the Bureau, cost $157,000.

The Bureau states that our budget was based in part on an estimate of 333,600 continued claims. Our estimate was for 448,500 continued claims. The Bureau reduced this to 346,800 and then applied a horizontal cut bringing the number down to 300,000 claims. To date, May 1, 1960, we have processed 400,659 continued claims. We anticipate that by June 30 we will have processed 450,000 claims. We know our estimate was more accurate than the Bureau's.

Paragraph 11: We reject the notion that our troubles were caused by overstaffing in the July–October period. During that time we were perfecting our procedures on the new law, completing the training of personnel on the new law. During much of this period, many of our staff were using their accrued vacation time. Those on duty did not process claims as quickly then as they do now, because of the unfamiliarity with the requirements of the new law. Even so we made considerable reduction in the size of our staff. This will be described below.

We feel that the Bureau's recomendation to save $11,400 by reducing travel to a minimum is false economy. We are following this recommendation, but a number of people, the performance of whose jobs depends upon travel, are working on work normally done by lower paid workers. We are not giving our field offices the attention and supervision they warrant. We are not serving our employers by helping them with their tax returns. We are accumulating a backlog of overdue field audits. We are not making some of our tax collections according to schedule.

Paragraphs 12 and 13: The Iowa agency reduced its staff more than 10 percent during this fiscal year. We doubt very seriously if the Federal Bureau in Washington has made a comparable reduction to help meet the budgetary shortage.

Paragraph 14: On March 1, 1960, the Iowa agency was slightly ahead of its schedule in staff reductions due to economies effected by electronic data processing. However, due to a heavier than normal claims load and the technical and highly complex nature of planning for use of electronic data processing, we did not meet target date (April 1, 1960) for putting our contributions work on the computer. This necessitated retaining five bookkeeping machine operators longer than expected.

The Bureau's delay in approving the installation of electronic equipment for 2 months beyond the expected installation date created many problems for our data processing people in that it postponed this difficult transition period into the busier part of the year.

Paragraph 15: Again the Bureau disregarded the fact that the Iowa agency was called upon to administer an amended benefits law as of July 4, 1959. The Iowa agency was granted additional funds because of the change in the law, but the grant was less than one-third of the amount which the agency determined by actual time study to be necessary for the extra work involved in this change.

Handling of claims under this new law was much slower during the July–October period because of unfamiliarity of the personnel with the new law. We have demonstrated to the Bureau by studies that in the later quarters of the year, our handling of claims was much reduced in time.

Paragraph 16: The Iowa agency believes that the Bureau of Employment Security at Kansas City, Mo., is sincere in their efforts to reduce administrative costs. However, we feel that a more open minded, better informed, and interested attitude on the part of Federal officials in management problems of the Iowa agency is needed rather than the critical attitude dictated solely by budgetary considerations.

Paragraph 17: The Bureau has made this mistaken assertion repeatedly. Someone in the Bureau does not understand how to analyze our payroll. Our payroll includes many people working on State retirement positions paid out of State funds in whom the Bureau has no interest. Under merit system procedures people going from emergency to provisional or probational status are shown as being terminated 1 day and rehired the next. Some of our employment security people were transferred to vacancies in the State retirement section. We can best answer their misconception by showing payroll count on June 30, 1959, and September 30, 1959:

June 30 (exclusive of State retirement)	507½
Sept. 30 (exclusive of State retirement	484½
Net decrease	23

The agency did add 10 temporary employees in October because of the steel strike, but all had been released by October 31, 1959.

Paragraphs 18–20: The Iowa agency has followed a policy of keeping the Bureau advised of its staffing plan and their reasons for such a plan. The Bureau representatives have not been particularly interested in discussing our reasons. Their sole concern is making the agency conform to a predetermined budgetary amount, regardless of workload and service.

The Iowa agency is not asking for an upward adjustment of its base allocation. It is asking for part payment on contingency workload accomplished, for adequate recognition of changes in the law and for extra legal allowances covered under Bureau regulations.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that discrimination against hiring older workers in this country be replaced by the principle of hiring on merit. The key facts are these:

That more older workers must be employed if we are not to experience a slump in the rate of growth and productivity of our economy.

That as the percentage of older workers is increasing, their employment is decreasing.

That is why Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell is preaching this doctrine more persistently than ever before:

America's older workers possess one-third of the skills and one-third of the production potential. It seems to me that if we continue to waste their skills and their potential for no good and honest reason, then we are squandering a striking opportunity to build an even better and richer life than our country knows today.

Jaycee's 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the 40th anniversary of the junior chamber of commerce. This organization has continuously worked for civic betterment and, while pursuing this great work, has helped to mold the leaders of our Nation.

It was 40 years ago in 1920 when a group of young men from different cities met in St. Louis to form the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Although the need for such a young men's organization is readily apparent today, this was not the case during the early twenties. The Jaycees, as they are commonly referred to, found the early going rough with their first decade marked with a slow but steady growth.

The depression of the thirties compounded the Jaycee's problems. Although small, they were determined. They realized that they must grow if they were to survive. And grow they did, gaining tenfold in chapter strength before their second decade came to an end.

As the 1940's approached, the junior chamber was one of the first organizations that took a definite stand favoring the controversal compulsory military conscription bill—even though they knew it would hit their 21 to 36 age group the hardest and might even be the deathblow to their organization.

Membership and chapter strength, as expected, dropped drastically during World War II. The few jaycees who remained behind, however, were able to keep the movement intact until their fellow members returned from the service. The organization was small yet strong in 1945. This served as a basis for the phenomenal postwar growth of the junior chamber of commerce.

Today, with 4,500 chapters and 350,000 young men scattered through 89 nations of the free world, the junior chamber movement ranks as one of the world's leading civic organizations.

One of its outstanding members is Tom Ruffin, of Shreveport, La., currently a national vice president and a candidate for president of the organization.

Tom joined the Shreveport chapter 13 years ago at the age of 21. Working very actively on many local projects he moved rapidly on up the ladder to the State level and subsequently to the national level. Serving this period in many capacities, he has become thoroughly familiar with every phase of jaycee activity and its functions in our American way of life. Having a reputation for always getting the job done, he brings into his campaign a proven record of experienced leadership.

As the jaycees return to their birthplace, St. Louis, for their 40th anniversary convention, let us wish them the best of luck as they continue to train future leaders through civic activities.

Commencement Exercises of the National Cathedral School for Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today the National Cathedral School for Girls, an outstanding educational preparatory school here in the city of Washington, held its annual commencement exercises. These exercises were of particular interest to those of us here on Capitol Hill because among the 61 graduates of this splended institution were Miss Lera Thomas, the daughter of our distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, and Miss Sara Patsy Miller, the daughter of our efficient and accommodating Doorkeeper of the House, "Fishbait" Miller. The complete list of the graduates of this the 60th anniversary year of this fine institution are as follows:

CLASS OF 1960

Sibley Anne Auchincloss, Harriet Carson Bass, Julia Sherman Beal, Barbara Lawrence Betts, Maureen Frances Black, Katherine Anne Boswell, Diana Carol Bulloch, Matilda Lou Butler, Julia Edison Cavan, Persis Jane Rhodes Charles, Elizabeth Pope Christenberry, Katharine Mary Clum, Ann Moore Cutler, Candy Helen Daniel, Deborah Davenport, Bertha Effingham Lawrence Newton Davison, Elizabeth Mason Denny,[1] Ysabel Dumouchel de Premare, Mary Susan Dick, Carolyn Engel, Lois Aileen Everett, Elizabeth Davison Fisher,[1] Nancy Ellen Geiger, Jean Marie Gladding, Wendy Gunn, Nancy Channel Hobart, Patricia Ann Hurston, Patricia Jean Jenkins, Lelia Symington Kauffman, Lucy Cage Kennerly, Craig Kerkow,[1] Jeanie Elizabeth Kinney, Beth Lee Kline, Mom Rajwongee Putrie Kritakara, Catherine Eleanor Krug,[1] Mary Susan Lanphier, Elizabeth Lynne Long, Mary Leighton McGavern, Ellen May,[1] Sarah Patsy Miller, Elina Rose Mooney, Alyson Moore, Christina Morris, Mollie Elizabeth Odom, Kate Grayson Oliver,[1] Dorothy Mann Olson,[1] Rebecca

[1] Cum laude.

Rivers Owens,[1] Mary Boyd Poindexter, Julia Porcher Wickham Porter,[1] Stephanie Raushenbush,[1] Joan Scott, Millicent Baltz Scrivener, Anne Bird Shenefield, Barbara Ann Smiley, Barbara Karen Sprague, Elizabeth Steele, Lera Thomas, Mabel Stuart Upchurch,[1] Elizabeth Wayne Van Leer, Penelope Webb,[1] Marcia DeFord Yingling.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., D.D., L.H.P., dean of Washington Cathedral, very appropriately read from chapter 55 of Isaiah.

The Right Reverend Angus Dun, D.D., S.T.D., bishop of Washington, delivered the commencement address. The bishop's address follows:

Members of the class of 1960, I shall talk to you this morning about pictures, especially about your pictures of yourselves. One of my best teachers wrote years ago that man is an animal that makes pictures. More striking still—he makes pictures of himself. These are of many kinds—scratched on the walls of caves in southern France, carved in wood or stone, painted on canvas, snapped on a camera film. To the pictures which are given shape and color in visible form must be added the word-pictures which man makes of man—a series of portraits that range all the way from the ancient picture of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden to the latest attempt of the psychologists, sociologist, and anthropologist to portray man as he really is. And behind these outward pictures lie the unseen images in the mind's eye, your idea of yourself and of your fellows and of the fascinating being you both are, called man.

Many things could be said about man's pictures of himself and of his fellows. I have time to speak of only one, the importance of the setting or the background. The candidates for high public office like to be taken with their families or even kissing babies. It gives a reassuring impression of domestic virtue. The judge is painted with his judicial robes, the doctor with his microscope, the mother with her children. The setting helps to indicate who and what this person is.

So it is with the images of man in general. The setting makes all the difference. We have only to compare the picture of man in Michael Angelo's creation—man reaching out his hand to receive life from the Creator God—with typical modern murals of man in the midst of his machines—man the doer of mighty works, or man threatened and shrunken before the monstrous things he has fashioned.

Among the great pictures of man is Christ's. It is a picture sketched in words, suggested in parables, reflected in His dealings with men, plainly carried in His mind as He met men. It is part of our inheritance from Him, which we seek to treasure here.

We might indicate His angle of vision by saying that Christ took a God's-eye view of man. He saw us against divine background. He looked on man as one who saw behind the veil the high and holy One who inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy.

I have long had an Arundel print of Peragino's Crucifixion. I once saw the original in Milan. It is a triptych. In the central panel is, of course, the cross, and one kneeling figure. In each of the side panels are two figures, one standing and one kneeling. Take the central panel away and the picture is plainly meaningless. It is not merely that the panels are parts of a total design; the positions and attitudes and expressions of the men and women in the side panels become pointless without Christ in the center. Adoration would then be left without any object of adoration, humility without any humbling presence, grief without a cause of grief. In the same way, Christ's picture of man is meaningless without the central presence. For man is not in the center of His picture. The mysterious reality he suggests by the great word—symbols—"the Father in Heaven," "the King," "the Lord of the Vineyard," "God"—is in the center. Man is a subordinate figure who draws his meaning from the central presence and purpose. The whole look and attitude of man is changed by the recognition of the central presence. Man is in the wings, brought to his knees, broken in spirit by the demands of perfect love, exalted by the same presence that humbles him.

No one can look upon Christ's picture of man without being impressed with the worth He saw in man, a worth so far outrunning any obvious attractiveness or excellence. In both the teaching and the action of Christ there is a paradoxical emphasis on the worth of the worthless. As though to stress the fact that His scale of worth is something quite other than the common scales by which men are weighed, He shows an almost perverse preference for the poor, the weak, the simple, the immature, even for the moral failures.

There is much talk in our American tradition of the inherent dignity of man and the supreme worth of the individual. This is too often vulgarized to mean that every man has an inherent right to accomulate the biggest pile he can of the common wealth and do with it as he desires. (Believe me, my young friends, that doctrine has little appeal for the hungry, deprived millions of our world.) The inherent dignity seems to be more widely recognized if the skin is white. But leaving these distortions aside, what is this mystical worth of personality?

A distinguished British scientist declared to the British Academy of Science some years ago: "Man is just beginning to know himself for what he is, rather long-lived animal with great powers of enjoyment, if he does not deliberately forego them."

If that is the last word in man's self-portrayal it is difficult to summon up any profound respect for the central figure in the picture.

The truth is that man's worth and dignity are not inherent, not something he possesses as an isolated being. The worth of man is a derived worth. The glory of man is a reflected glory.

Man, the rather long-lived animal, exercising his unusual powers of enjoyment, may be, on occasion, a pleasant or an entertaining sight; he is not as such a being to call out the sacrificial labor of saints or of the servants of justice; he is not a being for whom Christ dies. But man seeking to ensnare in lines and form a beauty that has captured him; man pursuing a truth that humbles and eludes him; man as the unselfish servant of the American dream; man cleansed and clothed in adoration finds high meaning in his own life and in the lives of his comrades. Man's worth and dignity come from beyond himself, and unless he can picture himself and his fellows in a setting that gives profound meaning to his life, a mood of futility possesses him. He has no antidote for his self-despair and his despair of his fellows.

Christ's care for men sprang from the fact that He saw them as belonging to God. He bore within Himself the vision of a love from on high reaching out toward men and conferring on them by pure grace a worth they cannot claim by any right. And He saw that they can only rise to their dignity as sons by yielding themselves to the claims of that love.

To men as the objects of that love He gave the name of "sons." To men as knit together by their common participation in that love, He gave the name of "brothers." This sonship and this brotherhood He pictured as at once something given, and unbreakable and inescapable fact, and something waiting to be realized, as hope held in trust for us by the giver of life.

This picture of man is not the picture of some abstraction called man. It is Christ's picture of you. The least of you is honored by it. The most honored has no honor that compares with it. It matters greatly whether you can accept this picture of yourselves, for we all tend to grow into the likeness of the image of ourselves which we hold deep within.

As you go from this good place carrying so much given here I pray that you may carry this picture with you into the hidden years that lie ahead. Then they can be full of promise, and even of glory.

Unjust 10-Percent Wartime Excise Tax on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recent world events point up the vital urgency for stepped-up economic growth in the United States and the free world, in order to meet the increasing competition of communism in this area.

At the same time, it seems incredible to me that the United States continues policies which stab such economic growth in the place where it is most equipped to advance: the automobile industry.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the continuation of the highly unjust 10-percent wartime excise tax on automobiles.

Year after year I have repeatedly brought its unfairness to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the American people.

I would like at this time to include in the RECORD a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee 7 years ago on this subject by Mr. A. E. Barit, then chairman of the Automobile Manufacturers Association's taxation committee. While the statistics used in 1953 are obsolete, the arguments which he advances are as valid today as they were then.

And no remarks, Mr. Speaker, can remain timely and truthful for 7 years unless they are saying something highly significant to a large segment of the Nation's population.

In 1953 Mr. Barit opposed the extension of the automotive excise tax because, first, it was unfair to a wide segment of the American people, including lower income groups; second, it discriminated against manufacturers and against owners who use their cars and trucks primarily as a necessity; third, it impeded the free flow of commerce by highway; fourth, it represented multiple taxation at its worst; and, fifth, it constituted a threat to price, demand, and employment in automotive and related industries. These reasons all remain valid today.

I think Mr. Barit's speech deserves careful analysis and consideration as we are about to act on the legislation which

once again extends this discriminatory temporary wartime tax. The speech follows:

PRESENTATION BY A. E. BARIT, PRESIDENT, HUDSON MOTOR CAR CO., AND CHAIRMAN, TAXATION COMMITTEE, AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, TO HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 1953.

Mr. Chairman, my name is A. E. Barit. I am president of the Hudson Motor Car Co., and chairman of the taxation committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

Without going too far afield from your consideration of excise tax rates, I should like to recall the law of inertia—the tendency of a body to remain as it is.

As you know, our industry has produced and distributed to the public the 53 million vehicles which daily overcome intertia and go forth on an endless round of necessary jobs.

Under the circumstances I suppose it is natural that we should be concerned about anything which smacks of inertia—even tax inertia—and certainly this is an apt description of the excise tax situation in this country. The nature of the emergency which put these excises on the statute books in the first place may have changed, or, indeed, may have ceased to exist at all. But the tax persists. From an initially temporary role, it has gradually taken on a semipermanent appearance, and has become virtually an integral part of the tax base. Since 1932, that, in brief, has been the history of automotive excises, which we refer to in this statement as embracing the manufacturers' tax on automobiles, trucks, buses, and replacement parts and accessories for all three types of vehicles; tires and tubes; lubricating oil and gasoline.

Since 1932, Federal excise taxes have been imposed on vehicles and parts as follows:

[Percent]

	Cars	Trucks, buses, and trailers	Parts and accessories
1932	3	2	2
1940	3½	2½	2½
1941	7	5	5
1951	10	8	8

We have been living with excises on and off since 1917, and at increasing rates since 1932, and the experience has proved to us—and congressional reports have concurred—that these highly selective taxes are objectionable, and were so regarded when they were enacted in 1932 as temporary measures to meet the depression, when they were increased in 1941 because of defense needs, and when they were further revised upward after the Korean outbreak. We think it is basically inequitable to perpetuate, through this thing I call tax inertia, a tax that can be justified only on a temporary or emergency basis.

We firmly believe these taxes should be canceled in their entirety. If, in spite of the evidence which we are presenting in this brief, pointing overwhelmingly to the unfairness of these taxes, you cannot see your way clear to such cancellation now, we respectfully urge that you at least examine into the situation to determine whether by reason of the very inertia I speak of, the Government is collecting less money through the present excise tax law than it otherwise would.

By this I mean that the current excise tax on automobiles is so large as to almost overshadow the retail price structure. In fact, recent market experience shows that a price segment considerably smaller than that represented by the excise tax will have a serious effect upon the size of the public demand for automobiles.

In other words the current automobile market is very sensitive as to price and it promises to become increasingly sensitive as we approach and pass the peak of Government spending for defense.

Because the Government shares, through its taxes, in the result of a rise or fall of public demand for automobiles, we respectfully suggest that Congress should give serious thought to reducing the excise tax and thus encouraging large-scale revenue from this source.

Quite possibly the Government would derive greater revenue by this action than by continuing the present program. This is because sustained or increased demand for automobiles means not only the collection of excise taxes on the automobile itself and on the tires and gasoline consumed, but also income taxes on the earnings of manufacturers and dealers.

Now we propose in this presentation to show that automotive excises are objectionable for the following reasons: (1) They are unfair to a wide segment of the population, including lower income groups; (2) discriminate against manufacturers and against owners who use their cars and trucks primarily as a necessity; (3) impede the free flow of commerce by highway; (4) represent multiple taxation at its worst; and (5) constitute a threat to price, demand, and employment in automotive and related industries.

AUTOMOTIVE EXCISES UNFAIR TO MILLIONS

The present automotive excise taxes are unfair to the lower income group who comprise more than 75 percent of passenger car owners. These 32 million people of small resources make up a group whose welfare you gentlemen have constantly in mind. Members of this lower income group, like practically all other automobile owners, bear an extra burden of taxation because they have found it necessary to use cars for getting back and forth to work, or for other essential travel.

Travel surveys reveal that more than half of all passenger car mileage is necessary, with 77 percent of all trips connected with earning a living or other economic activity. About 95 percent of the country's 43 million passenger cars are used wholly or partly for essential purposes.

Essentiality, too, prompts a substantial number of lower income people to buy used cars, but these purchasers escape only the initial excise charge on new units and this only because the excise tax was paid when the cars were new. But these buyers pay the 8-percent tax on spare parts, which is a tax on misfortunte, and the excises on tires, oil, and gas.

The present automotive excise taxes are unfair to farmers, the largest class of truck-owners, who have more than doubled their dependency on trucks in the last decade. Today farmers use nearly 2,500,000 such units. Because trucks are used so extensively in hauling products from farms, automotive excises become a direct charge against the cost of food.

Present automotive excises also are unfair to another large group of people who, like the farmer, have to depend almost entirely on the automobile and the truck. They are the 6 million persons living in 2,140 towns where there is no streetcar or bus service. In other words, they are subjected to a tax inequity because they happen to live where they do.

DISCRIMINATORY AGAINST MAKERS AND OWNERS

Excise taxes levied on cars, trucks, and automotive parts discriminate against the manufacturers and against the users because the tax is so highly selective. Indeed, it represents a serious departure from the accepted tax policy of uniformity of treatment.

As for the manufacturer, the tax does not become any less discriminatory merely because it is passed along to the consumer as a higher cost of doing business. The discrimination remains, due to the competitive relation between automotive manufacturers and makers of other transportation equipment, including streetcars, subway, freight and passenger trains, trolley coaches and aircraft; and between manufacturers of farm implements, tractors, and combines. None of these products is subjected to the Federal excise tax; yet none of them can be said to be more essential, either in peace or in war, than the passenger car, the truck, and the parts needed for their maintenance and repair.

The excise tax burden becomes cumulatively heavy on the operators of automotive vehicles, first as purchasers of new equipment, and later as users of parts, tires, oil and gas. But competitive forms of transportation are free from such taxes, yet who can say that such competitive transportation is more essential.

Similarly, trucks and passenger cars rank with the most necessary of industrial equipment, but machine tools, conveyors, hoisting equipment and packaging machinery are free from the excise tax. The same thing can be said in the construction industry where the truck is indispensable along with the bulldozer, tractor, crane, and cement mixer. But none of this construction equipment is taxed except the motortruck.

AUTOMOTIVE EXCISES IMPEDE COMMERCE

Because our existing excise tax laws discriminately single out one type of transportation equipment for general tax purposes, they automatically penalize that part of commerce borne by motor vehicles. These carry about three times as much freight as the combined total hauled by all other forms of transportation. But the class taxation of motor transportation is a burden from which competing forms of transport are free. To put it another way, there is no comparable excise tax on other freight carrying units, yet no one contends that the motor truck is any less essential. As a matter of fact, the services of the Nation's truckers, different from the services of other freight haulers, are depended upon to a large degree for the efficient operation of other freight carriers.

As carriers of freight over the highways, motor trucks, traveling an estimated 100 billion miles a year, continue throughout their active life to carry a punitive tax load. Like passenger cars, their Federal tax burden doesn't stop with the manufacturers' excise on each new unit. Their future use after purchase is a continual round of excises when they consume other automotive products. Basically, there is no difference between a tax on automotive and aircraft parts; between truck tires and railroad wheels; between gasoline and locomotive fuel. No difference, that is, except that only the automotive items are subjected to the tax.

LEVIES REPRESENT MULTIPLE TAXATION

Federal automotive excises represent multiple taxation at its worst because they are super-imposed on a special group of users already paying more than two score special taxes to State and local governments—all automotive taxes. These include state gasoline taxes and registration fees, and special city and county charges and levies on motor vehicles.

On a $2,000 car readied for driving, the Federal excise tax—superimposed on all other Federal, State, and local taxes which also are reflected in the vehicle's initial cost—amounts to $146, including the tax on the car, plus the heater and radio. The total taxes on such a car delivered to a resident of Michigan, for example, amount to $583, or 29 cents out of each dollar spent.

In general, highway users paid $5.292 billion in special motor vehicle taxes in 1952, more than two and one-half times the

amount paid 10 years earlier. Federal automotive excise taxes amounted to $1.854 billion the same year, including $601,092,000 on cars and motorcycles; $108,400,000 on trucks and buses; $174,251,000 on parts and accessories; $787,657,000 on gasoline; $47,813,000 on lubricating oil; and $134,429,000 on tires and tubes.

Coupled with the $3.438 billion in special motor vehicle taxes imposed by State, county, and local governments, these constitute not only a multiple tax but a burden of huge proportions on the use of a commodity that has proved to be universally essential.

THREAT TO DEMAND AND EMPLOYMENT

The universal essentiality of motor vehicles among all income groups in the United States is nowhere better illustrated than in the high rate of use—one passenger car for every four persons, or one for every 1.1 families. This rate of use in itself means that a tax of the size of Federal excises constitutes over a prolonged period a threat to price, demand, and employment in automotive and related industries. The users of our 53 million vehicles are extremely conscious of price trends affecting cars and trucks. There are 48,000 dealers who, along with the manufacturers, are supersensitive to demand fluctuations. Close to a million employees working in vehicles, parts, and tire manufacturing, plus almost 9 million more in highway transport industries, depend for a livelihood on a healthy automotive economy.

Such an economy in turn exerts an actual and potentially powerful influence on commerce and industry generally. To illustrate: One business in six is automotive, 1 out of every 5 retail dollars spent is automotive, and one out of every seven persons employed works in some phase of automotive transport.

Moreover, the automobile industry is responsible in normal years for a large proportion of employment in other industries. For example, in a typical prewar year it bought 17 percent of all steel, 80 percent of all rubber, 69 percent of all plate glass, 65 percent of all upholstery leather, 35 percent of all lead, 9 percent of all tin, and 10 percent of all cotton sold in the United States.

But this widespread consumption at such a rate depends upon continued high automotive demand, production, and employment. To a large degree, the future of these three depends on the factor of price, and the key to price right now, when the automobile market is very sensitive price-wise, may well be the Federal excise tax.

CONCLUSION

In recapitulating, I have tried to emphasize that the present discriminatory automotive excises are unfair to all vehicle users, particularly the lower-income group and the farmer; that they also discriminate against essential manufacture and transportation; impede highway commerce; represent multiple taxation; and threaten vehicle demand and employment. This means to me, in summary, two things: (1) that at existing levels these taxes weaken our mobility to a startling degree, and mobility, provided it is unimpaired, is the one basic and distinguishing advantage we have over other countries in peace and war; and (2) that the tax tends to limit the use of, and the demand for, an instrumentality which in itself generates activities, creates income, and thereby provides wider and more abundant sources for tax revenue.

For these reasons we respectfully urge that the public be granted prompt relief from the current burdensome automotive excise taxes.

If complete relief is not possible at this time there are, of course, other methods open to you, such for instance as the one uncovered by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, upon the occasion of the last tax bill, involving a general manufacturers' excise tax exempting foods, medicine, and shelter, which would produce considerably more revenue than the present excise tax law.

However, we refrain from suggesting the method which should be pursued to accomplish relief since we do not feel that we are qualified to undertake the detailed formulation of our Government's tax policies. We prefer to rest our case upon the very evident need for relief and the fact that the Government can, in accomplishing such relief, help its own fiscal problem.

In closing permit me also to pass along the information, which I have had checked by the Library of Congress, that practically all major countries except the United States currently levy either a general sales or a general manufacturers' excise tax.

Time and Life Challenges Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in our hearings recently the executive vice president of Time, Inc., inserted in the record of the hearing "some questions and answers on post office matters." He challenged Postmaster General Summerfield to deny the facts contained as premises in these questions and the flat affirmations or negations contained in the answers.

Chairman TOM MURRAY, of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, granted my request that the Postmaster General be asked to comment on these questions and answers and that his comments be made a part of the hearing record.

The questions and answers are included hereafter under unanimous consent:

OFFICE MATTERS

1. Did Deputy Postmaster General Stans testify before this committee in 1957 that there are costs aggregating millions of dollars (examples given alone totaling over $200 million) spread across first-, second-, and third-class mail which should only be charged to first-class mail? Yes.

2. Did Mr. Maurice Stans subsequently see to it that the proper accounting procedures be instituted to rectify the errors? No.

3. Does the Post Office use the concept of out-of-pocket costs and less than fully allocated costs when it appears before other Government agencies? Yes.

4. Has the Postmaster General publicly recognized that the principle of out-of-pocket costs must be considered in connection with second-class mail? Yes.

5. When supplying you with figures on individual publications in second-class mail, did the Postmaster General take into consideration the out-of-pocket costs of such publications? No.

6. Exhibit 1–B, page 21, of the 1959 Cost Ascertainment Report shows a breakdown of the various subclassifications of second-class mail in which expenses are termed "actual." Are they "actual"? No.

7. Does the cost ascertainment system allocate costs only to the general classes of mail and therefore is the breakdown of the subclassifications of second-class mail based solely on statistical averages and not on solid cost accounting? Yes.

8. Does the statistical breakdown of the second-class subgroups give full credit to those groups where more complete advanced preparation of the mail is more feasible and is performed? No.

9. Does the use of statistical averages misallocate whole cost categories such as millions of dollars of city delivery carrier costs to free-in-county mail which by definition cannot receive such service? Yes.

10. Does the Post Office Department have a cost system which provides for the costing of individual publications? No.

11. Did the Post Office use simple average cost statistics for all of second class when attempting to compute the individual costs of handling Life? Yes.

12. Did the use of simple averages substantially overstate the cost of transporting Life in the mails? Yes.

13. Did the use of simple averages substantially overstate the cost of delivering Life on rural routes? Yes.

14. In spite of the obvious conclusion by any competent analyst that the handling and sortation of pieces is the primary cost element in mail costs, did the Postmaster General ever testify to this fact prior to this year? No.

15. Is this fact clearly highlighted in the recently released "Survey of Postal Rates" and did we not testify to this very fact in 1957? Yes.

16. Is it a fact that the larger the circulation of a magazine the more complete the advanced preparation of mail before entering can be made? Yes.

17. Is it a fact, therefore, that the average cost per piece of handling a larger circulation magazine with complete advanced preparation is less than the average cost per piece of handling a small circulation magazine which cannot effect substantial advanced preparation? Yes.

18. Was this important fact given effect to in the Post Office calculations of handling Life? No.

19. Since the cost per piece is the most important element, is not the second-class rate structure which is based almost entirely on weight discriminatory against heavier pieces? Yes.

20. Does the recently released "Survey of Postal Rates" point up this fact on page 57 by stating that a disproportionate share falls on the heavier weight publications? Yes.

21. Does the "Survey of Postal Rates" state that the rates on 40 percent of second-class mail have not been changed since 1925 and the rates on 20 percent have not been changed since 1879–85? Yes.

22. Did the Post Office advocate and testify in 1957 that second-class mail should pay 50 percent of the costs allocated to it under their present methods of cost ascertainment? Yes.

23. Did the Post Office advocate and testify in 1957 that third-class mail should pay 75 percent of the costs allocated under their present methods of cost ascertainment? Yes.

24. Has the Post Office followed up its advocacy by peparing a consistent set of cost figures and releasing them at all times to the proper committees of Congress and to the press? No.

25. Do the Post Office figures show that free-in-county mail in 1959 furnished zero revenue and cost the Post Office $15,444,933 to handle? Yes.

26. Does the Post Office assert that the only public service cost for this category is $830,000? Yes.

27. Does the Post Office leave the balance of $14,600,000 as a deficit in second-class mail to be assessed in theory against the other users of second-class mail? Yes.

28. Does the Postal Policy Act state that the entire loss should be removed as a public service cost? Yes.

29. Does the Postal Policy Act state that no user or group of users of the mails should

be compelled to pay for an intended subsidy of this nature? Yes.

30. Is the Post Office contradicting both the law and reasonable logic when it handles costs in this way? Yes.

31. Do the Post Office figures for 1959 show an excess of expenses over revenues for exempt publications of $60,126,922 and does the Post Office assert that only $3,094,000 is a public service cost leaving the balance as a part of the second-class deficit to be paid for by other users? Yes.

32. Do the questions and answers Nos. 28, 29, and 30 apply to this case as well? Yes.

33. Do the Post Office figures for 1959 show an excess of expenses over revenues for exempt classroom publications of $3,757,631 and does the Post Office assert that only $224,000 is a public service cost leaving the balance as part of the second-class deficit to be paid for by other users? Yes.

34. Do the questions and answers Nos. 28, 29, and 30 apply to this case as well? Yes.

35. Have the McKinsey report conclusions that additional postal rate increases can be easily passed along or absorbed been confirmed by the mail users who have testified here? No.

36. Do the indexes quoted by McKinsey on paper and hourly wage increases take any account whatsoever of efficiencies put into effect by industry to help to offset such increases? No.

37. Is the Consumers Price Index up less than 10 percent from 1953 to 1959 and is the Post Office cost for handling a first-class letter up over 33 percent in the same time? Yes.

38. Can it be said that Post Office efficiencies compare at all favorably with the progress of the private economy? No.

39. Has the Post Office testified before you that its operation is still essentially manual and very few modern machines even exist today? Yes.

40. Since the handling of first-class mail is a granted monopoly should the mail users and the Congress demand greater cost efficiencies so that constant increases of postal rates is not the only method to balance the postal budget? Yes.

On the Firing Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected newspaper columists and editorial page pundits in New England, Darrell N. Toohey, completed his 25th year of authoring the "On the Firing Line" column in the Springfield Union on Monday.

Darrell N. Toohey has never missed writing his column, which has been widely quoted during that quarter century. He has a real newspaperman's knack for putting together words and ideas in pungent and humorous short paragraphs, pointing up an issue in a minimum of space.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to wish Darrell Toohey many more years of useful and productive service as the author who signs himself "D.N.T." in the Springfield Union. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed with my remarks an editorial in the Springfield Union on Monday, June 6, entitled "D.N.T.'s Silver Jubilee" and Mr. Toohey's "On the Firing Line" anniversary column:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, June 6, 1960]

ON THE FIRING LINE

(By D. N. T.)

"'Nobody wants to start at the bottom any more,' the editor of a national magazine complained to me recently."—Isabelle MacRae Hoover.

PRECEDENT

In green beginners, more and more,
The foreman's coming to the fore,
Their motto being: "Start out rich."
They will not play if they can't pitch.

To them the bottom seems to be
A place for anyone "but me";
The legion, not the pampered few,
Believe a lofty spot their due.

They spurn the oldster who explains
That someone has to grease the planes
As well as take them through the sky;
They tell him, "Someone else, not I."

This is deplorable, I think.
The world will soon be on the blink.
All chiefs, no Indians, is a state
Man can't achieve at any rate.

There's something reminiscent in
The boys today, when they begin
And vow they'll shun the bottom rung.
(They're like ourselves when we were young.)

Twenty-five years ago this morning the Springfield Union printed the first column that we wrote after taking over "On the Firing Line." It does not seem like yesterday.

A helpful hint says that "winter shoes should be stored with care to preserve them." And that's a pretty hard goal to attain when you have to store one on your right foot and one on your left foot each morning.

President Eisenhower has added Alaska and Hawaii to the list of places he will visit on his tour later this month. There is no doubt about his receiving a rousing reception in each State, provided he does better than most of us and remembers which is the 49th and which the 50th.

Some 2,000 teenagers fought a pitched battle with police squads during a recent jazz concert in a London park. The London bobby manages to handle the thoughest of customers, but only if the customers are old enough to shave.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, June 6, 1960]

D. N. T.'s SILVER JUBILEE

Today begins the 26th consecutive year in which the Union's editorial page column, "On the Firing Line," has been written by Darrell N. Toohey, whose initials appear in the column's heading. Every issue of this paper since June 6, 1935, has contained a "Firing Line," and every one has been Mr. Toohey's own work.

That figures out to more than 7,500 original columns without a break. The author has never resorted to substitutes, guest columnists, or any of the other gimmicks that his colleagues in the same field of work so often use. When he has had to be away from the job he has prepared columns in advance or sent them in daily.

Without any consideration of the nature of the product, the turning out of a daily column without a lapse over so long a period must be a record, but in addition Mr. Toohey has maintained always an exceptionally high quality of writing. The fact that his comments on man and man's works, always pungent and witty and tolerant, and often profound as well, for years have been widely quoted—often, alas, without credit—all over the country, is evidence of the excellence of his work.

We congratulate D. N. T. on the silver jubilee of his columning, and we are sure that a great many of the Union's readers will join us in the sincere hope that he will keep it up for many years to come.

Craig: Electronic Architects for Defense, Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article concerning a Craig Systems, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., an electronic systems engineering company in my congressional district. The article appeared in the First Annual Electronics Review section of the Boston Sunday Herald of June 6, 1960:

CRAIG: ELECTRONIC ARCHITECTS FOR DEFENSE, BUSINESS

Net earnings of Craig Systems, Inc., for the 6 months ended January 31 were $285,000 on $7,110,000 of sales, equal to 37 cents per share on 764,662 shares. Net for the corresponding 6 months period ended January 31, 1959, was $232,000 on $5,347,000 sales, equal to 31 cents per share on 758,862 shares.

Erick Kauders, president, predicted that the trend of increasing earnings shown in the first 6 months would continue. Earnings for this fiscal year are expected to 50 percent greater than last year, he said.

Recent operations have been highlighted by the increased acceptance of the company's commercial and military products and the further diversification of the business by the manufacture and sale of Fiberglas pleasure boats and the marketing of the world's first diesel outboard.

The Craig Helicop-Hut, a proprietary item developed by Craig's research department, continues in volume production and is being adopted for a wide variety of electronic systems. This lightweight but rugged aluminum shelter has uses ranging from tactical communication and navigation centers to missile firing, sighting, and checkout stations.

Other items in production are a new line of telescoping masts, submersionproof consoles for single sideband radio equipment, and mobile automatic radiating testing trailers for checking out fire control systems of the F-100 series of fighter planes.

In the commercial half of the business, the LeFebure Corp., Craig's subsidiary with a plant at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, continues to expand its product line and services for the bank and business fields. Several large bank installations were completed recently and others are in progress. An increasing number of banks are purchasing account coding services from LeFebure's service division.

STEADY GROWTH

LeFebure has experienced steady growth in sales and profits since its acquisition by Craig in 1956. It is currently operating at full capacity, and LeFebure President Ken-

neth Watts recently announced an expansion program which includes as its first step the construction of an additional plant to be in operation in early 1961.

Progress with the new marine operation has been decidedly encouraging, Kauders reported. The Fiberglas pleasure boats and diesel outboard motors have been popularly received at boat shows and private showings by the public as well as the trade. Some marine dealers have already been franchised to handle these products and more and more applicants are being screened.

Since Craig only recently started in the Fiberglas boat and engine business, it does not expect to have these lines reflected substantially in sales and earnings this fiscal year ending July 31. But Fred Kauders, brother of Erick and executive vice president and treasurer of Craig, stated that "next fiscal year it should result in a sizeable increase." He added that Craig looks for total sales of around $14 million in the current fiscal year, compared to $12.1 million last year.

Announcement of its entry into the Fiberglas boat and diesel outboard field was made by Craig Systems in January, under an agreement with American MARC of Inglewood, Calif., makers of pleasure craft and small lightweight marine diesel engines. The diesel outboard offers numerous features, including greatly reduced fuel consumption and cost, and lessened fire hazard.

Growth of the company has been sure and continuous since it was founded in 1941 in Danvers by the Kauders brothers—Erick was coinventor of the cone projectile used in the bazooka. Notre Dame graduate Cornelius J. Kvasnak subsequently joined the top management team as vice president. The company contributes importantly to military needs, but it also emphasizes the development and production of commercial products. With its wholly owned subsidiary, LeFebure Corp., Craig Systems now employs some 1,000 persons.

AN "ARCHITECT" OF SYSTEMS

A basic function of Craig Systems is that of an electronic systems engineering company—in the words of Erick Kauders an "architect of military and navigational systems, mostly mobile." Presented with a complex problem relating to electronic communication, transportation, missile guidance, and even business office management, Craig and LeFebure design and put into operation a modern electronic system and other equipment that offers a solution. Responsibility of meeting the problem is handled by the companies from initial study stages through completion of the project. The layout is engineered by Craig and LeFebure, as well as being constructed and tested.

In an analysis of the company, a noted investment service called Craig "virtually uncontested leader in the design and construction of custom-built equipment for housing various types of military electronic systems." Craig Systems not only builds the shelters, but also designs and installs the varied equipment systems that go into them. The huts, easily transportable by plane or helicopter, serve as mobile communications centers for the pentomic army.

They provide protection for tracking and control equipment at missile sites. Alone, they can provide all of the material necessary to operate Air Force fields. Numerous commendations have come to the company from the military for its work in this field. One such installation, a turntable radar set, is estimated to have saved the Nation $15 million.

A MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT

A major achievement on the commercial side has been made with its equipment and system for cycle billing, making possible the automatic billing of customers on a weekly, monthly, or other-interval basis. Most of Craig's commercial enterprises are handled through its subsidiary, the 60-year-old LeFebure Corp., which is devoted to improving the productivity of accounting and recordkeeping systems and equipment for business. With a major concentration on banking, the company plans and installs entire systems for recordkeeping, much of it automated.

LeFebure (and thus Craig) pioneered in introduction of the new signature verification device for savings bank operations, based on the invisible imprint of the customer's signature on his passbook. The signature is verified by placing the passbook into a small machine which makes it visible for comparison. This system will have additional application in practically all situations where speedy signature verification is important.

"We look for continued, planned growth," says Erick Kauders.

Letters Supporting Amendments to the Basic Law of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the basic law for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration come up for consideration in the Congress this week. One of the important changes in the basic National Aeronautics and Space Administration law refers to section 305 of the act which deals with property rights in inventions. I have received a number of communications on this subject and two of the important letters favoring the new change covering patent laws and the reasons given for this position come from the Boston Patent Law Association and the American Patent Law Association. As they are important letters and the subject is well expressed in them, I commend them to the careful consideration of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The Boston Patent Law Association letter is dated April 1, 1960, and is as follows:

APRIL 1, 1960.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Boston Patent Law Association is a professional association of approximately 170 patent lawyers serving New England industries, a great many of which constitute "small businesses" as conventionally defined.

Soon after passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, the Boston Patent Law Association, recognizing the serious implications of section 305 of the act relating to property rights in inventions, formed a committee to study the act and make recommendations to the association. Since that time this committee on Government relations to patents has studied the act in detail and has analyzed the numerous amendments to the act that have been proposed. Presentations by committee members have been made at hearings on the NASA waiver provisions and at the hearings before the Mitchell Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions.

The committee has carefully examined the recent report of the Mitchell subcommittee and its proposed amendment to NASA section 305. As a result of its study, the committee has formally adopted a resolution expressing its support of the Mitchell subcommittee report.

Your adoption and support of the Mitchell subcommittee proposal and recommendations are respectfully solicited. It is believed that amendment of the Space Act, as proposed by the subcommittee, will constitute and important step toward restoring incentives to our space program that are so important at this time.

Respectfully,

Committee on Government Relations to Patents, Boston Patent Law Association: David A. Rich, Chairman; Walter Kunz, Chairman, Subcommittee on NASA; Committee Membership: Stanley Belsky, G. Eugene Dacey, Albert P. Davis, Harry E. Finke, William Goodwin, Elmer J. Gorn, Oliver W. Hayes, Richard L. Hobbs, R. J. Horn, Jr., Harold A. Levey, Jr., Clarence S. Lyon, P. J. McFarland, Abraham Ogman, Alfred H. Rosen, Francis I. Sullivan.

The letter from the American Patent Law Association is dated March 30, 1960, and is as follows:

AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1960.

The Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: As you are undoubtedly aware, the American Patent Law Association, of which I have the honor to be president, has been vitally interested in the study made by the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions ably headed by ERWIN MITCHELL, Esq. A representative of the association testified at the hearings of the subcommittee and various members likewise appeared and presented their views. In addition, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and others attended a seminar which we held on the subjects being considered by the subcommittee.

On behalf of our association, I want to congratulate you, Mr. MITCHELL, and all of the members of his subcommittee on the manner in which the important subject matter entrusted to the subcommittee was handled and on the report which has now been rendered. Mr. MITCHELL and his committee were quite willing to hear the viewpoints of others and quite anxious to do everything necessary to get all enlightenment possible in regard to the important matters under consideration. The report shows on its face the tremendous job which has been done by this committee.

Again, I want to express our appreciation of the reception accorded this association and its members and other groups interested in the subject. If at any time we can be of any assistance, we trust that you and the other members of your committees will not hesitate to call upon us.

With kindest regards and best wishes to you and all of the members of the Mitchell subcommittee, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WEBB,
President.

What About the B–70?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as one of many of my colleagues who have been disturbed and troubled over the ultimate wisdom of the deep cutback in funds to develop the Air Force's projected B–70 superconic bomber, I believe it worth while for us to consider the following article by Malcolm S. Forbes as published in Forbes magazine under date of June 1, 1960, which I include under leave to extend my remarks:

THE NATION'S AIR FORCE
(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

The prime mission of the U.S. Air Force is deterrence—to prevent any aggression against this country and its allies by having ready the power to well-nigh obliterate any country which launches an assault against us. To maintain this ability, for the past several years we have been spending 28 cents out of every annual tax dollar. With an annual budget of about $18 billion a year, the Department of the Air Force is indisputably the biggest business in the free world. Since the creation of the Air Force as a separate department in 1947, American citizens have invested the sum of $184.8 billion in it. The Air Force has missiles, planes, supporting hardware and real estate worth an estimated $68 billion.

For this almost incomprehensible expenditure do we have our money's worth?

In a broad basic sense the answer is plainly, "Yes." Neither the United States itself nor the nations to whom we are committed within the wide borders of the free world are under military assault by the Communist powers. Had the U.S. Air Force failed to keep ahead, or at least abreast, of the Reds, neither highminded words nor moral indignation would have contained Communist aggression against great, vital areas of the globe.

Despite the many and varied cries of alarm which daily ring out from assorted sources in Washington about our current military power, I met no one in the Air Force in a position of real responsibility who had one iota of doubt of the Air Force's ability to devastate the country from which a strike against us might come and to do so in a matter of hours. This confidence was not of the braggadocio sort, relying on will rather than ways and means. It was based on coldly professional informed analysis and calculation. The recent dreadfully timed reconnaissance flight shot down over Russia did reveal to the world that our intelligence about Russia's capabilities is more soundly based than perhaps most Americans had heretofore believed.

But because decisions must be made today that will determine what weapons systems we will be relying on 5 and 10 years from now, there is indeed a deep disparity of views as to what will be our military power position vis-a-vis Russia and Red China from 1965 onward.

The fact is that our Air Force today has many strengths. It likewise has some critical problems.

Unquestionably its greatest strength is in its management. Its keymen in the Pentagon and in the field, at home and abroad, with rare exceptions, are men of vast capability in their areas of specialization. And this is true not only of today's top men. Experience, capacity, and the exercising of responsible judgment is several echelons deeper in the top commands of the Air Force than in any large corporation with which I am familiar. Here the Air Force has a management flexibility unshared by the other services. Men can rise to the top within the command areas; a topnotcher in research and development is not required also to have exercised command in SAC or TAC.

The Air Force, too, has taken giant strides in solving the ever-present military service problem of maintaining morale and high reenlistment in the ranks. Forty-six percent reenlisted last year. In fact, the Air Force will not accept reenlistment unless increasingly higher standards are met. Such a maintenance of standards is very vital in an organization where complex technology demands longer training and higher skills in greater and greater numbers.

There is much room for argument about numbers as it pertains to missiles, aircraft, and other essential hardware. But there is amazing unanimity throughout the Air Force about the quality of what it has in the way of hardware.

The Air Force appears to have its missile program well in hand. There are operational Thor and Jupiter IRBM's abroad, plus an ever-increasing number of Atlas and Titan ICBM's at home. And the Minuteman appears to be the answer to a missileman's prayer. The Minuteman is relatively less costly to make. It is inexpensive to house in a hole underground where only a direct hit could knock it out. Present plans call for great quantities of these to dot the land. Additionally, other Minutemen will be on the move on specially constructed trains in ever-changing locations. As the Minuteman and submarine-carried Polaris come into operation, it is inconceivable that any initial enemy strike could prevent us from launching a totally destructive retaliation.

Along with its present pluses, however, the Air Force is faced with some critical problems.

Its ability to participate in an effective, sustained way in limited wars appears to be alarmingly inadequate. More and more people are coming to the conclusion that we will not be faced with an all-out atomic war so long as the Air Force is capable of devastating nuclear retaliation. But there will be an increased possibility of military aggression of a limited type—Chinese "volunteers" into Laos, for example. Armed Red-supported "revolution" in South Vietnam. Possible conflict with East German forces as a result of the Berlin deadlock. Such small-war aggression will require immediate military support from this country and may not involve the use of nuclear weapons. These relatively small military beginnings might conceivably grow into an almost Korean-sized war before either side made the fatal decision to use thermonuclear weapons.

In this type of conflict the U.S. Air Force seems unprepared for what would be its vital support role. Supersonic fighters, bombers, an interceptors don't readily lend themselves to frontline strafing missions, or napalm-bombing in support of struggling frontline troops. As one important Air Force general put it, "It doesn't make much sense to use a $1 million airplane to drop a 500-pound iron bomb." These infinitely complicated electronic machines are so expensive as to make it impractical to build them in the numbers necessary for the attrition-type use involved in limited wars.

There is another critically important spot where the Air Force is short of planes. The Military Air Transport Service has the job of supplying airlift for the tough assignment of transporting and then supporting infantry in action in far places. MATS simply does not have what it needs. It needs to order today large numbers of modern transport and cargo planes if it is to play effectively its important role. Civilian airlines, with Capitol Hill know-how and extremely limited vision, have been dangerously successful in denying appropriations and legislation of critical importance to MATS.

The Air Force's future capability has also been seriously affected by the too-deep cutback of the B–70 program. This 2,000-mile-an-hour bomber delivers sensational manned aircraft performance far beyond that of the incoming B–58 Hustler. Few still feel we need the originally contemplated large numbers of B–70's now that Minuteman is on the near horizon, but there seems little doubt that we should have a reasonable, if lesser, number of B–70's as soon as possible. The present appropriation, supposedly enough for two B–70 prototypes, I am told, will probably not cover the cost of even one. To do the needful here would not cost an excessive amount. Failure to do it may cost us much in prestige as well as in military capability.

There is yet another area where the Air Force has a need for more money. SAC Boss Thomas Powers' widely misinterpreted request for an airborne alert should be planned for now. General Power explained to Forbes that preparation for such a program had to get underway now if SAC is to be capable of introducing and maintaining an effective airborne SAC fleet in 1961 or 1962. The funds requested by the administration were far from adequate but, fortunately, Congress has upped the figure.

Currently the Air Force's most hopeless assignment is in the hands of the Air Defense Command. The present "state of the art of war" would permit a reasonably effective but vastly expensive defense of this continent against strikes by manned aircraft. But there is at present simply no positive known method of destroying incoming ballistic missiles. Doubtless, some type of defense eventually will be evolved. This is certain to be of immense cost. Meanwhile, spending many billions more for expanding defense against manned aircraft doesn't seem to make too much sense. The Air Force has recognized this in recommending a sizable cut in funds for this program.

So, along with its magnificient capability to perform its prime mission of deterrence, the Air Force has its problems. To use a time-honored cliché, there is simply not enough money for all the things that all the services would like to have, to better perform their missions.

But—to give two concrete examples—there is certainly enough more money to help the Air Force expand its support capability and to implement more effectively its B–70 program.

Final Report of the Assembly on Africa for Illinois Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the growing importance of the emerging nations in Africa and their relation with the free world, I ask unanimous consent that the thought-provoking final report of the Assembly on Africa for Illinois teachers sponsored at the University of Illinois by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Foreign Relations

Project, February 28–March 1, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL REPORT, ASSEMBLY ON AFRICA FOR ILLINOIS TEACHERS, ARRANGED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION FOREIGN RELATIONS PROJECT

At the closing plenary session, the participants in the Illinois Assembly on Africa, at Allerton House, Monticello, February 28–March 1, reviewed as a group their discussions of Africa and of United States policies pertaining thereto and adopted the following statement. Although there was general agreement on the final report, it must not be assumed that every participant subscribed to every recommendation contained therein.

PREAMBLE

Africa is a continent in ferment. It is undergoing revolutionary change. Throughout the past decade, one after another African territory has achieved statehood and independence. The end is not in sight. With independence, each State is confronted with new problems of major proportions and each finds that it has great need for outside assistance.

Africa is a continent of great physical diversities. Ethnically, its people are many and varied.

The Illinois Assembly concentrated its attention on the sub-Saharan region but it did give some consideration to the area of North Africa as that area intruded into the discussion.

It is our firm belief that the peoples of Africa are well on their way to independence. It will not be long until each African political entity will be in a position to work out its own relationships with non-African states and with other African states. It is important in this formative stage that the United States win the confidence of the peoples and governing regimes in the newly formed states.

We are convinced that the United States should develop policies designed to assist the African peoples to achieve self-government, to build viable economies and enduring political entities. The United States should continue to support the principle of self-determination and should welcome each new African state as it achieves independence.

The Illinois Assembly believes that as racial relations in the United States improve we indicate to Africa and to the world that such problems are soluble.

POLITICAL PROBLEMS

The assembly recognizes that some of the European allies of the United States have very significant stakes in Africa. Suddenly to sever the ties between those allies and their African territories could seriously weaken our Western allies and could be most destructive of the collective security system we and they have constructed. On the other hand, if the European allies are too adamant in their resistance to inevitable change, they will be weakened by continuing civil strife.

The United States should continue to advocate the adoption of the principle of self-determination and should press for recognition by its European allies of the necessity of moving toward self-government for the African peoples. At the same time, the U.S. Government should seek to promote, wherever possible, the continued interdependence of the European States and the emerging African States. We should press to preserve the economic ties which make for strength both in the European allies and the new African States.

Americans must recognize that the emerging forms of African political and economic orders will not be identical to those of the West. Such forms must and should be African in character and should emerge from African cultures. Nevertheless, the United States should encourage the development of institutions which provide for and preserve the widest possible participation in the government of all African States, which protect minorities and preserve the right of dissent. We should also encourage developments which enlarge the scope for free enterprise in their economies.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The new African States stand in need of economic development. Capital must continue to flow into their economies in order that a rapid development may continue. Wherever and whenever possible the need should be met from a variety of sources, particularly from private investment. The U.S. Government is urged to develop with the new African governments ways and means for developing attitudes and the building of a climate which will encourage private investment.

To promote the investment of private capital it is necessary that the U.S. Government guarantee the convertibility of earnings of American investors and to take steps to reduce to a minimum the risk of confiscation of private property.

Private capital may be expected to support developments in mining, in general industry and even in agriculture, provided the necessary public works are financed by governments. To finance the necessary public works, the new African States will require intergovernmental loans and grants. Such loans and grants will be needed for the building of railways and other modes of transportation, for the construction of port facilities, for the building of hydroelectric plants, irrigation systems, etc. Unless such public works are built, private investment could be seriously handicapped and, therefore, not readily available.

It is recognized that Africa needs and requires technical assistance on a wide front. We recommend that the U.S. Government make every effort to see that such assistance is rendered by (a) United Nations agencies; (b) other multilateral efforts; and (c) by the U.S. Government.

Technical assistance can do much to assist the African States to increase productivity, to build their economies on a sound basis, to produce diversification and generally to promote viable economies. It must be recognized that there are limits beyond which technical assistance cannot go unless development assistance is also given. For this reason we commend an expanded program of financing African development plans.

In some cases, development loans made by an international agency will be more acceptable to African States. We recommend that the United States participate in the formation of an international development loan fund to finance African development plans.

We urge the U.S. Government to promote, whenever it can, the financing of African development plans by our Western allies.

We urge that a larger share of foreign-aid appropriations be made available for African States.

We commend private efforts, such as those of CARE, to utilize excess American production to aid African peoples.

EDUCATION

We find that the American people, including those in our schools and colleges, know far too little concerning Africa and its peoples. To better the situation, we urge the expansion of academic programs so as to include more instruction in African subject matter. We recommend the establishment of African area study programs in more American colleges and universities.

It is evident that the expansion of education in the new African States is crucial to their development and their welfare. This applies to education at all levels—primary, secondary, and college—but it is particularly important in technical education. It is our belief that U.S. Government aid to education should have as its highest priority the strengthening of African institutions which train technicians and teachers for the primary and secondary schools. Our program of technical assistance should provide for expanded programs of (a) aid to African educational institutions and (b) educational exchange.

Because the new governments desperately need trained administrative personnel, we urge the U.S. Government to expand its technical assistance programs so as to include major programs for assisting the new states to train personnel in public administration and allied fields.

We feel strongly that there is an unfilled need for adequately trained American personnel to serve as field representatives of the United States in the African States. To meet this need we urge the establishment of training programs in American universities designed to train for African service a corps of persons competent in language, technical fields, and knowledge of African cultures.

We commend the radio, television, and newspaper industries for the dissemination of information concerning Africa and events transpiring therein and urge that even more adequate coverage be provided.

We believe that the U.S. Information Service and all African channels of communication should be used by the United States to disseminate information about the United States throughout Africa.

Platform of Midwest Democratic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Midwest Democratic Conference held its annual meeting in Detroit, March 24–27. After 3 days of excellent discussion, in which many of the Democratic Party's most outstanding leaders were involved, the conference prepared a series of recommendations on solutions to some of the major problems facing the nations.

These papers, entitled "Goals for America," have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by midwestern Senators and Representatives. The subjects they cover are: "Peace," "Civil Rights," "Human Welfare," "Agriculture," "Economic Growth," "Metropolitan Problems," "Natural Resources."

I believe these papers represents a wise and democratic approach to the critical problems we face. If they were implemented by legislation, we could overcome the obstacles which now thwart a full realization of America's potential.

The excellence of these papers is not surprising, Mr. President, when their source is known.

From the list, it is apparent that the States represented in the conference have, in their political ranks, many of America's most distinguished leaders.

The Democratic Midwest Conference intends to urge the party's national convention to incorporate the views con-

tained in these papers into the Democratic platform for 1960. I believe that our platform would be one all Democrats would be proud to sponsor were it to contain the recommendations of the conference.

I am pleased to join several of my congressional colleagues in the introduction of conference material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask that the list of participants and the Preamble to "Goals for America" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Democratic Midwest Conference is a formal organization of Democratic Party officials from the 14 States designated in the national committee rules as the middle western group of States.

These States, which will have 458, or 30.1 percent, of the 1,521 delegate votes at the 1960 Democratic National Convention, are: Illinois 69, Indiana 34, Iowa 26, Kansas 21, Michigan 51, Minnesota 31, Missouri 39, Nebraska 16, North Dakota 11, Ohio 64, Oklahoma 29, South Dakota 11, West Virginia 25, and Wisconsin 31.

This 14-State area with 31.8 percent of the Nation's population in 1959, is the heart of America economically as well as geographically. Well known for its farm belt, this 14-State area in 1958 harvested 62 percent of the acreage of the nation's 55 principal crops and had 54.1 percent of the cattle, sheep and hogs.

The 14 States also contain 58 of the 174 metropolitan areas in the United States. Over 62 percent of the people in these 14 States live in urban areas. In 1956 the area produced 38.4 percent of the value added by manufacture.

Under the constitution adopted at the March 1959 meeting in Milwaukee, membership in the midwest conference includes those persons in the 14 States who have held in the past, or currently hold, statewide elective positions in their respective State parties or on the national committee. Voting privileges in the conference are limited to four representatives from each State, the State chairman, State vice chairwoman, national committeeman and national committeewoman. Members may vote by proxy.

Officers of the midwest conference elected at the September 1959 meeting in Kansas City are: chairman, Frank Theis, Kansas chairman and national committeeman; vice chairman, Mrs. Marguerite Benson, Wisconsin vice chairman; secretary, Mrs. Ruby Harris, Kansas vice chairman; and treasurer, Ray Hemenway, Minnesota chairman.

The 14 States of the conference currently have 10 Democratic Governors, 15 Democratic Senators and 75 Democratic Congressmen. They and the party officials from each State are:

Illinois: Senator Paul H. Douglas. Congressmen: William L. Dawson, 1st District; Barratt O'Hara, 2d District; William T. Murphy, 3d District; John C. Kluczynski, 5th District; Thomas J. O'Brien, 6th District; Roland V. Libonati, 7th District; Daniel D. Rostenkowski, 8th District; Sidney R. Yates, 9th District; Roman C. Pucinski, 11th District; Peter F. Mack, Jr., 21st District; George E. Shipley, 23d District; Melvin Price, 24th District; Kenneth J. Gray, 25th District. Party officials: Chairman, James A. Ronan (Illinois has not yet designated a vice chairman of the opposite sex as a voting member of the conference); national committeemen, Jacob M. Arvey; national committeewoman, Mrs. Elizabeth A. Conkey.

Indiana: Senator R. Vance Hartke. Congressmen: Ray J. Madden, 1st District; John Brademas, 3d District; J. Edward Roush, 5th District; Fred Wampler, 6th District; Winfield K. Denton, 8th District; Earl Hogan, 9th District; Randall S. Harmon, 10th District; Joseph W. Barr, 11th District. Party officials, Chairman, Charles E. Skillen; vice chairman, Mrs. Lawrence Arnsman; national committeeman, Paul M. Butler; national committeewoman, Mrs. Kenneth J. Luckett.

Iowa: Gov. Herschel C. Loveless. Congressmen: Leonard G. Wolf, Second District; Neal E. Smith, Fifth District; Merwin Coad, Sixth District. Party officials: Chairman, Donald A. Norberg; vice chairman, Mrs. James Dunbar; national committeeman, Donald J. Mitchell; national committeewoman, Mrs. Alberta Metcalf Kelly.

Kansas: Gov. George Docking. Congressmen: Newell A. George, Second District; Denver D. Hargis, Third District; J. Floyd Breeding, Fifth District. Party officials: Chairman and national committeeman, Frank G. Theis; vice chairman, Mrs. Ruby Harris; national committeewoman, Mrs. Georgie Neese Gray.

Michigan: Gov. G. Mennen Williams. Senator Patrick V. McNamara and Senator Philip A. Hart. Congressmen: Thaddeus M. Machrowitz, 1st District; James G. O'Hara, 7th District; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., 13th District; Louis C. Rabaut, 14th District; John D. Dingell, 15th District; John Lesinski, 16th District; Martha W. Griffiths, 17th District. Party officials: Chairman, Neil Staebler; vice chairman, Miss Adelaide Hart; national committeeman, Thomas H. E. Quimby; national committeewoman, Mrs. Margaret Price (alternate national committeewoman, Mrs. Mildred Jeffrey).

Minnesota: Gov. Orville L. Freeman. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator Eugene J. McCarthy. Congressmen: Roy W. Wier, Third District; Joseph E. Karth, Fourth District; Fred Marshall, Sixth District; John A. Blatnik, Eighth District. Party officials: chairman, Ray Hemenway; chairwoman, Mrs. Geri Joseph; national committeeman, Gerald W. Heaney; national committeewoman, Mrs. Douglas P. Hunt.

Missouri: Gov. James T. Blair, Jr. Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Senator Stuart Symington. Congressmen: Frank M. Karsten, 1st District; Leonor K. Sullivan, 3d District; William J. Randall, 4th District; Richard Bolling, 5th District; W. R. Hull, Jr., 6th District; Charles H. Brown, 7th District; A. S. J. Carnahan, 8th District; Clarence Cannon, 9th District; Paul C. Jones, 10th District; Morgan M. Moulder, 11th District. Party officials: chairman, Wilbur F. Daniels; vice chairman, Mrs. Marjorie Roberts; national committeeman, Mark Holloran; national committewoman, Mrs. Willa Mae Roberts.

Nebraska: Gov. Ralph G. Brooks. Congressmen: Lawrence Brock, Third District; Donald F. McGinley, Fourth District. Party officials: Chairman, Russell Hanson; vice chairman, Mrs. Ethel Kirwin; national committeeman, Bernard J. Boyle; national committeewoman, Miss Mary Cunningham.

North Dakota: Congressman Quentin N. Burdick, at large. Party officials: Chairman, Abner B. Larson; vice chairman, Mrs. Agnes Geelan; national committeeman, David G. Kelly; national committeewoman, Mrs. Daphna Nygaard.

Ohio: Gov. Michael V. DiSalle. Senator Frank J. Lausche, Senator Stephen M. Young. Congressmen: Thomas L. Ashley, 9th District; Walter H. Moeller, 10th District; Robert E. Cook, 11th District; Robert W. Levering, 17th District; Wayne L. Hays, 18th District; Michael J. Kirwin, 19th District; Michael A. Feighan, 20th District; Charles A. Vanik, 21st District. Party officials: Chairman, William L. Coleman (Ohio has not yet designated a vice chairman of the opposite sex as a voting member of the conference); national committeeman, Albert A. Horstman; national committeewoman, Mrs. Helen Gunsett.

Oklahoma: Gov. J. Howard Edmondson. Senator Robert S. Kerr, Senator A. S. "Mike" Monroney. Congressmen: Ed Edmondson, Second District; Carl Albert, Third District; Tom Steed, Fourth District; John Jarman, Fifth District; Toby Morris, Sixth District. Party officials: Chairman, Gene McGill; cochairman, Mrs. Grace Hudlin; national committeeman, James H. Arrington; national committeewoman, Mrs. Bertrude (cq) Fields Cummings.

South Dakota: Gov. Ralph Herseth. Congressman George S. McGovern, First District. Party officials: Chairman, James Magness; vice chairman, Mrs. Katherine Kuhns; national committeeman, C. L. Chase; national committeewoman, Mrs. Murman Jensen.

West Virginia: Senator Jennings Randolph, Senator Robert C. Byrd. Congressmen: Harley O. Staggers, Second District; Cleveland M. Bailey, Third District; Ken Hechler, Fourth District; Elizabeth Kee, Fifth District; John M. Slack, Jr., Sixth District. Party officials: Chairman, Hulett Smith; associate chairman, Miss Esther M. Heil; national committeeman, John E. Amos; national committeewoman, Mrs. Nunley Snedegar.

Wisconsin: Gov. Gaylord A. Nelson. Senator William Proxmire. Congressmen: Gerald T. Flynn, First District; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Second District; Clement J. Zablocki, Fourth District; Henry S. Reuss, Fifth District; Lester R. Johnson, Ninth District. Party officials: Chairman, Patrick J. Lucey; vice chairman, Mrs. Marguerite Benson; national committeeman, Herman F. Jessen; national committeewoman, Mrs. Vel Phillips.

GOALS FOR AMERICA—A PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Democratic Midwest Conference, assembled in Detroit, offer for the consideration of Democrats throughout the Nation the program papers developed by the committees of this conference, and refined in the thoughtful and thorough panel discussions in which we have here engaged.

The papers propose programs for action. They face up to some of the basic issues of our time. They represent one consensus of goals for America and of the steps which can be taken under Democratic leadership to carry them out.

Taken together, these Midwest Democratic declarations express in new terms and apply to new conditions the liberal and progressive sentiments of the 14 States which constitute this conference.

We pledge to put to work in the months ahead the enthusiasm and momentum for programatic politics generated by this conference.

We resolve to continue the excellent regional cooperation here established. The spirit of liberal kinship which has characterized these proceedings can mark the resurgence of the Midwest as a cohesive force for progressivism in American politics.

We resolve to bring to the attention of the platform-drafting committee of the Democratic Party the statements on economic growth, human welfare, civil rights, agriculture, urban problems, conservation, and the overriding issue of our time—peace.

We resolve to continue our efforts to achieve common language in areas not here included, such as education, employment opportunities, and similar questions of national concern; and to unite behind liberal programs in the platform of the Democratic National Convention.

To this end, we continue the steering committee which brought the statements of the Detroit conference to fruition. We ask that the steering committee develop program papers in such other areas as are

needed, and disseminate for discussion to the leaders and members of the Democratic Party throughout the nation the sense of this conference and of the papers hereto attached.

These goals for America, we believe, reflect the deepest sentiments of the American people, point the way to better tomorrows, and presage a sweeping victory for our party and its candidates in the balloting of next November.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tennessee Valley Authority Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to Tennessee Valley Authority financing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

My attention has been called to a statement in the 1959 annual report of the Long Island Lighting Co., an electric and gas utility operating in New York State, entitled "Apathy and the American Free Enterprise System." My immediate concern with this statement is that it contains a gross distortion of the action of the Congress last year in passing an amendment to the TVA Act authorizing TVA to finance additional power facilities through sale of electric revenue bonds.

Of course, the statement of a relatively small utility is not important in itself; it is significant in that it represents a settled policy of a large segment of the electric utility industry to persistently attack and misrepresent TVA and other projects established in the public interest.

Of TVA the Long Island Co. says:

"TVA won a victory at the last session of Congress in the enactment of the so-called TVA bond bill. We have in the past pointed out the dangers to the public at large in the unbridled authority granted to TVA by this measure—the ability of TVA to finance its operations without the usual check and supervision of Congress, to expand the scope of its operations, and to extend the period for repayment of the Government's investment in the project."

The most charitable view that can be taken of this gross misrepresentation of the facts is that the company has relied solely on the power trust's propaganda and has failed entirely to read the long and detailed bond amendment which it purports to interpret.

Far from unbridled authority, the bond amendment surrounds the TVA operations and issuance of bonds with many checks and safeguards. The amendment specifies in detail the conditions under which the bonds are to be issued. It requires the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the time of issuance and the maximum rates of interest to be borne by the bonds. It also provides that "the corporation shall advise the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount, proposed date of sale, maturities, terms and conditions and expected rates of interest of the proposed issue in the fullest detail possible and, if the Secretary shall so request, shall consult with him or his designee thereon." The amendment specifically provides that the bonds "shall not be obligations of, nor shall payment of the principal thereof or the interest thereon be guaranteed by the United States." It sets the terms of such bonds at no more than 50 years. It makes income from the bonds subject to Federal income taxes.

The amendment declares that "the principal and interest on said bonds shall be payable solely from the corporation's net power proceeds" and it carefully defines the term "net power proceeds." Under the definition, such proceeds consist of "the remainder of the corporation's gross power revenues after the costs of operating, maintaining, and administering its power properties * * * and payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes but before deducting depreciation accruals or other charges representing the amortization of capital expenditures, plus the net proceeds of the sale or other disposition of any power facility or interest therein."

The amendment specifies the priorities of the claims upon the net power proceeds—first the obligations as to interest and principal on the electric revenue bonds, then payments into the general fund of the Treasury. These payments to the Treasury include a repayment of the appropriation investment plus a return or dividend on the outstanding balance. Finally, remaining net power proceeds may be used for reinvestment in the power system or further reduction of the amount of appropriations investment or bonded indebtedness.

In order to protect the interests of the bondholders and the Government's appropriations investment, the amendment requires that TVA's repayments to the Treasury and its reinvestments of proceeds in the system in any 5-year period shall at least equal provisions for depreciation and any other charges representing the amortization of capital expenditures, plus the proceeds from any sale of power facilities during the period.

The statement that the bond amendment permits TVA to "extend the period of repayment for the Government's investment" omits half the story and thereby twists the facts; what is omitted is that the amendment places on TVA a new requirement for payments to the Treasury in addition to repayment of the investment. Under legislation nullified by the amendment, TVA was required to repay the appropriations investment in the system, amounting at June 30, 1959, to $1.2 billion, over a period of 40 years. The new legislation requires that TVA repay $1 billion of this investment over a maximum period of 54 years; it also requires that TVA pay to the Treasury a return or dividend on the outstanding Government investment in the power system at the average rate of interest paid by the U.S. Treasury on all its marketable public obligations.

What the change means is simply this: Under the former legislation, TVA would have paid the Treasury $1.2 billion in 40 years; under the bond amendment, assuming an average Treasury interest rate of 3 percent (which is below the current rate), TVA will repay $1 billion of investment plus some $1.2 billion in dividends—a total of $2.2 billion or more in 54 years.

The Long Island company goes precisely contrary to the fact when it asserts that the bond amendment permits TVA to "expand the scope of its [power] operations." The bond amendment placed a strict territorial limitation on the TVA, far more stringent than existed before. Prior to the bond amendment, TVA was empowered to sell electricity within "transmission distance," perhaps 200 miles, of its hydroelectric projects on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. Prior to adoption of the bond amendment TVA could have served a very large area not included in its service area which, as a matter of historical fact, has remained virtually constant over the last decade and a half. As opposed to this, the bond amendment limits TVA service to the area being served on July 1, 1957, plus "such additional area extending not more than 5 miles around the periphery of such area as may be necessary to care for the growth of the corporation and its distributors in said area." In other words, it provided for minor line extensions where necessary. It further stipulated that the total of new area served could not exceed 2,000 square miles, with no more than 500 square miles in one State. The Congress also specifically excepted from the limitation several municipalities within the present service area or on its fringes which had expressed serious interest previously in contracting for TVA power at wholesale, and to certain Federal defense installations.

Thus the bond amendment, contrary to the claim of the company, placed on TVA power operations a large number of limitations, requirements, and responsibilities in accordance with the will of the Congress. Furthermore, the TVA and its financing activities are—as they have been in the past—under the continuing close scrutiny of the Congress. The new amendment specifically requires that in its annual reports it shall provide "a detailed statement of the operation of this section during the year." TVA and its power operations are, of course, subject to close examination in the annual hearings before the appropriations committees of the Senate and the House, when TVA Directors and officials may be closely interrogated as to their operations and their plans.

Clearly the facts completely refute the claim that the bond amendment, or legislation of any kind in the past, gave TVA "unbridled authority." TVA has been, and continues to be, subject to the fullest control of the Congress which created it.

Are Tax Laws Killing Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat on May 31, 1960, containing the latest available figures from the Federal Trade Commission on corporation mergers and acquisitions for mining and manufacturing firms:

ARE TAX LAWS KILLING THEM?

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican from Missouri's second district, has put

his finger on a critical flaw in our income tax laws. At a dinner meeting of the Farmers Club of St. Louis, he pointed out that the present tax laws encourage large firms to swallow up smaller ones, and for that reason should be revised.

Few Americans realize how rapidly the pace of mergers and acquisitions has stepped up in recent years. These latest available figures from the Federal Trade Commission on corporate mergers and acquisitions for mining and manufacturing firms show the alarming trend:

	Mergers and acquisitions
1950	219
1951	235
1952	288
1953	295
1954	387
1955	525
1956	537
1957	490
1958	457

Sound Federal tax policies would encourage the growth of business firms, rather than their disappearance via the merger and acquisition route. Representative CURTIS' reminder that it's time to take a fresh look at our tax laws is very apropos—now that a prospective surplus makes tax revision possible next year.

Maj. Gen. George W. Hickman, Jr., Judge Advocate General of the Army, Delivers Impressive Memorial Day Address at Grafton National Cemetery, Grafton, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Army, Maj. Gen. George W. Hickman, Jr., delivered the Memorial Day address at the annual ceremony held in the National Cemetery at Grafton, W. Va., on May 30, 1960. It was a most meaningful message, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. GEORGE W. HICKMAN, JR., JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. ARMY, NATIONAL CEMETERY, GRAFTON, W. VA., MAY 30, 1960

Being a native of Kentucky, I am especially privileged to take part in Memorial Day services with West Virginians. Your great State and mine both grew out of the same mother Commonwealth—Virginia. We share the same traditions; we look back with common pride to the exploits and achievements of Virginians like George Washington and Patrick Henry; each of our States has in her own right carved out impressive niches in the history of our Nation.

West Virginia, indeed, has always placed herself in the vanguard when the United States finds herself in danger. Sixty thousand West Virginians saw service in World War I. Almost 200,000 of your sons flew to the defense of the country in World War II. Thirty-six men of Taylor County alone made the supreme sacrifice in World War II. Ninety-five thousand West Virginians were in the armed services during the Korean war, with almost 1 out of 100 losing their lives.

Fifteen citizens of this State have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor—the highest decoration for valor that our country bestows on its fighting men. The first Medal of Honor winner from West Virginia was Cpl. Leonidas H. Inscho of Charleston. I will read the citation. It is sort of brief, like Lincoln's Gettysburg Address:

"Corporal Inscho, while a member of Company E 12th Ohio Infantry, at South Mountain, Md., on September 14, 1862, did, alone and unaided and with his left hand disabled, capture a Confederate captain and four men."

The last West Virginian to be so honored was Pfc. Ralph E. Pomeroy, a resident of Kingwood (some 40 miles north of Grafton). His citation, in General Orders 97, Department of the Army, dated December 30, 1953, reads as follows: "By direction of the President * * * the Medal of Honor for conspicuous gallantry * * * is awarded posthumously to Pfc. Ralph E. Pomeroy, U.S. Army, a machinegunner with the 7th Infantry Division, who distinguished himself, near Kumhwa, Korea, on October 15, 1952. While his unit was consolidating a critical piece of terrain, Pomeroy manned a machinegun on a forward slope to protect his platoon's flank from surprise attack. When the enemy attacked his position, Private Pomeroy immediately opened fire on the advancing troops, inflicting a heavy toll in casualties and blunting the assault. At this junction, the enemy directed intense concentrations of artillery and mortar fire on his position in an attempt to neutralize his gun. Despite withering fire and bursting shells, he maintained his heroic stand and poured crippling fire into the ranks of the hostile force until a mortar burst severely wounded him and rendered the gun mount inoperable. Quickly removing the hot, heavy weapon Pomeroy cradled it in his arms and, moving forward with grim determination, raked the attacking forces with a hail of fire. Although wounded a second time, he pursued his relentless course until his ammunition was expended within 10 feet of the foe. Then, using the machine gun as a club, he courageously closed with the enemy in hand-to-hand combat until mortally wounded. Private Pomeroy's consummate valor, inspirational actions, and supreme sacrifice enabled the platoon to contain the attack and maintain the integrity of the perimeter, thereby reflecting lasting glory on himself and upholding the noble traditions of the military service."

I know that you citizens of Grafton take pride today in the deeds and activities of your sons and daughters who right now are serving the Nation at home and abroad. I am personally acquainted with your "adopted" son, Maj. Gen. Joe Potter of the Army Corps of Engineers, General Potter, currently serving as Governor of the Canal Zone, met and married his wife, Ruth (who is a Grafton girl), while he was stationed here during the building of the Grafton Dam.

Rear Adm. Frederick Warder, one of the most highly decorated naval officers on duty today and a distinguished member of the submarine fleet during World War II, is one of your home "boys."

Your recently selected "daughter of the year" in West Virginia is Grafton's own Judge Mary C. Barlow, a distinguished Federal judge in Washington, D.C. I understand that when she was appointed to the Federal bench about 10 years ago, people marveled that she could be such a good judge and look so young.

I feel sure that on any Memorial Day and while discussing the famous people of Grafton we should always pause to pay tribute to another famous daughter of your city, Miss Anna Jarvis, acknowledged everywhere as the originator of Mother's Day.

Yes, Memorial Day causes us to have some long thoughts about our obligations to our country.

Recently a young American soldier, let's call him Recruit John Doe, was offered the startling choice of earning an honorable discharge or taking a dishonorable discharge and going home.

This offer was made by a young lieutenant and lawyer from the Defense Appellate Division of my office. But the lieutenant's client came forth with a flat "no," and signed a notarized affidavit to that effect. Recruit Doe had been convicted by general court-martial of desertion and was sentenced to be dishonorably discharged from the U.S. Army.

However, because of a change in the law in a companion case of *United States* v. *May*, decided by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, this soldier was given another chance to clear his record of the dishonorable discharge. Because of this companion case, he was given a fresh opportunity honorably to serve his country and wipe out the stigma of his military and national misdeed. But he chose the dishonorable discharge. He was asked why he wanted, and why he was willing, to accept dishonorable discharge from the U.S. Army. His answer was, "I don't know, I just want out, and I don't care how."

Let's compare this unusual attitude and lack of feeling toward his country and himself with that of the men to whom we are paying tribute this morning. Recruit Doe apparently feels nothing toward America. The honored dead here, however, have made the greatest contribution possible to their Nation. Their sacrifice clearly indicates their attitude toward America. A comparison between the action of Recruit Doe and the men we are honoring today illustrates the opposite ends of the democratic spectrum. Of course, Recruit Doe's choice is not a typical one and represents only a small fraction of American thinking. However, the fact that there is even one man in this country willing to take a dishonorable discharge is to me frightening and disturbing.

The United States can maintain its position of world leadership only by paying for this position of trust on a day-by-day basis. You and I as citizens of the United States must daily help pay for our national strength. History is clear in recording that no nation has ever succeeded all at once, nor has a nation failed all at once. A nation keeps strong because bit by bit its citizens willingly, yes and spontaneously, make the payments needed for national prestige and survival.

The contributions of these honored dead are the very essence of the strength we need. Their efforts were not wasted. Their devotion to duty and sacrifice to our country have directly contributed to the perpetuation of our Nation. They have provided you and me with a challenge and have given us guideposts to follow. You and I as citizens of this country have a responsibility to uphold our democracy in the tradition of their sacrifice. Their actions cry out to us to make sure that we do our part in our time as they have done their part in their time.

The men we honor here died to support democracy. Democracy connotes the mandates of the many, not the whims of the few. It is embodied in the feeling of privacy in the voting booth, the feeling of communion in the library, the feeling of vitality everywhere. It's the belief that man can worship God any way and any where he desires.

To put it another way, democracy is a situation that gives us all the best chance to develop the best that's in us. Some people grab the chance, and some miss it, but each generation gets a new try at it, and that is

saying a great deal. These men served that you and I might have our chance to aid and enjoy democracy.

Our role as citizens is clear. The men we are honoring this morning laid down a challenge for us, a challenge that is not easy to accept. Fortunately, the John Does are in a very small minority, and these soldiers, some unknown, are in the vast majority. It is our job to keep it that way, and as long as we do this, our country has nothing to fear. We must rededicate ourselves to freedom.

Not too long ago, I heard a creed for America and for Americans. It goes something like this: We as American citizens do not choose to be common men. We have a right to be uncommon if we can. We seek opportunity, not security; we do not wish to be kept citizens, humbled and dulled by having the state look after us. We prefer to take the calculated risk, to dream and to build and to fail and to succeed. We prefer the challenge of life to the preempted existence of the police state or the communal farm, the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of an ordered universe. We will not trade our freedom for beneficence nor our dignity for a handout. We will not bow before any master, nor bend to any threat.

We have a grand heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for ourselves and to share in the benefits of our own creation, and to face the world boldly and say, this, we have done. All this is what it means to be an American.

It's an honor for me to stand here beside you today and pay tribute to a distinguished group of Americans of whom we are all justifiably proud. This memorial service shows that this country has the kind of men that can keep our Nation strong. I earnestly hope that you and I are able to meet the high standards of sacrifice shown by these men that we are honoring today and that we can in this generation and our sons in the next carry their significant work forward.

Bipartisan Front Shattered—"By Recognizing and Facing Up to Mistakes of the Past We Can Chart a More Effective Course for the Future"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been well and aptly said that politics should stop at the seashore, and once again we are reminded of this in the discussions which have followed the recent crisis in our international relations. Mr. Edward T. Folliard, the very able reporter for the Washington Post, reviewed the recent history of bipartisanship in foreign policies in a recent article in that newspaper. This article should be of interest to our colleagues and others.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

POLITICS IN POLICY—BIPARTISAN FRONT SHATTERED

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Bipartisanship in the field of foreign affairs, meaning an informal agreement to have American politics end at the water's edge, appears to have been shattered again as a result of the U–2 affair and the flop of the Paris summit conference.

The last great breach in bipartisanship occurred 10 years ago, not long after President Harry S. Truman ordered American troops to Korea to thwart a Communist aggression.

The arguments that arose in that summer of 1950, and flared up again in the presidential campaign of 1952, sounded remarkably like those that are reverberating across the land in 1960.

There is a difference, of course, a big one, and it lies in the fact that it was the Republicans who were on the attack in 1950 and 1952.

It was on August 13, 1950, that Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued a statement denouncing the Truman administration for being caught off guard in Korea. The Republican Senators assailed President Truman and his predecessor, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, for their "blindness" to Russian designs since 1945, and said:

"The American people will not now excuse those responsible for these blunders."

They were not criticizing Mr. Truman for intervening in Korea, but for what they said was a blundering Far Eastern policy that resulted in the Reds' attack in Korea. Even Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Republican leader of the Senate, said that he would have voted for intervention had it been put up to Congress, although he later began to call the conflict "Truman's war."

Former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, who was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee when the Republican outburst came in 1950, tried to preserve bipartisanship, saying:

"The best way to get international peace is to have unity at home, and not pettifogging attacks on the administration."

That is pretty much what the Republicans are saying now as they assail those Democrats who are jumping on the Eisenhower administration for the U–2 business and the collapse of the Paris conference.

Former Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican, of New Jersey, had this answer for Connally in 1950:

"We feel that by recognizing and facing up to the mistakes of the past we can chart a more effective course for the future."

If that sounds familiar, it is because it is the same argument that many Democrats are making now in justifying their attacks on the Eisenhower administration.

In that summer of 1950, the Republicans hoped that their excoriation of President Truman in connection with the Korean war would give them control of Congress in the fall. It didn't. But 2 years later, when Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was the Republican nominee for President, Korea was an even hotter issue. And this time it was an important factor in the big GOP landslide.

General Eisenhower agreed that once the Communists invaded South Korea, President Truman had no alternative but to resist with American forces. He did not agree with Gen. Douglas MacArthur that the United States should have started bombing Red China after the Chinese forces joined the North Koreans to hurl Americans back from the Yalu River.

Nevertheless, the soldier-candidate went after Mr. Truman in all-out fashion in what was called his kick-off speech, delivered in Philadelphia on September 4, 1952.

"Seven years after victory in World War II," he said, "this administration has bungled us perilously close to world war III."

He promised that he would bring "the kind of peace that can be kept."

"We will win this battle for peace," he said, "only after we have won the battle for Washington."

The late John Foster Dulles, who was to become Secretary of State, criticized Mr. Truman for being too much on the defensive, for merely conducting rearguard actions.

"We are accustomed to having the initiative," Dulles said, "and being the Nation which originated the impulses which swept through the world."

Senator RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, the Republican nominee for Vice President in that 1952 campaign, roamed the country blasting at the Truman foreign policy and saying:

"We should throw out the men who made that policy."

He said that "Ike won't be fooled by Stalin," and added:

"We need a big man as President because we have had a little man for the last 7 years."

He said that the Truman administration cannot be trusted to get us out of war in Korea or keep us out of future wars.

The following year Vice President NIXON addressed the American Legion and said that Mr. Truman's decision to fight in Korea was right. He said that the Communists had to be stopped in Korea and Mr. Truman deserves credit for making that decision.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, Democratic leader of the Senate, is something of a hero to Republicans right now because he is warning his party not to make an issue of the U–2 affair and all that has flowed from it. He says that foreign policy should not be made a target of petty party politics.

No Republican of comparative stature arose to defend Mr. Truman in that way in 1952. The GOP attack on the Missourian was justified on the ground that those who take credit for the sunshine cannot complain too bitterly if they are blamed for the rain.

The Silver Purchase Repeal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the June 1960 issue of Banking magazine entitled "Silver Again," written by Herbert Bratter. This article will, I trust, be of interest to my Senate and House colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER AGAIN—NOW CONGRESS IS BEING ASKED TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT—NOT FOR—OUR HUGE HOARD OF WHITE METAL

(By Herbert Bratter)

A silver purchase repeal bill has been introduced in the House by Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, (Republican, of California), and in the Senate by Senators GREEN, BUSH, DODD, and PASTORE, all of New England. The latter region is especially interested in the industrial consumption of the white metal.

This bill, for which Senator GREEN forecasts Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings, goes farther than any previous silver repeal measure. It not only would terminate the goal of the 1934 Silver Purchase Act—now a dead letter—calling for the building up of U.S. monetary stocks

of silver; it would reverse that goal by authorizing and directing the Treasury to dispose of practically all silver now in its vaults and hence not in monetary use.

Today most small-denomination currency notes are silver certificates, backed 100 percent by standard silver dollars or their equivalent in bullion.

The new bill takes cognizance of the fact that there is almost no public demand for redemption of silver certificates in dollar coins and permits the Treasury to hold against the certificates a proportional reserve for redemption purposes.

The bill also authorizes the issuance of $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes, should it be desired to substitute them for silver certificates. Moreover, the fast-dwindling supply of free silver from which the mints now supply demand for subsidiary coins will be greatly augmented should this bill be enacted.

Externally based on gold, the U.S. dollar internally is a managed currency. The chief circulating medium is the Federal Reserve note. Yet we lead the world in the amount of silver in our monetary stock. Much silver circulates as coin: dimes, quarters, halves, and wartime 5-cent pieces. Much more circulates only by proxy of the silver certificate and actually lies idle in Treasury vaults. If all the silver held in the Treasury were cast into a cube of sterling fineness it would measure about 62 feet in each direction.

The composition of our currency stock (in millions) on November 30, 1959, was:

Gold	$19,565
Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank notes	29,057
Subsidiary silver coins	1,513
Other silver	2,739
U.S. notes (greenbacks)	347
Other	601
Total	53,823

Nominally, at the beginning of our Government, we adopted gold-silver bimetallism. That system proved impossible to maintain and was legally abandoned over a century ago. Silver was forced into the monetary system, starting in 1878, to make an artificial market for the product of newly developed Western mines, the silver certificate being devised then since the public showed distaste for cartwheels—standard silver dollars. The silver inflation weakened the dollar, and 15 years later, under President Cleveland's leadership, the purchases were ended.

A 40-YEAR INTERVAL

Apart from World War I legislation (the Pitman Act) it was not until the great depression that the silver interests in the Senate were again able to get the Government to "do something for silver." In 1933 Congress agreed to accept war debt payments in silver. At London during the world economic conference Senator Pitman, although quite without authorization, negotiated the London Silver Agreement, which President Roosevelt in December 1933, put into effect by proclamation. There followed the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, which Senator Hayden of Arizona has described as designed to help the American miner. Later laws of 1939 and 1946 increased the subsidy to newly mined domestic silver.

It is to the measures of the 1930's primarily that silver owes its present prominent position in the U.S. currency system. Those measures, in the enactment of which the silver interests had the powerful support of inflationist pressure groups and speculators in the metal, accomplished the subsidization of U.S. silver producers at enormous expense, for most of the silver purchased by the Treasury came from abroad. The chief beneficiaries were foreign sellers. Before the 1934 act, silver was still the standard of value in China, Hong Kong, and Macao. As a result of our program, those countries were able to abandon the silver standard at our expense. Today, outside of the Red bloc, 55 countries make no provision in their coinage systems for any use of silver. This is true of the new currency law of India, once known as "the sink of the precious metals." China, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, and such mining countries as Bolivia, Peru, and Spain use no silver coins today. From all the world, including the U.S.S.R., silver has been swept into the U.S. Treasury.

Of the 3.1 billion ounces of silver acquired by the Treasury since 1933, only 28.5 percent has been newly mined domestic silver. All the rest was acquired as a monetary camouflage of the domestic subsidy. Most amazing is the unimportance of the industry which obtained this subsidy, now continuing in perpetuity, unless the law is changed. Silver is economically unimportant even in the so-called silver States. To the Nation as a whole, when the silver subsidy was launched in 1933, silver was less important than the production of hay, soap, string, or envelopes. Chewing gum, linoleum, nuts, lemons, and strawberries all were of greater economic importance than silver.

In all 48 States in 1937, after several years of silver subsidy, the value of the Nation's silver output was only eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of all accountable income; and even in the seven chief silver-mining States it was only eighty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent.

That a commodity of such microscopic domestic importance could obtain in the 1930's and retain ever since what the historian of the New Deal, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., has called "the most remarkable * * * special interest triumph of the period" is in large part to be explained by the Senate's rules which, whatever their justification, permit a small minority bloc to hold up the Nation. The seven States which produce most of our newly mined silver control 14 Senators, a cohesive and determined bloc regardless of party.

FOREIGN PURCHASES STOPPED

Foreign silver purchases, at first wildly pursued in 1934 and 1935, were by 1942 given up by Secretary Morgenthau as folly. Under present law the Treasury buys at 90½ cents any and all newly mined domestic silver offered and, in its discretion, sells at the same price to domestic industrial users. The mines are seeking an opportunity to get a higher Treasury price. As a step in this direction they want the Treasury to stop selling silver to industry. It is also proposed that the Treasury issue certificates against all the unobligated silver it still holds, and supply the mints' subsidiary coinage needs by market purchases. By diminishing supply and increasing market demand, the price would rise on the market. Thereafter, a "logical" step for the mining bloc would be to seek an increase in the present 90½-cent floor set by the law of 1946.

THE LOGIC OF REPEAL

More logical from the standpoint of the Nation's interest, however—as distinct from that of silver mines, most of whose stock appears to be owned outside of the mining States—would be repeal of the silver purchase laws. This need not mean taking out of circulation the silver certificates we are now using, mostly in $1 and $5 denominations. These fiat notes may be continued in use, but the silver now frozen behind them as reserve should be freed for gradual sale by the Treasury. The mints should be closed to any further deliveries of newly mined domestic silver. The political-compromise goal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, although it is now a dead letter so far as the Treasury is concerned, should be rescinded. This is the goal calling for building up the stock of silver until one-fourth of the total stock of gold and silver—taking gold at $35 an ounce and silver at $1.29 an ounce—is silver.

The 1934 act was both mandatory and discretionary. After sad experience Secretary Morgenthau used discretion and shelved the mandate. Since then discretion has ruled at the Treasury. But this is not enough. The mandate on the statutes should be reversed. The Treasury's power to buy silver so long as there is idle silver in its vaults should be ended. Any coinage needs should be met from that silver. And all silver not needed for that purpose the Treasury should be directed by law to sell in its discretion.

INSIGNFICANT DEMAND

Since outstanding silver certificates offer for each dollar of face value "one dollar in silver," the Treasury should be authorized under the above proposal to retain enough standard silver dollars to meet any such requests it considers likely to arise. Unless the market price of silver should rise above $1.29 an ounce, which is the "monetary value" of the standard silver dollar, the demand for silver dollar coins would be insignificant. The redemption phrase on the silver certificate in any case has no special significance, since in 1933 the Congress made all forms of currency interchangeable.

Our silver programs adopted to please the advocates of "doing something for silver" have in this century, as during the last, promoted demonetization of the metal and even its complete withdrawal from subsidiary monetary use in a long list of countries. Supporting the price of silver has made that metal too expensive for use as coin in various parts of the world.

Should our silver policies now be put in reverse and our unneeded billion be sold, any resultant softening of the market price should encourage greater use of this metal. Thus, unloading our white elephant would be "doing something for silver."

The Challenge Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Ecuador on Sunday elected Dr. Velasco Ibarra as President in a fair and decisive contest, putting him in a position of confronting the enormous task of imposing social reforms, against the opposition of the nation's oligarchy. What he faces and the possible outcome of failure is outlined in an editorial published today in the New York Times, which deserves our attention. Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include the editorial:

ECUADOR'S ELECTION

The triumph of Dr. Velasco Ibarra in the Ecuadoran presidential election on Sunday, is one of the most significant and interesting events of the year in Latin America. The striking fact is that he defeated the candidates of the traditional Ecuadoran parties, running as an independent with an appeal to the Indian masses against the so-called oligarchy.

Personalism, which is so strong throughout Latin America, played a big role in Dr. Velasco

Ibarra's victory. He has always had an extraordinary appeal to the Ecuadoran people. This is the fourth time he was elected President. He is an eccentric, unpredictable man who works alone and is in constant conflict with his associates. But he is also intelligent, honest, and disinterested in the sense that he comes from the traditional Spanish ruling classes, but makes his appeal to the Indian masses.

Now the crucial question is whether the new President can force social reforms on the oligarchy and bring about social progress by orderly methods. If not, the answer may well be a Castro-type—or Bolivian-type revolution. The effect of the Cuban revolution on Latin-American countries is generally obscured by the fact that governments and the press oppose revolutionary forces for obvious reasons. Ecuador has a typical Andean altiplano maldistribution of wealth—a few large landowners, paying almost no taxation, with no economic incentive to cultivate, and a great mass of wretched Indians unable to acquire land or to better their status. This resulted in a revolution in Bolivia, which is also an Indian country with similar problems.

The United States is naturally deeply concerned. Washington knows that the Cuban revolution has posed the challenge: evolution or revolution. Ecuador has shown remarkable and praiseworthy political discipline ever since President Galo Plaza Lasso, in 1948–52, managed to survive a 4-year term for the first time and to hold a fair election. This election, too, was peaceful and fair. Dr. Velasco Ibarra won by the largest plurality in Ecuadoran history and his opponents cannot contest his victory. He will carry the best wishes and the hopes of the hemisphere with him into the Presidency.

The Late Dr. Barnett Sure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on June 4, 1960, Dr. Barnett Sure, who was for many years one of the leading members of the chemistry faculty at the University of Arkansas, died. Dr. Sure, for some 34 years was a member of the faculty, and during that period he did some of the most significant research work in the field of biological chemistry and the development of very important vitamins. I think his career should be noted, and I ask unanimous consent that a short article published in the Arkansas Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. SURE, 68, EX-PROFESSOR AT UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, DIES

MILWAUKEE, June 4.—Dr. Barnett Sure, aged 68, former chairman of the department of agriculture chemistry at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, died Friday night at a hospital here.

Dr. Sure, famous for his work with various vitamins and vitamin complexes, had lived at Milwaukee since 1958 after retiring from the University of Arkansas where he was on the faculty 34 years.

While at the university he was a leader in experimentation with vitamin B_{12}, as a dietary supplement. He also discovered a vitamin, deficiency of which produces sterility, which he named "vitamin E," and it was largely due to his work that vitamin B_1, or thiamine, was introduced in the routine feeding of infants by specialists of diseases of children. He later formulated, and in 1957 began production of, a meat "replacer" called Sure Food.

He was born at Vilkomire, Russia, and attended schools in Russia and the Union of South Africa. He came to the United State in 1908 and became a naturalized citizen in 1915. He attended colleges in Milwaukee and obtained his bachelor's degree from Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and his doctor's degree from the University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Sure was a member of the American Society of Biological Chemists, the American Institute of Nutrition, the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, and Sigma Xi, an honorary scientific society. He is listed in "Who' Who in America" and "Who's Who in American Men of Science."

He published several books on vitamins and in 1945 wrote two chapters on vitamins in the medical nutrition book, "Wohl's Dietotherapy." He also wrote about 200 scientific papers and bulletins in the nutritional, chemical and medical fields.

In addition to his research, Dr. Sure taught for more than 35 years advance courses in the biochemistry of nutrition.

He is survived by his wife, and three sisters, Mrs. David Wolfson, Mrs. Max Sweet and Mrs. Benjamin Mishlove of Milwaukee.

Funeral and burial will be Sunday at Milwaukee.

Flag Promotion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a local service club, the Mount Vernon Civitan Club of Civitan International, has undertaken an ambitious program for promoting flag ownership and display for the residents of northern Virginia. Civitans would like to see the flag displayed in every home as evidence of our loyalty to our country and Government and to establish this as a tradition for our children.

What started out with a small program geared to the local area of Mount Vernon, Va., is gradually spreading to encompass the metropolitan area. In keeping with Civitan International's motto "Builders of Good Citizenship" the local Civitan Club under the presidency of Don F. Hunt and flag program co-chairmen Mr. Clark Tufts and Lt. Col. Glen Stutzman decided that ownership and display of the American flag should be the patriotic desire of all. It was decided there was no better time to proceed with such a program than now with the new 50-star flag.

The club initiated the program on the basis of making available to the public a 3- by 5-foot home display flag of high quality at a reasonable price—a price which could not be met by individual purchase. Through volume purchasing the Civitan Club has been able to arrive at a price that is making the purchase of these flags most attractive. Civitans hope to see their program gain such momentum that other Civitan clubs as well as other civic minded organizations will participate in the program on a nationwide scale.

A portion of this cooperation has already been achieved through phase one of the Civitan plan. This plan has consisted of inviting the cooperation of the presidents of local citizens associations, veterans' groups, auxiliary women's organizations, the Mount Vernon-Lee Chamber of Commerce as well as civic minded business firms.

I was presented recently with a desk set consisting of five flags which depict the history of our flag. These five flags are displayed on a base of mohagany in the shape of the Pentagon Building with a description of each flag engraved on each side of the Pentagon. Making the presentation were Mr. Hunt, president of the club; Mr. Tufts, and Mr. Herl, president of the Mount Vernon Terrace Citizens Associations and a designated representative for the local citizens associations.

The Mount Vernon Civitan Club proposes to make its local flag program accepted on a national scale not only by International Civitan but by our congressional leaders as well. I am deeply interested in the program and hope that others will follow with the idea of building good citizenship by cooperating with this program.

Review of U.S. Trade Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a Nation, we face the task of finding more and more markets for the output of our great productive system—if we are to remain healthy and grow stronger economically.

Traditionally, the American economy itself has been a major market for U.S.-produced commodities.

However, the ingenuity of the free enterprise system—revolutionized, particularly, by technology—has created a mass production capacity for turning out goods at a rate greater than can be consumed and/or utilized in this country.

Consequently, we face the need of looking elsewhere for more and more markets for the products of our farms and factories.

Today, there are vast underdeveloped markets of the world, holding out promise of a great potential market.

We recognize, of course, that taking full advantage of the potential market will require fundamental studies and long-range planning. The objective must be to provide the kind of products

that can be utilized by less complex economies.

We recognize that we also face stiff competition for these markets.

I am confident, however, that if we can direct adequate effort toward providing the kind of products that can be utilized by these countries, as well as encourage the creation of conditions that will assure fair competition for our products on the world market, the United States can produce for, sell to, and service the needs of, a fair proportion of the less developed market areas, particularly in the newly emerging nations where, literally, they need everything.

The task will not be simple. To the contrary, this will be one of our major challenges in the days ahead—particularly in view of increasing competition, also, for such markets from the Communist bloc.

Recently, Economic World published an informative article, reflecting upon important aspects of our foreign trade policies. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY NEEDS NO MAJOR CHANGE—SAY LEADING BUSINESSMEN, ECONOMISTS

Despite increasing foreign competition and shifts in world economic conditions, a group of 31 leading U.S. businessmen and economists sees no reason for a major overhaul of U.S. foreign trade policy.

In the opinion of the majority, the country's 30-year effort to encourage freer world trade remains a sound objective for both political and economic reasons.

These views are set forth in a study compiled by a special staff of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, made public as the committee opened hearings on export-import policies late last month.

CONSENSUS OF VIEWS

While some advisers expressed reservations about the direction of U.S. foreign economic policies the majority, however, felt that:

A change in U.S. liberal trade policy would invite retaliation by other nations, shrink world trade, and ultimately sap free world economic strength.

The recent outflow of gold and increase in foreign dollar holdings represents a return to more normal patterns of international commerce eventually good for both the United States and its allies.

Continued balance-of-payments deficits of major proportions would pose a threat to U.S. economic stability, but damage is unlikely to occur because the Government possesses the means to deal with the problem.

The United States should continue to press for an elimination of restrictions on dollar goods especially by industrialized nations which raised trade barriers for balance-of-payments reasons.

Increased export sales would either eliminate or substantially reduce the red ink on the U.S. payments ledger.

The growth of U.S. investment abroad involves little threat to domestic employment or production with the exception of possible short-term implications for some industries.

The flow of U.S. money into foreign industries has helped stimulate greater industrialization, higher living standards, and more purchasing power, all conducive to an expanded demand for U.S. products.

Aid to underdeveloped countries should continue; any dislocation of U.S. export markets resulting from the growth of competitive industries will be insignificant in most cases and vastly outweighed by the long-range benefits to the free world economy.

U.S. policy toward trade with the Communist bloc should be brought into line with the policies of its allies.

SOVIET COMPETITION

Included in the advisory group were three economists in addition to top-level businessmen with extensive foreign operations experience in such fields as automobiles, petroleum and petrochemicals, aluminum, steel, heavy industrial equipment, shipping, metals, textiles, and construction.

A question on how best to meet the stepped-up economic offensive of the Soviet Union and Communist China drew a wide variety of responses. Five members questioned whether private enterprise could compete for trade against state monopolies which can subordinate economic considerations to political purposes. Seven felt either that no specific action was necessary or that it was premature to judge Soviet intentions.

A majority of the group, however, felt that a more fruitful approach apepared to lie in the overall strentghening of the U.S. trade position. Their specific recommendations included: stabilization of world raw material prices through more commodity agreements; encouraging development of common markets; continued exchanges of technicians between free world nations; and greater encouragement of U.S. investment abroad.

The committee's staff report offered three recommendations designed to improve this country's export sales:

1. Reestablishment of the Foreign Commercial Service under the Department of Commerce and a vigorous effort to improve trade promotion activities. (The Service was incorporated into the State Department in 1939.)

2. Institution of a flexible system of export credit insurance enabling U.S. traders to match credit terms offered by West European and Japanese firms whose transactions are backed by government institutions. The report noted that an adequate guarantee system should offer exporters insurance on short- and medium-term transactions while covering all types of commercial and political risks at rates comparable to those available to foreign competitors.

3. Establishment of a U.S. Office of Travel and Tourism to promote visits to this country and recapture some of the $1 billion annual travel deficit generated by the flood of dollar spending U.S. tourists into foreign countries. Committee Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON has introduced legislation to set up the proposed tourist promotion office.

A Familiar Script—A Hero's Return—Is Played Again and Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent soul-searching discussions we have had on the failure of the summit conference, the very able commentator, Marquis Childs, made some comments which should be of interest to my colleagues and others and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Childs' article reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

A FAMILIAR SCRIPT IS PLAYED AGAIN

(By Marquis Childs)

The favorite script of the Eisenhower administration is the hero's return. Whether it is the President himself or Vice President NIXON, we have seen the personal drama played out again and again of the hero who stands up to sticks and stones, insults, bad names, and then returns to the acclaim of a tumultuous welcome.

It is natural that the patriotism of Americans should respond to the fortitude of a leader who meets with adversity. But how much the personal drama really means in relation to America's position in the world and to America's aims is something else again.

President Eisenhower's reception on his return from Paris and the efforts to enhance his role in the tragedy of the U–2 and the collapse of the summit have a familiar resemblance to the drama of NIXON'S return from Latin America 2 years ago. NIXON had been stoned in Venezuela, spat upon in Uruguay and denounced in Peru. When he returned to a highly organized reception at the airport, it was the President who directed the chorus of "Hail to the Conquering Hero." This was NIXON'S assignment as the President returned from Paris.

NIXON said that his trip had demonstrated that top priority must be given to Latin America. It is well the trip was taken at this time, he was quoted as saying, for it brought out into the open the problems we face before they could get worse.

There is little evidence that important steps have been taken to upgrade Latin America. Nothing like the recasting of American policy, which NIXON seemed to feel was essential, has occurred.

The Nixon drama, while it gave a boost to the Vice President's stock in the polls and filled the headlines and the television screens, had no demonstrable effect on policy. The script was faithfully adhered to, with the Vice President ignoring the cautious advice of the experts and boldly invading centers of anti-American opposition. But it was an interior drama, enthralling for home consumption while meaning little beyond our own shores.

All this is relevant to the President's proposed visit to Japan and the massive demonstrations being staged against the Japanese-American defense treaty. He can go as planned, arriving in Tokyo on June 19, the date the treaty is due to become effective. And, defying the fanatical left-wing opposition, he could probably return to Washington for another reception, more triumphal arches and Government workers dismissed to stand on the sidewalk to greet him.

Doubts are increasing, however, as to the wisdom of this course. There remains a possibility of postponing the visit until after the elections in November. The Presdent would have a valid reason to put off the trip in view of the complications growing out of the collapse of the summit and the stormy consequences in Congress of what has happened during the past month.

The administration apparently feels under the necessity to cast recent events in such a way as to absolve the President of any blame for what went wrong. The account currently being given of what led to the collapse in Paris varies radically with what American reporters were being told as the events occurred.

The major effort seems to be to convince the public that the U–2 made no difference whatsoever to the outcome. Secretary of State Herter's story is that Soviet policy had undergone a complete switch before May 1.

But this is not what we were told in Paris by briefers who presumably had authorita-

tive knowledge. It was said quite plainly that if the U–2 had not occurred, the conference would have been held; as with many postwar conferences with Soviet Russia, it would have been harsh and even acrimonious; but it would in all likelihood have ended with a formula calling for another summit conference and the President would have made his visit to the Soviet Union.

This is, of course, an election year and the Democrats will try to exploit the U–2 and the collapse of the President's plans. But surely, even for the Eisenhower reputation, a little more candor would be helpful. We shall be told next that the Soviets invited pilot Francis G. Powers to make his flight over Sverdlovsk so that Premier Nikita Khrushchev would have a fine excuse to torpedo the summit.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Establishment of American Aluminum Co.—Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey and the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey saluting the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the American Aluminum Co. at Mountainside and Newark.

This firm was founded by three distinguished New Jersey families who have continued to operate it through 50 years and two generations. The firm was founded in 1911 by Joseph B. Klausmann, 14 South Crescent Road, Maplewood; Oscar Brucker, 25 Brookwood Drive, Maplewood, and the late Henry Brucker. At the time of his death in 1948, Mr. Brucker was said to be the oldest aluminum products manufacturer in the world.

The firm began by making a complete line of cooking utensils. They expanded from that into their present contract operation for the design, engineering, and manufacturing of aluminum products. They have made over 6,000 different items during their 50 years of business.

The company is owned and managed by Henry J. Brucker of 10 Portland Road, Summit, N.J.; Milton H. Klausmann of 26 Portland Road, Summit, N.J., both sons of the founders, and Edward B. Parsell of 122 Timber Drive, Berkeley Heights, N.J., a grandson. The two living founders continue as directors.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas the American Aluminum Co. of Mountainside and Newark is celebrating its 50th year as a New Jersey company; and

Whereas the American Aluminum Co. was founded in Newark in 1911 by Henry Brucker, Oscar Brucker and Joseph Klausmann, and is operated and managed now by their sons, Henry J. Brucker and Milton H. Klausmann and grandson, Edward B. Parsell; and

Whereas the American Aluminum Co has been in continuous operation in New Jersey since its founding and over that long span of time has made a significant contribution to the industrial capacity and economy of our State and has been an active and useful participant in community and civic development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, That their congratulations be extended to the American Aluminum Co. for its successful establishment and their sincere wishes for greater success in the next 50 years; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the president of the senate and attested by its secretary, be sent to the American Aluminum Co., Henry J. Brucker, president.

GEORGE HARPER,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

HENRY H. PATTERSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas, the American Aluminum Co. of Mountainside and Newark is celebrating its 50th year as a New Jersey company; and

Whereas, the American Aluminum Co. was founded in Newark in 1911 by Henry Brucker, Oscar Brucker, and Joseph Klausmann, and is operated and managed now by their sons, Henry J. Brucker and Milton H. Klausmann and grandson, Edward B. Parsell; and

Whereas, the American Aluminum Co. has been in continuous operation in New Jersey since its founding and over that long span of time has made a significant contribution to the industrial capacity and economy of our State and has been an active and useful participant in community and civic development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the members of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That their congratulations be extended to the American Aluminum Co. for its successful establishment and their sincere wishes for greater success in the next 50 years; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the general assembly and attested by its clerk, be sent to the American Aluminum Co., Henry J. Brucker, president.

MAURICE V. BRADY,
Speaker of the General Assembly.

Attest:

MAURICE F. KARP,
Clerk of the General Assembly.

Phillip Reed: Master Craftsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Afro magazine section of June 4, 1960:

PHILLIP REED, MASTER CRAFTSMAN—HE ADDED THE FINAL TOUCH—THE MAN WHO PUT THE STATUE OF FREEDOM ON TOP OF THE NATION'S CAPITOL WAS COLORED

Every schoolchild readily recognizes pictures of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C., but few knew that atop the Capitol is a statue of freedom, placed there by a colored metalworker.

His name was Phillip Reed, who in 1863 was a worker in a foundry owned by a man history identifies only as Mr. Mills.

J. A. Rogers in his latest book "Africa's Gift to America," details the circumstances under which Reed undertook his magnificient feat.

The Statue of Freedom was cast in bronze at the Mills foundry. When it was completed and ready for erection, the foreman who had superintended the work from the beginning went on strike.

He was being paid eight dollars, and demanded ten. The raise was refused, and he walked out.

Phillip Reed took his place. Piece by piece the huge masses of metal were bolted together, joint to joint and hoisted to the top of the dome.

Bear in mind that the height of the Capitol from its baseline on the east front to the top of the Statue of Freedom is 287 feet 5½ inches.

The first dome of the Capitol was made of wood, covered with copper. It was replaced with a dome made of cast iron by 1865. The job took 9 years to complete.

Original plans for the Capitol were drawn by Dr. William Thornton, of Tortola, West Indies. They were accepted in April 1793.

Cornerstone laying was held in September of the same year with Masonic ceremonies, President George Washington presiding. The first section of the building was made of sandstone quarried at Aquia Creek, Va.

The northern wing was completed first. Congress occupied it in 1800, the Supreme Court in 1801.

The southern section was occupied by the House of Representatives by 1807, but not completed until 1811.

Then came disaster. After 18 years of construction, the interior of the Capitol was destroyed by fire set by the British in 1814.

The building process began again. By 1819 the Capitol was reoccupied.

Once again, the Capitol is under construction. A major job of rebuilding the east front, at the point where the Presidents take the oath of office, was begun early in 1959 by order of Congress.

The east portico was removed to make way for an extension of 32½ feet forward of the east front.

The wall of the original portico will become an interior wall, and the new section will provide space for 42 new offices and other facilities.

The former facade of Virginia sandstone will be reproduced in Georgia marble. Congress has voted $17 million for this and other work.

The new facade is expected to be completed in time for the presidential inauguration of 1961. During its construction, the rotunda will be closed.

For vacationers who plan to visit the Nation's Capitol this summer, here is a brief rundown on visiting hours.

The Capitol is open from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. daily. The only exceptions are Christmas, New Year's Day, and Thanksgiving Day.

Tours are conducted through the Capitol from 9 a.m. to 3:55 p.m., and include a brief visit to the Senate and House; there is a small charge for this.

Foreign Commerce Study by Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the course of the foreign com-

merce study by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee there has been much realistic and knowledgeable testimony on the developments in our foreign trade situation. The very fact that the study is being made is a recognition that our trade position is seriously deteriorating. One of the best overall concise summaries of the general situation and the factors which have influenced our trade position was made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein. In the interest of bringing this information to the Members of Congress and the public generally at the earliest possible date, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Strackbein's testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MAY 10, 1960

The concern of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over the general position of this country in foreign trade is thoroughly justified by the developments of the past few years.

I shall not dwell on the deficit that the United States has been running in every year but one in its foreign account since 1950. Ample statistics have been supplied to you both by the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce. It is enough to say that both departments admit the serious aspects of this situation.

It was in recognition of this seriousness that several steps have been taken by these departments and the Department of State designed to correct or at least to alleviate the condition.

One of these steps was an effort to induce other countries to eliminate or reduce their restrictions against our exports. Another was an attempt to persuade other countries, particularly the industrially advanced ones, to shoulder a greater share of the foreign aid burden than has hitherto been carried by them. Yet another was the program recently launched by the Department of Commerce to increase our exports. There are other avenues for possible steps, such as increasing tourist expenditures in this country by foreign visitors; but the foregoing represent the principal lines of proposed activity.

It is the purpose in this statement to analyze these proposals in the light of the realities underlying our precarious competitive position in the world; and to appraise the effectiveness of the proposals.

In order to arrive at the causes of our present discomfiture in the world of foreign competition we must go back two decades or more and examine our economic history since the great depression of the early thirties. We cannot properly interpret the present situation by simply looking at it as if it were the result of a sudden development. It has been a long time shaping up, concealed by many counter currents that have now either run their course or greatly slackened.

One of our national movements was centered around the internal economic problems created by the depression; another was centered on our external economic relations, or trade. Our domestic economic policy began moving in one direction some 25 years ago while our foreign economic policy moved in the opposite direction. What we witness today is the success of some aspects of both these policies, with some distressing side effects.

On the domestic front we moved upward on the economic escalator. This movement was managed by a broad line of legislative enactments designed to increase purchasing power by putting more people to work at higher wages and shorter hours, by improving the farmer's market position, by evicting destitution among the aging and poverty-stricken through a system of social security, and by other subsidiary measures. We were launched on the upward path when World War II burst upon the scene with its vast demand upon production. During its course it accumulated a vast backlog of consumer demand. Atop of that, foreign demand from the war-torn countries after the war combined to bear our economy ever upward. Then the Korean outbreak provided a new stimulus just as we were about to settle onto a lower budget level. Latterly the cold war assured a resurgence of demand and the attainment of the upper levels of economic abundance. One of the greatest dangers during this whole period came from inflation because of the pressure of demand on our productive capacity. The whole world looked to us for equipment, food, and supplies. Little wonder that we landed on an economic plateau in relation to the rest of the world.

Much of the domestic economic legislation, mostly enacted before the war, had the effect of increasing the cost of production; but the greatest contribution of all to our present abode on stilts was the war itself and the the cold war aftermath. Taxes reached uprecedented levels; defense expenditures reached proportions never before experienced in peacetime. These expenditures, being almost pure waste in the economic sense, and paid for in the form of taxes, gave a great boost to production costs. High wages and high profits were a natural counterpart of the heavy call for goods generated by accumulated war-retarded demand and postwar foreign demand for our products.

Meantime we were dismantling our economic defenses in the form of tariffs. By a succession of trade agreements we brought down their protective effect a full 80 percent. We thought we did not need them. We apparently had nothing to fear from imports. The effects of the tariff reductions were hidden by the other factors just mentioned. Was it not clear that we were constantly selling more than we were buying from abroad? Obviously the thing to do was to take down our tariffs still more so that other countries could ship more freely into this country. They needed the dollars desperately, over and above the extensive aid we were extending to them, so that they could buy what they needed from us. We all remember the cry of the dollar gap.

It was true that we had higher wages by far than other countries; but our productivity, it was claimed, was so much higher per man-hour that we had nothing to worry about. Only some few industries that had a high labor content had anything to fear. The great mass production industries stood serenely above the storm. They were held to be invulnerable. So ran the chorus; and the tariff-cutting force reached a high momentum. Our tariffs, to repeat, have been taken down 80 percent.

Beyond tariff reductions, designed to help other countries, we brought thousands of productivity teams to this country so that the other countries might learn the magic of our vaunted industrial know-how; and in the last decade we shipped abroad $30 billion worth of the latest types of our equipment and machinery, much of it under the foreign aid program. This machinery greatly lifted foreign productivity.

Even as we succeeded, by the grace of a world war and subsequent highly unsettled international relations, in reaching unprecedented levels of employment and of national income, accompanied by a high level of costs and prices; we also succeeded in reconstructing the other leaders of the industrial world and putting them on the road to very efficient competitive capacity.

Therefore it is surprising that we should be surprised today over what has happened. Of course, success is often surprising.

The question is, if we knew how to get ourselves onto this spot do we know how to get off it?

The spot to which I refer is, of course, the one from which we see our domestic market constantly invaded by increasing volumes of foreign goods that readily undersell our own output. It is also the spot from which we see other countries recapturing their prewar shares of third markets in different parts of the world because foreign prices are lower than ours. It is the spot yet again from which we see our own industries rushing overseas to gain the advantage of lower costs of production and then shipping out from there to third countries and in some cases back to the United States itself.

Fundamentally the explanation is very simple. We have succeeded in running up our costs above world levels despite our great productivity. The modern machinery installed abroad has in many cases greatly increased productivity overseas. The textile industry is a good example. Japan, it is reported, has more modern textile machinery than we ourselves. Automobile plants in Europe are another example. Some of them are said to be ahead of us. Office machinery, such as typewriters and calculating machines, another. We can also mention tractors, electronic equipment, sewing machines, cotton, footwear, petroleum, and much else as examples of industries built up abroad by us. In more and more instances American companies manufacturing abroad are shipping back to this country.

It is estimated that of the 668,000 automobiles shipped to this country in 1959 approximately 28 percent were shipped by companies in England, Germany, and France that are subsidiaries or branches or largely owned by General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler.

One of the two sewing-machine companies that were still manufacturing in this country closed and went into importing about 2 years ago. The other company is bringing in some of its own machines built abroad. American watch manufacturers have opened up abroad and are importing from there. Typewriter and office machine companies are doing the same. Transistor radios coming from Japan in large quantities are in some instances the products of our own branches or subsidiaries or licensees producing in Japan.

In other instances it is against the policy of the parent American company to ship into this country from their foreign plants; but when foreign companies do so, this policy sometimes gives way.

Over the past two decades or more certain notions have been widely entertained about our trade and have been used in defense and support of the trade program. One was that the dollars earned by other countries through their exports to this country always come back in the form of demand for our goods. This motion has been thoroughly exploded by the facts. Since 1950 with the one exception of 1957, we have run a deficit of a billion dollars or more per year. In 1958 and 1959 combined this deficit was over $7 billion. In those 2 years over $3½ billion of gold was drained out of our stock at Ft. Knox.

During the past decade the claims of foreign countries against our gold stock has reached a point slightly in excess of this stock. Only recently these total foreign claims were reported to surpass our $19.4 billion in gold. Here, then, are some $20 billion that did not come back.

The brutal fact is that it was a great fallacy to say, as did the erudite economists, that the dollars earned abroad always come back. Perhaps they will in the long run; perhaps; but we cannot necessarily wait it out. Where are all these dollars? They are in foreign treasuries, central banks and what not: One thing is certain, wherever they are, they have not come back and they seem in no hurry to do so.

Another false notion widely disseminated by the economists during all these years was that regardless of our high wages we could nearly always produce more cheaply on the basis of unit cost than other countries. We were head and shoulders above other countries in this respect. Well, brutal facts have contradicted this notion as flatly as they contradicted the notion that our dollars would always come back to us.

It seems to be about time to rewrite some of this fallacious economics or point out that reality usually runs the so-called economic principles off the tracks through one unforeseen event or another.

There remains the forlorn hope that wages in other countries will one day soon catch up with ours. If they do it will be because ours stand very still or fall back. The evidence is all to the contrary. Only a week ago a report in the Journal of Commerce drew a curtain on this hope. The Banque de Bruxelles, Belgium, recently issued an analysis, says the Journal of Commerce, "indicating that the disparity between United States and European unit labor costs has been growing rather than diminishing." This should come as no surprise because of the relative weaker position of the labor unions in Europe compared with the American. The Belgian bank's experts, continued the report, "see little evidence of any decisive change in the near future." I would like to offer the article for the record at this point.

Finally, there are those who vehemently deny that we are priced out of foreign markets. It is, of course, demonstrably true that we are not priced out in all products. The evidence is unmistakable, however, that we are indeed priced out in a number of important lines and that the number of products is increasingly rapidly. Why, if this were not true, would so many of our companies seek oversea facilities of production?

The fact is that in those instances in which we have at hand a measure of relative prices it is a very common thing to find our products priced some 30 to 40 percent above those of the world generally.

In the case of wheat our price is some 60 to 65 cents per bushel above the world price. This is an overprice of some 30 to 35 percent. In the case of cotton we are overpriced by about 8 cents per pound. This again, is some 30 to 35 percent; and we now subsidize both wheat and cotton exports to that extent.

Are these mere coincidences? Are wheat and cotton prices out of line with industrial prices, and on a higher level? Tell that to the farmers. This may have been true 10 years ago but not today. In instance after instance in which foreign manufacturers bid on our Government contracts they underbid our bidders by 30 to 40 percent. Are these also coincidences? A few months ago when the Secretary of the Treasury ruled that the proceeds of the Development Loan Fund must be spent in this country his action was deplored editorially and otherwise. The Washington Post, a paper not noted for protectionist tendencies, said editorially that in the case of our loan to India this would mean that the appropriated funds would fall 40 percent short of the distance they would reach if India were free to spend the money in countries other than the United States. This was an open admission that foreign prices on a miscellany of materials and supplies are some 40 percent below American prices.

Everyday experience of one American industry after another that faces import competition confirms the evidence provided by the examples offered by wheat and cotton. In many instances foreign prices are lower by more than a mere 30 or 40 percent. Were it not for the lower prices why would imports in 1959 have risen by some $2½ billion over 1958? Why otherwise could imports capture a progressively higher share of the American market in more and more industries and with a rapidity that is astounding?

Considering the undoubtable fact that we are overpriced in many and a growing number of lines of products, how can we expect to expand our exports materially by sending more commercial attachés abroad and by exhortations to our exporters to resort to the "hard sell?" Sales abroad revolve more around prices and quality than they do about salesmanship.

It is reported from official sources that our exports have increased 21 percent during the first quarter of 1960 compared with 1959. Imports increased 10 percent. Two comments are in order. Imports in 1959 were already at an all time high, and by more than $2 billion; exports were well below their 1956–57 peak. The other comment is that a substantial share of the increase in exports took place in subsidized products, notably raw cotton. These exports would be close to zero but for the 30 to 35 percent subsidy.

If we go back now to inquire into the effectiveness of the program launched by the Government to counteract our deficit position, we are forced to the conclusion that it will not do the job without drawing yet more on the Treasury.

The foreign sales promotion program will do little to overcome the underlying effects of 25 years of domestic and foreign economic policy. The situation is too far out of adjustment to yield to so superficial a remedy.

The effort to induce other countries to remove their trade restrictions may succeed to a far degree. If it does, it will mean that other countries can afford to lift the barriers. Our price levels being what they are, the lifting of restrictions by other countries may be done quite safely in many instances. We may be sure in any case that no country will lay the restrictions so far away that they cannot reach them and readily pick them up again if it becomes necessary in their view to do so.

How far other countries will shoulder more of the foreign aid burden remains to be seen. Also how greatly tourist expenditures in this country by foreigners may be raised only the future will reveal.

Nothing in the program is aimed at the root of the trouble. This is to be found in the relatively high level of our prices and costs.

Under circumstances similar to this, that is, a deficit position, other countries placed severe restrictions on their imports, resorting in the process to import licenses, exchange controls, import quotas, and other devices.

It is to be noted that these restrictions helped inestimably in bringing those countries out of their predicament. The medicine was good for them. With our help it restored them to vigorous health. Their restrictions did not provoke retaliation among themselves nor from us.

Herein lies a lesson for us. Let us learn it and apply it before it is too late.

Cold War Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the recent harsh actions of Premier Khrushchev in Paris have touched off a never-ending series of opinions regarding the reason for them and the possible results.

One of the clearest expositions of the effect on our way of life has recently been written by Roscoe Drummond and was published in the Washington Post under date of Monday, June 6, 1960.

I hope that it will be interesting to my colleagues.

The article follows:

COLD WAR TACTICS—MR. K. ENTERS THE U.S. CAMPAIGN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The shape of the cold war which Premier Khrushchev intends to wage during the next 6 to 9 months is becoming clearer.

Thus far Mr. K. has been making it pretty evident that while he will continue to use provocative and violent language, he intends to refrain from provocative and violent actions. The tactic could change, but from everything which Mr. Khrushchev has said and done since Paris, it looks like the shape of things to come.

The forms which this tactic will take will almost certainly be these:

Premier Khrushchev is virtually breaking off diplomatic relations with the United States as long as President Eisenhower is in the White House.

He will likely take no overt step—like a separate peace treaty with East Germany—but he will permit no agreement in any East-West negotiations now in progress. Illustration: In the nuclear test ban talks at Geneva the Soviets have just pulled back their announced willingness to undertake joint research with the United States on better methods of underground detection.

In his long, discursive cable to Senators Lyndon Johnson and William Fulbright, Speaker Sam Rayburn and Adlai Stevenson, Mr. K. showed how eager he is to address the American people while intent upon keeping Mr. Eisenhower from speaking to the Soviet people.

The Khrushchev cable to the four Democratic leaders, who had sent to the President an expression of their support during the attempted summit casts fresh light on why the Soviets refused to negotiate in Paris. It suggests very clearly:

That Mr. Khrushchev concluded that President Eisenhower and General de Gaulle were not going to give him what he wanted at the summit.

That it was, therefore, better to have no negotiations than to fail to get what he hoped through negotiation.

That his next hope that the new administration in Washington, to be elected this fall, will be more responsive to Soviet views of fair settlements and that to Mr. Khrushchev a Democratic President would be more to his liking.

Mr. Khrushchev's telegram is a bald intervention in American domestic politics. He is obviously seeking to pin the label of "aggressor" on President Eisenhower. He

suggests that prominent political figures in the United States will agree with him and these remarks cannot mean other than that the Kremlin believes that any alternative to the Eisenhower-Nixon administration would be an improvement from its standpoint.

I believe that few Americans will attach any weight to Mr. Khrushchev's advice on selecting the next President of the United States. American voters would have no reason whatsoever to pay any attention to a Khrushchev attack or to a Khrushchev endorsement, direct or implied, of either nominee.

Mr. Khrushchev is many things, but he is not a reliable political adviser to the American people.

As to the Soviet pattern for the cold war, making it colder in words but not in overt acts, the real danger is that Communist China will use this interlude to mount some new military thrust into Laos, Vietnam, India, or Formosa.

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization foreign ministers, meeting in Washington last week, all say this is the threat which poses an immediate peril. Fortunately the countries directly concerned and the United States are alerted. To counter this danger it will take the same quality of firmness and courage with John Foster Dulles showed in refusing to see American forces pushed off Quemoy and Matsu in 1958.

Repeal of Silver Purchase Laws of 1934, 1939, and 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by 62 members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, with the signers' names and addresses, urging support for S. 3410, which I introduced on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and myself, and also the House companion bill introduced by Representative HIESTAND, of California.

This statement in support of S. 3410 and H.R. 11744 will, I know, be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement and signature and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT URGED FOR HIESTAND BILL (H.R. 11744) AND THE GREEN, PASTORE, BUSH, AND DODD BILL (S. 3410) TO REPEAL SILVER PURCHASE LAWS OF 1934, 1939, AND 1946

A STATEMENT BY 62 MEMBERS

The Hiestand bill, introduced on April 13, and the Green, Pastore, Bush, and Dodd bill, introduced on April 25 by Senator GREEN in behalf of himself and three associates, both of which provide for repeal of the silver purchase laws of 1934, 1939, and 1946, should be enacted because those three silver-purchase, silver-subsidy laws were not, and are not, defensible from the point of view of a good monetary system.

Fortunately, some of the provisions of those laws have not been enforced for the reason that such action would have been impracticable as well as unwise.

Silver as needed for subsidiary coinage purposes should be purchased by the U.S. Treasury at the lowest possible prices in free markets in response to demands for such coins as measured by offerings of other types of money or deposit currency in exchange.

SIGNED

John F. Adams, Temple University.
Willard E. Atkins, professor emeritus, New York University.
John W. Beck, Santa Cruz, Calif.
James Washington Bell, professor emeritus, Northwestern University.
H. H. Beneke, professor emeritus, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Claude L. Benner, Continental American Life Insurance Co., Wilmington, Del.
William A. Berridge, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, N.Y.
Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University.
Cecil C. Carpenter, University of Kentucky.
Lewis E. Davids, Sr., University of Georgia.
Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J., Marquette University.
Raymond de Roover, Boston College.
Charles A. Dice, professor emeritus, the Ohio State University.
Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University.
James C. Dolley, the University of Texas.
D. W. Ellsworth, vice president, E. W. Axe & Co., Inc., Tarrytown, N.Y.
Fred R. Fairchild, professor emeritus, Yale University.
Charles C. Fichtner, Buffalo, N.Y.
Roy L. Garis, University of Southern California.
Alfred P. Haake, economic consultant, Largo, Fla.
Donald M. Halley, Tulane University.
E. C. Harwood, director, American Institute for Economic Research.
Hudson B. Hastings, professor emeritus, Yale University.
George H. Hobart, professor emeritus, High Point College.
John Thom Holdsworth, the University of Miami.
Harold Hughes, Grove City College.
Frederic A. Jackson, Morgan State College.
Robert V. Jones, Chicago, Ill.
Emil Kauder, Illinois Wesleyan University.
James H. Kelleghan, economic consultant, Chicago, Ill.
Donald L. Kemmerer, University of Illinois.
Arthur Kemp, Claremont Men's College.
J. L. Leonard, professor emeritus, University of Southern California.
A. Wilfred May, executive editor, the Commercial & Financial Chronicle; faculty member, New School for Social Research, N.Y.
Constantine E. McGuire, Geneva, N.Y.
David H. McKinley, the Pennsylvania State University.
Austin S. Murphy, Canisius College.
Fred R. Riehaus, University of Colorado.
Russell M. Nolen, University of Illinois.
Melchior Palyi, Chicago, Ill.
W. A. Paton, University of Michigan.
Robert T. Patterson, American Institute for Economic Research.
Clyde W. Phelps, University of Southern California.
Chester A. Phillips, the State University of Iowa.
Helen C. Potter, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.
Charles L. Prather, the University of Texas.
Frederick G. Reuss, Goucher College.
Leland Rex Robinson, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
Martin E. Rooney, North Texas State College.
Olin Glenn Saxon, Yale University.
Charles Schertenleib, Georgetown University.
Arthur O. Sharron, Duquesne University.
R. Harland Shaw, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Chicago, Ill.
Murray W. Shields, University of Florida.
Walter E. Spahr, professor emeritus, New York University.
William H. Steiner, Brooklyn College.
Charles S. Tippetts, Mercersburg Academy.
James B. Trant, dean and professor emeritus, Louisiana State University.
Rufus S. Tucker, Westfield, N.J.
V. Orval Watts, economic consultant, Altadena, Calif.
Edward J. Webster, professor emeritus, American International College.
G. Carl Wiegand, Southern Illinois University.

Cyrus Eaton, Chairman of the Board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Delivers Significant Speech to Company Stockholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently Cyrus Eaton, chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, which is a major carrier in West Virginia, delivered a significant and provocative address to approximately 2,400 stockholders of that company who attended a meeting at Williamsburg, Va., marking the 175th anniversary of the founding of the C. & O. by George Washington.

Mr. Eaton's April 28, 1960, speech on that occasion provides a clear-cut expression of his views as a dedicated capitalist, both from the viewpoint of theory and practice, and deals with some of our important economic problems.

Mr. President, a speech of the nature delivered by Mr. Eaton merits our study and consideration, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from his speech.

There being no objection, excerpts from Mr. Eaton's speech were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY CYRUS EATON, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CHESAPEAKE & OHIO RAILWAY, AT MEETING MARKING 175th ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF C. & O. BY GEORGE WASHINGTON, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1960

Fellow stockholders, we can all take great satisfaction that George Washington, the founder and first president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway's predecessor company, excelled as a sound and successful businessman, as well as a superlative statesman.

Washington was a capitalist, both in theory and in practice. In 1785, when our predecessor company was chartered, he opened its stock subscription books at $200 a share. The enterprise prospered, so that the stock was selling for $400 a share within a few years.

A question of paramount importance to all of my fellow stockholders today is, I am sure, can we ever again have our stock selling for $400 a share? My answer is, If all

the railroads of America could be emancipated from the bondage of Federal Government regulations, and really be permitted to practice free enterprise, I am certain we could pursue policies that would again bring our stock to the $400 level.

Our railroad has done well, it is true, because of the extraordinary dedication and devotion of our entire organization. The C. & O. probably has the most continuous record of success of any railroad in the world. But we can do infinitely better if the Government wraps are removed. You, of course, appreciate that this is a family party, where one can speak with complete frankness.

Last week I devoted a day in Toledo, Ohio, to inspecting our modern docks and examining our matchless new coal loading facilities. In Toledo we, in fact, have the most modern and most efficient coal docks in the world. We can put 300 cars of coal into a 20,000-ton ship in less than 4 hours. I am vastly impressed with what the Toledo installation represents in human intelligence, skill and accomplishment.

From Toledo I went to Detroit for a day at the Ford Motor Co. I spent several hours in the Henry Ford Museum, a building that covers 8 acres, all under one roof. The museum displays models of all forms of transportation from the earliest times until now, and also exhibits replicas of material progress in many other fields of industry and science.

My visit to the museum was made in company with distinguished representatives of our Federal Government. All of us became acutely conscious of the vast progress that has been made from the days of the ox-drawn covered wagon to the miracles of modern-day transportation.

The system devised by our wise Founding Fathers was appropriate for the time when the Federal Government played only a small part in the affairs of the Nation, and when the individual States held most of the authority and made most of the decisions. In recent years, the power and size of the Federal Government have increased far beyond the point contemplated by the Founding Fathers. Let me just cite an example or two of outworn features of our Government.

A Congressman faced with a primary and a final election every 2 years has, in effect, an election every year. With only 2 years between these congressional contests, as compared with 4 years between presidential elections, frequent conflict is bound to arise between the legislative and executive branches of government. Meanwhile, we are forced to witness the biennial spectacle of candidates from the same party fighting each other in the primaries, and furnishing fuel to the opposition by denouncing each other in undignified fashion. I submit that national elections should be held at 4-, or perhaps even 6-year intervals, and that all Federal elective offices should be filled at the same time.

Let me give you another illustration that seriously affects our railroad industry. In recent years a total of 75 so-called independent governmental agencies have been created in Washington. The men who run these bureaus are not responsible to either the executive or legislative branches of the Government. The occupants of these offices are human, so they are constantly seeking an extension of their powers. Well-meaning though they are, they consume endless time in efforts to interpret statutes. They feel that their main task is to crib, cabin and confine American industry and finance, and all of their ramifications. The railroad industry is the most completely regulated. Management is not permitted to use, on behalf of stockholders, the imagination and drive that are essential to success in the capitalistic system. One of the weaknesses of our Government that demands sweeping changes is the vast system of bureaucracy represented by these Federal agencies.

I appeal to you stockholders to take a personal interest in these political problems. The main buttress of free enterprise and the capitalistic system is the stockholder. If all stockholders of all companies would speak up at one time on a given subject, their voices would have a far-reaching effect on the politicians. In my economic philosophy, I believe every man and woman should be a stockholder in some corporation. I should like to see all men and women who work for companies have a personal stake in the ownership of those companies. This would bring labor and labor leadership into partnership with the management of corporations, big and small, and the combined influence would be irresistible.

We urgently need a revival of the spirit of George Washington, both as applied to business and to government. We urgently need a new constitutional convention to bring our Federal Government up to date and put it in harmony with the marvelous progress of science, business, industry and finance. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, I may add, would be proud to extend the superb facilities of our Greenbrier Hotel for such a constitutional convention.

We have neglected George Washington's example and advice. The Father of our Country warned us against entangling alliances. He reiterated, again and again, that we should never let our foreign policies be influenced by prejudices against any other nation. We have flagrantly disregarded these two pieces of sound advice. We are now inextricably entangled with one third of the nations of the world. We are angling for alliances with another third through a lavish foreign aid program. Finally, we are permitting prejudice to lead us into bitter wrangling with the remaining third. As Walter Lippmann wrote a few days ago, the ghost writers of the State Department and the Defense Department cannot compose a letter or issue a statement concerning any part of the Communist world without employing vulgar and opprobrious epithets.

These policies that flout the advice of George Washington are burying us under a crushing burden of taxation. If they are allowed to go to the length of flaring into open war, our people will be annihilated and everything that industry and science have created will be utterly destroyed. If the wise man who founded this transportation system and started his country on the road to greatness were alive today, he would move vigorously to restore us to common sense and wisdom.

For my peroration, may I borrow a couple of lines from Wordsworth. "Washington! thou shouldst be living at this hour: America hath need of thee."

Graphic Arts Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Buffalo Newspaper Guild, Local 26, in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsors a competition whereby staff members enter their respective work which was published in their newspaper during the year.

More than 300 entries were submitted by staff members of four Niagara Frontier daily newspapers. The winners were selected by newsmen in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Toronto.

Buffalo Evening News staff members won all five awards in the graphic arts—three in photography, and one each for cartooning and illustration. Its reporters and editors took both sports writing prizes and also scored in the editorial writing, individual reporting, woman's page and headline writing categories.

The Buffalo Evening News winners were:

Millard H. Browne, chief editorial writer of the News, who won the prize for the best editorial with an inspiring observation directed toward the "Class of 1959."

Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist, Bruce Shanks, scored again with a cartoon that asked what Premier Khrushchev had in his other hand on the occasion of his American visit last year.

For his analysis and description of the uproar attending the Buffalo reassessment job, Ernie Gross, a News city hall reporter, carried off the prize for the best individual reporting.

A heading on a story about the button industry's woe—"Buttons All at Loose Ends as Zippers Pull to the Top"—gained the best headline awards for Elwood M. Wardlow, assistant copy desk chief.

Jean Reeves Allan won the prize for the best woman's page writing, with three interviews with home economists at a convention.

A stunning story about people who drive in the classic 500-mile Memorial Day race at Indianapolis won Jack Horrigan, sportswriter, the accolade for the top sports feature.

Dick Johnston's piece about a preseason clash between the world champion Montreal Canadiens hockey team and the Buffalo Bisons won the sports news story award.

A warm pen-and-ink sketch of St. Bonaventure University's late Reverend Thomas Plassman to accompany a feature story about the famous "Father Tom" won John A. Sunley this year's illustrator's award.

The Buffalo Courier-Express had three winners—one in feature writing, one in spot news category, and the other in interpretive writing. They are:

Richard Hirsch, who won his award in feature writing for his weekly column "Offhand," which has appeared in the Sunday Courier-Express for more than 2 years. This is the second award he has won for his column. He also won another award last year for a series, and a fourth award as well as the Walter O. Bingham plaque in 1956 for journalistic achievement.

George Wyatt won his award in the spot news category for an interview of a Massachusetts resident who was kidnaped in his car and threatened with death until he escaped in Amherst. He was cited for presenting the interview in "an interesting and dramatic manner."

William Folger, a previous winner in 1956, won his award in interpretative writing for his weekly column on the church page. His column also won him a Freedom Foundation award earlier this year.

Three photography awards went to the following News staffers:

Robert L. Smith's shadowy dramatic picture of physicians at Our Lady of Victory Hospital trying to revive an asphyxiation victim won the spot news picture award.

Merrill D. Matthews scored in the feature picture category with a Thanksgiving picture showing a small boy trying to hold down a large turkey.

Two speeding girls racing to the finish wire in the Erie County Junior Olympics gave William Dyviniak the honors in the sports picture department.

One winner will be selected from all these categories for the 1959 Walter A. Bingham Memorial Award, a prize honoring a late Buffalo Evening News photographer.

The U–2, a New Kind of Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a very fine address on the summit conference delivered a few days ago by a distinguished American, Lt. George W. Lee, of Memphis, Tenn.:

THE U–2, A NEW KIND OF CROSS
(By George W. Lee)

History records as the most dramatic crucifixion, the Saviour on a rugged cross, it was a supreme effort to erase from the minds of men through physical death: the image of one who had come to bring peace and brotherhood to the world, but the effort failed when Jesus of Nazareth rose again.

Today history writes a new story of the attempted crucifixion of a man on the wings of an airplane who had come to lessen the tension and establish good will among the nations of the earth: but it too failed, when President Eisenhower rose from the ashes of the summit conference to a hero's acclaim in Portugal, echoes of that tumultuous acclaim traveled with the drift of the wind to Washington, to London, to Moscow and then back to Gettysburg where once another President rose on a gusty afternoon darkened by fierce civil strife and called to a divided nation to rise and shape itself into the proudest story of time.

Wiser men than I hold myself to be had long ago predicted the failure of the summit conference. In the first place the four heads of state represent about half of the population of the world. If they had had a happy conference there still would have been the question of what to do about China, of what to do about Africa, of what to do about India. They represent forces that hang heavier in the air than the U–2 plane incident, over the air of Russia.

A study of current history might reveal the motive that caused why the rotund, barrel-shaped, waving Khrushchev to wreck the summit conference. Hitler was the last of a long line of dictators who dreamed of conquering the geographical boundaries of the world; he harnessed science to the chariot of destruction and tried to baptize the last spark of freedom in rivers of blood. But Hitler's death opened the door to a cold age in which dictators no longer dreamed of conquering the geographical boundaries of the world, but rather the conquest of the minds of men; thus Khrushchev with the tremendous firepower of Communist propaganda aimed at the conquest of the hearts of all created mankind, as a prelude to the final conquest of world's boundaries against which the marshaled forces of capitalism could not prevail.

So Mr. Khrushchev set out on a good will mission posing as the 20th century prince. He visited country after country and crowds proclaimed him. He was making great headway in developing the yellow and black worlds as well as the white Christian West into the Bolshevik orbit. And then something happened; President Eisenhower moved forward into the breach. It was at a time when world's resentment of America was at its height that President Eisenhower set out on a world's tour to demonstrate the strength of democratic idealism and attitudes to a neutral world of more than a billion people. In cities where only thousands had proclaimed Khrushchev, millions proclaimed Ike. No figure in world's history had been followed by mankind with greater devotion. At the end of his triumphal tour he had almost neutralized world suspicion of our aims into the bright sunshine of a democratic tomorrow; more than that he had almost pushed Khrushchev and his dream of grandeur down the runways to oblivion. So Mr. Khrushchev destroyed the summit conference in a vain effort to destroy the magic name of Eisenhower and erase from the minds of men the Eisenhower image.

President Eisenhower reinforced and strengthened the American tradition by refusing to bow to Khrushchev. His crusade all over the globe for a new world of freedom and peace has not been sidetracked by the brass effrontery, the unmitigated gall of Nikita Khrushchev. The world will long remember the way in which our President met Mr. Khrushchev's bruising words and unkind speech with such admirable poise and tempered words. While Khrushchev was trying to exploit the plane episode in a harmful manner and making preposterous demands, Ike was trying to save the hopes that millions of people had in this summit meeting by turning the right cheek: by offering to stop spy flying over Russia and by challenging Khrushchev to two-way talks: when Mr. President stated that we don't want another Pearl Harbor, 100 million American voices rise in unison with a cry, "God bless Ike."

Other Presidents have done good things in the past, but Eisenhower has done a little bit more. Roosevelt boasted of his great social welfare program. When Ike came on the scene he extended social security and old-age pension to domestic and farm workers and covered 10 million additional people. The Democrats talk about job opportunities under Roosevelt but Eisenhower has done even there a little bit more. Nearly every American who wants a job today has one. There are more people at work in the United States than ever before in our history. The American Negro and white worker are making $12 a week more than they ever made before. The annual income of the American Negro today is $15 billion, this more than the yearly income of the whole population of the Dominion of Canada.

The Democrats talk about Mr. Truman's civil rights program, but in this field Mr. Eisenhower has done a little bit more. When the President took office 40 percent of the Army all-Negro units were still intact; 75 percent of the Negroes in the Navy were servants in the segregated messmen's branch. Today there is not a single all-Negro unit in the Army. Mr. Truman talked about the equality of man under God, but Mr. Eisenhower did a little bit more than talk. The very Capital in which Mr. Truman lived was one of the most segregated cities in the world, but Mr. Eisenhower, like Jesus driving the merchants and the moneychangers from the temple of God, drove segregation from the temple of freedom.

The Democrats point to the Negro leaders Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt appointed to office which was Governor or judge of the Virgin Islands and a few advisers to somebody, but Mr. Eisenhower has done a little bit more. He has appointed 300 Negroes to top positions. Among them are, Chairman of the U.S. Parole Board, a full-fledged Presidential secretary and an Assistant Secretary of Labor. The Democrats talk about Mr. Truman's appointment of an integrated committee to study the educational opportunities in America and make recommendations for change but Mr. Eisenhower did a little bit more. He plucked education out of the heavens and put it in the reach of the poor and today 300,000 Negro children are the beneficiaries.

The Democrats say that Mr. Truman made it possible for Negroes to have a sandwich in the dining car behind the curtain, but Mr. Eisenhower went a little bit further. He made it possible for the Negro to have a meal in the dining car with the curtains down. The Democrats claim to be a friend of the poor man, yet they sent millions of them to die on foreign battlefields. Mr. Eisenhower proved to be a little better friend. He went to the battlefield and brought back the soldiers that Mr. Truman sent to die in an undeclared war.

The Democrats claim that the Negro's progress in freedom can be best served under them. Yet, their party is split down the middle on freedom and almost a hundred Senators and Congressmen—all Democrats—signed a manifesto against extending opportunity to the Negro American. But Eisenhower has done a little bit more. He has signed a declaration on equality and dignity for all people whatever their racial origin. While the Democrats struggle to retain prejudice in America as a motive for action Eisenhower seeks to destroy prejudice with the full knowledge that its existence threatens the destruction of America.

Today we are showing great concern over Russian boasted conquest of outer space but if it is balanced by a purposeful exploration of inner space we will achieve the purpose of history, a world of free men living together in peace and brotherhood.

What won the last World War?

A Hurricane of Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, for the opening of the Moral Re-Armament Assemblies at Caux, Switzerland and Mackinac Island, Mich., this month, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman prepared an address entitled "A Hurricane of Commonsense." Because of the important message which Dr. Buchman conveys in his address, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Without objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HURRICANE OF COMMONSENSE

(By Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman)

There is a hurricane of commonsense sweeping through the world. "A Hurricane of Commonsense"—that was the headline in a newspaper read by the leaders of Washington. It refers to the manifesto Ideology and coexistence which in the last six months has gone to 73 million homes throughout the United States, Canada, Scandinavia, Germany, Italy, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Greece, and Turkey, as well as India, South Africa, South America, Australia, and Japan. It has already been translated into 24 different languages, and will be read by the millions. It puts squarely to the modern world the choice—Moral Re-Armament or communism.

My old friend General Guisan, wartime commander in chief of the armies of Switzerland, wrote the foreword to the Swiss edition. In it he said, "On the ideological plane neutrality can be dangerous, for refusal to fight for what is right plays the enemy's game. The training center at Caux is a unique instrument that has changed the conduct of nations. I long that our whole people should face realistically the forces which confront each other today, that we draw from our traditions a relentless determination to safeguard at all costs the freedoms we inherit."

This was the last public statement General Guisan made. When he died 300,000 citizens of Switzerland stood in silent tribute to the man who was regarded as the savior of his nation. His widow wrote to me, "General Guisan was gripped by the idea and the might of Moral Re-Armament. In the evening of his life it was a great girder of support to him."

MIGHTY WIND OF HOPE

Moral Re-Armament is a hurricane of commonsense sweeping irresistibly through the heart of nations. It is smashing down the barriers between nations and races, dispersing the fogs of hate that threaten humanity and bringing a mighty wind of hope to the millions of the earth.

Hoffnung—Hope—is the name of the play God put in the mind of a miner from the Ruhr. He is a worker at the coalface. He had never thought of writing a play. He changed. He found an answer to division in his home, his nation, and the world. Chancellor Adenauer heard of this play and sent for this Ruhr miner and his friends. He asked them to go to Britain and France to prepare the way for his own visits to those countries. "Many of us Germans," he said, "do not realize how deep are the wounds in other countries which were caused by what we did through having the wrong ideology." In an exclusive article in the New York Journal-American headlined "Adenauer Calls MRA World's Hope", the Chancellor said, "A nation with an ideology is always on the offensive. A nation without an ideology is self-satisfied and dead."

In Britain, Hoffnung was like a hurricane. It shifted the prejudices of years. In the spirit of Moral Re-Armament men like James Coltart, executive of the British press and television, took inspired and fearless action to prepare for Chancellor Adenauer's visit. His time in Britain was hailed as a triumph. Back in Bonn the Chancellor at a meeting of the Christian Democratic Party referred to the mistrust between Britain and Germany which had been swept aside, and said, "We have to thank Moral Re-Armament for that."

In Paris, French audiences stood and cheered. Some were in tears as the German miners sang the Marseillaise in French.

There is a shrine at Mont Valérien where during the occupation 4,500 Frenchmen of the resistance met their death. To Mont Valérien went those Ruhr miners. They were escorted by the wife of the General at the head of the French nation's defense and the niece of President de Gaulle. They were the first Germans to go there in 15 years. They gave news of an idea powerful enough to unite nations separated by generations of hate. They expressed their sorrow for the past and their resolve to lay down their lives to rebuild Europe and the world. The columns of Figaro gave the news of this event to the French nation.

CATHOLIC COLLEGES RESPOND

Vaterland, leading Swiss Catholic newspaper, reported the response to the miners' play in the monastery schools of central Switzerland under the headline, "Catholic Colleges Hail MRA Play." Vaterland reported Rektor Scherrer of Schwyz as saying, "We can all subscribe to the principles of MRA. To recognize absolutely the dominion of God, or to bow down under the domination of human tyrants, that is the alternative which should unite us all whether we are Catholics, Christians, or non-Christians." Vaterland also reported how Father Rektor Thommen of Kollegium Niklaus von der Flue in Sarnen declared, "Because you live what you believe, we can wholeheartedly accept this ideology."

In Luxembourg where the German miners were Government guests, the Prime Minister, Pierre Werner, said, "The moral and spiritual values on which your actions are based are the ideology that can save the Christian West from its enemy."

The hurricane blew into Kerala and its 16 million inhabitants, the first major state in the world to vote itself in the Communist camp. Night after night vast crowds flocked to hear the evidence of Moral Re-Armament. Mannath Padmanabhan, father of his state, leader of the Hindu majority in Kerala, had found at Caux the secret of uniting with Christians. The governor of the state, the cabinet ministers, trade union leaders, industrial men and students in their hundreds and their thousands came to hear the news of an answer.

COMMUNISM OUSTED IN KERALA

Archbishop Gregorius of Trivandrum said, "History will record our permanent gratitude to Mannath Padmanabhan not only for having ousted the Communist regime in Kerala, but for creating the unity of all the communities following his return from Caux." The governor of the state, Ramakrishna Rao, then said, "All our problems, political, economic, individual, must be solved in the spirit of MRA. It has an essential appeal to every man."

Men changed in Kerala. The leader of 38,000 students made the experiment of listening to the voice of God. He said, "I am going to end impurity in my own life and clean up the student body. It is through moral compromise among the students that communism has gripped us. I see that the choice for India is Moral Re-Armament or communism, and I choose Moral Re-Armament."

Rajmohan Gandhi, grandson of my old friend Mahatma Gandhi whom I met on the first of my nine visits to India in 1915, said, "Without Moral Re-Armament the new government in Kerala might already have fallen. Moral Re-Armament will save India and Asia and the world from Communist take over." When Chou En-lai arrived in India for his conferences with Prime Minister Nehru, the Times of India and the Hindustan Times carried full pages with the double banner headline, "Moral Re-Armament—the Next Step for Communists and Non-Communists Alike."

These pages challenged the two men who today lead 1 billion Asians to find a new way of doing things for the sake of all men everywhere. They said in part "Communism has failed to produce the new type of man—the unselfish man who can develop and run the unselfish society. The ideology of MRA changes people. That is why thousands of former Communists all over the world are fighting the battle of Moral Re-Armament to restore the world on the basis of absolute moral standards." It was a real hurricane, and it was common sense.

IN JAPAN A MASSIVE IMPACT

When Chancellor Adenauer arrived in Tokyo for his state visit, he was welcomed at the airport by his miners from the Ruhr. He spoke to a joint session of the Japanese Diet calling for a moral ideology that could unite East and West and answer Khrushchev's challenge to take over the world. Next day in the Japanese Diet a cabinet minister said, "Chancellor Adenauer proclaimed Moral Re-Armament to Japan."

The miners had come to Japan in response to an invitation from Japan's Prime Minister and other leaders of the country and they were the guests of the Japanese throughout their 6-week visit. A special train was put at their disposal by Governor Sogo of the Japanese National Railways in gratitude for the sanity of the news they brought.

Prime Minister Kishi said, "You are giving a moral backbone to the whole world. I wish to express my gratitude for the massive impact MRA has made on this nation during the past 6 weeks. The reports which I have received from all over Japan have convinced me of the effectiveness of this mission in giving ideological clarity and a moral answer to our people."

ANSWER TO CRISIS

A leader of the Japanese Socialist Party at a crisis point early this year said that Moral Re-Armament has played a key part in healing a fresh split in their ranks and prevented communism from taking over. A leader of the Seinendan, a political organization of 4,300,000 youth, cabled me at Easter saying that MRA had once again won every seat from the Communists at the annual election in spite of the Communists' outpouring of manpower and money in the last 12 months.

A trade union leader tells how, through Moral Re-Armament, the president of one of the great mines of Japan was changed and as a result of his change 3,500 miners who needed 3,000 armed police to keep them from attacking the president went back to work satisfied that their just claims were being met.

RESTORING JAPAN'S DESTINY

At the Miike mine, where workers had fought workers at the pithead, one man had been killed and hundreds injured. The leader of the organized women of the mine said, "You brought us the answer to hate. Without it more would have been killed and injured. MRA is the answer to every injustice and human hate."

And one of the great men of Japan, primarily responsible today for the security of his country, said, "For the first time since the end of the war you have given me hope. Moral Re-Armament is restoring a sense of destiny to a hundred million Japanese people. You are talking straight to us and cleaning us up in homes and politics. You are saying to us what no on else has dared to say."

A movie is going out to the millions which says what needs to be said in a way that the modern man understand, accepts, and follows. It is a full-length Technicolor musical called "The Crowning Experience," which in the words of Arthur Baker, for 21 years chief of the parliamentary staff of the Times of London, is of "indescribable beauty. Its message is so deep that it needs to be seen again and again and yet again. It answers all the hunger and hurts of nations."

THE CROWNING EXPERIENCE

When Spyros Skouras, president of 20th Century Fox, saw this movie, he threw his arms in the air saying, "Fantastic, fantastic, fantastic. This must go to every movie theater throughout the world."

S. S. Vasan, president of the Indian Film Federation, said of it, "A thousand times wonderful. You have shown me not only how to make a film, but how to live a life."

And the leadership of the nations of Africa are clamoring for "The Crowning Experience." They say it will blow like a hurricane through the hearts of the Africans and heal the hating of a continent. Dr. Azikiwe, the man to whom 35 million Nigerians say they largely owe their freedom, says, "I spent many years in America where I was fed with the bread of bitterness. It took me 15 years to find an answer to my spirit of revenge. I found that answer at Caux." He added that "The Crowning Experience" attacks with tact and subtlety the social inequalities that have created wrong ideologies between men and gives definite promise of a cure. And he says, "Moral Re-Armament was the secret of independence for Nigeria."

Jasper Savanhu, first African to be a member of the Federal Government of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, says "The Crowning Experience" must be seen by every African, black and white, this year. He says, "Winning political power will not by itself secure the future of the African. We can throw off the foreign yoke and then find African leaders who live only for personal advantage. Unless leadership is inspired by Moral Re-Armament, there is no future for the people. Moral Re-Armament is the solution to the greed, ambition, selfishness, and competition in high places all over the world."

END OF BLOODSHED IN AFRICA

Leaders for the 40 million French-speaking Africans eagerly demand "The Crownin Experience" for their people. They say its message could bring the bloodshed in Africa to an end. Gabriel Marcel, the world-famous French writer and philosopher, said after seeing it and talking with leaders from Africa, "I came to Caux in despair. Here I have found a transfusion of hope. A deep confidence flowed back into my being."

White and black leadership in South Africa want their Cabinet and the whole country to see this movie. They say it holds the secret that alone can cure the racial divisions that are tearing South Africa apart, dividing her from other countries, and undermining her economic life.

LITTLE ROCK—GOD'S WAY

Mrs. Daisy Bates, Negro leader of Little Rock, Ark,, known all over the world for the part she played in the battle with Governor Faubus over racial integration in the schools, saw "The Crowning Experience." She said, "Magnificent. It must go everywhere. It is essential in the South, but MRA is now needed throughout the world. It will soon catch the imagination of the whole world. Nothing else on the scene can do it."

Mrs. Bates, and her husband, as publisher of a newspaper, came to our training center in Mackinac Island, Mich. There Mr. Bates said, "For the first time in my life I have lost my hatred of the white man." On her return to Little Rock, Mrs. Bates invited some of the leading citizens of her State, white people who had also been to Mackinac, to dinner in her home. They came—the first time in the history of Arkansas that such a dinner-party had been possible. After dinner, Mrs. Bates suggested a time of quiet in which together they should seek God's way of ending the deadlock. The thought came that Mrs. Bates should visit Governor Faubus, the man who for years had been pictured to the world as her bitterest enemy. She trembled, but she went. She said later, "The Governor could not have received me more graciously if I had been the President." They shook hands, and the picture of that handshake went round the world. Governor Faubus had previously said, "Moral Re-Armament is sowing the seeds that will prove to be the salvation of us all."

FIGHT FOR WHAT IS RIGHT

Mrs. Bates told an audience in Washington, "Without Moral Re-Armament it would have been impossible for me to meet Governor Faubus without hate. But I have learned to fight for what is right without hatred. I want Moral Re-Armament for the children of the South and of America. We can see on the horizon a new day." A major American network in its review of 1959 described this handshake as possibly the most significant news event of the year, which could mark the end of a hundred years of civil war in the United States of America.

In the Republics of South America the hurricane is blowing too. Millions read the news of an answer. Millions more hear it over the radio. In one week alone all the main newspapers of Montevideo carried reports of the world work of MRA, and eighteen leading papers of Argentina, Uruguay, and Peru carried 51 articles. A leading editorial in La Prensa, the largest newspaper of Peru, said, "Moral Re-Armament has a unique strength for the ideological battle in the world today. It is an insistent call to all who believe in a supreme creator to confront those who preach atheism. It is a world effort to defeat materialism. The morally rearmed are not an easy prey to materialist indoctrination."

ECONOMIC AID NOT ENOUGH

Eudocio Ravines, one of the great revolutionaries of our time who, trained by Mao Tse-tung, introduced communism to Peru and Chile, met in Moral Re-Armament a superior ideology that changed him. He says, "The basic problems of Latin America are not underdevelopment, but corruption and communism. While our countries welcome economic aid, alone it cannot touch the root problem. Without a moral ideology, it may even aggravate the problem. The best export the United States of America or any nation can send to Latin America is Moral Re-Armament."

THE BATTLE WE CANNOT LOSE

In a long lifetime of experience that has taken me to all parts of the world and brought me in touch with every sort of people, I have never seen a greater hunger and a greater hope than we find today. Man must choose the road of commonsense or he will inevitably take the path of common suicide.

Mr. P. J. Little, the well-known statesman and thinker of Ireland, put the challenge clearly in the Dublin Sunday Press. His article about moral rearmament occupied two central pages. It was headed, "World War III—the war of ideas—the battle we cannot lose."

He said, "The cold war has only to heat up to boiling point for 10 seconds, and civilization will be blasted into eternity. Ideas, not bombs, will determine who wins the battle of ideologies, and on this battle depends the length of time we have left to live and whether our children will ever grow up."

But the far-seers of this century recognize in moral rearmament the certainty of cure. My friend Robert Schuman of France, who has twice written the foreword to the French edition of my published speeches, puts it this way, "moral rearmament is a philosophy of life applied in action that I have seen reaching the millions. It is a worldwide transformation of human society that has already begun."

VOICE TO THE KREMLIN AND WASHINGTON

It needs a hurricane of commonsense to bring men to their senses, restoring the Communist and the non-Communist worlds to sanity and unity before it is too late. That hurricane is sweeping through every nation today, and in the midst of the hurricane the still, small voice of the living God, an unseen but ever-present guide, willing and able to speak to the men of the Kremlin, the men of Washington, to the millions everywhere, leaders and led, who have lost their way and seek to find it.

It is so normal. It is so practical. It is a hurricane. And it is commonsense.

Masonry Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address delivered by the Honorable Wiley Odell May, most worshipful grand master of Free and Accepted Masons of Tennessee.

It is truly a fine statement of masonry, and regardless of any man's faith I am sure he will gain much by full explanation of what masonry really stands for.

The address follows:

MASONRY SPEAKS

As grand master of Free and Accepted Masons of the great State of Tennessee, I bring you a message of Masonry's rightful place in the history of the past, the present and the future and of our desire to instill in the hearts of Masons a love for the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This ancient and honorable fraternity, of which each of us is a part, is the largest and oldest group of men in the history of mankind. Although its origin is to a great extent obscure, we do know that a Lodge of Freemasons was established in York, England in the year A.D. 926 and all down through the ages Masonry has stood foremost for the inalienable rights and freedoms of the individual. It has been one of the outstanding contributors to the principles of free government for well over a thousand years. This group of dedicated men must have had divine sanction or we would not have remained intact—grown, and prospered—for such a long period of this world's history.

Each of us can point with justifiable pride to our Masonic heritage. Who among you would be ashamed to walk arm and arm with such men as George Washington, Paul Revere, John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson and on down through the years with such men of vision and greatness as Andrew Jackson, Sam Houston, James K. Polk, John Sevier and many distinguished brethren of our own State.

We are a chosen people, numbering some five million in these United States, who are privileged to meet around an altar with men of every rank and walk of life. Being one in spirit and hope, we can disagree and not bear malice, discuss and not dispute and learn to respect the viewpoint of our fellowman. Where we inquire "What Is Your Need?" not "What Is Your Creed?". We linger here for a brief period and are gone on morrow but while we are here, each should do his part in the warfare against evil, intolerance and ignorance. Long after our bodies have returned to dust and our spirits to God who gave them, this venerable fraternity will continue this battle. This great country was founded on the principles and teachings of our fraternity and it is up

to each of us to guard those principles with every means at our command. It is my earnest belief that the greatest contribution we can make as Masons is to create within ourselves a more diligent faith in God and our form of Democracy. The time has come when we must, with consecrated courage, stand forth for what we believe to be right.

For some time, I have been concerned regarding the truth about ourselves as a fraternity when we have been held up to ridicule, irreverance and critical questioning. I feel it is our duty, and certainly not at variance with the landmarks we have so long adhered to and respected, to answer our enemies. Somewhere along the line we have fallen into a state of complacency. I believe we now have a great decision to make—whether to break forth from this shell or permit ourselves to smother in indifference.

It would ill become our fraternity to engage in name-calling quarrels with any person or group. Indeed, it would nullify everything that we stand for. But the American public and the profane are entitled to know the truth about our teachings and principles as a fraternity. It's time we let Masonry speak.

Have you heard "Freemasonry is a secret society"? This statement is not true. Freemasonry is a society which keeps matters secret. The organization, its officers and its purposes are not secret. Freemasons meet in temples. Many of these are beautiful, prominent buildings in the cities and towns in which they are erected. Men enter and leave these temples openly, not secretly. A number of grand lodges, including our own, publish the names of many of its members in their proceedings. Many lodges issue directories of their membership. Men wear the square and compasses on their lapels. "Who's Who" lists Masonic membership in many of its biographies. Masons appear in public at cornerstone layings and at funerals. These are not the characteristics of a secret society. The vast majority of Masons are proud of being a member of the fraternity. They boast of it, knowing the general public thinks of Freemasonry as an honor, that not everyone can be a Mason and that it is a character building organization of good men. In this country, the Masonic fraternity, whose only objectives are charity and the building of character, counts 5 million men in its membership. It is difficult to understand how such a number, proudly asserting their affiliation, can constitute a secret society.

Another misconception that has gained national publicity in recent years is the claim that Masonry detracts, or is endeavoring to take the place of organized religion. This claim is revolting and repulsive to all of our true brethren. This statement is so untrue and ridiculous (if it were not for the seriousness of the assertion) as to be comical. Freemasonry is not, I repeat, is not a religion—it has no plan of salvation. No grand lodge phases a doctrine, and a religion without a doctrine is not a religion. No Masonic lodge uses any service of divine worship in its ritual or meetings. It is true that each lodge has an altar, places a sacred book upon it, opens and closes their meetings with prayer, possesses an officer called a chaplain and are dedicated to God and the Saints John. In almost every hotel room in America is to be found a Bible—does that make the hotel either a religion, or a church? The Army and Navy have chaplains for every regiment and ship—Does that make the Army and Navy religious, or the ships churches? The American Legion and hundreds of other organizations have chaplains, but no one thinks of them as religious. Our symbols are not religious symbols—our purposes, while virtuous, are not religious. We seek no converts—we profess no doctrine—we have no plan of salvation—we gladly accept men of any and every faith. Freemasonry does indeed inculcate morality, believes in human dignity, encourages charity, practices relief. The family, schools, institutions of higher learning and organizations of a hundred characters are all moral, charitable, humanly helpful—but that does not make them religious. Freemasonry is reverent, charitable and ethical in precept and practice. So are millions of people who are neither Masons nor church members. The only religious affirmation required of a Freemason is that he believes in one God. Freemasonry accepts as members the Christian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, the Parsee or the Buddhist. A man may be a Unitarian, a Baptist, a Spiritualist, a Quaker or a Catholic. Freemasonry accepts him as a man, not as a member of a church. Quakers and Catholics cannot become Freemasons without offending their religion—which fact Masonic authorities will always explain to men of those faiths that apply—but Masonry accepts them if they are good men and wish to join. Ministers are Masons just as Masons are members of churches. A minister of one faith cannot profess a doctrine other than his own—yet he can be a Mason. The fraternity is obviously and definitely not a religion, but only a philosophy of life. With the utmost reverence for all faiths, it is my hope that each of us could have real religion, that is—get it like a Baptist, experience it like a Methodist, know it like a Christian, pay for it like a Presbyterian, stick to it like a Lutheran, simplify it like a Quaker, be as sure of it as a Disciple, work at it like the Salvation Army, practice it like a Christian Scientist, be proud of it as an Episcopalian, as devout as a Catholic, as conscientious as a Jew and enjoy it like a Negro.

Another criticism of our fraternity is that Masonic charity is only for Masons. This is another of those misconceptions that are absolutely untrue. While the charity provided by the local lodges may be largely for Masons, their widows and orphans, the individual Mason participates in a number of other benevolent enterprises under Masonic auspicies which are not limited to Masonic beneficiaries. He can also point out examples of benevolence which his lodge has extended to non-Masonic or community projects. But let us suppose for a moment that Masonic charity is only for its own members. Is that a matter for censure? A father provides a home for his own children, not his neighbors—he clothes and feeds his own family, not another's—a church builds for its own members first. A member of a workingman's group gets into difficulties; his fellowworkers contribute to his necessities. To help, aid and assist those with whom we are closely associated is common practice—it is admirable, not reprehensible. It can be said that the Masonic fraternity, as a group of men, have contributed more time, money and thought, to the relief of the poor and distressed than any other single group in the history of the world. Many of the coordinate bodies of freemasonry have established outstanding charitable foundations or enterprises whose efforts to help the needy or to alleviate suffering are not restricted to those who are Masons or who have Masonic relatives. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this point—the Scottish Rite bodies in both southern and northern jurisdictions have made contributions to education, public health and relief. The southern jurisdiction founded the George Washington University's School of Government with a grant of $1 million and has supplemented it with additional grants and scholarships. Recently it has made substantial grants to the American University in Washington, D.C., and to Baylor University in Texas. The northern jurisdiction provides scholarships for young men and women at the Boston University School of Journalism and Arts of Communication. Proven ability and financial need are the only tests applied to applicants for these scholarships. Both supreme councils maintain a foundation or benevolent fund to help, aid and assist. In the northern jurisdiction the fund is used to promote public health by encouraging research in the field of mental illness. In the southern jurisdiction local bodies support particular charities, two of the most famous being the hospitals for crippled children at Atlanta and Dallas. Each of the local bodies of the Scottish Rite has an almoner who is provided with substantial funds to administer to the needy, without regard to Masonic membership. This longtime contribution of the Scottish Rite to public welfare is never publicized—its extent and importance are rarely known. Thousands of people are helped each year by Scottish Rite almoners.

And in the York Rite, for more than 30 years the Grand Encampment of Knights Templar of the United States, has maintained a large trust fund as an educational foundation, to enable young men and women to defray the cost of a college education by borrowing, on exceedingly liberal terms, a part of their college expenses. More than 1,000 young people are helped annually. They are using approximately a half-million dollars each year. The grand encampment has also set up a foundation which supports research and treatment of diseases and injury to the human eye, in an effort to prevent blindness. This treatment is provided for individuals who are in need regardless of race, creed, sex, age or national origin.

Most widely known, perhaps, is the extensive work of alleviating distress which is carried on in the Shriner's hospitals for crippled children—all Nobles of the Mystic Shrine must be Master Masons—but the 17 hospitals which the Shriners have built and maintain at a tremendous cost are for all children of all colors, all faiths, and either sex. The requirement for entrance into these hospitals is only that they must be crippled and unable to pay for other hospitalization. The Shrine requires no other tests for admission. They maintain these hospitals at an annual cost of $20 million and have accumulated an endowment fund in excess of $200 million. The thousands upon thousands of little children that have been restored to a useful life through the efforts of these Masons and Shriners will ever be a glorious tribute to the proof of the statement that "A man never stood so straight as when he stoqped to help a crippled child.

Then the great charities that are carried on continuously by our own Grand Lodges in all of the 50 States and many of our foreign neighbors add up to such an enormous sum of time, money, and effort that it is almost beyond comprehension.

Freemasonry is justly proud of its contributions to human welfare.

Another complaint often heard is that our fraternity is a political pressure group. It is difficult to say that one false charge against the ancient craft is more ridiculous than another, but no accusation is more unjust than this one. Freemasonry has existed in the United States since 1730 and enough years have passed since our earliest American brethren met in Pennsylvania, to demonstrate the political activities of the fraternity, if such existed. Politics (meaning partisan politics) are strictly forbidden to be discussed in lodges and have been since the publication of Anderson's constitutions in 1723. If Masons were a political group, obviously they would need a cause, an idea, or a program, or platform for which to exert pressure. No one has been able to name such an aim. Freemasons, as a general rule, elect new leadership yearly and each year every one of the grand lodges in the United States publishes its proceedings which contain the annual address of the grand master. In none of these, for any year or anytime in the history of freemasonry in the United States, is there to be found any political

objective, any aim to be obtained by pressure, or any indication of the fraternity's taking part in partisan politics. If freemasonry is a "pressure group," it must have something to press for. It must have a political leader to apply that pressure. Since not the slightest particle of evidence for such activity exists, it is obvious that this charge is nonsense of ignorance. But as individual Masons, we must not let ourselves be brainwashed into complacency and apathy to the extent that we will forget that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Let us not as individuals and citizens become tolerant to the extent of stupidity. Let us never gamble on the chance of losing our way of life by the double talk of some of our political aspirants. Let us not forget the Holy Inquisition, Jacque DeMolay, the statements and declarations of some groups that our public school system is their "Public Enemy No. 1," that all people who are not of their faith are in error and error, that's you and I, has no rights, political, spiritual, or civil. You might say—why that could never happen to us. It has happened elsewhere and is there one among you willing to take that chance?

What then is Masonry? If it could answer, I believe it would say: I am rooted in the midst of antiquity and point to God and eternity; I am past, present, and future; I belong to the ages; I circle the globe and stand at the crossroads of the world; I am steeped in tradition and traced in the pages of history; I have rites and words that have beauty, symmetry, and rhythm; I have knowledge, wisdom, and secrets locked in my bosom which I give to men who come to me desiring me in their hearts; I place upon my altars Holy Writ and turn to Deity in prayer; I hold a square and compass in my hands and contemplate a line from earth to heaven; I speculate with all the tools of operative Masons; I translate their use into moral values and spiritual building; I await all free men of lawful age and good report and solicit none; I admit them of their own free will and accord and teach them brotherhood and unity; I make builders of men of those who are willing and give them my tools that they may work; I stoop to raise the fallen brethren and cast out the unworthy; I walk in the way of charity and travel in peace and harmony; I render aid to the poor, the sick, and distressed; I answer the cry of the orphan and sustain the widow and aged; I commit to the earth brethren who travel to that undiscovered country; I ponder at that moment on the ravages of time, as I stand at the door to eternity; I am a way of life that teaches immortality; I raise men from darkness to light; I am Free Masonry.

Thus Masonry speaks. I earnestly pray for your help and cooperation in making these truths known to everyone for—

Someone must mix the mortar
Someone must carry the stone
For neither the man nor the Master
Has ever built alone

In building a roof for the needy
Or the building a house for the king
It is only by working together
That we will ever accomplish a thing.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on a bill which has passed the Senate and now is before the House of Representatives, S. 910, which would give local government financial relief when huge tax-exempt Federal installations remove taxpaying property from local assessment rolls.

The mountain counties of California, which I am proud to represent here in Washington, would not receive immediate benefit from this because of the limitations of the bill as drafted, but I support this as a matter of principle.

This is a positive step in the right direction. For nearly two decades I have been active in local, State and Federal Government. During that time I have been aware of the serious tax problems created by tax-exempt Federal properties. The extent of this difficulty can best be understood when one realizes that of California's approximately 100 million acres, the Federal Government is the tax-exempt owner of 46,311,044 acres.

More than 46 percent of the lands of California are not available for financing the costs of local government. Non-Federal owners must bear the total burden, in effect adding nearly $27 million to their own local tax burden in order to pay the bill for the Federal Government.

I believe this legislation is necessary, especially a bill such as this which provides the absolute minimum of emergency relief and calls for a thorough study of the overall relationship of the Federal and local governments. This study not only would bring together and place in the proper focus all the data compiled during the last two decades, but also would give us concrete facts on which to proceed in the future. It would be of inestimable value.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point a resolution which has been adopted by the boards of supervisors of two of the counties which I represent, Tehama and Siskiyou Counties:

Whereas the unfair and serious drain on the revenues of California counties, arising out of vast Federal ownership of tax-exempt property, has gone unchecked for many years, and

Whereas the U.S. Senate on May 12, 1960, passed and sent to the House of Representatives S. 910—the payments-in-lieu-of-taxes bill—a modest beginning solution to this great burden on local government, and

Whereas S. 910 would only authorize payments in lieu of taxes to local governments in cases where it has been demonstrated that "Uncle Sam does not play fair": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the county of Siskiyou, State of California, That the U.S. House of Representatives is respectfully urged and memorialized to take favorable action on S. 910 in the 2d session of the 86th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the county administrator is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Representative HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, to Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the National Association of County Officials and to the County Supervisors Association of California.

Dated this 24th day of May 1960.

/s/ W. C. EALY,
Chairman, Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors.

Attest:

RACHAEL N. CORDES,
Clerk, Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors.

Crime, Corrections, and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. George J. Reed, Chairman, U.S. Board of Parole:

CRIME, CORRECTIONS, AND THE COMMUNITY

(By George J. Reed, Chairman, U.S. Board of Parole)

It is a real privilege to particiapte in this, the Sixth Annual National Institute on Police-Community Relations. I am impressed by the interprofessional approach which you use in this conference. Our Government, our professions, and even our community organiaztions have become so specialized that it is extremely difficult to us to adequately communicate one with the other. This type of conference permits all of us who are interested in the problem of crime and its control and treatment to share ideas and become better informed concerning other related agencies and their progress and problems. In a Republic such as ours conferences such as these are the only method of procedure that assures us of an efficient operation while we retain our individual identity in a democratic society.

The fact that crime is increasing at an alarming rate is no secret to anyone in attendance at this conference today. Seven hundred and eighty-five thousand children will be referred to police and juvenile courts in 1960 according to the Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the number of crimes known to the police in this country has now risen to almost 3 million. There has been a 23.9 percent increase in known crime during the past 5 years. During 1958 alone, crime increased 7.4 percent while the population was increased only 1.7 percent. In other words, crime has increased five times as fast as population. Law violation continues to be even more a young person's activity. During 1958, arrests of persons aged 18 and over increased only 1 percent while arrests of persons under age 18 increased 10 percent. Can we long afford this unnecessary waste of human resources?

It is difficult to determine the cash value lost each year through crime. Much of the loss is temporary due to efficient police work but a great deal is permanent because of malicious damage and destruction not to mention the loss caused through inconvenience. And, of course, it is impossible to place a cash value on the damages caused through physical violence and mental trauma.

In addition to the losses traceable to the commission of crime, we are also spending astronomical amounts to house and care for inmates. Last year, it cost the Federal taxpayer an average of $3,488 for each prisoner in a Federal institution. There are more than 22,000 prisoners in Federal institutions alone, and there are almost 200,000 prisoners in prisons and reformatories for adults in the various States and localities throughout the country. These do not include the persons in juvenile institutions and the thousands of local jails.

Let us examine the reason for this tremendous upsurge in crime. Some of the most obvious factors in play here, of course, are our national "population explosion" and socioeconomic changes. We hear much about the need for increasing schools,

teachers, and recreational facilities to take care of the rapidly expanding number of children in our country—we must accept the fact that as more people are born and as they leave their parental homes a certain number of them will turn to law violation. The criminal, like the poor, I suppose, will always be with us. What is alarming though, is the fact that our crime rate increase is far greater than our population increase. In 1957, for example, the crime rate was 56.2 percent above the 1950 level. This is compared to a 13-percent increase in population level during the same period of time.

Crime, as I have mentioned, is primarily a phenomenon of the "young adult." The "war babies" of World War II are just beginning to enter that age group and in juvenile and youth institutions we now are seeing the result of the spurt in the number of births which immediately followed the war—and the end is not yet in sight.

Sociologists have been warning us for the past 15 or 20 years of the "cultural lag" here in America. They have told us that the physical sciences have made tremendous strides forward in improving and extending our mechanical and chemical scientific knowledge. At the same time they have pointed with concern to the lack of progress in the social sciences. We simply have not developed or made use of human engineers in the science of human behavior fast enough to keep pace with our progress in these other fields.

Let us examine our community attitudes of the adults as well as our young people today. What is happening to us that causes young people, in increasing numbers, to flout our laws and mores? We may find a clue to some of the answers in a very challenging article by William Attwood in the March 29, 1960, issue of Look magazine entitled "The Age of Payola." This article is a summation of a survey conducted by 12 Look magazine reporters who traveled over the country gathering expressions of attitude toward payola and other forms of cheating. The author, in his article, comments that "Payola is just one phase of an epidemic of immorality in this supposedly God-fearing Nation." Our youngsters, as they observe their peers, are being infected with a disease which tells them that anything is all right so long as they can get away with it. The fashion today is to go along with the crowd. The greatest possible insult is to be labeled a "square." A noted clergyman recently said, "Most of us have lost our sense of importance and personal value. If a man stands up against the crowd for something he thinks is right, we say he should see a psychiatrist." We seem to be developing a philosophy of personal whim without the regard of rights and convenience of our neighbors. A New Jersey judge recently stated that "youth no longer has a sense of responsibility. They just don't have an awareness toward their community, toward the fellow in the other car, toward the girl in their car, toward anyone but themselves."

I know that the favorite hobby of every generation is to condemn and criticize the generation which follows. We might better take a real close look at the attitude and practices of our own generation. I know there is always the raising of a human cry for "old-fashioned morality" as emphasized by a stern but kindly father dispensing not only food but wisdom at the head of the table. It is the accepted pattern today to be guided by the moral standard of the group or the gang rather than the standards of the father or a father figure. Personally, I feel, however, that the standards of the juvenile or youth group without proper motivation or guidance tend to deteriorate toward the lowest common denominator and that perhaps we have no satisfactory substitute for an understanding but firm concept of a final authority. In the end the community must leave to the church, the home and the character-building agencies the responsibility for educating and interpreting proper public and private morals for our people.

We have now stated some of the problems and have inquired into a cause or two as to why these problems exist. It behooves us now to take a good look at our responsibility in meeting these problems. We are people engaged in the profession of corrections. We are concerned with those individuals who violate our rules or regulations. As such, I feel we cannot solve the ills of society by ourselves. We can do only our small part in reducing the amount of crime committed. The fact is, that the community is producing more criminals than the correctional agencies are geared to accommodate. We are engaged in law enforcement, agencies of social welfare, correctional institutions, probation, parole, and so forth. What must we in the correctional and law-enforcement field do and what must we do quickly? As I see it there are a number of important tasks. First is the obvious one—we must have not only more staff but better trained personnel. As the greater number of law violators come before us we must have a correspondingly greater number of professionally trained people to deal with them. In corrections, as in education, to accomplish this goal we must rapidly expand our training facilities in the schools and elsewhere and we must pay higher salaries to attract and keep the persons who are most effective in their work. The next point is a bit less obvious but may be just as important. We must coordinate our services to eliminate overlapping and wasted motion. How often do we see juvenile police divisions who do not cooperate with, or perhaps who do not know of the existence of, social agencies in their city to whom youngsters might be referred? How often do we see one family being cared for by the staffs of three or four related agencies? How often do we see a person in trouble being shunted from one office to another because there is no central coordination bureau? It is time we leave off thinking of the best interest of our own particular little agency and begin to look at it as a segment of a total treatment program in a given area. We must subordinate our personal pride and jealousy else we shall all fail. I find governments over the country building correctional institutions based on the populations over the past year or two. There is no 10-year plan, no estimate of what will be needed in the years to come. There is little or no assumption that institutional populations will continue to increase. How much better and how much cheaper it would be to delay construction until a study could be made of the entire correctional system to determine if the use of probation, the reduction of detention time awaiting trial or the use of probation and parole might be modified and strengthened to cause a much smaller inmate population. By these and other means we must direct every welfare and correctional dollar we have toward the greatest good.

Now we have stated some of our problems, possible causes for the existence of the problems and considered a suggestion or two by way of solution. If we are able to attract and maintain better staffs and if we are able to eliminate waste by coordination what then is the goal and purpose of our combined agencies? Society has created correctional agencies as a means of self-protection and betterment. To accomplish this it has provided machinery for specialized treatment of those individuals among us who, by their tendency toward crime, show that they are in need of some form of specialized handling. The police, prosecuting officials and the courts deal with the individuals before the prosecution, and the institutional people and we parole people engage in individual treatment after the prosecution. It is important that all of us possess a similar philosophy or goal as we in our turn influence the behavior and attitude of the law violator. Any correctional agency that undertakes to understand human behavior is not automatically to be labelled as "soft on criminals." Sometimes the best type of treatment program for an individual offender requires a show of force and discipline. When it is needed it should be available and used to require the conformity to program and custody of the inmate, who will not or cannot understand any other approach. As a beginning, it is important that detection of crime is swift and sure. The greatest deterrent to future crime is the certain knowledge that wrongdoing will be found out and will be firmly dealt with. We do not seek retribution by way of a "pound of flesh" but we do seek to prove that the law-abiding citizenry is more effective and controlling than the nonlaw-abiding element. The policeman on the beat, like the rest of us, must carry out the instructions contained in the criminal codes and by the statutes which created us which set forth our rules and duties. There is latitude for individual thought and discretion even within our regulatory framework. There are frequent opportunities for all of us to exercise our own judgments during our daily routine. Some may think that a policeman on the street either makes arrests or does not make arrests solely upon the basis of the evidence presented to him. I know, however, that he often must decide for himself whether an arrest is indicated or not. I know that there are several times when a person who is a stickler for details may issue many summonses but who instead, and because he knows the community wants him to do so, handles the situation by persuasion or warning. I am reminded of two very different sort of policemen portrayed in a couple of old, old movies. One was the character who had memorized all the city ordinances and who, for example, carried a tape measure with him so he could be assured that all the shopkeepers on his beat had their awnings well above the minimum height called for in the ordinances and who delighted in hauling as many people as possible into the precinct station after discovering minor infractions. The other policeman, I recall, patrolled Chinatown in San Francisco. He was suddenly confronted one day by two elderly and not very bright Chinese struggling violently over possession of a slide trombone. Although language difficulties prevented him from getting at the heart of the matter, it was evident by the pushing and pulling that both claimed ownership of the instrument. The wise policeman merely took the trombone from both of them, separated it into two pieces by pulling the sliding part away from the business end of the gadget and handed one part to each of the individuals. Two smiling Chinamen went away happy.

Through the method of training such as you have here in Michigan, police departments throughout our land exercise informed and skilled individual judgment toward the goal of rehabilitation. I wish to mention specifically, in addition to the police training school here at the Michigan State University, the Universities of Minnesota, Northwestern, Wisconsin, and the University of Southern California, who also have excellent police and correctional training schools. There are approxmiately 15 other universities that have established short courses (that is, 3 days to 2 weeks) in the area of specialized police work with juveniles.

Just as the police, courts, and others have their role in working with the individual, we

in the parole field have our responsibility. Actually, the success or failure of a parolee is the final test of the effectiveness of all the other correctional programs which have touched him on his way out to the free community. We see parole working with a percentage of the population in the hope that salvage or control of those inmates will in turn serve to benefit the others. It is the best known system to provide controls over a released prisoner while at the same time offering him the necessary assistance as he attempts to follow through on the results of his institutional training and treatment. It is the best known system, too, by which the ex-prisoner may start repaying the debt to society he has piled up first by the commission of his crime and second by the costly institutional program he has been afforded for many months or years.

How common it is for the general public and the prisoner himself to feel that service in an institution is the method by which the criminal pays his debt to society. Nothing could be further from the truth. The accommodations he receives while incarcerated only magnify his debt. Oh, of course, society may get some measure of revenge against the man as we lock him away from his loved ones and restrict his freedom, but we don't thereby actually receive any payment on his debt. We cannot hope to receive any returns until he takes his place again in the community and begins to contribute something to his fellowman.

While a prisoner is incarcerated we are in effect paying his rent (utilities included), paying for his groceries, clothing him, occasionally defraying the cost of further education, and even paying the salary of his priest or minister. We build a ballfield and gymnasium for him, we provide professional people such as psychiatrist, psychologist, and social workers, and and if he becomes ill or injured he is given first-class medical care. To top all these first-class free services, the recipient enjoys a completely tax-free existence.

It is obvious that paroling authorities should terminate penal incarceration whenever the individual has demonstrated ability to resume his place in his home community. Laws should be sufficiently elastic and parole boards sufficiently able so that release can be effected when the individual reaches the correct psychological period in his term. Release before the prisoner is ready is dangerous not only to himself but to society. Detention for a long period after the individual is capable and willing to live a law-abiding life may generate an understandable bitterness and perhaps a cooling of his desire to live a respectable and law-abiding life.

Parole is a substitution for incarceration. It is a part of the sentence imposed by the court but served outside the prison walls. It provides realistic controls on the individual's behavior while permitting increased opportunity for him to make independent choices, using his own judgment insofar as he is able. All this is accomplished in the environment in which that individual must ultimately adjust. There is nothing artificial in the surroundings of the parolee as there might have been while he was within the institution. Parole is life itself. It is living with his own family and among his neighbors as he did before but this time with the added restraints imposed by the parole board and the supervising parole officer.

The parolee knows that violation of any of the conditions of his release may be grounds for revocation of parole and return to prison. His travel is restricted; he must remain honorably employed if possible; he must support himself and his family to the best of his ability. This latter requirement means that he must now pay his own rent, buy his own groceries, clothe himself and his family, buy his own medicine, and last but not least, he must pay his fair share of the tax burden. He must be a socially acceptable individual who either helps to produce goods or provides a service and who takes his place in the community as a contributor to the common good as well as being a taker. These are the only ways in which he can begin to really pay his cash debt to society.

There is a minority of persons who do not adequately profit from parole and who must be returned as violators. These individuals receive their chance to make good on yet another day. I am happy to report, however, that on the Federal level at least approximately 80 percent of the parolees complete their supervision periods free of behavior problems sufficient to warrant return as a violator. In 5 percent of the remaining cases, the behavior which leads to violation is not criminal behavior but instead is conduct of such character that the Board feels the individual should be returned to an institution before some criminal action does take place. Thus, 80 percent of the Federal parolees do not violate the terms of their release during the remainder of their term under parole supervision.

In summary, I wish to say that despite the soaring crime rate I believe there is cause for optimism. I say we in law enforcement and corrections should be heartened because of the following signs which I have noticed:

1. The unusual population increase occurring right after World War II will not continue to such a great extent and there should follow a leveling off.

2. We are swinging back away from progressive education and all the extreme permissiveness which that trend exercised.

3. Our legislatures and citizens seem to be more and more aware of the need for more and better training of policemen and other correctional personnel.

4. The processes of probation and parole are proving to be effective methods of rehabilitation.

5. Colleges and universities are expanding the number and type of training programs for professional, correctional, and police work.

6. Citizens' action committees on a statewide basis such as sponsored by the National Probation and Parole Association are starting to study the crime problem on the State and local level. Thus, the citizens as well as the administrators are jointly attempting to solve our problems.

7. And this last, I believe, is the most heartening—I feel that community leaders, police, and correctional people alike are beginning to realize that we all must coordinate our programs, join hands and close ranks if we are to be effective in meeting the ever-increasing challenge of crime within an orderly society.

Thank you for this opportunity to be with you today.

Benson's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a very excellent editorial from the Poughkeepsie New Yorker, which is an outstanding independent publication of the 29th District of New York. This factual review of agricultural problems, in the light of the questionable record of the 86th Congress on the subject, reflects a sound appraisal of the country's present difficulties. The author would undoubtedly be interested in the number of Congressmen who customarily go the limit on public housing on the one hand and high price supports and subsidized agriculture on the other. Such a list would certainly include the ultraliberals in the present Congress.

The editorial referred to reads as follows:

Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, has a right to say: "I told you so."

Benson has been blamed for the debacle which is costing taxpayers over a billion dollars yearly for the storage of surplus farm products. Yet he has striven for 8 years to avoid the very situation in which agriculture now finds itself.

Since 1933, maintenance of high and rigid Government price supports has resulted in losses of more than $15 billion. But Benson's record is clear. He has consistently urged the reduction of high price supports and has said, again and again, that the solution of the farm problem lay in eliminating unnecessary Government controls and interference.

In one of his first statements as Secretary of Agriculture, he said:

"The principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. We seek a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maxmum of dependence on free market prices as to the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market."

As time went by, Benson became more and more critical of outmoded programs which were foisted upon him.

"Today's agriculture is far different than the agriculture of 20 years ago," he said. "Yet our price support legislation or some crops is still based upon the Agricultural Act of 1938 and the amendments thereto. This program has been continued so long that some nonfarm groups have a vested interest in prolonging it—in keeping their warehouses filled with Government-owned wheat and other commodities.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote that to continue outmoded institutions make no more sense than requiring a man to wear still the coat that fitted him as a boy.

Surely this applies to agriculture today. For some crops we are still operating under depression and war-bred legislation, only slightly modified two decades after the depression and more than 14 years after the war. It just doesn't make sense."

In April of 1960 Benson told an audience in Salt Lake City:

"The advances this country has made have been the fruit of liberty—our free enterprise system—our American way of life—our God-given freedom of choice. The progress of the future must stem from this same basic blessing.

"Today the scope and variety of governmental operations have become amazingly wide. We are touched by government from before we are born until after we die. Government impinges on our lives every hour of the day and night.

"Most of these governmental activities are helpful in greater or lesser degree. But we must be aware of the price we pay when we place more and more of our lives in the hands of centralized government."

The signs increase that the farm problem will not be solved until the American people—and the Congress—listen to the gospel preached by Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America.

Soviet Intelligence Flights Over Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, when addressing the House on May 19, 1960, concerning the recent Paris Conference collapse, I spoke of Alaska and about Soviet intelligence flights over it and demanded that these flights be ended.

This address was published in part in the press of Alaska and promptly evoked a response by letter dated May 23 from a resident of that State, which I quote:

I, as one of the persons who has been in a position to observe, while living at Point Barrow and flying there for over 8 years, hauling hunts, flying the Dew Line sites, etc.

Have seen Russian planes a number of times in 1953. They made many trips nearly daily over to Barter Island and returned just north of Cape Tisbourne.

————, at Point Barrow, also has seen them many times close enough for their identification as Russian.

For about the last 2 years their flying has to our knowledge been less.

But during the years before we had our long-range fast aircraft, they definitely photographed all the Dew Line sites, etc., because during the construction period they flew just about daily and returned straight to Russia. I observed them from Tisbourne head to Russia a number of times and knew that they were not our planes.

During the building of our radar site at Cape Tisbourne they even came over and, on several occasions with jet aircraft with their gear down, made passes at the lower field of the first one built.

I have met and asked many Air Force pilots why they never did anything. I was told that they had orders not to fire on them unless attacked by them.

There are a number of respectable pilots and others who can verify all this but I suppose, for some reason not known to us, it has not been publicized. Thought I would pass this on as it makes us up here a bit angry also. They have a lot of Arctic I.G.Y. work on Ice Islands, etc., which are close at times and they do fly frequently close to us. We have seen them while polar bear hunting also. But they have photographed our northern Alaska area several years back without a doubt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what could be clearer than this letter from an "on the scene" observer of Soviet flights over Alaska? It confirms the revelations of travelers returning from Alaska where they had opportunities to talk with residents. Why is it that such information as this has not been told to the people of the United States? Why is it that officials of our Government have not used Soviet flights over Alaska to counter the browbeating attacks of Premier Khrushchev? Why the silence of our press?

To say the least, the situation is untenable and should be met. To this, Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said on May 19 to the House. Our Government should call for the arrest and deportation of Soviet spies, who form a far more extensive intelligence service here than we have in the Soviet Union. For this procedure, we have the recent action of little Switzerland in deporting spies as a precedent.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States will expect the President to issue orders to our Alaska commands to protect our positions there in the same way Premier Khrushchev protects those of the Soviet Union. These orders should include instructions to challenge Soviet planes and to shoot down those which do not comply with orders to land.

The Need for Meaningful Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the mail which I have received over a period of many months, indicates quite conclusively that there is tremendous national interest in behalf of workable, effective, and meaningful legislation in the area of health care for our senior citizens.

Typical of the interest and concern is the following letter:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 18, 1960.*
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMY: Referring to our previous correspondence and in further reference to needful amendments to the Social Security Act to insure medical assistance to needy aged, in my opinion, based on personal experience and contact over many years with hundreds of our citizens attempting to live under present provisions of the very helpful legislation, the administration bill would reach none of those whose needs are the greatest.

Most of the proposed legislation would indicate a general belief that assistance on the hospital expense is the paramount need. While this is very necessary, on the other hand, provision for additional funds for medical care, including physician's and nurse's visits to the home, would in many cases avoid prohibitive costs of hospitalization. In our State this cost is now approximately forty dollars per day, second highest in the Nation, which emphasises not only the need but desirability from a cost basis.

In talking with physicians we learn many cases of hospitalization could be avoided, many permanently even in the aged people, providing they could have even a minimum of proper care and medication in the early stages of their disability. Without the assurance of assistance in meeting costs of these early treatments, a great number of these people will gradually deteriorate to a point where hospitalization is obsolutely necessary and a great burden of cost is then shifted to the city, county, and State if not provided for otherwise.

Knowing your great desire to help solve this problem, and realizing you were cosponsor on the Forand bill, I do not hesitate to ask for your very decided and great influence to secure proper legislation.

With kindest personal regards.

Very sincerely,

T. K. BOYER.

A Familiar Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's New York Times there was an article describing changes being made in the Cuban educational system. There is a familiar ring about the new system, reminiscent of teaching processes and other so-called educational activities of communistic nations and satellites and of Germany of the thirties. I believe the article will help in the jigsaw puzzle job of evaluating this new nation on our southern threshold. The article:

CASTRO FREED CUBA FROM UNITED STATES IS "CORRECT" ANSWER IN HAVANA—REGIME REWRITES HISTORY TO BOLSTER CAMPAIGN TO INDOCTRINATE YOUTH—TEACHERS TRAINED IN NEW DUTIES

(By R. Hart Phillips)

HAVANA, June 6.—The teacher stood before a third grade class in a Havana public school.

"What did José Marti do?" she asked.

A boy of 8 raised his hand eagerly and the teacher gave him permission to speak. "José Marti freed Cuba from the Spaniards," he said.

"And what did Fidel Castro do?" the teacher asked.

"Fidel freed Cuba from the United States, which seized all our land," the boy said triumphantly.

That was the correct answer. The lesson went on.

UNITED STATES IS ACCUSED

What happened on February 15, 1898?

A tiny girl raised her hand and gave her answer in a thin voice. "The United States blew up the *Maine* so they could intervene in Cuba," she parroted.

Thus the hate campaign against the United States goes on among the children and teenagers of Cuba. The Castro regime is bending every effort to capture the minds of youth.

The pattern of training is similar to that used by many totalitarian governments. It includes indoctrination in schools, on radio and television, and in the press; military training from 7 years of age; a hate campaign, this time directed against the United States; the organization of work brigades of boys from 14 to 18; and meetings and fiestas, all with a political purpose.

The Government feels that once the youth of Cuba is indoctrinated with hatred toward the United States the relations between the two countries will be permanently damaged.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ALTERED

The educational system has been radically changed in structure and purpose. Teachers are being instructed to instill in their students a desire to till the soil and work with their hands rather than become professionals. The teachers are also being taught methods to use in developing hatred of the United States and hero worship for Fidel Castro as the saviour of Cuba.

Last January 28 the birthday of José Marti, Cuba's most beloved patriot, who was killed by the Spaniards many years before Cuba obtained her independence from Spain through the Spanish-American War, a rebel soldier was sent to each of the lower-grade classrooms in Havana.

The soldier spoke to the children about Dr. Castro, who led the 2-year revolt against

Gen. Fulgencio Batista, and told them stories of the fighting in the Sierra Maestra against the troops of the deposed regime. This was done, one teacher said, so that the children would identify themselves with the soldiers and would have a desire to join the juvenile patrols, which give military training to children from 7 to 17.

In Havana the public school teachers and prospective teachers are being given lectures every Saturday. After Friday, when school is out, there will be daily classes for 2 months to teach them the methods and aims of Premier Castro's new educational system. Hundreds of new teachers are being prepared for schools being built in the interior. Some complaints are heard that the educational level of these teachers is not up to the former standard in Cuba.

When schools open next September, the government plans to have new textbooks ready for the grade schools. All history books are being changed to conform with the attitude of the Dr. Castro's officials, who have repeatedly declared the United States is "Cuba's greatest enemy."

Among the changes to be made in the educational system, according to reports, will be the elimination of kindergartens. The "speciality" teachers, who taught music, English, domestic science, manual training and other subjects, have already been eliminated. These teachers are being utilized for regular teaching in the lower grades. Teachers in each classroom will give instruction in all subjects. English and music are being eliminated, it is said.

It is planned,according to reports, to have as many children over 5 years old as possible live at big scholastic centers, such as the one being established in Havana at the former Camp Columbia Army Headquarters. This is being done, it is said, so that the children will be under the influence of the teachers and not their families.

Most Representative Knight of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to see a deserving person receive the recognition due him. It is doubly rewarding when that honored person is from your home State, and in this instance from my home district in Texas. Last week I was very pleased to learn that a man from my home district in Texas had been selected as the 1960 trucking industry "Driver of the Year" by the American Trucking Associations.

He is Russell R. Brown of Mt. Pleasant, Tex., who drives a tank truck for the American Petrofina Co. of Texas. This coveted award to a professional truck driver in the United States went to Mr. Brown for his 14 years of truck driving without a chargeable accident, and for his heroic rescue of 6-year-old Charles Ray Schedule of Alvin, Tex., who was in danger of drowning.

The lifesaving incident occurred last July while he was delivering a cargo of gasoline in the small town of Alvin near Galveston. He saw three small boys and an elderly man run from a nearby house. Shortly after this, he heard the man's cry for help, and joining him, found him bending over the side of the 12- by 12-foot tank or pit containing about 7 feet of muddy water. He was told by the man that a small boy had fallen into the water.

Without hesitation or concern for his own safety, Mr. Brown dove into the water in search of the boy's body. Surfacing for air after an unsuccessful search for the boy, the driver then submerged again for the child. He found him, and although the boy appeared to have drowned, Mr. Brown began applying artificial respiration. The child began to regain normal breathing, and was taken to John Sealy Hospital in Galveston, where he recovered.

Mr. Brown's alertness, bravery, and immediate action saved the life of the child, the chamber of commerce, agriculture and industry of Alvin said in honoring the 31-year-old driver.

His driving record is equally impressive, with a total of nearly 900,000 miles logged in without a chargeable accident.

Mr. Brown, married and the father of four children, was also chosen the "Most Representative Knight of the Road," an award given annually to a Texas truck driver.

It is with justifiable pride, I think, that I include this recount of the honor accorded to Russell R. Brown of Mt. Pleasant, Tex. He is to be congratulated for his outstanding safe driving record and for his courageous and unselfish life saving action.

Time Is Short if This Democratic-Controlled 86th Congress Is To Enact and Have Written Into Law a Reasonable and Acceptable Version of Area Redevelopment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor released its May report on the classification of labor surplus areas in the United States.

This report discloses that of the 142 labor surplus areas in the Nation, 20 major industrial centers and 71 smaller areas are on a special new list of cities hardest hit by long-term unemployment.

Major areas on the list include Detroit, Mich.; Providence, R.I.; Evansville and Terre Haute, Ind.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Charleston, Huntington, Ashland, and Wheeling, W. Va. Others are Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford, Mass. and the Pennsylvania communities of Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton.

Towns in the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and West Virginia dominate the list of smaller areas. Included is the Clearfield-Du Bois area in my congressional district of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of good Americans live in these major and smaller labor surplus areas. They are not suffering from seasonal but from chronic unemployment as they try to exist by living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I did not approve the veto of S. 722 but when the Democratic-controlled U.S. Senate sustained the veto it meant permanent legislative death for S. 722.

It did not, however, close the door against enactment of an area redevelopment bill before adjournment. Speaking frankly, the unemployed of the Nation are looking to this Congress for further action before it adjourns.

Without becoming partisan, I think it is only fair to say that any possible political benefit has been wrung out of the veto of S. 722. This political benefit with its attendant noise is not going to provide jobs, feed the hungry or rehabilitate the economy of labor surplus areas.

Let us not forget in the coming fall campaign this army of unemployed is intelligent and will not accept lame excuses in trying to explain why this Democratic-controlled Congress, with nearly a 2 to 1 control over both Houses, failed to enact area redevelopment legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are various types of bills pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee, several of which the Chief Executive of this Nation has given indications he will approve if given the opportunity.

With only a few weeks left before Congress adjourns, it is my suggestion to the leaders of Congress that rather than use as a political football the plight of the unemployed living in labor surplus areas, it would be far wiser to set the legislative wheels of this Congress in motion immediately and send another area redevelopment bill to the White House.

Who's Soft on Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Marshfield News-Herald of Friday, May 27, 1960, carried an editorial entitled, "Really, Mr. Butler." Mr. Butler's fantastic charge that the Republican Party and our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, were soft on communism is answered very well by this editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

REALLY, MR. BUTLER

Two wrongs never made one right. We admit this frankly. But we must confess a large measure of amusement at the accusation by the Democratic National Chairman, Mr. Paul M. Butler, of Republicans being too soft toward the Soviet Union the past 2 years.

He may be correct in this accusation, President Eisenhower's administration may have been wrong in its conduct of foreign affairs with respect to the Soviets. That might be one wrong.

But we submit the other wrong is so vastly more glaring, so devastatingly wrong, that innocent peoples of innocent nations have suffered intolerable, and there is the terrible prospect that the whole world and all its peoples may continue to carry the yoke placed upon them by this second wrong.

Who and what turned Russia loose upon the world? The late President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. Who was soft toward the Soviets and Joseph Stalin? Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Here is the record for Mr. Butler and all Democrats to read and remember.

Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party recognized Russia in 1933.

Mr. Roosevelt made deals with Russia at Teheran and Yalta with the support of the Democratic Party.

Who agreed to the terrible mess of Berlin? Mr. Truman and the Democratic Party.

Who said, "I like Joe?" Mr. Truman.

Who pulled back Gen. George Patton when he and his army were on the banks of the Oder River in Germany so that Russia could move in? Mr. Truman and the Democratic Party.

Who was "soft" on Russia, communism, and Russian leaders, and as a result, brought forth the frankenstein now threatening the world with total extinction? Democratic leadership and the Democratic Party.

It takes a heap of nerve for Mr. Butler or any other Democrat to talk about "softness" toward Russia. The record is replete with evidence of his party's total lack of understanding of Russia, a shortcoming in foresight and leadership that gave the Soviets the advantage they now threaten to use against civilized people.

To use Al Smith's expression, "Let's look at the record" occasionally and keep it straight.

Mutual Security Statement by Mr. Walter F. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Walter F. Carey, president of the National Defense Transportation Association on Mutual Security.

NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.

DETROIT.—In connection with the mutual security program now under consideration before Congress, Walter F. Carey, president of the National Defense Transportation Association, issued the following statement on behalf of the association:

"These are serious times for the United States of America. Strong forces are currently at work between the East and the West which will in large measure shape future policies and programs of our country.

"The recent collapse of the summit talks coupled with the heightened Soviet condemnation of our leaders and of our country are clear indications that the so-called cold war is part of the Soviet strategy to separate our allies from us. It is clear that this is no time to weaken our allies and their faith in us. A major means by which we can continue to improve our collective position in providing a strong defense is in the continuation of the principle of mutual security. It is imperative that mutual security be fully supported, especially at this time.

"The National Defense Transportation Association is a nationwide organization dedicated to maintaining the maximum national posture to provide transportation support in any emergency situation. This is but a part of a greater overall objective of doing all in our power to secure the national defense.

"We are mindful of the serious implications of the current situation and recognize the need for national unity and solidarity. The National Defense Transportation Association strongly urges aggressive support of an adequate mutual security program in order that our allies everywhere may be assured that this country shall continue its national policy of collective security through mutual support among free nations."

He Who Pays the Piper Calls the Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, a naked lust for national power, rather than a pious beneficence, is the true intent behind federalized education. We who oppose the bill have long contended that its central theme is absolute Federal control of education in the States. We have gently reminded our colleagues that he who pays the piper calls the tune. This simple assertion of a self-evident truth has not sufficed. The proponents have argued with great skill that this is not the case, and offer us tranquilizers and pacifiers in the form of profuse and prolix assurances against Federal interference in the schools. This controversy is now moot, if it is indeed true that actions speak louder than words.

No less than three actions of the House have screamed out in chorus the real purpose of this bill, far more stridently than any of our debates could do.

The first of these actions was the original use of a so-called assurance clause in the bill. This in itself was a conclusive admission that the nature of such a bill is to give the Federal Government plenary power to interfere with our schools. Such a clause, assuring against the use of a power, necessarily recognizes the existence of the power; otherwise, it is mere surplusage and poor draftsmanship. This power is not doubted by the Supreme Court which said in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (1942:317 U.S. 131):

> It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

The best verification of the efficacy of this holding is to ask any farmer—he knows it very well.

The second action was the addition of the Powell amendment. This amendment was totally repugnant to the carefully inserted assurance clause, neatly rendering the whole bill a contradiction in terms. Federalized education is thus born a monstrous, cross-eyed infant, with domination staring balefully at piety. In this regard, one can only speculate on what sort of amendment the late Vito Marcantonio might have offered, what teachings in the schools would have been required, or what decisions of the Supreme Court on the subject of communism would be sought to be recognized.

It is, of course, no surprise that the feeble assurance against Federal interference was so easily contradicted, nullified, and overcome. The third decisive action was the defeat of the Landrum amendment which provided a genuine, effective, and meaningful guarantee of continued self-government in our schools. This defeat gave the death blow to any further pretense of permitting the States to educate the children of their citizens according to the desires of those citizens, or of allowing government by the consent of the governed in educational matters.

These three concrete actions have at last cleared the air, exposed the meaning of the bill, and give us an excellent insight into the future operation of federalized education, if such a thing is enacted. It is at once apparent that when power to control is coupled with the requisite intent to control, the final accomplishment of that control is the sole possible result. The bill is harshly discriminatory in its provisions. It imposes a triple burden on those citizens who choose, as is their absolute right, to educate their children privately. To their tuition bill is added a property tax bill for local schools, and an income tax bill for schools in some distant State. The practical effect of this built-in control is to discourage attendance at private and parochial schools, further aggravating the existing problems of the public schools and broadening the base of Federal domination.

By this form of control, and by whatever others that may arise from the inevitable investigations of real or pretended State misuse of Federal funds, we may well create a Frankenstein monster. We are certainly creating that which we say we deplore in the Soviet Union: the monolithic school. To deny this would be an interesting exercise in Orwellian doublethink. No one with any familiarity with other programs of Federal spending would deny it, and the portions of the bill relating to judicial review of administrative determinations fully provide for it. After 1954, southerners referred to the Supreme Court as the Supreme School Board, in jest. Should this bill reach final passage, it would then become so, in fact. The late Robert A. Taft said—Senate debate on S. 637, October 1943—

> The intrusion of the Federal Government into the field of education is one which threatens more than any other intrusion the control of the thoughts of the people in the localities. Education is something the peo-

ple are interested in having complete control of at home.

He went even further, and maintained:

Of course, education is not a Federal function. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which makes it so. On the other hand, all State constitutions contain educational clauses. The practice here for 150 years have established education as a State and local function, and it has been carried out by State and local governments.

The effect on State and local governments of this usurpation of one of the most important of their few remaining powers is painfully obvious. With the question of expenditures for education removed from their jurisdiction by a Federal spending formula, the school boards would become little more than advisory groups without authority, fit only to confer with the PTA and to utter feckless platitudes. This is indeed a sorry reward for those devoted men and women who have willingly and freely taken upon themselves the burdens of long hours, little or no monetary compensation, and ever present public criticism. It would also be a sorry end for one of our basic forms of self-government—we would miss it badly.

Parents, teachers, and children, while not attacked directly by the bill, would fare but little better than the school boards. With the Federal Government nearly insolvent through a long tradition of spending piled on spending, a Federal income tax rate increase is inevitable if Federalized education is to be financed at all. How much more in accord with the principle of no taxation without representation it would be to let the people themselves decide how much they desired to spend on their own schools.

In the long run, the principle of self-government is not mocked. It requires no great intelligence to see that the growing voter resistance to local school taxation, so often cited by proponents as proof of need for federalization, will be very easily transferred by the same voters to Federal taxes, with a vengeance. This bill, attacking as it does a matter very close to the heart of the voter, runs the great risk of turning him entirely against all Federal taxation, thus jeopardizing truly worthwhile and properly national programs. Again, "doublethink" is required to believe that the taxpayer will tolerate a Federal levy when he would not tolerate a local levy for the same identical purposes.

In the last analysis, the question before Congress reduces itself to one of humility. We all acknowledge that first-rate education is essential to our national security in the long run. We also freely acknowledge that the States, the localities, the school boards, the teachers, and the parents can make mistakes in providing the children with that education. But is Congress, then, infallible? The Federal Government may well have the power to seize absolute control of education in all the States, and substitute its own judgment for that of the people. It may have the power, temporarily, but there is no wisdom in such a course. What mythical Member of Congress would dare return home and say to his constituents: "School boards, you are miserly; teachers, you are incompetent; parents, you are obsolete; therefore I will take control, tell you what you want, build it for you, and send you the bill." No group or person could conceivably be pleased with such a speech—not even a few building contractors who might be enriched. They also have children, and they despise arrogance as do all Americans.

A vote for this bill is tantamount to making such a speech, which I am certain no Member is willing to do. We are all elected Representatives; it befits us far better to wear the mantle of humility, tolerate the wishes of the localities, and preserve the self-government so earnestly desired by all our constituents. The alternative is to attempt to squeeze 437 heads into the massive crown of Federal expertise. Our constituents have long trusted us to govern them in national matters—let us, just this once, trust them to govern themselves in local matters.

Public Order and the Preservation of our Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a most interesting and informative address delivered by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, at the St. George Association, Inc. of the Police Departmetn of the City of New York on May 1, 1960, on the subject of "Public Order and the Preservation of our Freedoms."

There is no person in our country, or throughout the world, better able to discuss this subject than Allan Dulles. As Mr. Dulles well said:

I am no economist, but I feel it is our primary duty these days to produce that which will keep our country strong and free. Strong not only in the sense of military might but in education, science and technology—free not only in the sense of freedom from want but free to develop the best that is in us—with the tools to enjoy our leisure but not necessarily every imaginable gadget.

The address follows:

PUBLIC ORDER AND THE PRESERVATION OF OUR FREEDOMS

(Address by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, to St. George Association, Inc., of the Police Department of the city of New York, May 1, 1960)

I am deeply grateful for the award you have tendered me. As an old resident of this great and inspiring city, there is no group of men from whom I should have more preferred to receive such an honor.

In accepting this award I wish to pay my tribute to you from the police force of New York for your contribution in maintaining order within the framework of protecting our freedoms.

I fear that injustice is often done you by the misuse of the word "police." We too loosely talk of police states, of police methods, and the like. Here in this country we well know that the police are the protectors of our freedoms and of our liberties. When order and discipline are not maintained, it is we the people who cannot exercise our natural rights and carry on our appointed tasks.

You, in turn, help to enforce the laws adopted by the representatives of the people to protect the people from the invasion of their rights. This is fundamental to our form of government.

If this country of ours does not set an example to the world of maintaining order under law, what can we expect from other countries less well situated than we—countries new to the task of making democracy work?

We meet here today on May 1, a day which has had particular significance in history. The idea for such a day of peaceful demonstration was initiated by American labor unions some 70 years ago. The purpose was to win an 8-hour day. Unfortunately, over the years, May Day has been more and more taken over by the Communists, and now we have our own separate Labor Day in September.

Before this day is over we may hear from various parts of the world some strange and dangerous doctrines preached—even from countries near to us. It is typically one of the techniques of the Communists to take over ideas which originated for the purpose of peaceful demonstration to protect the peoples' rights, and make them over into instruments for destroying those rights.

The problem of maintaining order in the world, so necessary for the protection of the rights of the individual, has become vastly complicated over the last few decades by the emergence of Soviet Russia and Communist China as world powers dominating nearly a billion people. And at the same time we see emerging scores of new states untried in the ways of democracy.

The Sino-Soviet bloc is dedicated to changing the face of the world and to replacing the democratic system of law by the dictator system of the proletariat. In the course of advancing this program, they have promoted violence and class struggle as one of their chosen instruments.

Here in the United States we are more fortunate than most of the peoples of the world. Due to our tradition, the inherent strength of our institutions and the vigilance and temperance of our law enforcement, Communist penetration and Communist agitation has been rigorously restrained.

Unfortunately, in many other countries of the world today this is not the case.

It is the strategy of the Soviets and the Chinese Communists to concentrate first on the weak and then to encircle us, the strong, by penetrations in Asia, Africa, Latin America. Even in some countries in Europe, the Communist Parties have considerable open strength, and a well-organized underground apparatus.

If you have thought of me for your award, it may be because as head of the CIA, I have the duty to bring together all of the information on the Communist plot on a worldwide basis, to expose it, and to furnish others with the means of exposing it, and to collect the evidence on which the policymakers in Government may frame an effective policy to combat international communism.

As you know so well in order to deal with crime and the artisan of disorder, whether locally or in the international field, we must have intelligence on their plans and objective; on their leadership and their techniques; and so it is also with the Communist plot.

The general Communist program has been well advertised to us all; their tactics are often disguised.

It is the Communist view that history rolls inevitably toward the final victory of communism.

Khrushchev told us all about this during his recent visit to this country. In his address last September at the National Press Club, he explained the "We will bury you" theme.

He said that by this he did not mean any physical burial of anyone at any time. It was merely a question of inevitable changes in the social system over the course of the historical progress of society.

In another address Khrushchev argued that the social system changes as society develops. First he said there was the feudal system. It was superseded by capitalism. Capitalism was more progressive than feudalism. But capitalism, he claimed, engendered irreconcilable contradictions and as it outlived itself, it like every earlier system would give birth to its successors. Capitalism, he said, as Marx, Engels, and Lenin have proved, will be succeeded by communism.

Khrushchev would have us believe that this evolution to communism will be a peaceful, painless process. One might footnote this view by suggesting that this had hardly been true in Poland, in Hungary, in the Baltic States or in China.

Although professing that history will take care of us, Moscow and international communism have a definite program for helping along this so-called historical evolution.

I shall briefly outline what I believe this program to be. And since today is Sunday, it is well to start out with the Soviet attack on religion as one of the cardinal points of their program.

Karl Marx taught that religion is the opiate of the people. As late as 1954 the central committee of the Communist Party labeled the church as "the prop and tool of the ruling classes which they use as a means to enslave the workers." They propose to instill atheism as a substitute for religion.

Here we can quote history back to them. No great civilization has ever prospered and endured without a deep religious background.

The Soviet's atheistic program of attack on the free world has three major elements; first, the military, second the economic, and third the subversive. I shall say a world about each of them.

The military threat is widely advertised and is easier for the people of the world to understand than their more subtle techniques.

This threat is based on Soviet missiles and bombers, nuclear weapons and a large conventional force, ground and air, supplemented by the largest submarine fleet in being the world has ever known.

For their own political purposes they rattle the missile; this took place notably during the Suez crisis about 4 years ago. Some foreign visitors to the Kremlin these days have also received Khrushchev's estimate of how many missiles and nuclear bombs were being reserved for them, or would be required for the destruction of their respective countries. He hasn't yet told us how many are reserved for the United States.

I believe, however, that Khrushchev is still confident that he can win the world without actually employing military force. He doesn't want to acquire a world in ruins if he can take it intact. However, he keeps up his military forces as an ever ready threat particularly for those countries which live under the shadow of Soviet Russia and Communist China.

Then there is the Communist economic threat. This has two main elements—their own domestic industrial growth, and their foreign economic penetration.

Khrushchev recognizes that the United States is the most highly developed economic power in the world today. However, he claims that with the Soviets' higher annual rate of growth, they will catch up with us in the next 10 to 15 years.

Such boasts are an exaggeration but this does not prevent his peddling them on a worldwide basis. Nor do these boasts fail to impress the underdeveloped and nonindustrial nations who see the great strides which the Soviet has made over a few decades. From a second rate industrial power they have now come to be second only to the United States.

While Soviet industrial production today is less than one-half of ours, it is true that their present annual rate of growth is about twice our own. If one takes the free world's industrial production and contrasts it with that of the Communist world, including that of Communist China, the gap in favor of the free world is still greater.

In the decade or so which Khrushchev allows for equaling our industrial production, the Soviet, on the basis of present relative rates of industrial growth, will narrow the gap, and in 1970 Soviet industrial production could be about 60 percent of our own.

This is impressive, and while not up to Khrushchev's boasts, it certainly gives us no call to relax.

As for agriculture, the picture is very different. With six times the number of farmworkers that we have in the United States, the Soviet Union is producing about 25 percent less in farm products than are we. The facts are that their agriculture is inefficient. Here they have little or nothing to boast of. There is too much of Karl Marx and collectivism and too little free enterprise incentive and ambition on the Soviet farms.

However, what should give us pause about their economy is that they are putting into national power goals, into military hardware, heavy industry, and related fields, a far greater percentage of their total production than are we.

We are spending a great deal these days for the production of certain types of consumer goods which add little to the sinews of our national strength. And in making comparisons with the Soviet Union, we must realize that it is the use to which we put our great economic resources rather than their absolute size that determines the measure of national power.

I am no economist, but I feel that it is our primary duty these days to produce that which will keep our country strong and free. Strong not only in the sense of military might but in education, science and technology; free not only in the sense of freedom from want but free to develop the best that is in us; with the tools to enjoy our leisure but not necessarily every imaginable gadget.

I admit this is easier to say than it is to accomplish in a free society.

In his regimented state, Khrushchev takes his military hardware out of the hide of his people. He limits the volume of consumer goods, of housing and the like. As a consequence, Khrushchev today faces a domestic problem of no mean proportions in meeting the growth demand for more progress in raising the standard of living.

The other phase of the Soviet economic threat is targeted abroad.

It is carried out on a highly selective basis but it is very efficiently publicized.

The areas of Soviet economic penetration are chiefly the Middle East, including Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan; south and southeast Asia, including India, Burma, and Indonesia. Recently, the Soviet Union is turning its attention to central Africa and to the hemisphere to the south of us, with Cuba now receiving Soviet credits and oil products from Communist countries.

It is well to remember that the less developed countries look upon the Soviet Union as a nation which in a few decades has developed from a backward country into the world's second industrial power. These less developed countries aspire to do the same. Although they do not expect to reach anything like the high economic and industrial levels of the United States, they are attracted by Moscow's claims that rapid industrial progress can be achieved if they just conform to Communist methods and discipline. We know the fallacy of that argument but many of the lesser developed countries do not.

The third major element of the drive of communism to fulfill its boast of inheriting the earth lies in the field of political action, propaganda and the subversive effort to undermine free governments everywhere.

They start of course with the weakest and most vulnerable targets but they lose no opportunity to work even against the strong and the sophisticated.

Their weapons include the control of their farflung Communist Party organization, underground and above ground, on almost a worldwide basis. Then they have their front organizations in the fields of labor, of veterans, students, youth, women, and the various professions.

Their so-called world peace and "ban the bomb" movements appeal to the aspirations of peoples in various parts of the world.

The overall strategy of international communism is generally worked out in Moscow or, in some cases, in Peiping, at secret conferences of Communist delegates from various areas of the world.

Take Latin America, for example. At the 21st Communist Party Congress held in Moscow a little over a year ago, guidance was given to the Communist leaders in secret regional sessions. The Latin American Communists were directed to develop the theme of nationalism and to omit any reference to relations with Moscow. They were were told to use every effort to eliminate pro-American elements, and to develop their local revolutions with the United States as the main target and whipping boy. I need hardly point out that these directives are being implemented. The theme in Latin America is liberation from what international communism describes as the domination of the "Colossus of the North."

This is just a short blueprint of the strategy of international communism.

It is a formidable threat to our free institutions and those of the free world.

But communism is not the wave of the future. It is reactionary, repressive, atheistic and intolerant.

As such it will not satisfy the strivings of man. While it may produce material strength, it does not create moral values.

There is some evidence today that those who are living under Communist domination are becoming restive as education and knowledge of the outside world become more general behind the Iron Curtain.

The example set by this country as the leader of the free world will play a major role in the shaping of the future and in our success in meeting the Communist threat.

In the opening paragraph of the Federalist papers in which men who had a great part in the framing of our Constitution and our system of government expressed their views, there is this statement, "It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country by their conduct and example, the important question, to decide whether societies of men are capable or not of establishing good government."

It has been an inspiration to me to meet with you today, to receive this award and to know that throughout this land there are great bodies of men who like you are dedicated to the upholding of law and the maintenance of order within the framework of the preservation of our freedoms.

Great Lakes Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the stimulation of ever-greater trade through the St. Lawrence Seaway is important, not only to the Great Lakes, but to the economy of the whole Nation. Currently, the flow of deepwater vessels through the channels of the seaway project reveals an increasing volume of traffic to and from American ports on the Great Lakes.

From all evidence, we can expect substantially increased traffic in 1960.

There will, of course, also be problems and challenges. Among others, these include encouraging more and more shipping interests to utilize the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway; resolving of pilotage problems; promoting good labor-management relations; and heading off efforts by special interests elsewhere in the country to divert traffic from the St. Lawrence Seaway.

These, and other, problems confront us.

In addition, there are still development problems relating to navigation on the seaway and the Great Lakes. These include: Further improving the Great Lakes connecting channels; need for greater harbor development; studies of ways to deal with the bottlenecks at the Welland Canal, and elsewhere on the seaway; accommodation to the changing pattern of navigation resulting from the seaway; and other factors.

Recently, the Great Lakes Seaway Journal published a review of the informative study by the Corps of Engineers entitled "Great Lakes Navigation."

Reflecting on the basic problems that need to be met, and solved, to assure that the seaway—once a dream, and now transformed into reality—lives up to its promises, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Great Lakes Seaway Journal, May 1960]

GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION

(By north central division, U.S. Corps of Engineers)

CONNECTING CHANNELS IMPROVEMENTS

The project for deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels as authorized in 1946 and 1956 has an estimated Federal cost of $146 million. Funds appropriated by Congress to this project amount to $70 million. The budget for fiscal year 1961 includes an additional sum of $30 million to carry on the work. The work is presently about 37 percent complete. The Amherstburg Channel in Detroit River and the Middle Neebish Channel in St. Marys River have been deepened to the new project depth over the westerly 300-foot channel width as provided for in the authorized plan of improvement. There are 11 other reaches of these channels which have work now underway at an estimated investment of $28 million and it is expected that contracts for work in 8 additional reaches at an estimated $22 million will be awarded by July 1960. Further, work in about seven additional reaches is planned for initiation with funds anticipated for fiscal year 1961.

The controlling depths in the connecting channels at the present time for upbound traffic are 21 feet in the St. Marys River and 25 feet in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers, and for downbound traffic are 25 feet in all channels. Completion of works to provide a controlling depth of 27 feet is scheduled for June 1962. However, this schedule is very tight. Many contracts are underway and many more are yet to be awarded. In view of the large amount of work remaining to be accomplished, it is possible, for reasons beyond control, that there may be some slippages and consequent delays in the schedule.

The question is often asked as to what effect the deepening and enlarging of the connecting channels will have on lake levels. The work will have no effect on the levels of Lake Erie and Ontario as these lakes are downstream from the channels being deepened. Neither will the work have any effect on the levels of Lake Superior as the outflow from that lake is completely controlled at the Soo. However, if not compensated for, the deepening of the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers would lower the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron.

The enlargement of the channels in the Detroit River has been compensated for by placing obstructions to flow in the form of dikes such that the net effect of the work will have no effect on the levels of Lakes Michigan-Huron.

Deepening the St. Clair River and construction of Southeast Bend cutoff channel would have the effect of lowering the levels of Lakes Michigan-Huron about 0.11 foot or 1⅜ inches if not compensated for. Studies show that the net effect of the deepening of the St. Clair River to 25 feet during the years 1933 and 1937 has been to lower the levels of Lakes Michigan-Huron about 0.15 foot or about 1¾ inches. Thus the combined net effect of the deepening of St. Clair channels to 25 feet and the present deepening to 27 feet, including Southeast Bend Cut-off Channel, would be to lower the levels of Lakes Michigan-Huron about 0.26 foot or 3⅛ inches.

The current program for deepening the connecting channels includes the construction of compensating works in the St. Clair River. These works will compensate for the lowering of Lakes Michigan-Huron levels which would be affected by the current deepening program in the St. Clair River and will also compensate for the lowering which resulted from the previous deepening of the river to 25 feet. The compensating works will consist of submerged sills in the upper reach of the river with depth over the sills of about 31 feet. Upon completion of the sills, it is expected that they will have the effect of raising the levels of Lakes Michigan-Huron by 0.26 foot. The regimen of levels on these lakes will then be the same as they were prior to the dredging which was accomplished to deepen the St. Clair River to 25 feet some 25 years ago.

All work on the project for deepening the connecting channels is scheduled to be completed by June 1965. However, the nature of the work expected to extend beyond June 1962 will not restrict the drafts of vessels. This work includes completion of the deepening of Point Iroquois Shoal and anchorage area, the channels in the Straits of Mackinac, Pelee Passage Shoal, and construction of the compensating works in the St. Clair River.

An important feature in the connecting channels program is Southeast Bend Cut-off Channel. This cutoff channel through Canadian territory, which has been approved by Canada and for which we have awarded a contract, will be a straight 700-foot-wide channel connecting the upper end of Southeast Bend in the St. Clair River with the present channel in Lake St. Clair. This is a worthy improvement from the standpoint of savings in vessel time and eliminates the hazardous Southeast Bend section of the river.

NEW POE LOCK AT THE SOO

Another important feature of the general program is construction of a new lock at the Soo to replace the obsolete Poe Lock.

The proposed lock will be 100 feet wide, 1,000 feet long between inner operating gates and will provide for 32-foot depth over the sills at low water datum. For comparison, similar dimensions of the MacArthur Lock are 80 feet by 800 feet by 31 feet.

The estimated cost of the new lock is $42,300,000. Of this amount, some $725,000 has been appropriated to date for planning purposes. Provided the $1,350,000 which has been requested is appropriated by Congress, construction will be initiated in fiscal year 1961. Completion of the lock is scheduled for fiscal year 1965, depending on this funding.

Design of the new lock is well advanced. The construction operation is planned so as not to interfere with vessel traffic through the other three locks at the Soo. The first contract will be advertised this fall. It calls for construction of the upstream and downstream cofferdams, removal of the existing Poe Lock, and reconstruction of that part of the approach piers lying outside the cofferdams.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The present high degree of development for the Great Lakes navigation system has been justified primarily by transportation savings on waterborne commerce in iron ore, stone, grain, and coal. The survey report completed in 1954 determined that anticipated benefits from transportation savings on movement of these bulk commodities exceeded by 78 percent the cost of deepening the connecting channels and associated principal harbors. In this report the system of harbors was considered as a group. The Great Lakes Harbors Study, currently in progress, will determine individual harbors which should be improved in this overall Great Lakes system.

There are two general groups under study in the report. These comprise harbor improvements needed for bulk cargo traffic and the improvements needed primarily for overseas general cargo traffic through the St. Lawrence Seaway. We have considered initially the harbors which require improvement to permit full utilization of the deepened connecting channels for bulk cargo traffic. Thus far, we have completed 19 out of 43 interim reports. The recommended improvements are in the interest of bulk cargo but will also benefit the iron ore traffic from Labrador through the St. Lawrence Seaway and to some extent oversea traffic. There are still interim reports to be completed which will consider further improvements of harbors for both bulk cargo and oversea traffic.

While it is appropriate to emphasize that benefits to bulk cargo traffic have been the basis for economic justification for deepening the connecting channels and harbors serving this commerce, the importance to the midcontinent of adequate harbor facilities for oversea traffic cannot be minimized. The interim harbor reports which will consider improvements for general cargo traffic have posed many difficult economic analysis problems. The development of the estimate of prospective general cargo traffic to individual harbors and evaluation of transportation savings to such traffic have been complex tasks. We are now entering the final stage of these economic studies.

Harbors on the Great Lakes have been studied and progressively improved as a con-

tinuing program for many years. Several survey reports are now underway for harbor improvements in addition to those for the comprehensive Great Lakes harbors report. The separate survey reports deal generally with improvements considered for bulk cargo traffic not directly related to the deepening of the connecting channels and construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

ALL AMERICAN CANAL

An investigation of interest to many is the proposal for a canal from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario in the United States, commonly known as the All American Canal. Provided funds which have been requested are appropriated in fiscal year 1961, a reconnaissance survey will be initiated in order to make an estimate of the overall problem before embarking on a detailed and comprehensive survey report.

SUMMARY

The Great Lakes navigation pattern is changing. There are two facets to this change. First, there is the gradual change which has extended over a long period of time, accommodating the larger, deeper draft, more economical vessels in the bulk cargo fleet. The second and certainly more distinct in character and recipient of widespread public attention upon completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, is the appearance on the Great Lakes of oversea traffic using modern ocean ships, and the ability of Great Lakes bulk carriers to reach the St. Lawrence River below Montreal.

The importance of the Great Lakes navigation system to the national economy will continue to be based primarily upon the economical transportation of bulk raw materials to serve the industrial complex of the region.

U–2 Probe Seen Revealing Loose Rein Before Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 3, 1960:

U–2 PROBE SEEN REVEALING LOOSE REIN BEFORE SUMMIT

WASHINGTON.—The thoroughly fair-minded Fulbright committee hearing is revealing some grave shortcomings in the administration's handling of the U–2 plane incident, although one aspect of the President's conduct of the affair seems to me to be strengthened.

The most damaging disclosure is that there was never any considered, specific high-level examination of whether the U–2 flights should be suspended prior to the summit. This suggests a grievous oversight and a looseness of reins at the top of an operation, which by any standard demanded close and continuous scrutiny.

The hearing has also revealed a gaping lack of coordination among the White House, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and between the State Department and its official spokesman, which resulted in contradictory and embarrasing public statements.

On the other hand, Mr. Eisenhower's reasons for telling the obvious but rarely admitted truth that the President is personally responsible for the Nation's undercover intelligence activities became more persuasive in light of the testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Understandably Secretary Herter sought to put the best possible face upon the administration's handling of the whole matter. At the very outset of the inquiry, Mr. Herter affirmed as one of his central points that "the decision not to suspend this program of flights, as the summit meeting approached, was a sound decision."

But the alert Senator FULBRIGHT was not deflected by the bland implication that the continuance of the flights represented a careful decision by those in authority. He pressed Mr. Herter to say who made the decision, and whether there was thorough consideration of summit consequences. The Secretary was forced to back away from his contention that the administration reviewed the flights in light of the summit. This fact emerges from the following questions and answers:

FULBRIGHT: "Was such a decision taken?"

Herter: "That I can't tell you. I was not a party to that."

FULBRIGHT: "You say that 'the decision not to suspend the flights as the summit approached was a sound decision.' Was there any decision taken not to suspend them?"

Herter: "I did not interpose any objection to (them) because of any diplomatic event that was coming up."

FULBRIGHT: "Is it fair to say that no specific decision not to suspend them was taken? They were allowed to go along without any decision being taken to suspened them?"

Herter: "I think that is correct."

FULBRIGHT: "Therefore, the other way around is that no positive decision was taken not to suspend them; is that correct?"

Herter: "That is right."

There you are. There can be an honest difference of opinion whether the flights should have been suspended on the eve of the summit. It is certainly damaging to have to admit that the matter was not even considered at the highest level of government.

The President's decision to take open responsibility for the flights was not casual; it was deliberate. Apparently Mr. Eisenhower felt with some reason that Mr. Khrushchev was simply baiting a trap for him in suggesting that the U–2 flights were being made without his knowledge and approval. He concluded that any such an out would not keep the Soviets from using the incident to explode the summit. He could see Mr. Khrushchev just waiting for such a disclaimer so he could come back with the argument that the U.S. warmongers in the Pentagon were an even greater peril to peace on the thus admitted ground that the President could not control their actions.

The administration can reasonably contend that since Mr. Khrushchev negotiated with the President at Camp David knowing that the U–2 flights were taking place, it was not the fact of the flights which caused him to refuse to negotiate at Paris.

But on balance it is clear that the administration's handling of the matter showed grave deficiencies and will be a legitimate aspect of campaign debate.

One Goal Is Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech by Chairman Earl W. Kintner of the Federal Trade Commission before a luncheon meeting of the National Independent Dairies Association in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1960.

Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president and general counsel of the National Independent Dairies Association, called my attention to this address and reported to me that it was most favorably received by the association's members.

I particularly commend to my colleagues the portion of the statement relating to the purposes and objectives of the Small Business Division of the Federal Trade Commission. It is my sincere belief that the best interests of our Nation will be served by unrelenting vigilance in the protection of small businesses—protection from those practices, often illegal, which have as their final effect the liquidation through bankruptcy or "forced" merged of locally owned independent businesses.

The statement follows:

ONE GOAL IS SERVICE

(Statement of Earl W. Kintner, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, before luncheon meeting of the National Independent Dairies Association, Washington, D.C., April 4, 1960)

I

For me this occasion is a reunion. Reunions are always pleasant, but this one is more pleasant than most for it is a source of pride to me that I was invited to address your founders meeting at Chicago in May 1957. Your new invitation gives me the opportunity to thank you once again for that honor.

Yours is a volatile industry. The swift pace of change, so evident in 1957 when the association was founded, is swifter today. The seeds of change sown in other years are now flowering and new seeds are being planted. It would serve no good purpose for me to recount the forces now at work within the dairy industry, to merely list the changes of yesterday and the challenges of today to this group. Indeed, it would be presumptuous of me to lecture you who are spending your business lives in the dairy industry on the problems that face you. Your industry's publications and the public statements of your officers and representatives demonstrate that you possess a very lively awareness of those problems. However, perhaps I can make a contribution if I am able to demonstrate that you are not alone in your awareness. For you are not alone. The Federal Trade Commission is a small agency charged with surveillance of the entire economy; but notwithstanding the manifold, hydra-like problems competing for our attention and the limited resources that we have to expend, I can assure you that we have a keen appreciation of the problems of the dairy industry, of the independent small businesses within the industry, and of the ramifications of problems manifest throughout the whole complex of food distribution.

Our awareness has been translated into action in many instances. Actions affecting your industry constitute a significant portion of the entire spectrum of Commission activity.

Our most important activity is, of course, the enforcement of the antitrust and trade regulation laws committed to our responsibility. The large volume of our antimonopoly activity in the dairy industry is a source of amazement to many. At this very moment, no less than twenty-three antimonopoly complaints charging members of the dairy industry with violations of the antitrust laws are pending at various stages of litigation before the Commission. In addition, our Bureau of Investigation is now

conducting eighteen active formal investigations in antimonopoly matters involving the dairy industry. It is impossible to say that the dairy industry does not bulk very large in our antimonopoly work.

I do not propose to discuss these pending matters with you today. However, one of the Federal Trade Commission's ablest young staff officials will do so. Mr. William R. Tincher, Associate Director of the Commission's Bureau of Litigation, unites a deep devotion to the principles of competitive free enterprise with intensive experience in antimonopoly matters. I am sure that his discussion will be enlightening. I might surmise that his analysis will be much more detailed than any I could give, restricted as I am by the strictures of the Administrative Procedure Act and the natural reticence to discuss matters sub judice that should be embedded in the conscience of all who exercise an adjudicatory function.

However, I think that there is still room for me to make a contribution to your understanding of the functions of the Federal Trade Commission. Enforcement is the core of our activity, but not the sum of it. Our first duty must always be unremitting enforcement of those great charters of economic freedom that we know as the antitrust and trade regulation laws. The greatest good that we can achieve is to furnish assurance that freedom of entry into any market is not foreclosed, that all can compete unmenaced by predators, and that no monopoly strangles individual decision in any segment of our economy. Effective enforcement of the antitrust laws achieves more than the proscription of the unfair competitor charged in a given case; effective enforcement also has a prophylactic effect. Nothing so discourages those who are tempted to gain unfair advantage in the market place by prohibited means than the sight of one who has been tempted and is now penalized for succumbing to that temptation. All our efforts come to naught, all our ideals crumble to dust if ever we abandon this basic premise. I can say confidently that we have not abandoned it, that we are not abandoning it, that we have no intention of abandoning it. Our performance should assuage all doubts, for despite our recent feverish manning of the fire line against a holocaust of false and misleading advertising, "payola," "plugola," and the like, our antimonopoly activity has increased, not decreased. Fiscal 1960 is now 9 months old. During that 9-month period the Commission issued 85 antimonopoly complaints. This was five more than the number issued during the entire 1959 fiscal year.

II

Competitive free enterprise is the core principle animating our economy. The Federal Trade Commission is dedicated to the vindication of this principle. I cannot reiterate too often that the primary means of effectuating this ideal is through timely and efficient enforcement of the antitrusts and trade regulation laws. But if deterrence is our central goal it is not our only goal.

From the time that the idea of a trade commission was first discussed, its proponents insisted that the proposed agency must be something more than prosecutor. The original intention was to arm the Commission with a panoply of means to achieve a better competitive atmosphere. They felt that the provision of assistance and encouragement to the honest trader was as essential as the disarmament of the dishonest one. For, as expressed by President Wilson in words that are as fresh and meaningful today as they were when first uttered in 1914:

"The businessmen of the country desire something more than that the menace of legal process in these matters be made explicit and intelligible. They desire the advice, the definite guidance and information which can be supplied by an administrative body." [1]

Therefore, one of our goals must be service to those businessmen who evince a desire to obey the laws we enforce and who seek guidance in the sometimes perplexing task of obedience. We covet voluntary compliance, and our door is always open to those businessmen who realize that self-regulation is the plain duty of every freeman. The Federal Trade Commission also serves business by functioning as an information center. The acquisition and dissemination of information essential to the identification of our economic problems and to the successful solution of those problems is a function not to be treated lightly. Today, I wish to describe briefly some of the service functions performed by the Commission.

III

The story of our Bureau of Economics deserves a wider audience. Much of the time of our economists is devoted to immediate support of our antimonopoly enforcement efforts. Cases attacking corporate mergers or discriminatory pricing practices in many guises often raise complex economic issues requiring detailed analysis. Our small staff of economists have discharged this important duty in a commendable fashion. However, their activities extend far beyond the provision of assistance to the trial lawyers. One of the Bureau's critical functions is the conduct of general economic surveys and investigations. These studies are both intensive and extensive. They may examine specific economic problems already identified. They may examine a specific industry or manufacturer or distributing process caught in a complex of problems, or they may range over a wide expanse of the economy in order to identify trends or significant changes in economic structure. These studies have been of incalculable value. I, for one, have no patience with those who say that theory is useless to practical men and that long-range study is of no value in daily activity. The converse is true. There is nothing more practical than theory, and few things have more immediacy than long-range study. If you doubt the validity of this contention, I suggest that you think of those citizens of a generation ago who laughed at the scientists who maintained that the atom could be split, or those "practical men" who invested in the securities of interurban trolley lines as Model T's were pouring out of Detroit.

Many of the studies of the Bureau of Economics have had immediate practical effect. The outstanding example was the response engendered by the final report on the chain-store investigation issued in 1935. Its revelation of widespread discriminations in price induced by large buyers, of large brokerage fees paid to the chains and of disproportionate advertising and service allowances granted to large customers furnished much of the impetus for the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act. You who are a part of the vast food distribution industry are, of course, very much aware of the immediacy of these problems.

However, I am sure that you do not need to be told that the problems attempted to be met by the Robinson-Patman Act do not exhaust the list of your difficulties. For instance, I am told that one of your principal difficulties has been caused by the contraction in the number of retail distribution outlets available to you. A small supplier is often disadvantaged in attempting to meet the needs of a large retailer, since the small supplier's geographical coverage and power to offer economic inducements are often limited. It is possible that the market power of large retail food distributors can be abused in many ways to the ultimate detriment of a small supplier. I am informed that one of your worries is the possibility of increased vertical integration by retail chains. Each time a chain purchases its own ice cream manufacturing plant or fluid milk processing station one more market is removed from the reach of the independent dairymen. Such an action may or may not be in violation of the antitrust laws, but the fact that such integration has taken place in the past and may take place again in the future creates an atmosphere in which practices clearly violative of the antitrust laws can proliferate. I refer, of course, to the possibility that a large chain may use the threat of vertical integration to force an independent who desires its custom to grant discriminatory discounts, rebates, services, advertising allowances, loans of money, free equipment or other inducements.

I am confident that a recent study just now being completed and not yet published by the Bureau of Economics will shed new light on these problems and others related to them that concern you so closely.

During 1959 the Bureau of Economics conducted an intensive study on the basic economics of food distribution. This study involved analyses of the distribution structure of the corporate chains, the voluntary group wholesalers, and the retailer-owned cooperatives—types which in 1958 accounted for the bulk of retail food store sales.

The report will show many interesting and dramatic changes in the industry. For example, stores selling over $1,000 a day accounted for only 4 percent of food store sales in 1929 but 70 percent in 1958.

Having found a large measure of concentration and integration in the distribution of food at the retail level in this first phase of the study, the Bureau of Economics during 1960 will study the economic impact of current trends upon suppliers. This study will include analysis of the buying and selling practices of chains and wholesalers and will examine the details of their business dealings with the growers and others who supply them with essential food items for the conduct of day-to-day retail business. Where adverse economic impact, unfair or illegal trade practices, unwarranted discrimination, or other evidences of abuse of free competition are discovered, remedial steps will be recommended. Such studies on marketing topics by Government, added to the wealth of research in business today, can provide important guideposts for marketing executives.

I suggest that this forthcoming report from the food industry can be of great usefulness to the members of this association. From this report you can learn hard facts about the present structure of the market that you seek to serve. Your opportunities for effective sales promotion may be maximized by using the report as a tool for analyzing the specific markets in which you operate or expect to operate. You may wish to use the facts contained in the study in shaping your sales promotion plan, and in this day of the supermarkets, sales promotion for the small independent supplier is more important than ever. The independent dairymen or any similar group of small businessmen should not be discouraged from imaginative sales promotion efforts by any contraction in the number of retail outlets available. As you plan, remember that you have the protection of the Robinson-Patman Act. Any pressure by a large retailer seeking preferential treatment from you violates that law.

Thus, you should be encouraged to develop sales promotion programs in cooperation with all of your retail customers. The big

[1] Sixteenth message and papers of the Presidents, 7910 at 7916.

chain and the small operator should both be given equal treatment and can be expected to give you full cooperation. You are entitled under the law to get all of them to work for you to sell your product with your label.

IV

I deliberately chose to discuss in some detail the importance of the work of the Bureau of Economics to the members of this association, to all small businessmen, and to business generally, because the import of that work is not readily apparent to the casual observer. However, the services furnished to small businessmen by the Federal Trade Commission are by no means limited to broad studies of business activity, valuable as those studies are. We also offer assistance in more immediate ways.

In order to systematize its assistance to small businessmen the Commission established a Small Business Division within the then new Bureau of Consultation in 1954.

The creation of this Division symbolized the Commission's determination to assist small businessmen in every way possible within the scope of its assigned functions. That determination persists.

The Small Business Division meets a variety of needs. Perhaps its most creative service is the provision of advice and guidance to perplexed businessmen. Small business owners preparing plans for future operations or beset by problems in their day-to-day activities have a standing invitation to draw on the resources of the Division of Small Business. Most of the problems submitted to the Division raise questions regarding the applicability of laws administered by the Commission to given business situations. Once the issue is defined the Division then analyzes precedents established in Commission and court cases that may bear on the particular problem under analysis. If need be, the Division of Small Business can draw on the combined knowledge of the entire Commission staff. When the analysis is completed informal guidance is then given to the businesman. The advice furnished, because of its informal character is, understandably, not legally binding upon the Commission. Rather, it is designed to assist the small business manager in adapting his practices to Commission requirements, as well as to assist him in obtaining the relief from the unfair practices of his competitors which Commission law affords.

The Division of Small Business does not abdicate its advisory role if the problems of the businessman seeking guidance extend beyond the confines of Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction. Whenever the situation warrants, it seeks to inform small businessmen of the functions and jurisdiction of other governmental agencies concerned with their interest. To better fulfill this role the Division maintains liaison with the House and Senate Select Committees on Small Business, the Small Business Administration and other agencies dealing with the problems of small business.

If a businesman wishes to make use of this individual advisory service it is important that he make a full revelation of the details of his problem in writing, when possible, and at the earliest convenient time. In that way our staff is given an adequate opportunity to do the necessary research. After this research is completed, a conference will be arranged if it is desired and if time and distance permit. In instances where such a conference is not desired or is impractical, guidance will be furnished by correspondence.

Another function performed by the Division of Small Business is the expedition through the Commission of those matters involving practices which adversely affect small business. Any small business concern which has reason to believe that a businessman is using methods proscribed by the laws enforced by the Commission should submit a complaint to the Division. The complaint may be submitted in any written form—a letter is sufficient. It should contain the name and address of the persons whose practices are questioned, together with a description of those practices in as much detail as possible. Where practical the complaint should be accompanied by any evidence that is readily available.

It is the policy of the Commission to hold the name of the complaining person in any proceeding in confidence. This policy is premised on the fact that a complainant is not a party to any Commission proceeding; since the Commission acts only in the public interest, all formal actions are instituted in its own name.

A letter of complaint receives prompt consideration. If it is determined that further proceedings would be in the public interest and that the Commission has jurisdiction, a formal investigation is docketed. When the facts are known, appropriate action is taken.

It should be understood, of course, that not every practice which adversely affects small business will be found illegal. In this regard, the Division of Small Business will be glad to ascertain whether a given complaint actually does involve practices which violate the law.

The activities of the Bureau of Economics and the Division of Small Business represent only two facets of the broad service functions performed by the Federal Trade Commission. Mention should be made, for instance, of the Trade Practices Conference program and the Guides program. However, I will count it a real gain if I have demonstrated to you that we have facilities available for your use and for the use of all other businessmen who desire to compete in an ethical and efficient manner.

If we can be of service to you please call on us. One of our goals is service to the business community, and, as with all our goals, we are determined to achieve it.

Support for Conservation Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James H. Murphy, chairman of the board of the Murphy Products Co., of Burlington, Wis., made a very interesting and informative speech at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Swine Breeders Association. This speech was recently called to my attention and I believe deserves the careful study of every Member of Congress.

The Murphy Products Co. is a commercial feed concern and for that reason Mr. Murphy's statement on the conservation reserve program deserves special consideration. The speech is as follows:

SIDELIGHTS ON THE FARM PROBLEM

The farm problem in its simplest form is a matter of an overproduction of essential foods and fibers for human use. This problem is not new, but is the accumulated result of two important factors.

First. For 50 years the efficiency of producing food and fibers has increased about 2 percent per year or 100 percent overall. This 50-year increase in efficiency is more progress than was made in the previous 2,500 years. It occurred as the result of experiment station research, improved machinery, better breeding, the use of hybrids, better fertilization, and newer, more up-to-date production methods.

Second. Under the stimulus of high prices during two world wars, much of our long-time grassland, and a lot of marginal land was plowed up and used for cropland farming. This occurred throughout our agricultural area, but especially in those areas normally considered too dry, too cold, or too rough for good crops.

These bothersome farm surpluses first occurred shortly after World War I and caused the farm depression of the 1920's, which became more accentuated in the 1930's. Under the Hoover administration, Alexander Legge, president of the International Harvester Co., was called in to head up the Farm Administration. He found the problem too big to cope with on an administrative basis, and didn't have time to develop an effective method of meeting the problem. In the following administration when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, he recognized the problem as one of overproduction beyond our needs. He undertook to solve it by killing off 10 percent of our newly farrowed pigs, plowing under every third row of corn, and cutting down on our overall agricultural production.

Then World War II took over and not only absorbed all surplus food and fiber, but demanded ever-increasing supplies for ourselves and our allies. The problem became one not of supporting prices, but on setting ceiling prices that would still encourage top production. As a matter of fact, any food and fiber material that could be produced could be sold at the highest prices permitted by regulations.

Then, following World War II, ceiling prices became support prices. The question of parity came into the picture. Farm crops were subsidized, not for production to meet our needs, but to give the farmer prosperity. These subsidies encouraged overproduction, developed ever-increasing surpluses, and knocked out the price factor which ordinarily controls supply and demand.

Now we face this monstrous dilemma, of our own making, and wonder which way to go. First, we must recognize that producing beyond our needs is wasteful, uncalled for, and, from a conservation standpoint, just as wrong as pumping our oil wells at full capacity and letting the oil soak into the ground, or of cutting our forests and letting the fallen trees rot away.

Second, our food and fiber production capacity, the fertility of our soils, is a sacred trust, a legacy or inheritance, if you please, that we should conserve for future generations when a greatly increased population will badly need it.

We should produce no more than we can consume or distribute, and I think you will agree it is morally wrong to produce and waste while others in this world are hungry and needy. We should produce for ourselves and face the responsibility of distributing our surpluses to those far more needy folks who are hungry and poorly clad in many areas of the world.

We can't sit back in smug, well-fed, well-clothed satisfaction and let our tremendous overproduction go to waste. Regardless of price, we must face up to the responsibility that if we can't use it we must distribute it to others. At the same time, our tremendous and increasing production capacity should be conserved. It is, as I say, a legacy—a trust fund—an inheritance that should be conserved and improved for our children and grandchildren.

This is not a new thought. During the past few years the U.S. Department of Agri-

culture, under Secretary Benson, has organized the conservation reserve of the soil bank. This department is headed by one of our top Wisconsin farmers, Mr. Tom Hamilton, of Westfield; he is a man who has made an outstanding farming success on comparatively marginal land by following new and approved production methods. He and his associates believe that one practical method of meeting the farm surplus problem is to reverse the trend from grassland to cropland.

The soil conservation reserve is set up to do this. It encourages farmers to put their cropland farms into grassland, reforestation, or develop them for recreational use. The privilege of putting land in the conservation reserve must be applied for and is not forced on anybody. It is a natural for folks who wish to retire and still live on the farm. It takes care of the widow with a growing family who wants to hold the farm until her youngsters grow up. It provides for taking cropland out of production and preserving its fertility for the future.

In 1959 nearly 23 million acres were enrolled in the conservation reserve. Twenty million aces went back into grass. Over 2 million acres was reforested, and the balance was developed into recreational areas. Most of this reserve consisted of whole farms, and none were taken unless a subsidized crop had been produced on them in one of the previous 2 years. Consequently, nearly 17 million of the 23 million acres was cropland.

This method controls production and costs far less than subsidies. The cost per acre on the average is $8 per acre for land that will produce 20 bushels of wheat per acre. The entire 23 million acres, much of it excellent cropland, cost the Government a total of $375 million or an overall average of $16 per acre—less than one-fourth of what a crop subsidy would cost.

Our authorities estimate that to control our present surpluses would require taking out of production somewhere from 66 million to 100 million acres, and this could be done at a yearly cost of a little over $1 billion, or about what storage plus carrying charges are on our present surpluses. In addition, we would be conserving vast areas of grassland and forests for future generations.

Then, too, we could stop pouring out billions in needless subsidies that now encourage marginal farmers to continue building up our unwanted surpluses.

For just a moment let's consider who gets these subsidies:

No. 1, there is the commercial family farm—well run, ably managed, efficiently equipped, that under normal conditions can make money without extra subsidies. About 25 percent of our farms fall in this class and they produce 75 percent of our food and fibers.

Prof. N. S. Hadley, head of the farm management division of Purdue University, says that while we now have 4½ million farmers, that in the next 10 or 15 years less than one-third of them—1 to 1½ million—will produce at least 90 percent of all the food and fiber we need. He says in the Corn Belt these commercial family farms will include 300 to 500 tillable acres with a capital investment of $200,000 up. He says the 80-acre farm, the 5-cow herd and the 100-hen flock are rapidly disappearing; however, we don't need 3,000 acres, 10,000 hens, or 500 cows to stay in business.

Returns to labor and capital increase very rapidly as the size of the farm moves from 80 acres to 200 acres. Then holds steady to 500 acres and from there up returns to capital and labor tend to drop off. This larger, more efficient, more productive and more profitable farm unit can support 30 to 50 dairy cows, 20 to 40 brood sows with their pigs, 1,000 to 2,000 hens and 75 to 100 steers. Of course, many highly successful farmers can go well beyond these numbers, and he concludes that the trend will be in this direction. So much for the commercial family farm and its potentials.

Then No. 2, there is the hobby farm owned by a man successful financially, often with a farm background. He likes the farm. He wants to raise stock. He likes to raise crops. He may consider the farm a hedge against hard times. However, he dsilikes regimentation and certainly doesn't need a subsidy.

The third class are the part-time or second-shift farmers. These are farmers near industrial areas or on marginal land. They do not make a living on the farm. They are employed off the farm at least 100 days a year. In some areas they work in industrial plants, and have a small farm to provide better family living or as a safeguard against unemployment, or because they like country living. Their production adds to farm surpluses but need not be subsidized.

Some of these part-time farmers are on marginal lands and may raise sizable families who help with the fieldwork. The farmer himself finds seasonal employment in construction, roadbuilding, forestry, cutting pulpwood, doing guidework during hunting and fishing seasons, or in any one of dozens of other fields of activity.

He makes as much off the farm as on, but is very vociferous about demanding that the Government subsidize his farm operations so as to make them pay. He probably would be as well off working full time off the farm, but still living on it and let it go back to grass and reforestation.

So, if a means were supplied to retire these marginal farms, our surpluses would be greatly reduced, the pressure on prices would be cut down and our efficient farmers could operate at a profit without subsidies. All this the Conservation Service of the soil bank provides. It is not the whole answer, but is an important, constructive step in the right direction.

Properly expanded to four or five times its present size it could cut down unmanageable surpluses to a reasonable size that could be handled. This, coupled with increased distribution to needy areas at a low world price or on a giveaway basis as we dispense money and munitions, would materially reduce our surpluses.

This would enable us to operate our farm production on a sound basis both morally and financially—and at less than one-fourth of what it now costs.

So, let's not merely sit back and agree with those who for political and other reasons criticize the efforts of our faithful public servants, but rather keep in contact with the constructive steps they initiate. Then when a worthwhile constructive proposal such as this Conservation Service develops, let us encourage it, cooperate with it and support it to the fullest possible extent.

It is a movement that is already started, can be developed and extended on a foundation that is both morally and financially sound.

Triton High School, Runnemede, N.J., Science Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the Congress the outstanding progress which has been achieved in the Triton High School in Runnemede, N.J. This school located in the Black Horse Pike Regional High School District draws its students from the three municipalities of Bellmawr, Runnemede, and Gloucester Township. This area was one of the earliest settled in colonial southern New Jersey and is part of the dynamic Delaware Valley.

I had the personal pleasure of visting this school during the week that a science fair was being conducted and was tremendously impressed by the number and quality of the exhibits that were there on display. I am also greatly impressed by the great respect which the students had for the teaching staff and the teaching staff had for the administrators of the school. All in all, it carried out, in my opinion, the ideal school system with an active board of education, a qualified administrator and teaching staff and an enthusiastic and industrious student body.

I wish to pay tribute to Mr. August W. Muller, superintendent and his assistants Mrs. Virginia Forneron and Mr. Walter F. Johnson. Mention should also be made of the heads of the departments as follows:

Mr. James A. Keegan, head of science department; Mr. Frederick Lynch, head of the industrial arts department; Miss Helen Megargee, head of the English-language department; Mr. John Oakes, head of the physical education department; Mr. Edward R. Ritchie, head of the social studies department; Mrs. Marjorie Simpson, head of the business education department; Mr. Charles W. Weigle, head of the mathematics department.

I am also happy to insert in the RECORD the names of the members of the board of education who are really responsible for the establishment of this school. They are as follows:

Mr. James Thomas, president; Mr. William Minkoff, vice president; Mr. George Burlingame, Mr. Leonard DeGeorge, Mr. Raymond Hansen, Mr. William Knippe, Mr. Joseph Moffa, Mrs. Frances Pyne, Mr. Elwood Robertson, Mr. Elmer Hill, secretary of the board.

Space does not permit inserting the names of all the students who participated in the science fair. In fact over 500 of the students participated by entering exhibits in the fair. Let it be said to all of the students of the Triton High School who participated that they demonstrated not only a great aptitude for and interest in the field of science; but by their enthusiasm and knowledge they also indicated the superb quality and dedicated service of the faculty of Triton High School.

I am, of course, pleased that Triton High School is situated in the First District of New Jersey which I have the honor of representing.

Job Exports and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an unusually provocative and interesting article entitled, "Blame for Job Exports Laid to Several Sources," by the distinguished economic columnist Elmer Roessner.

On previous occasions I have inserted some of Mr. Roessner's articles in the RECORD because I have found his presentations to be of real significance in the light of many developments taking place in the country and the world today.

When we ponder in the Congress, as we do, about the reasons for the so-called trouble spots and depressed areas in the United States which are not by any manner or means sharing in current prosperity, we would do well to consider the reasons for these conditions and for the steadily widening impact of foreign imports and foreign migration of American capital upon our own economic posture.

It is surprising to me that more of our national leaders do not realize where these trends are leading us and the devastating effects they have and are bound to have increasingly on the American economy and our free way of life.

As in other matters, I suppose we will wait until the horse is stolen before we close the barn door, but I merely want once again to make my own strong, emphatic protest against the policies and the laws that are making these threatening developments possible.

The article follows:

BLAME FOR JOB EXPORTS LAID TO SEVERAL SOURCES

(By Elmer Roessner)

This is more about exporting American jobs.

Jobs themselves, of course, are not exported. But when someone has work done overseas that could be done here, it means that somebody is laid off in the United States and someone is put to work abroad—and for all practical purposes that's a job export.

Two areas in which jobs have long been exported are in movies and in fine engraving. The color engravers of Germany, France, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and perhaps a few other countries do fine work cheaper than Americans.

Many will argue that despite the guild-like devotion to skills in the Old World, and the handing of skills from father to son, American engravers are superior to Europeans. Even if this is true, the European craftsmen turn out work cheaper. Engravings, and sometimes printed sheets themselves constantly flow in from abroad. Every day's work means the transfer of one job across the Atlantic.

FILMING ABROAD

The exportation of moviemaking is well known. American producers have been making many movies abroad for years. Scenery and backgrounds have been considerations, but lower scales and tax advantages are important. In Hollywood, extras live on unemployment benefits; in Italy, France, the Holy Land and elsewhere, natives draw unexpected pay for moving across the background.

Now work on cartoon films has been exported. Variety reports that major U.S. film companies are almost completely out of the cartoon field and the foreign countries may become chief suppliers of both short- and feature-length cartoons. "Estimates differ, but it's figured that a foreign cartoon can be acquired for from 50 to 75 percent less than one of similar length made in the United States," Variety says.

And Women's Wear reports that Warner Bros. Co., Bridgeport, is having its own staff design foundation garments for manufacture in Europe with the stated reason of using quality laces, elastics and workmanship abroad.

Is this export of jobs good or bad? Little of both. When there is heavy unemployment in this country, farming out work abroad worsens the situation. When labor is scarce, it is helpful. When foreign countries are in economic distress, sending jobs abroad can help them. It may be cheaper to support some Americans with unemployment insurance than to cause foreign workers to turn to communism because there is no market for their brassieres or transistors.

Who is to blame for export of jobs?

Partly the administration because it has been trying to shore up the economies of our allies, and has been reluctant to use discretionary powers to limit imports.

Partly our tax system, which provides great advantages for knowing persons who can transfer their earning powers abroad, and for corporations that can keep outside the taxing power of the United States.

And partly labor itself, which has priced itself so high that almost all of American industry is on a quiet search for ways in which its products can be made and its services rendered by low-wage workers abroad.

Faith of Our Fathers Living Still

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the youths from my district received recognition for her essay entered in the Daughters of the American Revolution Good Citizenship Contest. She is Miss Marie Weston of Freeland, Wash., and her paper, "Faith of Our Fathers Living Still," was among those which won top State honors.

I believe that what Miss Weston wrote is an indication of the seriousness of thought and purpose of today's youth, and is an inspiration for those who read it. The essay follows:

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS LIVING STILL

Our country's great leaders down through the years have shared a sure belief in God, in themselves, in their fellow men, and in freedom. In crisis and in peace they have placed their faith in God's wisdom, and in their ability to work out their problems, and in the great justice of a free people.

It is my belief that we still have as a nation that same faith, that same reliance on divine aid and assistance, as was needed at the Constitutional Convention. I am very grateful that they established and wrote into their documents a recognition of their dependence upon the Almighty; that they stamped on their coins the slogan, "In God We Trust."

The problems of our country are complex and difficult and there are many responsibilities. We need guidance as never before.

Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, says that the men who work with him in the Cabinet are men who believe that the Constitution contains eternal truths. They are men of faith who join in prayer in weekly Cabinet meetings, men who want to keep America strong and are willing, as their fathers before them, to sacrifice financially to serve the Government.

Several times President Eisenhower has issued a proclamation for a day of prayer in which all branches of the Government were asked to devote the day in giving thanks for blessings received and to ask God to strengthen us in our efforts for peace and to guide us as a nation.

At a prayer breakfast attended by men of various religions and political beliefs there was a piece of literature distributed by Conrad Hilton. It was inspired by the many letters he received as the result of an address given by him over the air. It was a picture of Uncle Sam on his knees in prayer saying "* * * not beaten there by hammer and sickle but freely intelligently, responsibly, confidently, powerfully." A prayer was pinned beside the picture and part of it read "Inspire us with wisdom, all of us of every color, race, and creed to use our wealth, our strength to help our brother, instead of destroying him."

The faith of our fathers still motivates the lives and thinking of our leaders. They believe as Benjamin Franklin that, "God governs in the affairs of men—without His aid we build in vain."

We are thankful for this land of abundant living, for freedom of conscience and individual opportunities and for faith itself. This is the legacy our fathers left for us. Let us preserve those sacred things of our heritage for those who come after us so as Lincoln said, "That this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

"In God we trust."

Midwest State Transportation Leaders Endorse H.R. 9488

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, additional support for H.R. 9488, which would prevent the airlift of first-class mail on which airmail postage has not been paid, is voiced in the following resolution adopted last week by the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, representing 11 Midwestern States.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas for over 6 years the Postmaster General of the United States has been conducting an airlift program for transporting by air ordinary first-class mail on an experimental basis and has recently substantially extended the program and has announced plans to further extend the program on a permanent basis; and

Whereas the diversion of first-class mail revenues from the railroads as a result of this program materially impairs their ability to continue to provide the service required of them in the interest of a sound national transportation system to adequately serve the national economy and properly maintain the Nation's defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners hereby go on record as opposed to the program to fly ordinary first-class mail and as

favoring and urging enactment of legislation to require discontinuance of the program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary to each Senator and Congressman from the States embraced in the membership of this conference, and to the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Commencement Address by Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, at Graduation Exercises of U.S. Naval Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., the distinguished representative of the United States to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, delivered the graduation address to the class of 1960.

Mr. Lodge has represented America with great distinction at the U.N. His task there is an insuperable one. He has gained much knowledge of world conditions because of this position and his other outstanding military and public contributions to his country. He spoke to the young men of Annapolis from this storehouse of information. His address was short, unequivocal, and direct. His words were inspiring and timely.

It gives me therefore, Mr. Speaker, great pleasure to include with this permission, the address of this distinguished man in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEXT OF COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT GRADUATION EXERCISES OF THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD., JUNE 8, 1960

To stand before this class, whose members are about to become regular officers of the U.S. Navy and other services, is an unforgettable honor for any man. It is doubly so for one who, like millions of other American soldiers in the Second World War, had the experience of putting his life into the hands of the Navy.

In the minds of the American people the Navy means daring, discipline, and sacrifice. It means bold feats of arms which, in times of danger, have changed the country's fortunes—from Lake Erie to the Battle of Midway and the Inchon landings. It means the rise of the United States as a great power with responsibilities as wide as the oceans of the world.

That idea of the Navy which Americans hold is not an illusion. It is true. There could be no higher wish for you who will become officers of the Navy today than that you yourselves should carry through your lives, in good times and bad, such a shining image of your calling.

Many centuries ago a wise man said:

"No counsel is more trustworthy than that which is given upon ships which are in peril."

In our generation the United States, and all nations which love their independence, are in peril. The realization of that peril should not cause us to become rattled. Rather, like sailors who are aware of danger, we should get down to fundamentals and seek trustworthy counsel about the things which really matter.

First on the list must come the country's security from armed attack. For that, America looks first and foremost to you, her professional military men. You must maintain our security in an era of dazzling change in weapons and in organization. You must not become mentally frozen. You may indeed see a time when new weapons and techniques will have wiped out the age-old lines of demarcation and our forces will no longer be divided into an Army, a Navy, an Air Force, and a Marine Corps. You will have to be able to take such radical changes in your stride and not be merely career-minded.

This means that you will have to keep your horizons wide—as wide as the interests of the United States. In fact many of you will have to be acquainted with more than military affairs. In this age of danger our military strength is the indispensable physical backing for our foreign policy. You will have to understand that foreign policy, the world in which it operates, and the basic American aims which underlie it. For the time is past—if it ever existed at all—when foreign policy and military affairs could be talked about in isolation from each other. The truth is that our security depends both upon our power and upon our purposes.

The Navy lives in that knowledge. Yours is not a mothball Navy which sleeps until war breaks out. In the Mediterranean and the Formosa Straits your ships and aircraft have accepted the risk of violence to give sanctity to the treaties and pledges of the United States. Your readiness is one of the profoundest reassurances of peace that free nations can hope for in this turbulent world.

We strive for our ideals and for a world at peace. Yet we know the road is difficult and dangerous. We know there can be misunderstandings, that our ideas can be distorted, and that the possibility of violence is a familiar fact of our time.

The most recent Kremlin press conference, for example, impresses us first by its untruth, its unpleasantness and its crudity. Yet on second thought we can see it as a healthy reminder of the facts of life. One of those facts is that basic Soviet aims have never changed. Another is that our military strength is now—and in the future must ever be—such that, as President Eisenhower said at West Point last week, no one dare attack the United States. Our reaction to such events, therefore, should be calm and cool.

America looks to the military forces in which you will play a great part, to lead her across dangerous seas. Vital though they are, it is not missiles which will ultimately save us, but men. And it is not at moments of celebration such as this that men prove their qualities, but in the hour of confusion and alarm.

Four hundred years before Christ, the Athenian ruler Pericles said this about the soldiers who had died in war:

"They faced the foe as they drew near him in the strength of their own manhood; and when the shock of battle came, they chose rather to suffer the uttermost than to win life by weakness. So their memory has escaped the reproaches of men's lips, but they bore instead on their bodies the marks of men's hands, and in a moment of time, at the climax of their lives, were rapt away from a world filled, for their dying eyes, not with terror but with glory.

"Such were the men who lie here and such the city that inspired them. We survivors may pray to be spared their bitter hour, but must disdain to meet the foe with a spirit less triumphant.

"They gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchres, not that in which they mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men."

The American people look to you, the officers of the Navy and of all our military services, for the hard, steely resolve which can stand up amid disaster and take command to save our Nation. Thus being ready for the worst, we can pursue with confidence the path which leads toward the best.

As you begin your careers of service to our cause, I salute you and wish you well.

Lewis G. Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N.Y., regarding my friend Lewis Castle, Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. This paper, as well as all of us in northern New York, knew of his fine character and the remarkable achievement that Mr. Castle made in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I know that the Members and the public Generally will want to read this fine tribute to a truly great American:

[From the Watertown Daily Times, June 6, 1960]

LEWIS G. CASTLE

Lewis G. Castle, who died in Massena Saturday afternoon, had the rare experience of satisfying a lifelong ambition. That ambition was for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway which he himself was able to accomplish through being the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. Here was a man who nationally was at the forefront of those who sought the construction of the seaway and those who campaigned for the construction of the seaway during the period of the 1940's and early 1950's. When the Federal Government finally passed legislation to undertake the seaway construction, Mr. Castle was appointed by President Eisenhower to be the responsible head of the corporation which was assigned the job of construction and later the job of running the seaway.

He was a citizen of Duluth, a member of an illustrious Minnesota family. He had been associated with the banking business in Duluth. He became the chairman of the executive committee of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association shortly before this association was to undertake its most successful effort to secure action on seaway legislation. For many years the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association had sought in vain Federal development of the seaway. His first reward was the passage of the law. His second reward was the assignment to build the seaway. His third was the completion, and his last was that of seeing the successful use of the seaway by ships from all over the world for almost 2 years. It was only

last June that the Queen of England participated in the ceremonies at Montreal and Massena officially opening the huge St. Lawrence canal system. Some ships had passed through the canal in the late fall of 1958. The shipping season of 1960 has been well under way since mid-April.

If he thought it was difficult to secure Federal passage of the seaway legislation, that was nothing compared with the last 6 years of his life during the period of construction and the initial use of the St. Lawrence Seaway. He had a unique role as the head of the seaway corporation. The United States was sharing the construction cost of the seaway with Canada. Thus there was the difficult challenge of accomplishing an international project. At the same time, and as part of the seaway undertaking there was also the associated power development project which was undertaken by the New York State Power Authority and the Province of Ontario Hydroelectric Commission. Here was a citizen of Minnesota who found himself enmeshed in the affairs of two Federal Governments and the State government of the United States and the Provincial Government of Canada.

To some extent he had experience in the complications of such a tangle of governments and personalities during the time when he was making an effort to secure Federal passage of the seaway legislation. He had competition in the sense that these various governmental units during the construction period were vying with one another to accomplish the project. He had to reconcile his concept of the project with that of the greatest and most colorful builder in the world, Robert Moses. He had the difficult role of representing a Federal Government whose financial stake in the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project was smaller than the stakes of New York and Ontario. Each of these instrumentalities spent more than two times the money on the St. Lawrence River that the Federal Government of the United States and the Canadian Government spent.

Yet through it all, Mr. Castle was successful in representing the Washington point of view, as well as his own personal attitudes which at times were difficult to argue in the face of the opposition. It wasn't a case of conflicting ambitions. It wasn't a case of jealousies. Rather it was an example of a billion-dollar enterprise in which the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. which Mr. Castle headed was a third or fourth partner. Let it also be said that the conflict within the United States with respect to the seaway was such that he did not ever secure the complete backing in Washington that his counterpart in Canada secured from Ottawa. What New York State and Ontario were able to do because of the nature of the backing to Ontario Hydro and to the New York Power Authority made it necessary for Mr. Castle to feel his way along carefully and conservatively.

The virtue of his service was that he was able to advance the U.S. Government interest in spite of the competition and the conflicts to the point that he was responsible for doing an almost impossible assignment.

Mr. Castle was a friendly, devoted public servant who was most successful in smoothing over the inevitable rough edges of the biggest public works undertaking in the modern North American continent. He has lived for the last 2 years in Massena, where there was a funeral service Sunday before the service which will be held in his home in Duluth. He will be greatly missed for his humanness in this tremendous enterprise. His success in accomplishing his ambition was due to the fact that he was a man of fine instincts, great persuasiveness and affability, who at the same time could be stern and aggressive.

The 14th Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to compliment one of my constituents, Attorney William Brewster, of Kingston, Pa., upon the completion and recent publication of another of his valuable historical works entitled, "The 14th Commonwealth."

It is very interesting to note that Attorney Brewster is a descendent of Elder Brewster, who came to New England with the first settlers. Another one of his ancestors was on the bridge at Lexington and helped repulse the British.

William Brewster was born on a farm in Susquehanna County in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania. Now past 80 years of age, he recalls that in his youth Galusha A. Grow, who lived in that general vicinity, rode by in his carriage. Grow, who succeeded David Wilmot in Congress, was Speaker of the House in the early days of the Civil War and introduced the Homestead Act in the Congress of the United States.

In his youth, Attorney Brewster was a newspaperman and he was working on a newspaper in Stroudsburg, Pa., when he decided to try his hand at newspaper work in the Wyoming Valley, which comprises my congressional district. For many years he covered the Kingston Borough area for a Wilkes-Barre newspaper and while thus employed entered a law office and pursued the study of law.

Attorney Brewster served as a board member and as solicitor of the Kingston Borough School Board for a total period of over 50 years. In 1922, he served as solicitor for the Luzerne County sheriff's office and for several decades was a prominent figure in the political life of Luzerne County.

Attorney Brewster is president of the Hoyt Library of Kingston, a position he has held for many years. He is an honorary member of the board of directors of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, of Wilkes-Barre.

For over 50 years, he has been a leading figure in the annual exercises held by the Wyoming Commemorative Association at the Wyoming Monument, in Wyoming Borough, which memoralize the battle and massacre of Wyoming which took place near there on Friday, July 3, 1778, and this year, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving as chairman of the commemorative program.

William Brewster is considered to be an authority on the Constitution of the United States and he is the leading authority on early Connecticut land claims in northeastern Pennsylvania.

A distinguished lawyer who was widely recognized for his oratorical ability, Attorney Brewster is generally regarded as the leading historian of northeastern Pennsylvania.

His current book, "The 14th Commonwealth," is a historical piece which merits the widest possible attention. It is a searching inquiry into the times and events when the residents of Westmoreland County of Connecticut—which encompassed Wyoming Valley—under the leadership of John Franklin and Judge John Jenkins and others, attempted to organize a new state in the northeastern portion of Pennsylvania.

In line with the publication of Attorney Brewster's latest book, I include a news story which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Wednesday, June 1, 1960:

KINGSTON MAN WRITES BOOK—WILLIAM BREWSTER'S WORK IS HISTORICAL

Wilkes-Barre Record has received an autographed copy of "The 14th Commonwealth" by William Brewster, Kingston. It is his most recent book. It is a history of the attempt to form a new State here in the Wyoming region and is on sale at local book stores.

George S. MacManus Co., Philadelphia, describes the volume as treating of the four movements for new States by Vermont, Westmoreland, Franklin, and Transylvania which developed during the Revolution and the period following its close. The publisher further says:

"About these movements, in newspapers and magazines, from time to time, much has been said, both inaccurate and incomplete; and only one of the lost States has been adequately treated by competent authority. The recurring interest in the subject, we believe, warrants this work which is a concise account contained in one volume. All had similar aspects. Vermont and Westmoreland had a somewhat close relationship and Ethan Allen was a leader in both movements. Likewise, Franklin and Transylvania had a close connection.

"Vermont succeeded and the others became the States that failed; and the intelligent reader of this work may perceive the reason why. Ethan Allen won the independence of Vermont, and the dramatic incidents in his startling career are vividly told. His more astute younger brother, Ira Allen, established the Republic of Vermont, which in 1791 became the 14th Commonwealth. The little known intrigues, by some considered treasonable, of the Vermont leaders with the British during the Revolution, are fully related.

"Westmoreland, the Wyoming region had the most tragic history, replete with Indian massacres, and an open war of pitched battles, murders and cruel evictions. A township and county of Connecticut for 8 years, there was a long, bitter and bloody struggle for its possession between Connecticut and Pennsylvania, known as the Yankee Pennamite Wars. There is a brief biography of John Franklin, the great Yankee leader, who drove out the Pennsylvanians and led the new State movement. The activities of such great national characters, for and against it as Ethan Allen, Oliver Wolcott, Joel Barlow, Timothy Pickering, and James Wilson are fully related. Every reader will be charmed with the fascinating story of Gideon Dudley and the exploits of his Wild Yankee Boys."

The author is a member of Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, and his publications include a "History of Kingston," treating of the history of the Wyoming Valley, and "The Pennsylvania and New York Frontier"; and he has also delivered many historical addresses, among which are "The

Connecticut Claim" delivered at the commemorative exercises at Wyoming Monument in 1939; and "The Beginning of the Anthracite Industry" delivered at the convention of the Mine Inspectors Association of the United States and Canada, both of which have been published.

Reds Enjoy U.S. Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in the June 3 issue of the New York Mirror, there appears an article by the able and fearless columnist, Victor Riesel, entitled "Reds Enjoy U.S. Privileges."

In this column Mr. Riesel vividly and effectively contrasts the treatment of Francis Gary Powers by the Communists with two well-known Russian spies that have been caught in this country. We cannot help but draw the conclusion from what has happened in these and other cases that there is a void in the law, due in part to the failure of the Congress to act and in a greater measure to decisions of the Supreme Court, which prevent us from dealing effectively with the various operations of the Communist conspiratorial apparatus within the United States.

I commend this excellent column of Victor Riesel and the information therein contained to the thoughtful consideration of the Members of the Congress:

REDS ENJOY U.S. PRIVILEGES
(By Victor Riesel)

Here is the line between sadism and civilization.

Our spy, Francis Gary Powers, is in solitary confinement. He has been dazed by injections of ampules of sodium pentothal—the truth serum.

Their spy, Col. Rudolph Ivanovich Abel of the Soviet Security Service, is in the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary in good health and thoroughly adjusted to the routine and privileges extended to all other inmates. Much of his time is spent in the prison's drafting and commercial art departments. There Abel can use his skills as a commercial photographer.

He is not sweated for information. He has it. He used three short wave radios for regular secret communication with the Soviet intelligence forces for years. We would like the colonel's knowledge. But he has complete freedom to speak or not.

Abel is entitled to an approved list of visitors—relatives or the nearest Soviet consul or even the Ambassador. But they have abandoned him. Our Ambassador in the U.S.S.R. has tried for weeks to exercise his diplomatic right to visit Francis Powers.

Nor is the line between sadism and civilization a thin one. It is a broad stroke. Take the case of Irving Potash. Years ago he was deported as an undesirable after being convicted of conspiring against the United States. He was—and is—a top official of the American section of the Communist International.

Potash reported to his bureau in Moscow after he was deported. He was assigned to China. He was shifted to Poland, his birthplace. Then he slipped back into the United States. The FBI picked him up. He served 2 years in Atlanta.

When he was released the Immigration and Naturalization Service tried to deport him again. No country would accept him. We did not imprison him or dump him somewhere beyond our borders. Potash got the full measure of the law, which says that if no country will accept him, he is free to move about in the judicial district where he was tried. This is the Southern District of New York.

Comrade Potash now is under supervisory parole. He may not go out of the district. But he is National Labor Secretary of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, which takes its instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party, USSR. He can conspire against us but there is no law apparently to stop him.

This amuses him. Late in March, for example, Potash broke parole. He had helped to plan a secret meeting of the Communist Party high command—the National committee. This was set for Chicago some 900 miles from the line beyond which he was ordered not to go.

But he went. He sat in on the meetings. They were held in the Midwest Hotel, 6 Hamlin St., Chicago.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service referred the matter of the broken parole to the U.S. Attorney in the Southern District. He checked the law as he would in any routine case.

There was the law. The fact that Potash has been serving the international Communist movement—the threat of which costs this Nation $40 billion a year and more in armament—made no difference. Nor did his association with the Polish and Chinese Communists. The U.S. Attorney ruled that Potash could not be held. He based this on court decisions in analogous cases.

So Potash, though a citizen of Poland and Soviet activist, is free to help run the Communist Party in America. How would you or you be treated if you were to slip into Moscow or Warsaw to organize an opposition party?

Khrushchev's Clean Hands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in this RECORD the comments of a constituent of mine, Mr. R. M. Norrington of Pasadena, Calif., as set forth in a recent letter to the editor of the Los Angeles Times. I feel these are very timely and well-chosen remarks:

RED CHIEF'S CLEAN HANDS, PURE HEART UNCOVERED

With his arms above his head, Khrushchev declared, "As God is my witness, my hands are clean and my soul is pure."

There are three lies in those few words. He doesn't believe in God, his hands are bloody from Budapest, his soul is as pure as a running sewer.

His esthetic nature was terribly shocked that any nation would resort to such low tactics as spying, even in self-defense. He completely overlooked the thousands of Commie spies who roam the earth and possibly the skies as well.

This saintly character called the spy incident an act of aggression. My dictionary defines aggression as "an unprovoked attack." The spy incident was neither unprovoked nor was it an attack.

There is really only one answer to this boasting, bluffing, bombastic, bloodthirsty bully—"baloney." So, I say to Ike:

"Adhere as closely as possible to the Monroe Doctrine. Straighten out your weak State Department. Veto the huge spending bills. Spend the taxpayers' money sanely. Keep the budget in balance. Curb inflation. Save what little is left of the value of the dollar. Keep the Nation strong, and forget the biggest hypocrite who ever lived. Then the Nation will be behind you 100 percent."

R. M. NORRINGTON.

PASADENA.

New Jersey's Most Honored Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable David A. Nimmo, judge of the superior court of the State of New Jersey, has been named "New Jersey's Most Honored Judge" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers. The following interesting article about the distinguished jurist by Mr. M. Martin Turpanjian, president of the league, appeared in the North Bergen Hudson Gazette:

NEW JERSEY MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By M. Martin Turpanjian)

SUPERIOR COURT JURIST DAVID A. NIMMO, OF JERSEY CITY, NAMED "NEW JERSEY'S MOST HONORED JUDGE" BY WEEKLY NEWSPAPER LEAGUE AS HIS SCOTCH ANCESTORS HAVE GLORIFIED THE ANNALS OF ENGLAND'S HISTORY FOR THEIR HEROIC STRUGGLES FOR MAGNA CARTA WHICH WERE FERTILE SEEDS THAT SET INTO MOTION U.S. INDEPENDENCE

Superior Court Judge David A. Nimmo, of Jersey City, was born in Hoboken, January 10, 1896. He received his early education in Jersey City and attended New Jersey Law School, now known as Rutger's University. He was admitted to the bar in 1919. He enlisted in the 104th Field Signal Battalion of the 29th Division, U.S. Army, serving in France during World War I until 1919 as a sergeant.

Judge Nimmo was appointed by Gov. Walter E. Edge as judge of Hudson County juvenile and domestic relations court in 1944. He was reappointed by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll in 1949. Governor Meyner named him to Hudson County court in 1954. In 1957 he was appointed to the superior court, chancery division.

He is a 33d degree Mason and a trustee of Emory Methodist Church, of Jersey City. He resides at 206 Fulton Avenue, Jersey City. He is a former commander of Hudson County American Legion. He is married to Pilar Huerta, of Ridgefield Park.

David A. Nimmo has been named as "New Jersey's Most Honored Judge" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., with all due respect to others. He is a splendid orator and after-dinner speaker. He is very unassuming. He has received plaques and citations from numerous racial or national groups and from houses of worship and organizations. Some people had been laboring under the impression as if

Judge Nimmo is of Italian ancestry; others believed he was of German ancestry while others felt he was of French ancestry and still others claimed he was of Spanish or Hungarian ancestry.

The Spotlight magazine, of Newark, N.J.'s picture news weekly, listed Judge Nimmo in its Rome edition a few years ago as if he is of Italian ancestry. Many people were consulted and the great majority claimed Judge Nimmo was of Italian ancestry and when the story was written by me in Spotlight a gentleman from Ocean County called up to tell me that he served with Judge Nimmo in the Army in Europe and he was positive that Judge Nimmo was of German ancestry; and finally I began to make my own investigation and went to him and asked him directly as to his ancestry background and Judge Nimmo said he was of Scotch ancestry and a 33d degree Mason, and that his ancestors came to America some 300 years ago and there had been a municipality by name of Nimmo Village in Virginia. Whereupon I wrote to the Governor of Virginia to get authentic facts and the chief executive asked the mayor of Princess Anne region to give the answers and the mayor told me if I wrote to the clerk of the court of that area he would be able to shed more light on the subject and finally I received a letter from Sadie Scott Kellam who said that she is the author of a book on old Virginia families and that she resides on James Nimmo plantation site. I bought that book for $8 and presented it to Judge Nimmo. References are made to Nimmos frequently. James Nimmo came to Virginia some 300 years ago as Ambassador of the Queen of England. He had many holdings and plantations. He erected a church which was known and is still known as Nimmo Church. Many roadways were named after Nimmos.

The family tree of Judge Nimmo also includes a William Nimmo around 1690. It was a William Nimmo who was on Washington's Committee of Safety and his son was with Morgan's riflemen who fought at Saratoga, N.Y. Like soldiers in all wars, some remain where they fought, and this one did and married a girl settling in Albany, N.Y., and Judge Nimmo's grandfather was born there in 1836. It is from him that Judge Nimmo's great-grandfather came to Brooklyn, N.Y., and Judge Nimmo's grandfather was born there in 1836. He is buried in Evergreen Cemetery, Brooklyn. In 1883, his son, the father of Judge Nimmo, came to Jersey City. On his grandfather's tombstone is cut a coat of arms that was bestowed in 1663 bearing an inscription "Nimmo of Scotland." The one who received this recognition had captured a Turkish fort in one of the crusades. After that there was a migration to the New World in the late 1600's.

Judge Nimmo has scored a record of judicial prestige and meticulous wisdom so illuminating in its consistency and its rigid inflexibility of fair play in all his decisions. He has truly glorified the historic American administration of justice. He has had a noble origin. His great ancestors were the pioneers for civil and religious liberty. His Scotch ancestry glorifies the annals of English history for their heroic struggles for the Magna Carta which were the fertile seeds that set into motion the American Declaration of Independence.

The unique characteristic quality of Judge Nimmo is the fact he has that sense of inner peace of mind and mental composure that radiates a magnetic personality and inspires a friendly approach for he is inherently friendly in his daily behavior pattern. He adheres religiously to the very exactitude of truth in all his legal interpretations.

Judge Nimmo has surely lived up to the lofty ethical ideals of his crusading ancestors.

Judge Nimmo personifies the highest note in the symphony of ethical manhood.

A Tribute to Will Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on August 15, 1935, we, as a nation, were truly shocked and saddened by the untimely and unfortunate death of Will Rogers.

I am sure that if Congress were in session on August 15 of this year, there would be many well-deserved tributes to this outstanding and beloved man. Since the time schedule makes this unlikely, I am today paying tribute to the memory of Will Rogers who made singular contributions to the American—indeed the world—scene.

Accustomed patterns are the basis of civilized life throughout the world and protection of the patterns is the general purpose of all civilized society. From this we derive stability and comfort, and also, unfortunately, a degree of stodginess and a preposterous sense of self-importance.

It therefore becomes necessary, from time to time, for some lighthearted soul to step forward and disrupt our patterns; to poke fun at them and us; and to remind us that our way of life, though comfortable, may be, in fact, a little ridiculous.

This is not an easy thing to do since it is, in a way, a form of attack upon a great mass of people, and none but the most astute humorist can pull it off without being drowned in a torrent of universal disregard.

Yet some can manage their attacks so skillfully and wittily as to emerge triumphant, having trampled the silliness of people and institutions and at the same time won the admiration of all.

Such a man was Will Rogers, the self-styled cowboy philosopher from Oklahoma.

Generally recognized as the foremost American comedian of his day, a star of stage and screen, Will Rogers was far more than that to his average fellow countrymen. He was, in a sense, an institution—the greatest debunker of stuffed shirts and fanciful ideas in the country.

He had the God-given quality for making people laugh and think at the same time. In a few words over the radio, on the stage, or in the newspapers he could say more and say it better than most of our would-be statesmen could say in hours of mouthings.

Nor was he a respecter of rank or social position. He kidded Presidents, crowned heads, Congressmen, and anyone or everything else when he saw fit; yet managed in the process to make even his victims like it, simply because there was never any venom in what he said.

But like all the great humorists in history, Will Rogers also had his serious side which, in his case, centered on the field of aviation. So devoted was he in this respect that the veteran aviator, "Casey" Jones—president of the Curtiss Flying Service—cited him among the leaders in the promotion of America's aviation industry.

"After Lindbergh," Jones explained, "Will Rogers was aviation's best press agent. The industry owes him more than he is ever likely to collect. His wit, his extraordinary publicity resources, and his genuine enthusiasm for flying entitled him to the nomination as patron saint of aviation."

Will Rogers called attention to commercial flying in his magazine articles, on the lecture platform, and from the stage, in his untiring endeavor to enlist the interest of America in air travel.

And when, ironically, the patron saint of aviation lost his life in a plane crash, a quarter of a century ago, the event could be said to parallel the death of so many frontier heroes at the Alamo. Dedicated to the pioneer instinct, all gave their lives in the interest of pioneer progress and for the benefit of generations to come.

Comedian, philosopher, pioneer—Will Rogers earned not only the adulation of contemporaries but also a place in the memory of time. It is a tribute worthy of his talents; a recognition of genius which the world cannot afford to neglect.

Military Guidance in a Counseling Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I received an article from a constituent of mine the other day which I believe touches on a real problem in our high schools today. There is no question that a concrete program of military guidance at the high school level is a very necessary thing. The article by John R. Lang, guidance counselor of the Babylon High School, Babylon, N.Y., follows:

MILITARY GUIDANCE IN A COUNSELING PROGRAM

I had the pleasant opportunity of visiting Pensacola, Fla., as a guest of the Secretary of the Navy and Vice Adm. Robert Goldthwaite, Chief of Naval Air Training. The "orientation cruise," as it was called, was extremely enlightening. The group was composed of leading businessmen and educators chosen by the local naval command. Counselors who are interested in learning how the tax dollar is spent in training pilots should apply through their local Navy commandant.

As a guest of the Navy, I was taken through every phase of pilot training that I could squeeze into 3 days. While at Pensacola, I learned that military guidance in many schools seems to be a forgotten part of the counseling program. Some schools fail to stress the fact that we are continually fulfilling military needs by way of the draft and enlistments. I think that many of us fail to realize just how this important phase of counseling is neglected. Many high school students about to graduate do not have any

conception as to what his military obligations are. Some students that enter college are not aware of the latest military requirements. For example, from August 9, 1955, the term of obligated military service by every male from 18½ years to 26 years of age is now 6 years. For example: If a man enlists now he might serve 3 years on active duty and serve 2 years in the Ready Reserve and 1 year in the Standby Reserve to complete his obligation of 6 years. There are other variations, but this is one of the common types of enlistment methods. There are also deferment plans for college students. The counselor should explain these deferment practices to each college-bound student also.

During this trip, the fact was repeatedly stressed that the service was not more interested in numbers of enlistees, but quality of enlistees. If the armed services of today were to entrust the modern machines and devices to the untrained student, millions of dollars would go up in smoke. The student of today should be advised that the military services encourage enlistments of high school graduates. In our area, if a student desires to enlist before graduating, the local recruiting station always contacts the guidance office requesting us to see the boy and to try to encourage him to finish high school. The recruiting officers have repeatedly stated this in all of their group guidance discussions in the schools.

At Pensacola, we visited the preflight school, where the prospective pilots are studying such basic fundamentals as aircraft engines, navigation, mathematics and reading. The last subject, reading, is one of the important subjects with the preflight school stresses. The program is always faced with a student, whether he is a college graduate or not, who cannot read according to accepted standards. Therefore, each student must take a speed reading course in order to improve his reading ability. In the preflight school, the commanding officer informed us that some of the pilots have improved their reading ability as much as 110 percent. It is a strenuous course for the average reader and is extremely helpful for disciplining the mind to correlate facts and figures correctly. If a pilot is flying an aircraft at 1,200 miles an hour, he must be able to disseminate many facts and figures in a split second. We saw an excellent example of just one of the decisions a pilot must make. A Blue Angel fighter came toward our viewing stand 50 feet above the ground at 1,200 miles an hour. As he approached us, he climbed almost vertically above us. If the controls varied a fraction of an inch from the standard position, you can imagine the holocaust.

Along the flight line, we questioned some sailors who were working on the jet engines. Some of the men were only 18, 19, and 20 years of age. These men were taught how to repair the jets while in their teens.

A $2-million plane might be entrusted to these men. Enlisted men had duties in the simulated high altitude laboratories. We also spoke to enlisted men in the labs where space suits were continually being subjected to experiments. Officers in these laboratories were using Buck Rogers-type machines which would break down if the incorrect buttons were pushed. One of the machines was designed to regulate the the amount of revolutions in a centrifuge containing a pilot. At the same time he is checking the recording machines which record respiration, pulse, brain wave patterns and the gravitation and pull on the body.

Therefore, if the students are being properly counseled, the students are in a better position to predict their futures, and the schools are fulfilling a tremendous need in informing the student of his military obligation.

Jobs After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 3, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, elimination of employment barriers on account of age is a practical necessity in our country. It is an objective which can be gained only by assaults from many directions. State antiage discrimination laws are one phase of the effort. The National Committee on the Aging staff report issued September 1959, discussed New York's experience with such a statute as follows:

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN NEW YORK

Evidence that public and private educational campaigns are inducing employers to hire on the basis of ability, not age, is provided by experience of the New York State Employment Service and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

Placement of nonagricultural workers 45 years of age and over by the NYSES has increased from 21 percent of total placements in the first 6 months of 1953 to 29 percent in the corresponding period in 1958 and 30 percent in 1959.

A spot check of the Hempstead office of the NYSES revealed that job orders containing upper age specifications dropped from 22.7 percent in 1955–56 to 0.3 percent in 1958–59.

The New York age discrimination law, effective July 1, 1958, is responsible for the precipitous drop in age specifications in advertising. Newspaper advertising specifying upper age restrictions, previously common, has virtually disappeared since the law became effective.

During the first year of operation of the age discrimination law, a total of 148 complaints were filed with the New York State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD). Eighty-two percent of these complaints were in the New York City area. Employers were named as respondents in 73 percent of the complaints, employment agencies in 17 percent, labor unions in 10 percent.

Fifty-four of the 148 complaints had been closed by the end of the first year of the law's operation. Charges of discrimination were sustained in 9 cases, dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in 28 cases, dismissed for lack of probable cause in 15 cases, and dropped by complainants in 2 cases.

Clerical workers comprised 38 percent of the complainants; professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers 22 percent; skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers 27 percent; service workers, salesmen, and sales clerks, 13 percent.

Among case histories reported by SCAD are the following:

Case 1: A 60-year-old draftsman applied for a position with a steel manufacturer. The chief draftsman who interviewed him stated that he could not hire a man of his age because it was against company policy. The applicant filed a complaint with SCAD. The investigating commissioner met with the assistant general manager of the firm, who stated that the information given complainant by the chief draftsman was not company policy. He agreed that age would not necessarily lessen an employee's usefulness in the job under consideration. Complainant was reinterviewed, passed the required physical examination, and was hired as an engineering draftsman at $120 per week.

Case 2: A 43-year-old man responded to an employment agency's newspaper advertisement for an accountant with construction experience to work at surety underwriting for an insurance company. On referral, the applicant was told by the insurance company representative that he could not be hired on account of his age. The applicant filed a complaint with SCAD. The investigating commissioner was told by the assistant secretary of the insurance company that the statement regarding age had been made to complainant, but that complainant had been rejected because he was not qualified by experience for the job. In the meantime, complainant obtained employment elsewhere and was no longer interested. The insurance company agreed to bring its employment application form into compliance with the law, display the SCAD regulatory poster, and issue a directive to all employees charged with hiring responsibilities that it is the company's policy to judge applicants without regard to age, race, creed, color or national origin.

Case 3: A 64-year-old woman applied to a county hospital for a cleaning job, but was refused on the ground that she was "too close to retirement age." She had references and a doctor's certificate stating that she was in good health and capable of performing such duties as the job might entail. She filed a complaint with SCAD. The investigating commissioner determined that the facts supported the charge of age discrimination. The hospital director agreed (1) to notify complainant when a vacancy occurred in a position for which she was qualified, (2) to consider her for such employment without regard to her age, and (3) to instruct all employees that "it is unlawful to discriminate in employment because of age, race, creed, color or national origin" and that any violation on the part of subordinates would lead to disciplinary action.

Case 4: A 38-year-old woman alleged that when she attempted to inquire by telephone concerning an advertisement in a newspaper for a position as a secretary, she was told that she must state her age if she wanted to be interviewed, as only girls in their twenties would be considered. She filed a complaint with SCAD. Respondent denied discriminatory practice and declared that no applicants were asked their age or denied appointments if older than the twenties. The only girls employed, however, were in their twenties, and the two employed as a result of the advertisement were 17 and 26. The investigating commissioner found probable cause for the complaint. Terms of conciliation were proposed similar to those in Case 3 and respondent was "advised that this Commission will maintain a continuing interest in respondent's employment practices and that a review will be conducted in approximately 6 months in order to determine whether the terms of conciliation have been fully and conscientiously carried out."

Case 5: Two supervisory employees aged 62 and 63 were retired with pensions by a metal products manufacturer on the grounds that they could no longer perform their duties adequately. They filed complaints with SCAD. Investigation showed that five other supervisors, aged 63, 56, 54, 45, and 35, had been discharged at the same time, while some supervisors in the 60–65 age bracket had been retained. The investigating commissioner dismissed the complaints for lack of probable cause, stating, "In view of our thorough and careful investigation of this complaint based on the record as a whole, it seems clear that the complainant was not dismissed from employment because of his age, but rather because of other considerations. The record clearly shows that at the time of his dismissal other and younger men in supervisory capacities were dismissed also for various reasons. Furthermore, our records show that the company has continued to employ over the years a considerable number of older workers."

By administrative interpretation, the State Commission Against Discrimination has held that the New York law bars complaints by persons over 65 years of age or by persons who claim discrimination on grounds that they are "too young." Requests by the Commission for clarification of legislative intent were not acted upon by the 1959 session of the State legislature.

Judge Paul R. Selecky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I received a great shock when I learned of the sudden death of one of my closest friends, Judge Paul R. Selecky, president judge of the orphans' court of Luzerne County. Judge Selecky and I had many common interests and we served together on a number of boards and committees over the years dealing with veterans, community, and national affairs. In addition, Mrs. Flood and Mrs. Selecky are very fond of each other and she joins me in expressing our profound regrets to Mrs. Selecky and the other members of the family in this hour of their most tragic loss. It is indeed most regrettable when a gentleman of Judge Selecky's accomplishments and contributions to a better community life passes on in the prime of a distinguished career.

As a further extension of my remarks on Judge Selecky's passing, I include two news articles and an editorial that appeared in last Friday's edition, June 3, 1960, of the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader:

ORPHANS COURT JURIST DIES AFTER ATTENDING DINNER IN POCONOS

Paul R. Selecky, president judge of the orphans' court of Luzerne County, died unexpectedly this morning at 7:15, following a heart attack at his home, 28 West Main Street, Glen Lyon. One of the most active jurists in northeastern Pennsylvania, Judge Selecky would have observed his 50th birthday anniversary June 14.

In apparent good health, Judge Selecky and his tipstaff, Alexander Polacheck of Wilkes-Barre, attended the Monroe County Bar Association outing and dinner last night at Sciota, near Stroudsburg. The dinner was held at the Linden Court Hotel there after which Judge Selecky and his tipstaff motored home, arriving about midnight.

After discussing the affair with his wife, Helen, Judge Selecky retired. He awoke this morning at 2 o'clock and complained to his wife of having pains in the chest. After awhile, Judge Selecky said he felt better and he and his wife went back to sleep. Mrs. Selecky awoke about 7 o'clock and noticed her husband was still asleep. Although he seemed to be all right, Mrs. Selecky became alarmed when she detected heavy breathing.

Mrs. Selecky immediately phoned Dr. Stanley M. Stapinski of Glen Lyon, former county coroner, and close friend of the family. Dr. Stapinski, who resides a short distance away at 80 West Main Street, Glen Lyon, hurried to the Selecky home. By the time he arrived, Judge Selecky had passed away to an acute coronary occlusion.

FUNERAL ON TUESDAY

The funeral will be held Tuesday morning from the family home and on that day there will be no sessions of Luzerne County court.

Judge Selecky was to have presided at sessions of juvenile court this morning at the courthouse. This afternoon at 3 o'clock, he was scheduled to leave for Washington, D.C., to attend the ordination of his nephew, Rev. Adrian Donald Tirpak to the priesthood at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. After hearing of his death, juvenile court was canceled and the flag at the courthouse was lowered to half-mast.

Judge Selecky's body, first taken to General Hospital, was scheduled for removal later today to Hazleton State Hospital where a post mortem will be performed by Dr. Julius Foldes, pathologist. Luzerne County Coroner Dr. Herman H. Feissner, Jr., Freeland, directed the post mortem at request of the Selecky family. Judge Selecky willed his eyes to an eye bank.

In November 1957, after serving as a lawyer for 23 years, Judge Selecky was elected orphans' court judge defeating Orphans' Court Judge Arthur A. Maguire by a margin of 9,000 votes. He was the leading vote getter on the Republican ticket for contested offices. Judge Maguire was appointed to the bench by Gov. George M. Leader to take the vacated place of Judge Ben R. Jones who, in 1956, became a justice of the State supreme court. Judge Selecky was sworn into office on January 6, 1958, for a 10-year term.

Prominent in legal circles, community, civic, and veterans' affairs, Judge Selecky was often described as a human dynamo by his friends and acquaintances.

SCHOLASTIC HONORS

In elementary and secondary schools and at college, Judge Selecky distinguished himself educationally. He was graduated first in his class from Newport Township High School in 1926, and first in his class at Wyoming Seminary the following year. Honor student and Phi Beta Kappa at the University of Pennsylvania, he was first in his class during 3 successive years at the law school and was first in his class at graduation in 1934.

Possessing the high ideals of his Slovak race, Judge Selecky had an interest in the education of children which he displayed by the way he successfully handled the various problems of teenagers each week in juvenile court.

A native and lifelong resident of Glen Lyon, Judge Selecky was born June 14, 1910, a son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Selecky. In high school, he was active in sports, serving as captain of the basketball team and was a member of the glee club and winner of the American Legion medal for high scholastic average. In college, he served as corresponding secretary of the Luzerne County Club, played the violin in the orchestra and cymbals in the band. He also was a member of the Aero Club and holder of a senatorial scholarship.

LAWYER SINCE 1934

Admitted to the county bar November 7, 1934, Judge Selecky was also admitted to practice law in the orphans' court in December of that year. He maintained law offices many years in the Miners Bank Building and soon after starting his legal career was appointed solicitor for Newport Township School District. In February 1948, he was named special deputy attorney general for district 2, Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board. He filled the vacancy caused by the death of his brother-in-law, Attorney Peter Jurchak, in December 1947.

A U.S. Navy veteran of World War II, Judge Selecky took an active part in veterans' affairs here soon after his honorable discharge. He served as district commander of Luzerne County American Legion and in July 31, 1953, was elected State commander of the Legion for a 1-year term.

A former vice chairman of the American Red Cross, Nanticoke-Newport area, he served as chairman of the Red Cross donor program. He acted as legal counsel for the Pennsylvania Slovak Union and was a past president of the Tatra Club, in addition to being affiliated with the Elks, Eagles and various Slovak fraternal organizations.

Active in arranging instruction in Polish and Slovak languages at Wilkes College, Judge Selecky helped introduce the teaching of Polish as a regular part of the high school curriculum at Newport, Nanticoke and GAR High Schools. Chosen as a member of the committee arranging refresher courses for GI lawyers after military service, he was a member of the court rules and minimum fee committees of the county bar association. He also served as director of the Legal Aid Society and was cochairman of the radio division of the bar association's public relations committee.

The United Mine Workers in Glen Lyon, claimed Judge Selecky as a member because he worked in and around the mines for six summers while he went to college and law school. Judge Selecky also was a director of the United Fund, the Heart Association and American Red Cross and was a member of the Boy Scout committee. He also served as legal adviser of the draft board during World War II. A member of Post 539, American Legion, Glen Lyon, he was a communicant of St. Adalbert's Church, Glen Lyon, and a member of the Holy Name Society.

Surviving are his wife, the former Helen Jurchak of Glen Lyon; seven children, Paul, Jr., a senior student at the University of Pennsylvania, scheduled to graduate this month and enter premedical school in the fall; John, also a student at the university; Mrs. Julianna Semple, Erie; Mary, Thomas, Helen and Peter, all at home; two sisters, Mrs. Catherine Tirpak of Glen Lyon, and Mrs. Emma Mras of Harrisburg, and a brother, Alois of Wilkes-Barre.

COURT NOTES THE DEATH OF LOCAL JURIST—PASSING OF JUDGE SELECKY TERMED GREAT LOSS TO HIS COLLEAGUES

A court minute, noting the sudden and untimely death of Judge Paul R. Selecky, was ordered filed this afternoon in court records by President Judge John J. Aponick. It follows:

"The court notes with extreme regret the sudden and untimely death of President Judge Paul R. Selecky of the orphans' court of Luzerne County.

"Judge Selecky was born in Glen Lyon, June 14, 1910. He was graduated from Newport Township High School, Wyoming Seminary, University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He was admitted to the bar of this county on November 13, 1934, on motion of the late Attorney Peter Jurchak.

"Judge Selecky practiced law in this county from then until he was elevated to the bench in January 1958.

"On July 1, 1958, at the request of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas, he assumed the burden of presiding in the juvenile court in addition to his other duties. He entered upon that task with his usual enthusiasm and was responsible for many innovations and improvements in the handling of the youth problem. He also created the traffic school to which are sent all of those involved in motor vehicle violations.

"Judge Selecky was a veteran of World War II, having served in the Navy. He was very active in the American Legion, being department commander in 1953–54.

"He was connected with numerous civic and fraternal activities. He also served by assignment of the supreme court in other counties of the State, particularly Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

"The passing of Judge Selecky will be a great loss to his colleagues on the bench. He was always more than willing to assist either in civil or criminal court, beyond anything that could reasonably be expected. He will long be remembered by the judges, the lawyers and the public in general as a cheerful, conscientious, and hard-working judge.

"Judge Selecky is survived by his widow, the former Helen Jurchak, and seven children.

JUDGE PAUL R. SELECKY

The Commonwealth and the County of Luzerne, as well as the community, his profession and a score of organizations with which he was identified, share the shock and sense of loss of the family in the sudden death of Paul R. Selecky, president judge of the orphans court of Luzerne County, at his home in Glen Lyon this morning. His passing at 50 has terminated a brilliant career that many believed was far from its climax when he was fatally stricken.

A native of Newport Township, Judge Selecky was of Slovak extraction and endowed with the zeal and ideals of his forefathers. It was apparent in boyhood days and when he reached man's estate that he was destined for high places because he was valedictorian in his class as Newport High School, Wyoming Seminary, and the University of Pennsylvania. At the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where top students are enrolled from all over the country, he was first for 3 successive years, proof of his drive as well as his intellectual attainments.

The activities in which he engaged and the progress he made since 1934 when he was graduated from law school and admitted to the bar offered incontestable proof of his unusual capacity and dedication to the public interest.

It was no coincidence that in every field he entered he forged to the top. That was true in his profession, in the American Legion of which he was State and district commander, and in other bodies and movements to which he devoted his time, skills, and energies. He was not content to go along for the ride; when he was named to a post, he made a substantial contribution to the success of the undertaking. When he received recognition, it was because he had earned it.

His election to the orphans' court bench did not change him. Applying himself with the diligence that singled him out as a student, legal practitioner, and civic leader, he not only served with distinction in his own bailiwick, but in the juvenile court of Luzerne County and as a relief jurist throughout the Commonwealth upon assignment of the supreme court.

The father of seven children, he used his high office to rehabilitate juvenile delinquents, to promote safe driving, and to raise standards. The files of this newspaper contain many letters from him, seeking support on these and other projects, so close to his heart. His erudition was matched by his sense of responsibility and his courage when the occasion demanded action.

A message he sent to the editor, commenting on an editorial that appeared in these columns, contained this passage which furnished an index to the character of Judge Selecky:

"I am happy that you have expanded on the duty of each generation to protect its own liberty. As I indicated in my talk to Kiwanis, liberty was proclaimed throughout the United States on July 4, 1776, only when the persons who proclaimed it were willing to pay the price therefor, when they closed the very Declaration of Independence with words to this effect: 'and for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.'

"It is for the veterans and all the citizens to renew that pledge every year if they are to protect the liberty in their time."

Man on the Spot—John Morton—Continental Congress Delegate Gained Eternal Fame and Pennsylvania Gained a Name—The Keystone State

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the conscientious legislator sometimes pays a high price for doing the right thing and adhering to high principles against heavy pressure from special pressure groups. One of the outstanding examples of voting right to serve this Nation is retold in the action by John Morton who, as the Representative in the Continental Congress from Pennsylvania cast the deciding vote for the Declaration of Independence, and freedom for our country. The immortal role that this delegate played is briefly but well reviewed in an article by Fletcher Thomas Beck, called Man on the Spot, which appeared in the June issue of the Liberty magazine. It is worth reading and preserving.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MAN ON THE SPOT

(By Fletcher Thomas Beck)

(The position of Pennsylvania's key delegate was precarious. The strong influence of a Tory lobby, the bribes of an intriguing diplomacy, threats of ostracism by family, relatives, and neighbors had been brought to bear upon him. The time had come to test his convictions. How would John Morton vote?)

The immortal role John Morton played in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence furnishes a story that has been told for generations at the fireside of the country he served so well.

And well it might, for it was one of the most dramatic and important incidents recorded in our history. It happened on the night of July 3, 1776, at Independence Hall. Around that historic table were delegates and alternates representing 12 colonies. John Hancock had the floor. He was talking—just talking, for six of these men had voted aye and six nay on the question of adopting the Declaration.

Supporters of the measure sent a messenger outside the hall to tell John Morton that the Pennsylvanian delegation was divided two and two on the issue. Without this colony's wealth and power the Revolution could hardly succeed.

How would Morton vote? That was the question uppermost in the minds of the Pennsylvania delegates. When the sound of the president's gavel rang through the assembly hall there was a hush. All eyes were turned to Pennsylvania's delegation. Franklin voted "aye." Willing, "no." Wilson, "aye." Humphries, "no." Dickinson and Morris abstained from voting.

At this decisive moment John Morton entered the hall. The Pennsylvania House of Representatives, of which Morton was the speaker, had instructed its delegates to the Continental Congress to "dissent from and utterly reject and proposition, should such be made, that may cause or lead to separation from our mother country, or to a change of the form of this Government." But by the time of the vote the assembly had withdrawn these instructions.

All eyes were fixed on Pennsylvania's key delegate. His position was precarious. The strong influence of a Tory lobby, the bribes of an intriguing diplomacy, threats of ostracism by family, relatives, and neighbors had been brought to bear upon him. The time had now come to test his convictions.

When the clerk called John Morton's name, the beating of anxious hearts was almost audible in the deep silence of the hall.

Although afflicted with an illness that was shortly to cause his death, with pallid face and fever-parched lips he answered in a clear firm voice, "Aye." The tie was broken. And thus the keystone swung into place. The arch was complete. A nation was born.

And so the mighty deed was done,
That makes us what we are today,
By which our sovereign right was won,
John Morton gained eternal fame;
'Twill last with Independence Day,
And Pennsylvania gained a name—
The Keystone State.

America's honored patriot was a descendant of 17th-century Swedish colonists. He was born posthumously, the son of John Morton and Mary Archer in the year 1724 in the township of Ridley in the county of Chester (now Delaware), about 4 miles from Upland (now Chester).

The widowed mother subsequently married John Sketchley, an Englishman, who, learned in mathematics and having taken a liking to his stepson, schooled him in the three "R's." The stepfather quickly discovered that he was tutoring no common scholar.

In 1754 John married Ann Justice (or Justis), a descendant of the Delaware Swedes, and had by her three sons and five daughters, who survived him. Many of their descendants have attained distinction.

John Morton began his career by farming the paternal estate and securing odd jobs as a surveyor. In 1757 he was commissioned justice of the peace, and was soon after appointed a representative of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania. An active and influential member for a period of 10 years, he for part of that time served as speaker of the house.

In 1765 Morton was made a delegate to the First American Congress, which sat in New York.

Governor John Penn appointed him associate justice of the Supreme Provincial Court in 1774, and in 1774 the Assembly delegated him to the First Continental Congress.

He took his seat in that body on the 10th of May at the meeting of the Second Congress. On the 3d of November, 1775, he was again appointed a representative, while serving as speaker of the house of assemby; and on the 20th of July, 1776, he was elected for the last time a member of the great National Council.

In "Biography of the Signers," Editor Robert T. Conrad describes him thus: "John Morton possessed a disposition at once lively, sociable, friendly and humane. Overpowering the deficiencies of early education, by the strength of his mind, and the force of his talents, he rose to the highest and most dignified office of the State. It would have been in vain to seek the plow-boy of Ridley in the dignified judge upon the bench, in the speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Pennsylvania, or in the important member of the most august body of assembled virtue and patriotism that the world has ever been taught to venerate.

"He was charitable to the poor; a kind friend, an affectionate husband and father; a social, and sometimes jocular companion. His modesty was equal to his merit, and the remark might justly be applied to him in the language of the poet that 'It is the witness still of excellency to put a strange face on his own perfection.'"

Out of appreciation for the services rendered his country, Pennsylvania, in 1938, rescued from the ravages of time the 284-year-old house believed then to be the birthplace of this signer of the Declaration of Independence. A recent survey, however, of the ownership of the Morton property by the staff of the Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission shows that this tract of land was never in the possession of the elder John Morton, the signer's father. Nor was it ever recorded as being in the possession of John Morton, the signer. At one time it was believed to have been acquired by his son, Sketchley Morton, but it has since been discovered that this is not the same tract as the one willed to his son.

The house where the signer dwelt at the time of his death appears to have been on the west side of Stone Creek, now in Ridley Park. Therefore it cannot be the same as the property at Darby Creek Ferry, restored by the Historical and Museum Commission, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Whatever the final verdict may be regarding the place of his birth, one thing is certain: John Morton, who paid the price of social ostracism for voting "aye" on American independence, is now permanently enshrined in the heart of a grateful nation.

In historical old St. Paul Cemetery in Chester a simple, weather-beaten monument marks the resting place of this patriot. It bears the following inscription:

"DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF JOHN MORTON

"A Member of the American Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, assembled in New York, 1765, and of the next Congress assembled in Philadelphia in 1774, and various other public stations.

"Born, A.D. 1724; died, A.D. 1777.

"This monument was erected by a portion of his relatives, October 9, 1845.

"In 1775, while speaker of the Assembly of Pennsylvania, John Morton was reelected a Member of Congress, and in the ever-memorable session of July 1776, he attended that august body for the last time, enshrining his name in the grateful remembrance of the American people by signing the Declaration of Independence.

"In voting by States upon the question of the Independence of the American Colonies, there was a tie until the vote of Pennsylvania was given; two Members from which voted in the affirmative and two in the negative.

"John Morton decided the promulgation of the glorious diploma of American freedom."

Censured by some of his friends for his boldness in casting the deciding vote for the Declaration of Independence, Morton dictated a message to them from his deathbed: "Tell them that they will live to see the hour when they shall acknowledge it to have been the most glorious service that ever I rendered to my country."

The Safety Valve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial, entitled "The Safety Valve," which was carried in the Monett Times of Monett, Mo., Friday, June 3, 1960.

To me it is a thought-provoking editorial and Mr. Kenneth G. Meuser, publisher, should certainly be commended because I am sure that he expressed the sound grassroots thinking of our Republic.

The article follows:

[From the Monett (Mo.) Times, June 3, 1960]

THE SAFETY VALVE

The most inconceivable statement that has been made by a military or political leader of modern times was spoken Tuesday in London by Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, British hero of World War II. After a 3-day visit to Peiping, capital of Red China, Field Marshal Montgomery told an Associated Press correspondent that Nationalist Chinese Formosa, or Taiwan, should be handed over to Red China.

Backing up his reasons for a bloodless capitulation, the field marshal stated:

"I believe there should be one China and not two, and that China is the one which has its Government in Peiping.

"When I survey the picture it seems to me that Formosa should be part of China." (Montgomery has spoken similarly in the past and has proposed that Peiping regime represent China in the U.N.)

Montgomery added that he prefers Communist-ruled China to pre-Communist China.

"I formed the impression that there is a great deal of misconception in the West about the new China as compared with the old.

"I am of the opinion that the new China is quite preferable. They (the Reds) have cleaned the country up and they've swept away corruption and bandits and there are no Teddy Boys." (Teddy Boys are a type of English exhibitionists who affect narrow trousers and sideburns and have become associated with juvenile violence.)

Montgomery went on to give this opinion of Red China's Premier Chou En-lai:

"I think he is most charming, very brilliant, a delightful person with beautiful manners, and he is most courteous."

The article was written by Colin Frost, a reputable Associated Press correspondent. It still seems impossible after we reread the Montgomery statement three times that a military leader who held the respect of the British people during World War II could possibly subscribe to such a disgustingly naive defeatist philosophy.

The free world should be thankful that Field Marshal Montgomery did not represent Great Britain at the summit conference which was torpedoed by Premier Khrushchev of Soviet Russia. Prime Minister Harold Macmillan upheld the dignity of England; he placated, to a degree, but he did not grovel before the bully from Moscow. I think that Prime Minister Macmillan, President Eisenhower, and President De Gaulle of France were keenly disappointed that the summit conference didn't get off the ground because they represent Western democracies who desire peace, but peace with honor.

For the good of the Western Powers, Field Marshal Montgomery should lie down on a couch and a group of England's best psychiatrists should give him a good going over before he is allowed to make another public statement. It is difficult for me to think that he has lost his patriotism to his country; rather I think that he has lost his marbles.

The Nationalist Chinese regime is anything but a straight and honest system of government, but at least they are on our side. If we would hand Formosa over to the Red Chinese Communists, we would henceforth give up all of our influence in the Far East, including the Philippines, Japan, and all of the nations which are a part of the SEATO pact in norheastern Asia.

The people of the Western democracies can rest easier at night because our 7th Fleet patrols the Straits of Formosa. We have strong naval bases in the Philippines and Japan and we send military missions to Nationalist China and show their military men how to operate planes, missiles, ships, and guns that are made in America.

About 5 months ago the Red Chinese Air Force which consisted of souped-up Russian MIG's that killed thousands of American troops in the Korean war, challenged the Nationalist Chinese Air Force on Formosa to an aerial dogfight. The Nationalists knocked the Chinese Reds out of the skies with U.S. Navy-developed Sidewinders and the Reds have been licking their wounds ever since. Incidentally, the Sidewinder is a missile which is standard equipment with our fighter aircraft and is quite effective. When it is spotted and locked onto its target—usually the afterburner of any enemy plane—it is guided directly to the plane by infrared heat with a deadly and effective destructive charge.

A group of intelligent Britishers should sit down and reason out the international problem with Field Marshal Montgomery, reminding him "that there will always be an England."

The position of the United States among many nations of the world is not in highest repute because of our advances in so many fields. Through the years we have fought defensive wars without acquiring 1 square inch of territory for our own gains. We have nothing to offer the world but the means of a better way of life and a deterrent to communism. We are not imperialists in any sense of the word.

I think that it is time for our Commander in Chief to play down soft platitudes, and do some hell-raising and saber rattling with the Communist world. If we're going to live with a global community of bandit nations who try to divide and conquer with bulldozing tactics, I think that President Eisenhower should send stern letters of protest to Premier Khrushchev of Russia, Premier Chou En-lai of Red China, Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, Premier Abdul Nassar of Egypt, and others of similar disposition. President Eisenhower is a peace-loving man, as most of us are. For the interest of our future security, his letter should be one which would call the bluff of all of the bullies in the world. We don't need to take insults from any nation or combination of nations. America is strong offensively and defensively. We need to command the respect that is due us.

If Field Marshal Montgomery really said what the Associated Press claims that he did about giving Formosa to Red China, he did the Western Powers far more disservice than did the late Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain when he partitioned Czechoslovakia at Munich and claimed that we would have "peace in our time." Frankly, I'm afraid that the old boy has finally cracked up.—K. G. M.

The Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another article on mutual secur-

ity which points out the importance to underdeveloped countries of this program. The article is a release from the Catholic Association for International Peace, entitled "The Mutual Security Program":

In this year's presentation of the mutual security program, the executive branch has introduced a new concept of concentrating economic development aid in a few selected countries of Asia with the expectation that it will result in a more effective allocation of resources for the purpose of accelerating development in the less developed areas. It is believed that there is merit in this new approach provided the selection of countries is not too narrowly conceived, both as to area and as to the criteria for selection. Although the magnitude of the U.S. efforts in economic assistance to the underdeveloped areas has been criticized as being inadequate, it is believed that the new principle of aid introduced by the executive branch should be recognized as constituting a significant step forward independently of the size of the economic assistance funds.

The economic life committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace endorses the mutual security program and its present plans wholeheartedly. The committee would also like to call attention to certain capital sources available to underdeveloped countries which should be broadened and strengthened as a matter of policy.

In addition to economic assistance provided under the aegis of the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund, there are a number of other public sources of capital available to the underdeveloped countries which potentially could make large contributions to their economies. First, there are the public banking institutions, either bilateral or multilateral, which provide capital funds on a loan basis, such as the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, the newly established Inter-American Development Bank, and the proposed International Development Association. Moreover, short-term capital is provided for stabilization purposes through the International Monetary Fund. In addition to the public banking operations, the U.S. Government has facilitated a flow of capital from private sources through the investment guarantee program. This program should be continued and, if possible, expanded.

One further aid source which plays an important role is the very sizable program amounting to $1.5 billion per annum deriving from the sale of agricultural commodities abroad under Public Law 480, which has a very great and directly beneficial effect on the economic development of these countries.

Apart from the various sources of capital assistance from public institutions, both national and international, we must also draw attention to the very close financial relationship existing between trade and aid. Most of the underdeveloped countries are raw materials producers and when the terms of trade shift against them, it causes them to become more dependent on external assistance in the form of loans, both hard and soft, and, in some cases, grants. More consideration should be given to the trade problems of these countries by all administrators of economic aid. This could well reduce the ultimate need for external aid and increase the capacity of the receiving countries to pay their own way for the capital imports necessary for economic development.

We should do what we can, for example, to remove those tariff and import quota barriers which reduce the access of these raw materials producers to our markets, recognizing that their resulting increased export earnings may far exceed any amount of direct assistance which is likely to be forthcoming. The effect of freer trade upon increasing our own efficiency in the use of resources is an important secondary advantage, since the growing magnitude of domestic and international claims on our resources requires maximum efficiency in their allocation.

In connection with the effort to increase trade, the underdeveloped countries themselves should be encouraged to diversify their economies, rather than to continue to rely exclusively on exports of one or two marketable commodities. Similarly, to avoid the negation of economic assistance by unfavorable shifts in the terms of trade, we should consider the advisability of supporting reasonable commodity stabilization programs proposed by the raw materials producing nations themselves.

In some countries the burden of military forces is oppressive. New technologies are changing the weapons and strategies of waging war. It should, therefore, be possible in several countries to reduce military expenditures, especially if disarmament agreements can be reached which will truly reduce the possibilities of conflict. Wherever military expenditures can be reduced—whether in Latin America or in Asia—it will be possible to move economic development that much faster.

The President's request for mutual security funds is the minimum needed for the support of U.S. policies in the underdeveloped countries. We should look forward to doing more, not less. Special emphasis, perhaps, should be accorded technical training programs to encourage increased productivity and marketing techniques through improved managerial, administrative, and other skills, for these serve to upgrade the most strategic resource of all, the human resource, the level of development of which determines to a very large extent the degree of utilization and the effectiveness of all other resources.

Our responsibilities in social justice demand an adequate response to the needs of others which, if adequately met, will redound to our own national interest as well. We cannot afford to do less.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under previous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a recent guest editorial appearing in the esteemed Palmer Journal Register of Palmer, Mass.

The editorial, written by Joseph A. Kszepka and Boguslaus S. Grzywna, president and vice president, respectively, of the United Polish-American Organizations Council of Palmer, expresses noble sentiments in paying deserved tribute to the Polish people and the cause of a Free Poland on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day.

All true Americans, blessed with a heritage of freedom, must respond to the call of captive peoples everywhere who are seeking self-determination, freedom, and liberation. Messrs Kszepka and Grzywna, in this excellent guest editorial, remind us of the great sacrifices made by the Polish people in the cause of freedom. Let us continue to extend the hand of friendship, trust, and confidence to the Polish people in their fight against oppression and tyranny.

The editorial follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(By Joseph A. Kszepka and Boguslaus S. Grzywna)

This year the United Polish-American Organizations Council of Palmer has set aside Sunday, May 1, to pay tribute to Poland on its 179th anniversary of Polish Independence. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document, inspired by the American Declaration of Independence, included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this sister document of freedom which symbolizes with our own, the will of man to achieve liberty for himself, his family, and his community.

The Polish people have a long and proud history of producing leaders of strength, courage, and deep conviction. Americans of Polish ancestry have proven themselves time and again equal to and reflecting the image of the great Polish leaders.

By a very fitting double coincidence the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Chopin is noted and honored this year. His compositions of national folk music, such as, mazurkas, waltzes, and polonaises are characterized by exquisite melody of great originality, refined harmony, subtle rhythm, and poetic beauty, making him the greatest of all composers of music for the piano. Likewise this year, we mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignacy Jan Paderewski, not only one of the greatest masters of the piano, but also a statesman who devoted himself to the cause of Polish independence by being elected prime minister of foreign affairs in the Polish Republic.

We only hope and pray that the Polish people will ultimately have their full freedom and independence as stated in the original Polish Constitution—so as to realize their full capabilities and their dignity as a completely free nation.

The Tidelands Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU radio:

THE TIDELANDS DECISION

In the tidelands oil case, the U.S. Supreme Court today ruled against Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama but in favor of Texas and Florida. The Court ruled that Louisiana and her two eastern neighbors own the oil under the Gulf of Mexico only out to 3½ miles from shore. But it gave Texas and Florida all the way out to 10½ miles.

This decision goes back to the Submerged Lands Act of 1953. That act gave to each

State the submerged lands within its boundary as it existed when that State joined the Union. On the basis of historic papers, the High Court majority ruled that three of the Gulf States came into the Union with 3-mile boundaries and two with 10-mile boundaries.

In the opinion of this station, today's decision may be legally and technically correct. But as a matter of practical effect, it is ridiculous and discriminatory to give some States three times the seaward territory of others.

Louisiana, incidentally, is the one State that stands to gain or lose the most by this decision. For instance, there is not now a single producing oil well off the Florida coast and only half a dozen off of Texas. But there are more than 1,500 producing wells off of Louisiana.

It is significant to us that two dissenting Justices said today they felt the middle Gulf States had been discriminated against.

Justice Douglas said he didn't think Texas was entitled to 10½ miles. But if it was, he said, then so were Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Justice Black said he considered the decision unfair to these three States. He said the Court should have considered that these States have actually been exercising possession over their marginal lands ever since they came into the Union. And until recently the Federal Government has always recognized State control of them.

Black said that, in the final analysis, it will be up to Congress, and he said he did not think Congress would want to treat the States differently as to boundaries.

We agree. There is no reason why Texas and Florida should take their stand 10 miles out in the gulf while Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama are cut off at the ankles. These States have no choice but to go to Congress seeking equal treatment.

Violation of U.S. Flag Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we have all been much concerned about recent revelations that surplus flags of the United States have been sold as rags and put to many and sundry uses. Every patriotic citizen of the United States is enraged that our flag should be so desecrated. We must put a stop to this and certainly penalties for violation of the flag code should be spelled out.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the Tablet of June 4, 1960, on this subject:

ASKS END TO VIOLATION OF U.S. FLAG CODE

DEAR SIR: There have been shocking violations of our flag code and desecrations of our flag reported during the past several years, but none as shocking as the recent sale of our national emblem to Haiti to be used for rags. This must not be overlooked.

Our flag, the Stars and Stripes, is a symbol of our Nation. It should symbolize everything our Nation represents. That includes honor, integrity, and the liberty and freedom it guarantees. If allowed to be sold to a foreign country for rags and other such uses then, figuratively speaking, that symbolizes that our honor and integrity are gone, that our Nation can be sold or bought for a price.

The New York State penal law, regarding our flag, does cover this particular desecration, and with penalties. The State or New York City attorney general is the one to enforce this penal law.

Section 1425, subdivision 16(b) regarding our flag says: "Any person who shall expose to public view, manufacture, sell, expose for sale, give away, or use for any purpose, any article, or substance, being an article of merchandise, or thing for transporting merchandise, or a receptacle upon which has been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed, a reproduction of any such flag—standard, color, shield, or ensign, or drawing * * * (d) shall publically mutilate, deface, trample upon, or cast contempt upon either by words or act, (e) shall raffle or place in pawn and such flag * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor; shall forfeit a penalty of $50 for each such offense—to be recovered with costs in a civil action, or suit * * * recovery to be certified by the district attorney of the county in which the offense is committed."

This covers the jobber who sold the bales of cotton, including the flags, to Haiti, and also those who sold them to him. Does it not also include the transportation to Haiti? Why did not our Ambassador to Haiti, who admitted the flags were being sold at Port-au-Prince, report the fact to the proper authorities here, rather than allow an American citizen visiting there to make the report?

Now that it is known, could not our State Department negotiate through the Ambassador from Haiti to have every such flag collected and properly disposed of? How can we be sure other such shipments have not been made to faraway ports?

With the new 50-star flag coming into use in July, there will be another wholesale elimination of flags throughout the country. Therefore this situation should be promptly taken care of and provisions made whereby such a disgraceful desecration of our flag could not happen again.

Be sure that on Flag Day, June 14, you not only display your flag, but be alert for any disregard shown our flag or violations of flag laws. This is just one more example of the great need for each and every American to be mindful that eternal vigilance is essential for the saving and welfare of our Nation, our freedom, and our liberty.

HELEN P. LASEEL,
National Chairman, U.S. Flag Committee.

Analysis of the Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of the wilderness bill which appeared in the Carmen's Railway Journal of June 1960:

THE WILDERNESS BILL

The purpose of the wilderness bill is to "secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness"—a resource that will "serve public purposes including recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment by the people."

WHAT THE WILDERNESS BILL WILL DO

1. Establish a national policy for wilderness preservation and a program to make it effective.

2. Give statutory protection to wilderness areas in national parks and monuments, national forests, and national wildlife refuges and ranges.

3. Establish a national wilderness preservation system "for the permanent good of the whole people" to consist of the now-existing wilderness areas in the forests, parks, and refuges.

4. Set up an orderly procedure for additions, deletions, or changes in the wilderness preservation system, with provisions for due notice, public hearings, and review by Congress.

WHAT IT WILL NOT DO

1. It will not conflict with established uses of the parks, monuments, forests, or wildlife refuges.

2. It will not interfere with established practices, such as grazing, for example. (It includes no areas now open to lumbering.)

3. It will not endanger existing private rights; it specifically safeguards them.

4. It will not call for money; it merely sets up a system by which existing Federal agencies will preserve wilderness values in the specified areas already under their jurisdiction.

WHY THE WILDERNESS BILL IS NEEDED

1. Wilderness now has only administrative protection. There is no national wilderness policy or program prescribed by Congress. Administrators change; their ideas on the composition and values of wilderness differ. One administrator can abolish or seriously reduce wilderness established by another. Administrators are under pressures hard to withstand when there are no congressional guidelines.

2. The wilderness bill would provide the guides and strengthen the hands of the administrators, since it requires administering agencies to preserve the wilderness character of the wilderness areas in their charge.

3. It authorizes multiple use, including wilderness.

4. Congress—representing all the people—should have the decisive voice in stating and carrying out a policy regarding the use of public lands for the benefit of all the people of the Nation.

Sponsored in Congress by Senators and Representatives of both parties, westerners and easterners, the wilderness bill has the support of conservation organizations which have long realized the need for a basic national policy, as well as garden clubs, women's organizations, sportsmen's organizations, labor groups, professional people, clergymen, businessmen, housewives, teachers and professors, students, naturalists, scientists, and "just folks." In one hearing there was testimony for wilderness preservation from a sawmill operator who saw greater public value in the forest as a wilderness in that area than in the timber that could be taken out of it.

AMONG SUPPORTERS ARE

Many prominent individuals, including—Ansel Adams, Elliott S. Barker, Guy Emerson, U. S. Grant 3d, Frederick Brown Harris, Paul G. Hoffman, Joseph Wood Krutch, Karl Menninger, Eleanor Roosevelt, Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Adlai E. Stevenson, Wallace Stegner, Edwin Way Teale, G. Mennen Williams.

Twenty-two National and 58 State and other organizations, including—AFL–CIO, American Planning & Civic Association, American Nature Association, Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources, Council of Conservationists, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Garden Clubs of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Independent Timbermen's Committee, Izaak Walton League, National Audubon Society, National

Council of State Garden Clubs, National Parks Association National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy, New York State Conservation Council, Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, Trustees for Conservation, Washington State Sportsmen's Council, Wildlife Management Institute.

Many newspapers, in editorials, including Boston Herald, Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, Minneapolis Star, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Bend Oreg., Bulletin, Eugene Register-Guard, Portland Journal, San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner.

The administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, Secretary of the Interior, and Secretary of Agriculture, has urged prompt approval of the wilderness bill.

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE BILL?

In the Senate the Interior Committee after two hearings in Washington, D.C., and six in the West is now considering the wilderness bill. Senators and staff members have worked out a revision to clarify, modify, and amend it in accordance with criticisms presented. This revision—known as Committee Print 3—has been accepted by wilderness bill advocates. They are urging that it be reported promptly by the committee and passed by the Senate. Substitute bills and amendments advocated by Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY and Senator GORDON ALLOTT have been opposed as representing attempts to frustrate and defeat the real purpose and needs of this legislation.

In the House, the Interior Committee leadership has agreed to take up the wilderness bill as soon as it is passed by the Senate. This will have to be done promptly so the bill can be enacted this year. The bill in its Senate Committee Print 3 form has recently been introduced in the House. Thus, the way is being prepared for prompt action that can bring enactment this year.

(This is being written on March 31, 1960.)

YOU CAN HELP

You can write your Senators urging them to speed up action on the wilderness bill as revised in Committee Print 3 and asking them to oppose last-minute substitute proposals by those who want to delay and frustrate this much-needed legislation. Address: Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

You can urge your Congressman (address: House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.) to support the wilderness bill and do everything he can to insure prompt action. Ask him or her to help see that the House Interior Committee acts promptly so we can get the wilderness bill through this year.

Protect American Music, Art, and Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an interesting and timely article by John Crosby which recently appeared in the celebrated Worcester Daily Telegram entitled, "Songwriter Has Some Bitter Ideas."

The Nation has been deeply concerned about payola, and the Congress has made some rather feeble, ineffectual efforts to rectify the conditions in American broadcasting and music that is uncovered by recent disclosures.

As Mr. Crosby's article and Mr. Harburg's views indicate, there are some very distasteful developments taking place in the musical, theatrical, and broadcasting industries which, of course, are matters of common knowledge to millions of Americans who are captive audiences, and have no way of defending themselves against the barrage of rot that is so often forced upon them.

In great public service industries, this situation is much bigger than payola and goes much deeper than payola. I hope that the distinguished and very able chairman of our House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, our distinguished friend, Mr. HARRIS, will broaden the scope of his current inquiries into this whole composite picture and come up with some effective recommendations before American culture is laid prostrate before the onslaught of greedy entrepreneurs who in effect are threatening to erase all traces of traditionalism and good taste from the music, folklore, stagecraft, and entertainment activities of the Nation.

SONGWRITER HAS SOME BITTER IDEAS

(By John Crosby)

NEW YORK.—"Finian's Rainbow," a lovely musical play from the 1946–47 theatrical season, has been revived at City Center, with such glowing success that it has been transplanted to a Broadway house for what I devoutly hope is a long run. "Finian's Rainbow" is fantasy with social implications, a difficult thing to carry off, and it is full of marvelous tunes like "How Are Things in Glocca Morra?" "The Begat," "Old Devil Moon," "Something Sort of Grandish," "When I'm Not Near the Girl I Love," and "If This Isn't Love."

The lyrics are impish, lovingly written, witty things, jampacked with ideas and the other day their author, Yip Harburg, divested himself of some ideas, many of them bitter, on the state of show business.

BOOMERANG

"We are trying to arrange it so that the tickets would be $6 instead of $9 top," he said. "But we couldn't. You can't do a musical for the people these days. This thing is going to boomrang back on the people who outpriced everything in the first place."

"Finian's Rainbow," Harburg said, was never bought by the movies because the movies were scared to death of fantasy. "Hell, we had a terrible time getting 'The Wizard of Oz' on," said Harburg, who wrote the lyrics for such songs as "Yellow Brick Road" and "Over the Rainbow" for that movie. "Just the same 'Finian's Rainbow' has a life of its own. There isn't a week goes by when it is not playing somewhere Nunneries and monasteries do it. Colleges do it. Tents do it. It's being done all the time. It has real life, that play."

Harburg turned to the state of contemporary popular music which he finds fairly awful. "Payola," he said. "What you hear is some stuff done by some professional who doesn't care about music as much as he cares about payola. But the reason there aren't many good lyric writers or composers around is they don't get the training we got in the twenties or thirties.

"We used to have 60 or 70 musicals come to town every year. Revues, lots of revues. You'd contribute a song to a revue and then stand behind the audience and get its reaction. Writing wasn't done under pressure. You'd sculpture things. You had time. But mass communication has touched the pressure button.

PRESSURE BUTTON

"Commercials have made a big impression. You can just kick them out, write a quickie, make it as close to all the other quickies as you know how, make a fast buck, and start on something else. Nobody writes the way we used to. We all tried to get into the catalog of time.

"The 'Hit Parade' did to songs what horse racing does to horses. It became a lottery, a competition. But good songs are not quick hits. The audience has to catch on to a song. George Gershwin never had a big hit, never sold a million copies of his songs—in his lifetime. Gershwin, Arlen—their songs grow little by little. When I wrote 'April in Paris' for a show called 'Walk a Little Faster,' it was a complete flop. Years later, Ilka Chase sang it in smart supper clubs and now it's a big song."

The tone grew bitter. "For the past 10 years, it's been impossible to sell a good song to a publisher. The influence of the radio, of television, is ruining the whole culture of the United States. It's because the sponsors are more interested in seeing their own commercials than in doing something worth while.

"A country whose President can't speak a simple declarative sentence doesn't deserve anything better for its children. The esthetic quality of life is disappearing and one reason is the cold war. We're living in an age devoid of elder statesmen like Edmund Burke or Tom Paine or Lincoln or Jefferson. The beautiful language of diplomacy is gone. We have fight language like 'Kill the * * *.' How can we expect this not to seep through to our children? This is the atmosphere our kids are brought up in. Rock 'n' roll, torch songs which are maudlin, self-pitying, undignified.

BERNARD SHAW

"Take our theater. Bernard Shaw said: 'When you leave a play and it leaves you, it's not a play. A play must give you something to think about, some wisdom—something. Entertainment alone without meaning is for the unthinking. Alexander Pope said that a long time ago and it's true.' "

It is certainly true right now. This is the age of the unthinking.

Miss Sally B. Heggie, of Indian Orchard, Wins First Place $500 AFL–CIO Massachusetts State Labor Council Scholarship for Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sally B. Heggie, a 17-year-old Classical High School senior from Springfield, Mass., and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William G. Heggie of 30 Homestead Avenue, Indian Orchard, won the first place $500 scholarship sponsored by the AFL–CIO Massachusetts State Labor Council. The subject of the 300-word essay was entitled "What Is Your Concept of the Ideal Role of Organized Labor in a Democratic Society?"

Under unanimous consent, I include Miss Heggie's well-written and prize-

winning essay in the Appendix of the RECORD as it appeared in the Springfield Union newspaper of June 7:

STATE'S TOP ESSAY ON IDEAL ROLE OF ORGANIZED LABOR

A 300-word essay on "What is Your Concept of the Ideal Role of Organized Labor in a Democratic Society?" was the major factor determining the winner of the AFL–CIO Massachusetts State Labor Council's first place $500 scholarship, according to Francis E. Lavigne, director of education and research for the council.

ESSAY STANDS OUT

Lavigne said the essay of Miss Sally B. Heggie, 17-year-old Classical High School senior, who won the first place scholarship, "stood way above the rest."

Miss Heggie, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William G. Heggie of 30 Homestead Avenue, Indian Orchard, was among 1,043 students from 172 schools throughout the State who took the 2-hour examination in the scholarship competition.

Following is her essay:

"The organized labor movement has the ability to play, and does play, a vital role in a democratic society such as America. With millions of workers in its ranks, organized labor wields considerable influence. What do I feel is the ideal role of this labor movement?

"Of first importance in its role are the individual members of the union. Its first responsibility is to these members. The unions should work vigorously to keep wages at a level with the cost of living. It is also up to organized labor to bargain collectively with employers to obtain proper sanitary and safety conditions in factories, to obtain fringe benefits for its members, and to safeguard the rights of the workers."

MOUTHPIECE OF WORKER

"The union is the mouthpiece of each and every worker and should work earnestly for these workers. The union's importance to the individual member cannot be overestimated, for it is by means of the union that he has progressed from the deplorable conditions of early America.

"Wage increases, hour decreases, proper working conditions, extra benefits, and a genuine voice against employers: These are the results of organized labor and show its importance to the individual member of the union. My concept of the ideal role of labor calls for continuation of these functions in a vigorous, unwavering manner.

"Ideal organized labor owes a great deal to the community, State, and to the Nation as a whole. Since it represents such a large segment of the population, it should make the beliefs, thoughts, and feelings of its members known to the general public. It is up to labor to take an interest in Government legislation and candidates, and inform its members about them. Its voice should be an influence in promoting legislation favorable to labor and Americans in general. For as one person said, 'What is good for America is good for labor.'"

LABOR'S RESPONSIBILITY

"Labor should work earnestly for everything that is of value and importance to America. Its cooperation in international labor groups (such as ILO), its work toward better schools and housing, its work to combat communism, its work for 'getting out the vote' at election time, and its work for increased social legislation should be an integral part of labor policies. A great responsibility rests upon labor and it is up to it to bear this responsibility—for the good of America and our democratic society.

"Organized labor is of great importance and contributes a great deal to the American economy. Because of this importance, additional responsibility is thrust upon labor. When wages go up, many times this is followed by a price increase. It is up to labor to make its demands on management reasonable to the cost of living. Management is equally responsible for wage and price scales, however. Together, it is up to the two groups to come to logical agreements.

"Organized labor has made the economy of America a constantly growing and vital state. It wields great influence, by means of its members, on the economy and is a prominent factor in the prosperity and greatness of our Nation. Labor, by the work of its individual members, has made America what it is today.

"Most of the characteristics possessed by my conception of the ideal role of organized labor in a democratic society are actually possessed by the unions throughout America. May the unions continue to work for their individual members, and may they continue strong in their contributions to America and its way of life."

Cold War Is Fought in Hunger's Arena

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a $4.1 billion foreign aid bill has been approved by the Congress and signed by the President. This amount is about $88 million less than the figure requested by President Eisenhower. The new measure includes provisions to tighten up administration of the program, and assures more detailed accounting of expenditures to the Congress. This is, however, only the first stage of congressional action. The real test will come when Congress votes on the actual appropriations. The appropriations step usually cuts the amount of money still further by some 5 to 15 percent.

Recently I received a most cordial message from President Eisenhower thanking me for my support of the mutual security program. I am deeply convinced that the alternative to a strong mutual security program is the drafting of millions of American men to guard the borders of distant lands. Despite these clear alternatives the opponents of mutual security have been growing in numbers and strength in recent years. If there is to be the necessary support for his mutual security program the President is going to have to work much harder for it than he has in the past, especially among members of his own party in the Congress.

There are compelling reasons, in addition to the purely military ones, for support of the mutual security program. Our economic self-interest also requires that we support this program.

America has always been one of the great trading nations of the world. In the last few years, however, our exports have fallen considerably from 5 percent of our total output of goods and services in the 1920's to 4 percent, with imports down from 4 percent to 3 percent for the same period.

The expansion of trade is basic to the proper functioning of our economy, and here the mutual security program is of tremendous assistance in opening up new markets and in helping us keep the markets we presently have.

The economic columnist of the Washington Post, J. A. Livingston, declares that:

Trade expansion is a social imperative as well as an economic desideratum. The Communists have made their finest capital out of the "splendid isolation" of the "have" nations. The have and have not struggle transcends wars. Its outcome, as President Eisenhower made so clear in his postsummit speech will determine who controls the peace—the Western World or the Communist dictatorship.

In his historic speech on May 2 in Washington, D.C., at a dinner sponsored by the Committee for International Economic Growth and the Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, President Eisenhower reduced the mutual security program to essentials. He said that the free world needs America but, just as importantly, America needs the world. "Important it is that our allies contribute 5 million soldiers, 30,000 airplanes, and 2,200 combatant ships to the common defense of freedom," he said.

Our involvement with our neighbors is more basic than this, however, according to the President. Foreign trade, he said, is the prime example of our need for other nations. Foreign trade is for America, President Eisenhower said:

A $30-billion-a-year business. To this trade 4,500,000 of our people owe their jobs * * * we export on the average a third of our cotton crop, just under a third of our wheat, and a fourth of our tractor production * * * the health of our economy depends upon materials owned by others. Manganese, chrome, tin, natural rubber, nickel are examples. As our economy grows, we depend increasingly upon others for such materials. Eight years ago we imported only about a twentieth of our iron ore. Today we have to import over a third.

One way to help America regain its great role as a trading nation is to sharply reduce executive featherbedding in American industry. In some areas of our economy, it would seem, practically everybody above strawboss is a vice president. Vice presidents have been seen carrying brief cases for other vice presidents.

Al J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO, declares wasteful management practices are not as well publicized as the feather-bedding which management charges unions with.

Mr. Hayes points out that "overloading of executive levels with surplus vice presidents, managers, and directors" is rampant today. In fact, inflated expense accounts, stock options, bonuses, country club memberships, and company-paid yacht cruises and hunting trips are standard operating procedure today as everyone knows.

These "fringe benefits" cost American industry staggering sums and are growing with every passing year. This executive featherbedding is the fat which

makes American industry increasingly sluggish in the sharp competition with the Soviet Union and other countries of the totalitarian bloc and the low-wage countries of the uncommitted bloc of nations, as well as the low-wage countries among our allies and friends.

The railroad managements of our country have for years talked and inspired others to talk about the "featherbedding" in the railroad industry which they charged to the railroad unions. In reply to this unfair charge G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, in a speech before the Southeastern Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, April 16, 1959, declared that:

In 1923, when the class I railroads had approximately 1.8 million employees, they had 16,000 employees at the management level. In 1959, when rail employment dropped to less than half its 1923 level, the number of managers remained almost constant.

The RLEA has recently completed a study, based on the railroads' own reports to the ICC, which shows that, for the railroad industry as a whole, 190 new officials were added on the railroads between 1955 and 1957, although the number of other workers in the industry declined from 1,041,792 to 969,737 over the same period. In the same time, the total outlay for officials' salaries increased by $21.8 million and reached a staggering total of more than $180.9 million annually.

I include as part of my remarks the article by J. A. Livingston in the Washington Post of May 29, 1960, to which I referred earlier:

COLD WAR IS FOUGHT IN HUNGER'S ARENA

(By J. A. Livingston)

Andrew Tunc, professor of law at the University of Paris and formerly in the Legal Department of the International Monetary Fund, makes this revealing comment about life in America:

"The front pages of your newspapers tell a great deal about Russia and communism. Day after day they describe military developments. Naturally, the summit conference gets full treatment. But anything about the underdeveloped countries appears on the back pages. Yet, that is the greater problem of the future."

Professor Tunc, who has been on leave to the University of Pennsylvania Law School, insists that the "have" nations of the Western World are doomed to defeat in the struggle with Communist Russia if they do not help satisfy the "rising expectations" of the people of the underdeveloped world. Americans, Frenchmen, Englishmen can't expect to live in comparative splendor while millions upon millions of persons haven't enough to eat.

INTERNATIONAL NEW DEAL

Professor Tunc cites data on the United Nations. Some 2 billion people live on a per capita income of less than $300 annually; 1.5 billion live on less than $100 a year—if that can be called living. Contrast that with America's $2,000 a year per capita spending power.

The ultimate political loyalties of the "have-nots" will determine the victor in struggle with Soviet Russia, not nuclear weapons or military might, says Professor Tunc. As a result of the greater literacy, people of Asia and Africa have an understanding of how the other few percent live. The times call for "an international New Deal."

Professor Tunc argues that the United States, France, Great Britain and other nations of the West must increase their foreign economic assistance—not purely out of sympathy, the desire to help those who are in misery, but out of self-interest.

What would happen if the vast majority of people in the United States had an income of $100 per capita per year and a comparatively few had $2,000 a year? There'd be a revolution, a forceful takeover of wealth, says Professor Tunc. This is what will happen in the world—in the form of a swing to communism.

ONE PERCENT OF U.S. OUTPUT

These ideas are not unique. They have been expressed by Paul G. Hoffman, the first administrator of the Marshall plan. They have been publicized by Barbara Ward, a contributing editor to the London Economist. They have been enunciated over and over by officials of the State Department and President Eisenhower himself.

America can expect to prosper only if the rest of the world prospers. Yet, every time mutual security aid legislation comes up in Congress there's an outcry. Charity begins at home.

This year the President asks a little more than $4 billion for MSA. It's a small outlay in the massive struggle against Soviet power and propaganda.

Mutual security aid has been split about 60 percent military and 40 percent economic. Current plans call for about half and half. But the total is only 5 percent of the U.S. budget. It constitutes less than 1 percent of the total output of goods and services. And it's down sharply from the 1953 peak of $5.7 billion.

Aside from sympathetic decency, economic self-interest is a sufficient reason for MSA. America has always been a great trading nation. In the late twenties U.S. exports amounted to 5 percent of the total output of goods and services. Imports came to 4 percent.

WHO CONTROLS THE PEACE

International trade in that era was helped along by the overly hopeful investment bankers who lavished loans on governments unprepared to use funds sensibly. Governments defaulted wholesale during the depression.

These were high interest loans. They were to be serviced by the improvements in economic development in the country which couldn't afford the toll. They differ from mutual security aid which not only is financial but also is technical. The beneficiary countries are advised how to adopt modern methods where applicable to their own economies and they don't have to dig up dollars to pay interest to impatient lenders.

In recent years, U.S. exports have fallen to about 4 percent of our gross national product and imports to about 3 percent. It is quite possible that as stability increases in other parts of the world, the percentages will rise to late 1929 levels. Foreign markets could be America's new economic frontier in the sixties.

Indeed, trade expansion is a social imperative as well as an economic desideratum. The Communists have made their finest capital out of the "splendid isolation" of the "have" nations. The have and have-not struggle transcends wars. Its outcome, as President Eisenhower made so clear in his postsummit speech will determine who controls the peace—the Western World or the Communist dictatorship.

Patriotism in Time of Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Patriotism in Time of Cold War." This was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 6, 1960. I believe this article should be read by every American as it is true in every respect, and I am also in accord with the views published in this article:

PATRIOTISM IN TIME OF COLD WAR—AID AND COMFORT TO ENEMY ARE SEEN IN U.S. ATTACKS ON PRESIDENT'S ERRORS

(By David Lawrence)

Time was when in the midst of war neither scribe nor politician ventured to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Time was when the citizen felt a tingle of emotion go up and down his spine as he sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" or saluted the flag.

Time was when the Nation found itself in peril, and nothing else mattered. No sacrifice—even of life itself—was too great to make for the honor of our country.

But things seem to be different now. The President of the United States is insulted and yet some writers continue to furnish aid and comfort to the press of the Soviet Union by denouncing Mr. Eisenhower and holding him cupable for errors he couldn't possibly have avoided and still protect the safety of the American people against surprise attack.

Is the country changing? Is patriotism just an obsolete notion, nurtured only by those of us who have witnessed manifestations of national spirit and pride over a long span of years? Are some of us old-fashioned because we cannot accept the modern cynicism which insists that a President of the United States shall be pilloried by political leaders and by some segments of the press of his own country as Moscow papers reprint every bit of captious and carping criticism?

Is a "cold war" any different really from the crises that call for nonpartisanship during a "hot war"? Time was when in wartime a newspaperman practiced "voluntary censorship" and when his conscience kept him from writing anything that might possibly aid the enemy.

A "cold war" and a "hot war" are no different so far as national danger is concerned. Today the demand is for almost every scrap of information, including "classified" information, and there are newsmen and Members of Congress who insist in all sincerity that they, and not the executive branch of the Government—which has the responsibility for our safety—shall be the final judges of what ought to be suppressed or disclosed.

Time was when this correspondent used to hear the expression: "I'm an American first and a newspaperman second." But today things seem different. No matter how damaging to one's own country, the tendency now is to give the information or comment publicly to the enemy dictator, who promptly quotes it in his propaganda speeches.

As America, moreover, approaches a political campaign, partisan writers say that the

President should have known in advance of every act to be performed by every subordinate in the numerous agencies of a big Government, and that efforts to gather information abroad clandestinely should have been in effect suspended indefinitely to the advantage of a gangster regime in Moscow. Immediately, Moscow seizes on every such adverse comment, especially when it emanates from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Was it too much to ask, as Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, did, that a public investigation by any congressional committee on international matters during a crisis be suspended?

Maybe the urge to patriotism is less strong today than winning an election or carrying on a partisan crusade. Maybe we are witnessing the rise of new "liberals" who espouse the cause of nationalism in the various countries of Africa and Asia, but denounce any nationalism expressed in the United States in behalf of the interests of our own country.

But these misguided "intellectuals"—so many of whom, in the scientific world especially, believe in "world citizenship" as superseding American citizenship—will some day be proved completely wrong. Back in the 1920's, after World War I, there were demonstrations of students in the colleges against war. They held meetings or organizations calling for the soldiers' "bonus of future wars." It was a satirical effort to put the label of selfishness on the men who had to leave their families and jobs and go to war. But when the United States entered World War II in 1941 this same generation acquitted itself nobly. No better troops ever fought for America than those who battled in World War II.

Grassroots Americanism today resents bitterly the insults flung at the President of the United States. It resents attacks on Mr. Eisenhower in the American press which the next day are parroted and quoted with exultation in the Soviet press.

It so happens that Mr. Eisenhower was the supreme commander of allied forces in World War II. He helped to save the Soviet Union from the yoke of Hitler. The American people between 1941 and 1945 sent billions of dollars to help equip the Soviet armies. When the war was over General Eisenhower was received with acclaim in Moscow. But Nikita Khrushchev now says Mr. Eisenhower is fit only to manage a home for children. Recently he called the President a "thief."

It begins to look as if Nikita Khrushchev is resentful of all military men. But he has miscalculated public opinion everywhere if he thinks he can belittle not only the President of the United States, but the very general who helped Russia in the winning of World War II.

The Soviet Premier, to be sure, has lost whatever prestige he may have had in the West. He has forfeited an opportunity for effective leadership as a negotiator with the West. He has really betrayed his own country. For the people of the Soviet Union don't want war, and when they get all the facts they will not long support a man who acts more like an uncivilized boor than like the dignified premier of a government which professes to represent a great people.

The Bracelet That Saves Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to incorporate in the RECORD, an article from This Week magazine of June 5, 1960, concerning the lifesaving Medic-Alert Foundation conceived and developed by Dr. Marion C. Collins, of Turlock, Calif. At considerable personal sacrifice, Dr. Collins has developed this foundation to the point where more than 20,000 persons are wearing Medic-Alert amulets to protect themselves from tragedy. The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, June 5, 1960]

THE BRACELET THAT SAVES LIVES

(By Don Duffy)

(If you're one of the millions of Americans who would be seriously endangered by the wrong medicine treatment, you need to know about this ingenious safeguard.)

TURLOCK, CALIF.—Today there is a magic amulet saving lives because a smalltown doctor has decided to gamble his own life in a struggle against senseless deaths.

The amulet is the emblem of the Medic-Alert Foundation. The smalltown doctor is Dr. Marion C. Collins, 53, a physician and surgeon in this agricultural community of 7,000 people in the San Joaquin Valley. The story began here 7 years ago, the day his daughter Linda, then 14, cut a finger on a rifle trigger.

Frightened by the thought of infection, Linda fled from the rifle range to the small 40-bed Lillian Collins Clinic founded by her grandfather. Linda's uncle, Dr. James Collins, quickly decided to treat her with tetanus antitoxin. Carefully but calmly, he made a scratch test with one drop of serum. Seconds later, the teenager was sprawled on the floor, jerking convulsively and gasping for breath. The serum droplet had set off a violent allergic reaction called anaphylaxis.

For 3 days Linda fought against death inside an oxygen tent. She finally won the battle, but no drug could cure her allergy. Once inside her sensitive system, the serum would have a lethal effect because her body had been sensitized by the serum. The terrible danger is that if she ever is given the serum again by mistake the very same reaction will occur.

Most of Turlock learned of Linda's near tragedy so there were no problems until she was ready to leave for college. But nightmarish scenes of what might happen then began haunting the Collins family—an injured and unconscious Linda in a strange hospital, unsuspecting doctors with no way of knowing that any protein serum injected might spell death.

The normally healthy coed needed some sort of positive protection, some device that would flash a warning whenever any emergency struck and she was unconscious. Dr. Collins weighed three widely used warnings and then rejected them all as too undependable. A note pinned inside her clothing or a card in her purse could easily be lost or overlooked. A tattoo, which Linda pleaded against, would cover only one area where serum could be injected into her body. But what would prove better?

A FAMILY BRAINSTORMING SESSION

The answer came out of a family brainstorming session—a silver bracelet with the warning "Allergic to Tetanus Antitoxin" engraved on its back. To accent this vital message, Dr. Collins had the snake-encircled Staff of Aesculapius, symbol of the medical profession, and the words "Medic-Alert" engraved and emblazoned in bright red on the bracelet's face.

Linda's new piece of jewelry calmed his fears as a father, but fanned the humanitarian instincts that had driven him to choose his father's profession and become California's youngest practicing surgeon at the age of 24.

What if his next emergency patient had a hidden health problem like Linda's and had no protective warning? The riddle prompted him to search out these frightening medical statistics:

Ten percent of all persons inoculated with tetanus antitoxin develop some type of allergy to the serum. In some cases, the reaction would be almost instant death.

Another 5 percent of us are allergic to penicillin, the antibiotic that causes one death every 5 days and half the nonfatal cases of all reported drug allergies.

HANDLE WITH CARE

More than 1 in every 10,000 Caucasian males is born an incurable hemophiliac who could bleed to death from a slight wound without special emergency care.

Some of our 11 million arthritics and rheumatics need cortisone, hydrocortisone or ACTH after shock or injury. Without one of these drugs, complications could be serious and painful.

Many of our 10 million cardiovascular patients take daily medications that must be counteracted by other drugs in certain emergencies.

Most of the 2 million diabetics and 1,500,000 epileptics face a different but equally dangerous threat. Anyone without medical training can easily mistake them for drunks when diabetics go into insulin shock and epileptics becomes ill. Police everywhere dread giving an unidentified diabetic or epileptic a night in jail to "sleep it off" instead of an ambulance trip to the nearest hospital.

MEDIC-ALERT IS LAUNCHED

"Millions of these people don't realize the tragedies that could happen when they're traveling alone," Dr. Collins told his wife, Christine. "And those who know the dangers, including some of my own diabetics, are depending on warnings we ruled out for Linda."

This realization was the beginning of the Medic-Alert Foundation. Dr. Collins canceled plans for a week-long vacation, started working on his new project. His heavy workday, averaging 40 office visits and at least 1 surgical case meant launching the foundation during evenings and over weekends.

He talked with doctors, police officials, nurses and health organizations who all agreed some standard, infallible method of identification was long overdue. But they also warned that the hurdles facing him seemed too high to clear. The bracelet would be too small to carry any detailed medical records so essential in many cases. Medical people and police would have to recognize the bracelet instantly. And finally, launching the project would take a large staff, months of work, and a considerable investment because costs to wearers would have to be nominal.

THE DOCTOR GOES INTO ACTION

Dr. Collins listened to these hard facts and moved ahead. He mapped out a system for filing complicated medical records at the hospital where nurses could answer emergency telephone calls and give out vital information at any hour. Bulletins describing the bracelet and its meaning would be sent to all hospitals in the United States and Canada, all State police forces, and municipal police departments in every city with more than 10,000 population, also all sheriffs and Canadian mounties.

He would finance the Foundation with his own funds. Christine, his wife, would do the clerical work and handle all correspondence. Tommy, their 12-year-old son and the last of four children still at home, would be bookkeeper and order filler. Dr. Collins sister would be traveling promotional representative. James, his brother, could handle his patients when foundation work and displays at medical conventions took him out of town. The Collins home would serve as headquarters.

For the next few nights he sat at a typewriter, pecking out copy for pamphlets and

bulletins. Then the whole family tackled the chore of addressing and stuffing envelopes so printed announcements would reach more than 8,500 hospitals and police departments.

Special dies for manufacturing bracelets and neck medallions cost $3,000. A month later, armed with a few dozen silver amulets and stacks of literature, Dr. Collins set up a display booth at the 1956 American College of Surgeons convention in San Francisco to announce his project to the medical profession. Hundreds of delegates left the meeting armed with Medic-Alert literature to spread among colleagues and patients back home.

Exhausted but elated, Dr. Collins went home to Turlock. And 2 days later, tragedy struck. A sharp chest pain jolted him awake in the early morning hours. The pain shot down his back and left arm, undeniable symptoms of a coronary occlusion.

A clinic colleague gave him a choice he already knew. Slow down or risk death. "If I quit now," he told his wife, "Medic-Alert is dead."

His fateful decision was soon rewarded when letters from doctors, police chiefs and hospital administrators flooded the Turlock post office. Among them was a bracelet order for a Miami epileptic, sent by a patrolman who had mistakenly jailed the man as a drunk.

THE FIGHT PAYS OFF

Once this initial impact waned, the doctor discovered his Foundation had hundreds of professional enthusiasts but ony a few members. He knew the lifetime membership fee and $5 for a bracelet and complete medical history listing could not be lowered without completely draining his finances. The main problem was in reaching potential wearers.

Instead of becoming discouraged, he poured more time and money into promotting the Foundation among doctors and health organizations. Weary from maintaining his own practice at the same time, he gulped down daily doses of aminophylline to ease the strain on his damaged heart.

Orders for memberships began trickling in again and then letters of a different nature started arriving. The first was from a Portland, Oreg., epileptic telling how a passer-by stopped when he was stricken on a street corner, saw the bracelet, and summoned an ambulance that brought an emergency oxygen supply. A New York City woman allergic to pencillin wrote how her bracelet had stopped a doctor from giving her a shot of the antibiotic while she was delirious with pneumonia.

DRAMATIC EVIDENCE

And then came the experience (see p. 4) of an elderly diabetic in Modesto, Calif., who was driving alone when his illness struck. A passing highway patrolman boxed in the weaving car, scraped fenders, and forced it off the road. Then he recognized a Medic-Alert bracelet on the unconscious driver's wrist and read the warning "I am a diabetic." Seconds later, the trooper was radioing for an ambulance.

With this dramatic evidence of the amulet's magic, the doctor and his sister stepped up their promotion campaign. Editors of company bulletins, religious publications, labor, newspapers, and dozens of industrial news letters accepted stories on the Foundation. A national radio network broadcast an interview with Dr. Collins. Public libraries in key Western cities set up Medic-Alert exhibits. Nurses' organizations began selling memberships as their special project, with $1 from each membership fee going into the Linda Collins Nurses' Scholarship Fund.

THE TURNING POINT

These developments provided the turning point. Today, more than 20,000 persons are wearing Medic-Alert amulets to protect themselves from tragedy. Among them also are deep sea divers and sandhogs who know the "bends" can strike them hours after surfacing, and alcoholics whose daily doses of antabuse would turn one swallow of alcohol into a nauseating emetic.

The foundation's success has cost Dr. Collins nearly $30,000. And now, he has removed any possible taint of commercialism by incorporating it as nonprofit with the legal name of the Medical Problem Welfare Association, Inc. Serving on its five-member advisory board are an internist, an industrial toxicologist, and a pediatrician from the University of California medical center; a Turlock deputy sheriff, and a San Francisco publicity expert. A pharmacist, a registered nurse, a jewelry manufacturer, and a Turlock business leader are among its consulting directors. All serve the foundation without salaries.

A SECOND HEART ATTACK

The first directors' meeting in San Francisco was a dream fulfilled for Dr. Collins. The new directors began planning State and national meetings, and discussed the possibility of interesting some national service organization in assisting them in all phases of foundation work. The doctor was unable to attend the second meeting 3 weeks later. His refusal to slow down had finally caused a second coronary occlusion.

A few days after the attack, propped up in bed with the crisis past, he again was planning the foundation's future. "We're gaining about 50 new members each day now," he told a visitor, pointing to a stack of mail on his bed stand. "It's getting too big for us to handle. That's why we hope some national organization will help."

And then maybe the doctor will give his twice-damaged heart an adequate rest. Until that day, though, the whole Collins family will continue devoting every available hour to the Medic-Alert oFundation and the magic amulet that could save your life.

Further information about the foundation may be obtained from Dr. Collins, 1030 Sierra Drive, Turlock, Calif.

The Story of Chief Joseph: From Where the Sun Now Stands—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am presenting the fifth article of the excellent story of Chief Joseph, one of America's most distinguished Indians. Tomorrow, I will present the concluding article.

The fifth article follows:

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, TO FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1877

"Left front into line," bellows an officer. Corporals pick up the shout. In perfect unison the blueclad 7th swings smartly to the north. Cantering horses are kicked into a dead gallop. Sabers glint dully in the cold morning light. The 7th's guidons stream behind their slender shafts. Above the thunder of hoofs, the short staccato notes of "charge" ring across the frozen land. It is a picturebook cavalry charge, dipping into hollows, sweeping over ridges, breaking into a ragged headlong rush for the enemy camp.

The flying troopers are hardly a hundred yards away when the final mound between them and the tepees crashes into smoke. Hats fly off; bodies careen to the ground. Wild-running horses with empty saddles appear everywhere as the magnificent charge begins to falter. Four of the 7th's five officers (and this was no accident) have been killed or wounded, leaving a single lieutenant in command.

The withering fire continues. Troopers mill about in deadly confusion. Hard-breathing infantrymen arrive, their ranks swiftly stained by casualties. A rider topples off a mule drawing a howitzer and two of the four mules go down. The gun lurches to a halt, its muzzle still pointing uselessly to the rear. In less than 5 minutes an earth-pounding cavalry sweep which had wrecked virtually every Indian position it was sent against has been turned into a blood-stained shambles by 60 or 70 leather-faced Nez Perces firing steadily from behind rocks and ridge crests. About 60 of 115 men in the charge have been killed or wounded. The 7th shudders and withdraws.

But the Nez Perces also have been hurt severely. They knew nothing of Miles' angling pursuit. With Howard still far behind, scouting was neglected. An hour before the attack two of the tribesmen rode in to report a buffalo stampede which might have been caused by whites. Looking Glass saw no need to worry. "Plenty, plenty time," he told the families at breakfast. Some were still eating and only a few loads had been packed when another Nez Perce was seen signaling with his blanket from a bluff to the south: "Enemy right on us. Soon the attack." Leisurely packing collapsed into turmoil. Grabbing rifles and cartridge belts, some warriors raced to the southern bluff. "Horses, save the horses," Chief Joseph shouted, and others followed him toward the herd. A few Indians, their ponies at hand, struck out for Canada. Less than 10 minutes after the blanket signal, the 7th came sweeping over the low, naked ridges.

Now the frontal attack has been fended off but Cheyennes and the 2d Cavalry have exploded into the Nez Perce herd, which stampedes in every direction. Here many of the finest warriors still surviving are caught without cover. They wrestle with ponies or fire from shallow ravines. The Paloos chief Hahtalekin goes down. Ollokot, Joseph's brother, is killed while shooting from behind a boulder. Another bullet ends the retreat for Toohoolhoolzote, the aging but sinewy chief who led savage counter-attacks at the Clearwater and Big Hole. Shouting and shooting, cavalrymen drive off several hundred ponies, the bulk of the Nez Perce herd.

Firing continues through the day as Miles, turning to seige tactics, extends his lines to encircle the village. A brief foray aimed at diverting Snake Creek from the Indian camp is driven off. A Hotchkiss gun is brought up but cannot be depressed sufficiently. Its shells burst above the camp, where women and children cower under buffalo robes.

Husishusis Kute, an excellent shot, picks off what he thought were three Cheyennes in a washout southeast of camp. But the victims were Lone Bird and two other Nez Perces. Later the hard-driving squawman trail leader, Poker Joe, meets the same fate, mistakenly killed by a Nez Perce across a small canyon.

The cold gloom of Sunday darkens into night. Joseph and others cut off with the ponies slip back into camp. Deep shelter pits are dug along the creek bottom for women and children. Rifle pits are carved in the bluffs above. But an icy wind springs up, driving gusts of snow through the camp. By morning 5 inches of snow cover the battlefield, and squaws no longer find buffalo chips for fuel. Wounded men lie in blan-

kets, silently waiting to die. Children cry with hunger and cold. In vales surrounding the camp, soldiers suffer from the same biting wind.

Sporadic sharpshooting greets the second day. One shelter pit caves in under fire from a howitzer, burying a woman and child. But of 25 Nez Perce casualties in this battle, 22 occurred the first day. Colonel Miles paces uneasily. He wants a surrender. But even a successful attack would be too costly. Miles has messaged Howard and Sturgis for reinforcements. But he knows some of the Nez Perces may have slipped through to Sitting Bull in Canada. Suppose the Sioux should arrive first to rescue the Nez Perces by tearing apart the seige?

The colonel sends out a white flag. Perhaps the hostiles, their herd largely captured, can be talked into quitting.

This overture calls for a council in the Nez Perce camp. Of the five chiefs whose bands have been fighting heroically for 3½ months, Toolhoolhoolzote and Hahtalekin are dead, killed the previous day. Looking Glass again has been discredited, White Bird (over 70 years old) is almost worn out, and Joseph, for the first time, emerges alone as a leader. A man of effortless courage but lacking the warrior's lust for killing, Joseph had fought as a rifleman in at least two of the battles. The roles he fitted most naturally, though, were those of providing leadership and protection for the women and children and of safeguarding the herd, whose loss would end everything. In many ways it was easier, in an Indian culture where warfare was almost a sport, to race off with a rifle to the firing line than to make sense of frightened squaws, crying babies and milling ponies. To a large extent Joseph had held together the fabric of the Nez Perce society more surely than the guns which defended its long retreat.

Joseph knew too that his people had become involved with far more than a single army under Howard. Now that the end was in sight, the words of this man who had always spoken for a realistic conciliation suddenly make sense. To him, no military genius but the greatest of the Nez Perce chiefs, a majority of the chilled, war-weary tribesmen now turn.

Between lines, an impatient Miles and a stolid Joseph speak briefly through an interpreter. Miles insists that Joseph surrender all his arms. No; half must be kept for hunting. The talk gets nowhere. As Joseph turns to leave, Miles orders him seized. The chief is led into the white lines where his arms are bound and his ankles hobbled.

But the colonel's coup backfires. Lt. Lovell Jerome, apparently believing the war was ended, wanders into the Nez Perce camp. He is detained, though far more comfortably than Joseph. Next day the two are exchanged. Whites and Nez Perces resume their potshooting with a mutual lack of enthusiasm.

The night of October 4, Howard arrives with a small party. Miles greets him coldly: Will his one-armed superior now take over command to receive credit for the surrender? Surely Howard has earned it. Through 1,300 miles of wilderness, he has doggedly pursued the Nez Perces. But Miles is an old friend, deserving of becoming a general. Despite the indignant protests of one of his aides, Lieutenant Wood, Howard makes it clear Miles will remain in charge. Instantly the colonel's attitude changes (cordially and with great solicitude): "General, you must be very tired. Let's meet in the morning to arrange the details."

Next day, Friday, October 5, the Nez Perces learn of Howard's arrival. This has a profound effect. The hostiles mistakenly assume Howard's entire army is close behind. An attack by two enemy forces would swiftly overwhelm the weakened village. Further resistance seems out of the question.

"The women are suffering with cold, the children are crying," Joseph says. "For myself I do not care. It is for them I am going to surrender."

Looking Glass and White Bird begin planning to escape. But time has run out for Looking Glass. Moments after the final council he springs from a rifle pit to stare at a mounted horseman coming from the north. Could this be the first of the Sioux? A sharpshooter's bullet drills into Looking Glass' left forehead. He topples backward, the last casualty of the Nez Perce war.

Joseph and a few warriors emerge from their camp for a final parley with Miles and Howard. The Indians are promised food, shelter, and decent treatment as prisoners of war, without trials or executions. It is stated or clearly implied they will be returned to the Lapwai Reservation in Idaho. Certainly Howard's orders direct him to retain the hostiles in the Department of the Columbia, where Lapwai is the only available area. On the basis of these terms, Joseph returns to camp and prepares for a formal surrender.

It is late afternoon when he rides slowly to the crest of a slope where Miles and Howard are waiting. True to his promise, Howard directs Joseph to give his rifle to Miles. Then Joseph speaks, Chapman interpreting, Wood scribbling on a pad of paper.

"Tell General Howard I know his heart. What he told me before I have in my heart. I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed. Looking Glass is dead. The old men are all killed. It is the young men who say yes or no."

Nearly 700 Nez Perce had started from Idaho in June. Their warriors, perhaps 150, had fought 4 pitched battles and numerous skirmishes against several different commands totaling 1,400 troops and volunteers supplemented by Indian scouts from 10 different tribes. Of the whites, 109 had been killed and 115 wounded. Under generally able leadership, they had been outmarched and often outmaneuvered. The Government's direct expenses approached $2 million.

"He who led the young men is dead. It is cold and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are, perhaps freezing to death. I want time to look for my children and see how many of them I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead.

Ninety-six Nez Perce had been killed, 36 of these women and children. Surrendering with Joseph were 418 made up of 87 men, 184 women, 147 children. That night 230 others, including White Bird and most of his band, would escape toward Canada. Once the most powerful Indian Nation in the American Northwest, the Nez Perces had now lost their horses, their land, and their freedom, and were helplessly reduced to the will of their conquerors.

"Hear me, my chiefs. I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever."

Facts About the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is confronting and attempting to solve the problem of mankind's survival despite the tremendous weapons he has contrived.

It is such a group that must help educate the public so that the force of opinion will require our Government to do far more than it has been doing in the interest of survival.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including hereafter information about the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, its purposes and related information:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

WHO WE ARE

Steve Allen, "The Steve Allen Show," co-chairman, "Hollywood for SANE."

Prof. Gordon W. Allport, psychologist.

Harry Belafonte, singer, actor.

Ray Bradbury, science fiction writer.

Allan M. Butler, M.D., chief of pediatrics, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Henry S. Canby, writer.

Dr. William Davidon, physicist, Argonne National Laboratory.

Prof. L. Harold De Wolf, School of Theology, Boston University.

Helen Gahagan Douglas, former U.S. Congresswoman.

Clark M. Eichelberger, Director, American Association for the U.N.

Jules Feiffer, cartoonist, author.

Harold E. Fey, editor, the Christian Century.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, the Riverside Church.

Dr. Erich Fromm, psychologist, author.

Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO.

Dr. Walter Gropius, architect, author.

Gen. Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, U.S. Army (retired).

Ira Hirschmann, president, the Ira Hirschmann Co., Inc.

Hallock Hoffman, Fund for the Republic.

Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, historian, Harvard University.

Walt Kelly, cartoonist.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., minister, Baptist Church, Montgomery, Ala.

Rabbi Edward E. Klein, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, New York.

O. A. Knight, president, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, AFL–CIO.

Dr. M. Stanley Livingston, director, Cambridge Electron Accelerator, Harvard University.

Arnold H. Maremont, chairman of the board, Thor Corp.

Prof. A. H. Maslow, psychologist, author.

Dr. Seymour Melman, industrial management expert, author, "Inspection for Disarmament."

Dr. C. Wright Mills, sociologist, author.

Lewis Mumford, author.

Dr. William F. Neuman, professor of radiation biology.

Richard Neutra, architect, author.

Earl D. Osborn, Institute for International Order.

Dr. Linus Pauling, chairman, division of chemistry, Caltech.

Josephine W. Pomerance, U.N. Disarmament Observer for A.A.U.N.

Dr. Charles C. Price, director, laboratory of chemistry, University of Pennsylvania; president, United World Federalists.

Dr. David Riesman, professor of sociology, author, "The Lonely Crowd."

Robert Ryan, motion picture actor, co-chairman, "Hollywood for SANE."

Dr. Jack Schubert, physicist, Argonne National Laboratory.

Prof. J. David Singer, department of political science, University of Michigan.

Dr. Ralph Sockman, minister, Christ Church, New York.

Dr. Pitirim A. Sorokin, professor emeritus of sociology.

Dr. Edward J. Sparling, president, Roosevelt University.

Dr. Harold Taylor, former president, Sarah Lawrence College.

Dean Howard Thurman, Marsh Chapel, Boston University.

Louis Untermeyer, author, editor.

Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, University of Minnesota Medical School; Minnesota Atomic Development Problems Committee.

Jerry Voorhis, executive director, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Bruno Walter, conductor.

Bishop Hazen G. Werner, resident bishop, Ohio area, Methodist Church.

WHY WE EXIST

"We are facing a danger unlike any danger that has ever existed. Nations now possess more than enough nuclear explosives to put an end to the life of man on earth.

"Our approach to the danger is unequal to the danger.

"What the world expects of America is not just bigger and better intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs. The world is looking to us for the ideas that can make this planet safe and fit for human habitation.

"The test of a nation's right to survive today is measured not by the size of its bombs or the range of its missiles, but by the size and range of its concern for the human community as a whole.

"There can be no true security for America unless we can exert leadership in these terms, unless we become advocates of a grand design that is directed to the large cause of human destiny.

"To the rest of mankind, America can say:

"That none of the differences separating the governments of the world are as important as the membership of all peoples in the human family;

"That the big challenge of the age is to develop the concept of a higher loyalty—loyalty by man to the human community;

"That the greatest era of human history on earth is within reach of all mankind, that there is no area that cannot be made fertile or habitable, no disease that cannot be fought, no scarcity that cannot be conquered;

"That all that is required for this is to redirect our energies, rediscover our moral strength, redefine our purposes" (from the first statement published by NCSNP, Nov. 15, 1957).

WHAT WE DO

SANE publishes full-page ads in major newspapers to achieve high visibility.

Distributes literature; 300,000 pieces in 2 years.

Forms committees in local communities which engage in educational and nonpartisan political activities. There are SANE committees in many American cities.

Maintains liaison with representatives of related movements in other countries.

Maintains liaison with the United Nations and delegations of the United States and other countries.

Presents its position on TV and radio.

Provides speakers for hundreds of lectures throughout the country.

Instituted a worldwide appeal in support of ending nuclear weapons tests—signed by Trygve Lie, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Lord Russell, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, and many others.

Petitioned the United Nations Trusteeship Council on behalf of the Marshall Islanders.

Protested the French tests in the Sahara.

Stimulated the formation of a National Student Council for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Helped form "Hollywood for SANE" committees with Steve Allen and Robert Ryan as cochairmen.

On the issues

SANE revealed the conflict of interests affecting the Atomic Energy Commission on testing and fallout issues.

Provides support for government efforts to secure agreement on nuclear testing and arms control measures.

But the most important, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy inaugurated a program in which individuals can become effective on questions of vital interest. The committee will continue to focus public opinion on the most critical issues of our time.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

"The development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems and of other weapons capable of causing unlimited destruction has made war unthinkable as an instrument of national policy. The best hope of a world without war lies in the achievement of universal, total disarmament with adequate inspection and control. Recent events suggest that this goal is within reach as a practical possibility.

"The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy works for:

"A. Cessation of all nuclear weapons testing with adequate inspection: Much progress has been made at Geneva, but public pressure is still urgently needed to guarantee:

"A continued moratorium on testing.

"Agreement by the three major powers at Geneva.

"Ratification of the agreement by the U.S. Senate.

"Adherence to the agreement by all other nations which have or might obtain nuclear weapons.

"Denial of nuclear weapons, weapons parts and delivery systems to additional countries, pending conclusion of international agreements to control nuclear weapons.

"B. General Disarmament: Practical steps toward this end will probably be cessation of the production and eventual elimination of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and international cooperation in the control of missiles and exploration of outer space. Arms control will ultimately involve the abolition of all weapons of mass destruction—fire, high explosive, chemical and biological as well as nuclear, and the reduction of all conventional arms and manpower down to levels adequate for maintenance of internal order.

"Only total arms control can result in world security. Stopping with partial measures in which certain important levels of arms are still retained would lead to suspicion and a revival of the arms race. Arms control can be carried out in stages, and each stage can be monitored and concluded before the next begins, but the agreed goal must be complete arms control" (from the Policy Statement of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, adopted Nov. 16, 1959).

THE POWER OF WEAPONS

A 10-megaton bomb (equal to 10 million tons of TNT) would:

Gouge a crater a half-mile across.

Level every brick building in a circle 14 miles across.

Collapse all frame structures for 18 miles.

Kill in 15 minutes anyone caught in the fallout for 20 miles.

Inflict second degree burns and start fires for 50 miles around.

A thousand-plane raid of the World War II type would be required each night for 13 years to equal the explosive power of one 20-megaton bomb.

Fallout

Even the testing of nuclear weapons inflicts suffering and takes a toll of human life. Since the time when testing began, the nuclear powers have set off the following nuclear explosions: United States and United Kingdom—120 million tons (U.K. part was small); U.S.S.R.—60 million tons.

These explosions result in the formation of radioactive debris which is carried around the globe and gradually falls to earth. This is "fallout." Fallout contains radioactive elements which are highly poisonous. Some did not exist until man created them.

The most dangerous are:

Strontium 90: Similar to calcium, strontium 90 is a bone seeker. It can cause leukemia and bone cancer.

Cesium 137: The main effects of cesium are genetic, causing mutations which result in stillbirths and deformities.

Iodine 131: Radioactive iodine can cause cancer of the thyroid.

Carbon 14: Radioactive carbon will cause genetic damage.

Other effects of exposure to radiation are reduced life span and lowered resistance to disease.

HOW MUCH DAMAGE?

"An estimated total of 25,000 to 150,000 cases of leukemia will ultimately occur * * * from tests already held.

"An estimated total of 2,500 to 100,000 genetic defects will occur over subsequent years from tests already held"—United Nations report on radiation.

"Carbon 14 from bomb tests will cause 100,000 gross physical or mental defects, 380,000 cases of stillbirths and childhood deaths, and 900,000 cases of embryonic and neonatal deaths"—Atomic Energy Commission report (WASH 1008).

Fallout from tests already held will rain to earth for years to come. If no more tests are held, a peak will be reached about 1965, which will only return to current levels by the year 2000. Our children and generations to come will pay the price of our recklessness with human life.

In war, nuclear weapons would bring unimaginable destruction. In a medium-sized raid:

"The expert testimony and supporting scientific data presented at the subcommittee hearings indicate that under present conditions such an attack (263 nuclear weapons) would have cost the lives of approximately 50 million Americans, with some 20 million others sustaining serious injuries. * * * Altogether approximately 50 percent of existing dwellings in the United States would have been destroyed or rendered unusable for a period of several months"—Summary-Analysis of Congressional Hearings, 1959.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Know the issue

Write for additional information. We will gladly provide it. (Single copies free.)

Read more detailed pieces. We will suggest some.

Begin to act yourself

Send for copies of this pamphlet and other current literature to distribute in your school, church, club, place of work.

Send it with a personal note to leading radio and television commentators, to religious and organizational leaders, to your neighbors.

Find local sponsors for an ad in your newspaper.

Write letters to the President, to your Senators, and your Congressman (or talk to them while they are at home).

Write letters to the editor of your newspaper. We will give you suggestions.

Seek out and work with others who believe as you do. Join a Sane Nuclear Policy Committee if there is one in your area. (We'll send you a list.) If there is not a group near you, start one. We will help you.

HONORARY SPONSORS

Max Born, Germany; Lord Boyd Orr, United Kingdom; Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; Brock Chisholm, Canada; Canon L. John Collins, United Kingdom; Francois Mauriac, France; Gunnar Myrdal, Sweden; C. Rajagopalachari, India; Lord Russell, United Kingdom.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (NATIONAL MEMBERS)

Cochairmen: Norman Cousins, editor, the Saturday Review; Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee.

Treasurer: Max Youngstein, vice president, United Artists.

Eugene Exman, vice president, Harper & Bros.

James Farmer, program director, NAACP.

Dr. Robert Gilmore, New York City, secretary, American Friends Service Committee.

Robert Gurney, motion picture producer-director.

Rev. Donald Harrington, minister, Community Church, New York.

Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, religious counselor, Columbia University.

Councilman Stanley M. Isaacs, New York City.

Dr. Homer A. Jack, assistant director, American Committee on Africa.

Clarence H. Low, retired.

Lenore G. Marshall, author.

Lawrence S. Mayers, Jr., New York.

Rev. Stewart Meacham, foreign service section, American Friends Service Committee.

Orlie Pell, president, U.S. section, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Norman Thomas, chairman, Post War World Council.

Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, chairman, Department of Physics, Cooper Union.

Executive director: Donald Keys.

And we are the thousands of individuals in and out of local committees across the Nation who are working for sanity in world affairs.

Time Grows Short for Lead and Zinc Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks remain before we reach the end of this session of the Congress.

There are many important measures still to be acted upon by the House, and I know the case of the domestic lead and zinc industry is not one to attract much attention in many States of this Union.

The number of men involved is relatively small, and the mines are scattered across 22 States which do not command large voting delegations in this body.

No other problem in our country today, however, poses a more serious test of our machinery for justice under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, than does the problem of the domestic lead and zinc industry.

For this is an industry, Mr. Speaker, which has proved its case three times before the U.S. Tariff Commission: in 1954, in 1957, and again in 1960. On all three occasions, it has been conclusively established that imported lead and zinc, under reciprocal trade agreements, are causing serious injury to our domestic producers.

For the small producers, the shutdown is a total one. It has been a total shutdown in the tristate area since 1958.

Is there no relief for a domestic industry, even when it proves its case before the body authorized by this Congress to hear the case and recommend a solution?

Is this Congress impotent to correct such a manifest injustice?

In my heart, I cannot accept a negative answer to these questions.

I cannot believe that this body will fail to act upon legislation now pending in the Rules Committee to save our small producers from total ruin. The time, however, is short indeed.

A Pig in the Mud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, not only the people of the United States, but the people in the whole free world have been shocked by the intemperate, castigating remarks which the Russian leader, Nikita Khrushchev, has used against our President. Such abusive language against President Eisenhower is, in truth, a slander of our people and anyone who has a sense of dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the fact that I have the honor to represent such red-blooded Americans as Bob Beer, publisher of the Ashland Times-Gazette of my congressional district in Ashland, Ohio, who is unwilling to take Mr. K.'s venom lying down.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Beer's editorial of June 6, 1960:

[From the Ashland (Ohio) Times-Gazette, June 6, 1960]

A PIG IN THE MUD

Nikita Khrushchev, the creature who looks like a pig and acts like a pig, is wallowing in the mud like a pig.

It would seem that those who have credited him with astute handling of Russia's diplomatic and propaganda interests would now see that the real danger lies in his stupidity and not in cleverness. As each day passes the Hitler image of wild and unreasoned lust seems to be incarnated more vividly in the Russian leader.

Like a pig in a parlor, he was totally disgusting to the American people who viewed his barnyard manners while he was the guest of our President. In true animal fashion his emotions were explosive and fleeting; he grinned, and he snorted; his gestures and expressions were repulsively swinelike.

Frightening, to be sure, but fearsome only because of obvious lack of depth in intellect and control.

His scuttling of the summit and his crude abuse of our President, Vice President, and the former and present Secretaries of State further reveal the horrible threat that this shallow beast holds over the life of the world.

Surely such a monster cannot be credited with uncanny finesse and genius when he single-handedly solidified the allies of free government in a speedier and firmer manner than they could have done by themselves.

Nikita is desperate, and in desperation he could suddenly bring us all to the end of our existence. Something is seriously amiss in Redland, and an awesome gamble is being carried to the veritable brink of war. Hopes of peace have never been more dismal; the fact cannot be covered up; armed conflict with all of its terrible aspects could come at any moment.

The United States and her allies have reached the saturation point of patience and tolerance. The slightest act of aggression by Russia against any one of the free nations would likely be construed as an initial attack, thereby justifying retaliation and the start of the final war on the face of the globe.

The seething contempt which we and our President hold in silence toward the pig of the Kremlin and his dirty litter is primed to burst in a flash unless some sensible and decent element or faction in Russia soon puts a ring in the Khrushchev snout and puts another twist in his tail.

Human beings—no matter where they live—cannot forever thrive on nor digest a diet of hogwash and swill.

R. M. BEER.

A Request That the President Will Meet With Taiwanese Leaders When He Is in the Far East Will Have Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence concerning my request that the President meet with Taiwanese leaders when he is in Taiwan on June 18 to hear what they have to say:

JUNE 2, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When you are in Taiwan on June 18 I hope that you will meet with Taiwanese leaders and hear what they have to say.

The Taiwanese on Taiwan number 8 million and the Chinese who came with Chiang Kai-shek number 2 million. In the recent elections only 18 Taiwanese were permitted to join with about 1,400 Chinese national representatives to elect Chinese officials to govern Taiwan.

These 1,400 Chinese were elected to office 13 years ago in China. While they have some claim to represent the 2 million Chinese on Taiwan, they do not represent the 8 million Taiwanese.

The United States has long supported Chiang Kai-shek, just as it long supported Syngman Rhee. Many believe it is high time that the United States took steps to show its concern about the nature of the Government of Taiwan. The Taiwanese, it appears, should have a larger voice in the affairs of their island.

I sincerely trust that you will deem it appropriate to meet with the Taiwanese leaders when you visit Taiwan, June 18.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.

The HONORABLE CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: On behalf of the President, it is a pleasure to acknowledge your June 2 letter and to assure you that your suggestion respecting a meeting with the Taiwanese leaders will have consideration.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Further Proof of Need for the Great White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks the newspapers have been full of stories of natural disasters—earthquakes and tidal waves— in the friendly South American Republic of Chile. The impact of this devastation has even been felt on our own west coast and in the State of Hawaii, and more than 400,000 Chileans are reported to be homeless today. As the United States has rushed aid to the stricken areas at tremendous cost, the sympathy and concern of Americans across our Nation have gone with this aid.

These disasters have only served to bring home more forcefully the need for action on the use of a Great White Fleet to support American foreign policy as suggested in the resolution which dozens of Members of this body introduced last year.

I do not wish to minimize the effectiveness of the U.S. military in carrying out the immediate rescue operations. Their activity was masterful, massive, and effective as far as it went. But the U.S. military has other important tasks. Regular forces should not be required to continue operations for as long as they are necessary in the event of such widespread and far-reaching disasters as these of the last several weeks. The envisioned Great White Fleet operation is essential for this type of relief.

Mr. Speaker, our delay thus far has cost us at least two major opportunities to come to the aid of humanity and enhance the effectiveness of American foreign policy both in Morocco and in Chile. We cannot afford further delay; American humanitarianism cries out against further delay.

I urge all Members of the House to make this resolution a matter of personal concern. I urge action now to declare the sense of the House as in favor of a Great White Fleet in our time, to meet the urgent needs of our day.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Advertisers Stress Global Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several days ago, I addressed the Senate on the need to stimulate American private investment overseas, especially in the presently less developed areas of the world, which I believe will be the most fertile and important markets of the future.

I spoke at that time of the various approaches available to us in encouraging such investment. Among them are: Tax incentives, improved credit export guarantees, and expanded and more widely publicized Government trade promotional services.

With regard to the latter, expanded trade promotional activities, I was happy to note that at the 12th annual International Advertising Congress, held recently at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, a number of leading American advertising executives stressed the importance of increased private efforts to sell American goods overseas.

Much of our domestic economic vigor is due to enthusiastic salesmanship, whether soft sell or hard sell, which has always been characteristic of our economy. Such efforts are now needed overseas as well.

With the recovery of the economically developed countries of the free world and with great strides that are being made by less developed countries, American goods no longer sell themselves. There is competition for sales in every market of the world.

Mr. President, the best and most logical way for us to meet our much publicized balance of payments difficulties of recent date is to increase exports, and one of the most obvious and direct ways to increase exports is to promote the sale of American goods overseas to the fullest possible extent. I am glad that many of the members of the International Advertising Association realize this fact. I hope that they will follow through on the speeches made at their recent congress in New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Herald Tribune by Joseph Kaselow which is entitled "Global Role Predicted for U.S. Firms," and which is about this meeting, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 2, 1960]

ALONG MADISON AVENUE WITH KASELOW—GLOBAL ROLE PREDICTED FOR U.S. FIRMS

(By Joseph Kaselow)

The growth of world markets may bring with it the expansion of American companies into global corporations, the 12th annual International Advertising Congress was told yesterday. This glowing picture was tempered, however, by statements that many U.S. firms are still amateurs in international operations and that their salesmanship abroad is not an unqualified success.

The congress, sponsored by the International Advertising Association at the Waldorf-Astoria, heard talks by Frank X. White, international vice president of American Machine & Foundry Co.; V. Z. Brink, oversea distributors and export manager of the Ford international group; Ray W. Macdonald, vice president of the international divisions of Burroughs Corp.; and Sylvester L. Weaver, chairman of McCann-Erickson Corp. (International.)

VIEWED AS WHOLE

Mr. White said that the most important change now taking place is that American management is viewing the world market as a whole as its province. Funds available for investment in expansion are now being allocated on a worldwide basis in the sense that the claims of the international division are considered in the annual budget process on an equal basis with the domestic investments, he said.

"The final result of this kind of organizational development in many companies will be the abolition of the international division and the conduct of the business on a worldwide basis from one headquarters without regard for national boundaries," he said. "Top management and corporate staff will not only think in global terms, they will also operate globally."

Mr. Brink, along with Mr. White, warned that many U.S. firms had a lot to learn about selling abroad and, in fact, were being outsold by foreign competition in some areas. Said Mr. Brink: "Despite the general acceptance of our products overseas, U.S. salesmanship has not been an unqualified success. We have engaged in the postwar market with the knowledge that many of our products could sell themselves. Now the situation is changing; we are losing our inherent product advantage and are faced with learning how to sell in depth. Sales of American-made products in foreign markets are facing increasing competition as oversea customers become more discriminating, more sophisticated and better judges of value."

The international market, he said, is expanding and volatile and U.S. businessmen must adjust themselves to it. International selling requires creative action in certain major areas, he said, and continued: "We must define our customers through market research and then develop an increased understanding of their customs, language, and traditions.

GREATER EFFORT URGED

"We must live closer to our field sales personnel and more effectively exploit their knowledge of the market. And we must reappraise and make more aggressive our total merchandising effort, giving special attention to financing and to servicing our market."

Mr. Macdonald said it is "quite possible" that within our lifetime, the most important economic and political fact wil be the European market. "The Europeans are thinking politically and ethnically as a group," he said. "This is a development that 15 or 10 years ago would never have been believed. They completely reject the idea of strife and warfare and now think only in terms of cooperation."

Mr. Macdonald, pointing up the opportunity for American firms, said the United States has only 9 percent of the world population but 50 to 54 percent of the productive capacity of movable goods and services.

The association also passed a resolution recording its protest on the intervention by the Cuban Government of Cuban newspapers and of station CMQ and said it will continue "to use all of its moral powers in behalf of maintaining the freedom of the press and other media."

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans and an editorial broadcast over radio station KSIG, Crowley, La.:

June 2, 1960.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOGGS: Our club in general meeting assembled on June 1, 1960, adopted, without opposition, the following resolution:

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama boundaries extended only 3 miles into the Gulf of Mexico from their respective coastlines at the time of their admission to the Union, but that Texas and Florida boundaries extended 3 marine leagues or about 10 miles from their respective coastlines into the Gulf of Mexico at the time of their admission into the Union; and

"Whereas the result of this decision is inequitable and should be changed by Congress to provide an equal offshore boundary for all States at least as far out as the boundaries of Texas and Florida: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Young Men's Business Club of Greater New Orleans go on record as urging Congress to speedily enact legislation to provide for an equal offshore boundary for all States at least as far out as the boundaries of Texas and Florida; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the YMBC of Greater New Orleans go on record as urging the National Conventions of the Democratic, Republican, and States Rights Parties to insert a plank in their respective platforms pledging support for an equal offshore boundary for all States at least as far out as the boundaries of Texas and Florida; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor and attorney general of Louisiana, the Louisiana congressional delegation and the heads of the national political parties for referral to their respective platform committees and to other interested agencies."

We earnestly solicit your support of the recommendations contained in the above resolution.

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. RAMOS,
President.

There can be no doubt that the Supreme Court decision relative to the ownership of tidelands oil is a serious blow to the State of Louisiana, which is already on shaky financial grounds. We at KSIG, though somewhat lost in the maze of large and complicated issues involved, realize that the decision must certainly have far-reaching effects, and they will not be good effects for us.

In attempting to make an estimate of the situation, it is difficult for us to divorce ourselves from the selfish viewpoint that the money involved is money which the State enjoyed for years without interference and which has now been taken away, as it were by the Federal Government. It is easy for us to cry out that "we wuz robbed." Words of protest rush to the lips, and we do not find it difficult to join with our State leaders in accusations of political punishment and reprisal, or to speak of money-hungry bureaucrats invoking technicalities to grab our natural wealth to be used for their own political ends.

However, no matter what we say about the tidelands situation, our words would not be based on a sound and thorough knowledge of the situation. There are not doubt very few people who know less about the intricacies of the laws and precedents involved in the situation than we. And so, knowing little of these things, we will not attempt to make any profound pronouncements on the subject.

We will content ourselves with observing what has come to pass: that the Supreme Court of our land has decreed that the offshore boundary of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama is 3.45 miles from shore, and that the offshore boundaries of Texas and Florida are 10.45 miles from shore. How they reached this decision, and how they justify it as not discriminatory against the free sovereign States of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama we will not attempt to fathom.

We do hope if the laws of the land permit this sort of discrimination and that it can be justified, that a sufficient number of Congressmen will see to it that the laws are changed. We hope that the lawmakers of the Gulf States will make this their primary concern in the present session and that they will use every resource at their command to achieve a more equitable settlement of the controversy.

Castro Criticizes U.S. Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Castro Calls U.S. Protest 'Aggressive' and 'Crude'," written by R. Hart Phillips, and published in the New York Times of June 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO CALLS U.S. PROTEST "AGGRESSIVE" AND "CRUDE"—NOTE CONDEMNING HOSTILE ACTIONS BY CUBA IS REJECTED—PREMIER AGAIN CHARGES ATTACK IS PLANNED

(By R. Hart Phillips)

HAVANA, June 8.—Premier Fidel Castro said today that the U.S. note of protest to Cuba last week was "aggressive and written in crude language." He also repeated his warning that the United States intended to launch an armed attack against Cuba.

The Premier spoke for about 2 hours in defense of his policies and in an effort to assure the people that both economic and military aggression against Cuba would fail. The speech was made to the closing session of the National Congress of Barbers and Beauty Shop Operators in the Palace of Workers.

The Premier appeared there unexpectedly at 2 o'clock this morning after he had attended a performance of the Peking Opera troupe now in Havana.

Declaring that the "hostility of our powerful neighbor is rising," Dr. Castro said: "We know that they will not leave us in peace and that each day they are more aggressive against Cuba."

What does the United States expect to accomplish with this "aggressive note"? the Premier asked his cheering audience. He referred to the note protesting the "campaign of slander being directed against the United States by representatives of the Cuban Government," the confiscation of U.S. property in Cuba, failure to pay U.S. exporters and other actions of the Castro regime against the United States.

"Are they trying to get Cuba to renounce its sovereignty and the right to maintain commercial and diplomatic relations with the countries it deems advisable"? the Premier asked.

The Premier declared that all military and economic efforts of the United States against Cuba would fail.

"If they intend to strangle our national economy they will fail," he shouted. "If they try to invade us they will be defeated," he continued.

The Cuban people must confront the aggressions of the United States "with courage and faith" because Cuba is the example that all Latin America will follow in defeating economic and military attacks from that country, Dr. Castro said.

"The triumph of Cuba means the triumph of the Latin American countries," the Premier declared.

This afternoon President Osvaldo Dorticós assured the Cuban people that Latin America was supporting Cuba solidly in her struggle against the United States. The President broadcast from his plane as it passed about 100 miles south of Cuba on the way from Venezuela to Mexico, where he will wind up his tour of six Latin American countries.

A Suggestion for Better U.S. Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extremely interesting letter which I received from Mr. John Edwards, editor and publisher, the West Side News, Forty Fort, Pa., in which he incorporates a fine suggestion for making our young people better U.S. citizens. I think Mr. Edwards' idea is a wonderful one and I stand ready to assist he and others who might be interested in the implementation of this suggestion in my congressional district.

The letter follows:

WEST SIDE NEWS,
Kingston, Pa., May 31, 1960.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Thank you for your courteous letter of May 26. We are pleased to know that you liked the group pictures in the West Side News. We are particularly pleased and impressed by the report that you take time out from your busy schedule for 50 such pictures each year with youngsters from Luzerne County, for their trips to Washington are important, and your greeting them and their pictures would be lasting mementos.

Impressing these young ones with the importance of their interest in government is a matter that has caused me great concern, particularly since our last primary election when 14.5 percent of the registered voters in Luzerne County made a decision on the question of horserace gambling, when only 48,000 of the 188,000 registered voters went to the polls. It is alarming to me that such a small percentage of our citizens can mandate a question like that, while such a large percentage expresses no interest.

Now, as you know, when a young person attains the age of 21 he is eligible to vote. It is to be hoped that his parents guide and advise him. But how often is this youngster left entirely on his own politically, to find his way to the polls for the first time, and to develop as a working citizen? What is there to inspire him to responsible citizenship? How many young new citizens are left, like Topsy, just to develop as citizens however they can.

When one becomes a naturalized citizen, he must take an oath that he will be a good citizen and there is a formality involved. But the native born new citizen is taken for granted. There is no fuss made over him, he is required to take no vows; he is left to sort of drift into citizenship if he happens to want to.

Now, I would like to know if it would be possible for formality to mark the 21-year-old's entry into the status of a working citizen of the United States. Why couldn't the 21-year olds of Luzerne County be invited to assemble in Wilkes College gymnasium, or some similar place, to be inducted as new citizens? They could be addressed by Governors and Congressmen on the obligations of citizenship; they could be welcomed as new citizens; an oath of good citizenship could be administered; they could be presented with some sort of certificate or card that would identify them as citizens. All this, of course, would be unofficial. But it would show the new voter that somebody has an interest in him, that he develop into a responsible citizen who will vote at every election, who will not cheat on his income tax, who will not violate the speed laws nor park in front of fire plugs.

Such a program could be the project of an institution like Wilkes College, or it could become the project of one of the major political parties. The important thing, however, is that some project be developed that will help promote and inspire these young people's interest in their government.

I have discussed this project several times in the editorial columns of the West Side

News and talked about it. My interest in such a project is quite simple: I have four children. I don't want them to just drift into U.S. citizenship. I want them to come into that honorable estate impressed and fully conscious of the obligations of good citizenship. So, when our eldest, Janie, attains her majority, I am going to hire the biggest hall in town, invite everybody I know, hire a brass band, and have you as the main speaker. When she was born she and her mother and I got our names in the paper. She will be graduating from high school in a week or so and again her name will be published. When she is married her picture will be in the papers. There are "sweet 16" parties and coming-out parties. There is a fuss made over her at all these milestones in her career. But what fuss will there be when she becomes a working citizen? I'm going to see to it that she is dined and shouted at, that she will be fully aware and feel honored that she is now an active, working citizen of the United States.

I respectfully solicit your views on this idea and your aid in working out some practical program.

Very truly yours,

J. EDWARDS.

Dairying—A Giant of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in recent years, June has been designated as Dairy Month.

The purpose of such special observances include:

First. Paying tribute to the significant role of dairying in our economy; as well as the important contribution of dairy foods to the health of our people; and

Second. Carrying on promotion programs to increase consumption, as well as utilization, of healthful dairy products by consumers.

We recognize, of course, that efforts to improve the outlook for dairying must be carried on on not just a 1-month but a 12-month schedule. In fact, "Every day should be dairy day" at meal time for the American family.

In reviewing the dairy picture, it is important to take into account the following factors:

First. Producers are entitled to a reasonable return for milk and other dairy products; in accordance with general goals in our economic system, that should include the cost of operation plus a reasonable profit.

Second. The handlers are entitled to a reasonable return for manufacturing, processing and distributing quality milk and milk products.

Third. Labor, also, has a right to expect an adequate wage.

Fourth. Last, but by no means least—is the consumer, for whom must be provided an adequate supply of good, healthful milk and dairy foods at reasonable prices.

Today, dairy foods are a best buy in the marketbasket of the American family. According to analysis, these provide approximately 30 percent of America's food nutrients at less than 20 percent of the food dollar, making dairy products a good investment for the family budget.

Here in Congress, we have opportunity—from time to time—to consider legislation affecting the outlook for the dairy industry. These include the determination of price support levels for dairy products; the carrying forward of the special milk programs for schools, child care centers, and other such institutions to expand the consumption of milk; and other programs.

During this month, the dairy industry itself is carrying on constructive, creative programs to increase the consumption of dairy foods—thus benefiting the health of the public as well as improving the economic outlook for the industry.

Recently, the American Dairy Association sponsored a special spring and summer edition of new plans, new ideas for celebrating June Dairy Month all over America.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article entitled "Dairying—A Giant of American Agriculture" from this special edition, reviewing the significance of dairying to the economy printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYS MILLIONS—DAIRYING—A GIANT OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The dairy industry, a giant of American agriculture, has itself become an important customer for a wide variety of goods and services.

The far-reaching economic effects of the milk produced by the Nation's 1 million dairy farmers are felt in scores of industries which directly serve dairying and many others which indirectly feel its influence.

Dairy farms themselves, located in all 50 States, represent sizable capital investments, with $35,000 considered mimimal. Most dairy farms are highly mechanized and run strictly as a dollar-and-cents business operation, requiring a steady supply of machinery, chemicals, feeds, and other commodities.

ARMY OF WORKERS INVOLVED

To keep the dairy milk supply moving from the farms through the various processing and distribution steps to the consumer requires the efforts of millions of workers. More than 300,000 are employed in dairies and processing plants alone, with many more engaged in sales and merchandising, scientific and technical fields, administration, education, and with the Government.

The dairy industry is one of the biggest single customers for the automotive industry, with an estimated 380,000 vehicles used to transport milk and dairy products. Tank trucks, hauling milk from farm to city, and from one market to another, are often refrigerated to keep milk quality preserved. This, in turn, creates a demand for cooling apparatus and vast amounts of stainless steel and other materials. A similar chain of demand is repeated in many other phases of supply to the dairy industry.

MODERN PROCESSING METHODS

Once the farmer's milk is received at the dairy plant, it is subjected to processes requiring more quantities of modern machines, glass and steel pipelines, pumps, and other industrial equipment. Automation and other modern time and labor saving techniques are becoming increasingly important in dairy plants as efficiency and costs of operation loom larger as vital factors in milk handling.

Science has been important to the milk business since the time of Louis Pasteur, over 100 years ago. An army of biochemists, medical and technical researchers, breed specialists, nutritionists, and other scientific workers are engaged in all phases of the milk field, working to make dairy foods better in every way. Through their contributions, and the millions of dollars invested in their work by the dairy industry, modern milk is safer, purer, and more nutritious than ever before.

BROUGHT TO THE CONSUMER

Once the product is ready, it must be marketed. The fields of advertising, sales promotion, merchandising, and public relations play a significant role in aiding retail sales. Packaging the millions of pounds of dairy foods sold daily makes this young industry another important contributor to dairy marketing, with many kinds of glass and paper containers needed.

The wide variety of dairy products available makes it possible for them to be sold through many channels and outlets. Milk is sold by routemen, supermarkets, grocery stores, dairy food stores, vending machines, and through restaurants and commercial eating establishments. A similar wide distribution is seen for ice cream, cheese, butter, and other milk products.

The growth of dairying and its far-flung influence on the American economic scene has been a major factor since the earliest colonial times, and is likely to remain so in the future. The cow and her milk have given rise to scores of dynamic new industries and have provided strong markets for many others, creating more jobs, additional outlets for goods and services, and adding strength to the entire economy.

TV's Just Wasting Away—Feeding on Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lawrence Laurent:

TV'S JUST WASTING AWAY—FEEDING ON VIOLENCE

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The decline of radio, from importance as a social force to a toy for adolescents, began when radio became a kind of juke box. The decline of television, it seems, began when it became a substitute for home movies. The parallel, while not quite as exact as one might like, shows up most clearly in a report from Los Angeles.

When radio (with some superb exceptions) began to concentrate on high school students, rock 'n' roll became the dominant ingredient. This is a formless, repetitious and monotonous sound. Musically, it is almost valueless and most of its advocates are nonskilled amateurs.

The day that junior high students began carrying radio receivers on walks to classes, radio's influence became important only to the bubble-gum and pony-tail set.

When television left (with notable exceptions) New York City and was concentrated in Hollywood, a similar series of events took place. The skilled professionals lost out to the beautiful boys and girls. Hundreds of unlined, blank faces and thousands of gleaming dental caps filled the 21-inch tube. In turn, violence became the great "entertainment" ingredient.

The current issue of Newsweek reports on a study made in Los Angeles by 300 students and faculty members of Pepperdine College. They watched seven Los Angeles TV stations for 669½ hours during a 1-week period.

During the monitored time, they reported a total of 1,261 incidents involving death; 1,348 of mayhem, and 1,087 threats of bodily harm.

They discovered, too, that on television a threat of maiming is four times as likely as an indication of love or affection. During the monitored week, the viewers saw 995 kisses of all varieties.

Included in the survey are 258 instances of property destruction and 784 alcoholic drinks consumed. The students and teachers counted 7,887 commercials, an average of 11 advertisements an hour.

The survey was under the direction of Speech Teacher Fred Casmir. His conclusion: "If this is what the public wants, they're getting it."

There is, of course, a simpler conclusion to be drawn. In the hard economics of the hard-eyed TV producer's world, violence is just about the cheapest commodity. Professional writers are expensive and so are the skilled actors who might create a story that is moving and successful.

Violence—the gun, the fist, the knife—is cheap. One doesn't have to be intelligently trained to fire a revolver or a machinegun. The machine does all.

Dramatic training is not required for the phony fights that fill the Westerns and private eye shows. Any young tumbler can fill the role.

If the producer really wants to save money, he can buy stock film of battles at a cheap rate per foot. After all, the cheapsters who made millions of movies for children to watch on Saturday afternoons have enormous libraries of mayhem, murder, and maiming.

Violence is as old as drama, and conflict of some kind is absolutely essential to a compelling story. The complaint here is not against the clash of men's wills, but the endless solution of problems by beating and killing. One must honestly question whether this is quite the ideal to be held up to a rather peaceful people.

Boris Pasternak—The Music of Unarmed Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many have eulogized the Russian poet and novelist Boris Pasternak in the days since his death. Many have struggled to define precisely what quality in this man made him not only a literary prize winner but a spokesman for men everywhere in our difficult age. They have sought also to define precisely what quality in his writing caused the Soviets—usually so eager to garner prizes and public honors—to reject and isolate this great Russian.

Ralph McGill in a column in the Washington Evening Star for June 8 called Pasternak's achievement and his ultimate victory "the inward music of unarmed truth" which permeated all he said and did. This service of truth does not win prizes in the slave society of communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Ralph McGill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, June 8, 1960]

PASTERNAK'S PASSIVE DEFIANCE—RUSSIAN AUTHOR'S DEATH IS CALLED A LAST REBUKE TO COMMUNISTS

(By Ralph McGill)

Boris Pasternak, poet and author of the Nobel Prize novel "Dr. Zhivago," has been buried, at his request, in the graveyard of a small Orthodox church near his home in a village some 20 miles from Moscow.

Pasternak was a "believer." The revolution had rolled over him. He had never lost his personal faith nor his love of country. Nor had his zest for beauty of nature, poetry, the written word and people in any degree lessened. Marxist communism understandably found him difficult. His faith in a supreme being was greater than that in Marx and his disciples. Pasternak's fame was a trouble. So was his death. His end was a last rebuke, a final passive defiance.

In thinking on the death of this lonely man who held fast to the hand of God, one thought in this time of increased world fear, of Matthew Arnold's "Dover Beach."

"The sea of faith
Was once, too, at the full,
But now I only hear
Its melancholy, long withdrawing roar. . . .
Ah, love, let us be true
To one another! for the world which seems
To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither joy nor love, nor light,
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain,
And we are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and light
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

Pasternak must have felt all this—and more. Certainly he did see, as he revealed through Dr. Zhivago, that he and many others in the world often felt they were on a darkling plain, swept with confused alarms as ignorant armies clashed in the symbolic night.

And so he was—and so are we all.

Edmund Wilson, in "The Shores of Light," quotes from Prof. Alexander Bruckner's "History of Russian Literature":

"To the intelligent Russian, without a free press, without the liberty of assembly, without the right to free expression of opinion, literature became the last refuge of thought, the only means of propagating higher ideas. He expected of his country's literature not merely esthetic recreation; he placed it at the service of his aspirations. * * *"

We get some hint of this from Ilya Ehrenburg, the veteran propagandist gadfly and novelist who in his novel, "The Thaw," in effect loosed a gusty sigh of relief at being permitted an expression of aspirations and higher ideas.

For Pasternak the quote seems a neat fit. He did place his writing at the service of his aspirations. His writings were not a denunication of the revolution. He himself had believed in the need for it. What he failed to do was to idealize it, to pretty it up, to hide the effect of the inevitable brutality and ugliness. For this he was condemned and isolated.

Pasternak wrote that if the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats—any kind of threats—then the highest emblem of humanity would be the lion tamer with his whip. But, he said, what has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but the inward music of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example.

This has given his grave a final victory. The inward music of his unarmed truth will everywhere haunt those whose symbol of authority is the cudgel.

Credit Given Where Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, all too often, when a public official does a good job, he is given no credit or praise for it.

So that credit may go to Assistant Secretary of Defense Murray Snyder, where it is due, an article by Pat Munroe in the May 21, 1960, issue of Editor and Publisher follows:

Newspapers have reason to feel a special bit of gratitude to Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder in the handling of news released on the world-girdling submarine *Triton*.

For the first time in this reporter's memory, all news media had a crack at this major Pentagon story on an equal footing. With obvious reference to officers who sell articles to magazines, Mr. Snyder says:

"When the news belongs to the public it should be available to all media at the same time. I've always opposed the theory that somebody who works for the Government can profit from these exploits simply by withholding information from the general public."

Mr. Snyder's plan for covering the underwater trip of the atomic sub was worked out in detail with White House Press Secretary Jim Hagerty. The fruition of their work was a press conference held at the White House by the sub's skipper, Capt. Edward L. Beach, on May 10.

Mr. Snyder's plan was twofold:

1. Captain Beach, a best seller author, was to keep an unclassified chronology of the trip. This lengthy document—68 pages, 43,000 words—was released at the press conference.

2. Recall to active duty, just for this trip, Navy Reserve Comdr. J. B. Roberts, a photographer for the National Geographic magazine. He was taken off the sub on May 2 in Spain after the ship had officially circled the globe, and flown with his film to Washington. His magazine has the same access to his pictures as other media.

Many daily newspapers were able to blossom with color pictures of the feat shortly after the news of the trip's success was known. There was no waiting around to see the pictures first in some magazine. Defense released 21 black and white and 14 color stills.

Mr. Speaker, one further comment should be made pointing out the fact that the day Captain Beach arrived at

the White House, 2,000 feet of movie film taken by Commander Roberts was immediately available for showing on TV that night.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this was a well coordinated public information undertaking, fair to all news media.

Tribute to Catholic Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to attend the congressional breakfast of the golden jubilee convention of the Catholic Press Association recently held in Washington. The Catholic press in our Nation has long represented one of the most vigorous and salutary forces of American journalism. Its influence in contributing to the spiritual and moral tone of the Nation has been inestimable. In particular, the vigilant and energetic action of the Catholic press in its continued fight against atheistic communism constitutes a vital and meritorious service to the cause of freedom.

On the occasion of the golden jubilee convention, the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, bishop of Belleville, Ill., delivered an address outlining the significant accomplishments of the Catholic press in the United States. Because of the timely importance of Bishop Zuroweste's address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE MOST REVEREND ALBERT R. ZUROWESTE, D.D., BISHOP OF BELLEVILLE, ILL.

It is an honor for me to greet our distinguished guests in the name of the Catholic Press Association. This particular convention marks our golden jubilee, and we look back with pride and satisfaction on the accomplishments of the past 50 years. During this half century great progress and advancement have been noted both in our Nation and our church. In all sincerity, we believe that the Catholic press has been a truthful and powerful communication means in promoting those causes and programs that have aided the material and spiritual growth of our Nation.

Our organization has defended nobly our Nation during the strain and stress of war years; during days of depression and prosperity. It has helped immeasurably in upholding the dignity of man, in fighting for the social betterment of the lower and middle classes, and in seeking justice and rights, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Today our subscribers number in excess of 25 million and are served by 131 newspapers and 150 magazines in the United States and Canada.

Every Catholic newspaper and magazine covering the field of missions, devotion, education, social sciences, philosophy, liturgy, current comment, and opinion, is staffed by competent and devoted editors, writers, and editorial contributors.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference Press Department, under the direction of the bishops, has established the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which is now in its 40th year. This news service issues dispatches daily utilizing radio, telegraph, teleprinter, and mail facilities. It is comparable to the AP, UPI, and other general worldwide news gathering agencies. This NCWC service gathers its news through 146 foreign correspondents, 115 U.S. correspondents, and is accredited as a bona fide news agency in the press galleries of Congress, at the White House, at other U.S. Government establishments, and at all other important centers of the United States and abroad.

Our association enjoys a freedom (of press) that is an enviable one. Difference of opinions on every subject, except that of defined doctrine of the church, makes for a healthy, progressive, and aggressive press. Since true freedom is founded on truth, we as Catholic editors are dedicated to the pursuit and propagation of truth.

The ideologies of communism are diametrically opposed to truth and democracy. There is no press, be it general or religious, more active and forceful against these false teachings of atheistic communism than we of the Catholic press. Our record of the past half century is one of loyalty and service to our church and our country, and this policy will ever be the standard under which we will continue to function. There is no group in the world more dedicated and appreciative of the freedom of religion and freedom of the press than the Catholic Press Association.

We are grateful to our distinguished guests who have honored us by their presence at this breakfast. Aware of your very pressing problems and busy schedules, we're all the more thankful to each and every one for making this, our golden jubilee, a truly noteworthy and historic one.

Winning Nebraska REA Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include in the RECORD two papers written by high school students in Nebraska, concerning the value of electricity in rural areas.

The first essay is by Mary Jo Marrin, 16, a senior at Dalton High School, Dalton, Nebr., and is entitled "Workers by Impulse."

The second is by Robert Hokom, 17, who was graduated this year from Lodgepole High School, Lodgepole, Nebr., and is entitled "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." The essays follow:

WORKERS BY IMPULSE

The letters "REA" stand for one of the greatest developments in the history of the United States. The high standard of living that western Nebraskans enjoy on their farms and in their small towns today would be impossible without the electricity supplied by the Rural Electrification Administration. But, to fully understand and appreciate the value of electricity, we must realize all that it does for us.

The story of electricity starts very simply. From only coal and water, Susie and Sammy Spark are born. Soon they are being whirled through giant electric generators in huge powerplants and carried out of the plants by a large network of wires. When Susie and Sammy have been transformed to the proper voltage, they speed through the wires on their way to play an important part in someone's life. Suddenly a switch is turned, and Sammy rushes to the scene to find a young polio victim in an iron lung. The young boy's very life depends on the power Sammy can give. Grasping the situation, Sammy soon has everything under control, starts the iron lung, and continues on his way. Finding Susie gone, he goes to look for her and finds her giving the necessary warmth to the tiny babies in the nursery of the same rural hospital.

Susie and Sammy feel proud that they belong to the great organization that has made possible hospitals like these and the saving of so many lives. As they resume their journey through the beautiful and peaceful countryside, the Sparks begin to understand why electricity has so revolutionized the farming industry. Before the REA came into existence, many farmers were moving to the city. The strenuous work and long hours seemed senseless when compared to the many comforts and better wages of the city. But, with electricity, the work was lightened, and farming once against seemed the best way of life to many people.

Susie and Sammy have now arrived in the next town and gone immediately to the places where they can be useful. Sammy is needed by the businessmen of town to give them light and heat. Susie is needed in the home by all the homemakers to cook the meals, do the washing and ironing, clean the house, and for countless other jobs.

The next stop for the Sparks is a small farm about 12 miles from town. They go right to work—Sammy providing power for the more than 200 jobs electricity can do on a farm, while Susie uses her power for appliances in the home. The farmer uses electricity all day long and in practically everything he does. He can pump water with it, dry hay, keep chicks and baby pigs warm, have milking machines, do his own welding, and besides many other things, maintain and run a larger farm with this electrical power. His wife also depends to a large extent on electricity for the water heater, refrigerator, range, washer, dryer, telephone, radio, and numerous other things. When the work for the day is done, and the people can relax, the Susie and Sammy Sparks go right on providing comfort through light and heat, television, and theaters. Without this priceless electricity, our modern living would be very backward. Rural electrification is invaluable.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

As I picked up a back copy of the Sidney Telegraph, I noticed in small print "Farmers Hampered by Power Outage." I said to myself, "Such news in small print? No. It should be in large print, being such a rare occasion." Thanks to the efficiency and expertness that the Wheat Belt is operated on, an occasion of this type is as rare as a blizzard in July.

I thought about that night when there was the power shortage. What a night. I remember distinctly the first inconvenience that there was no water available because we had an electric water pump. Somehow we managed to eat, but after that I went into the living room and turned on the television set. What, no television; that was unbelievable. What would I do until time to go to bed? A person couldn't study or read; after all, there wasn't any light except for that which was furnished by a candle.

A person doesn't realize the value of rural electrification until he has to do with-

out the conveniences electricity brings to a rural home.

Rural electrification plays the biggest steppingstone in the success of every farmer and every farming community. The farmer with his modern shop tools has his labor problem cut in half. There are electric elevators, milkers, pump jacks, welders, drills, sanders, to mention only a few, for any job that must be done by the farmer.

The housewife has improvements in the home that could not be replaced by anything. In contrast, take a woman working over an old coal-burner stove and compare her with the woman of today who has either an electric range or oven.

The housewife of today has things as sweepers, washers, dryers, and many other laborsaving devices. The farmer's wife of today can enjoy all of the modern conveniences that the urban dweller enjoys. Not so 25 years ago. Twenty-five years ago only 7 percent of Nebraska's farms had electricity; today 95 percent are receiving the benefits of REA.

On May 11, 1960, the Rural Electrification Administration observes its 25th anniversary. What other service has progressed so rapidly? Surely there is none other.

REA can, without doubt, be labeled the greatest asset to the farmer in the history of rural life. Now the farmer may receive any of the benefits that someone living in the city enjoys. The farmer of today is not some hillbilly, but is as far advanced as a dweller in an industrial metropolis or a sophisticated suburban commuter. The farmer has reached this level, but a large share of the credit must go to the availability of electricity provided by REA.

REA has raised the social standing of the rural communities. Just as gunpowder was known as the leveler of the great and common people in the time of England's Hundred Years' War with France, so is REA a leveler of the urban and rural people in social life and standings.

The values of rural electrification are too numerous to cover in detail in this paper. However, I feel that they may be divided into three categories: (1) Comforts received; (2) laborsaving devices; (3) the social benefits and the great leveling brought about by REA.

Suppression of Cuban Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cuban Free Press Buried on May 17," published in the Inter-American Labor Bulletin for June 1960.

There being on objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN FREE PRESS BURIED ON MAY 17—ITS DYING STATEMENT, SUPPRESSED THERE, IS REPRODUCED HERE

Symbolically, press liberty died completely in Cuba when the last of the opposition dailies "Prensa Libre" was shut down. The means used was the same as previously utilized against "Diario de la Marina," "Avance," "Excelsior," "El Mundo," and "El Pais," the same that the dictator Peron used when he strangled "La Prensa" and the rest of the free press in Argentina, the same as all dictatorial and totalitarian states use to silence any free expression from the opposition.

It is with a feeling of shame and repugnance that we note that the direct instrument, the cat's-paw used to silence the free press of Cuba, was the printing and journalist trade unions. These unions having been previously emasculated by the new labor code that prevents a worker from taking or quitting a job without permission of the Labor Ministry and substituting Ministerial decree for collective bargaining have now been perverted to the role of "goon squads" for the suppression of even a whisper of opposition to the ruling clique.

Much has been written in the daily press of the free world against this most recent abuse of civil rights, but it would be unfair to the valiant men who fought this abuse to the last minute if their last statement, meant to appear for all of Cuba to read in the May 17 edition of Prensa Libre (which was suppressed) were not made known to our readers. The statement follows:

"Cuba, we appear before you, before your people who are our people, before your judgment which is the only judgment to which we are beholden.

"We are neither lofty men nor heroes, but we have been sincere and have always written with our eyes on you. We have built this independent newspaper which never yileded to threat nor to bribe. And we have stated the truth even when it was an immediate danger to do so.

"We are no braver than others, but we have not permitted nor will permit that we be abused and annoyed. We are not infallible but neither do we believe in the infallibility of anyone.

"Today we appear before you, Cuba, to denounce an outrage, a crime against our liberty and our democracy. Dark forces that obey foreign orders have incited and conspired with elements who wish to capture the channels of expression in order to destroy us—these elements attack us for having our own viewpoint—for combating the sinister international conspiracy directed by Russia, against our land and against the solidarity of the American continent.

"If this crime is committed against us, against you, beloved Cuba, then let it be known in every Cuban family, in every Cuban heart, that we have sacrificed our all, our property, our personal security and that of our children because we did not submit to those who wish to substitute our symbol of the lone star with a red rag."

Signed by Humberto Medrano and Ulises Carbó, assistant directors of Presna Libre.

National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. ERWIN MITCHELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12049) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, in beginning may I state to each of my colleagues of the Science and Astronautics Committee, the great admiration I have for the work and support that they have given to me not only in this bill but in all of our joint endeavors together. There is great talent on this committee and I think this body realizes that there is tremendous talent, from the chairman of the committee down to all the members of the committee.

This is quite an important matter. It concerns quite a bit of money. It deals with a philosophy and I think you can draw your line as a result of your vote on the patent provisions of the Space Act as to what your political philosophy is.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act currently requires that the Government acquire complete ownership of all inventions produced under NASA research and development contracts. The act does more. It does not allow a patent to be issued on any invention which appears to the Commissioner of Patents to have "significant utility" for the space program unless the applicant can show that his invention was made without any Federal assistance. Even then the would-be patentee may be overridden by the NASA Administrator and compelled to go to court for whatever rights he may have.

It is true that NASA can waive its rights to title—but only if the Administrator can prove that it is in the best interests of the United States to do so. This is so stringent a requirement that NASA has felt able to waive title in only three instances (and one of those involved a contract initiated with the Air Force) in the 21 months of its operation.

Those 21 months have now proved that the patent section of the law is tending to hamstring the Space Administration in its efforts to meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in space.

This we obviously cannot afford, and we shall be both derelict and not very bright if we do not erase the trouble and erase it now.

So we propose, Mr. Chairman, to rewrite the patent section of the Space Act along these lines:

Our proposal would place in the NASA Administrator the discretion for acquiring title within certain limits. That is, the Administrator—in all cases—would be obliged to secure a royalty-free, irrevocable license to make or have made and to use the invention for governmental purposes. But he would not be obligated to acquire the entire right, title and interest to the invention unless some other law required it or until he found the national security or welfare required it.

This proposal is accompanied by a statement of intent in the report which outlines in some detail the conditions under which the Administrator should consider retaining title and those under which he should not. It is a carefully prepared statement which required months of work by experts in the Government research field in collaboration with the committee. Incidentally, the statement purposely was not incorporated in the bill itself for good reasons. One is that, as a statutory requirement, it would result in time-consuming, formal procedures and the necessity for spelling out procedures on factfinding. Another is that it would result in addi-

tional costs and possibly undesirable litigation. We felt the best all-around results could be obtained by making the statement a part of the legislative history of the act.

Please note carefully that what we are proposing is a balanced, middle-road approach to the problem. It is certainly not the Government-monopoly approach of the Atomic Energy Commission. Neither is it the approach of the Defense Department, which never acquires more than a royalty-free license to make and use inventions produced under its contracts so long as the contractor wishes to retain commercial rights.

In essence, we have come up with a flexible solution—one which guarantees that both the public interest and the equities of the contractor shall be protected.

Why is this change essential?

As indicated, the basic reason is because the present patent provision is detrimental to our space effort.

With the current patent provision in effect, NASA does not get the best research for the lowest cost. Sometimes it cannot get the research it needs at all. I have here summaries of eight specific instances in which the Space Administration has been seriously hampered in its efforts to secure research in crucial areas because of the inequitable requirements forced upon it. Eight times in the space of a few months—and other similar situations are bound to face NASA in the near future. It is incredible that we should permit this kind of thing to continue.

I should like to incorporate the background of these cases in the RECORD at this point:

Case No. 1: The Washington Electric Corp. believes that they have made some very basic and fundamental discoveries in the technique of maintaining and regulating an arc discharge in a gaseous medium. The discoveries which Westinghouse Electric have made in connection with arc discharge resulted from their studies over the years of the phenomena of arc discharge. It appeared to technical representatives of Westinghouse Electric that these recent discoveries could well have application to the development of high-velocity wind tunnels capable of producing velocity of the order of mach 15. Westinghouse Electric informally inquired of NASA whether or not a contract for research and development with NASA to apply their discoveries in the field of arc discharge to the development of a high mach number wind tunnel would permit them to retain commercial rights in inventions made in the performance of such a contract. Westinghouse Electric appeared to believe that there would be further demand for such wind tunnels not only by the Government but by industry, and the retention of commercial rights in inventions would enhance their competitive position in supplying wind tunnels, utilizing their techniques. Westinghouse Electric was advised that the only procedure to accomplish this objective is the waiver under subsection 305(f) of the NASA Act, as implemented by NASA regulations. These regulations provide for the granting of waiver by the Administrator of NASA upon recommendation of the NASA Inventions and Contributions Board, and therefore any specific action cannot be foretold. These regulations do provide that waiver may be granted if it is shown that the invention has only incidental utility in the conduct of activities with which the Administration is particularly concerned, and has substantial promise of commercial utility. It would appear that any invention in the field of wind tunnel design would not be said to have only incidental utility in the conduct of activities with which NASA is concerned. Accordingly, this provision for waiver offered little promise that a waiver of the Government's rights in these inventions could be obtained.

Another provision for waiver is where it is shown that the invention is directed specifically to a line of business of the contractor with respect to which contractor's expenditure of funds in the field of technology to which the invention pertains has been large in comparison to the amount of funds for research and development work in the same field of technology expended under the contract of the administration in which the invention was conceived or first actually reduced to practice. It would appear that any invention in the field of wind tunnel design would not be likely to qualify under this provision. None of the other provisions for waiver appeared to offer better hope to obtain commercial rights. Accordingly, Westinghouse Electric now has the matter under consideration. It should be added that Westinghouse Electric has contracts with NASA in fields of technology where their commercial position is not so critical.

Case No. 2: The Electric Storage Battery Co. was requested by McDonnell Aircraft Co., prime contractor for Project Mercury, to accept a subcontract for the development of a battery to be used in Project Mercury. Since the research and development to be undertaken pursuant to this requets would parallel the Electric Storage Battery Co.'s own sponsored research program, and since the inventions emanating from this undertaking would be subject to the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act, Electric Storage Battery refused to enter into this subcontract with McDonnell Aircraft Co. Had it not been for the development of an alternative power supply by another NASA contractor, the refusal of Electric Storage Battery to take a subcontract with McDonnell Aircraft merely because of the NASA patent provisions could have seriously impaired or delayed Project Mercury.

Case No. 3: The Motorola Co. has made certain discoveries in photographic processes and techniques which appear to have substantial promise of commercial utility. These discoveries in photographic processes and techniques were made independently of any Government sponsorship and are presently the exclusive property of the Motorola Co. It appears, however, that these photographic processes and techniques may have application in the solution of problems of photography in space exploration, and officials of the Motorola Co. approached NASA to suggest a research and development contract to apply these techniques to problems in outer space photography but desired to ascertain whether such an NASA contract would result in the Government acquiring title to any of these inventions.

The answer to the foregoing question depends upon whether these inventions have been "actually reduced to practice," a matter not easily ascertainable. It is the policy of NASA not to acquire, except by direct purchase, rights in inventions that have been actually reduced to practice prior to the placing of a contract with NASA. Because the investigations undertaken by Motorola are still in an experimental stage, some questions remain as to whether or not their present state of development would, in each case, be considered as an "actual reduction to practice." Moreover, the Motorola Co. desires to continue their own research and development program in the commercial applications of these new photographic techniques and processes, and therefore desires to retain commercial rights to all new inventions. The NASA patent provisions leave in doubt the desirability of making a proposal to NASA to support such investigation.

Case No. 4: The General Electric Co., under contract with an agency of the Department of Defense, had successfully completed the basis research and study to indicate the applicability to missile guidance of certain phenomena previously discovered by the General Electric Co. relating to superconductivity. NASA desired to join with the Department of Defense in applying these discoveries in superconductivity to space vehicle guidance. This joint sponsorship would, of course, necessitate the incorporation in the contract of the special NASA patent provisions which are less favorable to the contractor than those of the Department of Defense. The contractor refused to take the contract under such joint sponsorship, and presumably this investigation, if undertaken, will have to be supported solely by the Department of Defense. It should be added that the General Electric Co. is participating under research and development contracts with NASA in many other areas of research and development, and their reluctance to accept NASA's support in this specific case was undoubtedly attributable to their reluctance to grant any rights in the background inventions involved in this undertaking.

Case No. 5: Narmco Industries, Inc., of San Diego, Calif., was requested by NASA to undertake some research investigations bearing upon the development of new structural materials for outer space application which would involve the impregnation into plastic or metal structures of fibers or disk-like flakes of ceramic or glass materials. Narmco would be responsible for the development of the end material but would be required to seek from the glass or ceramic industries the improved fibers and disk-like materials which were to be incorporated into the plastic or metal matrix. On investigation, Narmco found that the glass and ceramic industries were reluctant to participate in this program if their participation would subject them to the patent provisions of the NASA Act. Because of these difficulties, this proposed investigation did not materialize. However, it is understood that Narmco has accepted contracts with the Departments of the Air Force, Army, and Navy for the above research and development investigations.

Case No. 6: The Associated Piping Engineering Co., of Compton, Calif., has apparently developed, independently of any Government sponsorship, a novel process for welding tungsten-containing alloys. It appears that the process developed by Associated Piping could be applied to tungsten or molybdenum to achieve a NASA objective which is important in our space program. The NASA patent provisions, which would be required to be contained in such a contract, are presently delaying the placing of a contract with this firm. It appears that Associated Piping has a well-established proprietary position in this field. Not only would they be required to give the Government patent rights, if they were to enter into a contract, but would also be required to convey information developed under such a contract and background information under conditions where they may be made available to the public.

Case No. 7: The Lesona Corp., subsidiary of Patterson-Moof Corp., was approached by NASA to develop a carbon dioxide analyzer for use in Project Mercury. Lesona, the owner of patents for this subject matter, had granted an exclusive license to another firm under all inventions covered by its patents and all improvements therein. Under the NASA patent provisions required

in the proposed NASA contract, the Government would acquire exclusive rights in inventions made in the performance of work under the contract and Lesona could be held to have violated the terms of its exclusive license agreement. Even though Lesona wanted to accept the NASA contract, the officials of the company decided that it would be in the best interests of the company to refuse the work with NASA.

The foregoing examples typify the difficulties encountered as a result of the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act. However, there is reason to believe that many other industrial firms are reluctant to do business with NASA because of the patent provisions of the act. NASA would not be aware of this reluctance because these firms have not been seeking business with NASA. I understand that the Industrial Nucleonics Corp. has, in testimony before the Congress, indicated their reluctance to do business with the Atomic Energy Commission because of the patent policy of AEC. I also understand that Industrial Nucleonics, for the same reason, will not do business with NASA. It is also understood that the Garrett Corp., of Los Angeles, would be unwilling to accept contracts with NASA in fields of technology related to their commercial business if inventions would be likely or necessary in the fulfillment of the work requirements of the contract. I also have reason to believe that Statham Instruments, of Los Angeles would refuse to accept research and development contracts of NASA in certain fields of technology.

Another very important example of the way the current patent provision is hamstringing NASA can be seen in this communication from the space agency.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D.C.

HON. ERWIN MITCHELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: By letter dated February 25, 1960, this office forwarded to you a number of specific examples of negotiation difficulties encountered by NASA which were attributable to the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. My attention has just recently been directed to another instance wherein NASA has encountered difficulties in contract negotiations which are again attributable to the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and it occurred to me that I should also bring this to your attention.

A proposal had been received from the Gravity Research Corp. for a design and feasibility study leading to the development of a lunar surface gravity meter system capable of meeting space, weight, and acceleration specifications imposed by vehicle system requirements for instrumented soft lunar landings. This proposal was evaluated and approved and funds were allocated to proceed with the contract. In fact, Dr. LaCoste of the Gravity Research Corp. was quite eager to commence work on the lunar gravity meter system, and, in anticipation, started some preliminary calculations on temperature problems which were to be anticipated in the lunar environment. Negotiations could not be carried forward at this time because of the lack of certain information. As a result, Dr. LaCoste was requested to submit a revised proposal as well as additional information necessary to proceed with such negotiations.

On February 2, 1960, a letter was received from Dr. LaCoste stating that the provisions of the NASA Act regarding property rights in inventions would be very unfair to the Gravity Research Corp., and consequently they did not intend to submit the requested revised proposal or to proceed with the contract. The technical staff of NASA responsible for this development believes that it is extremely unfortunate that the initial research on the lunar gravity meter system cannot be started right away and with the Gravity Research Corp. which appears to be the best qualified to handle the research problems involved.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES P. GLEASON,
Assistant Administrator,
for Congressional Relations.

Another reason for the change is because the current patent section of the law is awkward, cumbersome and difficult to administer. It is fraught with complexities and complicated appeal procedures.

A third reason is that the current law results in more expense to the Government. This is because private companies, when they are required to surrender all their commercial rights to an invention, are apt to increase their base costs for the research done.

A fourth reason is that NASA must often contract in the same research areas, with the same companies and at the same time as the Department of Defense. You can imagine the confusion and red tape which results when these two agencies, the principal ones involved in space research, cannot follow similar contract policy as necessary.

Mr. Chairman, even the minority views on our committee—subscribed to by only four members—do not oppose some change in the present law, which they concede to be unsatisfactory. Their thesis is that the matter should wait on legislation which might eventually unify all Federal patent policy relative to research contracts.

I submit we cannot wait. Such an approach may be 5 or 10 years away. Even then, we would not be sure of a different policy than we are proposing today.

Let me call attention to a letter of the Comptroller General to our committee on March 29, 1960, in which he cited his earlier comments to the House Judiciary Committee on the problem as follows:

In lieu of establishing one uniform policy, consideration might be given to legislation which would give recognition to the functions and problems peculiar to the activities of individual agencies, as well as the differences in the types of research and development being contracted for by the Government. Such legislation might appropriately set forth broad general policies, including basic principles, guidelines and criteria, permitting a measure of flexibility in administration where circumstances so dictate, and might embrace some features of the present administrative practices and methods.

Waiting, then, is no solution.

Moreover, a reasonable policy such as we believe our proposal to be may attract other departments to its standard and thus promote uniformity as a matter of practice if not of law. For example, let me read part of a letter which I have received from the Director of Procurement Policy, Department of Defense, following the report of our subcommittee.

I consider that the subcommittee report reflects one of the most thoughtful and carefully reasoned studies on a highly technical subject that it has been my privilege to read. Certain of the committee recommendations contained in the proposed statement of congressional intent would, if they became governmentwide policy, require modification in the existing nonstatutory policies of the Department of Defense. Since these recommendations seem so carefully reasoned, I have asked that our people who are responsible for developing policy recommendations in this field, give them immediate consideration looking toward the advisability of changes in our policy which would be in consonance with these recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who feel that NASA should indefinitely be compelled to follow the patent policies of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is the only Federal agency whose organic law, like NASA's, requires Federal ownership.

Their logic escapes me, for the factors involved are not the same.

The AEC has had a unique origin. The atomic energy industry was initiated, sponsored, and paid for by the Federal Government from its inception. Furthermore, it deals in a limited and highly specialized field. The situation confronting NASA is quite different. The Space Administration must deal with contractors who spread across the entire industrial spectrum. For the most part NASA must call on established industry to help with the space venture, on industrial elements with a broad background of self-acquired experience and know-how. It is highly inequitable, I think, to demand outright ownership of an invention produced under a NASA research contract when the production of that invention is normally not only an unpredictable incident but has resulted in considerable degree from a knowledge which far antedates the Government's interest in the field involved.

Another thing—the atomic energy advocates say that Federal ownership of a patent is a good thing because it means it is free for anyone to use. However, the fact is that "free" patents are not picked up and put to work for the simple reason that few companies will sink money into the development of an invention when they know anybody can take advantage of their work and market the same item the moment it reaches production stage.

The AEC, for example, now owns more than 2,300 patents. Private industry has requested licenses on less than 400 of these, about 16 percent. Nobody knows just how many are actually being worked, but it is known to be considerably less than 400. It seems probable that somewhere between 6 and 12 percent of the total AEC-held patents are being used. On the other hand, surveys undertaken by the patent, trademark, and copyright foundation of the George Washington University—under contract with the Federal Government—show that 57 percent of current privately held patents are worked and another 7 percent are licensed.

Even allowing for the limitations placed on atomic energy uses by its peculiar nature, this is a very broad dis-

parity. Certainly, it does nothing to prove that Government-held patents, in most cases, accomplish much more than gather dust in bureaucratic files.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me emphasize that title to inventions produced under NASA research contracts normally means very little. NASA will get all it can use when it receives a royalty-free, irrevocable license to have the invention made and to use that invention for Government purposes. There is no added cost to the Space Administration, which can have the invented article produced by any firm it chooses on a competitive bidding basis.

Finally, we need the best creative thinking we can get if we are going to win the race into space. And we will not get that kind of thinking until we make this change in the law.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Will the gentleman inform the members of the Committee as to what is the standard practice in American industry when one company subcontracts with another company for purposes of research; who gets the title to the invention when this happens within the private enterprise concept of America as it exists today?

Mr. MITCHELL. As far as knowing what is standard, in answer to my good friend from Pennsylvania, I will say what the testimony was—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a valuable member of the subcommittee—was to the effect that in contracting with employees or subcontractors the prime contractor would require in its contract that any invention resulting within certain limits would be in the prime contractor.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I think my subcommittee chairman is quoting the gist of the testimony correctly. My question then is this: If it is sauce for the goose, why is it not sauce for the gander? If American industry can say to its employees, "If you come to work here, if you develop any inventions in our laboratory or using our facilities, the patents to those inventions belong to the company, not to you," why cannot the American Government say to its employees, "If you develop any inventions working for Uncle Sam the patents do not belong to you, the patents belong to Uncle Sam?"

In private enterprise, if one company can say to another company, "If you do this research for us on a subcontract basis and you come up with anything patentable it is ours, it is not yours," by what logic then do we suddenly come up as the Committee is proposing here and apply an entirely different set of standards when the companies are dealing with the Federal Government?

Mr. MITCHELL. The logic of this is in itself apparent. This is a government; the other is private enterprise. As has been pointed out, when we are going to apply the employee-employer relationship with Government, I certainly hope that that is not the philosophy of my good friend and it certainly is not my philosophy.

Mr. QUIGLEY. The point I want to make is that a careful manager of any private enterprise interested in protecting his stockholders' money will make sure that if he gave out a subcontract for research and development, any patents that were developed would go to the general contractor and not revert to the subcontractor. Why, as the board of directors of this corporation, the United States of America, should we take the stockholders' money, the taxpayers' money, and say to any company, "Go ahead, use our money, and if you develop anything you can have it"?

Mr. MITCHELL. May I answer the gentleman by asking this question: The gentleman knows as a member of the subcommittee the Government never uses these inventions commercially and certainly should not, so what good is title to any invention in the Government? Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. QUIGLEY. What good is it is this, that with Government ownership they have the right to make it available to any private enterprise that elects to use it. Under the patent system a patent developed at Government expense through the taxpayers' money that was used for research can go to the corporation under a research-and-development contract, and thereafter that company does not have to make that available to anybody for exploitation and development. If it does it can make it available only on a royalty basis. It is a case of the private company gaining something at the taxpayers' expense. It is as far as private enterprise is concerned a competitor as distinguished from the Federal Government, using that only for its own profit.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course there is a vast difference. In this case the Government retains the royalty-free license regardless. In every contract, whether it be with the inventor or another contractor or another individual, the Government still uses the patent royalty-free. It is irrevocable. Every big company that patents an article is interested in promoting that patent. The Government has no interest whatsoever in promoting patents. If you take that patent away from that company it will not be used in many instances, it will not be promoted, and certainly the inventor is not prepared to spend any money in furthering the perfection of that patent right. Is not that right?

Mr. MITCHELL. The statement of the gentleman is correct. The testimony before our subcommittee was to the effect that—well, we have figures, for example, concerning the Atomic Energy Commission. Out of around 2,200, on only some 400 of them do they have a license. That approximates 16 percent. This is quite the contrary insofar as the situation under the private patent system where business is using about 57 percent, if I recall the figures correctly, of the patents that they have received. I think this is illustrative of the point that our chairman pointed out.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. ANFUSO. To answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is it not a fact that the Government does follow the policy that he speaks of in reference to its own employees? In other words, when any employee of the Government makes an invention, he does not get the title to it. That is a master-servant relationship. But when you are dealing with independent contractors, then the situation is entirely different; is that not so?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the gentleman has made the distinction very clear.

Mr. ANFUSO. A principal contractor can also make any contractual relation he would like to make with a subcontractor. But when we are dealing with the NASA agency which is a scientific agency, an important security agency, we then look to the best interests of the country; is that not correct? And is it not a fact also that here we are dealing with a scientific agency which is interested in making progress through space. Certainly, here time is of the essence. The gentleman has conducted long and exhaustive hearings. His committee has heard all kinds of witnesses. Is it not true that the witnesses disclosed the fact that in many cases substantial contractors refused to make an agreement with the Government because of the fact that they would not have title to the inventions, if any inventions resulted; is that not a fact?

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman is quite correct, and I have here 8 specific instances which at the proper time I will ask to be inserted as a part of the RECORD.

Mr. ANFUSO. Is it not true that that has retarded progress in the space field?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, definitely. I might say to the gentleman that in these hearings in the interest of the public, we searched to find some way and manner in which the public could benefit. In this bill, we have protected the public interest. That was our prime motive. But you can find very rare instances so far as the Space Act is concerned where there would ever be any occasion where the Government of the United States would be benefited by title to any invention.

Mr. ANFUSO. I think the gentleman knows when he presented this proposition before the committee that I opposed it because I, just as other gentlemen who have spoken today, thought the public interest would be better preserved if we did not pass this. But I was convinced, after read the testimony brought out before your committee, that this is in the best interests of our country. I commend the gentleman for the very fine job he has done, and I would also advise any critics of this proposal to read your report. Then, I am sure, they would change their mind as I have and realize that this is in the best interests of our country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who is interested in doing something for small business will support this proposal because the small business people of America want and need this.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. It should be remembered that the Government and the public interest is protected because the United States gets an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license for such inventions throughout the world by and on behalf of the United States.

Second, the question is between two provisions—whether any invention under contract with NASA shall be the exclusive property of the United States, or whether we shall have a provision that the Administrator of NASA shall, in his discretion, acquire title to inventions produced under NASA research and development contracts, and may then decide in his discretion what protects the public interest and what protects the equities of the contractors.

The thing I cannot understand, and that is why I agree with the gentleman from Georgia, the thing I cannot understand about the opponents is we are automatically depriving the contractors of the equity they have. This latitude was in the discretion of the Administrator under our type of provision. From the subcommittee's point of view the Administrator decides what is best and what will protect the private interest and the public interest. The opponents would automatically deprive the private interests of any standing at all, and I think that is wrong. I think the Administrator in the various cases that come up should have the right, as the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, in his discretion to make the decision either way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes to get an answer.

Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania wholeheartedly.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would like to direct the argument back for a moment to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY], and to the logic of his position. He was speaking of the employer-employee relationship. Is there any great difference between a contractor taking a contract from the Government and an employee who works for a company? The contractor working for the Government is engaged in business; he has the means and the people to develop the product and put it on the market for the common good. The employee who works for him or who works for the Government does not have this ability and as a result there is the possibility that great gains could be lost insofar as commercial industry is concerned.

Following the logic of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] further, his position is correct. If the Government can take title, and has the right to give that title to anyone else it can give an exclusive title to one company, and possibly one that did not make the invention in the first instance. I think that is another consequence of the gentleman's theory if you follow it through to its logical conclusion. Is that not true?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think my colleague very clearly states the proposition. It has been proved that when the Government takes ownership and title to inventions they are not used. What we are interested in is that the American people be the beneficiaries of the creativeness of its citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Assuming that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], is correct in pointing out the effect of my reasoning with regard to the employer-employee relationship, I would still like someone to explain to me why the relationship I spoke of in private industry of a subcontractor is any different from a similar contract relationship between the U.S. Government and private industry.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. GIAIMO. I hesitate to intrude in this discussion, not being a member of the committee, but I am interested in this problem. I think the difference—and the gentleman from Georgia can correct me if I am wrong—between the prime contractor and the subcontractor and an employer and employee under our free enterprise system, rests with the matter of profit and the question of property rights, whereas where the Government is the employer the Government's problem is not the profit motive but it is to see that these patent rights be used whether it be through Government ownership or through private ownership. It was explained to the gentleman's committee that there was not widespread use of these patents in the hands of the Federal Government such as there is in private ownership. Is that not the distinction between Government and private interests?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it has been well stated by my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say to the gentleman, if I might be recognized, that the Government does do a great deal of this type of research and development work. If the Government starts making it a policy to retain all of the patent rights, the day is coming when the percentage of patent rights will be large so far as the Government is concerned, compared with private industry, and, therefore, our whole system of patents, allowing incentive to private individuals to build up patent rights, will be lost and will result in the Government trying to take over everything that should be given to private industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

West Berlin—A Beacon at the Frontier of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the aftermath of the summit collapse is a most appropriate moment to reaffirm American support of West Berlin and its people in their unshakeable devotion to freedom.

It is my deep concern that the tragic lack of effective plans for dealing with the capture of the U–2 and the breakdown of the summit conference may indicate there are no effective plans for maintaining free Berlin in the face of whatever crisis the Communists may manufacture.

Roscoe Drummond last week in an excellent column in the Washington Post described the drama of West Berlin—its brightly lighted face turned toward the arriving air passenger as a striking symbol of the light of freedom it tends so staunchly.

Mr. Drummond pointed out that West Berlin indeed has never been "logically tenable" but West Berliners have against all logic made it tenable.

I would point out to my fellow Americans that it is actually the unchallengeable logic of freedom that America's abandonment of the brave men, women, and children of West Berlin to Communist slavery could be "the first step in the erosion of American freedom itself."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Roscoe Drummond's column, along with releases covering two of my statements on West Berlin—one delivered last Sunday before the Minnesota Volkfest Association in Minneapolis and the other delivered in Milwaukee on March 6 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST BERLIN—A CITY OF LIGHT, FREEDOM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—During my recent trip to West Berlin, I realized that Nikita S. Khrushchev is right; you only have to see and feel West Berlin in the flesh to realize why to the Soviet leader it is a "cancer" and a bone stuck in my throat, an abnormality.

It is all of these things—and more.

It is an annoying, disturbing, depressing vision of Western democratic spirit visible to the whole Soviet and satellite peoples, a

radiant image of what their life could be if it were permitted.

The truth is that West Berlin is a city of light and determination.

But Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchev is not willing to look upon West Berlin as a challenge which he will take up and eagerly endeavor to surpass.

Instead, West Berlin's freedom and resilience and prosperity are a "bone in his throat," an abnormality which he must try to suffocate.

I feel sure the West Berliners are not going to stand quietly by and have their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness suppressed. They will defend their postwar democracy with everything they own including their bare hands.

To travel by air to Berlin at night is an exciting experience. For 110 miles you have been flying over East German Communist territory and in every direction there is almost unrelieved darkness, occasionally a lone flicker of light to suggest a sleeping city—a kind of mental darkness as well as visible.

And then you come upon West Berlin as though a massive rainbow had burst through the clouds, a flashing, animate, multicolored city spread out below you as though proud to be alive and proud to be seen.

You can theorize all you want to about how West Berlin—a divided city in a divided country, a city surrounded by a regime controlled by Moscow—cannot last. You can look at the facts and say that this city can't exist, can't survive, can't sustain itself.

You can believe that West Berlin can surmount the latest Soviet-inspired crisis, but can it survive the next? Or the next? And you can logically conclude that West Berlin just is not tenable.

West Berlin has never been logically tenable but West Berliners have made West Berlin a great, a vibrant city of freedom, and made it tenable against all logic.

Some suggest that West Berlin is a dying city. It isn't. Because of the high percentage of elderly people in the city's total population, its population decreased 18,000 last year. Deaths still exceed births. But the birth rate is steadily going up. It mounted from 7.9 to 9.5 in the last 4 years. This measures the confidence of West Berlin youth in their future.

If there is one thing which the Western Powers must preserve it is the freedom of the 2,250,000 West Berliners who are using that freedom so magnificently.

HUMPHREY LAUDS WEST BERLIN AS "WHITE LIGHT OF FREEDOM" IN COMMUNIST DARKNESS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, told a gathering of the Minnesota Volkfest Association in Minneapolis Sunday that Khrushchev's "passionate resentment of the fact of West Berlin's independence stems from his fear that the white light of freedom streaming into the surrounding Communist darkness from West Berlin will keep all of Eastern Europe in a constant agitation for something better than the Communist can give them."

The Minnesotan, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told the group that he expected "renewed pressure on the United States and our allies" from the Communists to get out of West Berlin.

"We must have strong nerves and firm courage," he said, "the kind which the West Berliners themselves and their gallant mayor, Willy Brandt, have been displaying for so many years."

"Khrushchev has complained that West Berlin is a bone in his throat," Senator HUMPHREY commented. "What he really means is that West Berlin is a dazzling light that gets in the Russian eye. He doesn't like it, and I don't blame him: West Berlin as an island of freedom and prosperity is a psychological threat to the whole edifice of Communist power in Eastern Europe.

"I must confess that I am worried, however, about what plans our Government may have for dealing with any new crisis on West Berlin that Khrushchev may bring about at any time."

"After more than 18 months since I was in Berlin with Willy Brandt at the time of the last great Berlin crisis, I am not convinced that our Government has made any concrete, workable plan for dealing with the next crisis—just as there were not workable plans for dealing with the U–2 incident and the summit collapse.

"Indeed, in those 18 months, Communist military power as compared with our own has been strengthened, and Khrushchev's arrogance and threats have increased proportionately.

"We cannot permit ourselves to stumble and falter if we are again faced with the next naked threat to the Western position in Berlin. We must not only have definite plans to deal with the crisis, but we must be sure that the Soviet dictatorship understands very clearly that the United States and our allies will take firm and definite steps to protect the freedom-loving West Berliners.

"There must not be another humiliating disaster to the West like that which we have just experienced."

Senator HUMPHREY recalled his visit with Mayor Brandt of West Berlin in November of 1958, when the Minnesotan flew directly to Berlin to assure the West Berliners that the American people backed them to the hilt in the face of the Khrushchev ultimatum.

"I remember as if it were yesterday how warmly Mayor Brandt welcomed me and with what pride he showed me his half of the city—from its bustling shops and factories to its modern housing for workers. He told me how all this had been raised from rubble—rubble so tremendous that it has been piled into landscaped and terraced hills and made into public parks.

"In long and frank talks as we drove about the city, he shared with me the grave problems in maintaining this little island of freedom in a totalitarian sea. At the heart of the city, by the famous Brandenburg Gate, we stood together on the very frontier between freedom and slavery.

"I was deeply moved as he told me of the hardships of the first Berlin blockade, and expressed the gratitude of his people for the Allied airlift which kept the city alive. The people of Berlin have put up a beautiful memorial directly in front of Templehof Airport to the 38 flyers who lost their lives in the course of the airlift, and I was privileged to lay a wreath before it."

"I spoke to many Berliners, and asked them how their nerves were standing up under the strain. They told me: 'Don't worry about our nerves, and we won't worry about yours.' "

"That is the spirit that characterizes the brave people of West Berlin," Senator HUMPHREY concluded. "To abandon them to the tyranny of the Communists would not only be morally evil, but it could be the first step in the erosion of American freedom itself."

"The Communist tiger would not be appeased by feeding him the bone of West Berlin—his appetite would only be sharpened for bigger game."

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, RADIO STATION WISN, MILWAUKEE, WIS., MARCH 6, 1960

It is only 10 weeks until the opening of the summit conference at Geneva. It is 16 months since Khrushchev launched his ultimatum against the freedom-loving city of Berlin, and he is losing no opportunity to show his impatience. He very badly wants to push the West—and freedom—out of Berlin.

Even during his junket to Indonesia, he took time to threaten Berlin again. He demanded that the Western Powers sign peace treaties with both Germanies—West Germany and East Germany. If they did not, he threatened to sign his own treaty with East Germany, and to snuff out the legal rights of the occupying powers in Berlin.

"West Berlin," he said ominously, "is on the territory of East Germany."

The 1958 ultimatum has already yielded big dividends to Khrushchev—two Foreign Ministers' conferences, his visit to America, and an invitation to a series of summit meetings. But the appetite grows with eating, and he wants more and more and more.

At his press conference last month, Secretary of State Herter acknowledged that the tough Soviet talk on Berlin has him worried. With a frankness so far unique among administration leaders, he attributed it to the edge the Soviet Union now holds over the United States in intercontinental missiles—the so-called missile gap.

This raises a very grave question—what have we done with the 16 months since Khrushchev launched his warning?

One thing we certainly cannot complain of—the attitude of the free people of West Berlin. Under the leadership of their gallant mayor, Willy Brandt—a man whom I am proud to number among my close friends—they have remained steadfast in the face of a long series of veiled and naked threats.

I was in Europe in 1958 when the Khrushchev ultimatum was delivered, and I went direct to Berlin to assure its mayor and people that the American people backed them to the hilt.

I remember as if it were yesterday how warmly Mayor Brandt welcomed me and with what pride he showed me his half of the city—from its bustling shops and factories to its modern housing for workers. He told me how all this had been raised from rubble—rubble so tremendous that it has been piled into landscaped and terraced hills and made into public parks.

In long and frank talks as we drove about the city, he shared with me the grave problems in maintaining this little island of freedom in a totalitarian sea. At the heart of the city, by the famous Bandenburg Gate, we stood together on the very frontier between freedom and slavery.

I was deeply moved as he told me of the hardships of the first Berlin blockade, and expressed the gratitude of his people for the allied airlift which kept the city alive. The people of Berlin have put up a beautiful memorial in front of Tempelhof Airport to the 38 flyers who lost their lives in the course of the airlift, and I was privilege to lay a wreath before it.

I spoke to many Berliners, and asked them how their nerves were standing up under the strain. They told me: "Don't worry about our nerves, and we won't worry about yours."

I don't worry about our nerves—but I do worry about the yawning gaps in our readiness to meet a crisis which may burst upon us in 10 weeks time—or even sooner.

I am concerned, as many well-informed observers are, about the space gap and the missile gap.

Soviet sputniks and luniks are blazing out into space with a magnitude of thrust which, even now—2 years after the first sputnik—we are unable to match.

I am alarmed by the prospect that, within the next 2 or 3 years, the Russians may have a 3-to-1 advantage over us in missiles—but I am even more alarmed that the administration reacts to this appalling prospect as if it were nothing more than the Russian victory in the winter Olympics.

It is the complacency gap which troubles me even more than the missile gap.

When I was in college, we were taught in elementary psychology that a stimulus gives rise to a response. This administration, however, has repealed the basic laws of human behavior. There is plenty of stimulus, but tragically little response.

We have been warned—again and again and again. But all this administration does is to administer us another tranquilizing pill.

There is another gaping gap that bothers me—what I call the testimony gap, the gap between what we are told and what we uncomfortably suspect to be the painful truth.

Recently we were told, in an official manual that shall remain nameless—and, in fact, unsanctified—that the idea of Americans having a right to know what's going on is, and I quote, "Another foolish remark often heard."

The manual has been shot down, but the malady lingers on. Only a few days ago the President blasted two of our most responsible newspapers—the New York Times and the Washington Post—for printing perfectly accurate reports of the testimony of former Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett—a Republican, by the way.

I for one shall keep repeating this so-called foolish remark until someone up there hears and heeds—and lets the American people know what's going on.

Who are we fooling, anyway? Maybe our own people—but not, by Secretary Herter's admission, the Soviets.

Then there is a third threatening gap—the moral gap, the gap between what we preach and what we practice.

Almost 6 years have passed since the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregated schools. Yet the administration and Congress still shirk their share of responsibility for enforcing that decision.

We haven't even heard from the White House what we have every right to expect—a clear and unequivocal affirmation of the moral rightness of that historic decision.

We talk of our affluent society—and yet we leave over 20 million of our people languishing in poverty: the aged, the sick, and those marooned in the depressed areas which pockmark our country.

Khrushchev doesn't need a "seeing eye" satellite to spy out our weaknesses. As he sees it, ours is a dying system—and his hands are itching for the spade so that he can "bury" us—to quote his own blunt word.

There isn't any quizmaster who can slip us, under the table, the answers to the grave questions which hang over us. There isn't any payola that will insure our prestige in the world, unless we earn it by deeds as well as words.

I have made a pretty careful study of Soviet strategy, and I know this. There is no day-to-day fumbling in their policy, as there too often is in ours. They think in terms of years and of decades. They weigh future trends as well as present facts.

They will have one kind of policy if they think America is rising in the world. They will have another, and much more unpleasant one, if they see we are sinking.

They will be watching what we do, listening to what we say, in the coming weeks. They will form their own shrewd judgment about whether we will continue sleepwalking into the limbo of second-class powers or whether we will, at long last, wake up and rally our great energies and capabilities for the crisis that lies ahead.

It is good that we have all—Democrats and Republicans alike—united to say we will stand firm on Berlin. But we must do more than say the right words—much more. We must move to close the gaps that cloud with doubt the firmness of our purpose.

I have just heard that Mayor Brandt has canceled plans to visit America and put the case of his beleaguered city before us—because of the renewed gravity of the situation there.

He wants to be on the job 24 hours a day, to meet and to cope with whatever may come. I would to God that our own Government had been on the job 24 hours a day for all these wasted 7 years.

For myself, I shall continue to blow the bugle, sound the warning, seek to awaken the American people to the peril in which they stand. Given the full facts and alert, on-the-job leadership, we shall, I am utterly confident, surmount this coming crisis.

Restoration of Freedom to Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to insert the report submitted recently by Alexander Melnychenko, president of the executive committee of the Ukrainian National Council, local branch, Minnesota, regarding the restoration of freedom to captive nations.

I have many fine and loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent in the Third Congressional District of Minnesota, and this report of Mr. Melnychenko embodies their hopes and prayers that the leaders of our great Nation will never cease their efforts to bring peace and freedom—America's priceless heritage—to those behind the Iron Curtain:

RESTORATION OF FREEDOM TO CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Report sent by the Ukrainian National Council, local executive committee, Minneapolis, Minn., to the following members of the U.S. Government on June 7, 1960: The President of the United States of America, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Vice President of the United States of America, Richard Nixon; the Secretary of the Department of State, Christian A. Herter; the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge; the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.; the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.; the Ukrainian National Council-Ukrainian Government office in exile in Munich, West Germany; the President of the Ukrainian National Democratic Republic in exile, Dr. Stephan Wytwytcky; and the Ukrainian Democratic News Agencies-Press in United States and Europe.)

The members of the Ukrainian National Council, local executive committee, of the State of Minnesota takes the liberty of asking you to bring the following to the notice of the Representative to the United Nations and representative in the Security Council, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge.

Our people, who make up about 45 million of the population of the Soviet Union, have been conquered and incorporated in the imperialistic Russian empire at various times.

In the course of the 1917 revolution Ukraina was separated from Russia and formed its own republic, whose independence was recognized de facto by many governments, while a number of powers, including the Soviet Union, recognized them de jure.

In spite of this, the Soviet imperialistic government had scarcely seized the territory of Russia proper during the civil war when it treacherously turned its weapon against our country and many others, conquered them one after the other.

The legitimately elected democratic parliaments and governments of our democratic national republic were liquidated. The deputies to the parliaments and the ministers were executed or deported. The same cruel fate befell the men of science and the national intelligentsia, as well as wide circles of the population of the republics conquered by the unhuman and despotic Soviet Government.

Religion was proclaimed "an opiate of the people" and was profaned. Churches, mosques, Buddist temples, and Jewish synagogues were destroyed or turned into clubs, warehouses, or places of entertainment while priests of all denominations were either killed or deported to slave labor camps in Siberia.

All the conquered republics were subordinated to the central organs in Moscow and Sovietized. Millions of innocent peasants and workers of our country perished owing to Red terror during compulsory collectivization, during the famine which was artificially created by the Soviet Government, under the butcher Khrushchev, and during all kinds of purges, resettlements, and deportations, which are still continuing. The numbers of all prisoners in the concentration camps is beyond all calculation.

The dictatorship, which is carried out officially by the Communist Party, but in actual fact by only a few members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, continues undeviatingly its work of destruction, whose objective it is to spread communism and to seize power throughout the world.

Democracy, personal and national immunity, freedom of religion and of the press are not recognized in the Soviet despotic empire. Parliaments as the supreme legislative organ does not exist. Only in 1944 in some of these republics and autonomous territories more than 3 million people were wiped out with a stroke of the pen.

These crimes of the Soviet Government were at long last admitted by Khrushchev in his speech at the closed session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow on February 24 and 25, 1956. And yet Soviet despot Khrushchev was not ashamed to assert in the same speech that "the U.S.S.R. is considered a model multinational state, because we have insured in practice the equality and friendship of all the people who live in our great homeland."

Problems of such vital importance as the liquidation of a series of republics and peoples are not discussed by the Supreme Soviet, which is only a pretense of a parliament in the U.S.S.R. but by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Was the question of the genocide and the liquidation of the republics and territories discussed by the Supreme Soviet or by one of its two chambers? How did they defend the national peculiarities of the peoples, and how did the remaining deputies to the Supreme Soviet react to this crime? And finally, how did Soviet justice react to this heinous crime?

The answer is: There is no justice in Communist state.

We request the authority of the U.S. Government and our American representative to the United Nations and all the representatives of the democratic nations to the United Nations to ask the Soviet representatives what they have done, as members of the Soviet Government, to prevent the abovementioned crimes, what they have done to have the millions of deported and imprisoned people returned to their native soil?

We all know that there will be no answer from Soviet butchers.

We testify to the fact that there is no parliament in the U.S.S.R.. There are no free elections; freely elected nor a freely acting parliaments, being completely at the beck and call of the so-called collective leadership. The deputies to the Supreme Soviet are not freely elected representatives of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., they are individuals nominated by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Deprived of no chance to realize their legitimate rights and their will, our peoples are compelled to resort to the only means at their disposal; that is, to revolt againt Soviet despotism, which is evidenced by frequent uprising, in the Ukraine, in the Cossack territory, in the Caucasus, Turkestan, and in the Byelorussia. These uprisings, however, are fiercely suppressed by Soviet military might and even poison gas.

We take the liberty of drawing the attention of the people of the United States, of the members of the U.S. Government, of the representatives of the democratic nations to the United Nations and its governments, to the fact that all contact with the Communist pseudoparliaments strengthens the Kremlin dictators, who claim to the people throughout the world that they are the champions of all enslaved peoples and that they are against colonial oppression, while they themselves are subjecting our peoples to unprecedented oppression, terror, and eradication.

The fraudulent slogan of coexistence, which is being advanced by Moscow, is completely unfounded in the presence of a totalitarian U.S.S.R., which fact is testified to by constant opposition of our peoples and our countries, and the countries of the so-called people's democracies. Driven to despair by the Moscow dictatorship's cruelty, they are forced to demand their freedom insistently, a fact which is eloquently manifested by recent events in south Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other countries beyond the Iron Curtain.

Let us all beware of Communist slavery.

Let us all stand firm and united against any Communist movement to enslave the whole world.

Let us all have in minds about the "Restoration of Freedoms to Captive Nations."

We, American citizens of Ukrainian descent of the State of Minnesota, and as members of the Ukrainian National Council, local branch, of State of Minnesota, hope and pray that the members of the Government of the United States and the representatives of all democratic nations to the United Nations will strongly support our aspirations.

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER MELNYCHENKO,
President of the Council.

Federal Fishing Stamp Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the country, constructive efforts are underway by State conservation departments, as well as by conservation-minded individuals and groups, to preserve, conserve and, if possible, expand our fish and other wildlife resources.

Wisconsin, particularly, has carried forward realistic, well-designed, expansive programs in this field.

We recognize, of course, that traditionally, States have been hard pressed to find funds to carry forward such much-needed conservation programs. Nevertheless, the States have zealously—and rightly, I believe—guarded against unnecessary encroachment by the Federal Government.

Currently, there is pending before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the House of Representatives, a bill, H.R. 11410, which, among other things, would authorize the issuance of a Federal fishing stamp.

The purchase of such a stamp—appended to a resident license—would permit fishing in national park areas elsewhere in the country.

In addition, the provision would authorize two or more States to form a compact, under the following provisions:

First. Agree to recognize Federal-State fishing licenses and stamps.

Second. Agree on a uniform fee.

Third. Agree on an "equitable" formula for the allocation to the States which are parties to the compact of amounts from the sale of Federal-State fishing stamps.

Fourth. Agree not to subject the holder of a Federal-State fishing stamp to any requirement not applicable to the holder of a resident sports fishing license.

The measure would further provide for a compact between 10 or more States, in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior, for entering into agreements on recognition of fishing privileges.

Among other things, the compact would provide:

First. The proceeds would be paid into a special fund of the U.S. Treasury.

Second. After payment of all overhead, the Secretary of the Interior would prorate funds back to the parties of the compact.

Third. Not to exceed 10 percent of the moneys placed in the fund would be available to the Secretary of the Interior in any one year to promote fishing in national parks.

Fourth. The holder of a resident sports fishing license with a Federal fishing stamp attached could legally fish in all national parks, and, if his or her State were a party to the compact, in all waters of States in the compact.

Recently, I received a message from Lester P. Voigt, conseravtion director of the State of Wisconsin, expressing strong opposition to the objectives of H.R. 11410.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the points outlined in Mr. Voigt's letter, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, May 20, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U. S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Bill H.R. 11410 which is to be cited as the Federal Fishing Stamp Act has come to our attention.

Under title I of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue a Federal fishing stamp, the net proceeds of which, after deduction of expenses by the Postmaster General, would go into the Federal fishing stamp fund and would be made available for use by the Secretary of the Interior in promoting fishing within the national parks. The Federal fishing stamp would have to be purchased and attached to the resident fishing license within 10 days after the purchase of the latter. The holder would then be entitled to fish in any national park without payment of any additional fee.

Title II of the bill gives the consent of Congress to the States to enter into compacts for the purpose of establishing and providing uniform nonresident fishing licenses. The Secretary of the Interior would issue a Federal-State fishing stamp to be sold at a uniform fee and attached to the resident fishing license issued by the State of residence of the holder. The holder would then be permitted to fish in any member State to the compact, and also to fish in any national park without the payment of any further fee. Not more than 10 percent of the revenue would be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for promotion of fishing in the national parks. The net proceeds from the sale of the Federal-State fishing stamps would be allocated to the member States on the basis of a formula agreed upon by the States in the compact.

The State of Wisconsin has consistently taken the position that proposals such as this are an encroachment on the rights of several States in that the legal title to, and the custody and protection of all wild animals, including fish within the State, is vested in the State for the purpose of regulating the enjoyment, use, disposition, and conservation thereof, and that the Federal Government has no authority to impose a system of fishing license fees or charges for the privilege of fishing in the public waters of the respective States. Further, this measure is a dangerous and unprecedented invasion of the traditional revenue source of the State in the management of its native fish populations.

The States may presently enter into compacts subject only to the approval of the Congress to the compact and this measure is not required to achieve interstate license reciprocity. The proposal would without question prove most costly to the State of Wisconsin from the standpoint of reduced revenues since we are the favored vacation State in the Great Lakes region by reason of our location, climate, scenery, and water attractions and the natural result of a reciprocity arrangement such as this would be that residents of other States would be allowed to enjoy Wisconsin's fishing advantages whereas residents of Wisconsin could not expect to avail themselves of similar advantages in other States where comparable fishing opportunities do not exist.

The State of Wisconsin has for a number of years sold more nonresident fishing licenses annualy than any other State in the Union. Our State is favored with a multitude of lakes and streams that provide good fishing and the management of our fishery resource for sport fishing is nationally recognized as being outstanding. A large part from the revenues obtained as a result of the sale of such nonresident fishing licenses is necessary to maintain our fish management and law enforcement programs.

We believe that H.R. 11410 should be vigorously opposed and toward that end, we urge that your office express the oposition of the State of Wisconsin. We feel very strongly that enactment of this bill would seriously affect our income and cause us to reduce our programs materially. As you may know we recently found it necessary to adopt an austerity program because of increased costs and a drop in income. Further reduction in our program would really spell disaster.

If there is any further information that we can furnish, we will be most happy to do so.

Very truly yours,

L. P. VOIGT,
Conservation Director.

Scientists and Conflicts of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently, Chrysler in the city of Detroit bid on a Saturn missile contract. They did not receive the contract. When Michigan Representatives inquired from Dr. Glennan, the head of NASA, as to how the contract had been placed, we learned that one of the things done in placing such a contract is to set up a committee of expert scientists to determine whether or not the companies bidding have the technical competence to perform the contract. We were told that this committee on the Saturn contract placed Chrysler sixth among the bidders. In view of the fact that our first satellite put in orbit was made largely by Chrysler, this came as a distinct shock to those of us from Michigan.

In view of the fact that there are only a few scientists in the United States who are competent in space projects, such scientists are of necessity advisers both to industry and to the Government.

Without suggesting that such a thing was true in the placement of the Saturn contract, the method of placement raises the questions of first, whether or not there exists an inherent conflict of interests on the part of the scientists in such placement, or second, whether or not the scientists are to some extent being used as fronts behind which the Department of Defense places contracts as it chooses.

On May 5, the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, chaired by HOLIFIELD, of California, and of which I am a member, inquired into conflicts of interest. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point some of the information brought forth in that committee:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask a question. When do you consider a conflict of interest of such degree that those involved are unemployable?

Mr. STEMPLER (from the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Defense). That is a good question; you mean setting aside statutes which are on the books? As a matter of ethics and morality?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. No, right under the statutes.

Mr. STEMPLER. Under the statutes? Well, you start with an ethical principle that man cannot serve two masters.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. All right.

Mr. STEMPLER. If the man is a full-time Government employee, he is subject to certain restrictions in his work and he is also by law subject to certain restrictions after he leaves work for a period of time. This differs with civilians as it does with retired officers. They have different restrictions on them.

* * * * *

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, in my personal opinion, we have entered a new era. We have arrived at a place where we need people skilled in a very specific field, and these people are being hired by industry as consultants, they are also used by the Government as consultants on occasion. Now, I think a new conflict of interest situation has arisen. This is just my judgment. It is perfectly obvious that if you are the consultant, today, to a vast industry and you receive a really good fee for it, and tomorrow you are the consultant to the Government and you are determining the specifications for a purchase, even up to the point as to which companies are capable of doing it, that you have a possibility of a conflict of interest. I think the Government has arrived at a very difficult position.

Maybe those people who are hired as those consultants can be objective, but I doubt it. We are turning over the spending of $40 billion to a very small and select group of people. And I think while they may be excellent in science, they are subject to the same type of prejudices that other people are subject to. And they hand these contracts out to their friends. Now, that is just all there is to it.

I had an interesting opportunity to talk with a man who was one of the first employees of a firm that dealt exclusively for a long period of time with the Government, and he told me the one thing he never understood about that firm was the consultants that they had. They would bring topflight scientists into the business. It was in a very pleasant area of the country. They would spend long vacations there and he said, "As far as I know, they never did anything." They really didn't do any work, but they were paid astronomical fees. The Government paid them, of course.

Then these consultants went back into the Government and set up a set of specifications, really, that only a few people could meet, only a small part of industry. Now I think this presents a real problem. I think the power of government purchasing today is one of the biggest factors that this economy has to deal with, and I think it is being more and more restricted to only a few concerns in a few areas of the country.

I think one of the problems with it is this consultant business in the Government. I think this is one of the questions that the Government has to answer, and I think it is a real tough question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It poses the problem of requiring consultants who sit on one side of the table to restrict their consultative clients to the Government, for instance, if they are working for the Government.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I agree.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And a general consultant, as Mrs. GRIFFITHS points out, who is paid a fee of $10,000 as a consultant's fee for electronics company X one day, who has a new device, and 3 weeks later he is called into the Defense Department on a $50-a-day basis, $56-a-day basis, to advise them on what kind of electronics for a certain purpose they should purchase.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. He is in a perfect position to let us say, justify the $10,000 fee which he was paid the previous week or so.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I mean he could be above reproach and yet he is human. He thinks in terms of what equipment did that particular concern have and what kind of management did they have. They are his friends. I think you have to arrive at the place where you consider this a conflict of interest.

* * * * *

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. May I ask you, if the Defense Department required every bidder to supply the names and the salary paid to all consultative experts over a period of a year or 2 years preceding the bid and required every consultant they employed to list their employers for the last year, do you think that would help some in determining whether there has been a conflict of interest or not?

Mr. STEMPLER. I really don't think so, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, for this reason: When we pick a consultant, by "we" I mean when the person or people concerned decide they want Jones to help them on this matter, I assume they know Jones—what work he does, who he does work for, and I hope if Jones is an automotive engineer, a consultant to General Motors, they don't get Jones as a consultant to draw up specifications for procurement of a new truck. I hope they take this into account in what they are doing.

What you mentioned before could conceivably take place, but I would hope in prudent administration you would be reasonable in your selection of consultants, where, as a captive consultant, why, you would not use him in the situation where the results of the work they are doing, even though advisory, could come to pass to the benefit of the companies he consulted with on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I think it would relieve the minds of a lot of people, though, if they could see this in writing, see who these consultants have been. I think it would be helpful, myself.

I am happy to say that there is some concern over this problem in the scientific world and in a late May issue of Science, the publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, there is the following report:

SCIENCE IN THE NEWS—SCIENTISTS IN GOVERNMENT—GROWING CONCERN OVER CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There is considerable and growing concern over the position of scientists with regard to the conflict-of-interest laws. The subject is talked of a good deal in private but only rarely in public, a situation which reflects the delicacy with which it is felt this potentially explosive issue must be handled.

The relevant laws are a group of seven poorly defined, vaguely interpreted statutes which, in their broadest interpretation, prohibit anyone working for the Government from having a financial interest in any group having dealings with the Government. They tend to put almost anyone working for the Government on less than a career civil service basis in an extremely awkward position. The situation is difficult for administrative and legal personnel, often preventing the Government from obtaining the services of an outstanding man because of the unreasonable financial sacrifices he would have to make in order to protect himself from a possible accusation of violating the law. But nowhere is the situation more touchy than in the case of scientific personnel.

The Government today relies on an intricate web of consultancies, contracts, and part-time and temporary employees to provide itself with the scientific and technical assistance it must have. It underwrites more than half the scientific research done in this country. It "employs" in some fashion a very large fraction of the leading scientists in the country, and a question of conflict of interest could be raised in almost every case. The institution or corporation with which the scientist is associated very probably is receiving a share of the more than $5 billion the Government spends annually on scientific work. Quite often it

is doing work for the Government in precisely the area in which the scientist is being asked to advise the Government.

CONFLICTS UNAVOIDABLE

The situation is awkward, but it is also absolutely unavoidable. The Government clearly needs the best scientific advice it can get, and it can get this advice only from men with the pertinent experience—that is, in most cases, precisely from the men who will find themselves in a conflict-of-interest situation. The problem is complicated further because many of these men will not only be associated with a group doing business with the Government in the area in which they are to serve, but they will also be serving, in addition, as consultants to one or more other corporations or institutions which, again, are doing business with the Government in the area in which the scientist is asked to advise the Government. And to complicate the picture still further, a significant and growing fraction of these scientists own stock, and sometimes large blocks of stock, in the space age research corporations that have sprung up in intellectual centers throughout the country.

NEW YORK BAR STUDY

The entire conflict-of-interest problem has been studied by a committee of the Bar Association of New York, whose detailed report, together with draft legislation for clarifying and updating the statutes, will be published next month by the Harvard University Press. This article reflects the feelings of that committee, confirmed by talks here in Washington, that the touchiest part of this problem relates to the position of scientists. This concern stems from the feeling that not only are scientists caught with other personnel in a badly outdated system of laws, but that, in the case of scientists, to a dangerous extent the laws have simply been ignored and no effort to comply with them has been made. The reason for this is clear: it is simply that in the area of executive or legal talent there are usually enough men qualified for a position that it is possible to find one who is reasonably free of conflict-of-interest problems; in the area of science the talent and experience the Government needs tend to be so specialized that the number of men qualified to fill a post is limited to a very few, all of whom will commonly have quite involved conflict-of-interest problems. But the dilemma does not disappear simply because it is recognized as unavoidable.

There has been no real concern over scientists as a class behaving improperly. Indeed the general feeling seems to be that the scientists have done an admirable job of seeing that their conflicts of interest do not affect their decisions. There is a good deal of concern, on the other hand, over the possible congressional and public reaction to a scandal in this area. There is a fear that among the several thousand scientists advising the Government there must be some who not only have made no effort to clear up a clear conflict of interests, but have allowed this conflict to influence their decisions. But aside from the concern over the possibility of outright scandal, there is the feeling that even the appearance of scandal, where no wrongdoing had actually taken place, could have extremely unfortunate repercussions. There is concern over the effect that a sensationalist congressional investigation could have on such matters as the recruitment of scientists for Government service, on the system of contracting with Government-supported corporations for work which the Government cannot handle effectively within its departments, and on the prestige of scientists in general.

POSSIBLE REPERCUSSIONS

No one knows how much the Government, and the Nation, would suffer if it were cut off from the services of scientists who were unable to comply strictly with the present conflict of interest regulations; or how many scientists would avoid Government service if it involved the risk of exposure to scandalmongers, no matter how honorably they served, because of an unavoidable conflict of interest. Nor does anyone know what the effect of a series of scandals, real or imagined, would have on the use of corporate devices like the Air Force supported, nonprofit Rand Corp., or the Space Technology Labs Inc., which handles a major share of the work on this country's space program. The use of such corporations for work that might normally be done within the Government is usually a device for paying higher salaries than the present civil service scale allows, and sometimes for avoiding close control of projects by the congressional appropriations committees. It is not hard to find Congressmen who are suspicious of the whole business, nor is it hard to imagine the effect on these suspicions of even a hint of scandal.

The question of scientific prestige is a special one, resting on the fact that although the scientist is an increasingly admired person, he is also sufficiently exotic in the public mind that there is a strong tendency to stereotype him. If a lawyer or business executive is caught with his hand in someone else's pocket, no one is led to question the ethics of lawyers or executives as a class. Whether the same will hold for scientists is open to question, particularly in view of the sharp contrast it will present to the current stereotype of the scientist as a man so engrossed wih dissecting atoms that he never concerns himself with such gross things as personal advancement and money.

No one knows the answers to these questions, and perhaps the concern of those who fear the worst is unwarranted. But no one seems to feel that even the New York bar group's proposal for revising the conflict-of-interest statutes, helpful though these proposals undoubtedly would be, is capable of really solving the dilemma of the scientists. It appears to be unavoidable that risks must be run, and under the present circumstances, when the mere mention of the phrase "conflict of interests" suggests to the public not merely a questionable situation but a full-blown scandal, it is understandable that there are a good many nervous people in Washington.

The problem is one that cannot be legislated out of existence. Some sort of rules governing conflicts of interest are necessary, and no matter how carefully they are framed there will still be a great many difficult situations, particularly in the case of scientists. The bar group's draft legislation hopes to help matters by giving the President broad powers to grant exemptions "in the national interest." But an exemption can only make a conflict of interest allowable; it does not make it disappear. What everyone seems to agree is needed, if and when sensational revelations, justified or not, begin to appear, is a clear understanding among the public and on Capitol Hill that the risk of an occasional scientist acting indiscreetly is trivial compared to the risks to the national security if, in order to strictly enforce the conflict-of-interest laws, the Government were forced to cut itself off from the soundest scientific assistance it can get.

Condemnation of Trujillo Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Blow for Trujillo," published in the New York Times of June 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BLOW FOR TRUJILLO

The Peace Committee of the Organization of the American States has condemned the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic in terms that have no precedent in Latin-American history. This will be heartening for all the nations and all the forces in the hemisphere which hold democracy, freedom and human rights to be paramount.

The chairman of the Peace Committee is an American, Ambassador John C. Dreier. The United States is now lined up openly against the Trujillo tyranny for the first time, and in strong language. Of course, our statesmen never liked or approved of the brutal, corrupt and degrading tyranny that Generalissimo Trujillo has maintained in the Dominican Republic for more than three decades. However, the principle of "nonintervention" was considered too sacred to oppose. Now it is recognized that "flagrant and widespread violations of human rights," as the OAS report puts it, must be condemned on moral and practical grounds. Colombia, El Salvador, Mexico and Uruguay were reprtsented on the Peace Committee—a good cross-section of Latin-American opinion.

The question in everyone's mind will be: How much longer can Generalissimo Trujillo stand the powerful pressures being brought to bear against him in the face of a bad and steadily deteriorating economic situation? Six Latin-American nations have broken diplomatic relations with Ciudad Trujillo. The OAS is moving strongly for the first time. The Roman Catholic Church is in bitter opposition. The dictator may have intimidated and terrorized the internal opposition, but it is there and it represents the best elements in the country. The exiles are active, although still not united and still without strong leaders.

Then there is the economy. The foreign exchange position has deteriorated rapidly and continues to deteriorate. Reserves are almost gone. No international agency and no private banks will lend any money today. The fall in the price of coffee, the country's main source of income, has been a catastrophe. The huge expenditures on arms and on the Foreign Legion have been crippling. Tourism has fallen.

A dictator always looks strong until the last moment, but no dictator can long resist such pressures as Generalissimo Trujillo is being forced to bear.

Rural Electrification and Modern Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a particularly worthwhile essay written by a young constituent. She is writing about a subject which must seem foreign to most Americans living in cities; the lack of electricity.

Few of us in our lifetime have been without electricity as a normal part of our living. Once in a while there is a power failure and candles or lamps are

lit. It is usually a time for much merrymaking and laughter. But it wasn't so long ago in this country that literally millions of Americans were constantly without power; they had no light switches to turn on and they could not use such everyday implements as washing machines or vacuum sweepers. I refer to the farmers of America who were too far from powerlines to be able to afford the luxury of electricity.

Now, however, their number has dwindled to a very small point because of the activity of the Rural Electrification Administration which, through low-cost loans has made it possible for the farmers to bring the power to the farms of our land.

Miss Carol Lee Wall, of Haigler, Nebr., in an essay sponsored by the REA's of the State, has graphically outlined the situation in the following essay:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

How dark is the darkest night? Farmer Jones wakens from a fretful sleep needing a drink of water. He gets out of bed, searches through his overalls pockets trying to find a match to light the kerosene lamp. Finally he locates a broken match and by using extreme care, manages to strike it and reach for the smoky lamp chimney before the light flickers and dies. Oh well, he knows where the washstand and water bucket are. He can find his way in the dark. One, two, three, four steps across the living room and into the kitchen. One, two—whoops. He slips in a puddle of water and sprawls across the floor. Who forgot to empty that pan of drip water under the icebox anyway? Mrs. Farmer Jones had been completely exhausted at bedtime and is not exactly delighted at being wakened at 1:30 in the morning. After all, she had done the family ironing and baked a big batch of bread and it wasn't her fault that the old kitchen range wouldn't burn those wet cobs without putting out more smoke than heat. However, she is accustomed to such rude awakenings so she locates the little flashlight under her pillow and goes to the aid of Farmer Jones.

Sitting in a puddle of water in the middle of the night, he isn't conducive to joviality, and when he finally gets enough light to see a miller floating in the bucket of drinking water, his disposition isn't improved.

Remembering such incidents in the time before rural electrification became a part of our lives, seems amusing now but also makes us appreciate and realize the value of electricity to our farm homes.

Half of the world's supply of electricity is generated and used in the United States and about one-third of this supply is used in homes and on farms. More than 400 different chores in the farm home and barnyard are performed by electricity. The drudgery and tiring work are being taken out of farming but the farmer himself is only beginning to comprehend what electric power can mean in his occupation.

Little more than a generation ago, rural electrification was but a dream in the minds of a few public-spirited individuals. Nebraska is proud of Senator George Norris and others who had worked and planned for so long for a power project low enough in rates to benefit rural households. President Roosevelt signed the order that established the Rural Electrification Administration Act on May 11, 1935.

Let's look at Farmer Jones now: After a long day in the fields, the thought of milking the cows with the electric milking machine and separating with an electric cream separator is rather appealing. After chores, he goes into an air conditioned, vacuum cleaned house. A shower with plenty of hot water helps him relax and enjoy supper. Mrs. Farmer Jones had had a busy day, too, but she had the help of her washer-dryer, iron and mangle, and many other appliances. She can put the dishes in the electric dishwasher and join her husband for a time of reading (with good light), or watching television. Before retiring, Farmer Jones wants to look over the barnyard. He pushes the switch and light floods the farm. The sounds of the electric water pump, food freezer, and refrigerator are like a symphony to him. He can't help thinking how different his life is now from what it was before electricity came to the farm and a feeling of gratitude wells up inside as he thinks of REA.

Meadows which have been covered with water so late in the Spring and which previously affected the hay harvests, are now being drained by pumps powered by electricity.

If a piece of machinery breaks it goes to our own shop on the ranch where it is welded and put back into operation in less time than we could take it to town in the pre-REA era.

All of our corrals and cow barns are lighted simply by flicking a switch. Electricity provides automation to facilitate household chores, heats our homes, and supplies invaluable lighting. The school being better lighted lessens the eye strain and adds greatly to the comfort of the children and teachers.

Before REA came we had a windcharger and a few appliances, but to be able to iron it was necessary for the wind to blow in order to have sufficient power. It seemed that mother ironed accordingly to how hard the wind blew.

About the 20th of each month Dad gets our billing book, figures our kilowatt-hour consumption, and makes a check to Panhandle REA. I was looking over his shoulder and noticed the amount of the check and remarked, "Gee, Dad, electricity is very expensive, isn't it?" He answered, "No, it is probably the cheapest thing that we have today," and went on to explain that it is practically the only thing that costs less today than it did 10 years ago. He said our dollar today buys more electricity than it did at that time. I don't know much about that end of the business, but who am I to argue with Dad?

When I think of all the wonderful things REA makes available I'm so thankful and also realize that there is indeed a higher power than man. I know that it took man's money and initiative to get this to our homes but I also am reminded of this verse in the Bible: "In the beginning" God said, "Let there be light: and there was light."

How could anything so wonderful as REA be possible without divine blessing?

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By John D. Streiff)

When rural electrification came into our homes and on our places, it marked, not another milestone, but, a new era for us. An era of more modern living, work made easier, and conveniences never before possible.

Our homes blossomed out with hot and cold running water, food freezers, modern stoves, electric appliances, and to many, electric heat. The day of the "cow chip heat" is past. At Christmas time the gayly lighted Christmas trees add beauty to the televised Noel programs, which were probably even undreamed of by our forefathers who lighted their way and homes with candles. Air conditioning is no longer for city people only, but is available to 90-plus percent of Nebraska's rural families now served by rural electrification.

Among the thousand and one ways work was made easier for the house are the modern laundry, no more lamps to keep clean and fill, and ashes for father to carry out. Father also has his repair shop much more modern than he could possibly have it without electricity. He now brings his machines into the shop for welding or any repairs or changes he might want to make. Now a choice may be had of electric drills, saws, grinders, sickle sharpeners, and rundown batteries can be recharged at home.

On cold, wet, bone-chilling spring days and nights the newborn livestock is kept warm and dry under the modern heat lamps and brooders. A flip of the switch takes the place of the lantern. The yard lights light up the barnyards and makes the chores much easier to do.

Rural electrification has made it possible for the cattle to have warm fresh water all

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 1960 is the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program.

In celebration of the event and of the benefits of this quarter century of effort on behalf of the farmers of our Nation, students have been invited to write suitable esays.

Mrs. Lucille A. Clema, of Lincoln, Nebr. has sent in two of the winning essays from my native State.

Charlain Ferguson, junior in the Hyannis (Nebr.) High School is the author of one of these essays.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The author of another of these essays is 16-year-old John D. Streiff, of Flats, Nebr., a student at the McPherson County High School.

I also ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Charlain Ferguson)

One would have to be a resident of our community to realize the value of rural electrification.

No power company was ever interested enough in our area to provide us with electricity, and if one would have considered it the rates would have been exorbitant, out of the reach of the average family. In 1951, our area was fortunate enough to be electrified. In 9 years how our community has changed.

Barren acres due to the lack of water have been made productive through irrigation which is derived from electricity. Ranchers are not inclined to be farm-minded, but I firmly believe that, in the future, the soil in our community which is adaptable will be studded with fields of alfalfa. This will be fed to cattle which as every one knowns is the main product of the Sandhills ranchers.

the time. It has made possible the convenience of milking machines, electric separators, pasteurizers, and what have you. Feed grinding, loading, and unloading are among the many, many labor saving duties performed by electricity which cannot be measured in value.

During the spring and summer months when guests are entertained for the evening meal an electric grill or broiler adds to the pleasures of a lawn party. The children can enjoy their games and contests on a well lighted yard long after dark.

Last but by no means least is the small towns served by the rural electric lines. Most of these were served by diesel plants which made the lights jump every time a cylinder fired.

Loads were limited on such plants and now, with rural electrification, locker plants serve hundreds of patrons thereby making such conveniences more easily accessible for those not having sufficient freezer space. The little stores have modern meatgrinders, cutters, coolers, as well as freezers and air conditioning to compete with larger cities.

Rural electrification is the realization of a dream shared by a few of our forefathers who candlelighted the frontier of the past. Its value cannot be measured by us who can and are reaping the luxuries, benefits, and privileges of using such a powerful, yet economical servant as rural electrification.

REA Still Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, REA is now 25 years old. A whole new generation of rural people have enjoyed the benefits of electricity who never knew the life of wood ranges, kerosene lamps, and the other inconveniences of an almost primitive living.

But these young people appreciate the wonderful new life that was made possible by the rural electrification program. They have been regaled by the wonders wrought by this program which owes much of its existence to the great American, Senator George Norris, who served our State so magnificently for so many years.

Proof of the appreciation of REA can be found in the two winning essays of students from my hometown which were selected in a contest sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

Cassie Fuller and Roger Bodke are both juniors at Ogallala High School and their families are well known and well liked members of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point the two winning essays:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Roger Bodke)

The value of electricity in our home and community means a lot to the people who live in the community itself. The people that live in the community are common, ordinary human beings just like you and me. These people are interested in a way of life to make life easier for everyone else, too.

Electricity is one of the main backbones of our Nation. It takes a lot of communities just like the one we live in, to make up this Nation in which we live. The rural community has more of a chance to use the electricity more often than does the city person, because he has more things to use it on, and with more tools to work with.

Electricity puts movement into the machines that are being turned and used over and over again each day. There is an essential need for it in lighting, so a person doesn't have to get a candle like in the older days, and nowadays, it is possible to get different colored light for the different rooms of the house. Another essential of electricity is in heating. Nowadays a person doesn't have to go out to chop some wood in order to get warm; all you have to do is just turn a little screw to turn up the heat to keep yourself comfortable. In the winter time, electricity is handy again if you have young livestock that has just been born in cold weather, as most of them will survive. Electricity is important. You can compare the number of animals saved to the low cost of the amount of electricity used.

After a while, I think that the people of the community just use electricity as if it were a natural thing, or as a natural element, but after the electricity has been shut off for a few hours, people really stop to think how handy, and how valuable that switch is that is in the wall or wherever it is that lights or heats anything in this modern changing world.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Cassie Fuller)

Electricity in and around our home and community is very important because of all the electrical appliances and tools that are needed to make our lives easier and safer in everyday living.

Better storage and quicker handling of crops with electric motors on elevators and blowers give the farmers more leisure time as do the better, more efficient lighting systems. The lights throughout the dairy barns provide enough light to lessen the liability of accidents. The lights in the feedlots allow the farmer to check and feed the livestock.

The yard lights serve many purposes such as providing light for more outdoor evening activities, the yard is light enough that visitors can see where to walk, and on a stormy night, a yard light will show a stranded traveler where he can reach help.

Electricity in the house makes the duties of cleaning house easier with vacuums, electric scrubber and waxing machines. It makes food preparations simpler with deep freezers, refrigerators, electric stoves, ovens, roasters, and skillets, all of which are electrically controlled.

There is less work and worry with electric washers and dryers which can be set for a certain amount of time and forgotten while you go about your work, entertainment, or even go to town.

The repairing of machinery and the building of many things at home is now made possible by the use of electrical saws, drills, sanders, welders, and soldering irons. All of these tools help the farmers by saving the many hours of transporting the broken piece of machinery to the professional welder and it also saves the farmer from paying the welder's fee.

The milking systems are made to produce faster and easier work. Because of the larger motors in the milking systems, more milking machines can be used to save time and labor. While several cows are being milked, the farmer may go do some other chores.

Electric heat bulbs, when used properly, help the farmer save many small animals such as pigs, calves, lambs, and colts that are born during the winter months. The heat bulb is also very effective as a brooder lamp which helps warm chickens and other types of poultry. These bulbs keep the poultry from crowding.

Electric fences are used by nearly everyone in our community to keep their cattle in, which, in turn, keeps the neighbor's cattle out and off their fields.

The many irrigation wells in our community help make the crops grow and produce much more than the dryland crops, even during years with plenty of natural moisture.

The domestic wells serve many purposes such as supplying water to the house, the barn, and the stock tanks. In the house, many uses are made of this water, but outside of the house, this water is used to wash cars and windows, water lawns, flowers, and shrubs, and to water the gardens which are very important to most farm families.

Our leisure time is spent in our living rooms watching television, listening to the hi-fi, or listening to the radio, all of which we would have to do without if we had no electricity.

Electricity is very important to all of us in all we do for it lessens our work, saves money, and lengthens our leisure time in providing a needed essential at just the right time.

Morgan City, La., High School Band Again Visiting Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to again welcome to Washington from my congressional district the Morgan City, La., High School band and representatives of the Morgan City High School Music Boosters Club, sponsoring organization.

Members of the group, numbering over 100, arrived Wednesday morning for a busy 3-day itinerary of visits to major points of interest in and around the Capital. In general charge of the trip is Mrs. Steve Berniard, Boosters Club chairman. The band director is Richard Robichaux and also with the group is Principal L. T. Holmes of Morgan City High School.

A very popular and capable organization, with enthusiastic community support, the band previously visited Washington in 1956.

The visitors are taking time to boost the Morgan City Centennial August 27–September 5 of this year, and in recognition of that occasion some of the men in the group are wearing beards. The centennial will be held in conjunction with Morgan City's long-established annual shrimp festival which attracts widespread attention and draws throngs each year. The 1960 festival is scheduled for the Labor Day weekend.

The band members here this week are:

Bradley Achee, Karen Achee, Robert Adams, Dewey Aucoin, Jane Aucoin, Harry Badeaux, Audrey Beadle, Clarence Beadle, Ellen Belanger, Steve Berniard, Larry Broussard, Kathy Buckley, Sandra Cloutier, Sue Cloutier, Sherry Coleman, Brenda Comeaux, Janette Comeaux, Pat

Curfman, Jim Dalton, Huey Daigle, Pat DiMiceli, Renetta Dorion, Joann Dollahite, Karen Dupuis, Jerry Duval, Wayne Eues, Karen Forgey, Pat Green, Tim Gilmore, Joy Giroir, Betty Gorman, Johnny Gorman, Barbara Guidry, Conley Hardee, Connie Hebert, James Hylen, Joe D. Kimbrell, Jr., Wayne King, Kathy LeBlanc, Carol Lodrigue, Henry Paul Loeb, Judy Manfre, Judy Martin, Howard May, Bob McChesney, Pamela Meranta, Teresa Ann Metz, Hilton Michel, Jr., Eugene Morgan, Sandra Naquin, Horace Naquin, Clifford Olsen, Mary Jane Peebles, Kirby Phelps, Dianne Picou, Jerry Plessala, Carol Prestenback, Tommy Robison, Jerry Rock, Gaydell Roe, Lenny Roes, Kenneth Wayne Sellers, Kathleen Shepherd, Charles Teacle, Connie Joe Siracusa, Roland Stansbury, Russell Stoute, Pat Theriot, Beatrice Thompson, Garrett Topham, Janet Gayle Topham, Julia Wedaman, Dolores Westfall, Richard Rock, LeRoy Dupre, Jim White, all of Morgan City; and Celine Bourg, of Berwick, La.

Adults participating in the trip are:

Mrs. Steve Berniard, Mrs. Walter Gilmore, Mrs. Homer Achee, Mrs. Urban Prestenback, Mrs. Jean Picou, Mrs. W. J. LeBlanc, Mr. Joe Siracusa, Mr. Clive Cloutier, Mrs. Clive Cloutier, Mr. Erwin Beadle, Mr. Cyrus Giroir, Mrs. Cyrus Giroir, Mrs. George Buckley, Mrs. Oliver Bergeron, Mrs. Ivan Belanger, Mr. L. T. Holmes, Mr. Richard Robichaux, Mr. Horace Naquin, Mrs. Selma Blum, Mrs. Carl Loeb, Mrs. J. W. Peebles, Mr. J. J. Fontenot, Mr. Alvin Adams, Mrs. Alvin Adams, Mrs. Gerald Buford, Mrs. L. Cloutier, Mrs. Theresa Canty, and Mrs. Lynn Arceneaux, all of Morgan City; Miss Alice Landry, Mrs. Weston Landry, Mrs. Harry Bergeron, Mrs. William Theriot, Mrs. Ivy Nini, Mrs. Jeffry Theriot, Mrs. Oscar Hebert, all of Berwick; and Mrs. Lawrence Etie of New Iberia, La.

The Better Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I borrow for the title of this extension of my remarks the title given to an editorial appearing in the Waterbury (Conn.) American, of May 27, 1960. This editorial points up the "better way" that our distinguished Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, handled a situation which, in an earlier day and by other minds might well have resulted in unjustified and cruel injury to an individual or a group of individuals. Surely this is the "better" way. I am proud to know that this better way has been pointed out by Senator DODD and I commend its reading to all thoughtful citizens of the United States. Pursuant to permission previously granted I append this editorial:

THE BETTER WAY

No one questions the unqualified patriotism of the fine people banded together under the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. They are well-meaning folks with an acute concern for the horrors which atomic fallout can inflict on all mankind. Nothing cheaper than to disparage them. And Senator THOMAS J. DODD was exceedingly careful not to do that when he called their attention to Communist infiltration in their ranks. He confined himself to pointing out the condition and calling upon them to clean house. And we have no doubt that they will.

What strikes us in this episode is the contrast it offers to other times and to other congressional Members in those times.

Many of the organizations which a few years ago were denounced as "Communist fronts" were dedicated to the causes of peace and international friendship. Many of their members were high-minded people innocent of any slightest design to betray American principles. Indeed the reason they gave their names and their contributions to the organizations they supported were commendably altruistic.

But because the Red brethren had duped people or crept into their organization a lot of such folks found themselves facing congressional inquisitors. And it was demanded of them that they submit fellow members whom they had every reason to believe were as innocent as themselves to the same kind of inquisition they were facing, with all its attendant embarrassment, or be held in contempt of the Congress.

That was the feverish way things were done then, when witch hunting was in flower.

There is a better way—a nondemagogic way. And Senator DODD has admirably exemplified it.

What Rural Electrification Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, to those Americans who have lived their lives in our great cities and smaller towns, it is hardly conceivable that any American is so situated that he cannot flick on a switch and have light or power to turn the wheels of the countless gadgets in the modern home.

And yet, there are still Americans living on the small, remote farms of the Nation who do not have this electric power. There would be millions more who would not have it were it not for the Rural Electrification Administration program to bring electricity at a low cost to the farmers.

That the American farmers who have been able to take advantage of this program are deeply grateful to the American people for this privilege is ably demonstrated through the attitudes of their youngsters.

I would like at this point to place in the RECORD for my colleagues' attention an essay written by Miss Shirley Hadan, a 17-year-old high school junior from Franklin, Nebr. She is one of the Nebraska State REA essay contest winners.

Her essay, which I think merits wide circulation, follows:

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth. He said, "Let there be light, and there was light." I wonder if He knew then that today His tiny lamps would be dotting the rural countryside.

In 1948, I was a little girl of 6, but I can remember that thrilling night that REA was turned on at our farmstead. Mother and Daddy always speak of it as a thrill of a lifetime. Now that I'm older I, too, realize what rural electrification means to me and my community. Just let the electricity be off for a few minutes and I am at a loss. It just seems that everything is wrong. Well, it realy is; no lights, no water, no TV, no time, no refrigeration, and oh, so many advantages have been taken away. Then when the switch is thrown, so am I. I'm up at my regular routine again. I just can't imagine how pioneers or even my father and mother managed without rural electrification.

Without electricity, farmers would have to retire from the farm at an earlier age. But with all the conveniences of electricity such as lighted outbuildings, heat lamps, irrigation and all of the pushbutton feeding gadgets enables him to carry on. I don't think my father could do all the work he does today without the help of electricity. It is his cheapest paid hired help.

Mother, too, could not do so much community service work and enjoy life as much as she does without the help of electricity. She says it adds so much to family living.

When I stand out on our hilltop farmstead and look over the countryside, and see all of the yard lights around the community, it gives me a feeling of security and togetherness. This bad snowy winter, when we could not visit with our neighbors, it made us feel closer when we could see each other's lights.

I believe at sometime or another every REA user in our community has thanked the Lord—the giver of all good things—for the comfort and happiness that rural electrification has brought to him and his family.

A Program To Combat Illegitimacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years we have noticed with great alarm the rising number of illigitimate children that are born to unwed mothers, not only in Tennessee but the Nation as well.

A number of the commissioners of public welfare and other related agencies in several of the States have tried to do something about this problem and on every occasion the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of our Government has turned thumbs down on the proposal.

In our State of Tennessee we have an outstanding Governor, Buford Ellington. He is one of the greatest Governors our

State has ever had. In selecting his cabinet to administer the department of public welfare he selected Mrs. C. Frank Scott, a former State senator of Memphis, who incidentally was born and raised in my hometown of Union City, Tenn.

In several conferences Governor Ellington and Mrs. Scott and their respective staffs have adopted a program which has met with the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to do something about this problem. I have asked Mrs. Scott to write me a letter setting out in detail the way that they are meeting this problem. Governor Ellington and Mrs. Scott are operating under the slogan, "The difficult we will do today and the impossible will take a little longer."

I will insert this letter today and will at a future date insert editorials and other related materials on this outstanding accomplishment of Governor Ellington and Mrs. Scott in this field.

I believe that this problem is so great that we should not only bring this to the attention of the Members of this Congress but to the Nation as well.

Mrs. Scott's letter to me follows:

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Nashville, May 18, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT A. EVERETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FATS: I appreciated your long-distance call and your expression of interest in our new policy on suitability of the home. I am enclosing a copy of our policy statement which has been incorporated into our Public Assistance Manual and news releases which you requested.

The department's policy that a child receiving aid to dependent children shall be living in a suitable family home is based on a provision in our Tennessee Aid to Dependent Children Law. The new policy which is an expansion of our former policy provides for a plan of statistical reporting and review by regional and State office staff whenever one of the following factors is present:

1. Abuse of the child physically or mentally by beating, overwork, or other cruel treatment, or by improper relations with the child.

2. Exploitation of the child by having it beg on the streets, sell or make contracts for the sale of illegal products, or engage in prostitution.

3. Repeated conviction of the parent or other relative for disorderly conduct, alcoholism, prostitution, or other violations of law evincing a weakness or lack of moral structure in the home.

4. Neglect of the needs of the child by failing to provide proper food and clothing where this results, not from lack of income, but from use of the income or grant for purposes other than the procurement of necessities, or neglect of the child by failure to assist it in maintaining a satisfactory school attendance record when not prevented by factors outside the control of the parent or relative.

5. Neglect in care of the child by reason of the absence of the parents or relatives who leave the child alone in the home, on the streets, or frequently in the homes of neighbors, where such absence is not due to employment or other valid requirements, but to engagement in social activities or undesirable pursuits.

6. Feeblemindedness or disability of the parents or relatives to such extent that the parent cannot give the child the minimum care necessary to protect his physical and mental health.

7. Failure of the parent or relative to provide a stable moral environment for the child, by engaging in promiscuous conduct either in or outside of the home, or by having an illegitimate child while receiving an assistance payment from the department, or by otherwise failing to demonstrate an intent to establish a stable home. For purposes of determining suitability, an illegitimate child is defined as a child whose natural father is someone other than the mother's legal husband.

The Department of Public Welfare has a legal responsibility for protective services to children who are neglected and abused, and we are going to make a concerted effort to carry out the intent of our laws which give recognition to the right of a child to grow up in a family environment offering him opportunity for normal development.

We have a basic respect for the rights and responsibilities of parents and a deep interest in the well-being of children, and the Department is giving first priority to initiating intensive study and service in accomplishing the intent and purpose of the laws and policies governing the aid to dependent children program. Our reporting system provided under the new policy will enable us to obtain information in regard to the existing problems and needs and will be useful in future planning.

I shall be glad to have your reactions to this new policy, and please do not hesitate to write me regarding any questions you might have.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. C. FRANK SCOTT,
Commissioner.

Tribute to the Late Elizabeth L. Towne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading citizens of my district and, indeed of the Nation, Mrs. Elizabeth L. Towne, noted editor, author, lecturer, religious and civic leader, died Wednesday, June 1, in Holyoke, Mass. I should like to insert, under extension of remarks, a portion of an editorial paid to Mrs. Towne by the late Mrs. William G. Dwight, a close associate of Mrs. Towne's for over half a century in Holyoke affairs:

Elizabeth Towne was one of the leaders of the "new thought" movement in the United States, and she founded the Nautilus magazine which put the Holyoke, Mass., address on practically every newsstand in the country.

Travelers in far countries would be asked, when they said they came from Holyoke, if they knew Elizabeth Towne? Time was when followers of "New Thought," the title with which Mrs. Towne had popularized an ancient and enduring philosophy, accepted Elizabeth Towne in the measure with which Mary Baker Eddy has been held for her reinterpretation of one of the abiding truths of Christian teaching.

Born in Portland, Oreg., on May 11, 1865, the daughter of John Halsey and Jane Jones; Mrs. Towne had a long, full, and varied life. With the founding of her Nautilus magazine in 1898, she took her first step toward a dstinguished career which brought her national prominence as an editor, author, and lecturer. She had been instrumental in developing the modern philosophy of "new thought."

Mrs. Towne received her formal academic training in the grammar and high schools of Portland, Oreg., supplementing this instruction by intense study of the various subjects in which she became interested. She made a particular close study of the Bible, which was her source book and guide for more than half a century.

On May 26, 1900, she married William Elmer Towne, vice president and secretary of the Elizabeth Towne Co., Inc. Following this marriage, she went to Holyoke and centered her activities there. She brought with her the Nautilus which she has founded in Portland 2 years before her marriage. Her magazine was a journal of metaphysics whose original issue consisted of 2,800 copies. The magazine developed steadily and has filled a need in the lives of many readers.

The circulation grew until it exceeded 90,000 copies per month and has been distributed in every civilized country in the world. Many celebrated writers have contributed to its numbers, including Ella Wheeler Wilcox, Edward Markham, Dr. Frank Crane, Paul Ellsworth, Sinclair Lewis, Thomas Drier and others.

She was also the author of many volumes published between 1903 and 1926, including "Joy Philosophy," "Practical Methods for Self-Development," "How to Concentrate," "How to Train Children and Parents," and many more. The volumes cover many topics. Some cover "new thought" textbooks, some are religious treatises, and others are essays on various aspects of life. A number have been translated into German, French, Swedish, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, and Hindustani.

She was a pioneer among women in politics and, at the time of the progressive movement in American politics, she and her husband sat as delegates in the two conventions of 1912 at which the Progressive Party was formed and Theodore Roosevelt nominated for the presidency. Mrs. Towne was also one of the three women State committeemen of the Progressive Party in Massachusetts. In December 1926, she had the distinction of becoming the first woman alderman-at-large in Holyoke, and she took office for a 2-year term. In 1928, she became the first woman ever to run for mayor of that city. Running on a nonpartisan ticket, she faced the major disadvantage of having no party or machine organization to support her.

Yes, Elizabeth Towne will long be remembered. Probably there is no one teacher in the entire history of the new thought movement that is more beloved through the years than this gracious lady. Her name is a byword in the homes of most truth students, and anyone who has contacted her personally, remembers the joyous love which she unconsciously expressed toward them.

Mineowners and Labor Are Building Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an

article appearing in today's issue of the Washington Daily News titled "Coal Is a Giant," written by the distinguished and able president of the United Mine Workers of America, the Honorable Thomas Kennedy. This is a fine statement by President Kennedy, and I hope that my colleagues in the House will find time to read it:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 9, 1960]

COAL IS A GIANT—MINEOWNERS AND LABOR ARE BUILDING TOGETHER

(By Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers)

America's coal industry is a quiet giant—a colossus of strength, able and willing to provide the power and energy needed to keep the United States in the forefront as the greatest industrial nation in the world.

But the American people must be awakened to the dangers that threaten our most basic industry. The United Mine Workers of America and the coal industry are working together to overcome these dangers and to bring about economic stability for our great industry in the interest of the continuing freedom and security of America.

FEDERAL HELP

Many of the problems of the coal industry could be corrected by constructive legislative action by the Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The approximately 200,000 men working in our industry are now producing about 400 million tons of coal each year. Yet with some economic adjustments and recognition by the Federal Government of the vital role of coal in America's progress we could step up annual production to as much as 700 million tons. This jump in output is possible and may become necessary.

We can all recall the oil shortage in World War II. This was mild compared with what will happen if we continue to depend upon foreign sources of petroleum to the detriment of the well-being of our domestic coal industry.

A war between the free world and the Communists could, and probably would, cut off these foreign oil supplies virtually overnight. Right now, for example, the economy of the eastern part of the United States is dependent upon continuing shipments of this foreign oil as the major fuel to produce gasoline.

And foreign residual (waste) oil from Venezuela is still being dumped into coal's traditional eastern seaboard markets at cutthroat prices.

Yet American coal is virtually unlimited in supply. There are probably 2,000 years of recoverable coal reserves within our borders on the basis of the present rate of consumption. In contrast we may have only a 20-to-40-year supply of petroleum and less than that of natural gas, even including that which is coming into this country at below-cost prices by Canada and Mexico.

FAIR TREATMENT

There is no question about coal's future if our industry is given fair treatment. The productivity increases in our industry are the highest of any industry in the economy. These increases can and will continue, enabling coal to remain competitive with other energy sources. But there must be a halt to discrimination against coal in favor of the other fuels.

Despite lack of action by the present Congress, we of the coal industry will continue our fight for establishment of a national fuels policy. The objective of promulgating such a policy would be to bring about rational marketing and conservation of America's energy supplies.

We also are seeking final action by the Congress to expand the program of research and development of our coal industry, looking toward new markets for coal—both anthracite and bituminous.

PROGRESS

Union coal miners are proud of the progress made by our industry. The members of the United Mine Workers of America today are the best paid industrial workers in the world, working in one of the most productive and progressive basic industries in the Nation.

But as a union we also are aware of the continuing daily problems of the men who must go into the mines to bring out the coal. We know of the human tragedy caused by chronic unemployment in the coalfields of America. We know that this joblessness can be overcome only by an expanding economy.

Alaska and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the Air Force, presently under review by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to inactivate the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base, near Fairbanks, Alaska, has met not only with widespread opposition in Alaska and other States, but has opened to close scrutiny and analysis other phases bearing upon the question of the adequacy of our national defense effort in Alaska. The many implications affecting our country as a whole are ably set forth by the American Legion, Department of Alaska, in Resolution No. 60–19 adopted in convention assembled at Homer, Alaska, on June 4, 1960. The resolution follows:

It is inconceivable to thinking people in Alaska and elsewhere that America's top military strategists have apparently concluded that it would be preferable to allow an enemy to stage the air battle over densely populated areas of the eastern seaboard or over the Nation's industrial heartland instead of enforcing upon him the necessity for neutralizing destructive forces which could be aimed at him from Alaska.

In the 49th State, America possesses more than 500,000 square miles of territory under its own control and with vast uninhabited areas which could accommodate missile sites and other military facilities far distant from any vital populated nerve center. With Soviet Russia less than 100 miles distant intermediate range ballistic missiles (IRBM's) could be employed as effectively against enemy targets as intercontinental-type missiles (ICBM's) emplaced 3,000 or 4,000 miles away in the other States. The argument that manned aircraft and missiles emplaced in lower California or Wyoming or elsewhere can protect the State of Alaska or negate Alaska's strategic potential is in direct contradiction of other arguments advanced by Air Force spokesmen who claim that range is the big factor in determining the accuracy and effectiveness of ballistic missiles. Assuming the latter to be true, it makes no sense at all to reason that missiles should be placed in hardened sites in the south 48, thousands of miles away from any target, where a significant percentage of the weapon's fuel supply would be expended before it would reach a point as near to the potential enemy as an unfired missile stationed in Alaska.

The present concept of massive retaliation advanced so successfully by the Strategic Air Command during the last few years, has its advantages from a strict deterrent standpoint but it presupposes that heartland America will suffer the first blows. This means that millions of Americans would have to die while the lucky ones could take consolation in the knowledge that SAC bombers were off and away to wreak destruction on Russia.

The American people must be made to realize the full import of decisions being made in the Pentagon and what some of them could mean if war should come. By concentrating missile sites, fighter-interceptor forces and other defensive and offensive units in heartland USA instead of fortifying Alaska, the enemy is relieved of any significant worry about having to neutralize forces in Alaska before hitting the south 48.

The potential enemy should be forced to consider Alaska first and make preparations to deal with Alaska before daring to launch an attack in some other direction. The enemy should be made to face up to the fact that Alaska is fortified to the hilt with missiles aimed at specific targets and that first-line fighter interceptors such as F–105's are on hand in sufficient numbers to team with the Nike-Hercules and Pershing missiles to blunt any attempted assault and provide more time for alerting the other States. These forces could be augmented with submarines equipped with Polaris underwater-to-surface missiles which would constitute a deadly threat to the enemy right in his own back door.

As it stands today, the token military forces here are no threat to the enemy. These forces are not adequate to protect Alaska and are certainly not capable of assisting in the protection of the other States. The chief function is to warn the rest of the country of impending attack. Even so, without adequate first-line fighter-interceptors to make contact and establish positive identification, the fire order may not come until too late. Nike batteries can track blips on their radar screens but this does not establish positive enemy identification.

The American Legion and, indeed, all Alaskans, are deadly serious about this matter because we feel that decisions are being made in Washington which are of a life-and-death nature. We would prefer that the State of Alaska be developed into the highest type of priority target, from the enemy standpoint, rather than to stand by and watch decisions being made which would leave the enemy no choice but to strike America's heartland first. If given the choice of whether Alaska should be fortified or whether plans should continue which would guarantee that any future air battle would be fought over New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago, or Washington, D.C., there is no doubt that the majority of thinking Americans would insist upon having the missiles and fighters and troops in Alaska necessary to force the enemy to alter his whole concept of strategic planning in order to take into account the new fortified stature of the 49th State. The people cannot know about this and get concerned about it unless it is brought to their attention. Pentagon planners will not alter their plans to include Alaska unless tremendous pressures are brought to bear upon them from congressional sources and powerful organized groups. In fact, the trend seems to be in the opposite direction.

The citizens of Alaska and elsewhere cannot reconcile the actions of our officials in pleading with foreign nations to allow our Government to place missiles in their countries

and being denied because those governments do not want to become targets. At the same time elected representatives of Alaska in Washington are being told by Gen. Curtis LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, that Alaska is not of much strategic value in the defense picture. This is contrary to what Gen. Billy Mitchell said, and, we believe, contrary to what the present Alaskan Commander, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., believes. We insist upon some reasonable explanation of LeMay's thesis and will not be brushed off with statements such as "it costs too much" or "we can handle it from other locations." Many of the statements handed out to interested parties will simply not stand up if challenged for more specifics.

This is a crucial time for America and the free world. It is vital to our survival that Alaska's strategic importance as the closest American soil to Russia and to China be reviewed and reviewed thoroughly. The people of this State and of all the other States are entitled to know what is going on and the risks that are being taken. The citizens who pay the taxes and vote are not qualified to know precisely what type missiles and what type aircraft should be utilized in certain localities but even the most naive can look at a globe of the world and and ask some fairly intelligent questions about why no missiles in Alaska—why no firstline fighters—why no serious attempts to utilize this vast opportunity to force the enemy to redo his entire military concept. This is not a question of economic effect upon the new State, it is a question of blueprint for survival and time is running out. The Alaska Department of the American Legion calls upon all citizens of Alaska and on all Americans everywhere to assist our elected officials in obtaining a reevaluation of the military posture of Alaska.

Basil L. Whitener Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1960, one of my distinguished colleagues from North Carolina, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER, Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina, received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Belmont-Abbey College, Belmont, N.C. Accompanying the honorary degree was a citation which exemplifies his character and service and the high respect in which Mr. WHITENER is held by the people he has the honor to represent. This citation, I believe, will be of interest to all of his colleagues and speaks more eloquently than anything I can say about my friend and colleague, Mr. WHITENER, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this citation, as follows:

BASIL LEE WHITENER, ESQ.

In contemporary civilization, the democratic process has operated best under a republican form of government where the individual is enabled to participate in his own governace, through elected representation. The elected representatives function as agents for the people, and the quality of goverament rests upon the judgments and wisdom of these servants of the electorate.

The moral burden of representation is to steer toward a balance between two responsibilities, often in conflict with each other: to work for the general welfare and, at the same time, to reflect the will of a constituency.

The fundamental principle of the American democratic philosophy of government is the inherent dignity of the human personality and the protection of individual rights, guaranteed by our Constitution. When an elected Delegate to our Federal Legislature directs his efforts, his energies, his judgments, his wisdom, to this end, he deserves the gratitude of all Americans, but especially of the citizens whom he represents.

As the only senior college in the 11th Congressional District, Belmont Abbey College deems it a duty, as well as an honor, to give public recognition to its elected Representative in the U.S. Congress. He is a man dedicated to the preservation of American liberties, and labors to broaden opportunities for human growth. Aware of the complexities of modern legislation, he, nevertheless, has the acumen to synthesize into a simplicity the basic aim of all government: the common good.

He has prepared himself well for his duties, both by study and experience. As a student of law, a teacher, a father, a naval officer, he has learned the stern disciplines so necessary for personal freedom, which have provided him the wisdom indispensable in an elected Representative. He has called forth praise and admiration in the Halls of our National Capitol, and thus he has merited the confidence of his friends and fellow citizens.

As a special tribute to his past accomplishments and a pledge of our confidence in his future good work, the president and faculty of Belmont Abbey College call him here to be recognized, and with honor have designated that BASIL LEE WHITENER, Esq., receive, with all its rights and privileges, the degree: doctor of laws.

Given at Belmont Abbey College this 7th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the founding of this college, the 84th.

The Vanishing Passenger Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a great many of my colleagues share my feeling about the passing of the steam locomotive on the railroads of this country. Many of us in our youth unquestionably had an ambition to be an engineer, flagman, or conductor.

Dr. Paul Flowers, who writes a most interesting and informative daily column in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, has written feelingly about the vanishing passenger train.

So much did it stimulate me that I ask you to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include this column.

The article follows:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Aug. 20, 1959]

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

Nostalgia grabbed hold with a fury after Greenhouse shed a tear for the vanishing passenger train.

"I was what they called a drummer," wrote W. A. Ulrich, 993 Monroe. "I never rode anything but trains back in those days. Sometimes I even snitched a ride in a caboose on a local freight, and then called on my customers while the crew was spotting or picking up cars, or handling less-than-carload lots at platforms and wagonyards.

"I began as traveling salesman at the age of 18, and kept at it 36 years.

"Those were the days, playing pitch in the smoker, sometimes moving to the more sedate ladies' car. I did enjoy traveling and selling, even living in old-fashioned hostelries with the train running alongside the hotel."

Then B. Frank Lynn, which is the pseudonym for a well-known Delta schoolmaster, harks back to days of the Peavine.

In my own archives I find a tribute to the Peavine, as the Yazoo & Mississippi Valley's Delta Express was known, which appeared in this column in 1945.

"(The train) is a sort of neighborhood affair, which plies between Memphis and Greenville. Mothers time baby feedings by that train, folks stop what they are doing to note its passing, for it is the old reliable link with the world to the north and south of the lush Delta land."

(Remember, this was in 1945.)

"The gray-haired flagman is sort of mentor, father confessor, friend, and guide to all mankind on the train. He has cultivated a pleasant, almost singsong to call out the stops, although folks who ride the Winemvee don't need anybody to call out stations.

"This Delta train has another distinction, a colony of friendly, reasonably tame mice. In prehistoric times, figured according to mouse chronology, some beady-eyed little varmint around Memphis Central Station discovered that Delta folks had the habit of eating light lunches in those day coaches. Naturally, there were crumbs and other goodies, so the mice moved in. There was always a puddle of water at the coolers, so the train was a natural for mouse comfort and happiness.

"You can see them scurrying back and forth in the aisles, nosing into peanut hulls and rattling scraps of paper on the floor in search of tidbits.

"You'll notice some lady passengers with their feet drawn up onto the plush, and you might even hear an occasional squeal when some flower of Southern womanhood sees a mouse at too close range. But nobody's ever been hurt.

"One heartless and unimaginative traveler once brought a mousetrap and a scrap of hoop cheese aboard to snare the little rodents, but outraged public opinion required him to put traps and bait back into his pocket."

Well, the old steam-drawn Peavine is one with Nineveh and Tyre, replaced by roaring diesels and streamlined coaches, but the memory lingers on.

The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 25th anniversary of the Federal rural electrification program the Nebraska Rural Electric Association, in conjunction with the various rural public

power districts, sponsored an essay contest participated in by local high school students throughout the State of Nebraska.

I am very proud to state that two young ladies located in the Third District, which I have the honor to represent, were among the nine statewide winners whose essays were selected as best representing the thoughts and impressions the youth of Nebraska have of the benefits and conveniences brought to their homes, farms and their daily lives.

The two young ladies, Miss Cheryl Wallin, Tilden High School, Tilden, Nebr., and Miss Leola Evans, Plainview High School, Pierce, Nebr., by their contributions in a literary sense, are a distinct credit to their parents, teachers, school and the community in which they reside.

Their essays bring to mind the enlightened and deep-rooted thinking of the younger generation regard the lasting benefits that rural electrification has brought to the rural areas, the generally improved cultural level of rural families, which has moved with rapid strides since 1935 when only 11 percent of our farms were then electrified. Today, thanks to the rural electrification programs, 97 percent of America's farms have the benefits of light, heat and power.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of my colleagues in the House, include the essays of the Misses Wallin and Evans in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Cheryl Wallin)

Electricity, with its multitude of uses, has become a miraculous wonder for many rural areas. All of this really started in 1935, when Congress created the Rural Electrification Administration to finance the cost of the distribution of electricity. During the following years turbines, generators, transformers, huge poles, wires, bulbs, and electric appliances made their appearance on the rural scene. For the first time farmers and farming communities were able to purchase electricity at low rates.

Rural Electrification Administration is such a useful, silent helper in our homes today that we sometimes fail to realize its value as the star role in our life.

In our homes Rural Electrification Administration makes possible these jobs; the washing and drying of clothes; the warming of water; the sewing of clothes; the showing of television programs; the cooking, refrigerating, and disposing of food; the cooling of air; the hearing of records; the typing of words; but, best of all, the washing of dishes.

In the yard outside the house Rural Electrification Administration is found performing tasks, such as the pumping of water; the grinding of feed; the milking of cows; the separating of milk and cream; the using of heat lamps to warm the pigs and chickens; the mowing of lawns and the feeding of livestock.

While electricity saves us work at home, it also enables us to enjoy life in our small community.

Farms are kept green and productive by irrigation pumps, pipes and sprinklers. This equipment works day and night to distribute water to the verdant plants in the fields. Yard lights in the various farms, send beacons to visitors. The bulbs perched high on the poles, light the yard for the laborer doing the chores. Welders enable the farmers to keep their machinery in repair.

Rural Electrification Administration has enabled many rural youths to obtain employment, yet remain in the rural communities. Men are employed to build, repair, and maintain lines. Officeworkers are needed to keep the huge rural administration functioning efficiently and smoothly. Others are hired to do the various tasks that are necessary.

It is hard to measure the value of service. There is no convenient yardstick. Yet, Rural Electrification Administration service is valuable—it is the right arm of the farming community today.

We, in the rural areas, owe a debt of gratuitous praise to the concientious Congressmen of the United States of America who voted for the Rural Electrification Administration bill. Without their endorsement our rural areas might have remained in the stagnant condition they were a generation ago.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

(By Leola Evans)

Imagine, if you can, a rural community without electricity. It casts a rather dull scene that seems almost primitive. Although our ancestors lived and survived without electrification, they led an unnecessary life of hand labor.

In this space age, we are in the midst of new fantasies which have been declared impossible. How would we have progressed thus far if we hadn't had inquisitive men like Benjamin Franklin or Thomas Edison? These men proved to our forefathers the luxuries we now use as everyday living.

Many rural communities, like ours, depend almost entirely upon electrification; consequently, many would be unable to live without these luxuries. The farmer would have no electric lights in his house, barn, or in any of his farm buildings. Many animals would have a difficult survival. Baby chicks wouldn't have as good a chance to survive without the use of heat lamps many of the farmers use.

A few years back, people were inclined to believe that the cost of light bills was too high. Although many people still believe this, they still continue to use their electrical appliances; and will keep on because they have become so accustomed to living in such a way. If those who complain of being overcharged would think it over, they would realize how much more efficient electrical appliances are than hand-powered ones.

Schools in the community would be unable to hold their basketball and football games, class plays and other activities at night. These would take place during the day and interfere with school hours if we had no electrification in our community. Most of these extracurricular activities would be absurd because of the interference with school hours.

Our food would be of a completely different nature. No frozen foods would be available for quick use if there was no electrification system. A deep freeze and refrigerator would be unheard of. Our meats and other foods would not keep well like they are capable of in a deep freeze or refrigerator. It is very true that our food would be completely different without all of our electrical appliances.

Hot running water, radios, television, lighting of entire home, food freezers, and many other household appliances would be useless and unheard of if it wasn't for electricity. We should be thankful we have these conveniences in our community. Linemen are on duty to do their job of replacing power in a short time.

I am proud to live in a community with such efficient public power. Our Elkhorn Rural Public Power District is what we make it. It is through cooperation, and only cooperation, that we can benefit from this power district. Again, I say, I am proud to live in this community and be able to be a part of this remarkable organization to better our lives and living conditions.

AMA Versus Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1960 issue of Western Medicine, the medical journal of the West, appears a most thought-provoking article. It is a reprint of an address delivered by Dr. Aaron S. Leven, of California, before the medical staff, Beverly Hills Doctors Hospital, and the Bay Area Town Meeting.

In this address Dr. Leven takes sharp issue with the American Medical Association for its stand in opposition to my bill, H.R. 4700, to provide hospitalization for the aged.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Leven's address and invite all Members of Congress to read it. The address follows:

THE GREAT CHALLENGE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE RELATION OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE TO AMERICAN WELFARE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

(By Aaron S. Leven, M.D.)

Today organized medicine is at the crossroads of a great challenge to itself and to the American people. So far, in meeting the challenge, the medical profession shows inability to criticize its relationship to the social aspects of present-day medicine and medical practice. The science of medicine and the art of human relations in its practice are inseparable.

It behooves us to become more politically literate and astute—to be able to differentiate reality from flattery, confusion, distortion, and out-and-out lies. It is important to have profound knowledge and sympathetic understanding of the humanities and social sciences. Osler once said: "By neglect of the study of the humanities, which has been far too general, the profession of medicine loses much of this precious quality." The real tragedy concerning this precious quality is that many men in medicine today appear not even to have found it.

At the present time, a man of 60 unable to support himself and his dependents without employment faces the possibility of starvation. If he is employed, he is liable to lose his job and to refusal if he seeks another. If he reaches 70 he is definitely frowned upon by many segments of our society, and if he is unlucky enough to live until 80 or longer, he is often regarded as a freak. Better for a man if he dies at 50, for then he may be hailed with approval. At 75 years death is practically requested—if one lacks the financial means to live out a further life span.

Surgeon General Burney reports that "the number of people 45 and over has increased 3½ times since 1900. Today more than 40 million people, approximately 30 percent of the total population, are in this age group. By 1970 their number is expected to increase to 61 million. Moreover, 40 percent of the chronically ill in this country are persons over 65 years of age, of whom there are now

approximately 15 million in the United States."

Two years ago, addressing the Conference on Aging at the University of Michigan, Blakely foretold that "medicine will break the age barrier in the not too distant future, and we may find ourselves living to be 150 years old. But with no function in life after 65, we'll be saying that the last 100 years are the hardest, not the first. The problem is not only that old people are increasing in numbers, but that most of them have no personal philosophy for old age, and our society has no role for them."

Since the turn of the century, medical science has added two full decades to the average span of life. This blessing, however, confronts our youth-worshiping Nation with a new dilemma: The problems of an aging population. In 1900 it was a feat to live 65 years—only 3 million men and women managed it. Today there are over 15 million Americans over 65 and 5 million of them are over 75. And the number of senior citizens is still growing at a rapid pace. According to some authorities, 1 person in 10 will be more than 65 by 1975, as compared with 1 in 25 in 1900.

The gloomy significance of these statistics is obscured by our myth of the golden years. Here old age is depicted as a time when white-haired couples enjoy a life of well earned leisure. You see them playing shuffleboard with neighbors in a Florida or California retirement village or mailing postcards to the grandchildren during long-planned tours, etc. For a fortunate few, this may be an accurate picture of life after 65. But where in this picture are the 400,000 lonely oldsters staring at the ceilings of nursing homes? Or the 3 million who live with their married children or other relatives because they are unable, financially or physically, to maintain homes of their own? And what of the 7 million who try to get along on incomes of $80 or less a month? These are some of the people that Hobbs and other authorities have in mind when they say that Americans should quit kidding themselves about the problems of aging. At present, most 65-year oldsters quite properly feel that they are still a long way from old age. A custom, however, which dates back to the era when 65 was an advanced age holds that this is the time when men and women should retire from productive work. And in nearly all business and professional jobs, retirement at 65 is not merely customary but mandatory.

Social security came into being in the early thirties. This measure, and private pension programs, have helped, in a small measure, to cushion the financial shock of retirement. Nearly everyone, however, undergoes a drastic reduction of income when he stops drawing a salary check. At the time of the last census, the median income of the over-age group was about $960 a year—$80 a month. How to live on $80 a month without free medical care and remain healthy is too much of a problem for millions of oldsters today.

More than 15 million Americans are 65 years old or older. Too many reveal the story of the infirm, disabled, or discarded workers of both sexes, requiring public assistance to keep them from starving. Their plight varies with locality. California oldsters, with pensions ranging from $89 to $105 on proof of special need, are better off than many. The range in 24 States is from $60.57 (Idaho) to $95.56 (Colorado), while in 24 other States it is less than $60 and sinks to as little as $28.88 (Mississippi). The national average is $57.46.

Largely because of residential requirements, there are millions who desperately need these pensions and don't get them. In some counties a person must reside 15 years to receive the price of a dinner. One can imagine, for example in California, how this affects thousands of migrant workers and their families who have poured into the State seeking jobs and are now unemployed. When aid is granted, living on $89 a month means a starch diet, insufficient clothing, cramped and dingy quarters, relentless, nerve-racking battles with price gougers and at times with callous, arbitrary county and State welfare officials—and with the medical profession.

Presently, 39 of the States have adopted medical care programs under State and Federal laws. California became the 39th State to adopt such a plan, only after due deliberations with the organized medical groups of the State. This became law in California on October 1, 1957. Federal laws were designed to aid the needy. Each succeeding Congress has strengthened these laws and enlarged the scope of coverage to include more age groups, to enhance their income to meet their needs to survive. All these laws, State and national, were promulgated and adopted in the hope that these needy people might be helped to be more useful and to lead less precarious lives. The recipients and beneficiaries of social security under the law are not wage earners and must not be confused with wage earners.

How does organized medicine react to all this? The California medical assistance care program, known as bill No. 679, and the Forand bill, which is now known as H.R. 4700, which are directly linked up with the medical welfare program of our American people and are currently before legislative bodies, created such a furor among the doctors of California and the Nation, that there is a rumble in the ranks of organized medicine both on a local and national scale. In this regard the spotlight is on the Forand bill which is only one of many such bills, and the official stand of the American Medical Association is that it objects to this bill. The medical leadership of the local, State, and national organizations suddenly term these medical welfare programs, "The Itch To Regulate," "The CIO–AFL Socialized Medical Concoctions, etc." The ire is so great that much misinformation and distortion of facts have been fed to the rank and file medical membership and to the Nation as a whole, by certain powerful political segments of the organized medical profession. The AMA opposes any Federal legislation which would provide hospitalization and medical benefits under the social security program, and is therefore vehemently opposed to the Forand bill. It even created a "Task Force" to direct active, effective, opposition to such welfare measures.

The past president of our AMA and the spokesmen for our organization admit that the pressure for expansion of the social security system into the area of health and medical care benefits is formidable; that the Members of Congress will inevitably support such legislation because of pressure from their constituents, especially those over 65, who will be favorably impressed by the immediate benefits to be gained. Also, that the workers of America, the most dynamic segment of the national labor force, are for such legislation. On the other hand Dr. Allman states, "Allied with the AMA in its opposition are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Retailers' Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Life Insurance Industries, the National Association of Manufacturers, and innumerable other organizations and individual citizens who are opposed to Government intervention into medical and other "private affairs."

The health of the people is the concern of all the people, not just politicians, big industrial concerns, or the medical profession. Virchow, the great German pathologist, at the turn of the century argued, "Medicine is a social science, and politics is nothing else but medicine on a large scale." Medical science has become highly specialized and highly technical. It has progressed more in the past 50 years than ever before in history. We have learned to do marvelous operations, transplant kidneys, corneas, do open-heart operations. We have invented extraordinary apparatus like nuclear microscopes and atom-powered X-rays. But so far as social medical advancement is concerned, our medical notions and the medical profession of America are years behind time.

How valid is the objecton of organized medicine to social security and its programs? Isn't it a fact that bankers, industrialists, lawyers, farmers, dentists, and other groups (except the medical profession) which have as much at stake in the free enterprise system as the medical profession, are quite pleased to get social security coverage? Their acceptance of these benefits has not led to any public outcry that banks be nationalized, business enterprises socialized, or farms collectivized. Moreover, the objection of organized medicine to having the Government help those citizens who need it most, is that it makes it embarrassing for many individual physicians, and for the medical profession on a national level. Our medical leadership persists in explaining its enthusiasm for the Jenkins-Keogh type of tax-deferment plan because it favors the medical profession most, and at the same time tells Congress that social security is socialistic. American medicine goes to great lengths to point out gaps and deficiencies in the social security program. Of course there are. There are gaps and deficiencies in private enterprise too. For example, physicians and others who have serious ailments and need insurance most, are often turned down by private insurance companies, or have to pay exorbitant premiums if and when they are accepted for insurance coverage.

Social security has become a part of our American way of life, and the nation's top economists and insurance experts agree that it can be operated on a self-sustaining basis. The medical profession is the only agency that can ruin this program by demanding absurd, unreasonable, and exorbitant fees for services performed. It is absurd to think that the fate of our children and grandchildren is dependent upon whether we physicians do or do not participate in social security programs and their benefits, as advocated by some medical leadership.

The rules that govern the economic life of our Nation also apply to the doctor. Today medicine is big business. In 1958 AMA investments of nearly $10 million earned $362,064 in dividends; membership dues brought in $5,393,378 and advertising in the AMA Journals grossed $5,893,100. It can be seen that organized medicine runs into many millions more. As for the hospital and the pharmaceuticals take, the record throughout the nation speaks for itself. Yes, today medicine is a service, a commodity which is purchased under our competitive system.

In this scheme of affairs the doctor is exploited like all other Americans living under the same economic system. We are constantly reminded by some segments of our society that, "doctors have always given services to indigent sick even to the detriment of the medical profession, and purely from humanitarian motives." This may have been the case many years ago when the economic life of our Nation was of a different nature. Now we are definitely creating a myth which on close study is contradictory to the realities of life. Doctors hate to admit the fact that medicine today follows the line of trade. As physicians we try hard not to be dragged into the economic sphere of life, but as human beings and as a segment of our society, our efforts in this respect are wanting, and most of the time are in vain.

Isn't it unrealistic to imagine that a gesture by some 200,000 physicians in organized medicine out of a population of approximately 180 million would somehow halt the wheels of progress? If we are so afraid of socialized medicine (which has been with us for more than 25 years in some form or another) it would seem that our chances of warding off this dreaded event would be enhanced if our profession would integrate with the American people, and not stand aloof and apart from them by promulgating all sorts of obstacles aimed against the people in expressing their opinion as to the peoples' health problem. We physicians have our opinions as to health problems, but we must realize that the people also have their opinions on the subject.

The generosity of big business, industrial giants, and certain commercial insurance companies is indeed commendable in advocating various private schemes for aiding our indigent and sick oldsters. But charity in any form proves to be an unreliable, unworthy, and unsatisfactory system of protecting the peoples' health. Funds are always needed for this purpose and during times of economic depression are not readily available or forthcoming as evidenced by the 1932 depression. Americans do not want charity. At no time is it possible for charity to provide adequate medical care. The people's health cannot be protected adequately or efficiently under purely commercial systems of medical care. The American people do not expect charity or pity in any form, and abhor the paternalism of big business, which also includes the medical profession. What the American people do expect and want is the opportunity to earn a decent living with job security, no matter what age bracket one may be in. Only in this way will the American citizen be able to support himself and his loved ones, and enjoy the truly American way of life we hear so much about these days.

Throughout the years American medicine has taken on numerous tarnsformations. In the realm of scientific medicine, the tarnsformation has been excellent; in the realm of social medicine, especially the socio-medical, economico-medical and politico-medical phases it has constantly trailed. Has American medicine answered the call of the American people for a better life? Medicine has infinitely more to give than it actually bestows. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "The great thing in this world is not so much where we stand as it is in what direction we are going." It's about time that American medicine ceases to follow the tail of human events. Its choice of direction is the great challenge to American medicine today.

Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12381) to increase for 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of H.R. 12381, it is difficult for me to vote against this measure, sponsored by the Ways and Means Committee and its outstanding and distinguished chairman, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills.

Last year I voted against the temporary increase in the statutory debt limit for the reason that the administration could reduce its spending to the extent of the increase. The same situation now exists. Nearly the full amount could be saved by proper unification of the armed services. More savings could be made by eliminating the waste and extravagance in our foreign aid program. In addition, if the high interest rate policy of the administration were reversed, no extension would be necessary.

Because I feel that the administration should be compelled to effectively unify the armed services and because it may do so if this measure is defeated, I expect to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12381 also continues in effect the excise taxes imposed during wartime on telephone service, transportation of persons, and in other areas, which I believe constitute a burden on business as well as the consumer.

With all due respect to Chairman MILLS and his excellent committee, I feel I must vote against this measure as not in the best interests of the economy of our country.

The Ideological Battlefield: The West and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very important article which just appeared in the Free World Forum, written by Adm. Adolphus Staton. Admiral Staton is a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor and the Navy Cross. Hs is one of the collaborators of the Moral Rearmament Assembly. I know that every American would greatly profit by reading this article. Leaders of the free world everywhere should read and reread this article, for it contains the true solution to world peace. I wish to thank the eminent editor of the Free World Forum, Dr. Z. Michael Szaz for bringing this statement of moral responsibility to my attention.

The article follows:

[From the Free World Forum, April–May 1960]

THE IDEOLOGICAL BATTLEFIELD: THE WEST AND COMMUNISM

(By Adolphus Staton)

As leaders of the free world meet with Khrushchev at the forthcoming summit conference, it is appropriate, once again, to emphasize that we are in a world war and that our freedom is at stake. This war is being waged on four recognized battlefields—political, military, economic, and psychological. Speaking from the experience of 40 years of naval service, and as a graduate of both Army and Navy War Colleges, I am convinced that this war can be won or lost on any of these battlefields.

It is to the last-mentioned, the psychological, that our special attention must be given. The emergence of the ideology of communism, with its rapid expansion among nations as a weapon of world conquest, belongs to this category. Khrushchev has publicly boasted that the Communists are winning the war against the free nations and that they owe their success to their ideology. The success of international communism in the past 50 years is truly frightening.

Unfortunately, the free world has had no recognized, unified, and trained force operating in the same field of ideology. All nations and peoples are targets of the Soviet march to world conquest. Under this heavy threat, it is easy to see that every nation must share in our mutual defense. But more important is the need for the free world to move into the offensive in the ideological field.

NO IDEOLOGICAL COMPROMISE POSSIBLE

Three questions, boldly faced and answered, can put matters in their proper perspective on the eye of this summit conference.

First, why can there be no ideological compromise between the free world and communism? Second, can the free world find an ideological platform from which to answer communism? Third, what is the evidence of effective positive action in the field of ideology?

To the first question, "Is ideological compromise possible?" the answer is a ringing "No".

Communism is an ideology with one definite, unvarying objective—world conquest; its tactics may switch, but its aims remain the same. On August 20, 1950, Radio Moscow stated: "From the point of view of Communist morality, only those acts are moral which contribute to the building of a new Communist society."

When the men of Moscow urge upon us "peaceful coexistence," they do so with the firm intention of continuing to advance toward their world goal through economic and cultural exchanges geared to that objective. "Peaceful coexistence" is but a temporary tactic in a global war.

In 1946 Molotov clearly outlined Communist policy when he said:

"We are not fighting America as yet. But once we deprive her of her markets, crisis will follow and cause confusion. After we have taken her markets in Europe, expelled her from Asia and elsewhere, she will have no market for her merchandise. She will curtail her production and then will follow unemployment. Our opportunity to square accounts with America will be at hand."

The World Marxist Review for December 1959, stated:

"Marxism-Leninism teaches: Nobody and nothing can halt the march of history which is leading to the triumph of communism. • • • Conflict between the bourgeois and the proletarian ideologies is inevitable. In this struggle the Communists will never retreat a single step from the principles of Communism, and will never abandon this struggle."

Another unpleasant reality challenges the free world. Communism knows well how to exploit the moral weaknesses of leaders and ordinary men alike. Chou En-lai has said, "We can slip in our Communist ideology through the weak spots in men's character." Lenin once stated, "We postpone operations until the moral disintegration of the enemy makes the delivery of the mortal blow both possible and easy." Any person who is not clear morally can be taken over

and used knowingly or unknowingly by communism.

From these considerations one thing is clear. Ideological compromise with communism by the free world is suicidal. Coexistence without a superior ideology inevitably leads to no existence, that is, to a Communist takeover. This has already been the tragic history of nation after nation.

AN IDEOLOGICAL ANSWER TO COMMUNISM

Now comes the second question, "Can we find an ideological platform to answer communism?" This time the answer is a confident "Yes." Bearing in mind the nature and aims of communism, it is important to consider what must be the nature and aims of an answering ideology.

Dr. Frank Buchman, the initiator of the ideology of Moral Re-Armament, has said: "Could it be that the hate, greed, fear, and selfishness which create confusion and division in our society, are the strength and essence of communism? Millions who would never join the Communist Party make its advance inevitable by the way they live."

The nations of freemen therefore must learn to cure these destructive forces in the human heart. In other words, the answering ideology must be a moral ideology.

It is my profound conviction, based not only on firsthand experience, but on conclusive evidence from many nations, that such a superior ideology exists. It is the ideology of Moral Re-Armament. There is a trained and dedicated force already in being.

Men vitally concerned with the defense of the free world—soldiers, scientists, statesmen—share this conviction.

The free world lost a great fighter on the recent death of General Guisan, wartime hero and commander in chief of the Swiss Army. Last year he wrote a foreword to the Swiss edition of the MRA handbook, Ideology and Co-Existence.[1]

"On the ideological plane neutrality can be dangerous, for refusal to fight for what is right plays the enemy's game. I long that our whole people should face realistically the forces which confront each other today, that we draw from our traditions a relentless determination to safeguard at all costs the freedoms we inherit."

In August 1959, Air Commodore Blair-Oliphant, director of weapons engineering of the British Air Ministry, said:

"World War III is a total war, because it is an ideological war that is being fought for the hearts and minds of men and nations. There is only one answer and that is Moral Re-Armament. In Britain, the Communist line is, 'Better Red than dead.' In America the line is, 'Coexistence or war.' But the real choice for America and Britain is whether we continue to allow communism to advance or whether we will match it with the superior ideology of Moral Re-Armament."

Mr. Eudocio Ravines—founder of the Communist Party of Peru who broke with communism and exposed its tactics in his book, "The Yenan Way"—speaking at the 1959 Moral Re-Armament World Assembly in Mackinac Island, Mich., declared:

"There is need for an ideology—a superior thinking that will satisfy the hunger for the absolute which burns in the heart of the illiterate and the educated alike. That is why Moral Re-Armament can and must make possible a new type of revolution—a revolution of the spirit. The only thing that can defend our hemisphere at this time when we face the greatest danger of our history is ideological armament. The task for all of us is to advance Moral Re-Armament throughout this hemisphere and the whole world."

Scientists say that the world can now be destroyed between the lunch and the cocktail hour. We need, of course, to maintain our armed, scientific, and productive strength. We need to develop them. But, as Admiral Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, once said: "The most we can do by these means is to buy time. Victory must be won by other means."

"What is basically an ideological struggle," says Dr. Douglass Cornell, Executive Officer of the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C., "can be won only by a superior ideology. Moral Re-Armament is that ideology."

ORIGINS OF MORAL RE-ARMAMENT

Dr. Frank Buchman, the father of Moral Re-Armament, was born in Pennsylvania. One of his ancestors fought at Valley Forge. Another was the first to enlist in Lincoln's army. For half a century Dr. Buchman has been building on a world scale a trained and dedicated force of men and women who have proved in their own lives that human nature can be changed, and are one in their commitment to restore God to leadership in the lives of men and nations.

He has told how, in 1938, he was walking in the Black Forest in Germany near Freudenstadt:

"The world was on the edge of chaos," he said. "Just as today, everyone longed for peace and prepared for war.

"As I walked in those quiet woods, one thought kept coming to me—'moral and spiritual rearmament, moral and spiritual rearmament. The next great movement in the world will be a movement of moral rearmament for all nations.'

"A few days later I was in London in the East End where the British Labor movement began. The workers responded. Moral Re-Armament went to the world."

The new type of man that Moral Re-Armament is producing finds that the basic problem is not economic, but moral. The four moral standards—absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, absolute love—make it possible to decide issues on the basis of what is right and not who is right.

This is the alternative to the class struggle, whose grip can only be broken by men and women armed with the strategy, the unity, and the commitment of a superior ideology. This comes through the acceptance of the guidance of God when every man can know the immediate action he can and must take.

Needless to say, the Communists themselves recognize Moral Re-Armament for what it is and attack it bitterly and constantly. Speaking this month at the Moral Re-Armament assembly in Caux, Switzerland, Mr. Ole Bjorn Kraft, Vice President of the Danish Parliament and former chairman of NATO, said that in recent weeks 50 Soviet newspapers, such as Pravda, Izvestia, and Trud, have carried attacks on Moral Re-Armament. But even as they make these attacks, Communists have been forced grudgingly to acknowledge the power of MRA. Moscow and Taskent radio in 1953 warned the Communists of the world:

"Moral Re-Armament is a global ideology with bridgeheads in every nation in its final phase of total expansion throughout the world. It substitutes for the inevitable class war the eternal struggle between good and evil. It has the power to capture radical, revolutionary minds."

Attacks, however, only serve to show the effectiveness of Moral Re-Armament. Wherever in the world the two ideologies have come face to face, communism has been thrown on the defensive.

EFFECTS OF MORAL RE-ARMAMENT

What is the evidence of such positive action in the field of ideology? Here is the third question.

To this world statesmen provide the answer. Chancellor Adenauer of Germany and Robert Schuman, former Prime Minister of France and architect of the Schuman plan for Western Europe, both have testified to the part played by Moral Re-Armament in creating unity between their countries, divided by three bitter wars in less than a century. As a sign of their appreciation, both countries have conferred high decorations on Dr. Frank Buchman. Schuman wrote:

"Moral Re-Armament brings us a philosophy of life applied in action. It is the beginning of a far-reaching transformation of society in which the first steps have already been taken. My plan will never succeed unless hearts are changed on both sides of the Rhine."

Chancellor Adenauer in 1951 wrote to Dr. Buchman: "In recent months we have seen the conclusion, after some difficult negotiations, of important international agreements. Here, also, Moral Re-Armament has played an unseen but effective part in bridging differences of opinion between the negotiating parties." In June 1958, in another of his many messages to Dr. Buchman, Dr. Adenauer wrote: "Now is the time to work more strongly than ever for European unity through Moral Re-Armament. Unless the work of Moral Re-armament is carried forward, peace in the world cannot be maintained."

Less than 2 years ago Cyprus was a powder keg in the Mediterranean. Moral rearmament helped to bring about the end of bloodshed and the beginning of healing between British, Greeks, and Turks. The President-elect, Archbishop Makarios, leader of the Greek community, has stated: "We had the opportunity to follow closely the work of moral rearmament and particularly appreciate its contributions to the solution of the Cyprus problem."

Dr. Kutchuk, Vice President-elect and leader of the Turkish community, said: "Your power of reconciling countries and of giving a strong moral foundation to every nation is what Cyprus needs at this very crucial hour in her history. Today we see how the different communities can live together."

Sir Hugh Foot, British Governor of Cyprus, told an MRA delegation: "Cyprus will be regarded in the future not as a source of trouble but as a symbol of how trouble can be overcome. We congratulate you on your contribution."

Another victory for democracy was won in the province of Kerala in southern India. Here, too, moral rearmament played a decisive part. Kerala had elected a Communist government. Rioting and violence were erupting all over the province. All of India and all of the non-Communist world feared that the fate of Kerala might become the fate of all India. But, as a result of the activity of the moral rearmament forces in the province, the various political factions were drawn together to present a common front, which won a victory over communism in the elections.

Padmanabhan, leader of the liberation movement which ousted the Communists, has said: "Kerala can never be grateful enough to the ideology of MRA. Through transforming human nature it is answering forever the onrushing menace of communism."

In the Far East, Niro Hoshijima, senior member of the Japanese Diet, stated in January 1959: "History will record five events in the Pacific which have been brought about by the spirit of MRA—

---

[1] Seventy-five million copies of this handbook in 24 languages have gone out to every home in Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, the Scandinavian countries and Switzerland, and to key areas of Africa, Asia, Australia, and Latin America. It has also gone to every home in Washington, D.C., and is being widely distributed throughout America.

1. Reconciliation between Japan and the Philippines and payment of reparation by Japan;

2. Relaxation of tension between Japan and Formosa;

3. Wresting of power from the Communists in the Seinendan (the 4,300,000-strong youth organization of Japan);

4. Signing of Japan's reparation agreements with Indonesia and Vietnam;

5. Giving the basis for diplomatic talks between Japan and South Korea.

Chancellor Adenauer, himself a close friend of Dr. Frank Buchman, in his courageous fight against ideological compromise offers a lesson to other leaders of the free world. When in the Ruhr industrial area between 1948 and 1952 the Communist vote in the works' councils dropped from 72 percent to 8 percent. Chancellor Adenauer spoke of this as "the test of the effectiveness of moral rearmament." His bold initiative in commissioning a force of German miners trained in moral rearmament to carry around the world their dramatized presentation of the superior ideology in the MRA play, "Hoffnung" (Hope), demonstrates Adenauer's realization of the need for a positive offensive by the democracies.

United in statesmanship with Dr. Adenauer is Prime Minister Kishi of Japan. Under the inspiration of moral rearmament he has put into practice what he has called "the statesmanship of the humble heart." In 1958 he visited nine southeast Asian countries, former enemies of Japan, and in each apologized for the wrongs done by his nation. Kishi's message to the 1959 moral rearmament assembly at Mackinac Island, Mich., stated:

"The democracies are on the defensive because of the lack of a moral ideology superior to communism. In the ideological war there is no neutrality nor coexistence. The leaders of the free nations must pay serious attention to the work of moral rearmament throughout the world if we are to win in the decisive struggle for the future of mankind."

Dr. Hans Koch, who was Chancellor Adenauer's adviser on Soviet affairs, said:

"What Moscow feared most was the ideology which could unite countries as far apart as Japan and Germany; which could unite all other nations with these two; which could unite free East and West and black and white in an ideological answer to communism. Moral rearmament is preparing the way for the next great phase in history. It provides the platform where East and West, Germany and France, the Anglo-Saxons and the colored races unite.

During his recent visit to Japan, Chancellor Adenauer joined Prime Minister Kishi in receiving German miners who had brought their play "Hoffnung" to Japan. This play, since its commissioning by the Chancellor, had been welcomed in many parts of Europe and Asia. Notable among these were the Catholic monasteries of Switzerland.

Eleven U.S. Senators cabled Chancellor Adenauer for support to "cement the unity of our two countries," by sending the moral rearmament play, "Hoffnung" to Washington: We warmly invite the miners to bring their play to Washington this spring, and would value your support for this important ideological move."

The great French Catholic philosopher, Gabriel Marcel,[2] has evaluated the work of moral rearmament in these words:

"What seems to me really marvelous and providential is the connection that has come about between Moral Re-Armament and the young nations which are now being born into freedom. I believe that in this, as in other instances, Frank Buchman has truly shown prophetic insight. And here I would like to emphasize what seems to me of great significance: that the leaders of these young states have preserved an awareness (which we Europeans have almost entirely lost) of the link which must exist between politics and moral principles."

John Amata, revolutionary African leader, speaking this month at the Moral Re-Armament Easter Conference in Caux, Switzerland, said: "Today when all Africa is inviting the white man to leave, leaders from all over the continent are inviting the MRA leader, Dr. Frank Buchman, and the force of moral rearmament to come." Mr. Amata told delegates from 29 countries that official invitations had been extended to Dr. Buchman by the Sultan of Morocco, the Emperor of Ethiopa, the President of Cameroon, the President of Dahomey, and the President of Liberia, as well as national leaders of Nigeria and the Belgian Congo, to visit their countries.

The question naturally arises: How is such a vast operation financed? Moral rearmament is entirely financed through voluntary contributions, made out of sacrifice, not surplus, by thousands of people in the free nations who are convinced of the basic necessity of this answer.

It should be emphasized that MRA is an ideology which enhances the primary loyalties of every man's own faith and is in competition with none. Christians, Moslems, Jews, Hindus—men indeed of every faith—find in Moral Re-Armament the unity of a common dedication to a global task.

Think what it would mean at the summit conference for Khrushchev to face men who were strong in the knowledge that behind each of them stood a nation united by the force of a superior ideology; that in every detail of their own lives there was the moral clarity of that ideology; and that with their fellow leaders of the free nations they were standing united, shoulder to shoulder, in a commitment to remake the world. Against such men no materialistic ideology could prevail.

CONCLUSIONS

What, then, can each of us do to take our place on the ideological battlefield? For the ordinary man, as for the statesman, old ways of doing things, idealism, and genuine goodwill have of themselves proved to be outmoded weapons on today's ideological battlefield.

Khrushchev says, "We will bury you," but we don't need to make it easy for him by sticking our heads in the sand. Moral Re-Armament has the best answer to communism I know. In this cold war, which is an ideological war, every man, woman, and child must have a battle station. There is no distinction between home front and battle front. Everyone is now on the front line.

Today millions in every continent are responding to the challenge and promise of these words of Frank Buchman: "Human nature can be changed; that is the root of the answer. National economies can be changed; that is the fruit of the answer. World history can be changed; that is the destiny of our age."

[2] Marcel's latest book, "Un Changement d'Espérance" ("Fresh Hope for the World"), published in Paris (1959) and London (1960), presents a comprehensive account and evaluation of the work of Moral Re-Armament in world affairs.

Summit Costly to Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kansas City Kansan of May 19, 1960, which represents a viewpoint that I think is extremely important to our country:

SUMMIT COSTLY TO REDS

(By Leon Dennen)

PARIS.—What is the meaning of the summit disaster? Here are the words of a member of Premier Nikita Khrushchev's entourage:

"For Khrushchev the end of the summit was a political defeat and a personal tragedy.

"It may eventually cost him his leadership in the Kremlin.

"It certainly makes a shambles of his policy of peaceful coexistence and international relaxation on which he staked his career."

I first met the man who made these statements when he was in the United States during Khrushchev's tour. I encountered him again at the Palais de Chaillot where hundreds of correspondents from the four corners of the globe were milling about.

Speaking rapidly in Russian, he left no doubt of his opinion.

"I know that the West will interpret Khrushchev's adamant position as a sign of strength and an act of courage," he continued. "This will not be the first time the West has completely misread events in Russia.

"Khrushchev is no Stalin. He is not the master of the Soviet but its public relations man.

"He was ordered by the Presidium to torpedo the summit.

"Even if Eisenhower had crawled on all fours in apology for the spy plane Khrushchev could not have kept the summit alive."

From French Communist sources I also get the view that Khrushchev's position at home is uncertain. They called my attention to a Tass agency announcement that Soviet Finance Minister Arseny Zverev resigned because of "ill health." The terse announcement of the resignation and replacement were made after Khrushchev had already been in Paris for 3 days.

A French Red said:

"Imagine the stir it would cause if a news agency, however official, announced in Washington that the Secretary of the Treasury had resigned and was immediately replaced while Eisenhower was in Paris."

Who, then, the Red asked, decided to accept Zverev's resignation—"obviously the reshuffled Presidium, which now is sole authority in Russia today."

The consensus of experts on communism here is that Khrushchev will hold his job as Moscow's front man for the present but his fate may be decided at the extraordinary session of the party's central committee scheduled to meet in Moscow in July. They believe he might win out but he will have to fight hard to avoid defeat.

An interesting sidelight on the manner in which the summit was blown up is shed by French Communists, who told me that Khrushchev's declaration including the withdrawal of the Eisenhower invitation to Moscow was prepared in Moscow. Even translations of the text into English and French were brought here.

President Charles de Gaulle of France was tipped off to full contents of the declarations 2 days before the Big Four met at the Elysse Palace. His efforts to induce Khrushchev to soften his words failed because, my source said. "He had only one mandate from the Presidium: wreck the conference."

A follower of French Communist leader Maurice Thorez, long an opponent of Khrushchev and supporter of Mao Tse-tung, threw out this interesting statement:

"If you read in the next few weeks that Khrushchev has made a hurried trip to Pieping to consult with his friend, Mao Tse-tung, you will know whose voice now is strongest in the ranks of world communism."

Our Distinguished Colleague, Hon. Leo W. O'Brien of New York, Is Honored by His Alma Mater, Niagara University, in the Conferring on Him of an Honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a source of great joy and satisfaction whenever an honor comes to one of our colleagues. It is a special source of pride and satisfaction when the colleague who is honored is one who is held in universal respect and affection by all of his colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, and one whose record of accomplishment in this body so fully justifies any kind of honor that might be conferred upon him.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I take special pleasure in bringing to the attention of the House the fact that our friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who is also my neighbor, was honored last Sunday, June 5, by his own alma mater, Niagara University, in New York State, with an honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

Those of us who have had the privilege of serving in this body with the gentleman from New York know his warm and friendly personality; we know his eloquent command of the English language acquired through years spent in the newspaper profession before coming to this body, and we also know his tremendous qualities for leadership that have been demonstrated so fully in this body by his actions in pushing through the enabling legislation that made Alaska and Hawaii into our 49th and 50th States. I am sure we will want to congratulate our colleague for this new and well-deserved honor that has come to him. In fact, in honoring LEO O'BRIEN, Niagara University has honored itself in the character and the career of this outstanding and distinguished alumnus of hers, and has also indirectly honored this body of which Dr. O'BRIEN, as he now properly can be called, is such a distinguished an able Member.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the full text of the citation for the honorary degree awarded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]:

DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS—HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

The dissemination of truth is a tremendous task, a tremendous responsibility. One who would undertake such a task must divest himself of all personal interest, prejudice, and bias. His object must be the common good. Such a one has the making of a true statesman.

Today the avenues of truth are many: The press, radio, television, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

To be in control of these avenues of human expression and not to make a good use of them is to betray a trust that can only evoke from the mass of humanity a cry of dismay.

Fortunately, however, we have men who make the best use of these media; gentlemen who put aside selfish personal ambition and strive, through the best use of their personal talents and the available means of communication, to accomplish what they deem in conscience is best for the common good.

Today, Niagara University honors an uncompromising, unselfish alumnus, who from his newspaper, journalistic, and congressional experience has proven himself an instrument of the truth. His interest in his country and his zeal for its expansion have added Hawaii and Alaska to these United States of America.

Niagara University is proud that one of her graduates has attained national stature and confers upon the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN the degree, honoris causa, doctor of humane letters.

Civitan's Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Civitan International, which has as one of its many worthwhile objectives the building of good citizenship, sponsors an annual essay contest among the Nation's young people.

This year, the first place winner in this contest is a young lady from the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia, Miss Attalee Smith, of Gate City, in Scott County. She was sponsored by the Gate City Civitan Club.

Miss Smith's thought provoking essay is titled "Intercommunication as a Factor in Citizenship Building."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Miss Smith's essay, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

INTERCOMMUNICATION AS A FACTOR IN CITIZENSHIP BUILDING

"East is East, and West is West
And never the twain shall meet."

When Rudyard Kipling wrote these lines, they so accurately expressed the realities of his day that they became a famous epigram. But it is the next two succeeding lines which most nearly suggest our world today, characterized by terrific atomic explosions, rocket ships, and attempted visits to remote planets. Put the lines together—

"East is East, and West is West
And never the twain shall meet
'Till earth and sky stand presently
At God's great judgment seat."

Yes, at least the poet's words have, in one sense, become reality. East and West have met, but in their meeting the gap has become more enlarged. The modern methods of communication have made neighbors, but not friends, of all mankind. Our material resources are extensive, but the spiritual values, necessary for effective communication, have fallen short.

Charles Dickens, in perhaps his most frequently quoted passage, said of the period in which he lived: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair; we have everything before us, we have nothing before us."

In such a paradox, the age of Dickens is not unique. Now in the middle of the 20th century, there are again combined the best good and the worst evil, the brightest promises and the most dreadful threats.

Advances in scientific discoveries and inventions are continually opening up new possibilities. Such rapid material progress opens alternative roads ahead: The one promises an age of plenty in which poverty and disease will finally have been conquered. The second road can lead to the possible destruction of civilization.

What the destiny of the world will be is likely to be decided by the way the United States exercises the leadership which has come to rest upon it.

It has taken two World Wars to make the people realize the great responsibility the United States has in the world as a whole. A world community cannot exist merely by shortwave facilities scattered all over the globe; a more enduring foundation is necessary. The United States must take the lead in educating citizens equipped to relate themselves to all peoples, all over the world. An uninformed citizen is a hindrance to any society. "As a brain is no stronger than its weakest think, a nation is no stronger than its weakest citizen."

Such a conception of communication is basically exemplified by the family relationship. When a new member is initiated into the society of a family, his one, and often misunderstood, method of communication is that of cries and gestures. By trial and error, the newcomer's desires are finally determined and satisfied. He is, however, to a degree a burden to the family society, because his ability to communicate is inadequate.

So it is with minorities in our world society. Because we do not understand the problems of others, we cannot deal with them in a just manner. Even in our own country, America, the land of the free, many people are persecuted because of their color or beliefs. Do we really have a true democracy in America? Is our Nation really a land of freedom and justice for all? If, in America, we continue to tolerate conditions such as these, the road to world understanding presents a rough and rugged terrain.

Good citizenship begins in the home; it is here that we learn to communicate with others. Good citizenship demands the best utilization of the talents of the individual who will place above his own interest the interests of his fellow citizens and of the society of which he is a member.

On his tour of South America, President Eisenhower was accompanied by Lt. Col. Vernon Walters, an Army officer who learned Spanish as a child and Portuguese overnight by order of the Pentagon during World War II. This is an example of the lack of intercommunication between nations, a contributing factor to the many misunderstandings on an international level. If man could speak a common language he would be better equipped to be a good citizen of the world. Man certainly can't communicate adequately with someone with whom he cannot talk. If the family of nations could learn to communicate as closely as the members of the average family, surely we would be a step nearer to peace on earth.

The desire for peace is as young as the rainbow and as endless as time. Every man wants peace. If there is to be peace on earth, man must find peace within himself; he must understand himself before he understands others. Peace depends upon understanding, and understanding cannot be accomplished without effective intercommunication. Understanding and sympathy are the first requisites of all peaceful existence; intercommunication is the prime requisite of understanding.

Communication is merely relaying an impression from one being to another; intercommunication, as it relates to citizenship,

is the sharing of knowledge, ideas, and aspirations for the common good.

It has always been man's hope that one day his imagination, his ingenuity, and his intelligence would bring world peace; and, with peace, international citizenship would finally exist among men.

The indisputable fact that must be faced at once is that man, with all his imagination, his ingenuity, and his intelligence, must be able to communicate his thoughts and desires to other men, or they will die a slow death in the narrow cell of a single brain.

The only real objective of a dedicated citizen must be to accomplish a world of peace and happiness for all people. All people are citizens of some group, large or small. Man needs to be made wise enough and strong enough, possible only through effective intercommunication, to bring about a rule of law and justice for all people.

Man has demonstrated that he can stand against the massed power of class, race, or nation and that he can refuse to bow to Baal. He possesses God-given reason and the ability to love. It is only through intercommunication that he is able to let others know about this gift. The union of love and reason and the ability to communicate are the only assurance of victory.

The voice at Gettysburg, a single voice, must be communicated to the millions. It must be heard in Hungary, Russia, and Poland. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish, unless the people themselves lose faith in man and his ability to intercommunicate.

We must take off our blindfolds and see the world as a whole, and life as a flowing stream for all. In my short span of years, I have learned that the people I feared the most and those from whom I turned in awe were really simple human beings, who thought, breathed, dreamed, and wanted much the same things from life that I want. All that was needed to make us friends was an awareness of each others' problems, thoughts, and far-reaching desires. This was brought about through intercommunication.

I believe that if it were possible to communicate with world neighbors in much the same way our world problems might one day be solved. The outcome may well be determined by the advances which we are able to make in intercommunication. If we believe that what we have is worth great sacrifice, if we have a real understanding of the cost of freedom and a compelling vision of tomorrow's world, we will devote our time, abilities, and prayers to the principles of intercommunication for all men, regardless of locale, race, creed, or color.

It is up to us—to you and to me—whether the world community will remain a dream or whether it will become a reality.

The Lord has made us neighbors; let intercommunication make us friends.

Collectivization as Subterfuge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a study prepared by Dr. Walter Becher, a member of the Bavarian Landtag, which points out the subterfuge of collectivization in the Soviet Zone of Germany. You will note that this was prepared before the recent summit collapse. In my opinion, Dr. Becher's article is very enlightening:

COLLECTIVIZATION AS SUBTERFUGE—THE CONCEPT OF MOSCOW'S GERMAN POLICY

The comprehensive collectivization taking place in the Soviet Zone is not only a process of expropriation and pauperization subduing the rural population of central Germany—it is, above all, an act camouflaging the foreign policy of the East and resembles in significance the Berlin provocation and the peace treaty tactics. The "class struggle in the village" (according to Lenin) is added to the great political combat between the unfree and the free world. Besides the strong arm measures liquidating individual rights to farm property and harvest returns, the decision "for peace"—for communism—against the Federal Republic and German unity features dominantly. Since in Communist interpretation Socialist states can only conduct "just wars," even when bearing all the marks of otherwise "aggressive and imperialist wars," socialist states can therefore conclude only "just peace treaties," even when bearing all the marks of national rape. "If you are for peace, then you are also for collectivization (and against Adenauer)," reads one of the standard slogans addressed to the farmers confronting the alternative of collectivization and expropriation.

During the eighth plenary meeting of SED's Central Committee (from March 30 to April 2, 1960) Ulbricht stated: "It can be said that the DDR has liberated the farmers from any capitalist exploitation. * * * The progressive step made by the DDR farmers meets the very interests of peace in unison with the spirit of Camp David. By making the excellent decision to adopt the cooperative mode of work before the summit conference, the farmers have expressed their desire for a lasting peace, for a firm peace. They have contributed to a solid establishment of peace in the DDR and to making this country a bulwark of peace. Said occurrence is particularly important before the summit conference inasmuch as the farmers' move has frustrated all the machinations of Bonn to undermine the DDR. By joining the LPGs and creating village unity our farmers have dealt a serious blow to the warmongers of West Germany."

Hardly ever in the history of Marxist dialectics, which certainly does not lack its instances of muddled speculation, has the "negation of negations" or "identification of opposites until their abolition" been demonstrated so cynically, brazenly and deviously; but hardly ever in Marxist history has an act of economic terror been used more baldly for purposes of political subterfuge. Agricultural collectivization as a means of diverting attention is likewise no innovation since in most agricultural states, now of Communist structure, the bulk of the population and still remaining individual property has been drawn into the class struggle.

The farmer question has been the mainstay of Communist propaganda since the inception of Marxism. The German peasant revolts of the Middle Ages against feudalism and clergy (including Protestantism because of Luther's censure of the "thieving peasants"), against emporer and empire were presented as the prime example of suppressed class struggle. Peasant expropriation, socage, serfdom, forced service by cottagers and midget farmers—these terms are militant ones in the Communist vocabulary before the usurpation of power, and they live on for rhetorical purposes ever afterward. According to Adolf Damaschke, Saxon land reformer, the Soviet Zone constitutes within the framework of the East the "first state of the workers and farmers in German history." "The ancient peasant dream of Junker land being turned into farmers' land" is the slogan utilized to ultimately transfer all land into the ownership of a single feudal master, the omnipotent and monolithic state.

The Communist Manifesto of more than a century ago states: "Among all classes * * * only the proletariat is a truly revolutionary class. * * * The middle class * * * the peasant, they all fight the bourgeoisie to assure their existence as a middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Still more, they are reactionary." Karl Marx in his book "Das Kapital" shows his recognition of a most important economic-political factor in the Communist structural transormation, which prompts accelerated industrialization and comprehensive peasant expropriation in the various agricultural countries: "The capitalist mode of production is based upon land expropriation * * * creates an outlawed peasantry as the necessary labor supply for the factories in the cities." For communism, in form and structure an adaptation of early capitalism, from which the social market economy and industrialized society of the West has progressively deviated, the "emancipation of the the progressive farmers" into the "higher forms of collective work" was but a brutal act of camouflaging the creation of an uprooted industrial proletariat and of reducing the remaining independent farmers to agricultural wage earners.

The peasants are the great victim of the Bolshevist coup d'etat. Not Lenin's handful of professional revolutionaries and Peterburg workers and soldiers brought the czarist system to its downfall; the revolution came about only due to the peasants, their hunger for land, their miserable status, their longing for peace in a war incomprehensible to them. But already one of the first laws issued by SNK (Sovnjarkom, i.e., Council of People's Commissars)—the decree of November 7, 1917—though expropriating the feudal lords without indemnity and handing over their land to the peasants for gratuitous use—nationalized the ownership of all land. Initial collectivization endeavors did not get on. The obligatory delivery quota became the first heavy mortgage on farm life. "Carry the class struggle into the village. Fight the kulaks mericelessly," was Lenin's inflammatory slogan, which decimated the peasantry. The NEP interim (new economic policy) was followed by Stalin's fight for the Lenin heritage, a fight covering up the collectivization drive decided by the 50th party congress. The process is one of the most cruel periods in domestic Soviet affairs. Even Stalin, when exchanging reminiscences with Churchill in 1943, calls it a "terrible struggle," and Kennan, shifting between ludic vision and solid self-deception, reports that Stalin had his wife Svetlana killed for trying to intervene in favor of the peasants.

A frightful famine, the forced deportation of 5 million farmers, gigantic migrations from the country to the cities, the tragic fate of the besprisorni (homeless children), a 50-percent reduction in livestock and harvest returns, the rationing of bread until 1934 are the circumstances accompanying the utter terror of that forced collectivization. From the middle of 1928 until spring 1929, a million private farmers were caught by the murderous campaign, the figure rising to 2 million in the fall of that year, to 4 million at the outset of 1930, to approximately 11 million a month later. In an article "Dizzy With Success" Stalin explained the monstrous abuses by throwing the responsibility on the shoulders of his overzealous agents. After a short interval the procedure went on unmitigated. By 1933 already two-thirds, by 1936 nine-tenths of the rural population of 75 million souls had been pressed into 250,000 Kolkozes. The 1935 "Model Statute for Agricultural Artels" establishes the three forms of collectiviza-

tion: the kolkhoz (kollektivnoje Khasaistvo), the machine-tractor-station, abbreviated MTS (maszino-traktornaja stancija) and the sovkhoz (sovietskoje khasaistvo). The first form consists, besides the collectively cultivated area, of privately cultivated lots—usually 25–50 acres—and a very complicated system of remuneration based on "working days" (trudodjen). Turning agricultural labor completely into wage earners (as in the sovkhozes) would have far surpassed the financial strength of the state at that time. Said forms subsequently reappear—faithfully copied as to their relentless drive and integral terror—in some of the people's democracies. The merciless procedure, however, achieved the following: the party, its very existence or ruin depending on the struggle's outcome, was tied to Stalin, "the sources of a possible revival of capitalism were choked, new conditions for building up socialism were established" (short introduction to the history of the CPSU).

A newly created proletariat was driven into the urban industrial combines, the propertyless farmer became, once again, an "outlawed" land proletarian, a "dead soul." Those in the know estimate the population loss during that outrageous period at roughly 10 million dead. The ensuing era of "socialism advancing to communism"—interrupted for a while by the short-lived Malenkov regime—began with the 21st party congress. Kolkhozes transformed into sovkhozes, concentration of cooperatives, artels limited to garden patches, a standard delivery price, the progressive performance wage at an increased work norm remunerated in currency only—all these changes presage complete pauperization up to Khrushchev's agro city or agro commune, institutionalizing board and lodging, the training of children, the use of leisure time, exemplified—with the Marxist leap ahead—by the Chinese communes. The 1959 Comecon conferences to synchronize the 7-year plans, Khrushchev's tireless drive for the new agro structure in the people's republics, finally the agriculture meeting of the Communist and workers parties in February 1960, sharpen everywhere the class struggle in the village, not for a primary purpose, but to force all states into the great struggle between East and West. The West's effort to ward off such a design can then always be interpreted as being only an attack, an aggressive move against the peaceful construction of socialism, against peace generally. Thus the renewed class struggle in the village is an ubiquitous device to camouflage the provocation of the free world.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, later this year, the Post Office Department will issue a "Champion of freedom" postage stamp honoring the centennial anniversary of the birth of Ignacy Jan Paderewski of Poland. This will take place here in Washington on Paderewski's birthday, November 6.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a brief sketch about Paderewski and his close connection with our own freedom.

The statement follows:

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

The year 1960 marks the centennial of Paderewski's birthday. Americans of Polish descent and all Americans will not only honor his memory but the freedom and justice seekers over the civilized world will pause to pay respects to one of the 20th centuries great men—a musician, composer statesman and humanitarian. To the world Ignace Paderewski was first a musician, world's greatest piano recitalist.

He was born on November 6, 1860 in Kurylowka, Podolia Poland. From an early age he showed musical talent, and his basic musical training was under the direction of great teachers at the Conservatory at Warsaw, then at Berlin and finally at Vienna under contemporary living piano teacher Leschetizky. Paderewski made his debut in Paris in the year of 1888 which proved in every respect a sensation. In 1891 he made his appearance at New York City and his recital was received with acclaim. At his Pittsburgh, Pa. debut in 1893 the music critic described his personality as the main factor and the essential attribute to his success; while another wrote of him "He is the great poet of the pianoforte. All his work seems to be done by his wrists and fingers which appear slender and delicate. His hair would mark him in any gathering but were it not for his gold cloud which stands out and makes him a conspicuous object for attention he could appear to be slender rather fragile young man."

PADEREWSKI LEADER AND FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

With the outbreak of World War I, 1914 Paderewski devoted all of his energies toward raising of relief fund for Polish refugees. As the conflict progressed, he realized that if there was to be a free and independent Poland and it was to receive world's recognization as a nation, a concentrated movement toward the end was of paramount need. Practically all factions advocating Polish nationalism agreed that Paderewski was the only man that could unite all parties.

When the Polish Falcons and representatives of other Polish organizations in United States held a convention in Pittsburgh in April 1–4, 1917 at the Polish Falcons Hall No. 97, South 18th Street, there was unamity of opinion of need of leadership that would have contact with the world powers, especially with the United States.

PADEREWSKI'S APPEAL

The appeal went to Paderewski to take the leadership of Poles in the United States and abroad. Upon receiving the formal invitation he responded to the call and on April 2, 1917, appeared before the jammed Falcon Auditorium. The enthusiasm was unprecedented as he mounted the rostrum to speak. To the assembled Polish Falcons he spoke to the effect that if Poland was to be freed it would not be because of politicians, but only by a fighting sword.

He added "I have fullest confidence in United States, because of peoples' constant belief in ideals and surness of future, especially I am depending with fullest trust in President Woodrow Wilson whom I regard as the greatest living mortal among men. Again I assert I have placed my implicit trust in him. As I address you there exists a state of war between United States and Germany although no formal declaration has been made.

"In a few days you will be obliterated in the same manner as your brothers and sons, who are unknown in the European armies despite the fact that there are 2½ million fighting in the European front. Therefore, I call upon you now to form an army of Kosciuszko to fight beside the American forces.

"Therefore, with your permission I will take this opportunity to make a motion that the Polish Falcons of America offer to President Wilson 100,000 men to serve in the U.S. forces and to be known as Kosciuszko Army. I do not know if the offer will be accepted but this will be a proud moment in the Polish Falcons history."

President Wilson did accept the offer with fullest appreciation and gratitude and the Polish Falcons were ready to fight with the American forces. Because Russia was still an ally of the United States, any attempts to accept such an organized Polish Nationalist armed body was viewed as inimical to good diplomatic relationships and the offer was held in abeyance. It was not until October 8, 1917, after abdication of the czarist government that President Woodrow Wilson gave a formal consent for recruitment of the Polish Armed Forces in the United States.

The formation of the Polish Army was an idea conceived in Pittsburgh, and was the chief factor which led Paderewski to represent newly created Poland at signing of the Versailles Treaty and to be the first Prime Minister of modern Poland. This army fought with the allies in France 1917 and later in Poland against the Communists 1918–20.

On June 27, 1941 when returning from speech making at a Polish Army veterans outing at Oak Ridge, N.J., Paderewski took ill and died on June 29. He was buried with full military honors at Arlington Cemetery. Eventually he will be reinterred in Poland. It is therefore fitting and proper that the commemorative stamp will be issued by the United States in the fall marking this great champion of freedom in his 100th anniversary of his birthday November 6, 1960.

How Shall We Govern Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under approval of the House, I am including an informative and interesting address delivered by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, on the occasion of the commencement exercises at Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tenn.

I am sure Members of the House and Senate will appreciate the opportunity to read this splendid statement:

The honor you have given me today is one I shall cherish all my life.

May I begin by expressing my profound gratitude to the board of trustees of Tusculum College.

Like all who know Tusculum College, I deeply admire this institution. It is a shining example of the greatness of higher education in our country.

In its 166 years of service, this college and its graduates have played a notable part in our Nation's incredible progress.

Standing here in this beautiful setting, where the highest standards of education and nature appear so perfectly blended, one can well understand the inspiration that comes to those who live, teach and study here.

Equally understandable is the ennobling and enduring influence that rises from the

opportunity to be associated, as student or faculty member, with a great humanist and scholar such as Dr. Raymond Rankin.

He is of the men who have enriched America with their genius beyond measure.

It is also a matter of real pride to me, as your Postmaster General, that our very able postmaster of the great post office in New York City, Dr. Robert K. Christenberry, is one of your distinguished alumni and a member of the board of trustees.

In considering this commencement occasion, it has occurred to me that the subject matter might be taken for granted. It would be easy to say to the members of this graduating class: There is great opportunity for success in America today. You are outstandingly prepared, scholastically, to build a fine career. Work hard, using well what you have learned, and you will achieve your goals.

This is time-honored advice that would be well meant and, I am sure, well received.

But the fact is, it would be only a half-truth. And indeed, the members of this class would quickly recognize it as such.

For this college itself has taught that more—much more—is involved in the opportunity and the obligation which fall upon the individual in this Republic.

I have noted, with great pleasure, that the Tusculum statement of purpose declares that its course of study "seeks to develop judgments, principles and experiences meaningful in preparation for fruitful living, and useful sevrice, in the complex social order."

Useful service, in these times as never before, means participation—intelligent and devoted participation—in the administration of this free society, through its government and its laws.

It means individual responsibility for taking part in the momentous decisions that will determine the course of this Nation tomorow, and in these years ahead.

This is a challenge of first magnitude. I want to talk with you briefly about it—and then I would dare to suggest, with a sense of urgency, the part you can play in meeting it.

In the past week we have seen again, in raw exposure, the great menace to the free world presented by the godless forces of communism.

Our President has met this venomous display with a firm dignity and a stanch dedication to world responsibility; and we may be proud that the whole American people have reflected this response.

We cannot, and will not, underestimate the danger before us. We must keep ourselves invincibly strong in every respect.

We have maintained a military power that is the greatest deterrent force on earth. We shall continue to do so.

But this is not, by any means, the whole of the challenge.

Physical strength is not enough. Our future will hinge as well on the economic and moral strength of this Nation and its people. And here the danger lies within ourselves—within what we do or fail to do over these months and years just before us, in the administration of this society of ours.

I say to you that the crucial decisions to be made are yours. We face, in this country today, a problem more grave than the threat of force expressed in the bluster of the leader of the Soviet Union. It is more serious because we assume less urgency to defend against it; and because, if we do not meet it squarely, no amount of military defense can keep us strong. We shall weaken fearfully the foundations upon which all our strength is built.

Let me define this problem by making two observations that are well known to you.

The first is that Government policy vitally affects the economy of any Nation. In a dictator state, of course, the effect is absolute. But even in a republic with a free enterprise system, the Government literally determines the broad conditions under which the economy shall operate.

The second point is that, in a republic, the elected representatives of the people presumably are to provide the kind of government the majority of the people want.

It is therefore to be assumed that the people have the right—if not the obligation—to insist upon getting the policies they want.

One natural consequence of this process is the formation of pressure groups—groups that may represent only a small fraction of the electorate, but that organize their efforts, vocally and actively, to advance their own self-interest.

When their self-interest is detrimental to the people as a whole, they may still succeed—and all too often do. They succeed because the interests of the people have too few champions—too few men and women with the talents and the willingness to speak up, to lead the fight in the people's behalf.

To the public officeholder, the self-interest groups appear to have the initiative; the public appears to be apathetic.

Not only does this influence the man already in office; it has its effect on the kind and quality of men who will become candidates for office.

And these are the men who make the most fundamental decisions for us, who determine whether we are to have economic folly through Government by pressure group, with recurring inflation, ever-higher taxation, and deadly monopoly power; or, whether, over the years, we are to have sound government, with sound economic policies that rid us of inflation, confiscatory taxation, and abuses of monopoly power.

At present our Nation has reached the highest level of prosperity in our history. We have the healthiest, strongest economy America has yet known.

Our people are enjoying better living standards—greater individual opportunities—than ever before.

The institutions which mean so much to us are making historic progress.

These are achievements made possible by sound policies of Government—policies maintained by a determined Federal administration. They are the result of a resolute and successful battle to bring rampant inflationary momentum under control; to keep the economy healthy and strong.

All are hard-won gains. And the continued advancement of sound policies will be harder still.

For the blunt fact is that we do not have throughout our Government, in all its areas, the numbers of men and women of capacity, integrity, and courage we must have to meet our challenge.

Government is not simply a process—it is people. Able people give us able government. Weak people will give us weak government. Courage in government can come only from courageous men and women.

We are seriously weakened when we have government by pressure group, rather than government for the people, in the Congress of the United States.

The result is a commitment to excessive spending of public money by a majority of the Congress, which can have the most serious consequences to the economic stability of our country.

Vast sums are voted which push government costs far above our means, which have nothing to do with the Nation's defense, and which put tremendous new tax burdens on every citizen, present, and future.

This is the situation which confronts us at this very time. Special-interest bills are being passed that can raise our annual spending by billions of dollars in 1961—and burden our Federal budgets over the years ahead with many, many more billions.

Already, in fact, the indebtedness of the United States stands at more than $292 billion. The interest, alone, each year, at present rates, is more than $9 billion.

But this is far from all. The full amount of commitments for the future—your future—has reached $750 billion—three-quarters of a trillion dollars.

But, the spenders say, we can eventually tighten our belt and make up this monstrous debt. The question is: Who will make it up eventually?

There is little doubt they must mean the young students of today, such as you, who will bear this burden in due time. It is you who will have to pay most dearly for the victories of the pressure groups now.

Such a pressure group, for example—and by far the most dominant in affecting the Congress—is the clique of men who exercise the great power of union monopoly leadership.

There is no question but that all conscientious Americans favor a responsible union movement.

But the people of America have suffered this movement to become a vast monopoly, used by its leaders to dictate the making of law in the legislative halls of our States and our Nation's Capital.

And the danger can only grow unless, and until, the Congress is persuaded to bring this power into balance.

The battle for sound government is always precarious when the number at the front is relatively small. In recent years, this fight has been led by the President, sustained by key members of his administration and some stalwart Members of the Congress.

I say to you that too much is being expected of too few.

No one man, nor small group of men, can uphold such a great burden indefinitely. More—many more—are needed.

A great American statesman has said: "Nothing will ruin the country if the people themselves will undertake its safety; and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own."

I believe the great majority of our people want the Nation's growth and security to be accomplished through sound and sensible government. But the people need articulate help and leadership in the effort to accomplish these goals. There must be leadership that will take an active, vigorous part in politics and in public affairs.

And here we come to the crux of the challenge to you:

It is the vital need for you to apply the genius, the talents and the dedication with which you leave this college, to the political life of your Nation.

There can be no real strength of government, no preponderance of able men and women in the Government, unless young men and women of your caliber take an active and durable interest in public affairs.

Nothing could be more valuable to this Nation than for some of you, who have the ability, to go directly into politics—and there serve the urgent cause of good government.

I have never sought or held elective office, but this I do know:

I have been a businessman who devoted much time over the past 24 years to politics and public affairs as an avocation, and all my time for almost 8 years in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower. And the most fruitful, satisfying, inspiring experience a man could have, in my opinion, is constituted in these years I have served in Washington and participated in the councils of this Government.

Whatever your calling, give of your time to the critical task of selecting men and

women who will render America the kind of government she must have in these years. No time you spend will be more vital to every purpose, every ambition, every dream you hold.

You have not obtained this superior education for the purpose of adjusting to the status quo. Higher education exists—or should—precisely in order that you will not be content to adjust yourselves to current standards, but will set about with courage and confidence to adjust society where you see it in need of change.

Consider when the first great democracy, in Athens, reached its full glory. It was in the period when political participation was a duty of every citizen of leadership ability.

The Athenian code demanded that the citizen attend council meetings. It required him to recognize his obligation to further the security and prosperity of his free society.

This duty was judged equally as important as military service, and to shirk either was a matter of personal disgrace.

Said the Athenians: "We regard the man who holds aloof from public affairs as useless."

During Athens' great years, the citizens entered into this participation with a deep sense of responsibility. At the open meetings, where decisions were made, the most important moment came when the presiding officer asked, "Does anyone wish to speak?"

As long as there were many who did wish to speak, and who spoke for strong and responsible government, the people of Athens remained strong and free.

But when indifference and corruption finally set in, and only those wished to speak who wanted to promote their own selfish interests, the decline came. This was the time when, as one observing philosopher put it, "the only freedom we now seek is freedom from responsibility."

And another declared sadly that there was "no champion of justice at whose side to fight."

The centuries have not altered those principles.

Today, in America, each of us must face this question squarely: "Does anyone wish to speak?"

And upon our response depends the course our country will follow.

I would appeal to you, in the exciting years into which you are moving, to speak, work, and fight for sound government and a stronger America.

Find the candidates for public office who stand for what you believe, whatever their political affiliation, and support them.

I have said again and again: We need 100 more men and women of courage in the Halls of Congress.

We need these men and women, to strengthen the hard-pressed forces of courage and integrity already in the Congress.

As you become active in the public affairs of your community, your State, and the Nation, help to give us more men and women of ability and courage in all levels of our governments.

Keep home the demagogues, the fuzzy thinkers, the irresponsible, the darlings of the pressure groups.

Send us the doers who will give America the true policies of sound leadership.

And give us your own leadership in the quality of national thinking and vision; leadership in finding the solutions to our economic, social, and political problems; leadership in welding our people together toward a common purpose.

This is your obligation, your opportunity. Above all, it is your sacred right.

With millions of other Americans, I am confident you will preserve this right—and in the process, you will give it great new luster as the most precious heritage known to mankind.

Address by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter at University of Pittsburgh Commencement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday morning, June 8, 1960, was the occasion of the annual commencement exercises of the University of Pittsburgh.

This fine university, whose trademark has been the cathedral of learning, this year had 2,282 graduates from its several undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools.

The principal speaker at the graduation was our good longtime friend and former colleague in the House, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State. The Secretary was also presented with an honorary degree.

I am calling the account of the graduation which appeared in the June 8 issue of the Pittsburgh Press to the attention of the Congress and the American people, and especially the excerpts from the Secretary's excellent speech on current international affairs.

The article follows:

REDS FEAR DISARMING, HERTER SAYS—SECRECY WOULD END WITH INSPECTIONS, PITT GRADUATES TOLD

(By Kenneth Eskey)

"The Soviets profess to want disarmament," the world, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter said here today.

"The Soviets pofess to want disarmament," Mr. Herter said, "but their obsession with secrecy has made them unwilling to accept the type of inspection arrangements which are absolutely indispensable to any safe and acceptable system of controlled disarmament."

One of the great issues of our times, he said, is the conflict between open and closed societies.

Speaking at University of Pittsburgh commencement exercises, Mr. Herter told the 2,282 graduates:

"One reason why a closed society is a danger to our world community is that it harbors secrecy; it cherishes estrangement from and hostility toward the outside world.

"In states so dominated, concealment becomes a fetish. Such states instill fears of other nations in their peoples."

According to Mr. Herter, Soviet secrecy has a practical purpose.

"Excessive secrecy is regarded as a great military asset," he said, "the equivalent of so many divisions or missiles."

The former Massachusetts governor did not touch directly on the U–2 spy plane incident. Of relations with Russia, he said:

"The important thing is to face our tasks of the future in a constructive frame of mind. Mutual recriminations about past actions are futile.

"Nor is it helpful to try to define our policy toward the Soviet Union as either 'hard' or 'soft,' nor to depict the international conflict in colors of black and white.

"Our posture should be calm, resolute and vigilant, at the same time that we explore every available opportunity to move our relationships on to a more hopeful plane of increased understanding and mutual cooperation."

Mr. Herter was greeted at Allegheny County Airport by four Pitt officials—Dr. Alan C. Rankin, vice chancellor; Dr. Holbert Carroll, who heads Pitt's political science department; Leon Falk Jr., vice president of the board of trustees, and Dr. Shepherd L. Witman, director of cultural and educational exchanges at the University.

The Secretary of State, attired in gray suit with blue tie, proceeded immediately from the plane ramp to an auto.

At Pitt he told newsmen he thinks President Eisenhower will follow through on plans to visit Japan, despite demonstrations there.

He said the Japanese wouldn't withdraw their invitation unless they feared the President would be in danger or suffer indignities.

AMBASSADOR PRESENT

Also attending the graduation exercises was Howard Jones, U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia, a friend of Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, Pitt chancellor.

Secretary Herter and his party lunched at Dr. Litchfield's home on Beechwood Boulevard with some 200 university and civic officials.

Most of Mr. Herter's commencement speech, "The University and the World Community," dealt with international exchange programs.

He urged the Pitt graduates to apply their learning to the great tasks of the future.

FATE AT STAKE, HE SAYS

"For we are truly engaged in a contest of which the stakes, and the outcome are the fate of our culture and our civilization," he said.

Mr. Herter made a strong plea for togetherness.

"The basic and central reality," he said, "is the essentially political fact that all nations now must live together and that a community of interests must come into existence."

Mr. Herter recalled our national goals.

"Aware as we must continue to be of the Communist threat, and with all our precautions to deal with it, we must never be so preoccupied with the Soviet challenge as to forget our own constructive purposes," he said.

"We have our vision of the future. We must press forward toward the new horizon. The values of our culture are not ours alone. They are a heritage which we must seek to conserve and pass on to coming generations."

Mr. Herter spoke glowingly of cultural exchange programs.

PRAISES DR. LITCHFIELD

"You are all aware of the special progress we have made in recent years in what are called East-West exchanges, or more properly, exchanges between the West and the Soviet bloc," he said.

Mr. Herter hailed contacts of all kinds—social, business, labor, cultural, educational, scientific, athletic, diplomatic and political.

He had particular praise for Pitt and its chancellor, Dr. Litchfield.

Pitt has contributed to international understanding "to a degree found in very few American universities," Mr. Herter said.

He commended Pitt for creating the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange and organizing the Intercollegiate Regional Council for International Educational Exchange.

"Moreover," he said, "your university has not confined its interest to the campus, but has enlisted the support of the entire community through the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors."

Mr. Herter thanked Dr. Litchfield for his work as chairman of the Governmental Affairs Institute.

The Secretary of State was one of four men receiving honorary degrees during the commencement ceremony on the Cathedral of Learning lawn.

Presenting the degree to Mr. Herter was Gov. David L. Lawrence, a Pitt trustee.

"In a time of turbulence and adversity," said Governor Lawrence, "he has distinguished himself and his office with sagacity and dignity."

Other honorary degree winners were:

Courtney Craig Smith, president of Swarthmore College; Henry J. Heinz II, chairman of the board of H. J. Heinz Co., and Robert Douglas Stuart, chairman of the board of Quaker Oats Co.

Adding an international tinge to commencement were 30 graduates from 18 foreign countries.

Highest honor graduates were:

Liberal arts: David Breakstone, Paul Harper, Bertram Nemitz, Gerry Sack, John Strauch, Richard Watson, Catherine Wilson, Richard Butera, James Greaves, James Harrison, Alice Jervis, Robert Sekerka and Winifred Little.

Engineering: Donald Jessep Jr., Harry Wetklow and Caroline Louise Rodder.

Business administration: Ray Rowney, Jr. and Harry Kaufman.

Education: Janet Hecht, Gloria Levinson, Rita Natale, Audrey Lang, Janis Markham and Elizabeth Irene Tassoney.

Graduate Social Work: Morton Coleman and Helen Warga.

Dentistry: Donald Pipko.

Nursing: Evelyn Hearn, Perina Chioldi and Norman Rodgers.

A fanfare of trumpets from the fourth floor parapets of the Cathedral of Learning opened the ceremonies at 9:30 a.m.

Black-robed graduates and faculty members marched in the processional.

Remarks of Bishop Zuroweste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic press of the United States has made a powerful contribution to the material and spiritual advancement of the Nation. Recently, many Members of Congress had the pleasure and privilege of attending a breakfast of the Golden Jubilee Convention of the Catholic Press Association at the Hotel Statler-Hilton, Washington, D.C.

The principal remarks on that occasion were made by the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, D.D., bishop of Belleville, Ill., Bishop Zuroweste is the Episcopal chairman, press department, of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The Senators and Representatives were guests of editors and publishers attending the Golden Jubilee Convention.

In his remarks, Bishop Zuroweste pointed out that the ideologies of communism are diametrically opposed to truth and democracy, and he pointed to the effective opposition of the Catholic press against the false teachings of atheistic communism. He asserted that the Catholic press record of the past half century is one of loyalty and service to church and our country.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, under unanimous consent of its membership, I herewith include the remarks which Bishop Zuroweste gave at the congressional breakfast on May 12, 1960:

REMARKS OF THE MOST REV. ALBERT R. ZUROWESTE, D.D., BISHOP OF BELLEVILLE, ILL., EPISCOPAL CHAIRMAN, PRESS DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE AT CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST OF THE GOLDEN JUBILEE CONVENTION OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS ASSOCIATION, HOTEL STATLER-HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 12, 1960

It is an honor for me to greet our distinguished guests in the name of the Catholic Press Association. This particular convention marks our golden jubilee and we look back with pride and satisfaction on the accomplishments of the past 50 years. During this half century great progress and advancement have been noted both in our Nation and our church. In all sincerity, we believe that the Catholic press has been a truthful and powerful communication means in promoting those causes and programs that have aided the material and spiritual growth of our Nation.

Our organization has defended nobly our Nation during the strain and stress of war years, during days of depression and prosperity. It has helped immeasurably in upholding the dignity of man, in fighting for the social betterment of the lower and middle classes, and in seeking justice and rights, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

Today our subscribers number in excess of 25 million and are served by 131 newspapers and 150 magazines in the United States and Canada.

Every Catholic newspaper and magazine covering the field of missions, devotion, education, social sciences, philosophy, liturgy, current comment, and opinion, is staffed by competent and devoted editors, writers, and editorial contributors.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference press department, under the direction of the bishops, has established the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service which is now in its 40th year. This news service issues dispatches daily utilizing radio, telegraph, teleprinter, and mail facilities. It is comparable to the AP, UPI, and other general worldwide newsgathering agencies. This NCWC service gathers its news through 146 foreign correspondents, 115 U.S. correspondents, and is accredited as a bona fide news agency in the press galleries of Congress at the White House, at other U.S. Government establishments, and at all other important centers of the United States and abroad.

Our association enjoys a freedom (of press) that is an enviable one. Difference of opinions on every subject, except that of defined doctrine of the church, makes for a healthy, progressive and aggressive press. Since true freedom is founded on truth we as Catholic editors are dedicated to the pursuit and propagation of truth.

The ideologies of communism are diametrically opposed to truth and democracy; there is no press, be it general or religious, more active and forceful against these false teachings of atheistic communism than we of the Catholic press. Our record of the past half century is one of loyalty and service to our church and our country, and this policy will ever be the standard under which we will continue to function. There is no group in the world more dedicated and appreciative of the freedom of religion and freedom of the press than the Catholic Press Association.

We are grateful to our distinguished guests who have honored us by their presence at this breakfast. Aware of your very pressing problems and busy schedules, we're all the more thankful to each and every one for making this our golden jubilee a truly noteworthy and historic one.

President Kennedy Asks Commerce Department Not To Use Foreign Goods on Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I believe this letter from President Kennedy of the UMWA to Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller is of such importance that every Member of Congress should be given an opportunity to read it.

I believe the time for reappraisal of foreign import business and policy is slipping away and unless we heed the warnings contained in the message that follows, this Nation will have a ruder economic awakening in the very near future.

The letter follows without further comment:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ASKS COMMERCE DEPARTMENT NOT TO USE FOREIGN GOODS ON HIGHWAYS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—One of the problems facing the United States today is increasing use by big business of cheap foreign commodities, including such basic items as steel and cement. The Federal Government plans to use foreign imports on roads built in conjunction with the States under the jointly financed highway building program. On April 22, UMWA President Thomas Kennedy wrote a letter to Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller protesting the use of such materials. No final decision had been given by Mueller as the journal went to press. The text of President Kennedy's letter of protest is printed below.)

Through Gov. David L. Lawrence of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I am aware of the fact that he and other officials of his administration conferred with you recently concerning the question of importing foreign materials for use in construction of Federal aid highways in Pennsylvania. Assuredly, I am in complete accord with the protest which was lodged with you because I am fully aware that the importation of cement, steel, or any other foreign product for highway purposes in Pennsylvania would be a terrific mistake. By the same token, I am not dealing with Pennsylvania alone, because I am cognizant of the fact that the pursuance of such a policy anywhere in the country would have devastating effects that might severely impair our national security.

It is a positive fact that Pennsylvania is first in steel and cement production in the United States. It is also definitely known that the steel industry in this Commonwealth employs 243,600 individuals and the cement industry employs 13,500. Certainly, in view of these facts, the earning power of over 257,000 persons cannot be regarded lightly. By the same token, if you were to delve into the employment situation which prevails in these two industries in other States, I am quite sure conclusions would be reached that the employment which prevails there comprises a vast segment of the Nation's economy.

In view of these circumstances, I am therefore, appealing to you to do everything in your power to impress upon those who are responsible for the regulations of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that such action is absolutely contradictory to good commonsense. I make this assertion because you know and I know that reckless

importation of any foreign-made product to this country works detrimentally against our industry, especially when we take into consideration that the earnings of American workers, the profits of American industry and business, as well as the taxes derived therefrom are responsible for the success of this Nation. Certainly, these factors should receive primary consideration before any attempt is made to place foreign-made products, which are produced under cheap labor conditions, on our markets in unfair competition against American-made goods simply for the purpose of catering to the will of special interests whose primary goal is huge profits.

The devastating effect which importation of residual oil from foreign nations has had on the American coal industry, and the huge problems of unemployment which have been created as a result, should be convincing evidence to your office that there should be no toleration of importing foreign-made products for highway purposes, because the end result will bring about further grave problems of unemployment. It is, therefore, my sincere hope that you will cooperate to the fullest extent to abolish such practices which are now in effect and that you will take whatever steps are necessary to wipe out the possibility of further ventures of this character.

Aid to the Suffering People of Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of recent years is the havoc created in Chile by the series of earthquakes, seismic waves, floods, and rains which caused untold damage there in the last few weeks. Thousands of people have been killed, many more thousands are wounded, while hundreds of thousands are homeless.

Throughout our history the people of the United States have always responded generously to help stricken nations with food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, and the like. This is being done now, too, chiefly by the Red Cross and others. From reports reaching us from Chile, I believe that we are not fully aware of the extent of the tragedy and the size of the damage done, both to people and property. I am afraid that what we are doing under the present circumstances is far from enough and will reach only a limited number of people.

We are in the fortunate position of being blessed with surpluses in various agricultural commodities, such as wheat, corn, rice, edible beans, certain dairy products, also cotton which could be used for clothing and other purposes. We have available feedstuffs for animals and building materials for the construction of new homes. All of this may mean the difference between life and death for the people of Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a letter to President Eisenhower urging him to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to make available some of our agricultural surpluses to the people of Chile, who are not only our good neighbor but good friends and allies of the people of the United States. Let us share our blessings with them in this very tragic hour they are experiencing and show them that we have not forgotten them. Large-scale aid to the people of Chile now will also serve as a manifestation of our generosity to other peoples all over the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Daily News, June 9, 1960, dealing with the same subject:

NEEDED: "OPERACION AMIGOS"

The convulsive temblors that racked Chile with death and destruction left perhaps 200,000 persons homeless and defenseless against the cruel winter season just beginning.

America's response to this disaster was, as always, generous and warm-hearteded. But as fine as has been our effort to help these stricken people, it has been inadequate to cope with the appalling havoc created by nature gone wild.

Individuals can, of course, continue to help through local Red Cross chapters and organized religious charities. But the need in Chile is of such overpowering proportions that it is doubtful individual help alone can turn the trick. Instead, what is needed here is a major effort on the part of our Government—a major effort to rebuild shattered lives and, let's not kid ourselves, to refresh Uncle Sam's somewhat tattered image in the minds of the world's needy people.

Our warehouses are bulging with commodities and building materials that can mean the difference between life and death to countless men, women, and children in Chile. The Government should at once organize a humanitarian D-day—an "Operacion Amigos," if you will—to get, by ships or planes, these supplies in the hands of the homeless people of Chile before winter extracts its toll of suffering and death.

Whatever it costs this Government, this mission of mercy is going to be a bargain. It cannot help but create a needed reservoir of goodwill toward our country throughout Latin America. It will give the lie to Communist slurs about the callous materialism of our society. It will reaffirm in the eyes of the world the fact that good neighbors come to each other's help in time of crisis.

But time is of the essence if "Operacion Amigos" is to do the job. It must be undertaken at once, and with the skill and generosity that is the true hallmark of the United States.

City Tries To Repeal State Milk Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the attempt of New York City to repeal a New York State milk law is just another example of the weird maze of conflicting sanitary standards which hamper the free flow of high-quality milk from State to State. Writing in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Associate Editor Alfred Stedman pointed out that enactment of my national milk sanitation legislation would free interstate milk from such absurd legal entanglements by establishing a Federal quality standard for fluid milk shipped in interstate trade. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Stedman's editorial in the RECORD:

NEW MILK LAW TANGLE

In New York, the weirdest of city-State conflicts has produced a new reason why Congress is so strongly impelled to set dairying free from the maze of contradictory State and local sanitary regulations that are hamstringing interstate commerce in milk. Establishing uniform Federal sanitary regulations for milk, as already is being done for meat and poultry, would do the job.

The New York State Legislature passed and Governor Rockefeller signed an act prohibiting State or local health agencies from requiring the dating of milk. Such requirements mean that each bottle or carton must be stamped with the date of pasteurization.

No doubt at one time justified on health grounds, this requirement now has been made obsolete and senseless by modern methods of sanitation and distribution. These methods enable milk to retain its high quality, flavor and freshness for far longer periods than formerly was the case. They make dating a needless expense to the farmers and consumers, who profit from or pay for milk and cream that are consumed by the public.

But of course the requirement does create a certain number of jobs in dating and handling and hauling outdated milk. And, in the eyes of New York City Council, these advantages were deemed to outweigh all the glaring disadvantages of dating. So the council by a vote of 20 to 1 has reenacted or voted to reenact the dating requirement which was specifically outlawed by the legislature of the State of New York.

The absurd legal tangle that results seems to cry aloud for enactment by Congress of the Lester Johnson bill whose uniform Federal sanitary code on interstate milk shipments would sweep aside all such conflicting and contradictory local regulations. Representative JOHNSON, Senator HUMPHREY, and other members of both political parties who are supporting the bill could properly call this situation to the attention of Congress as a conclusive argument in behalf of their measure.

When New York City tries to repeal New York State milk law it seems high time for the Federal Government to step in with national requirements for free trade in wholesome dairy products.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Griffith Park Observatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Griffith Park Observatory and Planetarium, which is located in the congressional district I represent, recently observed its 25th anniversary.

Situated in Griffith Park, high above surrounding areas of Los Angeles and nearby cities, the observatory has over the years become the center of attrac-

tion to millions of local residents and visitors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the following editorial that appeared in the May 20, 1960, Los Angeles Times which pays well deserved tribute to the observatory and its staff:

GRIFFITH OBSERVATORY'S SILVER ANNIVERSARY

Twenty-five years ago this month the Griffith Park Observatory and Planetarium was opened to the public. Since then 13,750,000 persons, including residents of this city and visitors from throughout the world, have seen the fascinating exhibits in the Hall of Science and 4.25 million adults and children have attended the popular shows in the planetarium theater.

A quarter century is an almost unnoticeable period in the infinite history of the universe but it is a fair span in the life of man. In that time our knowledge of astronomy has increased to a remarkable degree, and much understanding of a complex science has been passed on to the general public by the talented staff of the Griffith Observatory.

Among the most popular features of the planetarium are its "trips" to various solar bodies. This summer, in commemoration of its anniversary, the planetarium will present the interesting and realistically illustrated trips to the Moon and Mars. More than 17,500 of these informative shows have been put on since 1935.

The work of the Griffith Observatory staff has entertained and instructed millions over the years, and undoubtedly it has also been responsible for planting the first seeds of wonder in many of tomorrow's young astronomers and space technicians. We add our congratulations to the observatory for its work of a quarter century in bringing the stars closer to man and, perhaps, man a little closer to the stars.

The Story of Chief Joseph: From Where the Sun Now Stands—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am presenting the final article of the story of Chief Joseph, leader of the famous Nez Perce Indian Tribe and one of America's most distinguished Indian leaders.

This excellent article was authored by Mr. Bruce A. Wilson, editor of the Omak (Wash.) Chronicle newspaper, and it has received wide acclaim. Mr. Wilson depicted the last year of struggle of the mighty Nez Perces during which they were forced to give up their carefree living in Oregon and, after bitter armed conflict with American troops, settle on a reservation.

Mr. Wilson did a fine job, I believe, in describing Chief Joseph when he stated that Joseph was not a ruthless savage; a Red Napoleon, as he was often called. Rather, he was more comparable to Lincoln—a man of peace, gravely concerned with the welfare of his people.

The concluding article follows:

The Nez Perces who surrendered with Joseph were taken by horseback and Missouri River flatboats to Fort Leavenworth where they spent the winter in a squalid camp so suffused with malaria that more than half became sick and 20 or 30 died. Gradually it dawned on those still able to think about anything except surviving that the field army's promise to return them to Lapwai was not worth the buffalo chips needed to roast a chestnut.

Howard was now arguing that a lot of white settlers would boil up their own version of justice if the nontreaty Nez Perces reappeared in Idaho, where a dozen of them were still under indictment for murder. Besides, he said, even if he had promised a return to Lapwai, the hostiles had violated the surrender terms by permitting so many to escape to Canada. (In the Nez Perce mind, of course, Joseph ultimately had surrendered only himself and everyone else could do what he wished.) Miles said the army ought to keep its word.

But General of the Army Sherman refused to consider sending the prisoners west, though he admitted: "The Indians throughout (the war) displayed a courage and skill that elicited universal praise; they abstained from scalping; let captive women go free; did not commit indiscriminate murders of peaceful families; and fought with almost scientific skill, using advance and rear guards, skirmish lines and field fortifications."

This fraternal slap on the back afforded thin comfort to the emaciated Nez Perces when in July, 1878, the army released them to the Indian bureau. This agency felt the early atrocities in Idaho made a return impossible. For the next 7 years the Nez Perces, far from the wild, fresh mountain air, were situated in Indian territory (for the most part in present-day Oklahoma). There they were allocated a dismal diet of tepid drinking water, poor rations, searing heat, soaking rains, cold winds and virtually no medical supplies. More than a hundred of them died.

Meanwhile many of the tribesmen who had fled to Canada now were drifting back to Idaho where all the whites seemed too busy farming, mining, and logging to concern themselves with revenge.

During all this time Joseph was fulfilling the role of a leader whose stature increases with the despondency and helplessness of his people. Early in the period of exile he traveled to Washington, D.C. Dignitaries gawked but saw no solution. In the early 1880's, however, the rather lonesome campaign Miles (now a general) and Howard's aid, Wood (now a Portland, Oreg., attorney), had launched on behalf of the Nez Perces spread into a persistent philanthropic movement with the Indian Rights Association and Presbyterian Church, among others, demanding action. Soon citizens' groups from Kansas to Connecticut were up in arms. Following an outburst of responsive leadership by Congress, the Indian Commissioner in April 1885 ordered the Nez Perces returned to the Northwest.

A month later 268 Nez Perces, survivors of nearly 500 who had surrendered with Joseph or were later delivered to Indian Territory, left Arkansas City by train with 35,000 pounds of baggage. At Pocatello, Idaho, there came another parting—118 continued to the Nez Perces Reservation at Lapwai while 150 were sent to the Colville Reservation Agency, then located at Spokane Falls. The Indian Bureau, still fearing reprisals, insisted that Joseph, many leading warriors, and others who might be accused of atrocities in Idaho be delivered to the Colville Reservation.

Religion may also have entered the picture. Yellow Wolf said an interpreter asked each of the exiles: "Where you want to go? Lapwai and be Christian, or Colville and just be yourself?"

The refugees who chose or were assigned Lapwai received a warm welcome from others of their blood. Soon some were well on their way toward becoming self-sufficient farmers. Those who followed Joseph to Fort Spokane were greeted by a blast from the Colville agent: the Nez Perces had become used to Oklahoma, "sickly sentimentality" forced their return, insufficient funds were available to feed them, etc. After 6 months of this the weary Nez Perces, at their own request, were transferred to Nespelem; and one day in December 1885 about 120, of whom all except the younger children had heard the shots echoing through White Bird Canyon, awakened in stark terror at Big Hole, shivered from cold and fear at Bear Paw, crossed into Okanogan County to live their remaining years.

The Colville Reservation, sprawling through north central Washington from the Columbia River to Canada, had been created in 1872 for local tribes, including the Nespelems, Okanogans, Methows, and San Poils, and for any other bands the Commissioner of Indian Affairs might wish to place there.

Arriving at the subagency at Nespelem, the Nez Perces easily detected a certain amount of resentment on the part of some of the resident Indians. It is entirely probable the feeling was mutual, for the Nez Perces no more wished to be there than the native tribes wish to see them coming.

Chief Moses, another outstanding figure in Northwest Indian history, became friendly with Joseph and did much to ease friction between the two groups. But for some years the Nez Perces kept pretty well to themselves, pitching their tepees along several miles of Nespelem Creek, southeast of the subagency, and riding alone on fall deer hunts into the San Poil country.

Joseph and many others from his band were heartsick because they had not been returned to the Wallowas, whose ownership they had never relinquished. But as an alternative, they could hardly have been assigned better country than the Colville Reservation. Here were the same sweeping forests of ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir and lodgepole, with ample pasture and at least a scattering of lakes. "On the Colville we found wild game aplenty," Yellow Wolf said. "Fish, berries, and all kinds of roots * * *. Deer everywhere, and good salmon at Keller. It was better than Idaho, where all Christian Nez Perces and whites were against us."

But the more spectacular beauty of the Wallowas was missing, and the winters seemed colder. Here the Nez Perces found no sheltered Imnaha, virtually without snow at an elevation of only a few hundred feet. Most of all, the Wallowas had been theirs. This land was not.

In 1892 a 13-year-old white boy from Portland, Oreg., spent 6 months living in Joseph's tepee. He was Erskine Wood, son of the lieutenant who had written down Joseph's surrender speech and later urged returning the Nez Perces to the Northwest. Now, 15 years after the war which had torn apart his life, Joseph welcomed the son of one of his former enemies. Erskine spent 3 more months with Joseph the following year. Today a 90-year-old Portland attorney, he supplied much of the following material during a recent interview.

In the early 1890's, Nespelem consisted of a flour mill, sawmill, a corral for slaughtering beef, a Government warehouse, and a single residence for two white Government employes. To the warehouse rode the Nez Perces, once a month, to be issued rations, salt, sugar, bacon, flour, coffee, hard-bread, beef, and the like, to supplement the food they provided for themselves * * * wild roots (camas, chaweet, kows, bitterroot, all of

them boiled); wild berries; venison, duck, pheasants, and grouse when available; trout, and salmon. Occasionally clothing was issued. These supplies were packed to the tepees, made of twill cloth, unbroken by decorations.

"In the center was a bare earth for a fire," Wood recalled. "Around the circumference were stacked rawhide iktas bags, used for storing things and as suitcases when traveling. These bags also helped keep out the wind. Food and cooking utensils were piled near the entrance. Between the supplies and fire, we slept like spokes in a wheel, each on wild ryegrass covered by older blankets with better blankets on top. The tepees were warm and comfortable though sometimes smoky when you stood up. Nearby, in some cases, thatched ryegrass roofs had been mounted on upright posts to provide shade in the heat of summer. After the fall deer hunt, winter camp was set up closer to Nespelem where the rations were issued. Several families would live together during the winter, with four or five tepees combined into a single long one. Fires would be spaced through its length. The same arrangement was used during the fall deer hunt. Then a frame of willows was built above each fire. From the frames hung strips of freshly killed venison, curing in the smoke.

With Joseph lived his two wives and a lad about Erskine's age named Cool-Cool-Smool-Mool. Apparently he was an orphan. Joseph left no descendants. A daughter born a few days before the battle at White Bird Canyon died 5 years later in Indian territory. During Erskine's first visit, Looking Down and his wife also shared Joseph's tepee. Looking Down had been shot in an ankle during the war. But the wound never healed, and drained continually through an ever-present bandage.

"Joseph was well built, slightly heavy set, maybe a little overweight, dignified as a Roman senator, with a forelock and two long braids of black hair. Usually he wore a dark blue flannel shirt, breechcloth, blanket leggins and buckskin moccasins. He never talked to me about the war or the Wallowas (I was only a boy). But he often sat staring into space. I am sure he was thinking of the Wallowas, where his father and mother were buried. Joseph's leadership was never questioned. Many of the band consulted him. When a need for decisions arose, such as how to divide a venison, all others stood back while Joseph cut into the deer."

The young Erskine spent much of his time trapping muskrats, shooting ducks and pheasants, and riding with Cool-Cool-Smool-Mool. One of his chores was to locate Joseph's 40 or 50 horses in the hills and bring them down to a water hole in Nespelem Creek. There thick willows formed a natural corral, making it easy to lasso fresh ponies before turning back the used ones.

Whatever Sundays meant to Joseph, they were usually the occasion for a special breakfast followed by horseraces. Perhaps half a dozen other Nez Perce leaders would come to Joseph's tepee for breakfast. One might be Two Moons: would you guess this aging visitor had led the howling attack that crumpled Perry's left flank in White Bird Canyon, or helped steal Howard's pack mules from under the general's nose at Camas Prairie? Often Yellow Wolfe came, slowly moving, in a white man's flannel shirt and pants: had he fought like a painted demon along the Clearwater Bluffs, and crushed troopers' skulls with his warclub at the Big Hole? Even had Erskine been old enough to know these things, he could hardly have believed them as he joined these time-creased elders for frying pan bread cooked in grease, boiled meat, stewed huckleberries, coffee and sugar.

Breakfast was followed by a slow, cheerful ride to the racing flats (probably today's encampment site) where older boys, stripped to their breechcloths, raced ponies out and back again while the spectators shouted and wagered blankets. The afternoon sun settling behind the Cascades, everyone mounted again and in the finest of spirits swept at breakneck speed back to their tepees.

In the crisp air of late November, the Nez Perce men brought in their horses while squaws struck the tepees and packed supplies for fall hunting. The caravan headed northeast, the families about 75 yards apart to keep the horses from getting tangled. In the wooded hills of the San Poil country, tepees were pitched winter-style while the men and boys set out to stalk deer across slopes and through ravines.

"During summer," Wood recalled, "we took sweat baths about once a week. They were no ordeal because the outside air was warm. But deer hunting meant a sweat bath the first thing every morning, before it was light, to remove scent from our bodies. The sweathouse consisted of saplings stuck in the ground and bent over to form a circular hut about 4 feet high. The saplings were covered with blankets. Another blanket hung over the entrance. Inside the hut, a hole was dug and filled with rocks heated by a fire. Then five or six of us, naked, crawled inside. One would dribble warm water from a tin can onto the rocks (cold water might break them). This produced great clouds of steam. Sweat poured from our bodies. Everyone crouched low with his nose close to the ground to breathe. I didn't know this at first, kept my head high and almost choked to death. After 10 or 15 minutes, we walked from the sweathouse to a creek and plunged in, sometimes having to break through a layer of ice. The shock was petrifying. But our bodies were thoroughly cleansed."

Apparently neither Joseph nor any of his band, in those early days at Nespelem, ever crossed west of the Okanogan River, where Ruby and Conconully were booming and the Cascadian foothills rang with the shouts of miners. By 1890 30 Nez Perce families were farming 200 acres and horse herds were thriving.

But adjustment came slowly. For too long the Nez Perces had been wards of the Government, standing in line to receive most of their sustenance. Their initiative drained away. As many died among Joseph's people as were born. An 1890 census turned up only 32 males over 18 years of age. Only four could read English; nine could speak it. A few wooden houses were built (in the $62 class, according to the agent's cost records). One was assigned to Joseph. He preferred his tepee.

In 1900 Joseph traveled by train to the East. He was at once a 60-year-old incongruity wearing a suit of black broadcloth, pitifully out of place in crowded hotel lobbies, and a splendid Indian specimen as he rode with his full war bonnet and other native accoutrement in a New York parade to dedicate Grant's tomb. Joseph talked about returning to the Wallowas with President McKinley and with General Miles, one of the few whites whose word he trusted. (Four years earlier the north half of the Colville Reservation had been opened to settlement, and whites again were hemming in the Nez Perces.)

Following his return to Nespelem, Joseph and James McLaughlin, an Indian Bureau inspector, visited the Wallowas to see if land could be purchased. For the first time in 23 years Joseph rode through the land of Winding Water. A thousand memories must have washed through his mind. But the Wallowa River as it left the lake was now an irrigation channel. Land was expensive. "There are 1,107 votes (in the district)," a report warned. There could be no return.

In 1903 Joseph again traveled east, probably back for lack of anything better to do. He was entertained lavishly by General and Mrs. Miles, and appeared briefly with John Cummins' Indian Congress and Life on the Plains exhibition at Madison Square garden. Returning, Joseph and a white-bearded General Howard were together a few hours at the Carlisle Indian school.

This was followed by a trip to Seattle where Prof. Edmond S. Meaney hoped a public appearance might drum up support for the better-forgotten Wallowa proposal. Covering the program at a downtown theater, a caustic Post-Intelligencer reporter, wrote:

"After a long drink of water, Joseph folded his hands over his stomach and with Henry Steele, a former Indian agent, as interpreter, said what sounded like, 'Um mum mum halo tum tum um mum,' interpreted as 'Today my heart is far away from here.' 'Um mum cumtux sicamoose tar ra ra,' meaning, 'I would like to be back in my old home in the Wallowa country.' 'Hi-yu mum um tum tum,' translated as, 'The white father promised me long ago that I could go back to my home, but the white men are big liars' (laughter). 'Kopet,' translated as, 'That's all,' and he sadly sat down."

It was no use.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1904

Joseph, greatest of the Nez Perce chiefs, his bronze skin wrinkled by 64 summers, his spirit weakened by a cancerous melancholy, steps slowly from his tepee along Nespelem Creek, feels the pain in his heart and a sickening fear which cannot be denied, sags heavily to the ground. Soon he is dead.

In his younger days, when Old Joseph solved all problems and the wild, free world of the Wallowas spread in every direction, this man must have been happy. With the chieftain's mantle came inescapable concerns and a deep-rooted dread of failing his station. From that instance on, his life was a struggle in which the welfare of the people entrusted to him was the only thing that mattered. He bore no hate for early settlers in the Wallowa Valley. He feared them, for he knew what they meant. He would bury his independence and surrender a treasured homeland to spare his people the blood-smeared stains of a war. Forced into flight, he would try to see that should the warriors win, their victory would have a meaning. Beaten, he never ceased hoping he might return his people to the mountains from which he had taken them. But near the end, his hope grew dim.

Now the struggle was ended. Joseph had won and had lost. Whatever a leader of intelligence and compassion could do, he had done. The future was for others. "From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever."

Why New Laws Are Needed To Curb Chain Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, has laid bare a most disturbing march of events in the business life of our country. Too little attention

is paid, I think, to what is happening to small and independent business. It is tending to disappear; it is being squeezed out and being pushed to a minor, ineffectual competitive role in the business life of the Nation. JIMMY ROOSEVELT has, with hard work and rare insight, intensive and patient investigation brought to light the exact nature of the problems small firms in the distribution fields are up against. More than that, he has advanced some very stimulating and fairminded proposals for coping with these problems.

I believe that the Members will find both stimulating and extremely instructive JIMMY ROOSEVELT'S expressions on a wide range of problems confronting small business today, as these appear in an exclusive interview with Larston D. Farrar, the noted writer and business analyst, and Washington correspondent for Food Merchandising. This interview, on the subject of the growing chainstore monopoly, appears in the May 1960 issue of Food Merchandising, a trade magazine which is read by tens of thousands of independent food retailers throughout the United States.

As matters now stand, the future of independent food retailing is anything but bright. A new survey of the food retailing industry recently made by the Federal Trade Commission shows that in the 10 years from 1948 to 1958, independent retailers' share of food store sales dropped from 58 to 25 percent. On the other side of the coin, corporate chains with 11 or more retail outlets increased their share of food store sales from 29 to 44 percent in the same period. These facts should dispel any notion that the prospect of a chain monopoly in food distribution is merely a remote and fanciful spector. The problems which are knocking on our doors today should concern every Member of Congress, every housewife—in fact, all citizens in all walks of life.

A word about Mr. Larston Farrar: In this interview he has again turned his noted talents to exposing and analyzing the half-hidden problems which affect the welfare of the whole Nation, as distinguished from problems raised by the ambitions and campaigns of some special interest group. Mr. Farrar is, of course, the author of many books, such as "Washington Lowdown," which have attracted national attention.

Needless to say, I am personally very proud of the fact that JIMMY ROOSEVELT is a Member of our Select Committee on Small Business. For almost 10 years now he has been chairman of the subcommittee dealing with small-business problems in the distribution fields, and I doubt if there is anyone in the country who can match his knowledge and expertness in this field.

The interview from Food Merchandising is as follows:

OUTLAW CHAIN MONOPOLY?

(Representative ROOSEVELT leads the Government fight to limit power of the chains. In this exclusive interview, ROOSEVELT answers such vital questions as: Why are new laws needed to curb chain monopoly? What are these new controls that should be put into law? How do we know these won't smother free competition instead of helping it?)

(By Larston D. Farrar)

JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, eldest son of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has served as Representative of California's 26th District since elected in 1954. He was former chairman of the California Democratic Central Committee and was Democratic national committeeman. A Marine Corps veteran, he now heads Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee and has been conducting an investigation of the food field. His new bills would regualte competition through increased U.S. control of the industry.

Larston D. Farrar, Washington correspondent for Food Merchandising, is one of the most noted wrtiers on the Capitol scene. He has been called "1 of the 10 best-informed men on economic and national affairs in the country." His "Washington Lowdown" was a fast-selling pocket edition and his latest book is "Successful Writers and How They Work." His interviews and feature articles have appeared in leading magazines. Mr. Farrar's interview with Representative ROOSEVELT follows:

"LARSTON D. FARRAR. Mr. Roosevelt, our readers are aware of your energetic investigation of food distribution practices. We hope, through this interview, to gain a better understanding of your work.

"Representatives JAMES ROOSEVELT. I'm delighted with this interview because the more we all know about our problems, the better we can agree on solutions. One thing is certain: Sound action comes from sound thinking which is based on adequate and reliable information. I congratulate Food Merchandising for probing into this. I feel you are fulfilling the true function of a magazine serving a tremendously important industry faced with a multitude of problems.

"Question. To lead off, what specific legislation have you introduced to thwart the forces of monopoly you feel are at work?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are three main bills which affect the food industry. First, H.R. 9896 would give the Attorney General and the FTC the chance to review, in advance, any mergers of firms with capital, surplus, and undivided profits exceeding $10 million. Its purpose, of course, is to prevent mergers which might lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

"Second, there is H.R. 9898 which is aimed at 'vertical integration.' If enacted the FTC could prevent a company in the retailing business from going into the manufacturing or processing business if this activity would tend to create monopoly or affect competition adversely.

"The third bill, H.R. 11315, would prevent any packer or any wholesale firm marketing meat, dairy goods, or poultry products, with gross annual sales of $10 million or more, from selling these products at retail. This would eliminate the retail chain from getting into the business of meatpacking and would also keep packers from getting into the retail business—if the firm's sales are $10 million a year or more.

"Question. What findings have you made that justify these controls?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. The 10 largest chains account for almost 30 percent of U.S. grocery sales. The three largest chains account for approximately 47 percent of total chain sales.

"There is considerable evidence that most large chains have integrated vertically until they now are in business at every stage, from the farm to the home. These chains handle a piece of meat from the time the calf is born until the steak is eaten at home—eliminating independent marketmen, brokers and processors at every step. As a result, independent business operators at all levels of the industry have been disappearing at a rapid and alarming rate, with the resulting threat to free competition. In time, this is bound to be disastrous to the ultimate consumer.

"Let's not make any mistake about it, if the time comes when a few men, in effect, can set prices on all groceries, they will not hesitate to do so. There is more than one way to come to a collusive agreement—a knowing wink, reference to the same 'suggestions' in bulletins, and so forth.

"Question. What specific actions have you uncovered that would be corrected by your new legislation?

"Mr. Roosevelt. There are ample findings to justify not only these bills but even more stringent legislation. My subcommittee's evidence shows that there has been buyer-seller collusion; that there is no shelf space available in many chainstores for independent manufacturers but plenty of room for private brands; that there is preferential pricing for favored buyers; that there are many sales below cost on specific items; and that there are many other practices to fully show the need for this legislation. The small independent retailer doesn't need a congressional committee to tell him what he can see with his own eyes and what he feels in his own profits.

"Question. In your proposal to divorce retailing from manufacturing, what would you do about the small retail baker who makes all, or most, of his products in his own store? What about the independent retailer who makes some specialty item in his backroom kitchen?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer is fairly simple. No one in his right mind would confuse a small retail baker or grocer with huge companies doing tens of millions of dollars worth of business each year. The small businessman who isn't aiming at monopoly has no reason for fear. There is a tendency on the part of big business to throw up smoke screens and to strive to show that the legislation would affect the small businessman. The only way this would affect him would be that it gives him a chance to compete and stay in business against the tremendous power of the big businessman.

"Question. What would prevent chains from setting up wholly-owned subsidiaries for manufacturing purposes? In a family-owned chain, what would prevent the members of the family from making a substantial investment in (and thus control to some extent) a food manufacturer?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of course, any person can violate a law. But any such subterfuge as you have outlined would be classified as such by the courts. Nothing in a law automatically guarantees that it will be obeyed; but just because individuals try to get around a law, this does not mean they will get away with it. Still, people will probably try it.

"Question. What about chains which already own packing plants? Would they have to get rid of them?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, if they did an annual gross business of $10 million or more. Otherwise, the law would not apply to them.

"Question. What about packing plants which sell such a large portion of their production to one chain that they must depend on that chain? Isn't that the same thing as control?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer is the same; such control would be allowed if the business had not grown to the point of having $10 million gross sales or more in a year.

"Question. You want to require notification of impending mergers. Would this also apply to small chains and individuals who may have a chance to buy another store nearby?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. The small chain or individual would have no difficulty in buying another store unless he or the other party were large enough to have capital, surplus and undivided profits totaling more than $10 million.

"Question. Let's pursue this further. Suppose a small firm is doing badly, has exhausted its money source and the owner decides he must merge with the competition.

The merger is refused by the Government. How would this protect the public interest?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Government could not deny any such merger unless it would tend to establish a monopoly and/or eliminate competition. If the monopoly already exists, the law does not apply. On the other hand, if the firm is small, it could not honestly be accused of affecting competition or establishing a monopoly.

"Question. In this matter of mergers, many people feel that the Government itself is to blame—that the present tax structure encourages mergers and almost makes them necessary because growth cannot be financed out of earnings after the tax takes its bite. Any comment?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. For months, I have suggested and supported changes in the tax structure to deal with this. I would give small business the opportunity to grow through retaining large amounts of earnings before payment of taxes * * * the incentive and necessity to merge would be greatly lessened.

"Question. Your present bill is aimed at the merger itself; wouldn't it be better to aim at the taxes which foster the mergers?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. We must remember that the appetite for power is sometimes as great as the appetite for profit. Our approach to the problem must be on both fronts.

"Question. In your investigation, did you uncover illegal pricing? Do you plan additional legislation dealing with grocery pricing?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; we uncovered pricing arrangements which definitely tend to destroy competition. I believe that we should first pass the bills I have proposed and see how they work before considering any additional legislation. I am in favor, however, of a concerted effort to improve law enforcement operations.

"Question. What is your thinking about mandatory functional discounts—forcing manufacturers to give more favorable prices to wholesalers than to direct buying retailers?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is a controversial matter on which there are two sound opinions. I have not reached any conclusion.

"Question. Are you in favor of Federal fair trade—putting a floor under all food prices and thus removing price from the competitive arena?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am concentrating on Representative WRIGHT PATMAN'S proposal to forbid below-cost selling. In general, I do not believe that a Federal fair trade law would remove all price from the competitive arena.

"Question. Many businessmen, large and small, are worried these days about the trend to protect free enterprise by putting Government more into control than it already is. The worry is that the effect of new laws would be just opposite to the intent—that they would restrict competition rather than free it. Any comment on this?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is exactly what the big businessmen want the small businessmen to believe. Big business is constantly putting out propaganda to lull the many small businessmen and, in effect, use them. Any small businessman who holds such a view is under the influence of false propaganda or else he suffers dismally from lack of information about what is going on today.

"This legislation, with the exception of the merger bill, gives the Federal Government no added controls whatever. It merely prohibits practices which eliminate competition from the economic picture. I believe that most small businessmen who read and think will understand that this proposed legislation will not hurt free enterprise but will increase competition, keep it within bounds and enable the small businessmen to stay in business.

"The Government has been getting into the economic field—by necessity—ever since the first antitrust laws were passed in the 19th century. This is not due to Government planning but to the excesses and abuses by men of financial power who would stop at nothing to bring about monopoly. If the Government had not acted through the years, it seems plain that there would be very little economic freedom left.

"Many times, those who talk of free enterprise really are talking about freedom to loot or freedom to take over and monopolize. If the little businessman falls for this propaganda and cooperates with those who want to gobble him up, then we can only voice our sympathy for him.

"Question. Do you seriously feel that present laws, if enforced, cannot cope with the problems of the big getting bigger and the small getting weaker?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. I not only feel this is so but the record proves it beyond any question. This does not, however, excuse us from all efforts to enforce present laws—or from trying to streamline the procedures and discourage delays.

"Question. Earl Kintner, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, has said: 'That government is best which governs least—too much further regulation, the passage of too much restrictive legislation, is apt to whittle away at the free enterprise system—to erode it until too little is left to permit a healthy competitive economy.' Does that statement put you and the man who would enforce the laws your sponsor on opposite sides of the fence?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. Certainly not, unless Mr. Kintner means that there is need for better law and better enforcement. I can't believe he reached such a conclusion. I believe he would join us in our overall objectives. I would join him in being against overrestrictive legislation.

"Question. If you had the chance to address some well-chosen words to the independent retailers of the country, what would you say to them?

"Mr. ROOSEVELT. I appreciate this opportunity to make a comment: Our American enterprise system has been responsible for our national development because of the existence and preservation of true competition. Free competition is the essence of what we call freedom in our economic system. Without it, all that means America would quickly disappear. A monopolistic economy would lead rapidly to a Communist or Fascist dictatorship. The independent grocer should work to convince the housewife that in the long run, elimination of small businessmen would bring economic slavery.

"The trend toward monopoly, unknown to most citizens, is growing at an alarming rate. There's an old saying: 'Forewarned is forearmed.' Let us arm ourselves now to preserve our freedoms and our way of life."

Sacramento Is Host to National JACL Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the 16th Biennial National Convention of the Japanese American Citizens League, more popularly known as the JACL, which is to be held at the newly constructed Hotel El Dorado in Sacramento, Calif., June 28 to July 3.

As most of my colleagues are aware, the JACL is the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry in this country, with members and chapters in 32 States, including the newest, Hawaii. Its name identifies most of its constituency, for all of its members are native-born or naturalized citizens, most of whom are also of Japanese ancestry. Its name too delineates its reasons for being, to keep watch and ward over the welfare of those of Japanese ancestry in this Nation and to promote, in the words of its national slogan, "Better Americans in a Greater America."

APPROPRIATE CONVENTION SITE

The historic capitol city of Sacramento is an especially appropriate site for the JACL convention, for no other State in the Union has had a more intimate association with Americans of Japanese ancestry on the continental mainland of California. Today, it is estimated that one-half or more of all persons of Japanese ancestry residing on the U.S. mainland live in California.

One hundred years ago, the first Japanese Embassy to this country landed in San Francisco preparatory to traveling to Washington, D.C., to sign the first treaty of friendship and commerce with our Nation. It is this centennial of diplomatic and commercial relations that we are celebrating this year, which includes exchange visits by President Eisenhower to Tokyo this month and by the Crown Prince and Princess to Washington in September.

It was 75 years ago that the first Japanese immigrants were brought over to this country through the port of San Francisco, which has come to be known as the Gateway to the Orient. And, it was in the Sacramento Valley and the surrounding hills that they first made their great contributions to the agriculture of the West, settling on unwanted wastelands and transforming them into productive farms and orchards, thereby demonstrating the value of irrigation and intensive cultivation. It was around Sacramento and the rugged mountain barriers to the East that the Japanese immigrants first joined in laying the tracks that enabled this Nation to bind itself together in an intercontinental network of iron rails. It was also in these rich mountains that these immigrants first joined to mine the ores that helped to make Western America the treasure house of the world.

Indeed, the once frontier West in general and California in particular owes much to the many and varied contributions of these so-called Japanese pioneers. And, it is to their greater credit that they accomplished and achieved so much under the handicaps of the anti-oriental discrimination and prejudice that they inherited from the Chinese immigrants of an earlier day. And, few of us will ever recall with pride our wartime mistreatment of this tiny minority, when Americans and their parents of Japanese ancestry were arbitrarily eva-

cuated from their homes and associations on the West coast in the spring of 1942.

Since World War II, the legislative halls of the State House which once spawned persecution of the Japanese have resounded with corrective and remedial acts for the benefit of those of Japanese ancestry in California. The courts of our State, too, have joined in striking down discriminatory statutes directed against our fellow Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Perhaps no city in America stands as a more eloquent reminder of the vicissitudes and the triumphs of Americans of Japanese ancestry than Sacramento.

SACRAMENTO LONG IDENTIFIED WITH JACL

Although the JACL movement began during World War I and local clubs were established under various names to promote the citizenship of the then very young Japanese-American minority, it was not until 1930 that the National JACL was organized at its first biennial national convention in Seattle, Wash.

The next year, in October of 1931, the Sacramento chapter of the JACL was formally organized and Walter T. Tsukamoto, a Japanese-American attorney who is now a lieutenant colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army, was elected its first president. Except for the World War II years when the group was inactive because of the exclusion of American Japanese ancestry from the west coast, the Sacramento chapter has been an active participant in the league's activities, particularly insofar as representing the interests of Americans of Japanese ancestry in California were concerned before the State legislature. The minutes of the Sacramento chapter reflect the changing attitudes of Californians and other Americans to their fellow citizens of Japanese ancestry.

The various chapter presidents from Tsukamoto to the present include Dr. Jiro Muramoto, Henry Taketa, Dr. George Takahashi, Edward Kitazume, Dr. Goro Muramota, Mitsuru Nishio, Dr. Alvin Sato, Kiyo Sato, William Matsumoto, Toko Fujii, George Tabmara, Dean Itano, Percy Masaki, Mamoru Sakuma, Katsuro Murakami, Richard Matsumoto, and Tak Tsujita, the present chief executive.

Of particular note is the chapter's joint sponsorship recently with the Veterans of Foreign Wars Nisei—Japanese American—Post No. 8985 in the securing and the maintenance of the Nisei War Memorial Hall to honor the Japanese-American war dead of World War II, most of whom volunteered for combat duty from the confines of war relocation camps to which they and their families had been evacuated, with the now famous 442d Regimental Combat Team, often cited as the most decorated military unit for its size and length of service in American annals.

CONVENTION THEME "DECISIONS FOR TOMORROW"

The theme for this biennial national convention is "Decisions for Tomorrow," which reflects JACL's concern for the immediate future not only as an organization but also as Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Only 18 years ago, these Japanese Americans were an unwanted, suspect minority confined to virtual prison camps. That today they are the accepted Americans that they are, enjoying equality in and under the law and opportunities that never before existed for members of their nationality is a tribute not just to the JACL, which provided the leadership during the dark and troublesome days of their travail, but to the American way of democracy that has enabled these fellow Americans to overcome the bigotry and hatred of a recent era and to enjoy their status today as one of America's more fortunate minorities.

Some 1,000 delegates from the 88 chapters that comprise the National Organization are expected to convene in Sacramento later this month to chart their "Decisions for Tomorrow." The recommendations of a specially-appointed National JACL 1960–1970 Planning Commission are to be considered by the delegates who are not only aware of their opportunities as Americans but also that this is the dawn of the space and nuclear age, as well as the beginning of the second century of diplomatic and commercial relations between Japan and the United States.

SPECIAL CONVENTION EVENTS

Traditionally, the climax event is the convention banquet, to be held the evening of July 2. Guest speaker will be our esteemed colleague, DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, the first American of Japanese ancestry to be elected to the U.S. Congress. As most of you know, the JACL was among the forefront of organizations that labored long in behalf of statehood for this long deserving territory. At the last or 15th biennial national convention which was held in Salt Lake City, Utah, 2 years ago, the guest speaker was also a distinguished colleague, D. S. "JUDGE" SAUND, of California, the first person of Asian ancestry to win election to the Congress.

In addition to the announcement and installation of the national officers for the next 2 years, the highlight of this affair is the naming of the Nisei of the biennium 1958–60, the highest honor that is presented by the JACL to the American of Japanese ancestry who in the past 2 years by his achievements or his services has contributed most to the welfare or to the credit of persons of Japanese ancestry. Congressman INOUYE, who was named as one of the 10 outstanding young men of America this past January by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, by the way, is an outstanding candidate for this recognition, for he was nominated by the Washington, D.C. chapter for this honor. William Hosokawa, assistant managing editor of the Denver Post of Denver, Colo., was the Nisei of the 1956–58 biennium. A previous winner was Hiroshi Miyamura of Gallup, N. Mex., the only living Japanese American Congressional Medal of Honor holder who was also named as one of the 10 outstanding young men of America a few years ago.

A special feature of the Sacramento convention will be the pioneer banquet, which will be held the evening of June 28. This event will pay tribute to those remaining Japanese immigrants who have not only helped to make thel and of their adoption a better place in which to live but also raised their children into the loyal, exemplary citizens that they are. The Honorable Dr. Koto Matsudaira, Permanent Representative and Ambassador of Japan to the United Nations, will be the principal speaker. As former chairman of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Use of Space and a member of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, as well as the former Japanese representative on the Security Council during the crucial debates on the Suez crisis, Ambassador Matsudaira should be in an excellent position to suggest to JACL some of the vital challenges of these troubled times.

The customary Convention Luncheon which honors the JACL'er of the biennium and other organizational leaders is being converted into a testimonial to Dr. Thomas T. Yatabe, now of Chicago, Ill., for some 40 years of active leadership in JACL. Dr. Yatabe, a dentist, helped found the predecessor American Loyalty League in Fresno, Calif., in 1918 and was the first constitutional president of the National JACL. During and immediately after the war, he voluntarily gave up his professional work to help Japanese-Americans from the camps find housing and employment in the Midwest and East. He has served longer—some 28 years—on the national board than any individual.

Another Convention event will be a panel on housing and employment discrimination, the two remaining major areas in whieh the Japanese-American still faces prejudice, featuring Tad T. Masaoka, Intergroup Relations Specialist of the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Urban Renewal Administration for region six, which embraces the Pacific Coast States and Alaska and Hawaii, of San Francisco, and John Yoshino, liaison officer for the President's Committee on Government Contracts, of Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL BOARD MEMBERS

Typical of the cross section of America that comprises the JACL is its national board members.

Shigeo Wakamatsu, national president, Chicago, Ill., is a chemist with Lever Bros.

Akiji Yoshimura, national first vice president, Colusa, Calif., is proprietor of the Vogue Cleaners.

Toru Sakahara, national second vice president, Seattle, Wash., is an attorney at law.

George Sugai, national third vice president, Payette, Idaho, is a produce dealer and shipper with the Central Produce Distributors.

Aki Hayashi, national treasurer, New York, N.Y., is merchandise manager for Noritake Chinaware Co.

Lilly Okura, secretary to the national board, Omaha, Nebr., is the administrative assistant and secretary to Hospital Administrators.

William Matsumoto, National Thousand Club chairman, Sacramento, Calif., is an insurance agent and assistant district manager of the West Coast Life Insurance Co. He is also the chairman of the convention committee.

Dr. Roy Nishikawa, immediate past national president, Los Angeles, Calif., is an optometrist.

George Inagaki, past national president, Los Angeles, Calif., is an investment counsellor and area manager of the Financial Industrial Fund.

Frank Chuman, national legal counsel, Los Angeles, Calif., is an attorney at law.

William Marutani, chairman, eastern district council, Philadelphia, Pa., is also an attorney at law.

Joe Kadowski, chairman, midwest district council, Cleveland, Ohio, is purchasing and production manager of the Jones Optical Co.

Minoru Yasui, chairman, mountain plains district council, Denver, Colo., is another attorney at law.

Joe Nishioka, chairman, intermountain district council, Idaho Falls, Idaho, is a farmer.

Kay Nakagiri, chairman, Pacific southwest district council, Burbank, Calif., is an aeronautical engineer at Lockheed Aircraft.

Fred Hirasuna, chairman, central California district council, Fresno, Calif., is a shipper of fruits and vegetables for the Sunnyside Packing Co.

Yone Satoda, chairman, northern California-western Nevada district council, San Francisco, Calif., is an accountant and office manager for the House of Rib.

George Azumano, chairman, Pacific Northwest district council, Portland, Oreg., is a travel agent and insurance salesman.

Masao Satow, national director, San Francisco, Calif.; Daisy Uyeda, administrative assistant, national headquarters, San Francisco, Calif.; Mike Masaoka, Washington representative, Washington, D.C.; Fred Takata, southern California regional representative, Los Angeles, Calif.; Esther Hagiwara, Midwest regional office, Chicago, Ill.; and Sam Ishikawa, New York office, New York, N.Y., are among the staff officers. Harry Honda is the editor of the Pacific Citizen, official weekly publication, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Miss Linda Yatabe, a student at the University of California at Berkeley, Calif., will be the official hostess as the convention queen.

JAPANESE AMERICAN CREED

I know that Members of Congress join in wishing the delegates to the 16th biennial national JACL convention a successful and constructive 6 days in Sacramento and express the hope that they will be as successful in determining their decisions for tomorrow as they have in their past plans, for most Americans can take pride in the living example of democracy in action that is the JACL.

If, in their deliberations, they live up to the spirit of the Japanese American Creed, which was authored by Mike Masaoka, whom many of us respect as the able Washington JACL representative who is so responsible for many of the legislative and other gains made by Americans of Japanese ancestry since the end of World War II, then the delegates will not fail their trust as custodians of the JACL destiny.

The creed, which may be well commended to other Americans, too, reads as follows:

I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this Nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in this world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way: aboveboard, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her Constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America.

H.R. 5636

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have taken the liberty to express the purposes upon which I was motivated to introduce H.R. 5636 in the 86th Congress, being legislation designed to afford relief to certain American nationals whose property was damaged in Central Europe as a result of World War II and providing a means for return of a limited amount of sequestered German assets arising out of that conflict. In this latter regard, as a condition precedent to returning these assets to Germany, H.R. 5636 provided that the West German Government should honor certain long-existing debt obligations to American nationals.

It did not come with complete surprise that the Reichsbank and the Deutschgolddiskontbank liquidation law was defeated in the Bundestag. This most recent disinclination on the part of the German Government to discharge Germany's prewar debts emphasizes and further justifies the conditions precedent contained in my bill, H.R. 5636. Because of this most recent action, I am now more than ever convinced that there should be no further discussions concerning the return of German property until the West German Government has discharged its prewar obligations to U.S. nationals. This refusal on the part of West Germany is, as I have emphasized before, something of a less-than-scrupulous pattern in fulfilling its longstanding obligations to the international community, especially those in connection with the Reichsbank's guarantee to non-German investors in the Golddiskontbank whose dividends continue to be in default and remain unpaid solely because of the delay in the liquidation of the Hitler banks, all of which have been a great prejudice to many American investors.

Because of this recent action by the legislative body of the West German Government, I will submit new legislation in the next Congress, as well as respectfully requesting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to defer any action upon any treaty arrangement with Germany and defer any arrangement to return sequestered or vested assets until the German Government has met its obligations to our citizens. This position is not only reasonable but is further motivated by the desire to protect American investments abroad and to announce to the world that the Congress of the United States will, on every occasion possible, support its American nationals in doing business abroad and making investments overseas.

Conservation of Our Greatest Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that the greatest resource which this Nation has is the ability of its children. It is clear that the abilities of many children will not be properly developed and that this will be a tremendous loss to our Nation at a time when it is competing with the Soviet Union.

Robert P. Crossley says that college costs are our next nightmare and he has taken a long, hard look at a problem that's going to get worse.

Under unanimous consent I am including a page from the June 1960 issue of McCall's. I commend it to my colleagues and strongly recommend that we make ready to take appropriate action:

I have a friend who has seven kids. The two oldest were graduated recently from a private university in the South. It cost him $10,200 apiece—$20,400 for the pair. If the other five go to college and cost no more, his total bill will be $71,400. He wants his children to have the best, although he had only 2 years of high school himself. The $71,400 doesn't stagger him; he makes $50,000 a year.

I have another friend. He has six children, all under 6. (There's a pair of twins.) He makes about $8,000. He says if his kids get to college, they'll have to make it on their own, the way he did.

"College costs are getting crueler and crueler," a newspaperman said to me the other day. He has two girls in private colleges in the East and a son who will be ready in a couple of years.

"There's getting to be a real fellowship among parents," he went on. "I meet a stranger, find he has a son or daughter in college, and right away we have a nice profane chat."

Three months ago, I started to write a simple report on how parents can save up or put aside enough money to send their children to college. How naive can you get?

I questioned nearly 300 families in every State, college presidents, financial-aid directors, students themselves, bankers, Government experts, and investment counselors.

Here are some of the jolts I got, some of the paradoxes I ran into, some of the conclusions I was forced to draw. They scare me.

1. Tuition and fees have gone up an average of 129 percent in publicly supported colleges and 165 percent in private ones in the past 9 years. During this period, many colleges have raised their charges more than they did in the preceding 200 years.

2. The cost boom is just getting started, and will go up faster than prices in general and family incomes. The U.S. Office of Education expects total costs at both public and private colleges to double by 1970. That means $3,400 a year at a State university; $4,600 at a private one.

3. College costs five times what is did 50 years ago (so do a lot of other things); but professors' salaries are worth only half as much.

4. Most parents feel "obligated" to provide their children with a college education, but have no idea of the cost or where the money will come from. Unless you make more than $10,000 a year, don't count on saving up enough to send more than one child through college. No matter what kind of savings plan you have, it will probably prove too small.

5. Scholarships are fine, but there aren't enough to go around, and they aren't big enough. And as costs go up, even upper-income students are going to need scholarships' financial help.

6. Most parents think working your way through college builds character, but don't want their kids to do it.

7. More and more students will borrow for an education. The family of the future will be paying on three mortgages, house, car, and college.

8. Private colleges are in a desperate squeeze; their struggle to escape endangers our tradition of democratic low-cost education. Never has there been such bitterness between the two.

9. Everybody wants the Government to keep its hands off higher education, but our most famous engineering school is getting three-fourths of its total income from Uncle Sam—and our largest State university nearly half.

10. The best thing a man with three kids can do is move to California. Why? Where else can you find 64 free junior colleges, 10 State colleges, and a State university with 8 campuses?

11. Young people who really burn with a desire for education will still find a way to get one.

The full report on which the preceding comments are based is being made available in mimeographed form. Many of the findings are startling, the misconceptions widespread. If you would like a copy of this special McCall's report, write to "College Costs," McCall's, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N.Y. Please enclose 8 cents' postage to cover mailing.

Soviet Regime's Work in East Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have recently inserted in the RECORD two articles by Dr. Walter Becher, of Munich, Germany, on the Soviet regime's work in East Germany. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include additional information on the Soviet machinations in Germany:

The process of forced collectivization has entered the final stage in almost all people's democracies, but signs of the next step, the trend toward concentration and the sovkhoz system—the "transfer from socialism to unfolded communism" in Khrushchev's words—are already visible. In Bulgaria, after military suppression of farmer revolts in many places, over 90 percent of the farmers have been collectivized. The first form of the TKZP (agricultural labor cooperatives), comparable to the kolkhoz or the Soviet Zone's LPG grade I, was confirmed by the CC plenary session of January 1959. As in all other people's democracies, the procedure followed the Soviet pattern: After 1945 expropriation of the large and middle-sized farms and their transfer to the peasants who sustained the agricultural setup—as yet lacking any investments and installations for collectivization—and kept the food supply going. Since the end of 1948, simultaneously with the first attack on Berlin and the total Communist absorption of the satellite states by suppression and physical annihilation of all democratic forces, irresistible collectivization sets in. It transforms partially or completely these agrarian states into industrial countries and moves labor, hitherto agricultural, into the cities. In Czechoslovakia, subsequent to the expropriation period, there arise four different types of cooperatives, types I and II being transitory and abandoned after 1955, types III and IV being dominant today and constituting the initial form of concentrating the usable area, collectivized by 80 percent. In Rumania approximately 70 percent of the tillable land was collectivized or nationalized by the end of 1959. In Hungary, during the party congress of December 1959, Kadar announced (in the presence of Khrushchev): "The still independent farmers know quite well that they are going to be collective farmers sooner or later."

In Poland the October revolution had led to the complete decline of collectivization, especially since fictive bookkeeping (Cyrankiewicz) left the plan figures almost a quarter behind the actual result of the first agricultural measures. The pressure of the class struggle in the village did not industrialize the Polish population to even a half, much less to two-thirds as intended by the economic planners of the Stalinist type, now largely reinstated in power. The new collectivization was prepared at the CC plenary surprise session called last year shortly after the Third Party Congress. As in all Socialist countries, the difference between the obligatory delivery price and the free market price came to nothing and was merely a calculated amount added to the agriculture fund, which the Agricultural Circles (Kolka Rolnicze) control, thereby deciding all matters such as seed, fertilizer, machinery and installations, livestock, electrification, amelioration of the soil and boundary improvements. In addition, most of the midget economy (three-fourths of the privately owned usable area being less than 10 hectares, one-fourth less than 5 hectares) had class struggle enough. Even in view of the special situation of the Polish peasantry, the financial preponderance will decisively influence the still moderate degree of collectivization there. Considering the East Block as a whole, the dismaying collectivization drive in the Soviet Zone assumes particular significance. Its murderous speed recalls the terrible period in the U.S.S.R. Though disowning a whole stratum of Germans beyond the River Elbe, the collectivization as such is not the most important angle of the procedure. The white book of the federal government reveals all details and figures concerning the pauperization process. We don't have to elaborate on it.

But, as already mentioned, collectivization as such is not the prime point. Ulbricht clearly said in his declaration before the people's chamber: "The entrance of the farmers, male and female alike, into the LPG was, in a sense, also a preliminary plebiscite in favor of the Germany plan." His concluding words clarify entirely why collectivization is only a challenging camouflage: "All farmers in Germany wholeheartedly wish that the summit conference will lead to agreements regarding nuclear and general disarmament and that, above all, in West Germany nuclear armament and the installation of rocket artillery be canceled and the military forces reduced. The Germany plan of the people also reveals to the farmers the road to a peaceful solution of the German question."

There we have it—the exact concept of Moscow's German policy as the actual issue. Collectivization, effected at this time and speed, is quite clearly a subterfuge for creating faits accomplis.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

A Continuing Responsibility—The World's Homeless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, World Refugee Year is drawing to a close. We have still to pass refugee relief legislation of even a modest nature and object in this Congress. The President has still to advance plans for using almost one-half of the special World Refugee Year fund of $10 million authorized by the Congress last year.

In plain language, World Refugee Year has met its major objective to call to the attention of the entire world its responsibilities for those without home or country, but these responsibilities have not been fulfilled in this one year. There are continuing responsibilities and they are ours as Americans, as brothers of all who suffer because they have been deprived of freedom and rights.

Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] eloquently set forth the needs of the world's refugees and the great and continuing heritage and strength which new immigrants have brought to our Nation, in an address before the New York Committee for World Refugee Year at the United Nations on May 24.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART AT THE DINNER FOR WORLD REFUGEE YEAR AT UNITED NATIONS, SPONSORED BY THE NEW YORK COMMITTEE FOR WORLD REFUGEE YEAR, DELEGATES DINING ROOM, UNITED NATIONS, MAY 24, 1960

We from Michigan have a very special reason this year to be reminded that there is a continuing heritage in our Midwest, as there is here in the East, of strength drawn from new immigrants to our States. The one-millionth person brought to a new home by ICEM has come to live in Kalamazoo, Mich., and arrived last week.

Writing to this young Latvian boy to welcome him to our State reminded me again that there is no satisfactory short-term way to look at the opportunities and responsibilities of the United States in this controversial field of refugee and immigration legislation.

It starts at the beginning of America. Our Declaration of Independence proclaimed one of the grievances against England as the fact that the Crown attempted to hinder free immigration into the Colonies.

Since the end of World War II our Nation has been immeasurably strengthened, both in fact and in spirit, by the admission of well over a million homeless persons welcomed to our shores and, I hope, our hearts.

Each of you knows that this accomplishment has not been without bitterness and often immense effort every time new laws needed enactment or amendment.

There are always those in Congress who loudly proclaim, "We have done our share;" "Only the special interest organizations want more refugees admitted;" "This is not the kind of people we need in the United States." And they echo persons not in Congress. These cries were echoed again, not long ago as the sadly reduced House Joint Resolution 387 passed the House and came to the Senate.

There is some very real, and not too pleasant truth in the critics' charge that only once every 4 years are messages on revising and liberalizing our basic immigration and citizenship laws forwarded to the Congress from the White House.

House Joint Resolution 387, should be reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee shortly. Hopefully, we will succeed in eliminating the concept that U.S. participation in refugee resettlement should be contingent on a percentage of what other nations do. This is a cruel concept, one which should not be introduced as part of our immigration policies.

The Senate should also broaden the areas of the world from which persons can be admitted, liberalize the definition of persons eligible and assure that we do not ignore the most difficult cases left in the camps of Europe.

This is the program for the next few weeks. But what of the program for the next decade; yes, the next quarter of a century?

This presidential election year quite properly is the time to raise our sights; to see beyond the crisis of the moment and build into our laws permanent policies for admitting the homeless and the oppressed as a matter of continuing public policy.

There would seem to me to be real reason to believe that the American public is further advanced in accepting basic reforms in our immigration laws than most of our leaders in the Congress or the executive branch realize.

The record since World War II has shown a willingness in the United States to accept—over the quotas set by the national origins quota system—more than a million displaced persons, refugees, escapees and homeless.

Fact is, the national origins quota system has not been operative in the postwar years. The further fact is that it is time that we junked it as the basis for our long-range immigration policies.

The post-World War II displaced persons law, and amendments to that law, marked the meeting of one crisis. The Refugee Relief Act, the special Hungarian action, orphan's bills, and now the legislation for World Refugee Year, all were designed to fit some emergency.

All of us know of the long and sometimes heated disagreement among persons of good will as to when it is proper to press for basic change in our laws, and when to meet crisis with emergency bills. But from the data and information collected by groups such as yours, it is clear that refugees in this troubled world are a permanent problem. For as long as we can see, our tomorrows will have trouble areas. And tomorrow's trouble area will have tomorrow's refugees.

How do we know that the events of last week in Paris will not bring new refugee movements overnight? Hopefully this will not be so, but certainly one thing is clear: We have no permanent law or policy of our Government to meet this possibility.

May I propose that 1960 be the year when all of us work to shift our basic efforts to that of achieving this shift, to build in these long-needed reforms in our immigration and citizenship laws. Especially should we push to rid the laws of the national origin and racial restrictions, while building in flexibility that will permit the United States to express as part of our spirit to the world a continual open door to apparent oncoming years when assuredly there will be the homeless.

If I am correct that there is already a willingness of the American people to underwrite such a change of law and policy, how do we capture and effectively use this disposition? First, as in so many of the national problems which touch no single region or part of our Nation but affect each unequally, we must have the vigorous and continuing support of the President of the Nation.

Each candidate for the Presidency, as he develops his programs and plans before the American people this fall will have an opportunity to sound this need. Many of you here tonight can influence a change in an unhealthy political tradition—a tradition which has a paragraph on immigration reform included only in those speeches to be given in cities with large foreign born populations. The 1960 presidential campaign offers both candidates the chance to demonstrate to all Americans the role our immigration and refuge policies will play in the decade ahead.

Beyond this the continuing programs, not only of migration, but of rehabilitation, relief, resettlement, all the projects being undertaken as part of World Refugee Year, present exciting and potent forces for the United States to support through the United Nations, and through its own direct actions.

To increase the likelihood that the fall campaign might result in action, an additional agreement is needed. In the weeks immediately ahead, I believe the President should consider the appointment of a top-level Presidential commission to consider the broad sweep of our immigration and refugee policies.

It is often "old hat" to propose another "study" commission. Sometimes it is a way of escaping responsibility. Nonetheless, in this case I believe the President should establish a commission of responsible citizens to report sometime next year just before the new administration has taken office. It has been 8 years since we have had such a review of our immigration and refugee practices and policies. President Truman's 1952 Commission on Immigration rendered great service, and set many goals. It is unfortunate that the interest and activity it generated did not result in broader legislative reform. But a new impetus now, together with firm pledges to carry through from both presidential candidates, could reverse the old trend of a message every 4 years. We could have a message in 1961, with 4 years of presidential leadership to bring its recommendations to fruition.

What sort of commission? It could include the president of the AFL–CIO; and the president of the NAM; the president of the Foreign Policy Association; the president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges; two or three Governors; the publishers of one or more of our national newspapers or magazines.

The recommendations of such a group could not be ignored by the President from either party in 1961.

This might be the "hypodermic needle" that is really needed to get us out of this crisis-to-crisis merry-go-round that we have been on with immigration and refugee legislation. And it is not even a predictable merry-go-round, because it is creaking and slowing down to a very dangerous point. Soon we may be arguing over emergency bills to let in only a hundred persons.

The events of the past 2 weeks have underscored the kind of crisis-ridden world which is ours. The United States is not the most populous nation. Most of the peoples of the world are not white, they are not literate, they are not well fed, they are not free from fear. In this latter we show signs of joining.

As immigrants and sons of immigrants, we in America are blessed with U.S. citizenship. We are not able to say to all or even very many of the peoples of the world, "Come be citizens of our Nation." But we must not foreclose that possibility to any person because of his color or place of birth.

Our Nation's laws and policies must be a reflection of the kind of world we hope all mankind wants to achieve in the 20th century and beyond. No more clear evidence could be given than in how we assume responsibilities for the homeless of the world.

We can do better than we have, much better. I repeat my belief that the people of America are prepared to support leadership which sets these goals and policies. No better time to start can be found than now, for the world rushes toward us at frightening speed.

Growing Red Influence Places Extra Responsibility on Parents, Educators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a fine editorial which appeared in the Granite City (Ill.) Press Record of June 6, 1960.

I agree with the sentiments which are expressed in this editorial by the publisher of the Press Record, the Honorable C. E. Townsend, who has been frequently recognized by Illinois and national press associations for his progressive and outstanding contributions in the field of journalism. Mr. Townsend has been a recognized leader for good in his home community and in the State of Illinois. The thoughts expressed in this editorial indicate the reason he is so well respected.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Townsend in the expressions contained in his editorial:

GROWING RED INFLUENCE PLACES EXTRA RESPONSIBILITY ON PARENTS, EDUCATORS

A report by Senator THURMOND to the House Un-American Activities Committee on his observation of last month's riots at the committee hearings in San Francisco emphasized that most of the participants were students. He testified that the riots were "inspired and incited by Communists or fellow travelers," and he placed most of the blame on "the lack of self-discipline and moral training of the young people involved."

The South Carolina Senator viewed as a disturbing development enemy agents' success in distorting American concepts and influencing the minds of yonug Americans. "This should impress on our minds the fact that Communist efforts to misdirect and mislead the formative minds of the youth of the United States is every bit as dangerous, if not more so, than their spying and espionage activities in this country," he said.

Most American youths have self-discipline and moral stamina, but the riots and the rousing welcome accorded Russian leaders in the same city indicate that some youths are susceptible to the Communist line. The Biblical saying that "the truth shall make you free" has always applied to this Nation; its success in establishing and maintaining freedom reflects the fact that democracy is a better and fairer way of life than dictatorship, and that this truth has been widely disseminated and believed.

An answer to the problem typified by the riots may be greater emphasis on democratic principles and the need to defend them; citizens of all ages must use commonsense, and not just oppose for the sake of opposing. Student action has been responsible for the return of freedom to some countries, but it has done harm in other lands. Certainly, an uprising against democratic concepts, with use of mob force in a nation dedicated to law and order, is greatly out of place.

The situation imposes a responsibility on parents, schools, colleges, and churches. Everyone, in fact, is involved in the education and indoctrination of each new generation. We should all know something—and probably we ought to learn more than we know now—about democracy, communism, free enterprise, economics, and other topics affecting our own and our country's future. Parents have the greatest reesponsibility and can do more than anyone else to properly orient their sons and daughters.

Richard Nixon: "We Believe in the Creative Genius of a Free People"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "RICHARD NIXON: 'We Believe in the Creative Genius of a Free People,'" published in the U.S. News & World Report of June 13, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD NIXON: "WE BELIEVE IN THE CREATIVE GENIUS OF A FREE PEOPLE"

(The following by Vice President NIXON gives his view of the 1960 issues and the differences between the major parties—in foreign and domestic policy and policy toward business. The statement was in response to the questions asked by U.S. News & World Report.)

What is the best way to achieve the goals that all Americans want?

As Republicans and Democrats, as conservatives and liberals, we do not necessarily disagree about goals. All of us want to secure a just and honorable peace; we want to preserve and extend a life of freedom; we all want to share in the abundance of sustained economic growth and progress.

But the key difference—and here is the issue that ought to be sharply debated in the 1960 campaign—centers on the best way to achieve these goals. I am convinced that the right way can be summed up in one phrase—the principle of freedom.

On this score, the Republican Party has a proud tradition and a great record of achievement to offer.

We believe that freedom for the individual is the dynamic of real progress in every area of human action. We equate progress, not with increased activity by the Government in Washington, but with increased opportunity for individual initiative, for private enterprise, and for people working through their highly responsive local and State institutions.

We believe the role of the Federal Government should be limited to creating a proper climate for individual and private enterprise, and to supplementing it only when the public interest is unquestionably paramount.

We believe in a maximum of individual enterprise and a minimum of Government intervention—not because we are afraid of Government, but because of our supreme confidence in the creative genius of a free people.

We are economic conservatives—not because we want to stand pat with what we have, but precisely because we are convinced that a sound currency and a pay-as-you-go budget are absolutely essential for sustained economic progress.

For us, the choice is not progress or freedom; it is progress with and because of freedom. Conservatism works—it preserves what is good from the past and then builds on that foundation—and we think the record of the last 8 years proves it.

That record, in terms of economic progress for 69 million American wage earners: More jobs at higher rates of real take-home pay than ever before in history. As I said to Mr. Khrushchev and the Russian people a year ago in Moscow, we in America have achieved through free institutions the widely shared abundance in a classless society that socialism merely poses as a future goal.

U.S. News & World Report asks: "Would business be better under a Republican or under a Democratic administration?"

My answer is that business always flourishes best in an atmosphere of freedom. Government fiscal and tax policy must provide a solid floor, but the only ceiling on American growth and progress ought to be the productive capacities of a free people.

The same principle applies to every aspect of human activity. For Americans, a life of cultural and spiritual freedom, and of true social mobility, is infinitely more important than mere economic well-being. Material abundance is only the foundation for the fullest and freest development of the human spirit.

Republican foreign policy—I prefer to call it American foreign policy—carries this principle of freedom forward into every corner of the world. We will maintain the military strength we need to defend freedom. We will use our economic resources, public and private, to assist others in their quest for progress with freedom and for national self-determination, free of all outside domination. And we put the enemies of freedom on warning, worldwide, that we will tolerate neither subversion nor overt aggression against the integrity of free nations.

If the American people want leadership dedicated to a maximum of freedom—in every aspect of our national life—if they reject the idea of Government intervention

as a panacea for all our problems, then I think 1960 will be a Republican year. And the years ahead will be years, for all of us, of sustained progress.

Sand and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial included below by unanimous consent was written by T. Jeff Williams, a senior at the University of Oregon School of Journalism. His home is Santa Fe, N. Mex. It was printed in the Umpqua Courier for May 26, 1960, and is, in my opinion, a clear-headed, factual analysis of the development of the proposal to establish a national seashore park in the Florence-Reedsport area in my district, a matter now before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses:

SAND AND POLITICS

(By T. Jeff Williams, a senior at the University of Oregon School of Journalism; his home is Santa Fe, N. Mex.)

A National Park Service survey of the Pacific coast in 1958 selected the Oregon sand dunes and inland lakes in the vicinity of Florence as an area of national recreational significance. Shortly following this survey, the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, proposed in a bill (S. 1526) to make this area a national seashore under the auspices of the Park Service.

The 40,000 acres requested for inclusion in the national seashore by Neuberger encompass four inland fresh-water lakes—Tahkenitch, Siltcoos, Woahink, and Cleawox. Some 25 miles of ocean beach form the western boundary and behind the beach towering dunes form an intricate landscape pattern of outstanding scenic and geologic interest.

A storm of controversy broke in Oregon over this proposal and began seething on all levels—local, State, and Federal.

But why, some might ask, should this proposal create such widespread opposition?

The whole controversy revolves around the economy of Florence and its vicinity. Basically, the problem is whether, in long-range economic terms, Florence will benefit or lose by the establishment of a national seashore.

When Neuberger's proposal was first made public, the leading opponents of the bill were the Western Lane Taxpayer's Association, the Governor's committee on natural resources, and behind the scenes, the U.S. Forest Service.

The most outspoken of the three is the Western Lane Taxpayer's Association, an organization formed by Florence residents for the express purpose of combating the proposed national seashore. Jack Hayes, a wiry, quick-minded, and persuasive speaker, was elected chairman.

The association's principal argument charged that if the dunes park were established it would have unfavorable effects upon the private citizens and landholders in the area.

The Park Service, whose main purpose is to preserve scenic lands for public recreational use, cites the population trend in Oregon in its argument for the national seashore; by 1990 the U.S. Bureau of Census estimates Oregon's population will be some 3 million compared to 1,773,000 in 1958. Increased travel is expected in conjunction with the population expansion. In 1990, it is predicted, some 7 million tourists will visit the coast compared to the 1,500,000 visitors in 1957.

The Park Service predicts that the establishment of a national seashore would attract more tourists and would greatly benefit the local economy through tourist trade.

The Western Lane Taxpayer's Association spokesmen say the economy would suffer because of the loss of income from the land and resources that would be taken in by the proposed park.

On the State level, Governor Hatfield asked his committee on natural resources, headed by Dan Allen, to investigate the problem and give him its recommendations. From all evidence, it appears that in his investigation Allen talked primarily to those who opposed the park. Many community leaders in the Florence area who favor the park proposal say Allen never approached them. The resource committee recommended to Hatfield that a national seashore should not be established in the Florence vicinity.

Meanwhile, NEUBERGER and Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, who were working together on the proposed park, held hearings in Florence, Reedsport, and Eugene in an attempt to determine what problems would face the residents if a park were established in the Florence area.

Initially, it appeared that NEUBERGER had made little, if any, headway in establishing the dunes park from his encounter with the opposition in these hearings. But the effects were to be far reaching.

From March through November, Dan Allen and his resource committee had flatly opposed a national seashore in the Florence area, and Hatfield accordingly agreed with Allen. The final decision in Oregon on the proposed national seashore rested with Hatfield; it could not be established without his authorization.

But, after three committee hearings and statewide notice, the developing situation was putting Hatfield in an untenable position. Figures from a questionnaire on the park circulated by PORTER showed a majority of people in seven counties predominantly favored the park.

Thus, it began to appear that if Hatfield remained opposed to the park he could alienate a large number of voters. But if he switched his position, it might be interpreted as an admission of hasty and ill-considered earlier actions.

NEUBERGER, intentionally or not, had forced Hatfield into an awkward position. This was the turning point: To which side would Hatfield move?

He began a slow swing in favor of the park proposal—with amendments, of course.

From this time forward the resource committee approached the park proposal with a positive philosophy. There was now room for further negotiations between the Park Service and the resource committee where there had been a near stalemate prior to the change. Hatfield presented NEUBERGER with a bill of minimum standards which would need to be satisfied before he would allow the establishment of the national seashore. Changes in acquisition of land, tax payments, provisions of ownership, and administration of game were major suggestions.

Jack Hayes and his association continued to oppose the seashore proposal primarily because Hatfield didn't specify in his bill that the Park Service's right of condemnation should not be allowed. But Hayes was fighting a losing battle now. He and his association stand alone against the Park Service, the resource committee and many of the Florence residents who favor the park.

The Forest Service continues to oppose the park but apparently it realizes there is little it can actually do, for Congress has the right to turn the Forest Service land over to the Park Service.

The arguments for a final settlement will continue, but basically to be considered is this: is a national seashore desirable here?

The answer, in the judgment of this writer, is yes.

Expanding population and increasing tourist travel in Oregon are pressing present recreational facilities to the limit. And hand in hand with the population increase goes the continual buying of land for private homes and the erection of new industries. What appears to be a considerable amount of public land still available on the coast is rapidly being bought for private homesites.

Even though the beaches are held free by Oregon law, the intervening land, if made private, will block access to the beach in large sections.

With the responsibility dispersed among local and State agencies and the Forest Service there is no guarantee that the recreational potential in this area will be protected. There are too many loopholes through which private interests can encroach where the land is not protected by Congress.

With all the natural resources available in the Florence area there has been remarkably little development done by the existing agencies in the past 5 years. To fully protect this area from private interests that could control or spoil this scenic wonderland of dunes and lakes, it should be placed under a unified administration.

Only under the administration of the Park Service can the lakes and dunes be fully developed—and protected—for the recreational development that Oregon so badly needs.

Wisconsin Farms Bank Three-fourths Million Acres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that the conservation reserve of the soil bank, a controversial program, was "stopped in its tracks" by a 59 to 32 vote yesterday.

During its brief lifetime, an accumulation of about 28 million acres in the reserve will have been reached in the 1960 program.

Overall, the conservation reserve had attempted to serve multiple objectives, including first, taking cropland out of production to "hold down" surpluses; second, establishing a reservoir of fertile soil for the future; and third, permitting a broadened program for watershed, reforestation, preservation of wildlife, extension of grasslands.

We realize, of course, that the conservation reserve did not make a "big dent" in the surplus stockpiles. In addition, there have been severe criticisms on the way in which the conservation program has operated in some areas of the Nation.

Frankly, I have felt that, insofar as is feasible, greater efforts should be directed toward the major surplus crops, particularly wheat and corn.

However, we must face the fact that if the conservation reserve is not extended, and no adequate alternative is adopted, and the 28 million acres in the

reserve gradually come back into product, the country may well face an increasingly difficult surplus problem.

This is a serious matter not only to the American farmer but to the economy of the country.

Recently the Wisconsin Agriculturist published an informative article entitled, "Wisconsin Farms Bank Three-fourths Million Acres." Reviewing the way the conservation reserve has been operating in our State, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FARMS BANK THREE-FOURTHS MILLION ACRES

Taxpayers are getting more for their money now that the conservation reserve is streamlined. An example is the extra million or so acres that came into the conservation reserve this year.

There was enough money appropriated for 1960 contracts to cover 5.1 million acres, according to early estimates. But competitive bidding for the contracts brought the rental payments down enough for 6.3 million acres to be signed up. Lower costs of establishing conservation practices have helped, too.

The national average rate for conservation reserve land was set at $13.50 per acre early in the year. Competitive bidding brought the average national rate down to $12.90 per acre by the time all the contracts were signed.

Here in Wisconsin 4,002 contracts were signed, at an average rental of just over $14 per acre. Whole farms accounted for 3,867 contracts. The acres brought in this year add up to 251,795. Total conservation reserve acreage in Wisconsin, for all contracts now in effect is 767,135 acres.

NEW PURPOSE FOR PROGRAM

The reduced cost of establishing conservation practices comes from a new concept of the purpose of these practices, according to Nick Calabresa, a Government soil bank specialist. He points out that the conservation reserve no longer pays for lime and fertilizer on the establishment of a vegetative cover. The new line of thinking is that all the Government expects is erosion protection and possibly a litle wildlife cover.

On whole farms there are generally several fields already in grass and legume cover. This part of the farm doesn't require cost sharing payments, as the cover's aleady there. So right now only about 20 percent of the land being signed up requires cost sharing payments on cover work.

Wisconsin land going into the conservation reserve is higher quality than it used to be, says Calabresa. One reason is that under the old system of a single State rate, the better cropland often stayed out.

Even with the extra acreage for a higher proportion of the Nation's total cropland going into the conservation reserve than does that went into the conservation reserve this year, there was some money left over at the deadline. In Wisconsin, the money authorized for conservation reserve payments is $11,123,613. But only $11,024,635 worth of land was signed up. This left a balance of almost $100,000.

Oats, barley, grain sorghum, and flax are taking the biggest acreage cuts in proportion to the total acreage devoted to these crops.

SMALL FORAGE ACREAGE

Corn, wheat, soybean, vegetable and peanut land is going into reserve at about an average rate. Cropland hay, rotation pasture, and marginal land in the reserve is low in proportion to total acreages.

These figures seem to indicate that the conservation reserve is helping a higher percentage of cash croppers get out of business than livestock producers.

None of the figures given here are final. They were figured on March 15, a month ahead of the deadline for signing conservation reserve contracts. Preliminary figures indicate well over 28 million acres will be in the conservation reserve this year.

Good-Will Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a good-will message from the children of Wales to the children of the world. It seems this message is worthy of our attention, especially in view of the need of good will and friendship throughout the world. It is also of importance because it is a message from children of one country to children of other countries. The contents of the message and the facts concerning it are especially interesting:

GOODWILL MESSAGE OF THE CHILDREN OF WALES TO THE CHILDREN OF THE WORLD

This is "Goodwill Day." Once again, we, the boys and girls of Wales, send to you, the boys and girls of all nations, our warmest greetings.

This year, the nations of the world are making a united effort to help the refugees who have suffered as the result of war. We too, in our goodwill message, wish to remember those boys and girls who are today without homes, without comfort, and without hope.

There is a great deal we can do to help. We can write to them, and we can send them gifts of money and clothes. We could also invite some of them to spend a holiday in our homes and make them our friends. In doing this, we would bring new hope to some of the millions who are today in despair.

Will you, therefore, join with us, as members of one big family, in a special effort to help the refugees this year? Where today there is despair, let us bring hope, and where there is sorrow, let us bring joy.

FACTS ABOUT THE MESSAGE, 1922–60

1. The idea that the children of Wales might one day call the children of the world in the name of peace and good will came to the Reverend Gwilym Davies in 1918 as he watched an officer in a YMCA camp in Pembrokeshire, South Wales, receiving, by earphones, messages in Morse code from Cornwall and Ireland.

2. At a youth conference of the Welsh School of Social Service held at Llandrindod in 1922, it was unanimously decided to adopt the Reverend Gwilym Davies' suggestion that a message of good will be sent by wireless from the children of Wales to the children of other countries. That was before the days of the BBC.

3. At dawn on June 28, 1922, the first Welsh children's good will message was sent out by wireless from Leafield Station in Oxfordshire. It was heard by at least one person—the director of the Eiffel Tower Station in Paris, who repeated it by wireless telephony at 10:15 a.m. on the same day. But there was no reply. The same thing was done in 1923, and again there was no reply.

4. The goodwill message was first broadcast by the BBC in 1924. Two replies were received—one from the Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden, and the other from the Minister of Education, Poland. The message had caught on, and the decision to broadcast it on May 18 every year helped to make this date an International Children's Goodwill Day throughout the world. May 18 was chosen to commemorate the anniversary of the opening of the first official peace conference at The Hague in Holland in 1899.

5. From 1925 to 1939 the message was widely heard and an increasing number of replies were received year by year. Goodwill festivals were held in many countries, goodwill magazines were published in many languages, and there were broadcasts by the radio systems of five continents.

6. Then came the Second World War, and silence fell upon many lands. But the BBC in Wales never failed to broadcast the message and a special goodwill program on May 18, even in the darkest years of the war. But the replies were few and far between.

7. In 1946, when the war had ended, the links that had been broken began to be restored. Many old friends of the message renewed their contacts with the founder, and many new friends came forward, with the result that more and more replies poured in from all parts of the world.

8. Then the message suffered its greatest loss. In January 1955 the Reverend Gwilym Davies passed away, but not before arranging for the continuance of the goodwill message by a special committee composed of representatives of the Welsh National Council of U.N.A. and of "Urdd Gobaith Cymru" (the Welsh League of Youth).

9. In 1960 the message will be broadcast from the Wales region of the BBC on May 18 in "Children's Hour," commencing at 5 p.m.—1700 hours summer time, on a wavelength of 341 meters.

10. Many other radio systems will give out the message on May 18. There will be different times in different countries. Inquiries should be made, well in advance, of the broadcasting authorities in each country.

National Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on maritime policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In its declaration of national maritime policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress envisioned a U.S. merchant marine sufficient to carry a "substantial portion" of the Nation's foreign commerce. To this end, it enacted, within the framework of the 1936 act, a farsighted program of assistance for our Nation's shipping designed to achieve for it at least some degree of parity with its foreign competitors.

Historically, and, I think, most reasonably, the "substantial portion" of ocean-freight carriage set as a goal in the 1936 act has been considered to be "at least 50 percent" of the Nation's export and import cargoes. Yet today, instead of 50 percent, vessels under U.S. registry are carrying little more than 10 percent of the Nation's foreign trade.

The handicaps under which U.S. vessels labor in competition with their foreign counterparts are many and severe. Wages, for instance, on many foreign vessels are only one-third, or even one-fourth, as much as wages on U.S. vessels. And certain other costs of operation on foreign vessels are relatively as low. With three-fourths of U.S. commerce now in bulk cargoes—grains, ores, coal, petroleum, etc.—where vessels must bid for cargoes on a shipload basis, it can readily be appreciated that low-cost foreign vessels can underbid our operators every time.

When the maritime nations of Europe following the close of World War II began to blossom forth with large, modern vessels as replacements for their war-shattered commercial fleets—with the aid of U.S. foreign-aid moneys in some cases—the competitive deficiencies of our war-built commercial vessels became even more pronounced. Then it was that Congress decided it was necessary to take a further step to preserve our dwindling merchant marine from extinction.

First, on a piecemeal basis, in the various foreign aid and mutual security acts, and, later, in 1954, as a permanent policy, there were enacted statutes which required that at least 50 percent of all Government-aid and Government-financed cargoes be transported in U.S.-flag vessels. But it should be borne in mind that, while we were reserving 50 percent of these cargoes for our own vessels, we were, at the same time, making available to other nations, recipients of these aid and financed cargoes included, half of the cargoes involved. I doubt very sincerely that any of these nations who now protest so vigorously at this minimum reservation for our own vessels would have allowed even 1 percent of cargoes to go in U.S.-flag vessels if they had been the donors instead of being, in many instances, recipients of these aid or financed cargoes.

They would have been no more generous to our shipping insofar as any aid cargoes they exported than they are by and large with their commercial exports and imports—a type of cargoes to which our 50–50 acts never extended. These nations do not pass laws to restrict carriage of their cargoes to their own merchant ships—they have more subtle ways to accomplish it. But the net result is that we do not carry any perceptible percentage of their ocean cargoes. Even with the 50 percent of aid and financed cargoes, the total percentage of our country's imports and exports transported in U.S. flag vessels is, as I have said, little more than 10 percent.

Inasmuch as they refuse to be satisfied with 50 percent of our aid and financed cargoes perhaps it might be in order, as one U.S. shipping leader has suggested, to change our policy and require that all aid and financed cargoes go in U.S. ships. We certainly need badly the cargoes which we so generously have permitted foreign ships to carry.

Along the lines of the views which I have expressed are two editorials which deserve the attention of Senators and citizens alike. One, from the Merchant Marine Bulletin of the National Security Commission, the American Legion, is from the pen of a long-time stanch supporter of the American merchant marine, Mr. Henry C. Parke, who is chairman of the Legion's national merchant marine committee and president of the Propeller Club of the United States. The other editorial is from the Alabama Register, of Mobile, Ala., a State which has contributed vastly to the advancements of the American shipping and shipbuilding industries.

I append hereto two editorials to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Merchant Marine Bulletin, May 1960]

CHIPPING AWAY

(By Henry C. Parke, chairman, National Merchant Marine Committee)

Each year the American Legion, at its national convention, adopts a merchant marine resolution, reaffirming its support of privately owned U.S.-flag shipping and specifying areas of necessary action to keep it strong for both commerce and defense. This year's resolution included the following clauses: "Assure the appropriation of adequate funds to enable the Government to meet its obligations and proceed in an accelerated vessel-replacement program" and "Effectively administer the 50–50 law." Events in Washington so far this year suggest that some straight thinking and talking on both these subjects is called for, from citizens with the Nation's and the merchant marine's interest at heart.

So far as ship replacement is concerned, it cannot be said that the funds called for this year were adequate, or that they could have any other effect than to decelerate the program. Actually, to replace even the subsidized part of our fleet in the time left before it becomes obsolete, by the standards of every major shipping country, would require us to build well over 30 ships a year. It is understood that the Maritime Administration recommended 26. The 1961 budget finally called for only 14—2 less than the average number for which funds have been appropriated annually since the inception of the program. This is "acceleration" with a vengeance, and we may live to regret it.

So far as 50–50 is concerned, we seem to be witnessing similar lack of concern on the part of the administration and the State Department about maintaining this life-or-death form of aid to the merchant marine. The Department's attempt—already successful in both Houses—to gain authority to disregard the cargo preference law in the case of the huge Indus Basin project is too much in keeping with its historic apathy or opposition to 50–50 from the start for us to be much impressed with the excuse given. This is that, since funds of several nations will be contributed to the project, it will not be feasible to apply the law to the contribution of the United States. Yet the administration is understood to favor an increasing number of such commingled ventures in order that other advanced nations may be made to share the burden of aid to underdeveloped countries. What happens to 50–50 if this policy succeeds? The answer is altogether too clear. Once the entering wedge has been driven in the Indus Basin case, the Government can excuse itself in every similar future instance, with the result that American-flag ships will receive less and less of the benefits Congress intended from the 50–50 law, as Uncle Sam extricates himself more and more from singlehanded foreign aid.

These are serious threats to our welfare and security, and they are the very threats against which our resolutions were directed. All Legionnaires, please note.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, Mar. 15, 1960]

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF IN U.S. MARITIME FIELD

What of the future of the American merchant marine?

This is a question to be seriously asked today.

It actually suggests itself, appearing against the background of a whole set of somber facts.

Some of these facts are contained in a report of the American Merchant Marine Institute, just issued.

The report shows:

1. In the past 12 months 5,500 shipboard workers on privately owned U.S. vessels have been laid off.

2. Employment in the merchant fleet as of the past January 1 was only about one-half the peak reached during the Korean war.

3. As of January 1 this year, 115 privately owned vessels were inactive, compared with 72 inactive vessels 1 year earlier.

In Congress, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, has been criticizing the Maritime Administration for a new policy in reacquiring old vessels.

This agency, he complained, in some instances is now accepting old ships as trade-in allowances on newly constructed vessels at prices averaging from 30 to 50 percent higher than that for which the Government sold these same ships to the companies several years ago.

This liberal policy is being carried out under a decision made at the management level of the Maritime Administration, rather than by legislative authority.

Congress, the Senator said, rejected a Maritime Administration request several years ago for legislative authority to make these liberal allowances and later their counsel ruled that they did not need congressional approval anyway, and they proceeded with their original intentions.

Senator WILLIAMS declared that the Maritime Commission's trade-in policy represents nothing other than an outright gift at the taxpayers' expense.

He also said, this is only one of the many examples which have been called to the attention of the Congress of the careless and irresponsible manner in which the Maritime Administration handles public funds.

He took the position that the time is long overdue when the appropriate committees of the Congress should direct their attention toward an examination of the policies and activities of this agency.

While Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware is criticizing the Maritime Commission and more and more American merchant vessels are becoming inactive and more and more workers on American merchant vessels are being laid off, take a look at the American shipbuilding industry.

The shipbuilding decline in the United States has been such that Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the House majority floor leader is urging that appropriate committees of Congress study that situation.

Taking note at the same time that the United States now ranks eighth as a shipbuilding nation, he calls on the administration for some action to put our country back to the position that it formerly occupied.

Statistics in a recent New York Times article by John P. Callahan help illustrate what the House majority floor leader terms the terrible plight that the shipbuilding industry of our country is now in.

Mr. Callahan wrote that few of the 15 major yards throughout the country have any future business to talk about, and most of them complain that there is not enough current business.

This country's shipbuilding industry, he pointed out, entered 1960 with contracts for the construction of 60 vessels—a drop of 15 below the number of contracts on hand at the beginning of 1959.

Moreover, according to the Times article, not a single new contract was reported during the entire final quarter last year.

The dismal maritime picture currently witnessed in the United States is another unhappy example of history repeating itself. Time and again down through the years, this country in peacetime has lost much maritime vigor and strength.

Before it's too late, the Nation should resolve not to let itself go to secd as a maritime power.

Defense Preparation and Waste Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the unhappy collapse of the Paris summit meeting, and the apparent cancellation of the U–2 intelligence information flights, there is much talk about the necessity for increasing the proposed military budget of $39.3 billion.

Indeed, there is no question about the imperative necessity, in the light of the belligerent and threatening attitude of the Kremlin, of our military forces being fully prepared to protect the security of the United States against any surprise move by the Soviets. It would seem logical in the consideration of our recent experiences with Russia that the proposal to maintain an airborne alert at all times to be reexamined, and that our research and development activities in the space field be accelerated.

If these, and other proposed military security provisions, require additional appropriations, over and above what the House has appropriated, then, of course, such additions must be seriously entertained. It is evident, from the recent actions of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, that the Members of that body feel that the Nation's military power should be boosted.

When the House returns to the consideration of this grave subject, in the near future, I most earnestly hope we will not be of a spirit to disregard the necessity for including every reasonable safeguard against and restriction upon wasteful and extravagant military spending that we can. Thirty-nine and a third billion dollars is an awful lot of money and its very enormity provides an avenue for careless and negligent expenditures.

As you all realize, this House levied a 3-percent cut in the $13 billion military procurement fund in the bill in an attempt to force the Defense Department to adopt more economical and frugal procurement practices.

On this score the Comptroller General, in his recent report, pointed out the existence of waste and inefficiency, by the Defense Department, in its management of electronic supplies of the military services.

He revealed that a recent review disclosed that electronic equipment valued at $2.5 million was being unnecessarily repaired at a cost of $680,000 when usable items were available in large quantities in the other services.

He indicated that unnecessary administrative costs were being incurred because there are six independent organizations performing the same or similar stock management functions.

In past reports multitudinous examples of extravagance and waste by the Defense Department have been disclosed through the use of negotiated contracts instead of competitive bidding and confused and antiquated bookkeeping methods.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Congress, and of the administration itself, to insure that the purse strings operated by the various departments of the Defense Department are kept sensibly and economically tight. Closer supervision of negotiated contracts to prevent exorbitant profits and a wider use of competitive bidding practices would do much to save the taxpayers' money.

A more strict adherence to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and a better organized central procurement unit would go far toward preventing duplication and waste.

Adequate national defense is indeed vital but the people of this country are seriously disturbed by the continuing revelations of wasteful and extravagant spending by the military without regard to the fact that each and every penny spent comes out of the hard earned, and highly taxed, pay of the average American workingman and business. The duty of the Defense Department to guarantee our security does not carry with it any license to indulge in loose and careless financial practices.

With past experience in mind, and with due respect to whatever action the Senate may take, I hope that this House will continue to impress upon the Defense Department that economic frugality and wise spending can be a mark of efficiency in the military field as well as it is of an enterprising business.

If and when an emergency hour should come immediate authorization can always and readily be given to place the military on an actual war spending scale.

Miss Frances Knight, Director of the U.S. Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State may well be proud of Miss Frances Knight, Director of the U.S. Passport Office.

In many instances State Department personnel are subject to criticism and ridicule, many times without justification. My knowledge of them is that they are generally a very fine group of devoted public servants, good Americans.

However, Miss Knight's article, "Don't Be an 'Ugly American,'" inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6, 1960, on page A4779, is proof positive of a sincere desire to create a proper and true image of Americans abroad. As in the State Department, so among our tourists abroad, a small minority cast unfortunate shadows on the unoffending majority.

If my colleagues have not already done so, I urge them to read the article to which I have referred.

I hope the Department of State will recognize that Miss Knight has made a real contribution to its prestige and that if her admonitions are followed its job will be more pleasant throughout the world.

Our Water Resources Program for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on May 26 General Itschner, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, addressed the Rivers and Harbors Congress on the subject, "Our Water Resources Program for the Future." General Itschner's remarks are so pertinent to the work of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources and are so informative that I believe they deserve a much wider audience. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, before Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1960)

I was particularly pleased when your president, Mr. Henry H. Buckman, asked me to speak on future water resources development programs. For the past several months, the Corps of Engineers has been cooperating with the Senate Select Water Resources Committee in an endeavor to estimate our future national water resources needs and how best to meet them.

We know that U.S. waterways are the most efficient and productive in existence. The modern tow will commonly carry as much as three freight trains, each a mile long, or 50 times as much as one of Mark Twain's river packets. The trend is toward even greater efficiency. On the deeper and wider waterways, giant barges are now coming into service, each one carrying as much as a good sized freight train.

All but a small portion of our 20,000-mile commercial waterway system has been improved and is now operated and maintained by the Federal Government. About a third of it has channels 12 feet or over in depth. Another third has from 9 to 12 feet depth, still suitable for modern traffic. While the remainder is obsolescent by modern standards, don't write it off. These smaller water-

ways have become very valuable for growing recreational traffic, one of the mainstays of the $2.5 billion per year recreational boating industry. Moreover, these waterways were needed at the time they were built and they met that need very well.

Traffic on our waterways increased markedly after World War II. By 1957 tonnage had grown to four times the amount being carried a decade earlier. The average annual increase in barge freight, alone, was comparable to adding to the Nation's transportation system each year the freight-carrying capacity of a brandnew transcontinental railroad. And this was achieved without adding any new waterways, although some of the existing waterways were improved. Sometimes it is represented that the railroads could take over all of the waterway traffic without additional expenditures for new tracks and equipment. Our study shows that the railroads could not absorb even the annual increase in waterway traffic without making additional capital expenditures—much less absorb the entire 109 billion ton-miles of traffic carried by the waterways in 1958. And the cost would have been far greater than the corresponding cost of waterway improvements.

Anyway you measure it, the United States has a big bargain in its inland waterway investment. The entire cost of our inland waterways, exclusive of the Great Lakes facilities—including every cent spent for construction, operation, and maintenance since the Corps of Engineers began work 135 years ago—comes to less than $3 billion.

The waterways are just beginning to enter their period of greatest value. The rapid increase during the past 15 years reflects a dynamic growth of industry along the waterways. I am confident that this growth will continue with the expansion of the population and the economy of the United States. It follows that the use of the waterways will continue to grow, and this, in turn, will stimulate economic growth.

As we look ahead, 20 years from now—which is scarcely tomorrow in terms of time required for major waterways improvements—it is anticipated that the United States will need a combined transportation system with a capacity about double the present freight traffic moved by all carriers. In 40 years, the traffic load is expected to be four times what it is now.

An appraisal of project opportunities shows the physical possibility of extensive increases in waterway capacity through improvement of the present system and the construction of some new waterways. For the most part, these will be extensions to existing waterways. However, economic, rather than engineering, feasibility must control the rate at which this is done.

It appears physically feasible to increase the capacity of about half the commercial waterway system through enlarging the present channels. Also, the physical possibilities for building new waterway units appear to aggregate some 3,000 miles or about a 15 percent increase. The price tag on all these improvements would be on the order of $8 billion.

If need were imperative, all of these projects could be built by 1980, but it is not anticipated that such rapid progress will be required. However, we should maintain a continuing program of investigations so that we are prepared to proceed with new projects as they become necessary.

In the meantime, we can gain much in transportation efficiency from the modernization efforts already underway or pending such as on the Ohio and the Illinois. There are other things that can be done, such as better maintenance to preserve efficiency, and improved terminal facilities, particularly to cut the cost of interchanging freight between water and rail carriers.

You are aware of the growing apprehension as to the adequacy of dependable streamflows to meet increasing demands on our rivers for all the many purposes they serve. Recent estimates by the U.S. Geological Survey indicate that total U.S. water demands by 1980 will approach 600 billion gallons daily. This is the equivalent of 1.9 million acre-feet of water, or of using an entire big reservoir such as Norfolk in Arkansas and Missouri or more than Dale Hollow, in Tennessee and Kentucky, every day. Looking at it another way, it is equivalent to a constant flow of 930,000 cubic feet of water per second, which is 1½ times the average flow of the Mississippi at Baton Rouge, almost 5 times the Columbia at The Dalles, or 83 times the Potomac here at Washington. It is evident that our rivers will have to be regulated to a high degree to meet this need, and this will, of course, make necessary the construction of many more reservoirs than we now have.

The specific estimates of water requirements within each river basin are now being analyzed for the Senate select committee by the Resources for the Future, Inc., a research agency endowed by the Ford Foundation. The respective estimates are being consolidated and compared with forecasts of the amount of water that can be made available through conservation storage, so that we might have an idea of the necessary size and scope of future reservoir programs. This study, the first of its kind ever made, may have considerable effect upon the future flood control and water conservation activities of the Corps of Engineers.

In general, we have sufficient water potentially available to meet growth requirements in this country, if we but conserve it wisely and keep it clean. There are certain areas in the West, however, which undoubtedly will not have enough to meet all desired uses.

But all of us, including the relatively well-watered East, can expect that most of our rivers will have to be brought under virtually complete reservoir control, to the extent that it is economically feasible.

I cannot predict, at this time, the rate of progress in reservoir construction that will be necessary. However, we may have some fairly good indications after we will have had an opportunity to study the Senate committee's findings, scheduled for issuance in January 1961.

It would appear that the Federal Government will be obliged to bear the basic responsibility for building adequate storage to assure required riverflows. Of course, there are the problems of proper cost sharing to be worked out, but the answer to effective control and conservation of water lies in integrated, comprehensive river basin development. All interested Federal agencies, the States, and local governments should share in the responsibility and participate in the planning.

The trend toward increasing emphasis on water supply has already been reflected by the Water Supply Act of 1958. This act provides for restudy of existing or authorized projects to ascertain whether changes should be made for including water supply in reservoirs. It granted authority to recommend storage for future water demands even though no immediate users were ready to share the costs. Such foresight is necessary if full use is to be made of scarce storage sites. Of course, users will ultimately have to pay their share.

Municipal water supply is only a fraction of the demand on river flows which must be met by storage. Enormous quantities will also be needed for industrial purposes, including cooling water for electric power generation, and water to dilute sewage and industrial waste. And, of course, the needs for fish and wildlife and public recreation must be considered.

The fact that the water must be reused over and over again as it flows down our rivers places a premium on effective handling of the pollution problem. We must find and apply practical measures other than mere dilution of waste flows with clean water, because there won't be enough water for that method.

While we can greatly increase our dependable water supply by building reservoirs, there are practical limits to our ability to do so. Some of the Western rivers already have been developed nearly to their economic and physical limits. In the more congested and rapidly growing areas, particularly in the East, industry, housing, highways, and other improvements are overrunning potential reservoir sites at an alarming rate.

Our studies show that we still have a long way to go in providing adequate flood protection. Floods annually cause damages averaging $700 million—over and above the $600 million yearly damages prevented by existing projects.

River flood plains remain attractive for human use despite the flood hazard. It is probable that even if all the works found feasible are built over the next 20 years, we will still have an annual residual flood loss of about $300 million as people move into unprotected areas. This figure, however, might be cut down by more orderly use of the flood plains achieved by regulation, a program that merits considerable attention.

In conclusion, let me outline what I believe to be an orderly approach to our water resources problems:

1. Economically sound and progressive modernization and expansion of our waterways as the need occurs.
2. Reduction in the waste of water.
3. Full consideration of the need for river regulation as a primary purpose of river development and prompt construction of reservoirs as required.
4. Forthright measures to clean up pollution.
5. Preservation of essential reservoir sites.
6. Completion of feasible and necessary flood control works.
7. Sensible regulation of the use of river-flood plains.

With these measures we can have a sound and adequate water resources base for national growth.

West Virginia Primary Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three editorials concerning the West Virginia primary election be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunset News-Observer, May 13, 1960]

THEY COULD BE WRONG

This should be borne in kind: The pollsters and the pundits said that Senator KENNEDY was going to lose in West Virginia. They were wrong. And they are the same pollsters and pundits who are now saying that with his overwhelming victory in West Virginia he is practically in as the Demo-

cratic presidential nominee. They could be wrong again.

It is true that Senator KENNEDY has been given a psychological boost for the nomination—but there are a lot of smoke-filled rooms between here and Los Angeles. The powerful State leaders who control delegations will be the deciding factor.

The West Virginia results argued powerfully against the church-State issue as a major drawback for KENNEDY. But some influential Democratic leaders have already spoken up in the wake of his victory here to voice doubts as to whether the Nation is ready to elect a Roman Catholic president. Their views—and their votes—must be reckoned with.

The other principal arguments advanced against KENNEDY have not been altered in any way by the West Virginia results. One is his youth and the other his lack of any administrative or executive experience. KENNEDY himself argues the vital importance of the president's job. A fair question is: Does his experience fit him for it. After all, the qualifications for the presidency demand more than a winsome personality, a prize-winning book, and campaign pledges unlimited.

At least three Democrats we can think of without much prompting are better qualified than he—Lyndon Johnson, Stuart Symington, and Adlai Stevenson. Government is the art of politics, and LYNDON JOHNSON is the best practitioner of that art in America. He is mature, seasoned, a man whose leadership has been thoroughly tested and proven. The same can be said for SYMINGTON and Stevenson. Both are men of rare ability, with long backgrounds of executive responsibility in business and Government.

This writer was particularly impressed with Senator SYMINGTON when he appeared last week at the Ninth District Democratic convention in Abington. He even looks like a President.

The poll takers will have their day. But they were wrong about KENNEDY in West Virginia and they may be wrong about KENNEDY in California.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News, May 20, 1960]

IT MAY INTEREST YOU

(By Bill Hart and staff)

West Virginians are a rugged breed of people and that goes double for that great army that takes its politics under the banner of the Democratic Party—a classic example—and there have been many and we hope there will always continue to be—of independent thinking—wearing no man's collar, bending the knee to no one, as it were—may be seen in the election returns of the Democratic primary of May 10. Senator JOHN KENNEDY ran away with the marbles in the popularity contest against HUBERT HUMPHREY—everybody knows that, of course, but what many do not know is the man who was supposed to have broken his political plate because he was for LYNDON JOHNSON—Senator ROBERT BYRD is leading the list of delegates to the Democratic national convention on the basis of receiving the most votes—now, how does one square that?

BYRD, the man who confessed long ago that in his youth he once was a member of the Ku Klux Klan, came out for his senatorial friend, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas—immediately, there were those who declared that BYRD was merely for JOHNSON because he, a former Kluxer, was against KENNEDY because KENNEDY is a Catholic—in other words, BYRD, because of his admitted membership in the days of long ago, could not be for anyone; he had to be against the man because he is a Catholic, and because of that, so said the experts in all camps. "BYRD has cooked his goose; he is finished." Well, let's look at the goose and the goose's record:

BYRD, of all running for places as delegates to the Democratic National Convention, at last account was out in front with the most votes of any of the group. Would this be an indication he was through in politics? Of course, this performance shows what all of us who take the trouble to find out what is going on knew all along. The West Virginia voter is an independent person and he and she will make up his or her own mind as to what to be done and the reasons thereto, the reason so many missed the full import of what was happening in West Virginia during the primary battle was they were talking about themselves too much. They had made up their minds before they had enough facts, bringing the matter closer home. Z–1 deeply resented the statement of one friend who said "of course, you'll have to be for KENNEDY because you're both Catholic"; z–1 has to be for no one on any score including religion and that goes for everyone else, too.

So it will be most interesting to note how those who have already written off BOB BYRD as a political force in West Virginia explain this great vote for him and the sweeping wonderful vote for KENNEDY? If any person can really explain that on any ground other than the West Virginia voters make up their minds as to merits of charges and performances z–1 will be most happy to entertain such a dissertation. And so let us pass to some other pressing matters and confine our remarks chiefly to the Democratic Party for this period:

First, it will be most unwise for Senator KENNEDY or anyone to assume he has the West Virginia delegation to the national convention wrapped up in his hip pocket because of his wonderful victory. West Virginia's delegation will go to Los Angeles uninhibited as well as uninstructed and it could be definitely faulty for any candidate to assume he has the delegation or inversely he has lost it—let this be a statement for the record and let no one miss its meaning and import—now, some State problems: the State Democratic committee will meet soon and, as tradition and custom has it, the nominees, such as those for Governor and the U.S. Senate and the Congress, will make known their desires as to leaders in the campaign.

Most will agree that the campaign director and chairman should come from south of the Kanawha River—this would provide more balance from a standpoint of geography since three of the major nominees are from north of the river and the river means the Kanawha River, in politics—but these selections will be the responsibility of the new committee and the nominees and we are quite certain they will understand and meet the problems with wisdom and courage.

[From the Moorefield Examiner, June 1, 1960]

CRYSTAL GAZING

West Virginia has been through the unique experience of being important in a presidential primary for the first time in its history. Anyone would have thought that West Virginia had just joined the union along with Hawaii and Alaska for it was certainly the only time in memory when our State held the limelight nationally for weeks before an election, had scores of out-of-State reporters and correspondents solemnly telling people how the State would vote and in general giving us a feeling of importance. At least the Nation found out there is a West Virginia.

Apparently what is forgotten is that West Virginians didn't have the chance to really express a preference for the man they wanted to run for President on the Democratic ticket. The only choice they had was between two politicians who became carried away with the importance of getting more "X's" on a ballot than the other. Candidates become infected with a strange virus at election time which actually changes them from rational thinking beings to wound up characters as alien to average people as men from outer space. It is a contagious malady which infects their coterie of followers into thinking the same way.

Our point is that Mr. KENNEDY does not have the Democratic nomination for President yet. With his win in West Virginia he doesn't even have the West Virginia delegation vote. We recall a candidate a few years ago who appeared to be a shoo-in as a presidential nominee. Senator KEFAUVER rushed around the country campaigning in primaries in a score of States collecting delegates like mad and the average citizen presumed it was a foregone conclusion that KEFAUVER would be the nominee. That was before the practical and professional politicians got in their licks at the convention. Sure, KEFAUVER came up with an impressive total of votes on the first ballot but if you recall it was safely under the necessary total to nominate. After that first ballot even the uninitiated could see the pattern.

Our prediction now is that LYNDON JOHNSON will be the Democratic nominee for President after the convention on the west coast. This guy JOHNSON is a might savvy sort of a guy. He is acknowledged to be head and shoulder above anybody in the field and he isn't exactly sitting idly in Washington doing nothing about it.

In the first place, he is majority leader in the Senate and charged with getting legislation through the mill. That is an 18-hour-a-day job and he hasn't time to be whooping it up all over the country declaiming on any and all subjects. He is one of the few Democrats on speaking terms with the administration and is a wizard at getting fractious Democrats together when it really counts. He lets them have their fun, their show, and their shouting; but when the chips are down he quietly has them in line. All his years of devoting full time to his job necessarily makes him the best informed man in our country. He undoubtedly knows three times as much about our Nation, its policies, its resources, its Government, and its probabilities than Ike himself, who is too busy playing golf and running around to know what is really going on in the store.

You can bet your bottom buck that JOHNSON and his powerful supporters haven't been idle when it comes to lining up delegates for the convention and with 10 times the efficiency as candidates waging popularity contests in a few scattered States. Any guy smart enough to keep the South appeased on the racial problem without losing support from the Yankees is smart enough to be able to handle Khrushchev, Gromyko, De Gaulle, Castro, or Nasser, or any other problem people. JOHNSON is the best in the business, and certainly we are going to need the best in the business over the next few years.

The really serious members of the Democratic Party inevitably end up with JOHNSON as the logical candidate this fall and as our next President. We predict JOHNSON on the 6th to the 10th ballot and KENNEDY as the Veep.

Clock Turned Back 20 Years by Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on several occasions in recent weeks I have

called the attention of my colleagues to a decision of the Air Force to withdraw the 449th Interceptor Command from Ladd Air Force Base in Alaska. This decision of the Air Force has caused deep concern among many of our citizens and has been the subject of editorial comments in papers particularly in the Pacific Northwest. On June 6 the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times carried an editorial which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, June 6, 1960]

CLOCK TURNED BACK 20 YEARS BY AIR FORCE

Latest strategy expressed by military authorities at Washington seems to make Alaska one of the world's safest places for people to live.

It will be safe because there is to be no target here to attract an enemy. It stands a good chance of being untouched in the event of war, because the enemy will be too busy in other areas.

Reduction and removal of military forces from Alaska is an effective way of making this State safe from attack. The enemy would have no reason to attack.

Alaska, with nothing but a handful of fighter interceptors and a big collection of electronic warning equipment would be no target. There would not be enough here for the enemy to give heed even during the later cleanup activities.

One might expect that this policy would make for happiness and relaxation in Alaska. Perhaps it does in some instances.

At the same time, the policy should make the populous industrial centers of the Nation mighty uneasy. It earmarks for the skies over their homes the first battles in the next war.

This is a result of the change in U.S. policy regarding Alaska. Until recently, Alaska was recognized as a gateway from Russia to the United States. Indeed, it is the short way to the heart of the Nation—via the Arctic Ocean. The military planned to deny Russia the use of this gateway.

The old policy was to fight the first battles in the skies over Alaska instead of over the industrial centers of the Nation.

For more than 20 years this policy was accepted as sensible. The United States spent more than $2 billion in effecting and maintaining it.

It has been within the last 6 months or so that some change has taken place.

The new policy turns the clock back more than 20 years.

When World War II started, Alaska had 200 infantrymen stationed at Chilkoot Barracks as its total defense force. The troops had a 20-year-old tug as their only transportation.

The deficiency was obvious and the military tried to overcome it by the expenditure of a billion dollars. Things were built in many places. Troops and airplanes were moved to Alaska. But the effort was too little and too late.

The enemy landed in the Aleutian Islands. The United States was compelled to spend many more millions of dollars, and use more than 60,000 troops, hundreds of ships and airplanes to dislodge them. The loss of life was another cost.

Will the next war allow time for the Nation to make up deficiencies through expenditures of dollars and lives?

The Nation must see that the lessons of the past are not forgotten, and that the Alaska gateway should be closed to the Russians as the military told us until the last couple of months.

Constructive Program for Crime Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on a constructive program for crime prevention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM FOR CRIME PREVENTION

Since the end of the Second World War the crime rate in this Nation has been increasing at an alarming rate. Especially disturbing is the increase of juvenile crime. Seven hundred eighty-five thousand of our children will be referred to police and juvenile courts in 1960, according to recent projections of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

In the past 5 years there has been almost a 24 percent increase in known crime. During 1958 alone crime increased 7.4 percent while the population increased only 1.7 percent, which means that crime has increased five times as fast as the population. This increase in the crime rate is reflected especially among the young people. During 1958 arrests of persons aged 18 years and over increased only about 1 percent, while the arrests of persons under 18 years increased 10 percent.

The cost of crime is tremendous. It is impossible to place a cash value on the damages caused through physicial violence and mental trauma. But crime entails not only a danger to the life, physical well-being, and property of those suffering from it, crime is also a threat to the Nation's sense of security. Furthermore, we are also paying astronomical amounts to house and care for the criminals with whom society catches up. Last year, for example, it cost the Federal taxpayer an average of $3,488 for each prisoner in a Federal institution. This is a tremendous cost when we remember that there are over one quarter of a million adult prisoners in State and Federal institutions.

With this state of affairs, it is obvious that we must search for the reasons of crime, for it is imperative that we deal not only with the punishment of crime but with the means of preventing it.

Social scientists inform us that the most obvious factor for this tremendous upsurge in crime is the population explosion which was produced by the high birth rate during the Second World War and after. This population increase, together with the socio-economic changes produced by the war years and the postwar economic growth, have much deteriorated the influence of the home and family on the younger generation.

It is apparent that our crime problem can be also attributed to the cultural lag in America, about which sociologists have been warning us for many years now. The physical sciences have made tremendous strides forward in improving and extending our mechanical and scientific knowledge. At the same time, there has been much more limited progress in the social sciences. We have not developed the science of human and social behavior fast enough to keep pace with our scientific progress.

The youth learns from the adult, and the social and moral climates to which our youngsters are exposed are not always conducive to healthy growth. A recent issue of Look magazine, in an article dealing with "The Age of Payola," commented that "payola is just one phase of an epidemic of immorality." Our youngsters are being infested with a diseased social attitude which tells them that anything is alright so long as they can get away with it.

The fashion among youngsters today is to go along with the crowd and with the standards of the crowd. In most older societies, time-tested standards established by the father, the chief of the clan, the community head, or some other respected leader provided guidance for the young generation. The accepted pattern today is for the young to be guided by the moral standards of the gang. Unfortunately, the standards of the juvenile or youth group without proper guidance tend to deteriorate toward the lowest common denominator.

It is clear, therefore, that in the American community we must again reassert the duty of the church, the home, the school, and the other character-building agencies for educating, for guiding, and for providing our youth with proper public and private morals.

Recently, Mr. George J. Reed, Chairman of the U.S. Board of Parole, discussed the relationship between crime, law enforcement corrections, and the community in an address before the National Institute on Police-Community Relations. Our community is now producing more criminals than the correctional agencies are geared to accommodate. The answer, therefore, is not correction but prevention. The duty of the policeman is not merely to catch the criminal after the crime has been committed but to aid in instilling lawfulness in our youth and in the prevention of crime.

Mr. Reed discusses also the use of parole instead of incarceration as a means of restoring the criminal to beneficial social existence. He states very wisely that "detention for a long period after the individual is capable and willing to live a law-abiding life may generate an understandable bitterness and perhaps a cooling of his desire to live a respectable and law-abiding life." It is interesting to note that on the Federal level approximately 80 percent of the parolees complete their supervision periods without any mishaps and without the need for incarceration.

I want to call especial attention to the following conclusions:

1. The unusual population increase occurring right after World War II and the related economic changes are responsible for the disruptions in our social organization and the increase in juvenile crime. But this pattern should now be leveling off.

2. In the education of our youth we are swinging back away from progressive education and all the extreme permissiveness which that trend implied.

3. There is a need for community programs that would give our youth constructive missions for the utilization of their energies.

4. The home, the church, and the school must reassert their influence in providing socially accepted standards for our youth.

5. Our legislatures and citizens seem to be more and more aware of the need for better training of policemen and other correctional personnel.

6. The processes of probation and parole are proving to be effective methods of rehabilitation.

7. Colleges and universities are expanding the number and type of training programs for professional, correctional, and police work.

8. Citizens' action committees on a statewide basis are starting to study the crime problem on the State and local level. Thus, the citizens as well as the administrators are jointly attempting to solve our problems.

9. Legislators, community leaders, parents, and correctional people alike are beginning to realize that they must also coordinate their programs if we are to be effective in meeting the ever-increasing challenge of crime within an orderly society.

Senator Kefauver's Philosophy of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has again put his finger upon a vital point in American governmental philosophy. He has called for greater participation in government by the citizens of the Nation.

The great record in the Senate of the senior Senator from Tennessee has benefited the people of the entire Nation. His invaluable service is recognized by the Nation, and not merely by his native State of Tennessee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Mysterious 'They' Is Very Often Us," published in the Oak Ridger (Tenn.) of May 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYSTERIOUS "THEY" IS VERY OFTEN US

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has hit on an important point.

In a recent address to the Tennessee Junior Chamber of Commerce in Knoxville, the Senator talked of the " 'they' philosophy of people toward government."

He defined it as the philosophy that seems to satisfy people, particularly Americans, that they are not responsible for what government does.

He said:

"The 'they' philosophy is the height of cynicism. If we assume our officials are cynical and corrupt, we become cynics ourselves. In fact, we may thereby take a mental step toward corruption."

His remedy is simple: more participation in politics by individuals; participation at the local level.

How true.

How often we hear ourselves criticize and berate and blame the cause of our troubles, the community's troubles, the world's troubles on some mysterious "they."

We very seldom stop to define and identify "they." The handy pronoun scapegoat is always purposely vague.

Senator KEFAUVER suggests that we stop and analyze. It will likely hurt, but it will do us good. For, in most cases, this convenient "they-type" whipping boy, if we look closely, turns out to be "us."

This applies particularly in the case of government. We rant and rave about what "they" have done, what "they" haven't done.

Who are "they"? Most often "they" are the public officeholders we have elected either by indifferent, selfish, or unintelligent votes—no votes at all.

Or "they" are the public officeholder who got elected because nobody else would run—because he had no opposition in the primary, or even in the general election, and thus we had no choice. But what did we do in advance to guarantee a choice—a positive choice? So often "they" are a policy project, that we are responsible for "them" adopting because we have been too concerned with urging our own immediate interest, or no interest at all, and failing to look at the long-range benefits, or detriments.

Building Up Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial, published in the Richmond News Leader of June 8, 1960. The editorial speaks very highly of the attitude taken by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I wish to add my commendation to what the editorial states concerning the position of the Senator from New Hampshire. We are facing a serious situation in regard to competition from foreign countries, especially in the textile industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING UP COMPETITION

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, writing in the currrent Human Events, makes a novel and persuasive argument: The concept of "internationalism," he contends, has gone out of style; the free world "is more and more being divided into separate, autonomous, and violently nationalistic units." A foreign policy based upon the giveaway benevolence of recent years is less effective now than it ever was.

The New Hampshire Senator marshals a convincing case. France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Spain are going through an astonishing period of resurgent nationalism. In Africa and the Middle East, new nations are spawning at an incredible pace. Pakistan, India, Cambodia, Vietnam, Indonesia are part of this wave. In our own hemisphere, the nations of Latin America and South America are seeking individual recognition in their own right.

This nationalism is having a profound effect upon the economy of the United States. Members of the European Common Market, to mention one example only, have put their own self-interest first and relegated theories of global brotherhood to a poor second place. They are applying discriminatory tariffs and cold-eyed policies of currency exchange not only to the United States but to other nations also. One consequence is that the ECM's export trade is booming while the United States have a substantial trade deficit.

Facing these conditions of fact, what does our foreign policy propose? Why, our foreign policy proposes basically what it proposed 15 years ago. This is to subsidize foreign competition through grants, loans, and heavy foreign spending on defense.

The lunatic results can be seen in the textile industry. Textile workers are heavily taxed to provide funds for foreign aid; these funds wind up in textile factories abroad, where labor rates are a small fraction of labor rates here at home; finished goods pour into American markets at prices the domestic industry scarcely can meet. And when American mills begin to shut down, the only answer that occurs to the Congress is to inject further public funds into the community through a Depressed Areas Act. The steel and optics industries have suffered from the same suicidal process in action.

Senator BRIDGES predicts an increase in this worldwide industrial competition. He foresees the day when Russia will be able to create deliberate chaos in consumed goods by dumping Russian-made products where such dumping would hurt Western nations most severely. He urges that these conditions be met by a foreign policy that is hard-headed and not soft-hearted.

He does not mean by this a "return to isolationism." National defense requirements alone, he remarks, would make such a proposition absurd. He does urge that foreign policymakers face the facts of life: "We are not living in an international-minded world. We are trying to be an internationally oriented nation in a world rampant with nationalism."

The first order of business for the United States, he submits, is to get our own fiscal house in order. A second step would be to insist that those free nations whose economies have been restored "assume a fair share of their responsibilities toward the underdeveloped nations." Third, reciprocal trade programs must be revised to make them truly reciprocal: "If discrimnated against by our friends, we must institute appropriate countermeasures."

Mr. BRIDGES also calls for tax reforms that will reduce the outflow of American capital, and for a renewed dedication by American labor to those principles of efficient quality craftsmanship that established this Nation's industrial reputation long ago.

None of the recommendations advanced by Mr. BRIDGES is new. Grouped together, they provide the basis for an intelligent and respectable foreign policy. The dogmas of pure internationalism have application these days only in such lofty realms as disarmament and in the empty reaches of space where science knows no frontiers. Here on earth, nations are brothers as Macy's loves Gimbel's, and the sooner we revise our tariff and foreign polices to take this resurgent competition into full account, the stronger America is bound to become.

Forest Products Laboratory's Research Hailed as Key for a New, Creative Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 4, the Forest Products Research Laboratory

at Madison, Wis., celebrated its 50th anniversary.

Research by the Laboratory—and by the forest industry itself—has opened the way to a new and better life for more Americans.

The outstanding record of the Laboratory—since its establishment on June 4, 1910—deserves the commendation of the people not only of Wisconsin but of the Nation.

Within its brief lifetime, the Laboratory has made outstanding contributions to more effective utilization of wood and wood products throughout the country, through efforts aimed toward:

First. More efficient utilization of wood, beginning with the harvesting of trees, continuing through the various manufacturing processes, and including means of improving service to the customer.

Second. Maintenance of markets for forest products under competitive conditions with other material.

Third. Use of our woodlands in such ways as to stimulate good forest management.

More specifically, the accomplishments have included:

First. Development of prefabricated home construction. Approximately 10 percent of the homes built in the country now are prefabricated. This principle is a publicly patented, stress-cover system of roof, wall, and floor construction, developed by the Forest Products Laboratory.

Second. The Laboratory also did the basic work which resulted in the development of chlorinated phenol type of wood preservative which is one of the major wood preservatives used today.

Third. The factors used for the design and fabrication of laminated beams and arches were developed by the Laboratory.

Fourth. Lumber manufacturers use some 8,000 dry kilns of a type on which basic patents were granted the Laboratory. The gross value of products seasoned in these kilns is over a half billion dollars per year.

Fifth. Annually the cost of packaging industrial and agricultural products runs about $7½ billion. The Laboratory has developed scientific principles of box and crate construction which are in wide use by industry, saving many millions of dollars. To illustrate this: In World War II, a determination was made for military use. Due to the work of the Laboratory, they were able to cut down the size of packaging to a point where four Liberty ships were required where five had been required previously.

Sixth. The Laboratory has developed two processes for making pulp products from little used hardwoods. As a result of this development, approximately 20 percent of our pulp production is now from hardwoods.

These, of course, are only a few of the highlights of research accomplishments of great significance to American families, business, industry, and the Government.

Today, forest research projects, as all things—are costly. However, the Government, according to best estimates, gets back in taxes about $70 for every dollar spent for forest research. This revenue would be further multiplied if the wage factors of additional jobs that are created could also be accurately computed.

Overall, the effective forest research, as carried on by the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., is a good investment for the American people.

Recently, the Green Bay Press-Gazette carried an informative article entitled "Knowledge Can Protect Nation's Wood Supply." I ask unanimous consent to have the thought-provoking article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE CAN PROTECT NATION'S WOOD SUPPLY—FEDERAL OFFICIAL SPEAKS AT FOREST LAB ANNIVERSARY

MADISON.—The great forests that existed when the United States was founded have been replaced with inferior species of little economic value, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin Peterson said here last week.

Peterson told 450 persons gathered from around the world for the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Forest Products Laboratory here that "in addition, pests, diseases, fire, and remoteness from market all in their own way take a heavy toll of our wood supply."

The Secretary said, "As a nation richly endowed with an abundance of natural resources, we have used them with profligate abandon. We have grown rich and strong. It is for us now to exploit a new and limitless resource so as to assure our continued prosperity and strength. That new resource is knowledge."

SAVE NATURAL CAPITAL

Peterson said that with knowledge provided by exhaustive investigation and experimentation, the United States can use resources without destroying them or impairing our natural capital. He said research would show us how to get more use from each unit of product while increasing the units as our needs for them continue to expand.

Peterson said the Forest Products Laboratory, founded at the University of Wisconsin 50 years ago this month, "was the first research institution created anywhere in the world for the specific purpose of applying the findings of science to the problems of producers and users of forest products."

OTHER FOREST VALUES

He said that forests were vital to the Nation's economy not only for their wood, but as regulators of watersheds, a home for wildlife, and a source of raw products to sustain a highly industrialized society that distributed more goods among more persons than anywhere else on earth.

"Present forestry leadership, both public and private, needs a thorough biting by the hurry-up bug. Time is growing shorter," Peterson said.

He said much of the present forest lands would be lost in the future to expansion of cities, farm lands, and industries required to support a predicted population of 400 million persons by the year 2000.

Peterson said that private enterprise has enabled the United States to produce and distribute more goods and services than any other nation in history.

He said that were it not for the profits of this system, from which is provided taxes to support Government services, a substitute will have to be found.

The Secretary warned that government as a substitute for private enterprise would be "the road to mediocrity and stagnation. Government is not the creator of wealth, but the user of wealth. We must remember that if government is big enough to give us everything we want, it can also be big enough to take everything we want."

Peterson said the private enterprise system is the best vehicle for the application of knowledge and creative forestry that will lead to a fuller life for all mankind.

Dewey Short, Orator in the Classic Manner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, eloquence has been described as a combination of "thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

If this is a valid definition, then the reigning master of eloquence must surely be the gentleman from Missouri whose profound thoughts have helped breathe new ideas into every corner of our land and whose epithets have seared our memories—Dewey Short.

Having had the good fortune to serve with Dewey Short in the House of Representatives, I can remember vividly how the galleries would fill with eager listeners when the word was passed that he was to speak.

These audiences were never disappointed.

The object of their attention consistently had something to say—a remarkable feat in itself—and he said it in a manner which was truly unforgettable.

An extremely interesting article on this amazing oratorical ability was published in the June 2, 1960, edition of the Kansas City Star, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In view of the difficulties which prophets traditionally experience in their own lands, I would like to make special reference to the source of the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY SHORT, ORATOR IN THE CLASSIC MANNER

(By Ira B. McCarty)

Very probably some Democrats will be in the balcony of the municipal auditorium arena Saturday morning when Dewey Short delivers the keynote address of the Missouri Republican Convention.

The Democrats will be drawn there for the pure pleasure of watching and listening to one of the last orators still practicing in the classic manner. It was Short's platform ability that carried him from the pulpit of the Methodist Church at Springfield, Mo., into a career of 24 years in Congress. He now is the Assistant Secretary of the Army assigned to civil functions.

Dewey Short's reputation as an orator played a major part in the decision to hold the State convention on the floor of the arena, with the balconies left open to the public, said Vincent E. Baker, chairman of the distinguished guests committee.

Short's reputation as an orator is based on three things: His broad education (he attended three universities in Europe); his unexpected shifting of gears from flowing classic allusions to homey and sometimes even barnyard terms, and his ability to project his voice in great rolling waves of sound into the highest balcony or the farthest reaches of a county fair grandstand, even without the aid of a microphone.

SOME PUNGENT SIMILES

Here are two samples of his phrase-turning:

"The happiest and warmest hour of Harry Truman's Fair Deal was at the inauguration. Since that Belshazzar's feast and bacchanalian revelry the heat has turned to cold and rejoicing has given way to weeping."

His knowledge of national affairs attacked on the House floor by a Brooklyn Congressman, Short retorted:

"Why, I have been farther back under the barn looking for eggs than you have been from Brooklyn."

Every time Short took the floor of the House the word spread quickly. Republicans and Democrats hurried to get in on the fun. Long before the "give 'em hell" line came to be attached in the public mind with the performances of Harry Truman, the phrase had echoed through the Ozarks as Dewey Short made his campaign rounds of the courthouses, the county fairs, and the weekly auction sales.

Followers of Short say that he "can give a man more unshirted hell, lacerate, slash, rip, and tear," than any other practitioner of the art of oratory. And all this without resort to even so much as a cussword.

EARNED WAY IN SCHOOL

Short was born in Galena, Mo., April 7, 1898, the eighth of 10 children. In those years money was hard to come by that far back in the Ozarks. Short did a variety of small jobs to assist the family income. The funds that took him beyond the local high school he earned selling ice from a wagon.

His first college work was at the State's first teachers' college, a Methodist school at Marionville, Mo. There he won a scholarship to Baker University at Baldwin, Kans., where he was graduated. He then entered Boston University's School of Theology on a scholarship. In taking this degree, Short won the Frank D. Howard scholarship that took him to Heidelberg University, then the University of Berlin, and finally to Oxford. By lecturing on his foreign travels he managed to earn enough to finance a year's study of law at Harvard.

A PROFESSOR 5 YEARS

From 1923 to 1928 Short served as professor of psychology and moral and political philosophy at Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans. It was during this period that he began preaching, first as a supply pastor. His sermons drew wide attention.

Short's father was by this time a powerful Republican leader in the Ozarks. The father and his friends were able to persuade Short to run for Congress in 1928. He won, but was defeated when he sought a second term. He tried again in 1934 and won. He continued to win reelection every 2 years until his defeat in 1956.

It was with some misgivings that Short took over his job with the Army. He had been an officer in World War I, but through all his years he has been a bitter foe of universal military training, believing that the armed services can be better maintained by a voluntary force.

Some of his congressional votes earned him a classification as an isolationist. He credits the isolationists with delaying the entrance of the United States into World War II for the period of time it took to make the Nation strong.

As long ago as May 24, 1940, 18 months before Pearl Harbor, he was on record demanding something be done to strengthen our fighting forces. In a speech to the House that day he asserted that "in the present hour our defense is woefully and pitifully inadequate." He called for more aircraft, more guns and ammunition, and all the other tools of war, and when the time came he voted for taxes to pay for those things.

ARMED SERVICES CHAIRMAN

At one time Short served as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. His attitude on military affairs seems to have been better understood by his colleagues in Congress than by some military-minded persons.

When he appeared before a Senate committee considering his appointment to the Army post only one questioning voice was raised. It was that of MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. Short has rather old-fashioned, chivalrous views about the proper place of women in our society. He managed to persuade the Senator that the splendid performance of women in the Armed Forces during World War II had led him to a change of viewpoint on the matter of women in military service.

In his new office since March 1957, Short has performed without any major criticism coming his way.

Where's Our Offensive Team?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there is an article by George Dixon entitled "Where's Our Offensive Team?" I think we have been on the defensive too long. It is time that we became more positive, and instead of trying to answer insult after insult and all the other propaganda brick bats thrown at us by Khrushchev we should speak out boldly. We should show the world that the purpose of this great propaganda offensive of the Soviet Union is to cause turmoil in our ranks and dissention among the free nations of the world.

We should not, of course, weaken our defensive position because many times answers are required. But, let us not lower our guard and depend on answers alone. We must have a strong, positive approach. Mr. Dixon's column discusses this matter and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE'S OUR OFFENSIVE TEAM?

(By George Dixon)

We used to have a War Department. Now we have a Defense Department. We used to talk about taking the initiative. Now we talk about taking the defensive. Almost every day we issue a note, a reply, an explanation or a "cover story" in our defense. We're becoming too conditioned to being on the defensive.

Have we forgotten the defensive team can't score?

It seems to me that domestically as well as internationally we're letting the wrong side run with the ball. We let the most unworthy opponents keep the offensive while we stay on the defensive.

On the home front, Jimmy Hoffa keeps the forces of reform on the defensive by issuing statement after statement. Instead of taking the initiative from the Teamster dictator, the clean-up forces allow themselves to be kept on the defensive, issuing answers.

On the international front, Nikita S. Khrushchev employs the same technique. Whether Hoffa learned it from Khrushchev or Khrushchev from Hoffa, or whether they developed it indepndently should concern us little. It's the effect it's having that should worry us.

I am bloody tired of hearing that Secretary of State Christian A. Herter has answered Khrushchev; that Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., has answered Khrushchev; that Central Intelligence Director Allen W. Dulles has answeredf Khrushchev, and that Senate Foreign Relations Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT is debating how we should answer Khrushchev.

I'm just as sick of this Khrushchev-answering as I am of answering Jimmy Hoffa. I would no longer dignify either of them with an answer. Why let them have permanent possession of the ball and allow them to throw pass after pass over our defenses?

Khrushchev gets a headline a day by holding the offensive. We keep him in the game by answering. The cause of eradicating labor union corruption isn't being advanced by answering Jimmy Hoffa. If he was kept busy defending himself he wouldn't be so offensive.

We have a great defensive backfield in Herter, Gates, and Dulles, but what we could also use are a couple of good offensive halfbacks. We could use them to run some plays around Fidel Castro. And while they're at it they might do a little stiff-arming to Dominican Dictator Trujillo.

My undercover men inform me Trujillo is ripe to be knocked over anyway. We could get the credit for helping crowd him out. I hear he can't last much more than another 60 days before becoming one with Batista, Peron and Perez Jiminez.

Let's take the offensive now and give him advance notification he could go anywhere he can flee to—but not here. Let's take the ball away from him and keep him hopping on the defensive.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Recognition of June Dairy Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the dairy industry is of tremendous significance to the health of our people, as well as to the economy of Wisconsin and the country.

Basically, dairy products—one of nature's most nearly perfect foods—are serving to strengthen and revitalize the health of our people. At the same time, the dairy industry is tremendously important to our economy. Nationwide, over a million farm families make a substantial part of their income from dairying. In addition, a great many Main Streets of the Nation depend upon the buying power of our dairy and other farmers.

Traditionally, June has been observed as Dairy Month across the Nation. The purpose is to increase programs for, first, paying tribute to the significance of dairying to our economy and the health of the Nation, and, second, carrying on sales and promotion programs of dairy foods to improve the health of the dairy industry and, thus, better enable it to meet the needs of our citizens.

Recently I was privileged to discuss the significance of dairying—as well as to make recommendations for improving the outlook through June Dairy Month observances—in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF CHIPPEWA FALLS, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS

Friends, as you know, this is June Dairy Month.

Over the years, our dairy industry has contributed —to a large degree—to bringing fame and recognition to our Badger State.

We realize, of course, that all the industrial, manufacturing, educational, cultural, scenic, commercial, and other features of our "land of milk, honey, and other fine products and great people" are significant to our progress.

However, because this is June Dairy Month, and because of dairying's significance, past, present, and future, to our progress, I'd like to discuss with you briefly, the outlook in this field, statewide and national.

SIGNIFICANCE OF DAIRYING TO OUR STATE AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

Question. Senator WILEY, what is the significance of dairying to our State and National economy?

Answer. Across the country, over 1 million farm families—including more than 100,000 in Wisconsin, make all or a substantial part of their income from dairying. In addition, a great many "main streets" of America depend, to a large degree, upon the buying power of our dairy and other farmers. These include the local hardware store, grocers, equipment sales and service, auto dealers, drugstores, and other businesses.

In Wisconsin, for example, farming itself is a $1 billion industry, ranking fifth in the Nation in cash received from livestock and livestock products; and ranking sixth in farm income from all sources.

Question. Does the dairy industry create any additional jobs?

Answer. Very definitely.

The processing and delivery of fresh milk employs about 200,000 persons.

The processing of butter, cheese, dried milk, also creates jobs for an additional 100,000 workers.

In addition, about 380,000 motor vehicles are used in transporting milk and dairy products from farm to plants, and from plant to consumer. These are only a few of the wide effects of dairying on our economy.

Question. Is Wisconsin continuing its tradition as a major dairying State?

Answer. Yes. Currently Wisconsin is the No. 1 milk producer in the Nation, with an output of about 18 billion pounds annually; we produce over 50 percent of the Nation's cheese, with an annual output of about 615 million pounds, and about 21 percent of the butter.

Question. Dairy foods, of course, continue to be a highly important part of the diet of the American family.

Answer. Yes. As nature's most nearly perfect food, milk products contain nearly all of the elements necessary for energy, growth, vitality, and health. This includes muscle-building proteins, as well as minerals, vitamins, and other nutrients.

Question. You feel, then, that the dairy industry will continue to play a significant role not only in our economy, but in further improving the health of our people?

Answer. Yes. I want to stress, however, that it is absolutely essential that efforts be made to brighten the outlook for the dairy farmer economically. This is essential—if the farmer is to continue to provide healthful dairy foods for the people of our country—and if he is to continue contributing significantly to our economic progress.

POINT PROGRAM FOR JUNE DAIRY MONTH

Question. Now, Senator WILEY, as a long-time booster for dairying, do you have any specific recommendations for a June Dairy Month program?

Answer. During June Dairy Month, a great many promotion activities are underway, sponsored by the dairy industry itself, as well as by State departments of agriculture, including Wisconsin, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

We recognize, of course, that the job of increasing consumption and utilizing of dairy products is not just a 1-month, but a 12-month job. To help brighten the outlook, I believe promotional activities as well as a wide variety of other steps should be carried forward:

First, we need to expand efforts to "sell the dairy food story," stressing that dairy products are a "best buy" for the family budget; and dairy foods provide over one-half of our total food needs for less than one-fourth of the food budget.

ESTABLISHING A SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE FOR MILK

Question. In addition to its health giving benefits for the American family, what are other ways in which consumption of milk can be expanded?

Answer. The sales and promotion activities, of course, can go a long way toward increasing consumption of milk. According to surveys, it has been estimated that a swallow a day—think of it, one swallow a day per person in the United States—would balance the supply of milk.

Consequently, I continue to believe that greater consumption of milk and other dairy products by the general public is the best answer to our supply-demand inbalance.

However, there are additional ways in which we can constructively increase the consumption of milk. These include:

Further expanding the Federal-State-locally sponsored special milk programs, distributing milk to schools, child care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions.

Incidentally, you will recall a measure was passed this session along the lines of a bill I introduced, for carrying forward and expanding this program.

In addition, a greater effort must be made to provide dairy foods—particularly from any surplus supplies—for needy people at home and abroad.

Also, we need to educate the public "out of the outmoded idea" that there is an age limit on milk consumption. To the contrary, dairy foods are good for people of all age brackets—babies, teenagers, mature folks, and individuals in their golden years.

EXPANDING DAIRY RESEARCH

Question. Now, what about research, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Personally, I feel that expanding research holds a key to our difficulties in dairying. You may recall that I introduced legislation in Congress to establish a dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis., the heart of the dairyland.

The purpose of much-needed expanded research facilities would be to find better ways and means of utilizing, processing, distributing, and marketing dairy products. In addition, the purpose of the laboratory here would offer an opportunity to better coordinate the many efforts now scattered across the country.

NEEDED: FAIR PARITY FOR DAIRY FARMERS

Question. What about farm parity, Senator Wiley?

Answer. Through the years, I have felt that the dairy farmer was entitled to a fair price for his milk and other dairy products—a price that would provide him the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. Unfortunately, the high cost of labor, taxes, equipment and other farm expenses have made it increasingly difficult for farmers to make a living in dairying.

To help deal more effectively with this situation I have cosponsored legislation to improve the support price level. The overall objective, of course, is to provide the farmer with a fair proportion of the retail price of his products—as well as to continue to make dairy foods available at reasonable cost to consumers.

ADDITIONAL STEPS FOR IMPROVING THE DAIRY OUTLOOK

Question. Recognizing that it is important to keep the dairy farmer happy economically, do you have additional recommendations?

Answer. Yes; I believe that maintaining a healthy dairy economy serves not only this special, but also the public, interests. Consequently, I believe this can be done in the following ways:

1. Maintain a strong dairy cooperative program;

2. Improve the Federal milk marketing order system to better reflect production costs and provide more equitable prices to the dairymen, particularly in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Midwest;

3. Protect the dairy industry from a dangerously large volume of imports that would displace markets for U.S.-produced commodities;

4. Prevent oleo and other substitutes from usurping dairy markets. Incidentally, we recently defeated such a move in the Senate;

5. Expand the use of milk-vending machines and other devices and special techniques for distributing milk products to the American people;

6. Establish realistic policies by the Food and Drug Administration to avoid public scares; but at the same time, assuring a healthful flow of dairy foods to the American public.

7. Improve educational opportunities including better libraries, extension services, from local universities, and availability of publications from State and Federal departments of agriculture;

8. And, finally, I believe we must create greater opportunity in dairying to encourage young, dynamic, imaginative youth to enter the field vocationally, to further strengthen our dairy economy and provide a reservoir of rich, healthful, tasty dairy foods for the future.

CONCLUSION

This, then is a brief look at the major features of the dairy picture.

Again, I emphasize that maintaining a healthy economy in dairying benefits not only the farmer but the public and the general economy as well.

Thank you very much.

Nixon No Question Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial entitled "Nixon No Question Mark" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 13, 1960]

NIXON NO QUESTION MARK

A television discussion of the issues of the day by Vice President NIXON and his challenger, Governor Rockefeller, could have served a useful public service. We are disappointed that the Governor turned down NIXON's offer to answer Rockefeller's questions in a public forum. We suspect, however, that the New York Governor may have backed away from a face-to-face appearance with NIXON because such an appearance would have dispelled Rockefeller's contention that NIXON's banner is a question mark.

The fact is that NIXON's position on major issues has been spelled out time and again. He has had a better opportunity than Rockefeller to go on record on public policy questions; as a Member of Congress he had to stand up and be counted. As Vice President he has stood before innumerable groups of citizens and answered questions from the floor. (A 22-page record of NIXON's public stands is available for $1 from Congressional Quarterly, 1156 10th Street NW., Washington, 6, D.C.)

If a public debate between NIXON and Rockefeller were held, it would be helpful also in delineating the Rockefeller policies as well as NIXON's. Although Rockefeller demands that NIXON be specific, Rockefeller himself is not specific on many issues.

Rockefeller accuses NIXON of being a question mark, but he himself speaks in vague terms in discussing foreign policy, farm problems, civil rights, and arms control. Rockefeller said he would not be willing to debate NIXON until NIXON had made his position clear on these and other issues. But Rockefeller hasn't made his own position clear. In many cases he merely has stated the problem without proposing a solution.

For example, Rockefeller criticized the Eisenhower administration for having no prepared American position a month before the disarmament conference at Geneva.

Rockefeller's solution: "The machinery of free government can and must be geared to do better than this."

He who criticizes should certainly be able to do better than that.

Rockefeller is more specific on arms control in the April issue of Foreign Affairs but he concedes: "The field of arms control is technically so complex and still so incompletely understood that it would be irresponsible to make specific proposals."

In those areas where Rockefeller grows specific, NIXON is just as specific.

Rockefeller is for the Democratic Forand bill for medical help to the aged. NIXON supports another plan providing Federal-State sharing of part of the cost of volunteer health insurance.

Rockefeller is for Federal aid for school construction and for scholarships. NIXON is for Federal aid to school construction.

Rockefeller is for government compulsory arbitration in strikes that cause national emergencies. NIXON is against this, saying "Government wage fixing inevitably means Government price fixing." We agree with NIXON. Rockefeller wants tax changes to encourage investments. NIXON says he has urged tax revisions, too. Rockefeller is for racial equality; so is NIXON.

On the farm problem, Rockefeller says, there should be "redefinition to make low-income farmers more productive members of the economy." How?

NIXON has endorsed the farm views expressed by the Republican committee on program and progress. He is waiting to see what Congress does on Mr. Eisenhower's farm recommendations. The farm problem is one area in which NIXON probably will assert a modified line since what Congress is willing to do has not solved the problem.

Governor Rockefeller says featherbedding in industry must be eliminated. He doesn't say how this can be done, but presumably he wants an answer from NIXON on this.

The Rockefeller challenge to NIXON so far has merely raised a question mark over many of his own positions. Perhaps in the weeks that remain before the Republican convention Rockefeller can clarify his own views so that they can be presented to the platform committee.

Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is general recognition that adequate health and medical care for the aged should be available to all over 65 who need it at a cost they can afford. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that with the mounting costs of medical care and the growing pressure on our medical facilities, most of our older citizens cannot get the kind of health care they need without some form of Government help.

The bill which I have introduced offers a comprehensive way to provide senior citizens with the health care they need at a cost they and the Government can afford. It places emphasis on preventive care, as the doctors say should be done, by providing that at least one-third of the coverage under this program include care in the physicians' office or in the home. This is the kind of coverage senior citizens need more than any other, because modern medicine can do a great deal preventively to keep aging persons well enough to make institutional care unnecessary. Doctors can treat many conditions better and less expensively in the office or home.

Hospitalization or the equivalent cost care in the nursing home or home for the aged, surgery, laboratory tests, diagnostic X-rays, drugs, visiting nurse service, and other benefits will also be available under this bill.

An examination of some of the proposals before the Congress has been made by Dr. Merle D. Evans, of Rochester, N.Y. He is the past president and present legislative chairman of the Monroe County Medical Society, and his remarks were made before the platform committee of the Monroe County Republican Party on June 2.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Evans be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present interest in providing health care for the aged should be guided and directed by a logical and methodical study of the needs for such care rather than a policy based on political expediency. The low income, over-65 citizen is, to some extent, the creation of society's enforced retirement age policy. Medical care is but one of the many needs that confront this group of enforced retirees. Medical care has become a basic need of society, along with food, clothing and shelter. It is a basic tenet of the medical profession to provide care to all regardless of economic status.

That help is needed by many to obtain adequate health care for themselves and their families is admitted. Naturally, the average citizen would rather provide for his own care than depend upon the community to care for him. But just how great is the need for help in providing necessary medical

care among the over-65 group? In January 1960, a study here in Rochester of all hospital admissions for that month showed that 81 percent of those over 65 paid their own hospital bills. Most had some form of prepaid insurance. Countrywide studies show that over 70 percent of the population carries some type of prepaid health care insurance. The growth of these insurance plans has been rapid.

In January 1961, a White House conference for the study of the needs and associated problems of the aging is to be held. As an adjunct to this conference or in addition to it, I would recommend that an advisory council be created composed of representatives of medicine, social services, economists, labor, industry and government to make a study in depth of the health needs of this group. Once the need has been established, a sound program could be devised to meet the problem.

In the present Congress, much pressure is being brought to bear for legislation this year to provide a medical care program for the senior citizens. The first suggestion—the Forand bill—is planned to give hospital services and nursing home care and surgery performed in the hospital to those eligible for social security benefits. A modification, proposed by Senators McNAMARA and KENNEDY, would provide hospital and nursing home care and would cover all over 65, including those who are not eligible for social security benefits. Both of these bills would be financed by an increase in the social security tax paid by the employer and the employee. This tax already is scheduled to rise to 9 percent in the next few years.

Financing any such plan through social security is wrong. The basic philosophy of social security is to provide the retiree with money which he can use at his own discretion. This addition would be giving him a service. It is compulsory. No one can say with certainty right now what such a program will cost. It would create a huge Federal bureau that would subsidize many who do not need it. Under the McNamara and Kennedy bills, those paying social security taxes would have to provide for many who have had no hand in providing the taxes. In short, there are many unresolved problems in this approach.

The other two plans under study—the administration's plan and the Javits-Keating-Weis, et al., plan—are Federal and State subsidy plans, financed out of general taxation funds. They are voluntary in participation, coinsurance in form, more extensive in provision of benefits, use existing agencies and facilities for provision of benefits and services and would be locally autonomous in administration to a great extent.

The administration plan, excluding the indigent or actual needy who are cared for completely by total subsidy, is a major medical insurance plan providing protection against catastrophic illness but without the benefit of coverage for basic needs.

The Javits-Keating-Weis plan has much merit in that in it there is a relationship between the premium and the income of the subscriber. It provides a subsidy only for those in need of one and is built upon basic health care coverage.

None of these proposals is ideal. Nor can parts be picked from any or all of them to create an ideal plan because the exact needs are not known. Any legislation passed at this time—in the absence of data on the need—could prove far from satisfactory in the future. Before committing ourselves to a course of action, we should know where we are going.

Rather than rush through hasty legislation, now that the Nation is aroused to the desirability of providing help in getting medical care for our over-65 citizens, let this problem be seriously studied. Out of such study, a plan can be evolved that will be: (1) Voluntary in participation; (2) broad and all inclusive in the provision of benefits; (3) coinsurance in form; (4) designed to use existing agencies and facilities; (5) financed by joint State and Federal payments from general funds; (6) as local as possible in administration so as to avoid unnecessary Federal bureaucracy; (7) a real help to those over 65.

Areas to be studied in the preparation of legislation having to do with this problem of a medical care program for the senior citizen should include:

A. Inflation: This must be controlled before any reasonable solution to the economic difficulties besetting a fixed income group can be arranged. Retirement programs that were adequate when set up years ago are no longer sufficient to supply even the necessities in the face of the inflated dollar. To take further inflationary steps only compounds the problem.

B. Needs of senior citizens: Subjectively, the needs, wants, and desires of this group should be explored in order that the specific help needed can be determined.

C. Attitude toward retirees: We should reevaluate the attitude of society regarding this group. Is the fact that a man has reached a certain age any criterion of his economic productivity? Must he be put on the shelf and be cared for because he has attained a certain chronological age? Is an antisocial policy which takes these persons out of the labor market a good policy to retain?

D. A breakdown of senior citizens by economic status: Because of the complicated personal budget problem that is common to all American families, the aged can be separated into several groups:

1. The indigent aged: To this group, the cost of medical care is not a problem because it, along with other living costs, is met by public assistance programs, by relatives and by religious and community agencies.

2. The near indigent who cannot fit the cost of an annual premium for health insurance into their budget. Some subsidy to help this group pay annual premiums would be of great benefit.

3. The nonindigent who might become indigent if confronted with a prolonged illness. This group would be helped enormously by prepaid medical insurance plans.

4. The nonindigent group of people who are able and want to work beyond normal retirement age. If they could work to supplement their social security benefits, the increased income would solve many budgetary problems for them.

5. The nonindigent with no particular budget problem and no need of a Government subsidy.

Such classification as this could be done by using data obtained in the 1960 Federal census taken in the last few weeks. This information is not yet available and won't be in time for its consideration by this session of Congress.

E. Our social securtiy structure: It is evident that the social security program is not functioning in accord with sound actuarial policy. It has been altered so many times—usually under political pressures of an election year—that its original concept can no longer be recognized. Does the public really want to alter the philosophy of this program which was intended to provide our citizens with an income in retirement?

These are but a few suggestions of the approach which I feel should be made to this most important problem. Others will develop during the actual study.

There is no alternative, in our estimation, to the fact that this matter should not be entered into lightly but deserves a thorough study in depth before any legislation is approved.

The Pennsylvania Farmer and the Green Acres Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of the green acres farm program to each of the county agricultural agents in my congressional district, as well as to the officers of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association. In the near future, I am going to send out 300 copies of Mr. Andersen's proposal to other farmers in my district. I can readily see where there can be a difference of opinion between our relatively small Pennsylvania area farmers as compared to the larger ranches, and so forth, in the West. The smallness of our Pennsylvania farms is shown by the tabulation of "Value of Products Sold from Commercial Farms in Juniata County, Pa."

The comments submitted to me are interesting, especially so, in the light of the authoritativeness of the views expressed.

Mr. Speaker, here are the letters I received from the extension agents from Dauphin, Juniata, Lebanon, and Perry Counties and from the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association:

DAUPHIN COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION ASSOCIATION,
Harrisburg, Pa., May 25, 1960.

Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you very much for the information on the Anderson-Jensen green acres farm program.

The program looks as though it would have a lot of merit, and I believe would work better than the present soil bank.

I would question, however, if it will solve the present wheat surplus, since I note the wheat quotas will not be changed. I also question whether we can increase supports to 90 percent of parity without running into the problem of surplus production.

I have not had an opportunity to talk with any of our Dauphin County farmers on this program, but it looks as though they would be favorable since most of them would have 20 percent of their land in hay and pasture crops at present.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. STEWART,
County Agent.

JUNIATA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION ASSOCIATION,
Mifflintown, Pa., June 7, 1960.

Hon. WALTER MUMMA,
Member, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUMMA: This letter is an atttempt to give you some of my impressions of Congressman ANDERSEN'S green acres proposal in response to your request. I would also like to make some additional comments on the whole farm problem especially as it relates to Juniata County.

There are two aspects to the farm problem. The one that receives the most attention is the so-called surpluses of certain crops with resultant low prices. I will call this the price problem. The most critical problem appears to be wheat with the other grain

crops of corn, soybeans, sorghum, and so forth, also involved. This is more a Midwest than an Eastern problem. However the east is concerned with egg and milk prices.

The second aspect is the small farm or low income problem, which exists everywhere in the Nation. I feel it is even more important to us here than the price problem.

The following table rates the farms by value of products sold. It was taken from the 1954 census of agriculture. Approximately two-thirds of our farms are rated commercial by the Bureau of Census.

Value of products sold from commercial[1] farms in Juniata County, Pa.

	Percent of farms
$250 to $1,199 (55 percent below $5,000)	8
$1,200 to $4,999 (55 percent below $5,000)	47
$5,000 to $9,999	27
$10,000 to $24,999	15
$25,000 and over	3

Our farm management studies show that $5,000 gross income is about the breaking point between profit and loss. The figures in the table indicate that the major problem on over half the farms is that their enterprises are too small. Their gross income does well to cover such fixed overhead expenses as taxes and insurance plus the cash operating expenses such as gasoline, seeds, fertilizer, and feed. There is little left for family living and depreciation.

Prices are relatively less important to the small operator than to the large operator. A small dairy farm may produce about 80,000 pounds of milk per year worth about $3,600. Assume some program, Government or private, or a combination of both, raised the farm price of milk 1 cent per quart. This would only increase the gross income of the farm about $400, to $4,000, which is still not enough to put this farm in a sound financial position.

The conservation reserve program is being criticized because it is removing whole farms from production. However, I feel that, especially for these small farms, the whole farm approach is a better solution than restrictive programs that require every farmer to cut back a stated percent. Again, the slightly higher prices that may be realized as a result of the program won't do much more than offset the loss of income from the present total production.

The entire farm problem is complicated by the different interests of the different parts of the Nation. The eastern farmer has usually not voted in favor of the wheat allotments, but has been outvoted by the western wheat farmer. Each has been trying to protect his interests as he sees them.

The green acres program, in my opinion, is another program more specifically prepared for the West than for us. The comment by Mr. Andersen, on page 9166 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, about eliminating the 600,000 producers who grow less than 15 acres of wheat is an example of what I mean. He assumes that each one of them will quit growing wheat and take a payment in kind.

However, I don't think that will have much appeal in this area because much of our wheat is grown as a nurse crop to establish a new seeding of alfalfa or clover. It is the best crop we have for late fall seeding for this purpose. So unless the production of wheat is specifically prohibited, many of our less than 15 acre producers will stay in business.

I am not certain, either, that if the green acres program does cut back somewhat on the current surplus that the increased price supports and relaxation of controls at the end of the 5-year program will not soon have us back in the same situation again.

Nor am I certain that the 50-percent penalty for noncompliance will not make it impossible to get green acres approved at the proposed referendum. In general the producers have favored price support programs with rather ineffective controls. The only controls that would really be effective would be allotments based on bushels rather than acres. As yet no one has been able to get enough support to have such controls established.

There are so many angles to all this that it is impossible to do more than comment very briefly on a few of them in letters such as this.

I would be glad to comment on any specific questions you may ask.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. SETTLEMYER,
County Agent.

LEBANON COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION ASSOCIATION,
Lebanon, Pa., May 24, 1960.

Hon. WALTER M. MUMMA,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUMMA: The four words, "what do you think," written in your recent letter presented a real challenge. It was the first time a Member of the Congress of the United States asked for my opinion and I feel honored, but a bit uneasy in attempting to tackle a problem with so many involvements.

Mr. Anderson gave a very real review of the farm problem, but I'm not too sure that his program will work. We got into this mess through controls and I'm not convinced that more controls will get us out. He is speaking of a grain surplus area, while we are in a grain deficient area. Great quantities of feed for livestock and poultry are imported each year—Lebanon County alone spends over $4 million. He must not like little people.

Farm legislation has limited wheat acreage here little by little until farms that normally grew 40 acres can now grow only 15 acres, and now Mr. Anderson wants to, "eliminate the 600,000 15-acre farmers."

Bedding is in short supply for our livestock and presently is costing as much as hay. Mr. Anderson didn't even mention this item, but he did mention enforcement, "a penalty of 50 percent of the total production on any farm not in compliance." I wonder how he would like to pay a fine like that for going 36 miles an hour in a 35-mile speed zone. I don't believe he ever did explain how the Vermont farmer with 85.8 percent of his farm in hay and pasture can take an additional 20 percent of his farm out of grain production.

The big problem is in the West and Mr. Anderson wants the West to benefit by new legislation as they have in the past. They get the lion's share of money to build dams to irrigate more land to create more surpluses. Why not stop bringing new land into production until it's needed?

His program is much too complicated for a farmer to understand, and it would be very costly to administer.

That's the way I see this proposal, WALTER. Thanks for asking, "what do you think."

Very truly yours,

GLENN E. MILLER,
County Agricultural Agent.

PERRY COUNTY AGRICULTURAL
EXTENSION ASSOCIATION,
New Bloomfield, Pa., June 1, 1960.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

(Attention: Congressman WALTER M. MUMMA, 16th District, Pennsylvania).

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUMMA: Received your letter dated May 17, 1960, relative to the green acres program as outlined by Congressman ANDERSON of Minnesota. I should have answered you prior to this date, but I have been thinking about the matter and discussing it with a number of people in the county.

It would appear to me that in designing a program for agriculture certain desirable features should be kept in mind. These would include: (1) Supplying the people with adequate amounts of high quality food and fiber to maintain the health and welfare of the Nation. (2) To provide the farmer with a fair share of the gross national income. (3) To maintain freedom of operation. (4) That the production of food and fiber be done in such a way that prices to the consumer will be reasonable.

As you probably know, the demand for agricultural products is of such a nature that if you increase the supply 1 percent the price decreases approximately 3 percent. It is also fairly evident that if the prices of agricultural products decrease farmers tend to try to overcome this decrease by further increasing the level of production. This is done by changing the inputs of capital, land, labor, and management in such a way that the total output will be greater.

It is also fairly evident that if you reverse the process, that is, decrease the total supply of agricultural products by 1 percent the price level will increase approximately 3 percent. In other words, I am convinced that any program which is to contribute to the solution of the agricultural problem must cut down total production. During the past 25 years there have been programs introduced which would solve the problem if properly administered. For example; I believe that the soil bank program would solve the problem if 50 to 60 million acres of agricultural land were taken out of production. To date only 28 million acres have been put into the soil bank. Farmers have taken labor, capital, and management which would have been used on the soil bank acres and added them to the production process on their remaining acres. This has resulted in increased yields per acre so that the total production has not been cut. If twice this amount of land were in the bank you can see that the farmers could not increase their yields enough to maintain total production. By the same token, allotment and price support programs would also do the job, if allotments were cut sufficiently to curtail total production.

The green acres program as outlined by Congressman ANDERSON should work because I believe the principle is sound. There are two problems in relation to the green acres program. First, the 20-percent requirement is not high enough to affect total production. Second, if this percentage is made high enough I question whether farmers on a nationwide referendum would give the necessary two-thirds vote in favor of it.

In general I feel that farmers do not understand the tremendous effect of a surplus production on agricultural prices. I believe if a good sound program were devised and an effort made to explain the objectives of the program to the farmers as well as the general public that it would be accepted. Conditions of the program should be such that you are absolutely sure that total production would be cut and that the program be maintained long enough for its adoption across the Nation.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture each year issues a yearbook. The last issue was devoted to food. I would appreciate it very much if you could obtain and send me a copy of this yearbook. I appreciate your letter and I hope that what I have written will be of some help to you.

Yours truly,

ROY F. SNYDER,
County Agent.

---

[1] A commercial farm is one where the operator worked off the farm less than 100 days per year, sold over $250 worth of farm products, and reported no other income exceeding the value of agricultural products sold.

PENNSYLVANIA FARMERS' ASSOCIATION,
May 31, 1960.

Hon. Congressman WALTER H. MUMMA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MUMMA: Thank you very much for sending me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing Congressman ANDERSON'S proposed farm bill the green acres program.

My general reaction to the Congressman's program is that it appears to assume that farmers must continue to rely on the Federal Government for a portion of their annual income.

Although the program appears to be an improvement in some respects over some of the Brannan-type proposals we have seen in the past, it still advocates support prices at relatively high levels.

The green acres program calls for continued strict controls, with various incentives which will continue to induce a certain element in agriculture to think the answer to our problem is to be found in the Federal Treasury.

I doubt that Pennsylvania farmers would find much in Congressman ANDERSON'S program that would appeal to them.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

C. M. WILSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

A Sixth Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to some extremely important and timely remarks delivered recently by a distinguished public servant and citizen of my State.

The Honorable Stewart Lamprey, speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, in a recent address to the Laconia Chamber of Commerce pointed to the peril of what he described as a Sixth Column movement in this country. I think the term is very appropriate for the group of so-called Americans who, knowingly or unknowingly, are bent upon discrediting America and our way of life. Mr. Lamprey's comments are the subject of a recent laudatory editorial which appeared in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader.

The editorial is an excellent commentary and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, June 13, 1960]

A SIXTH COLUMN

House Speaker Steward Lamprey has performed a distinct public service in warning of an insidious Sixth Column at work in the United States today. In a recent address to the Laconia Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Lamprey described the Sixth Column as distinct from the well-known Fifth Column as a person or persons who wittingly or unwittingly, sow the seeds of revolutionary philosophy and thus weaken us morally, spiritually, and even militarily.

To illustrate his warning that such a Sixth Column is real and, moreover, close at hand, Mr. Lamprey read to his audience a most astonishing paragraph taken from an address recently delivered in Meredith. The paragraph follows:

"Our final hope cannot be in America. It will fall, as other nations before it have fallen. Nor can our hope be in democracy. Is this the perfect political system? God help us if it is."

This paragraph is representative of the pratings of the extreme liberal, the fuzzy thinker, the harkers of doubt and doom and the avowed Communist. Mr. Lamprey did not disclose the name of the Merideth speaker, leaving us, for the present at least, to hope he does disclose the speaker's name to the Attorney General so that this sort of rotten business, this Sixth Column as Mr. Lamprey calls it, can be ferreted out and flushed away.

National Defense Aspects of Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines Superliners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I am pleased to include an interesting, informative, and challenging address made by H. B. Carter, president of the Carter Hotels Operating Corp. of New York City, on June 3, 1960, to the New York Chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association, which address was entitled "The National Defense Aspects of the Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines, Inc., Superliners."

Mr. Hilly, honored guests and gentlemen, I was extremely gratified to receive your very kind invitation to visit with you and discuss my project of building two superliners to provide a $50 fare to Europe. For the first time since my plan was formulated I will explore this evening some of the national defense aspects involved.

It is a pleasure to address such a knowledgeable audience on the defense transportation situation, a situation which must be of vital concern to every one of you. The woeful inadequacy of marine transportation for American troops in case of emergency is very serious indeed.

At superliner hearings before the Bonner committee in Congress, Admiral Wilson of the Navy testified that the United States has only 10 passenger ships which can exceed 20 knots-per-hour speed. This is the minimum speed required for transports swift enough to evade attack by modern submarines. Gentlemen, only 10 ships in the entire United States are available to handle troop transport to every corner of the globe. During the last war when we were faced with a similar emergency, we paid England hundreds of millions of dollars to transport our troops under generally deplorable conditions. Should the need arise, Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines superliners could carry a full division each with four men to a cabin, each cabin air conditioned, with private toilet and shower facilities: substantially more civilized and modern than in the past.

As for peacetime—or cold-war time, if you prefer—we find that the Military Sea Transport Service carries 20,000 to 30,000 passengers every month to and from foreign ports. This figure includes not only service men, but their dependents as well. A considerable portion of these passengers are carried on avowed luxury liner ships with extras in service and facilities that are simply incompatible with efficient Government transportation economies, and it all adds up to burdensome costs to the taxpayer.

The MATS has no choice; it requires mass passenger space, space that often is not sufficient to warrant requisition of an entire MATS transport. It must then turn to the only form of large passenger carrier available, namely, the luxury liner or airplane, at many times the cost of our proposed superliner Sea Coach fares.

Here we have two interrelated situations: First a wartime emergency and, second, a peacetime waste, both focusing on inadequacy of wholesale low-cost ocean transport facilities. Sea Coach has the only solution to both these problems. Its superliners could serve with dignity, comfort, speed, and protection as modern troop carriers at great savings to the American taxpayer.

I offer here the greatest bargain for the American Government.

Two of the largest troopships with standby capability of the largest aircraft carriers in case of emergency, always on call to the American Government—and provided at private cost, private operation, privately trained crew, all free to the American people.

In addition to these national defense aspects, there are national economic aspects to be examined in connection with these ships. The employment activated by their construction and operation, the supplies consumed, and business generated all could create income and additional tax revenue for this country. What has the Government done about these proposals?

Well, there have been six bills before the Congress which had 1 day of hearings which were aborted and the time wasted. Remember, we will require no operating or construction subsidy. The profitability I have checked and tested from every possible angle, and from the deluge of mail and inquiries I daily receive I can easily demonstrate a 5-year all-around complete sellout.

Each Sea Coach superliner will be capable of carrying a full division plus 50 interceptor aircraft for protection. This can be expanded to even 150 interceptor aircraft. With 34 knots service speed and 40 knots of forced speed, protection is guaranteed from submarine attack. I had offered Washington a design similar to a flattop aircraft carrier; the stacks and other superdeck fittings could be retractible for a cleared flight deck. All of this I offered to the American Government at no cost to the taxpayer, but I could not get it done. I was forced to take my project to Hamburg, Germany, where I have signed a construction contract with the Deutsche Werft Shipyards, Dr. William Scholz, president. They guarantee delivery in 36 months after final plans for the first vessel, and the second vessel will be delivered 12 to 15 months after the first one.

You all have been provided with cards and brochures explaining my $50-to-Europe project, and the scale models are on display in my Dixie Hotel, West 42d Street, and at various points around the city. The newspapers, radio, television, and magazines all have carried a steady flow of information on this project, which will be the greatest boon both to the American public and to the nations across the Atlantic for peace, good will, and human understanding on the one side, and education, culture, and trade on the other.

President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON and Senators JAVITS and MAGNUSON are constantly emphasizing the need for more "Peo-

ple to People" visits and intermingling, thereby fostering peacetime understanding. But how is this possible when the masses—the average people, the little fellows—are not provided with the low cost facility to do it. Again the Cantor superliners are the answer.

One American steamship line receives $28½ million a year in subsidies, and there are 15 other ocean lines receiving similarly large operating subsidies. This same line advertises luxury service in the New York Times, to wit: "One steward to every couple," which means that they cater to clients such as chairmen of the boards and presidents of rather large corporations, in other words, catering to perhaps not even 5 percent of our population. But no facility has thus far been provided at low cost for the masses, for the little fellow. But you are permitted to pay the tax to support this luxury service. Seems incredible doesn't it? I cannot understand it.

New ship construction is in the doldrums. During April: not one new ocean ship contract, and 5 months prior to February, not one new ship contract—and America has gone from first to eighth place in world shipbuilding. Why? Because of lack of financing; or lack of interest on the part of Washington, and practically and basically because we do not build ships as we do everything else in America, large volume and little price, catering to the masses, which is exactly what I am advocating here.

FHA and title I financing make it possible to construct new apartment houses and other real estate. Under these acts the Government permits a responsible operator a 90-percent guarantee of loan for 30 years at a reasonable interest rate, which is exactly the type of financing I will accept, and build two additional ships in America, besides the two I will build in Germany. Why isn't this same type of financing available for shipbuilding? What good is all this housing without having the weapons—such as these ships—to defend them? Under this proposal I will require no operating or construction subsidy and will build two additional ships in my country and keep the employment here where we might soon badly need it.

The American merchant marine provides annually a payroll of over $1 billion. American foreign trade employes over 4½ million people, generating wages of over $13 billion annually. Many of you make your living from the sea. With ship construction in America in the doldrums, a lack of ships might eventually strike a mortal blow to our economy: In fact, we are beginning to feel the effects right now.

Fifty-dollar fare to Europe for the little people of the world is the goal to which I have dedicated myself and I will leave no stone unturned to get it accomplished both in Germany and in America. Why can't we get it done in our own country?

I repeat, here is the greatest defense facility. It is convertible and useful and extremely important either in peacetime or in wartime. We will require no operating nor construction subsidy.

Why can't we get it done in America?

The Emergence of West Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at a conference on world tensions held at the University of Chicago. Dr. Lewis is one of the most experienced professional and practical observers of events in West Africa, and this address sets forth with clarity the present and looming requirements of policy in Africa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMERGENCE OF WEST AFRICA

(This is the text of an address given by Dr. W. Arthur Lewis, principal, University College of the West Indies, Kingston, Jamaica, at 8:30 p.m., Thursday, May 12, at the University of Chicago. Dr. Lewis is one of the participants in the Conference on World Tensions, sponsored jointly by World Brotherhood, Inc. and the University of Chicago.)

My subject is west Africa, the vast area lying below the Sahara desert, and stretching from the Atlantic Ocean in the west to the Cameroons in the east. Here live 65 million people, in 16 different countries. Half this population lives in one country, the British colony of Nigeria, which has 32 million people. Next in size is Ghana, with only 5 million. Only three others have more than 3 million people. So with the exception of Nigeria, we are dealing with a large number of small countries, whose typical population is only about 2 million, spread rather thinly over the ground.

All these countries are now self-governing with the exception of 2, and it is probable that by the end of next year 14 of them will be independent members of the United Nations. This is an astonishingly swift development. At the beginning of the year 1957, there was only one independent country in west Africa; namely, Liberia. Today there are five, namely Liberia, Ghana, Guinea, Cameroon, and Togoland; four others will join the list this year; namely Senegal and Sudan, who have federated under the name of Mali, Nigeria, and Mauritania. Next year for certain there will be Sierra Leone, and probably also the remaining French territories of Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Volta, and Niger. The arrival of all these west African countries in the United Nations will, by the end of next year, give Africa the largest block of votes in the General Assembly, when you include North, West, and Central Africa.

My instructions tonight are to say a few words about the tensions existing in this area which has burst so dramatically upon the world stage. I shall first describe the situation and then tackle the question, What help the outside world can give.

From the many problems of the area, I will focus tonight on five sources of tension, as follows:

First, the division of the area into British and French spheres of influence.

Second, the lack of education, which helps to maintain that division.

Third, the mix-up of tribes and religions, which menaces the stability of each of these states.

Fourth, frontier questions.

Fifth, the Federal idea, which is meant to reduce tensions, but which actually increases them.

First let me take the division of the area among the metropolitan powers. In 1957 there was one independent state, Liberia, which was really a satellite of the United States of America. Apart from this there were 4 British colonies, 10 French colonies, and 1 Portuguese colony. These divisions still have important cultural, economic, and political consequences. Culturally, there is virtually no exchange between French and British. French Africans and British Africans have no means of communication with each other. The British African intellectuals know what is happening in London, whether in the markets, or in the theater, or in politics, and the French Africans know what is happening in Paris, whether in philosophy, or at the opera; but neither knows anything about what is happening in the other countries. There is similar economic isolation. Currencies are exchanged into each other only with difficulty. Transport facilities, whether roads, railways or harbors, have been designed for political and not for economic convenience. Trade is parcelled up by tariffs. Above all, there is political isolation, which is a continuing obstacle to the removal of other barriers. The French territories, although claiming independence, remain deeply attached to France, by sentimental as well as by economic ties, and are a little frightened of Ghana and Nigeria. French Africans and British Africans do not feel at home with each other, and it is going to take a lot of working together as independent states before they agree to break down some of the barriers which now separate them.

The second weakness of these countries is their lack of education. When Ghana became independent only 1 percent of her children were receiving a high school education, and that is typical of the whole area. It has several consequences. First, though these countries become independent, they continue to depend upon the outside world to run their affairs. In the government, the ministers are African, but the civil servants and technicians are still British or French. So also the whole of large scale private business is run by foreigners. Thus the dependence on Britain or on France is maintained. A second consequence is that the cost of any kind of development is very high, since it has to be done with foreign staffs paid at higher rates than they earn in their own countries; this, for example, is a formidable obstacle to industrialization on a competitive basis. Another consequence is that some desirable developments cannot be undertaken. Every society is kept going by the products of the high school, who become teachers, nurses, secretaries, or junior administrators or technicians. Most of the obvious types of development are hindered by shortage of people at these levels. Nothing could do more to put West Africa on its feet than a large program of high school education.

The third source of tension on which we are focusing is the fact that none of these countries is homogeneous. Each is a mixture of tribes, languages, and religions, without any sense of common history or of common nationhood. This is poor material for democracy. Many adjacent tribes are traditional enemies, having fought each other regularly right up to the beginning of the 20th century. The new rulers in West Africa are trying to create modern states where national loyalties are to take the place of tribal loyalties. At the same time they are for the most part revolutionaries, in the sense that they wish to break the power of tribal chiefs, and to advance the status of the common man as against the old family oligarchies. In these circumstances, politics is inevitably rough; its weapons are not so much the newspaper and the microphone, as the knife, the club, and the prison cell. At my last count, in five of these countries the opposition had no seats in parliament, and in three other parliaments the government had more than 80 percent of the seats. This has external, as well as internal consequences, for the attitude of the dictator of one country toward the dictator of another country is more often enmity than fellow feeling. Each country praises its own democracy, while looking with scorn and fear at the other's dictatorship.

This hostility is at its greatest where frontiers are disputed—my fourth source of tension. This occurs in three areas, involving Ghana, the Cameroons, and Gambia. The metropolitan powers kept only small forces in West Africa—even now Ghana's

Army has only 6,000 men. Unfortunately these are signs that this happy state may not long persist. In view of current threats, this is just the right time to promote in West Africa a convention for the limitation of armaments.

I come lastly to the fifth source of tension, which might be a solution for all the others—namely, the idea of a federation of West African states. Three federal solutions have competed in West Africa. First, there was the possibility that the French territories would form one federation, and the British territories another. This was decisively rejected. As soon as Ghana became independent it proceeded to destroy all its links with the other British territories—the common airline, the common currency, and the common research services—claiming that it could not continue in partnership with other territories which were still in colonial status. In the same way, as soon as the French territories received self-government, they destroyed the existing federation of French West Africa. In place of this latter was offered the possibility of federation with France, in the French community. This was at first accepted by all the French territories except Guinea, who became independent. Now the others are following suit. Mauretania, Senegal, and Sudan are contracting out of the federal arrangements of the French community, and the others will probably follow soon. Finally, there is the idea, championed by Ghana and by Guinea, of a federation of all West African states. In present circumstances this can hardly come to pass. The leaders distrust each other too much, and are not being subjected to the kind of outside pressures which seem to be a necessary prerequisite of federations. Nevertheless, this is the topic of the day. Ghana and Guinea have already announced a union, and though this has not come to much, they are busily engaged in summoning conferences of other African leaders to work out a wider West African union. They can expect no help from Britain or from France whose Commonwealth aspirations are at first sight incompatible with local unions. However, the more serious danger is that aggressive initiatives by Ghana and by Guinea may frighten rather than conciliate other West African countries.

So much for this brief account of these five sources of tension. But before I go on to speak of how the outside world might help, I must pause to set the picture straight. Because I focused exclusively on tensions, I must have created in your minds a false picture of West Africa as a country grimy with hatreds and oppressions. This is not how most West Africans feel. Politics touches the lives of very few. In West Africa, as in so many other parts of the world, the rule of life, for the great majority of the people, is to find out who is in power and vote for him. While life in the capital cities is politically exciting, and the newspapers resound with speeches and threats, the exertments of life in the country, for the great mass of the people, are in economic progress—in new roads, new water supplies, new schools, buses, electricity, hospitals and other such fruits of progress, which are expanding rapidly throughout this area. West Africa is really a quite and prosperous place, except for handfuls of political leaders who are jockeying for position with each other. This jockeying has dangerous potentialities, because it may inflame the area, but at present its dangers are confined to the relatively few who chose to play this game.

Until independence came, the outside world was represented by Britain and by France, who were anxious to maintain their monopoly. When it was proposed, shortly after the war, that the United Nations should enter the area, either through a Regional Commission, or through establishing regional headquarters of the Specialized Agencies, Britain and France refused, and hastily created, along with other colonial powers, a new body, called by Committee for Technical Cooperation in Africa South of the Sahara, to keep the United Nations, the United States, and all other intruders out of Africa. However, the withdrawal of Britain and of France from parts of West Africa has at once been followed by the entry of the United States, of the United Nations, and of the U.S.S.R.

Russia is well established in Guinea, and is about to open an Embassy in Ghana. West African politicians have a divided mind on this subject. Some, as in Nigeria, or the ivory coast, argue that if you play with fire you will get burned, and they will therefore not establish relations with Russia. Others, as in Guinea and in Ghana, believe that the dignity of Africans requires them to have the same freedom to have embassies from Communist nations as is enjoyed by London or Paris or Washington. Besides, a Russian Embassy has its uses in the quest for economic aid. Ghanaian politicians say to London and to Washington, "If you do not lend us £150 million to build our new aluminum works, we will get the money from Moscow." Since there is no evidence that Moscow is willing to fork out £150 million, the British merely smile at this, but Americans are probably more nervous. What is certain is that no African politician wants his country to become a Russian satellite. The Russians have not yet carried the cold war into West Africa, and if they did, they would probably gain very little by doing so.

The outside world can help West Africa by giving aid, by helping to create an international framework, and by maintaining friendly criticism.

Technical aid is very necessary in view of the lack of education. West Africa needs hundreds of administrators and scientists, and has specially welcomed the beginnings of the United Nations civil service—the OPEX. Thousands of teachers are needed. And, of course, a considerable inflow of capital, both private and public. West Africans would welcome a considerable enlargement of United Nations aid in all these fields, but they will take aid from whatever source it comes, provided that it does not menace their independence. Current flows are small; a mere fraction of what is needed.

I have mentioned the difficulties West Africans have in coming together to solve their own problems, because of mutual jealousies. Here the outside world helps by extending the services of existing international organizations, on a regional basis.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, and the regional conference of such bodies as the FAO and the ILO provide a framework for bringing West Africans together against a wider world background. Private international organizations, and private foundations are also effective in bringing West Africans together in circumstances where purely African initiatives might be less effective. It is still possible that the West Africans may create sufficient of a Federal system of their own to grapple with such obstacles as tariffs, currencies, passports, transmissible diseases, the nationalistic organization of scientific research, and the peculiar design of transportation systems. All these are matters, however, which can be hammered at within the framework of existing international institutions.

Indeed the United Nations has also the opportunity to show what it can do in solving frontier problems, and in preventing war. If the cold war can be kept out of West Africa, as it has been so far, the Security Council may find itself quite usefully occupied in sorting out West African political disputes over the next 10 years or so, such as the disputes between Ghana and her neighbors, or between Gambia and Senegal. Thus the Security Council, which seems almost to have withered away, may find new life in Africa.

This brings me to my final point, which is that the outside world can help West Africa by insisting on judging Africans by the same standards as other people. I say this because the relations which now exist between Africans and liberals in the rest of the world are somewhat unbalanced. Africans, like Asians and Latin Americans, tend to take a holier-than-thou attitude toward Europe and North America, which are freely criticized for their shortcomings. Indeed, in recent months in the U.N., the African bloc has tended to take a holier-than-thou attitude even to the Asians and the Latin Americans, which is quite some achievement. On the other hand, liberals in Europe and America tend to be mealy-mouthed about what is going on in West Africa, as if to say that an African nationalist can do no wrong. This ignores the fact that African nationalists do not think alike. Some are ruthless bosses, of the type of Huey Long. Others, like Olympio in Togoland, or Awolowo in Nigeria, are subtle and sophisticated liberal statesmen, who would bring distinction to political office in any country in the world. Such men are seeking to set new political standards in West Africa, and to create new and healthy political traditions. They are not helped when liberals in the outside world pay homage to men who behave like gangsters, or keep silent in face of African atrocities. The West has a long political tradition, of a kind which West Africa is just learning, and criticism of African mistakes is an important form of aid. The best way to treat West Africans is to treat them as equals, recognizing that some are good and some bad, some are highly educated while others are illiterate, some have good sense while others are silly—in short that they are just like other people, neither better nor worse. The unequal treatment of the past underlies most of the current tensions; in the same way a friendly and helping hand now can set West Africa on a firm road to happiness and prosperity.

New Welfare Department Rule Worthy of Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD on page A4918 information relative to the new program that has been initiated in Tennessee by Gov. Buford Ellington and Mrs. C. Frank Scott, Commissioner of Public Welfare.

Two editorials appeared in the Nashville Banner and the Nashville Tennessean, two outstanding newspapers of the Nation, praising their initiative in this matter. The Nashville Banner editorial and also the editorial that appeared in the Nashville Tennessean follow:

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 21, 1960]

NEW WELFARE DEPARTMENT RULE WORTHY OF TEST

The State welfare department deserves recognition for its action in tightening regulations governing the aid to dependent children (ADC) program.

The ADC program always has been beset by problems. In the past administrators have been hesitant to take action, being fearful that correction would penalize the innocent child for the sins of his parents.

One of the most vexing situations is created by the numbers of illegitimate children on the rolls. There has been a feeling among many legislators that certain women are bringing illegitimate children into the world for the purpose of gaining additional public money.

An effort was made in the 1957 legislature to do something about it, but was killed by veto; the reason given was that it was the innocent child who would be the loser.

This new regulation, put into effect by Mrs. C. Frank Scott, welfare commissioner, gets at the root of the evil—the parent—and continues to aid the child or children.

If all efforts to correct unsuitable home conditions are resisted by the parent, the welfare department is empowered to stop assistance, seek to remove the child from the home and place him in a foster home or institution.

The department plans a home-by-home investigation to determine eligibility. This statewide check will take a year, but the investigating team will move fast in emergency cases.

And it should be pointed out that the department is not taking a hardhearted approach to the problem. Mrs. Scott has said that welfare workers will exhaust every resource to correct an unsuitable situation before initiating court action for removal of a child from his home.

The ADC program is expensive from both a State and Federal viewpoint. In Tennessee alone $17 million will be spent this year. Of this amount the State contributes $2.8 million and the Federal Government $11 million with the balance coming from the local level.

Mrs. Scott believes that the announcement of the pending investigation will cut the roll to some degree, for many of these homes would be fearful of scrutiny.

This is a step in the right direction and possibly may prove to be the answer to a serious problem which calls for protection of the individual child, but not the rewarding of an errant parent.

If this is not the solution, then the field should be thoroughly investigated again with the thought of passing controlling and workable legislation.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 21, 1960]

CHANGE WORTHY OF A TRIAL

The State welfare department has announced that it will tighten its regulations on aid to dependent children. In the future, says Mrs. C. Frank Scott, welfare commissioner, greater emphasis will be given to "suitability of the home" in determining assistance eligibility.

The success of this experiment will depend to a very large degree, if not exclusively, upon the opinions of welfare department social workers. Indeed the program has always hinged upon those opinions. For there simply is no way that an objective rock-bound formula can be devised which is capable of determining without dispute that this case is eligible and deserving, that one is not.

This proposed reform should be subject to review and future reappraisal. But it is worthy of a trial.

The growth of aid to dependent children rolls in the face of a national prosperity is a paradox which confounds sociologists and throws psychologists into disputes.

It is true that the national population is growing. But in Tennessee it is not growing with the rapidity of child dependency rolls and the birth rate is not keeping pace, percentagewise, with the rate of illegitimacy.

The upshot of the situation, unfortunately, falls out in cold, hard statistics and public dollars when human lives are involved. For this reason, extreme caution should be exercised by the department in interpreting its own new policy.

We do not believe there is a person in Tennessee who wants a child to go hungry because that child, through no fault of its own, was born out of wedlock, or because shiftless fathers and mothers refuse to live up to their responsibilities.

However, there is a limit to which society can be pressed in assuming, through its tax bill, the responsibility of parents who refuse to make any attempt toward improvement.

Somehow, this problem must be attached at the source root. It would seem that an improved and broadened educational system would produce a more responsible citizenry, and a strengthening of home influenses. For some reason, the reverse seems to have occurred too often.

Society, therefore, may well feel that since it has allowed these factors to emerge, it must assume financial responsibility. But there is a measure of merit in the countering argument that public sibsidy of moral decay has done little to halt the rotting process.

Let's All Register—Let's All Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am greatly encouraged by the growing number of responsible organizations attempting to encourage greater voter participation in elections.

There are, of course, a great number of reasons—more often excuses—why a great many American voters do not go to the polls.

The Nation, however, cannot be proud of its poor showing at election time. Fortunately, an increasing awareness of a lack of public responsibility is motivating more and more individuals and organizations to do something about it.

For example, I was recently privileged to have forwarded to me by Stephen Slipher, legislative director, U.S. Savings & Loan League, a program, endorsed by the league, entitled "Backing the Vote." The article reflects the fact that such public service efforts not only express good citizenship but also are good public relations. I ask unanimous consent to have the article, by Robert R. Sprague, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BACKING THE VOTE"—WINS VOTES FOR YOUR ASSOCIATION

(By Robert R. Sprague)

Public relations is the most nebulous facet of business operation, and savings and loan is no exception. Too often we in the savings and loan business embark on a public relations program that is vague or cloudy and, at best, will produce results that are strictly in the intangible category.

Therefore, a public relations program that produces tangibles for us is indeed a revolutionary one. Such a program is the "Let's All Register, Let's All Vote" campaign which has received the enthusiastic endorsement and support of both the U.S. Savings & Loan League and the California Savings & Loan League and which we have been requested to present to the savings and loan business throughtout the Nation.

This is a program which will result in tremendous goodwill for savings and loan associations. It will result in civic betterment and will produce the finest publicity and public relations for our business. Speaking selfishly, it will also result in more business for savings and loan associations through increased awareness of our business. Our experience at Pioneer Savings, where we have been privileged to serve as a test case for the program, has proved this.

Basically, the "Let's All Register, Let's All Vote" program is a simple one and a very inexpensive public relations endeavor for savings and loan associations. What the individual association does, at very little cost, is perform a great public service by serving as the information headquarters to help get out the vote. We can either encourage people to register and vote through inexpensive signs in our offices and through our regular advertising media, or we can also provide one of our staff members (where State, county, or local regulations permit) to actually register the voters. Since voting regulations vary extensively, the public will welcome information centers that are easily accessible, as well as easily accessible registration places.

When we at Pioneer first heard about the program, we were enthusiastic, but had no idea of the tremendous response it was to have from customers and the general public. The program, as presented to us, had been previously approved by the American Heritage Foundation, the American Legion, both major political parties, and the League of Women Voters.

At first glance, "Let's All Register, Let's All Vote" seemed to be in the realm of an idealistic venture, rather than a venture that would produce tangible business results for us. We orginally entered into the program, motivated by the shocking fact that millions of citizens do not take advantage of their right to vote. This situation has been a disgrace to our country and the subject of criticism from other countries in the world. For example, in 1956 only 60 percent of the qualified voters turned out in the general election. The other 40 percent either were not registered or did not bother to exercise the most important privilege a citizen in a democracy has.

The more we thought about it, after we had agreed to participate, the more we realized that getting people to vote would not be just an idealistic gesture one our part. It is, instead, a logical one from a cold, business standpoint, since businessmen should be vitally interested in getting the right representation and the right government. If we don't get such government, we cannot remain in business, and it is up to us to see that the special pressure groups, voting en masse, do not sway the future of our Nation.

Briefly, what we did at Pioneer Savings was this: At a very small cost ($1.50) we obtained one of the large, three color boards which contained three categories of "Who Must Register," "Where and When To Register," "Where To Vote." This information for our local area was readily available to us from the office of the registrar of voters, and we merely tacked it on the board. The latter was placed on an easel easily seen from the street or by customers entering our association. Subsequently we purchased boards for our other offices.

Basically, the plan is that simply for associations wishing to participate in the program—you purchase one or more boards and obtain the information to tack on the boards.

At Pioneer Savings, in addition to purchasing boards for our main office and our branches, we also had smaller cards printed with the name of the association and the

"Let's All Register, Let's All Vote" theme. These were placed in our offices and are used on our television newscast. We are also planning to mention the program in our regular newspaper advertising.

Although as yet we have not promoted the program to the extent it would be possible, associations joining the program could have their local newspapers take pictures of the board and the association manager who might pose with leaders of both political parties or the mayor or some such civic official. The publicity possibilities are endless.

Each association sponsoring the campaign should have someone from their office available to give information to the prospective registrant or voter. This, obviously, would require little of the employee's time. At Pioneer Savings we also sent one of our staff members down to the registrar's office for a 2-hour briefing, after which she was made a deputy registrar who can actually register those who come in for voting information which includes registration. While this is not absolutely necessary, it has proved an additional service appreciated by our customers and the general public, alike.

We have been overwhelmed by the response to this program and have received highly complimentary comments from civic and government leaders, from the public, and from leaders of both major political parties. It is still another service to the public that we can talk about and that our advertising and public relations agencies can talk about for us. Obviously, it has certainly built up traffic into all of our offices.

Both U.S. league President W. O. DuVall and California league President Lewis S. Eaton have strongly urged 100-percent participation in the program by each individual member association. Other State leagues and savings and loan associations throughout the country are invited to participate.

* * * * *

We sincerely believe that "Let's All Register, Let's All Vote" will prove to be one of the most successful public relations campaigns undertaken by our business. Although very uncomplicated and inexpensive, the rewards from both an altruistic and strictly business standpoint are many.

We have proved this at Pioneer Savings and hope that all savings associations in the Nation will take advantage of the industry-sponsored program.

Rockefeller: Suicide Plunge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following editorial entitled "Rockefeller: Suicide Plunge?" in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, June 10, 1960]

ROCKEFELLER: SUICIDE PLUNGE?

Nelson Rockefeller's attempt to bomb Vice President NIXON may turn out to be a kamikaze attack—and a miss at that.

It may well mark the downturn of this fast-budding new career as a national political figure.

The stunt, including the trickery of a visit with Eisenhower earlier in the day, may look like smart politics to the slick public relations experts on Rockefeller's staff in New York, but here in the grassroots it smacks too much of the familiar picture of the spoiled brat who'll take his bat and ball and refuse to play unless you let him pitch.

That is the worst kind of picture and performance a man can make when, like Rockefeller, his chief public identity is as a man with fabulous inherited wealth.

In his own right, Rockefeller has won a single election in his life and that in the peculiar political climate of New York—a climate unlike that of any other State in the Union.

From personal experience, we know that his staff immediately assumed that the New York governorship entitled him, as a sort of divine right, or perhaps a natural inheritance, to the Presidency of the United States.

In this arrogant attitude, they revealed a shocking blindness to the rights, attitudes, and even the feelings of those millions of Americans living in the other 49 second-class States. It is no accident that the record shows, in fact, that New York has provided this country with more losing presidential candidates for both parties than any other State in the Union.

NIXON will, of course, be attacked by people with a right to attack him—and be attacked on his record, which is reasonable—but it was singularly out of place for a man who didn't have the courage to challenge NIXON openly or face him in a single primary test anytime, anywhere, to throw an 11th-hour stab-in-the-back.

His final folly, as a man in his first season in the public eyes, was to charge NIXON with secrecy about his intentions. By contrast, NIXON has been in the glaring light of public office for 15 years, and has had a widely publicized record as an outstanding young Congressman, a respected Senator, and as a man who for 8 years has raised the level of the Office of Vice President to a standard never known before in American History, and on that point, even his opponents must agree.

NIXON has a record. Rockefeller has none.

In addition, while Rockefeller offers a late in the day carefully concocted catchall for a program, NIXON has been facing batteries of questions repeatedly, recently right here in central Illinois, and answering them frankly, openly, out of his own mouth, with no scrip and no prompting.

This is as open as possible, and certainly in contrast with Rockefeller's New York stage effects.

Because of the facts, Rockefeller's attempt at a stab-in-the-back may turn out to be a sort of unintentional hara-kari.

C. L. DANCEY.

Visit of Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker to Washington and International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a time when the eyes of the world are focused on the bitter words now being exchanged between East and West, it is indeed heartening to have some kind words and good relations steal a bit of the spotlight.

Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker's visit to Washington afforded a much-needed dramatization of the friendship and cooperation which can and does exist between two neighbors. I'm sure we can all agree with Mr. Diefenbaker's remarks describing the way our two countries live together as a "model relationship."

It is especially gratifying to have this example of friendliness and good will stressed now, coming as it does in the wake of a series of arrogant and belligerent insults cast upon our country by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev.

Not only does Mr. Diefenbaker's visit exemplify the way two countries ought to get along with each other, but it also emphasizes the strengthened Western unity forged, albeit unwittingly, by Khrushchev's insolence. If this bully thinks for a moment that he can intimidate the American people into losing confidence in their leadership or divide the allies of the free world, he has been badly misinformed.

Let Khrushchev look at the way Canada and the United States coexist peacefully, so that he may know what those words really mean before he uses them again. To Prime Minister Diefenbaker and the people of Canada, I want to express the hope that our model relationship will continue to serve as an inspiration to people everywhere for many years to come.

A recent editorial in the Rochester Democrat-Chronicle points out that there are problems between the United States and Canada and cautions that we cannot take Canada for granted. It contains some very constructive insights into these problems and suggests that the Prime Minister's recent visit will "help focus American attention a bit more on our northern neighbor." I know this editorial will be of interest to many Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat-Chronicle, June 3, 1960]

LET'S COOPERATE WITH CANADA

Successful tests of the Bomarc antiaircraft missile yesterday provided an excellent greeting for Canada's Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, who arrives in Washington today for a visit wtih President Eisenhower. The missile's success should help solve one of the visitor's pressing political problems.

About 14 months ago Canada had to scrap plans to build its own jet interceptor, developed by Canadians at a cost of a half billion dollars. It couldn't sell the plane to U.S. military planners who were switching to missiles, Canada could not afford to produce the aircraft for itself alone, so it was forced to drop the plane of which Canadians were very proud, and instead buy American Bomarc missiles.

The missiles hadn't checked out very well in previous tests, so Diefenbaker has been under political attack for the switch to Bomarc.

Canada has other pressing problems concerning here relations with the United States, notably the fact that Canadians buy so much more from us than we do from them. Diefenbaker himself was elected Prime Minister in a great upset over the Canadian Liberal party, largely as a symbol of dissatisfaction with United States-Canadian rela-

tions. A great many Canadians were not and still are not at all happy with us, for many reasons.

When we give away surplus wheat, Canadians can't sell theirs. That hurts their pocketbooks, unfairly, they believe. There is a joint Canadian-American defense planping, but Canadians say they don't get a fair share of defense contracts to supply both nations. Since Canada has a fairly large unemployment problem, this issue arouses ire against Americans. American dollars have flooded into Canada to develop oil and gas fields and other natural resources and many American firms have large branch plants in Canada. This hurts Canadian pride, although the American money is needed.

Talks between the President and Prime Minister Diefenbaker can't make a large dent in such problems, and there are others, but they can help focus American attention a bit more on our northern neighbor. That in itself should help. We need to know more about Canada and take her loss for granted.

Is the United States Becoming a Second Best Military Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest Members of Congress, possessing vision and courage and truly "A People's Congressman" is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. In addition, there is no Member of either branch of the Congress who has a more profound knowledge of the strength and weaknesses of our national defense and of our relative position in the field of national defense to the Soviet Union than our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

DAN FLOOD recognizes the sinister intent and purpose of international and atheistic communism under the direction and guidance of the determined and evil minds in the Kremlin. He recognizes that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves. Congressman FLOOD also recognizes that you cannot deal with Soviet leaders on a moral level because they have no moral origin or concept and he also knows that you cannot deal with them on the level of idealism. Congressman FLOOD recognizes, as any logical mind should, that the only level on which you can deal with Soviet leaders is the law of self-preservation. Even the Soviet leaders cannot deny that the law of self-preservation applies to the Soviet Union and her people just the same as it applies to any other nation of the world and their people. With this sound, logical thinking on the part of DAN FLOOD, he has reached a logical conclusion that the only journey toward future peace is by putting into active application, the policy of peace through strength.

In a number of newspapers in Massachusetts and elsewhere throughout the country, an excellent article on national defense and our relative position with reference to the Soviet Union, written by Congressman FLOOD, was published. It is a pleasure for me to include in my remarks the article written by our friend, DAN FLOOD, and carried by the Tribune Publications of Massachusetts which company publishes 22 newspapers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

IS THE UNITED STATES BECOMING A SECOND BEST MILITARY POWER?

(By DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress, key member of the all-important Department of Defense Subcommittee of the National House Appropriations Committee)

For the first time in the proud history of our country, responsible military and civilian leaders are sounding solemn and repeated warnings that a hostile foreign nation may soon be able to threaten our very national survival, while we lack sufficient retaliatory power effectively to deter such threats. They see the next few years as a time of gravest national danger. They call for an all-out effort to increase our military strength before it is too late.

At the same time, President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and our top official military authorities are giving flat assurances that our military strength is adequate to any challenge; that there is no serious threat to continued "peace and prosperity"; that no special or additional effort is called for.

This difference in view certainly involves the highest stakes of any question which has ever divided our Nation's leaders. Even the grave issues at stake in the Civil or in World War I and II did not involve possible threats to the basic survival of our country.

This is a miserable dilemma to be in. My purpose is to assemble some of the most impressive statements which have been made to date on both sides of this vital question in its various aspects, in order to assist each reader to make up his own mind on where the weight of the evidence lies.

The following specific questions point up the issue:

1. Is there a missile gap?—No one denies this and there will be for several years.

2. Is there a lag in space exploration?—Again, no one denies this and there will be for several years.

3. Has the United States suffered a significant loss of world prestige as a result of recent space and missile developments?—absolutely.

4. Are we properly using our intelligence estimates?—Indeed not. The "Achilles heel" of our intelligence operations is not the collection of raw intelligence, but its analysis at the Washington level.

5. Has our military position been weakened by giving priority to budget considerations?—Beyond intelligent debate and this is the crux of the whole issue.

6. Are these appropriate subjects for political and public discussion?—A thousand times yes. These are questions of our very survival as a nation.

What are the facts on the missile gap?

The latest, most powerful and dangerous weapon of warfare is the ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead. This missile is being made today by the United States and by the Soviet Union in two types, the Intercontinental (ICBM) with a range of more than 5,500 miles and the intermediate range (IRBM) which can travel more than 1,200 miles.

The United States at present has one type of ICBM—the Atlas—in operational position. Our total current operational force is reliably reported to be "less than a handful" and these are in exposed bases. In the IRBM range, our total current operational force consists of a few dozen Thor missiles in the United Kingdom. By the end of 1960 the United States hopes to have two nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles in operation, with others following in 1961 and 1962. The Minuteman, a "second generation" solid-fueled ICBM to operate from hardened bases, is in stages of research and development.

SOVIET IN LEAD

It is uniformly agreed that the Soviet Union currently has more powerful rocket engines at its disposal than does the United States. The number of Soviet ICBM's currently in operational position is believed to be at least three times as many as the United States has, and this disproportion is expected at least through 1962. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has hundreds of IRBM's in operational positions.

Former Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy reluctantly conceded in a public news conference early in 1959 that the Soviet Union's lead in ICBM's would grow to a 3-to-1 advantage in a few years compared to the U.S. position.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., in testimony before my House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations on January 13, 1960, admitted that a missile gap will exist during the next 3 years.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, former Chief of the Army's Research and Development, said: "We are now entering a missile-lag period in which the Soviets will have a steadily increasing ICBM striking capability which we will be unable to match for several years. We are in mortal danger, and the missile lag portends trouble of a serious nature."

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, said: "We are now threatened with a missile gap that leaves us in a position of potentially grave danger."

The conclusion is clear.

The controversy about defense arises from the fact, which nobody denies, that the Soviet Union is several years ahead of us in the production of missiles and in the exploration of outer space. The Russians have more missiles. They have bigger missiles capable of carrying bigger loads, and they are far ahead in the whole art of guidance of missiles. The real situation, which is the source of our peril, is that because in this vast field (missiles) the Soviet Union has gotten its research and development effectively organized; and because the Soviet Union is allocating to it all the resources that it requires, the gap is not becoming narrower; it is becoming wider. Not only did they have a head start, but they are now running faster.

They Never Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Oakland Tribune an editorial commenting on the addresses delivered before the graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy and the National Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I think the conclusions drawn in the editorial are very interesting, and are worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled "They Never Change" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, June 9, 1960]

THEY NEVER CHANGE

In a way, graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy and the Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation serve the country in identical ways. It was appropriate therefore that what those two graduating classes heard yesterday was devoted to the same theme: that of the continuing dongers to the free world from Communist designs upon it.

At Annapolis, U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge pointed out that Nikita Khrushchev's attacks upon President Eisenhower, and all that underlay those attacks serve as a healthy reminder that the basic Soviet aims have never changed—and never will.

In Washington, addressing the FBI Academy graduates, Senator STYLES BRIDGES warned that too many Western leaders "still make the mistake of assuming that Communists think, act, and react like normal beings." He added:

"It is high time that we stopped kidding ourselves that through endless talks with Communist leaders we might be able to find areas of mutual agreement and accommodation."

The combination of those two thoughts, that Russian aims have never changed and talking to the Russians will never get them to change, is something for everyone, not only the graduating classes that heard them, never to forget.

Inflation Is Devouring Our Incoming Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Union, an independent labor newspaper, State edition of December 1959, referring to a speech by J. Russell Duncan, president of Minneapolis-Moline Co.:

In going through the papers on my desk, I found among them an independent labor newspaper, the Union. On the front page was an article by J. R. Duncan, president of Minneapolis-Moline Co., a very fine firm that manufactures farm machinery.

This article on inflation seemed to me to merit attention and I attach it for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

INFLATION IS DEVOURING OUR INCOMING PAY

"Rampant inflation is as dangerous to our Nation as the threat of Russia. It eats up personal savings, shrinks incomes, undermines financial institutions, and breeds financial immorality."

That is the view of J. Russell Duncan, president of Minneapolis-Moline Co. He adds: "Our gross national income, an estimated $480 billion this year, is being devoured by an omnivorous Government, extravagant business practices, and a luxury-loving domestic economy."

Mr. Duncan goes into some of the specifics of the matter. In the case of business, he finds, many executives grew up in an extremely favorable economic climate. They often tend to favor practices which add unnecessarily to overhead. Plants are loaded with high-priced frills. He cites the case of his own company where, due to a rigorous reduction in needless overhead, more business is being done with 25 percent fewer employees. Without this surgery, he goes on, all of the company's employees would have been out of work.

Labor must bear its share of the blame for inflation—and it's a big share. When payroll costs increase beyond increases in productivity, prices can go nowhere save up.

Last, but certainly not least, Mr. Duncan deals with Government spending. He says: "For every instance of excess overhead in business that we have mentioned, you can multiply it a thousandfold when talking about excess overhead in Government." Here is the most fruitful of all areas for economies and reforms that will protect what is left of the American dollar's shrunken worth.

Boyce House Writes Brilliant, Timely Article on Bryan's Political Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the national political conventions scheduled within a few weeks and, since this year is the 100th anniversary of the birth of William Jennings Bryan, I feel that many Members of Congress will be especially interested in a brilliant historical feature recently written by one of Texas' most distinquished journalists, Mr. Boyce House.

He wrote:

How a 36-year-old lawyer-editor stampeded a national political convention with a speech and became the youngest man ever nominated for President is the greatest Cinderella story in all the annals of American politics.

From that opening paragraph, Mr. House goes on to deftly chronicle the tremendous excitement and eloquence of Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold" speech which rocketed him from virtual obscurity to the presidential nomination.

Mr. House vividly captures the convention scene and the power of Bryan's opening salvo:

The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error. I come to speak to you in a cause of humanity.

And, not unlike some of the major legislative issues facing our Nation today, Bryan pointed out the different views on the gold-silver standard held by those residing in the metropolitan centers and the rural areas. He said:

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

Mr. President, I will not take the time to read the full report here, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. House's outstanding article as it appeared in the Houston Post of June 5, 1960, under the heading "Bryan's Epic Day: A Political Miracle."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRYAN'S EPIC DAY: A POLITICAL MIRACLE

(Since 1960 is the 100th anniversary of the birth of William Jennings Bryan, this article is of timely interest, especially in view of the approaching national conventions.)

(By Boyce House)

How a 36-year-old lawyer-editor stampeded a national political convention with a speech and became the youngest man ever nominated for President is the greatest Cinderella story in all the annals of American politics.

It was 1896. A panic gripped the land. The farmers, especially of the West and South, in desperate straits, felt that if there were more money, conditions would improve. Silver had been demonetized years before and many came to believe that the country's economic salvation depended on its restoration; so "free silver" became the cry—"the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." Many opposed this bitterly and feeling grew intense.

Congressman Richard P. (Dick) Bland of Missouri had been the leading advocate of the white metal. Others in the race for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency included former Gov. Horace Boies, of Iowa, Gov. Claude Matthews, of Indiana, Senator J. C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky, Robert E. Pattison, of Pennsylvania, John A. McLean, of Ohio, and former Gov. Sylvester Pennoyer, of Oregon.

There was still another, William Jennings Bryan, who considered himself a candidate but this idea was shared by almost no one except faithful friends from his home State of Nebraska. He had been elected to Congress in 1890, reelected in 1892 and was his party's candidate for U.S. Senator in 1894 but the Republicans won the Legislature—(Senators were elected by the Legislature in those days).

During his first term in Congress, Bryan made a masterly speech on the tariff. Then he became interested in the silver question and, during his second term, he made a brilliant address on silver.

Beside his acquaintance with the Members of his party in Congress, Bryan had, through a series of speeches in the South and West, come to know free silver leaders in those sections. He participated in a conference in Memphis to organize the silver forces of the country; he sent out a draft of a free silver plank for the national platform and, as editor of the Omaha World-Herald, he mailed copies of his editorials to editors and many other influential men.

In addition, he carried on a heavy correspondence. Bryan knew personally more delegates to the convention than any other man.

Yet he was not regarded as a contender. When Bryan told Champ Clark that he held some hope of being the choice of the convention, the Missouri Congressman was amazed. But Bryan was sufficiently optimistic that he persuaded his wife to attend.

He brought along $100 to defray his expenses while in Chicago. The Palmer House was full so they registered at a small hotel close by.

He arrived several days ahead of time in order to help plan the stategy of the silver forces; and, before the convention opened, he went to a Nebraska town to debate the

money question. There was a passage which he had used a time or two before and then had, as he himself later said, "laid it away for a proper occasion," and, in this debate, he gave the passage a final tryout.

Bryan had been named a delegate, and his Nebraska friends were confident that if the "boy orator of the Platte" could be heard, he would make a great impression. He himself, however, states in his memoirs, "While I had, before the convention met, regarded my nomination as a possibility, I had relied upon what I called the logic of the situation rather than upon the influence of a speech." There was a serious obstacle to his addressing the convention. The "gold crowd" had sent a contesting delegation from Nebraska. Bryan had hoped to be temporary chairman of the convention and make the keynote address, but he had not been seated as a delegate when the convention began.

In fact, it was not until 2 days later that he won his fight before the credentials committee.

Then he hoped to be named permanent chairman of the convention since this would give him the privilege of a speech; but, by that time, he was receiving some slight mention as an aspirant for the presidential nomination and so friends of other candidates objected that it would be unfair to make him the permanent chairman.

Another was chosen for the honor. It appeared, therefore, that Bryan was not to have an opportunity to speak.

And then an unlooked-for development occurred. Senator James K. Jones of Arkansas, chairman of the resolutions committee, asked Bryan to take charge of the debate for the silver forces.

Afterward, Jones said he made this request because Bryan, alone among the silver leaders, had not addressed the convention; the others had been called on while the delegates were marking time—waiting for committee reports—which was during the period that Bryan had been waging his fight for a seat before the credentials committee and, afterward, had been serving as a member of the committee drawing up the platform.

The only speakers for silver in the debate were to be Senator Ben (Pitchfork) Tillman of South Carolina and Bryan. Tillman wished to close and, of the hour and a quarter allotted to each side, he desired 50 minutes. Senator David B. Hill of New York, in charge of the debate for the gold side, objected to a closing speech of such length, so Tillman agreed to open. Bryan, therefore, would get to make the final speech of the debate. Thus had fate, after tantalizing delay, fitted the pieces, one by one, into place.

Another stroke of fortune for Bryan came when the convention adjourned until the next day, which gave him time to plan his address. He put into the proper place his definition of a businessman and for the close, he chose the passage which he had laid away for a proper occasion.

Besides being a delegate and a candidate, Bryan was covering the convention for the Omaha World-Herald, of which he was editor, at a salary of $30 a week. Picture him then in a room, in his shirt sleeves, collar and tie discarded, as he was writing an account of the day's events when a delegation of Senators and Congressmen entered.

They came to urge him to support, for the nomination, Senator Teller of Colorado, a Republican who had bolted the GOP convention on the silver issue. The young man listened courteously, then said that he did not think Teller could be nominated.

"Then who do you think can be?" one asked.

In a mild tone, Bryan replied, "I think I have as good a chance as anyone."

Amazed, the visitors looked at him as though they had not heard aright. One managed the politeness to inquire on what he based his hope. Bryan answered, "I have my own State's delegation and, on the second ballot, I expect to have half the votes of Indian Territory."

There was an interruption and he did not finish; though, truth to tell, he had very little more on which to base his prediction.

Back on the sidewalk, the distinguished men looked from one to another and then burst into laughter at thought of a man who hoped to be nominated because he had the small delegation of his own State—and half of Indian Territory on the second ballot.

Eighteen thousand packed the coliseum for the debate on the platform. Bryan had his customary feeling before a speech of unusual importance: Weakness at the pit of the stomach and a desire to lie down. This of course was not possible so he busied himself with a sandwich and a cup of coffee as he waited for the debate to get underway.

The silver men constituted two-thirds of the delegates and they were confident that Tillman, a forceful speaker, would rise to the occasion. Imagine then how great was their disappointment when, picturing the struggle as a sectional fight, he was actually hissed, whereupon he became angry.

After Tillman had finished, Senator Jones went to the platform and rebuked him by stating, "I protest the charge that this is sectional."

Hill then spoke but he could scarcely be heard beyond the small area occupied by the delegates.

He was followed by Senator William F. Vilas of Wisconsin. Former Governor Russell of Massachusetts, who was to close for that side, complained to Hill that Vilas was taking his (Russell's) time. Bryan, sitting across the aisle, heard the complaint and offered to extend the time 10 minutes if a like extension was granted him.

Hill and Russell agreed—another fortunate circumstance for Bryan as he needed that much more time for the speech he had planned.

Among those who beheld the unfolding drama was a young newspaperman of North Carolina who was destined to become one of the South's outstanding editors, Secretary of Navy in World War I and Ambassador to Mexico.

Josephus Daniels (in his "Editor in Politics," University of North Carolina Press, quoted by permission) said that Russell's speech "was a classic; his every sentence was chiseled and he spoke with a sincerity and earnestness that captivated those who heard him."

But the thousands in the galleries had to strain their ears to catch his words; and this had been the case also when Vilas was on the platform. Hill, as has already been noted, could not be heard by the galleries at all. (This was, of course, long before public address systems.)

An Atlanta newspaperman, Clark Howell, scribbled on the back of an envelope, "This is a great opportunity" and handed it to Bryan, who wrote underneath, "You will not be disappointed" and handed the envelope back.

As the able addresses of the gold advocates were given, the convention majority sat in sullen and ever-growing frustration. The New York World correspondent had depicted the situation perfectly when, the day before, he wrote, "The silverites have neither machine nor boss; the opportunity is here; the man is lacking."

Bryan himself knew what the occasion called for. "All that was necessary to success was to put into words the sentiments of a majority of the delegates—to be the voice of a triumphant majority"—("Memoirs," Bryan, completed by his wife, Mary Baird Bryan, John C. Winston Co., quoted by permission.)

And now it was Bryan's turn. The hoped-for moment had arrived. He walked down the aisle with quick tread, climbed the steps to the platform two at a time, turned and faced the audience. They saw one who "was every inch an Apollo, young, lithe, with flashing eyes."

A faint smile upon his lips, he at once began speaking. "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention"—the words rolling to the farthest reaches of the auditorium—"I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were a mere measuring of abilities; but this is not a contest between persons.

"The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error. I come to speak to you in a cause of humanity."

Bryan (says Daniels) "did not seem to raise his voice at all. He seemed to be speaking with less effort than anyone who had preceded him. His voice was made for great gatherings."

Not only was it an instrument of volume, of carrying power, but there were resonance, flexibility, and organ-like melody, perhaps the most superb voice that American oratory has ever known. Truly, the orator of silver's cause was silver-toned.

His nervousness had left him and he felt as composed as if he were speaking to "a small audience on an unimportant occasion." The silver delegates began to smile and to nod with satisfaction.

To one side in the audience was former Gov. James Stephen Hogg of Texas, a huge man, and at the other side, equally huge, was Ollie James of Kentucky. The sight of these two, their faces beaming with delight, was very heartening to Bryan throughout the speech.

In the preconvention campaign, Bryan said, the silver Democrats, with a zeal rivaling that of the Crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit, had gone "from victory unto victory until now they are assembled, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment already rendered by the plain people of this country."

These militant words were what the majority had been waiting for and there was terrific cheering. Daniels records, "Bryan had not been speaking 5 minutes before he held the convention rapt. I had never dreamed that a mortal man could so grip and fill with enthusiasm thousands of men."

The audience seemed to rise and sit down as one man, rising and shouting at the close of a sentence; then, as another sentence began, the auditorium was as still as a church.

Bryan proclaimed, "there are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that, if you will only legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, their prosperity will leak through to those below. The Democratic idea, however, has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous, their prosperity will find its way up through every class which rests upon them.

"You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

His closing words were: "Having behind us the producing masses of this Nation and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor

this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

There was silence and he had walked almost to his seat when someone shouted; then bedlam broke loose. A parade around the hall began, led by the Nebraska delegation. Bryan was lifted on the shoulders of admirers.

Pale from his effort, he had to hold to keep from falling and asked to be put down. Men hugged him, shook his hand, shouted in his ears. For 30 minutes, the wild demonstration continued.

While the tumult was raging, a delegate said, "You can be nominated if your friends will prevent adjournment."

Bryan replied, "If their desire to nominate me will not last until tomorrow, would it last during the campaign?" The platform was adopted, then the convention adjourned until the next day. Bryan was nominated.

And, after paying his hotel bill and other expenses, he had $40 left of his original $100.

The famed editor of Emporia, Kans., Willian Allen White, stanch Republican, has recorded that the speech "fired the hearts of that convention and, tingling over the telegraph wires of the land, enthralled the Nation. * * * Up to that moment, probably, no single speech in American history, by any man in any case—not even by Webster, by Clay or by Calhoun in the Senate in their noblest moments, tuned into the will of Americans so much moving emotion as that Bryan speech in the Democratic National Convention of 1896."

To the present-day reader who wonders how a speech on a money question could have been so stirring and so tremendous, these words of Daniels may be illuminating:

"The truth is, free silver was the expression of the hope for legislation of a people who had been through the panic and hard times and were seeking to strike at government by privilege. * * * It was a conflict, rather, of man versus money. * * * They believed that Bryan was a young David with his sling, who had come to slay the giants that oppressed the people."

As to the campaign itself, Bryan waged, almost single-handed, the most spectacular fight in the Nation's annals. He traveled 18,000 miles by train, and made over 500 speeches to more than 5 million persons. No man in the history of the world had ever before spoken to so many in the same space of time. And he polled the largest vote a Democrat had ever received until then—but William McKinley was elected.

Twice more, Bryan was his party's nominee and, in 1912, he played a major part in bringing about the nomination of Woodrow Wilson.

No other man was ever the foremost figure in the affairs of a major party as long as William Jennings Bryan, the darkest of dark horses who captured the presidential nomination with the magic of a speech which, occasion and purpose considered, was probably the greatest masterpiece since Mark Antony spoke over the corpse of Caesar.

The Stassen of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial, entitled "The Stassen of 1960," in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, June 10, 1960]

THE STASSEN OF 1960

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York takes himself seriously, if few others do. The measure of his ambition was disclosed in his all but incredible performance Wednesday. In effect, he called upon Vice President RICHARD NIXON to subscribe to a loyalty oath committing him to the Rockefeller version of Republicanism.

The effrontery of this petition cannot be matched. Mr. NIXON already has many more convention votes than he needs for nomination. As Rockefeller spoke, the returns from the California primary were showing another Nixon triumph. And Governor Rockefeller has no visible support at all, except what he can muster among his New York payrollers. Even some of the party leaders in the State cut his staged attack on NIXON.

The script was prepared with a careful attention to detail. First, Rockefeller arranged a breakfast conference with President Eisenhower in Washington. Then he flew back to New York City, where the assembled members of his organization were waiting.

The speech he read to them was not only an attack on NIXON but also on the policies of the Eisenhower administration. So Rockefeller not only sought, by implication, to bring the prestige and sanction of the White House to his distillation of sour grapes, but he doublecrossed Mr. Eisenhower by making the President an accessory before the fact to an attack on his own administration.

This churlish cargo was unloaded with the sanctimonious statement that national unity is no excuse for stifling debate. As the criticism was almost wholly directed at the Republican Party and at its present and prospective leaders, Rockefeller could have been under no illusion that he was contributing to party unity or making the Republican path to victory in November easier.

His evident intention was to inform Republicans that only Rockefeller, in Rockefeller's estimation, will do for President. If the party won't take him—as it will not—then he will sulk on the sidelines. This may win Democratic acclaim, but it is not likely to endear Rockefeller to Republicans, now or in the future.

The Governor's principal allegation was that NIXON had not disclosed his program and policies and had indicated he would not do so until after the nomination. NIXON is not only a candidate for President in his own right but he is an officer of the present administration and a loyal adjutant to Mr. Eisenhower. If his views differ in any marked particular from those of the President, a sense of propriety certainly justifies discretion, the more so in that the party nominee must run both on the Eisenhower record and on the platform drafted at the national convention.

But it simply is not a fact that NIXON's views and policies are a mystery. The Vice President has been in public life since 1947. He has served two terms in the House, has served as U.S. Senator, and has served 7 years as Vice President. His voting record and his position on public questions are plain to read. He has addressed scores of audiences, asked for questions from the floor, and answered them with a candor that must be almost unprecedented in a candidate. His travels to Russia, to Latin America, to Africa, to more than 50 countries, have given him a wide experience. Yet Rockefeller persists in ignoring all this when he proclaims that the Nixon candidacy is being pursued under a banner whose emblem is a question mark.

Rockefeller's outline of his own preferred program is a hodgepodge of devices to attract every pressure group, combined with more foreign aid and more military spending. You can get the same stuff from Jack Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, or Stu Symington.

In 1956 Harold Stassen sought an interview with Mr. Eisenhower and then tried to improve the occasion by launching his own stop NIXON campaign. It never got off the ground. Rockefeller's ambition seems to be that of being the Stassen of 1960. Mr. NIXON should rejoice in the thought that, if he must have enemies, they are always so implausible and inept.

Houston Post Praises Mrs. R. D. Randolph, National Committeewoman From Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time the Democratic Party in Texas is indeed fortunate to have the most dedicated and hardest working Democratic national committeewoman that the State has ever had. She is Mrs. R. D. Randolph, of Houston.

To say that Mrs. Randolph is the most dedicated Democrat ever to hold office as national committeewoman from Texas is saying a great deal. Yet in her case, I say it without fear of valid contradiction. As a matter of fact, I will take in even more territory than Texas. It is probable that we could search the country over and not find a single other person who has put in as many hours of hard work as she has the last several years as a volunteer worker in the interest of the Democratic Party.

In my State, Mrs. Randolph has taken the lead in the fight for honest government and party integrity. She has fought for honest government for all the people of my State. She has worked for a dynamic progressive Democratic Party. In keeping with her great, unstinting, and devoted service to the Democratic Party, she has won thousands of friends.

Recently the Houston Post, one of Texas' finest daily newspapers, published a front-page story concerning Mrs. Randolph, written by Charlotte Phelan. It is an excellent feature story about Mrs. Randolph as a longtime leader in the city of Houston. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It appeared in the Sunday, May 29, 1960, issue of the Houston Post under the heading "Mrs. Randolph Is Controversial and Dedicated Person."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A DEMOCRAT MRS. RANDOLPH IS CONTROVERSIAL AND DEDICATED PERSON

(By Charlotte Phelan)

"Have you ever been in a roomful of Democrats when she walked in?" a Harris County Democrat said recently in trying to assess the depth and range of Mrs. R. D. Randolph's influence over liberal Democrats, from precinct level to the national hierarchy.

"There's a wave of feeling and affection for her that's really hard to describe. I think the key word is dedication. Hers is a daily dedication, around the clock, around the year. It goes on day after day after day.

"She's a peacemaker and holder-together. Where there are personality conflicts within the ranks, she's a wonderful catalyst. People tend to want to find areas of agreement, rather than make things hard for her."

In recent years that internal harmony and cohesiveness among the loyal-liberal Democrats of Texas, of which Mrs. Randolph is chairman, and the Harris County Democrats—of which she describes herself as a mere member—was a source of strength and certain power, and a bulwark against continuous onslaughts from party conservatives, who consider themselves the real Democrats, too.

Liberal Democrats failed in retaining that strength in a majority of precinct conventions throughout the State May 7 and, it is almost certain, a majority of delegates to the State Democratic convention in Austin June 14 will want to elect another Democratic national committeewoman, a conservative, instead of Mrs. Randolph.

She takes the same practical, direct view of that possibility that she has taken of other setbacks, and successes, in a political career that has given her plenty of both. And she will go to the State convention—and national convention in Los Angeles—full of the same fighting spirit that won for her a seat on the Democratic National Committee in 1956.

Her return to the national committee, she said the other day, was "very doubtful, but I hate to say that because of my own people."

Mrs. Randolph, a 66-year-old grandmother whose close-cropped iron-gray hair, husky voice and gray-eyed gaze, squinted in a smile or against smoke from a constant cigarette, give her a mien of utmost casualness and self-effacement, sat at a cluttered desk at the headquarters of the Harris County Democrats.

Her conversation was broken frequently by a ringing telephone, which she would answer, "Harris County Democrats," or by a dropper-in, a candidate still working for the upcoming Democratic run-off, an office worker, or one of the innumerable volunteers who inhabit the extensive premises at all hours of the night or day.

It turned out she was sitting in someone else's office. "I have a private office back there but I hardly ever use it. Someone else is in there now. There's nothing private around here. "We're very democratic," she added with one of her frequent chuckles.

Friends and colleagues, who freely and affectionately use her given name, Frankie, think one of Mrs. Randolph's most valuable characteristics is her "organizational ability," a term that is used frequently, just that way.

Mrs. Randolph herself regards it as "more or less of a gift. It's something I like to do. I got into it back in the days of the city charter committee, when we brought in the council-manager form of government for awhile.

"We also had a hard fight on city planning—which we lost—for more public housing and for improvement of drainage conditions and the like in the poorer parts of town."

Her job on the city charter committee was as chairman of precinct work. She still considers this her organizational, to use the inevitable term, specialty. She also regards it as her chief function with the Harris County Democrats, where she can be found from 9 to 5—and later—every week day, and frequently on Saturdays and Sundays, the year around.

"This is a permanent organization," Mrs. Randolph says, "and it has to function all the time."

Before she turned "my one-track mind" to politics, and to the Democrats in particular, Mrs. Randolph helped spur other groups to success in varied undertakings during her years in Houston. She has lived here since early childhood.

A member of a socially prominent family with varied East Texas lumber interests and the wife of the senior vice president of the Texas National Bank, she is a long-standing member of the assembly, the Bayou Club, River Oaks Country Club and a sustaining member of the Junior League.

"I served a stint on the old Community Chest, like everybody else did. I think it was 2 years. During the depression I was a volunteer for the Social Service Bureau, when they asked volunteers to take so many families—I think I had eight—and report on their needs."

It was during a lunch of cold smoked salmon with capers and the inevitable coffee at Rudi's that Mrs. Randolph was moved to reminiscence about her work in founding the Junior League of Houston and other activities, far afield from politics.

"I think it was in the early twenties when some of us were approached about a Junior League for Houston. I said, 'I don't know what a Junior League is but let's do it.' Lottie (Mrs. S. P.) Farish and I were talking to my brother, Will (the late W. T. Carter, Jr.) about it when he still had the Gibraltar building there on San Jacinto.

"He told us he had all the room in the world there in the basement, so we took it over, to put in a tearoom. A few days later he heard all the noise down there and came down. 'What's going on?' he wanted to know.

" 'You told us we could have it,' we told him, and went right on with what we were doing. Lottie and I would look in at lunch and just hope those ladies couldn't see all that dust filtering down from the streets above.

"I think we built the present building around 1928, 4 or 5 years after we had organized. I was president at one time and chairman of the finance committee. We borrowed money to build, right in the middle of the depression, but paid off the debt with a series of fund-raising benefits.

"I haven't been over there in 10 years or more. It's supposed to be a Junior League," she added with that easy, throaty chuckle.

"I used to do quite a bit of riding. Mr. Randolph played polo, when they had the old polo club out on Westheimer, and we had a stable out there on Post Oak Road. That's when the children were quite young, it must have been 30 years ago.

"I used to enjoy horse racing, too. I remember one summer, when my mother had a place at Lake George, N.Y., which was only an hour and a half from Saratoga. Some friends from Houston were up there, visiting, and we didn't have anybody to bother us. We had a lot of fun.

"I made a killing. I put my whole wad on a horse named Sarazan. We went on from Saratoga, to Aqueduct and Belmont. I bet on another horse that came in first, but he was disqualified. That's when I quit the races.

Mrs. Randolph, who was born in Polk County and attended the Baldwin School at Bryn Mawr, Pa., married Randolph, a pilot in the young Naval Air Corps during World War I, in 1918. They have two children, Mrs. James Parker Cushman of 2317 Drexel Drive, and Mrs. David Longmaid of Bryn Mawr.

These days the one interest that can keep her away from Democratic headquarters, or divert her attention from the pursuit of politics are the Cushman children: Frances, 17; Molly, 13, and Jim, 8. Another grandson, Harry, 14, lives with his parents in Bryn Mawr.

"They spend the night with me every Friday night," Mrs. Randolph explains, and one of three bedrooms in the Randolph home at 3726 Meadowlake Lane, is called "the children's room." One of the first things a visitor encounters, chained to a front porch lock at the rambling, one-story red brick and Lambert green home, is a small motor-driven buckboard.

"It has a lawn mower motor," Mrs. Randolph explained, lifting a corner of a protective cover to display the low, two-seated vehicle.

For many years the Randolphs lived in the family mansion in Courtland Place, which Mrs. Randolph inherited from her mother, Mrs. W. T. Carter. It is one of four homes that stand side by side in the handsome, tree-grown, boulevard belonging to Carter sons and daughters.

Wanting a home with fewer demands, the Randolphs spent several years in apartment living and finally bought the "simple, convenient, one-level home" on Meadowlake.

The pleasant, informal household, which has been run by Mrs. Annabelle Tapscott, maid and cook for some 35 years, is furnished generally with handsome family pieces brought from the old home on Courtland.

"It was an enormous house and we couldn't begin to get all those things in here."

Oil portraits of children and grandchildren hang on walls in living room and library. Paintings of the Carter hardwood mill, done by Cushman, hang in a glassed-in extension of the long dining room and over the sofa in the living room.

Randolph, she said, does not share her preoccupation with politics.

"We get up at 6 and the first one up puts the coffee on. We have a chance to visit over breakfast. It's very pleasant. He goes to the bank and I go to the office, and we're usually home about the same time. We do our work and then we have our life together.

"I'm a very early-to-bedder. If I don't have to go to a meeting, I'm asleep by 9 o'clock. My sleeping pills are detective stories. They keep most people awake, but they put me to sleep. Sometimes I get awakened, with long-distance calls mostly.

"I usually have several hours of work here before I go down. I do a lot of telephoning early in the morning. They don't love it, but I can always get them at that time. I write letters, too. I'm not very good at dictating, so I write them out. Then I have a girl who types them for me.

"I work a little in the garden on Sunday. Sunday morning is about the only time I have free. I'm no great shakes at gardening. My rose garden has three bushes, and they look like death.

"We have a place up at the sawmill and we get up there from time to time. We're going up there this weekend. It will be the only chance I'll have to go this summer, I think. We have a swimming pool, or I play some tennis up there and walk and chop down a tree occasionally."

Mrs. Randolph spotted a small black cat with a yellow collar, stalking a lizard in the backyard. "That's Jupe. His name comes from an old story I used to read the children. He turned up, collar and all, at the children's home over here on Drexel.

"They have two Chesapeakes, and when they couldn't find the kitten's owner, they gave him to me. They say now they want to take him home and I say, 'Not after I've raised him.'

"See that metal shield there on the trunk of that tree? We put it there to keep him from jumping up in the tree and over the fence. If he ever got over there on San Felipe with all that traffic, it would be 'good night, Jupe.' "

Earlier, in the office at Democratic headquarters—where two portraits of Franklin D.

Roosevelt and one of Adlai E. Stevenson share walls with the usual maps of precincts and State districts and voting records, posters of election dates and a card declaring "No Sales Tax."—talk never strayed far from Mrs. Randolph's Democrats, at home and afield.

The defeat of liberal forces at the recent precinct conventions—making her relinquishment of the post of national committeewoman virtually a foregone conclusion—she ascribed to heavily increased organizational efforts of conservative opponents and "the pretty sanguine" attitude of "some of our people."

"We tried to begin the reorganization of all our precincts May a year ago. Success is always dangerous. It made some of us feel that we didn't have to worry.

"Being national committeewoman is not an end in itself. It has made it possible for me to help the liberal cause a great deal. Through personal friendship we have been able to bring speakers here that couldn't have been brought by others, people like PROXMIRE (Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE of Wisconsin), Mennen Williams, and Paul Butler, whom I have helped in every way.

"They have come because they know I am fearless, and what I have been able to do for our people."

On the other hand, being national committeewoman has been "expensive and tiring. I'm a poor traveler. And I don't care anything about saving money," she added with obvious levity. "That's what Mr. Randolph says."

Had she any predictions on the Democratic presidential nominee?

"That's what all these people ask me—to make a prediction along those lines. I haven't come out for anybody. It's been said I was for Stevenson. I just said he was a great statesman. I will support the candidate of the party and your guess is as good as mine."

And what about the toe-to-toe slugging matches, the often bitter and always active controversy that has swirled around her in the acrid atmosphere of politics?

"That part has never bothered me," Frankie Randolph smiled, as a gentlewoman would. "As my friend say, I like that."

Rockefeller Ambush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial entitled "Rockefeller Ambush" in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, June 12, 1960]

ROCKEFELLER AMBUSH

Rockefeller and his gang of experts took up a carefully selected position and opened fire on NIXON from the side streets while the Vice President stood alone in the center of the wide main street as the only admitted candidate for President.

NIXON's immediate, direct response exposes an . outwits Rockefeller and his whole stable of hot shots.

He has simply challenged Rocky to come out, alone, into the middle of the street at high noon and meet him face to face—and then draw if he wishes.

Rockefeller has shouted, "No, No, No" and headed deeper into the shadows of the sidelines.

This NIXON did by cutting through the whole business and challenging Rockefeller to sit down with him before the TV cameras and the Nation and discuss the issues in depth.

Thus, once again, NIXON has demonstrated his remarkable skill and courage and political instinct on meeting a challenge head on, and going to the heart of his opponent's game with deadly accuracy and with deadly effect.

If Rockefeller accepted the challenge, it would provide NIXON with the most tremendous platform and national audience any candidate has ever had—since NIXON did it before in 1952.

In such an areana, NIXON is skilled. He has lived intimately with Government problems for 14 years. He has faced panels of politicians, panels of newspapermen, and panels of college professors fearlessly and off the cuff in questions and answers, or discussions in depth on U.S. problems over and over again—and would make Rockefeller look pretty sick in such a presentation.

On the other hand, when Rockefeller refuses the challenge, he stands exposed as a fake in his prewritten program and his charge that NIXON hasn't spoken up in the campaign.

What is more, in refusing, Rockefeller invites the earthy criticism that he is afraid to meet NIXON man to man, and afraid to attempt any discussion of national affairs without his writers, his idea men, his public relations experts, and the rest of his battery of advisers. In short, people are already wondering if Rockefeller is a man or an image created by paid professionals.

Ingemar Johansson once said that he never throws a knockout punch—his right hand does it all by itself when the opening appears without waiting for orders from Ingemar. In the political arena, NIXON is a lot like Johansson. His instinct is amazing.

Richard E. Mooney Analyzes Foreign Competition Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in recent months, considerable concern has been expressed about the rate and distribution of low-wage-produced imports coming into the United States. Many Members of Congress, including myself, have taken an active interest in this problem.

I wish to point out here that I have always supported our reciprocal trade programs and policies and our mutual security endeavors. I intend to continue to do so.

However, I feel strongly that certain changes are presently needed to bring our trade agreements statutes up to date and to prevent certain specific industries from bearing the full burden of increased foreign competition. I have introduced a bill (S. 2882), which is a bipartisan measure and which, while conforming with the basic principles of our trade agreements legislation, would, I believe, help us to strike a better and fairer balance between our domestic and international economic policies.

Mr. President, in drafting S. 2882, I received much valuable assistance from Mr. Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, whose industry is very much concerned about low-wage-produced imports. I want to call the attention of the Members today to a very excellent article in Sunday's New York Times, which places considerable emphasis on the problems faced by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the position which this union has taken on them. This article was written by Mr. Richard E. Mooney, the very distinguished and able economic reporter for the Times, and is one which I feel is very much worthy of the attention of all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1960]

MADE-IN-JAPAN DILEMMA—UNITED STATES SEEKS TO REDUCE COMPETING JAPANESE IMPORTS WITHOUT ABANDONING ITS FREE TRADE POSITION

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—Ten years ago the United States imported not quite $200 million worth of goods from Japan. This year the figure will be something more than $1 billion. For a year now, and for the first time, Japan has been selling more than she buys in this country. She remains, however, the United States second best customer, second only to our natural trading partner to the north.

The movement of more and more Japanese wares over American sales counters has not escaped notice by the American makers of similar wares—most of all the makers of cloth and clothing, from head to toe, from caps to Zori sandals.

Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, has noticed it, too. Seeing a new threat to his members' jobs, he threatened 2 weeks ago to have the members refuse to work on clothing or fabrics made in Japan.

MORE MANUFACTURERS

Textiles and wearing apparel are one-third of what Japan sells here, roughly $330 million of last year's $1 billion total. But the emphasis is shifting: Japan's pre-World War II ambition for major industrial status has become post-war policy. She has developed a number of highly specialized industries—among them cameras, sewing machines, and transistor radios for the consumer market, and scientific instruments, heavy equipment, and metals for industry.

What are the Japanese advantages that permit her to sell certain things so successfully in this country?

Wages are always mentioned first. Mr. Potofsky said that the average wage of Japanese clothing workers is less than the 17½-cent hourly raise that American clothing workers started collecting on Wednesday—14 cents an hour in Japan compared to $2 or more here.

The advantage of low wages may be canceled out if the workers' productivity is low, because it takes more workers or more hours, or both, to produce the goods. It might be noted that despite the disparity in electrical machinery wages—33 cents an hour in Japan, $2.22 in the United States—it is the United States that is selling such machinery to Japan, not Japan to the United States. (This may change as Japanese productivity rises.)

Two U.S. programs particularly rankle the American manufacturers who are hurting from Japanese competition: taxpayer contributions to the development of that competition through foreign aid and cotton subsidies.

The favorite aid example is stainless steel flatware—knives, forks and spoons—the product of an aid missionary's guidance to a once small industry. Was the aid missionary wrong to counsel on development of a new product? That's what he was there for.

The subsidy issue, now before the U.S. Tariff Commission, arises because the U.S. Government sells surplus cotton to foreigners at the going price for cotton on world markets, which is lower than what American textile makers pay for it on the supported American market. The American textile industry is understandably aroused by this artifice, which can be explained—not very satisfactorily—as the consequence of a subsidy system for American cottongrowers that is artificial to begin with.

One final factor frequently cited, as a cause for Japan to direct her sales efforts our way, is the loss of her traditional markets on the Chinese mainland.

In the current swelling of anti-American sentiment in Japan, some businessmen there have revived pressure on the Government to cut loose from the West and pursue better trade ties with the Communists. That is viewed here as an unlikely development.

Of course, it is in the security interests of the Western World to fill the gap in Japan's markets and, beyond that, to contribute to Japanese growth. It is also in the United States' general objective of greater world prosperity, and its policy of freer world trade.

However, few would argue for the willful sacrifice of American industries, and American jobs in the process. Trade liberals argue that, on balance, exports generate more American jobs than imports wipe out, and that imports provide price competition that permits every American to live better. But the industry that feels hard hit is not swayed by generalities, and maintains that—willful or no—it is being sacrificed.

UNITED STATES DILEMMA

What does the United States do with this dilemma, particularly with regard to Japan?

First, a negative. It is not abandoning its liberal trade policy of 25 years' standing to adopt protection for each industry that feels heat from abroad, even though some who seek protection do get it.

While holding in general to liberalism, the Government has nonetheless resorted to a protective device. It has pressed the Japanese Government and industry to restrain themselves, under a veiled threat that restrictions will be imposed here otherwise. Japan has adopted restraints, but has lived by them less than perfectly, and has relaxed them in succeeding years.

Japan's own attitude presents a formidable block to trade benevolence by others. Ironically this nation that is so successfully invading foreign markets maintains tariffs, quotas, and other import restrictions that are among the world's most rigorous. The Japanese Government has given assurances lately that the barriers will be lowered substantially, but only after intense pressure from Washington, and the lowering it only part way to date.

Address by Patrick A. Tompkins, Commissioner of Public Welfare, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Given at the Governors' Coonference on the Aging, April 20, 1960, at Concord, N.H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an address made by Hon. Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner of public welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, one of our outstanding experts in the field of public welfare, which address was delivered at the Governors' Conference on the Aging, at Concord, N.H. on April 20, 1960.

ADDRESS BY PATRICK A. TOMPKINS, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WELFARE, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, GIVEN AT THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON THE AGING, APRIL 20, 1960, AT CONCORD, N.H.

I am more than delighted to be a participant in this, the New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Aging. Although the topic assigned to me by your distinguished chairman, my fellow State public welfare commissioner, is entitled, "Public Assistance and Services," I shall indulge in both poetic and Boston license to address myself to the problems of the aged, the services needed, and the responsibility of public welfare leadership in recognizing problems and providing services, not alone to the aged individual, but to the aging population as a whole. In the evolution of population changes in this country, as crystallized during and at the end of World War II with increasing and accelerating warning signals by a succession of demographic studies through 1958, the aged as a group began to emerge as a special unique, maligned, misunderstood, frequently exploited, sometimes demanding, sometimes meek, but always a larger minority of our country's population; and, as their numbers grew and as more studies were made, more warnings were issued, dire predictions forecast, yet two inescapable facts impressed the student, the researcher, the administrator, be he an administrator of health, welfare, or insurance, the political leader, and the everyday citizen: (1) The economics of the problem of the aged was of national concern and not soley a local responsibility; (2) the aged as a group are self-sufficient, well-integrated, responsible human beings—provided their economic problems have been resolved.

True, many aged individuals as individuals present problems; the chronic physical maladies for which protection and remedial medical care must be not only initiated but also provided by resources outside of their homes and families; mental illness requiring institutional or hospital care for the protection of the individual and protection of society; special problems of living arrangements with inlaws, the need for available and continuing spiritual consolation, cultural and recreational opportunities, on occasion even part-time or full-time employment, plus healthy hobbies to foster inner and spiritual growth. And for these individual problems, the local community in some measure and with increasing awareness, understanding, and better utilization of existing tools and resources is well equipped to provide.

Each of the succession of studies and reports on the aging problem, whether national in character, statewide, or limited to more provincial or local scopes further crystallized as the No. 1 problem of the aged and two-pronged threat of fear of disease or accident necessitating hospital care and the fear of economic and financial disaster should disease or accident strike. Certainly the high desirability of preventive health care has been emphasized, as has been expanded diagnostic facilities, better, improved, and expanded home-care programs, plus research and demonstration projects for community health services. But overshadowing all of these constructive and desirable observations and recommendations is the special report on hospitalization insurance for Old Age and Survivors Insurance beneficiaries submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means of the National Congress on April 3, 1959, by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This study and report was, in fact, submitted to the Congress in compliance with a congressional request for such a study known as House Report No. 2288.

Merely as a digression, I think it important to point out that even if preventive health care, home care, and diagnostic facilities were available in all communities, it is highly questionable that the aged person who believes he is in good health can be expected to spend his limited available income when there is no localized or obvious complaint, disease, or injury, particularly in the light of the present high cost of medical services, including the cost of prescribed medication.

The hospital insurance report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made no precise and specific recommendations. Yet, no impartial or objective review of the findings included in the report as to the annual income of persons over the age of 65, the incidence and duration of hospital care for this age group, and the demonstrated longer duration of hospital care for those having no hospital insurance could evade the inescapable conclusion that social insurance for hospital benefits is an absolute necessity now if not long overdue. There are 16 million persons over 65 years of age; 2,500,000 of these have some employment; 8,800,000 receive some old age and survivors insurance; 2,500,000 receive old age assistance. Of the total of 16 million, over three-fifths had income from all sources of less than $1,000 annually—virtually the actual cost of a hospital bill for an aged person at modern-day, inflated hospital costs for a serious illness or accident.

Less than 40 percent of these 16 million aged persons had any form of health or hospital insurance and a large portion of the insurance coverage available was inadequate both as to the per diem hospital payment or the limited number of days of coverage the insurance would provide. More significant, the cost of commercial or nonprofit insurance policies is prohibited when the group contract of the employee in business or industry is continued upon retirement on an individual contract basis. Even more catastrophic is the purchase of two individual contracts for husband and wife out of retirement funds whereas the employee group contract at much lower cost and with higher income also covered the dependent wife. There are and have been pending before Congress for some years legislative proposals for expanding and extending old age and survivors insurance so as to include hospital and nursing home benefits to currently insured beneficiaries. Probably the best known, since it is the original and oldest such legislative proposal, is H.R. 4700 popularly known as the Forand bill. This is a very simple legislative proposal. It provides that the taxable wage base shall be raised to $6,000 per annum, and the tax on the employer and employee alike shall be

increased by one-half of 1 percent in order to provide for hospital, nursing home, and surgical costs of retired persons and their spouses not to exceed 60 days in any one year. It provides for admission to a duly licensed hospital or nursing home upon referral by a physician who is freely selected by the sick person.

So, there is nothing complex and, in fact, nothing new in a sense about such a proposal. As long ago as 1935, the National Congress, exercising the will of the people of this country, established a compulsory social insurance plan to combat the hazards of unemployment, advanced age, the death of the breadwinner, and permanent disability and impairment. There has been a "watch dog" advisory fiscal council which, from time to time, has assured the people of America and Congress that the trust fund out of which the beneficiaries are paid is in sound, solvent actuarial condition. Indeed, it has indicated in no uncertain language that the soundness of Congressman Forand's bill cannot be challenged despite the projected cost of $1 billion during the first year of its operation if the legislation were enacted.

The American Medical Association has charged that the proposal constitutes socialized medicine. Such a charge is spurious when, in fact, there is no fundamental difference between the method of selection of a doctor under this insurance plan or the method of payment for physicians' services than is presently followed by the nonprofit Blue Shield plan or the commercial insurance plans presently operating. In fact, H.R. 4700 and companion bills in the U.S. Senate, sponsored by Senators KENNEDY and HUMPHREY, are, in the final analysis, merely a solvent method of payment of hospital, nursing home, and surgical bills, and more important, no new administrative machinery needs to be created. The OASI trust fund is already established and can absorb this new responsibility. The principles of this legislation have been overwhelmingly endorsed by organized labor, and the individual worker whom you consult is more than delighted to start paying today for insured hospital and nursing home coverage for the days of his retirement when his income is so limited. Also note that the employee pays only when he is working and the contract is noncancelable. How many persons pay for years to Blue Cross or commercial insurance, get sick or disabled once and find their insurance canceled?

The elimination of the high-risk cases of the aging population from present Blue Cross and other nonprofit and commercial health insurance carriers would, in fact, increase the sales attraction of a better health package to the currently employed and younger employees when they are at their earning peak. Equally important is that the insured, in accordance with our social insurance system, would pay not a flat rate premium but one-half of 1 percent of his earnings whether the employee made $2,000, $4,000, or $6,000.

Of course, the extension and expansion of an insurance system, which has become in the last 25 years an American way of life for the American workingman and his dependents, is inextricably interwoven with administrative and political problems. In our democratic system, it is the special prerogative of our elected representatives to differ in philosophy, to compromise so long as principles are not compromised, and to weld a protective fabric against the hazards to security which are ever present in an industrial economy as fast moving as that of America's.

Yet, today, there is ample financial and statistical data to adequately demonstrate that, at least for the aged population over 65, the most demanding inroad on the available limited income of the retired person and his spouse is no longer made by the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing, but, rather, by the actual cost of medical, hospital, and nursing home. For example, in Massachusetts, 45 percent of the old-age assistance dollar is spent for medical need and one-third of that medical expenditure is for hospital care and almost one-half for nursing home care. For 18 months, over 50 percent of all applications for old-age assistance in Massachusetts have, in fact, been referred by and taken at the bedside of the applicant in the hospital or in the nursing home. Though retirement funds from whatever source may meet the basic necessities of food, shelter, and clothing, a hospital or nursing home bill becomes financial disaster and the aged person is forced to the indignity of applying for and receiving public aid. Indeed, the hospital and nursing home administrator is the chief source of referral for public welfare business today.

Unfortunately, there are not studies available as to the pressures and tensions created among sons and daughters who are either legally forced or by pride attempt to assume these catastrophic costs of hospital and nursing care with immeasurable harm to their home and family life and limitation of educational opportunities for their own children.

Again emphasizing the rights of both elected and administrative officials in Government and representatives of interested and organized groups to differ, it appears remarkable that in the light of the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, submitted to the National Congress on April 3, 1959, that almost 1 year later in testimony at an executive session of the House Ways and Means Committee of the National Congress on the subject of medical care for the aged, the Secretary, testifying specifically on H.R. 4700, the Forand bill, said, "* * * therefore I want to make it clear that as an administration, we will oppose any program of compulsory health insurance." The Secretary continued by stating, "* * * at the same time, I desire to emphasize again that I believe that continued progress in the direction of covering an increasingly large percentage of the aged by voluntary hospital insurance programs will still leave us with serious problems. There will still be aged persons whose policies provide inadequate protection. Also there will still be aged persons who will have no protection but who would be willing to participate in voluntary programs if provided with policies at rates that they could afford to pay. This administration—indeed all thoughtful citizens—are acutely aware of the need for approaching these problems with a sense of urgency."

Still later the Secretary stated, "Before arriving at a final conclusion as to whether the Federal Government can devise within this framework of principles a practical program, it is going to be necessary for us to explore further some complex issues." And still later in his testimony, the Secretary said, "We have not reached a conclusion as to the best manner in which to deal with such basic issues as these. In the effort to arrive at sound conclusions, it will be necessary for us to begin immediately to consult further with experts in Government, with outside experts and groups, and with State officials. It is, of course, not possible to predict the length of time that it will take for these consultations." If this problem must now be approached with a sense of urgency, the implication is clear that, despite the report rendered by the Department 1 year ago and the inescapable conclusions that must be drawn from that report, no sense of urgency had, in fact, existed either during the time that the report was being developed or in the year since it was presented to the Ways and Means Committee. The fact that, since Mr. Flemming testified, a number of alternative measures have been independently introduced by members of both major political parties in both branches of the Congress, suggests that the urgency merits not further study, further consultation with experts both in and out of Government, but rather the enactment of full-scale coverage of all persons over the age of 65 for purposes of hospital and nursing home protection. The Forand bill in the House and the Kennedy and Humphrey bills in the Senate are simple prepaid insurance bills which add to the present basic necessities of life for the aging population a new and more compelling basic necessity of life—hospital and nursing home care. Psychologically, they eliminate the greatest and most poignant threat to the business of growing old, the fear which accompanies advancing age as to imminent illness or accident, and how medical care is to be secured.

There have been so many studies as to the scope of this problem, the need has been so well defined that one of the most eminent of our newspaper reporters, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, has in the past 6 weeks devoted six separate and distinct columns to this problem. The Washington Post during the week of March 28 wrote an erudite editorial in support of the Forand bill and stated in part, "* * * We think that President Eisenhower has put his party not only on the unpopular side of this issue but also on the wrong side of it." The editorial ended with the following quote: "Why automobile workers—and wage earners in every other trade and industry—should be enthusiastically eager to pay during their productive years for this kind of protection in old age should be readily understandable to anyone in political life. There is no more compelling aspect of social security."

In summary, the problem of hospital and nursing home insurance for aged and retired employees and their dependents is the great and compelling humane issue of today. It is the great reassurance in terms of services and social security that aged persons want and demand. The substitute plans now before Congress would inevitably double and more than double present public welfare expenditures both in terms of administrative costs and insurance costs for hospital services. The continuance of the means tests would be extended to all who desired to participate and be covered by the voluntary insurance plans. They heap indignity upon indignity and fail to face up courageously to the problem of today. This is the basic service that the leadership in public welfare should espouse and encourage by every means legitimately available. The savings to general revenue funds and expenditures out of public welfare appropriations would be enormous not only today but for challenging years ahead. The American Public Welfare Association of which I am a member endorses H. R. 4700, Mr. FORAND'S bill, or any other bill embodying the principles of the Forand bill. Although I am professionally a product of the "casework school" of social work, my 27 years of administration in public welfare convince me that national social insurance is the best social service for aged people. This particularly includes the Forand bill with its protection against the economic disaster of hospital and nursing home costs.

Foreign Aid and Military Assistance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I in-

clude the following letter which I have received from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in which he makes a good case for continuing our foreign-aid and military assistance programs:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1960.

Hon. JOHN H. RAY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RAY: I am taking the liberty of writing you with respect to the President's budget request for foreign aid and military assistance funds. I have recently completed a 10-week world tour, visiting many of the newly emerging nations and have had an opportunity to observe the application and effect of U.S. foreign aid and military assistance firsthand. With some exceptions I was impressed with what I saw.

The breakdown of the Paris Summit Conference and subsequent events reveal clearly that whether we like it or not, foreign aid, and particularly military assistance, has become a most vital issue in our national security program. If the United States fails to provide a reasonable amount of military assistance to other countries the evidence seems rather clear, and is supported by my personal observation, that such aid will come from sources not friendly to the United States.

In past years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has taken a dim view of heavy U.S. outlays for foreign aid although we strongly supported the technical assistance program and recognized the need for some military assistance. It is my considered judgment that if there ever was justification for foreign and military aid, in the light of recent world events, such aid is now justifiable. I sincerely hope you will support the President's request for the necessary appropriations to carry out his foreign-aid program. We should not curtail foreign and military aid funds at this critical time.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS G. FELDMANN,
Commander in Chief.

The Scientist's Stake in the Kefauver Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days much has been spoken and much has been written about the activities of the pharmaceutical industry but unfavorable misinformation about its activities, ideals, and aspirations has been noised abroad. This is to be deplored and may we hope that such practices will not dishearten or discourage the devoted and dedicated men and women who have contributed so much the world over to the promotion of health and well-being. I hope the talk given at the Honor Scroll Dinner, New Jersey Chapter, of the American Institute of Chemists, on April 20 in Newark, N.J., by Dr. Max Tishler, president of Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, entitled "The Scientist's Stake in the Kefauver Committee Hearings," which is included with my remarks may be read by many. It is factual, informative, and reassuring and makes one proud of our American contribution to the welfare of mankind:

THE SCIENTIST'S STAKE IN THE KEFAUVER COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(By Dr. Max Tishler, president, Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories)

In accepting the honor scroll this evening, I feel deeply honored and, at the same time, grateful to the officers of the New Jersey Chapter of the American Institute of Chemists. I accept the scroll as a high distinction, with the knowledge that there are many others in this group worthy of this same recognition for their contributions to the profession and to the science of chemistry. In expressing my profound appreciation for the scroll, I want to pay tribute to the many men and women of the Merck scientific community who, during the past 22 years, have given me stimulation and happiness by their dedication and achievements. I also want to proclaim on this occasion my sincere thanks to Mr. John T. Connor whose enthusiastic support and deep understanding of research and the scientific professions have made him an acknowledged leader in the pharmaceutical industry.

Up to a few days ago, it had been my intention to talk to you about "The Chemist in Medicinal Research." I had planned to describe the important role of the chemist in the research team devoted to the search for new methods of controlling disease, and to illustrate his activities by some of the medical accomplishments of the past 25 years. Events of the past week have compelled me to change my subject.

You are all aware of the preoccupation of the Kefauver committee in Washington with the pharmaceutical companies, initially to investigate something called administered pricing and subsequently expanded into charges of collusion, price gouging, unfair advertising and other abuses. This hearing has been given widespread press coverage. When this investigation was scheduled, most of the pharmaceutical companies accepted it as responsible citizens. We believed we had an honorable story to tell Congress and the people and that our contributions to the health and welfare of our Nation far outnumbered our deficiencies. We were prepared for a fair investigation recognizing that our very rapidly growing industry was reaching maturity and that some of the features characteristic of our adolescence needed to be corrected. We were a proud group, since we believed that through the American free enterprise system we had helped to build in the United States over a space of 25 years the greatest health team that the world has ever seen. Achievements in medicinal chemistry, brought about largely through industry's research, had given us in the industry an almost religious confidence in our ability to tackle and solve through research some of the most baffling, unsolved diseases which plague mankind. We had the conviction that our pharmaceutical industry with its research and development know-how was one of the country's greatest assets, particularly in this period when the international image of our scientific superiority is being seriously questioned.

THE COST OF RESEARCH

It is not my purpose this evening to comment on the Kefauver charges of exorbitant prices of drugs to the public. I leave this question to those experts in economics and the business leaders of the industry. However, there is one part in the industry's story to Congress on drug costs which directly concerns research; namely, the cost of doing research and the quality of industry's research.

Research and development expenditures in the drug industry were reported to be about $190 million during 1959 and are estimated to exceed $200 million during 1960. This research and development cost must be paid out of income, for industry has no endowment, no endless cornucopia of wealth. This simple fact of economics is not a serious issue of the Kefauver committee, but during its hearings charges have been made on a number of occasions that research done by our pharmaceutical industry is negligible and tainted. Allegations also have been made by some witnesses that most of the important discoveries in medicinals were made in foreign countries or in nonindustrial laboratories and not in the laboratories of the American pharmaceutical companies. Far from leading in drug research, it is alleged that the American pharmaceutical industry has usually followed and often only after a definite lag. The critics claim that much of the laboratory work done by the pharmaceutical companies is centered on exploiting and marketing of foreign discoveries.

These charges have been demoralizing to those of us who have devoted our lives to research in the pharmaceutical industry. Suddenly, our scientific dedication and motives are challenged. We are dismissed in a manner that makes us appear as charlatans; unscientific, and undedicated.

OUR ETHICS ARE IMPUGNED

I am not a person who is easily led to a point of indignation but at this time I am moved to that emotion, and I believe rightfully so. I am indignant because of the unfair criticism of people whom I know to be dedicated, sincere scientists whose motives are actuated by the impelling desire to help mankind. When our ethics, purpose, and accomplishments are impugned, then I, as a man of science, have not only the right but the responsibility to speak out for the facts. This duty transcends all commercialism. As a member of the Nation's scientific community and as a spokesman for the scientists in the pharmaceutical industry, I must vigorously protest against the irresponsible and degrading criticisms leveled at us.

In making my protest, I speak from my own experience with scientific people in my own company who are earnestly looking for new and better ways to treat maladies and not to create markets. Our scientific people recognize that our research is supported from the income we make and yet they have come to our laboratories from the universities with the conviction that our methods of objective research provide the best opportunities for the conquest of diseases through drug therapy. Basically, within Merck & Co., Inc. with which I am most familiar, our research programs are selected by our research people. The manner in which we prosecute our research and the decisions needed in its operations rest essentially within the research organization. Although our programs of research are approved annually by top management, I can say with complete honesty that never has a research proposal of any magnitude sponsored by our research organization been significantly altered or refused by management or by marketing considerations. It is the people in Merck's research—the chemist, the biologist, the pharmacologist and the physician in charge of clinical research—who are responsible for new drugs; who determine through objective experimentation whether a drug is effective and safe; who decide whether a drug is a worthwhile contribution to the armamentarium of the physician; who conclude whether it is medically suitable for marketing; who judge when it is ready for marketing consideration and who dictate what can be said to the practicing physician. These are the responsibilities given to the research

division by our top management. If a drug does not measure up to the high standards of good medicine, we in research must take the blame entirely.

Actually, during the 10-year period from 1949 to 1959, the Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories spent $111 million for research. There were years in this period when we did not offer to our marketing organization a single new basic compound for distribution. This was our situation in spite of the number of promising compounds that were being studied in the clinics after long periods of research in the laboratories. When the clinical data for these promising compounds were examined by our medical research people, we concluded that none of these met our standards and concepts of a drug with distinction.

A REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Let us now review some of the accomplishments of the past 25 years and remind our critics to count their blessings. First, let me quote from a paper which appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association during 1956, written by Dr. L. H. McDaniel then chairman of the section of general practice of the American Medical Association. In reviewing his 33 years of medical practice, Dr. McDaniel stated: "I remember the reluctance with which I viewed the approaching winter, for I knew that before spring 15 patients, including several close friends, would die from pneumonia. * * * Then we felt helpless, but today, we can walk into the sickroom with confidence, knowing that often a little ampule or vial the size of one's thumb contains drugs that can conquer diseases formerly thought hopeless."

It was not so long ago that the many infectious diseases in addition to pneumonia struck mortal fear within us. Some of us can remember when tuberculosis meant a lingering doom; when septic peritonitis was common and fatal; when bacterial endocarditis was certain death, and when all forms of bacterial meningitis and septicemias were spoken of with fervent prayers. It wasn't so long ago that our knowledge of nutrition was very meager; when pellagra was not uncommon in our country; when pernicious anemia was a killer, when the terms beriberi, scurvy and rickets were part of the layman's vocabulary. Today, our medical students learn of most of these deficiency diseases not from the clinics but only from textbooks.

Prior to the early thirties, the American pharmaceutical companies were enlarged apothecary shops which, in contrast to their European counterparts, did little of what we now call research. In fact, most of the important drugs used in America up to 1935 were the result of research in foreign laboratories. Today, the situation is significantly reversed. The productivity of our research laboratories has profoundly affected medicine in every country. In world affairs, the American pharmaceutical industry has become one of our greatest resources of good will.

Modern research in the American pharmaceutical industry really began in the decade commencing with 1930. During this period Parke Davis, Merck, Lilly, Abbott, and Squibb established research organizations with new concepts and dimensions. They brought together under a single roof scientists of many disciplines, all needed to carry out programs of research from the conceptual stage through clinical evaluation. Men and women of different training—chemists, pharmacologists, pathologists, and physicians—joined together for the first time in seeking solutions to medical problems. This was a new concept of research in our country, for until then research was reserved for the individual investigator in the university and the institute, often isolated and because of this, frequently ineffective. This was the beginning of interdisciplinary research about which we hear so much today in Government-sponsored research programs. It is not uncommon today to find in our research that 50 to 100 technically trained research people have had some part in creating a useful therapeutic agent. No other research organization in the United States devoted to health problems, whether it be the university, the institute or Government laboratories, has this capacity. It is through such organization of research that the American pharmaceutical industry has had such a significant effect on the science of therapeutics.

MIRACLE DRUGS AND SHORT MEMORIES

I don't believe that any of the experts would question the superiority of today's therapeutics over those of 1935. Let us remember that the term miracle drug was not the invention of the pharmaceutical industry. It was the doctor, the public, and the press who almost simultaneously acclaimed the miracle drugs of modern chemotherapy. The trouble is that our memories are short. We have forgotten what it was like before the advent of the drugs we now have. Who would want to turn his back on our present armamentarium and rely solely on the therapeutics of 25 years ago?

Let us look at the record of the American pharmaceutical industry during this short space of 25 years. No one can deny the contributions of the industry in the field of the vitamins. It was largely through its research and development that a number of the vitamins were isolated and characterized and that economical production of most of the important ones originated in this country. From these same laboratories came also such important therapeutic agents as benadryl, the first antihistaminic available to the general practitioner; the first uricosuric agent, benemid, for the treatment of gout; cortisone and its analogues, for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and a host of other diseases; diamox, the first carbonic anhydrase inhibitor of medical importance; diuril and its analogues for the control of edemas, heart failure and hypertension; the broad spectrum antibiotics, chloromycetin and the family of tetracyclines; the antibiotics erythromycin and novobiocin; pyrazinamide and isonicotinyl hydrazide for the treatment of tuberculosis; the less toxic and more versatile sulfa drugs; nilevar, the first oral anabolic agent; merprobamate and librium for mental health, and drugs such as cogentin for the control of Parkinsonian syndrome. This is only a partial list and is only one part of the record for the past 25 years.

DISTINGUISHED COLLABORATION

The second part of the industry's record is derived from the collaboration between the scientists of our laboratories and those of the universities, institutes, and hospitals. We at Merck are proud of our collaborations with outside investigators, since six of them had later become Nobel laureates. Now what has this collaboration between the academic and industrial scientists meant? Streptomycin might have remained a laboratory curiosity or its availability as a drug may have been delayed a number of years had not Dr. Waksman sought the collaboration of research and development in the pharmaceutical industry. Insulin in a form suitable for the treatment of diabetics resulted from a collaboration between the Lilly research staff and the discoverers of insulin, Banting, McLeod, Best & Collip. From such collaborations have also come the female sex hormone, estrone; such vitamins as B_1 and pantothenic acid; dilantin for epilepsy; nystatin for fungal infections; the thiouracils for hyperthyroidism; and nalline for the diagnosis of morphine addiction and morphine poisoning.

It is in this area—the collaboration area—that our critics often forget industry's paramount contribution. In some of these collaborations, our contributions are clearly research in nature; in others developmental and still others a combination of both. Unless an organization pursues the development of a new therapeutic agent, the agent is worthless. Unless the physician has the agent available to him in effective dosage forms and useful formulations, his patients must do without it. Until the industry learned how to make an injectable form of vitamin K_1, therapy with Dicumarol, a life-saving method in many instances of coronary thrombosis, was too hazardous for widespread use.

The ability to collaborate and move quickly in research and in development is a priceless attribute of the industry, for one can't put a price on the urgency of saving lives or combating illness and relieving pain. Penicillin, discovered by the British, undoubtedly, would have been delayed for the whole of World War II, had not the American pharmaceutical industry applied its research and development resources when it did. The great rapidity with which Salk's polio vaccine and the Asiatic flu vaccine were made available to physicians can only be measured in terms of people saved.

SOMEONE ELSE'S TEST TUBE

It is senseless for anyone to charge that laboratory discoveries alone constitute the reason for the existence of research and to say that scientists who carry a discovery from someone else's test tube to a useful drug have contributed nothing. Is it correct to say that the German physicists who demonstrated nuclear fission in the thirties should receive the credit for atomic energy? Certainly, everyone recognizes the contributions of those who worked on the Manhattan project. As a matter of fact, the names we best remember in connection with the atomic project are Fermi and Oppenheimer and not Meitner, Hahn, and Strassmann.

The pharmaceutical industry today is characterized by the tremendous influx of new drugs and by an obsolescence of the older ones. As a matter of fact, we have been criticized for this. Why does this constant change of drugs occur? The answer is the intense activity that exists in the research organizations of the pharmaceutical companies. We think of this as competition but actually the motive in research is the intense desire to produce a better drug. There is no drug in existence that is completely satisfactory—that cannot be improved upon from the standpoint of effectiveness, reliability or toxicity. Even pencillin, considered at one time an almost ideal drug, has its failings. Some patients cannot tolerate it because of the dangers from anaphylactic shock. Some physicians are expressing alarm at the growing number of fatalities resulting from infections of penicillin-resistant staphylococci. The need for improved antibiotics is obviously imperative. The need for improved drugs in other fields of therapy is just as important. This is why during the past 10 years so many newer drugs have appeared in the fields of steroid therapy, hypertension, mental, and cardiovascular diseases. You may expect that still more drugs will appear as even better ones are discovered.

A DEDICATION TO SCIENCE

At this point you can well understand why I changed the title of my talk and why I am exercised by events in Washington. I am addressing you this evening on this subject as a research chemist and not as an official of a pharmaceutical company. I am talking to you in the name of scores of thousands of research chemists who have made a career in industry. We have made this our career for many reasons beyond the need for a means of livelihood—a dedication to science, a desire to create and, not least of all, a desire to contribute something of importance to our way of life.

I think this is true in every field of chemical research, whther it be research in heavy chemicals, petroleum, steel, coal,

food chemistry, or the pharmaceutical industry. The feelings of creating and contributing are important factors in the morale, enthusiasm and dedication we bring to our everyday performance of our jobs. Factors such as these spell the difference between inspired work and just doing a job.

If, as Mr. Kefauver and a number of the drug experts who spoke critically of our accomplishments would have us believe, the result of the tremendous research and development efforts which have gone into the pharmaceutical field has been to defraud the public, to swell the coffers of the companies and to exact merciless tribute from the infirm and the aged—it is a sad commentary on the meaning of the thousands of man-years of dedicated effort by thousands of chemists, engineers, biologists, and physicians throughout this country.

AN IRRESPONSIBLE INDICTMENT

Irresponsible attacks on motives and ethics of scientists can be permanently damaging to their morale. Irresponsible indictment of the best efforts of such an important segment of our scientific and technological manpower can have serious consequences in decreasing the sources of scientific manpower and on the youth of our country who see an expression of their idealism in the accomplishments of chemistry, biology and medicine during the past 25 years. Toward these dangers, our critics must take a responsible attitude. Those who have gone to such lengths to degrade the medical accomplishments of the American pharmaceutical industry must be made to realize the extent of the damage they cause and be willing to take the responsibility for it.

I can't believe that some of our scientific critics at the Washington hearings really meant what they said. I question whether the views they expressed represent their overall assessment of research in the drug industry. Could it be that they failed to appreciate the seriousness of giving their views in such a preemptory manner, not reflecting sufficiently on the importance of adequate perspective when expressing their views in the public spotlight?

I had a special reason for bringing this unpleasant issue to you this evening. Having been a member of the American Institute of Chemists for over 10 years, I know of its aims and purpose. Each of us here this evening has deep convictions about the ethics, motivations and dedication which make up the profession of chemistry. We know that if the scientific integrity of one group of dedicated scientists is attacked with impunity then the dignity of all science will become degraded. If one group of scientists can be tarred and feathered without vigorous protest, then we are all slandered.

I hope that I have conveyed to you an appreciation of the seriousness of our situation and the obligations each of us has to defend the rightful position of the research scientist in the industrial and scientific development of the Nation. I also hope that each of you is equally indignant over this challenge to our scientific profession and that each of you will make yourself heard in words and deeds.

Shriners Salute Negro Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the New York Amsterdam News, June 4, 1960]

SHRINERS SALUTE NEGRO BUSINESS

Negro business throughout the country will receive the support and encouragement of the Prince Hall Shriners during the week beginning Sunday, June 12, which has been designated as the annual "Prince Hall Shriners Salute to Negro Business Enterprise Week."

Announcement of the weeklong observance came from the Atlantic City office of John Henry Hester, the director of economic education for the Shriners.

Mr. Hester said that during the observances, each of the 15,000 Shriners and 7,000 Daughters of Isis, their ladies auxiliary, will spend a minimum of $25 with Negro-owned enterprises in the 156 cities where the organization's temples are located. This is to be followed up by a weekly expenditure of $5 throughout the year.

In the campaign last year, Mr. Hester declared, "more than $13,000 was spent by Shriners during the campaign" and "thousands and thousands of dollars were spent by other Negro citizens who joined with the Shriners in this worthwhile effort."

The Shriner program "is definitely not a boycott of business owned by all other American citizens but a program designed to help ourselves through cooperative efforts," he said. Government statistics alluded to by Mr. Hester assertedly showed that out of their $17 billion annual total income, American Negroes spent only 1 billion with Negro businesses.

Annual Pennsylvania State Convention, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Altoona, Pa., June 10, 11, 12, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Altoona local, No. 776, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, was host for the 1960 Pennsylvania State convention of the federation at Altoona, Pa., June 10, 11, and 12, 1960.

The principal event of the convention was the annual banquet held at the Hotel Penn-Alto during which time it was my privilege to deliver the principal address which follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA AT THE 1960 CONVENTION BANQUET, PENNSYLVANIA FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, ALTOONA, PA., JUNE 11, 1960

It is a pleasure to be invited by the convention committee to attend the annual banquet of your federation.

It is pleasing that your annual convention is being held here in Altoona and that your convention host is local union No. 776, which is comprised of earnest, energetic and highly dedicated fellow employees of the U.S. Post Office Department.

The fact that you have selected Altoona for your convention city for the third year out of the last 4 years is a tribute to your host—local 776 and its entire membership.

The strength and effectiveness of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks is due to the combined faithfulness and spirit of the various locals in Pennsylvania and other States.

The result of such dedicated teamwork is evident in the strength of your national federation in the field of organized effort to promote the welfare of all postal employees.

When speaking of the organized effort to advance the welfare of all postal employees, the recent accomplishment of securing 219 signatures on the so-called Thompson discharge petition—regarding an increase in salaries of Federal employees—was due in a great measure to the activities of the various postal groups—including your organization, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

As a matter of fact, the anxiety was so great to sign the petition that a few of us who were absent because of committee work were denied the opportunity of being among the 219 signers.

No doubt all of you know that the bill is scheduled for consideration by the House on Monday, June 13.

Since it will be on the floor under a closed rule—prohibiting amendments—there is no doubt in my mind that it will be approved overwhelmingly.

When the bill reaches the Senate, early action has been promised.

Therefore, the time factor will be favorable as far as a possible veto is concerned.

From my standpoint, it is my intention to support the legislation and this includes overriding a veto, if necessary.

As many of you have heard me say previously, it is the duty of Congress to try to keep salaries in pace with living costs, and that is why I am favorable to the pending legislation.

On an occasion like this, there is a great temptation to wax historical when discussing the postal system and its vast army of employees.

With that thought in mind—there is an old saying to the effect that nothing in this world is inevitable except death and taxes.

I would like to add that there is one other thing almost as inevitable—and surely far more pleasant—and that is the delivery of the mail.

It certainly is no exaggeration to say that the quality and scope of a country's postal service constitutes one of the most important and reliable examples of its culture and civilization.

There are a great many important and useful Government services without which the country would suffer—although it would survive.

The mail service is not one of these because—without it—I don't think we could get along at all.

If there is any one Government function that is absolutely indispensable—it is the delivery of the mail.

Americans have always believed this—as the history of the postal service in this country very clearly proves.

When one considers the importance of the mail, it is not surprising to realize that some form of postal service is more than 300 years old in America.

The first official post office was established in Boston in 1639 by a decree of the General Court of Massachusetts.

A few years later the Virginia Assembly enacted a measure to insure the delivery of letters.

In the early seventies the first scheduled intercolonial transportation of the mail was instituted with a monthly service between New York and Boston.

During the next 10 years or so, several attempts were made to establish additional postal routes in the Colonies.

Some of them failed but one of the most successful was that started by William Penn in 1683.

In this same year a route was initiated from Maine to Georgia.

With the population of the Colonies growingly rapidly, the British Crown in 1691 issued a patent or franchise to Thomas Neale to establish an intercolonial postal system in the New World.

Neale appointed a Scotsman, Andrew Hamilton, to be Postmaster General for America.

Hamilton, whose Intercolonial Postal Union began operations in 1693, was a man to whom all Americans should be eternally grateful.

He was a man of great enterprise and imagination.

Although he was anxious to make money, he was also apparently a strong believer in public service.

Andrew Hamilton was widely respected throughout the entire land.

It is shown by the fact that he succeeded in getting practically all of the colonial legislatures to enact measures, sufficiently alike in their provisions, that an integrated postal system could be set up.

Hamilton's mail carriers had to put up with hardship and difficulties that are almost impossible for us to visualize today.

For example, between many of the settlements there were no roads, so the company had to build its own post roads through the wilderness.

These post roads soon became the accustomed routes of travel for everyone.

It is difficult to overestimate the tremendus role they played in uniting the young country.

Unfortunately, the excellent progress made by Hamilton was not destined to continue without interruption.

In 1710 Queen Anne of England took a more direct hand in American postal affairs.

The right to set postal rates was removed from the Colonial legislatures.

Then followed an increase of 33⅓ percent in these rates—designed to supplement the royal treasury.

This action led to a large deficit in the postal union as use of the service declined.

In 1737 a truly great American began his long association with the postal system.

In that year Benjamin Franklin was appointed postmaster of Philadelphia—a position he was to hold for 16 years.

The Colonies were divided into northern and southern sections for postal purposes in 1753.

Franklin was appointed as one of the two head postmasters for the northern region.

His compensation was based upon the amount of profit the system was able to show.

For several years the postal service lost money, but eventually Franklin's farsighted plans—for extending services and making improvements—began to pay off and to show a substantial profit.

As the tensions between the Colonies and England became more acute, Franklin's sympathies—openly on the side of the Colonies—resulted in his dismissal from the postal system in 1774.

This event further stirred the colonies—and in 1775 the Continental Congress created the first all-American postal system with Franklin as Postmaster General.

The two systems operated side by side for a few months, but in December, the English realized they could no longer continue to operate their service and terminated it.

The postal system has been exclusively American since that time.

The establishment of a Federal post office was authorized by a clause in the Articles of Confederation.

However, as with a great many other legislative matters, the Government under the articles was so weak that it lacked any real power to create and install a mail network.

After the Revolutionary War, under the new Constitution, it was fortunately a different story.

Congress was given the power—which it still retains—to establish post offices and post roads.

Not only was a postal system established, but private posts were abolished, giving the Government a monopoly in this matter.

Other early legislation protected the secrecy of the mail, provided against violations, and set the rates.

The growth and development of the postal system in those early years was phenomenal.

It mirrored and encouraged the vast changes that were taking place in the new United States of America.

In 1790, 75 post offices and 1,875 miles of post roads served about 4 million people.

During Washington's term in office the service grew five times this size.

By 1829 more than 8,000 post offices and 115,000 miles of post roads served a population of about 12 million.

As the years went by the horseback rider and the stagecoach gave way to the steam train as the primary method for moving the mail.

There was the brief but exciting period of the pony express and the times of tragedy, hardship, and peril during the early days of the airmail.

Through the years the Post Office Department has steadily expanded its services to the people as the need for these services arose.

There came postage stamps, letterboxes, registered and special delivery mail, Rural Free Delivery, postal savings, and parcel post together with many other such services.

You members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks know of these things better than I and I am sure you could easily expand the list.

Although the story of the delivery of the mail and the performance of its other services are in themselves a fascinating narrative, they account for only part of the value that the postal system has been to the United States.

From the very beginning—the mail served to tie together the people of the different Colonies and communities.

This made the dissemination of news and information possible—it awoke people to an awareness of their common causes and interests—it served to stimulate the vision of America as one great, united country—and then to make this vision into a reality.

Today the Post Office Department is a vast enterprise that serves every American.

Of all agencies of the Federal Government—the Post Office and its employees have by far the most direct and frequent contact with the American people as a whole.

This is the sort of opportunity for service that, I am sure, fills each one of you with a sense of real pride.

Along with this pride is the deep feeling of responsibility that is shared by people who know that the work they are doing is important.

I have been in Congress long enough to learn that the overwhelming majority of Federal employees are a loyal, intelligent, and hard-working group of people.

Because I sincerely believe this, I welcome this opportunity to speak to you.

I give you my assurance that as long as I am a Member of Congress, it will be a pleasure to continue to look after your interests as employees of the Federal Government.

Let me say it in another way. It is always a pleasure to be in the corner of such a large segment of our citizenry who are good, loyal, employees of the Federal Government.

Thank you for inviting me to participate in the program of your annual convention banquet.

Remarks by President Eisenhower at the Testimonial Dinner in Honor of Katharine St. George, Member of Congress, Sponsored by the Republican County Committees of the 28th Congressional District, Bear Mountain Inn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to place the following remarks made by President Eisenhower at a testimonial dinner given for me on June 4 at Bear Mountain.

The President spoke extemporaneously and these remarks were taken down at the time by a stenographer.

The President was inspiring and the great crowd who heard him were filled with admiration and enthusiam. For me personally it was the happiest moment of my political career.

The remarks follow:

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Senator KEATING, and my friends, it is indeed difficult, in the circumstances in which I find myself, to discover words that seem applicable to this situation. I am here as a member of the class from West Point of 1915, my 45th anniversary. The members of my class and their wives and their widows, their children and their grandchildren, have been here in this inn, trying with me to recapture something of the atmosphere of 1915, the year we graduated.

You know at that moment, when the first European war had started, we were still cadets, and the world seemed reasonably quiet—indeed, almost leisurely in its approach to every question public or private. We had no sense of urgency or tension. The United States was a long way from this war—and we have been talking about those times, when our great preoccupation really was to find out whether the tactical officers could discover any of the offenses that we were guilty of committing. Fortunately for me, they didn't discover all of them.

Now tonight we meet at a time of bewilderment. I don't like this term, or the using of the term that we are "living always in a crisis." We are not. There is no nation in this world that dares at this moment to attack the United States, and they know it.

But we wonder what is the outcome of every decent, proper gesture we make to those that live in the other camp. They live in a closed society, secrecy of intent—which we try to penetrate, and in my opinion, properly, but we are certain of this: Our problem is not only keeping ourselves strong, and by strong I don't mean merely militarily, I mean spiritually, intellectually, scientifically, economically and militarily; and then we must make certain that all of those people who live with us, in the hope that those concepts of human dignity and freedom and liberty are going to prevail in the world, will stand always by our side in the determination that freedom and liberty will eventually triumph over tyranny.

We have stanch allies. And as a matter of fact, many of the excesses, particularly the ill-tempered expressions of Mr. Khru-

shchev, has really brought the West closer together than I have known it, ever since I have been occupying my present office.

Now I am talking about matters, for this moment, that are not partisan. They are bipartisan. But I want to say this: It is a tremendous satisfaction to me to know that the Republican Party believes in the kind of things that I have tried so haltingly to express to you.

My colleagues here in Government, Senator KEATING, and your guest of honor Mrs. ST. GEORGE, have in every single vote that has anything to do with these important world questions, stood exactly in the ranks, exactly like any soldier would when asked by his commander to do so.

So I want to say to you a very simple word—and I promised my classmates I would only be 5 minutes, and I think I have used 10 minutes already, but I just want to ask you to do this: Look at the records of your Republican representatives in the Congress, do they represent what you understand to be firm, sound, middle-of-the-road Government that refuses to make Government a centralized Government capable of governing your lives in every single item, refuses to accede to the doctrine of collectivity or centralization, or is it the kind of philosophy that says "We want to live in liberty, in freedom"?

This is the kind of thing they have been supporting, and therefore you support it not because of a word: Republican, or because of some particular or special vote. You support it because you believe in what they believe: that the Government of the United States intends to do its full duty by every one of its citizens, but it shall never—in the words of Abraham Lincoln—do those things for the individual that he can do better for himself.

Now I just have a simple request of you. If you believe in the basic principles these representatives of yours, congressional and senatorial, if you believe in those basic principles, then not merely do I ask you that you register and you vote—I know good Republicans will do that, I ask you to go out and work as you have never worked before.

Because I tell you, this kind of policy, internally and externally, is the thing that will keep America strong, safe and sure—for you and every single person that comes behind you.

This is what I hope to do myself, so far as it is proper and the people who will meet within a few short weeks to take over the direction of campaigns—I am ready to do my part.

And I tell you this, it will be an honor to be associated with such people as you are, as you do your part.

Thank you and goodnight.

Anthracite Coal Used To Heat Many New Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Friday, May 20, 1960, which reports that an increasing number of new schools throughout the northeastern section of the United States are installing automatic anthracite heating equipment because of fully automatic operation availability, dependability, and specific economy over competing fuels and systems:

Proof that anthracite is the modern fuel is evidenced by the increasing number of new schools that are using it as their fuel, reports the Anthracite Institute in its current weekly bulletin.

Automatic anthracite heating equipment is being installed in new schools all over the Northeast, says the institute.

An example of fine performance of automatic anthracite heating equipment is given by the institute in relation to the new Louis E. Dieruff High School in Allentown. Designed for 1,000 students, it has 900 registered at present. There are 31 classrooms, a gymnasium, cafeteria, library, auditorium, swimming pool, and other facilities.

Fire-Jet stokers, using anthracite, were selected as the heating equipment after a survey of the fuel situation by the school board and the architects.

Anthracite and automatic heating equipment were chosen because of fully automatic operation available, dependability, and specific economy over competing fuels and systems.

The heating plant is in operation for an average of 18 hours a day. During the period April 1, 1959, to April 1, 1960, only 850 tons of anthracite of rice size were consumed.

"This is a remarkable performance," says the Anthracite Institute, "particularly when the large amount of extracurricular heating is considered and it is well below the cost of heating with competitive fuels."

The Anthracite Institute, in another section of its bulletin, noted, however, a decline in coal year sales of union produced anthracite. During the 1959–60 coal year, anthracite sales totaled 15,554,000 tons, a decrease of 1,633,000 tons, or 9.5 percent, from the previous year's total.

Commercial union production of all sizes of anthracite from January 1 to May 14, 1960, totaled 5,138,000 tons. This is a decrease of 702,000 tons, or 12 percent, from the like 1959 period.

Rally the People of Harlem To Buy From Negro-Owned Liquor Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 13, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADAM C. POWELL: As one phase of our "Support Negro Business Week" we call upon you to rally the people of Harlem to buy from Negro-owned liquor stores.

We are submitting herewith a list of these stores. There is one of these stores only two blocks away from every Negro consumer.

Sincerely yours,
CLIFFORD J. STORY,
Potentate.

(Prince Hall Shriners annual salute to Negro Business Enterprise Week, New York Lodge, 454 West 155th Street.)

HARLEM NEGRO-OWNED PACKAGE LIQUOR STORES

BELOW 125TH STREET

H.A.T. Corp., 9 West 110th Street, EN 9–6660.

Branch & Merit, 4 West 112th Street, EN 9–7410.

Anderson & Ransom, 101 West 114th Street, RI 9–8402.

P & S, 281 West 114th Street, RI 9–6600.

West 116th Street Store, 300 West 116th Street, AC 2–4024.

Diggs & Washington, 2 East 117th Street, EN 9–0080.

Ferguson & Sylvan, 83 West 118th Street, EN 9–4460.

Baker, 302 West 118th Street, RI 9–7410.

Lenox Star, 101 West 119th Street, MO 2–4440.

Daly & Woolfolk, 500 West 119th Street, MO 6–6367.

Gumbs, 347 West 120th Street, MO 2–5801.

Green & Raymond, 168 West 120th Street, RI 9–3788.

H & R Store, 273 West 121st Street, MO 2–5210.

West 122d Street Store, 167 West 122d Street, MO 3–7453.

Liggins & Scott, 265 West 123d Street, UN 4–3199.

One hundred and twenty-fourth Street Store, 102 West 124th Street, MO 6–7288.

BELOW 145TH STREET

Square, 204 West 127th Street, RI 9–0977.

Marion B. Smith, 43 East 128th Street, AT 9–8247.

White's 301 West 128th Street, RI 9–6870.

Brooks, 67 West 129th Street, SA 2–2263.

Rouse & Williams, 1814 Madison Avenue, LE 4–4203.

King, 2087 Madison Avenue, WA 6–9415.

H & R Young, 301 West 130th Street, AU 6–8660.

H & S Store, 5 West 131st Street, AU 6–7586.

Cooper & Gallup, 273 West 131st Street, AU 6–8514.

Roy Campanella, 198 West 134th Street, WA 6–4545.

C C Store, 273 West 136th Street, FO 8–3533.

Cardun Inc., 102 West 137th Street, WA 6–7306.

Sunshine Inc., 299 West 137th Street, AU 3–6063.

Willis & Brown, 201 West 138th Street, AU 3–6516.

Eulace Peacock, 200 West 140th Street, WA 6–6535.

Drew & Taylor, 501 West 140th Street, WA 6–0996.

J & D Store, 271 West 141st Street, AU 6–6150.

Roberts, 501 West 142d Street, AU 1–2300.

Allen's, 295 West 142d Street, FO 8–9251.

Skiz Inc., 152 West 143d Street, AU 6–1310.

West 144th Street Store, 303 West 144th Street, FO 8–5146.

C. A. N. G. Store, 2481 Seventh Avenue, AU 3–5061.

Convent Avenue Store, 42 Convent Avenue, MO 2–5734.

John A. McDonald, 52 Bradhurst Avenue, AU 6–1494.

Selby, 647 St. Nicholas Avenue, FO 8–5128.

ABOVE 145TH STREET

Macomb's, 26 Macombs Place, WA 6–6015.

Hudgins, 37 St. Nicholas Place, TO 2–2900.

St. Nicholas Store, 757 St. Nicholas Place, AU 6–2429.

Hamilton Place Store, 150 Hamilton Place, AU 6–5630.

Cannon, Curry & Carter, 2220 Amsterdam Avenue, WA 3–4250.

Progressive, 501 West 146th Street, AU 3–6190.

Lido, 200b West 146th Street, SC 4–6050.

Starling Penn, 298 West 147th, AU 3–6800.

Charity, 483 West 150th Street, AU 6–8314.

Ed Smalls, 272 West 15th Street, AU 6–4574.

Sugar Hill, 473 West 158th Street, AU 3–6470.

Inniss, 481 West 159th Street, LO 8-5525.
Dorden, 501 West 16th Street, LO 8-6356.
All stores deliver anywhere.
By N.Y. State law, all brands are price fixed at same level.

The FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Oklahoma Chapter, FBI National Academy Graduates, meeting at Enid, Okla., June 1960:

RESOLUTION OF THE OKLAHOMA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ACADEMY GRADUATES, MEETING AT ENID, OKLA., JUNE 5, 6, AND 7, 1960

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, recognizing that the newest developments in police science are the common property of all law enforcement agencies, and further that up-to-date training in police science and techniques is the most effective weapon in combating crime and other enemies of our society throughout the Nation, made available the training facilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and established on July 29, 1935, the FBI National Academy; and

Whereas in its nearly 25 years of service to law enforcement over 3,800 ranking officers from agencies in the United States and foreign countries have been graduated from this national academy, thereby extending the training they received in the FBI National Academy to members of their individual departments; and

Whereas the facilities of the FBI Laboratory, as well as the FBI's Identification Division, are available to all law enforcement and have made, and are continuing to make, tremendous contributions to successful local law enforcement; and

Whereas the FBI, through the policies established by Director Hoover, has been a major factor in promoting and maintaining the excellent spirit of cooperation among law enforcement agencies in the State of Oklahoma and throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates in meeting assembled extend to Director Hoover and the FBI its sincere appreciation for the training which has been afforded through the FBI National Academy to us, and through us to others in the field of law enforcement; be it

Resolved, That the Oklahoma chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates express to Director Hoover its appreciation for his efforts in furtherance of the FBI National Academy and police training in general, as well as for the other excellent cooperative services, including the mutual exchange of information, which have resulted in raising the standards and efficiency of law enforcement in the State of Oklahoma and throughout the Nation; be it

Resolved, That the chapter also express its sincere appreciation and thanks to Special Agent in Charge Wesley G. Grapp and his staff of the Oklahoma City office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for extending to this chapter and to law enforcement agencies throughout the State of Oklahoma their training program and numerous other services and exchange of information so necessary to successful law enforcement; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given appropriate distribution to show the opinion of this organization.

Maine Needs Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, a letter from the very able and farsighted president of our State university, Dr. Lloyd H. Elliot, sets forth in most logical and detailed manner the need for educational television in the State of Maine. His letter, in my opinion, is a most persuasive and constructive appeal for the support of H.R. 10609.

This legislation would be extremely valuable to the State of Maine; since our State university anticipates a 100-percent increase in its enrollment within the next 10 years. Our State department of education has also indicated, by already making the necessary preparations, that it will give educational television its firmest support.

The enactment of this legislation would enable every State in our great Nation to benefit from this excellent mechanism of communication. Wholehearted support of H.R. 10609 is completely justified.

Dr. Elliott's letter is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
Orono, Maine, April 6, 1960.

The Honorable JAMES C. OLIVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OLIVER: In reply to the invitation extended in your letter of March 25 to prepare a factual statement on the needs of our State for educational television, I am happy to submit the following which will serve as a description of the need, activities, present status, and plans for educational television in Maine.

1. THE NEED

(a) Elementary schools need programs in music, art, and foreign languages, such as are a part of the programs in the more populous States.

(b) Programs for the gifted student would be an invaluable supplement to the curricula in most Maine high schools.

(c) Inservice training programs for teachers could be conducted so as to reach the teachers of the State in an effective way.

(d) With a possible 100-percent increase in enrollment at the University of Maine during the next 10 years, educational television may become a necessary teaching method for resident students. The sharing of television programs with other Maine instiutions is a definite possibility.

(e) There is urgent need for adult education, both in formal courses for credit and in general cultural development.

(f) The size of the State, combined with the fact that the population is widely scattered, places even greater emphasis upon the need for this educational facility.

2. ACTIVITIES TO DATE

(a) The Educational Television Association, a nonprofit corporation with about 1,000 members, has done much to arouse and maintain interest in educational television in Maine. In addition to developing interest in educational television in Maine, the association has leased for a second 18-month period a tower on a mountain near Orono, for possible use by an educational television station.

(b) A music course was organized and supervised by the State department of education during 1958-59. This course was made possible through substantial gifts by the Educational Television Association, the Maine Teachers Association, the Supervisory Principals Association, and the State education department. Two hundred and eighty-seven classes participated in this program.

(c) Two courses, Mathematical Concepts and Science for Space Age, for talented secondary school students, are being offered through the State department of education. These experimental courses, in which 67 schools are participating, were made possible by a grant under the National Defense Education Act, title VII.

(d) College credit courses have been given at the University of Maine and Colby College.

3. PRESENT STATUS

(a) The Federal Communications Commission allocated one VHF and two UHF channels for educational use in Maine.

(b) The Ford Foundation has made a grant of $20,500 to the University of Maine for a thorough survey of educational television in Maine. The survey will give information which is essential to activating a station or stations which will serve most or possibly all of the State.

(c) Although the commercial stations have given generously of their time, it is apparent that they cannot allocate additional time for educational television. Further, the hours offered are not those which can be used advantageously in expanding an educational television program.

4. PLANS

(a) The first objective is to establish a station at the University of Maine in Orono and to develop a network coverage for the entire State as rapidly as funds can be obtained for this purpose.

(b) Because Maine is not an industrial State and because incomes, in general, are only moderate, the problem of securing the funds necessary to establish one or more educational television stations has been a major obstacle in establishing a station.

(c) It is believed that the legislature will consider an appropriation to match funds which may be made available from other sources to build a station, but there is less likelihood that the State will feel that it can appropriate all funds necessary to build and operate such a station or stations.

(d) It has been agreed that any educational television program in Maine should be a cooperative project with other educational institutions and organizations. The State department of education has indicated its interest by expressing a desire to make funds available in school programing.

In summary, it would seem to me that no single development within reach offers as great a potential for the educational program of Maine as does educational television. It is most important that H.R. 10609 be passed at this session if we are to continue to advance educationally in our total educational efforts.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to put together the facts concerning this facility.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD H. ELLIOTT,
President.

Reactions to Khrushchev Stir Doubts on Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following column by David Lawrence appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 6. It certainly should have a sobering and chastening effect on us all.

Patriotism today is played down, let us make no mistake about it. It is depicted as childish sentimentality in some quarters, and as an old tribal custom that we have outgrown in others.

The Fourth of July and Memorial Day celebrations are indeed tame and listless compared to those of years gone by. Yet, Mr. Speaker, if the Russians believe that because of our political bickerings we have lost our will to fight and our love of country, they are sadly mistaken.

Our people, by and large, still love their country and are still willing to fight and die for her.

Our people still ask the question, with incredulity:

> Lives there a man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself has said,
> This is my own, my native land.

REACTIONS TO KHRUSHCHEV STIR DOUBTS ON PATRIOTISM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Time was when in the midst of war neither scribe nor politician ventured to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Time was when the citizen felt a tingle of emotion go up and down his spine as he sang "The Star Spangled Banner" or saluted the flag.

Time was when the Nation found itself in peril, and nothing else mattered. No sacrifice—even of life itself—was too great to make for the honor of our country.

But things seem to be different now. The President of the United States is insulted and yet some writers continue to furnish aid and comfort to the press of the Soviet Union by denouncing Mr. Eisenhower and holding him culpable for errors he couldn't possibly have avoided and still protect the safety of the American people against surprise attack.

Is the country changing? Is patriotism just an obsolete notion, nurtured only by those of us who have witnessed manifestations of national spirit and pride over a long span of years? Are some of us old-fashioned because we cannot accept the modern cynicism which insists that a President of the United States shall be pilloried by political leaders and by some segments of the press of his own country as Moscow papers reprint every bit of captious and carping criticism?

Is a cold war any different really from the crises that call for nonpartisanship during a hot war? Time was when in wartime a newspaperman practiced "voluntary censorship" and when his conscience kept him from writing anything that might possibly aid the enemy. A cold war and a hot war are no different so far as national danger is concerned. Today the demand is for almost every scrap of information including classified information, and there are newsmen and Members of Congress who insist in all sincerity that they and not the executive branch of the Government—which has the responsibility for our safety—shall be the final judges of what ought to be suppressed or disclosed.

AN AMERICAN FIRST?

Time was when this correspondent used to hear the expression: "I am an American first and a newspaperman second." But today things seem different. No matter how damaging to one's own country, the tendency now is to give the information or comment publicly to the enemy dictator who promptly quotes it in his propaganda speeches.

As America, moreover, approaches a political campaign, partisan writers say that the President should have known in advance of every act to be performed, by every subordinate in the numerous agencies of a big government and that efforts to gather information abroad clandestinely should have been, in effect, suspended indefinitely to the advantage of a gangster regime in Moscow. Immediately Moscow seizes on every such adverse comment, especially when it emanates from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Was it too much to ask, as Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, did, that a public investigation by any congressional committee on international matters during a crisis be suspended?

Maybe the urge to patriotism is less strong today than winning an election or carrying on a partisan crusade. Maybe we are witnessing the rise of new liberals who espouse the cause of nationalism in the various countries of Africa and Asia, but denounce any nationalism expressed in the United States in behalf of the interests of our own country.

But these misguided "intellectuals," so many of whom in the scientific world especially believe in "world citizenship" as superseding American citizenship, will some day be proved completely wrong. Back in the 1920's after World War I there were demonstrations of students in the colleges against war. They held meetings of organizations calling for the soldiers' "bonus of future wars." It was a satirical effort to put the label of selfishness on the men who had to leave their families and jobs and go to war. But when the United States entered World War II in 1941 this same generation acquitted itself nobly. No better troops ever fought for America than those who battled in World War II.

Grassroots Americanism today resents bitterly the insults flung at the President of the United States. It resents attacks on Mr. Eisenhower in the American press which the next day are parroted and quoted with exultation in the Soviet press.

KHRUSHCHEV CALLED BETRAYER

It so happens that Mr. Eisenhower was the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in World War II. He helped to save the Soviet Union from the yoke of Hitler. The American people between 1941 and 1945 sent billions of dollars to help equip the Soviet armies. When the war was over, General Eisenhower was received with acclaim in Moscow. But Nikita Khrushchev now says Mr. Eisenhower is fit only to manage a home for children. Recently he called the President a "thief."

It begins to look as if Nikita Khrushchev is resentful of all military men. But he has miscalculated public opinion everywhere if he thinks he can belittle not only the President of the United States but the very general who helped Russia in the winning of World War II.

The Soviet Premier, to be sure, has lost whatever prestige he may have had in the West. He has forfeited an opportunity for effective leadership as a negotiator with the West. He has really betrayed his own country. For the people of the Soviet Union don't want war and when they get all the facts they will not long support a man who acts more like an uncivilized boor than like the dignified premier of a government which possess to represent a great people.

Belmont Abbey College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HUGH ALEXANDER has drawn our attention to a recent honor conferred upon his fellow North Carolinian and our distinguished colleague, BASIL WHITENER, when Belmont Abbey College of Belmont, N.C., conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws in recognition of his outstanding public service, at its graduation exercises on June 7. We are grateful to Belmont Abbey College for this recognition of our distinguished colleague. We feel that in honoring him, the college has also honored itself.

Belmont Abbey College, one of the oldest Catholic educational institutions in the South, dates back to the October of 1876 when classes were first held upon arrival of the monks of the Order of St. Benedict from the archabbey of St. Vincent, Latrobe, Pa. The September of 1878 marked the official opening of St. Mary's College, as it was then known.

So rapid was the growth of the institution and so thorough the work of the monk-educators that the Holy See elevated the dependent priory to abbatial rank in 1885, and the Right Reverend Leo Haid, O.S.B., was elected the first abbot-president. The college was chartered according to North Carolina State law on April 1, 1886, with all the rights and privileges of colleges and universities in North Carolina.

The abbot-president brought a corps of trained monk-teachers to the abbey. They proved very efficient. The college building was enlarged to more than three times its original size, a cathedral was erected, the library increased and cataloged, laboratories were equipped, and the student body grew. In 1900 the college building was destroyed by fire and rebuilt. Other buildings were added through the years.

The announcement of the change of name from St. Mary's College to Belmont Abbey College was made at the meeting of the alumni association on November 27, 1913.

From 1924 until 1959 the college operated under the presidency of the Right Reverend Vincent G. Taylor, O.S.B., D.D., who was elected in that year (1924) to the post made vacant by the death of the first abbot-president. In 1928, due to the conditions of the times, the college was reorganized as a junior college (with the exception of the philosophy department, which continued to grant degrees to young men studying for the Benedictine Order) and remained such until September of 1952 when it was reestablished as a senior college.

In 1959 the Very Reverend Walter Coggin, O.S.B., Ph. D., was elected abbot. He took the title of chancellor of the college and appointed the Very Reverend Cuthbert E. Allen, O.S.B., the fourth president.

The college is situated in Gaston County, 12 miles from Charlotte, and 1 mile from Belmont. In this center of industry, amidst the beauty of mountain, valley and stream, in a spot 800 feet above sea level, stand the buildings of the abbey.

In striving for the development of virtue and good character in its students, Belmont Abbey College is carrying on the highest traditions of liberal and humanistic education. The true liberal tradition, inherent in benedictine education, has always sought the formation not only of the intelligent man, but of the good man.

In its effort to attain this end, Belmont Abbey College seeks as immediate objectives for its students:

First. The habit of study and reflection in the search for knowledge and truth.

Second. The mastery of the curriculum content, leading to general culture as well as to vocational fitness, for continued study or for industry and business.

Third. The appreciation of the good, the true and the beautiful in nature and art.

Fourth. The development and application of virtuous living.

Fifth. The love and appreciation of physical well-being, and the formation of habits of corporal and mental cleanliness, neatness, and orderliness.

Sixth. The love of cooperative competition and fair play.

Seventh. The practice of tolerant gentlemanliness.

Eighth. The courageous pursuit of American democracy.

Ninth. The persistent following of a conscience made right and virtuous by a sound philosophy.

Belmont is proverbial for its healthfulness, pure water, excellent drainage, and relief of asthmatic allergies and hay fever. The prevailing winds are from the southwest, bringing with them the warmth of the gulf region and keeping the temperature mild and equable. Thoughtful parents, having in mind the physical good as well as the mental and moral development of their sons, will appreciate what such surroundings will mean to a youth who spends his years at the abbey.

Congressional Expense Accounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 12593, a bill seeking to require full disclosure of Government and counterpart funds used by Members of Congress in making their various trips in the interest of our Nation. I hope my bill will be considered in committee and then enacted into law in due season by the Congress.

As one who has never taken a junket or trip at taxpayer expense in the 6 years I have been a Member of Congress, I must say that in my opinion about 75 percent of these congressional trips serve no good or necessary purpose for the benefit of the taxpayers. But if some of these trips do serve valuable purposes, then certainly all of them should have the luxury fat completely trimmed off and should be made to conform to basic standards without bar bills or accompanying wives in secretarial clothing. It is inconceivable to me that I myself should go to the Plaza Hotel in New York and engage a $50-a-day suite at the taxpayers' expense when some of my constituents in southeastern Kentucky have insufficient food, clothing, and medicine for their needs. And it is just too bad that bar bills and booze purchases by Congressmen should ever be saddled upon the taxpaying descendents of those Puritans who came to this new land more than 300 years ago and hewed out an incipient nation with a new concept of freedom and an old concept of integrity. Furthermore, whenever I take my wife on a junket at public cost while camouflaging her as my secretary, then I hope the voters of my district will rise up and whip the unvarnished meanness out of me by a majority of better than a thousand to one.

Mr. Speaker, our country has many needs, problems and troubles on every hand. Yet most basic and bedrock is that need called integrity. We must start out with that element, for without it we are really lost. Integrity is the alpha and omega of both our private and national existence. It is now time to regain our integrity and maybe it is a little later than we think. Every part of our Government must put its own house in good order and we should certainly start with the house of the House. Free bread and free circuses preceded the downfall of Rome. Shall free luxury suites and free night club entertainment for Congressmen be permitted by Congress and will these precede the twilight hours of this country called the United States of America?

The Star-Strewn Class of 1915

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this year June Week was celebrated at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in the traditional manner. The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was with his class, the class of 1915.

This class of 1915 was indeed the "Star-Strewn Class" as noted in the New York Herald Tribune editorial of June 6.

THE STAR-STREWN CLASS OF 1915

In June, 45 years ago, a group of young men were graduated at West Point and commissioned as officers of the United States Army. They came out of the military academy into an ominous world: terrible battles were being waged at Gallipoli, in Artois, in Poland; the United States was uneasily contemplating a revolution-torn Mexico on its southern border; among warring nations the conventionally tiny Regular Army seemed even smaller than usual. It was not difficult to prophesy that the class of 1915 would find employment.

It did—in 3 wars. And it served its country faithfully in all of them. Purely as a matter of timing, it would not be surprising to find the class of 1915 winning stars on the battlefields that history provided for it. But one member attained the highest office in the gift of the American people—President Eisenhower; two received the highest military rank and office—Eisenhower and Bradley, five-star generals and Chiefs of Staff; two more became four-star generals—Van Fleet and McNarney; in all, 59 generals, from brigadier to general of the Army, came out of a class of 164. That is a great record for even so effective an institution as West Point.

When one considers the heavy responsibilities these men bore in war and peace, and especially the burdens that have rested upon the chief of all of them, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the petulant explosions of Nikita Khrushchev can seem only childish. There have been complaints, in the services and outside, of the "trade schools"—West Point and Annapolis thus far; the new Air Force Academy will doubtless come in for its share. But certainly the class of 1915 demonstrates that not only military skills but duty and patriotism are inculcated at the Point and that these qualities reveal themselves in the White House as well as in the field. The class of 1915 has deserved well of the Republic, and its 45th reunion supplies an opportunity to say so.

Local Boy Makes Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of May 26, 1960, which comments upon the business, philanthropic and public service record of the Honorable Andrew J. Sordoni, founder and president of the Sordoni Enterprises, with main offices in Wilkes-Barre, who recently completed a half century in business.

LOCAL BOY MAKES GOOD

Andrew J. Sordini has proof positive today that he has arrived, that he has made good, that he is an outstanding success. It came last night when he was honored by his home town, Nanticoke. At the annual dinner of the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce, he received a plaque, congratulating him, as a native son, on 50 years in business.

No man, it has been written, is a hero to his valet. And this has been paraphrased to include his home town, the implication being that familiarity detracts from fame, if not reputation. Mr. Sordoni is one of the notable exceptions to the rule, certifying to the stature he has acquired in a career that took him from the mines where he earned 10 cents an hour to a leading U.S.

industrialist who heads enterprises with a payroll of $50,000 a day.

Nanticoke's pride in the achievements of Andrew Sordoni is understandable. Fortunately, the eminence he has attained in business, in philanthropy, and in public service is such that not only Nanticoke, but Wilkes-Barre, the West Side, Luzerne County and Pennsylvania are able to bask in the shadow of his attainments, with enough room left over for his country which he served with fidelity as a soldier as well as a private citizen.

Characteristically, Mr. Sordoni rose to the occasion last night when he attributed whatever success he may have had to his parents, with special emphasis on the counsel of his gifted mother who taught him to be sure what he was undertaking was right and then do it. That has been the guiding philosophy of Sordoni Enterprises. The distinction Andrew Sordoni has attained in the community, in the Commonwealth and in the country attests not only to the wisdom of his mother, but to his own acumen as a dutiful son in heeding her advice while standing on his own two feet.

Twentieth Annual Labor Mass Sponsored by Building Trades Council of Chicago and Cook County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of attending the 20th Annual Labor Mass sponsored by the Building Trades Council of Chicago and Cook County, which was celebrated at St. Viator Church in my district.

This annual Mass is dedicated to the members of the building trades council who passed away during the preceding year. I believe Mr. Earl McMahon, president of the council, and his entire organization deserve the highest commendation for arranging this annual Mass, which gives the members of this council an opportunity not only to pay tribute to their deceased colleagues, but also in silent prayer to reflect on the aims and responsibilities of the labor movement.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to include in my remarks today the sermon delivered during this 20th Annual Labor Mass by the Reverend John W. Stafford, C.S.V., Provincial, Chicago Province, the Clerics of St. Viator. I believe Reverend Stafford's inspiring message defines the ideals of the American labor movement, as seen through the eyes of a servant of God, more eloquently than anything I might say.

Reverend Stafford's sermon follows:

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE 20TH ANNUAL LABOR MASS, SPONSORED BY THE BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL OF CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY, ST. VIATOR CHURCH, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1960, BY FATHER JOHN W. STAFFORD, C.S.V. PROVINCIAL, CHICAGO PROVINCE, THE CLERICS OF ST. VIATOR

One of the most touching events in the life of our Divine Lord is recorded in the 21st chapter of the Holy Gospel according to St. John. It was after the resurrection. The apostles were still employed in their labor as fishermen, not yet having become full-time fishers of men. In St. John's chronicle, Peter one day said: "I am going fishing." Six of the disciples, James and John, Nathaniel and Thomas, and two others, said: "We also are going with thee." St. John records simply, as I am sure you have heard often of other fishermen: "That night they caught nothing." As the day broke forth in splendor, Jesus was standing on the beach, and said to them, not without humor, we can reverently surmise: "Did you catch any fish?" Being God and knowing all things He knew perfectly will they had caught nothing. They answered, as have thousands of other fishermen, with a simple "No." Then Jesus told them to cast to the right of the boat. They did, and they were unable to draw up the net for the great number of fishes. At that, John recognized the Lord, and Peter, impetuous as usual, jumped into the sea to swim to His Beloved Master. Soon after, those in the boat landed, to find that Jesus had a fire ready, with a fish on it, and bread. But He asked the disciples for some of the fish they had just caught. And after it was cooked. He served it to them. Thus, our Divine Lord treated His fishermen, His laborers, with one of the most wonderful of this world's gifts, an early morning breakfast on the fish one has just brought in oneself.

This is how our Lord treats His friends: with understanding, with infinite delicacy and respect, with that wondrous personal touch that delights the heart. Although He set up an organization of laborers, His church, to do His work over the centuries, He wants us never to forget that He is the personal God, the personal friend, of each of us.

You men and women in organized labor are convinced, just as was our Divine Lord, that an organization is needed to achieve your ends. The purposes of our Lord's organization were purely spiritual, to guide men to their final purpose in heaven. Nevertheless the organization He founded was to function in this world, and much of the business of this world is also its business, for men must strive to live together in justice and charity and peace and neighborliness if they are to achieve the salvation of their souls. Hence Our Lord preached and enjoined justice and charity, and peace and neighborliness—the laborer is worthy of his hire, and there must be a day's labor for a day's pay. Sharp practices are against His Law, and even if the law of the land may be gotten round, the Law of God written in our hearts and delivered to us by God Himself must be observed. So the principles of Christ are applicable to the business of this world. An organization, established by God, is to continue in the world to assist men to apply these principles of Christ.

So, too, labor recognizes that many of its rights can be safeguarded only by organization. It is a tribute to your faith in the ideal that man does not live by bread alone that you have dedicated this 20th Annual Labor Mass to the members of your affiliated organizations who have died during the past year, and for the spiritual needs of labor. It is also a tribute to your faith in the ideal that man does not live by bread alone that, led by your sponsoring organization today, the Building Trades Council of Chicago and Cook County, you have been most generous in supporting educational and charitable organizations. We of the Viatorians are grateful from our hearts for all you have done to help us educate young men to the Sacred Priesthood. I am sure that the graces of many Masses offered by the Viatorian priests you have helped educate have descended upon you to bring you closer to Christ.

We see, then, Our Lord passing out the personal touch; and we see Him establishing an organization to do His work. The central thought I want to leave with you this morning is the need to make organizational work personal. An organization can be something quite impersonal, almost cold, and even irresponsible. Thus it is a healthy sign for labor as for any organization to recognize that it has spiritual needs. Perhaps the greatest need in our world today is that we do not often enough recognize our need for the spiritual. We hear much today about a spiritual revival, an awakening of interest in religion and in the things of the spirit, a renewed recognition of the dignity of man, created in the image of God and only a little less than the angels. There is clear evidence of such an awakening. But a spiritual revival must be based on a deep realization of spiritual need. It is not awareness of our goodness, but awareness of our weakness, that is the beginning of our turning back to God. Hence when more men begin to see the emptiness of our culture and the weakness of our spiritual values, then will we begin to approach the end of our era of materialism, our era of the worship of pleasure and the things of the body, with forgetfulness that man does not live by bread alone. Many in our world are still underprivileged, deprived of legitimate material needs, underfed in body and without many of the decencies of human living. But all of us, if we have the honesty to look at ourselves, can see our undernourished souls, our weakness of the things of the spirit, our emptiness of God. As we see this need, this spiritual need, more clearly, we shall, with God's help, be moved to revitalize our spirit with the things of Christ. For it is only out of a deep sense of our own emptiness and nothingness that true virtue can arise.

We are praying today, then for the spiritual needs of labor. What does that mean? At an organizational level it means that we ask God to let labor see its problems as well as its triumphs, to continue, humbly and without arrogance the task of bringing Christ's justice and Christ's charity to all those who are themselves without arrogence and humble. At the organizational level please God that labor may continue its splendid work of aiding in the educational, charitable, and religious activities of our land. At the organizational level labor may well become, after the church, the greatest spokesman of our century for the rights of man. And in the view of many, when the history of this century will have been written, it may well be that the headings of the chapters will not be the atomic bomb or the conquest of interstellar space, or any other of the epochal technological triumphs of our age, but rather the raising of millions of men literally from the gutter to hold up their heads in grateful and humble dignity as the sons of God. And in these chapters the story of organized labor in our century will find its place. The spiritual needs of labor as an organization, then, will be to continue to fight for the rights of man under the banner of God. For these needs today we pray.

I venture to declare that, even more important than the spiritual needs of labor as an organization, are the spiritual needs of laborers as men. Our Lord on the seashore did not serve bread and newly caught fish to an organization, He served seven men. The personal touch of Christ is a touching of the hearts and lives of persons. Your spiritual influence as men will be more important than your influence as an organization. The ideals of an organization may indeed be only a reflection of the ideals of Christ, but they are lived realities only in the lives of men. The lives of all of us touch countless lives of others. You are all members of families, with daily chances to be apostles of Christ preaching in your family lives the truths of Christ. We are all

in daily contact with others on the job, socially, at recreation; in all these contacts we act as individuals. We will be able to bring spiritual renewal to others if we ourselves are reborn in Christ. Justice and charity and peace and neighborliness are important mottoes and slogans at the organizational level; at the personal level they must be lived in the lives of each of us. And it is especially for these spiritual needs of labor that we pray today, the needs of each, the needs of one and all, to preach Christ in our lives.

Our Lord treats his friends with understanding, with infinite delicacy and respect, with that wondrous personal touch that delights the heart. He wants us to come to Him, too, in this intimately personal way. He wants us to think of Him as often as we can during the day, not only during our prayers, but during our work and our play. He wants us to speak to Him, not only in gratitude, after sins forgiven in confession, or in the close communion of the Blessed Sacrament; but often during the day, to thank Him when things are going great, to plead with Him for help when things seem to fall apart, to sing to Him in praise whether our hearts are joyous or loaded with sorrow. He wants us to be happy, as He himself is now happy in heaven after His sufferings and death for us on earth; and He knows that the only way we can be truly happy, even in this life of sorrow and trial, is by being close to Him. "Come to me, all you who labor and are heavily burdened, and I will refresh you." This is His invitation to us. And we come to Him simply by bending our wills to His, by doing the best we can with the help of His strength to keep His Commandments. This is the great spiritual need of all who labor, the great spiritual need of us all.

May God reward you for being here today, for helping those who are trying to do God's work; may He reward you for praying for all your faithful departed, and for the spiritual needs of all those who labor. May He keep you all, individually and personally, close to himself forever.

Gen. I. D. White and the Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 10, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that, because of the way we are preoccupied with our continuing legislative duties, we sometimes overlook, or fail to recognize events that are occurring in the international field which are of great significance to us.

During the past several weeks the United States has been gravely concerned in a problem of international relations which is most unique and virtually without precedent. I refer to the uprising in Korea. Please consider with me, for a moment, the truly explosive nature of these uprisings. Korea is a country which has, or had, a very strong central government; it has, or had, a large and powerful police force; and the third largest army in the world, well trained and well equipped. In addition to this there is presently within the moundaries of South Korea a formidable battle-ready military force of some 30,000 strong, of a foreign country—the United States.

Under such a condition it is reasonable to assume that any widespread uprising against the established government would afford any group, large or small, an excellent opportunity to demonstrate their antagonism, animosity, dislike, or even slight disfavor, against this foreign military force, or other foreign nationals in their midst. Is it not a most significant thing that not only was there no large-scale demonstration against the United States; the condition was completely the reverse. There has not been reported a single incident, even by a single person, directed against the presence of the U.S. personnel in Korea. No U.S. property, and no private property of U.S. citizens was intentionally destroyed or damaged. No American was intentionally injured although two were hurt by accident and one by mistake. Those Americans who were inadvertently caught in the surge of thousands of demonstrators were not harmed, molested, impeded in any way and upon their being recognized as Americans, some were actually cheered by the crowd. The American flag was fully respected.

How then can we account for this most amazing fact that not one person even so much as raised his voice against the United States. I think I know part of the answer, and I think we should all acknowledge it. You can be assured it was not a coincidence, it did not just happen.

It was brought about primarily by the imaginative planning on the part of our top military commanders in the Pacific area and their ability to recognize and meet the challenge of change as it pertains to our Armed Forces today. As we become more and more deeply involved in international relations, it becomes increasingly important that all of the resources of the United States be utilized to the fullest. These men of whom I speak are fully aware that the Army abroad is one of our most potent influences in the field of international relations.

In the early spring of 1957, a series of unfortunate incidents arose between the Korean people and our military personnel which brought relations to a very low ebb. Pilferages and larcenies were rampant; the Army was forced to commit large numbers of combat personnel to the sole duty of safeguarding our military supplies and our soldiers were being goaded to the point of retaliation without regard to local law. It was a situation that could not continue and demanded alleviation. To that end, Gen. I. D. White, our present Commander in Chief, U.S. Army, Pacific, who was then commanding the 8th U.S. Army in Korea, caused a detailed survey to be made of the causes and consequences of these unfortunate incidents and armed therewith requested a conference with the appropriate Korean officials at the highest level. In the forceful manner of an able field commander, General White made it quite plain to all concerned that the situation, as it then existed, could no longer be tolerated and positive remedial action was required on the part of the Korean Government. He proposed that there be established community relations councils, which councils were to consist of local Korean officials, police personnel, the local U.S. Army commander and members of his staff, and where considered appropriate personnel of the local Korean Army commander's staff. The proposal was readily accepted by the Korean ministers and the program was immediately put into effect. Orders were issued from the Army headquarters to the corps commanders, division commanders, down through the regimental, battalion, company, and platoon commanders, so as to reach not only all echelons of command but to every individual soldier of the command. Better relations based on mutual respect and understanding were to be developed and maintained with the Korean people and the Korean authorities. This was not a collateral undertaking, but a military operation in the truest sense. Correspondingly, similar instructions were issued by the Korean officials. The councils were established, constituted as indicated above, and from then to the present time the great bulk of any misunderstanding, differences of opinion, and so forth, has been resolved without any uncontrollable serious incidents. In other words, by mutual understanding and cooperation, the problems were solved before they were started.

To give additional meaning to this undertaking, it was incorporated into the Armed Forces assistance to Korea program—AFAK. As you may not know certain moneys, at the present time approximately a million dollars a year, are provided to the Army for the purpose of assisting the Korean population in reconstructing their war-torn country and to integrate the efforts of the military and civilians in an all-out effort to stabilize the economy of the country. It was felt that additional good will could be generated by incorporating the Armed Forces Assistance to Korea Program into the Community Relations Program whereby the local Korean officials and people, in coordination with the local American commanders, could have a voice in recommending how the moneys provided to the Army could be used most beneficially in their particular communities. Bear in mind that this program is a most extensive one. Its accomplishments include the construction of some 1,500 schools, 400 civic buildings, 320 public health facilities, 275 orphanages, 250 churches, 121 public utility installations, not to speak of greater amounts of medical supplies, work on bridges, highways, reclamation and flood control projects, and other endeavors beneficial to Koreans in all walks of life. These programs have had a great impact upon the thinking of the Korean people generally. They can now associate good things, such as I have just mentioned, that they presently have, and which they did not have before, with the American and Republic of Korea Armies. They have come to look upon these armies as being a source of good rather than solely as instruments

of force. New meaning was given to the military uniform in Korea and through all elements of the civilian population soldiers are welcomed and respected.

When Headquarters U.S. Army, Pacific, was reorganized in Hawaii and General White was placed in command, there was constituted on his general staff a civil affairs section. The prime duty of this section, under the personal direction of General White, is to assure that all of the capabilities of the Army Establishment are utilized to further the good will and mutual understanding between the military personnel and the civilian communities within the U.S. Army, Pacific area wherein our troops are stationed.

It required a widespread uprising to bring to light the great benefits of such a program. Not only had the day-to-day operations in Korea benefited immeasurably by these efforts, but a great stockpile of good will had been created. It is now history that, when put to the task, this imaginative and energetic program withstood any threat of U.S. personnel. Not to be overly dramatic, but without the foresight of our outstanding military leaders in the Pacific, those who regrettably lost their lives in the Korean uprisings could well have included U.S. soldiers and civilians. To all those who aided in accomplishing this great work, it must be most gratifying; and to us here in the Congress it is most reassuring.

Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the distinguished gentlemen from Florida and California [Mr. SIKES and Mr. SHEPPARD], have certainly impressed upon the Members of this body the importance of maintaining a good vigil in connection with projects and undertakings of the Department of Defense.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is realized that the legislative branch of Government cannot trespass upon the functions of the Executive, but where so many billions of dollars are expended every year, this committee performs a distinct service to the taxpaying public in policing, to the extent possible, the expenditures of the Department of Defense.

In 1957, the Sunflower Ordnance Works near Lawrence, Kans., was placed on a standby basis. There is over one-half billion dollars invested in Sunflower, which consists of over 10,000 acres, 3,271 permanent buildings, 28 miles of standard gage railroad, 43 miles of narrow gage railroad, and is complete with modern utilities, ample nitric acid, nitrocellulose and nitroglycerin capacity and facilities, and modern equipment. Sunflower is maintained in excellent condition, and is the property of the Federal Government under control of the Army.

This plant was designed and equipped to produce solvent type single- and double-base extruded propelants. It was later modernized to produce triple-base and solventless double-base propellants, and it is presently equipped to produce completely finished extruded grains for many of the military rockets.

With the land and equipment and the excellent labor force available, it seems grossly unreasonable that this plant should stand idle when other branches of the armed services find it necessary to acquire sites and spend millions of dollars on structures and equipment.

The outstanding efforts of the gentlemen from Florida and California, together with those of the distinguished gentlemen from Texas and the members of their committee, have no doubt saved the taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars by their attempts to compel the Department of Defense to use existing facilities instead of acquiring and constructing new ones.

No one in my district, Mr. Chairman, would want to see the Sunflower Ordnance Works reactivated if it is not needed, but when the people of that area read of new construction and new equipment and the great costs incurred they, of course, wonder why the one-half-billion-dollar investment at Sunflower is not being utilized.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that officials in the Defense Department heed the sound advice of this committee.

H. R. 12263—Amistad Dam and Reservoir

SPEECH
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12263) to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on H.R. 12263 and certain aspects of the Amistad project which the bill would authorize. First, let me say that I support this bill and I believe that this is a meritorious development because of the benefits it will produce and because of its importance in this Nation's relationship with Mexico. I understand that we are committed by treaty to participate jointly with Mexico in the development of the Rio Grande including the construction of this project. I have been told that Mexico is ready and anxious to proceed with its part of this undertaking and certainly I believe that the United States should not be placed in the position of delaying this important international dam.

My one concern with respect to this project goes to a matter I have discussed in the House many times. It goes to the question of treating fairly and alike everyone benefiting from our water resources development programs. Recently, when we were considering the Norman project legislation, I pointed out that our water development projects should be treated alike with respect to the payment of interest. I have stated on other occasions that our water resources development programs, regardless of which executive department they come under, should be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to allocations, reimbursement, and so forth. In comparison with irrigation and municipal water beneficiaries of other Federal programs who are required to repay an equitable portion of the project cost, such beneficiaries from the operations of the Amistad Dam and Reservoir are required to pay nothing. I have heard that they are unwilling to pay. It appears to me that the conservation beneficiaries of this development, as well as those of the existing Falcon Dam and Reservoir, are taking advantage of our treaty commitment to get a free ride.

According to the committee report on H.R. 12263, almost $2 million in primary irrigation and municipal water benefits will accrue annually to the water users in the area; however, under the bill, they will pay nothing. It is difficult to explain to beneficiaries of similar developments, but under other programs requiring reimbursement, why they are treated differently. It is also very difficult, with precedents such as this, for those of us who are responsible for legislation on similar projects under other programs to explain to the sponsors of these projects why we cannot bring legislation to the floor of the House unless they meet certain rigid reimbursement requirements.

In summary, let me say again that I am not criticizing this project because I think it is a worthwhile project and is necessary under our treaty with Mexico. I am disappointed, however, that those who will benefit from the conservation features of this project, by their unwillingness to pay for the tremendous benefits they will receive, are taking advantage of our treaty commitments to construct the project and are placing the financial burden on Uncle Sam.

Stuart Chase on World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in an eloquent and thoughtful letter on social and

economic issues, Stuart Chase writes: "Whoever first presses the button to light the hydrogen suns of world war III will himself be consumed."

His letter to the New York Times, June 7, 1960, should be read by every American citizen, particularly those who are in positions of responsibility. He restates a familiar thesis but does so with his usual flair combining fact and reason with forceful persuasiveness.

His letter especially should be read by those political leaders who believe that a "hard line" is the way to avert nuclear conflict.

Under unanimous consent I am including the text of his letter:

TO MAKE OUR PLANET SECURE—SUMMITS, OLD-LINE DIPLOMACY HELD OUTMODED BY MODERN WEAPONRY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

You quoted the Peiping Review on May 29, saying that the survivors of a nuclear war (presumably Chinese) would rear a glorious civilization on the ruins of capitalistic imperialism. So why, the Review asks in effect, work for coexistence and East-West negotiations?

The late summit conference broke up before it started. But if it had proceeded on schedule, without preliminary blunders by the United States and subsequent histrionics by Mr. Khrushchev, would it have resolved the question of Berlin, hastened disarmament, banned atomic tests? I think not.

The probabilities of anything constructive coming out of a conference of this design have always been remote. A little relaxation of tension might have been won, but not those firm guarantees against ultimate incineration for which the world hopes.

It is doubtful if old-line diplomacy, urged by some experts—the diplomacy of Metternich, Disraeli, John Hay—would be an improvement, although it would certainly be quieter, without the brassy racket of the mass media. The great diplomats of the past were committed to defend their nation or alliance against all others, the in-group against the out. Always at the end of their bargaining, no matter how smooth the phrasing, lay naked power. Our broadsides are heavier than your broadsides.

CAPACITY FOR DESTRUCTION

But now, in 1960, we cannot use our broadsides. Back of our words lies a futile threat. The United States even in 1958, says Gerard Piel, had stockpiled the power to destroy Russia as a going society 25 times over, while Russia had enough to destroy the United States 10 times over.

Whoever first presses the button to light the hydrogen suns of world war III will himself be consumed. No nation can win a nuclear encounter, for the objectives will be obliterated in the war itself. Suppose that—our patience exhausted, as Hitler used to say—we should decide to fight over Berlin. Within a matter of minutes Berlin is extremely likely to be a radioactive heap of rubble.

Nor would the result be confined to mutual suicide. Fallout from the hundreds of megaton weapons rained on Russia, the United States, and the NATO nations would poison the planet for years. If it did not kill all animals and people in the manner of "On the Beach," it would gravely damage the pool of genes upon which the race depends. When Mao, the tenderhearted fellow, boasts that only 300 million Chinese would be eliminated the first day or two, he neglects the effects of fallout on the other 300 million.

For a conference between East and West to succeed, its delegates must represent all humanity, as well as the homeland. This is not another plea for the brotherhood of man—a plea stanchly resisted by diplomats down the ages; this is a sober, practical recognition of the technological imperative which now grips everyone alive.

Neither summit meetings, in a blaze of flashlights and propaganda, nor the old diplomacy can deal with the monstrous weaponry of today. Where are the Americans, the Russians, the men of other nations who will enter a conference pledged to make the planet secure?

STUART CHASE.

GEORGETOWN, CONN., *May 31, 1960.*

Honoring Its 1952 Commitment, West Germany Moves To Pay Its Citizens for War Losses by Allied Seizure of German Property Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have had a strong and continuing interest in the problem of vested enemy assets, there has recently been encouraging news from Bonn indicating that the Federal Republic of Germany, honoring its 1952 commitments to the Western Allied Powers, will soon begin to compensate its citizens for losses caused by the seizure, during World War II, of German property abroad by the Allied Powers.

The first indication of this action was a statement made on the floor of the Bundestag on April 7, 1960, indicating the clear intention of the Government to soon begin compensation payments. This was followed by a story by Mr. Arthur J. Olsen in the New York Times of June 3, 1960.

This is indeed heartening news to those of us who have advocated a "sale" rather than a "return" policy for vested enemy assets now held by the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice. The chief remaining property is, of course, the General Aniline & Film Corp.

Mr. Speaker, this recent action on the part of the West German Government destroyed one of the major arguments against enactment of H.R. 404, H. R. 1345 and S. 1103, by Representative O'BRIEN of New York, myself, and Senator KEATING, respectively.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., reporting the Bundestag statement and the New York Times story of June 3, 1960, which outlines the proposed action and background information:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 19, 1960.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROBISON: I refer to your request for information concerning an exchange which took place on the floor of the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany with regard to compensation for the losses of German citizens arising out of World War II.

According to a report which the Department has received from the American Embassy at Bonn, this exchange took place during the question and answer period in the Bundestag on April 7, 1960. On this occasion, the State Secretary in the Federal Ministry of Finance, Dr. Hettlage, answered a question which had been submitted by Dr. Wahl, a Deputy from the CDU party. The question, which was in two parts, read as follows:

"How far have preparations progessed toward the settlement, as specifically provided in the General War Sequel Law, to compensate persons affected by the loss of their property abroad and when can such proposal be expected?

"Should not an advance settlement be made at least for the benefit of older people over and above what can at present be done in hardship cases?"

The statement in reply made by State Secretary Hettlage was as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the question submitted by Professor Wahl concerns the settlement of damages resulting from reparations. The General War Sequel Law has reserved the settlement of reparation damages for future special legislation. Preparations in the Federal Ministry of Finance for such legislation are far advanced. Unfortunately, they are made difficult by differences of opinions between the Ministry and the associations of claimants concerning the legal nature of the claim for compensation.

"The associations maintain that unlike other persons who have suffered damages arising from the war, persons who have been injured as a result of reparations have a claim for full compensation in accordance with the constitutional principles governing compensation for expropriation. The Federal Ministry of Finance, on the other hand, considers that, on legal and political grounds, compensation can be granted to these claimants only in accordance with the principles governing the equalization of burdens. The Ministry of Finance has on several occasions suggested that these legal questions be clarified in a test case before the Federal Constitutional Court. Unfortunately, however, nothing has as yet been done along these lines. It may, however, be expected that the Federal Constiutional Court will make a ruling on these fundamental legal questions within the forseeable future.

"In order to avoid hardship which may result from this uncertainty with respect to the legal basis of the compensation claim of persons having suffered damages as a result of reparations, the Federal Ministry of Finance is preparing directives for a provisional settlement. According to these directives persons of advanced age or persons in economic difficulties shall receive payments on a priority basis. While the general war sequel law provides only for grants-in-aid to old and disabled persons, these persons, under the directives now in the stage of preparation, shall receive noninterest-bearing advance payments, viz genuine compensation in anticipation of future compensation. Conditions and extent of such provisional assistance shall be determined in accordance with the principles governing the equalization of burdens. The 1960 budget will contain the necessary budgetary provisions for such payments."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

BONN ACTS TO PAY ON WAR SEIZURES—BID TO COMPENSATE CITIZENS INDICATES SLIM HOPE FOR REGAINING ASSETS IN UNITED STATES

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, GERMANY, June 2.—Eight years after giving its formal promise, the West German Government has now moved to compensate its citizens for losses caused by wartime Allied seizures of German property.

The decision is seen here as a tacit admission that the chances of getting back any of $500 million in assets seized in the United States are poor indeed.

Cash payments to natural persons only will be indirect and paid under highly restrictive conditions. By a rough estimate no more than $50 million can be disbursed in nonrepayable "loans" authorized by an unpublicized May 20 administrative decision of the Federal Cabinet.

The Finance Ministry will be ready to receive applications in about 3 months.

AMOUNT SEQUESTERED IN UNITED STATES

In the United States alone $400 million in German-owned assets was sequestered during World War II. The value of this property—much of it already sold off and the cash disbursed—has since risen to an estimated total of $550 million.

In 1952 the Bonn government pledged to the Western Allied Powers to compensate its citizens for the loss. This was part of a bargain by which the victor nations agreed not to exact war reparations from West Germany.

Although the commitment was reaffirmed in 1954, Bonn instead bent its efforts to obtain return of the sequestered assets.

The United States offered in 1955 as "an act of grace" to give back the holdings of all natural persons up to a value of $10,000. This offer was turned down, however, and the demand for "full return" was pressed on the legal principle of the sanctity of private property.

Sentiment in Washington has since turned sharply against the West German claim. The administration is committed to liquidate all vested enemy assets and use the proceeds to compensate American citizens who suffered property losses abroad during the war.

ADENAUER RAISED QUESTION

Chancellor Adenauer raised the assets question again during his visit to Washington in March. He came home apparently convinced that the full-return demand pressed upon him by West German corporate interests, was no longer realistic.

The Cabinet directive, however, is carefully framed to hold open the door for renewed efforts to obtain the return of seized assets or their equivalent value. Large financial interests have opposed all previous compensation plans—and this one as well—on the ground that West Germany would seem to be giving up the struggle in Washington.

The May 20 directive merely makes administrative changes in the General War Consequences Act, a 1951 law that provides for financial assistance to persons who suffered particular material losses as a result of the war.

It derives from the equalization-of-burdens principle whereby citizens who escaped major war losses are assessed, through taxation, to help their less fortunate countrymen.

The new directive adds to the categories of those entitled to financial assistance individuals who suffered losses abroad from postwar dismantling and—under certain circumstances—from Allied recapture of properties in West Germany.

These persons will qualify for interest-free loans, with repayment required only if a foreign entity makes good the original loss.

Corporations and shareholders in former German corporate assets abroad are excluded.

The directive limits eligible borrowers to natural persons living in West Germany who are in hardship, who have special problems of educating dependents, or who have reached the age of 65.

Lights Up on Broadway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the theater strike in New York is over, which is happy news for everyone. A compromise between the producers and Actors Equity was reached which appears to be fair and equitable.

What has been achieved, however, is a short-range solution. The long-range solution to the problems of the theater industry in New York City remain. They will not be solved without intelligent planning and a deep and continuing interest by the city administration. The theater is one of the chief things that contributes to New York's greatness. Certainly it is one of the reasons the 17th Congressional District of Manhattan, which I am honored to represent, is the most exciting congressional district in the country—at least it is in this particular Congressman's judgment. The 17th has within it most of the Broadway and off-Broadway theaters in New York.

I am pleased in include in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with these remarks, an excellent editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Lights Up on Broadway":

LIGHTS UP ON BROADWAY

Monday isn't one of the most spectacular theater nights of the week, as a regular thing, but many New Yorkers are going to count tonight as one of the big evenings of the season. For the strike is over, even if its effects are not, and all through the theater district actors will be acting and audiences watching and listening—which has been the way with the theater from the beginning of time.

We expect to be hearing about the 10-day dispute that darkened the theaters for a considerable time to come, for the settlement left a good many economic loose ends still to be tied. But these are matters that should be straightened out in discussions among the parties concerned, not through strikes, lockouts, and the other violent manifestations of a labor dispute.

If the Equity strike demonstrated anything, it was that the whole city is immediately concerned with the affairs of the Broadway theater. People who come in, sometimes from great distances, to see a "show" leave money not only at the box-office but elsewhere as well. Besides, it isn't merely an economic matter. New York takes pride in its legitimate theater, for it is the only city in the entire country that has it on a year-round, major scale. Shows have shakedown tryouts in other towns before they come here, and if they're hits in New York, they go out on the road. But New York is what counts, for it's the showcase of America's theatrical culture. We all have a stake in keeping it bright and flourishing.

So tonight at 8:40 a lot of people on both sides of the footlights will be feeling happy. Broadway will go back to being Broadway; off-Broadway to being off-Broadway, and New York to being New York. The lights are on again; let's hope they never go out.

Another Attempt by Department of Agriculture To Weaken Poultry Products Inspection Act Must Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members will remember that on May 10 we had a discussion here in the House about certain language proposed in H.R. 12117, the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1961, bearing on the poultry inspection program. As a result of the questions I raised that day in interrogating the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the bill, it became obvious that the language in question was legislation on an appropriation bill and would be subject to a point of order the following day. The point of order was raised the next day and the language in question was deleted from the bill, along with some additional funds for poultry inspection which the bill would have contained had the language in question been agreed to.

I could not agree to that language, for it would have drastically weakened the law, and I am glad the point of order was raised in my absence from Washington by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and was sustained. That action knocked out an extra $500,000 for poultry inspection. I had hoped the Senate would not only restore this $500,000 but add an additional $500,000 besides to cover all of the costs in fiscal 1961 of inspecting all plants engaged in processing of poultry for interstate commerce. About 300 plants engaged in further processing—making soups, pies, and so forth—have been exempted from the law for the past 18 months, but the exemptions automatically expire on June 30 and they must then be brought in under the compulsory program, with the Government paying in full the cost of such inspection just as it does now in all of the slaughtering and eviscerating plants.

Although the Senate did not provide any of the additional money poultry inspection will require in the coming year, the Senate Committee on Appropriations made clear that it was prepared to do so as soon as the formal request for such supplementary funds was forwarded to Congress by the President. So far, the administration has not asked for the additional funds it will need—funds the law now requires must be spent in the coming year on poultry inspection.

The reason no such request for additional funds has been forthcoming so far is that the Department of Agriculture has been attempting in every possible way to avoid the necessity of complying with the law beginning July 1 in connection with further processing operations. First, it sought through the appropriation bill to have language enacted which

would set up an entirely new basis for determining what plants should be inspected. This language would have provided the "out" the Department is seeking in order to avoid placing inspectors after July 1 in the plants processing into soups, pies, and so forth, poultry slaughtered elsewhere. When that effort failed on the appropriation bill, it then urgently requested enactment of an amendment to the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 to give the Secretary wide discretion—permanently—to exempt any poultry plant he chooses from the requirements of continuous inspection. A bill to achieve this purpose, H.R. 11050, was introduced at the Department's request.

It is important to keep in mind that the language of the original law is such that the amendment proposed by the Department of Agriculture in H.R. 11050 would throw the program wide open to mass exemptions. This would be intolerable.

This morning I appeared before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture considering H.R. 11050 and explained why I feel that the bill should be tabled. I think there is enough interest among Members of the Congress in this matter to warrant my putting this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE HOUSE AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING H.R. 11050, A BILL TO AMEND THE POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT, MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1960

The bill before you, introduced by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee at the request of the Department of Agriculture, should be rejected. It is a bill to weaken the Poultry Products Inspection Act by giving the Secretary of Agriculture unlimited permanent authority to exempt from inspection any plant in the country he so chooses, on the vague and variable grounds that inspecting some plants might be impracticable. This is not a proper basis for giving such broad discretionary powers to the Secretary at this time.

A few words are certainly in order at this point about the background of this proposed legislation. The Poultry Products Inspection Act, which we enacted in August 1957, after great study and comprehensive hearings on both sides of the Capitol, provides for compulsory Federal inspection for wholesomeness for virtually all poultry and poultry products sold in interstate commerce. A second feature of the law, one not put into effect anywhere, would permit the Department of Agriculture to set up compulsory inspection programs within major marketing areas to include poultry sold there, including that sold only in intrastate commerce. But we are concerned right now only with interstate shipments.

Because of the fact that this act set up a brandnew program of Federal inspection for an agricultural commodity produced and sold in great quantity throughout the country, and because of the further fact that there was a shortage of technicians trained in poultry inspection work compared to the suddenly increased need for such people—veterinarians and lay inspectors—we provided in the original act that when the compulsory interstate inspection program went into effect generally in January 1959, the Secretary could, at his discretion, and for the convenience of the Government, temporarily exempt individual plants from inspection but only for as long as 18 months, or until July 1, 1960. It was felt that all of the available inspectors would be needed at first in the plants producing the bulk of poultry sold in interstate commerce, but that, as more inspectors were trained and became available, they could be assigned to the temporarily exempted plants, presumably smaller plants including those in somewhat remote areas.

It has not worked out in that fashion. The Secretary used the authority of this temporary exemption provision to exempt all plants engaged in the further processing of poultry products—for instance, those making chicken pies, turkey pies, soups, and so on. Most of the plants engaged in such processing work, incidentally, were so anxious to have inspection that they were willing to pay for Federal inspection during the year-and-a-half period of exemption. That was the only way they could have the right to use the U.S.-inspected-for-wholesomeness seal on their products. They therefore paid to have Federal inspectors assigned to them under the voluntary poultry inspection program run by the Department as a separate activity from the compulsory inspection program.

The bill now before you primarily represents an attempt by the Department of Agriculture to continue the present setup beyond July 1. The Department's reasons are purely budgetary. They feel that the 200 plants now paying to have their poultry products inspected would continue to do so and the 100 which have never bothered to seek inspection would perhaps eventually come in under the voluntary program. The budgetary aspects of this are twofold if the bill now before you were to pass: First, the Department would save the $1 million or so a year it will otherwise need in order to pay for compulsory inspection beginning July 1 in all 300 presently exempted plants; and secondly, it would lose the revenue it now receives from the 200 plants now paying for their inspection work under the voluntary program.

These are not valid reasons, Mr. Chairman, for opening a huge wedge into the effectiveness of the Poultry Products Inspection Act. Note that the language of the original law is such that the bill before you would open up the act to unlimited exemptions by the Secretary, not just to plants now exempt. He could find it impracticable to have inspection in all plants making this or that poultry commodity, or in all plants having fewer than so many employees, or less than so much output per day. It was our purpose in writing the act that all poultry in interstate commerce, except for some few strictly limited specific types of shipments, must be inspected for wholesomeness. There is no reason now to change the act on that point—and certainly not for the mere purpose of some budgetary sleight-of-hand.

The Department has been trying to achieve its exemptions goal this year in several ways. First, it tried to accomplish broader exemptions under the act by some far-reaching language it either suggested or accepted in the appropriation bill for the coming year. After I raised many questions on the floor as to the possible consequences to the program of the proposed appropriation language, and it was established that the language would drastically rewrite existing law on poultry inspection, the language was stricken from the appropriation bill on a point of order. Fortunately, the Senate failed to include in the appropriation bill any similar language to reduce the effectiveness or broaden the exemptions under the Poultry Products Inspection Act. As a matter of fact, the Senate Appropriations Committee ordered the Department to proceed on the assumption no change would be made in the law, and asked the Department to come forward with a supplementary appropriation request to cover the added cost beginning July 1 of inspecting plants now exempted under the temporary provision.

Mr. Chairman, I covered many aspects of this issue in some detail at the time the Agriculture appropriation bill was before the House on May 10, particularly in a series of exchanges on the House floor with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handled the money bill. I would appreciate it if you would include in your record at this point my exchanges with Congressman WHITTEN and the subsequent remarks I made at that time in explaining the importance of continuous inspection of poultry, not only at the time of slaughter, but when the poultry slaughtered in one plant is shipped and then made into poultry products in another. The wholesomeness of such poultry at the time of slaughter is no guarantee that the poultry is still wholesome when delivered and processed in another plant halfway across the country.

I hope I have made it clear why this bill should be tabled—defeated in subcommittee—so that on July 1 the Poultry Products Inspection Act will go fully into effect on all poultry in interstate commerce as Congress originally intended and as the law now requires. The Budget Bureau will then have to release funds to the Department to cover the added cost of plant inspections on July 1 and Congress, in turn, will provide these funds through a supplemental appropriation bill. Otherwise, if the present exemptions continue beyond July 1, it will be only a question of time before meat inspection is similarly undermined on this question of further processing. Let's kill this right now.

EXCERPTS FROM DEBATE ON POULTRY INSPECTION APPROPRIATION FOR 1961 FISCAL YEAR IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 10, 1960, IN CONNECTION WITH H.R. 12117, AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

QUESTIONS ON POULTRY INSPECTION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I asked the chairman of the subcommittee for this time in order to obtain answers to several questions which occur to me about this appropriation bill and its accompanying report, which I think will be of great interest to every housewife.

First of all, on poultry inspection, may I ask if the additional $500,000 provided in the bill for poultry inspection will permit the continuous inspection beginning July 1, as required under the Poultry Inspection Act, of food items processed from poultry? It is my understanding from the officials of the Department that an additional $1 million over the current year's appropriation would be required for this necessary function, and I have seen other figures showing it would cost anywhere from $500,000 to $1 million more. Therefore, the question which I have very strongly in mind is whether the extra $500,000 provided in this bill will be enough to allow the Poultry Division to place inspectors on a continuing basis in all 300 plants now temporarily exempt from inspection because of a shortage of trained inspectors, but which, under the law, must have their products continually inspected beginning with the coming July 1, and at Government expense.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentlewoman, it is my personal judgment that what is involved is what we might interpret continuous inspection to be. The committee tried to investigate fully this whole matter. It is to some degree between the Department and the processors as to protecting public health. In no instance have the inspectors in the 200 plants found anything injurious to the public health, but the proc-

essors in turn could use the stamp of the Department as part of their advertising. In fact, 200 out of the 300 do that. They definitely would like to shift the burden of that cost to the Government. The other third would like the Government to give them the inspection free so that they would be on equal terms with the others.

The Department feels, as I understand it from their testimony, that having the little plants continuously inspected is not necessary to protect the public health, but they in turn refuse to give the stamp unless they do that inspection. What we do is say to the Department, "We are giving you that much money. Inspect them to the fullest degree to protect public health, but when you do it, go ahead and issue the stamp."

We thought that was a fair solution of the problem instead of meeting it head on. Whether you have to repeal the law by providing that no funds shall be used, or whether you have a lot of inspections to get the stamp, so far as the testimony is concerned, we thought that this was the best solution we could think of, and we hope we are right.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will be patient with me the law says all processing plants in interstate commerce must have inspection. About 300 have been temporarily exempted, but beginning July 1 that exemption expires. Now will he please explain the somewhat confusing, technical language on page 17, beginning on line 2, dealing with the poultry inspection program. Does that language change existing law so far as the requirements of the Poultry Products Inspection Act are concerned? If it does not change the law, why put this language in the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Frankly, I would take it that it changes the law by giving the Department some say-so about what inspection is necessary to protect the public health.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If it does change the law, as I also believe it does, is it proper for the Committee on Appropriations to change the requirements laid down for poultry inspection under legislation drafted by the legislative committee on agriculture, and enacted by Congress several years ago?

Mr. WHITTEN. If we ask for a rule and they grant it, we would have the privilege of changing it if we saw fit to do so. But, this is, frankly, subject to a point of order. We think it is better than nothing and this is the best we can do. So we have not tried to override anybody, but we do think it is the best solution that we could think of.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The law says that all poultry moving in interstate commerce should be inspected, including products made from poultry. This language in the bill on page 17, "*Provided*, That the Department is hereby authorized and directed to make such inspection of poultry products processing plants as it deems essential to the protection of public health and to permit the use of appropriate inspection labels where it determines from such inspection that such plants operate in a manner which protects the public health, and not less than $500,000 shall be available for this purpose," seems to say it would now be up to the Secretary in his discretion to decide which processed products are to be inspected, and under what circumstances the Department should assign inspectors to such processors, and also permits, apparently, some substitute seal to be used to attest to the wholesomeness of poultry which has not actually been inspected.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentlewoman will yield to me, I must say I have never been a stickler about jurisdiction. We have so many problems here that if somebody were to handle some of them, I certainly would not object. The Department cannot determine which products are to be inspected, but they can determine what inspection is necessary to protect the public health. But when a legislative committee says that the Committee on Appropriations must appropriate, it looks to me as if some other group has probably stepped a little far. I think they should inspect, but I think it should be for the protection of public health and not for the stamp. But if they say that they have inspected this plant fully and adequately to protect the public health, I do not think they should be permitted to withhold the stamp.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The point I wanted to call attention to is this: If it is to be only a spot inspection program in plants making poultry pies, poultry soups and other products containing poultry, and yet anything that goes through that processing plant would carry a seal of wholesomeness then I think we are misleading the housewife in allowing that seal to be on the product indicating that it has been inspected when it probably has not been inspected.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know where we should end this. But they have been inspecting 200 plants and they have not found anything that would injure the public health and according to the letters that have been sent to me, they say that they pay for it because they want to use the stamp because it is a matter of advertising. I do think if the gentlewoman would go along with this, we can work with this and see if we can resolve the situation. Again I say, only one objection and out it would go.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But under the law, all these 300 exempted plants will have to be inspected beginning July 1, will they not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Unless the other body should put in a statement that, notwithstanding the legislation, no part of these funds can be used for such inspection. Then the law would be repealed. We do not want to do that. We try to resolve it by saying that they must inspect, but the inspection must be for the purpose of protecting the public health, and when you do inspect, to say so.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank my colleague very much for his frank answers. It is clear to me that the language in the proviso in question on page 17 relaxes the strict requirements of the Poultry Products Inspection Act insofar as that act now requires the inspection of all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce. The act permitted temporary exemption of some plants from the inspection requirements for the convenience of the Government, because it was not considered feasible to provide inspectors at the start of 1959 for every plant in the country subject to the act. There was a shortage of trained personnel in this field.

So the act as originally passed allowed this temporary exemption for 18 months of plants for which inspectors were not available. The Secretary chose to use this administrative authority to exempt from compulsory inspection all plants doing further processing of poultry into poultry products like soups, pies, and so forth, on the assumption that he would need all the trained inspectors available in January 1959 just to cover all of the slaughtering plants.

The exemptions for the further processing plants expire on July 1. The Secretary has asked Congress to amend the law so that he can continue to exempt such plants. Congress has not done so. In the meantime, many of these further processors—200 out of about 300 exempted plants—have felt it was so important to have their products inspected for wholesomeness by the Federal Government that they have paid out of their own funds to have their products continuously inspected under a voluntary inspection program operated by the Department. Under the law, however, they are entitled to the same kind of free inspection the slaughtering plants receive.

This bill provides an additional $500,000 to the poultry division to provide inspection at plants processing poultry products but the language of the proviso on page 17 gives the Secretary discretionary powers he would not otherwise possess after July 1 to exempt particular plants from inspection. As I understand it, the proviso would permit a spot check inspection program, with a seal attesting to the wholesomeness of poultry products not produced under continuous inspection.

President Eisenhower's Greetings to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am presenting herewith the message sent by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. It is addressed to me because I am chairman of the board of this organization, which has already served over half a century in the water utilization program for this Nation. I am sure that all of us are interested in the President's views on the progress of this program:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 24, 1960.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Chairman of the Board, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR OVERTON: Please give my greetings to those attending the 47th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

When I addressed you in 1954, I said that America would soon come to look upon water as its single greatest resource. That day is fast approaching. In subsequent letters to you I have pointed out that there must be cooperation at all levels of Government and among our individual citizens if we are to advance sound programs in this field.

Good progress has been made, but we must learn to work even closer together and improve our planning—long-range and comprehensive planning. In view of the ever-increasing annual flood damages, we must give greater consideration to flood plain zoning. We must give more attention to the provision of adequate industrial and domestic water supplies for our expanding economy. Moreover, we must take into consideration not only our water resources but also the need for development of other resources. If we follow such a course and provide a sound balance between programs, we can best assure attainment of our Nation's maximum strength and welfare.

Thank you for your past cooperation and support. I am glad to send my best wishes for a productive convention.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1960, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter written by the national commander of the American Legion to each Member of the House urging that appropriations for the mutual security program not be cut below the levels which the President and Secretary of Defense deem necessary for our national defense.

This plea has now been joined by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the national commander of AMVETS—the American Veterans of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

AMVETS,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1960.
The Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: AMVETS have long advocated a strong mutual security program for our Nation. At the most recent AMVETS National Convention, a resolution favoring a strong, supple, and effective mutual security program as a fundamental element of our foreign policy was unanimously adopted.

We are deeply concerned about reports appearing in the press that the Congress may reduce drastically the funds requested by the President for mutual security. Any cut in this program which plays such an essential part in our collective security program could seriously handicap our efforts to strengthen the free world.

Providing, as it does, military, technical, and economic assistance to 42 nations of the free world, this program is an integral part of U.S. national security. It serves as a major deterrent to the extension of the frontiers of communism. Its scope and effectiveness must not be permitted to lessen because of the failure to appropriate necessary funds.

It is our understanding that the House of Representatives will soon have the opportunity to vote upon the mutual security program appropriation for fiscal year 1961. We of AMVETS solicit your active support of a strong mutual security program. We respectfully urge that you support the appropriation of the funds requested by the President for this essential program.

Sincerely,

HAROLD T. BERG.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1960.
Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I am taking the liberty of writing you with respect to the President's budget request for foreign aid and military assistance funds. I have recently completed a 10-week world tour, visiting many of the newly emerging nations and have had an opportunity to observe the application and effect of U.S. foreign aid and military assistance firsthand. With some exceptions I was impressed with what I saw.

The breakdown of the Paris summit conference and subsequent events reveal clearly that whether we like it or not, foreign aid, and particularly military assistance, has become a most vital issue in our national security program. If the United States fails to provide a reasonable amount of military assistance to other countries the evidence seems rather clear, and is supported by my personal observation, that such aid will come from sources not friendly to the United States.

In past years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has taken a dim view of heavy U.S. outlays for foreign aid although we strongly supported the technical assistance program and recognized the need for some military assistance. It is my considered judgment that if there ever was justification for foreign and military aid, in the light of recent world events, such aid is now justifiable. I sincerely hope you will support the President's request for the necesary appropriations to carry out his foreign aid program. We should not curtail foreign and military aid funds at this critical time.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS G. FELDMANN,
Commander in Chief.

H.R. 9786

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the only Spanish-American War veteran left in this body, I naturally am interested in the enactment of H.R. 9786, which will place on the same basis as other veterans the veterans of the Spanish-American War who are so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person. It is only fair that such should be the case. I am happy that the Veterans' Committee reported the bill unanimously, and I anticipate its unanimous passage by the House.

There is one provision in the bill, however, that I would call to the attention of my comrades of the war with Spain. It gives the Spanish War veteran the option of remaining under the Spanish War Act, where if totally disabled and needing the regular attendance of a nurse he receives a maximum of $135.45 a month as against $170 under the act becoming effective July 1, 1960. But the option can be exercised only once. That means that the Spanish War veteran, having elected to go under the new pension law, would forever thereafter be under that law and not under the law governing Spanish War pensions. As Chairman TEAGUE has said, his election would be irrevocable.

If the Spanish War veteran is permanently in his present condition of total disability to the extent of requiring the regular attendance of another person, and there is little or no prospect of a change in his financial condition, it will be to his advantage to go under the new law. It will mean to him the difference between $135.45 a month and $170.

If, on the other hand, there is a change for the better in his physical or financial condition he may under the new law end up by receiving a pension less than his Spanish War pension of $101.59.

H.R. 9786 unquestionably will benefit many of my Spanish War comrades, but before electing to go under its provisions I would suggest they consult with the local, departmental, or national officers of the United Spanish War Veterans. The point to bear in mind is that an election once made is irrevocable. Each case must be decided by its own facts and circumstances.

Louisiana's Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I ask to have spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Concurrent Resolution No. 45 by Mr. Gibbs, of the State of Louisiana. This resolution appeals to Congress to take all measures to restore to the State of Louisiana revenues derived from offshore minerals development. I am heartily in favor of this resolution. It is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States denying rights of this State to its lawful wealth from the production of oil from submerged offshore lands has resulted in the application of one rule to other States and a different rule to the State of Louisiana, which is clearly discriminatory and based in law upon the justification of ancient treaties which never contemplated the production of minerals from such areas; and

Whereas the result of the drawing of one set of seaward boundaries for the States on the coast of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and of another set of boundaries for those on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico with each of the States upon the Gulf of Mexico having different boundaries, has been the allowance to all of the petroleum producing States except Louisiana of all or at least the major portion of the coastal production areas; and

Whereas this discrimination against one of the States is unwarranted in a Nation comprised of States of equal rights and dignity; and

Whereas this particular discrimination against the State of Louisiana causes a discriminatory reduction of revenue to the one State out of all of the petroleum producing States which has the greatest expense to afford roads, schools, law enforcement, judicial process, and the other benefits of State and local government to the petroleum industry and the citizens engaged in making their livelihood therein because of the swamp and marsh coastline of the State which extends across virtually the entire coastline for an inland depth in many areas of as much as 100 miles; and

Whereas the economic burden upon the State of Louisiana of providing the normal and necessary State and local governmental facilities for the petroleum industry and its

employees and equipment, such as roads, schools, and law enforcement, is greatly in excess of the burden of other coastal States having a more accessible coastline; and

Whereas the loss of revenue from petroleum production from the area which other States are allowed to receive, will necessitate the State of Louisiana being unable to provide the necessary facilities for assisting the petroleum industry to expand and develop the petroleum resource of our tidelands, with the resultant loss to the entire Nation of the benefits to be derived therefrom: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Louisiana, the senate thereof concurring, That the Louisiana Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby urged and requested to take all measures within their lawful powers to obtain the restoration to the State of Louisiana of the revenue derived from offshore mineral development and operations which other coastal States are allowed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Louisiana Senator and Representative in Congress.

———— ————,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

———— ————,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the summit collapse has made the matter of our national security of even more interest and I, for one, am thankful for the leadership and strength which has been displayed by the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr. His policy of sitting with the Joints Chiefs of Staff has made it certain that our civilian military leadership is intimately and thoroughly familiar with the knotty problems which necessarily arise in an organization as large and complex as our Department of Defense. It has assured that his decisions are based upon a knowledge of all the facts regarding any matter under consideration. And perhaps most important of all—this policy, combined with Mr. Gates' strength of character has resulted in timely decisions in these important security questions. Civilian responsibility and control is a fundamental of our form of government and the Secretary of Defense has done much to enhance this concept.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from one of the outstanding family newspapers in the Midwest, the Royal Oak Tribune. Mr. Phillip Miller, publisher of the Royal Oak Tribune, is a knowledgeable and conscientious newspaperman. I commend to my colleagues his reactions to a recent speech by Mr. Gates. I agree with Mr. Miller that it is heartening to find that our defenses are strong—our deterrents to aggression powerful.

The editorial follows:

[From the Royal Oak Tribune, May 3, 1960]

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE SAYS

(By Philip F. Miller)

When the Secretary of Defense of the United States speaks at a meeting which you are attending, you pay attention.

When his audience is one of the most critical you can find, a group of working newspapermen, you know that what he says has to be provable fact.

I heard the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, speak to such a group the other day. The occasion was the Associated Press luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York during the American Newspaper Publishers Association convention there.

He stated definitely that the U.S. defenses are strong, that their strength is a powerful deterrent to any nation thinking about making war against us.

He denied that there was any gap in the U.S. deterrent posture, that the country had been overtaken militarily by the Soviet Union, or that it was second best.

The United States, he further said, need not downgrade itself because of the sputnik. In fact, he declared, "The United States can take pride in its nuclear missile progress. The United States has put 18 satellites and 2 space probes into orbit compared with the Soviet's 6, and has 11 now in space compared with their 2."

He admitted that the Russians have developed rocket motors with greater thrust than ours. Therefore they have been able to put larger satellites into orbit.

Part of this is due, he said, to the goal which each nation seemingly has set in its guided missile program. The United States has been able to develop a nuclear warhead which has been much lighter and smaller than originally planned. Therefore the rockets needed to deliver it to any spot on earth need not be as powerful as they would be if the warhead were larger and heavier. Our efforts, therefore, have been to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles of the size needed to boost such warheads. We have been able to go faster along this line because we have worried less about power and more about precision.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union seems to have concentrated on boosting larger payloads and as an offshoot of their military program, has been able to orbit heavy satellites as well.

The United States is not neglecting such possibilities, he declared, but its main emphasis to date has been on the smaller, but nonetheless effective missile system. By this means, he stated, we have assured that there is no gap in missile potential.

Therefore our defenses remain strong and a powerful deterrent.

I'll have to admit that I felt better after listening to the Secretary give his views on how we stand. He is one man who should know.

The Challenge Is Pinpointed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of June 9, I commented on the statement of Governor Rockefeller of New York State which I regarded as a remarkable contribution to vigorous and intelligent discussion of the great issues which our Nation faces in this election year.

I said that I felt Governor Rockefeller threw down a forthright challenge which I felt should be read by every American.

In today's New York Herald-Tribune, Columnist Joseph Alsop has written a column which I believe most explicitly pinpoints and evaluates the Governor's statement both as to its immediate and long-range effects.

The column:

NIXON AND ROCKEFELLER

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—With most of the early returns in, it is now clear that Gov. Rockefeller has both helped and hurt Vice President NIXON by coming into the open against him. The help to NIXON is short run. The hurt is long run, which makes it no less serious.

Before examining how this can be, it is well to look into the origin of the Rockefeller statement that started the storm. The question of how Gov. Rockefeller came to say what he said last week in the way he did and when he did, is still being argued by every politician in both parties. The real answer to the question explains how one and the same statement can have been both helpful and hurtful to the Nixon cause.

In brief, then, the large Rockefeller staff has been divided into two camps, and the Governor himself has been assailed with conflicting advice, for many months past. The point at issue was whether to "speak out" (the phrase used in the hidden argument) or not to "speak out."

In other words, the men around Rockefeller have been arguing about whether the Governor should air his real opinions of the Eisenhower administration's policies. He has long regarded the administration's foreign and defense policies as hopelessly unimaginative and dangerously weak. In the same way, he has always considered the administration's social and economic policies as too narrow and backward-looking.

Every practical political consideration weighed against open expression of these opinions. Most of the Rockefeller staff and virtually all the New York Republican leaders were therefore opposed to "speaking out." But the Governor himself wanted to voice his opinions, precisely because they are deeply, even emotionally held opinions.

And the new Rockefeller public relations adviser, Emmet Hughes, who holds the same opinions with equal or greater fervor, also thought the Governor should say what was on his mind.

In the presummit period, the advocates of silence had a point that held the precarious debating balance true. It was the point that the Governor should not attack the administration in the rear, so to say, when the President was just about to embark on negotiations with the Soviets at the highest level.

After the explosion at the summit, however, this point lost all force. The Governor then issued a short comment which in reality foreshadowed the major declaration he made after his breakfast with President Eisenhower. The intervening time period was largely occupied by further staff debate about the nature and the frankness of the planned major declaration. The question, now, was whether to speak out with complete truthfulness. Rockefeller himself finally decided to mince no words; and so the bombshell was thrown.

Thus the timing and character of the Rockefeller statement are revealed as the results, primarily, of two parallel conflicts.

One was the staff conflict already described. The other was the conflict, in the Governor's own mind, between practical political prudence on the one hand and strong personal conviction on the other.

The sweat and turbulence of these inner conflicts were obviously controling, because no cool political schemer could possibly have done what Governor Rockefeller did. Above all, no cool and crafty schemer would have included in the famous statement the personal attack on Vice President NIXON that got all the headlines. The attack was included because both Governor Rockefeller and his public relations adviser have haunting doubts about NIXON'S character and capabilities, doubts which Hughes long ago voiced in public with extreme asperity.

Once this attack on NIXON was included, and after NIXON had met the attack with great dignity and shrewdness, personalities absorbed everyone's attention. It was all Rockefeller versus NIXON, without regard to the larger issues. The whole Republican Party, already committed to nominating the Vice President, at once rallied to NIXON'S side with cries of fury against Rockefeller. Among Republicans—even among Republicans generally sympathetic to the Rockefeller viewpoint—Rockefeller has suffered badly; and NIXON has been helped thereby.

But this shortrun help to NIXON is more than counterbalanced by another feature of the Rockefeller statement. With undeniable sincerity and real authority, Rockefeller has made the case against the Eisenhower administration policies that the Democrats have been too woolly minded or too cautious to make. It is just the case the Democrats are bound to make in the campaign, especially if their nominee is Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. This is the longrun hurt to NIXON. It is painfully felt.

Federal Employee Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a large number of inquiries from Government employees regarding the several health insurance plans being offered those in the Federal service on July 1. Therefore, I have read with interest the series of articles written by Jerry Kluttz and appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Kluttz has attempted to analyze the various policies as they might affect both single persons and those with families.

I believe this information will be of help to a great many Federal employees, especially those outside of Washington, in determining the type of policy to which they may wish to subscribe and I include the articles as part of my remarks:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—I

VENTURE IS WORLD'S LARGEST GROUP INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Federal and District Government employees, with a major financial assist from Uncle Sam, will share health costs for themselves and their families in a truly cooperative venture to start in early July.

Simply stated, they will contribute fixed amounts into pools, pay an estimated 10 percent overhead to about 40 insuring concerns to manage their moneys and provide health services for themselves and their families.

The result will be the world's largest employer-sponsored voluntary group health insurance program. An immediate benefit will be a sharp decline in the time-honored practice of passing the hat among the employees to give financial help to an unfortunate colleague who is suffering from a costly and bankrupting illness.

An estimated 4 million persons, 1.8 million employees and 2.2 million dependents, including roughly 500,000 in the Washington area, are expected to be covered in the $250 million-a-year project which will be administered by the Civil Service Commission.

More than 2 million regular, full-time employees will be eligible to participate in the vast undertaking, and CSC estimates that 90 percent of them will take advantage of it.

Uncle Sam will pay an estimated $115 million annually toward the cost of the extensive program, up to a maximum of half of the employee's cost, thereby making Federal jobs and careers more attractive by reducing health insurance costs to employees and their families.

The late Senator Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, author of the health law which was approved last September, declared at the time that the program would become a "milestone" among employee fringe benefits and one of the most attractive features of working for the Government.

CSC Chairman Roger W. Jones shares the view, declaring that the program is a "significant addition to the attractiveness of Federal employment," and he has expressed the hope that employees will participate 100 percent in it.

The Government-sponsored program will open up new fields and have major impacts on other employees, both public and private, as well as on the health insurance industry and hospital and medical services here and elsewhere.

For example:

Employees will be given a choice of plans, a rarity for any group insurance program, which are usually offered on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. In the process, the health insurance industry and other employers will be given a good idea for the first time of what a large bloc of intelligent workers desires in the way of health coverage.

Other employers and employees are watching the Federal program as it unfolds, particularly those in State, county, and municipal governments.

The Dominion of Canada has set up a health program for its employees, also effective July 1. Bills were introduced this year in the State Legislatures of California and Hawaii to set up health benefits for their employees, modeled after the Federal program.

Other States, counties, and cities as well as private employers have shown an interest in the Federal health venture. New York is the only State that has a similar group contributory health plan for its employees.

Hundreds of employers in the Washington area and elsewhere will be affected by the Federal operation. They have employes who will be covered by the program because either their spouses or parents work for Uncle Sam and are eligible for health benefits as dependents.

Low-pressure methods are being used to explain the program to Government workers, and, if successful, they can revolutionize selling techniques of responsible health carriers.

Each Federal employee will be given a factual brochure on each plan for which he is eligible. CSC has advised employees to make their selections from the facts as set forth in the official documents. The brochures give equal prominence to health costs that are fully covered, partly covered, and not covered. In other words, the shortcomings as well as the benefits of each plan are given equal emphasis, a fresh approach for many insuring concerns.

CSC not only has frowned on, but it has caused some organizations to withdraw material, other than the brochures, which smacked of high-pressure selling tactics by failing to give all the facts to employees.

The Federal program is certain to step up the use of health services, hospitals, doctors, etc.

An estimated 70 percent of the eligible employees now carry some sort of health insurance, much of it for themselves only, and they must pay the full cost. Therefore, the Federal program doesn't fill a complete void.

Nevertheless, many thousands of employees who will get coverage under the Government plan are unable, because of health conditions, to buy coverage in the open market. They are those who have suffered heart attacks and who have chronic illnesses of one kind or another.

Many have had their private policies canceled following payments of large claims by insuring concerns. It follows that those in this poor risk category will make above-average use of medical services.

Furthermore, relatively few employees, probably fewer than 5 percent, carry insurance to cover costs of long and costly illnesses.

Protection against the heavy costs of cancer, heart conditions, polio, and other lingering illnesses that lead to family bankruptcies is one of the outstanding features of most of the approved plans. Employees and their dependents will be more inclined to avail themselves of health services which many of them now avoid for fear of their cost.

Some employees, not nearly as many as were expected, have postponed their retirements to August 1 and later to become eligible for the health program which they can carry into retirement with no increase in costs.

Finally, Congress is expected to approve, next year if not this year, a bill to set up a similar health program for an estimated 415,000 civil service retirees and survivors. The bill has unanimous approval of the Senate and is awaiting action of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—II

NEW FEATURES OF INSURANCE PROGRAM INCLUDE 16-MONTH RATE FREEZE

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Many appealing features, generally new to the health insurance field, are carried in the Federal employee health program which will become effective in early July.

With Uncle Sam blazing the trail, workers in private industry and in other governments will seek similar benefits from their employers. Insuring concerns may offer them at a price, if a public demand develops for them.

These features as well as certain other guarantees and conditions are identical in all of the Federal plans even though the plans vary widely as to benefits, coverage, and cost. They are:

Rates are frozen for 16 months in a time of rapidly rising health costs. They can't be changed before November 1, 1961, even if some of the insuring concerns lose money on them. This means the premiums paid by Federal employees will be better bargains as rates continue their inevitable rise in the health insurance industry.

Employees who retire on immediate annuities after 12 years of service or for dis-

ability on or after the first day the system becomes effective can continue coverage for themselves and their dependents at no added cost and with the same benefits. A recent study shows that health costs of retirees are double to triple those of active workers.

Furthermore, the survivors of retirees will have the privilege of continuing coverage at the same rates paid by active workers. This same benefit will be extended to the families of employees who die while actively employed, provided they're eligible for Civil Service or other Federal survivor benefits which require a minimum of 5 years of civilian service.

In cases where employees die with less than that amount of service, the families will have the option of converting to individual policies with the same insuring firm. In either case, if there is only one eligible survivor, family coverage will automatically be changed to an individual policy.

Uncle Sam will continue to pay up to half of the health insurance cost of both retirees and survivors who are paid CS or other annuity benefits. Retiree and survivor shares of costs will be deducted from their monthly benefits paid from the CS or other retirement fund.

No regular, full-time employee can be denied coverage because of age, sex, race, physical condition, or occupation. The worst possible health risk, says a 70-year-old who has recently contracted cancer and who has a hazardous job is just as eligible as a healthy 18-year-old file clerk. No physical test or standard is required for coverage.

No waiting period for benefits, even in maternity cases. Employees and their dependents will be eligible for limited benefits even if they're hospitalized on the day the program becomes effective.

Maternity cases are one of the single largest causes of hospitalization. The wife of an employee or working wife can be paid maternity benefits if she has a baby on the first day her particular plan becomes effective.

A covered employee who leaves Government service for any reason other than retirement on an immediate annuity will have 31 days to convert to a policy with the same firm that handles his Government policy. This conversion right is guaranteed the employee and his dependents.

Equally important are the facts that the insuring companies can't require either the former employees or their dependents to pass physicals to get the converted policies, and they're forbidden to cancel the converted policies except for fraud, overinsurance, or nonpayment of premium.

The policies, of course, will be more expensive as the Government will not contribute to their cost but they won't cost more than the general public is required to pay.

During the 31 days the former employees will have to convert to individual policies, they and their dependents will have free coverage under the Government system.

Also, if either the former employee or a covered dependent is hospitalized at the end of the 31-day grace period, the benefits of his Government plan will be extended to cover the period of hospitalization, or 60 additional days, whichever comes sooner, all at no cost to him.

An employee who goes on leave without pay will have his coverage and that of his family continued for up to a full year without charge to him.

The insuring company is forbidden to cancel the policy of any employee or any member of his family because of health reasons or because of the amounts of benefits used.

However, the employee may cancel at any time. All he needs to do is to get form 2809 from his personnel office, fill it out and file it with that office. Those who drop the insurance can't switch to another policy or get a chance to buy it again until November 1961.

Family coverage must include the employee's spouse, all unmarried children under 19 and children over 19 who are incapable of self-support because of a disability which began before age 19. A medical certificate for children 19 or over must be filed with your personnel office before they are eligible for benefits.

Most of the plans will offer favorable rates for the continued coverage of unmarried children as they reach age 19. The law does not permit parents and other family members to be covered even though they're entirely dependent on children who are in the Federal service.

Two types of coverage will be offered, one for individuals and the other for families. A "family" consists of one or more dependents. The program offers no lower rate for the parent and child or the employee and spouse, cases of only one dependent. And it doesn't compel an employee with a house full of children to pay a higher rate.

Husbands and wives who both work for Uncle Sam will have the option of either buying individual policies or having the husband or wife subscribe for a family policy; the husband, however, can buy it at a lower cost than his wife who must pay a higher rate because her husband isn't dependent on her. A single employee who marries after July 1 may have his policy broadened to the family type.

If any approved plan is terminated for any reason, all of the employees in it will have the opportunity to join another plan without loss of coverage. The employee who transfers from one agency to another will have coverage continued without change.

The program will be effective for each employee at the start of his first pay period after June 30 or from July 1 through July 12.

The benefits cited above are all costly and they have been computed in the premiums the employees must pay. Many of the liberal features in the new Government program are unavailable to the public and this makes it difficult to compare them with features of other policies.

Federal Employee Health Plan—III

Thirty-eight different programs, including 10 of unions, approved by CSC

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Thirty-eight different plans have been approved by the Civil Service Commisison for participation in the big Federal employee health program to become effective early next month.

They differ widely as to benefits, costs, coverage, and other features.

Regular full-time employees will have a choice of the two Government-wide plans and perhaps others. The service plan is backed by Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the indemnity package by the Aetna Life Insurance Co.

In the Washington area, all eligible employees will have a third choice, a prepaid plan offered by Group Health Association, Inc. Additional information on these three plans and how they function will appear here in articles to follow.

Other approved plans are sponsored by employee unions and organizations with coverage limited to their members, and various local comprehensive health programs which are designed primarily to serve people who live in areas served by them.

The two Government-wide and many of the other plans will give employees a choice of low and high options. The high option in all cases will cost more but it provides broader benefits.

Uncle Sam will contribute as much as 50 percent of the cost of many approved plans. Overall, his share will be approximately $115 million annually, or about 46 percent of the estimated entire cost of $250 million.

By law, the dollar amounts the Government can contribute toward the cost of any plan selected by an employee are maximums of $1.30 for each biweekly pay period for self only, $3.12 for family coverage, and $1.82 for a working wife with a nondependent husband.

Plans which agencies helped to set up earlier for the protection of their employees are being continued:

American Foreign Service Protective Association, which is available to foreign service employees in State, U.S. Information Agency, and International Cooperation Administration. Its plan is underwritten by Mutual of Omaha.

Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency plans, both backed by Mutual of Omaha. (For "security" reasons, these plans are not published.)

Special Agents Mutual Benefit Association, restricted to FBI employees, and handled by Prudential Insurance Co.

Group Health Insurance Board is operated by employees in the Panama Canal Zone and underwritten by Mutual of Omaha.

Besides Group Health Association, Inc., here, CSC has approved 20 other comprehensive plans, mainly in New York City and on the west coast.

Ten union plans have CSC clearance and each sponsoring organization is enthusiastic over them. Their officials hope to use them to increase and stabilize their memberships.

Unions without their own plans are resentful over this tactic. In fact, AFL–CIO's National Association of Special Delivery Messengers has accused the AFL–CIO's Letter Carriers of using its health plan to try to raid its membership. Other unions have protested to CSC over the use of health plans as a recruiting device by competing organizations.

Three other AFL–CIO unions that have plans of their own have joined with the Special Delivery Messengers to accuse the Letter Carriers of a "completely inexcusable raiding tactic" by opening up its membership to "associate members" who aren't letter carriers. Associates would be eligible for the Letter Carriers' self-insured health plan. The four unions have called on AFL–CIO President George Meany to stop the expansion proposal of the Letter Carriers.

It is clear that Congress never intended the plans for other than insuring employees against heavy health costs. It is equally clear, as officials point out, that an employee whose sole interest is in a health plan should consider the cost of union membership which is required before he can buy a union-sponsored plan.

Nevertheless, those unions with solid health programs are sure to become stronger and healthier because of them. If they offer employees a better health package, the unions and their health plans will sell themselves and their memberships will grow.

Since there is no checkoff of union dues in Government, the collection of dues is a constant headache to most organizations. But now the employee's health cost will be withheld from his salary and the union member who buys a union-sponsored plan will want to pay his dues to retain health coverage. This will have the effect of easing union organization and of stabilizing union membership and facilitating dues collections.

But by the same token, unions that offer members below-par health plans could suffer because of them.

In the future, after the 38 different plans have been in operation CSC will publish facts on each of them, such as the percentage of each dollar in premiums paid out in benefits. Government employees are an intelligent group and they would quickly drop any plan, union or not, that pays out below-average benefits.

CSC rules will permit any employee who is expelled or otherwise loses his union mem-

bership and loses his coverage under the union health plan to buy, within 31 days, another plan for which he is qualified.

But an employee who drops his union or any other health plan on his own volition must wait until the first so-called open season, October 1 to 15, 1961, to buy another plan. Switches from one plan to another also can be made at that time. Thereafter, an open season will be held about every 3 years.

These employee unions are offering health plans to their members:

AFL–CIO American Federation of Government Employees, which has over 10,000 members in the Washington area, and it hopes to sign up others before July 1. It has a low-cost plan with Mutual of Omaha as the underwriter.

AFL–CIO's Postal Clerks and Letter Carriers and the independent National Postal Clerks Union each has its own self-insured health plan.

The independent National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, National League of Postmasters, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, and the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, plus AFL–CIO's Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, are all offering members approved plans which are backed by American Standard Insurance Corp. of Indiana.

AFL–CIO's Postal Transport members carry most of their health insurance with the Federal Postal Hospital Association of Kansas City but the association has expanded its operations and it will insure any postal worker.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—IV

U.S. WORKERS ASK MANY QUESTIONS ABOUT NEW INSURANCE PROVISIONS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

"The health program is too costly. It's terribly complicated; we're all confused by it. The insurance companies will get rich from it. Why so many different plans? Which plan gives me the most benefits for the money?"

Federal employees and officials alike are making these comments repeatedly and asking these questions as they prepare to enroll in the new Federal employee health program.

Unfortunately, they are not fully satisfied with the explanations and answers they have been given. In this series we are trying to give you a better understanding of the program and to make it easier for you to choose the plan that best suits your needs. But it is not possible to give every employee answers that will entirely please him.

Some of the confusion over the program is based on misunderstanding that can easily be cleared up.

First, there is the general impression that Uncle Sam will pay a flat 50 percent of the cost of every approved plan selected by an employee. This can't happen under the law.

The maximum the Government can contribute is 50 percent of the employee's cost up to these fixed dollar amounts every 2 weeks: $1.30 for self only; $3.12 for self and family, and $1.82 for woman employee and family which includes a nondependent husband. Overall, Uncle Sam will pay about 46 percent of the program's cost.

Second, numerous employees say they were led to believe that the broad and comprehensive health program would cover all, or nearly all, of their health costs.. Some will cover more expenses than others; none will cover all of them, but nearly all of them provide benefits, as cited in Wednesday's article, that no employee now has in any policy he carries or can buy.

A good example of this latter point is the case of a Pentagon employee with five young children. The family lives in Fairfax. This employee's out-of-pocket cost of health services last year took $1,176 from his $8,000 salary. He's bitterly disappointed, he says, because not a dime of this big bill would be recovered under either of the Government-wide health plans.

His $1,176 costs were largely for drugs, glasses, dentists, checkups, doctor's calls, pediatricians, etc. No hospital or surgical costs were involved.

This employee could subscribe to the plan offered by Group Health Association, Inc., and he could get many of the above services from its clinics. But this family likes their doctors and it would be inconvenient for him and his wife to bring their children to GHA's clinic here.

In search of the plan that's best for them, employees are comparing rates and benefits of the two Government-wide packages and Group Health Association in this area. About 70 percent of them now carry some form of health insurance and they also are comparing what they have now with what's being offered.

Naturally enough, the most questions have been raised about Blue Cross-Blue Shield because it has more Federal employees than any other health insurer. It has 55 million worldwide members and nearly 850,000 here, of whom 367,000 are Federal employees and dependents. The Blue rates to subscribers for its Government-wide plan (with Uncle Sam paying part of the cost) are substantially the same as its present charges to subscribers here. But its benefits and coverage are different in its Government-wide plan.

To a smaller extent, simply because it has fewer employee policyholders, similar doubts have been expressed about the Government-wide plan offered by Aetna Insurance Co. on behalf of the commercial insurance industry.

Yet these two Government-wide plans—of the 38 different plans that have Civil Service Commission approval—have had their rate and benefit structures declared to be fair and equitable by experts both in and out of Government.

Rank-and-file employees may get some reassurance from the fact that the hard-working CSC officials who negotiated these contracts also had their own doubts and misgivings regarding them. These officials are charged by Congress with the heavy responsibility of getting the best possible health insurance bargains for Federal employees.

CSC officials haven't relied solely on their own limited judgments in this matter. They retained Wendell Milliman, a nationally known professional health actuary of Seattle, and he concluded, after a study, that both the Blue and Aetna plans were reasonable and fair. Milliman gave CSC this breakdown of each premium dollar:

The Blues will pay 92.7 cents in benefits; Aetna, 90.6 cents. Each will be allowed a maximum of 5.5 cents for operating expenses. The Blues, nonprofit groups, will pay only three-tenths of a cent in taxes while Aetna will pay 2.4 cents. Aetna is allowed two-tenths of a cent as an expense allowance.

The risk charge, or profit, is 1.5 cents for the Blues but that amount will be renegotiated when a reserve equal to a full month's premiums is built up. Aetna's risk charge is only 1.3 cents and it will be cut to 1 cent when a similar reserve is accumulated. It is entirely possible for both outfits to lose money on the plans. But, of course, both hope they won't.

But it is certain that neither can make more money from their plans than the maximum risk charges allowed in their contracts. If smaller amounts are paid in benefits and if operating expenses are under the fixed maximum allowance of 5.5 percent, the insuring concerns won't pocket the excess but it will be used for the benefit of the insured employees through broader coverage, etc. In other words, the two Government-wide insuring concerns will not be in a position to get rich windfalls from their plans.

Many of the other 36 health plans will be subjected to similar restrictions on costs, profits, etc.

Milliman has his own doubts about the program in general and you should know about them. He expressed "serious concern" over having 38 different plans participate in the program which CSC had to approve under the law.

The unknown factors as, Milliman brought out, having made it unusually difficult to fix rates and benefits on a worldwide basis. Neither the Blues nor Aetna know the number of subscribers they will have and if those they do have will be mainly in the low or high cost areas. Admittedly, the numerous plans complicate the program for all concerned.

This concern is shared by others. In fact, there's solid reason to believe that the Government-wide plans could have offered lower rates and better benefits if there were fewer plans. Others feel the Government should discard all the plans and set up its own self-insured program to give its employees the best protection possible at the lowest possible cost. That, however, is an unlikely possibility in the foreseeable future.

Milliman said that the requirement to continue coverage of those who retire after the program becomes effective at the same rates active employees must pay will "substantially increase" the average cost per insured member over present rates.

He observed that employee savings are not uniform under the Government-wide plans. Both the Blues and Aetna based their premiums on the averaging of costs on a national basis. Therefore, Milliman said, the rates are better for employees in high-cost medical areas and less favorable for those in low-cost areas. Costs in the Washington area are regarded as about the national average.

The Seattle actuary foresees higher premium rates even if present benefits remain unchanged. He said health costs are rising from 5 to 10 percent a year and that the rates of the Blue and Aetna plans may or may not be adequate for a second contract period of 12 months from November 1, 1961.

Finally, attempting to protect the best interest of both Uncle Sam and his employees, CSC is setting up a system to require each of the insuring carriers to supply detailed reports.

The facts supplied will enable CSC, it believes, to detect abuses such as overly long stays in hospitals and excessive doctor and surgeon fees.

This information will be made available to employees and it could have a bearing on their choice of plans after the first 16-month period. CSC is well aware that critics of the program believe that the rate structure is too high and that it will have the effect of inflating health costs with little actual saving to the employee. With Uncle Sam footing part of the bill, some doctors and hospitals may be more disposed to increase their charges. CSC not only has promised to guard against any such tendency but both the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees have given notice that they will investigate reported abuses.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—V

OFFICIAL INSURANCE BROCHURES WORTH CAREFUL STUDY BY U.S. WORKERS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

How should you, the Federal employe, go about selecting the health plan that best suits your needs? You can do it but you must spend some time on it.

By now your agency has supplied you with separate brochures on the two Government-wide plans and the prepaid package offered to Washington area residents by Group Health Association, Inc. Union members also have received brochures of plans sponsored by their organizations.

You have until the end of June to make your decision but the Civil Service Commission urges that you register as soon as you have made up your mind so that you may receive your identification card as soon as possible.

The brochures are official; each was prepared by the CSC. Read and study them with care. The brochures relate in simple and direct language the health expenses and services that are covered, partially covered, and not covered.

Bear in mind that the sponsoring firms will be compelled by CSC to stand behind and to pay off every single benefit listed in their respective brochures which are, in effect, contracts with the employees who subscribe to them. So be sure and save the brochure of the plan you buy; it could come in handy in a later dispute over benefits.

On the other hand, you will be wise to be somewhat skeptical of any information you may have received which attempts to sell you on this or that plan by stressing the best points in it.

CSC not only has frowned on but it has forced the withdrawal of some of the material which was put out either by plan-sponsoring organizations or their friends. Such information is entirely unofficial.

CSC also has cautioned agencies not to use case examples to show how a particular plan would pay off. A slight change in the case facts could make any plan look either good or bad.

To sum up, you can't go wrong, be misled or get the wrong impression by studying the facts in the CSC brochures.

No one, not even a Solomon, can look into the future and say which plan is best for you. You will not need any plan if you and your family can be sure of good health.

But CSC has endeavored to help you make a good selection by passing along these suggestions:

Read the brochures thoroughly * * * ask about any statement you think important but do not understand * * * use the benefits in brief pages for reference and to help you make comparisons with other plans.

Consider your present and probable future health needs such as * * * young and growing family * * * health problems of the middle years * * * nearing retirement * * * frequent moves or travel * * * planning to leave this area permanently * * * and, any special known health problem.

Consider each plan's provisions for such items as * * * hospital room and board—how much; what limits; what provisions for more * * *. Doctor's services—what kinds; by whom; at what rates * * *. Maternity care—what hospital benefits; what doctor's care * * *. Other services and supplies—what is included and excluded, to what extent, and under what conditions?

Think about the importance you attach to such features as * * * choice of doctors * * * preventive care * * * locations at which care is provided * * * direct payments by the plan to doctor or hospital * * * coverage of expenses from the beginning of an illness * * * away-from-home and emergency services, and benefits for specific conditions requiring long-term or other expensive care or treatment.

Consider the cost in the light of your conclusions about the above and what you can afford.

Make your choice and enroll promptly.

Personally, I believe that's sound advice. Your study will easily reveal the weaknesses as well as the strong points in each of the plans. And it is not too difficult to spot them.

Incidentally, an official of the Justice Department, an attorney, is demanding the CSC supply the Department with a copy of each of the Government-wide contracts. He wants to read them himself so he can be in a better position to advise his employees on the various features in them.

The official believes CSC should supply each agency with copies of the contracts and that any employee should have the right to examine them.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—VI

CHANGES LIKELY IN PROPOSED FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Significant changes are brewing in the Federal employee health insurance program even before it officially starts.

Indirectly, they could easily lead to improved retirement and life insurance systems and other fringe benefits for Government employees.

Some of the liberal revisions foreseen in the future include:

Payment by Uncle Sam of a greater share of the cost of the program.

Health coverage of survivors of employees who have less than 5 years of service.

A new program to cover retirees and survivors now on the rolls.

A realinement of the rate structure to include in the family rate working wives who have nondependent husbands.

Wider benefits to include preventive medicine, broader coverage of oral surgery, etc.

The cost of the program to the employee, now an issue, will become even more controversial as charges for health services continue their inevitable rise and as private employers pay a greater share of the cost of health coverage for their employees.

The steel strike settlement, for example, requires the steel companies to pay the entire cost of life and health insurance programs for their employees. A growing number of concerns are paying a greater share of employee insurance costs than the Government is.

A group of career employees and officials, at an informal meeting recently, foresaw the not-too-distant time when the Government will finance the full cost of a life insurance policy that will be double the employee's annual salary, and 75 percent of an even broader comprehensive health plan for the employee and his dependents.

The life and health programs are closely related and modifications for one cannot be made without considering the effect on the other.

Under the present law, active employees, in effect, must pay part of the health cost of retirees, and this cost will rise rapidly as more employees retire. Therefore, the question arises whether the Government isn't obligated to pay a heavier share of these costs. The only alternative is higher rates for active employees.

Congress set the policy in this matter when it wrote into the law that those who retire after the program becomes effective can continue coverage at the same rates paid by active employees even though the cost is several times greater for elderly persons.

The new employee health program does not continue coverage for families of employees who die with less than 5 years of civilian service. In such cases, however, the survivors have the option of converting to individual policies.

The 5-year provision of the health plan has a direct tie-in with the civil service retirement system. Retiree and survivor share of health costs are to be withheld from their monthly benefit checks paid by the retirement fund.

Otherwise, CSC would have no way to collect the premiums. But before any benefit can be paid from that fund the employee involved must have had a minimum of 5 years of civilian service.

The health program will increase the pressure on the Government to lower the 5-year rule for retirement and health benefits for survivors.

One answer is coordination of the CS retirement system with social security's old-age and survivors insurance which provides better survivor protection for short-term employees and their families. The Eisenhower administration, CSC, and OASI all look with favor on this general approach.

If the Forand bill or something similar to it is enacted into law to provide health benefits for elderly social security recipients, the demand for lowering the 5-year restriction for Federal employees will be even greater. That measure has no similar provision.

Furthermore, the wide public and political support to provide health care for the aged makes inevitable the approval of S. 2575, the Senate-approved bill by the late Senator Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, to set up a health program for upward of 415,000 CS retirees and survivors now on the rolls. The legislation is before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The administration opposes it in its present form.

CSC has been deluged with mail and phone calls on the health program. Many of them are from working wives who protest the higher rates they must pay for their nondependent husbands. These women say they're being discriminated against because of their sex; that they should be permitted to receive the same Government contribution as male employees.

The appeal by the women has been heard on Capitol Hill where Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, Kansas, and Representative DANIEL K. INOUYE, Democrat, Hawaii, are sponsoring bills to allow them to receive the same Government contribution as male workers. CARLSON is optimistic about approval of the bill next year.

Another group also is being heard from—the employee with a single dependent who feels he shouldn't be required to pay the same rate as an employee with half a dozen or so dependents. Group Health Association, Inc., and other insuring groups see their point and hope to be able to offer a special rate for them at the start of the next contract period, November 1, 1961.

Such a program is bound to be improved in time.

For example, officials are confident that the Government-wide plans of the future will stress preventive medicine and will pay a substantial part of the cost of physical checkups, etc.

Several plans that have CSC approval offer preventive medicine features, including GHA in this area. The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and Group Health Insurance of New York show that preventive medicine pays off. Their members spend about 20 percent fewer days in the hospital each year than members of different plans.

CSC officials have expanded coverage of oral surgery and mental health near the top of lists of improved benefits they will seek in the second contract.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN—VII

ANSWERS TO READERS' KEY QUESTIONS ON GOVERNMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Answers to some of your many questions on the big new Federal employee health program:

Contracts for each of the 38 different plans are signed and sealed. Civil Service Commission can't make changes in them during the 16-month contract period. Besides, Congress would have to amend the law to provide some of the liberal modifications being demanded by employees.

Each of the 2 million qualified employees must fill out a registration form. You must either select one of the plans you're qualified for or else go on written record as rejecting participation in the program. The latter is required as proof every employee had the opportunity to enroll.

Reemployed retirees are eligible to participate provided they meet the same conditions as required for other employees. They're ineligible, for example, if their appointments are for a year or less. Also, in order to continue their coverage when they again retire they must have earned a new or supplemental annuity.

The law limits each employee to a single health plan in the Government program; however, numerous employees say they plan to retain policies with outside insuring concerns. Those who do should first study carefully any restrictions on double coverage in their contracts.

The two Government-wide plans, underwritten by Blue Cross-Blue Shield and Aetna Insurance Co., will limit payment of benefits if by reason of law or employment the employee or dependent collects benefits for the same expenses from another policy. Aetna applies this limitation to its entire plan while Blue Cross-Blue Shield has it only on its so-called supplemental benefits.

Examples of how these restrictions could apply: An employee covered by Medicare through her husband who is in the Armed Forces, and an employee whose spouse works in a private industry and who is covered by the dependency provision of the industrial plan.

Other approved Government plans either have different or no restrictions on double coverage. Double coverage doesn't include insurance for the loss of income.

In general, none of the plans will pay for the illnesses or injuries covered by Labor's Bureau of Employees Compensation which administers workman's compensation in Government.

Also, employees who are treated at VA, Public Health, military and other Government hospitals can be reimbursed for only those covered expenses for which they're required to pay.

Two conditions apply to continuing coverage after retirement and they are: (1) You must retire on an immediate annuity after 12 or more years of service or for disability; (2) you must have been covered for 5 years immediately preceding your retirement, or you must have been enrolled in an approved plan from the beginning of the program.

Under this latter provision, an otherwise qualified employee can enroll now and retire the very first day the program is effective, early next month, and have continued coverage at no increase in rates.

Aetna has worked out an agreement with the hospitals to admit, without advance payments, any of its subscribers who display their identification cards. The insurance firm will guarantee payment to the hospitals while it checks on eligibility and coverage. It will also arrange to make direct payments to the hospitals for its clients. The Blues have a similar arrangement of working with both hospitals and doctors.

If you aren't a member now, you can join the AFL–CIO's American Federation of Government Employees and subscribe to its health plan. You can get a copy of the AFGE health plan brochure from either your personnel office or by calling the union's headquarters here.

In studying the Blue plan, bear in mind these two key points: Basic benefits for hospital and surgical-medical care do not have a deductible. The deductible, $100 for the low option and $200 for the high option, applies only to supplemental benefits.

Also, some features of the Blue plan are based on family income. Let's say your family income exceeds the limit, you have an operation and the surgeon charges you $200 more than you're allowed under the fee schedule. The $200 excess is then included as an expense for supplemental benefits and part of it will be paid, too.

The Blues have no direct control over the fees charged by doctors but in most cases, its officials say, the doctors will accept as full payment the amounts set forth in their fee schedules. That may not happen in your case, however.

Group Health Association, Inc., has two health centers, one in the downtown area and the other in Takoma Park. It's planning two others, in the Southwest redevelopment area and in Falls Church. But the Virginia law may be changed before the Falls Church clinic can be established. GHA is hopeful of that being done next year.

But the Blues and Aetna are setting up extensive machinery to administer their Government-wide plans. The Blues are setting up temporarily in Harrisburg, Pa., an electronic processing unit to handle the vast amount of paperwork that will be involved. Eventually, this entire unit will be moved here.

Aetna has 155 claims offices all over the Nation, and it is training people to handle Federal employee claims in all of them. All of the participating insuring groups, in fact, are stressing speedy service to Government employees.

The Blues' fee schedule for the Washington area is correct as printed and distributed to you. This is the only plan where some cost allowances under the cheaper low option are greater than those under the high option.

For diagnostic X-ray of ribs, $12 is allowed under the high and $15 under the low option. For fingers, the allowances are $5 and $7.50, respectively, and for gall bladder, $20 and $25. Officials of the Blues explained the figures were arrived at by averaging the costs of fees charged for those services.

An employee who is separated or divorced can provide for his children under 19 under the health plan even if they don't live with him.

A woman employee will have to cover her separated husband even if she doesn't care to if she subscribes to a family plan to protect her children who live with her. And she will have to pay the higher rate since her separated husband isn't dependent on her.

Should the Interest Rate Ceiling Be Removed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles E. Walker, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury has written an excellent article concerning the interest-rate ceiling on new issues of marketable Treasury bonds. Mr. Walker has served as an economic consultant to the Secretary since 1959 and he has taught economics at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and at the University of Texas.

Mr. Walker's timely article, "Should the Interest Rate Ceiling be Removed?" appearing in the May issue of the Tax Foundation's Tax Review presents cogent reasons for removal of this restrictive and archaic obstacle to effective debt management. I urge my colleagues to study this matter carefully and under unanimous consent I include Mr. Walker's article in the Appendix to the RECORD:

SHOULD THE INTEREST RATE CEILING BE REMOVED?

(By Charles E. Walker, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury)

Treasury debt management today is the weakest weapon in the Federal Government's arsenal of financial policies to promote sustainable economic growth, and the Federal debt grows shorter and shorter in maturity. The facts behind this situation are these. A 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on new issues of marketable Treasury bonds, established in 1918 in connection with a particular financing operation of World War I, has effectively prevented the Treasury from selling more than a token amount of long-term securities for almost a year. Through no choice of its own, the Treasury has had to rely almost completely on new issues of notes, certificates, and bills—securities that mature in five years or less and on which no interest rate ceiling applies.

There are four major arguments for removal of the ceiling. In the first place, forced reliance on short-term financing contributes to further shortening of a marketable debt that is already much too short in maturity. Today, almost 80 percent of the marketable debt matures within five years; this figure contrasts with 50 percent in 1946 and 67 percent at the end of 1952. Most of the shortening in the debt during the postwar period occurred between 1946 and the end of 1952, during which time the Treasury sold only $5.2 billion of marketable issues of more than 5 years' maturity. Since the end of 1952, $49½ billion of over 5-year securities have been marketed. But despite these determined efforts during the past 7 years, the passage of time has moved more and more securities closer to maturity. Moreover, if the marketable debt does not change and no securities of more than 5 years' maturity are issued, the under 5-year debt will swell to 87 percent of the total by the end of 1964.

Debt-lengthening must, therefore, continue to be a high priority goal of Treasury debt management. Otherwise the average length of the debt will grow shorter and shorter, and Treasury refunding operations will occur more frequently and in larger amounts. This will not only tend to disrupt the Government securities market, but will also complicate the flexible administration of Federal Reserve credit policy. The relentless shortening in the public debt cannot be viewed with complacency.

Progressive shortening in the maturity of the public debt has another important implication, which leads to the second major argument for removal of the ceiling. It is universally agreed the unbridled creation of new money to finance government deficits or to pay off maturing issues would result in disastrous inflation. But apparently too few people realize that excessive reliance on short-term issues in debt management can also exert strong inflationary pressures. This is because the shorter the term of a government security, the more like money it is. A 25-year Treasury bond is a true investment instrument, but a Government security maturing within a few days is almost the same as cash. Similarly, a security maturing within a few weeks, a few months, or even a year or two automatically turns into cash within a relatively short period of time. Thus, a large build-up in short-dated Government securities increases the inflationary potential embodied in the Government debt; holders can easily liquidate short-term securities to obtain cash for spending for goods and services, either by selling the securities or by simply letting them run off at maturity.

Federal fiscal and monetary policies have been used effectively in recent months to

contain the inflationary pressures that, although sometimes dormant, are always present in a prosperous economy. But because of the interest rate ceiling, Treasury debt management has actually contributed to the inflationary potential in the economy.

A third major argument for removing the interest rate ceiling arises from the distortions in credit markets that result from confining Government financing to short-term securities. Even though the Government is now operating with a balanced budget, the Treasury must turn over $70 to $80 billion of marketable securities each year. The confinement of so huge an amount of financing to securities of less than 5 years' maturity—and this will be the inevitable result if interest rates do not decline significantly from present levels and the ceiling is not removed—may add unduly to pressure on the short-term market. Thus, short-term interest rates would be higher than otherwise would be the case, and the availability of credit to private short-term borrowers—particularly consumers, small businesses, and farmers, all of whom rely heavily on short-term credit—would be curtailed. Moreover, experience last autumn indicated clearly that such distortions can contribute to severe drain on savings institutions, as customers withdraw money to buy high-yielding securities. This in turn may unduly restrict the flow of savings into home construction and other long-term projects.

Finally, experience during the past year indicates that the interest rate ceiling has caused interest on the public debt to be higher. Knowledgeable market observers estimate that the arbitrary confinement of Treasury financing to short-term securities has caused short-term interest rates to average one-fourth to one-half of 1 percent higher than if the Treasury had been free to spread its borrowing over a wider range. This additional interest, when applied to the $70 billion to $80 billion of securities that must be turned over each year, increases Government spending by some $200 million to $400 million.

CEILING PRESCRIBES MARKET'S AREA

What are the arguments that have been presented by those who oppose removal of the ceiling? The first and most familiar argument is that removal of the ceiling would cause interest rates in general to rise. But if the ceiling were truly effective in holding down rates, it would be logical to expect rates on outstanding Government bonds to remain below the ceiling. During most of the past year, however, such yields have exceeded 4¼ percent.

The fact is, of course, no Government-decreed interest rate ceiling can prevent forces of demand and supply from exerting their effects so long as credit markets are free. Quotations on outstanding Government securities that are the product of each day's free market trading among thousands of holders of Government securities cannot be repealed by Treasury or congressional fiat. If interest rates are to be controlled then the actions of lenders, borrowers, and all market participants must be controlled. But so long as the basic freedom or the marketplace is maintained and direct controls are not used, interest rates—or the price of borrowed money—will continue to reflect changes in the basic forces of demand and supply, including the impact of flexible monetary policies.

Rather than preventing interest rates from responding to market forces, the real effect of the ceiling is to prescribe the area of the market in which the Treasury can borrow. President Eisenhower put the matter succinctly in a special message to Congress last summer. He said, "To prohibit the Treasury from paying the market price for long-term money is just as impracticable as telling the Defense Department that it cannot pay the fair market price for a piece of equipment. The result would be the same in either case; the Government could not get what it needs."

NO GUARANTEE OF BENEFITS TO BANKS

As a corollary to this argument, some of those who oppose removal of the ceiling argue that such action would only serve to enrich the large financial institutions of the Nation. This view is basically in error because interest rates, as noted above, are not determined by Government edict but by forces of demand and supply; in and of itself, removal of the ceiling would not cause interest rates to rise. But even when interest rates do increase, it does not follow that the financial institutions themselves receive all of the benefit. Many of the large lending institutions in this country are mutual in nature, and a substantial portion of the rise in interest rates has been passed on to the saver.

Although commercial banks are not mutual institutions, it is important to understand that their current earnings would tend to fall rather than rise if the ceiling is removed. This is because the vast preponderance of commercial bank loans and investments are of relatively short maturity; for example, the average bank loan is estimated to mature in about 2 years and the Government securities banks hold have an average maturity of only 3½ years. A principal effect of the interest rate ceiling is to force short-term interest rates to higher levels than would otherwise prevail, since the Treasury must arbitrarily confine its financing to the less than 5-year maturity range. As short-term rates rise, including rates on bank loans and short-term Government securities, the current earnings of banks also expand. But if the Teasury could prudently spread its borrowing over a wider maturity range, pressure on short-term rates would be eased, and bank current earnings would tend to be less than would otherwise be the case.

A second argument sometimes made against removal of the interest rate ceiling is that, in so doing, Congress would in effect be relinquishing its historic right to determine the general terms of long-term bonds issued by the Treasury.

To determine general terms of new issues is one thing, but to lock the Treasury firmly into the short-term market is another. Rather than determining the general terms of new bond issues, Congress, in failing to remove the ceiling, is in effect flatly prohibiting any significant debt-lengthening through sale of long-term issues. The Treasury is responsible for the management of our $290 billion public debt; that is precisely where the responsibility should rest. But by insisting on retention of the interest rate ceiling, the Congress is denying the Treasury the essential tools for sound, noninflationary debt management.

REFORMS WOULDN'T HELP

According to a third argument, the interest rate ceiling should indeed be removed, but only if the Treasury first agrees to instituting some so-called reforms in its debt management operations. Such reforms include abolition of the committees of commercial bankers, investment bankers, and others that commonly advise the Treasury with respect to financings; sale of intermediate- and long-term securities at public auction; issuance of bonds with relatively early call provisions; and a signification of the intent of the Treasury to market long-term securities only when interest rates are relatively low. The proponents of these first three reforms maintain that their inauguration would probably permit the Treasury to sell bonds at lower interest rates than now prevail and, as a result, the removal of the ceiling would not be necessary.

The Treasury believes that just the reverse is true. If, for example, the Treasury's periodic consultations with advisory committees were discontinued—a practice, incidentally, that was started by Secretary Morgenthau in 1942—the Treasury would be foregoing the opportunity of obtaining firsthand and expert information on the Government securities market. Its only alternative, therefore, would be to price securities more liberally—to offer somewhat higher interest rates than otherwise—in order to make certain that a particular financing did not fail. This void of information could not be filled by increasing the Treasury's debt management staff; the type of information that is obtained from the advisory committees can only be provided by individuals who operate daily in the Government securities market. By consulting with these committees, the Treasury obtains accurate and firsthand reports on the attitudes of the thousands of potential buyers of Government securities.

Moreover, it is important to emphasize that Treasury officials, in approaching a financing decision, talk to scores of individuals all over the country; in fact, these contacts are maintained on a more or less continuous basis. The Treasury also engages in intensive studies and analysis on its own. By the time the advisory committees are called in, responsible Treasury officials have already carefully considered the many alternatives involved. And in every case. All that the Treasury obtains from the committees, and other contacts, is advice: the final decision is made solely by the responsible Treasury officials.

RATE MOVEMENTS UNPREDICTABLE

Similarly, it is the Treasury's judgment that extension of the auction technique to securities other than Treasury bills in the near future would result in higher—rather than lower—interest rates on Government securities. This is primarily because the market for new long-term securities would be significantly narrowed, inasmuch as many long-term investors would be reluctant to incur the risk of submitting bids in auctions, but would prefer to purchase the securities later in the market.

The case is even stronger that the use of relatively early call features on Treasury bonds would result in higher initial interest costs to the Treasury. An investor will be willing to purchase a new 25-year Treasury bond, callable, say, in 5 years, only if the initial interest rate is sufficiently high to warrant his taking the risk of an early call. Still, call features, if properly constructed, may save interest costs for the Government over the long run. It is primarily for this reason that the most recently offered Treasury bond—the 25-year, 4¼-percent issue sold last month—included a 15-year call feature. By extending the call feature to 15 years—several years longer than prevails with respect to corporate issues—the Treasury believed that the initial attractiveness of the security was not affected.

Although the suggestion that the Treasury market long-term bonds only when interest rates are low appears, on the surface, to have considerable merit, it is important to understand that this suggestion is tantamount to recommending that the Treasury ignore the state of the economy in its debt management decisions. This is because long-term interest rates usually fall to their lowest levels during business recessions. If the Treasury sold large amounts of long-term bonds during such periods, it would run the serious risk of absorbing long-term funds that would otherwise be used to finance homebuilding, State and local government projects, and business capital expenditures. Such a policy would, of course, impede recovery and might even intensify recessionary pressures. Minimization of interest rates, therefore, cannot be accepted as the overriding goal of Treasury debt management.

The decline in interest rates earlier this year—which has since been reversed at least

temporarily by market forces of demand and supply—apparently convinced some people that there was no longer any reason for removal of the ceiling. This view is and was wholly unwarranted. The very decline in interest rates earlier in the year, in contrast to widely held expectations to the contrary, is convincing evidence that interest rate movements are quite unpredictable. The Treasury has no way of knowing which direction interest rates will move in the future, simply because it cannot accurately predict the outcome of the millions of individual decisions which, in a free economy, actually determine interest rates. Interest rates may stay close to present levels, they may go up, or they may go down. Unless they decline considerably from present levels, the Treasury will continue to be locked into the less than 5-year sector of the market.

The problem of the interest rate ceiling is not a short-run, transitory problem, nor should it be approached on a partisan basis. The ceiling, if not removed, can continue to obstruct debt management through many administrations in the future. In the interest of sound debt management—which means in the public interest—the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling should be removed permanently and as soon as possible.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 11, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, June 11, 1960)

The Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 passed after spirited debate and controversial differences of views. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, responsible for taxation and the public debt, I participated in presenting and supporting the bill. A temporary $8 billion increase to the permanent debt limit of $285 billion was asked by the administration to keep the Government solvent. The $8 billion replaces the present $10 billion temporary increase voted earlier. (Note—This is not the total debt—contingent liabilities of the Federal Government are not included.) This temporary debt increase is requested rather than a permanent increase in the hope that ultimately revenue will exceed income and a permanent increase will not be necessary. Either type, however, permanent or temporary, is caused by the need for money to pay the bills which Congress has run up. So the effort of some Members to combat increased expenditures by holding down the debt limit is no more logical than refusing to pay your charge accounts when they come due because you don't want to spend more. Reducing the spending in the first place is the way to keep your debts down in personal affairs, business, and government finance. Equally illogical is the proposal by some to reduce the debt by lowering the debt ceiling on the one hand while voting for more spending on the other. It really is not a complicated proposition.

The extension of the Korean taxes (corporation tax, 47 to 52 percent, equaling $2.5 billion annually, and alcohol, wine, tobacco, manufacturer's excises, etc., $1.5 billion annually) including telephone and transportation excises is still a necessary evil and was passed—why? For the same reason—big spending. If we do not pay as we go, that is, impose current taxes to pay for current spending, then we inflate the currency through deficit financing and simply water everyone's savings and salaries—again quite simple. Yet some Members would yield to constituent demands to cut this or that tax, forgetting the tax burden then must be transferred to other areas and people, undoubtedly themselves in another form.

The questions to be resolved are: (1) Should we cut Federal spending? (Answer: Yes—particularly welfare programs); (2) Should we have a tax cut? (Answer: Yes); (3) What kind of tax cut? (Answer: Income tax rate adjustment as well as excise tax cuts); (4) Should debt reduction come first, before a tax cut? (Answer: Yes—out of respect for future generations and sound fiscal policy). We can, should, and must have debt reduction and tax cuts—but they must be real—not political illusions coupled with deficit financing and inflation. We will have real cuts only when people demand them and demand the reduced Federal spending which can make them possible.

Congress (and I'll speak specifically of the House) does its work largely through committees whose function it is to study controversial bills (each committee assigned a specific area of jurisdiction) and to report their findings, for or against, to the House as a whole. Short of this orderly committee process, Members of the House couldn't begin to assemble, each for himself, the information necessary to proper consideration of the hundreds of bills handled at each session. Each committee then is a creature of the House and is normally an invaluable tool in the legislative process. However, it is also possible (as sometimes happens) for a committee to frustrate the will of the House which created it by interminably delaying committee action on a bill in which there is general interest or even by altogether refusing to consider a bill, year after year. To prevent any such crippling of the power of Congress to act when most Members are willing and ready to debate and vote—and after the appropriate committee has had ample opportunity to study and report on a bill—a House rule provides that a bill may be removed from a committee's jurisdiction and brought directly to the floor for argument if a majority (219) sign a "discharge petition." It's a rule which certainly should be invoked but rarely, and one which can pose a moral problem for a Member who may even be against a particular bill but resent a committee's obstinate refusal even to let the House discuss and vote on it.

The home rule bill for the District of Columbia precisely illustrates the point. It happens that I am opposed to this bill for a number of reasons. (1) Washington, D.C., as the National Capital, is the home of the Federal Government. It is not like any other city, it belongs to the Nation, not the residents. (2) It is a shrine of our national history for our people to visit, with monuments and relics to be preserved. (3) It is the residence of many foreign sovereign nations in embassies where the exchange of international rights is involved. Nevertheless, I am equally disturbed over the flat refusal of a subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee to report out a bill or even to discuss one on a subject in which every Member of Congress has a considerable interest one way or the other. Is the Nation to be governed in this respect by a handful of men on a single subcommittee?

The year's wrap-up of Congress before adjournment (or recess) may well include these major items—minimum wage increase, foreign aid appropriation, aid to education, another housing bill, farm subsidy, and social security revisions.

Communism—What It Means and How It Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "the Veterans of Foreign Wars has often been referred to as an ever-green organization—self-perpetuating—always growing with the seasons." The VFW is kept alive by the succeeding generations of men who have defended our Nation. One such devoted comrade, who has long been active in the affairs of this loyal, patriotic group, is Mr. James Weber, past commander of the Ohio Seventh District. Mr. Weber continues to devote his efforts, and the benefit of his past leadership experience, to the VFW in his present capacity as district magazine business manager.

Very appropriately, at a time when we should remember the price paid for democracy and freedom, the Memorial Day issue of the VFW News contained Mr. Weber's enlightening article on communism. In view of the tremendous influx of communistic propaganda infiltrating our country, I believe, this article is worthy of the attention of my colleagues:

COMMUNISM—WHAT IT MEANS AND HOW IT WORKS

(By James Weber, District magazine business manager, past seventh district commander)

Communism is a never-ending change of face and pace. Its technique is to keep the opposition off balance and confused. Its best jousting weapons are the lie, contradiction, pretension, and utter disregard of truth.

Only one thing is as certain today as it has been since the 1917 Red Revolution and that is—communism never changes its ultimate goal. That goal has always been world domination by any means, false or foul.

No less an authority than Communist Party leader Khrushchev has declared—"If anyone thinks that we shall forget Marx, Engels, and Lenin he is mistaken. This will happen only when shrimps learn to whistle."

So, regardless of their frequently feigned friendship, hearty handshakes and martini horseplay, the Communists are still hard-shelled revolutionaries. Contrary to their seemingly bombastic shattering of the idol Joseph Stalin, they have not foresworn purges, fear-inspiring pressures against captive nations and doublecrossing. In contradiction to their pretended eagerness to substitute aid and cooperation for earlier intolerance, violence, and subversion the Communist leaders are, by their own shrimp whistling declaration, still adhering strictly to the vicious theories of the German propagandists Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Furthermore, the Communists still hold reverence for their mummified first president, Nicolai Lenin.

What were some of the things those men advocated? What is it that the Red leaders of today really believe? Here are five examples:

BLOOD—NOT TRUTH

"Communism abolishes all eternal truths"—Marx-Engels.

"Be prepared to resort to every possible subterfuge, trick, and illegal device to conceal the truth"—Lenin.

"The worldwide nature of our (Communist) program is not mere talk but an all-

embracing and all blood-soaked reality"—Pravda, official Communist newspaper.

"Those who cannot coordinate illegal forms of struggle with legal ones are very poor revolutionists"—Lenin.

"It would not matter a jot if three-quarters of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining quarter should be Communists"—Lenin.

The only Communist goal is destruction of every democratic, or free people's, government and domination of all nations by enslaving communism.

So, anything else the Communists tell us is merely hogwash slimed over the truth to hide and confuse our understanding of the real Soviet purposes. It has been so for 40 years. It has not been changed and cannot be changed today, tomorrow, or as long as communism exists. Anyone who declares otherwise is either naive or actually peddling the Communist "line."

Communists everywhere are the same. That means in the United States as well as in Soviet Russia or in any of their satellite countries. Communists, wherever they are, recite the same catechism and all get their instructions from one source—Moscow.

Leaders of the Communist Party in the United States are "underground." Our prosecution of the first-line bigwigs put the old boys out of circulation. The second string leaders are now in control. But that doesn't mean the Communists in our country and their so-called "fellow travelers" have ceased to be a threat to the security of our Nation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation says not.

THEY'RE WORKING HERE

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, says that the Communist Party in the United States is planning and working intensively on a new crusade to defeat our internal security measures and to convince confused Americans that "the Communist menace is mere myth or hysteria."

Hoover gives some facts and figures. He declares that the hard core of the American Communist Party contains 21,000 members who are using Communist front groups and so-called "pseudoliberals" to achieve its subversive purposes. Also Hoover estimates that there are more than 200,000 additional Communist supporters, or fellow travelers, in this country. He says they are "individuals who vociferously deny any sympathy with communism but who, being duped, espouse Communist causes."

The FBI chief declares that 69 percent of the Communist Party members are in the States of New York and California, the remainder are in scattered urban industrial areas. The Communists are concentrating on infiltration of essential U.S. defense industries. This includes communications, steel, heavy machinery, mining, electrical, maritime, and transportation industries.

The Communists have set up an elaborate interparty check against traitors and spies within their own ranks. Communist investigation committees have been established in each State to keep tab on their party leaders and workers.

What is the technique today? FBI investigators who have infiltrated Communist ranks report as follows:

"The modus operandi of the Communists with front organiaztions is to exercise extreme pains to conceal the Communist character of the front and to give them innocuous or even patriotic sounding names. Then through those fronts the Communists set forth a seemingly good and orthodox program and have as sponsors an array of prominent persons who should know better but do not."

The Attorney General's office adds this:

"The Communist Party in the United States is substantially dominated and controlled by the Soviet Government and Communist International in Moscow. The Communist Party of the United States takes its orders direct from those sources. Throughout its existence the Communist Party (of the United States) never knowingly has deviated from the views and policies of the Government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

What would the Communist Party of the United States do in case of open hostilities between this country and Soviet Russia? The attorney explains that all Communists owe primary allegiance to their Red flag. If there should be war between the United States and Soviet Union the Communists in the United States would turn instantly against the military efforts of the United States. They are obligated to support the Soviet Union. Meanwhile the Communist Party teaches its members that they must foment a civil war in the United States as means of establishing a Soviet America—a dictatorship such as exists today in Russia and her dominated countries.

YOU CAN HELP FIGHT

Every loyal citizen can help combat the Communists. Every suspicious act should be reported to the nearest Federal Bureau of Investigation office in full detail. Then let the FBI complete the investigation. Or reports on suspected Communists or subversive activities can be sent to the Americanism Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Headquarters, 34th and Broadway, Kansas City 11, Mo., for relay to the FBI.

Communists are masters at doubletalk. They call their system of government a democracy. They confuse our understanding of that word. They have fooled some of our supposedly intelligent citizens with their propaganda. However, the Communist Party line is clear. Seizure, domination, and enslavement of any nation through intrigue, oppression, and armed control are methods sharply contrasting with our concept of individual rights and government by the people.

What is communism? What is democracy? What would the Communists do to us and how would we live if the Reds should gain control of the United States? What do the Communists think about God? What would they do to our religious freedom if they could? Do the Communists offer us anything better than what we already have?

Those questions are asked frequently so let us compare the two philosophies, item by item. What does democracy give us? What would the Communists actually give us regardless of all their propaganda claims?

REGARDING PERSONAL RIGHTS

Democracy: Guarantees everyone basic rights and freedoms.

Communism: No one has any guaranteed rights. Everyone is subservient to the party but only a few can belong. In the Soviet Union Communist Party members total about 6 million out of the 217 million total population. Everyone obeys the party dictates—or else.

Democracy: Forbids arbitrary seizure of persons, property or search of homes. Fair trial by jury is guaranteed.

Communism: Secret police can search any home, confiscate possessions, arrest, convict and imprison anyone without impartial trial.

ECONOMIC FREEDOMS

Democracy: Says everyone is free to establish and own any kind of business, a home or a farm. An American worker has the right to choose and change his job. He may join a labor union. Through collective bargaining and union contracts he may negotiate his working conditions and wage status.

Communism: "State" controls all business, housing facilities, farms. Government dictates where and when a man may work. It freezes the worker in his job. No labor unions are tolerated. The party determines wages, working conditions.

Eichmann and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles by Roscoe Drummond as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1960:

WASHINGTON—EICHMANN AND ISRAEL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The brilliant feat of detection by the security police of Israel in capturing the long-wanted Nazi war criminal, Adolf Eichmann, who directed the despicable murder of 6 million Jews in the gas chambers of Hitler Germany, is one of the unearned dividends resulting from the creation of the Israeli Nation.

The Jews of the world have had a rightful and powerful incentive to track down this brutal mass-murdered who has been hiding in the back alleys of civilization for the last 15 years.

Had there been no Israeli State, which was brought into being by the United Nations under the leadership of the United States and Great Britain, there would have been no Israeli secret service. Had there been no Israeli secret service, Eichmann would still be at large, haunted and hunted but still mocking the processes of justice.

Eichmann would already have been tried as a major war criminal before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg had he not escaped the country after unsuccessfully seeking to burn down the gas ovens (which he built to look like shower baths) and other execution spots where so many were herded to their death. But he eluded the Allies at the time and he has eluded them ever since.

After the Nuremberg legal machinery was disbanded, the Adenauer government brought proceedings against him and he would have been tried by West Germany had his hiding place—or places—been found.

Credit for his capture goes wholly to the implacable perseverance of the Israeli security police.

The boon of Eichmann's capture is not that he will be punished. There is no punishment which will fit either such a crime or such a criminal. The boon is that he will be brought to public trial, preferably in Germany or by an international tribunal, through the due process of law. If he cares to, he can explain himself to his fellow men.

The objective is not revenge. The tide of revenge has long receded and, in any event, there is no revenge equal to the destruction of whole families, old people, young parents and their children, in a plot to extinguish a whole race.

The benefits of the trial which will be on exhibit for the whole world to watch will be:

That historians will then be able to write the authoritative account of one of the most heinous crimes ever perpetrated against humanity so that the facts will be indisputable.

That it will remind many who have forgotten—or chosen to forget—the evil nature of Nazism and teach a new generation some of the facts which have receded into the past.

That it will likely extract from Eichmann himself the necessary evidence which will enable West Germany to bring other Hitler war criminals to successful trial.

Eichmann was no mere agent under orders. He was the foremost architect of the plan to bring about the total extermination of all

Jews in Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Upper Silesia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece and, when possible, France, Belgium, Holland, and Britain. The evil taste of this man is well shown by Ruth Gruber who, on the basis of the Nuremberg documents, wrote in the New York Herald Tribune:

"Eichmann * * * took careful interest in finding the right kind of chemical to be used in the furnaces to kill Jews; how the gold teeth of the victims were to be removed; how the hair of the dead women was to be cut and sent to factories; how the jewelry, watches and currency should be given to the Nazi Reichsbank; and the final burning of the corpses, since you couldn't really bury 6 million people."

How appropriate that Eichmann should be brought from his hiding place by the newly created State of Israel.

Mrs. Norah Robertson of South Eugene High School Recognized as the Outstanding Science Teacher of the Year for All of Oregon and Southern Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Nora Robertson, biology teacher at South Eugene High School, has been recognized as the outstanding science teacher of the year for all of Oregon and southern Washington.

She was given a gold award which reads "Mrs. Nora Robertson, who has that priceless quality in a teacher—the ability to awaken a student's intellectual curiosity. 'A good teacher affects eternity.'"

Two of her students, Brian Gannon and Lynn Quam, were honored that same evening in Portland at a dinner sponsored by the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

For nearly 3 decades Mrs. Robertson has been teaching. A busy woman she keeps on the go because as Eugene Register—Guard reporter Marvin Tims quotes her as saying, "There is so much to learn and so much to do." Mr. Tims excellent story of June 5, 1960, about this outstanding Oregonian follows under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

LIMELIGHT CATCHES UP WITH DEDICATED SCIENCE TEACHER—SEHS INSTRUCTRESS IN BIOLOGY WINS "STATE BEST OF YEAR" HONOR

(By Marvin Tims)

You can search a long time before you find a teacher as enthusiastic and dedicated to her work as Mrs. Nora Robertson, South Eugene High School biology teacher.

And her tremendous interest in biology and education in general "rubs off" on her students, awakening them to the many wonders in nature.

A rather modest woman, who doesn't seek publicity, Mrs. Robertson had to stand in the limelight last week, whether she wanted to or not.

PRICELESS QUALITY

She was recognized as the outstanding science teacher of the year for all of Oregon and southern Washington, receiving a gold "Oscar" at a Portland award dinner sponsored by the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry.

Her award read: "Mrs. Nora Robertson, who has that priceless quality in a teacher—the ability to awaken a student'sintellectual curiosity. 'A good teacher affects eternity'."

And two of her students, Brian Gannon, a senior, and Lynn Quam, sophomore, were also at the award dinner as gold medal winners at the recent Northwest Science Fair. They were the only gold medal winners from this area.

Gannon's exhibit in the senior physical division involved carbon 14, and Quam had experimented with irradiated fruitflies.

Mrs. Robertson kept so quiet about winning her award that officials at South Eugene High School didn't learn of it for several days.

A biology teacher in the Eugene school system since 1943, Mrs. Robertson doesn't believe in preparing her pupils "just to go to college."

"I, of course, want my students to attend college, but in teaching them biology I also attempt to instill an appreciation of the world around them. There can be wonderful mental therapeutic value in contemplating the wonders of nature, even in just think of the workings of the inside of a leaf."

SO LITTLE TIME

A teacher for nearly 30 years, Mrs. Robertson has a keen interest in all fields of learning. Over the years she has taught English, history, general science, and other subjects. She has had 5 years of college French and "reads everything I can get my hands on."

But she said there seems to be so little time to keep up to date on the latest developments in the field of science. "My biology students go into the subject in much greater depth than they did a few years ago. This is because everything is becoming more complex. I don't feel like I know anything any more," she smiled.

HALF HER LIFE

Few instructors devote as much time to their work as Oregon's science teacher of the year. She virtually lives at the school, often coming early to feed the many live specimens that are housed around the perimeter of the classroom, and staying after school to assist pupils with special projects or making plans for future class sessions.

Clifford Moffitt, SEHS principal, said last week the work Mrs. Roberston does is "fantastic."

"She really doesn't take a vacation—she seems to devote half her waking life to her work. Her course organization and the work she does in her classroom is probably the best I have ever seen."

Moffitt said Mrs. Robertson understands youngsters and is exceedingly patient and understanding. "Each pupil seems to be her ward and care."

Mrs. Robertson's classroom is filled with displays of remarkable projects her students have completed in recent years. Many of the projects appear to be at the college level.

A quick look around the room will reveal a black widow spider, donated by an enthusiastic former student who felt his teacher would love to have such a specimen, a 3-foot bullsnake, white rates, turtles, snails, guppies, catfish, guinea pigs, algae bread (made by her students from algae taken from the sea), mounted animals—including a racoon, weasel, crow and fox—25 baby snakes, flowers and plants, and a host of other living things.

A SPECIAL STUDY

Mrs. Robertson demands that each of her students complete a term project. "Some of my pupils might think I am a slaver driver, but I have found that often a project will awaken an interest the student didn't know he had."

Mrs. Robertson, who has taught every summer for the past 7 years, says she is going to try to "take off a little time and relax" this summer.

But in the next breath she said she will be working out plans for a special biology class she will teach next fall geared for the superior student.

Those who know Mrs. Robertson well doubt that she will be able to relax very long. And as she has said: "There is so much to learn and so much to do."

Jobless Picture Getting Darker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following:

Needless to say, the jobless picture is going from bad to worse. As important as figures are, there is a time when the figures will not and cannot tell the whole story. This is true in the pernicious and chronic question of unemployment.

Although we are in the midst of a relatively prosperous period we find unemployment at a rather static level, unemployment in the one and most necessary field of employment, the production worker in the manufacturing industries.

All employment is important, but few jobs can be maintained without production payrolls, in a community, a State, or a nation.

This lesson should have been learned long ago by the theoretical planners who are most responsible for the plight we find ourselves in.

A nation loaded down with national, State, local, personal, and corporate and business debts, with taxes in all levels of Government at a point where they are reaching the breaking point in many of our communities.

Recently a timely article appeared in one of the leading Canadian papers, the Financial Post of Toronto.

It might start some of us thinking if we will take time to read and study the challenging questions posed by the writer.

Some of us find ourselves condemned because we are trying to awaken our colleagues to the great and compelling ned to reevaluate our entire picture of trade and aid.

Basically, too much is made out of dollar balances when discussing trade and aid and little or no attention is paid to man-hours, production losses in the products that mean daily employment as against production of heavy machinery and raw materials.

Helping our friends to help themselves is a worthwhile and necessary national policy. Helping our friends by weakening ourselves is foolish and could be suicidal for this Nation.

The problems our neighbors to the north talk about so freely and intelli-

gently appear to be given the hush-hush treatment here in our country.

Following are a few samples of some items out of one issue of a Canadian paper. One wonders why we are not exposed to more of this type of public information:

JOBLESS PICTURE GETTING DARKER

Here are some remarkable facts about what's happening in the Canadian economy. They are of immense concern to all Canadians. They should give the new Senate committee on manpower clues to why there is high unemployment in the midst of what looks like prosperity.

1. The much-vaunted Canadian standard of living has dropped 3 percent since 1956. Let it be granted that Canada's gross national product has doubled in terms of dollars between 1949 and 1959. And let it be granted that after population increases are noted and price increases taken out, the real per capita gain over the entire decade was still 16 percent. But the big gains came in the first part of this decade and, despite the 1955–57 boom, the real per capita share of GNP began to decline after 1956.

2. Both as a provider of jobs and as a producer of goods, Canadian manufacturing has been losing its earlier share in the Canadian economy. Since 1949, total employment in Canada rose by 19 percent—but the number of jobs in manufacturing alone went up only 11 percent. Overall gain in Canada's industrial output since 1949 was 64 percent—but manufacturing production advanced at the slower rate of 47 percent.

3. The 1955–57 boom in capital spending increased Canada's reliance on the construction industry as a provider of jobs—the very industry where seasonal unemployment is highest. The boom increased Canada's output as gas, minerals, and oil—all low manpower users—and decreased, relatively, the role of manufacturing as a creator of new jobs.

If this country is to develop wise policies to prevent unemployment—rather than distribute charity after grave unemployment becomes a fact—the Senate committee must get down to the exact causes of present ills before it can tell what remedies are needed.

This will land the committee neck-deep in the touchy and hereto avoided problems of commercial policy. It will have to ask: What are we going to do about promoting manufacturing in this country? How, other than by encouraging manufacturing, can we produce enough new jobs to go around? How can we hold a wage and price level that will allow us to compete abroad?

Current unemployment, even if overstating honest-to-goodness hardship, is a clear warning that national policies in the economic sphere are lagging behind the realities of growth and change here and abroad.

The welfare of all Canadians is very much at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I have always maintained that the jobs that create jobs are the production workers and goods producers.

This is even more so today than ever before because our economy is not different in this regard than our Canadian neighbors.

If production jobs fail, the incentive for profit in the service industries dries up and these jobs fall by the wayside.

A grapevine report on this phase is contained in the following article:

Only three activities with predominantly male employment have increased more than the average—utilities, construction, and mining (which includes oil and gas).

Utilities and mining added together still provide substantially less employment than "finance, insurance and real estate." Mining (including workers on oil and gas wells) provided an average of less than 90,000 jobs last year. Utilities provided only 75,000. (That's about 3 percent of nonfarm employment between them.)

Construction is the one that matters. For the last four years it has employed 8.6 percent of all the people with jobs outside farming. This is higher than it has ever been—absolutely and proportionately.

It raises two serious problems:

It is the most seasonal of all occupations. Our heavy reliance on construction in recent years is certainly one of the reasons for the extra-high level of winter unemployment.

It is "parasitic" in partly the same sense as all the service group of occupations. Construction is not, itself, a producer of wealth.

It may either erect a plant that will produce wealth, in which case it is paid for out of the goods which the plant produces.

Or, it may provide better communications, better accommodation or better services—in which case it is paid for, ultimately, out of the wealth that has already been produced.

In both cases, it rides—like the services, the financial and insurance houses and all the other "tertiary" activities—on the back of the industries that produce and sell goods that were not there before.

The only dynamic force behind all these activities is production of goods.

And production depends on sales.

Orthodox economists will say that growth of the office-stool, barber's-chair jobs is the sign of a maturing economy.

But the "tertiary" services—trade, consumer services like barbers and beauticians, insurance, finance and the rest—contributed a larger share of Canada's national output at the height of the depression in the 1930's than they do now. Even in the 1920's they were more important than they have been in recent years.

They weren't much of a sign of maturity then. So we might be cautious about applauding their growth now.

MANUFACTURING IS SLIPPING, BUT VITAL

You can't measure the value of any business by the number of jobs it creates.

Mining and oil now employ 123 workers for every 100 they employed in 1949. But they produce 2½ times as much.

The theory is that such increased productivity creates the wealth out of which we pay for all our improved services. It doesn't have to provide more employment in mining. It provides it in hotels and laundries and insurance offices.

The theory works—at least up to a point, and with a possible time lag.

The oil-based prosperity of Alberta is a clear example.

But mining and oil now represent just over 4 percent (by value) of all the goods and services produced in Canada. They cannot, by themselves, carry the 35 percent which is represented by trade and services (including finance, insurance and real estate).

Whether you look at it in terms of jobs or in terms of production, there is no escaping Canada's dependence upon manufacturing industry.

In jobs: Manufacturing provides one job in every four—nearly four times as many as construction; six times as many as mining or forestry; twice as many as farming, fishing, and trapping taken together.

In production: Manufacturing well over a quarter of all Canada's domestic product; more than twice as much as all the services; nearly twice as much as the distributive trades; four times as much as construction or transportation; six and a half times as much as mining (with oil included).

Yet, both in jobs and in production, manufacturing is losing its earlier share in the Canadian economy.

Now let us see, from some limited figures, what is happening here in the United States of America:

With the return of good weather, jobs rose in April by 1.9 million in a substantially better than seasonal rise. Total employment was reported at 66.2 million, about 850,000 over April of last year. The rise took place chiefly in agriculture, construction, and trade—all seasonal industries. In part, the rise reflects abnormally high retail trade since the job survey was made the week before the Easter holiday. While joblessness dropped more than seasonally by 550,000 to 3.7 million, unemployment was still 5 percent of the labor force.

Concealed in the brighter job picture was a further decline of 100,000 in manufacturing employment to 16.4 million. Reflecting the leveling off of the economy, the factory workweek also dropped by another 0.3 hours to 39.4. The factory workweek now is down 0.9 hours from last year. Reflecting the drop in the workweek, wages of manufacturing workers were down by $1.08 over the month to $89.83 weekly. Commenting upon latest job statistics, AFL–CIO President Meany noted that the unemployment rate of 5 percent is still greater than in February, traditionally the month of highest unemployment.

It certainly should be clear to all of us that production of goods and their sales are the basic ingredients for a prosperous economy.

U–2 Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received by me from a constituent, Mr. Milton B. Shaber, whose comments on the U–2 incident are those of an American citizen much concerned with the handling of the so-called U–2 incident. I think they are worthy of careful thought by the Members of this body. The letter was directed to the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, and a courtesy copy was sent to myself and several other Members of Congress.

The letter follows:

MILTON B. SHABER,
Detroit, Mich., May 31, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The U–2 incident is most unforgivable. I read in Pearson's column when that was proposed 3 years ago, Adm. Arleigh Burke was against it as too risky, but you, Dulles and others overruled his objection. When we are preaching peace all over the world, why was it necessary for you to undertake such a colossal risk; it could have lead to war. No matter what information you gained from this undertaking it could not have been worth the risk taken.

You are not a good salesman. Mr. Khrushchev was cordial and pliable at Camp David, he was in a compromising mood, and any

good salesman knows when a client is in such a mood he follows up as quickly as possible in signing him up. This you might have done by arranging for a summit conference only a month or two after his visit here. By postponing it to May, you have allowed opposition forces in the Kremlin and Red China to work on Khrushchev. You apparently postponed it for political reasons, to bring it closer to election time, with the peace issue involved.

I think the U–2 program will go down in history as our greatest diplomatic blunder of the century, and we will pay dearly for the cost of its consequences for a long time.

The trouble is that you really are a part-time President and not a leader, and delegate too many of your presidential duties to immediate subordinates, who are not very competent.

Yours truly,

MILTON B. SHABER.

Medical Aid for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, despite our vaunted boast of high living standards and Christian concern for the well-being of all our people it remains a fact that the United States is the only major industrial country in the world without some form of national medical insurance for its elderly and retired citizens.

From the overwhelming evidence in the record, contained in economic statistics and the testimony of experts, it is painfully obvious that our aged people are in imperative need of some type of Federal medical aid.

According to Dr. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, out of the 10 million persons in the Nation who have heart disease, 4 million are 65 or older. At any given time, some 750,000 persons have cancer and most of these are persons over 65. Almost 3 million individuals have diabetes and the aged account for the majority. This is also true of the 5 million suffering from arthritis and the 6 million who are affected by related rheumatic disorders. Each of these diseases brings with it the high costs of medical and hospitalization treatment as well as the need for expensive drugs. In considering these dramatic and disturbing figures let us not forget that medical costs have increased 46 percent in the last 10 years.

The economic distress caused by these advanced medical costs is even more impressive when we realize that 74 percent of the aged have income of nothing to $1,000; 11 percent have incomes from $1,000 to $2,000 and only 15 percent have incomes of $2,000 and more. These statistics make us consciously appreciate that illness among the elderly is truly a staggering and discouraging financial burden.

There is no commonsense in any attempt to deny or gloss over this obvious national problem, and the urgent necessity of promptly dealing with it. There are multitudinous bills before the Congress now in recognition of the problem. The administration itself has openly admitted its existence. There remains only the legislative task and duty of designing a measure acceptable to the Congress and the President, which will extend the fullest and most equitable Federal insurance possible to the desperate aged in their gallant fight against the economic distress and discouragement of costly sickness in their declining years.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this session of the Congress will not conclude until those of us, in the Congress and the administration who have the responsibility, have fully discharged our duty and obligation to the elderly citizens of this blessed and bountiful country.

The Missing Link in the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech delivered by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, at Oakland, Calif., on May 17, 1960.

Captain Eddie has had a long association with the metropolitan Oakland area. Early aviation history was made in this area and, naturally, he played a great part in it.

Captain Rickenbacker's speech follows:

THE MISSING LINK IN THE JET AGE

(By Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, chairman of the board, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.)

It is a great pleasure for me to be with you today, to join again with old friends and to meet so many of Oakland's progressive young leaders whose dedication to the community's welfare is the logical way of guaranteeing the development of this great port city in the future of unlimited jet speed opportunities, which is opening before us.

I am grateful, also, from the bottom of my heart, for the honor you have bestowed on me in this homecoming celebration.

I firmly believe it is a good omen and a promise of an even greater celebration in which we shall join, in the not too distant future, when we achieve the victory in the war for recognition we have been waging so long for the southern transcontinental route.

The continuing crusade we have championed, together, for more than 20 years—to establish Oakland as a key terminal on a southern transcontinental air route—to link together the three fastest growing areas of the Nation, is only one of the causes in which we have fought side by side.

As some of you oldtimers may remember, as I do so vividly, I enlisted in your fighting squadron to win a place for Oakland in the then-still-to-be-born air age, at least 40 years ago. In fact, I might even qualify as one of your recruiting officers.

My first appearance was in a little shiny Junkers monoplane, the first all-metal airplane ever seen in America. My companion was Ed Allyne, who was then president of the Aluminum Co. of America, whom I had induced, much against his better judgment, to take an interest in the development of aviation.

We landed on a strip of sod along the waterfront and one of the first things I did was to lecture my reception committee on the importance of building an airport for Oakland.

Air transportation, I boastfully predicted, was bound to progress and with airplanes, traveling possibly at 200 miles an hour, shuttling men, mail and merchandise back and forth across the country, aviation would change the entire concept of industrial, commercial and personal travel in this Nation of ours and around the globe.

"Don't miss this great new age," I urged. "Get in on the ground floor. Build an airport to match the unique commercial importance of Oakland, and the service is bound to come."

Well, at least I was half-way right. I have just come from an inspection of Oakland's great airport and looked at the plans for its further development. In all sincerity, I can say that it is one of the finest airports of any metropolitan community in the United States today.

However, there is one thing wrong with it. And it proves one-half of my early prediction which has not yet, in proper proportion, come true. The airport is here, all right, and far beyond what any of us visualized in our wildest dreams, but the full measure of service your community needs is yet to be secured.

While waiting to fly across the bay this morning and, as a matter of fact over the past several days when I was trying to figure out the best way to get to Oakland, I thought many times how at least on my first trip in the old junkers, 40 years ago, I came directly to Oakland. That's more than I could do today.

Through the years we have worked together on other projects, all aimed at the progressive growth of Oakland in this age of the air, whose expansion has dwarfed to pygmy size the most optimistic visions we nurtured more than two decades ago.

Now, we stand once more on the threshold of a still greater future. Once again, far beyond the future we envisioned only a few years past, the opportunities ahead will multiply and expand at the rate of jet speed itself.

The crusade in which we are joined today—the crusade to provide direct access to both coasts for the public, commerce, and industry of our great tier of Southern States—to my mind, has most important consequences for the community of Oakland in this fabulous future.

The establishment of Oakland as a Pacific terminal for this southern transcontinental route will go far to compensate your great city for what it has not been able to achieve as our air transportation routes have developed, and will, beyond question of a doubt, fix Oakland's place on the airways of a world transformed by jet transportation.

Oakland, as a terminal seaport, has historical ties with many seaports throughout the world. Oakland, as a terminal airport for the southern transcontinental air route, will have access to all the ports in the world—because of the jet age we visualize, every city, town, and hamlet on the face of the globe will be a port on the vast ocean of air along whose shores every man lives.

My reasons for stressing the importance to Oakland, in this future which is already so rapidly unfolding before us, are obvious, I am sure, to all of you. This southern transcontinental route I first envisioned more than 22 years ago would bridge the only remaining gap in the Nation's network of air routes.

It would link together, directly and for the first time, the three fastest growing areas of our great country—Florida, the South and the gulf coast, and the Pacific—the areas

which have been most handicapped by lack of modern transportation facilities.

During the same period, we have seen transcontinental service across the northern tier of States, multiplied four times to link the industrial, commercial, and financial regions of the Atlantic Northeast, the Middle West, and the Pacific coast. One reason for this may have been the fact that the South was, as the report transmitted to the Congress of the United States by one President expressed it, "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

At the price of considerable political censure, I challenge that statement. To me, rather, the South was the Nation's No. 1 opportunity.

Eastern Air Lines has routes that go deep in the South. We pioneered the first air service along the eastern seaboard of the United States. In addition, we concentrated many years of effort and millions of dollars in the deevlopment of a network of air routes to link the communities of our Southern States which have not benefited, relatively, to the same extent as other areas of our Nation, in the development of earthbound transportation. As a result, there is more air service concentrated in the South today than in any other comparable area of the United States.

There was sound reasoning behind this pioneering development. The South, as you all know, has tremendous resources which, for years, had been relatively untapped. In 1938, when Washington was concerned over the economic plight of this great area, I had already detected positive signs of its economic awakening.

It remained for World War II, however, to break through the roadblock of inherent inertia. Because of the vulnerability of our coastal areas, many production plants involved in the national defense were moved into the Southern and border States. Because of the ideal weather conditions, many of our great military training areas were also located there.

A few years before the war, textile manufacturing had begun its march South to shorten the gap between raw materials and the manufacturing machines. This was closely followed by a similar trend in the chemical industry which began its movement to the site of oil production.

With the development of our tremendous missile industry, this, too, is largely concentrated across the band of Southern States from the Pacific to Florida, and on down the South Atlantic, so that in a very real sense, this area of which we speak has become the Nation's first line of defense.

During this period of tremendous growth, the industrial, commercial, and financial alliances—and the community of interest between the cities have been magnified many times. The only thing it lacked was proper and modern air transportation, coast to coast, because, significantly, the North is no longer the financial and industrial master of the South. Its axis runs East and West today.

Superimposed on these three naturally joined areas, the benefits to these areas and to the Nation of the southern transcontinental air service, for which we are fighting, should be obvious. Then, follow that route on the map and the importance of Oakland as a terminal of the southern transcontinental route must also be obvious.

Oakland is the apex of the great industrial empire of the bay area. It is a natural gateway to all the Pacific.

With a direct transcontinental route of its own, through the southern tier of States to Florida and on to Puerto Rico, Oakland will expand eastward as well as westward, because Puerto Rico, the way station between the continental United States, the Caribbean, and eastern South America, is also the natural gateway to the west coast of Africa, and through that rapidly maturing continent, to the southern half of the Eastern Hemisphere.

No one who has even the Biblical mustard seed of faith in the progress that lies ahead of our free Nation, blessed as it is with such an abundance of God's good gifts, and propelled forward by the dynamo of private enterprise, can fail to recognize the importance of Oakland and of Oakland's airport in this tremendous future.

The entire bay area has a great stake in this projection. There is room and the necessity for all to participate.

Many of you, I know, have chafed at the secondary role Oakland has been assigned in the way the Nation's air services have developed through the past 20 years. It serves no useful purpose, in my opinion, to concern yourselves with the past.

What is needed, more than ever before, is to concentrate all of your vision and imagination, your political, and economic resources, as well as your loyal community spirit, upon a future which will have little relation to the past.

We are entering an entirely new era—a jet era. The yardsticks we used in the past are no longer adequate to measure the future. Because of the jet airliners' speed and long-range capabilities, the geographical factors which once dominated the choice of airports, no longer apply.

Just as industry is decentralizing and moving to those areas which provide access to raw material, manpower, and other natural advantages, air transportation in the jet age will inevitably follow the same course.

The productiveness of industry is the bulwark of our Nation's progress and that of the free world. Industry produces not only products, but a density of population. And the jet airplane is ideally adapted to serve the needs of both.

Our jet transports, already flying almost at the speed of sound, and with their most economical and effective operating performance at longe ranges, understandbly will be impatient with intermediate stopping points. The trade routes of the future will follow the seaman's Great Circle, over land as well as the oceans, and will have for their terminal points those areas where industry and population dictate.

The problems this certain development will pose are, indeed, most serious. Centuries of trade route development is involved. The future position and prosperity of many communities will rest on the decisions faced today and tomorrow by our civic leaders who must plan—and fight for—the place their communities will hold in this future of unlimited opportunities.

Through the foresight of your civic leadership, through the aggressiveness of your commercial enterprise, and through the loyalty and devotion of your citizenship, Oakland, with its magnificient airport, is in an exceptional position to capitalize on this future. That main 10,000-foot runway with its clear overwater approaches at each end, is capable of handling the largest jet transports in operation today.

You have on this site ample room for expansion of facilities, for the development of industries closely associated with aviation, and quick access to both concentration of population and of industry. This is a combination of advantages rarely found in areas available for the development of jet age terminal airports.

There is no doubt in my mind that, as this great Bay Area continues to grow, and as the public takes more and more advantage of the speed and convenience of air transportation, the facilities you have now will be needed, and needed badly.

But I would like to direct your attention to one other, and too often forgotten, facet of this development we visualize. That is the importance of what I call an "industrial air terminal."

To date, and for natural and logical reasons, air transportation has concentrated primarily upon the movement of passengers and mail. So rapidly has aviation advanced in this direction that, today, the airlines have superseded the railroads and the buses, as the Nation's primary means of intercity transportation.

You can visualize the future ahead for air travel in the fact that, despite this tremendous progress, less than 10 percent of our Nation's population has yet experienced the comfort and the superior advantages of air travel. Yet, the best analytical brains in our industry and the best students of transportation in industry and Government, have told us, for years, that air passenger transportation represents but one-twentieth of the true potential of air transportation. The key to this expanding future, they tell us, is in air cargo, a phase in which we have hardly made a start.

The carriage of cargo by aircraft, on regular schedules, was initiated in 1946 by our country's airlines. The past year, our industry carried about 2.7 billion ton-miles of cargo in interstate and foreign commerce. We now carry more tonnage in a single week than we did in the entire first year of our service.

The trend in that growth is indicated by the fact that in the past 10 years, while we increased our carriage of passengers 4.3 times and mail 4.1 times, we multiplied our carriage of airborne cargo 38.7 times.

Today, over 5,000 cities are provided with this air cargo service—750 directly, and the rest by truck lines under contract to the airlines to provide door-to-door delivery. We carry cargo by air to 160 foreign ports, as well. Yet, today, only 140 of our civil aircraft fleet of 2,000 airliners are equipped as all-cargo carriers.

By 1965 it is estimated that our airlines will be carrying 7 to 10 billion ton-miles in cargo service. This figure, too, can be multiplied, conceivably, if we are successful in developing a jet-powered air freighter, designed for truck-bed level loading, and capable of carrying freight at 3 to 3½ cents a ton mile. Both the industry and the Government are now studying this subject, because of its great importance for both commerce and the national defense.

Today, 15 percent of our airborne cargo is carried in the same airplanes we use to carry passegers, the remainder is carried in cargo craft converted from passenger airliners. Obviously, this is both limited and expensive. It is like trying to carry freight in the trunks on the passenger cars we drive, or like taking out the seats so we can use the family car as a moving van.

Most of the country's leading airlines are now converting more passenger carrying aircraft for all-cargo service. Eastern Air Lines, for instance, is now completing the conversion of the first five of our fleet of 88-passenger Super-C Constellations into "flying freighters," each of which will be able to carry a net weight of 34,000 pounds nonstop across the proposed southern transcontinental route.

This is but a token start. Reading the handwriting on the wall, many airports are already adding facilities for the handling of airborne freight and cargo, entirely separate from passenger operations. Undoubtedly, as the airfreight industry expands, many other airports will do likewise.

The reason I bring these few facts to your attention is to encourage you to think, to plan, and to work toward a distinctive future for Oakland's airport. Visualize, if you will, the funneling of this area's great industrial output, through this airport, for transportation not only to the key cities of

the United States, but to ports around the world.

This will mean not only greatly expanded passenger traffic through the airport of Oakland, but it will also mean the most productive utilization of the facilities on which you are in such a unique position to capitalize as a terminal on the southern transcontinental route and for which we have labored so diligently.

There is no quetsion in my mind but that the Civil Aeronautics Board must recognize the public's need for this service. There is no need to remind you that the opposition is just as determined today, as it has been during the years past when, despite a clear presentation of the public need, the service was not authorized.

That we have been successful in bringing the matter again to our Government for decision is due, in no small measure, to the determined effort made by Mayor Rishell and your civic leadership, by the port of Oakland, by the board of port commissioners, by the chamber of commerce, and the political and industrial leaders of these areas.

That victory, however, is still to be achieved. We must all, in every proper way and at every opportunity, continue to urge our Government to make a prompt and proper decision in this matter, which is of such importance to this area and to this Nation.

As I said before, we stand on the threshold of a new dimension in progress—a dimension of unlimited opportunity in a future, the form of which we can only surmise at the moment. In my opinion, that for which we are fighting will, in a large measure, determine the place Oakland will hold in that expanding future for aviation.

What lies ahead for aviation?

Any attempt to visualize, within 50 percent of reality, what will be accomplished in the next 50 years of aviation would, in the eyes of his friends, qualify one as a fit subject for an insane asylum.

I can speak from experience because, just 30 years ago, I ventured to predict such a glimpse of what we might expect in the next 25 years. Despite the fact that several of my predictions fell far short of what actually has taken place, my description of multi-engined transports, of transoceanic air services, of wide-ranging, high-flying military aircraft, and yes, helicopters, sounded to many like the outpourings of an unbalanced mind.

Yet, with this popular penalty vividly in mind, I will venture the following predictions for aviation over the next 50 years.

Long before the year of 2010 is reached, military aircraft, both fighters and heavy bombers, will progress from turbo-jet engines at the speed of sound to the more powerful ram-jet and rocket engines with speeds up to 2,500 to 3,000 miles per hour.

These will be the forerunners of nuclear powered fighters and bombers, cruising 50 to 250 miles above the earth, with sufficient range to circle the globe without refueling and will form a perpetual peace patrol.

Even these will be but stepping stones to rocket-driven guided missiles, which are making obsolete our present conceptions of fighters and bombers. Carrying a much further developed and devastating nuclear bomb, these war machines will be controlled electronically, and will require the help of human beings only at point of takeoff.

Speeds of these nuclear-powered guided missiles will increase progressively from 2,500 miles an hour to 25,000 miles an hour, and they will locate their targets with acoustical devices as yet unperfected.

This, I admit, is an ugly picture, but as man develops his ability to engineer these deadly instruments, the need for them will diminish proportionately. In this fact lies mankind's greatest hope since the beginning of time.

Spectacular as are the developments ahead for military aircraft, the advance of aviation as the world's primary means of travel over any appreciable distance will be equally fantastic.

Jet-powered transport planes will progressively graduate from today's giant aircraft with speeds of 600 miles per hour to veritable airliners cruising high above the weather with silent, vibrationless comfort at speeds of 2,500 miles per hour or more. With these, we will be able to cross the American Continent in little more than an hour, span the Atlantic in less than 2 hours, cross the Pacific in scarcely 4 hours, and circle the globe in scarcely 10 hours.

The application of atomic power to transport aircraft will bring to reality, aviation's inherent potential of being man's most economic, as well as safest, means of travel.

Because of the limited weight of nuclear engine fuel, by comparison with the weight of tens of thousands of gallons of the fuel now required for propulsion, the atomic engine will make possible tremendously increased payloads and ranges. This will mean far more efficient aircraft, and consequently relatively lower and lower costs for the traveling public and the shipper.

While these nuclear-powered airliners will link all major cities over the continent and across the world, helicopters for intercity short haul travel will progress from today's reciprocating engines, first to jet power and then to atomic propulsion, increasing in size and carrying from 50 to 100 passengers.

To utilize this advanced means of transportation, all cities of any size will zone building heights in their downtown areas and bridge the streets, to make heliports of adequate size—an ideal convenience for the greatest number of people.

The development of electronic devices and controls will make the operation of aircraft independent of the weather.

The conscious acceptance, by the passengers, of the individual's role in promoting friendship and preserving peace, will be evidenced in a universal passport, used for identification only, and airborne cargo will move freely in response only to the demands of commerce.

Finally, in the span of this next half century of aviation, spaceships will become commonplace for interplanetary travel. With luxurious accommodations for 150 to 200 passengers, they will use power derived from nuclear energy to develop speeds up to 25,000 miles per hour, or better, and will have a practically unlimited range. In fact, spaceships 50 years hence will be semi-self-sustaining planets in themselves.

What lies ahead for aviation? Our progress will be limited only by the limits of human imagination. To make these things and even far greater wonders, man already has the God-given intelligence, and the capacity for the knowledge they will require.

Yet, unless we can anchor our knowledge to moral principles, science may turn out to be not the guide, but the betrayer of humanity. With aviation's development in the hands of men of good will we have, for the first time in the long history of man, the one instrument, which can forever eliminate the barriers of time and distance, of ignorance and misunderstanding which, since time began, have set men apart and against each other.

In terms of human relationships, these advances in aviation mean that the world will grow progressively smaller. Then people of all nationalities will have, within their own hands, the means of meeting and understanding all people, and for eliminating the petty hates and jealousies which breed wars.

Then instead of being the most deadly weapon God ever let man create, the airplane will truly become the Angel of Peace He intended it to be.

Nationalities Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered on Sunday afternoon, June 12, 1960, at a Nationalities Day celebration held in Prospect Park, Brooklyn, N.Y.:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very delighted to participate in this celebration devoted to Nationalities Day. The idea of dedicating this day in honor of the various nationality groups who make up this great Nation of ours is an excellent one. I want to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation and congratulations to the people and the organizations sponsoring this wonderful idea, particularly the Italian Historical Society of America, and to give my support in helping you realize it. I hope that in the near future Nationalities Day will be celebrated on a nationwide scale.

On an occasion such as this, when we commemorate the contributions of the different nationalities toward the makeup of our beloved America, we think of the words of the poet and philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said:

"Not gold, but only men, can make
A nation great and strong;
Men, who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.

Brave men who work when others sleep,
Who dare while others fly;
They build a nation's pillars deep,
And lift them to the sky."

From its earliest beginnings, America has been a land of immigrants, of people of various national origins. All of us are very proud of the fact that these nationality groups have brought with them to this country the rich heritage of their national culture, along with their passionate love for freedom and human dignity. They have helped build America, physically and spiritually, to its present greatness. They have made wonderful contributions to America in every sphere of activity.

These nationality groups—and I include not only the original immigrant generations, but their children and grandchildren as well—always were and still are among the most loyal, devoted, industrious, and hard-working citizens in our country. They came to this country primarily because of political oppression, religious persecution, economic dislocation, abject poverty, and no opportunity of ever improving their lot in their homeland. Here they found a country which offered them life, liberty, and an opportunity for all. These are the concepts on which this Nation was established. These are also the concepts that have molded the cultures of the nationalities who have poured their strength and their spiritual gifts into the common treasury of America, to build it up and to make it what it is today—the hope and the inspiration of the free nations all over the world.

The "face" of America today is the face of a land which enjoys vast material blessings, a land of plenty, of tremendous agricultural and industrial productivity, of great scientific achievements. It is a land which has reached the greatest peak in political liberty, in economic progress. It is the most powerful nation on earth. In fact, in the long

and turbulent history of mankind there has been no equal to it.

But the "face" of America as we know it today was made possible only by its people, by its own human resources, by the labor they put into it, by their sweat, toil, and tears, by their confidence in themselves—but, most important of all, by their confidence in America and in its future. We and our children do not want the face of America marred or overshadowed by any other concepts or foreign ideologies.

There is a very interesting story told about Leonardo da Vinci, the famous Italian painter, sculptor, and scientist of the 15th and early 16th century. When Da Vinci decided to paint the "Last Supper," he threw all his energies into the work. He labored day and night. He studied the pages of the New Testament where the sacramental feast is described, in order to fully grasp and reproduce the memorable scene. At last his work was finished and Da Vinci invited a few close friends to see it. They gazed attentively at the painting, and then one of them spoke up with great admiration of a golden chalice shown on the table where the Lord and His disciples sat.

"The shape, the color, and the size of this chalice are perfect," he said. "It is the most beautiful object in the picture."

When Leonardo da Vinci heard what he said, he took a brush, dipped it in black paint, and smeared it over the whole canvas. He then said to his astonished friend:

"If what you tell me is true, that the chalice is the most beautiful object, then my painting is a failure. I meant my Master's face to be the chief and most beautiful object."

In a way, each of us is painting a picture of life, sometimes good and sometimes not so good. In painting this picture of our life, some of us will often make the trifles, the petty things, the most conspicuous objects on the canvas. The great majority of the people, however, are able to distinguish between the trifles and the important things in life.

The nationality groups have helped paint the picture of America in its true colors, stressing the importance of its concept and ideals. They have helped to make the face of America an inspiration to all of humanity. They did so because they fully understood the meaning of American ideals, its democratic traditions and institutions, which are precious to them. It is no wonder that, whenever called upon in times of stress, these nationality groups would send their sons in overwhelming numbers to defend America and its way of life. They are ready to do so again whenever the need arises.

If our country is richer and stronger today, if the face of America is that of a land enjoying many blessings, it is due in great measure to the efforts and the hard labor on the part of all these nationalities. It is due also to the infusion of their ideals, their culture, and traditions. It is due no less to the moral uplift of their spiritual strength. All of these have been blended with American democratic life, to give it greater harmony and greater unity of purpose.

America owes a great debt of gratitude to these nationality groups, who have joined their destinies with those of America in order to make it truly a land of freedom and a leader among nations. But they are not looking for special recognition or personal gains. I believe that the establishment of Nationalities Day as an annual observance in recognition of these contributions will serve as a welcome reminder of the part played by the nationality groups in the development of America. No greater glory is required. No greater honor is needed.

I ask you, my friends, where but in a land such as ours could people of various national origins get together at a public meeting like this to testify to the opportunities of the precious freedoms afforded us in America? Where else could people of diffeffrent racial and religious origins, as we represent here today, gather to express our appreciation of the individual liberties and human rights which make life in this country an experience of justice, equality, and happiness? Where but in America could we demonstrate a fellowship that is more than mere tolerance—a partnership in our common efforts for the good of all?

The Scriptures tell us that "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." This Biblical admonition reminds us that we cannot think in terms of failure, and then hope to succeed; we cannot think in terms of weakness, and hope to be strong—any more than we can think in terms of doubt, and then have faith. We must think in terms of faith in God, faith in our fellow men, and faith in America. We must think in terms of a strong America, an America that has succeeded in the past and will succeed also in the future.

We are living in a time of great responsibility which has been thrust upon us by circumstances. While America is benefiting from the cultural and spiritual gifts of many nations, freemen everywhere and those behind the Iron Curtain dreaming of freedom are today looking to America for guidance and leadership. All their hopes and aspirations to regain human rights, justice, and a life of dignity are centered upon us. Everything that we do now and in the years ahead will affect all of humanity.

This is a time of responsibility which finds us at the crossroads of human affairs—where one road leads to higher destiny, the other to horrible destruction. Men's minds have succeeded in discovering the secrets of space with their promise of abundance and peace for all mankind, or infinite evil and war. We must make sure that we choose the right road. We must utilize the new knowledge obtained through space exploration in order to bring the nations of the world closer together in new patterns of cooperation. If we succeed in doing that in a spirit of true understanding, then space may become the way to the creation of a world of abundance and peace, making war and the destruction of civilization unnecessary.

Perhaps, you will say, these are heroic dimensions. But these are also heroic times in the annals of human history which require heroic efforts. We have the opportunity to help lift the impoverished and undernourished nations to a better life. But, in addition to the great hunger for food and sustenance, there is an even greater hunger in the world today for freedom and equality. Men are ready to fight and die for the attainment of human dignity. If others all over the world are ready to die for freedom, equality, and human dignity, then surely we can live and work for these ideals with all the talents and the resources we possess.

Whether we like it or not, America has been entrusted with the responsibility of defending Western civilization. The success of that defense will determine not only the survival of our way of life, but even more so the maintenance of the dignity of man everywhere in the world.

To help assure our success, we must attain throughout this country a firm unity of the American people—a unity which comes from understanding, group by group; a unity which comes from an appreciation of the cultural heritage, nationality by nationality; a unity which comes from deep respect for the religious differences, faith by faith; a unity which comes from tolerance and cooperation, race by race. If we can attain this kind of unity—and I am firmly convinced that we can—then America and its way of life will have a strong and solid foundation for the future.

I want to close with the words of a great American pote, Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We have made this thing, this dream,
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This priceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
Over submitted bodies and the dead,
But as live earth where anything could grow.
We made it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. Is shall be sustained."

May God give us the strength to maintain the security of our land and the welfare of our people for many generations to come. And may we have the opportunity to observe this Nationalities Day for many more years and to tell future generations of the great contributions made by all those who preceded us to these friendly shores.

Air Force Fiasco on Bong Airbase Was Unnecessary Waste of Taxpayers' Money; Air Force Gained $30 Million Without Having To Account to Congress on How It Was To Be Spent

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, while the House of Representatives was considering the military construction appropriations bill for 1961, which appropriated additional funds so as to make available $1,535,388,956 for the construction of military bases, I spoke on the floor of the House of Representatives and reminded the House of Representatives that we had an obligation to protect the taxpayers of this country from further gross extravagance and waste by the Air Force. The Air Force came to Congress and secured approximately $62 million out of a total of $82 million authorized for the construction of Bong Air Force Base in Wisconsin. The Air Force started construction of the base, and including the cancellation of contracts spent approximately $32 million of this sum. They pocketed the remaining $30 million and did not return it to the General Treasury of the United States. Congress had no further control over these funds; and although they undoubtedly took the matter up with the Armed Service Committee, they nevertheless were the beneficiary of about $30 million which they could use for such purposes as they desire, even though this purpose might be the building of commodious quarters for Air Force officers, which the Congress as a whole would not approve, or for some equally luxurious whim of the Air Force, such as printing pamphlets for its recruits with instructions for the proper way to dress or hold a fork. A similar situation occurred in another air base that was canceled recently and the Air Force became the beneficiary of several million dollars of free money from that cancellation. I

state that it is the duty and obligation of Congress to see to it that any such funds that are not used for construction after they are appropriated should be returned to the General Treasury and not be left for the agency involved to boondoggle in accordance with their desires.

In the case of Bong Airbase, the area involved strongly opposed the installation of the base for the reason that it was being installed in a highly populated, highly valuable, highly fertile, highly industrial area. I personally opposed the base, and supported it only after Air Force officers, in secret mission, assured me that the base was essential for the defense of the country as a whole, and that it was strategically located. The Air Force never secured authority from the FAA to fly planes off the base and squandered $32 million of the taxpayers' money without even applying to the FAA for authority to use the base after it was constructed. The FAA opposed the use of the airbase on the ground that it was unsafe because of other air activity in the Chicago-Milwaukee region, which is highly concentrated with population. The FAA scheduled a hearing, as the work on the base continued, to question the right of the Air Force to use the base after completion. The Air Force apparently feared that the result of the hearings would be adverse and that they would be prohibited from using the base after it was constructed and the entire $82 million spent. The Air Force then, without notice to any elected official from Wisconsin, canceled further work on the airbase. The FAA canceled the hearing and the authorities in charge of the Air Force were saved the embarrassment that they would have suffered if the FAA had denied them the right to use the base after it was constructed. All of this cost the taxpayer $32 million; and the Air Force, in addition to this amount, became the beneficiary of $30 million, which it kept and can use as it sees fit without the approval of Congress to reschedule the use of the money. They, undoubtedly, will take the matter up with the committee that supervises them, but it is improper for the Air Force to have the right to spend this money without congressional review.

The Air Force in canceling the base failed entirely to take into consideration the welfare of the community involved. If they had contacted the elected officials, a great deal of the adverse economic impact on the area involved could have been avoided. They did not contact any elected official, and since the cancellation they have been arrogant and arbitrary in the decisions that they have made and have virtually failed, in any respect, to consider the wishes of the Congressmen from the district or the Senators from the State.

The Air Force has now asked to abandon the base for disposal by GSA. The area has been, for the most part, completely despoiled and is almost a hole in the ground. The topsoil has been removed and the subsoil disturbed. The runway of 14,000 feet is ready for the pouring of concrete. The area involved is close to 9 square miles and takes up to 5,700 acres in the heart of a highly industrial and heavily populated community.

The Air Force could have completed the contracts under construction for approximately $1,631,000 more than the cost of canceling these contracts, yet it refused to do so. If the contracts had been completed, the community could have utilized the area to economic advantage in several ways, but an arrogant Air Force refused to cooperate and virtually failed to discuss the matter with the Congressmen from the district.

The time has come for Congress to impose upon the military the obligation of discussing cancellations of contracts with elected officials prior to cancellation in order that the impact on the community involved may be lessened, and Congress has a duty of seeing to it that funds appropriated for military construction which are not used should be returned to the Public Treasury for recommitment to places where needed. The Air Force, as well as other branches of military, should be compelled to consider the wish and the will of elected officials from the areas involved and should not be permitted to arrogantly do as they please without adequate consideration to the economic effects of their acts upon the localities where the bases are located.

Arrogance and waste, such as has been exemplified by the Air Force in the construction of Bong Airbase, should not be tolerated by Congress, and the proper committee of Congress should thoroughly investigate the entire situation.

Aid Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 10 edition of the Harvey Tribune, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on a subject of grave concern to all of us, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

AID SHOULD BEGIN AT HOME

Every so often one is confronted by idealistic persons or organizations who are seeking funds for some far away charity.

The further away the need, or the more remote the facts and circumstances, the more idealistic the project sometimes becomes.

The perfect answer to many of these pleas is that charity begins at home. There is nothing more admirable in sending charity 8,000 miles than in putting it to use in this community or in a nearby area where the charity is actually seen.

There are many adults and children in the United States, and in this community, who are in need of charity, or some kind of help, in the way of food, clothing, education, or otherwise. We suggest that those inclined to send their money 8,000 miles think twice before they start it on its journey.

Such money may wind up intelligently utilized, sensibly distributed, and thriftily handled. On the other hand, one really does not know what happens to it at the other end, who gets it, how much of it is drained away along the route, or by unknown sources who handle it at the other end of the line.

Chamber Wins National Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the ctizens of San Leandro, Calif., are exceedingly proud of their progressive, growing community. Living in an area in which the population growth is near the percentage top in the Nation, they have had to meet this challenge in stride.

A number of factors contribute to their success. There is a fine cooperative newspaper, the Morning News, in the community heretofore published by Abraham Kofman and now under the directorship of Carl W. Schooss.

The active, efficient, and wholesome chamber of commerce headed by John A. Deadrich, with affable and able Frank King as secretary-manager, deserves great credit.

The San Leandro Chamber of Commerce was recently singled out by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for its fine work by an award of merit. An editorial appearing in the Morning News recites the attainment of this honor and the reasons for it:

CHAMBER WINS NATIONAL HONOR

The San Leandro Chamber of Commerce has won a well-deserved national honor, which was presented to Chamber President John A. Deadrich III at a recent U.S. Chamber meeting in Washington, D.C.

Only five chambers in San Leandro's population class were given this honor, an award of merit in recognition of the local organization's varied community program.

Chamber activities affect us all. The chamber conducts a series of citywide retail promotions that make shopping in San Leandro a pleasant and profitable experience.

The chamber works to improve the city by seeking, and getting, favorable zoning, street and drainage improvements, good overall planning, and the like.

A noteworthy example of chamber effort was the campaign waged in behalf of the recent zone 9 bond issue, which passed by a large margin. The chamber, representing merchants and industrialists, supported the measure along with homeowners and citzens' groups.

The zone 9 election was climaxed this week when the county board of supervisors put the $1,200,000 in bonds up for sale. Bids will be opened at 10 a.m., July 5.

Drainage improvements financed by the bonds will raise the value of western section industrial and residential property, and open the way for more development.

The San Leandro Chamber is not afraid to take sides in controversial political issues, as evidenced by its stand against the school tax increase. A big majority of voters apparently agreed with the chamber, because the tax hike was killed at the polls.

The chamber here has become a vital, aggressive, necessary segment of community life. Besides taking part in the more serious aspects, it devotes energy to making people happy. There is the chamber float, laden with beautiful girls—what could be a better gesture of goodwill?

The chamber meetings with special speakers, such as Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, Assemblyman Carlos Bee, and other area notables, bringing the regional, State, National, and even world picture in focus at a local level.

The membership breakfasts, the welcome new teachers day, the groundbreakings, the action courses in practical politics, the beauty contests.

U.S. Chamber officials told Deadrich:

"We extend to last year's president, Paul Shepherd, and all chamber officials our hearty congratulations for attaining this recognition—San Leandro Chamber members have every right to be proud of their achievement."

We agree wholeheartedly with these words, and would like to add another special salute to the chamber manager, Frank King, whose vitality and devotion to chamber work have pushed the local group to the top of the national heap.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 passed after spirited debate and controversial differences of views. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, responsible for taxation and the public debt, I participated in presenting and supporting the bill. A temporary $8 billion increase to the permanent debt limit of $285 billion was asked by the administration to keep the Government solvent. The $8 billion replaces the present $10 billion temporary increase voted earlier.

(NOTE.—This is not the total debt. Contingent liabilities of the Federal Government are not included.)

This temporary debt increase is requested rather than a permanent increase in the hope that ultimately revenue will exceed income and a permanent increase will not be necessary. Either type, however, permanent or temporary, is caused by the need for money to pay the bills which Congress has run up. So the effort of some Members to combat increased expenditures by holding down the debt limit is no more logical than refusing to pay your charge accounts when they come due because "you don't want to spend more." Reducing the spending in the first place is the way to keep your debts down in personal affairs, business, and government finance. Equally illogical is the proposal by some to "reduce the debt" by lowering the debt ceiling on the one hand while voting for more spending on the other. It really is not a complicated proposition.

The extension of the Korean taxes (corporation tax, 47 to 52 percent, equaling $2.5 billion annually, and alcohol, wine, tobacco, manufacturer's excises, etc., $1.5 billion annually) including telephone and transportation excises is still a necessary evil and was passed—why? For the same reason—big spending. If we do not pay as we go, that is, impose current taxes to pay for current spending, then we inflate the currency through deficit financing and simply water everyone's savings and salaries—again quite simple. Yet some Members would yield to constituents demands to cut this or that tax, forgetting the tax burden then must be transferred to other areas and people, undoubtedly themsleves in another form.

The questions to be resolved are: (1) Should we cut Federal spending? Answer: Yes, particularly welfare programs; (2) Should we have a tax cut? Answer: Yes; (3) What kind of tax cut? Answer: Income tax rate adjustment as well as excise tax cuts; (4) Should debt reduction come first, before a tax cut? Answer: Yes, out of respect for future generations and sound fiscal policy.

We can, should, and must have debt reduction and tax cuts—but they must be real—not political illusions coupled with deficit financing and inflation. We will have real cuts only when people demand them and demand the reduced Federal spending which can make them possible.

Congress (and I'll speak specifically of the House) does its work largely through committees whose function it is to study controversial bills (each committee assigned a specific area of jurisdiction) and to report their findings, for or against, to the House as a whole. Short of this orderly committee process, Members of the House couldn't begin to assemble, each for himself, the information necessary to proper consideration of the hundreds of bills handled at each session. Each committee then is a creature of the House and is normally an invaluable tool in the legislative process. However, it is also possible (as sometimes happens) for a committee to frustrate the will of the House which created it by interminably delaying committee action on a bill in which there is general interest or even by altogether refusing to consider a bill, year after year. To prevent any such crippling of the power of Congress to act when most members are willing and ready to debate and vote—and after the appropriate committee has had ample opportunity to study and report on a bill—a House rule provides that a bill may be removed from a committee's jurisdiction and brought directly to the floor for argument if a majority (219) sign a "discharge petition." It's a rule which certainly should be invoked but rarely, and one which can pose a moral problem for a Member who may even be against a particular bill but resent a committee's obstinate refusal even to let the House discuss and vote on it.

The home rule bill for the District of Columbia precisely illustrates the point. It happens that I am opposed to this bill for a number of reasons: (1) Washington, D.C. as the National Capital, is the home of the Federal Government. It is not like any other city, it belongs to the Nation, not the residents; (2) it is a shrine of our national history for our people to visit, with monuments and relics to be preserved; (3) it is the residence of many foreign sovereign nations in embassies where the exchange of international rights is involved. Nevertheless, I am equally disturbed over the flat refusal of a subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee to report out a bill or even to discuss one on a subject in which every Member of Congress has a considerable interest one way or the other. Is the Nation to be governed in this respect by a handful of men on a single subcommittee?

Some days ago, I signed the District of Columbia home rule discharge petition in the belief that the House committee had been derelict in failing to vote down or to report to the floor this bill. I believed then, and I believe now, that by obstinately shelving controversial legislation a committee invites discharge efforts by the supporters of ignored bills and thus helps subvert the committee system itself.

Out of my concern for protecting the committee system and my belief that a discharge petition by proponents of the bill is, in this instance, warranted, I joined in the petition. Upon reflection, and after a careful restudy of the history of home rule legislation prepared by the Library of Congress, I have concluded that this action on my part was a mistake. Hence I have withdrawn my name from the petition. I believe still that the petition by the proponents of this bill is, in this instance (and such instances are rare) wholly warranted. But it happens that I do not favor the bill for the reasons stated above.

In view of this belief, whatever my concern over the committee's inaction and however great my desire to protest against it, I cannot but conclude that my signature on the petition which would effectively advance this legislation to which I am opposed, is unwarranted.

The year's wrapup of Congress before adjournment (or recess) may well include these major items—minimum wage increase, foreign aid appropriation, aid to education, another housing bill, farm subsidy, and social security revisions.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Our New Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1960, Mr. S. T. Williams, president of the Scoville Manufacturing Co., Waterbury, Conn., addressed the Kings County Club award dinner in Brooklyn, N.Y., on the subject "Our New Competition."

Since Mr. Williams' address describes the foreign invasion of America's domestic markets which I seek to correct in my bill, H.R. 9841, sponsored in the Senate by Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, I am inserting Mr. Williams' address in the RECORD so that Members of both Houses of Congress will better understand the threat posed by cheaply manufactured foreign products:

OUR NEW COMPETITION

It is good to be back in Brooklyn. It is particularly good to be allowed to share in an evening wherein Lloyd Larson is deservedly honored. I have been interested in the health and activity of this association since it was founded, and I have been a card-bearing member through the years.

So I know, firsthand, what Lloyd Larson has meant to the association, and in how much it locally and nationally is indebted to him. And again, it is good to see that the association recognizes the value of this association; and is tonight conferring upon him the award of the Silver Knight.

I do not need to attempt to duplicate the good things that have been said, and that will be said to him and of him on this occasion. Others can do that more eloquently than I. But none can say, with more sincerity than I, "Well done, Lloyd. You are tops as an associate and a friend."

Beyond this, my choice as a speaker may not be a happy one. At least, my choice of a subject is not a happy one—for competition as it exists in the world today is not a happy circumstance for most of us concerned with production in the United States today. In discussing it, I can but little more than hit the high spots; but I will try to stick to my subject and word-paint the picture as I see it. I can't promise to send you home happy—but I may send you home more thoughtful, and action starts with thought.

It used to be that "if a man makes a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to his door" to buy it from him. From the noise of the Madison Avenue boys of advertising, of radio, and of television, paths these days need a lot of beating and with it all, if today you make a better mousetrap, the Germans improve upon it; the Japs copy it; the World Bank finances its production; Congress cuts the duty and the low price gives it to the domestic and world market. After that, the unions demand more pay and increased unemployment benefits, and go on a strike. That isn't competition—it's murder.

In the past 10 years I have traveled in many countries. Ten years ago many of these countries were but little changed through the years; and if affected by the war, discouraged and tired.

Increasingly has a spirit of universal discontent swept over these countries—whether they be in Asia, in Europe, Africa or in South America. And with this has come to their people a spirit of high adventure of determination and of change. The good Lord only knows whether this is good or bad, but it certainly catches the United States in a heavy backwash.

Previously was this spirit expressed where present, in the emigration to the United States; for the United States was the living evidence of all things desired and all things hoped for. These people came, and in an environment of free enterprise, with minimum government interference, made us what we were at the end of World War II. It was during this period we acquired our Yankee ingenuity, our spirit of enterprise, and our mass markets.

Today the United States is more and more a have-not Nation. Each day we approach nearer and nearer to the point of no return. If tonight I can impress these points upon even a few of you—and you in turn can impress others—perhaps it is not yet too late. Those who govern for us ride with the pack.

Perhaps if enough of us make our feelings known, it will not yet be too late.

Let us not forget that the hair of the dog is no more effective in this hangover of ours than it is for other kinds of hangover. More immigration, as now being authorized; more high wages and fringes; more taxes, more inflation; and more population increases; more subsidies; more Government control are not cures for our illness. The old principles, guided with a real self-interest are needed.

The old saying that competition is the life of trade is still true. But if you are the individual or business on which the competition is focused, the reverse may be true. So our problem as producers is to get and stay on the right side of the competitive situation.

Today that takes a lot of doing. As far as business as usual is concerned, Pandora's box of troubles has been completely kicked open by two World Wars; the airplane, radio and the movies; and the attendant destruction of the neat compartments in which various peoples lived, worked and died. Attendant, and perhaps from these came communism; racial and geographic unrest; an explosive birth rate and a continuing turmoil both national and international.

Doing business as usual under these conditions takes on all of the problems of selling china with the bull still in the shop. Except instead of one bull, there are dozens of them.

Say what you may, this is an exciting and wonderful time to be living—providing you are a congenital optimist. I think I am one, but I must admit I ofttimes wonder what my predecessors used to do with their time. Certainly it was not spent on the things that concern us today, for they did not exist.

Now I do not believe I am going to answer in this talk many of the problems that beset us, but I do want to examine some of the more important ones, and maybe, as I have said, some group thinking and eventual group action may be helpful.

These are the new and enormously powerful forces, crossing all social and geographic boundaries, that have changed our world. They have changed the relationships of peoples and nations, of government and politics, of labor and management, of production and marketing. They have broadened the dimensions of competition and narrowed the capacity of the individual company to meet it.

What are some of these new dimensions? Perhaps the best way I can describe their effect is in terms of the company I know best, in which I have served for 30 years, and which I now head.

The Scovill Manufacturing Co., in which Schrader, with headquarters here in Brooklyn, is an important division, is a diversified company. Its output ranges from brass and aluminum mill products to a multitude of manufactured items. In size, Scovill stands about halfway in Fortune magazine's list of the 500 leading companies.

Founded in 1802, it is a living history of competition, and bears the scars to prove it. It spans the whole period of competition as we know it, which really began with the industrial revolution.

When Abel Porter and associates poured the hot brass into the little 1-pound molds, squeezed the small cast bar in a steel wringer to make a wider and thinner strip, the idea was to make brass for buttons. Buttons had been imported from England. Thus was established the first brass mill in America.

Its competition, once 3,000 miles away, was not long in coming home as others got the idea of melting, casting, rolling, and rerolling into wider, thinner, longer strips. Metal wrought and crafted in a dozen ways, to make a thousand products.

The competition was quick to catch up. Metalworking know-how, and the cost of man-hours in terms of productivity, set the price-profit relationship.

Nowadays, Scovill pours molten brass by the ton into a continuous casting machine from which exudes a ribbon of metal so wide and thick that a 10-foot length weighs as much as an automobile. A similar machine produces round stock.

This is about as far as you can get in producing the most of the best basic metal at the lowest cost. So what happens after that?

Competition. A new dimension of competition. A kind of competition which overwhelms the plain facts of lower production costs, by local price tags, that make a mockery of technology and bulk savings. Plumbers have bins full of imported brass mill products: tube, tees, elbows, all perfectly good, and why not?

As taxpayers we find ourselves in the peculiar position of setting up our own competition. As a nation we have provided technology, manpower, and money to create industrial capacity in friendly nations and conquered countries, which has grown to bite the hand that fed them. It is a cynical reflection that the way to win in progress and world markets is to lose a war with the United States.

Competition, in the new decade, is factored also by labor contracts which seek to share profits without assuming the burden of losses. This is another new dimension of competition, a kind of internal competition, which fights cost reduction but proffers no savings as a result of mechanization.

Competition is now political, industry-wide, worldwide, cutting across all boundaries. For a company like Scovill, it includes not only the normal competition of similar companies in the same market. The new dimensions of competition include also the squeeze between the little local shops, and the growing pressure from the growing combinations of companies which are creating a corporate giantism that stifles competition.

For even the youngest company, dedicated to development, to growth—meaning the accumulation of capital—these new dimensions of competition are a constant threat.

For an older company, the new dimensions of competition present additional problems. To grow big means also to grow old. To accumulate old thinking, old habits and patterns, old limits of what can and cannot be done. The greatest foes of progress are those who know what isn't so, have tried it, and it won't work.

If we are to survive in this admittedly gloomy picture, we will have to remodel our thinking as well as our machines and factories, where possible, and abandon them where not possible. We will have to recognize that the new dimensions of competition are not simply local, or national, or even international. They are also political. For perhaps our greatest competition comes from our politicians, our bureaucrats, and from those we elect in the fond hope they will represent the country's best interests.

Perhaps I am prejudiced. After all, one running a business, trying to make a profit for the stockholders (of which the Government takes more than half before the stockholder gets a look at it—and then the stockholder has to give some real part of his share to the Government); trying to keep the prices down; buy new equipment from inadequate depreciation allowances; carry on a comprehensive research and development program; tool up for new models; and continue increasing labor's benefits or face a strike. Well perhaps I do not come with clean hands and a clear mind, and perhaps in this paragraph, not very good English.

Well let's see what an economist thinks. He doesn't have to face these problems, he just talks about them. I turn to Peter F. Drucker, who writes in the May-June 1959 Harvard Business Review under the title "Realities of Our World Position." He asks, in the subtitle "Are we too blind, too smug, or simply unaware that the conditions determining our world position have changed?"

He starts off: "American public and business policies reflect some basic assumptions regarding our position in the world economy. With some oversimplification, these assumptions can be summarized in the following four statements:

1. The domestic market is the most important market for the American economy; performance in it is a full measure of the performance both of American business and of the American economy.

2. American superiority in productivity and in technological and managerial knowledge is normal. (Some people might even say "God-given," I suspect.)

3. The dollar gap is a permanent fixture of the international economy; foreign countries want as many American goods as they can get—and they want much more from us than we shall ever want from them.

4. Altogether the world economy needs us more than we need it."

He goes on to say that these assumptions are widely considered—by laymen as well as businessmen, labor leaders, and Congressmen—to be self-evident truths, is not inexorable laws of nature. He says "I believe, however, that in fact they not only are dangerously taken for granted but echo much of the complacency with which Edwardian England viewed its place in the world (to the sorrow of Britains ever since World War I). The assumptions are also at best half truths—and rapidly becoming less true all the time."

An almost opposite set of assumptions would, I submit, be far closer to the truth. Also it would give us a better foundation for business and public policies and attitudes and a more reliable yardstick by which to measure our true position in the international economy.

Mr. Drucker then goes on to what he considers a realistic approach to our international business problems. His assumptions are:

1. The foreign (i.e., export and import) market is fast becoming the truly critical market for the American economy.

2. American leadership in productivity and in technological and managerial know-how is not normal but abnormal.

3. Within a few short years—perhaps even less than a decade—the central problem of U.S. economic policy may well become earning enough foreign exchange to pay for imports (and to finance production of needed raw material imports in oversea plants).

4. Altogether, America's position in the world economy is both crucial and precarious.

In support of these four assumptions, he notes that our ability to produce is now dependent on our ability to import a long list of industrial raw materials, materials we either do not produce at all or do not produce in quantities adequtae to sustain our present industrial level. He suggests that a full half of the jobs in our economy already depend in one way or another on our capacity to import.

He comments as follows: "The United States is rapidly becoming a have not country, not because it is poor but because it is rich. "Export or die" may never become our slogan but 'export or decline" is a proper one already. For there is only one way to maintain the ability to import let alone to expand; that is to maintain and expand the ability to export."

"The foreign market, regardless of its size, is therefore already the crucial market for our economy. Performance in it will increasingly determine the ability of the American economy and of American business to prosper and grow." What Mr. Drucker is saying is that the United States already imports a tremendous amount of material that it does not have, and that it must continue to import this material increasingly. Furthermore if we are to stay strong we must process this material, and export those things that we can make increasingly to world markets.

I have already spoken on the second point; namely, American leadership in productivity in connection with our so-called Yankee ingenuity. He ends up his comment on this point as follows: "All this means, of course, that we cannot take our leadership for granted. We must instead assume that other people have brains and use them and that others can do just as well or better whatever we can do."

In commenting on the third assumption, he expresses real concern that under the present conditions the dollar gap may disappear quite quickly. Most economists agree completely with this assumption. In 1958 our country's balance of payments showed an estimated deficit of almost $3½ billion. Last year it was $3.7 billion or 8.8 percent more. Merchandise imports rose from $12.9 billion to $15.3 billion last year, and U.S. exports remained at $16.2, and this latter amount includes the value of our giveaways. When these deficits are coupled with a trend toward a much smaller favorable trade balance, the conclusion is inevitable that we are spending more dollars abroad than we can afford and that we should. This question of balance of payment, which has worried so many other nations since World War II is now coming home to us.

Somehow we must find a means of keeping our products competitive domestically and in foreign markets. We can't do this unless we control and possibly roll back inflationary forces in the United States. Excessive budget deficits, too easy money during boom periods, the wage-price spiral, and the farm price support programs are all elements. So are conditions that hamper productivity.

Other countries establish quotas on imports from the United States, and these should be removed, under threat of establishment of quotas by ourselves. We should correct many things that are bad, such as offshore purchasing under our mutual security program. We should correct the impression that the amount of funds we have available for grants and loans to foreign countries are inexhaustible and we should not be expected to carry more than our fair share of the overall military and economic systems program. Somewhere this assistance should begin to taper off.

So much for what various economists think and various economists have written. Let us take a few for instances. A few short years ago our automobile makers were saying, "The American people do not want a small car—they want big ones. The way we sell them, they can afford them and if anyone wants a low-priced car, there they are in the secondhand carlots. Sure, there are a few people who will buy those foreign market-baskets on casters, but not for us."

Last year the story changed. The foreign cars are established here. Our car makers remind me of the two Texans at a New York cocktail party. Whatever the subject, the Texans always top the story—bigger, better, or whatnot.

Finally the talk turned to midgets. One Texan was confused. He got the other one in a corner and asked "Do we have the biggest midgets in the world in Texas, or do we have the smallest?" In looking over our compact cars I am not sure whether we have the smallest big cars, or the biggest small cars in the world. Anyway it's a change of pace, and I hope we and the world like our new small cars in being or to come.

I am going to spare you from pages of statistics and dozens of charts and diagrams. You can collect your own, but I do wish to give you a cross section of some of them just so you may see the background of my remarks.

Acton Chance, who calls himself "metal-workings private eye" in Steel magazine investigates the case of vanishing taxes.

He gives one example of a domestic company bidding on a Navy ship plate contract. They are underbid by a foreign company and the Navy boast that it has saved $37,000 by taking the low foreign bid. Well what did the country and what did the rest of us save? The direct taxes lost on this deal were $67,000. The foreign company paid no U.S. income tax and the net loss to the United States was $30,000.

He gives other examples. The steel industry lost 1.6 million tons of steel production to imports in 1958 versus 1954. Translated into jobs, it means that there were 14,400 less jobs here in 1958, if we had purchased domestic steel, and continued to maintain our export markets. The automobile industry lost 520,310 units in 1958 versus 1954 due to increased imports and decreased exports. This, Mr. Chance states, means that there were 48,650 fewer jobs here because of this foreign production.

In machine tools there was $31,800,000 lost in 1958 as compared with 1954. Imports were up $7 million, and exports were down $24,800,000. Last year it was even more. This he says means 3,180 fewer job in the United States. The total of these three examples is 66,230 jobs. I assure you that these

are but a minute part of the whole picture, but do show the trend.

Similar comparisons could be made here in our own Connecticut backyards. The casualty lists include clocks and watches, brass mill products, bicycles, rubber footwear, typewriters, stainless steel flatware, sewing machines, fire alarms, zippers, and snap fasteners, to say nothing of textiles.

Comparative wage scales do not tell the whole story. Wages and productivity must be combined. Let no one tell you our workers are consistently outproducing our foreign competitiors. It just is not so, and where it is so, it will not be so for long.

In the steel industry, in 1957, the following comparison in wage scales existed:

United States	$2.91
Britain	.827
West Germany	.694
France	.583
Italy	.55
Japan	.361

In the face of increasing costs all along the line is it any wonder that our steel industry is fighting inflation, and endured a long strike in trying to hold the line. They should have had the support and commendation of every thinking citizen; but an economic battle was settled for political reasons.

The Copper and Brass Research Association has made "A Study of an Industry's Decline Due to Our International Policies." Samples of this study are available for you here tonight. With it is a condensation that "he who runs may read," prepared for those who wish a quick understanding of the situation. I have sent the former to all of our company bankers, and the latter to all of our employees. Copies of these are available from the Copper and Brass Research Association for your similar purposes, if you so desire.

Do I think data of this kind has any effect on our Tariff Commission—our representatives in Washington? No. They are dedicated to continued reduction in duties, to aiding foreign competitors, to promote imports. And they will continue to be dedicated until enough of us do something about it. At long last our Government is making a gesture of promoting the sale of U.S. merchandise through its foreign offices. Week before last one of our commercial attachés in a foreign country told me, "We get bales of literature and peptalks for sale promotion, and we do fine until we bring out the price list." There is no competition in the world as successful as one with a lower price and better credit terms. Or perhaps foreigners will buy from us because they love us?

Sure, in its defense industry has the right to prove injury to the Tariff Commission. It has the right to appeal. But by the time you can prove injury, you are dead. You need no relief then, for you are out of business. And should you get relief, it is but a Smith Bros. cough drop given to a patient in the last stages of galloping consumption.

When the competition you face from abroad has but 3 to 15 percent of the labor content in its products as compared with three times those amounts in your equivalent products; when he has no fringes; benefits from tax refunds on products exported; possesses new and better equipment than you do; has no engineering expense because he copies your products after you have developed them and established a market; where he benefits from long-term credit loans and favorable financing through world banks; what possible difference can a few percent duty increase mean? The chances are that he was already overpriced on his costs and making 40 to 50-percent profit on operations to begin with. We in the United States are pikers when it comes to making a profit, and I know what I am talking about. Our profit generally comes from the last 25 percent of our business—and when we lose that—no more business.

Now what does all of this do to the dollar? Recently I was talking with a French industrialist. He knows all about inflation. It went so far that France recently revalued the franc. It had already been devalued, and is now, I believe, on the way back to a stronger position.

He said: "In France we are counting on a devaluation of the dollar in the early sixties. We do not think it can hold up much longer." It was a shock to me when our dollar became worth less than the Canadian dollar. To become worth less in world markets would be a national admission of calamity. It may happen, but I hope not.

It would mean we could buy less and less of needed commodities, and you will remember I have submitted evidence that we are becoming "a have-not Nation." We have spent Federal money, and keep on spending it as though we believed that the spending need not be paid for. Seventy billion has gone for foreign aid since World War II, and continued foreign aid at the rate of something like $4 billion a year is an important factor in our gold outflow.

Well, I could go on and on, but what to do. There are short range possibilities, and long range possibilities. There are individual industry possibilities and there are national possibilities. I am not going to attempt to cover all of them.

Short range, for any single industry, the program seems to be to meet foreign competitions in foreign markets with foreign plants. This takes jobs away from the United States. But they are going or are going anyway, as far as export markets are concerned, from the United States. For that reason we have two plants in England, two in Canada, one being doubled in Brazil, one in making in Australia, and two underway in Mexico. Possibly others will come elsewhere. We need these foreign plants to maintain our world markets and we cannot afford to lose by default.

Let me affirm that these plants are not planned for import into the United States. Building a backfire to protect your property from a conflagration is one thing. To use these plants for importing to the United States would eventually do the opposite. But it may come by necessity.

Short range planning also includes the dispersion of domestic plants to smaller units in favorable areas in the United States. Domestic competition cannot always be met by old industries in obsolete multi-story buildings, with old organizations operating under rigid labor agreements.

It is worthwhile to modernize, to try to improve output, to try to secure improved labor contracts in the old operations. But there are some clocks you can't turn back and they may have to be slowed down or stopped to wait for time to catch up.

Increasingly must each community, each State, each section of the economy examine itself. That, we of industry and commerce are doing in the Waterbury area. From it we hope may come helpful plans and programs. But these are long range plans and will take courage, intelligence, and time to carry out.

Tax revisions downward and decreased Government spending is necessary. Again must come group understanding and group sacrifices. Some sacred cows must be butchered if we are to endure beneficially. Plans for tax revision should start with plans for less spending and that isn't very popular in certain quarters.

But the thing we need most is a realization of our national and local positions by those who govern for us. That is a matter of public expression; these expressions must be based on a realization of our domestic and international position. That is why I am talking here tonight; that is why others must talk and continue to talk, and that is why I hope each of you will do likewise.

Look at little Finland. Stuck in the side of Russia, bullied and beaten by them, yet asking nothing of others, it endures—it makes progress and it shames us all. Let us take a lesson from Finland.

Let us try to get some of that same spirit and let us individually and in groups write to our representatives and our candidiates that we want less spending, less taxes, less foreign aid except for specific defense, intelligent protection for U.S. industries. Let us recognize that labor has grown up, that unions are here to stay and as a proper part of our economy must take a proper responsibility, a less selfish interest and be subject to equitable laws as are the rest of us.

Let us know what we are voting for and let us make sure that we get it. To do this we must vote. We have seen how tough the Russian philosophy really is. Let's get tough too before it is too late.

If we are indeed rugged individuals, let us resist individually and in our homes the purchase of low-priced foreign merchandise fo rourselves and for our businesses. In the long run, good U.S. merchandise will be in fact the lowest in price, because the dollar we spend at home remains here to keep on working.

We of industry pray, as did the backwoodsman in mortal combat with a bear—"Oh, Lord, I never asked your help before—but I 'shore' need it now. And Lord, if you can't help me, please don't help the bear."

Senior 65'ers Citation to Senator Patrick V. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate have been made keenly aware of the current status and living conditions of the 16 million human beings who constitute the aged population of America, thanks to the persistent work of my respected colleague, PAT MCNAMARA, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

His leadership has been recognized around the Nation, the most recent evidence being the presentation to him of the Senior 65'ers award by the retired members of district 65 of the AFL–CIO Wholesale and Department Store Union. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation to the senior Senator from Michigan, on the occasion of the award ceremony, in New York City, on May 25, 1960, in recognition of his contribution to the wider understanding of the needs of America's growing population of senior citizens.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENIOR 65'ERS CITATION TO SENATOR PATRICK V. MCNAMARA

In many ways, Senator PAT MCNAMARA speaks for us, the retired members of dis-

trict 65. Perhaps that is because he and we have two very important things in common. He, like us, is a senior citizen and he, like us, is a union member. Before he became a Senator, Mr. McNAMARA was for many years a member and leader of Detroit Pipefitters Local 636.

There are few men in Congress who are better fitted for the work which he has done and continues to do in tackling the overall problems of the aging in our country. One of the best indications of this is his own feeling about older members of the community, which he expressed soon after he became head of the first congressional group ever to deal with the total needs of our older population. He said:

"Let us not be caught in the pitfall of regarding our senior citizens as problems. With years of living to their credit, they have much to contribute in terms of wisdom and experience."

These sentiments, Senator McNAMARA, are the same as ours here in district 65, and we honor you above all for putting this practical approach to work and for the great accomplishments which are the result of that work.

The greatest of these accomplishments is the health-care legislation you have proposed, which has the strong likelihood of soon becoming law. Thus, our country's retired citizens would receive the health care they so badly need, as a matter of right and not as a matter of charity, thanks largely to your efforts.

But we honor you for more than this. With characteristic thoroughness, you have carried out the mandate of your committee by calling attention to the equally crucial needs of elderly persons in the areas of income, employment and housing. Your recommendations for substantial increases in social security benefits; for greater employment opportunities for older workers, and for adequate publicly aided housing for the elderly with low or moderate incomes, have stirred new awareness of our Nation's needs in this field.

The thoroughness you have shown in this work, the leadership you have given to organized groups such as ours and others all over the Nation in the campaign to add life to the years of senior citizens, merit the honor of all Americans. We are happy to be among those expressing a deep esteem of you and your work.

Stupidity or Madness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE BROCK

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the collapse of the recent summit meeting and the events preceding and subsequent thereto have been distressing to all of us, the Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Time and history alone will eventually relate the circumstances, the fault, or the blame, if such can be properly characterized, for the incidents which the Soviet Union so conveniently utilized to disperse the scheduled talks dwelling upon peace in the troubled world, dispelling the cold war and lowering the Iron Curtain.

In all this history of international relations, and particularly those involving the very personages of the heads of government, has there been such abuse and vilification heaped upon the head of a sovereign people, as has occurred in the series of irresponsible, vitrolic, and extremely vulgar utterances by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

While we, as officials of this Government, and the citizens of this great Republic have the constitutional right to our thoughts and expressions, if you will, as to the rights or wrongs leading to the summit collapse, we should meditate very seriously on the immediate tensions that have arisen out of this situation. Further, this is the time that, "we, the people," should unite and stand fast in support of our Chief Executive and our Government until these tensions subside and the vitrolic and polluted air is cleared.

We should bear in mind that right or wrong, he is our President and this is our Government. United, we stand but divided, we shall fall.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in this House the purpose of an editorial published on June 6 in the Norfolk Daily News, Norfolk, Nebr., a progressive daily with an enterprising editorial staff.

The editorial, entitled "Stupidity or Madness?" is an excellent treatise on the summit and postsummit actions and utterances of one Nikita Khrushchev. It is a courageous piece of writing, one that endeavors to reflect our national thinking on the ultimate results therefrom.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of my colleagues in the House, include these portions of a fine editorial in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be available for all to read and give sober reflection to the threat about us.

The article, in part, reads:

The world, or, at least, that decent portion of it which still believes in manners and morals, was gagged by his vitriolic attack on President Eisenhower at Paris following the collapse of the summit meetings. But his freelance repeat performance in Moscow the other day was even worse.

Khrushchev has been so arrogant and ill mannered against the man whose efforts for peace have given the world its great hope that he no longer can be regarded as a responsible leader of a major nation.

The world hasn't seen such a disgusting display of irresponsibility since Adolf Hitler was spouting curses at all who stood in the way of his designs for world conquest.

Immediate war was Hitler's aim. We cannot believe that Khrushchev really wants war. The only conclusion to be drawn is that we are watching the spectacle of a world leader roaring into the winds, cloaked in a mantle of stupidity and madness.

Father of National Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is National Flag Day, and I am proud to note that the recognized father of Flag Day was born in the village of Waubeka in Ozaukee County, in eastern Wisconsin, and first conceived the idea of Flag Day while teaching in a little country school in that area.

Fourteen years ago today the citizens of Waubeka dedicated a memorial, a most fitting memorial, a flagpole, in the memory of this patriotic American, Bernard J. Cigrand. I ask unanimous concent that a portion of the memorial booklet entitled "The Life and Works of Bernard J. Cigrand—The Father of National Flag Day" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF BERNARD J. CIGRAND—THE FATHER OF NATIONAL FLAG DAY

Bernard J. Cigrand, the nationally recognized father of Flag Day, was born at the village of Waubeka, township of Fredonia, Ozaukee County in the State of Wisconsin, on October 1, 1866.

Undoubtedly inspired by his father, who had always been interested in education and who formed study clubs, became justice of the peace, postmaster and school commissioner, young Cigrand displayed an early interest in American history, a devout patriotism for the land of America, and a great love for the flag of the Nation. Members of his family recall that "he was always reading American history and talking about the flag." And although flags were not too plentiful in those days, the young lad always managed to find a flag to display. Later on, he always had a flag on his desk in school.

It was after he became a schoolteacher at the age of 19 and conducted classes at the little country school at nearby Stony Hill or Schumacher's Hill that Cigrand conceived the idea of observing June 14 with fitting ceremony as the "birthday of the flag," bearing in mind that Congress had officially adopted the stars and stripes as the flag of the United States on June 14, 1777.

In the role of $40 per month schoolteacher, he held the first observance of Flag Day in 1885, where observers recall the small American flag that stood in a bottle on his schoolroom desk. On that day, the graduating students turned in themes he had assigned them on the subject of the American flag. That was the beginning of long years of fervent and devoted effort to bring about national recognition and observance of Flag Day.

In 1886, the young patriot terminated his teaching career and went to Valparaiso, Ind., to begin training for his chosen career in dentistry at Northern Indiana Normal School. In 1888, he graduated from Northwestern University Dental School and in 1891 from Lake Forest University. In 1892–93 he studied industrial, educational, and political economy at the University of Chicago. He had married Allie Needham Crispe, of Chicago, in 1889 and from that union were born six children: Bernard H., Joyce A., Elroy F., Elaine, Virginia E., and Clyde E.

Never once through these years did Cigrand falter in his crusade to have June 14 recognized as a national holiday when Americans might pay homage to the national emblem. He made his first public proposal of the idea in June 1886, through the medium of the Chicago Argus, and he campaigned tirelessly thereafter in newspaper and magazine articles, in books and on the lecture platform, advocating recognition of this memorable day as "Flag Birthday."

In an address to the Sons of America in June 1888, he emphasized the good that would come from a flag holiday and as a result, that organization undertook the publication of a magazine called the American Standard to inculcate reverence for Amer-

ican emblems. Dr. Cigrand became its editor in chief.

In 1894, Cigrand and Le Roy Van Horn, of Chicago, a Civil War veteran, issued a newspaper call to "all persons who desire to commemorate the birthday of the American flag," to attend a meeting in the assembly hall of the Grand Pacific Hotel in Chicago. At that meetoing was formed an Illinois corporation known as the American Flag Day Association, whose purpose was to celebrate on the third Saturday in June and to conduct the exercises in the interest of school children. Cigrand was made secretary of that organization and when he later became president in 1896, he driected that the actual date, June 14, be observed. The association held celebrations in the large Chicago parks and because of the nationwide interest they evinced, the national American Flag Day Association was formed and Dr. Cigrand became its president.

Dr. Cigrand was a lecturer for the Chicago Daily News and was well known for his authoritative lectures on "The Evolution of the American Flag" as well as other historical subjects. Among his best known printed works were the profusely illustrated "Story of the American Flag," and "History of the American Emblems." His other writings included "The Real Abraham Lincoln," "Life of Alexander Hamilton," "History of American Heraldry," "History of Dentistry," "History of Medicine," and "The Cigrand Family Geneology." He was a contributing editor to the Encyclopedia Americana and to dental and literary journals. Among other works, he wrote "The Origination and Meaning of Flag Day" for the Encyclopedia and a widely distributed pamphlet on "Laws and Customs Regulating the Use of the Flag of the United States."

He took up the practice of dentistry in Chicago during 1888 and later practised in the communities of Batavia and Aurora, Ill. He served on the faculties of Northwestern University, the Illinois School of Dentistry, of which he was dean, and the University of Illinois. National recognition for leadership in his chosen profession was evidenced when he was elected and served for several years as president of the American College of Dental Surgery. And he was at one time president of the Chicago Public Library.

Dr. Cigrand served with distinction as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy during World War I. But the crowning achievement of his life had come at the age of 50, when President Wilson, on June 14, 1916, had issued a proclamation calling for a nationwide observance of Flag Day. Cigrand had also assisted in forming the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag in 1889 and had later petitioned President Wilson to urge its acceptance by the War Department. On June 14, 1914, the coming wartime President of the United States had echoed Cigrand's sentiments when he said: "This flag for the future is meant to stand for the just use of undisputed national power. No nation is ever going to doubt our power to assert its rights, and we should lay it to heart that no nation shall ever henceforth doubt our purpose to put it to the highest uses to which a great emblem of justice and government can be put." And then he added that the flag "has vindicated its right to be honored by all nations of the world and feared by none who do righteousness."

Bernard J. Cigrand departed this life on May 16, 1932, at the age of 65 years and his body lies at rest in Aurora, Ill., where he had made his home for many years. He left behind for his fellow men an honored memory, a lasting tradition in this national day of recognition for the flag of our Nation and a great inspiration to all the future generations of American men and women.

Biology—A Weapon for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roger D. Reid, Director, Biological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, recently delivered an address on "Biology—A Weapon for Peace."

This is a provocative document worthy of reading, and I am honored to include it as part of my remarks.

The opinions or assertions expressed herein are the private ones of the author, and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Department of the Navy.

BIOLOGY—A WEAPON FOR PEACE

(By Roger D. Reid)

The basic aim of science is generally, and always should be, human betterment. Although it is unfortunate that scientific knowledge must sometimes be directed to less noble purposes, that same knowledge is often used to improve man's social and economic status. For example, the sciences which produced the holocaust at Hiroshima and make ballistic missiles a reality are the same ones that are giving us a basic understanding of the universe.

We all know how costly it is in time, money, and effort for nations to carry on a race for arms superiority which presently seems to be a progressive stalemate. It is also common knowledge that while the gods of war are growing fat on their diet of hate, greed, and mutual distrust, many millions of human beings are undernourished, underhoused, and have inadequate health facilities, educational, and social opportunities.

Technology has made it possible for about one-third of the world's citizens to enjoy a high standard of living. In the United States we enjoy great comforts and conveniences, overproduction of food, and superior diets. This is not the case in many less-favored countries in which communism finds fertile fields for its seeds to germinate. Science has made gigantic strides in improving the conditions for peoples favored by geography, human and natural resources, but has failed to meet the needs of many others.

Can science do any more? I believe that biology can succeed where, in a humanitarian sense, the physical sciences have not. This will require time, money, thought, and cooperation. With more basic understanding of biology more people will be assured of a fuller life and democracy will prosper.

There is a growing realization among scientists that biology is the most important branch of science today as well as for many years to come. Hans Selye has said, "We cannot afford to concentrate all our attention upon the physical sciences." A. M. Weinberg, Director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, agrees. He has said: "It seems inescapable that the current preponderance of mankind's scientific effort toward the physical, rather than the biological, sciences is wrong. One of the most important responsibilities of science at large is to redress the balance between the physical and biological sciences, and to direct more of the world's scientific resources along lines which are more nearly concerned with the issues of human happiness."

A prominent Soviet scientist has predicted that the role of the leading branch of natural science will pass in the relatively near future from physics to biology.

Biology has not developed as rapidly as the physical sciences for several reasons. One important reason has to do with the complexity of biological problems and the difficulty of isolating the variables involved. In comparison with the biological sciencce the physical sciences utilize relatively general laws which are clearly and individually demonstrable in rather clear examples. Biology, on the other hand, deals with many complicated and interacting charactertistics of living organisms, many of which cease to exist—or are completely out of context—when singled out for study. Techniques needed for investigating life processes at submicroscopic or molecular levels have only recently been developed by adaptations of physical technology.

Other reasons why biology is retarded have to do with the current fashions that relegate biology to a place of relatively low esteem in science. This results in inadequate support of research on basic biological problems.

By comparing the amount of money available for support of research in the various scientific disciplines it is obvious that only those aspects of the biological sciences pertaining to the relief of suffering and death by disease are in any measure adequately supported.

The United States and many of our friends feel that we lost a great deal of prestige by falling behind the Soviets in the space race. This may be true but is it truly important? The people in India; for example, are not really worried about whose satellite is orbiting the sun or which nation owns the copyright to photographs of the moon's backside. What concerns them is their empty bellies, their bare feet and bodies when winter comes, and the lack of medicine to relieve their chills and fever. Gandhi is believed to have said, "To the millions who go without two meals a day the only acceptable form in which God dare appear is food." Dare science appear in any lesser form? So I say any prestige the United States may have lost when sputnik went into orbit can quickly be regained by solving problems which will insure a more adequate standard of living for the world's underprivileged people.

Although progress in biological sciences has not kept pace with that in other scientific disciplines, we should recognize that a graet deal has been accomplished. On the credit side of the ledger—many of the crippling diseases of man have been brought under control. There is much more to be done to relieve the misery and suffering caused by infectious and metabolic diseases but this is not the only nor even the most basic problem in biology. While scientific progress in the realm of human health has surpassed advances in the control of plant and animal diseases, control of a few plant and animal diseases has made it possible to increse supplies of certain types of food. The application of genetics to agriculture has led to the development of new varieties of plants that prosper under environmental conditions which would have inhibited their ancestors. New varieties of wheat have made it profitable to extend by sevenfold the acreage on which it can be grown in Canada. Similar increases have been possible in Australia and in Argentina. Hybrid corn has increased yields 20 to 30 times over its ancestral Indian maize. Practical plant and animal breeding have produced varieties that yield larger quantities and of better quality with less waste, often in shorter growing time. Indeed, it is now possible to "tailor-

make" plants and animals to meet almost any desired requirement.

Now that we have learned through biochemistry and microbiology that the prime carrier of heritable characteristics is the decxyribonucleic acid component of chromosomal nucleoproteins, and DNA and RNA can be synthesized in the laboratory, the future in this field is most encouraging. Studies on transduction in bacteria have shed light on the mechanism of heredity and in fact may yield new concepts of the causation and prevention of diseases by built-in resistance factors in previously susceptible hosts.

By scrupulous adherence to pure culture techniques, microbiologists have learned a great deal about infection, fermentation, nitrogen fixation, and many other activities of microorganisms. But life is not a pure culture. We must always consider the interactions of host and parasite regardless of the size or complexity of the interacting systems. Many of these associations can be used to man's benefit.

Any consideration of biological systems is incomplete without giving some thought to the tremendous adaptive capacity of living things. Plant breeders have used empirical methods to develop plants adapted to normally adverse climate or soil. To fully exploit the adaptive ability of plants or animals we must try to understand the basic factors in such adaptability. Attempts to do this have been singularly unproductive in the past but with new tools, techniques, and advances in our knowledge of the nature of life itself we should soon be able to explain such things as hibernation, sporulation, germination, metamorphosis, and development of resistance to adverse conditions. These are but a few of the many puzzles of adaptability that have not been solved. For example, what is the "inhibitor" which prevents germination of seeds of desert flowers for many years yet turns the landscape into a sudden blaze of bloom at the first substantial fall of rain? How does the desert horned toad live on an almost water-free diet, and how can the African lungfish remain alive in dried mud for many weeks without elimination of urine? What are the properties of the protoplasm of the slime mold that allow it to be a streaming fluid in one stage and a dry, brittle solid in another? Living things are highly adaptable and by using this characteristic we can expect the biologists to build new plants that can be grown profitably on lands we presently consider submarginal for agriculture because of lack of rainfall, minerals, nutrients, sunshine, and favorable temperature.

Probably the greatest unknown among the many great secrets of life is the mystery of biological energy and energy transformations. In photosynthesis, chlorophyll traps solar energy and converts carbon dioxide and water in the presence of enzymes and cofactors, into glucose and other substances which animals use as a source of energy. The carbon cycle, so simple in principle, yet so complex in detail, is further complicated because we know so little about photosynthesis. Transfer of energy to animals from that trapped in the tissues of plants presents still another mystery. Some clues and partial understanding have recenty been discovered by biochemists working on transfer of energy in bioluminescence. For example, it has been found that one compound essential for energizing life processes, such as transmission of nerve impulses, contraction of muscles, division of cells, formation of optical images, and luminescence of a firefly, is adenosine triphosphate (ATP). In addition to ATP, each process, of course, requires and utilizes its own set of specific enzymes and cofactors.

This leads us to a consideration of the role of important enzymes in all metabolic processes. For example, how are enzymes synthesized? What holds them in check? Why don't the proteolytic enzymes of the stomach and duodenum digest the proteins constituting the tissues in which they come in contact? We have learned by using techniques of radiobiology that enzymes are less sensitive to ionizing radiations when present in resistant tissues. What is the nature of the protective substances in such tissues? Could it be that a simple element like sulfur may hold the answer? And for that matter, where are enzymes stored, when not needed, or what triggers their activity when a demand for them arises? If, as we believe, enzyme synthesis is controlled by genes; what then controls the nature of genes?

Another fundamental problem of biology is that concerned with cell division. Starting with a single fertilized human ovum there occur some 43 successive divisions, giving rise to 10 trillion highly specialized cells, tissues, and organs in the human at birth. What are the waves of determination that regulate embryonic development? Investigations have shed some light on this problem and practical applications of this minimal knowledge makes use of chemicals that regulate blooming in plants and fixation of carbon dioxide in others.

We have recently been hearing a great deal about a world population explosion. We must indeed be concerned over the failure of food production to keep abreast of population growth. However the problem is not insurmountable. It is a problem having biological origins and has some rather obvious biological solutions if we but find and apply them. Perhaps a better understanding of the basic biology of human reproduction will yield information which will make it possible to control populations and to improve humanity qualitatively rather than merely increase it quantitatively.

Through knowledge gained by research in the physical sciences, engineering, and technology have made it possible to plant and harvest more crops. If universally applied, modern agricultural technology could go far toward meeting the food needs of everyone on earth today. To meet the needs of the rapidly increasing population we must intensify our search for means to understand and apply basic biology. It has already been shown that basic biology can be applied to these problems with gratifying results. There can be no doubt that as our knowledge increases the benefits will be intensified.

Aside from the immediate practical problems of establishing and maintaining a desirable balance between food production and population, biology is needed to accomplish the ultimate goal of space science.

If men are ever to journey to the planets and stars, we must know the biological effects of cosmic radiation, extreme temperature variation, weightlessness, meteoric collision, synthetic air, and food-waste cycling. We must determine the biophychological effects of these factors and of disorientation and illusions of space and time.

The powerful engines and intricate devices needed to send and guide satellites and space vehicles to the stars and planets are relatively simply in comparison with the biological systems involved in successful transportation of man on extended trips into outer space.

What then do we propose? Because the problems to be solved have pronounced social and political, as well as scientific implications, attempts to get answers should not be left entirely to individuals or solitary laboratories. Important as individual research is—and it is extremely valuable to scientific progress—we can no longer afford the luxury of leaving biological research to the chance that someone may come up with an essential bit of information. We must define our problems and make a concerted effort to find answers. If this is done on a national or international scale there is no doubt that the results would be most satisfying.

The recent International Geophysical Year yielded much valuable information and proved that the first and most important object of science is the welfare of man. As nations work together toward this objective they find that scientific accomplishment is more important than fighting wars. Because biology promises so much for humanity, coordinated international effort in the biological sciences should prove more effective in developing permanent peace than any other field of science.

I, therefore, propose an International Biological Year—or Decade—because it will take a decade to fully appreciate how biology is in fact an effective weapon for peace.

(The suggestion for a biological decade was first made by this author in an address delivered at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., May 8, 1958, and is included in the proceedings of the Second Symposium on Gnotobiotic Technology, University of Notre Dame Press, 1960. Pp. 97–104.)

Cuban Editor Urges United States To Fight Red "Hate America" Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some 4 or 5 weeks ago the Senate approved an amendment which I offered to earmark $100,000 to initiate medium-wave Spanish language broadcasts by the Voice of America to Cuban listeners. I felt and the Senate felt we can no longer afford to permit Communist dominated propaganda to monopolize the attention of the people of Cuba.

Mr. President, under leave of the Senate I now call attention to an article written by a Cuban editor supporting this same point of view. The article appeared recently in the Herald of the Dominican Republic. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Herald of the Dominican Republic, June 5, 1960]

CUBAN EDITOR URGES UNITED STATES TO FIGHT RED "HATE AMERICA" CAMPAIGN

(By Chesly Manly)

HAVANA, CUBA.—Some members of the American Embassy staff here are concerned about the failure of the United States to combat effectively Premier Fidel Castro's Communist line "hate America" campaign.

Such misgivings were voiced privately by Embassy staff members in commenting on a column by Carlos Todd, a pro-American Cuban, in the English language Times of Havana, which deplored the "childish and pitifully inadequate" information policy of the United States in Cuba.

"The United States gently lifts its pants to keep from soiling them in the mud of propaganda and leaves a free field to its enemies," Todd wrote. He is one of the editors of the Times.

SOME AMERICANS AGREE

Americans in Cuba, including some members of the Embassy staff, agree with Todd's contention that Castro's slanders should be answered immediately by official statements to the newspapers and radio and television stations, telling the Cuban people what the United States has done for their country.

The revolutionary press might not use the statements but the independent Diario de la Marina, Prensa Libre and Arance, as well as the English language Times and Post, would use them. Todd says they would be used also by radio and television stations.

One Embassy spokesman, apparently reflecting the attitude of the State Department and Ambassador Philip Bonsal, implicitly confirmed Todd's attribution of a "pants lifting" policy to the United States.

EXPLAINS U.S. POSITION

"The question is whether to put yourself in a direct controversy with a person who will not be convinced anyway," he said. "That would be getting on the same level with him. There are other ways of going about it and many things are being done which are not apparent on the surface."

"How many people," asked Todd in his attack on the U.S. information policy, "know of the enormous benefits in dollar exchange accrued by this country by the quota system that gives Cuba the lion's share in competition with other Latin American countries?

"How many people know that if the Americans were to reduce this quota it would make one enemy and nine friends in Latin America—nine sugar producing sister nations that are desperate in their need for dollar exchange?"

One of these sugar producing countries is the Dominican Republic, which sells its sugar on the world market at the world price, while Castro contends that its Rafael Leonidas Trujillo is a protege of the United States in all kinds of conspiracies against Cuba.

The Castro's supporters raised most of the funds for his revolution at mass meetings in the United States; he charges that America supplied arms to Fulgencio Batista, the former dictator, which cost 20,000 Cuban lives, and now harbors "Batistianos" and "war criminals" who are planning an invasion of Cuba.

The United States has restrained the activities of these adventurers and intercepted many shipments of arms intended for use against Castro, but the Cuban people are not told about it.

BUDGET IS $127,000

The U.S. Information Service has an annual budget of more than $100 million for its operations throughout the world and its budget for Cuba is about $127,000.

It has a staff of 26 in Havana and operates 6 mobile units in Cuba.

Todd's column warns:

"There is no law in this country as yet that says that the United States cannot explain its position to the American people—and to explain it without condescension—if the United States does not do so, it is waging a losing battle in the propaganda war that is taking place in this country 24 hours of every day. If the United States does not do so it cannot come crying to the Cuban people to say that it has been misunderstood—to the United States: You are asleep, sound asleep. Khrushchev has already said, 'We will bury you.' He means it in Moscow. He means it in Havana."

Happy Hunting Grounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in a release from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game under date of June 8, 1960, we are told of the saga of William Burns, an Alaskan conservation officer with seven league boots, and we are told of such scenery and hunting and fishing along the Gulf of Alaska as would heal the frayed nerves and restore the physical vigor of any Congressman. The colorful reporting of a colorful subject, valuable as a tonic for all of us, prompts me to set forth at this point a major portion of the mentioned release, which is as follows:

William Burns is responsible for the area which embraces a coastal strip bordering the Gulf of Alaska for 300 miles from Lituya Bay to Katalla, and extending east to the Alaska-Canada boundary. As roads are practically nonexistent and the ocean waters too treacherous for patrol craft, he uses a plane to cover the fishing and hunting areas and construction camps. During a busy summer season he makes five or six reconnaissance patrols daily, using sea beaches, river bars, and unwooded strips for landing fields.

Public relations play an important part in the contacts Burns makes during his landings, which may total 25 in 1 day. His duties entail enforcement of the fish and game regulations, salmon stream surveys, game counts, creel and hunting checks, briefing hunters and fishermen on the regulations.

"It is the policy of the department," Rhien declared, "to try to prevent violations before they occur rather than to just make arrests. Arrests signify a lack of cooperation with the conservation aims of the department and a lack of consciousness on the part of hunters and fishermen of the true meaning of sportsmanship and conservation."

Enforcement in Burns' area is complicated by the summer influx of workers for three oil companies, four construction companies, and three White Alice sites along with the normal pressure from sport fishing, hunting, and the commercial fishery which opened for king, red, silver, and dog salmon, May 30.

Many newcomers, Burns said, are under the impression that Alaska is a wide-open hunting and fishing country with an unlimited supply of resources. This attitude keeps him on the hop correcting these erroneous impressions and curbing "Daniel Boone" instincts that don't conform to the regulations.

Like other fieldmen in the Department of Fish and Game, Burns has become a resident of the area in which he serves. Aside from its commercial possibilities, Burns foresees a bright tourist potential for his area. First is the spectacular scenery. The St. Elias and Fairweather Ranges which front the sea along the coast, constitute some of the world's loftiest mountains rising directly from salt water. They spew into the Pacific the continent's mightiest glaciers. One of these, Malispina, now inactive, is the size of the State of Rhode Island.

For the hunter there are brown and black bear, moose, mountain goat, and deer. The deer have been transplanted from further south and are only fairly plentiful at this time. Moose are abundant and the game division estimates there are 1,500 in the Yakutat area. Burns counted 750 on a 5-hour aerial survey. Mountain goats, due to their penchant for dwelling in rugged, inaccessible mountain country, get only light hunting pressure.

Fifteen to twenty hunters visit the area annually to hunt the so-called glacier bear in the rough terrain around the Hubbard glacier. Although it is merely a color phase of the black, its bluish pelt and comparative scarcity make it a prized trophy. Burns reported that in 1959 two were reported taken and, so far this year, five.

Sport fishermen have a choice of rainbow, cutthroat, and steelhead trout as well as king and silver salmon.

Access to the area for hunters and fishermen is afforded by either commercial airlines or by smaller planes which are privately owned or chartered.

Reds Stepping Up Mission to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the increasingly close Cuban-Communist ties are a matter of deep concern to the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

In a distubing succession of events, Castro has been "playing footsies" with the Communist bloc.

Following trade agreements earlier this year, about 70 or 80 Soviet industrial, mining, trade and cultural so-called experts are working in Cuba as a vanguard of what is expected to become a major technical assistance program—more likely, an ideological invasion.

The Western Hemisphere, itself, is naturally concerned. However, the Cuban people have an even greater stake in this turn of events.

At tremendous sacrifices, they overthrew what they felt was a dictator. Through the deceptive tactics of Castro—and his Communist cohorts—the Cuban people—if they are not careful—may find themselves subject to a Communist dictatorship too powerful to overthrow by themselves; that is, the Kremlin-dominated communism of Moscow.

Recently, the newspapers have published an increasing number of articles reviewing the way in which the Soviets are invading Cuba, pointing out the dangers, and proposing actions by the states of the Americas to deal with the situation before it may be too late.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have three articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD: First an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "If Cuba Goes Communist"; second, an editorial from the Green Bay Press Gazette entitled "Mr. K.'s Invitation to Cuba"; and third, an article from the New York Times by Tad Szulc entitled "Reds Stepping Up Missions to Cuba."

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, June 10, 1960]

IF CUBA GOES COMMUNIST

As the Castro regime in Cuba continues its manifestations of hostility toward the United States and liking of Soviet Russia and communism, the dilemma of the American people deepens.

We are sworn, under the Buenos Aires treaty of 1936, not to intervene in the internal affairs of any of our Latin American neighbors. To do so in Cuba, whatever the provocations, would arouse anti-American feeling around the world. It would help to lift the curse of the bloody Hungarian intervention from Khrushchev and Russia.

However, in self-interest and the interest of a free Nation, we cannot allow international communism to take over Cuba, whatever its guise. We cannot let Cuba become an American funnel for Communist infiltration, propaganda, and sabotage.

The problem seems to be coming to a head rapidly. The invitation to Nikita Khrushchev to visit Cuba, the continuation of the intense official campaign of slander, the anti-American activities of President Dorticos during his present Latin American tour indicate that Castro plans no change. Our policy of good will and patience toward the Castro regime is obviously wearing thin. And who can blame our officialdom?

There is a way to deal with this problem, should it reach the crisis point, that might enable the United States to escape the onus that would accompany unilateral intervention under the Monroe Doctrine. It is provided in the various agreements reached with Latin American nations in recent years. It permits joint action in the interest of hemispheric security.

Article 6 of the Rio Treaty of 1947 provides that if the sovereignty or political independence of an American state should be affected by any fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, representatives of the Organization of American States (OAS) will meet immediately in order to agree on measures to be taken. The OAS charter, signed in 1948, formally provides for meetings of consultation of American foreign ministers for considering urgent problems of common interest.

At Caracas in 1954 the American governments directly condemned the activities of the international Communist movement as constituting intervention in American affairs and declared that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement would constitute a danger requiring joint action in accordance with existing treaties.

President Eisenhower had these agreements in mind in March when he reported to the Nation on return from his trip to Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. He said:

"If a tyrannical form of government were imposed upon any of the Americas from outside or with outside support—by force, threat, or subversion—we would certainly deem this to be a violation of the principle of nonintervention and would expect the Organization of American States, acting under pertinent solemn commitments, to take appropriate collective action."

The Castro regime is moving closer to the Communists. So it might only be caution and foresight for this country to start the machinery to get appropriate collective action if this becomes necessary.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, June 9, 1960]

MR. K.'S INVITATION TO CUBA

When Khrushchev makes his visit to Cuba, possibly accompanied by one of Red China's bandits, Chou En-lai, there may be some evidence as to just how enthused the Cuban people are about the increasing signs that Fidel Castro has been selling them out to communism.

There were plenty of protests when Mikoyan visited Havana and he ran for cover when someone shot off a machine gun. Mikoyan is a realist and he knows he isn't the most popular person in the world. Certainly Castro will have things somewhat better organized for Khrushchev.

In the meantime Castro and the puppet Cuban president, Oswaldo Dorticas, have been slathering on the anti-American sludge. Dorticas, on a South American tour, has been charging that the United States was responsible for the explosion of the French ship in Havana harbor last winter, that American planes are violating Cuban air space, and that all American property owners have been reimbursed for their confiscated property. As the sharp and timely note from the U.S. State Department pointed out, all three charges are lies. There is even evidence that Castro hired the planes flown over Cuba to give him some propaganda ammunition.

There is small likelihood that many Latin American leaders believe Dorticas or are enthused enough about Khrushchev to extend the invitation. In recent months Castro's fiasco of freedom has been apparent to these people. They have regularly turned down invitations themselves to visit Havana, have politely boycotted conferences, and have criticized Castro's attempts to involve all Latin America in his hate-America campaign. It has been as obvious to many of them as to North Americans that the Cuban people are little better off under Castro than they were under Batista. There is just a different group filling both cells and firing squads.

Khrushchev's visit is a direct attempt to take advantage of the Red tinge in Cuba to spread communism to the Western Hemisphere. The United States should continue to contradict Cuban charges against us and stop making any attempt to soothe Castro. And, despite crowds maneuvered like TV audiences, Khrushchev may find his reception in Cuba just as full of chill and disillusion as those he received in Asia during last winter's tour.

[From the New York Times]

REDS STEPPING UP MISSIONS TO CUBA—70 TO 80 RUSSIANS GIVING TECHNICAL AID—TRADE PACTS CALL FOR EXPERTS

(By Tad Szulc)

HAVANA, June 9.—An estimated total of 70 to 80 Soviet industrial, mining, trade and cultural experts are working in Cuba as the vanguard of what is expected to become a major technical assistance group here.

The technical specialists are to advise in the development of Cuban industry and mining, particularly for the industrial plants Cuba is to begin receiving soon from the Soviet Union under the February trade pact. The treaty provides, among other things, the shipment of $100 million in equipment and for technical assistance.

With similar treaties already reached with Poland and Czechoslovakia, still another being negotiated with East Germany and a fifth one that may be arranged with Communist China, Cuba is relying to a high degree on Communist aid for her industrialization program.

CULTURAL GROUP IN CUBA

There is also a seven-member cultural mission, headed by Aleksandr Alekseyev of the Latin-American division of the Soviet Foregin Office here. It is presumed that they concern themselves with political affairs and handle such tasks as the exchanges of visitors, the handling of students to whom scholarships for Soviet universities are being granted, the planning of cultural programs and the supply of Soviet books to Cuba.

With Cuba entering into close relations with the Communist powers, Havana is turning into a busy center for the arrivals of various missions from Communist countries as well as individual Communists from other regions.

Last week 15 industrial and mining experts arrived here and were welcomed by Maj. Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba and the chief of Cuba's economy.

Sunday a four-person Bulgarian delegation, headed by Angelo Lubomir, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, arrived for a 4-day stay.

A nine-man Czechoslovak mission led by Frantisec Krajcir, Minister of Foreign Trade, arrived Monday to complete the treaty negotiations.

M. Krajcir conferred Tuesday with Dr. Guevara and Maj. Raul Castro, Minister of the Armed Forces. This set off speculation in diplomatic circles whether the trade pact with Czechoslovakia might include the sale of military planes and weapons.

It is known that Cuba is especially interested in jet aircraft, and the speculation on an arms deal with Czechoslovakia included reports that a jet airstrip was being completed on the north coast north of Cardenas. One report said Soviet engineers were directing the construction.

MILITARY ADVISERS REPORTED

There are also reliable reports that a small number of Soviet and Czechoslovak military advisers were working with the Cuban armed forces.

The Soviet civilian experts are operating in three independent groups: the cultural team, a commercial mission of about 20 persons headed by Vassily Murkulov, and an industrial team of from 30 to 40 specialists directed by a Mr. Kosariev. The general coordinator is a Mr. Egorov.

A geological-mining team of four men and one woman is operating near the Matahambre mines in Pinar del Rio Province and a larger team is in Oriente Province. They are surveying for manganese, nickel, iron, and aluminum ore.

Geophysicists, geologists and oil engineers are presumably assisting the Cuban Petroleum Institute in oil prospecting.

Double Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, a transcript on an editorial presented on WCCO–TV News, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn. on June 5.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I wholeheartedly concur with the sentiments as expressed therein except the portion referring to the understandability of women. I am sure, however, that reference thereto was mentioned facetiously and as a figure of speech rather than in a critical manner.

I should like to call to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that, I have introduced a bill to do just what the editorial says needs to be done—treat postal workers with the humanity and dignity they are entitled to. My bill, H.R. 10101, would allow the employees and their representatives to be recognized as a matter of right—not only as a "privilege conferred grandly from above." The mere fact that they would have the right to be heard, may in itself boost their falling morale.

Mr. Speaker, I trust also that the Congress this week will pass a meaningful salary increase bill, for if ever anyone today is underpaid for what knowledge he must possess, it is the Federal employee. The editorial follows:

Governments are sometimes like women: impossible to understand. One of the things

most difficult to understand about the U.S. Government is its curious double labor standard. And here the reference is to the Post Office Department.

While our Government, through stacks of statutes and numbers of boards, commissions, committees, and offices, takes great pains to protect, defend, uphold and otherwise guarantee the rights of labor in private industry, it consistently denies the same rights to its postal employees.

We are not speaking of the denial of the right to strike. That is general in government service, Federal, State, and local, and there are sound arguments for it.

What appears most inconsistent with an enlightened labor policy is the Post Office Department's attitude toward the unions of its employees. These unions do not exist by the right of the employees to organize. They exist—the Department has repeatedly said—by the sufferance of the department.

There is no collective bargaining in the Post Office Department, but even this would be tolerable if the postal workers were assured they had the right to carry their grievances and their views to either the Postmaster General or to Congress. But the Post Office Department has decreed, in its wisdom, that the employees do not have the right to do this—only a privilege, a privilege conferred grandly from above.

Add to this humiliation the self-evident fact that postal workers are among the lowest paid, anywhere, and reports of falling morale in the Post Office Department become believable.

Absence of Suffrage in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can't Vote Yet," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of June 6, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN'T VOTE YET

It is hard to realize that after so many, many years, American citizens in the Nation's Capital cannot vote and do not have any voice in the affairs of their city.

Presently there are two pending pieces of legislation before Congress pertaining to voting rights. One, which would give residents of the District of Columbia national suffrage, or the right to vote for President and Vice President, is a constitutional amendment that has been approved by resolution in the Senate and now needs to get through the powerful Rules Committee in the House before it can go to the floor there. Subsequently, it would require ratification by two-thirds of the States.

The other would provide Washington with a limited form of self-government. A bill to do this was passed by the Senate last year but it has since been tied up in the House District of Columbia Committee.

In the case of home rule, there are terrific political overtones. The southern-dominated District Committee is fearful of Negroes (now comprising 53 percent of the population) eventually gaining control over the Capital. A petition needing 219 signatures of Congressmen is only 19 short of getting the home rule bill from committee to the floor.

Sadly, however, with adjournment nearing it would appear that the home rule proposal, bottled in parliamentary procedure, will not have much chance at this session. But there is a possibility that the national suffrage amendment might squeeze through. Certainly the nearly 1 million citizens in our Capital should have the right to vote for our national officers.

And in the next session we shall hope that the discharge petition to get home rule to the House floor will succeed. It is a black mark on the Nation that our Capital does not enjoy conditions that the rest of us take for granted.

Voice of Democracy Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, our great Nation has faced many threats and has been tested in many arenas—but it continues to stand as the bulwark against godless ideologies. Its ability to meet the challenges, I think, is attributable to the freedom of our people.

We need to be really concerned with the future of our Nation if we lose sight of this basic reality. It is comforting to know that the young people of our country do realize this and this knowledge is the assurance that we need that this amazing form of government will continue in years to come.

I have received the speech that won for Linda McPhillips, of Grand Island, the Nebraska title in the Voice of Democracy contest. I found inspiration in the words and a renewed faith in our system of government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this speech and will insert it into the RECORD at this time:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Linda McPhillips)

Look at America. How magnificient she is. How powerful is her prestige. How important she is to the rest of the world. America is a democracy.

Where else but in our type of government—our democracy—could the standard of living be so high?

In what country, other than America, could you find the number of spacious homes, automobiles, television sets, telephones, and varied and splendid sources of entertainment and the many paid vacations?

Do I speak as though my love of democratic America is based primarily on materialistic thinking and living?

Then listen well to the testimonial of my love for the spiritual mindedness of our American people. This testimonial is borne out by the ever-increasing number of churches and the ever-increasing membership in those churches. Is this not definitely in keeping with the spiritual ideas of the Founding Fathers of our democracy as they built an infant nation under God? Listen well also to the testimonial of my love for the serious mindedness and education consciousness of our American Nation. This testimonial is borne out not only in the ever-increasing numbers of our public, private and parochial schools, but more importantly, it is borne out in the vastly improved products of those schools.

Do you now think that my love of America is based merely on material things? Listen well again to the testimonial of my love for the great freedom of a democracy. What a consolation to know that I, a simple citizen in a vast nation of millions, can attend the church of my choice; can attend the school of my choice; and above all, can follow a way of life of my own choosing wherein I can best serve my God, my America, and my fellow man.

This love of freedom—a freedom that only a democracy can give—is reflected in a hundred ways and a hundred times each day of our lives:

In a mother's joy as she tucks her child in bed or as she holds him close, knowing he is safe and has no fear.

In the gay, carefree pace of a young boy starting out for a hike in the woods.

In a young girl's thrill when she attends her first formal party.

In a deep satisfaction of a man after a job well done.

In the white, bowed head and the wrinkled toil-worn hands of an old man, folded in prayer.

Thousands of more words, hours more of speaking could not adequately express my love for the freedom of our American democracy.

Do Americans in general love their democratic way of life as I do? A person does not die for a cause in which he does not believe. Proof of their love indeed is the fact that thousands have died to preserve this democratic freedom. An extreme sacrifice is proof of love. I am reminded of a line from a famous revolutionary speech. It began: "These are the times that try men's souls. What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly."

"What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly."

May I shout it from the housetops and the highest mountain.

I am an American. I love America. I am exceedingly proud to speak for democracy.

Address by James C. Oliver Before the Ahepa Tristate Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, at the Ahepa Tristate Convention, Portland, Maine, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], made a noteworthy address which I feel could give inspiration to all of us and which I deem a pleasure to include in this RECORD. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of humility that I speak here today before you, a distinguished assembly of American citizens of Greek-American extraction.

Yet, it is most appropriate that I, as an elected public official, holding office through the indulgence of a free electorate in one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of all assemblies of freemen, the U.S. House of Representatives should take advantage of this great privilege which you have accorded me to address you, the dedicated members of Ahepa.

For, as your freely elected Representative, here in this meeting assembled today, I take this opportunity to speak to you of liberty and freedom, as fought for and practiced by the ancestors of all of us. I, also, must avail myself of this opportunity to warn you that the threat of loss of freedom hangs heavily over us and, in fact, over the entire world.

Today we face a common foe, not only in Greece and in America but in every section of the world, more ruthless, more cunning, more determined, more barbarously willing and eager to enslave mankind than were the Huns, the Slavs, the Persians, and all the other power-drunk conquerors of the ages.

The Soviets and the Red Chinese, ladies and gentlemen, have never changed their spots. These despoilers of freedom are dedicated to the conquest of peace-loving and freedom-worshipping peoples of the Western World. Their boast that they will bury us is no idle talk. This is no game which they are playing for mere marbles of gain. They are playing in deadly earnest and for keeps. We are fat, we are complacent, we are unwilling to listen to the hard facts and the harsh realities of the world in which we live today.

Your family ancestors in Greece for centuries faced up to the facts of life, as for example at Thermopylae and Salamis. A small and battered slab of marble discovered about a year ago in Troizen, just south of Athens, tells, through its inscription, of the battle orders issued by Themistocles when the Persians were on the march from Sardes, the seat of their government.

This slab and its inscription of fighting words has been described by its discoverer as the Athenian equivalent of our Declaration of Independence.

In truth, this battle order cut in marble backgrounds the crucial victory of the Greeks that followed at Salamis over the greatest empire of that period of history. It gave your ancestors command of the sea. It restored their freedom to pursue their ideals of liberty and made possible their golden age for which mankind has ever since gained the political and cultural inspiration which will never be extinguished.

So, my friends, we know from the past that we must fight for freedom and the heritage of liberty which, in fact, have been passed to us in this generation on a silver platter and which we are destined to lose if we fail to wake up to the threatening clouds which are becoming ever blacker, almost daily.

Then, again, as we refer in rather inadequate words to another episode in the glorious history of your great fatherland, we are once more inspired by the bravery and the indomitable courage of the Greek people and its leadership of the past.

It was 139 years ago when Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the standard of revolt in his monastery at Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, and his people joined him in this national struggle against their oppressors, his daring act ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous deed by a stouthearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break from the events of preceding centuries when Greeks were subjected successively to the Romans, the Frankish kings and the Turks. That day became the independence day of the Greeks.

We in this country have always held the Greeks in exceptionally high esteem. We have always had great sympathy for them, and have done our utmost to help them whenever we could. In their fight for freedom and independence against the tyranny of the Turks, and especially in their desperate struggle to maintain their independence against fascism, nazism, communism, and all forms of totalitarianism, they have counted upon our sympathy and on our aid. We are proud to say that fortunately we have been in a position to help them and have not disappointed them. And this has been true in the past as it is at present.

In the early days of the Greek war of independence a number of philhellenic groups were formed in this country for the purpose of raising funds and thus extending material aid to the fighting Greeks. A wave of philhellenic enthusiasm swept over America. President Monroe himself was not immune to the contagion of this philhellenism. This is clearly shown in his annual message on December 3, 1822, when he gave some reasons for our interest in the Greek cause. "The mention of Greece," he said, "fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret for ages past. It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

This was an eloquent and welcome explanation. As the elected head of the government of this country, he expressed the feeling of our people. No less eloquent was Daniel Webster, perhaps the most illustrious statesman-orator of his day, when he characterized the Greek War of Independence as part of a greater struggle between the absolute and the regulated governments. He stated that America could not and should not hold aloof from world affairs, and it was time for the people and the Government of this country to take a stand. "As one of the free states among the nations," he declared, "as a great and rapidly rising republic, it would be impossible for us, if we were not disposed, to prevent our principles, our sentiments, and our example from producing some effect upon the opinions and hopes of society throughout the civilized world." "Our side of this question," he added, referring to the Greek War of Independence, "is settled for us, even without our own volition. Our history, our situation, our character, necessarily, decide our position and our course before we have even time to ask whether we have an option. Our place is on the side of free institutions."

There are many fine thoughts and noble ideals in these few sentences of that inimitable orator-statesman, but the core is found in the last sentence, for it reflects the full and free American spirit; our place is, and has always been, on the side of free institutions, erected and kept erect by freemen. And the Greeks were among the forerunners of freemen who founded free institutions and fought for their preservation.

Nor has our expression of sympathy and our show of kinship of ideas with the Greeks been limited to mere words and declarations. It is well known that whenever Greeks have been in trouble, in need of material aid, we have been generous in helping them. This has been particularly true at the end of the First World War, and, of course, more so during and since the end of the last war. Early in the course of that war, when Greece was overrun by the Axis forces, our wartime President, the late Franklin Roosevelt, declared confidently that Greece would be liberated and rewarded for her heroic fight on the side of democracies against the forces of barbarism and darkness. He certainly echoed the true and genuine sentiment of the people of this country when he said: "I am glad to have the opportunity to reassure my friends of Greek origin and Greek birth everywhere that it is the desire of the American Government to help Greece to the utmost of its capabilities."

Our postwar role in Greek affairs, our aid to Greece, both financially and militarily, is rather widely known and I need not dwell upon them in detail. As soon as circumstances permitted, toward the end of the last war, we were more generous in aiding Greece than at any time in our history. In March 1947 when we were asked by the hard-pressed Greek Government for urgent emergency and military assistance, we felt that it was our duty to comply with this request. The then President Truman felt that it was our solemn responsibility to give all we could to save Greece from the tightening clutches of communism. In his message to Congress on March 12, the President declared: "I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government."

Here again the President was echoing the sincere wishes of our people. We could not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government, even though we had already expended more than $500 million in the form of supplies, lend-lease aid, and under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Fortunately, we had some more expendable dollars, and we did not seem to mind to add close to $3 billion worth of aid to the Greeks. Yes, the Greeks have deserved well of us. I am indeed glad to say that we were able and willing thus to pay at least a part of our intellectual debt which we all feel humanity owes to Greece and to the Greek genius.

In their enthusiasm for creative things of lasting value, the attainments and accomplishments of the Greeks remain unsurpassed and unequaled. In their fervent enthusiasm for liberty and democracy, they have struggled against great odds, have fought bravely and have guarded their democratic institutions tenaciously. For almost 2,000 years, from 146 B.C. to A.D. 1821, Greece was ruled by the Romans, the Frankish kings, and by the Ottoman Turks. From the Battle of Corinth in 146 B.C. when Greece was overrun by Roman legions to the Battle of Navarino in 1827 when the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks was finally brought to an end in Greece, Greeks lived under alien rule, but during those centuries their spirit of freedom was not extinguished; their dauntless will to fight never deserted them. And the best proof of that was the long, often despairing, and almost endless fight which they carried on for 8 years before they could attain their freedom and independence.

While we are discussing the Greek heritage to the civilization of the free world it would be most remiss of me to neglect a brief reference to the tragedy of Cyprus where the Greek majority have been frustrated for too long in their legitimate fight for this preponderantly Greek area. The gallant struggle, symbolized by the dedicated efforts of that great patriot, Archbishop Markariys, will eventually succeed and the ends of justice will be served. Of this, I feel certain.

Today, my friends of Ahepa, these memorable events of history inspire us to defend our freedom and liberty, eternally, against the impending and potential dangers of totalitarian tyrants.

I should speak, if time permitted, of the great contributions which have been made to America by those in your families who came to our shores and now comprise in every center of population in the United States the core of God-loving, law-abiding, public spirited citizenry, which has helped to make and will continue to help to keep America great.

I would speak, my friends, if time permitted of the cultural contributions which America has gained from the illustrious history of Greece and its people down through the centuries. For these America is profoundly grateful.

But the greatest contribution of all is the philosophy of the dignity of man and of the freedom of the individual. It is for these that freedom loving people all over the world must be the most grateful. It is for these priceless values that we must prepare to fight when threatened. It is for this heritage which our forefathers died to preserve that we will fight to defend against any and every enemy of human self-respect wherever and whenever he shows his ugly head and his rocket rattling belligerency.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, my friends of Ahepa, may that day never come again when we shall be compelled to fight in defense of these greatest of all assets of mankind, freedom and liberty, but, if, God forbid, it does come then in the philosophy of the song of the Greek heroes of the ages, we shall find this to be our one and only reply:

I may have a rock for my pillow
And only the snow for my cover
But I will never serve as a slave!
Dig a grave for me
Large and deep,
That I may stand with my gun—
Ready to fight.

The Executive Branch of the Louisiana State Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to incorporate at this point in the RECORD a magnificent address recently delivered in Baton Rouge, La., by one of our most distinguished citizens, the former Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Sam H. Jones. The address follows:

The subject assigned to me is, of course, impossible of accomplishment by any one person. No State government is quite so complex and complicated as our own. It would take a staff of experts many hundreds of man-hours to even approach an explanation that would be satisfactory to either the political scientist or the practical politician. It is therefore flattering that I should be called upon to do the impossible.

Some have generously suggested that certain experiences in my career befit me for the task which I accepted with fear and trepidation. But a closer examination indicates such appraisal is not justified.

The fact that I participated in writing our present constitution does not. For this constitution is certainly the longest of any of the 50 States; it is admittedly the most complicated and puzzling; and it has been characterized by some of the worst "ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

My ill-fated efforts to reorganize the executive branch of the State government back in 1940 would seem to constitute no particular qualifications. For although the legislature did succeed in consolidating 174 agencies into 20 departments and 5 independent agencies, and although the people ratified the idea at the polls, we can legally claim but one distinction: That of establishing something novel in constitutional jurisprudence, namely that constitutional amendments can, themselves, be unconstitutional.

My participation in the crusade to stop centralization of government in Washington, through the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was something less than a brilliant success. Since our sine die adjournment in 1955, the National Government has proceeded to move out in all directions, grabbing more power and money on the run, and leaving the States and localities much the worse for the noble experiment that was to correct the evils on all three levels of Government.

But there is a brighter side. There are compensations for failures and setbacks. Even the poet has said: "Sweet are the uses of adversity." Another great man has reminded us that "Failure is usually the beginning of success." and we might profit from the philosophy of patience, so eloquently expressed by Woodrow Wilson when he said: "It is the discovery of what they cannot do and ought not to attempt that transforms reformers into statesman."

I have one qualification for my appearance before you today. I am not discouraged. I am as optimistic about the future of Louisiana now as I was 40 years ago when I began my career. There is much in our heritage, and in the genius of our people and in the wealth of our resources that sets aside and gives our State a special place of preeminence in the constellation of American States.

Never let it be forgotten that the white man came to Louisiana long before he landed at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock. Alonzo Alvarez de Pineda preceded the *Mayflower* by a full century. Narvaez came to Louisiana in 1529, and De Soto crossed the Mississippi in 1541. We had the benefit of the early mixing of the cultures of the Spanish, the Portuguese, the French, and the Anglo-Saxon, which gave to Louisiana the international flavor that exists down to this day. Ours is an older, a broader, a richer civilization than exists anywhere else in the American Union.

Then 150 years ago there came to our land the immortal Acadians to further enrich our Commonwealth. Theirs is an epic which has given a spiritual lift to our people that will never die. Theirs is a saga that will inspire Louisianians and Americans as far down the path of history as men can vision.

We have lived under France and Spain; portions under the rule of Mexico and Great Britain and the West Florida Republic. Our State emerged briefly as an independent nation; then as a part of the Confederacy. For 50 years the Spanish Province of Tejas, or Texas, had its capital well within the present borders of our State. Napoleon was thinking about that part of the larger territory now represented by the State of Louisiana when he referred to its transfer to the United States as the economic and political force which would enable America to surpass in power the British Empire. Finally we came to rest under the Stars and Stripes.

But we brought with us much to enrich the American Nation. We brought many cultures and varied languages and numerous religions. We brought manners and customs and ways of life of far-off lands. History, for us, was written by the Spanish conquistador, by the intrepid French explorer, by the exiled Acadian in his pirogue, and the Anglo-Saxon in his covered wagon. It was written by the pirate, Jean Lafitte; and by the schemes of the Scotsman, John Law, and the Frenchman, Antoine Crozat, in the promotion called the Mississippi bubble. It is still being written by the hillbillies of the north and the Cajuns of the bayous, as well as by the intellectual aristocracy of a State that, in its versatility and distinctiveness, has no peer.

Then, if you have any doubt about the genius of our people, I would remind you of such artists as John James Audubon, the great naturalist, whose fame is worldwide, and of Caroline Wogan Durieux; of such educators as Alexander Dimitry, and Paul Tulane, and William Preston Johnston, and Thomas D. Boyd; of such great engineers as James Buchanan Eads, and Henry Miller Shreve and Lester Alexander. And in the same field I would mention the Spanish architects, who gave us the charm of the world-renowned Vieux Carré; and of James Gallier and Henry Hobson Richardson, whose architectural gems are scattered throughout the North and East.

I would remind you of the experiments of Etienne de Bore and Valcour Aimé, in the culture and refining processes of sugar cane, experiments and discoveries that became a boon to the entire world, and which have caused Louisiana to be the leader in this industry for a century and a half, and to be the trainer of 90 percent of the sugar engineers, chemists, and technicians for the entire world. So also of Louisiana's early business leaders and industrial giants such as Daniel Clark and John McDonough and Judah Touro and Julien Poydras.

In the field of medicine Louisiana, since its earliest beginnings, has been an outstanding leader in the Western Hemisphere. Here plagues were conquered. Here tropical medicine found cures that have benefited all mankind. Here was formed the first State department of health in the entire Union. And here great leaders in medicine and surgery, such as Drs. Stanford E. Chaille, Tobias G. Richardson, Edmond Souchon, Rudolph Matas, and Alton Ochsner have caused their names to be known and revered throughout a grateful world. And there were the illustrious philanthropists such as Almonester, Pontalba, Margaret Haugherty, and Poydras, Touro, McDonough, Tulane, and Edgar Stern.

Onto the field of military battle from the State went such outstanding leaders as Beauregard and Braxton Bragg and Dick Taylor and the "Fighting Biship" Leonidas Polk. And, at this point, we might remind our Texas friends that Jim Bowie, of Alamo fame, was not a Texan but a Louisianian. And still later John A. LeJeune, who became head of the Marines, and lightning Joe Collins, later to be Army Chief of Staff, and Lt. Gen. Troy H. Middleton, classed by his superiors as one of the great generals of World War II, and Claire Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame.

Alcee Fortier and Charles Gayarre lead a long list of Louisiana historians. It would be impossible to name all the literary personalities that have lent fame to our State, but we cannot pass without listing George W. Cable, Ruh McEnery Stuart, Alfred Mercier, Eliza Jane Nicholson, Dorothy Dix, Lafcadio Hearn, and Grace King. Nor should we miss the great musician, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, whose fame and concerts led to every land of the world. Nor the great religious leaders like Abbe Adrien Rouquette and Bishop Leonidas Polk.

In the field of law, so closely connected with government, I would remind you of Louisiana's most illustrious lawyer, Judah P. Benjamin, the "Brains of the Confederacy"; of Francois Xavier Martin, Christian Roselius; of Pierre Derbigny and Edward Livingston, adopted son of Louisiana, two of the authors of the civil code; and finally, of course, Edward Douglas White, who went on to become Chief Justice of the United States, intellectual giants and great leaders who would do justice to any civilization anywhere.

Now come we to the political leaders of the past: The Spaniards DeSoto, Galvez, Almonester, Carondelet and Esteban Miro, who "knew what all must learn as they triumph over adversity, communities only

build above themselves upon the dust of their shattered dreams." There were the Frenchmen LaSalle, the LeMoyne brothers, Bienville and Iberville; St. Denis, De Tonti, Cadillac, and the Marquis de Vaudreuil, who conquered the wilderness and brought culture and social graces to the growing empire of Louisiana. Then came the English-speaking Anglo-Saxons, the Claibornes, the Wilkinsons, and the Livingstons, whose efforts merged Louisiana as a sovereign State into the American Union, the 18th in order of admission.

From that time until the War Between the States the political control of Louisiana alternated between Frenchman and Anglo-Saxon and, as the historian Chambers said, Louisiana became "America's first melting pot." Not only French and English, but Spanish and German whose names and tradition and influence enrich our civilization today; and the Scotch-Irish who came overland from the East in their covered wagons; and later the Slavs, the Greeks, the Italians, and the Jews, whose business acumen did so much to develop the rich American midlands. And many, from many other nations, and religions and climes.

And, it seems to me, this mixture of peoples and ideas, and customs and religions, make for the greatness of our people. History gives us many examples. There was the British Empire which consisted not only of Englishmen, but of ancient Britons, of Romans, of Vikings and Danes and Normans, of Angles and Saxons, of Scots and Picts and the Gaelic of Ireland. The same may be said of the Greek and Roman Empires. Some of the most stable countries of Europe today, are the small states of Belgium and Switzerland, who combine mixtures of French and Flemish, and of German and Italian and of descendants of ancient Romans.

Thus, not only through the bloodstreams of our original settlers, but through the media of our distinctive legal system and our specialized medical achievements, and our versatility of land and resources and minerals, and the almost unbelievable diversity of our agriculture, and our connection with the outside world, by our own superior lines of communication with foreign lands, we have carved for Louisiana, a place in the American Union which has not, and never will be duplicated by another American State.

As an American State we have produced men of great political stature: A President of the United States, Zachary Taylor, a Chief Justice Edward Douglas White; great Governors like Villere and Mouton and Francis Tillou Nicholls, and Henry Watkins Allen; great Senators like John Slidell, Pierre Soule, Judah P. Benjamin and Donaldson Caffery—to name only a few down to the end of the 19th century—lest we travel into the controversial areas of contemporary politics.

If we have been blessed with great leaders and men of genius, we have been even more blessed, by nature itself, with a great outpouring of rich, basic wealth; with fabulous natural resources that make us the envy of our neighbors. As far back as 1850 we were the richest State in the Union, both in per capita wealth and per capita income (including slaves). Seven-eighths of the Nation's millionaires once lived in Natchez, Miss., but made their fortunes across the river in Louisiana. New Orleans was once the Nation's third largest city and for 7 years its financial and banking resources exceeded those of New York City. The commerce, not only of this Nation, but of the British Empire, was largely controlled from the Crescent City.

All this would seem to have been the fulfillment of the vision of the great leaders of the past. Of Father Charlevoix who, in 1721, said: "Rome and Paris had no beginnings so considerable, nor were they under auspices so happy, nor did their founders meet upon the Seine and upon the Tiber the advantages we find upon the Mississippi."

Of Napoleon who looked upon lower Louisiana, with its undeveloped hinterland, as the economic and political force which would enable America to surpass in power the great British Empire. Of Thomas Jefferson who, speaking of New Orleans said that it would "forever be, as it is now the mighty mart of merchandise bought from more than a thousand rivers," and would "in the not distant time leave the emporia of the eastern world far behind."

Of Robert R. Livingston who said, on the occasion of the Louisiana Purchase, "the treaty which we have just signed will change vast solitudes into a flourishing country. Today the United States takes their place among the powers of first rank," further predicting that the purchase will prepare centuries of happiness for innumerable generations of the human race."

There is not the slightest doubt that those of our generation have let the greatness of Louisiana slip; and have failed to properly develop the cornucopia of wealth, resources, and natural advantages that nature has provided. We are the greatest undeveloped agricultural frontier in all of North America. We have been in the past, and we will be again, the leader in forestry, for here we can grow a tree in 40 percent the time required by the climates of the North and of Canada, and we have 16 million acres of land upon which to do this job.

We have seen our mineral wealth grow to staggering proportions; salt deposits sufficient to outlive the span of the Roman Empire; sulphur supplies of almost unbelievable proportions; shell reefs that have been deposited over thousand of years; oil and gas that already place us in second rank among the States, with additional reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico, competition geologists say, will outproduce the fabulous supplies of the Middle East; waterways, that nature gave us, which cannot be equalled anywhere else in the world; and supplies of fresh water that, daily, flow through our State in quantities greater than is consumed by the Nation, by all its people, for all purposes, domestic, agricultural, and industrial.

Then, too, contemplate our fish and wildlife, the quantity and versatility of which is without equal; a fur-bearing industry that surpasses all the other connected 47 States put together, and a seafoods supply from the Gulf of Mexico and our lakes, bays and inlets that destines we shall be the leading commercial fisheries State of the Union.

We are thus blessed with products and supplies from the forest, and the farm, and the mine and the sea that causes us to be the No. 1 example of economic sufficiency, still largely waiting for its development by the brains and tools of man.

When we repeat the inventory of the wealth which is our, and hear one of the Nation's great developers say: The lower Mississippi Valley has the potential to become the Ruhr Valley of America," we can only conclude that John Law and Antoine Crozat, with their "Mississippi bubble," were merely some two centuries ahead of their times.

Perhaps by now I have convinced you of at least one thing I said earlier. That there is much in our heritage, and in the genius of our people, and in the wealth of our resources, that sets us aside and gives our State a special place of preeminence in the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, the balance of Governor Jones' address was devoted to a penetrating analysis of State affairs of great interest to the citizens of our State.

Former Wilkes-Barre Girl Ace Newspaper Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that was featured in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of June 12, 1960, which sets forth the great accomplishments in the newspaper world of Nannette Ryan Milstead, a former resident of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., now of Chevy Chase, Md.:

EX-CITY GIRL ACE REPORTER—NATION'S CAPITAL NEWSBEAT OF FORMER MEYERS HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

A girl who learned how to write a news story while a staff member of the Meyers High School Elmprint and later went on to become a topflight writer for the International News Service and the Hearst Headline Service is giving up her journalistic career to rear an adopted 18-month-old son.

She is Nanette Ryan Milstead, daughter of the late Mr. and Mrs. Glenn N. Ryan of 392 West Academy Street.

Nanette capped her career as a bylined writer on the national scene by recently being selected for inclusion in the latest edition of "Who's Who Among American Women." She previously was included in "Who's Who in America."

Nanette Ryan Milstead covered the ever-changing Washington scene for the past 10 years. She started her career in the Nation's Capital by first working as a fashion coordinator for style shows staged at the famous Statler and Shoreham Hotels. She then served as an editorial assistant to "Austine," a syndicated columnist and also known as one of the "10 Best-Dressed Women" in the Nation.

The former Wilkes-Barre resident next worked with the Montgomery County News Advertiser and from there she went to the International News Service, since merged with the United Press.

Until recently, Mrs. Milstead was a byline correspondent for the Washington Bureau of 17 Hearst newspapers and the Hearst Headline Service. Her articles on Capitol Hill activities, as well as governmental and national affairs, have appeared in papers from coast to coast. She has also had articles published in Good Housekeeping magazine.

COVERED NATIONAL ELECTIONS

Her assignments have included traveling with Vice President RICHARD NIXON as well as coverage of national elections.

In 1945 Nanette married Charles Howlett Milstead, an ensign in the U.S. Navy. Her husband, a graduate of the University of Maryland and Georgetown University Law School, is associated with the State Farm Insurance Co. The couple has one adopted son, James Dennis Milstead, 18 months old.

Mrs. Milstead has written numerous articles including "College Now—Pay Later" and "Women of the FBI."

The latter article produced the following quote in a letter to her from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"DEAR MRS. MILSTEAD: Once again it is my pleasure to express my sincere appreciation for one of your outstanding stories. I am,

of course, referring to the article entitled 'Danger Is Just Routine to Heroines of FBI' which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Mirror."

For the past 4 years, Mrs. Milstead has also appeared in the Congressional Directory under news correspondents accredited to Capitol Hill.

ON THE WASHINGTON SCENE

Until her retirement as a reporter following the arrival of her son, Mrs. Milstead was an active member of the White House Correspondents' Association and the U.S. House and Senate Press Galleries. She is still an active member of the Women's National Press Club where she has personally entertained Senator John F. Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy, U.S. Ambassador to Spain and Mrs. John Davis Lodge, a former Dominican Ambassador to the United States Manuel DeMoya, Senator Warren Magnuson, of Washington, Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, as well as many others prominent in national and world affairs.

She has interviewed and met Shirley Temple, Peter Lawford, Myrna Loy, Rudy Vallee, Margaret Truman, Mrs. John Kelly (mother of Princess Grace of Monaco), Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh, Edward G. Robinson, Justice Hugo Black, ex-President Harry S. Truman, Mrs. D. D. Eisenhower, the former Apostolic Delegate Giocnani, and many others of national prominence.

Mrs. Milstead also received special commendations from the former Delegate to Congress, from Alaska, E. L. BARTLETT, now U.S. Senator, and the former Alaskan Governor GRUENING, now the other Alaskan Senator, for her editorial work in promoting the admission of the 49th State.

The Milsteads have resided for the past 6 years at 5116 Bradley Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md.

What Makes Towns Grow in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "What Makes Towns Grow in Kentucky," which appeared in the June 10, 1960, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.:

WHAT MAKES TOWNS GROW IN KENTUCKY

It would be useless to try to simplify the reasons for a town's growth. No doubt there are dozens of factors, some of them extremely complex, that account for the unusual population growth of Bowling Green and Hopkinsville during the past 10 years. According to the census reports, these two cities lead all Kentucky towns in rate of growth, Hopkinsville having increased its population by 55.3 percent, Bowling Green by 52.8.

Certainly studies will be made of the two towns, and it will be interesting to know what factors of their economy sparked their vigorous expansion—annexation policies, industrial investment, land prices, building rates, power costs, transportation availablity and nearby farm stability. We suspect, however, that much of the growth can be traced to a fact that is not likely to be revealed by statistical studies: both Bowling Green and Hopkinsville are pleasant places in which to live, attractive towns of sound businesses, good homes and nice people. With admiration just touched with envy, we salute them.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing issues before the Congress at the moment is the question of increasing the minimum wage and expanding coverage under the law.

Just a year ago I received a copy of a letter from one of the prominent businessmen in my State. His very successful farm machinery business in DeWitt, Iowa, attests to his ability and to his far-minded attitude toward his employees. This original letter was addressed to the secretary of the Iowa Retail Farm Equipment Association in response to its pressure letter urging its members to write to their Congresmen and Senators asking them to work against revision of the wage and hour law. Because I feel that this letter is so to the point and because we will soon be debating minimum wage legislation, I include it in the RECORD. I congratulate the Honorable James Reed, mayor of DeWitt, for his helpful, cogent, and pointed comments:

Have been reading with interest your many communications regarding proposed changes in the wage and hour law. While I do not generally question the honesty or sincerity of those opposed to changes in the law, I think the association is in error in taking such a short-sighted position.

I would perhaps state my position better by commenting on the five points made by Mr. C. R. Frederick before the Senate Labor Committee recently:

Point No. 1. A substantial number of farm equipment retailers have an annual volume in excess of $500,000 and that a number of farm equipment retailers own more than one establishment which under the bill would be considered as part of one enterprise.

Answer. Any dealer having a volume of $500,000 or more, who objects to paying a minimum of $1.25 per hour and who is not at least working toward a 40-hour week forgets the fact that the first charge on any business is a decent living for everyone contributing to its success.

Point No. 2. Farm equipment dealers cannot serve farmers on a 40-hour week because farmers' hours are irregular from season to season and in months from Washington's Birthday to Thanksgiving, the farm workweek frequently exceeds 60 hours. And servicing agriculture during that period requires more than 40-hour week.

Answer. Merely because farmers work a 60-hour week it does not necessarily follow that our mechanics should work 60 hours and be paid for 40 hours. This is a real problem but it must be solved if we are to attract young men to the trade of mechanic and hold them after they are trained. Under present wage and working conditions what is there to attract them? With machines and tractors becoming steadily more complicated, good alert mechanics were never more needed and never have there been so few competent ones available. Decent working hours and decent wages by Federal edict might be strong medicine, but that is what it took in the 1930's to force our major suppliers to pay up, and according to recent financial statements they have never had it so good.

Point No. 3. Now hours of employment are adjusted as crop seasons demand to serve the agricultural needs of the particular agricultural area in which the dealer is located. Coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act would change this and in many cases employes would receive a smaller annual income. Also, cost to farmers would be increased during the longer workweek with extra-time pay to employees.

Answer. Hours may be adjusted but wages very seldom are, since most mechanics are paid a weekly wage and work as required. Dealers cannot adjust wages downward very much in slack seasons because they would lose their best mechanics. As to annual income being less under the proposed changes, Mr. Frederick is completely in error and, moreover, he knows it.

Point No. 4. Frederick stated that original cost of compliance would be economically prohibitive. The detailed recordkeeping which would be required would not be possible without revising bookkeeping systems and employment of additional personnel to keep records.

Answer. Mr. Frederick states that cost of compliance would be economically prohibitive. It would be for some dealers who do not now keep adequate records of labor costs. Chances are they do not keep adequate records of other costs, too, with the result that they wonder at the end of each year why they are not getting ahead. If changes proposed in the wage and hour law would promote better recordkeeping, that in itself would be worthwhile, because a dealer who does not know his costs of doing business is the very worst kind of competition there is, and in our industry the woods are full of them.

Point No. 5. Employer and employee would resent wage-hour investigators checking on businesses to see if firms were complying and unrest would result with poorer service.

Answer. Good employers and good employees would not resent wage-hour investigators checking on businesses to see if firms were complying; on the contrary, they would welcome such investigators.

In summation, I believe that the warrant for starting a business or taking a job is the hope that it can promote happiness: personal happiness and the happiness of those who are truly loved, Profit is a means to so ennobling a goal but not an end in itself. Therefore, I believe that, as an employer, my first responsibility is to see that all who are engaged in it get first a living wage; only then do I feel rightfully entitled to a profit.

In conclusion, I want it clearly understood that I do not support the association in this present endeavor and will notify my Congressman to that effect.

Good News for Pittston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittston Sunday Dispatch of June 12, 1960, which comments on the great progress made in the Central Pittston urban renewal development program that will cost an estimated $2 million to complete, including Federal, State, and local funds:

IT'S BIG—$2 MILLION BIG, PEOPLE ASKED TO VOICE VIEWS

Pittston received exceptionally good news last week when word was received that the Federal Government had approved plans and set aside funds totaling $1,694,267 for the Central Pittston urban renewal development program. That's not an error folks—it is $1,694,267.

And it also moves the city redevelopment program to the point where the State will contribute approximately another $400,000 to the project. Pittston City will be required to contribute one-sixth of the entire amount to complete the task, but much of Pittston's contribution will be in the form of credits and services. Actually, it figures out that the Federal and State governments will spend $5 to improve Pittston for every dollar spent by Pittston, in cash, credits, or services.

Much work has been done on the Central Pittston urban redevelopment program in Pittston by the planning commission, the redevelopment authority, the executive director, Mr. Edwin A. Sites, and the city council. The latter body must initiate such programs and approve the various proposals.

It can be safely stated that at least 50 major communities in the State, including Wilkes-Barre, would dance a jig with joy, if their programs had advanced as rapidly and as successfully as the Pittston urban redevelopment program.

The approval of the funds for Pittston is a major step in the program—but not the final step.

Now it is time for the citizens to take part in the program by voicing their views—whether they be for or against the program of redevelopment.

The opportunity will come at a public hearing to be held by city council on June 23 at Pittston City Hall. Before city council gives final approval of the city to the program, it is required that a public hearing be held. The Federal Government is interested in how the citizens of the community feel about the redevelopment program and its ramifications. They want the people to be interested, one way or another.

At the public hearing the full details of the redevelopment program will be given to all those who attend the public hearing. So be there as an interested citizen.

For years, Pittston has been condemned in various circles for not making what people considered normal progress in development. Years ago Pittston failed to take advantage of the many benefits that came from WPA projects.

Now, Pittston has something in this urban redevelopment program, and no matter who gets the credit for it, be it city officials or others, it really represents accomplishment—and we've all been anxious for that.

The fund approved is in the form of a loan-grant, but will become an outright grant for the full amount when Pittston has proven its interest and when 25 percent of the work has been completed.

This is the safety-valve phase for the Federal Government. They want community participation—and a desire on the part of the people of the community to improve their community, and enhance it for future generations.

This Pittstonians can do by being present at the public hearing to voice their views on June 23.

The project presently being concentrated on is the central city redevelopment. It is the heart of the entire redevelopment program.

Plans call for razing of many buildings in the central city between Main Street and the river, and also some on Main Street. It provides for extending William Street to the rear of Main Street, for parking lots, for beautification, and for many things badly needed for scores of years in Pittston.

And the nice part of it all is that more than $2 million is coming Pittston's way from Federal and State Governments to do the job.

Isn't it worth the interest of the community?

Ex-Nazi in West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, 1960, Defense Minister Franz Joseph Strauss, of West Germany, has arrived in Washington to ask for long-range missiles and other armaments to strengthen Germany's military posture, already sufficiently enhanced to have aroused uneasiness and apprehension in bordering countries and elsewhere in Europe.

Today, June 14, also happens to mark the 20th anniversary of the first transport of Nazi victims to Auschwitz, the notorious death camp in Poland set up by the Germans during their occupation of that nation during World War II. Four and a half million men, women, and children, guilty of no other crime than being non-Nazi, Mr. Speaker, were murdered in Auschwitz.

Last year, a group of 36 Polish women, known as the Ravensbrueck Lapins, survivors of Nazi medical atrocities suffered at the Ravensbrueck Concentration Camp for Women, were in the United States for long-needed medical treatment and rehabilitation. I was among the privileged Members of Congress who met with them when they visited the Capitol. These heroic women are among the 1,500 survivors of similar Nazi medical crimes, none of whom, I remind you, have yet to receive any pensions or compensation from the German government.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because our policy and decision to rearm Germany and accept her as an equal partner in the Western Community of Nations is based on the hopeful premise that Germany today is different from the Germany of Hitler. In considering Germany's desire for more and more powerful armaments, it might be well for us to reexamine this premise * * * not merely in the light of its past history, but in terms of a Germany which in 1960 includes in its Government many former high-ranking Nazis.

In the spring issue of the Chicago Jewish Forum, a national quarterly, there appears a well-documented article entitled "West Germany and Anti-Semitism." This article contains highly revealing and significant facts about today's so-called New Germany. Its author is Lillian Levy, Washington bureau chief for the National Jewish Post and Opinion, a contributor to the Washington Evening Star, and a journalist with a reputation for reliable and honest reporting. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following excerpts from this article.

EXCERPTS FROM "WEST GERMANY AND ANTI-SEMITISM"

(By Lillian Levy)

Willie Brandt, mayor of West Berlin, is among those German leaders who attribute the development of neonazism in West Germany to the laxity of the present Government in dealing with known and notorious Nazis and their restoration to respectability and even their appointment to high political office.

Among former Nazis high in the Adenauer government are Gerhard Schroeder, Minister of the Interior, formerly a Hitler stormtrooper; Dr. Hans Bethge, Labor Office Director for North Rhine Westphalia, who was an intimate associate of Heinrich Himmler; Dr. Heinrich Hoehn, a former SS brigade leader, now managing director of the German Society of Economics; Rudolph Enkhaus, Buekeberg County judge, who once dispensed justice as a Nazi military judge; Heinz Reniefaith, a former Gestapo group leader and now mayor of Westerland und Sylt.

To date, Chancellor Adenauer has chosen to disregard complaints against these and other former Nazis, now members of his cabinet.

The laxity of the Bonn government toward former Nazis is perhaps most evident in the treatment it accords those doctors guilty of medical atrocities on concentration camp inmates during World War II.

A list of these doctors, together with the crimes committed, is contained in the files of the Association des Deportés et Internés de la Resistance (A.D.I.R.) in Paris, France.

A.D.I.R. is an organization of former resistance fighters whose objective is to seek compensation for the 1,500 victims of medical atrocities who still survive and punishment for those who committed the medical crimes. Its president is Mme. Genevieve de Gaulle Anthonioz, niece of France's President Charles de Gaulle, who, like her uncle, fought in the French Resistance. According to Mme. de Gaulle Anthonioz, "neither compensation for the victims nor just punishment for the guilty has been rendered thus far by Adenauer's government." She attributes Bonn's failures in this area to the influence of such former Nazis as Herr Globke; Adenauer's Minister of Justice, Fritz Schaeffer, who some months back openly opposed Bonn's program of restitution to victims of nazism; and Minister of Finance, Dr. G. Blessing, who also is outspoken in his opposition to further reparations.

Included in the ADIR files is the record of Dr. Hertha Oberhauser, now a practicing pediatrician in Schleswig-Holstein in an office equipped with the aid of a Government loan. Dr. Oberhauser was sentenced to 20 years at hard labor by the Nuremberg Allied Tribunal for the deaths of hundreds of women and young girls in her care in the notorious Ravensbrueck concentration camp for women and for having assisted in surgical experiments which either killed or crippled those forced to suffer them. Mme. de Gaulle Anthonioz was sent to Ravensbrueck by the Nazis when they captured her and other young women in the French resistence and witnessed Dr. Oberhauser's inhuman medical behavior and its results.

Dr. Oberhauser served only 7 years of her sentence. Upon her release, West German authorities compensated her financially for the years spent in prison. None of her surviving victims * * * have received compensation from the same government.

Dr. Oberhauser resumed her medical practice in Munich; but her license * * * was temporarily withdrawn when the local association of victims of Nazi persecutions protested. She appealed the withdrawal successfully on the grounds that she was not found guilty by a German court but was condemned by a foreign tribunal. She has an excellent practice despite the fact that her past is well known. She lives comfortably in a well-appointed home * * * that con-

trasts sharply with the poor economic circumstances under which her victims exist because of their physical inability to work.

Dr. Herman Pook, a former SS officer, was the author of the order to remove all gold from the teeth of inmates murdered in the concentration camps. An American military tribunal sentenced him to 10 years penal servitude. He was released before serving his full term and managed to be classified as "not duplicated" by Berlin denazification court in 1951. He has since been readmitted to the association of dental surgeons and now practices in a penal institution in West Berlin.

Dr. Hans Bobo Gorgass was sentenced to life imprisonment in 1949 for the murder of the sick and the Jewish children in a hospital to which he had been assigned. The Minister of Justice at Hesse subsequently pardoned him. He now is chief of medicine at a hospital in one of the provinces. Dr. Adolf Prachtl subjected prisoners at Dachai to experiments that, in some instances, led to blindness. He is a practicing gynecologist in Munich. Dr. Hans Eisele is one of the few doctors found guilty of atrocities by a German court and sentenced. He managed to escape to Cairo before imprisonment. According to editorials in German newspapers in July 1958, his escape was managed with either government connivance or cooperation.

Dr. Seigfried Ruff teaches at the University of Bonn and is a medical officer in the Federal German Air Force. During the war, he directed the low temperature experiments for the Luftwaffe on concentration camp inmates. In these experiments, subjects were suspended in icy waters until consciousness was lost and then exposed to bodily stimuli to observe responses. According to Dr. Hubertus Strughold, these experiments, done in the name of German aviation medicine, have dishonored the history of medicine in Germany. Dr. Strughold, now an American citizen and internationally known as the father of space medicine, was a medical officer in the Luftwaffe during the period of the experiments; but he avoided participation in them either directly or indirectly. Now professor of space medicine in the U.S. Air University Command, Dr. Strughold denounced his former country for allowing such criminals as Ruff to go unpunished. He said, "If Germany permits Ruff to practice, the disgrace is hers."

The German Government has preferred to ignore the history of the Hitler era rather than educate against it. It has bitterly resented any public reminders of this past.

"Genocide Day" for Baltic Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the understanding of current world problems is facilitated by placing them in a historical sequence since the events of the past, when duly documented, are a great aid to us in the consideration of current problems and plans for the future.

Today, June 14, sadly and with a sense of frustration, we make note of what is historically described as Genocide Day. In June 1941 the forces of the Soviet Union conducted mass deportations of Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians to central Russia from which area very few ever returned to their homeland. The purpose of these deportations was to complete the consolidation of control of the Communists over these previously independent Baltic peoples. Each of the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had a long history of nationalistic opposition to Russian control, inspired, in a great part, by the religious structures of the countries which provided the people additional strength and the will to resist. In the previous period from 1918 to 1940, they made remarkable strides in developing as free nations.

Mr. Speaker, we, in these days of renewed international tensions should reiterate our solemn promise to these brave peoples that the conduct of our foreign policy pledges us to work so that they may eventually regain their freedom from the present oppressive Communist slave regime.

To Assure Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter written by J. Douglas Brown, of Princeton, N.J., which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 12, 1960.

Mr. Brown, dean of the faculty of Princeton University, is another outstanding personality who favors health insurance under social security for our aged and points out the flaws in a means test approach to a pressing problem.

His letter follows:

TO ASSURE CARE FOR AGED—AMENDING SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE SICK BENEFITS SUPPORTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The unwillingness of the House Committee on Ways and Means to recommend an amendment to the Social Security Act to provide hospitalization coverage for aged beneficiaries is most difficult to understand, especially in the light of the long record of statesmanship which that commitee has demonstrated in the development of social insurance legislation in this country. This committee, more than any other, must understand that:

Needs-test medical assistance for the aged will require ever-mounting appropriations, unless counterbalanced by contributory social insurance coverage.

The cost of needs-test medical assistance will create fiscal problems for many States, even if the Federal Government can find ways and means to meet its share of a steadily mounting cost.

There is widespread evidence that the contributors to the old-age insurance system are more willing to pay the costs of hospital benefits for the aged than the general taxpayer is willing to pay higher income taxes.

COOPERATIVE CONTRACT

Contributory social insurance embodies the concept of a continuing cooperative contract between the citizens and the Government, to the mutual advantage of both. Needs-test assistance retains the age-old concept of paternalism.

Paternalism, like colonialism, is a costly and outmoded expression of the desire for superiority over others less fortunate than ourselves. It is an unstable basis for social policy or international relations.

The majority of American citizens appear to want a means of paying their share of the cost of health protection in old age. They need the help of the Federal Government to provide this means. A tested means is readily at hand. They want a cooperative contract, not paternalism, whether that paternalism is implemented by Government or by private individuals.

Should it be so difficult to combine sound economics with sound political philosophy after a quarter of a century of social insurance in this country and far longer experience throughout the world? Must we pay a mounting cost in dollars and human dignity to find out that paternalism is a Victorian relic in an atomic age?

J. DOUGLAS BROWN.

PRINCETON, N.J., *June 7, 1960.*

Who Will Qualify?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in this election year no doubt many people are dreaming of the man they would like to see occupy the White House—some for selfish reasons and some for political reasons. But the great majority desire an honest man—one who is humble, courageous, sound-thinking, and a gentleman.

The need was never greater for a President who would rid the various Government agencies of those who have lost their sense of moral responsibility—those who do the bidding of the preferred contributors to political campaign funds.

The need was never greater for a President who would use good judgment in the selection of his advisers and his appointees to responsible positions in government.

The need was never greater for a national administration that gives first consideration to the welfare, the happiness, the health, and the safety of the people of this country—to the education of our children, the problems of little business and the farmer, to the aging veteran, and to good and sound relations between labor and management.

In the Ottawa Herald of Thursday, June 2, Mr. Speaker, a good, solid Kansas newspaperman, Lamar Phillips, gave expression to his dreams, and I include his editorial as part of my remarks:

JUST DREAMING

Had a serious talk with yourself lately? This year, one is in order. Something, maybe, like this:

If I could, all by myself, select the next President of the United States, what would I consider in making my decision?

Do I want a Republican? A Democrat?

Do I want a Protestant? Catholic? Jew?

Do I want an attorney? An industrialist? A soldier? A businessman? A politician?

First I think, he should be humble, courageous, a sound thinker, and above all, an honest man.

He should be humble enough to realize that the affairs of so complex a Nation as this are not handled by a single man residing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Rather, the affairs must be handled by those minds with which a President surrounds himself in forming his official administrative family.

I would want him to gather about him, for the Nation's defense, men wise enough to set up a proper spy system over the world, and also wise enough to realize that other nations will do the same thing, because they have the same right to do so.

I would want the President to be sound enough in his thinking to realize that all of the knowledge man has been able to accumulate for the business of running a free nation is as close to him as his telephone, but that it is not all gathered together in his own mind.

Should he be Protestant? Catholic? Jew? Better not get into that, unless I want to admit at the same time that the part of our Constitution which talks about freedom of worship, was intended just for William Jennings Bryan's 1910 4th of July oratory.

Should I chose Republican? Democrat? Either way, I hope I would be able to choose a man who would look to the welfare, peace and prosperity of all, and forget, most of the time, whether he was elected by people of one party or the other.

Whether the man I was privileged to select would be Methodist, industrialist, Republican, Presbyterian, Democrat, Catholic, attorney, Holy Roller, businessman or Episcopalian, I would want him to be humble, courageous, sound thinking, a gentleman, and above all, an honest man. And, that is quite an order.

Oh, well * * * just dreaming.

Statement of Dr. M. J. Zucrow Before the Science and Technology Panel of the Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, among the eminent scientists and educators who addressed the Committee on Science and Astronautics at its recent meeting June 2 and 3 with the committee's Panel on Science and Technology was Dr. M. J. Zucrow, of Purdue University.

Dr. Zucrow is acting professor of engineering at the university's school of mechanical engineering in Lafayette, Ind.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD Dr. Zucrow's statement to the committee:

STATEMENT BY DR. ZUCROW

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and members of the panel, when I was privileged to address this committee on March 25, 1960, I indicated that whether we like it or not we are engaged in a technological race with the U.S.S.R., not only in space, but also in other fields of science and technology. The challenge to our technological supremacy should not be taken lightly, or we may find ourselves lagging behind the U.S.S.R. in other scientific fields as we now lag behind them in space flight.

Dr. R. J. Russell, in an excellent paper, pointed that we lag behind the U.S.S.R. in a planned approach to determining the constitution and physical characteristics of the earth, and he made some suggestions for strengthening our scientific position in the earth sciences. Dr. Revelle discussed the importance of more research effort in the field of seismology, so that methods can be developed for detecting underground explosions. He also pointed out that a change is occurring in the planning of scientific developments in the U.S.S.R. The change is to the system which until a few years ago was predominant in the United States; that is, giving much more support to the universities in conducting research through enhanced support of graduate study. It is with the latter subject that I wish to deal today.

If we expect to expand our activities in science and technology, then we are confronted with a major education problem. I will confine my comments to engineering education, since I have some knowledge in that area of education.

With the advances in scientific knowledge and technology which the future will bring, there will be a great need for engineers who have a basic education in science and the humanities, who have the ability for solving new problems as they arise, and of conceiving new applications for existing knowledge. Although an engineer's education is somewhat similar to that of a scientist's, being based on the sciences and humanities, its objectives are different. It must be directed to equip him so that he will have the capability of applying his scientific knowledge and judgment not only to solving practical problems, but also to developing new knowledge as required for solving such problems.

It does not appear possible to me that the necessary fundamental education of the type of engineer needed for solving the complex problems of the future can be accomplished in a 4-year program. His education will have to be more extensive. This calls for an expansion of our educational facilities and staffs in the field of graduate study, so that an ample supply of engineering leaders will become available for meeting the demands of the future. Every effort must be made to attract and make it possible for the top engineering graduates to undertake programs of graduate study.

Experience has demonstrated that research must be an integral part of a graduate study program in engineering as well as in science. Through research the student learns the true significance of the scientific method, develops his confidence and judgment, and, in addition, contributes to new scientific or engineering information.

The problem is to develop the needed type and number of engineers and scientists required for insuring that the United States has the scientific and technological capabilities for maintaining its world leadership in science and astronautics. To achieve that goal it is essential that there be adequate support of research and graduate study in our engineering schools and universities. Since Dr. Van Allen has presented a written statement in which he discusses this need in detail, I submit my statement as an endorsement of the general ideas contained in his statement.

Dr. Noyes made some interesting comments on the educational system in the U.S.S.R. and corroborated Dr. Revelle's statement of increasing the cooperation of research institutes with the universities.

Remarks of Dr. W. Albert Noyes Before the Panel on Science and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently our Committee on Science and Astronautics had the pleasure of meeting with the eminent educators and scientists of our Panel on Science and Technology. Among those who addressed the committee was Dr. W. Albert Noyes, professor of chemistry at the University of Rochester.

The committee was fortunate in that Dr. Noyes had just returned from a trip to Russia, including Leningrad and Moscow, where he attended a meeting of the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, of which he is president.

Dr. Noyes gave a fascinating account of his stay in the Soviet Union and his discussions with scientists and technologists in the U.S.S.R. which I wish to draw to the attention of everyone who is concerned about our relationships with the Russian people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the statement of Dr. Noyes, which was presented to our committee on June 3.

Dr. Noyes' statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, my trip to Russia was 9 days in Russia, that is 11 days from portal to portal, you might say. I have always been suspicious of people like André Maurois, who visited the United States for a week and wrote a book on the United States.

So you will have to admit that a person who doesn't know the Russian language and who was there such a short time might make very superficial observations which would need to be checked by other people.

My purpose in visiting the U.S.S.R. was to attend a meeting of the executive committee and of what is called the Bureau of the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry in Leningrad.

Following that, we were invited by the Soviet Academy of Science to visit Moscow. Unfortunately, this is the time of year when examinations are held and I couldn't stay the full time we were invited to stay in Moscow. I had only 3½ days there.

I came in via Helsinki, directly to Leningrad in a small plane that looks like a DC–3. There were so many people that they had to run it in two sections. It only runs normally twice a week, and the plane I happened to be on was full of American tourists.

I think there were only about 2 people out of the 18 on the plane who weren't Americans. I am sure that most of them weren't on official business, they were just touring around. These were nice elderly men and their wives, the kind of people who have retired and just want to see the world. This is the way they acted and I am sure this is what they were.

During the time in Leningrad, we were mostly in committee meetings, but I can give you a few personal remarks.

In the first place, we were met at the airport in Leningrad by a member of the Soviet Academy. There was no baggage inspection, we went rapidly through customs and immigration and we were treated, in other words, as honored guests.

There was no evident hostility on the part of the hotel employes or the man in the street. They were curious about the States, and boys, as always, who stop you to ask you for chewing gum.

This was after, immediately after, the U–2 incident. In fact, I just left Moscow last Monday afternoon. So it was all after, and in spite of that, when you would smile at a Russian he would smile back.

There were a few incidents which indicated that the scientists may be somewhat worried about the situation. One young man, for example, has applied to come over here for a year of study. And he said: "Well, in view of recent incidents I am afraid I may not be able to come, but I am sorry for this because I very much want to visit the United States for a year."

There was one professor whom I met in Paris, actually, 3 years ago, in Leningrad, and I asked him whether he was coming to the United States and whether he might not give us a lecture on what he was doing. He is an eminent authority in his field.

He said: "A few weeks ago, beyond question I would have said 'Yes.' Now we will say, 'Let's see what develops, I am not sure I will be able to come.' "

This indicates not so much an antagonism which has resulted from the U–2, as an uncertainty as to what the relationships between the Russian scientists and ours are going to be in the months to come.

But I can say I think beyond question that there was no open antagonism, but rather still the real curiosity on which many people commented. They would stop you on the street and ask you why you were there. Since I don't talk Russian, we would have to find a common language. I can handle French and English and German up to a point. And a surprising number of them talked German, so this is the language I know least well but the one we most often used.

I visited, also, the circus, last Saturday night. Scientists have to amuse themselves as best they can at times. One of the clowns was playing around while the scenery was being changed. Suddenly he stopped and looked up in the sky and while I can't understand Russian I can understand Amerikanski, and there was something up there which was American and obviously a plane, and then there was a big bang and some junk fell on the floor and everybody laughed. So apparently, at least some of them can treat the U–2 incident with a sense of humor still.

I think it was supposed to be the U–2. I couldn't understand Russian but it was something American up in the sky anyway that came down.

Anyway, as far as the scientific laboratories are concerned, I saw only two, really. One was the laboratory that deals with plastics, viruses, large molecules, in Leningrad. It is housed in the old administration building used by the czarist government for customs administration. The floor is uneven, the walls are unpainted, it looks awful, and yet inside there are beautiful instruments and they seem to have no dearth of these. They apparently have all the money they need to buy scientific instruments.

The people to whom we talked, I think, were the people they wanted us to see, but they did seem enthusiatsic about their work. They knew what they were doing, and I had the impression that they were exceedingly well trained.

Now, the laboratory I most wanted to see in Russia was the laboratory of chemical physics in Moscow. I put in a request for this and I did see it, and as far as I can tell there were no strings on what I saw.

I did know two or three of the people already. I had met them in Paris in previous visits, and we had a really delightful morning talking just science. There was no political implication as to what we were talking about. The director has the Nobel Prize and others are also extremely competent people.

It is an outstanding laboratory, perhaps one of the best in its field in the world.

That was Saturday, and if you remember Khrushchev gave a speech on Saturday. It was one of his major speeches in the last few weeks. The head of the laboratory had to go to hear Khrushchev, so he asked me to come back to his office on Monday morning.

Well, about 8 o'clock Monday morning as I was going down to breakfast at the hotel, I got a telephone call saying that Professor Seminov and his wife expected me for breakfast. They sent a car for me and I went to his home.

"Well," he said, "This is a special occasion." So he pulled out a bottle of wine before breakfast and said, "We have to drink a few toasts."

This is a tough way for an American to begin breakfast, I can assure you.

But it was very pleasant.

Well, I had about an hour there in his home. It is over his laboratory, overlooks the city of Moscow, with a beautiful view.

Then I went to the university, which is a skyscraper. Most Americans think this is the University of Moscow, but it is only the scientific part of the University of Moscow. The social sciences and humanities are relegated to the old buildings downtown that were built at least two centuries ago.

But the scientific part of the university is this magnificent skyscraper, 32 stories high, surrounded by institutes.

They have about 15,000 students in the University of Moscow, divided into 11 different faculties. About two-thirds of them are in science. Their standards are high.

Just in wandering around the hall you see students from many other countries, particularly Arabs, people from North Africa, people also from South Asia, and many Chinese students.

So I think we Americans need to face the fact that in many ways Moscow is becoming the intellectual center for the peoples of some of these underdeveloped countries. It is a thing to which we need to give attention in our thinking in the next few years, or for the long-range future we may suffer as a consequence.

We have got to be sure that at least our share of these people look toward us and not toward that country for their leadership in the intellectual things of life.

Also, you might be interested to note that in the hotels now these little notices that tell you not to leave your valuables around and all this kind of thing that are customary in hotels are given in Russian, French, German, and Chinese.

They put Chinese on a par with the other three languages in the hotel.

Well, I think I have talked much more than the 10 minutes which I promised to talk. I ought to stop. I will just conclude then by saying that there was no outward, open antagonism toward Americans, a curiosity, rather a feeling that they didn't want war. One must remember that the city of Leningrad was under siege for 900 days, 600,000 people there died of starvation during these 900 days, that they don't particularly love the Germans in that city and while I didn't become pro-Soviet over there I think one should remember that they did suffer during the war and that they don't want war repeated. The man in the street I think makes this evident when he talks to you.

Whatever antagonism there is to the U.S. is, I would suspect, high up and I am ont sure orders haven't gone out to treat Americans well. I believe they expect about 60,000 tourists who will spend some money over there.

There was one minor incident. On the tables in the restaurant of the Astoria Hotel in Leningrad they had flags of several nations, a Soviet flag and American flag or French flag on each of these tables. A French and a Swiss friend of mine sat down at a table where the American flag happened to be. They thought they might get a little better service if they moved this flag over to another table. The waiter came over and said, "Nyet, nyet, we want this flag over here." They apparently were under orders to keep the flag where it was.

Some of the people on the street just stopped me out of curiosity and asked me who I was. Occasionally they would take my blue eyes for being German and not American. Once at least when I said I was an American instead of a German, the face lengthened, but then my questioner got curious more than taken aback and asked me questions about the United States.

The Soviet's scientific equipment were made in Russia. Without having used them myself it is a little hard to say whether their quality is as good as ours, but in at least a few instances I saw machines, for example, on electron spin resonance so-called in this laboratory in Moscow which gave perfectly beautiful pictures of the resonance in organic molecules. Really they were better, I think, than any I happened to have seen in this country. So I would say on the general level you would have to assume their instruments are pretty good, that is the best I could say. As to the standards set by Russian science, one has to mistrust a little bit a person who has been there as short a time as I was. I asked in particular how they chose their professors for the university, because this concerns all of us. No university is better than its faculty and if these men aren't carefully chosen then one has to assume that the university will not maintain its standards.

Well, if a professorship in chemistry comes open at the University of Moscow, the duty of finding the successor is assigned to the faculty in chemistry. So the first thing that is done is to advertise in the newspapers that this vacancy exists. Anybody who has the so-called Soviet doctor's degree can apply for the position, i.e., doctor's degree in chemistry, of course. And this doctor's degree is a much higher degree than ours. They have a "Kandidate" degree which corresponds very roughly I suppose to our Ph. D. But the doctor's degree is given after 5 to 10 years more of work and after a man has published a good many papers on his own. These are sized up. He doesn't pass any examination or have to write a thesis. But he applies for this doctor's degree on the basis of his accomplishments.

So it is a sort of semihonorary degree and there are about 6,000 of these in the Soviet Union in all fields. Anyway one must have this degree to be a professor at the University of Moscow. So the people who apply are examined, i.e. their credentials and careers are examined by the chemistry faculty. The chemistry faculty consists of the full professors in chemistry, plus a few representatives of the young faculty members elected by these young faculty members. Thus people like the assistant professors are represented on the faculty officially. They go over these credentials and, of course, I suppose, they have politics just like our universities have politics, and friendships may mean that there are votes for some people and not for others. So I asked him: Suppose this procedure led to what was believed to be a poor person to be a professor, is

there any safeguard? And he said, Yes, the council of the university reviews this nomination. To his knowledge the council had never turned down a recommendation from the chemists as to the person they wanted, but it can. The rector may overthrow a recommendation.

Then I asked what happens if the recommendation is overthrown. Then it is referred to the chemists of the universities of the U.S.S.R. But essentially they allow chemists to pick chemists. They don't trust some university president or dean who thinks he knows all about 40 fields to do the job. In that sense I think we might well learn something from their procedures.

The salaries for all professors are the same, except that they do go up with seniority, they tell me. That is a salary gradually increases as one gets older. But if one holds an administrative post such as a director of an institute or a deanship then one is paid more.

Professor Seminov, the Nobel Prize winner, is obviously living extremely comfortably. He has a car with a chauffeur, and he has this apartment over his laboratory, which is unpainted but nevertheless has a nice view, and one just gathers that he is comfortably situated.

Someone has asked me as to the equivalent pay of their doctors as compared to our scientific doctors. I think one might have to compare not the pay in dollars, because there are three rates of exchange, as you are well aware. The official rate of 4 rubles to the dollar which nobody uses, the intourist rate of 10 rubles to the dollar which is what we get as tourists and occasionally some of our group were stopped on the street and offered 25 rubles to the dollar on the black market. So you can take your pick as to what the ruble is worth. I think you have to compare rather the pay of a professor relative to that of a workman over there. On that basis I would gather the professor, the good professor, the eminent one, is getting about 10 times as much as the man who would be classified as a common laborer.

What does a common laborer get here, $3,000 or $4,000 a year maybe? There are very few professors getting $40,000 a year; I can assure you of that.

The Russian educational system, in common with most of the systems in Western Europe—this is not peculiar necessarily to Russia—is a competitive system. The boy or girl who is going up through the educational system is compared with his fellows, or sisters, and it is only the good ones who survive and go on year by year into the higher levels and up to the university. It is quite different from our sysem, where with 2,000 different institutions giving bachelor's degrees, if you can't get into a good one you can go to a less good one, provided you have the money. This is not true in the Soviet Union. The students are hand picked. I can only answer your question partially, as follows: I spent last October in the United Arab Republic at the request of our Department of State. And they have had about a thousand students studying in the Soviet Union in the last 2 or 3 years. I talked to some of these chaps. In fact, I have one of them working with me at the University of Rochester, today. There is one thing these boys seem to be proud of: while they were in Russia they were held to high standards. This I think is something we could stop to worry just a wee bit about. Are our standards academically such as to be compared favorably with those over there? I am sure your best students are just as good if not better than theirs, but we have a lot of others, too.

I wouldn't by any means adopt their system. Because some children develop slowly, I think the competitive system weeds them out too early.

Some of our chaps who in the twenties find themselves, catch fire and become fine people. They would have been weeded out in Western Europe as well as in Russia, in my opinion.

I wouldn't adopt their whole system, but I do think we should look at it and take perhaps some of the better lessons we can learn from it. That is all.

With our 2,000-odd institutions we may be scattering our efforts too far. Can we find good faculties for 2,000 places? Isn't it better for the very good student to have a little competition by being with good students? This is the kind of thing we need to worry about, I think.

The girls in Russia are very numerous in medicine, perhaps two-thirds of the people are girls. In physics, it is more like 2 to 1 in favor of the boys, and in engineering I am told it is even higher than that and the vast majority are boys.

Incidentally, without any insult to our friends in engineering, engineering is not deemed to be worthy to be a university subject in the U.S.S.R. It is given in technical schools, but not in the University of Moscow.

The ratio of people in various scientific fields in the U.S.S.R. is very different from the United States.

You probably realize, as I do, that chemistry in the 1920's had a big expansion in the United States. The chemical industry has grown in the last 35 to 40 years since World War I, enormously. So while the figures you give of percentages of people in academic life applies to the whole of science, in the chemistry field, where you have 100,000 people, only 15 percent are in academic life and most of the other 85 percent are in industry.

Now, in Russia they have developed physics, for obvious reasons, nuclear physics, physics of all kinds, so you will find more physicists than chemists over there, if the figures I have are right, and I won't guarantee them.

But they have found that their chemical industry has lagged. So they are making a deliberate effort to train chemists.

I am sure they are doing as much for the basic sciences as for the others, but there is one point they have begun to realize, namely, that a research institute set off by itself apart from the university becomes sterile. They are now combining these research institutes which have been alone, with universities so that the young people will go to the institute sometimes for their research, and so forth.

One advantage of a university is the turnover of young people, of the uninhibited young minds that are not afraid to express opinions. These students are trained for the Ph. D., and then go on. Hence there is always fresh blood coming into a university.

If one isn't careful in a research institute, the people may get old and sterile and become administrators instead of scientists.

This advanced doctor's degree I was talking about is practically similar to the degree in the United Kingdom. Their "Kandidate" degree is much more widely given and is like our Ph. D. here.

Perhaps their particular kind of a doctor's degree that is the semihonorary type is not so necessary in industry, in plants, as it is in the universities. It is just a peculiar trademark which supposedly qualifies a man to become a professor. I don't think it has much more use than that.

They are starting, you might be interested to know, a new city for science. It is roughly in the geographical center of Siberia. They are going to have about 30,000 to 40,000 inhabitants in this city, of whom 5,000 to 6,000 will be scientists.

This Professor Vojevodsky, who was kind enough to show me around the institute in Moscow, was going there. I asked him whether he was going voluntarily.

He said, "Sure, I have a wandering foot. I like to travel now and then. I am glad to move. I will keep a couple of people working for me in Moscow so I can come back occasionally each year."

It is a scientific city from the ground up. It is built for that purpose. I don't know whether they will get to fighting with each other or not. Scientists are individualists, you know, they don't accept orders from anybody.

The Flag Wavers Forget the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the following article, Columnist Marquis Childs adds his own favorable evaluation of the Fulbright enquiry into the U–2 incident. Furthermore, he goes on to underscore what many of us feel to be so very important, namely that such an enquiry, far from weakening the Nation, has in fact been "a service to the Nation." He points up the political significance of the incident and says of the forthcoming presidential election "it will be a sad commentary on the democratic process and the choice of a free people if that choice is posited on the threats and imprecations of the dictator of a totalitarian state, with Americans told they must keep silent because of those threats."

The article follows:

THE FLAG WAVERS FORGET THE PAST

(By Marquis Childs)

No matter how many ways individual members of the committee may divide in their conclusions, the sober, restrained inquiry conducted by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT into the shooting down of the U–2 and its consequences has been a service to the Nation.

A great many questions remain unanswered. Despite persistent questioning administration officials did not supply even on an off-the-record basis the reason for scheduling an espionage flight on May 1, a day of nationwide celebration in the Soviet Union—2 weeks before the summit conference was to open in Paris.

But reading between the lines committee members deduced that those directing the flights had become so confident after 4 years of operation that they believed they could detect in advance any spectacular rocket or missile shots the Soviets planned to send up on the eve of the summit. The photographs of Russian installations they were shown convinced the committee of the remarkable achievement of this high-altitude photography. While no one is likely to say so in public, overconfidence, together with lack of any effective high-level direction and coordination, seems to have been a principal reason for the tragic mishap.

There were bound to be questions which could not be answered in public and much of the transcript was necessarily censored. Some of the blank pages resulted not from highly secret evidence but as a consequence of heated exchanges between certain committee members. It was considered in the public interest to strike this out.

A loud and continuous complainer was Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio. He seemed to feel there was some-

thing immoral about any inquiry, and on the day that Hugh L. Dryden of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration testified LAUSCHE went to extraordinary lengths of denunication.

"I want to congratulate the Senator from Ohio on his 4th of July oration," Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, said after one especially fiery outburst.

"What do you mean by that?" LAUSCHE demanded. "I was not delivering a 4th of July oration."

"Why, I thought it was such a fine 4th of July address that I amost stood up and cheered," GORE remarked.

This suggests one of the remarkable aspects of the current controversy—that it is unpatriotic to inquire into or criticize any aspect of the fiasco of the U-2 and its far-reaching political consequences. To do so, the argument runs, is to give aid and comfort to the Communist enemy at a time when unity must be the first order.

Memories are short. In some instances the talk of patriotism first, last, and always comes from those who throughout the Korean war kept up a drumfire of attack on President Truman. They attacked him for getting into the war at all, for the way in which it was conducted and finally for not concluding it as these critics thought it should be concluded. This was in the midst not of a cold war but in a shooting war, with Americans in numbers being killed and wounded every day.

The Republicans in 1952 pitched most of their campaign on the "useless" Korean war and the "Democratic President" who by his blunders had got us into it. In one informal back-platform speech after another candidate Eisenhower said that Asians should fight their own wars and American farm boys should go back home on the farm. The climax came with General Eisenhower's pledge to go to Korea and, so the implication was, bring an end to the war.

The Eisenhower administration did end the Korean war under terms Truman had previously rejected. This was by ceding half the country to Communist control, leaving in the overcrowded southern half such a congested population with so few natural resources that it is doubtful whether the Republic of Korea can ever become a viable nation or, for that matter, can even survive without continuing massive aid from the United States.

The Republicans are at this moment supremely confident that Premier Khrushchev will elect their candidate, RICHARD NIXON, President. They are even a bit smug about it.

Things may turn out this way in November. But it will be a sad commentary on the democratic process and the choice of a free people if that choice is posited on the threats and imprecations of the dictator of a totalitarian state, with Americans told they must keep silent because of those threats.

Million Filipinos Greet President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the visit of the President to the Far East including the Philippines, there appeared a leading editorial in the Journal of Commerce of New York in its issue of Tuesday, June 7, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith this timely editorial:

A PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE

In a letter to Senator WALLACE BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, last week, President Eisenhower said he attaches "particular interest" to congressional enactment of a 4-year extension to the Sugar Act together with flexible authority for the President to change U.S. quotas for foreign producers.

We should think he would attach particular importance to it. We should think Congress would, too, including the House Agriculture Committee, which just voted a simple 1-year extension of the act, and the Rules Committee, which is now considering what priority, if any, the subject should be given on the floor.

For as matters stand today, what the Agriculture Committee has done has been to vote a handsome dividend for Mr. Fidel Castro, that well-known exponent of the democratic way of life in Cuba, while threatening to deprive the President of something that could prove very valuable to him and to American foreign policy generally in the course of his forthcoming visit to the Philippines and the Far East.

As the law stands today, and as it would stand until the end of 1961 under the 1-year extension of the Sugar Act approved by the Agriculture Committee, whenever any domestic sugar-producing area cannot fill its assigned quota, the Secretary of Agriculture must award a substantial proportion of the shortfall to Cuba.

And right now it looks as though Puerto Rican output will fall short of its quota by 300,000 tons and the Hawaiian crop by 200,000 tons.

So the prospect is that unless Congress as a whole overturns this ill-advised move on the part of the House Agriculture Committee, Dr. Castro's regime will automatically get a bonus of 160,000 tons as a reward for his confiscatory attacks on American business and for his incessant vilification of the United States and its institutions. This assumes, of course, that Cuba could actually supply that much, which is very doubtful.

As we previously remarked in discussing this subject, if anyone has ever demonstrated the need for an extensive overhaul of U.S. legislation on sugar quotas, it is Dr. Castro. It is ridiculous that U.S. controls should be so rigidly fixed that they cannot be adapted to changing circumstances in general, and to deal with as consistently bad an actor as Castro in particular.

But the shortcomings in the present Sugar Act were evident long before the present Cuban regime shot its way into power. President Eisenhower himself called attention to some of these when in signing the present act 4 years ago, he said explicitly that in any further extensions of the act, provision ought to be made to permit the Philippines to enjoy the same proportionate share of increasing American consumption as is enjoyed by other countries.

Not only is the present system too rigid, but its rigidity is fixed in such a way that it discriminates painfully against a country whose steady friendship and cooperation is of the utmost importance to the United States.

It would be one thing to be caught in a situation in which a rigid system of controls permitted no change to be made for a period of years, as might be the case if, say, the Sugar Act had 2 or 3 years to run.

But it is quite another to find the way open to such a change, and then fail to make it. The way is now open, for the 1956 Sugar Act (which was of 4 years' duration) expires at the end of this year, so Congress must deal with it in one way or another during 1960 or the whole quota system will collapse.

But here we face a peculiar situation. Congress has ordered the administration to stop all foreign aid to Cuba—an action we thought and still think unwise because we believe the administration should have more discretion in such matters. Now, the House Agriculture Committee, and some other legislative circles, seem bent on refusing the President the discretionary powers he needs to cut down on the quota bonuses that would automatically go to Cuba under the existing law. Moreover, he is still frustrated in his efforts to achieve a better break for the Philippines, which certainly deserve one.

It certainly doesn't make sense, unless it is expressed in terms of a conviction that Congress is better-equipped than the President to handle the day-to-day twists in our foreign relations, economic as well as political, a conviction from which we heartily dissent.

We very much hope that more responsible quarters in the Senate and House will grasp that "particular importance" of passing a sensible 4-year sugar bill, and of doing so before the President sets off for the Philippines.

On Sunday, June 12, the New York Times carried two articles datelined Havana entitled "Reds Stepping Up Missions to Cuba" and "American Hotels Seized in Havana."

How much more of the Castor regime can the American people stand?

On the other hand, we were told a few days ago by Secretary of State Herter who spoke before the SEATO Council, that further Communist activity in the Far East is likely as an aftermath of the failure of talks at the summit. We have our firm friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines, with 600 million Chinese Reds breathing down the back of her neck. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a reevaluation of the world situation with respect to the United States and the millions of our friends in the Far East, especially the Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine-American relations have rather been subjected to a rough beating. Long unresolved problems between the two countries have generated irritants which in turn have developed into big thorns in the side of Philippine-United States friendship. Most of these irritants are caused by misunderstandings. President Eisenhower can do much to dispel these misunderstandings.

As a matter of fact, in the statement made by President Eisenhower as his reasons for the trip he stated and I quote:

I am going to these countries: Because with the Republic of the Philippines we have the closest ties of association beginning six decades ago, and because it was in the Philippines many years ago that we launched our first major program to help a developing people achieve a prosperous independence.

PHILIPPINE SUGAR

Every American is aware of the sacrifices of our friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines made during World War II. The sacrifices of the Philippine sugar industry because of its experience during World War II is even more pronounced when you consider that sugar lands and processing factories were devastated and destroyed. Recovery and rehabilitation were slow because of the shortage of machinery and the lack of cane seeds, work animals, and agri-

cultural implements. It actually consumed more than the proverbial 7 lean years by Philippine sugar producers to attain their prewar position. In the period from 1941–53, the Philippines shipped to the United States only 4,433,591 short tons out of what would have been their share of 12,376,000 short tons. Other foreign sources, principally Cuba, supplied the difference of almost 8 million tons lost by the Philippine sugar interests through no fault of their own. The facility with which U.S. sugar users were able to obtain the sugar supply curtailed by the war in the Fart East is commendable and has been recognized and rewarded. The Philippine sugar industry by the same token should not be deprived of its opportunity to come back to some extent through sharing with other foreign suppliers the increased demand in U.S. sugar consumption.

During 8 years after the liberation of the Philippines, sugar lost its preeminent position as a Philippine export product and ranked second to copra in importance. Today, however, the sugar industry is again on its prewar productive capacity and from now on will provide the country with a source of dollar income of $100 million annually. Moreover, the industry is a major source of revenue to the Philippine Government. According to recent estimates 25 percent of its total receipts is derived from the sugar industry.

Among all foreign suppliers no other country occupies the position of the Republic of the Philippines in its relationship with the United States and no fair analogy might be drawn between United States-Philippine relations and other international connections and loyalties. For more than 50 years the Philippines to all intents and purposes were a part of the United States and the continuing interest of the Government and citizens of the United States in promoting the welfare of the relatively new Government of the Philippines has been manifested in many generous gestures. To detach sugar legislation from a broad program of diplomatic, legislative, political, economic and social collaboration and cooperation, and to adopt standards based on such considerations as the payment of duties, the assistance to other countries in exploitation of agricultural resources or in other respects on an arms length basis affords an anomaly in U.S. official and unofficial conduct.

At this point it may be well again to clarify what seems to be an impression, mistaken though it is, that the fixed Philippine quota of 980,000 tons annually cannot be increased due to the provisions of the Sugar Act and the trade agreement in force between our country and the Philippines. Article II of the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955 specifically provides:

> The establishment herein of the limitation on the amounts of Philippine raw and refined sugar that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, in the United States for consumption, shall be without prejudice to any increases which the Congress of the United States might allocate to the Philippines in the future.

There are many other strong economic and political reasons for including in any revisions which this Congress makes of the Sugar Act for the period commencing January 1, 1961, an increase in the Philippine quota commensurate with other foreign suppliers to meet the annual increased sugar needs of the United States. I shall not elaborate upon them, but point again only to the moral obligation which we have to act in this manner in fulfillment of the promise of the President of the United States reflected in the editorial which I have quoted to the effect that at this very time we would allow the Philippines to share in increased consumption.

The Atomic Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has been publishing a series of articles concerning the history of atomic energy. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I can attest to the excellent job of the author, Mr. William Hines, the Star's science writer. I believe the article which appeared in the June 13 issue will prove both informative and interesting to the Members of Congress.

The article follows:

THE ATOMIC YEARS—BOMB STOCKPILE OPENS THE DOOR TO MORE NUCLEAR ENERGY USE

(By William Hines)

Two public men have brought into the open the fact that now assures the future of the civilian atomic energy industry: We finally have plenty of nuclear bombs.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, a leading Democratic presidential aspirant, recently cited figures that would mean our arsenal now contains the equivalent of 1,250,000 bombs of the type that leveled Hiroshima. This was confirmed in substance by Thomas E. Murray, former Atomic Energy Commissioner when he said we now have more than enough weapons to destroy the world.

Obviously, that many is plenty. Equally obviously, the physical plant created to produce this fearsome array of atomic weapons is too big and too important economically to shut down. Not all the factories in the atomic complex produce items of peacetime use, but many of them do. What is more logical now than to take advantage of this production potential?

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND WORK IN PLANTS

The gaseous diffusion plants of Tennessee and Ohio and the men who work in them do not care whether they produce uranium for bombs or for reactors. Processing plants in Washington State and South Carolina can make plutonium just as handily for electric power as for a cataclysm. Mines and mills on the Colorado Plateau turn out uraninite and yellowcake as readily for Shippingport as for Armageddon.

About 120,000 men and women now work for the Atomic Energy Commission in a vast complex of factories and laboratories which the AEC values at $8.1 billion. Most of these workers are on the payrolls of industrial contractors, such as Union Carbide which runs Oak Ridge, but the work is done for AEC.

In addition, probably another 80,000 men and women work in privately operated industrial plants directly connected with the atomic energy business. It is no more than an educated guess, but this private plant investment approximates $2 billion.

AEC DOMINATES INDUSTRY

Bomb production entirely aside, the atomic energy business is close to a billion-dollar-a-year proposition. Thus, although it is only in its infancy, the peaceful atom is already a significant element in the national economy.

At present, and for as far ahead as anyone can see, AEC unquestionably dominates the industry. This will remain the case even if the Commission ever relinquishes its role of No. 1 operator in the field. More important than how much business the AEC does is its primacy over the industry as judge, jury, policeman, licensing agent, and absolute (if benevolent) czar.

Furthermore, the AEC is sole owner of all key atomic materials in the United States. When it releases a supply of atomic fuel to a peaceful user, it does so on a rental basis, at a rate fixed by the Commission. The Commission guards its hoard of special nuclear materials far more closely than any miser ever watched his gold.

This sort of tight control over all things atomic, while understandable and probably unavoidable, accounted in part for industry's early reluctance to get started in the nuclear business. Under AEC rules and pricing policies, it was difficult for a cost-conscious business executive to know exactly where he stood. A good deal of wheedling by the AEC, together with considerable subsidizing was needed to get industry interested.

INDUSTRY GETS IDEAS

But private enterprise is now in the act for keeps, and occasionally it even attempts to shoulder the commission out of some area that looks particularly promising. The AEC is willing to be shouldered but to some extent, but for the present not entirely.

The industry's roster today includes some of the biggest names in American business. Union Carbide, DuPont, General Electric, and Westinghouse are among the principal contractors operating AEC-owned plants with the Commission as their sole customer.

Some of the old-line companies, notably GE and Westinghouse, have gone into the atomic business in a big way on their own. The former has built the largest atomic electric power station now operating anywhere in the world, and the latter holds a letter of intent for a power reactor twice as big.

POWER ENGINEERS JOIN IN

Leading builders of conventional electric power plants have also plunged into atomics, possibly in part to hedge against the fate that befell the buggywhip makers. Two leaders are Combustion Engineering and Babcock & Wilcox, both of which have atomic-energy divisions headed by scientists who got their basic training in the wartime Manhattan District bomb project.

Specialized atomic concerns—actually, autonomous divisions of diversified corporations—have sprung up to share in the promised payoff. Outstanding examples, both in southern California, are the General Atomic Division of General Dynamics Corp. and the Atomics International Division of North American Aviation, Inc.

Around these big atomic operators are scores of smaller concerns dealing in the strange new commodities needed for the nuclear age: Beryllium, zirconium, cadmium, hafnium. Others offer relatively common materials with something new added: High-purity sodium metal in carload lots; boron-free graphite (like the "lead" in a pencil) in accurately milled shapes of high density; seamless, flawless stainless steel tubing of the most precise dimensions.

DISPOSAL AND MONITORING

A few companies are working on a fairly large scale today in activities that had no commercial reality before World War II. One is Crossroads Marine of Boston, which concentrates on packaging and disposal of radioactive wastes at sea. Another is Tracerlab, a concern engaged chiefly in detection and monitoring of extremely small amounts of radiation.

Who needed radiation film badge service in 1940? Today, Tracerlab checks thousands of such badges each week for atomic-industry clients all over the country. Purpose of the badge service is to insure that no worker receives more radiation than the AEC allows. Slight overexposure receives routine notice in a report to the customer; serious overdoses get immediate attention by phone or wire.

Tracerlab also monitors fallout for the Atomic Energy Commission, decontaminates areas befouled by radiation accidents and (original source of its name) prepares medicines and other chemicals containing small amounts of radioactive tracer materials.

A NEW ENTREPRENEUR

A novel byproduct of the atomic age has been the emergence of the big university as a major industrial entrepreneur. This fuzzing of the line between the lab and the factory has been augmented by industry's invasion of the academic field. It is sometimes difficult, at first glance, to decide whether you are standing on a college campus or in the middle of an atomic industrial plant.

Among AEC contractors today, the University of California ranks third in number of employees, and the University of Chicago ranks seventh. The former hires about 9,000 workers at three sites (one in New Mexico) and the latter has about 3,500 at two locations.

Where universities are mixed up in heavy industry of this nature, it is sometimes difficult to tell what role an individual is playing. For example, until his recent retirement as director of the University of California's Livermore Laboratory, Dr. Edward Teller held that post as well as the rank of professor in the university's physics department. Now he is a professor of physics at large on the the university faculty—but remains as associate director of the laboratory.

INDUSTRIAL CAMPUSES

Six hundred miles south of Livermore, by contrast, a long-time associate of Dr. Teller works for a private concern, General Atomic, in far more collegiate surroundings. This scientist, Dr. Marshall Rosenbluth, is paid a comfortable salary principally to think.

One of the things Dr. Rosenbluth thinks about is power—energy—how to release it from the atom, and how to control it. So great is the promise of atomic power that the Government, universities, and private industries are happy to pay good salaries to all the Rosenbluths they can find just to sit around and think.

Words To Tell Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable CATHERINE MAY, of the State of Washington, on May 28, 1960, delivered the commencement address to the graduating class of Marjorie Webster Junior College here in Washington, D.C. Because I feel that this address carries a message of great importance, not only to our youth, but to every American, under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAN YOU SELL THE TRUTH?

(Hon. CATHERINE MAY'S commencement address given May 28, 1960, Marjorie Webster Junior College, Washington, D.C.)

Graduates, Dr. Webster, Dean Dumas, Mrs. Smart, parents and friends, I am honored to be the speaker for your 1960 commencement. This is an important day in the lives of you young women who are members of the graduating class, and I am proud to share it.

Traditionally, commencement speakers refer to this day as a milestone, a point of departure into a new life. Timeworn as the statement may be, it is very true—this day is the door into your world of tomorrow. And you will go by many different paths on to more education perhaps, many of you into careers, and most of you eventually into marriage and motherhood. Wherever you go, you will have an influence on those around you. You will become the center of an orbit where, very much like a pebble dropped into water which sends ever-widening circles onto the water's surface, your words and actions will reach out to touch the lives of others. And those lives, thereby, will be changed and influenced to some degree. Thus, I feel that my responsibility as your graduation day speaker, is to convey to you, if I can, in the next few minutes some special message, an idea, an inspiration that you may carry away with you today to be used as a contribution to your world of tomorrow.

Now, as members of the 1960 graduating class of the Marjorie Webster Junior College, already you have been well educated and trained to contribute much to the good of society here at home and abroad. To this special knowledge and preparation for your life ahead there is probably little I could add that would not be duplication. But, the other day as I sat in my office trying to string together some thoughts for this address to you, I recalled a meeting I attended in June of last year in London. In particular, I remembered with great clarity sitting in a room with 30 or 40 other people, men and women from many nations, and discussing with them the youth of our countries. Because this was a meeting of the Atlantic Congress where 14 member nations of NATO—in other words, 14 of our free world countries—had sent over 600 citizen delegates to discuss, among other things, how well we were doing in the great war that rages, as you well know, out in that world you are about to enter—the war for men's minds. The war between two great ideologies—that of freedom, as exemplified by our American way of life versus the Communist doctrine. Now, as it happened, as a delegate to this Atlantic Congress from the United States, I was appointed to work on a subcommittee which had as its subject of study a most fascinating and frightening subject—Communist propaganda.

The work of our committee was based on some excellent depth studies that had been made on the extent of the Communist propaganda penetration into our free world countries, as well as our uncommitted countries. The studies presented proven and factual information on the thousands of agents and provocateurs who were trained and sent out by the Soviet into the world to spread Communist propaganda. It presented the actual figures of the millions of dollars being spent by the Soviet on their propaganda program alone. In addition, the material on the extent of the success of Communist propaganda penetration pointed up the fact that the youth of Russia were highly trained as Communist crusaders. A basic aim of Russian education for its youth is to instill in them a burning dedication to the Communist way of life. As a result, young men and women of Soviet countries are extremely effective, convincing and articulate in persuading youth of other nations to their beliefs.

It was then that we started this discussion which made such an impression on my memory. We had just agreed that we should be providing more opportunities for our citizens and our young people to go into uncommitted countries, to youth festivals, to cultural exchange meetings so they might tell the story of freedom.

Then, a delegate from Norway pointed out, "Ladies and gentlemen, I think we are agreed that the doctrine of a free world democracy has far more appeal for humanity than the Communist doctrine. And, I know the young people of my country are just as dedicated to their beliefs as are the young Communists. But, when it comes to telling and selling the great truth of a free way of life I don't think they are prepared. I am afraid a great many of them could not find the words.

"Tell me, is this true of the young people in your countries?"

A thoughtful silence followed his words. Then, one of the other delegates spoke up and said: "I am afraid it's quite true, not only of our youth, but of our adult citizens, too." And, one by one, all of us nodded in serious and even shocked agreement.

I think by now you young women know what message and what idea I wish to try and leave with you today. You see, this episode I have just related taught me first of all something about myself that I had not known. In evaluating how well we Americans do as ambassadors for our country and its free way of life, I was brought to the shocking realization that I myself was sadly lacking in effective word weapons to fight against the Communist ideology. To admit this on behalf of myself, as well as my fellow countrymen, was both puzzling and frightening. Puzzling, because I knew I was a patriotic American, a loyal American, with a deep and abiding love for my country. Frightening, because for many years now we have recognized that the great world struggle in which we are engaged is not alone one of military might. Beyond that, and even bigger than that, is the power of an idea. And our opposition in this struggle is so well organized that they can train and support their spokesmen all over the world while they spread their Red death among the brain cells of humanity.

Since my return from the Atlantic congress, I have brought this subject up for discussion and study wherever I could. I have done this, because it seemed to me that I had no more significant contribution to make my country as a result of this free world meeting than to try and influence the young people of America to prepare themselves to sell the truth better than their elders have done.

Now, in bringing you a few thought-provoking ideas on how you might best do this:

In one group where we were discussing this, a friend of mine said: "We Americans are a funny lot. We have such great dedication to freedom, for others as well as ourselves, that we would fight for it and even die for it, but, by gum, we can't tell others what it is." Partly, I think we can agree, this is because we've had the plain good fortune to be born Americans. We have just always taken for granted the air of freedom which we breathe. There may have been a time when it was apathy, but, with two great world wars in the past, and with the present serious international tension, I

cannot believe this is true now. I am certain that the generation which you young women represent does not look at what's going on in the Iron Curtain countries and say smugly, "This cannot happen here." I think that is perhaps why I have such high hopes that some of the ideas I leave with you will fall on fertile ground. With things as they are today, and as they have been since the day you were born, never has a generation in this country had a heavier burden of responsibility for learning to sell the truth laid upon them.

I can't give you any set words to use for expressing your beliefs, but I think maybe I can try to set up a few thinking guidelines for you.

First, I would sincerely hope that, in the busy lives that lie ahead of you, you would take some time out and search deeply into your hearts and minds for the answer to the question, What do I truly believe? Start with thinking of the basic beliefs which all of the free world countries engaged in this struggle against communism have in common—respect for the freedom of the individual, for the dignty of human nature, and a simple faith in God. Then, go behind these words in a search for their real meaning. Because, at this point, I would remind you of what I hope you already know—that the words of the Communist manifesto are beautiful words, too, apparently offering a wonderful life to those who would follow the creed, unless one went behind them and realized how the goals were to be accomplished.

So, having found the words for our basic beliefs, how then do we communicate to someone else what we in America mean by freedom and democracy, as opposed to what Communists mean by these words? We know that, in the hearts of all men, there is a universal and unquenchable longing for an atmosphere of freedom, for equality of opportunity, and the establishment of human dignity. How can we communicate the truth that these goals can be reached only through nontotalitarian government—with words that are the same words that the enemies of this way of life also use?

One night, when a group of us were discussing this problem, we came up with what I think is a pretty good idea. It was decided that we might start with the material approach to life, because something that everyone understands, regardless of race or language barriers, is hunger and cold and the desire for possessions and good things around us.

Frankly, I have never been exposed to a debate with a dedicated Communist over the virtues of a totalitarian form of government versus democracy, but, since the episode I related earlier in my talk to you, I've put myself through a lot of mental practice as to what I might say if such an occasion should arise. And, by the way, I recommend this mental exercise to you. It's not only challenging, but it's kind of fun.

But, to go back to preparing myself for this imaginary debate, one day I discovered a book that to me provides the perfect approach to telling our freedom story so that anyone can understand its basic truth. That book is called "The Mainspring of Human Progress," and it was written by Henry Grady Weaver. And, after reading it, I decided that I would present my argument as he does by posing a question to my imaginary opponent in this way: Why did men die of starvation for 6,000 years? And, why is it that we in America have never had a famine? For 60 known centuries, this planet we call earth has been inhabited by human beings not much different from ourselves. Their desire to live has been just as strong as ours. They have had at least as much physical strength as the average person of today, and among them have been men and women of great intelligence. But, down through the ages, most human beings have gone hungry, and many have always starved. The ancient Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, and Greeks were intelligent people, but, in spite of their intelligence and their fertile lands, they were never able to get enough to eat. The Roman Empire collapsed in famine, the French were dying of hunger when Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States. As late as 1846, the Irish were starving to death, and, it is only within the last century that Western Europeans have had enough food to keep them alive. Even in this century, famines have killed multitudes, in China and India and Africa, and, as late as the 1930's thousands starved to death on the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

Down through the ages, countless millions, struggling unsuccessfully to keep bare life in wretched bodies, have died young in misery and squalor. Then, suddenly, in one spot on this planet, people eat so abundantly that the pangs of hunger are forgotten. Just think, for 6,000 years, men died of starvation. For 6,000 years, families lived in caves and floorless hovels without windows or chimneys. Then, within a few generations, we in America take floors and rugs and chairs and tables for granted, and regard electric lights, refrigerators, running water, and porcelain bathtubs as common necessities. For 6,000 years, men and women and children toiled desperately from dawn to dark to eke out their meager existence, and then, suddenly, in one place on earth, there is an abundance of such things as radios and TV sets, nylon hose and shower baths, and ice cream sodas and lipstick, and permanent waves. If you just think about it, it's almost incredible. In less than 100 years, Americans have conquered the darkness of night, from pine knots and candles to neon lights and fluorescent tubes, from fireplaces and stoves to automatic burners and air conditioners. We are conquering pain and disease and prolonging life. We've made stupendous attacks on space, from oxcarts to airplanes, and attacks on time, from pony express to telephone and television.

Now, it's true that many of these developments originated in other countries, but new ideas are of little value in raising standards of living unless and until something is done about them. The plain fact is that we in America have outdistanced the world in extending the benefits of inventions and discoveries to the vast majority of people in all walks of life. How did it happen? Well, perhaps the best way to find the answer is to first rule out some factors that were not responsible. To say that it was because of our natural resources is hardly enough. The same rich resources were here when the mound builders held forth. Americans have had no monopoly on the metals. China, India, Russia, Africa all have great natural resources. Crude oil oozed from the earth in Baku 4,000 years ago. And, when Julius Caesar marched west into Gaul, Europe was a rich and virgin wilderness inhabited by a few roving savages, much as America was when the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth.

Is it because we work harder? Again, the answer is no, because in most countries people work much harder on the average than we do.

Can it be that we are people of inherent superiority? That sounds fine in after-dinner oratory, and goes over big at election time, but the argument is difficult to support. Our own ancestors, including the Anglo-Saxons, have starved right along with everyone else.

Can it be that we have more energy than any other peoples of the world? That's not the answer either, but it's getting pretty close. We are not endowed with any superior energy, mental or physical. But, it is a fact that we in the United States of America have made more effective use of our human energies than have any other people on the face of the globe anywhere or at any time. That's the answer, the real answer, the only answer.

Now, I would remind you that I'm saying all this in my mythical debate with a dedicated Communist in trying to explain what we mean in America by freedom. But, I think you gather that my real purpose is to offer you here today a starting place in your thinking and in your search for words to sell the truth.

Let me lead you down this path a little further, before I set you out on your own. Why does human energy work better here than anywhere else? Well, now the answer here is actually a study in physics with which I won't attempt to bore you. But, as simply as I can tell you, it is that the nature of human energy is controlled by yourself—nothing else can control it. The decision to use your energy to act or not act is always under your own control. And, this leads to two important points. One is that individual freedom is the natural heritage of each living person. And, second, freedom cannot be separated from responsibility. Your natural freedom—your control over your own life energy—was born in you along with life itself. It is a part of life itself. Any time you try to turn the control over to someone else, or any time anyone tries to take the control of your energy from you, something happens. It just can't be used effectively. For centuries, it's been tried. Every conceivable form of authority has been tried. Every conceivable form of unified control that takes this individual's use of his own energy away from him. But, each time, the experiment has failed, because only an individual human being can generate human energy, and only an individual human being can control the energy he generates.

The lack of understanding of these simple basic truths has for over 6,000 years stagnated human progress, kept the vast majority of people underfed, poorly clothed, and embroiled in wars and dying from famine and pestilence.

Don't take my word for it. Just take some time to study world history, going back to the pagan days, right up through all this whole history of all the dictator forms of government that rose and fell over a span of 6,000 years. And, then think of the history of your own Nation, which had its beginning just a little over 160 years ago. As John Gunther once said: "Ours is the only country deliberately founded on a good idea."

I realize that, by this time in your education, you've had a pretty good grounding in American history. But, I promise you that, if you'll spend sometime going back over this rich and wonderful heritage of every American, you'll find it very exciting to find out how every move our Founding Fathers made was with this great idea in mind.

I think with this approach you'll see the history of your country with entirely different eyes. You'll realize, maybe for the first time, that the great fact of our history is that the American Revolution had no leader. To again quote from Mr. Weaver's book—"This fact is the hope of the world, because human freedom is a personal matter. Only the individual can protect human rights in the infinite complexity of men's relationships with each other. Nothing on earth is more valuable than the person who knows that all men are free and who accepts the responsibilities that go with freedom." As I said, the war for American Independence was begun by an individual. He was asleep in bed when someone pounded on his door, and shouted in the night—"The Redcoats are coming." Well, what

could he do? He was not a king or a governor. He was not rich or important. He was just one little man, unknown to anyone outside his neighborhood. Should he take the initiative? Such things usually cleared up. They always had. He must keep calm, consider the practical aspects, think of his family. Most men felt that way. They knew they could do nothing, and they had better sense than to try. And, that night in Lexington, many of them stayed in bed.

But, the unknown individual chose between submission that looked like safety, and rebellion that seemed utterly helpless. He had the courage of his convictions. He got up, put on his clothes, took his gun, and went out to meet the British troops. And, I like to think that he had a good wife there helping him put on his boots, as she said: "This is the right thing, and you must do it, John."

Not acting under orders, not being led, or wanting to be the leader, he stood on his own feet, a responsible, self-controlling person, and fired the shot heard round the world. And, the sound of that shot said that man is a free agent, that government is the servant, rather than the master. You know, it's men like this, and the thousands of others we find in the pages of history—the Washington and Lincoln and Jefferson and Lee—with whom you and I walk today, and we walk because of them carefully and proudly and also humbly, lest we fail them. And, because of this knowledge of our past, with a keen sense of the present and the future, we should each say to ourselves: "I am an American, and therefore, what I do, however small, is of importance."

It just seems to me that, once we grasp this root idea of our freedom, it becomes much easier to explain the tree of liberty that has grown from it.

For instance, words to explain to somebody about the form of government we set up to protect our idea of freedom. "Mainspring" says it this way: "America was to be set up as a republic, which means that the laws would be made and administered by representatives chosen directly or indirectly by the people to protect the interests of all the people. In the last analysis, any government, regardless of what it may be called, must be one man or a small group of men in power over many men. That being the case, how is it possible to transfer the power of the ruler to each man of the multitude? The answer is that it's not possible. The only solution lies in the direction of destroying power itself. The only way in which men can remain free and left in control of their own individual energies is to cut the power of the government to its smallest degree."

The answer was simple, once it was found by our Founding Fathers. The head of a State is a human being, and a human being's thinking and deciding and acting and judging are inseparable. But, in this new American Republic, no top official would ever be permitted to act as a whole human being. The function of government would be divided into three parts:

1. The first part was to think and decide, and it would be called Congress.

2. The second part was to be responsible for getting action. It would be headed by the Chief Executive, the President.

3. And the third part was to serve as a judge or a referee, known as the Supreme Court.

Each of these three parts was to act as a check on the other two, and over the three was set a written statement of political principles, intended to be the strongest check on them all. There was to be government by law, with clearly defined rules of the game, rather than government by whim. The Constitution. The dangers of dictatorship must be avoided for all time to come. No one person or small group of persons must ever be permitted to get too much power, and the minority, even down to the last individual citizen, must be protected against oppression by the majority, or by any organized pressure group.

And these objectives made it possible for our American Revolutionary leaders to draw the blueprints for this new and completely different political structure—our unique form of government, not only in the world of today, but in all time.

I said when I began this that all I would even try to do this afternoon was to offer you a few guidelines to follow on your search for words to sell the truth. My mission is accomplished if I start you on that exciting journey. It is accomplished if I have succeeded in getting you to look at your country and your birthright of freedom with new eyes—eyes that are both critical and understanding, because it is very important that you know that America is far from perfect.

And, I'm sure you do. Otherwise, we wouldn't get from your generation what our country must always have to keep progressing—ideas for a much better world. But, as you find our shortcomings, and think of plans to overcome them, be sure you always ask to what degree are our shortcomings traceable to the form of political structure under which our country was founded—are they due to having drifted away from that concept, and how does our record compare with the records of countries which have tried to operate under the opposite philosophy?

Godspeed you, graduates of 1960, in your world of tomorrow. As students seeking more knowledge, as successful career girls, as happy wives and mothers, and as enthusiastic ambassadors for freedom. If you understand, and believe because you understand, you will find the words, and I guess I don't have to tell you how very important it is for you and the young people of all free world nations to find those words. Because it may well be that, in your generation, this great war for men's minds will be decided. Remember, your battleground is wherever you go. Use your voice, with your heart and beliefs behind it, among your fellow citizen and fellow workers, family and friends, and—very importantly—on the children you raise.

Thank you again for giving me the privilege of sharing this important day with you. You have my congratulations on winning your diplomas, and my very best wishes for your future.

The 185th Birthday of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, June 14, 1960, marks the 185th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army. The Continental Congress in 1775 established the U.S. Army and since that date the relationship between the Congress and the Army has been both close and cordial.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Army on this anniversary of their 185 years of faithful service to our great Nation. In the celebration of this event, marked in our Capitol by a retreat parade at historic Fort Myer this afternoon at 5 p.m. and at the one Army birthday ball this evening at the Willard Hotel, the best wishes of a grateful Nation should be extended to the dedicated men of the U.S. Army who are today continuing to provide for the security of our country by standing firm on the borders of freedom throughout the world.

How Technological Revolution in Agriculture Affects Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the technological revolution—with far-reaching effects upon agriculture and other areas—has brought with it both blessing and problems.

Because of this revolution, the worker today in farming, manufacturing and other fields can produce more than his predecessors. As a result, there has been a tremendous need for adaptions and adjustments in our consumption, distribution and commercial patterns.

In a fast-changing age, it is often difficult—for the general public and sometimes for the experts—to keep up with the fast-evolving developments in a specific area.

Recently, the Wisconsin Farmers Union News published an informative article by Peter Dorner entitled, "How the Technological Revolution in Agriculture Affects Farmers." In a constructive way, the article reviews not only the impact of technology upon farming but also its significance for the consumer and the economy. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Farmers Union News, June 13, 1960]

HOW THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE AFFECTS FARMERS

(By Peter Dorner)

(The following article is a reprint of a special circular from the "Economic Information for Wisconsin Farmers" series. These publications are prepared by members of the staff of the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture.—editor.)

It is not news to anyone that agriculture is in the machine age. Neither is it difficult for many to recall when horsepower meant horsepower. The machine process of production has been in agriculture on a large scale only a relatively short time—25 to 50 years compared with 200 years in industry in general.

Agriculture is in a technological revolution. But there is more to this technological revolution than the ever-increasing use of mechanical power and equipment. Many other scientific advances have given farmers materials and know-how to greatly increase production for each acre, each animal, and each man-hour used.

DRAMATIC CHANGES

The accompanying table shows some of the changes in agriculture from 1910 to 1958. The figures indicate how rapidly the machine age hit U.S. farms—most of the big changes have been made since 1940 and 1950.

Trends in agricultural technology

[All figures are for the United States]

	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1958
Index of total farm output (1947–59=100)	61	70	72	82	101	124
Index of crop production per acre (1947–49=100)	79	86	75	88	97	126
Index of plant nutrients used (1947–49=100)	23	31	42	48	120	176
Index of man-hours of labor used for farmwork (1947–49=100)	135	143	137	122	90	66
Index of farm production per man						
Index of farm production per man-hour of labor on the farm (1947–49=100)	45	59	53	67	112	188
Persons supported by the production of 1 farmworker	7.07	8.27	9.75	10.69	14.56	22.98
Horses and mules on farms (millions)	24.2	25.7	19.1	14.5	7.8	3.4
Tractors on farms (thousands)	1	246	920	1,545	3,394	4,685
Cropland used for crops (millions of acres)	330	368	382	368	377	357
Grain combines (thousands)	1	4	61	190	714	1,040
Cornpickers (thousands)		10	50	110	456	745
Farms with milk machines (thousands)	12	55	100	175	636	725
Pickup balers (thousands)					196	580
Field forage harvesters (thousands)					81	253

In recent years, livestock production has advanced very rapidly and increases in crop yields per acre have been even more dramatic. In the years from 1947–49 to 1957–59, per-acre yields of sorghum grain increased 75 percent. Cotton yields jumped 54 percent—corn 38 percent—and wheat 37 percent. Per-acre yields of the 28 leading crops increased 35 percent in this period.

BIG POTENTIAL

Even more important is that our farm production potential isn't near exhaustion. Recently USDA estimated that if all farmers applied technical knowledge as fully as the top 25 percent, then one farmworker could supply food and fiber for 45 people. This is double the present figure. In other words, we could cut our farm labor force in half at our current rate of production.

DEMAND FOR FARM PRODUCTS

In view of this fast-growing supply of farm products, what has happened to demand? Let's examine the changing demand for farm products according to changes in: Population, per-person consumption, and exports.

Population of the United States has been increasing at a high rate. We have 180 million people compared to 152 million just 10 years ago. Yet, over the past decade, farm output has increased almost 1 percent per year more than the population has grown.

CONSUMPTION CONSTANT

Per-person consumption of farm products has remained almost constant during this period, and there is no prospect for much of an increase. However, there has been a definite shift toward more meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and fresh vegetables consumed per person, and less potatoes, bread, and starchy or fatty foods.

Exports of farm products, since 1955–56, have increased substantially. Much of the increase has come in surplus disposal operations authorized by Public Law 480.

THE SURPLUS PROBLEM

The net effect of changes in the three demand factors listed above is that we have more supply than demand at prices that provide the farmer with a reasonable income. Farm income is definitely being aided by the purchase, storage, and disposal operation carried on by the Government. But even with this help, net farm income has been declining. The Government's efforts haven't kept up with production.

CCC HOLDINGS

At the end of 1950, price support holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) totaled slightly over $2 billion. Today they total about $9 billion. CCC stocks have increased even though the soil bank program has idled 17 million acres formerly grown in allotment crops of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, and tobacco.

Wheat, corn, and cotton account for most of the surplus. But feed grain surpluses are building up rapidly—increasing from 20 million tons in 1951 to 80 million in 1959. This surplus of feed grain can be a major problem to livestock producers instead of a blessing. When feed supplies are heavy as they are now, feed prices are lower and livestock producers benefit from lower production costs. But low feed prices soon lure more producers into livestock enterprises, increasing production and depressing livestock prices.

"INELASTIC" DEMAND

The surplus may not seem large when expressed as a percentage of total farm production. Recently this surplus has been 8 to 10 percent of total farm production. But demand for farm products has a peculiar and, for the farmer, unfortunate characteristic—it is a highly "inelastic" demand. This means that consumers don't change very much the amount of food they buy when prices change. To sell just a small increase in food on the market requires a drastic reduction in price. Estimates indicate that an 8- to 10-percent increase in food on the market would drop farm prices 30 to 40 percent.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

This decline in farm prices wouldn't hurt so much if production costs would drop also. But, while farm prices keep falling, prices of production goods the farmer buys keep rising. We call this widening gap the cost-price squeeze.

The parity ratio is now under 80. A very sharp decline in farm prices would bankrupt many commercial farmers. Even with protection in the form of Government programs, net income from farming has declined in 6 of the past 9 years.

LESS NET FROM GROSS

The continuing cost-price squeeze means farmers are getting less net income from their gross income. In 1945–46, net farm income was 50 percent of gross. In 1959 it was about 34 percent. Farmers are buying more and more of the goods they use in production, instead of producing these goods themselves. And most of these goods are produced by large corporations with enough economic power to withhold supplies and maintain their prices. The individual farmer doesn't have this power.

PRODUCTION GOODS

In 1947–49, labor made up 45 percent of all production inputs in farming—today it accounts for only 30 percent. Machinery, chemicals, fuel, fertilizer, and other such non-farm-produced items make up an increasing proportion of production goods used in farming.

Fifteen years ago, $10,000 of gross sales would yield $5,000 net income. Today it takes $15,000 gross to net $5,000. Thus dollar sales would have to be 50 percent higher today to give an operator the net income he had 15 years ago. And to keep up with his nonfarm neighbor, the farmer would need to double his volume, since nonfarm incomes have been rising rapidly.

CHANGING FARM SIZE

With the possibilities created by the technological revolution, farmers are changing the economic organization of agriculture. From 1949 through 1957, there was a net migration from farming of over 9 million people. In 1948, farm population was 17.7 percent of the total U.S. population. In 1957, it was 12 percent.

Thus we have fewer farmers, and they are living on larger farms. In 1940 the average farm size was 220 acres. In 1954 it was 336. Large commercial farms are getting larger and more numerous, while the number of small commercial farms is rapidly declining. In the 15 years from 1940 to 1955, the number of farms with sales of more than $10,000 about doubled. The number of farms with sales of less than $5,000 was cut in half. The 1959 Census of Agriculture will undoubtedly show these trends are continuing.

USDA ESTIMATES

A recent USDA estimate is that by 1975, the number of commercial farms is expected to decline from the present 3.1 million to 2 million. This would be a reduction of more than one-third in 15 years.

Many farm families have responded to the technological revolution by enlarging their farms. In 1950, only 22 percent of farm purchases were for farm enlargement, in 1959 42 percent were for this purpose.

Declining farm income has also influenced farmers to seek more land to work. Machines make larger farms possible, declining incomes make them a necessity. More and more farm purchases are being financed with credit. In the Lake States, the percentage of all transfers financed by credit increased 12 percent in the past 10 years. An increasing amount of machinery and other production goods are also being financed with credit.

The technological revolution has been a mixed blessing for the farmer. It has lightened his work and given him more productivity per acres and per animal. But it has also created the problem of surplus production with downward pressure on prices and incomes.

THE CONSUMER BENEFITS

The major beneficiary of the technological revolution in farming has been the consuming public. Consumers spend a lower percentage of their income for food than ever before. Furthermore, they are getting many new services with the food, including precooked and conveniently packaged foods.

Even though the retail cost of food is rising, the consumer has fared well because of his improved income position. In 1959, consumers spent 21 percent of their disposable income (net income after taxes) on food, compared with 27 percent in 1947. Price support operations in recent years have run about 5 percent of retail food cost. If we add the Government expenses for price supports to retail food costs, this would make the percent of disposable income spent for food only 1 percent higher, or 22 percent.

FOOD PRICES INCREASING

There is no denying that retail prices of food are increasing. However, this has happened in spite of declining prices at the farm.

Food prices to farmers have generally dropped since 1947, while retail food prices have generally risen.

This means that the prices farmers get for food have helped hold prices to consumers down rather than increase them. The in-

crease in retail food prices has come largely through increased marketing charges. The marketing spread is rising, which means that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is falling.

Rising marketing costs aren't the prime evil underlying farmers' problems. These increased costs are reflecting increased labor, packaging, handling, storage, and other costs. Many of these increased costs pay for services that consumers want. But the important fact remains that the rising retail food prices are not due to farm prices.

SAVINGS IN RESOURCES

A final and very important part of the technological revolution in agriculture is the amount of resources, land, labor, and capital, it has saved annually through its more efficient methods of production. A recent USDA report states that this saving "was much larger than all the expenditures of the Federal and State Governments on agricultural research and extension since 1910. Agricultural technology has advanced even faster since 1950. If the agricultural output achieved in 1957—the latest year for which complete figures are available—had been produced by the methods available to farmers in 1939, it would have cost the Nation about $7½ billion more in land, labor, capital, and other resources than the actual cost in 1957."

FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, later this month, on June 29, the FBI National Academy will be 25 years old.

Director Hoover has again been justifiably honored for his dedicated public service, this time by the law enforcement officers in the State of Ohio, known as the Ohio Chapter, FBI National Academy Associates. The resolution adopted follows:

Whereas the FBI National Academy celebrates its silver anniversary July 29, 1960, and during its 25 years has rendered signal service as "the West Point of law enforcement"; and

Whereas the Academy is a monument to the foresight, perception, and inspiration of its founder, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI; and

Whereas Director Hoover, more than any other citizen of the United States, has dedicated himself to the advancement of the police profession, inspired, taught, organized, and supervised all forms of law enforcement training of which the FBI National Academy is the pinnacle; and

Whereas Director Hoover has set a personal example of selfless service, devotion to duty, leadership unexcelled, moral character of the finest, cooperation extraordinary, loyalty unequaled, and is the epitome of dedicated personal service to the community; and

Whereas the men and women of the FBI reflect and pursue the outstanding example set by Director Hoover with cooperation the theme coupled with harmony in all relationships with agencies small or large throughout the land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We the law enforcement officers representing communities, cities, counties, and the State of Ohio do hereby commend and honor Director J. Edgar Hoover for his many accomplishments with particular merit for his founding of the FBI National Academy on July 29, 1935; and be it further

Resolved, We reaffirm our faith in the principles of democracy, protection of the rights of all individuals, loyalty to the United States, just pride in the FBI; and be it also

Resolved, We pledge our cooperation with all honorable law enforcement officers and in witness thereof offer ourselves and our sacred honor.

Adopted unanimously this 9th day of June 1960, at Reynoldsburg, Ohio, by the Ohio Chapter, FBI National Academy Associates in convention assembled.

STACY HALL,
Sheriff of Franklin County, President.

Visit to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

VISIT TO THE PHILIPPINES

President Eisenhower is scheduled to arrive in Manila early this morning (our time) for the first of his visits to four free Asian countries. It is appropriate that these visits should begin in the Philippines.

For the Philippines are the showpiece of this country's international policies. Under these policies the United States first prepared a dependent people for self-government and then launched them on an independent existence as a new nation. Under the same policies we continue to maintain and develop the warm ties of friendship and mutual cooperation that are rooted in history.

Now our ties are growing even closer because of the Red shadow that looms up over the Pacific from Communist China. The Philippines have been among the first to enroll in collective defense of the area on which their own security depends. A mutual American-Philippines defense treaty was concluded in 1951, shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war, and 3 years later the Philippines became a partner in the Manila Pact which created the Southwest Asian Treaty Organization. They are the hub of the whole Pacific defense structure, in recognition of which they have granted the United States important military bases which President Garcia declares to be an absolute necessity.

At the same time the Philippines are striking out for themselves in an upsurge of national pride that is well merited and natural, though it creates some transitional problems. The new trend manifests itself in the "Filipino First" policy proclaimed by President Garcia, in the drive for closer ties with Asian nations in keeping with the country's geographical position and in some issues raised with the United States. But all Philippine authorities emphasize that this trend involves no diminution of the ties with the United States, and the accuracy of such declarations is demonstrated by the fact that some of the most delicate problems, such as the territorial and time limitation of the bases, have been solved and that the problem of jurisdiction over our Armed Forces is approaching solution. Some problems, such as the Philippine war damage claims, the drive to assure Filipinos a major share in their own economy, and the adjustment of trade relation between the Philippines and the United States remain.

But in comparison with the stakes involved for both countries these are minor problems which cannot interfere either with their friendship or their alliance, and President Eisenhower's visit should do much to strengthen both of them.

Never Had It So Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 24 issue of the Harvey Tribune, an outstanding community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on a subject of great concern to all, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD

This is a story about a man who could be you. Chances are, he is a lot like you. He works hard and supports his family. Like all of us, he has his ups and downs. Let's call him Robert Gilmore.

Our story starts a long time ago. During the thirties.

At the time, Gilmore had depressingly few dollars. But they were all good ones. They were U.S. dollars—the most prized money in the world.

Time passed.

Gilmore noticed his dollars were getting weaker. They just couldn't do the things they used to do. But it was hard to put your finger on what was wrong.

Because, Gilmore did have a lot more dollars than he ever had before.

By 1960 he noticed it took two dollars to do what one used to do. When he told his friends they said it was inflation.

But the word "inflation" had a distant economic sound. Said Gilmore to himself: "How come inflation is so bad? I never had it so good." And to prove it he counted his dollars.

Now Bob Gilmore was not the smartest man in the country, but he was reasonably thrifty. He had been salting away some dollars. He had two goals: educate his children; quit work.

That's when Gilmore finally learned about inflation.

"Two thousand dollars per year per child. That's $16,000 for my two kids' education. Why, when I went to college in the thirties" Gilmore stopped to think, then added: "I know costs have gone up but this is ridiculous."

Quickly Gilmore priced retirement cottages and groceries on that sunny seacoast he so coveted, just to see if his suspicions were correct.

Clutching his bankbook he cried, "I can't afford to retire. I've been robbed."

Gently he was told that the thing that had done him in was called inflation.

"But," he croaked hoarsely, "I understood a little inflation was a good thing."

Now he knows better.

When will you learn?

The Trail of Hoover's Life an American Heritage—Speech at the Dedication of the Hoover Boy Scout Trail at West Branch, Iowa, Saturday, June 11, 1960, by Congressman Fred Schwengel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 11, I was privileged to be the principal speaker at the dedication of the Hoover Trail for the Boy Scouts of Iowa at Herbert Hoover's birthplace in West Branch, Iowa.

On this occasion it was only fitting that I pay tribute to the wonderful force for good which President Hoover has been, not only in the Boy Scout program, but in the lives of all Americans.

It is my feeling that Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest living Americans and the attributes which have marked his distinguished career provide guidelines for all of us in becoming better citizens and in dedicating ourselves in serving our fellowman.

With that thought in mind, I would like to bring my address to the attention of my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks, ask that the speech appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE TRAIL OF HOOVER'S LIFE, AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

(Speech at the dedication of the Hoover Trail, June 11, 1960, by the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL)

This dedication of this Hoover Trail is a historic, meaningful event in the life of this Nation and it will prove to be a picturesque feature of your Boy Scout program.

The appeal of Iowa's countryside is strong, but the citizenship values that we can get from appropriate thoughts during this dedication can likewise be very important.

The combination of the life of Herbert Hoover, the Scout program, and the Iowa woodlands and countryside is a rare and beautiful combination that should give to us a special message of confidence in and hope for the future of America.

It is my desire that we may receive from this dedication a little of what the surroundings of West Branch gave to Herbert Hoover as a boy, and in turn what Herbert Hoover has given to America and the world. He has already testified to the early influence of this community on his life.

I invite you to explore with me for a few moments the trail that President Hoover took through life—a trail that began in this peaceful and charming community.

For centuries before the advent of Herbert Hoover, his ancestors had been Quaker pioneers. The American part of their story started in 1725—half a century before the Boston Tea Party. America was still the red man's country. White settlements, except for the outposts of fur traders and explorers, were scattered only along the Atlantic coast. Trails were important then—not only as routes to adventure, but as the routes of travel—there were no roads as we know them today.

It was in 1725, according to family tradition, that three small boys, landed in Boston from a sailing vessel just in from England. Their father and mother had died during the hard 3-month voyage, and they were taken into religious, kindly, stern New England homes. Papers in their baggage showed their name to be Minthorn and the oldest of the three, William, was Herbert Hoover's great-great-great grandfather—his first ancestor to live in America.

Many trails were followed by the Minthorns and the Hoovers from the eastern seaboard into Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, and eventually across the Mississippi to a spot they decided to call home. The little community in Iowa named West Branch grew quickly. It was not long before there appeared a Quaker meeting house, frame homes, stores, and a blacksmith shop. These were in the midst of some of the most fertile land in America.

West Branch and surrounding settlements never became a metropolis but it did grow into a pleasant, prosperous town and the good Quakers carried their faith into their relations with one another. They did not consider written agreements necessary to bind any business deed—an oral promise was all that was asked. And as the boy Herbert Hoover grew to manhood, his world held high the Quaker tradition of honesty.

The ability to stand and walk erect is the most distinguishing characteristic of man. The best books of travel have been largely views afoot. One gets only passing views and superficial knowledge from automobiles, planes, and trains. There is no other way to acquire a true love of nature or an intimate acquaintance with birds and flowers and rocks and trees. Trails are a necessary laboratory to the study of botany and biology.

The trail also has an intimate social side. It tends to develop comradeship and intimacy. One can walk 10 miles on a trail with less fatigue than would grow out of a 5-mile hike on the concrete.

The boyhood of Herbert Hoover in the atmosphere of West Branch of that time taught him to follow the trail, to stand erect, to dig deeply for the knowledge that lies alongside the path, to hold with high regard comradeship and respect for the dignity of his fellowman, and to let the trail yield beneath his feet as a source of relaxation and introspection.

A great deal of America has been lost to view. It is behind our fences, over our hills, down our old tangled trails. The broadening aspects of exploring, as the Scout well knows, the education to be had from nature at firsthand, the joy one gets from being in the open, all were a part of Herbert Hoover's youth. In later years President Hoover said of the Scout program, "I know of no other form of Americanization that so produces real Americans."

In 1927 in a speech to the Iowa Society in Washington, D.C., Mr. Hoover spoke of the old swimming hole near West Branch under the railroad bridge "which needs to be deepened" because it was "hard to keep from pounding the mud with your hands and feet when you shove off for the 30 feet of a cross-channel swim." He spoke of fishing with his friends in the creek for "sunfish, suckers, and catfish with a willow pole, a line of butcher's string, a cork salvaged from a rubbish heap, an angleworm and a 1-cent hook." He recalled in the wintertime "sliding down Cook's Hill in a homemade sled and thawing our young chilblains with ice water." He remembered the tasty wild strawberries and wild grapes to be had for the picking along the trail he followed; the skating in winter over the frozen swimming hole on a pair of heelplate skates and the collection of fragments of coral, agate, or other bright-colored stones from the ballast along the railroad tracks. Perhaps here is the introduction of Herbert Hoover, the mining engineer.

Apart from these outdoor pastimes and school attendance there was the quiet, gentle, home life, with its family Bible reading at the day's close. But you good people of West Branch know the detailed story of Herbert Hoover better than most.

Herbert Hoover followed the trail across America to Oregon when his parents died. He earned his way through Stanford University, graduating with a degree in geology and engineering. He was employed in mines in several Western States and then in Australia, and held numerous important mining jobs around the world.

It was when World War I broke out, that Mr. Hoover's trail took him to Europe. Thousands of Americans were stranded in London. Herbert Hoover organized resources to help them back home, and then worked to send relief to the overrun population of Belgium and France. His success in this endeavor brought him wide fame and led to his appointment as U.S. Food Administrator ni 1917. He was able to get cooperation from the United States and successfully supplied the Allied food demands. The war over, he headed the American Relief Administration and when that agency was liquidated he raised a private fund for the same purpose.

Ambassador Walter Hines Page wrote President Wilson when Hoover had completed the refugee job:

"Life is worth more, too, for knowing Hoover. * * * He's a simple, modest, energetic man who began his career in California and will end it in heaven; and he doesn't want anybody's thanks."

A Secretary of Commerce under both Harding and Coolidge, Hoover reorganized the Department and sought to maximize its usefulness to business. At the same time he organized several famine relief campaigns. Four years later, in 1928, he was the Republican nominee for President and won the election.

Many of the disturbing factors prevailing in 1929 were international in character while others were manifestations of domestic trends in particular countries. Basically, World War I had thrown the economic and financial organization of the entire world completely out of balance. It was difficult to maintain the balance of economic and financial equilibrium in the United States.

Before he took the oath of office as President, Mr. Hoover stated and I quote that he "conceived the Presidency more than an administrative office; it is a power for leadership bringing coordination of the forces of business and cultural life in every city, town, and countryside. The Presidency is more than executive responsibility. It is the symbol of America's high purpose. The President must represent the Nation's ideals and he must also represent them to the nations of the world."

After 4 years in the White House Herbert Hoover still regarded the Presidency "as a supreme obligation."

A basic tenet of his faith in the American way of life—a phrase which he is said to have originated—was "voluntary cooperation within the community." It included perfection of the social organization, care of those in distress, advancement of knowledge, scientific research, education, and the many phases of economic life.

"This," and I again quote President Hoover, "is self-government outside of government; it is the most powerful development of individual freedom and equal opportunity that has taken place in the century and one half since our fundamental institutions were founded."

Mr. Hoover believed in voluntary cooperation of all the people in all of the Nation's communities, along with a growing sense of individual responsibility, rather than an extension of government into our social and economic life which would find the correct "solution of many of our complex problems."

He once stated before a group of Young Republicans:

"While the inspiration to reform comes from the human heart, it is achieved only by the intellect. Enthusiastic hearts have flooded us with illusions. Ideals without illusions are good. Ideals with illusions are no good."

This advice is timeless, indeed, and we with the complexities of our age could really make something of this earth if we approached the solutions of our problems with high ideals and advanced programs with intellignce and enthusiasm.

Enthusiasm is an earmark of youth. It is an earmark of the Boy Scouts of America. As the Scouts of this area grow in stature to man's estate, it is my fond hope that they will study the life of Herbert Hoover so that they may become intimate with the trail that he has followed throughout his great and good life—a life he has shared with so many with completely unselfish motives.

Mr. Hoover has always been concerned with the kind and sort of men we place as leaders of America's youth. His stamp of approval would be placed upon those leaders who are sterling, clean, genuine—successful men, capable men, leaders in their own field—sympathetic and patient with boys. He has recognized that scouting is more than building a fire without a match along life's trail. That is only a part of the initiative needed to keep America strong.

During Herbert Hoover's term as President of the United States he was honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America. As you know, it is the custom of scouting to confer this honor and privilege upon the President of the United States. He is currently your honorary vice president. It is interesting, however, to glance over our shoulders today and recall a message from Honorary President Hoover which came from his heart in 1929—the first year of his Presidency. I quote as follows:

"I have gladly assumed the honorary presidency of the Boy Scouts of America because the first ideal of our democracy is that each individual shall have opportunity to take that position of leadership in the community to which his character, his ability, and his ambition entitled him; and because the progress of our country is thus directly related to the training in leadership we can give to the youth of the Nation. In meeting the vital need that when the oncoming generation takes over our national affairs it shall be a generation bulwarked with character, the Boy Scout movement plays a most useful part. I wish all success to the boys themselves and to the scoutmasters who lead them, and I commend both to the unwearied support of the public that they so inspiringly serve."

The American Boy Scouts have done millions of good turns, from helping someone to cross the street to saving lives; but the greatest achievement is the millions of better men they have made, or are making of themselves by daily discipline and struggle toward an ideal. I refer especially to that quiet and determined discipline and struggle which Herbert Hoover learned so well from the trails he followed as a boy around West Branch.

Many years ago—it was either in the late twenties or early thirties—Herbert Hoover composed a "bill of rights" for boys which I give you today:

"1. Like everybody else, he has a right to the pursuit of happiness.

"2. He has the right to play that will stretch his imagination and prove his prowess and skill.

"3. He has a right to the constructive joy from adventure and thrills that are a part of an opening life.

"4. He has a right to affection and friendship.

"5. He has a right to the sense of security in belonging to some group.

"6. He has a right to health protections that will make him an inch taller than his dad.

"7. He has the right to education and training that amplifies his own natural bents and that will fit him into a job.

"8. He has a right to a chance in getting a job."

Mr. Hoover has commented that these are not all the "rights" of an American boy, but they are the ones which should be of deep concern to all.

The direction which individuals and nations have traveled has always been of tremendous concern to Mr. Hoover. The direction of the trail that he took through life has continued to keep him active and interested in public affairs through his boyhood days into the present. He was born August 10, 1874, in West Branch, and we now find him in his 86th year, still alert with the characteristics that took him to the White House, to head the Hoover Commission, and again in more recent years as Chairman of a Famine Emergency Committee to serve the food requirements in 38 countries around the globe.

I could do no greater service to you today in the dedication of this Herbert Hoover Trail than to close with the following words from an address prepared by Mr. Hoover in February of this year. He wisely advised America and I quote:

"In looking over the current scene in our national life, if we take a worm's-eye view of the crises and forces which surround us, we may worry that we are approaching the decline and fall of the greatest nation in history. If we take a bird's-eye view, we see the fundamental strength of the American people."

These words of admonition come from one who followed the trail with an aim so high and so clear, with the spirit of the out-of-doors filling his being, that his usefulness to mankind will continue to reverberate for years to come.

Learning from the life and work of men like Herbert Hoover and the training and experiences that shaped their destinies can be very important in retaining and promoting those ideals that made and can keep us the great nation that we are.

The 185th Birthday of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, 185 years ago today, on June 14, 1775, the Continental Congress established the U.S. Army to protect the freedom of our Nation. Since this date, the Army has met every test both in peace and in war. Today, in a world unsettled by tension due to threats of war and the ever-present specter of communism, our Army continues to provide for our freedom by guarding the frontiers of the free world.

To celebrate this occasion here in Washington, the Army is holding a special retreat review at Fort Myer, Va., at 5 p.m., to which the public is invited and a One-Army Birthday Ball at the Willard Hotel at 9 p.m.

I rise to extend congratulations to the U.S. Army on the occasion of their 185 years of faithful service to our Nation and to wish them well in all future undertakings.

Lynn, Mass., Deanery, Council of Catholic Men, Urges Religious Liberty for All Creeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received from Mr. Cornelius F. Burke, president of the Lynn Deanery, Lynn, Mass., pledging support to the President, the Congress, and the State Department in efforts to combat communism:

COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC MEN,
LYNN DEANERY,
Lynn, Mass., June 11, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At a recent meeting of the Lynn Deanery of the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, the representatives of the 29 parishes of Lynn, Saugus, Revere, Winthrop, Malden, Melrose, and Everett, together with the representatives of all interparochial organizations from the above cities and towns expressed deep concern and indignation at the trial and prison sentences imposed on Bishop James E. Walsh, N.M., and Bishop Ignatius Kung, S.J., by the Red Chinese courts. Thirteen other priests, eight of them Jesuits, were tried with Bishop Kung and were given prison terms ranging from 5 to 20 years. These men were arrested in 1955, and were held prisoners until their trial at Shanghai on March 16, 1960, and March 17, 1960.

The charges against these men of God were that they were participants in a counter-espionage group that was "plotting to overthrow the New China." These dedicated disciples no doubt did advocate the overthrow of the atheistic Communist government of new China. Before the Christian world they could never be guilty of treasonous or disloyal acts in the eyes of Almighty God. Being unselfish men, concerned with the spiritual welfare of the Chinese people, they opposed where so many others accepted the Communist godless regime.

Consequently, they encountered the wrath of an atheistic Communist government because they dared to challenge a system which denies man his God-given rights of freedom and equality.

Our interest in the religious liberty of all creeds who are being persecuted in the Red-ruled countries of the world will be a continuing one. We will do all in our power to alleviate their suffering and pray that God will increase their fortitude to valiant resistance.

We desire, therefore, that the Congress of the United States, through our own representatives, be cognizant of our opposition to the recognition of Red China by the United States and also its admission to the United Nations.

We oppose the recognition, or even its consideration, by the United States of any country that attempts to silence or obliterate any religion by persecuting and imprisoning those who love and serve God. They should be compelled to release their prisoners before their application is given consideration.

The Deanery further voted as strongly opposed to any legislative action by Congress that would abolish, destroy, or limit the effectiveness of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Se-

curity Committee. Further, we hold in abhorrence any action by Communist dominated and controlled organizations that would discredit that honorable and courageous public official, J. Edgar Hoover, or that would in any way curtail or hamper the effectiveness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its fight against Communist activities in this country.

It is unfortunate that so many people in the United States fail to recognize the seriousness of this deplorable situation. It is also unfortunate we have in this country those who, either through fear or ignorance, selfishness or false complacency, have associated themselves with known Communist-inspired organizations now operating in this country for the avowed purpose of ultimately overthrowing our democratic form of Government. They would be known as liberals, some as the intelligensia, but they are adherents to a false philosophy, hold distorted values, and are out of step in the parade of democracy. Their presence in our society demands constant vigilance.

We, as Catholic men, pledge ourselves to support in this hour of crisis, our President, our Congress, and our State Department in their efforts to halt the march of this diabolical atheistic force known as communism which, like a conflagration, has swept around the world, enslaving one-third of its people.

For God and country.

Respectfully,

CORNELIUS F. BURKE,
President.

The 100th Small Business Investment Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration recently announced the issuance of a license to the 100th small business investment company under the authority granted in the Small Business Investment Act of 1959.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I am, of course, interested in this milestone, but I am particularly interested in this achievement because two of the member banks participating in this Small Business Investment Co. of New York, Inc., are located in my congressional district.

All of us who are interested in the small business community and the help which it may receive from small business investment companies hope that the first hundred SBIC licenses will soon be matched and rematched.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the press release from the Small Business Administration dated May 27, 1960:

The Small Business Administration passed a major milestone yesterday (Thursday) with the issuance of its 100th small business investment company license. The event took place only 21 months after the Small Business Investment Act was signed by President Eisenhower and little more than a year after licensing of the first company, March 19, 1959.

The law authorizes the Small Business Administration to license, regulate and in certain instances to help finance the establishment of small business investment companies which in turn supply long-term loans and equity capital to small businesses.

The 100th licensee is Small Business Investment Co., of New York, Inc., located at 40 Beaver Street, Albany, N.Y. It is owned by 12 upstate New York banks in Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, Elmira, Norwich, Rochester (4), Syracuse (2), and Troy. It is the 10th license granted to a firm in the State of New York.

The license was given to the company in an informal ceremony in Albany yesterday by Arthur E. Long, New York regional director of the SBA.

Companies licensed under the new law now have combined assets, including proceeds received and expected from public stock offerings, of almost $80 million, of which slightly more than $10 million was supplied by the SBA in exchange for the subordinated debentures of the licensees.

To date, licensed companies have supplied long-term capital to more than 75 different types of businesses, including small manufacturers of light and durable goods, retailing companies, wholesale firms and service organizations.

Nearly one-third of the companies licensed required no Federal funds, authorized under the act, in establishing their companies. A minimum of $300,000 in capital and surplus is required to obtain a license.

Nearly 200 applications for licenses have been received to date. Besides those licensed, nearly 60 more have received a "Notice To Proceed," tantamount to obtaining a license, upon full compliance with the regulations. SBA Administrator Philip McCallum said:

"The recent increase in the number of licensed companies indicates an awareness of the countless opportunities for private investors to share in the growth potentials of small business.

"Small business investment companies are serving as a catalyst—bringing private capital and small business together and thereby helping to meet the needs of small firms for equity capital and long-term loans."

The upstate New York company will begin operations with $452,500 and plans to supply equity capital and long-term loan funds to diversified small businesses in New York State. No Federal funds are involved.

Charles W. Millard, Jr., executive vice president of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co., in Buffalo, is board chairman of the new company, and Prentice J. Rodgers, executive vice president of the National Commercial Bank & Trust Co., of Albany, is president.

The company has two vice presidents, Elmer B. Milliman, president of Rochester's Central Trust Co., and Bertram J. Miner, executive vice president of First-City National Bank of Binghamton.

Milton D. Stewart, Albany attorney and special counsel to the New York State Thruway Authority, is secretary, and William N. Posner, partner in a firm of certified public accounts, is treasurer.

Reactions to Khrushchev Stir Doubts on Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Henry Morpurgo, of Yonkers, N.Y., has drawn attention to an editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, June 6, 1960. Mr. Morpurgo felt that Lawrence's article should not be overlooked. I therefore wish to take this opportunity to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REACTIONS TO KHRUSHCHEV STIR DOUBTS ON PATRIOTISM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Time was when in the midst of war neither scribe nor politician ventured to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Time was when the citizen felt a tingle of emotion go up and down his spine as he sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" or saluted the flag.

Time was when the Nation found itself in peril, and nothing else mattered. No sacrifice—even of life itself—was too great to make for the honor of our country.

But things seem to be different now. The President of the United States is insulted and yet some writers continue to furnish aid and comfort to the press of the Soviet Union by denouncing Mr. Eisenhower and holding him culpable for errors he couldn't possibly have avoided and still protect the safety of the American people against surprise attack.

Is the country changing? Is patriotism just an obsolete notion, nurtured only by those of us who have witnessed manifestations of national spirit and pride over a long span of years? Are some of us old-fashioned because we cannot accept the modern cynicism which insists that a President of the United States shall be pilloried by political leaders and by some segments of the press of his own country as Moscow papers reprint every bit of captious and carping criticism?

Is a cold war any different really from the crises that call for nonpartisanship during a hot war? Time was when in war time a newspaperman practiced voluntary censorship and when his conscience kept him from writing anything that might possibly aid the enemy. A cold war and a hot war are no different so far as national danger is concerned. Today the demand is for almost every scrap of information including classified information, and there are newsmen and Members of Congress who insist in all sincerity that they and not the executive branch of the Government—which has the responsibility for our safety—shall be the final judges of what ought to be suppressed or disclosed.

AN AMERICAN FIRST?

Time was when this correspondent used to hear the expression: "I'm an American first and a newspaperman second." But today things seem different. No matter how damaging to one's own country, the tendency now is to give the information or comment publicly to the enemy dictator who promptly quotes it in his propaganda speeches.

As America, moreover, approaches a political campaign, partisan writers say that the President should have known in advance of every act to be performed, by every subordinate in the numerous agencies of a big government and that efforts to gather information abroad clandestinely should have been in effect suspended indefinitely to the advantage of a gangster regime in Moscow. Immediately Moscow seizes on every such adverse comment especially when it emanates from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Was it too much to ask, as Senator WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin did, that a public investigation by any congressional committee on international matters during a crisis be suspended?

Maybe the urge to patriotism is less strong today than winning an election or carrying on a partisan crusade. Maybe we are witnessing the rise of new "liberals" who

espouse the cause of nationalism in the various countries of Africa and Asia, but denounce any nationalism expressed in the United States in behalf of the interests of our own country.

But these misguided "intellectuals," so many of whom in the scientific world especially believe in "world citizenship" as superseding American citizenship, will some day be proved completely wrong. Back in the 1920's after World War I there were demonstrations of students in the colleges against war. They held meetings of organizations calling for the soldiers' "bonus of future wars." It was a satirical effort to put the label of selfishness on the men who had to leave their families and jobs and go to war. But when the United States entered World War II in 1941 this same generation acquitted itself nobly. No better troops ever fought for America than those who battled in World War II.

Grassroots Americanism today resents bitterly the insults flung at the President of the United States. It resents attacks on Mr. Eisenhower in the American press which the next day are parroted and quoted with exultation in the Soviet press.

KHRUSHCHEV CALLED BETRAYER

It so happens that Mr. Eisenhower was the Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in World War II. He helped to save the Soviet Union from the yoke of Hitler. The American people between 1941 and 1945 sent billions of dollars to help equip the Soviet armies. When the war was over, General Eisenhower was received with acclaim in Moscow. But Nikita Khrushchev now says Mr. Eisenhower is fit only to manage a home for children. Recently he called the President a "thief."

It begins to look as if Nikita Khrushchev is resentful of all military men. But he has miscalculated public opinion everywhere if he thinks he can belittle not only the President of the United States but the very general who helped Russia in the winning of World War II.

The Soviet Premier, to be sure, has lost whatever prestige he may have had in the West. He has forfeited an opportunity for effective leadership as a negotiator with the West. He has really betrayed his own country. For the people of the Soviet Union don't want war and when they get all the facts they will not long support a man who acts more like an uncivilized boor than like the dignified premier of a government which professes to represent a great people.

Watch Out, Someone's Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson as it appeared in the New Republic magazine of June 13, 1960:

WATCH OUT, SOMEONE'S THINKING

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

Some observers have found it odd that while the echoes of the crash of the summit conference were still reverberating, the Republican big guns opened up not, as you might expect, on the front-running Democratic candidate but on a man who, technically, is not even in the race. They blasted Adlai Stevenson, with only a snapshot or two at Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY.

But there was a reason and it showed up conspicuously in Stevenson's speech at Chicago last Wednesday. His speech contained an innocent-looking suggestion that conceals a cluster of barbed hooks. Stevenson said, "Instead of always worrying about what Russia will do next, let's concentrate on what we can do next."

What's wrong with that? Nothing, apparently. Everything, in reality. For the crafty Democrat from Libertyville spotted and neatly blocked the obvious way out for Republican orators. That exit is the simple question, "Well, what would you suggest?" But it is closed, because Stevenson told them. He outlined five steps that we might take, all of them easy to understand and none involving any departure from time-tested American principles.

To detect the hook in this it is not necessary to believe that Stevenson has solved the problem of the cold war. It is necessary only to note that his five steps are all apparently feasible; for when any feasible program is suggested, it is necessary to explain why it has not been adopted. A convincing explanation does not come to mind at once. It requires thought—and there's the rub. For as one does not gather figs from thistles, one may not reasonably expect thought of the Eisenhower administration.

Not long after that administration took over it was suggested in this place that it might end by meriting the comment that a Republican wheelhorse of many years ago made upon President Harding: "Warren lacks mentality." It was a good guess. Not many of the errors that have brought the country into its present embarrassing position can be laid to wickedness. From Charles E. Wilson's failure to conform to the law before presenting himself to take office down to the bungling of the spy plane affair, nearly all have been attributable to sheer lack of thinking, not evil intentions.

Unfortunately, that is a most difficult error to point out effectively to the voters. In 1956 Adlai Stevenson tried in vain; and he would not have much chance today were it not for the fact that events at Paris speak more eloquently than he can—and he is probably the best political speaker now in practice. The catch in it is that by the time lack of mentality has been demonstrated by events the damage is done and what we have on our hands is a repair job, not construction.

Stevenson's insistence on calling attention to this is driving the administration into the very form of activity to which it is least adapted—cerebration. No wonder it is resented, for it is far more deadly than all the charges of influence peddling, of subservience to big business, and of demagogic encouragement of McCarthyism; for mere venality hits the country only in the pocketbook, whereas inability or unwillingness to exercise the brain cells comes under a far more sinister rule—"where there is no vision the people perish."

It follows that knocking off the frontrunner, KENNEDY or any other, is far less important than silencing this fellow who keeps yelling for precisely what the administration can't supply. For though there may be a rational explanation of why we have not taken Adlai's five steps, the fact that we have taken no steps at all is inexplicable.

Stevenson, in fact, has done no more than present the converse of Walt Mason's philosophy: "O human head. Majestic box. O wondrous can, from labels free. If man is craving fame or rocks, he'll get them if he uses thee." Per contra if man or nation consistently refuses to use the "majestic box" what it will get is not what it is craving. Witness the United States of America that, 8 years after the ceasefire in Korea, is still saddled with cold war, which it certainly did not crave.

If this point can be driven home, it will not matter much—from the Republican standpoint—who the Democratic candidate may be, for the Democrats could win with Mencken's Chinaman. Therefore this point must be blunted at any cost. Never mind KENNEDY, or JOHNSON, or SYMINGTON, or any other avowed candiate. Get the man who may not be running, but is ruining every Republican prospect. Get Stevenson.

From the standpoint of conventional politics they are probably right, but even so a doubt lingers. Is conventional politics practical politics in 1960? This deponent sayeth not.

The Challenge of Oversea Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today more than a million and a half U.S. citizens representing both public and private interests are serving the Nation abroad. Approximately two-thirds of this total are members or employees of the Armed Forces and their dependents, while a number are students and teachers studying abroad. American civilians actually working overseas total nearly 100,000, divided about equally between businessmen, missionaries, and Government employees.

Every one of these citizens abroad carries a heavy responsibility for projecting a positive image of the United States to other peoples. Increasingly, such representation requires not only a basic knowledge of local customs and traditions, but also a broad understanding of our own country's history and national aspirations. Unparalleled leadership demands necessitate the entrance of intelligent, informed and alert young Americans into positions of service in Government and private activities abroad.

In a recent commencement address given at Williams College, June 5, Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon eloquently described the growing need for dedicated service abroad and the challenge it presents. As many recent graduates are considering such possible service and will want to read Secretary Dillon's interesting and informative remarks, I include them at this point in the RECORD:

THE CHALLENGE OF OVERSEA SERVICE

(Address of Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, upon receiving honorary degree at commencement exercises of Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Sunday, June 5, 1960)

Thank you for the gracious welcome you have extended to all of us who are being honored today by Williams College. Since I want to discuss the challenge of oversea service, I can think of no more appropriate setting than this justly famed campus, where there is a perpetual reminder of the five students who met for prayer in the shelter of a haystack in 1806 and dedicated their lives to the church overseas. Out of their dedication was born the American Board of Foreign Missions, under whose auspices thousands of American men and women have

carried the message of America to other peoples as they served their God and their country in far distant lands.

It is for me a particular personal pleasure to be here. In talking to you this afternoon, I claim a special dispensation. For your distinguished president, Jim Baxter, was my faculty tutor at Harvard some 30 years ago, and so must bear a measure of responsibility for me and for what I have to say.

Looking back, I am struck by the profound changes that have radically reshaped the world over the past 30 years:

First, the transformation of the United States from a relatively isolated nation to an active participant in every sphere of international life as a leader of the free world.

Second, the enormous growth of the Soviet Union as a military and industrial force, the passage of Eastern Europe into the Communist orbit, and the emergence of Communist China as a potential power center.

Finally, the collapse of colonialism—which is now clearly a thing of the past—and the achievement of nationhood by scores of new countries, whose leaders are struggling desperately to give independence real meaning by enriching the traditionally barren lives of their impoverished peoples. The full impact of this socioeconomic revolution is most dramatically evident in Africa, where but 4 nations existed 30 years ago—and where there soon may be 29.

These sweeping changes—accompanied by increasingly rapid communications, the fateful release of nuclear energy, and man's adventurous probing into space—have fashioned a world which simply didn't exist when my generation was graduating from college. Today's shrinking universe—the inextricably interdependent world into which you are graduating—makes demands upon us as a Nation and as a people that were undreamt of 30 years ago. If we are to meet today's pressing demands and respond to the formidable challenges of the coming 30 years, we must enlist every resource—human, material, intellectual, and spiritual—at our command.

On the home front, we must strengthen our defenses against possible aggression. We must expand our educational opportunities to enable our citizens to lead more fruitful, more purposeful lives. Special priority must be given to accelerating the growth of our economy along sound, productive lines. Unless we do so, there can be no assurance that the future will bring increasing opportunities for our people. Nor can there be any assurance that we as a Nation can sustain our capacity to meet our international obligations, to counter the Communist threat, or to project to the newly developing lands the image of our system of free institutions as one worthy of emulation in the struggle for nationhood. We must clarify our national goals and promote better understanding by all our citizens of the policies that must be followed to fulfill them. This is especially true in international affairs, which are now the concern of every American.

On all fronts, we must reinforce the free world's system of collective security, so that we and our allies can withstand the mounting pressures of Communist imperialism. In particular, we must continue to provide military equipment and training to nations on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet Empire. For without our help, many of them cannot support the defense establishments they urgently require to ensure internal security and to discourage aggression from without.

We and our stronger allies must exert ourselves to speed the growth of the newly developing lands. These are the areas where most of mankind lives, and where the future course of history will ultimately be decided. The Communists are making massive efforts, through trade, aid, and propaganda, to persuade the peoples of these countries that communism offers them their only hope of rapid progress. But even if the Communist leaders were to suddenly renounce their expansionist ambitions and cease their efforts to penetrate and capture the developing nations, the need for us to help these peoples achieve a better life would still exist. For our free way of life and our prosperity simply cannot survive in a sea of hopeless poverty. The peoples of the newly developing areas must have reasonable hope that the well-being we now enjoy can eventually be theirs to enjoy.

At the same time, we must do everything in our power to achieve rational communication with the Communist world. We must seize any opportunity to reach agreements with the Communists that could bring genuine progress toward peace.

The immense tasks stretching before us make heavy demands upon the talents, training, and good sense of the men and women who represent our country abroad. For the human factor is the overriding factor in determining whether we can meet the challenges that confront us. These challenges place a premium on qualified people—whether they are negotiating with the Soviets, administering foreign aid, telling America's story abroad, or serving overseas with American business, philanthropic foundations, or church missions. We have irretrievably committed ourselves to participation in international activities. No matter how admirable our intentions, no matter how well conceived our policies and programs, their success in the final analysis depends upon people. Therefore, it is of people that I will speak today.

It is a measure of our present involvement in world affairs that the number of American citizens representing our public and private interests abroad has multiplied to more than a million and a half. Of this total, more than two-thirds are members or employees of our Armed Forces and their dependents. The rest are civilians and their families. Aside from students and teachers studying abroad, American civilians actually working overseas number roughly 100,000, divided about equally between businessmen, missionaries, and Government employees.

Even though their backgrounds and working assignments may be widely separated, these oversea Americans share a common responsibility: The very fact that they reside in another country, where they participate in the daily lives and culture of its people, inevitably means that our country and our people are judged by their individual competence and conduct.

It is an exacting—and, at times—a burdensome responsibility. If these oversea Americans are to help project a positive image of America to other peoples, as in fact, they must—they should possess far more than purely technical or professional skills. They should have a knowledge of local languages and an informed respect for local customs. They should be able to participate without ostentation in the daily life of the country to which they are assigned. They should know its history, institutions, and national goals, for only if they understand other peoples' traditions and aspirations can they help to bring about reciprocal understanding of the United States and the American people.

It is important that our citizens overseas keep constantly abreast of international developments, since their service abroad involves them personally in international affairs. It is equally important that they have some knowledge of Communist theory and tactics, because they are in the forefront of the epochal competition between communism and freedom.

Above all, I hold that no American is qualified to represent the United States abroad unless he has a basic knowledge of his own country's history, culture, and institutions, as well as an informed understanding of our national goals and aspirations. I cannot stress too strongly the fact that an American working abroad is the United States. His assignment carries with it an obligation he cannot escape. Indeed, it is an obligation that foreigners will not permit him to escape. Our position of international leadership and the consequences which our actions can have upon other peoples far across the globe, raise compelling questions about our domestic affairs, our international policies, and particularly about our national purposes. Other peoples are eager for accurate and informative answers. If our citizens overseas are incapable of answering their questions and explaining our policies and goals, they serve us poorly.

Moreover, our oversea citizens must be on the alert to counter the propaganda of Communists and their unwitting dupes, who are ready, willing, and sometimes able, to distort the true image of our country.

Despite the effective work of our U.S. Information Agency, and the widespread impact of our news services, our motion pictures, books, magazines, nothing can substitute for person-to-person contact and discussion. Such person-to-person dealings are especially important in newly developing lands, where channels of communication are limited, and where there is a residue of resentment against former colonial powers which often rubs off on us because of our close ties with Western Europe.

The pride and sensitivity of the newly emerging peoples makes it incumbent upon us to remember that in providing them with military, technical, or financial assistance on a government-to-government basis—or, for that matter, in bringing them the benefits of American business and other private undertakings—the manner in which our help is extended is equally important as the aid itself. In assisting the developing peoples, we must never attempt to impose 20th century institutions upon an oxcart economy. We cannot export our way of life intact. We can only help to adapt some of its most useful features to meet differing foreign needs in conformity with local customs and traditions.

Historian Arnold Toynbee has properly called technical and financial assistance "the greatest idea in foreign policy to emerge from the 20th century." Clumsily or unwisely given, however, it can be useless—or worse. Mindful of this, we in Government are constantly striving to improve our foreign aid programs and to recruit and retain the best qualified people to operate them. Despite occasional errors which are inevitable in a new endeavor, any honest, overall appraisal of our efforts in this radically new approach to foreign relations would clearly demonstrate that they are highly effective. Credit for their effectiveness rightfully belongs to the hard working, dedicated Americans who are out in the backlands and in the rice paddies helping less fortunate peoples to realize their mounting expectations for a better life.

The need in our foreign-aid programs for people with talent and the sort of sensitive awareness that leads to friendly understanding and appreciation of alien cultures underscores the need for outstanding people in all of our international activities, public and private. The task of representing the United States abroad in today's highly technological world presents both private citizens and those in Government with challenges that mount in complexity with each day that passes.

Our representatives are confronted with problems ranging from atomic energy to sales of surplus American farm products, from educational exchange to the intricacies of currency stabilization, from immigration policies to nationalist sentiment as it affects

private investment. They are directing huge construction projects, healing the sick, and introducing modern manufacturing and marketing methods.

In truth, it is difficult to think of any problem—be it political, economic, scientific, cultural, educational, or spiritual—that does not carry with it heavy responsibilities for the men and women who represent us overseas.

Educational institutions such as Williams have a vital role to play in preparing present and future generations for overseas assignments—whether on Government service, or with private business and agencies. Special training is particularly necessary in languages, area knowledge, international politics, and in American history and institutions. Some special schools and courses already exist. But many more are needed.

Fortunately, the need for intensive training is being more and more recognized in Washington. For example, the Department of State now operates a Foreign Service Institute where specialized facilities are available for the indoctrination of new foreign service officers going overseas, and for further training of all officers at later stages in their careers. Both the International Cooperation Administration and the U.S. Information Agency also conduct special training programs. In addition, our Government agencies make good use of the highly specialized courses of study which have recently become available at many of our leading universities.

Private American business and other groups are also recognizing the need to prepare their representatives for work abroad. Many of them run their own company or institutional programs. Others send their people to our universities. Recently, leading executives of U.S. companies doing business overseas established the Business Council for International Understanding, which has the active cooperation of the Department of State and the USIA. This program fills two closely related needs: First, to send overseas individuals who are better prepared to make a success of their assignments for their companies; and, second, to build goodwill for the United States. Although it has been in operation for less than a year, this program holds out great promise—for the private sector of our economy is the very antithesis of the State enterprise that is central to Communist doctrine. It is perforce the very best advertisement of freedom at work.

Now, I should like to say a special word to today's graduates about government as a career:

Our efforts to strengthen and unify the free world, our attempts to increase communication with the Communist world, depend in large measure upon the apparatus of American diplomacy. The effectiveness of our diplomacy depends, in turn, upon the people who wage it. Over the years, we have been fortunate in attracting to foreign service men and women who measure up to their exacting responsibilities admirably. You can well be proud of your fellow citizens who represent you abroad. But our increasing international obligations call for more and more of our most outstanding young citizens to make Government a career.

They are especially needed for service in the newly developing lands, where political leaders are also intellectual leaders. These leaders are almost always highly educated and cultured individuals. They respect the qualities of America's arts and literature, as well as our scientific and economic achievements. They have high regard for the quality of excellence in every field. Hence, the enduring leadership which the United States must provide can only be rooted in enduring excellence. This is a quality which we must increasingly export through our oversea representatives. We can best do this by recruiting young men and women for foreign service who exemplify our finest cultural, intellectual, and spiritual heritage.

Make no mistake: It is outstanding talent that we are seeking. The service of our country demands nothing less. I am hopeful that some of the most talented among you will consider Government service as a career. You will not become wealthy. You will probably never make the headlines. You may experience hardship overseas—even danger. But you will find warm satisfaction in carrying the human spirit of the American people to those with whom we wish to live in peace and prosperity as members of the world community. Your greatest reward will come from the knowledge that you are, in some way, large or small, contributing as an individual to the security and well-being of your fellow citizens and of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Thank you.

Mill Hands Keep Unions in Two Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert at this point in the RECORD a brief news item from the Baker Democrat-Herald of May 12. Then I want to comment on some of the implications of this story:

MILL HANDS KEEP UNION IN TWO VOTES

Employes of the Salmon River Lumber Co. at Riggins, Idaho, voted 44–3 Wednesday in an employer-sponsored election to retain their union.

Local 2649 at Riggins is an affiliate of the Blue Mountain District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers with headquarters in Baker.

A similar move to oust the union failed at Elgin April 19 when 48 employees of Western Stud Mills, Inc., voted by a margin of 2–1 to remain unionized.

Russ Chandler, secretary of the Blue Mountain District Council, said the employers are misusing the intent of the Taft-Hartley Act by taking advantage of the current National Labor Relations Board policy of "allowing an employer-sponsored election without requiring proof that the employer's claim is justified."

He said that an NLRB report quoted in a trade magazine May 6 showed that the board received the highest number of election petitions in March of this year since August, 1946.

"The present NLRB policy in regard to employer petitions is inviting a completely unwarranted expense of tax money," Chandler said.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that in both of these employer-sponsored elections, the vote in favor of the union was so lopsided as to indicate clearly that the employer had no legitimate reason to expect the union to lose the election. Rather, it would cause one to wonder whether it was called to harass the union and involve it in an election campaign as a nuisance tactic and a means of draining its resources. It should also be pointed out that these elections are supervised by the National Labor Relations Board and so constitute a cost to the taxpayers. In other words, the Government is financing elections which are possibly aimed at nothing more than harassing the recognized representatives of the employees of these firms.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to another aspect of this problem. Certification elections may be sought either by individual employees, by a labor organization claiming to represent those employees, or by an employer as a challenge to the union's claim of representing its employees. When an individual employee or a labor organization files a petition for a certification election, a "substantial showing of interest" must be presented. The NLRB has ruled that this means proof that at least 30 percent of the members of the bargaining unit support the petition. When an employer, on the other hand, petitions for a certification election, no such "substantial showing of interest" is required.

This seems to me to be highly inequitable and it seems to me further that it is precisely this loophole in the NLRB procedures which permits employers to utilize a Government-supervised election as nothing more than a means of harassing a union. Why should not an employer be required, as a union or an individual employee is, to furnish some evidence, beyond his own contention, that there is at least a substantial portion of the bargaining unit which favors a new certification election? If this were the case, it seems clear to me that at least one, if not both of the elections mentioned in the news story would not have been held. The union would not have been forced to expend its resources in a new certification campaign which can only increase enmity between labor and management rather than further the cause of industrial peace, and the Federal Government would not have been forced to spend the money required to send its representatives to the plant and supervise the holding of these unnecessary elections.

Further indirect evidence that increasing use is perhaps being made of these employer-called certification elections is also furnished by data from the National Labor Relations Board on filing of election petitions. In fiscal year 1955, there were 545 petitions filed by employers. By fiscal 1957, the number had risen to 654 and in the most recent fiscal year 1959, there were 847 employer filings. Not only have these been increasing in number, but also as a share of total filings.

I am furnishing the National Labor Relations Board with a copy of my statement today, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking them to inform me as to what justification there is for this apparently discriminatory aspect of their procedures. I am asking them also to advise me if appropriate legislation would be required to correct this inequity, since I feel that, unless this difference in the handling of petitions for certification elections can be shown to have adequate justification, serious consideration should be given to eliminating it and placing all such petitions on the same footing.

Sound Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took note of the recent Treasury offering to exchange up to $5½ billion of new 4-year notes and 8-year bonds for outstanding securities maturing on November 15, 1961. The gentleman views this offering as a giveaway, inasmuch as the existing bonds are earning interest at 2½ percent, whereas the new notes and bonds will earn rates of 3¾ percent and 3⅞ percent, respectively.

The gentleman's predilection for perpetually low interest rates, which could only lead to disastrous inflation, are well known to us, and need not be repeated at this time. It is important that the record be set straight, however, and that the current Treasury operation be judged for exactly what it is—a sound and imaginative debt management transaction that will ease the task of the next administration and benefit the American people.

The facts are these. On November 15, 1961, $11.2 billion of 2½-percent bonds come due, of which almost $11 billion are held by public investors. This huge amount is the largest publicly held maturity now outstanding. The easiest course for Secretary of the Treasury Anderson to take would be to do nothing, but simply ignore the problem that will confront the Treasury in November 1961.

If the size of this maturity is not in some way reduced, the pressure on the Government securities market in November 1961 could be almost unbearable. As anyone even vaguely familiar with the market mechanism knows, $11 billion of securities is simply too much to refinance efficiently at one time. Any attempt to do so would shoot interest rates upward and could greatly disrupt the market. This could do serious damage to the cause of sound Government finance. It would not be responsible for Secretary Anderson to ignore this problem.

The gentleman from Texas implies that it is foolish to offer securities with higher interest rates for outstanding bonds with lower rates. He attempts to compare the situation with an individual who might voluntarily refinance a home mortgage or an automobile loan at a higher rate. But I am sure that all of us would agree that such an action, rather than being improvident, would be quite appropriate if the individual were confronted, as is the Treasury, with a huge amount of debt coming due all at once. Such an individual would be wise to arrange for refinancing some of the debt well in advance, even if he had to pay a little more in interest to do so. Moreover, there is no assurance at all that the Treasury will be be paying more interest for this necessary debt extension than if it waited until November 1961 to meet the problem. In fact, the necessary rate of interest to refinance $11 billion of securities at one time could be very high indeed.

There is another important reason for the Treasury offering. The refusal of the Congress to remove the 4½-percent interest rate ceiling has forced the Treasury to sit by while the outstanding marketable debt has grown shorter and shorter in maturity. Today, almost 80 percent matures within 5 years. This progressive shortening of the debt cannot be viewed with complacency; it is highly dangerous. It forces the Treasury to come into the market more frequently and for larger amounts, and it complicates the problems of avoiding inflation, because the shorter a security gets, the more like money it is.

Thus, the current offering is a sensible and well-designed attempt to stretch out some of this ever-shortening debt. The Treasury is offering a coupon rate of 3⅞ percent on the new 8-year bond. It is willing, as stated many times, to sell a reasonable amount of such bonds, and would have done so in the past year, but the 4½-percent ceiling has prevented such action.

The record should also be set straight on the net interest cost of this operation. The gentleman from Texas maintains that the extra interest payable between June 23, 1960, and November 15, 1961, to those holders who elect to exchange will come to $130 million on the whole $5.5 billion. The gentleman's arithmetic confuses me, because I come up with an additional cost, for that period alone, of about $99 million. But this is not the significant figure, if we agree, as we should, that some debt extension at this time is imperative, lest our huge public debt grows ever shorter in maturity. The true net cost, then, must be judged in terms of what it would cost the Treasury today to obtain the debt extension beyond November 1961 represented by the new 4-year notes and 8-year bonds. Assuming market conditions in November 1961 are as they are today, such securities would have to carry interest rates no less than 4½ percent and 4⅛ percent, respectively. On this basis, the net cost to the Treasury of achieving this valuable debt extension is less than $25 million, a modest amount indeed in view of the good that will be achieved.

Finally, note should be made of the reference of the gentleman from Texas to this offering as a "big giveaway." If such were the case, we would expect current holders of the 2½-percent bonds to be clamoring to exchange for the new securities. But the New York Times noted the other morning—June 9—that, as the books opened yesterday, "dealers in Government securities continued to sense that the Treasury invitation would meet largely with indifference." This is hardly a picture of a gigantic giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, the man who occupies the position of Secretary of the Treasury in November 1961, regardless of party, will owe a large debt of gratitude to Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for his courage and imagination in making this current offering. Rather than criticizing this action, the Members of this body should rise up with a resounding vote of thanks.

Jacob H. Cohen Child Guidance Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 5, 1960, there was dedicated at the Pride of Judea Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., the Jacob H. Cohen Child Guidance Clinic. In attendance were charitable-minded members of the community such as Mrs. Max Blumberg, City Council President Abe Stark, Senator Simon J. Liebowitz, Judge Sidney Squire, Hon. Nathan W. Math, Isidor Leviton, Morris Kirsch, Surrogate Maximilian Moss, and many others.

Jacob H. Cohen has dedicated approximately 50 years of his life in the service of the Pride of Judea which will long remain as a monument to him and his associates. On that occasion, the group was addressed by the Comptroller of the State of New York, Hon. Arthur Levitt, and under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include that address which follows:

ADDRESS BY COMPTROLLER ARTHUR LEVITT AT DEDICATION OF THE JACOB H. COHEN CHILD GUIDANCE CLINIC, PRIDE OF JUDEA CHILDREN'S SERVICES, BROOKLYN, N.Y., JUNE 5, 1960

I am pleased and honored to be present today for the dedication of this child guidance center.

Children and youth constitute the most precious asset of any nation. Our greatest obligation as citizens is to develop this asset to its fullest potentialities. Our highest ideal is that of a society in which every child may receive all the encouragement and guidance he needs to grow into happy, creative, responsible maturity.

Working toward this ideal has never been easy, and is not easy now.

Schools, recreational facilities, health facilities, and psychiatric counseling services frequently are inadequate. That most distressing form of crime, juvenile delinquency, has increased, indicating a progressive alienation of the younger generation from the community in general.

Here in New York our children find their environment especially unsettling. Our people are mobile, often hundreds or thousands of miles away from their hometowns, cut off from close relatives and family tradition. As New Yorkers, we have come to take for granted and take pride in the fact that most sections of the city bear little resemblance to themselves as they were only a decade ago. But to a child constant shifts in his surroundings—new people, new places, new rules of behavior, or perhaps no rules of behavior—can lead to insecurity.

It is encouraging, however, that in the current situation so many of our children do grow up to be all that we could hope.

It is encouraging, too, that today, perhaps as never before, our dedicated social scientists stand on the frontier of new discoveries in the field of delinquency prevention. Experiments begun within the past few years have proved successful. Indications are that

we are developing tools to enable us to make a real start toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Let me cite a few of the recent programs that have received widespread publicity—as I am not a professional in this field, I may well be unaware of discoveries not widely reported.

As New Yorkers, we can be proud of the national attention recently given to our "600" school system and encouraged that the small classes, especially trained teachers and careful guidance work lavished on these "600" pupils—perhaps the most emotionally disturbed in our school system—have succeeded in reaching so surprisingly many of the children once considered unreachable.

We can be proud, too, of the successes of our New York City Youth Board in its efforts to channel the energies of street gangs into constructive, socially acceptable outlets—to prove to these boys that a reputation for holding the best dance or fielding the best basketball team can give satisfaction far greater than can a "rep" for toughness.

We can be encouraged, further, to read of the remarkable accuracy with which Prof. and Mrs. Sheldon Glueck, Harvard professors, have learned to predict potential delinquency in children as young as 4, 5, or 6 years old. If methods such as the Gluecks' are now experimenting with can enable us to find and help seriously troubled children long before they come into actual conflict with the law, we will have moved far toward learning how to prevent juvenile delinquency. And as with any other illness, one preventive is worth a thousand cures.

Finally, we can be encouraged by the remarkable successes which modern, well-staffed child guidance centers have been able to score with seriously disturbed children who have been referred to them for help.

One indication of what can be done comes from the New York City Bureau of Child Guidance, a board of education agency.

The board has undertaken several pilot projects in selected schools designed to study and diagnose cases of maladjusted children in the schools and to recommend treatment and instruction for them. Under this program, a team consisting of a psychologist, a social worker and a consulting psychiatrist, with a supervisor, concentrates on one school alone—many, many times the amount of attention that could be given one school under ordinary staffing procedures. The remarkable successes scored by these pilot projects have proved dramatically how much could be done to prevent trouble and to help emotionally disturbed children to adjust to society.

However, the fact remains that our public agencies are not able to deal with the ever-growing numbers of disturbed children turning to them for help.

Private citizens are desperately needed to step in and bridge the growing gap between public capacities and the needs of our children.

We in the pride of Judea have already acted to meet the challenges presented us, as citizens, by the technical discoveries of our social scientists. In opening your new child guidance center, we have taken action to give the children in your community the benefits of up-to-date psychiatric and psychological counselling. We are working to ensure that for the children around you, at least, the findings of recent pilot projects shall not be theoretical alone.

I can only offer my fervent prayer that your example will be emulated in other communities, that everywhere men will accept as you have their responsibility to move forward toward the society of our dreams—the society in which every child shall be given an opportunity to develop all that is best in him.

Thank you.

Massachusetts 1960 Convention of Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my remarks as guest speaker at the department of Massachusetts 1960 convention held on June 11, 1960, at Springfield, Mass.:

Greetings, the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A., is less than 2 years old.

Even though the average age of our membership is in the sixties, we believe that our greatest period of growth is just ahead of us. In fact, there will be a few of our comrades left to remind the Nation of our service, and to our ideals, in the year 2000.

To those who say that our organization exists for one purpose only, I say that during the next 10 to 20 years we shall develop a fullbodied program to strengthen our national heritage, and to protect our freedom.

In line with this, we have taken steps toward the creation of a memorial to the veterans of World War I.

It is likely that it will be built in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., near the site of a famous Civil War battlefield. Its proximity to Arlington National Cemetery and other heroic shrines will emphasize the courage which unites all who have fought in defense of our liberties, through the generations.

This is a good beginning.

World War I had its special goals, that gave a new vision to our national purpose.

Under the farseeing leadership of President Wilson, we were in step with the future. Although the cause for which we fought and bled was betrayed by politics at home, and by conspiracies abroad, we know that we did not sacrifice in vain. The enemy of 1917–18 is the friend of today—and one of the allied powers of those days, seized by the new tyranny of communism—has become the oppressor that would conquer the world.

In this age of swift communications, and of missiles that leap across the oceans, the need becomes more imperative for a world organization to eliminate warfare. And when that time comes, the world can look back to Woodrow Wilson and to the men who fought to make the world safe for freedom.

Before we achieve that goal we shall have to overcome many dangers, and to learn new techniques for turning back the Communist challenge to our survival.

Around the clock, communism is waging war against us with economic and political, and psychological weapons.

And because of this invisible but unrelating strategy, many of our people find it hard to comprehend that we are presently engaged in a war where we could suffer defeat and slavery without a shot being fired.

The zigs and zags of Communist policy are directed against the minds of the free world in order to confuse, disarm, and demoralize us for the Communist takeover.

We were shocked and dismayed when Khrushchev sabotaged the summit conference and insulted the President of the United States.

But we should have been prepared for any eventuality, including that one, and should have been ready with measures to counteract it.

Our great weakness is the belief that the Communists will respond to reason, when we should know by this time that they will exploit every sign of weakness or indecision on our part.

In the field of psychological warfare we sometimes help them without realizing it.

When Khrushchev wrecked the summit conference it was news—sensational news—but we did not have to play it up to the extent that we did. I noticed on one day that a highly respectable New York newspaper carried six separate stories on its front page, each one of them containing the name of Khrushchev in its headlines. This overemphasis gave to the Communist dictator the recognition and the prestige that he does not deserve. In other words, he scored a propaganda victory, and this newspaper helped him to exploit it—by featuring him in six front-page stories.

This is but one example of how the Communists play upon your gullibility, and use us to further their own ends.

For several years I have been disturbed by our preoccupation with the defense. This is a negative frame of mind, that gives every advantage to the Communists. It betrays fear of initiative, and fear of mounting the counter-offensive to win the minds of men.

The Communists spend on brainwashing, $2 a year for every person in the free world. While we spend only 2 cents for each person within the Communist orbit in an effort to reach them with the truth.

To expose the lies of Communist propaganda which so often hyponotize innocent people and then to advance the missionary work of freedom, we must enlarge and intensify our program not only to help the underdeveloped countries, but to nourish and strengthen the underdeveloped minds, in the West as well as in the East.

Remember how the Communists promoted the so-called Stockholm peace petition a few years ago and induced millions of well-meaning people in the free world to sign it? Under the cloak of the word "peace" which appeals to most of humanity, they sought to lull the free world into a sense of false security. Fortunately, more realistic minds saw through this clever maneuver, and were not fooled by it.

Although myself and a few other Congressmen vigorously protested against the invitation of the White House to have Khrushchev visit the United States, we opened the doors of our hospitality to him.

Many Americans deluded themselves with the hope that he would be impressed and softened by the evidence of our material prosperity. But in one of his tantrums at Los Angeles he threatened to "bury us," if we failed to appease him by concessions that would mean surrender on the installment plan.

Soviet diplomacy is not diplomacy in the accepted meaning of that term. It is a principal weapon among the many used by Soviet propaganda. "Every form of exchange between Communist and other countries, whether diplomatic, cultural, commercial or technical, is conceived and worked out with propaganda in mind." According to Suzanne Labin who wrote "The Unrelenting War," a study of the strategy and techniques of Communist propaganda and infiltration.

"All members of Soviet missions abroad are trained primarily to charm and hoodwink high political or financial circles in the countries they are to undermine."

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, aptly described the Communists as "masters of deceit."

But, in spite of these warnings, too many Americans are apathetic toward the danger.

The Congress is forcing the administration to strengthen our retaliatory power in order to discourage and prevent a massive surprise attack upon the free world.

But this is not enough.

Our one, dangerous, unprotected front is psychological, political.

On the battlefield of "the war of minds" it is folly to sit back and wait. We must advance toward definite goals and with firm purpose.

Earlier in my remarks, I mentioned the need of a well-rounded and positive program for the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A.

As we are the older veterans, we must assume the responsibility of leadership in order to make our country strong and to keep it vigilant.

But we also have needs of our own, and those needs have been neglected by the Federal Government. Our self-respect requires that we battle to overcome the benefits deficit that has discriminated against the veterans of 1917–18.

We shall attain equality with our fellow veterans of other wars only when we finally succeed in winning a service pension for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I.

The Baltic Peoples and Their Tragic Fate in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians has been fraught with much tragedy relieved by occasional triumph. Centuries before World War I they had lost their independence and lived under foreign regimes.

The end of that war ushered in a new era for these peoples. All three regained and proclaimed their independence in 1919, established their own democratic governments. These governments were duly recognized by other countries and they became members of the world community of nations.

During the period of freedom which they enjoyed during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged countries, and were perfectly content with their lot. Unfortunately, however, in the larger world of international politics and diplomacy they were not masters of their fate.

With the rise of totalitarian governments both in Germany and in Russia the Baltic peoples found themselves in a very precarious position. They succeeded in maintaining their independence until the outbreak of the last war, and then brute Soviet force became the arbiter of their fate.

As the friends of these peoples in the West became involved in the war, the Soviet Union felt free to deal with the Baltic peoples as its dictator wished—to occupy and annex these countries and enslave their inhabitants. This was done not only in a high-handed manner but by resorting to barbaric methods.

By early June 1940 these countries were occupied by the Red army and at about the middle of the month the Soviet authorities in these countries rounded up all those suspected of opposing communism, numbering hundreds of thousands, and exiled them to the distant corners of the Soviet Union. From that day to this, 20 years after that tragic event, we still do not exactly know the fate of these helpless and unfortunate people who were arrested, herded into freight cars and destined to incarceration, servitude, and even death in desolate parts of the Soviet Union.

Today it is possible that some of these people, who survived the terrible years in exile, have returned to their homeland, but it is more probable that most of them have died in exile and misery, far away from their beloved homeland.

In observing the 20th anniversary of that tragic event, the Soviet deportations of men, women, and children by the hundreds of thousands in 1940 from the Baltic States, we pray for the souls of these brave but helpless people.

Address by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter at University of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the full text of the excellent speech by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, at the annual graduation exercises at the University of Pittsburgh.

With the mutual security appropriation bill about to come before the House, I feel this excellent address should be called to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people.

The address follows:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY

(Address by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., Wednesday, June 8, 1960)

It is a privilege to be with you today, and a pleasure to share in this ancient ritual. The gowns and hoods we wear remind us of the antiquity of the university tradition, and the legacy of faith as well as knowledge on which it draws. We are made aware of the significance of the life of this university to the city, the State, and the Nation. You are part of that "republic of learning" which knows no frontiers, and which in our times is perhaps more vital than ever before in history if the barriers which separate peoples are to be broken down and man is to measure up to the potentialities and opportunities of our unparalleled era.

OUR CHANGING WORLD

We now live, together with all peoples, in a relatively small world, the dimensions of which are further rapidly shrinking. This fact has already completely revolutionized the relations between man and man, between different societies, nations, and continents. Our world is a neighborhood. Science has wrought wonders which tend to create the physical, the technical basis for a world community. The material foundation of such a community lies ready to our hands; it exists in rudimentary form.

We are, all of us, confronted today by new and challenging frontiers, not between men and nations but frontiers surrounding us all, as individuals, beckoning us on to new endeavors and concerted efforts. You of the community of learning bear a special responsibility, that our common cultural heritage be preserved and made pertinent and applicable to the great tasks that challenge us on many fronts. For we are truly engaged in a contest of which the stakes and the outcome are the fate of our culture and our civilization.

Let us be clear in our minds about what has been happening. Many of us here can recall the days when most of our world seemed far away from us, rather unreal in fact. Our people, in town and country, were preoccupied with local and personal—or at the most, national—affairs. Europe and Asia were far away. So was Latin America. Africa was a great unknown. Newspapers recorded little of world events, usually only at a time of disaster or war.

Now these times are gone beyond recall. We would not call them back if we could. We live in a new and utterly different kind of world.

It is a startling thought that it now has become possible, for the first time in history, for all peoples of the world to live together. The so-called backward peoples can now begin to enjoy the benefits of our modern civilization. The techniques are available whereby all members of the human race can be well fed and clothed and housed. We seem on the verge of conquest of the abysmal poverty and disease and misery that have long been the lot of most of mankind. The basic and central reality is the essentially political fact, that all nations now must live together and that a community of interests must come into existence.

OPEN AND CLOSED SOCIETIES

This poses one of the great issues of our times, the conflict between the concepts of open and closed societies. In America we have aspired to an open society, and have sought increasingly to realize it in our world relationships. In such a society there is an absence of needless and artificial barriers, and a cross-fertilization and free competition of ideas. This is a fundamental aspect of our tradition and heritage, of our national style. In general this concept is shared and exemplified in the other countries of the free world, where there is freedom of communication, of expression, of travel, and of initiative.

The other concept, that of a closed society, still prevails in many parts of the world, even though it is gradually being modified by the influx and pressure of modern forces and ideas. In such societies men must live largely separate and secluded from their fellow men elsewhere, bound by tradition and often superstition, subservient to governments and institutions over which they have little control. Their thoughts are patterned after the concepts and ideologies imposed upon them from above.

It will be difficult to resolve the central political problem of our times so long as closed societies of repressed and unfree peoples exist. This is particularly true when all peoples are being pulled more and more into the course of world history. Hermit nations are an anachronism. There is no room for unfree nations, whether subjected to the tyranny of human despots, or to the tyranny of false and outworn systems and ideas. Our world can never become a true community so long as a part of its peoples remain shut off from the main currents of history.

One reason why a closed society is a danger to our world community is that it harbors secrecy; it cherishes estangement from and hostility toward the outside world. In states so dominated concealment becomes a fetish. Such states instill fears of other

nations in their peoples. Excessive secrecy is regarded as a great military asset, the equivalent of so many divisions or missiles.

I believe it is this same fetish of secrecy that obstructs progress toward arms control. The Soviets profess to want disarmament, but their obsession with secrecy has made them unwilling to accept the type of inspection arrangements which are absolutely indispensable to any safe and acceptable system of controlled disarmament.

It is even more true now than when it was stated by President Eisenhower before the United Nations General Assembly in 1958, that "the nature of today's weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies. * * * The concept of the open society is the ultimate key to a system of arms control we all can trust."

RELATIONS WITH THE U.S.S.R.

The important thing is to face our tasks of the future in a constructive frame of mind. Mutual recriminations about past actions are futile. Nor is it helpful to try to define our policy toward the Soviet Union as either hard or soft nor to depict the international conflict in colors of black and white. Our posture should be calm, resolute and vigilant, at the same time that we explore every available opportunity to move our relationships on to a more hopeful plane of increased understanding and mutual cooperation.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Returning to our main political problem, that of creating the reality of a world of peoples living together, and through their relationships building the foundations of a true world community, I would refer to the special significance in this connection of our exchange program. This process of exchange was well called by the late Secretary Dulles "a curative and creative force in world affairs." It fosters human contacts, serving as a catalytic agent, strengthening bonds between friends, diminishing the gulf between antagonists. These contacts are of almost every conceivable kind—social, business, labor, cultural, educational, scientific, athletic, diplomatic, even political.

Much of this program relates to what might be called cultural and educational exchanges in the literal sense. It involves mainly students and scholars. It plants many seeds of intellectual growth which are bound to ripen and bear fruit, to the benefit of both countries concerned.

Closely related to this is the exchange of specialists in various fields of useful endeavor—agricultural, industrial, technical, military, athletic. Artists and entertainers communicate not merely their talents but increased understanding of and respect for the genius of the nation they represent.

All this is to the good. But I would especially emphasize that this program is and should be, to a large extent, political in the best sense. The leader exchange program is designed to fill this need. This is so because it brings about the mutual interchange of persons who are, or are destined to be, leaders and persons of distinction in their respective countries. These are people of prominence or promise in political, governmental, business, and labor activities. Each year this program brings to our shores key personalities of other nations. We exhibit to them America as it is; not a glamorized picture fixed up by propagandists, nor yet the sordid version so often propagated abroad by certain of our realistic school of writers.

You are all aware of the special progress we have made in recent years in what are called East-West exchanges, or more properly, exchanges between the West and the Soviet bloc. You know that these have been at many levels and of diverse types.

ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES

Surely no institutions are better fitted than our universities to advance these purposes. Their role in the advancement of scientific knowledge is too obvious to require elaboration. Let me stress, however, their role in our progress toward a world of open societies as the basis of world community and in contributing to the exchange of ideas among peoples out of which eventually may emerge a sense of community and a consensus about those things on which the very survival of our civilization depends.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The University of Pittsburgh has caught the vision of this new horizon. We in the Department of State fully appreciate what you have done in various ways.

You have a long record of active interest and participation in the international exchange idea. By creating the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange, you have added a new dimension to the intellectual life of the university. In fact, Pittsburgh has shown an increasing awareness of our Nation's responsibility to assist other peoples and to learn from other cultures, and has made this the basis of its programs to a degree found in very few American universities.

You have made great advances in affiliation with foreign universities, in the number of foreign students and faculty members, in new and varied programs of study in international affairs, and in the growing number of Pittsburgh faculty members and students who study abroad.

Moreover, your university has not confined its interest to the campus, but has enlisted the support of the entire community through the Pittsburgh Council for International Visitors. The modern city of Pittsburgh is rich with the history and contributions of many nationalities, and is a striking example to the world of the benefits born of mutual cooperation and friendly exchange.

You have organized the Intercollegiate Regional Council for International Educational Exchange, together with affiliated colleges and universities in a five-State area, thus pooling the great intellectual and cultural resources of the region for exchange activities.

In addition, your chancellor has contributed greatly to the success of the exchange of leaders program through the Governmental Affairs Institute.

These outstanding achievements of the University of Pittsburgh deserve the highest commendation. I bring to you from the Department of State my warmest congratulations and appreciation.

What you have accomplished moves me to make certain comments and suggestions.

First, I should like to repeat and emphasize what I have indicated throughout my address; namely, that a cultural exchange program in the broadest sense is of vital importance in our whole foreign policy in the swiftly changing and dynamic world in which we live. Whatever the importance we attach to political, economic, and military programs, we must always remember that what touches men's minds and influences their thinking is, perhaps, the most determining factor of all in shaping historic events and the course of civilization.

Second, I would suggest that our higher institutions of learning, so far as possible, attach primary importance to the educational exchange program, in their planning, and in their budgeting and staffing, for it is an integral part of their responsibilities and activities.

Third, I would appeal to industrial, labor, and private organizations generally to make systematic efforts to contribute to such an exchange program within the range of their special interests and capacities.

Fourth, I believe, that the Federal Government should give increasing emphasis to the exchange program as one of the essential components of a sound foreign policy.

CONCLUSION

Let me conclude by pointing to our long-term goals as a Nation. Aware as we must continue to be of the Communist threat, and with all our precautions to deal with it, we must never be so preoccupied with the Soviet challenge as to forget our own constructive purposes. We have our vision of the future. We must press forward toward the new horizon. The values of our culture are not ours alone. They are a heritage which we must seek to conserve and pass on to coming generations.

A new world is dawning—a world, we trust, swept by the winds of freedom; in which freedom's message and rewards may be shared by the newly emerging nations; in which a true world community will come into being resting on the rule of law and not of force.

The cause of civilization is not the selfish interest of any one nation. The universities are uniquely fitted, intellectually and philosophically, to interpret this new world to us and to our friends in other lands. It is the common task of all of us—educators and scholars, scientists and religious leaders, businessmen, labor leaders, and all those groups which make up our free and open society—to find ways, together with the Government, to work with people in other countries so that we may all move forward together, building better societies and strengthening gradually the foundations of a true world community.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Fullness of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Sunday the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Tufts University, in recognition of his notable achievements as lawyer, businessman, and legislator. I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to my distinguished colleague on being selected for this honor.

I also wish to commend Tufts University for strengthening the ties that bind Hawaii to New England. It is not well enough known that from 1820 to 1835 groups of Congregational missionaries from New England journeyed to Hawaii, where they settled permanently, teaching Christianity and contributing to the development and stability of Hawaii in education, government, and social responsibility.

In his address to Tufts graduates at the 104th commencement exercises, Senator FONG paid tribute to those New England missionaries who helped to create in the Pacific, "out of diverse tongues and cultures," a homogeneous American community. He urged college men and women to serve "in the noblest tradition of America as 20th century missionaries sowing the seed of neighborly love and freedom in other lands, bringing hope of a better life to a needy world, and laboring in the vineyard for peace on earth, good will to men."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this stirring address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FULLNESS OF LIFE

(Address by U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG at Tufts University commencement exercises, Medford, Mass., June 12, 1960)

President Wessell, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, candidates for degrees, students, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very happy to be here with you on this joyous occasion of your 104th commencement. I am grateful and thankful for the honorary doctor of laws degree you are bestowing upon me. To be associated with you as an honorary alumnus of Tufts University with its 107 years of glorious history is for me a high privilege and a great honor.

Having been advised that I will receive from you a diploma, without attending classes, study, examinations, and anxiety leaves me with a mixed feeling of guilt, delinquency, and immorality, especially when I know how hard you have worked for your diploma and how hard I worked as a Harvard Law School student. Your bestowing upon me this honor will continue what has been for me a happy and most rewarding association with New England.

Since early childhood, long before I attended Harvard, New England has been a part of me, for the influence of New England has been felt in my native Hawaii for 140 years. From 1820 to 1835, 12 groups of Christian Congregational missionaries left their homes in New England by sailing ships to bring the Christian Gospel to Hawaii. Their voyages by way of the Cape of Good Hope covered a distance of over 12,000 miles and took 5½ months to complete. Their journeys were fraught with much seasickness and hardship. The contributions of these sturdy New England missionaries you sent us have been enduring and many. They and their descendants have contributed greatly to our development and stability and their Puritan philosophy has deeply influenced our outlook and life.

Through their influence, the Hawaiian language was reduced to writing, the Bible was translated, and schools were established. Through their influence, the first written constitution was approved in 1840, creating a supreme court and a representative body of legislators elected by the people.

Through their influence, prohibition was placed on immorality, gambling, drunkenness, theft, and violation of the Sabbath. These prohibitions were strongly resisted by the sailing men. They demonstrated on several occasions against these Christian influences by armed riots, not against the natives, but against the missionaries and on one occasion they fired several cannon shots into the home of one of them.

Architecturally, too, New England has left its visible mark on Hawaii. Even today, it is not unusual to see a Cape Cod cottage on any one of the seven inhabited islands.

New England's influences on me have been quite personal. Besides being a graduate of the Harvard Law School, I am a graduate of the public school system which the Congregational missionaries helped to inaugurate. My name of Hiram is taken from the Reverend Hiram Bingham, leader of the first group of missionaries. By now you have surmised my religion is Congregational.

So, it is indeed a distinct honor and a great privilege for me to be speaking here today in New England, for to me it is in a sense in more ways than one, like returning home.

To me, it is opportune and seemly for you at this commencement occasion, to pause and thank with gratitude this school, its faculty, its benefactors, and all those who have contributed to its facilities to enable you to receive the learning and the knowledge you now possess.

It is opportune and seemly for you also to pause here and pay homage to parents, family, and friends who have labored and sacrificed for you to receive this day your degrees.

Today, you are, as college graduates and as men and women, the possessors of a great fortune. You are the inheritors of the accumulation over centuries of man's vast wealth of knowledge and culture, the beneficiaries of the civilizations which have preceded you.

The rights and privileges of freedom of speech, press, worship, and assembly and all of the freedoms and rights that your forefathers shed blood and died for—are yours full-blown, not by sufferance or whim, but by long-established law.

Educationally comprising the upper 5 percent of our population, you, as college graduates will have a decided advantage in potential earning power and in regularity of employment over noncollege workers. The job outlook this June for college graduates is excellent, with starting salaries higher by some 4 to 8 percent over a year ago. Long-range prospects are likewise auspicious. It is anticipated that within a few years if we do not have new methods and new machinery, there will be a shortage of manpower to produce the goods and services needed to sustain the American standard of living. Your talents will be in greater demand than ever.

The startling and provocative economic indicators of the next 15 years show that we will be a Nation of 240 million people, 60 million more than today, with a labor force of about 95 million producing goods and services totaling $900 billion.

Translated into other tangibles, these vital statistics mean that we will build millions of dwelling units, thousands of miles of roads, and many, many bridges, dams, and flood control projects. We will need some 77,000 more doctors, 34,000 more dentists, and a third of a million more nurses than we have today.

To educate 15 million more children, we will need 600,000 new schoolrooms in public schools alone and 500,000 additional teachers. We will have to triple the capacity of our present colleges and universities.

We will need a greater output of foodstuffs and of most basic raw materials, nearly three times our present production of electric power, and double the supply of our fresh water.

Not only are there jobs for everyone, but there is also a wide choice of careers. A few years ago, there were no electronics industries, no atomic energy projects, no missiles or rockets or space vehicles. New vocations created in the past 10 or 15 years run the full spectrum of man's pursuits and offer careers undreamed of only a few decades ago.

Sitting here today, as graduates, you are on the threshold of a very interesting, fascinating, and rewarding era, witnessing what promises to be the birth of a new golden age.

All around you life's pace has quickened. From sails to steamboats and from pushcarts to motor vehicles embraced thousands of years. Today, speed and power change within decades or less. In the first six decades of this century in America, changes have been greater than in all the thousands of years of mankind's history. It was only 18 years ago in 1942 that Enrico Fermi discovered the principle of atomic chain reaction that launched us into the atomic age. Scarcely had this era dawned when 15 years later in 1957, we found ourselves in the space age with the first sputnik.

Fifteen years from now, supersonic airplanes will bring Paris within 2 hours from New York and Geneva about 3 hours from Los Angeles. Space travel will approach reality. In 1961 we hope to launch our first man into space with safe return; about 1970, to transport an American astronaut to the moon; and perhaps by 1975, to other places.

Life's expectancy now has approached the seventies and will be longer once we conquer cancer and diseases of the circulatory system as we soon may do. Social security, unemployment compensation, and promised old-age health insurance have materially lessened the anxieties of unemployment and old age.

With minimal efforts, 5 days of work and 2 days of leisure per week, you can expect to meet the material needs of yourself and your family, home, food, car, vacation, and the upbringing and education of your children. Never before in the history of mankind have college graduates been more richly endowed than you nor more likely to succeed.

By now our 5-day workweek is typical of our contemporary American life, but, as educated men and women from whose ranks will be chosen many of our future leaders, you ought to be willing to devote to whatever you may choose to do longer hours and greater dedication. These extra efforts on your part, accompanied by further technological progress which we expect, will help to increase our Nation's productivity resulting in more leisure time for future generations.

Men of wisdom and learning throughout the ages have cautioned that the use of leisure time wholly for fun, pleasure, and comfort renders life narrow and empty. Gratifying only material wants does not satisfy the soul. Lasting satisfaction contributing to the fullness of life comes from cultivating in one's heart a spirit of charity and service toward all men and from devoting a portion of one's life to benefit mankind. Look to the lives of our great moral teachers, Jesus Christ, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, and others.

Therefore each of you ought to ponder how, with your particular talents and in your particular circumstances, you can serve family, friends, community, Nation, and mankind.

As long as millions of people in the world still suffer from the ravages of disease, from malnutrition, from undernourishment, and illiteracy, you, as favored men and women, owe a duty to extend a helping hand to those less fortunate than yourself. More than 90 percent of the world is less fortunate than you.

Last October and November, I made a 45-day tour of 14 countries of the Far East. The trip was most enlightening—it was fascinating—and yet somewhat disturbing. The Far East is a fantastic area. Here is situated more than one-half of the entire world's population—the new throbbing core of our continuing global struggle for peace. It is vast beyond our imagination. It is diverse to the extremes of ultramodern and utter primitive. We know it too little; we understand it far less.

With rare exception, I found mass poverty, illiteracy, economic and political instability, inadequate capital and technical know-how.

Prospects for improving the well-being of fellow men such as I found in the Far East fundamentally rest upon a world at peace, for war would further impoverish them. Indeed, the well-being of all of us likewise depends upon a world at peace. Each of you, therefore, has an abiding stake in preserving world peace.

Of paramount necessity to the preservation of peace are substantive actions to nourish, to clothe, to shelter, to heal, and to educate those in want. Men released from the grinding struggle for mere existence are more likely to possess the will to be free and to join other free men determined to strengthen the deterrent to war. Thus as we raise the standard of living of the less fortunate so will the prospects of peace be raised.

Similarly essential to lasting peace with justice are the easing of international tensions, the devising of enforcible bans on nuclear weapons tests, and the accepting of valid steps leading to disarmament.

In every conceivable way consistent with our national honor you should explore the possibilities not only of avoiding war but also of diminishing the threat of war.

Simultaneously as you work for peace maintain a watchful eye on your Government, insist on honesty and integrity in public and private matters, give loyalty and respect to government and keep on being a student.

By cultivating in your heart the spirit of charity and by contributing generously of your time and effort in the service of mankind to alleviate suffering, want, and disease, you will do your share for the molding of a peaceful, homogeneous world community, although diverse in nationality and culture but firmly unified with the love of freedom and liberty.

Thus, in some measure, you will be treading in the worthy footsteps of your illustrious forebears, those hardy, self-sacrificing New England missionaries who journeyed 5½ months—one-half way around the world, by sailing ships, to bring to Hawaii the concept of universal love, brotherhood of man, and fatherhood of God and who helped so substantially to create in the middle of the Pacific, out of diverse tongues and cultures, a happy, homogeneous American community living in understanding, amity, and concord.

You, as college men and women and as the elite of our country, even without leaving home, will be serving in the noblest tradition of America as 20th century missionaries sowing the seed of neighborly love and freedom in other lands, bringing hope of a better life to a needy world, and laboring in the vineyard for peace on earth, good will to men. A life thus spent will indeed be a full life.

Central Mortgage Reserve Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial is included in the July issue of the American Builder magazine on the question of housing for Americans. This forthright editorial of Joseph B. Mason, editor of the American Builder, analyzes simply many of the difficult problems facing the building industry today. Its central theme concerns the need for a central mortgage reserve facility. It further supports S. 3541 and H.R. 12603, introduced by the great friend of those in need of adequate housing, Congressman ALBERT RAINS.

I commend this editorial to the membership of this body:

TO CONGRESS AND THE PLATFORM WRITERS OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES: A MESSAGE ON HOUSING AMERICANS

(By Joseph B. Mason)

THE UNHAPPY POSITION OF HOUSING IN POLITICS TODAY

Not since FHA was founded 26 years ago has there been such a need and opportunity for a giant step forward in housing. Our population is expanding, our economy booming, our youngsters and our oldsters seeking better homes in unprecedented numbers. Yet housing is caught in the middle of a political debate involving inflation, monetary controls, fixed interest rates and other problems that can and should be resolved.

This 82-year-old publication has fought for many sound building causes, including the establishment of FHA. We believe now is the time for a united move to secure sound, long-range housing legislation. The major objective should be an improved central mortgage reserve facility to stabilize home financing and encourage increased long-term investment—particularly by pension and retirement funds.

WHY BUILDERS DO NOT WANT INFLATION OR HANDOUTS

More than 200,000 builders, large and small, put up the Nation's houses. Like farmers, they are individually small businessmen. But collectively they count up to a gigantic industry. They know that faith in the future is vital both to the buyer of homes and the investor in home mortgages.

Builders do not want inflation, or handouts, or giveaways. A sound national monetary approach to homebuilding finance makes none of these necessary. Bills S. 3541 and H.R. 12216 now before Congress point the way to better housing by establishing a Central Mortgage Reserve facility.

THE UNFAIR AND DESTRUCTIVE EFFECT OF TIGHT MONEY

The history of housing shows many periods when tight money has pinched the lifeblood of building. The results have always been painful—not only to builders, but to workers, to the public, and to the economy. The cause is a piling up of financing and credit demands in an expanding era. The unfortunate and unfair result is a drying up in the supply of long-term mortgage money for homebuilding. Homes are the first to suffer—and low-cost houses the worst hit.

THE COST OF TIGHT MONEY IN LOST HOMES AND JOBS

When mortgage funds for homes dry up, builders lay off workers, stop buying lumber, cement, appliances. In several recent years the Nation has lost from 200,000 to 300,000 houses this way. It will do so in 1960, and again in 1961—unless Congress takes action.

In terms of jobs, this means millions of man-hours lost in factories, forests, and local communities. And the sharp peaks and valleys of production caused by a money shortage are costly to builders, who must plan far ahead. They increase the cost of houses—an added burden.

THE EVILS OF HIGH DISCOUNTS AND SECOND MORTGAGES

A particularly evil result of "tight money" and of uneconomic fixed interest rates is the paying of discounts to obtain mortgage loans. Builders are caught in a trap. To get a loan they must pay from 2 or 3 percent up to as much as 10 percent of the face amount of the mortgage. On a $15,000 house the discount cost may run from $500 to $1,000—an unconscionable and usurious addition to the cost of the house.

Another widespread practice resulting from our present ineffective money system is the skyrocketing use of second mortgages. These are costly to the buyer, dangerous to the builder, and a threat to the economy if a depression occurs.

OUR STASTICAL CONFUSION—HOW DEFINE HOUSING NEED?

The building industry is woefully lacking in statistics, and to complicate matters, the Census is now revising our long-standing series on starts to include farm and seasonal housing. But however defined, the need for better homes in this country today far exceeds present production.

Our goal should be 2 million units a year. We need to take care of a population "explosion" of 34 million in the sixties. We need to replace 250,000 houses demolished each year by highway construction, fire, and other causes. We need to start replacing some of our 30 million obsolete dwellings over 40 years old. We should pay special attention to lower-priced housing, which has suffered most from recent monetary policies. And we need more housing for the elderly.

THE CHANGING PATTERN OF U.S. SAVING AND BUYING

Vast sums of money are held today by pension, trust, and investment funds. In fact, the character of U.S. savings has altered radically, with a sharp effect on housing finance. People save less, buy more on down payments. To build more houses, the industry must attract new sources of money—especially the large union and corporate pension funds. An effective Central Mortgage Reserve facility would make such a flow of new funds to home financing feasible and desirable.

WHAT A CENTRAL MORTGAGE RESERVE WOULD DO FOR HOUSING

A system such as outlined in bills S. 3541 and H.R. 12216 would stabilize and expand the mortgage credit structure. It would bring in vast sums of pension and trust-fund investments, and make mortgage investments generally more fluid. The bill is nonpartisan and has the support of builders, mortgage bankers, real estate men. Its principals were approved by HHFA. It permits the Federal National Mortgage Association to sell its securities at a new ratio of 15 times its capital, and to make loans on the security of FHA and VA loans. It also sets up a system of private, federally chartered mortgage investment firms supervised by FNMA. These little "Fannie Maes" would be authorized to sell long- or short-term debentures, backed by insured mortgages. Such debentures would be attractive to pension funds and other investment capital.

OPPORTUNITY GREATEST SINCE THE FOUNDING OF FHA

As this editorial is written (June 8), it is felt Congress may not have time to act on a long-term measure of this importance. The values will hold just as strong next year. Another measure (title III of H.R. 12153) would also create a secondary market for conventional mortgages within the Federal Home Loan Bank system. This too should be enacted into law promptly.

These measures, backed by a vigorous national policy of leadership, could make America truly the best housed nation in the world. We recommend such a program to the Congress and to the platform writers of both parties.

Award of Honorary Degree to Senator Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, at its recent commencement, Elon College, which has woven much strength of mind and spirit into the warp and woof of our land, conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon my colleague, B. EVERETT JORDAN. I ask unanimous consent that the citation accompanying the award of the degree be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENJAMIN EVERETT JORDAN

Born in the State of North Carolina, the son of a Methodist minister; educated in the public schools of his native State and at Trinity College. In 1927 he organized the Sellers Manufacturing Co. and has held many positions of responsibility in business and industry.

Always interested in the welfare of his community and his fellow man, he has served as a member of the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, the North Carolina Peace Officers Benefit and Retirement Commission; as a director of the Alamance County Chapter of the Red Cross, the Alamance County Tuberculosis Association, and the Cherokee Council of the Boy Scouts of America; he is currently serving as chairman of the board of trustees of the Alamance County Hospital and as a member of the board of trustees of Duke University and Elon College.

For many years he has been an outstanding political leader having served as State chairman of the Democratic Party in North Carolina and as national committeeman from his State. In April 1958 he was appointed to the U.S. Senate by Governor Luther Hodges. In November of that year he was elected to fill the remainder of the unexpired term of the late Senator W. Kerr Scott. On May 28, 1960, he received an overwhelming vote of confidence from the members of his party as he won renomination for a full 6-year term in the U.S. Senate. During his tenure as the junior Senator from North Carolina he has earned the reputation of being diligent, conscientious, hard working, representative of his State.

Successful businessman, civic and political leader, dedicated public servant—Mr. President, it is my honor to present the Honorable BENJAMIN EVERETT JORDAN, candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Address by Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, at National Interfaith Award Luncheon, Washington, D.C., June 8, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to serve as honorary vice chairman of the Washington, D.C., Interfaith Committee, which on June 8 observed its Fourth Annual Interfaith Day.

The committee, composed of representatives of the Shriners, Knights of Columbus, B'nai B'rith, and Order of Ahepa, fosters the ideals of brotherhood and good human relations and raises funds for the charitable activities of the four sponsoring organizations.

Highlight of the day's observances was a luncheon meeting at which the committee presented its 1960 awards to the following persons: Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, national interfaith award; Robert E. McLaughlin, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, District of Columbia interfaith award; Paddy Chayefsky, author-playwright, national interfaith celebrity award; and Jack Twyman, Cincinnati professional basketball player, national interfaith sports award.

The humanitarian contributions of each of these outstanding Americans were as different and as personal as their fine acceptance speeches.

Each of these men in the pursuit of his profession—in a State government, in a local council, at a writing table, and on a basketball floor—symbolizes the responsibility of the individual, whatever his calling, to his fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call particular attention to the eloquent speech made on the acceptance of the national interfaith award by the Honorable LeRoy Collins, the distinguished and courageous Governor of Florida.

Governor Collins' speech follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. LEROY COLLINS, AT NATIONAL INTERFAITH AWARD LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am deeply grateful for the very meaningful award you have just presented to me. Without intending to appear modest, I seriously question that I deserve it. If my public record reflects tolerance and understanding, I regard this as no more than conduct in line with my public duty. A public official's prime impulse should be one of obligation to every citizen he serves. If he feels that any citizen is outside his range of responsibility, he is unfit to hold the office entrusted to him.

Respect for the right of other men to have different beliefs is essential to the preservation of our democratic society. It is a principle embedded in our National Constitution, and it must find expression in the lives of our people.

This respect for the right of others to believe, is not of course, the same thing as being indifferent to what other men believe.

I do not share the all too common belief that it does not matter what a man believes, as long as he believes in something.

What one believes about God and man and the world in which he lives has an important bearing on his behavior as a private individual and as a citizen.

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS ARE TOO IMPORTANT TO BE STRAITJACKETED

Religious tolerance should be cultivated not because a man's religious beliefs are unimportant, but because his religious beliefs are too important to be straitjacketed by the power of public authority or the subtler forces of group conformity.

What a man believes may be highly destructure to his own well-being and to the tranquillity of society. But it is far more destructive to the human personality to seek to coerce beliefs and far more dangerous to the vitality of society to obstruct progress toward truth through dissent, dispute and discovery.

The tolerance that makes a contribution to a healthy society arises not from indifferences to belief but from reverence for human individuality, and from the desire to understand those who are different from ourselves.

THE DESTRUCTIVE WORK OF PREJUDICE

I do not pretend to any specialized knowledge of the psychology of prejudice and intolerance. But I have known them in myself, and I have seen their destructive work in our society.

I read recently that perhaps 10 percent of Americans are virtually free of prejudice. But I rather doubt that there is one among us today who has never felt—or who has entirely eliminated from his life—the emotional rejection of persons on the basis of preconceived notions.

I am not sure that this deep-seated feeling can be eliminated entirely in the makeup of any man. Sometimes I am even inclined

to feel that a little prejudice—if it is consciously recognized—may be to the good as an energizing agent. The struggle to overcome in ourselves what we deplore when we see it in its grosser forms in others should strengthen us for the big battles against prejudice and intolerance in our society. Also it makes us more understanding and less self-righteous in our dealings with our fellow men.

THE ANTIDOTE TO PREJUDICE IS PEOPLE

I am convinced, in any case, that the antidote to prejudice is people—people learning about people who are different from themselves—learning about them as individuals, learning that they have common hopes and fears, common concerns and aspirations, and learning that the people we have classified under a single label are as different from one another as those we have long identified as our own kind differ among themselves.

In the language of international relations, we need more people-to-people contacts within our own communities.

Standing apart from one another we cannot achieve understanding. The unknown then becomes something we wish to avoid. Thus separation breeds prejudice, and prejudice obstructs the channels of communication and this heightens the spiritual separation.

We are beginning to realize, I think, that peoples of the whole world must get along together notwithstanding drastically different social, political, and economic orders, if we are not to cease to exist in mutual desolation. We must also realize that we will have to learn to live more harmoniously and more constructively with people of different creeds and colors if we are to avoid spiritual desolation in the communities of our own land.

THE GREAT AMERICAN GOAL IS FREEDOM

The great American goal is freedom—both at home and throughout the world. We cannot be free if our minds and hearts are enslaved by prejudice.

I recall seeing a little report in a paper a few months back about a rather strange happening in a southern town. A county was building a new jail. One of the workers on the project on the day it was completed was arrested for drunkenness and disorderly conduct and became the first prisoner of the jail he had built.

When we allow prejudice to enter our lives we build the jails in which we are then imprisoned. We cut off communications. We can no longer be free.

AMERICANS ARE LINKED TOGETHER

Some time ago, there was a very allegorical type of movie in which a white man and a colored man chained together, escaped from prison. During their escape, they fell into a deep pit together. There was only one way out and that was for the one to stand on the shoulders of the other. Since the Negro was the stronger, the white man stood on his shoulders and climbed over the edge of the pit. Since they were chained together, the white man had no alternative but to pull the colored man out of the pit after him.

Americans are linked together by bonds stronger than chains. We are dependent upon one another for mutual progress and ultimately for survival. We are all the children of God and the brothers of all mankind.

In that simple commitment with open hearts and willing minds we can move forward.

Mail Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the State which I represent embraces more than 83,000 square miles of jumbled mountains and great plains. Since the day when the pony express riders first carried messages to and from the early day mining camps, this vast and rugged terrain has presented problems of mail distribution. Recently, the Post Office Department inaugurated its new nationwide integrated postal service plan in Washington, which affects Idaho. The results so far are questionable in Idaho.

Recently, because of an editorial he had written on the subject, I wrote Mr. Louis A. Boas, editor of the Daily Idahoan, at Moscow, for his impressions as to how the new system is functioning in his area. Mr. Boas is a well-known and outstanding citizen and newspaperman of my State. Because he writes interestingly and well, and is acutely familiar with the problems which have been generated by the changeover, I ask unanimous consent to have his answering letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEWS-REVIEW
PUBLISHING CO., INC.,
Moscow, Idaho, May 9, 1960.

Senator FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter of May 3 asking my views on postal service in answer to the Department's explanation of its recently inaugurated "metro" system of highway transportation of mail.

I have been unable to note, during the 6 weeks this new system has been in use, any improvement nor have I noted any deterioration of service. But adoption of the new system has resulted in the elimination of one Seattle-to-Spokane passenger train, and institution of the previous "hypo" truck service now supplanted by the "metro" resulted in the discontinuance of passenger trains serving Moscow, Lewiston, and other Union Pacific points. I am not persuaded this is progress, particularly in view of the fact that trains historically have been more reliable during periods of bad weather than trucks, either large or small. The "hypo" service several times was delayed badly by heavy snows during the years of its use. At the same time Spokane many times is fogged in and planes never land there; but the trains did operate.

For example, I have for many years received mats of wirephotos out of San Francisco, via airmail. I receive them now exactly as I received them 12 years ago—the second day. Twelve years ago they were airmailed out of San Francisco on a plane leaving about 5:30 p.m., relayed to train at Portland, thence to Moscow via Union Pacific. Today planes travel at twice the speed, Moscow is served by West Coast Airlines out of both Portland and Spokane—but I receive my package of mats the second day out of San Francisco. Periodically I complain to the Post Office Department. An inspector in Seattle promises action, the local office crew keeps a record of this package receipt, tracers are put on—and that's all I ever hear about it.

Meantime the hours at our post office have been drastically shortened. The windows open at 9 a.m. and close at 4:30 p.m. where they used to open at 8 and close at 5. Saturdays they close at noon and some windows are not open at all Saturdays.

I appreciate, of course, the advantages of the 40-hour week and shortened workdays, only in the newspaper business we don't have it. I can judge my times to still do business at the post office before 4:30 p.m. I can accommodate earlier mailings of important messages to make the "metro" truck. I can suffer airmail from San Francisco that reaches me the second day it is mailed. But I cannot accept the statement that postal service has been improvd. It has not been. It may be cheaper but the territory has suffered vital transportation reversals. I repeat: If they continue "improving" the mail services we may, eventually, get to where we were 20 years ago.

Sincerely,

LOUIS A. BOAS,
Editor, Daily Idahonian.

Hugh T. Bennett, Sr., in 54th Year as Member of the Gibson County Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Commerical Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, on Sunday, June 12, an article written by Joe Freeland, an excellent reporter at Jackson, Tenn., about a prominent citizen, Mr. Hugh Bennett of Fruitland, Tenn., which is in the Eighth Congressional District that I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Bennett's record in public life is so outstanding that I wanted to call it to the attention of the membership of this Congress. The article follows:

LONGTIME MAGISTRATE WILL NOT RUN IN AUGUST

(By Joe Freeland)

JACKSON, TENN., June 11.—A West Tennessean believed to have been a magistrate longer than any other person in the State said this week that he will not be a candidate for reelection in August.

He's genial, personable Hugh T. Bennett, Sr., of Fruitland, now in his 54th year as a member of the Gibson County court.

"I am strong in my belief that 54 years is long enough for any man to serve on his county court," Mr. Bennett said in announcing that he won't seek reelection.

Few—if any—West Tennesseans have been accorded as many political honors as has Mr. Bennett, who is a handsome, distinguished-looking man, with Chesterfieldian manners.

When he was elected to the first of his nine 6-year terms, he was the youngest member

of the Gibson County court. He continued to be the youngest member of that body for 12 years.

Mr. Bennett ventured a bit further into the field of politics when he was elected direct representative from Gibson County to the State legislature, but did not seek reelection after serving one term (1909) in the lower house.

He was named to the county Democratic executive committee and served as the committee's secretary from 1910 until 1924.

SERVED ON DRAFT BOARD

It was during Ham Patterson's tenure as Governor that Mr. Bennett was elected assistant clerk of the State senate and served his first term during the 1915 general assembly. He continued to serve as the senate's clerk in the 1917, 1919, and 1921 sessions.

Since Mr. Bennett was clerk of the senate in 1916, he also served as clerk of the high court of impeachment which impeached the late Circuit Judge Jesse Edington and the late Attorney General Newton Estes, both of Memphis.

While serving as chairman of the Gibson County Draft Board during World War I, Mr. Bennett was elected without opposition to two terms (1923 and 1925) in the State senate.

In 1930, he was appointed examiner for the inheritance tax division of the State department of finance and taxation. His territory included all of west Tennessee outside Shelby County, and he held that post until his retirement in 1951.

Mr. Bennett has not been content to wash his hands of things political in his post-retirement years. Besides holding down his magisterial post, he is now in his third 2-year term as an eighth district member of the State Democratic executive committee and in his second term as west Tennessee chairman of the committee.

HIGHEST HONOR

Also, Mr. Bennett entered a five-man race and was elected one of Gibson County's two delegates to the 1953 State constitutional convention. It was during that session that Tennessee's constitution was amended for the first time since 1870, and Mr. Bennett said he considers being chosen a delegate to the convention the highest political honor ever accorded him.

Aspirants to political offices would doubtlessly like to know his formula for being elected without opposition. Seldom has he had opposition for the office magistrate, and he was elected State senator three times without an opponent.

Once—in 1924—his name was on the ballot in Gibson County three times without an opponent: for the offices of State senator, magistrate, and county Democratic committeeman. He withdrew as a candidate for committeeman, saying, "Three times is just too much for one man's name to appear on the same ballot."

Citizen in a Democracy—Double Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to extend my congratulations to my good friend and our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] who received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Thomas College in St. Paul, Minn., on June 3. Senator McCARTHY is the former head of the sociology department at that fine college.

At the commencement ceremony, the Senator discussed the responsibility of the college graduate as a citizen in our democratic society and in his usual penetrating fashion set forth both the individual and social responsibilities of each citizen. He called the serious problem of our times "not the absence of goals, but the weakening of the traditional institutions by which good men learn to choose their goals and also to develop the will to stand by them," and warned against "the disturbing reliance upon mass appeal—to sell rather than inform and to substitute emotional persuasion for reasoned acceptance."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story from the Catholic Bulletin, weekly newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of St. Paul, Minn., reporting Senator McCARTHY's address be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRADS ASKED TO HEED DOUBLE RESPONSIBILITY—McCARTHY HONORED

The college graduate of today must enter into society with a double sense of responsibility, Senator EUGENE McCARTHY, Democrat, Minnesota, declared at the St. Thomas College commencement June 3.

The Senator, former St. Thomas sociology department head, was honored with an honorary doctor of laws degree during the ceremonies for 164 new graduates in O'Shaughnessy Stadium.

McCARTHY said the graduate must first "accept his individual responsibility as an educated person—and in the case of those of you graduating here today, your individual responsibility as an educated Christian.

"No matter how bad the times nor how great the temptations, the individual is a free person, capable of integrity in his personal life and capable of making the hard decisions on the side of the good and true."

The second responsibility is to society, he said. "For the Christian, social responsibility is raised to the supernatural level and becomes the law of love of neighbor."

The college graduate today "cannot ignore the risks involved in a democratic society or withdraw from the marketplace where conflicting goals are offered," the Senator warned.

Democracy does not make life simpler, but rather complicates it, he said.

"The essence of democracy is to establish conditions under which the individual choice and decision, the fullness of personality can be achieved.

"The test of democracy is to win the voluntary acceptance by a majority of the true and the good, to achieve a consensus of ends that are good through means that are good."

The Senator contrasted democracy with the totalitarian state which imposes national planning and goals on the people.

"The essence of totalitarianism is the control of the whole man. The frightening thing about modern totalitarian states has not been so much the economic control which they have imposed, but rather the domination of the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of the people."

The inner formation of the individual, he said, is beyond the power of the state in a free society and has been the traditional work of the family, church, and school.

He said that "the serious problem of our times is not the absence of goals, but the weakening of these traditional institutions by which good men learn to choose their goals and also to develop the will to stand by them."

He told the students that in a world of attractive distractions, they have a greater need of self-discipline, of dedication to mastery of fact and formula, to the reading and reflection without which no man can be liberally educated."

He also warned his listeners against the disturbing reliance upon mass appeal—to sell rather than inform and to substitute emotional persuasion for reasoned acceptance."

In society, he said falsification is condemned, yet the practice is to some extent indulgently accepted.

"To the degree that we compromise the morality of means," he said, "or substitute the lesser means for the disciplined one, the end is diminished, and the person is that much less a whole man."

Dairying In Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in a release from the University of Alaska on May 27, 1960, the foresight displayed by the President and the Congress in 1935 with regard to Alaska is very well demonstrated.

I speak of the Matanuska Valley colonization project begun in May of 1935 to stimulate growth in Alaska, to demonstrate the agricultural potentialities of Alaska, and to give people from stricken agricultural areas in certain States a chance to start life anew. Hardships were encountered, and many of the first settlers gave up, but those with the necessary vigor and stamina made good as did others who later joined their ranks. The scope of their success in the beautiful Matanuska Valley is documented in the mentioned release with regard to dairying, and I assure you that comparable success has been attained in truck gardening. The release follows:

ALASKA DAIRY INDUSTRY GROWS IN VOLUME AND EFFICIENCY

June is National Dairy Month throughout the Nation. This is an appropriate time to recognize and pay tribute to one of the newest and the most rapidly growing food industries in the State—the local dairy industry.

Between 1950 and 1960 Alaska dairymen increased fresh milk production from 3 million to over 7 million quarts a year. Most of this increase occurred in the rail-belt area where some 600 to 800 people earn a living from the production and distribution of "nature's most complete food." This local industry requires the equal to a $6 million investment. About two-thirds of this is invested in dairy farms and the remainder in processing the delivery facilities.

A comparison of the farm and retail prices of fresh grade A milk produced in Alaska reveals an interesting situation favoring the local industry. Since 1951 the retail price increased from 19 cents to 23 cents a quart in Seattle. In Anchorage it has remained

at 40 cents a quart for the past 10 years. In fact you can now buy a half-gallon carton for 79 cents. In Fairbanks a quart of fresh milk costs less now than 5 years ago. During the same period the wage scales for most trades have more than doubled. This means than an hour's wages will now buy more local fresh milk than 10 years ago. A recent survey of Anchorage households indicate they drink only about 80 percent as much as the average for other States.

During this period of wage-price increases the dairy plants and retailers have also held the line on prices. Through greater efficiency they have been able to pass on a greater proportion of the consumers' milk dollar to the farmer. In addition they have also been able to improve plants, stores, and services while selling a more attractively packaged product of better quality.

It takes a lot of hard work and confidence in the future of Alaska to develop a commercial dairy farm. A considerable investment in effort, time, experience and money is necessary. Normally from 10 to 15 years is required to develop a homestead into a commercial dairy with the equivalent of a $50,000 to $75,000 investment.

Dairying continues to develop more rapidly in the Matanuska-Anchorage area (see table below). This reflects the greater availability of development capital, marketing facilities and size of market as well as more agricultural experience in the area. In the Fairbanks vicinity the Tanana Valley has a greater area for development. Here, farming is likely to increase at a more rapid rate during the next few years.

Area	Farm sales of milk		Percent increase
	1949	1959	
Matanuska Valley	$479,000	$1,438,169	200
Tanana Valley	68,000	175,414	158
All others	117,000	157,493	35
Alaska total	664,000	1,771,076	182

Leisurely Motoring in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many motorists are accustomed to high speed travel through New Jersey. Our highways, turnpikes, and parkways have made it convenient for drivers to reach our shore, our major connections with highways of neighboring States, and other destinations.

Mr. George Cable Wright of the New York Times, in the issue of June 12, has written a story giving good arguments for a more leisurely look at the Garden State. He has given details on the sights to be seen within very short distance from our busy cities. His story should be of help to anyone who wants to know New Jersey better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY BYWAYS FOR LEISURELY MOTORING

(By George Cable Wright)

TRENTON.—The New York City motorist who enjoys a day-long drive through scenic and historic country should find both stimulating and relaxing a tour of the byways and less-publicized points of interest in New Jersey.

The autoist's first stop, after crossing the George Washington Bridge, could be the Steuben House in River Edge. This structure, now a State museum, contains an interesting collection of relics. The house was a gift of the United States to Gen. Baron von Steuben for his services as a great military leader in the Revolutionary War.

From River Edge, the motorist can continue east and then north, via New Bridge Road and Washington Avenue, to Tappan, N.Y., just across the State line. This route is lined with typical examples of Dutch Colonial architecture. At Tappan, he can visit the prison and site of the execution of Maj. John Andre, adjutant general of the British Army, who was hanged as a spy in connection with Benedict Arnold's plot to betray the Continental fortress at West Point to the British.

A picturesque, tree-lined asphalt road leads from Tappan west to State Route 17. The motorist then should turn north on that artery to Suffern and Sloatsburg, N.Y., and then west to Ringwood Manor State Park, N.J. Here, he can visit a 78-room manor house that once was occupied by Peter Cooper, industrialist and philanthropist, and is now a State museum.

IN WASHINGTON'S FOOTSTEPS

From there, State Route 511, a wooded, backroad, leads south past Wanaque Reservoir to Pompton Lakes. Here, the motorist should turn left onto State Route 23 and left again at Mountain View to Preakness Valley Park. This is the site of Dey Mansion, which was George Washington's headquarters on several occasions during the Revolution. Returning to Route 23, the autoist can turn left to U.S. 46. This will lead him back to the George Washington Bridge.

Another interesting tour may be begun by taking U.S. 22 to Union, then State Route 82 to Springfield and State Route 24 to Morristown. One of the most famous of all of Washington's headquarters is situated in Morristown, as well as a museum displaying many valuable documents and relics of the Colonial period. U.S. 22 can be reached via the Newark Airport Interchange of the New Jersey Turnpike.

At the top of the hill near the Morris County Courthouse, also in Morristown, Fort Nonsense, an earthworks of Revolutionary War days, has been reconstructed. The Jockey Hollow section of Morristown National Park, where Washington's troops encamped, also is worth viewing.

Typical soldiers', officers' and hospital huts have been reconstructed in the hollow and may be explored by the visitor. The Tempe Wicke House, in which Mrs. Wicke is reputed to have hid her horse to prevent its seizure for army use, also is open to the public.

From Morristown, the tourist can take U.S. 202 to U.S. 46 and the George Washington Bridge.

The motorist with a full day to spare should find interesting that part of U.S. 22 between Mountainside and North Plainfield. It has been planted with flowering dogwood trees and named Blue Star Drive in honor of those who served in the Armed Forces in World War II. Cedar Brook Park in Plainfield has a garden abundant with trees, flowers and shrubs found in Shakespeare's plays.

CROSSING THE DELAWARE

Continuing west on U.S. 22, the motorist can stop at Wallace House in Somerville. This is a historic shrine of the Revolutionary War period. From there, he should proceed south on U.S. 206 to State Route 518 and then turn right again and travel through the colorful Sourland Mountains. This leads to Skillman, Blawenburg, Hopewell, and State Route 69 and, eventually, to the road to Washington Crossing on the Delaware River.

The communities on both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the river are called by that name, for it was here that General Washington made his historic crossing on Christmas night, 1776. On each river bank is a beautiful park with picnic facilities.

Also on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware River is a new national museum that exhibits the famous if inaccurate painting by the German artist Emanuel Leutze (1816–68) of the historic crossing.

On the Jersey shore in the 200-year-old McKonkey Ferry House, originally operated as a tavern by the ferry man and restored to its original appearance.

A few miles farther south on the river road the tourist will see a modern bridge that spans the river but has no access roads. The explanation: the Delaware River Toll Bridge Commission erected the span as a replacement for one badly damaged in the 1955 flood, but the highway departments of the two States have not got around to completing the necessary road connections.

Still farther south at Trenton, points of major interest include the Old Barracks, the Trent House, the Trenton Battle Monument and the 163-year-old State House. The Trent House was the home of the founder of this city and is now open as a museum. The barracks were built in 1758 during the French and Indian Wars and were occupied by Hessian troops when Washington made his surprise attack. The monument has an elevator and stands in the spot where the battle actually took place.

From Trenton, the motorist should proceed on U.S. 206 to Lawrenceville and Princeton. On entering Princeton, he will observe Morven, built by Richard Stockton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and now the State's executive mansion. It is open to visitors on Tuesdays between 2 and 4 p.m.

PRINCETON NEARBY

Nearby is the extensive campus of Princeton University with its imposing Gothic structures and Nassau Hall, where the Continental Congress met in 1783.

From here, the motorist should continue along Nassau Street, past Carnegie Lake to Kingston and then to Rocky Hill, where he can view the Berrien House, in which Washington wrote his farewell address to the Army. State Route 27 leads from Rocky Hill to New Brunswick, where the motorist can connect with either U.S. 1 or the turnpike for his return home.

One of the most scenic tour in the State is that from Morristown to High Point at the northwest tip of New Jersey. From Morristown, the motorist should proceed via Mount Freedom, State Route 10, Landing, Lake Hopatcong (which he should circle counterclockwise), Woodport, Lake Lackawanna, and U.S. 206. He then should follow U.S. 206 north to Newton, take an equally colorful secondary road to Swartswood Lake and State Park and then continue north to Branchville and Stokes State Forest.

FLOWERS ABOUND

Here, the motorist should be sure to visit Tillman Ravine, a beautiful gorge at the south end of the forest, and then continue to Wallpack Center. A side trip to Buttermilk Falls, 2 miles south of Wallpack Center, is recommended if time permits.

From here, the motorist should head north through Flatbrook Valley to High Point, 1,804 feet above sea level. A most satisfying return trip leads along State Route 23 through Sussex, Franklin, Stockholm, and

Newfoundland. The rugged wooded hills in this area are dotted with wild flowers of every color imaginable, and the route is lined with large dairy farms and sizable herds of beef and dairy cattle.

Why I Want To Go to College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the honor of including herein an essay written by a young high school student in my district, which won for her first place in the national Thom McAn Leadership Awards program.

The young lady is Jo Ann Molomut of 32–15 157th Street, Flushing, Long Island, N.Y., who is due to graduate from Flushing High School later this month. Her prize winning essay brings her a college scholarship and a week's all expense tour of Washington, D.C., and New York City.

Jo Ann has been interested in scientific research since early childhood, spent much of her time in her father's laboratory (her father is a biologist engaged in cancer research), and plans to continue her studies in this field in college.

She is an outstanding student—a credit to American youth, and her desire to enter this highly technical field is most commendable.

The essay, entitled "Why I Want To Go to College," follows:

WHY I WANT TO GO TO COLLEGE

(By Jo Ann Molomut, Flushing High School, Flushing, N.Y.)

As far back as I can remember I have spent most of my weekends at my father's laboratory. At first I just ran around underfoot and played with the animals. Later, as I grew up, I became more and more interested in the research going on around me. I spent hours watching the scientists at work. From these observations, and with some instruction, I learned many laboratory procedures.

During the summer of 1957 a fellow student and I did some research at the laboratory in the field of cancer. Although our experiment had been carried on before and therefore was not new, it was new and exciting to us. We learned how an experiment takes shape and how to follow through to a conclusion. It also became apparent to us that one experiment leads to dozens of others so that research is really a continuously growing thing, feeding on imagination and foresight and producing knowledge. In November of 1957 we demonstrated our work on a board of education television program, "Biology One."

This past summer I continued to work in science by doing research work at Cornell University. The program was one of those sponsored by the National Science Foundation for high school students. My work was in the field of nematology. This research was doubly interesting because it was so very different from anything I had ever done before.

Now I am just beginning a new project. One of the teachers in my school is starting some research in high temperature chemistry and he has asked another senior and myself to assist him. The work will be done after school during this coming term and we are scheduled to begin the preliminary preparations in a few days. Not only will this work broaden my knowledge of chemistry, but it will give me a chance to increase my experience in the many phases of scientific research.

Because I am so interested in science and have done some practical laboratory work, I would like to go to college in order to study the theory behind these procedures and to learn new procedures. I do not, however, believe in too much specialization, especially in undergraduate work, because in our highly complicated society one needs a broad education. Because I love learning, I have enjoyed my high school courses immensely. I would like to continue to study such subjects as mathematics, social studies, English and languages, and to begin to explore new fields such as psychology and comparative religion. I know that college will be a great opportunity to broaden my horizons, both in the classroom and outside of it.

The Blitz That Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Nation on June 4, 1960, entitled "The Blitz That Failed."

Foreign policy is much too important and much too serious to be debated for purely political advantage. This was the attitude of Senators CARROLL, KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, MORSE, MONRONEY, and MUSKIE, and the editorial compliments their position. As Senator CARROLL pointed out in his speech that day, there can be no political advantage to either party if there is no advantage to the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLITZ THAT FAILED

The strategy of the early Monday morning surprise attack on Democratic critics of the administration's handling of the summit conference was clear enough. Catch the opposition off guard by a swift attack, without notice, in full force and—by the savagery of the attack—seize the initiative, keep the opposition off balance, and (with good luck) spike their guns. It was the classic, "rule book" counteroffensive formula. Senator DIRKSEN led off with a soft-on-communism tirade directed against Adlai Stevenson for his "crowbar and sledge hammer" speech in Chicago. But the dirty work was left for Senator HUGH SCOTT, who suggested that Mr. Stevenson and Senator KENNEDY should "relieve themselves of the curse of the suspicion of appeasement," and who called both men "turnquotes"—a phrase which, in the excitement of the early morning assault, registered with many sleepy Senators as "turncoats."

But the blitz failed. Recovering from their rather stunned initial reaction, the Democrats quickly rallied and, with hastily summoned reserves, proceeded to give Senators DIRKSEN and SCOTT a brutal drubbing. Few issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this season make more lively reading than volume 106, No. 93, devoted to the Monday, May 23, debate. Senators CARROLL, SYMINGTON, MORSE, MONRONEY, MUSKIE and—once he had been notified of Senator SCOTT's sneak attack and rushed to the Senate floor—Senator KENNEDY, made mincemeat of what Senator CARROLL accurately characterized as "a raw, partisan, political piece of chicanery." In the end, Senator DIRKSEN sought to mollify his Democratic critics by expressing undying "love" for them as friends and colleagues. "His opening speech," he said, "was just plain politics, spelled with a capital 'P.'" But the Democrats wouldn't buy it. "The response," said Senator KENNEDY, "was grudging and evasive; there was nothing amusing about an indirect charge of disloyalty." Senator SCOTT, to his credit, was more manly than DIRKSEN; he apologized. Bruised and battered, neither DIRKSEN nor SCOTT will be anxious to return to the "apostles of appeasement" theme soon. As Senator MONRONEY pointed out, the Monday morning blitz was all too reminiscent of "another Senator who once waved papers and shouted, 'I hold in my hand.' We are tired of that sort of procedure. Mr. President, Americans are tired of the attacks which are strictly for the purpose of diversion, in an attempt to light another fire, to try to direct attention somewhere else."

The lively debate suggests strongly that Senator MONRONEY may be right—that in the Senate at least, the ghost of the late Senator Joe McCarthy has finally been exorcised.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Osmers Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, those at home and abroad who think the Paris summit fiasco has divided the American people had better take a look at how voters in my district reacted to Khrushchev's abuse of our President.

On May 2, I mailed out 46,000 questionnaires to typical voters in my district. Just about half of the more than 9,800 replies which have been received to date came in before the ill-fated Paris meeting. Only 52 percent of my constituents replying prior to the Paris blowup favored the overall record of the Eisenhower administration, 34 percent were opposed to it with 14 percent undecided. Immediately after the vicious attack by Khrushchev on our President the percentage of those favoring the administration jumped to the almost unbelievable high of 82 percent, with only 11 percent in opposition, and 7 percent undecided. If Moscow is laboring under the impression that our people are divided by the U–2 incident and subsequent events, these answers from a good cross section of our people will set the record straight. Once again we have

proof that, despite our many partisan differences over domestic issues, Americans close ranks when facing up to foreign threats. The final percentages on the record of the Eisenhower administration were 59 percent in favor, 30 percent opposed, and 11 percent undecided.

The replies to another one of my questions prove that Castro is in serious trouble with the American people. Only 9 percent of those answering were opposed to cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues his anti-U.S. campaign, with a resounding 77 percent favoring such cuts.

It is interesting to note that a Federal program of health care for older citizens had better than 7 to 1 support among my constituents, 85 percent voting in favor and only 12 percent in opposition. On this question only 3 percent were undecided. A voluntary plan for such health care was favored by 56 percent while 44 percent thought a compulsory one best.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will be interested in the replies to other questions, too: Seventy-eight percent favor the United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace; 80 percent want Congress to pass a strong law to curb radio and TV payola and fakery, and 60 percent favor legal action to end Southern lunch counter sit-downs by requiring stores to treat all customers equally.

More than half, 53 percent oppose the present foreign aid program.

A strong majority want Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads. An increase in the present Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour was favored by 63 percent with only 34 percent opposed to the increase. On this question 3 percent had not made up their minds.

On two of the three questions relating to education, the poll showed an almost even division of opinion on two of the questions. Those favoring education benefits for peacetime GIs led by a 46-percent to 44-percent margin over those opposed, while 10 percent gave no opinion; 39 percent opposed eliminating loyalty oaths and non-Communist affidavits by Federal scholarship students; 36 percent want them retained; 25 percent were undecided. On the third education question, voters favored Federal aid to education by 2 to 1, 59 percent to 29 percent, 12 percent expressing no opinion. Of those favoring Federal aid to education, 69 percent want the aid used for school construction, 14 percent for teachers' pay, while 17 percent thought all purposes should receive help.

This is the 6th year that I have conducted this broad poll, and the number of replies is the highest ever received. As in previous years, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of letters and comments on the questionnaire subjects, and others, have given me a wonderful insight into public opinion on the issues of the day at the grassroots in my district.

For the first time, a presidential poll was included this year at the request of many constituents. As soon as the results have been tabulated, they will be made public.

The mailing list used consists of two categories: First, 85 percent are registered voters taken at random from voting lists in the 39 municipalities in the Ninth Congressional District. Second, 15 percent are leaders and professional people in the district, such as doctors, dentists, clergymen, lawyers, labor leaders, club women, businessmen, bankers, retailers, public officials, accountants, engineers, architects, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the 12 questions and the answers in percentages immediately following these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Percent]

Do you favor—	Yes	No	Undecided
1. The overall record of the Eisenhower administration?	59	30	11
2. The United Nations as the best means of maintaining world peace?	78	12	10
3. Cutting Cuban sugar imports if Castro continues anti-U.S. campaign?	77	9	14
4. Our foreign aid program at present levels	39	53	8
If no, more economic aid? 27 percent; less economic? 24 percent; more military aid? 3 percent; less military: 38 percent. No aid at all? 8 percent.			
5. A Federal program of health care for older citizens?	85	12	3
If yes, compulsory plan? 44 percent; or voluntary plan? 56 percent.			
6. A strong Federal law to curb payola and fakery on radio and TV?	80	15	5
7. Eliminating present loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit requirements for students receiving Federal scholarships?	36	39	25
8. Legal action to prevent southern lunch counter sitdowns by requiring stores to treat all customers equally?	60	25	15
9. Increasing Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour?	63	34	3
If no, minimum of? 67 percent $1.15; no increase? 33 percent.			
10. Providing Federal help and tax relief for commuter railroads?	58	35	7
11. Granting peacetime GI's, with at least 2 years' active duty, education benefits similar to those given wartime GI's?	46	44	10
12. Federal aid to education?	59	29	12
If yes, for construction? 69 percent; teachers' pay? 14 percent; all purposes? 17 percent.			

Wider Use for Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, those who favor the extension of social security coverage to provide medical care for the aging received several good supporting arguments June 13, from an editorial in the New York Times. The editorial quotes an insurance company memorandum which sums up many of the reasons for the social security principle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIDER USE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

A convincing case for using the Federal Social Security System to finance health insurance for older people has been made by Nationwide Insurance. It is persuasive not only because of the arguments used but also because of its source.

Nationwide has had a unique experience in giving the public protection. Founded by a small group of Ohio farmers in 1926 as a cooperative automobile insurance concern with a capital of $10,000, it has become one of the largest insurance operations in the country. With assets of more than $350 million it gives many kinds of coverage in 20 States through more than 3 million outstanding policies.

The directors of Nationwide have stated in a formal resolution that the health costs of older people are not being met by insurance, that those over 65 haven't either the income or the assets to cover those expenses, that Nationwide favors the use of the social security principle to help meet their needs and, more specifically, that it will support "appropriate legislation" to provide basic health insurance to those eligible for Federal social security benefits.

A memorandum ably summarizes the statistical and historical evidence for the stand Nationwide has taken. It emphasizes a point which seems to be generally overlooked in the current discussions. It claims that, far from damaging the interest of private insurance companies, the companies "would have a broader, sounder market for voluntary insurance among our older people by building on the basic provisions of social insurance legislation."

The Nationwide memorandum also points out that before the establishment of the Social Security System in 1935 the medical societies and many insurance companies opposed the program for most of the same reasons they now oppose the social insurance approach to health care for the aged. But the three decades of experience since then have shown that the minimum social security pensions "have made possible a widespread development of private plans in recent years." We hope that the interests now opposing this extension of the Social Security System will prove to be as wrong as they were in 1935.

Honors for Congressman Canfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of the House, I was gratified to learn of the recent great distinction accorded my dear, esteemed, and distinguished friend, the amiable and

beloved gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman GORDON CANFIELD, upon whom the famous Paterson State College recently conferred the honorary degree of doctor of letters.

GORDON CANFIELD is most respected, admired, and loved by all of his colleagues and ranks with the greatest Americans who have served in this distinguished body.

The citation conferring the degree appropriately commented upon the high quality of the service to Nation, State, district, and constituents which this great Congressman has rendered during his long career in the Congress of the United States.

I take genuine pleasure in congratulating Congressman CANFIELD and his family upon this significant honor and remarkable citation.

If there are more amiable, loyal, and unselfish qualities to be found in the human being, I am at a complete loss to know where to find them, because in my opinion, GORDON CANFIELD exemplifies the highest type of Americanism, the finest attributes of humaneness, the most unselfish and self-effacing kind of public service, and the truest brand of friendship.

He is indeed a man of honor, distinction, and high achievement, and this Congress may well be proud of the richly deserved honors that have come to him, and the fine tributes that have been paid to his illustrious career, ability, and spirit of dedication.

Tribute to Justice Levi S. Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, 3 months ago I had occasion to make a few remarks about Arizona Supreme Court Justice Levi S. Udall, who earlier in the year had received recognition for his outstanding public service, through the award of an honorary degree of doctor of laws from the University of Arizona. It was, therefore, with great sadness and a sense of personal loss that on May 30, I learned from his son, Stuart, of the sudden death of his father the afternoon before.

We became friends over 40 years ago, a friendship that was accompanied by admiration as I observed the growth of his ability as a lawyer and the soundness of his reasoning in his decisions during his service as a county judge and as a member of the Supreme Court of Arizona.

He was born when Arizona was a territory, and his service was rendered when his wisdom was needed to transform Arizona into a great State. No one could have performed in a better way his 29 years of service on the bench. From his achievements the people of Arizona will gather strength to face the many problems that lie before them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials paying tribute to the late Justice Udall, that appeared in Arizona newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, June 1, 1960]

THE PASSING OF A PATRIARCH

In a civilization where often the emphasis on the home is obscured, or families tend to become matriarchal, it is worth comment when a real patriarch passes. Justice Levi S. Udall, of the Arizona Supreme Court, was one. He was a patriarch, with a growingly prominent family, a decade and a half ago. The years have done nothing except add legend and luster to his name.

His sons, including Congressman STEWART UDALL, and Attorneys Morris and D. B. Udall, all of Tucson, must have given Levi Udall much satisfaction, as a source of pride. This is equally true of his daughters, Elma, who was the only Arizona woman in the Red Cross contingent in the Persian Gulf Command during World War II; and Mrs. Eugene Turley and Mrs. Warren Whiting, who have families of their own.

Definitions of a full and rich life vary. However, according to a standard that has been recognized for at least 7,000 years, Justice Udall lived a full and a rich life, leaving progeny to carry on his name. He was an influential and a respected figure on the legal and political scene. He reared a family and he helped judge his people. Arizona will miss him.

[From the Yuma (Ariz.) Daily Sun, June 3, 1960]

A GREAT ARIZONIAN PASSES

Arizona yesterday laid to rest one of her most distinguished citizens, Justice Levi S. Udall, of the Arizona Supreme Court. Few men in this State have been so widely mourned, so universally respected.

For Levi S. Udall lived a life that exemplified the virtues so many of us profess and so few of us practice. In a world that rewards arrogance and ostentatiousness, he preferred humility and self-effacement. In an era of cynicism and hypocrisy, he enjoyed the luxury of integrity.

His achievements in the field of law, from a humble beginning to the State's most honored judicial seat, are in themselves remarkable. But the exemplary life he led and his steadfast devotion to public service, religion, and family set him far above his fellow man. His passing is a great loss to the entire State. His place will not soon be filled nor his role ever matched.

[From the Flagstaff, Ariz., Daily Sun, June 1, 1960]

A SHOCK FOR ARIZONA

Justice Levi Stewart Udall's death came as a shock to Arizonians. Only 69, he appeared to be in excellent health and had been carrying a full workload in the supreme court.

Judge Udall was a native of St. Johns. After being elected to the State's highest bench he moved to Phoenix—but northern Arizona was always his home.

Levi Udall had many sterling qualities: a fine, upstanding man of the highest integrity, a church leader, able and wise attorney and judge, a kindly and friendly person, a good father.

He loved Arizona and was an authority on its history. While activated by the highest principles, he was also an able politician in the best sense.

Judge Udall made friends easily because he was friendly. People loved him because he loved people.

He spent his life in serving his church, his profession, his family, his friends, and never lost the common touch.

Judge Udall had some of the practical, wise kindliness of Lincoln.

The people of Arizona have lost a great and good friend and public servant.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, June 1, 1960]

UDALL'S RECORD WILL LIVE ON

Some men are mourned at death by hosts of friends. Others in their passing leave an empty place in the lives of thousands who never met them. Arizona feels both reactions to the death of Levi Stewart Udall.

There is little anyone can say to ease the ache for the many who have lost a loved one and a friend. Grief is a lonely thing which only time can placate, and only memory can turn into something precious. But for friends and strangers alike, Justice Udall left more of himself behind than most men do.

It is for the members of his church to attest how strongly and wisely his leadership was exerted there. Those who served with him in civic effort will tell how well he wrought for community and State. But his work which most nearly touched every life, whether of friend or stranger, was in the law. It was there that he came as close as man can to gaining earthly immortality; many of the decisions that were his, or in which he had a strong hand as a justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, will continue as a living influence for justice for generations to come.

Justice Udall's passion for the law extended from the details of administration—he was one of the first to espouse a presiding judge system for Maricopa County—to the broad and vastly important sweep of philosophy. He believed in the written law and the processes of the law as mankind's safeguard against tyranny by dictators, be they individuals or groups. He believed the social, economic, and legalistic fads of the moment have no place in the unswerving continuity of justice.

Lawyers and courts for many years to come will be seeking guideposts in opinions written by Justice Udall. They will find guideposts to liberty under the law. This is the measure of Justice Udall's worth: that his record will inspire others to make freedom more secure.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, June 1, 1960]

A GREAT ARIZONIAN

The three great passions of Levi Udall's life were the law, the church, and the family—not necessarily in that order.

For 16 years he served on the Apache County superior court, and for 14 years on the Arizona Supreme Court. He was always courteous on the bench, but there was an air of authority about him that lent dignity to his judicial temperament. Arizona has long been fortunate in the caliber of its supreme court justices, but Levi Udall's name stands out on a roster that included such distinguished jurists as Turner, Porter, Stillman, Lockwood, Doan, Kent, and Windes, to mention some of those no longer on the court.

Son of a Mormon bishop, Judge Udall served as president of the St. Johns stake in northern Arizona. He played a leading part in the local affairs of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and was a scholar among a hierarchy devoted to scholarship.

On the death of his father, Levi Udall became patriarch of the Udall clan. The Udalls have held more high political offices in Arizona than any other family. In addition to a supreme court justice, the Udalls have given

Arizona three superior court judges, a Congressman, half a dozen county attorneys, and a flock of municipal officials. Last year Levi and his sister, Pearl, collaborated on a biography of their father, David King Udall, which will stand as a monument to the Udall family for years to come. It is a fine story of a pioneer Mormon who helped make the Arizona desert bloom.

Levi Udall died Sunday, at the age of 69. It is a mark of the man that the last event of his life was a simple family picnic. His greatness lay in his love of family, and in his devotion to religious principles as well as the intellectual prowess that he applied to the law.

Homes for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, municipal officials, builders, and others throughout the Nation are demonstrating imagination and initiative in providing new forms of housing for our retired elderly citizens.

They are experimenting and making talk become action. We will need much more of this effort as the size of our aging and aged population grows steadily over the next few years and decades.

R. O. Beckman, in an informative column called "The Vintage Years" which appeared in the Newark Evening News of June 6, described some of these housing efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VINTAGE YEARS—HOMES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS—NATION AWAKENING TO NEED FOR REASONABLE HOUSING

(By R. O. Beckman)

Better housing for our retired elders, to enable them to live in greater comfort and self-respect, at a cost they can afford, is slowly shaping up across the Nation. Construction and rehabilitation take time but the progress is heartening. Bold, imaginative effort is being shown at the local level.

Of first importance to persons on marginal incomes is the expansion in public housing projects in larger cities, built by local housing authorities with Federal assistance. These provide small apartments renting from $20 up, a certain number of which are set aside for older persons of low income. New projects are underway in Newark, Cleveland, San Antonio, and Miami.

A second important trend stimulated by last year's amendment to the Federal Housing Act is the growth in plans for retirement homes and villages, many including health care, by nonprofit organizations. These mostly serve persons of the middle-income group and often require an initial downpayment for membership. Detroit and several California cities provide examples of going enterprises. Portland, Oreg., now has a $2,500,000 retirement apartment. Toledo is completing a retirement city for 2,000 oldsters adjoining a hospital. Oklahoma City, Evanston, Del., and cities in North Carolina and Iowa plan senior homes. One of the most ambitious projects, a profitmaking enterprise, is a $6 million apartment-hotel for retirees in St. Petersburg, Fla.

Construction activity is most noticeable in larger cities but small ones are also at work. In South Dakota, for example, the Hospital and Home Association has built homes in Spearfish, Lake Preston, Deadwood, and Huron. These provide accommodations for from 60 to 150 residents with complete medical care when it is needed. A charge of $135 a month is made for room and board with $50 added for nursing care.

Combined hospital-nursing home projects are being developed in a number of Rocky Mountain towns. New nursing homes are projected in many cities but few of them have found it possible to utilize the new FHA insurance program because of the difficulty of finding mortgage buyers at the low interest rate authorized.

Retirement hotels are growing in number but have not always proved successful; they provide rental quarters for retirees at reasonable rates. Since they cannot afford to provide health care, they do not provide a lifetime solution to the housing problem of many older persons. Older hotels converted for retired persons do not adopt themselves for the care of convalescent cases. The Milner hotel chain recently abandoned its effort to turn its establishments into retirement hotels.

The latest group to enter the hotel field is Senior Citizens Hotels, with headquarters in Sapulpa, Okla. Headed by C. L. Little, it now operates 28 hotels in smaller cities, mainly in the Midwest. Community kitchens are available for persons wishing to prepare light meals in preference to using the hotel dining room.

One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of the Admission of Arkansas Into the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 124th anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. On June 15, 1836, Arkansas became the 25th State. It is fitting indeed that we should pause and recognize this anniversary, for Arkansas has indeed been hailed as one of the outstanding States of this country.

Rich in heritage, Arkansas was first visited by the early European explorers in 1541 when Hernando de Soto crossed the Mississippi River and entered the Arkansas country. This early expedition occurred appoximately a half century after America was first visited by Columbus.

Other explorers who followed de Soto were Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet. Then on April 9, 1682, Robert Caveleir, Sieur de la Salle claimed all the land drained by the Mississippi River for France. Henri de Tonti established Arkansas Post in 1686 and this became the oldest permanent white settlement west of the Mississippi. De Tonti has often been called the Father of Arkansas.

After Arkansas was admitted to the Union 124 years ago today, the State government was housed in the Old State House which now stands as one of the outstanding examples of Old South antebellum architecture. In the Old State House one finds one of the finest existing State museums, with a record of the various roles played by Arkansas in the history of America.

Arkansas today is rapidly gaining stature in many fields—industry, agriculture, education, recreation, and so forth. The State's official nickname, "The Land of Opportunity," was adopted in 1953 in recognition of the vast potential in Arkansas and the citizens of Arkansas have not been disappointed in this selection, as evidenced by a rapid and steady economic growth.

Arkansas rivers and springs provide one of the State's major resources. The primary rivers of the State are the Mississippi, St. Francis, White, Arkansas, Red, and Ouachita Rivers and their tributaries. All of these offer ample surface water for industrial and recreational use.

The variety of Arkansas' minerals is almost unlimited. The State is blessed with rich deposits of bauxite, coal, chalk, manganese, natural gas, petroleum, clay, gypsum, glass sand, novaculite, nepheline, and syenite. These minerals are now being produced on a commercial scale and several others are awaiting development. Arkansas is the only State in the Union with a diamond mine.

There are numerous other resources with which Arkansas is more than amply endowed and I think that most of us readily realize that Arkansas stands as a true land of opportunity in America. Arkansas looks to the future full of confidence and optimism, and I am most proud to call this anniversary to the attention of this great body.

The Eye of the Hurricane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on last Sunday, June 12, 1960, it was my privilege to attend the commencement exercises of the University of Buffalo at Buffalo, N.Y. The highlight of the occasion was a thoughtful and scholarly address entitled "The Eye of the Hurricane," delivered by the distinguished chancellor of the university, C. C. Furnas.

The challenge which he laid down for the benefit of the graduating students in the following words is one which is properly directed to all Americans:

It is still to be proven in this complex world that the sanctity of the individual can still be maintained, that enough of the members of a democratic society will voluntarily do the things that have to be done to prevent defeat by an arbitrary dictatorship.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chancellor Furnas' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EYE OF THE HURRICANE

(Commencement address by C. C. Furnas, Chancellor, University of Buffalo, June 12, 1960)

Members of the graduating class of 1960, it happened that, on the afternoon of September 21, 1938, I was supervising some test activities of a group of engineering students at an industrial plant on a point of land that protrudes into the harbor of New Haven, Conn. For 2 days there had been a deluge of what can only be described in the trite phrase—torrential rains. On this particular afternoon the barometer dropped with extreme rapidity and the wind as well as the rain increased in a rather terrifying fashion. We were in the midst of a severe hurricane which was quite unexpected because it had been predicted that morning that the storm would veer out to sea.

I will not attempt to describe this particular hurricane or my own reactions. Such descriptions have been very well handled in some classic literature of the past. I will merely summarize by saying that it was quite an afternoon. I remember it well.

After some 3 hours of howling wind and drenching rain, a dramatic change occurred. The wind and rain stopped completely. Rays of sunshine came through the broken clouds and a strange quietness prevailed. People emerged from the various buildings, looking puzzled and a bit unbelieving, and even began picking up the scattered debris and putting things in order. We were in the eye of the hurricane—that peculiar phenomenon which is the hole in a meteorological doughnut—aerodynamically explainable, but still very strange—where seemingly nothing unusual is happening and the world seems to be standing still.

This placid interlude lasted for perhaps half an hour. Then from an entirely different quarter than before, the wind and rain started again as suddenly as they had previously stopped. The calm had been a delusion. Before the night was over, some six hundred people lost their lives in New England because of the storm and the physical damage amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. This particular hurricane was rated as one of the major natural disasters of history.

Why should I mention such an unpleasant event at commencement time? I think it is fairly obvious that I am searching for an analogy. I am suggesting that America, as it proceeds into the latter half of the 20th century, is resting in the eye of a sociological hurricane and that a substantial proportion of the citizens assume that the storm is over.

You know the tempestuous history of the first half of this century, from reading if not from experience—two world wars of unprecedented magnitude and destructiveness, a Communist revolution, the development of the atomic bomb and man-made satellites, the technological revolution which is changing the old patterns of life throughout the world. This is not to imply that all of the events have been destructive. But we must admit that they have been violent. These have constituted the first half of the storm.

In the 6 years since the end of the Korean war we as a Nation have had a tendency to settle into an era of complacent calm. Will the present pattern continue, or will the second half of the hurricane suddenly strike us from another quarter with destructive force?

Better to define this thought, I will call on the recent words of Mr. George F. Kennan, a man who has been an important gadfly in American diplomatic circles for quite a few years.

"If you ask me—as a historian, let us say—whether a country in the state this country is in today: with no highly developed sense of national purpose, with the overwhelming accent of life on personal comfort and amusement, with a dearth of public services and a surfeit of privately sold gadgetry * * * with an educational system where quality has been extensively sacrificed to quantity and with insufficient social discipline even to keep its major industries functioning without grievous interruptions—if you ask me whether such a country has, over the long run, good chances of competing with a purposeful, serious, and disciplined society such as that of the Soviet Union, I must say that the answer is 'no'." [1]

Is Kennan merely a modern Jeremiah unjustifiably spreading gloom and doom over the land? There is considerable evidence from history to support his pessimism.

An American father took his 12-year-old son on a tour of the historical landmarks of Europe. They stood on the edge of the dramatic ruins of the ancient Roman Forum. Very puzzled, the boy asked the question of the ages: "What happened?" The father replied, "The roof fell in." That was about as succinct and significant an analysis as historians have been able to give to date.

It was not Rome alone that went through the ropes. Relative to the environments of their times ancient China, Babylon, Egypt, and Greece were just as powerful, proud, progressive, and dynamic as Rome—or as modern America. Yet they all fell to the forces of decadence and decay and outside conquerers.

Though there are no major wars at this time, there is ample evidence of a world in conflict. Recall a few recent headlines: "Suez Crisis," "Lebanon Crisis," "Vice President Stoned in South America," "Race Riots in South Africa," "Revolution in Cuba," "Nikita Scuttles Summit Conference."

In a vague way we feel that these are all elements of the cold war in which we are continuously engaged and that our adversary in this conflict is communism.

It is popular to state that this is a battle for men's minds—the conflict between the individualistic, free-enterprise approach to living of the Western World versus the regimented, state-controlled dictatorship of the communistic world. Let no one underrate the seriousness of this or the impact on every individual in America. The posture of communism has recently been stated as follows: [2] It has "a general conviction that the State comes before the individual, that unbridled free enterprise based on the exploitation of multitudes by private and irresponsible individuals is a bad thing and vulgar into the bargain, that the Western peoples * * * are heading for economic catastrophe * * * and that it is the duty and the glory of the Soviet Union to hasten with all means in its power the collapse of the Western system and the consolidation of her own."

If one merely mixes the great failures of history with the current headlines and pronouncements, he admittedly can concoct an unpalatable and indigestible stew, leading to mental dyspepsia and indigestion and to fatalistic resignation. But you who are now looking brightly to the future need not automatically accept the verdicts of the past. Despite the contentions of many people, history does not necessarily repeat itself. It need not, if important new factors enter into the formulas and the actions. Have there been any significant changes since the ebb and flow of ancient civilizations? In the vernacular of this day: So what's new?

There is much that is new—and truly significant, too. Best known and most obvious has been the fantastic increase in the scientific knowledge of the physical world and the subsequent development of technology. For the first time in all of history we can dare to hope realistically that the means will soon be available to provide not only the bare essentials but also the reasonable amenities for a decent standard of living for all human beings on the surface of the earth. This is really new, and it makes it possible to conquer one of the basic enemies of civilization—poverty. A host of economic and social problems are still to be solved but at long last the possibility of elimination of hunger, chaos, and despair is almost at hand.

In ancient Greece there were said to be almost three slaves for every freeman. It was thought that this was a necessary sociological pattern to take care of the grubby routines of living so a handful could enjoy the good life. Today machines and automatic processes are our slaves. This has removed one of the major sources of conflict and weakness of the past.

For Americans today, the average span of life is over twice what it was for the ancient Romans. Further, because of good nutrition and medical advances, our health and vitality are much greater during our living days. Pestilence and major epidemics have practically disappeared.

Need I remind you of the revolution in communication and transportation of the past century? The physical means are at hand for practically instantaneous communication of thoughts and information to anyone, anywhere in the world. This has not yet brought about an era of universal understanding but it has helped, and the real impact is yet to come. The speedy transport of goods is no longer stopped by lack of facilities; political and economic barriers, yes—physical barriers, no.

Though the physical sciences have thus far outstripped the social sciences, there have also been very important sociological advances. In that half of the world which lives in an industrial civilization, at least some degree of universal education is the rule. Mass illiteracy in these parts is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. Almost everyone recognizes that a modicum of knowledge is the first essential of a peaceful and stable world.

Despite their brutality and destructiveness, the explosive, noisy, and chauvinistic adventures of Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese were only minor valleys which temporarily distorted the upward course of history. There is a general recognition of the common interest of the community of nations as evidenced by the existence of the United Nations. Ineffective as it may be at times, this organization represents a major sociological phenomenon that could not have even been attempted a century ago.

Even the existence of the hydrogen bomb has its beneficial side. All major nations are now honestly striving to avoid an all-out war because of the alternate prospect of mass destruction. This stalemate of mutual terror does form the basis for the prevention of World War III, if we can maintain the necessary military balance for another generation or so, while peaceful methods of solving world problems are being devised.

Finally, except in periods of military strife, the Golden Rule has had more application on the international scale than ever before. This has been particularly true of America. We have been, by all odds, the most generous nation of all time. Directly and indirectly, our medical and educational missionaries have bettered the lot of many millions of foreign people. The Belgian relief program, under the superb leadership of Her-

[1] Speech by George F. Kennan to the Woman's National Democratic Club, Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1959.

[2] Cranshaw, Edward, "Khrushchev's Russia"—Penguin Books, 1959.

bert Hoover in World War I, was a great monument to American generosity. The Marshall plan of recent years was not a selfish program. It was a generous plan for helping others to help themselves. In recent years we have poured many billions of dollars (though not always wisely) into helping people of other lands. Some of the nations of Western Europe are also carrying on similar programs. We give voluminous aid to the unfortunate—from the starving Armenians of earlier days, to the thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters in recent years.

Despite these advances the population of the world is now segmented into three approximately equal and conflicting parts, the democratic world, the Communist world, and the uncommitted peoples with about a billion people in each camp. Just as the independent voter often decides the results of a major election, the fate of Western civilization, including America, will depend to a major degree upon whether these uncommitted peoples, within the next 50 years, turn primarily toward democracy or toward dictatorial communism. It will probably continue to be a hectic and nebulous struggle but a critical one. Never has the bare anatomy of the future been laid out so clearly.

History is embellished with accounts of the rise and fall of tyrants and dictators, with interim periods of governments which operated to some degree with the consent of the governed. There is some evidence that the voice of the people is beginning to make itself felt in present-day Russia. It is possible, though by no means certain, that the latter half of the 20th century will mark the time when the roots of democracy became deep enough eventually to be universal and permanent.

Because of the quirks of modern circumstance the outcome will depend primarily on the economic, political, moral, and military strength of America. It will be determined largely by the example and the leadership furnished, in large and in small degree, by the present graduates of our colleges and universities. This is where you come in. Whether you choose it or not, you will be involved in dramatic world events.

Our country obviously has some great strengths. It also has some pronounced weaknesses. As I see it, our problem of ultimate strength revolves around a contest between statesmanship and gamesmanship. Some definitions are called for. I will give my own, which will serve the present purpose.

Statesmanship is not the sole prerogative of Presidents, Ambassadors, and Secretaries of State. It is actually a quality which can be exercised by every democratic citizen. Essentially it means voluntarily thinking and acting for the welfare of the group, rather than merely for the individual. When the early pioneer voluntarily helped his newly arrived neighbor to hack a home out of the wilderness and plant his first crops, he exhibited statesmanship. When the mother voluntarily labors endlessly for the parent-teachers association, or even the Cub Scouts, she is being statesmanlike. Sometimes wisdom is forthcoming from such activities—sometimes not. But this attitude of statesmanship is the first and most important requirement.

Gamesmanship is a new word in our language, imported from across the Atlantic. It was coined by Mr. Stephen Potter who penned the minor classic "The Theory and Practice of Gamesmanship or the Art of Winning Games Without Actually Cheating."[1] Superficially, it is British Punch-like humor at its best. In my opinion, however, it is really a biting satire of Western civilization, worthy of Jonathan Swift. It essentially lays bare the prevalent attitude on both sides of the Atlantic of "How can I get mine and who cares about what happens to others?" It involves the search for the "ploy" which is the equivalent of the Hollywood gimmick. It is the very opposite of statesmanship.

I am suggesting that the attitude of the majority of the thousands of college graduates each year can be shifted substantially away from gamesmanship and toward statesmanship. This may well be the significant factor in combating the destructive forces of the second half of the hurricane. This is not something which can be left to the so-called national leaders. It is everyone's task, and particularly yours. Statesmanship does not need to be nourished on great flurries of national crisis. It can be a part of day-to-day affairs.

Though there is only a small chance that any one of you will become President of the United States, many of you will occupy positions of importance in many fields. Some will be influential in labor, directly or indirectly. Will you have the statesmanship to give objective consideration to the inflationary impact of forcing wage rates ever higher without regard to consequences? Some of you will be involved in politics. Will you attempt to exercise judgment and wisdom in approaching the major issues of your constituency, or will your vision be limited merely to the next election? Even defeat at the polls is often a long-time gain for the public. Almost by definition, democracy depends upon the existence and effectiveness of the loyal opposition—the continuing honest battle between the ins and the outs. Will you be statesman enough to accept being an out if that seems to be the best course to take? Or, will you confine yourself to the subtle tricks of political gamesmanship?

Many of you will acquire real stature in the professions. You will probably abide by the appropriate code of ethics but will you go beyond this? Will your activities be confined to getting more and higher fees or will you also pursue opportunities for public service? Many will be called for uncompensated duties for your city, State, and Nation. Will you respond? If you should be asked to serve in an uncomfortable post in some distant and backward land, will you automatically say no?

As you rise to positions of importance will you remember that it is the business of business equitably to provide goods and services at a profit and not merely to make a profit?

As you are able, will you support with work and finances those institutions which serve in the public interest and which can function in a democracy only through voluntary support—churches, welfare agencies, universities?

Are you really interested and informed about the world and the people around you? If so, will you maintain that interest? What magazines and books do you read? Diversion is essential to human life—but is all your reading confined to froth and amusement, or is there some substance there? Or, am I being presumptuous in asking if you read at all?

All of you, and I mean all, will have the privilege of voting. Wise voting in itself is an act of statesmanship. The cynic on the sideline contends that it is a useless business because everything is rigged before hand and there really is no choice. This is not true. There is always at least some increment of choice, and progress is only made in small steps. Are you and will you be informed on the important issues? Do you know your political leaders and where they stand? Do you know in which congressional district you reside? Incidentally, who is your Congressman?

The summation of your public attitudes and actions can constitute the firm foundations for the necessary statesmanship of a significant segment of society. You may be justified in being dissatisfied with the world but you have no excuse for saying you can do nothing about it—as long as we have a democracy.

Twenty-four centuries ago Pericles spoke his famous funeral oration. Athens did not survive as an autonomous city-state, but some of the thoughts and words of the Golden Age are as great and timeless as ever. Here are a few, brief excerpts from Pericles' immortal address, in which he commemorated the first Athenian soldiers who fell in the first campaign between Athens and Sparta, but in which he also extolled the virtues of Athens for which they had died.

"Our citizens attend to both public and private duties, and do not allow absorption in their own various affairs to interfere with their knowledge of the city's. We differ from other states in regarding the man who holds aloof from public life not as quiet but as useless.

"We secure our friends by not accepting favors but by doing them. We are alone among mankind in doing men benefits, not on calculations of self-interest, but in the fearless confidence of freedom.

"Fix your eyes on the greatness of Athens as you have it before you day by day, fall in love with her, and when you feel her great, remember that this greatness was won by men with courage, with knowledge of their duty."

Every year there are many hundreds of commencement addresses, well embroidered with trite expressions and cliches, exhorting the younger generation to clean up the mess which the older one left behind. Possibly 20 years from now one of you will be standing here doing the same thing. It is probably essential, repeatedly to remind the members of the graduating classes that the future does depend on them. That is the essence of democracy. It is still to be proven in this complex world that the sanctity of the individual can still be maintained, that enough of the members of a democratic society will voluntarily do the things that have to be done to prevent defeat by an arbitrary dictatorship. In that demonstration and that proof lie the future and the greatness of your country. You can be party to that greatness.

For the next 50 years your thoughts, knowledge and acts will be important in shaping the course of human events. You will be subjected to many sociologically destructive forces as we come out of the eye of the hurricane. I know you can do well. I will not be here to learn the final results, but I have confidence that your final record will be one which you can well view with pride and deep satisfaction.

[1] Potter, Stephen: "The Theory and Practice of Gamesmanship." Henry Holt & Co., 1948.

Federal Employees' Pay Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I manifested my support of the Federal employees' pay increase legislation by signing the discharge petition some time ago. While I do not favor the discharge petition method of operation in the Con-

gress, I think the situation was urgent enough in this case to warrant this procedure.

My interest in the legislation was motivated largely by reason of the fact that the postal workers in my area, at all levels, are receiving inadequate compensation for the job they do, particularly in the light of today's high cost of living and the depreciated value of the dollar.

The postal workers are among the most loyal of our Government employees. They perform arduous and trying tasks with great patience and skill. They are devoted to their jobs and to the Government which they serve. It is incumbent upon that Government, our Government, to see to it that they are properly compensated so that their families can live in reasonable comfort and not have to be harassed by the vexations of penury.

I know of cases where postal workers are working at two jobs in order to keep their households together, feed their families, and educate their children.

Fine men though they are, they are limited in their opportunities for financial growth because of the peculiar nature of their field of activity. The postal workers' one source of relief is in the hands of the Congress.

I am delighted that the motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 324 to 94 and that the motion to pass the measure finally was carried by such a convincing margin.

I would have voted for a 9-percent increase, but the Post Office committee thought more equitable to reduce the amount to 7½ percent across the board.

Not only postal workers but all Federal employees will benefit by this measure if it becomes a law, and my feeling is that that is as it should be. Federal workers should be compensated at a rate comparable to that in private industry.

Invocation by Rev. Robert J. McEwen at Navy Research and Development Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Friday in Boston the Reverend Robert J. McEwen, S.J., delivered a most thoughtful invocation at a Naval Research and Development Clinic, where Navy scientists discussed national defense matters with top businessmen and engineers from Massachusetts and New England.

Father McEwen is chairman of the Department of Economics at Boston College at Chestnut Hill, Mass. He has become one of the outstanding spiritual leaders in our Commonwealth, and his constant concern for the public interest is an inspiration to all of us in public service in Massachusetts.

Since his invocation provides a fine standard of guidance for our overall purpose and our everyday way of life, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY REV. ROBERT J. MCEWEN, S.J., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, BOSTON COLLEGE, CHESTNUT HILL, MASS., AT NAVY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CLINIC, JUNE 10, 1960, JOHN HANCOCK HALL, 200 BERKELEY STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Almighty God, the Father and Creator of us all, we ask Thy blessing on this gathering of eduators, sientists, business leaders and national defense administrators. Bless their joint efforts and deliberations, concerned with the physical defense of our native land and of the religious and spiritual values to which we, as a free people, are sincerely dedicated. Inspire us all with the confidence that such values constitute our proudest boast and the most worthy object of our national protection. Such conviction will preserve a true order in our society, even while we bend every effort to master and harness the latest developments of science in the defense of our national welfare.

We pray also that You strengthen our hearts and wills against any temptation to use the occasion of national defense activity as an excuse for unjustified or unwarranted private profiteering at the expense of the common treasury. We cannot hope to preserve our heritage of spiritual and moral greatness and heroic dedication if we resort to means that are personally and nationally reprehensible. Protect this great city and this great country from political and business leaders who would disgrace their noble professions and scandalize ordinary citizens by giving merely lipservice to the simple principles of honesty, truth, service, and dedication which have in the past strengthened our society against all assaults. Support instead all those who, in the words of our President, enter public service as intelligent, educated, selfless persons dedicated to raising the political standards of the body politic, and bless their efforts with Thy divine inspiration and guidance. Amen.

Drinking Charged to Seven on Airliner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the New York Times for June 8, 1960:

DRINKING CHARGED TO SEVEN ON AIRLINER

WASHINGTON, June 6.—The Federal Aviation Agency announced Monday that it had started action against seven men accused of violating its new rule against drinking from private liquor supplies aboard airliners.

The Agency said this was the first violation of the regulation since it went into effect last March.

The incident occurred aboard an Eastern Air Lines scheduled flight from New York to Montreal May 20.

The Agency said in a news release that the drinking passengers had "turned the passenger cabin into a littered shambles."

"The incident also brought threats from the airline captain of an emergency landing," the release said, adding that the airline neither served nor carried liquor on the flight involved.

FAA said that it had notified the seven persons that under the Federal Aviation Act they were subject to civil penalties not to exceed $1,000. It gave them 10 days in which to file oral or written comments.

Six of the seven gave the following addresses: Dan Hansey, 31 Terrace Place, Brooklyn; Henry Raad, George Fattell, and George Gibney, Clifton, N.J.; George Byrouty and George Massoud, Paterson, N.J.

John Raad, the seventh man arrested, was not arraigned in Montreal and his street address was not available.

Official Map and Guide for New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey citizens often extol the scenic splendor of their home State, but often they find it difficult to describe exactly how to direct their friends to the scenery or destination they describe. The New Jersey State Highway Department, however, wants to make it easy to do so.

For the first time since 1955, the department has revised its official map and guide. It is a folding map, convenient and useful. Mr. President, it is a map that will be of great service to motorists throughout the Nation, and it is available to anyone who requests a copy. A new release from the highway department describes it in some detail. I ask unanimous consent to have this release printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENTON, June 14.—The 1960 edition of the New Jersey State Highway Department's official map and guide will be ready for free distribution within a week, Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer announced today.

The new map, first to be issued by the department since 1955, will be available to anyone requesting a copy. Postcards only should be mailed to Post Office Box 555, Elizabeth, N.J., with printed or typed address of the party making the request. Requests should not be sent to the highway department.

According to a highway department spokesman, advance requests already received will be honored without the need for further action on the part of the requesters.

The official map and guide again employs the booklet design rather than the single sheet; this type of map was used as a convenience to the motoring public since it is more convenient to use in a car. In addition, the design permits use of a larger scale, especially valuable in metropolitan areas where large numbers of roads and streets are shown.

The front cover of the new map and guide pinpoints two of the State's most important vacation areas in brilliant color photos—the New Jersey seashore and the mountain areas of the northern part of the State.

On the inside front cover is a photograph of Morven, the Governor's official residence,

in Princeton, and a message of welcome from Gov. Robert B. Meyner.

Opposite the Governor's message is a single page map of the State divided into the five longitudinal sections. Each of these sections is shown separately in larger scale on the following pages.

With each of the five map sections there is a list of important recreation facilities and historic sites found in that section. Color photos of many of these vacation retreats are scattered throughout the booklet.

Of special interest to motorists are a number of photographs showing the highway department's new safety construction features. These include creeper lanes, center barrier, jughandles, overpasses, and outside white lines. Text explaining the purpose and results of these safety items accompany each photo.

Highways and streets in the State's two principal metropolitan areas, Camden and North Jersey, are so numerous and close together that the department has included large scale maps for easy reading. These large scale metropolitan maps are especially valuable for their complete picture of the approaches to the Hudson and Delaware River crossings.

The last page of the booklet is a special fold-out with a complete index to cities and towns on one side and economic and marketing advantages of the State on the other. This survey outlines New Jersey's potential and existing status in industry, commerce, and transportation.

The back cover presents a tableau of State highway signs. Of the 70,000 signs found along State highways most types are shown. These include informational signs such as route markers, and regulatory ones, such as speed limits.

Another Historic Landmark Will Soon Be Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, my district is the home of many historic sites from Revolutionary and pre-Revolutionary days. One of the localities rich in such history is the Borough of Morrisville in Bucks County, which was the home of Robert Morris, for whom the town is named. An interesting article on one of the structures erected by Robert Morris appeared in the Levittown Times, of Levittown, Pa., in its issue of June 13, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I desire to include the aforesaid article, which is as follows:

(By Tom Werner)

One of Morrisville's larger buildings, an uninhabited, rambling structure standing diagonally across Chambers Street from Borough Hall is usually identified by passing citizens as "the old rubber works."

The two-story building, which seems to lean into the wind, has plainly seen better days and seen those days some time ago. The oddity is how long ago those better days were, and how few persons know about them.

The two-story building was Robert Morris' stable, fashioned after the Royal Family Stables in England. The colonial financier, signer of the Declaration of Independence and U.S. Senator, had the stable built, probably before the Revolutionary War. It was an extravagant way to house horseflesh and may have been a contributory cause to Morris' eventual fate—3 years in debtor's prison.

TREMENDOUS STABLE

The structure wasn't much as a rubber works, but as a stable it must have been tremendous. As a home for his horses, Morris built the place to scale with his sumptous estate, which at the time included most of what is now the incorporated Borough of Morrisville. It was a leg-wearing 2,500 acres or so in size.

Although they are now walled up, there were two arch doors at each end of the structure large enough for horse and carriage—any size. When the doors were open at each end, the place served as a sort of throughway for the horsey set in the area.

The second floor served as quarters for Morris' carriagekeepers.

The building is 123 feet long and 25 feet wide. There were 36 feet of stalls on each side of a center carriage space of 51 feet.

DECLARATION SIGNER

After Morris departed from the scene, the estate went from owner to owner, including Declaration of Independence signer George Clymer and Thomas Fitzsimmons.

Eventually, the estate was taken over by Gen. Jean Moreau, one of Napoleon's cohorts who fell out of the "little corporal's" favor and wound up in the Colonies, independent by that time.

History has it that General Moreau stayed up most of one bitterly cold Christmas Eve hurling wood into the fireplace in order to make it warm enough for the rare flowers he raised and coveted so dearly. As the night wore on, and General Moreau wore out, he tolddied to bed.

A BIT TOO WARM

As it turned out, the general made it a bit too warm and the mansion burned down. Moreau made it outside before he shared the fate of his precious flowers.

Through the 19th century the estate crumbled, but the stables held up just fine.

When the Pennsylvania Railroad came rumbling through, the stable was used as a machine shop. Then it was turned into an oilcloth factory. Then a dish factory. Finally, the Vulcanized Rubber Co., now the Vulcanized Rubber and Plastics Co., moved in.

After the rubber firm moved out, people moved in. Even the people left after a while, and now it's only an old building—its past luxurious glories obscured by the utilitarian uses to which the building was forced.

Reuben B. Robertson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a recent issue of Dixie Business carries an editorial by Col. Hubert F. Lee, entitled, "The Late Reuben B. Robertson, Jr.," which depicts with great accuracy a basic characteristic of the late Deputy Secretary of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monument: Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., is dead and if you want to see his monument, look about you.

Monuments of good memories living in human hearts, including my own.

I was proud when he was picked for Deputy Secretary of Defense and proud when he was elected president of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co., stepping in the footsteps of his wonderful father. And all the important positions he was asked to fill.

For every time I read about him, my mind's eye turns back to a summer in North Carolina and the young executive who took time out to proudly conduct me over the Canton plant and let me have lunch in the new cafeteria.

How proud he was of the men who ran the machines and did the many jobs in the different buildings.

I still have volume XVI No. 5, June 1933 copy of the Log:

Published by "the Champion Family" as a symbol of the cooperation and good fellowship existing at the plant of the Champion Fibre Co., Canton, N.C.

I remember how proud Reuben, Jr., was of the big new paper machine and its auxiliary equipment. It was the wonder of the paper industry.

The paper machine was the biggest and most up-to-date book paper machine in the world at that time, and no wonder Reuben was proud of it.

My eyes popped out in amazement as we watched the giant wonder, traveling at a terrific speed to make roll after roll of the world's finest paper.

A quarter century later, Reuben, Jr., wrote me to come up for the commissioning of No. 20 machine, May 1, 1959.

No. 20 machine is the world's best fine papermaking machine, a Champion just as the one I saw years ago.

The years had seen Rueben, Jr., become one of the truly great leaders of America, yet he had the same consideration for others that had so impressed me the first time we met.

Reuben, Jr., said in one of his talks—

"It is not our machines, our buildings, our money or our materials that make the difference between success and failure, it is the people in our company that determine how successful we are. We can have the most modern and perfect machines that can be made—but they will do no better than the folks who run those machines."

Every man on the Champion team knew he was sincere.

I watched the way the men at Canton greeted him. And the way they eyed him after he had moved along.

I thought I could see them thinking "I had a part in teaching the paper business to him."

They gave him the loyalty and devotion they gave his father, who had in 1907 come to the mountains and had stayed to see the company become the world's finest enterprise.

In all the places that Reuben, Jr., has been—look about you.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the attention of the House this speech by Palmer Hoyt, editor of the

Denver Post, as delivered before the Eureka (Calif.), Rotary Club, and reported by the Humboldt Standard of June 6, 1960. I am particularly interested in Mr. Hoyt's remarks on this occasion, because they are almost exactly parallel to speeches I have been recently making in the First Congressional District of California. In light of Mr. Hoyt's well-known sympathy with President Eisenhower, it is particularly gratifying to note his emphasis on the need for dissent, for analysis of the U–2 incident and the lessons it affords to us if we shall give debate full play. It places the national budget in the proper perspective of national survival; and national survival in adequate defense and needs for education.

The speech follows:

FULL TEXT OF ROTARY CLUB SPEECH BY PALMER HOYT

THE GREAT DEBATE

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." Proverbs.

"I want to talk to you about the great debate. For many months, I myself, and my newspaper, the Denver Post, have been promoting the idea of the great debate. We do so under the theory that the crisis we now face is the greatest in our history. We think it calls for the greatest debate in our history.

"The great debate is getting underway. Newspapers, magazines, radio, and television stations are using the term and using in increasingly. Most of you are aware of the elaborate treatment at least one phase of the great debate is currently getting in Life magazine.

"What is the great debate about?

"It is and should be about many things.

"A. It is about survival, not just staying alive as individuals, but survival of our country with the opportunity for it to grow and develop into an even greater nation than it is now.

"B. It is about the important issues without which talk of survival would be meaningless.

"Let's look at these issues.

"First is the basic and somewhat stilted idea that we must equal or excel Russia in all things.

"Before we do this, we are going to have to face some hard facts.

"These hard facts include this, that in this fight for survival, we often have been second best.

"Recently Walter Lippmann wrote a column which, in my judgment is one of the great utterances of history.

"In this column, Mr. Lippmann, a man not given to loose talk, referred to the President's recurrent emphasis on consumer goods as evidence of national strength.

"Lippmann said:

"'There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union.

"But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the life giving principle of national power.

"While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what must not be allowed to end is our parity with the greatest powers.

"For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

"Nobody can say as yet when the Nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency.

"The voices that will serve this country and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things.

"They may not as yet do well in the Gallup polls. But they will be listened to sooner or later."

In this age of the bomb, it is important for us to remember that if we are to compete successfully with dictatorship, we must strengthen democracy; and one of the ways to do that is through discussion, frank and free.

It is well, too, to remember that this country, this America, was founded on the New England town meeting; on the conflicting voices of citizens ever engaged in search for the truths so necessary to bulwark freedom and insure its necessary growth.

"The history of our country is written in the great debates: as to the form of government we were to have; as to whether the Union would or could endure; as to whether we would enter wars to fight for human freedom.

"And now the greatest of all the great debates is being joined.

This debate is more important than the Great Debate in Athens in which the Greek philosophers urged the Athenians to add the social system of Sparta to the culture of Athens; it is more vital than the discussions of slavery that preceded the Civil War; more significant than the words that were spoken in the world before World War II or the Korean incident; for the very fact of freedom now may be at stake and possibly the very existence of the human race itself.

"Because today, at long last, man has the power to destroy himself—and completely. It is doubtful that any living thing on earth could survive all-out nuclear warfare.

"The best insurance against the nuclear war is the strength of America, a Nation that believes in peace and goodwill, and is committed to live and to let live.

"Only a strong America can save the world from destruction, and only a strong America can prevent its falling under the rule and domination of imperial communism. Make no mistake: the choice is as simple as that.

"And so what is this great debate upon which we now enter?

"It is whether affluence and prosperity alone equal strength.

"It is whether America, having lost primacy among nations, can afford not to maintain parity.

"It is whether we can afford not to match Russia in space exploration, in education, and missiles.

"It is whether our leaders are right or wrong when they say we have nothing to worry about.

"It is whether or not America indeed has lost her way.

"We hear a lot of talk these days about the need to avoid criticism. Some say criticism undermines national unity. Of course national unity is important. But the best way to unite a free people is to give them the facts and have them rally, as they will, behind a course they know to be right.

"Other persons go so far as to equate criticism with selling out to the Communists. For example, recently there was a political cartoon in the Chicago Tribune showing Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung and Adlai Stevenson grouped together pointing the accusing finger at President Eisenhower.

"As a representative of the press, I am ashamed of this sort of thing. I am a longtime supporter of President Eisenhower, but I think Stevenson, whatever else he may be, for or against, was quite right this time when he said the administration, through its mishandling of the U–2 incident, handed the disagreeable Mr. Khrushchev a crowbar and a pickax to wreck the summit. When this incident was disclosed on the eve of the conference, first we said no. Then we said yes. Then we said we would keep on with the flights over Russia because they were essential. Then we said we wouldn't do it any more. As far as the summit meeting is concerned, maybe the fact that it was broken up was for the best. I don't know. But that's not the only point involved. The way we handled ourselves over this unhappy incident had some very bad long-range results.

"We put ourselves in the spot where we openly advocated violation of international law; whereas in the past we were in the fortunate position of being always on the side of morality. We helped to undercut worldwide respect for our veracity. And we revealed a shocking lack of coordination among those who were supposed to be making our overall strategy.

"This is the most bothersome of all the side effects of the incident. Even now, the administration still hasn't got its stories straight. In his recent television address, President Eisenhower said we made a conscious decision to continue the U–2 flights over Russia just before the summit. But a couple of days later, Secretary of State Herter told the Fulbright committee that there had been no review of the U–2 program in the weeks before the summit, and therefore, no conscious decision one way or another, about stopping the flights or not stopping the flights.

"The other day an Australian editor was in my office. He called the U–2 incident an unfortunate one for the West, but he seemed much more concerned about another problem in U.S. foreign policy.

"'Why is it,' he asked, 'that no one here seems to be talking about Red China?'

"I replied that I thought it was much too involved a subject to throw into the present controversy, that it would only complicate matters.

"'This he deplored. 'What is the worst news you could print in your paper?' he asked, and then said, 'I'll tell you in headline form, "Red China has the bomb."'

"We gain nothing by keeping ourselves from all contact with these people. Sooner or later we are going to have to face up to the problem of recognizing Red China. When we do, it may well be painful for us. But it might be less painful to recognize her now than to act as if Red China doesn't exist.

"Certainly we can do no less in this period of great debate than to talk about it. So far the only prominent political leader who has made such a speech to my knowledge is Governor Meyner of New Jersey.

"And yet, it is one of many issues that make up the debate. This is one of the important thoughts I want to leave with you. That there is so much to discuss, so much that the people should know about. That is why I hope that the 1960 election is not to be decided on the misleading issue of peace and prosperity. America cannot afford it.

"The central question the American people must decide is whether we, as a Nation, are willing to do what is necessary to survive. Candidates who dwell only on the present state of peace and our private affluence do the people a disservice by covering up the harsh realities.

"I believe the people will rise to the challenge. The people voted scared in 1932, and I believe they will vote scared again in 1960. They'll vote to compete with the Russians, because they will come to realize they have to compete. They'll come to realize they have to win, and, given the chance, they will win.

"To do so they are going to have to step in and convince their leaders that they are prepared to do whatever is necessary to defend themselves adequately. And nowadays adequate defense involves coordinated efforts in arms, missiles, space and foreign relations.

"It also involves the need for a greater national effort in education, for this is the source of the people who will bear the burden of the competition in the years to come.

"All this means we are going to have to operate from the base of a strong economy. Our economy is going to have to be the one that, in the broadest sense of the term, will give us both guns and butter.

"I have no doubt that we can maintain our free enterprise economy intact and still compete successfully with the Soviet Union. The best evidence is how much we have been able to do already. In the face of an effort to meet worldwide responsibilities we would never have dreamed of a generation ago, we have still done well ourselves. This must really confuse the Russians, who, we may surmise, expected our economy to collapse from the strain of meeting our military and other cold war obligations. It must send them frequently back to their Marxian texts in despair to discover where their theories went wrong.

"Our experience ought to give us self-confidence that we need not fear to do the things we must do. We should ask ourselves first what we must do, and then what it will cost, rather than the other way around. If we have to ask ourselves first whether we can afford to survive, we won't survive.

"Let me say here, parenthetically, that my confidence in our fiscal strength implies that we will find a way to do without the luxury of wholesale wasting of our tax dollars on such things as duplication of organization and effort.

"Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Representative FRANK KOWALSKI and other like-minded men in the Congress have estimated that we could save some $10 billion a year through a proper reorganization of the Pentagon and the armed services. If this figure is anywhere near accurate, we had better get busy and do something about it.

"In addition to making and keeping ourselves strong physically and economically, we are going to have to operate from a position of moral strength as well.

"We are going to have to see to it that we make the Constitution and the Bill of Rights living documents. We can't let our colored people remain second-rate citizens and still maintain our moral character in a world that is three-fourths nonwhite.

"I said a few moments ago that I believe the American people will rise to the challenge. They will if they are led by men of vision. In the book Proverbs, the Bible reminds us that 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.'

"Let us pray for that vision we need so badly, so our people will not perish from the earth, but will instead continue as the bulwark of freedom and the hope of the oppressed."

Milk Sanitation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a difference of opinion between the State of New York and the city of New York regarding an outdated, unnecessary milk sanitation regulation has underlined the need for Federal legislation in this field.

An act prohibiting State or local health agencies from requiring the dating of milk containers was passed by the New York State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor. Modern methods of sanitation and distribution have made such a requirement obsolete. Now the New York City Council is attempting to reenact this requirement on a local basis.

If S. 988, the Milk Sanitation Act sponsored by myself, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. PROXMIRE] were enacted, local health regulations that act as barriers to trade, such as the one in dispute, could not prevent the free movement of milk meeting the high sanitation standards of the U.S. Public Health Service.

An editorial appearing in a recent issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press ably summarizes the issues in the New York legal tangle and proposes the solution.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, June 2, 1960]

NEW MILK LAW TANGLE

In New York, the weirdest of city-State conflicts has produced a new reason why Congress is so strongly impelled to set dairying free from the maze of contradictory State and local sanitary regulations that are hamstringing interstate commerce in milk. Establishing uniform Federal sanitary regulations for milk, as already is being done for meat and poultry, would do the job.

The New York State Legislature passed and Governor Rockefeller signed an act prohibiting State or local health agencies from requiring the "dating" of milk. Such requirements mean that each bottle or carton must be stamped with the date of pasteurization.

No doubt at one time justified on health grounds, this requirement now has been made obsolete and senseless by modern methods of sanitation and distribution. These methods enable milk to retain its high quality, flavor and freshness for far longer periods than formerly was the case. They make dating a needless expense to the farmers and consumers who profit from or pay for milk and cream that are consumed by the public.

But of course the requirement does create a certain number of jobs in dating and handling and hauling outdated milk. And, in the eyes of New York City Council, these advantages were deemed to outweigh all the glaring disadvantages of dating. So the council by a vote of 20 to 1 has reenacted or voted to reenact the dating requirement which was specifically outlawed by the Legislature of the State of New York.

The absurd legal tangle that results seems to cry aloud for enactment by Congress of the Lester Johnson bill whose uniform Federal sanitary code on interstate milk shipments would sweep aside all such conflicting and contradictory local regulations. Representative JOHNSON, Senator HUMPHREY and other members of both political parties who are supporting the bill could properly call this situation to the attention of Congress as a conclusive argument in behalf of their measure.

When New York City tries to repeal New York State milk law, it seems high time for the Federal Government to step in with national requirements for free trade in wholesome dairy products.

Red Leaders Cannot Explain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a column by Ed Koterba, well-known Washington correspondent. This column deals with what the Russians are telling other parts of the world but have not admitted to their own people, namely, that they detected over 100 U.S. flights over Russia in a 3-year period.

I can understand why the Russians are not telling their people this, since the military leaders in the Kremlin would be hard pressed to explain to their people why the Red army and air force cannot stop the penetration of these planes to the heart of the Russian Empire. The column which appeared in yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News follows:

The broadcast, from Radio Moscow, was an extraordinary one. It was beamed to Austria in the German language. The theme: United States spying inside the Soviet.

"Dear listeners," the commentator started, "we now invite you to visit a unique museum on a quiet Moscow street. It is the museum of Soviet border forces."

The Red radio man then set down an amazing admission as he purportedly toured the museum. He told how our spies had penetrated the Soviet borders—in ways other than the now-exposed U-2 flights.

"U.S. spies," he said "have not only landed by sea, but their agents have dropped from the clouds."

The broadcast, and subsequent programs, disclosed that in one 3-year period, from 1953 to 1956, the Soviet Union detected 113 penetrations of Russia.

"Flying either above the clouds or at great heights," the man said, "American aircraft violated our state frontiers and dropped agents." He added sardonically: "The agents were rendered harmless."

"Before him in the museum," the narrator said, "were tools of intrigue stripped from the captured U.S. agents." He reeled off a bizarre list:

Automatic guns in the guise of fountain pens, walking sticks, and umbrellas. Cigarette cases and lighters containing poison. Miniature radio transmitters. Equipment for writing secret messages.

From agents who landed by sea, he said, were taken items now displayed that included "glass vials of strong poison designed for large-scale operations."

If our spy network is of such large proportions, as the broadcast intimated, this would be enough to send a million chills up the spines of the Soviet people. But, from information I have, the program was not beamed to listeners inside the Soviet Union.

It is not known how much of this hysterical stuff is true, since the Central Intelligence Agency here won't even confirm the time of day. However, the Moscow narrator dropped this spicy hunk of hot information:

"Scientific laboratories—whole enterprises in the United States—are working in the service of the bandit-espionage technology."

He said we're devising such fascinating gadgets as radio interception sets that can be hidden in neckties, the hair, or in the frames of spectacles.

Most fantastic of all, the Communist said the United States has designed an atomic bomb that can be carried by one man.

Mostly, Moscow broadcasts are filled with lies. This is one time I fervently hope they were telling the truth. It would prove at least one thing: The taxpayers of America are getting their money's worth out of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Federal Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we hear many offhand criticisms of Federal aid programs. Usually such criticisms are made with little understanding of the ways in which well-planned programs can help local officials do local jobs better than they could without such help. There need be no dictation from Washington if the legislators do their work well when they prepare legislation for a Federal program.

An editorial in the April 23 issue of the Jersey Journal gives some very valuable commentary on this matter.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE TEAM

The President's Joint Federal-State Action Committee has disbanded after 3 years because Congress has established a permanent advisory commission in the same area. Although the presidential committee cannot be credited with any great achievements, there are some useful observations in its final report.

Two of these observations are of particular note. The committee advised that problems should never be allowed to become so big that Federal emergency programs offered the only solution. Before that happens, it was implied, authorities should push hard to do something at the State level, perhaps with Federal aid.

The committee did not, however, go along with the notion that Federal aid is always to be shunned. Asking for State alertness to responsibility, it was noted, is not the same as demanding "a negative view of Federal participation in the emerging problems and needs."

The distinction is wise. As the Nation grows in size and complexity, new problems are bound to arise and old ones are bound to become more important. States should do what they can to meet needs, but when Federal help is indicated as the best means of solving a problem, that should be welcomed. Ideally, Federal and State governments should work as a team dedicated to the public interest.

Address by Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom Before American Committee on Italian Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1960, I had the pleasure of attending the second annual dinner of the American Committee on Italian Migration in Cheshire, Conn. During the course of the evening, it was my privilege to listen to an address by the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, and I insert this address in the RECORD at this point:

I am very happy to come here to this very beautiful little suburb of New Haven this evening to address this grand dinner of the Connecticut Branch of the American Committee on Italian Migration. When Judge Toscano and Mr. Sidoli invited me some weeks age, at the urging I am sure of my dear friend, Father Caesar Donanzan, I accepted their invitation without any hesitancy.

For more than 15 years now, I have had the privilege to be associated with the indefatigable Judge Juvenal Marchisio, your national leader, in his organization efforts to focus attention upon and to bring assistance to the people of Italy who even at this late date have not fully recovered from the dire effects of the last great World War. Many of you here this evening were closely associated with us in the vast program of relief and assistance that was carried on by American relief for Italy in the years immediately following the war.

It is no surprise to me and I am sure it is not to Judge Marchisio to see you good people of Connecticut so actively participating in this latest effort to attack another of Italy's most basic problems—the emigration of its surplus thousands through the work of this magnificent American Committee on Italian Migration.

I know for me, personally, it has been one of the greatest privileges of my life to be associated in such important efforts with such wonderful people.

As you probably understand from the position I hold as Director of the Foreign Relief Programs of the American Bishops, my journeyings during the past 15 years have taken me to all quarters of the globe. I have made at least three complete trips around the globe, crossing two times by way of the Pacific through the countries of the Far East, down through Asia and on through the Middle East to Europe and back across the Atlantic. On the other occasion I went the other way around. I couldn't begin to tell you how many countries of Europe I visited time and time again and my wanderings have also taken me to most of the countries of South America and Africa.

For us in America, the world still presents a face of some calm and orderliness. Our lives have not been caught up in the incessant upheavals that have afflicted so many human beings whose fate it was to be thrust over frontiers as refugees or to be part of post-colonial areas, battling their way into freedom and struggling for some semblance of stability.

Life in America is in sharp contrast to all the unrest, the homelessness, the hunger, and the anguish that I have witnessed all over the world in the past several years. I had occasion to see some of it again only a few weeks ago when I travelled through some of the countries of South America and last fall, when I spent a great deal of time in North Africa and in various countries that make up southeastern Europe—places like Spain, Portugal and Italy, where you still find a great deal of poverty despite all the recovery that has taken place in Europe since the end of the war.

When I return from a trip I am often asked my impression of need abroad and whether there is still a necessity for American Catholics to engage in oversea aid. Well, I can tell you immediately that despite all the economic recovery that has taken place in most countries throughout the world since the end of the war, there is still an unbelievable amount of dire poverty.

While I was in Italy last fall, we spent about 4 days traveling from one little Italian city to another in a helicopter. It gave me an opportunity to cover a large part of southern Italy. I can tell you that despite all the American foreign aid and our own help that has gone into Italy since the end of the war, there are still thousands of people who live in extreme poverty because of the lack of sufficient employment and the out-and-out inability of the economy of Italy to support its millions of inhabitants.

However, one of the strongest impressions that I carried away from that trip was a visit to a displaced persons camp in the town of Bari on the Adriatic Coast. This DP camp is located in an old damp monastery known as Santa Chiara. Into its dilapidated rooms were crowded some 500 Yugoslav families. They were gradually being evacuated to make room for hundreds of Italians who were being returned from Tunisia.

The Yugoslav refugees had fled from a regime which many people want to call democratic but which subjects people to so many pressures that they would prefer to become exiles, rather than endure it. The poor Italians were returning to Italy because they were literally starving in the economic desert that is Tunisia today, where one out of every three families is on public relief and for which these poor Italians could not qualify because of their Italian background.

Santa Chiara is one of the many ancient buildings of Europe that has sheltered in the past 15 years several generations of helpless and dispossessed people. As I walked through the dark halls of Santa Chiara, I thought of the prayers and the blasted hopes of these generations, who are the victims of the violence and upheavals of our time. It is no exaggeration to say that the help you have enabled us to bring to them is often the only source of hope to these people at this critical time of their lives.

It was against this background that I suggested to Judge Marchisio some weeks ago that it would be a good idea for him to visit the Italians who are suffering such hardships in Tunisia today and to visit the camps in which they were being placed upon their return to Italy. I had seen their plight with my own eyes and my heart was filled with sadness when I thought of what life in these horrible refugee camps might mean to them for the next several years. Perhaps by portraying their situation rather graphically we might be able to interest the Congress of the United States in permitting at least a limited number of them to find their way to hope and freedom in our own dear country.

How well Judge Marchisio accomplished that mission many of you know. If you have an opportunity to read his report which is

being circulated these days, I would advise you to do so.

He found out that in Tunisia itself there are still 51,702 Italian nationals who are living in complete destitution. There are already in Italy 35,196 refugees, more than half of whom are living in the refugee camps whose precarious conditions I have already described. Not all of them came of course from Tunisia. Many are from Venezia Giulia or from the Communist zone of Trieste. How anyone can expect to absorb the 50,000 or more who are still in Tunisia, I for one, cannot possibly understand.

Have you ever had the good fortune or it might be better to say the unhappiness to see one of these refugees arrive in a camp? He comes with little more than the clothes on his back, perhaps a few precious possessions in a small bag, a handful of consular papers and what little of human self-respect he has managed to preserve through all his recent years of suffering.

This being World Refugee Year some of us were urging Congress to enact another emergency immigration bill to permit a few more refugees to come to the United States as part of our recognition of that year. Together, the judge and I, armed with his very graphic report, appeared before a committee of Congress with a plea to have some of these Italians from Tunisia included in such a refugee bill. Did we succeed? To put it very bluntly, this particular committee, which happened to be a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on Immigration, paid no attention to us.

As a matter of fact this subcommittee, which is under the chairmanship of Congressman WALTER, wasn't any more receptive to the plea of ourselves and representatives of a number of other large agencies—Protestant, Jewish and nonsectarian as well as Catholic that little groups of refugees from other parts of the world be allowed to come here also.

The committee finally passed a resolution, drawn up by Mr. WALTER himself, that will give entry to a limited number of refugees who happen to be fortunate enough to be under the mandate of the High Commission for Refugees. That resolution is under consideration in the Senate right now, but none of us are sanguine enough to even hope that the bill which will probably finally pass both Houses will include any permission for Italians from Tunisia or anywhere else.

It is rather a sad situation. But it will always be so until enough voices have been raised around the United States demanding a change in our basic immigration policy. As you well know under our sacrosanct national origins quota system only a limited number of persons from certain countries can come over each year.

It is true that in the years since the war America has been providing a home and a sanctuary for thousands of people who were displaced by the war but always under emergency legislation and in the beginning they were only permitted to enter through a mortgage placed on the regular quotas of their country of origin.

Thanks to your tremendous interest and help—and that of people like yourselves all over the United States, we were able to convince Congress that a fairly substantial number of Italians should also be permitted to enter on this emergency basis over and above the regular quota. It should amount to about 120,000 in all—not a bad record—but never lose sight of the fact that it was all done on an emergency basis.

But it will take many years of hard work on the part of yourselves and all of us if we are ever to achieve the hopes and dreams of all enlisted under the banner of the American Committee on Italian Migration of a fair and just immigration policy in the United States.

You have to always bear in mind the fact that the pages of our American immigration history do not always make the most pleasant reading. They are sometimes filled with accounts of prejudice and discrimination, mistreatment and exploitation, restriction and isolation, of racism and nativism. Fear and distrust of the stranger has not been the least of our sins. The American of today, no less than the descendant of the early colonists, seldom takes an idealistic view of immigration. Over the past 175 years, all of us have been too prone to forget that the only native American was the American Indian. Although our land was peopled by the oppressed, we need to be urged that it is a duty and a privilege to offer a home to others who are oppressed.

Even during those days when immigration was at its height here in the United States, the Italian, the Pole, the German, the Irishman, and other nationalities who came to this country in such great numbers received at best a grudging welcome. And all during those years there were forces at work that would destroy entirely, if they could, the melting pot that in God's providence had been forged on these shores. It did not matter that the immigrant came with his tradition, his culture—his faith—all of which he desired not to be melted away, but to be woven into a mosaic, rich and colorful, of Old World custom adapted to the New World.

An American immigration policy that would permit the entry of, say, 250,000 people a year, would be reasonable. The admission of the immigrants could be based upon our needs, their need for asylum, their relationship to others already in the country and finally their economic needs. It seems that such a system of selection could be established that would be a realistic substitute for the national origins quota system, which is so heavily weighted in favor of those who have no need or desire to come to the United States.

We are all aware that our beloved America, with its expanding industry, its farm problem where so many young people are deserting the farms for the cities, still can use and is in need of additional manpower. We know that countries like Italy have more people than their economies possibly can maintain. Some countries have the products of their factories, their mines and their farms to export, the better to maintain their own people. Italy is relatively poor in natural resources, but she is prepared to give up the most precious of her possessions—her cherished sons and daughters.

At this crucial moment in the world's history, it is very important for every man and woman to have a very broad concern—to have, what I might call, an international point of view—of the problems of the church and of her children. We cannot help but do this, if we will but contrast the tremendous vitality and strength of the church in our own United States with what we find in other countries.

By your interest and support of an organization like the American Committee on Italian Migration you are demonstrating that you have this broad point of view. God bless you for it.

In our own way each one of us can bring about a new understanding, a new sympathy, a new love for the immigrant who wishes to find a home in our midst.

The Educational Effort in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Education Association recently offered a survey which indicated that New Jersey ranks fourth among States in average teacher pay and third for the amount spent for the education of children. While we citizens of New Jersey are proud of our educational efforts, we are nevertheless aware of the fact that 73 percent of the amount spent for schools in our State comes from local government.

An editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of June 8, points out that the local government property tax may well be approaching the point of no return. It also suggests that a new source must be found if growing needs are to be met.

Mr. President, the editorial suggests to me, and probably to many others who favor Federal assistance to education, that Federal funds should be put to work to help State and local governments to meet the demands which now are borne so heavily by the homeowner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW IT'S SPENT ISN'T THE WHOLE OF THE PROBLEM

The New Jersey Education Association has tapped 10 of its more energetic members to enlist new recruits among the teachers of Bergen County. The New Jersey Education Association, as almost everyone knows, is the teachers' organization which carries the ball for legislation and on some often delicate occasions for teachers involved in controversy with school boards. It appears it might have use for its recruiting team and other ambassadors sooner than it thinks. There could be abroad, as the result of a National Education Association report, a misconception about New Jersey's status as an education leader.

The National Education Association has just told us that New Jersey ranks fourth in average teacher pay, behind only California, New York, and Alaska. It is also among the first 10 States in the amount of money spent for the education of each pupil, $497, which puts New Jersey in third place.

Among the New Jersey Education Association's basic objectives is an increase in State aid for schools. Some persons reading the above statistics might form a hasty conclusion that New Jersey does pretty well both by teacher and by pupil. That's true enough. How it gets done is another matter, and it would be advisable to read the whole report, perhaps even the fine print.

A closer study of the statistics shows that New Jersey is 38th among the States in parceling out State aid. Of the money spent on education in New Jersey, 73 percent comes from local government. The State and the Federal Government contribute the rest, but the share local government bears is the seventh highest in the Nation.

Therein lies New Jersey's problem. It is not that our teachers are underpaid—if $5,740 a year average is good—or that our children are denied opportunity for learning. But we are rapidly approaching the point of no return in local taxation if we have not already reached it. What the New Jersey Education Association points out is that real estate taxes cannot supply much more than they are now doing. Some new source must be found if growing needs are to be met. We are doing splendidly at the minute. The point the educators raise—and it is a perfectly valid one—is how long we can do as well on the same old shaky basis.

Mass Deportation of Baltic Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that Americans should be concerned not only about our own freedom but about the freedom of those who have lost it. To those who love liberty there are no accounts more revolting than the tragic deportations of peoples to Siberia by the autocratic czars and dictatorial communism of the Soviet Union. This month those Americans who still remember are commemorating the sorrowful mass deportations of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to Siberia where thousands upon thousands perished under the Communist yoke.

I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in bringing to the attention of my colleagues a letter from the Lithuanian-American community of Stamford, Conn. These fine Americans express their gratitude to the Government of the United States for its unyielding stand against the Soviet Union. They urge our Government to reject the claims of the Soviet Union to the Baltic lands and request the United States to expose these illegal territorial seizures as an international crime.

May I urge my colleagues to read this letter:

LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY OF STAMFORD,
June 10, 1960.

Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI,
Congressman at large,
Meriden, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Resolution unanimous adopted at the meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Stamford, Conn., sponsored by Lithuanian community of Stamford and held June 4, 1960, in the 51 Lindale Street, Stamford, to commemorate the sorrowful 19th anniversary of the beginning of mass deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia:

"Whereas the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—in 1940 against their will have been forcibly incorporated into Soviet Union, and as a result of that incorporation several hundred thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have been deported and perished in the wilderness of Siberia; and

"Whereas the illegal occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union as well as oppression of the Baltic peoples continue under the present rulers of Kremlin; and

"Whereas the fate of Lithuania and of the other subjugated Eastern European countries depends mostly on the success of the foreign policy of the United States and its allies: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this gathering of Lithuanian-Americans of the city of Stamford expresses its gratitude to the Government of the United States for its policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania and other two Baltic States into Soviet Union, and for its unyielding stand against Soviet intimidations and threats as it was recently demonstrated at the meeting in Paris; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this gathering calls upon the Government of the United States not to enter any agreement with Soviet Union which would directly or indirectly lead to the recognition of status quo in Eastern Europe; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to expose to the world opinion the crimes of the Kremlin rulers by publicly charging them with breaking of numerous international treaties, enslaving of their neighbors and exiling of millions of innocent people to Siberia; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That this meeting urges the Government of United States to raise the question of the illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union at the nearest session of the United Nations and to demand that this international crime would be rectified."

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH VALIUSAITIS,
Chairman.
NIKODEMAS CEREKAS,
Secretary.

Conversion of Saline Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation held hearings last week on a bill to increase the program conducted by the Office of Saline Water in the Department of the Interior. Among the witnesses was Carrol M. Shanks, president of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. He told of the potential importance of the saline water program to his home State, New Jersey. He also gave, I believe, many compelling arguments on the national need for the program.

Mr. President, a news article in the June 9 issue of the Newark Star Ledger gave some excerpts from Mr. Shanks' testimony. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE MAY BE MANY A DRY MOUTH IN NEXT 10 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—In 10 years Jerseyans may have dry mouths unless sea water is converted for drinking. Carrol M. Shanks, president of Prudential Insurance Co., told a Senate Interior Committee hearing yesterday.

Shanks said converted water from the sea is the only choice open for the State's burgeoning population and water demands.

Two reservoirs with a total capacity of 66 billion gallons authorized at a 1958 referendum will provide only stopgap relief from a critical water shortage, Shanks said.

Referring to the 1958 shortage that hit Jersey, Shanks said:

"In some areas we will be right back in the same critical water shortage within the foreseeable future—certainly within the next decade."

Shanks was among several witnesses from various States urging Congress to authorize a stepped-up search for a cheap way of converting sea water for irrigation and human consumption.

The hearing committee is examining a bill which would provide up to $20 million for expansion of the Interior Department's program of saline water conversion.

Shanks, who served as chairman of a citizens' group for the reservoir referendum in 1958, told the committee:

"In Jersey the rain goes mainly down the drain, and this seems to be the general situation because the problems of storage are difficult and expensive to solve."

Shanks said costs of converted sea water and storage of surface water are about the same. The State's new reservoirs will supply water at about 18 cents per thousand gallons wholesale. Conversion plants would handle sea water for about 22 cents per thousand gallons.

Senator WILLIAMS, who also supports the bill, said Atlantic City and Cape May are among 13 eastern cities being considered as sites for an experimental plant.

"The municipality finally selected as the site," he said, "would test a freezing process which would convert sea water to fresh at a rate of 100,000 to 500,000 gallons a day."

Mr. Jozsef Kovago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting Mr. Jozsef Kovago when he came to my district to speak under the auspices of Crusade for Freedom last month. Twice the freely elected mayor of Budapest, Mr. Kovago deeply impressed me and all those who were privileged to see and hear him.

I understand that this longtime fighter for democracy, who now resides in Wilmington, Del., will address the Federation of Women's Clubs tomorrow in the Sheraton Park Hotel here.

From my experience at Camp Kilmer in 1957 when the Hungarian refugees came to our shores, I know and will never forget the suffering they endured and the depth of their dedication to democracy. Mr. Kovago was a leader of these people. Last year he wrote a moving book about his struggles called "You Are All Alone."

That book recounts the story of Hungary from 1950 through the noble revolution of 1956, and it is at the same time the personal biography of Mr. Kovago. For more than 6 years this patriot suffered the agonies of imprisonment by the Communists—and he did not break. Released just before the outbreak of the revolution, he again placed himself in danger by working for the establishment of a multiparty system. On November 1, 1956, he was elected mayor of Budapest—the second time he had held the office—and 4 days later Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest and the revolution was crushed. With his wife and daughter, Mr. Kovago escaped to Austria.

In the years that have followed Mr. Kovago has become a leading spokesman for Hungary's case. He has told an eloquent story of his shackled, freedom-loving country in his book, in the United States and Europe, and before the United Nations.

Lessons for Marketing Men in Lung Cancer Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an article by Mr. E. B. Weiss, a recognized marketing specialist, with respect to the importance of digging into statistics rather than accepting them at face value.

Mr. Weiss' article becomes of particular significance to all of us because of the pertinency of his subject matter to the welfare of our people. All of us, I know, are familiar with the recent cancer scare attributable to cigarette smoking because some statistical evidence had indicated its prominence as a causative factor in lung cancer. Of course, from the statistical standpoint the arguments pro and con can go on forever—as the old adage has it: "There are statistics, then there are more statistics, and then there are facts."

Mr. Weiss is a recognized authority in his particular field and has made many outstanding contributions in the merchandise marketing field.

I urge each member to closely scrutinize the article because I feel it most enlightening and a source of substantial alleviation with respect to the lack of conclusiveness of statistical data tending to prove a biological problem. As Mr. Weiss so emphatically points out: "Cancer is a biological problem—not a statistical problem," and points to the quotation from a great scientist to the effect that "If biologists permit statisticians to become the arbiter of biological questions—scientific disaster is inevitable."

I feel certain that all of us will find Mr. Weiss' article most interesting:

[From Advertising Age, May 30, 1960]

ON THE MERCHANDISING FRONT—LESSONS FOR MARKETING MEN IN LUNG CANCER STATISTICS

(By E. B. Weiss)

No business subject has ever been put through a statistical mill to the same degree as the relationship (if any) between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

Now I make no pretense of knowing which side is right. I have absolutely no opinion on the subject; I'm not entitled to any.

But the statistical torrent on this subject has provided the world of marketing with a classic example of how (1) statistics can sometimes mislead and (2) how easily they can be misinterpreted.

In order to make these two points, I am being entirely one-sided—on the side of those who see no connection between lung cancer and cigarette smoking. But I do this solely to give the world of marketing a revealing illustration of the vital importance of digging deeply into statistics rather than accepting them at face value.

I therefore present in this column only the points made by eminent scientists and by eminent statisticians who are more than merely dubious that any kind of link, including the statistical, has been forged between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. (I present these observations in no particular order—and extremely abbreviated from the original documents.)

1. Why is it that deaths from all other sites of cancer (other than lung cancer) are higher for cigarette smokers than for nonsmokers? Does smoking cause bone cancer?

2. Why is it that deaths from all other causes (other than coronary and cancer) are higher for cigarette smokers? Does smoking cause deaths from meningitis?

3. Could it be that heavy cigarette smoking and the tendency to cancer are both expressions of a more fundamental cause of illness of a constitutional or hormonal nature?

4. Presumably cigarette smoking also causes cancer of the larynx. But cancer of the larynx has not increased significantly. Why not? The larynx is a gateway to the lungs.

5. Do people with different occupations have different smoking habits? If so, may differing death rates represent job differences rather than smoking differences?

6. Is it possible that the cigarette smoker may differ physically and socially from the nonsmoker? No study to date has investigated physical, social, or occupational factors. Maybe differences in these factors could account for differences in the death rate rather than smoking habits.

7. Many who would have died between 18 and 50 are now saved by modern medical science. Could this mean that a high percentage of these survivors are physically weak and thus more prone to lung cancer from all causes? (Ditto for infants who formerly died in the first year of life and who, under nature's law of survival of the fittest, were not destined to reach maturity.)

8. When mathematical adjustments are made both for growth in population and aging of the population—total cancer deaths between 1930 and 1953 showed a definite relative decrease. Yet, during this period, medical ability to detect cancer, and medical tendency to think in terms of cancer, had increased enormously.

9. A relationship of cancer, in all its aspects, to stress, to emotion, to anxieties is known to exist. Asthma is considered today to be essentially of emotional origin—and asthma is a lung ailment. The various allergies, some of which involve the lungs, are known to be essentially of emotional origin. How does all this relate to lung cancer? Could the equation be: more stress—equals more asthma—equals more lung cancer?

10. If there is a statistical increase in lung cancer, what percentage of it is traceable to more accurate diagnosis?

11. It is a well-recognized medical fact that increased publicity of a disease often produces a rise in the number of cases reported. This results both from the fantastic ability of the human to develop the symptoms of a well-publicized ailment, and from the unconscious tendency of the doctor to look for symptoms of a well-publicized ailment and to diagnose symptoms as indicating that same much publicized ailment.

12. The difference in the lung cancer rate between men and women has widened over the last 30 years—it was about 2½ times greater for men in 1930 and is now about 4½ times. Yet it was during these very years that women took up smoking by the millions.

13. Lung cancer rates are about the same in the United States, Denmark, and Switzerland. Yet the per capita consumption of cigarettes in Denmark and Switzerland is about half the rate in the United States. The English and the Welsh smoke only 70 percent of our per capita cigarette rate, but their lung cancer mortality is more than twice as great. Per capita consumption of cigarettes in New York State and in Idaho is about the same, yet the lung cancer rate in New York is four times greater than in Idaho. Smoking habits in Charlotte, N.C., are little different from those of other comparable communities; yet Charlotte has a lung cancer mortality ratio that is about one-third the national average and less than one-fourth that of some heavily industrialized areas.

14. The lungs are exposed to external environment more than any other organ. They function in a sea of known cancer-producing substances. How can air pollution be separated from cigarette smoking as a cancer causative?

15. Why is it that millions of very heavy cigarette smokers do not develop lung cancer? (Only a tiny percentage does.)

16. The death rate from all of the five major categories of causes of death is smallest among nonsmokers. Why all the emphasis on lung cancer—particularly since the death rate from all forms of cancer is high among heavy smokers? Why not point the finger at smoking as the basic cause of the five major mortality causes?

17. As for mouse-painting experiments, a man would have to smoke at least 100,000 cigaretes daily to get an equivalent exposure to his lungs. Moreover, when these mice were painted with half the dose, they did not get skin cancer—which suggests, theoretically, that man could smoke 50,000 cigarettes daily without danger of lung cancer from smoking. Certainly the one deduction must lead to the other.

18. Tobacco was once considered to be the principal offender as a causative agency in cancer of the mouth (cigars and chewing tobacco were presumably the offenders). Today, it is known that cancer of the mouth is attended by a severe nutritional deficiency and the tobacco theory has been almost totally discarded.

19. Completion of a medical course does not always eradicate unscientific concepts regarding the requirements of valid evidence. Medical doctors are no more skilled in interpreting statistics than are marketing executives—probably less so.

20. Since the vast majority of heavy smokers do not get lung cancer, isn't it possible that the tiny minority of heavy smokers who do get lung cancer may have physiological, psychological, and emotional characteristics that predispose them toward this—and other ailments? And may not the heavy smoking be an indication of the existence of these characteristics—not the cause of them?

21. There has been a growing body of evidence in the past decade or more to indicate that multiple factors are operative in setting the stage for a considerable variety of cancers in man. There is a rather small group of human cancers in which only a single environmental agent is apparent as a predisposing cause of any significance; more commonly there are two or more separate factors (frequently of entirely different nature) which combine to increase the likelihood of cancer developing in the individual. Why blame cigarettes?

22. Up until the 1930's, medical textbooks referred to a certain form of cirrhosis of the liver as being alcoholic cirrhosis. This was proved by the fact that 9 out of 10 individuals with this type of liver disease had been excessive users of alcohol over long periods of years. Now it is known that this form of cirrhosis of the liver does not have anything to do with excessive alcohol consumption but is due to a nutritional deficiency. (So stoke up on those martinis.)

23. A distinct correlation could be shown between beer drinking and rates of lung cancer. That may be no sillier than the presumed correlation between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

24. The tabulation of individuals presumably dying of lung cancer is based on death

certificates—without post mortem verification in the vast majority of cases. Death certificate identification of the cause of death is in error to the tune of perhaps 30 percent. And death certificate identification of the cause of death has its fads. Doctors are in no way immune from the current trend of thinking.

25. Seventh Day Adventists, who do not smoke, were found to have a low lung cancer rate. But—they constitute a small, special sample, which is poor statistical procedure. They also eat less fish and meat, drink less coffee and whisky. They drink more milk. They differ in other characteristics from the general population, including perhaps more freedom from stress because of their religious beliefs.

26. Cancer is a biological problem—not a statistical problem. Said a great scientist: "If biologists permit statisticians to become the arbiter of biological questions—scientific disaster is inevitable."

27. It has been found that cigarette smokers have more ulcers, divorce more often, change jobs more frequently. Amazing what the weed will do—isn't it?

28. It is obvious that many of the deaths in the earlier decades of this century, which actually were due to lung cancer, were recorded in vital statistics as due to pneumonia, influenza, tuberculosis, etc. Said one scientist: "If one will accept that this error of past decades was as little as 5 percent, this adjustment would show that there has been no real increase in lung cancer during this century."

29. And, to wrap this up, I quote Dr. Joseph Berkson, head of the section of Biometry and Medical Statistics of the Mayo Clinic, who said: "It is my personal opinion, and I know as much about it as anyone else, that smoking does not cause cancer of the lung."

Dr. Harry S. N. Greene, chairman of the Department of Pathology, Yale University School of Medicine, agrees. He challenges the whole theory that smoking causes lung cancer. "The case against tobacco is derived mostly from statistical associations and some experimental work with animals," Dr. Greene wrote: "The mere fact of a coincident increase or decrease in the frequency of given happenings does not necessarily mean that one is casually related to the other."

I still do not pretend to know whether or not there is a relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer—but I do hope that this one-sided exposition of the case will persuade marketing men to examine statistics more analytically and also more intuitively.

So, when you see a neat table of statistics which presumably makes out an air-tight case for a marketing procedure, get your eyebrows up.

Old Saying, Reworded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on June 8, 1960:

OLD SAYING, REWORDED

"Millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute," said Representative Robert Goodloe Harper in 1798. And little did he know that by 1960 it would be billions for defense, with a good hunk of it going down the rathole.

The Wall Street Journay recently carried a long list of the ridiculous places our money goes after the military spenders get their hands on it. It would be funny if it weren't so expensive—and so frightening.

The newspaper quotes a top Government official as saying that installing a few standard good management practices in the Defense Department would save $2 to $3 billion a year, and produce a better defense effort besides.

There has never been any secret about the waste involved in military spending. Most people have simply looked upon it as inevitable, which it is not. At a time when the country is going deeper and deeper into debt to keep up its gigantic Defense Establishment, military waste comes close to sabotage or treason.

"Billions for defense," we say, "but not 1 cent for waste."

The Pacific Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when President Warren S. Titus, of Orient and Pacific Lines, was invited to address the Los Angeles Advertising Club this spring, he decided to give the club's membership and the entire Nation some facts to remember.

Preparation of the address took much research because President Titus, also a director of the Pacific Area Travel Association, knew there was an important story to tell.

Growth of Pacific trade and tourism was phenomenal. It would be even greater, President Titus knew.

Because he has blended the Pacific accomplishment with the Pacific promise so well, I ask unanimous consent that the address made by President Titus be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF SEA TRAVEL

(Address by Warren S. Titus, president, Orient & Pacific Lines Agency, Inc., and a director, the Pacific Area Travel Association, before the Los Angeles Advertising Club, Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., April 5, 1960)

A NEW CONCEPT OF SEA TRAVEL

Since time immemorial man has been on the move. In the beginning his movements were motivated to a large degree by such things as war, pestilence, and persecution.

This movement occurred despite overwhelming odds. Fear, superstition, and primitive transportation facilities made it nearly impossible for man to move from place to place at will.

Today millions of people are moving over the face of the globe with an ease never known in the history of mankind.

These people are motivated by the need for knowledge, or by the spirit of adventure. While some travel for special needs such as business, others do so simply to escape the humdrum of a drab life and search for sheer fun and romance.

Until the early thirties intercontinental travel was of necessity by sea and vessels of those days were operated accordingly. The emphasis was on transportation pure and simple, and only the wealthy could afford to live at sea in the manner they were accustomed to in their homes.

With the advent of air travel an entire new era of transportation was opened, which in turn had a tremendous impact on sea travel.

No longer were steamship operators required to gear their facilities to the simple act of transporting people from point A to point B.

Those who wanted to get there in a hustling hurry could travel by air and still can and do. But the steamship became more than means of transportation. It became an extension of the traveler's home. It became a resort hotel as well.

Today steamship operators find themselves in the position of providing transportation, of course, but much more—a vacation afloat.

THE FUTURE OF SEA TRAVEL

We sea carriers have complete confidence in the future of ocean travel.

As an indication of the measure of confidence our company, Orient & Pacific Lines, has in sea travel, we are translating our confidence into investment.

Next year we will add two new superliners to our fleet of seven modern passenger ships already operating between the North American west coast and the Orient and Australia.

These liners are presently being built in the United Kingdom by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. and Orient Line which together operate Orient & Pacific Lines as a joint service. They are the largest ships to be built there since the *Queen Elizabeth*.

Our colleagues at Matson Lines, in the oceanic division which services Australia, tell me they have 17 percent more reservations on their books for the first 6 months of this year than last year.

Matson's confidence in the development of the Pacific is seen in its two beautiful liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey* which were put in the line's South Pacific service 3½ years ago.

In addition Matson has the *Lurline* and the *Matsonia*—well known and extremely popular with the visitors to Hawaii.

American President Lines has the *President Cleveland*, the *President Wilson*, and the *President Hoover*, and is currently negotiating for a fourth vessel to be added to the line's Pacific fleet. (I am sure that you have all read of APL's proposed new superliner the *President Washington*.)

Our confidence in the continuing popularity of sea travel is shared by shipping companies around the world. More than 30 major vessels are either presently under construction or awaiting funds or are on the drafting boards.

In spite of the fact that we are in the steamship business, I must bring up the jets.

They are shrinking the Pacific amazingly and bringing trips across the ocean within the reach of million of persons who would have never had the time for such a trip.

The traveler has never had it so good. The jets provide not only speed of themselves but a perfect complement to the wonderful leisure of sea travel.

We steamship people welcome the jets. Both sea and air have their place in the travel picture of the Pacific—in fact of the world.

Fly one way, sail the other has become a commonplace byword in the travel agency business.

I am indebted to Bill Meeske of Matson Lines for a little story that illustrates perfectly one's point of view on jet travel.

A middle aged couple called on their local travel agent who extolled the wonders of jet

flying. After suffering in silence for some time the wife, fixing the agent with a beady eye, said:

"We've waited 25 years to make this trip, and we're certainly not interested in getting there in any 6½ hours."

To put it another way, there is plenty of room for both the speed of the jet and the leisure fun and comfort of a modern passenger liner.

THE PACIFIC BOOM

We have a tremendous confidence in the future of the Pacific area. Here on the West coast we are not only living on the edge of the greatest ocean on our planet, but we are also living on the threshold of a tremendous area development.

The Pacific is booming.

A few years ago that sentence would have referred solely to the boom of high explosives as our men and our Pacific fleets battled out the Pacific end of World War II. And a little later it would have referred to the greatest boom our earth had ever known—the boom of the atomic devices set off in remote areas of the Pacific.

But today no area of the Pacific is remote and the boom I speak of is the kind we associate with the business pages of our newspapers—economic boom—trade with the countries which border the Pacific, foreign investment and the enormous boom in oversea travelers which has taken place since the war.

Newsweek magazine has called the Pacific the world's greatest potential market. And back in 1950 author James Michener, one of the greatest Pacific travelers since Captain Cook said, "I can foresee the day when the passage of goods and people and ideas across the Pacific will be of greater importance to America than the similar exchange across the Atlantic."

We are entering the Age of the Pacific.

Less than 200 years ago Captain Cook was the first traveler to discover the Pacific. Today travelers are discovering the Pacific at the rate of more than a million per year, of whom 400,000 are Americans.

Pleasure travel to the Pacific has increased 136 percent within the past 5 years—twice Europe's rate of tourist growth.

According to figures released by the Pacific Area Travel Association there was a 27-percent increase in Pacific visitors in 1959 over 1958 and a 35-percent increase in visitor expenditures in the 22 countries, states, and islands that make up the membership of that association.

In fact the growth of travel in the Pacific has been so great that some problems have developed as a result. The development of hotel facilities is a prime project for Pacific developers. At present there are 10,000 new hotel rooms under construction or on the drawing boards with an estimated 18,000 more required by 1965. Fortunately various interests are hard at work now to meet this situation.

The Pacific is exerting an ever-growing fascination for Americans. We are influenced here at home by such things as architecture, interior decoration, food, and fashions of the various Pacific countries. Here on the west coast especially we are fond of decorating with Japanese shoji screens. Hong Kong brocade coats for the ladies have enjoyed a vogue, and I don't have to describe to you the many influences of the Hawaiian Islands.

I notice that in our group here today are quite a few of my friends in the travel agency business. It is not difficult or necessary to point out ways and means for them to take advantage of the age of the Pacific.

Sunset magazine tells us that the Far West is the biggest source of visitors to the entire Pacific area. Passport figures show this also.

Not only are all Pacific carriers, both sea and air, actively promoting the Pacific area, but the Pacific Area Travel Association, has been carrying out an aggressive campaign inviting the traveler to turn his eyes westward.

I recently attended the annual Pacific Area Travel Conference, held this year in Christchurch, New Zealand, where that association voted a new advertising budget continuing a campaign begun a year and a half ago. With the ad campaign there will be one of the strongest and most effective merchandising programs ever to have been used in the travel industry.

Here is an excellent opportunity for the travel agent to tie in with his own allied, Pacific, promotional plans.

Much of this interest in the Pacific can be traced back to the end of the war when thousands of GI's returned home from there.

After the war, too, GI's were stationed in Japan, one of the loveliest countries in the world. Many others were exposed to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, many of the Pacific islands, and that fabulous city, Hong Kong.

The GI's of the 1940's and 1950's are family men now and a large percentage of them, when they think of traveling, wax a little nostalgic and think of the Pacific.

When most of us think of travelers, the image which springs to mind is one of carefree holiday makers enjoying a vacation trip—cameras slung over their shoulders and money in their pockets.

But we tend to overlook the fact that international travel brings manifold benefits. Not the least of these benefits is a mingling of national cultures, with the ordinary people of one country associating on a friendly basis with those of another. This is communications on a person-to-person basis, of which transportation becomes the catalyst.

The traveler is on a holiday, certainly. But wherever he goes his mind is busy absorbing impressions of his fellow man at work and at play.

His camera records impressions of people and places which reach a wide audience among his friends at home.

Even his money buys much more than transport and accommodations. In return for it he also gains indelible memories of friendships made in foreign countries of pleasant experiences and the knowledge that basically, men everywhere are much the same. I am compelled to add that this is particularly true when one travels by ship.

In this way each traveler plays his part in developing international understandings. When the individual communications contribution is magnified to the scale of the entire travel industry, a great benefit is gained.

Vacationers have also made their contribution to foreign trade and in business travel to the Pacific. Many a traveler has visited a Pacific country and come away convinced of a business opportunity he could develop.

(Incidentally, the *Himalaya*, which docked this morning in Long Beach is equipped with radio-telephone service for the busy executive who can call from the privacy of his cabin anywhere in the world.)

NEED FOR A NEW CONCEPT OF TOURISM

So far I have been directing my remarks regarding Pacific travel along a single route—from East to West across the Pacific. But travel goes two ways.

And what is the travel picture along this two-way street?

Well, in 1959, U.S. expenditure for foreign travel totaled $2.3 billion.

That same year travelers who came to the United States spent only $825 million.

The difference represents a large portion of our adverse foreign trade balance of $4 billion.

Americans spent $165 million in the Pacific while visitors from the Pacific spent less than $30 million here.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, a strong exponent of travel to the United States, called attention recently to the fact that this travel dollar gap, unlike the other elements in our total trade picture, becomes consistently worse every year.

In 1949 it amounted to $360 million, by 1953 it had jumped to $447 million, and by 1958 it had climbed to $886 million.

It appears obvious that while there has been enormous success in encouraging Americans to travel abroad, we are lagging to a great measure in encouraging visitors to this country.

Our entire Nation has a stake in the attraction of visitors to the United States but in a city such as Los Angeles—a gateway city of the Pacific—the stake is dramatically emphasized.

Visitor expenditures have a tremendous economic impact as evidenced by the extreme competition between countries for the traveler.

One authority estimates that the travel dollar has an economic value 3.2 times the initial expenditure. It is apparent that the carriers and travel agents are not the only beneficiaries of travel spending.

Hawaii has done an interesting study of what happens to part of the visitor's dollar in Hawaii and has come up with the following breakdown:

	Percent
Lodging	25.4
Clothing	10.1
Gifts and souvenirs	10.7
Food	32.0
Beverages	6.8
Domestic transportation (that is, air, rail, and auto)	7.5
Personal care (drugs, cosmetics, etc.)	3.5
Photography	2.0

I will not enumerate the balance, but this will give you an idea of how the dollar spreads through the community. In addition Hawaii found that out of visitor expenditures, of $100 million, $18 million found its way into the State tax coffers.

Incidentally, Hawaii, our 50th State, with a population of only 650,000, spends approximately $1 million annually to attract visitors. As a result, the travel industry surpassed pineapple growing in 1959 to become Hawaii's second largest industry, next to sugar.

In addition to travel spending, the passenger ships that come into the twin harbors of Los Angeles and Long Beach pour millions of dollars into the economy of southern California each year, as do the airliners, that land at southern California airports.

I suggested a little earlier in my remarks that the American traveler wherever he goes, absorbs impressions of his fellow man at work and play. Each American visitor plays his part in the development of international understandings.

This, too, works both ways. Our international neighbors who visit here are viewing Americans on their home ground. There is nothing like seeing for one's self. Every visitor to our country is able to see for himself what we Americans are like.

In order to correct this imbalance in our trade picture in which travel figures so prominently we must sell America.

How can we do this?

FIVE PROPOSALS

Well, I would like to propose to you today five ways in which we can aid in encouraging visitors to come to the United States.

First. The international carriers, both sea and air, must recognize the problem and through the use of our oversea offices and agents actively promote tourism to this country.

To date the emphasis has been to sell the world to America. We now have to sell America to the world.

(I might note here that recently I read in the Travel Gazette, that in London, Trans World Airlines opened what amounts to the first U.S.A. tourist information office that has ever existed. It is a private enterprise venture in selling America. TWA is certainly to be commended for this important step.)

Second. The U.S. Government must take a continuing and aggressive interest in the developing of U.S. tourism through the establishment of a governmental tourist bureau with money and power.

Last year President Eisenhower proclaimed 1960 Visit the U.S.A. Year. All over the Nation citizens' committees are active in the promotion of the United States as a travel destination. But Visit the U.S.A. Year is only one promotional effort in the overall problem of attracting visitors to our Nation.

Many other positive steps have been proposed to encourage the oversea visitor.

For example, Senator MAGNUSON, Chairman of the U.S. Senate's Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has introduced a bill in Congress which if passed will establish an office of International Travel and Tourism with a travel advisory board composed of 12 nongovernmental members.

I understand the bill also established a budget of $5 million and the office would be charged with the responsibility of encouraging travel to this country.

It has also been reported that Senator JAVITS of New York has a similar bill prepared for introduction. The bill is designed to promote the foreign policy of the United States by facilitating and encouraging travel by citizens of friendly foreign countries to and within the United States, and by citizens of the United States to such countries.

Third. Is the facilitation of travel through relaxation of Government restrictions, such as visa requirements, tax clearance, foreign exchange controls and customs barriers. We have our share of these restrictions and while there have been recent improvements, there is still much to be done.

Fourth. I mentioned earlier the tremendous economic benefits gateway cities such as Los Angeles derive from visitors, but I feel that along with these benefits goes responsibility—responsibility to see that the visitors to America have a good first and last impression of our country and our people. This can be accomplished in a number of ways, not the least of which are courtesy and the maintaining of a high standard of business conduct in those areas most directly exposed to visitors.

Fifth and last. We must carry out an active educational program in this country so that the Americans we send abroad will be ambassadors of good will. If our oversea neighbors are favorably impressed with the American visitor abroad they will be encouraged to come to the United States and visit him on his home ground.

This of course, is something that is up to all of us as individuals. The U.S. Passport Agency has a fine booklet advising travelers abroad in their relations with people of other countries. But greater effort should be put into educating our people to be good ambassadors abroad. This can be accomplished by the joint effort of the Government, our schools, the travel industry, and civic minded groups.

THE CHALLENGE

Herein is the challenge to you in the communications industry. No group is better equipped to perform this.

First, discover the Pacific. The potential to all of us is tremendous.

Second, aid in rectifying this imbalance of tourism between the United States and our oversea neighbors by making visitors to the United States welcome and by showing our neighbors a proper and friendly face when abroad. Your participation in this important progam will not only contibute to the economic well-being of the United States but will also bring you the satisfaction of contributing to the improvement of international relations.

Dixon on Trujillo's Downfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by George Dixon which appeared in the Washington Post today. His story has a familiar ring to those who have followed the decline and fall of dictatorships:

VISIT TO TRUJILLO'S POLICE STATE
(By George Dixon)

Former handholders and patticake-players with Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo are now returning from the Dominican Republic with confidential assurances that the arrogant old despot can't last another 60 days. Having observed the workings of his unconscionable tyranny down there I wonder what's taking so long.

My informants tell me Trujillo knows his days are numbered and has taken the precautions customary with dictators who see the handwriting on the wall. They say he has gotten millions out of the country and has only to get himself out safely too to become another exile in looted luxury.

My informants also tell me that they are sure his escape plans call for seeking haven in the United States. His pitch for sanctuary will be that he was a bulwark against communism. About the only thing Trujillo has been a bulwark against is human decency.

If you have never been to the Dominican Republic you can't imagine the kind of police state it is. I went down there a couple of years ago with a young woman named Ymelda and found the people so conditioned to accepting everything without question they didn't even question her name, which the peoples of the free world find incredible.

Before we were allowed to land in Ciudad Trujillo, a burly young fellow boarded the plane. He introduced himself as Jose Carbonel. "Call me 'Joe'," he added overheartily. He said he was from the Dominican Tourist Bureau.

"If he's a tourist guide I'm crazy," whispered Ymelda, who may be unpronounceable but not crazy. "He's got cop written all over him."

"Joe" Carbonel said the Tourist Bureau had reserved a room for us at the Jaragua. He said he'd take us there. I said we'd like to look at the town first. He said we'd go to the hotel.

We went to the hotel. We told Carbonel we had known Trujillo's daughter, Flor when she was Minister Counselor at the Dominican Embassy in Washington and asked what had become of her. He ignored the question in both my imperfect English and Ymelda's perfect Spanish.

We tried to be crafty. We told Carbonel we were going to our room to rest a couple of hours. We waited until we figured he had gone, then sneaked back to the lobby. He met us at the foot of the steps.

For the whole of our stay in the country, on the south coast, north coast, plains and mountains, we never succeeded in shaking him once although we tried every scheme we could think of. The only time Carbonel did not have us under direct surveillance was when we were in our room—and we caught him standing watch in the corridor a couple of times.

Carbonel said the Tourist Bureau would be glad to facilitate transmission of my column. Instead of entrusting it to him, however, I slipped it every day to a fellow American who was leaving the country, to be mailed on touching U.S. soil. I was happy to note that this drove Carbonel almost berserk with frustration.

We kept asking about Flor Trujillo. Carbonel could never get the name. Finally a bartender whispered she had gotten loaded one night and kicked out a couple of lights in the bar. Her father put the Jaragua out of bounds for her.

Everywhere we went, under guard, Carbonel kept up a steady patter about the wonderful things the "Benefactor" had done for the country. He said before Trujillo the peopled lived in squalor. Now their homes were all so spotless you could eat off the floor.

To demonstrate, he drove us past rows of huts. In front of each sat children in pristine white, all starched and ironed. Ymelda remarked you would never find children in the United States all dressed up at 2 o'clock of a schoolday afternoon.

When we got back to the hotel I told Carbonel I though we would take a taxi and go take another look at the frilly kids. He said there wasn't a car of any sort to be had.

There wasn't. The normally car-jammed court of the Jaragua was empty of all transportation.

Telephone and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the House recently failed, unfortunately, to eliminate the telephone tax from the excise tax extension bill, in spite of the fact that a number of us made a very determined effort to bring about this change even under the "gag' rule under which the measure was presented to the House. Fortunately the issue of the telephone tax is not yet dead, however. Only today the Finance Committee of the other body voted to eliminate the telephone tax, as well as the transportation tax, from the excise measure. I am still hopeful therefore, that before the bill emerges from Congress in its final form the telephone tax will have been eliminated.

Something of the effect of this tax can be gained from a reading of a thoughtful editorial which appeared recently in the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, and under leave to extend my remarks I include that editorial:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder]

TELEPHONES AND TAXES

There is a note of painful irony in the approach Congress is taking to two closely

related questions. On the same day that the House began debate on a $975 million Federal school-aid bill, its Ways and Means Committee voted to retain the $350 million telephone tax, instead of dropping it so that States which so desire could levy it for support of their schools.

So, on the same day, the House was told that the Federal Government needs revenue so badly that it can't afford to surrender the telephone tax, and that States need school aid so badly that it may be necessary to provide $975 million in Federal funds for that.

We have opposed the telephone tax on the grounds that it is discriminatory and un-American. We still feel that way about it.

But it does seem that if Congress actually wants to help the States improve their schools the way to do it would be by repealing the telephone tax. In New York State this would provide $70 million worth of the most direct aid to education.

Even in those States which chose not to levy the telephone tax for school support, the people would benefit from comparable sums in tax relief. This would enable them to carry the tax burden for school support through local taxes levied in other ways.

New Yorkers have a particular interest in this. Of the $350 million Uncle Sam collects in telephone taxes, $70 million comes from our State. But under the proposed Federal school aid plan we would receive only $44 million. In other words, New York would get almost twice as much from repeal of the telephone tax as it would under the Senate version of the aid-to-education bill.

If it keeps the telephone tax and passes a school-aid bill, Congress will, in effect, be taxing New Yorkers for the benefit of other States. Our representatives in both House and Senate should do everything they can to prevent this from happening. They may not succeed, but they certainly do not have to vote for it or profess to be unaware of what is taking place.

A Time for Extra Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a season for graduation at all levels in education—grade school, high school, and college.

Unfortunately, not every graduate received the kind of challenging stimulation given those in Seattle University's graduating class.

The date was June 3, 1960. Speaker was Richard E. Berlin, president of Hearst Corp. Into his remarks went a wealth of personal experience, and observation; the formula for success as Richard Berlin had discovered it through perseverance and diligence.

Conferred upon Richard Berlin was a richly deserved doctor of laws degree. He, in turn, imparted the sage advice, outlined the specific objectives and offered to those graduating from Seattle University and other colleges across the Nation the needed help which is contained in his address.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Berlin's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY RICHARD E. BERLIN, PRESIDENT, HEARST CORP., AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, SEATTLE UNIVERSITY, SEATTLE, WASH., JUNE 3, 1960

Your Excellency, Archbishop Connolly, Very Reverend Father Lemieux, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers, devoted Sisters, distinguished faculty, members of the graduating class, parents, and friends, I am happy to be a member of the class of 1960, although I am a little old for such a distinction.

I was asked to make a commencement address. I am, of course, not an orator and you will not hear an oration. I am a publisher and business executive of newspapers, magazines, radio and television properties, not an intellectual, not a philosopher, not a politician; just a simple businessman and white-collar worker like most of your fathers. Therefore, perhaps I was brought to you under the false pretense that I would tell you something that would elevate your spirit and how to leave this hall and immediately become a great man because you have a college degree.

Frankly, I would not know how to say that. It has not been my experience. In the trade with which I am associated, it has been traditional that those who succeed work hard along a thorny path. Many start; few reach the top. I cannot give you the comfort that it is easy to go from rags to riches. Quite the contrary; with our present tax structure, it is much easier to go from riches to rags.

I do not want to mar your day by seeming to be so pessimistic. In my business, we give employment to thousands of writers, reporters, short-story writers, novelists, editors, business administrators, cartoonists, artists, and specialized columnists. We seek them out more avidly than a Hollywood talent scout hunts for future stars. We watch young men, like yourselves, fresh out of college, emerge into authors of note, or experts on particular subjects. We are always in need of new talent and there is always room at the top.

But we cannot take anyone at his own valuation. You would be surprised how good most writers think they are until their work is rejected. The really competent person does not become discouraged. He never quits. He works harder and harder until he clicks.

You may hear that so-and-so got the breaks. He knew somebody who knows somebody who knows a man who can give him a break. Of course, that does happen. You know it as well as I do. But can the fellow last?

In our business, where we deal with black type on white paper, there are no alibis. The stuff is printed and there it stands for the whole world to read. It is too late to cover up. It is too late for an alibi. There are the words; there is the result of his work and his genius.

The point I want to make to you is that these are difficult times you are moving into and I, for one, am glad that they are difficult. I say that because it is in such times that it is possible to discover real ability and real talent. What does it mean to have real ability? It means the will and the capacity to work hard—not 35 hours a week or 40 hours a week or 56 hours a week, but as long as it takes to do a job so competently that it attracts attention.

I do not wish to mention names or show favoritism, but in our organization we have some remarkable people. We sell the intellectual product of men and women. We do not sell the products of steel or copper or fabrics; we sell the mental outpourings in words and drawings of men and women who must attract readers or we do not need them. Some of our writers attract as man as 20 million readers a day.

They are the hardest working people I know anywhere. They work all the time. You see them at a dinner party. They seem to be having a good time but they are storing up ideas and incidents which they will research. They read a novel and a thought comes to them. One of them can pursue such a thought for months until he has found the data to establish its truth. One goes to a fashion show not only to look, but to write a description in such detail that it represents absolute experience. One watches the march of international relations, reading a vast amount of material, reading day and night, meeting important people, training his memory so that he does not forget what is said. One reporter I know has never used a notebook in his long career. He depends entirely on a trained memory.

I can go on for hours telling you what men do to succeed in our business: But it all comes down to one word. That word is work.

I have said often, success is the result of 85 percent perspiration and 15 percent inspiration.

This country was not built by security and leisure; it was built by risk and work. Certainly those of you who live in this fine State of Washington descend from daring men and women who braved a wilderness to reach the great Pacific Northwest. These men and women did not worry about their leisure, or their security, or the breaks in life. They had enormous confidence in themselves and in the future of their country and they went to work to prove that their confidence was not misplaced. They built a wonderful civilization here and it was not done by miracles or breaks; it is the result of risk and work.

Some young men who come to see me about jobs these days often ask about the fringe benefits, about how much vacation they will get with pay, about what their chances are to advance by seniority. I cannot help but feel that these young men lack confidence in themselves; that they are more interested in the protection of the mediocrity than in the opportunity to seek advancement through hard work and ability. I say this to you to emphasize the importance of individual initiative. It is not intended as any reflection on the unions for the gains they have achieved for the working man and woman. I well realize the good they have done in helping to raise the standard of living of the workers. I recall when Mr. Hearst first championed the union movement in this country with Samuel Gompers. No group of newspapers supported organized labor more strongly than the Hearst newspapers did in those days when unionism was in its infancy. Today we respect those unions who leaders honestly represent the interests of the rank and file members and who show a sense of responsibility for the welfare of the properties that provide well-paid employment for the workers. We welcome the members of such unions into our organization, and we offer them complete equality of opportunity to move ahead.

All must take their chances with other men, the college graduates as well as those who may not have been forunate enough to get a college education. College graduates sometimes think that a bachelor of arts degree entitles a man to a job, that a master of arts is a dead cinch and that a doctor of philosophy ought to bring a byline or an editor or publisher's assignment.

Truth to tell, the degrees are just the word "commencement" means. You have an excellent background. You have learned many things. You remember some of them. You have assimilated some wisdom. Now you must begin to learn to apply your knowledge

to life. And life is a very tough master. It compels you to prove your capabilities.

Today we live in an international society. We are closer to other countries than we ever were in our history. Here in Seattle, in the past, there was always an association with Canada and a friendly rivalry with Vancoover. Now, Seattle is only a short distance from Tokyo and across the North Pole to Paris.

What this destruction of distance will do, we really do not know. There are some who believe that because distance is being annihilated, people know other people better than before. Do they? Do we, for instance, know Soviet Russia better than we knew czarist Russia? The Soviet regime has organized Russia into a power not only to conquer the world but to destroy the religious civilization which is the basis of our way of life. Do we understand the Soviet communists? Do we recognize the peril of international communism's hatred for the United States? Do they hate us because we are capitalists or because we acknowledge the supremacy of God?

For more than a century, American ships sailed from this country to China, first from Salem, Mass., and then from all the eastern ports. In time, Seattle picked up this trade and a constant service was set up between Yokohama, Shanghai, Hong Kong, and other ports with Seattle, Vancouver, and San Francisco. I recall the beautiful President ships that sailed out of this harbor and I recall the pride of Capt. Robert Dollar in this important Asiatic trade.

But do you understand how it could come to be that the Chinese people whom we aided and benefited for over a century, whom we protected after the Boxer Rebellion, whom we safeguarded when Russia and other countries tried to partition their country, which we guarded with John Hay's Open Door policy, to which we sent missionaries to educate and help medically millions of people—can you explain why this same country turned on us, imprisons our sons, violates priests, nuns, and ministers of the gospel, abuses our flag and expresses hate for us?

The shortness of distance has thus far not improved human relations. Perhaps as the years go by, it will all be different but today an American must recognize that his country is still the envy of the world, that what your parents and mine have achieved hereby their work is still the grandest structure of human rights and human freedom ever known to man and that to preserve these and also our way of material life, we need to labor valiantly, each in his own way.

Idleness, laziness, featherbedding, waste, the tendency to try to get the most and give the least—these are our most dangerous diseases. These can destroy America. They are the termites eating into and rotting the foundations of our society.

I hope you will prove immune to them. I hope you will show the courage and the spirit reflected in an editorial I read recently. This editorial was not written by Horace Greeley or William Randolph Hearst. It was written by a young man in Cuba whose name is hardly known elsewhere, but whom history will surely record as one of the great patriots of his country.

I know this young man's father, who was a fearless fighter for the principles of democracy. His son seemed to be a mild-mannered, unemotional young man. Yet the editorial he recently wrote at the risk of his life glows with the courage that has inspired the spirit of freedom in mankind throughout history.

I am going to read to you a free translation of pertinent excerpts from this editorial which was written by Jose I. Rivera, editor and publisher of Diario de la Marina in Havana, Cuba, and published on Passion Sunday, April 3, 1960. I believe you will be pleased to know that such a courageous fighter for political freedom exists in Cuba today. The editorial is entitled "With God and My Conscience." The editorial reads:

"Christ came upon this earth to redeem men. Human beings are not perfect but they will come closer to perfection if they live according to the dictates of their conscience, in accordance with the will of God. This is written from the heart as well as the intellect. It comes naturally to a writer when he writes what he knows he ought to write. Courage is to stand fast and to make a sacrifice if necessary, for the sake of justice. Cowardice is to abandon justice because of the risk entailed. The task of an editorial writer is always risky but more so in these times in our land when passions blind those who wish to gain advantages by creating chaos. It is the writer's job to fight with the pen.

"In these difficult times, it would be easier to remain silent about things which do not please us and which violate justice. Communism is a dangerous and a deadly enemy. The Diaro de la Marina is not so much interested in physical health and safety and neither am I. We are interested in moral health. I am young but I have already suffered and I remain faithful to my principles and ideals. Only God and my conscience guide me. This newspaper is the same.

"We wish to devote our lives to the defense of our most precious rights—our liberty, our faith, and our ideals. If these are made to disappear, all that remains will be of little value. We must sacrifice even our lives, if such sacrifice becomes necessary, and we must do so that men can remain free, to believe in God and enjoy the benefits of modern civilization in a spirit of thankfulness to Him to whom we owe all."

"For us the triumph of materialism, atheism, hatred, spoils, persecution, and communism would be worse than death. This newspaper is trying to defend Cuba against these evils.

"We are Catholics and we cannot reconcile our Roman, Apostolic Catholicism with Russian atheism.

"I do not look for danger but I will face it if and when it appears. I am on a crusade without fear." End of editorial.

This paper was confiscated by the Castro government on May 12. I understand my friend, Jose I. Rivera is alive, under the protection of a foreign Embassy in Havana.

The author of this editorial is a young man who I believe was trained by the Jesuit Fathers. Their teaching obviously took root and has yielded fruit. His philosophy of life leads me to express to you one final thought.

I began speaking to you of worldly and material things. They are proper things of which to think and speak because we must live our lives among worldly and material things. They are, however, merely means to an end. I am no moralist and I would not suggest that anyone pattern his life after mine, but I have lived long enough and observed enough to know that there is no substitute for good character.

You have just concluded 4 years of intense training under the guidance of the Jesuit Fathers, the last two of which have been devoted in large part to the study of philosophy, which enables man better to seek and to know the truth. Sometimes the highly educated become lost in a maze of learning, which they are unable to relate to the task of everyday living, and sometimes they use their learning to rationalize and justify wrongful acts. In either case, such people lose track of fundamental principles. At the end of your student days and the commencement of your life in the world, I ask you to remember what you learned as a child—that you were created for the greater glory of God, and that which necessarily follows—the salvation of your own soul. These are the ends to which all material things are a means. Anything which tends to swerve you from those ends, however pleasant or gratifying, must be put out of your lives if you are to attain success.

If the class of 1960 runs true to form, a few—and thank God only a few—will forsake the ideals with which you are all now imbued and either forget or deliberately subvert the eternal and immutable laws of God and the laws and regulations of His vicar on earth. When the final accounting takes place, these will be the failures among you, and all the others, however insignificant their material accomplishments and however humble their status in life, will be the successes. So I say to you keep ever in your thoughts and actions the motto of Saint Ignatius, the founder of the Society of Jesus, "To the greater glory of God"—"ad majorem Dei gloriam." Thank you.

Minority Views on Compulsory Old-Age Annuities Expressed in 74th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, since the very beginning of the program for old-age and survivors insurance, warnings have been sounded that such a program is of dubious constitutionality and that the basis upon which the program was planned was unsound. It may be well for us to review some of these early warnings, the logic of which have never been disputed, merely ignored. Under permission to extend my remarks, I call your attention to the following statement by minority members of the Ways and Means Committee to the first report on social security. This statement is taken from House Report No. 615 of the 74th Congress, 1st session, on the social security bill:

COMPULSORY OLD-AGE ANNUITIES

The bill is separated into several titles. Title II provides for compulsory old-age annuities, and title VIII provides the method by which the money is to be raised to meet the expense thereof.

The two titles are interdependent, and neither is of any consequence without the other. Neither of them has relation to any other substantive title of the bill. Neither is constitutional. Therein lies one of the reasons for our opposition to them.

The Federal Government has no power to impose this system upon private industry.

The best legal talent that the Attorney General's office and the brain trust could marshal has for weeks applied itself to the task of trying to bring these titles within constitutional limitations. Their best effort is only a plain circumvention. They have separated the proposition into two titles. This separation is a separation in words only. There is no separation in spirit or intent. These two titles must stand or fall together.

The learned brief submitted by the Attorney General's office contains in its summation the following, weak, apologetic language:

"There may also be taken into consideration the strong presumption which exists in favor of the constitutionality of an act of the Congress, in the light of which and of the foregoing discussion, it is reasonably

safe to assume that the social security bill, if enacted into law, will probably be upheld as constitutional."

We also oppose these two titles because they would not in any way contribute to the relief of present economic conditions, and might in fact retard economic recovery.

The original bill contained a title providing for voluntary annuities. This was another attempt to place the Government in competition with private business. Under fire, this title has been omitted. It was closely akin to title II. In fact, it had one virtue that title II does not possess in that it was voluntary while title II is compulsory. These titles impose a crushing burden upon industry and upon labor. They establish a bureaucracy in the field of insurance in competition with private business.

The minority membership of the Ways and Means Committee have at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure that would be constitutional and that would inure to the general welfare of all the people.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.
ISAAC BACHARACH.
FRANK CROWTHER.
HAROLD KNUTSON.
DANIEL A. REED.
ROY O. WOODRUFF.
THOMAS A. JENKINS.

House Joint Resolution 757

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, "As the District of Columbia goes, so goes the Nation" could very easily become the new political slogan.

The only reservation I had with respect to House Joint Resolution 757 was that if the District of Columbia is granted the privilege of voting for President and Vice President and the election returns were broadcast while the polls were still open in the States to the west, the outcome of the election could very easily be affected. With the difference in time from here to Hawaii and the fact that the majority of people go to the polls in the late afternoon and evening, the returns of a Presidential election in the Capital of the Nation—the Federal city—could have a tremendous psychological effect upon the results elsewhere in the Nation.

To those people who have never been in Washington and know nothing about its citizens or the compact nature of its population, together with their attitude of hostility toward the occupant of the White House regardless of his political affiliation, the vote in the District could be controlling. This unprecedented situation should be desired by no one.

A study of the resolution, together with the committee report and the explanation by the able chairman, plus the colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], both members of the Judiciary Committee and able lawyers, have resolved this question to my complete satisfaction. The debate this afternoon has made it clear that Congress would have the power to prohibit the counting of the ballots or the totaling of them on voting machines until after the polls had closed in our most western State. It is also clear that Congress would have such power and authority to determine when the results of a presidential election in the District of Columbia would be made public.

No doubt House Joint Resolution 757 will receive early approval by the Congress and will be signed by the President. The critical hurdle will be to secure the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures on the proposed amendment within the 7-year period.

Many State legislators might very well oppose the adoption of the amendment were they not cognizant of the fact that the Congress could postpone the release of the District of Columbia returns until the last American had cast his ballot. The debate this afternoon should resolve all doubt as to the congressional power in this regard.

The Committee on the Judiciary and its great and sincere chairman deserve much credit for the measure now about to be approved by the House, and the rapidity with which House Joint Resolution 757 was brought to the floor for consideration. The distinguished chairman and the members of the Rules Committee are to be commended for their expeditious consideration.

The prompt action by these two outstanding committees, composed of members from different sections of the country and of different psychological viewpoints, demonstrates the desire and purpose of this body that no American should be denied the right to vote for the two highest offices in the land.

I am sure the vote in both bodies, Mr. Chairman, will be practically unanimous, and I join with my fellow Members in hoping that the requisite number of States act within the prescribed time.

The AMA, as Usual, Is Running Day Late, Dollar Short, on Proposed Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in the following brief editorial from the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of June 4, 1960. It reflects again the concern which exists across the Nation relative to the problem of medical care for our older people. It also reflects the disappointment which many of us feel that organizations such as the American Medical Association have not devoted more time to the formulation and presentation of constructive proposals and less time to blind opposition.

The article follows:

THE AMA, AS USUAL, IS RUNNING DAY LATE, DOLLAR SHORT, ON PROPOSED HEALTH BILL

This being an election year, some sort of national health insurance bill will probably be passed, the most prominent candidate right now being the Forand bill.

Aside from the merits of the Forand bill, or the proposed administration substitute, one thing is clear: the doom-criers of the American Medical Association have no one but themselves to blame if the bill is not to their liking.

More than a year ago, in discussions of health insurance at that time, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Arthur S. Flemming suggested that a bill be postponed for a while to see what the private segment of the medical insurance business, namely the doctors and insurance companies, could come up with.

The AMA, instead of, first, realizing the time for evading this question was past, and, second, presenting a program for more extended medical care of its own volition, chose to fight the whole idea of planned medical assistance to those who need it. All the old "socialism" cliches, shelved since the fight against Truman's health insurance program in 1950, were dusted off for reuse. We shall probably hear more of them before some Federal bill is finally passed.

Time, however, and the needs of old persons, wait for no man. The medical association would be performing a much greater service to the cause it affects to promote if it were to acknowledge the need for greatly expanded health services, and assist the Government in producing the best program for that purpose.

Federal Aid to Distressed Areas Is Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware the whole matter of depressed areas was thoroughly explored and debated during our recent House approval of the aid-to-depressed-areas bill and I am not going to, at this hour, unnecessarily belabor the subject.

The Department of Labor officially testified to the existence of multitudinous pockets of economic distress and decline throughout the country and we have our unhappy share of them in the New England region and within my own home State of Massachusetts. It has been demonstrated that the economic distress in these areas cannot be alleviated by the resources of area industries and municipal authority, alone.

Unfortunately the President saw fit to veto the bill to extend these areas Federal aid and the Congress did not override the veto. However, the President did express his hope "that suitable legislation would be enacted at this session of the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, on that hope, and in that spirit, I most earnestly urge that the leadership, together with administration representatives, will work out compromise legislation that can be presented and acted upon by the Congress before adjournment.

Minority Views on the Compulsory Social Insurance System—81st Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. In a further study of the history of the social security program, I would like to call to the attention of the Members some of the thinking contained in the minority views to H.R. 6000, a bill passed by the 81st Congress, increasing benefits and expanding coverage. I would like to point out again that a conscientious minority has constantly warned against the unsoundness of a political system of providing security for our older citizens. The following views were expressed by the minority in Report No. 1300, 1st session, 81st Congress in the report on Social Security Act Amendments of 1949:

THE COMPULSORY SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

The provisions we oppose will increase the cost of this system at its maturity by approximately $3,500 million a year and this amount when added to the huge and pyramiding cost of the other features of the program may well mean the difference between the success or breakdown of the system.

In our opinion, the purpose of compulsory social insurance is to provide a basic floor of economic protection for the individual and his family and in so doing to encourage and stimulate voluntary savings through personal initiative and ambition. It should not invade the field historically belonging to the individual.

We believe that such a form of compulsory social insurance which unnecessarily takes from the individual funds which he would invest or otherwise use for building his own security is incompatible with our free-enterprise system. Accordingly, we do not conceive it to be a proper function or responsibility of the Federal Government either to compensate individuals for all types of losses in earning capacity or to provide a scale of benefits which pay substantially higher amounts to those with higher income.

We believe further that if this vast program is to fulfill its social objectives, the most important factor is to restrict the burden of its pyramiding cost within an amount which the economy can bear. This is so because in the final analysis the basis of all security is a productive economy and the burden in any one year of the mounting cost of this program will have, in the main, to be paid for out of the production of the goods and services which the system seeks to distribute. In 20 years the payroll tax provided for in this bill will be 6.5 percent or a dollar cost based on present wage levels of over $8 billion a year in this one program alone. If this burden becomes too great, the system may well be repudiated by future generations, and if benefit payments are carried to extreme, the inevitable result of the companion tax burden will be a stifling of the incentive and ambition to produce.

Daniel A. Reed, Roy O. Woodruff, Thomas A. Jenkins, Richard M. Simpson, Robert W. Kean, Carl T. Curtis, Noah M. Mason, Thomas E. Martin, Hal Holmes, John W. Byrnes.

Capital Punishment—Should It Be Abolished?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by J. Robert Regan, Jr., which appeared in the June 15, 1960, issue of Contact Concern, a publication of the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—SHOULD IT BE ABOLISHED?

(By J. Robert Regan, Jr.)

Congress is giving renewed consideration to the matters of the use of the death penalty for Federal offenses. Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York, has introduced H.R. 870 which would abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States except the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Life imprisonment would be authorized instead.

Reaction of the press and the public to the Caryl Chessman case indicates a general distaste for capital punishment in the United States. It is one of the things that an enlightened civilization gradually sloughs off much as it does slavery, polygamy, and dueling.

In most of Western Europe and Central and South America, the death penalty has now been abolished. Nine States in this country do not use it.

UNITED STATES MAY FOLLOW SUIT

Statistically speaking, the United States is gradually following Europe's lead. In the 1930's there were approximately 82 executions per year. But in 1959, there were only 48.

The General Conference of the Methodist Church passed an outstanding comprehensive statement calling for the abolishment of the death penalty. (See June 1 Contact, p. 17.) This statement was read into the record of recent hearings on the Multer bill before the House Judiciary Subcommittee concerning the Multer bill by the Reverend Robert Regan of the Methodist General Board of Christian Social Concerns.

DETERRENCE QUESTIONED

The Methodist statement and statements from other groups emphasized that the death penalty, contrary to popular opinion, does not deter capital crimes. The homicide rate in the nine States that do not use the death penalty is similar to or lower than the rate in the other States.

Stuart Innerst, of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, pointed out that executions in old England were held publicly to serve as a warning to potential wrongdoers. There were 8 hanging days in the calendar. Work was put aside so that the whole population might turn out to see the offender put to death. Pickpockets operated freely in the large crowds although men were sentenced to die before their eyes for that same offense.

Innerst further pointed out that in the States of Rhode Island, Michigan, and Wisconsin, which do not have the death penalty, the average homicide rate per 100,000 for the years 1934–46 was 2.4 percent. In three States respectively adjacent to these, Connecticut, Indiana, and Illinois, which have the death penalty, the average was 44 percent.

EXECUTIONS MAY CAUSE CRIME

Testifying for the American League To Abolish Capital Punishment, Mrs. Herbert B. Ehrmann gave a striking example of the fact that capital punishment does not deter other crimes. While the Chessman case was headlined in all the newspapers, an Associated Press release carried the story of another red-light robbery and acts of sexual perversion in Los Banos, Calif., similar to the crimes for which Chessman was executed. Her measured opinion, following a 30-year study of homicides, in that capital crimes occur during, preceding and following sensational capital trials and executions. Instead of deterring crimes the publicity given a death penalty case may actually incite further acts of violence, Mrs. Ehrmann related.

She said that eight States have abolished capital punishment and then reinstated it later. A study of the States indicates that the change back came before there was time to see any results of the deterring effects of either law. In most instances, the change was simply an action that came with a change in administrations.

WHAT IS JUSTICE?

The demand for justice is a second reason proponents of capital punishment use as an argument.

On this point the Methodist statement emphasizes that to define justice as retribution or retaliation "is a sub-Christian concept." The emphasis must be on the reformation and rehabilitation of offenders. This, of course, cannot be done if the death penalty is used.

The Christian Gospel expressly forbids the treatment of another human being singly on the basis of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Even if the law should require a life for a life, in practice the principle is denied. Innerst pointed out that in 1957, 7,000 Americans were found guilty of murder, but less than 1 in 100 paid for it with his life.

ADMINISTRATION DISCRIMINATORY

One sobering fact—the way the penalty is administered. Often there is discrimination against the poor, the helpless, and minority groups. Warden Lewis E. Lawes, formerly warden of the Sing Sing Prison, escorted 150 men and women to the death chamber. All were alike, "all were poor, and most were friendless," he stated. The defendant of wealth and position seldom goes to the electric chair or the gallows.

The concluding emphasis of the Methodist statement argues that punishment and segregation from society can be corrective and remedial action for offenders. The emphasis must be on discipline, reform, and rehabilitation, however.

STATE ACTION LIKELY

Although churchmen and the thoughtful enlightened citizenry of the Nation realize the need for the abolishment of the death penalty, it is still a controversial issue as far as Congress is concerned.

Therefore, it is not expected that Congress will give the issue much more atten-

tion in the hurry to finish business before adjournment. But it is also evident that many State legislatures will be dealing with questions of capital punishment during the coming months. Eighteen States saw bills introduced in 1958.

WHAT CAN INDIVIDUALS DO?

Congress and various State legislatures will be given further attention to capital punishment in the next several months. The opinions of annual conferences, districts, local churches, and individuals could therefore be made known to Congressmen and legislators.

Letters and statements might go immediately to Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., in support of H.R. 870, which would abolish capital punishment for capital offenses and substitute life imprisonment instead. Congressman LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, is chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee conducting hearings on this issue.

A careful study of the general conference statement (Contact, June 1) and of the above article will help in phrasing letters and statements. There is also an excellent article on capital punishment by Lester Kinsolving in the June issue of Pastoral Psychology.

Going Through the Motions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial captioned "Going Through the Motions," the Wall Street Journal analyzed the status and implications of the foreign aid bill and made some extremely pertinent comments about what it termed "this annual ritual."

As all of us in the House know, a definite pattern has been established by the Congress for considering and acting upon this bill.

First, we have very extensive hearings conducted by our able friend, the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], an undoubted expert on this subject, and his able committee. Then, almost invariably, the bill is brought to the House floor during the closing weeks of Congress. The practice has been and apparently is for the committee to make sizable cuts predicated on the elimination of waste and inefficiency in the program well known to all observant citizens as well as to Members of Congress, and these cuts are usually sustained in their entirety by the House.

After the bill is passed by the House, which is usually even closer to the adjournment date, it goes to the other body where, in the past, practically all of the cuts made by the House are restored at a time when adjournment is imminent and when any real serious consideration of the action of the other body by the House would be almost impossible.

I have nothing but words of praise for Chairman PASSMAN and his committee because I think that they have done outstanding and most painstaking work throughout the years in considering this legislation, even though I am of the opinion that the committee hearings could and should be completed and the bill brought to the floor at an earlier date.

It is especially noteworthy that this year, as in former years, the total amount listed on the recap sheet for the ensuing fiscal year as being available for expenditure is well over $8 billion.

I recognize that this huge sum may seem to be a mere bagatelle to those good souls who insistently urge the largest and most lavish foreign aid grants. Notwithstanding that fact, $8 billion is a tremendous sum of money, and it all has to be taken painfully from the pockets of the hard-working American people. That fact should be kept in mind as we appropriate funds for foreign aid or for any other purpose.

I have long favored streamlining and revamping the entire foreign aid program to weed out wasteful practices, inefficiency of administration, and demonstrated flaws in the way these vital matters have been handled.

Certain objectives of the program are not only laudable but necessary to security, the fulfillment of our international commitments and definite humane obligations which most Americans feel. But there is no reason for waste, nor is there justification for unnecessary outlays. To the contrary, the Congress must insist upon strictest economy and prudence in formulating and conducting this program.

It is for these reasons that a basic reappraisal and reevaluation should be made and it should include the appropriate consideration of the fact that many of the perennially assisted nations have developed high economic and financial potentials of their own, which we have every reason to expect, should be put at the disposal of any free world program for strengthening our common military and security posture, and the various programs for developing backward areas and serving humane needs as best we can.

It is not a healthy situation to lay such a program open to so much justifiable criticism from thoughtful citizens and the people as a whole. This is especially true in the light of our growing national debt, our ever-increasing burdensome and heavy taxation, and the serious budgetary and financial problems which we face as a nation.

Too much money for this or any other program, however worthy, is worse than too little, because it begets maladministration and waste, and it engenders deep-seated bitterness from large numbers of people who have to pay the bills at considerable sacrifice to their own standards of living and their own financial standing.

The Congress has a distinct obligation to right the wrongs that are implicit in this vast program and demand a much higher degree of accountability and efficiency from those who are charged with administering the program, as well as a larger participation and contribution by those nations now able to make them.

Under unanimous consent I insert in this part of my remarks the very thoughtful editorial, "Going Through the Motions," to which I have alluded:

GOING THROUGH THE MOTIONS

It was expected that the House Appropriations Committee would cut the foreign-aid request, just as it is expected that the Senate will restore a sizable part of the cut. There are some comments to be made about this annual ritual.

In reducing the appropriation by $790 million, the committee is still providing $3.4 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1—a handsome sum in any language. Actually, when previously appropriated but unspent funds are added, the available money comes to well over $8 billion. In such circumstances it is ridiculous to talk about the committee's cut imperiling the foreign-aid program.

That kind of money, moreover, is an invitation to continue waste, blunders and loose practices for which the program has always been known. The committee action, in one sense, can be taken as a protest against the defective concepts and poor handling of foreign aid. And in fact the committee report, like so many previous congressional studies, cites specific instances of haphazard management and worse.

The truth is that the effectiveness of foreign aid has never been imperiled by lack of funds; if anything, it is ineffective because there is so much money the dispensers don't rightly know what to do with it all. More basically, its ineffectiveness rests at the door of successive administrations and Congresses; in all these dozen or more years they have failed to come to grips with the fundamental questions, and they have failed to develop selective programs of worthy help that might really promote American national interests.

There is, in short, no rationale for foreign aid; there has been, and continues to be, only indiscriminate squandering. Instead of going through the motions of cuts and restorations of cuts, Congress should at last insist on a thorough review and a thorough overhaul.

Until it does, foreign aid will appear to foreign eyes as either dollar imperialism or an amazing demonstration of national gullibility.

Results of Poll on President and Issues in Third Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in April I mailed questionnaires to some 160,000 registered voters in the Third Congressional District of Indiana, asking my constituents to register their opinions on major issues facing this Congress and also requesting them to indicate their preferenoe for President of the United States. More than one of every eight persons receiving the poll responded.

Because the Third District of Indiana is considered a representative cross-section of public opinion, I believe the tabulation of the 23,485 replies may be of interest to my colleagues.

POLL PREDICTS ACTUAL PRIMARY VOTE WITHIN 1 PERCENT

I point to the fact that the poll, which was taken before the May 3 presiden-

tial preference primary in Indiana, predicted within 1 percent the actual Democratic and Republican Party votes in the Third District.

The poll showed 55 percent of the voters indicating a preference for President favoring Democratic candidates while 45 percent favored Republican candidates. The actual primary vote in the district on May 3 in the presidential race was 56 percent Democratic and 44 percent Republican.

The apparent accuracy of the poll's presidential results strongly suggests that the answers to questions on issues should provide a fair and reliable measurement of public opinion in my district.

SUMMARY OF SOME RESULTS ON MAJOR ISSUES

Mr. Speaker, let me summarize some of the more interesting results of the poll. Substantial voter approval was given to such programs as health insurance for the elderly, Federal support of education, loans and grants to depressed areas, and amendments to the minimum wage law.

Nearly two-thirds of all voters were for using Federal funds for classroom construction. Democrats favored such aid by a margin of 5 to 1, Republicans by 5 to 4, and independents by 5 to 3; 53 percent of all voters approved the use of Federal help to improve teachers' salaries as well.

Voters strongly supported—by 2 to 1—a Federal program of health insurance for social security beneficiaries—70 percent approved an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour as well as extension of coverage to more workers.

Opinions were most divided on the issues of agricultural policy and the missile gap. Nearly one-third of the voters expressed "no answer" on the complex issue of farm policy. A slim majority of 51 percent felt the United States was keeping up with Russian space and missile developments.

Because voters were asked to indicate their party preference, the following tables of the results of the poll are divided into these categories: Democratic, Republican, independent, and total of all replies.

TABLE 1

Questions	Democratic			Republican			Independent			Total of all replies (23,485) and percentages					
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Do you favor legislation to guarantee all Americans, regardless of race or color, the right to vote in State and Federal elections?	8,699	445	199	5,233	278	117	7,754	402	268	21,686	92	1,215	5	584	3
2. Do you favor reducing the national debt in preference to cutting taxes if the budget shows a surplus?	5,681	3,243	419	4,317	1,112	199	6,036	2,056	422	16,034	68	6,411	27	1,040	5
3. Do you favor an agricultural program providing:															
A. Price supports and limitations on production?	3,750	2,889	2,704	1,141	2,895	1,892	2,003	3,647	2,864	6,894	29	9,131	39	7,460	32
B. No supports and unlimited production?	4,353	1,955	3,035	3,645	824	1,159	5,151	1,245	2,118	13,149	56	4,024	17	6,312	27
4. Do you favor providing health and hospitalization insurance to social security beneficiaries?	7,507	1,702	234	2,564	2,852	212	4,841	3,325	348	14,912	63	7,879	33	794	4
5. Do you feel confident that the United States is keeping up with Russian space, missile, and other defense developments?	3,843	4,779	721	3,658	1,451	519	4,596	2,885	1,033	12,097	51	9,115	39	2,273	10
6. Provided there is a guarantee against Federal control, do you favor Federal support of State and local efforts to:															
A. Build more classrooms?	7,503	1,460	380	2,928	2,460	240	4,947	3,095	472	15,378	65	7,015	30	1,092	5
B. Improve teachers' salaries?	6,000	2,528	815	2,424	2,871	333	4,069	3,697	748	12,493	53	9,096	39	1,896	8
7. Do you favor a program of loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment?	6,862	1,912	869	2,299	2,846	483	4,302	3,375	837	13,463	57	8,133	35	1,889	8
8. Do you favor:															
A. Raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour?	7,801	1,145	397	3,126	2,171	331	5,451	2,515	548	16,378	70	5,831	25	1,276	5
B. Extending coverage of workers not now covered?	7,533	832	968	3,449	1,507	672	5,638	1,672	1,204	16,620	71	4,011	17	2,844	12
9. Do you believe we should seek an agreement with the Russians for nuclear disarmament with effective inspection?	7,203	1,660	480	4,333	1,030	265	6,357	1,589	568	17,893	76	4,279	18	1,313	6

TABLE 2.—*Results of presidential preference poll*

Candidates for President	Democrats	Republicans	Independents	Total	Percent
Humphrey	866	26	330	1,222	5
Johnson	331	35	173	539	2
Kennedy	4,572	232	1,488	6,292	27
Nixon	352	4,789	2,897	8,008	34
Rockefeller	165	276	416	857	4
Stevenson	1,201	29	431	1,661	7
Symington	1,003	19	302	1,324	6
No answer	823	222	2,477	3,522	15

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to present these questions on issues as fairly and objectively as possible, and I am glad to say that the reaction of my constituents as well as the press in this regard was excellent. I cite the following editorial which appeared in the LaPorte, Ind., Herald-Argus on May 20 as an example of the nonpartisan reception given the poll:

BRADEMAS' POLL

For several years Third District Congressmen have sent questionnaires to register voters of the district to try to get voter reaction on various issues. Returns on the recent one of Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS were the most extensive of all with 23,485 persons responding. This represented about one out of every eight to whom the questionnaire was sent.

Questionnaires which require straight yes or no answers are not wholly satisfactory. A weakness of any such query is also that so few voters out of the total electorate respond at all. Once a Congressman gets the returns, he will if he is honest with himself be somewhat in doubt as to just what he has on his hands.

However, just as only a relatively small percentage of the registered voters go to the polls in any election so the fact that only one of eight voters responded to the questionnaire does not mean it is valueless. That 34 percent of those responding indicated Nixon as their choice for President seemed to dampen the effectiveness of any charge that inasmuch as BRADEMAS is a Democrat only Democrats would respond to the queries.

If we can accurately assume that those replying constitute a cream of the crop of registered voters in that they give more attention to issues and tend to think them through and are willing to express themselves, then the results give some solid food for political thought.

Substantial majorities of those replying favor hospital and health insurance for social security beneficiaries, Federal aid for more school classrooms and improvement of teachers' salaries, legislation to guarantee full voting rights in Federal and State elections for all persons regardless of race or color, raising the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour, Federal loans and grants to areas of serious and persistent unemployment.

In short, those replying feel rather strongly that responsibilities of the Federal Government for the general welfare should be extended rather than cut back. Those replying in this Third District poll apparently don't take seriously the cries of those Hoosiers who would turn back the calendar to a rapidly receding States rights era.

Panama and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a recent lecture by His Excellency, Dr. Erasmo de la Guardia, Ambassador of the Republic of Panama to the United States of America. The views expressed here are not necessarily my views and do not represent my thinking but in my judgment, the Ambassador presents a clear picture of the principles which can guide friendship and progress between the people of Panama and the citizens of the United States. He very clearly sets forth the Panamanian case and I believe it well that their case be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that each Congressman can judge for himself as to the true merits of Panamanian-American relations.

In this connection, one can say that it is always good to get the point of view of a good neighbor, even if that outlook may not coincide with views that are current in our own beloved country. Ambassador Erasmo de la Guardia, as is clear in this speech which I commend to the attention of my esteemed colleagues, thinks as a friend, writes as a good neighbor, and speaks as a loyal suporter of inter-American solidarity. His development of the Panamanian point of view on an important subject is bound to be of value to all those who seek a constructive solution.

Dr. Erasmo de la Guardia is respected throughout the Western Hemisphere as a distinguished man of letters, an author of books, a master of international law and a talented diplomat who has won many friends in Washington. The lecture is inserted at this point:

LECTURE ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN PANAMA AND THE UNITED STATES DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE AMBASSADOR FROM PANAMA, DR. ERASMO DE LA GUARDIA, AT THE AMBASSADOR'S FORUM, CHAMBERSBURG, PA., APRIL 28, 1960

Having successfully digged the Suez Canal, the French undertook to build the Panama Canal but failed in their try because of a sad state of affairs at home brought to a climax by the famous Dreyfus case. One of the engineers for the French company, very smart and shrewd, then took upon himself to convince the United States of finishing the job. And we find before us here, another sad story whose most colorful and revealing aspects I shall only touch upon.

This man's name is verboten to Panamanians. Anyhow, I would not care to mention it, since it is not in the least my intention to hurt anyone's feelings nor to stir up the past. When the possibility of the Nicaraguan route was discussed in your Congress he distributed among Congressmen Nicaraguan postage stamps showing one of its volcanoes. The implication that such was not the place for a canal produced the expected results. He got therefore your Government to support us in our aspiration to become independent. That was the preliminary step for your signing a treaty with us and purchasing the French interests, which was what mattered to him, in order to finish the construction of the canal. The French company received $40 million.

With your help we were a free nation the 3d of November 1903. It was a decisive help no doubt. But in view of the historical antecedents would it be accurate to say that you created us? Not when we had been stubbornly persistent throughout a whole century in our eagerness to tear off the chains binding us to Colombia. But I shall not dwell in that aspect. Once free, the leaders of our new Government sent this man as our diplomatic representative to Washington and when the negotiations of the treaty were in progress they realized it was not to our best interest to let him act with full powers and sent a commission which would serve as a check to him. Upon discovering that the commission would soon arrive, he speeded up the signing of the treaty.

What followed is too embarrassing and disagreeable to retell here. That night he worked hard on a final draft to present to your Secretary of State whom he led to believe all kinds of complications would ensue if any time was lost. So when our three representatives arrived the damage had been done. It was because of those circumstances that an outstanding spokesman of your government made the revealing comment that it would be difficult for Americans in high official posts to conceal how disadvantageous that treaty was for Panama and that "no Panamanian patriot would agree to it." However, we did agree to it—compelled by the irresistible force of necessity. In a few words; a double cross, a state of despair, and this little nation of ours had again fulfilled its urge for liberty but would come to grips for years on end with the most powerful nation in the world.

At this point I wish most respectfully to make a reference to a gentleman who has adopted a definite stand against Panama in your Congress. In a recent session he paid a warm tribute to a report prepared by a person who has been a resident in the Canal Zone for over 20 years. Therein this individual asserts that the United States "most certainly did create the Republic of Panama." From the previous outline you must have surmised how distant from the truth that assertion is. We do not take offense at it, or even resent it. We just feel disappointed to hear such a thing at this day and age and from one who has been our neighbor for such a long time. And yet one wonders if his attitude does not reflect that of many of those neighbors today.

What does he pretend? That the United States by helping Panama against Colombia actually expected it to be forever bound and submissive; that it acted in bad faith counting on making a protectorate out of us? If it did, then it too, like him, was unaware of our past and shortsighted. Showing a contrast, the Honorable Senator Mr. GEORGE AIKEN refers to the "support and encouragement" given us by you in the early days.

The person goes on to say that, based on the original treaty of 1903 with the United States, "Panama has raised a hue and cry that they have complete jurisdiction and sovereignty over the Canal Zone." Again, that is not so, not at all. Our basic claim concerns sovereignty, titular or residual or bare sovereignty, whichever way you wish to call it, but still sovereignty. In the next couple of paragraphs he talks of our Government's objectives being developed and extended, by the example of the Suez Canal. How could our objections be extended any farther than a "complete" jurisdiction and sovereignty?

I can assure you definitely that Panama, in what concerns the main issues arising from the canal treaties, has maintained a remarkably consistent position throughout the years, not a bit less so than that of the United States, probably more. Which gives me a footing to glance over the legal aspects of our position.

Article III of the original treaty of 1903, the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty, if I must mention it by its name, has been the heart of the controversy. Its relevant wording is as follows:

"The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, powers, and authority within the zone * * * which the United States would have if it were the sovereign of the territory * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

When Americans quote that article in a controversial mood they are inclined to underline the words "grants" and "to the entire exclusion." We underline the words "if it were sovereign," putting emphasis on the "if" and "to the entire exclusion of the exercise," putting further emphasis on "the exercise."

We claim simply that the very fact that we granted all rights, power, and authority which the United States would have if it were sovereign implies clearly and indubitably that the United States would not be sovereign. In our judgment, that is no less and no more than a way of saying that sovereignty was not granted. Indeed, had we granted it then the Canal Zone would have been transferred or ceded, which it has not, by any means, as you can readily see if you consider that your country cannot sell or transfer it, nor internationalize it, nor even use it for any other purpose than operating the canal, without our consent.

The deal did not involve a sale, obviously, not even a lease. It is true that according to the same article the grant is in perpetuity and this phrase Americans will also underline heavily. But you must bear in mind, too, that in the treaty the United States agrees to pay a yearly amount or annuity. From the legal standpoint a sale requires a set price and you cannot conceive of one in which the buyer is bound to pay an annuity forever. By the same token, at the light of legal principles a lease for an indefinite period of time is inadmissible. The deal involved a grant or consession of public utility, the interoceanic transit, which is more apt to have a limitless duration. Anyhow, the least that can be said is that we have here an unusual and anomalous type of agreement probably due to the very rush in which it was sealed.

We could quote from a long line of eminent Americans ranging from Mr. William Taft in 1906, one of the Presidents of the United States and one of the Chief Justices of your Supreme Court; from Mr. Davis, the first Governor of the Canal Zone; up to Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the actual Chief Executive, to show that they agreed with us on the specific point so far considered. We could quote from some of your great minds in the field of international law as well as from decisions handed down by your Supreme Court. A special reference must be made to Mr. Merchant's public statement issued when he flew down to Panama at the end of last year in a capacity of a sort of troubleshooter, in behalf of the State Department. He said then that the position maintained by the United States since more than 50 years ago is that Panama retains titular sovereignty. But it is not worth the while to stress the point since article III of the 1936 treaty settles it once and for all stipulating that the Canal Zone "is territory of the Republic of Panama under the jurisdiction of the United States."

Using the simplest terms possible, let me say that sovereignty represents a nation's full capacity of action over its territory.

Whence it follows as plainly as daylight that if the Canal Zone territory is Panama's the sovereignty over it resides in Panama as a matter of principle. Jurisdiction, on the other hand, represents something like the bundle of attributes or perhaps outlets or means through which sovereignty finds expression. So a brief, graphic and practical way of putting it would be this: Panama owns, the United States controls. Despite all that and against the very words of the above quoted Treaty of 1936, one critic has declared that the Canal Zone is "constitutionally acquired territory of the United States," giving us a baffling surprise.

As to our hottest issue, that of the flying of the Panamanian flag next to yours in the Canal Zone, our position boils down to this: Our flag should fly there as a symbol of our sovereignty. Just as it flies alone over all the rest of our territory it should fly alongside yours within the limits of that part of our territory controlled by you.

Nothing is more striking than to note, by the way, that the American authorities in charge of the Zone immediately after our independence did not feel they could raise the American flag there; and the first Governor, when questioned by a Senate committee, in 1906, said it never had and he thought it never would be raised, since the right to do so was questionable.

For your information, the first of last March, on occasion of one of our festivities, we woke up to see our two flags flying together on every pole, along the border, within the Canal Zone's side.

One more thing I must point out in connection with this question of sovereignty and jurisdiction. Article II of our first treaty of 1903, stipulates that the zone is granted for purposes of constructing, maintaining, operating and protecting the canal; in short, we could say operating since the construction is already finished and the rest of those purposes are of a secondary nature. I have established as a premise that Panama has sovereignty over the strip of land while the United States exercises jurisdiction. Now then, in view of the fact that the grant was exclusively for the purpose of operating the canal, does that imply the exercise of full and total jurisdiction, that is, the exercise of the whole bundle of attributes of sovereignty or only of those necessary or pertaining to the operation of the waterway?

We claim that those questions answer themselves, it being obvious that Panama retains the exercise of such jurisdiction as is not pursuant to the fulfillment of the end of the deal, such jurisdiction as has not been expressly or specifically granted. In this respect it is interesting to turn to article XIII, for example, insofar as this stipulates that only merchandise classified as "convenient and necessary to the operation" of the waterway may be introduced or imported into the zone free of Panamanian duties. Thus it reasserts the principle that the zone's activities and scope of action are constrained by its lofty purposes of rendering an international transit service.

In keeping with the same idea we claim naturally that in the commissaries and post exchanges articles not convenient and necessary to the operation purposes should not be sold at all.

Apart from the main issues, there are many minor differences and smaller problems between your country and ours. Most of them are due to the complexity of our contracts with the zone resulting from the mere fact of our neighborliness. Some have no connection with the zone. As an illustration of the latter, take the case of our sugar quota. It does not come up to 4,000 tons a year and we are very anxious to have it raised to 10,000. A mere trifle, considering that countries like Cuba have one that goes up to millions. But then again we meet there with your huge administrative machinery and the democratic structure of your Government with all the inevitable delays and stumbling blocks. This matter depends now upon your Congress.

However, I am not here to tire you out with an endless recount of our claims, complaints, and differences. Furthermore, this by no means would be the proper occasion. On the contrary, there are good tidings at present. The State Department gave an important press release a few days ago wherein it announced a nine point program to be carried out in Panama. We are quite pleased with it, since it satisfies some of our aspirations. It is bound to relieve the tension existing of late since it represents comforting evidence of a new attitude and a step forward in the road leading to a closer understanding and to a revival of our old cordial friendship.

Many of the points in the program have to do with favoring our laboring classes. There has been a general insistence in that direction, both in your Senators' and your newspapermen's reports. From some of those reports you would draw the impression of a feudal or medieval setup existing in Panama, in which 50 families, representing the business interests, rule over a million people in abject poverty. That not only is exaggerated but overlooks significant factors. However, I do not care to discuss them. The really important thing is that we, too, are developing a deep social sense and are determined to improve the economic condition of the people. We share with you, therefore, a common interest in this respect.

Finally, let me turn to the setting of the overall picture, by pointing out a series of basic considerations:

Our relations are unique in the international field because of our country being split in two by a strip of land under a foreign jurisdiction, which in itself is enough to arouse our sensibility.

The Canal Zone represents a sort of segregated socialist state, which makes quite a contrast of manifold consequences. There should be all the integration possible, in both the human and the economic sense; the latter in order that Panama obtains the benefits deserved from its geographical position and that the joint enterprise develops into a real joint venture.

More confusion and difficulty is added by the fact that the canal is run by the Panama Canal Company, an agency of the American Government under the Defense Department, while a Governor, also appointed by the Defense Department, is in charge of the zone. The Governor is at the same time the head of the company. On the other hand, the Ambassador of the United States in Panama handles before our Government, in behalf of the State Department, the problems arising from the Zone.

People from the Zone may naturally have a grudge against us at times. The viewpoint of American residents and investors in Panama should also be taken into account. They have always received a fair treatment from our authorities and our people and will certainly vouch for it. Let that be clear.

Because of the canal, Panama has become a sort of show window for Latin America as to the attitude and policy of the United States toward its neighbors to the South. No one can doubt that the latest measures taken by the State Department have had a favorable reaction there.

Times change, and we must simply face present and future realities as they present themselves, which calls for a periodical revision of our stands instead of so much hairsplitting about interpretation of outdated texts.

The Canal Zone brings face to face about the weakest nation in the world with the most powerful of them all. Herein lies another extraordinary feature of our relations.

The United States is much more than a powerful nation, it is a great nation. It is great because of its wealth and power, which made possible the building of the Canal for example; because of its true democratic spirit and sense of fairplay, which explains the open and varied expressions of opinions concerning problems like ours, sometimes perplexing, in search for the right and just answer; because of its humane feelings toward others not so fortunate. Equally great are the responsibilities weighing on its shoulders and the wisdom required to bear them.

We must, in the last analysis, so rid ourselves of anything obstructing our vision that we may see our mutual problems as something of common concern in a common venture. This is my highest and sincerest hope, just as it is that, in so doing, the day is not distant when we will celebrate together the raising of our national emblem over the strip of land at the service of the world.

We must strive to be the good friends we were. I, for one, say this from the bottom of my heart.

And thank you so much for your kind attention and the opportunity to speak my mind.

Honored War Dead of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Are Paid Solemn Tribute in Annual Ceremonies at Neahwa Park in Oneonta, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent includes the birthplace of one of the great labor organizations in our country, the distinguished Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Every year for the past 10 years members of this great labor organization, from the United States and Canada have assembled at Neahwa Park in Oneonta, N.Y., for the purpose of paying tribute to their departed comrades who lost their lives during World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. The 10th annual memorial ceremonies were held at the base of the brotherhood's war memorial in Oneonta on Sunday, June 5. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an account of these ceremonies which appeared in the June 13 issue of Trainman News, the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

BRT WAR DEAD CITED AT ANNUAL CEREMONIES—OVER 300 ATTEND MEMORIAL DAY PROGRAM HONORING DEPARTED VETS

ONEONTA, N.Y.—Solemn tribute was paid to departed BRT war veterans at services conducted here recently in Neahwa Park.

Over 300 from the United States and Canada turned out for the 10th annual BRT Memorial Day program honoring BTR'ers who lost their lives during World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict.

General Secretary and Treasurer W. E. B. Chase represented President W. P. Kennedy.

"There is no higher honor," Chase declared, "than to pay homage to departed members who gallantly made the supreme sacrifice to preserve the principles of democracy and brotherhood."

Before placing a dedicatory wreath at the base of the BRT war memorial monument, General Secretary and Treasurer Chase stated that the "Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen will never forget these patriots who rose from its own ranks" during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

"We cannot long stand here without feeling the power of their sacrifice," Chase emphasized. "We are here, free, strong, confident in our nations and in ourselves because these men gave their lives for us."

In his solemn tribute to the railroaders who heroically rose to the national emergencies, Chase declared:

"We salute them, and take courage from their gifts to us, the gift of freedom."

General Secretary and Treasurer Chase also made note of another group of inspired men who met in Delaware & Hudson Caboose 10 on September 23, 1883, to launch the BRT. They were men of principles, he declared. Railroadmen of that day were denied the basic rights of free men by heartless managements.

"Their battle was against the prejudice of the times" and they lived in constant dread of violent death due to unsafe conditions, he said.

One of the founders of the BRT, Elmer Wessell, a resident of Oneonta, is still living today.

Drawing a parallel to the war dead and to the founders of the brotherhood, Chase said railroadmen "will always rise in the future, as these men did in the past, so that our organization and our nations might continue leading the way among free men.

Another highlight of the service was the presentation of emblems to veteran BRT'ers.

Principal figures attending the services where General Secretary and Treasurer Chase delivered the main address included Vice President James Anderson, Deputy President Carl Savage, BRT New York State Representative C. H. Sullivan, Board of Appeals Members Dan Curry, chairman; George B. Beck and Fred Shearer; David Wykle, 705 local chairman; Joseph E. Gallagher, chairman of New York Legislative Board; General Chairman W. K. Kniskern, Delaware & Hudson Railroad; Field Supervisor J. J. McGurn, Tim Brust, BRT organizer; E. V. Heeran, 37 president; P. S. Kennedy, former 37 local chairman, and Hugh J. Wuerdeman, 250 president.

Officers of lodge 1 present were Gordon Haskin, president; John Erickson, vice president; A. W. Ludwig, treasurer, and T. J. Rosenfeld, secretary.

Members of the memorial committee were General Secretary and Treasurer Chase, G. E. Haskin, J. W. Erickson, A. W. Ludwig and T. J. Rosenfeld. Those on the reception committee were Gladys Butts, Mildred Rosenfeld, Violet Hicko and Theresa Howland of LA Lodge 96.

The memorial services opened with the Oneonta High School band playing "The Star-Spangled Banner" and "O' Canada" (Canadian anthem). Invocation was given by the Reverend Roswell W. Lyon of First Methodist Church. Gordon E. Haskin was master of ceremonies and the welcome address was delivered by Oneonta Mayor James N. Georgeson. After a few selections by the Oneonta High School band and a few remarks by General Chairman Kniskern, General Secretary and Treasurer Chase delivered the memorial address.

Benediction was given by the Right Reverend Monsignor Arthur A. Cunningham, St. Mary's Church. Company C Firing Squad and 2d Armored Rifle Battalion gave a salute to the dead which was followed by taps. After closing remarks by Haskin, the high school band, under the direction of Carmen E. Caiazza, rounded out the program with several numbers.

Bank Holding Companies and Branch Banking Under New Omnibus Banking Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Richard S. Simmons, deputy superintendent and counsel of the New York State Banking Department as it appeared in issue 31 of the New York State Banker dated May 2, 1960:

BANK HOLDING COMPANIES AND BRANCH BANKING UNDER THE NEW OMNIBUS BANKING ACT

(By Richard S. Simmons, deputy superintendent and counsel, New York State Banking Department)

Provisions of the holding company section (of the act) relate primarily to the subjection to administrative approval of the formation and expansion of a bank holding company which owns or controls or will own or control a specified percentage of the voting stock of two or more banking institutions, one of which is located in a banking district different from that in which the other or others are located. The principal exception to this is that in no event may two bank holding companies merge or acquire all or substantially all the assets of another bank holding company without the approval of the banking board regardless of whether all their banking subsidiaries may be located in the same banking district.

To be more specific, the following comprises the situations in which a company may become a bank holding company:

(1) Where a company which is not a banking institution, directly or indirectly, with power to vote, holds (a) more than 50 percent of the stock of a bank holding company, (b) 25 percent or more of the voting stock of two or more banking institutions, (c) 25 percent of the stock of two or more bank holding companies, and (d) 25 percent of the stock of one or more bank holding companies and 5 percent of the stock of a banking institution.

(2) Where a company is a banking institution and holds, directly or indirectly, with power to vote, 25 percent of the voting stock of another banking institution.

(3) Where a company controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of each of two or more banking institutions.

(4) Where a company controls the election of the majority of the directors of a bank holding company.

(5) Where a company is not a banking institution and (a) 25 percent of the voting stock of each of two or more banking institutions is held for the benefit of such company's stockholders, or (b) 25 percent or more of the stock of a bank holding company is held by trustees for the benefit of the stockholders of such company.

(6) Where a company is a banking institution and (a) 25 percent or more of the stock of another banking institution is acquired after July 1, 1960, and is held by trustees for the benefit of the stockholders of such company, or (2) 50 percent or more of the voting stock of a bank holding company is acquired after July 1, 1960, and held by trustees for the benefit of the stockholders of such company.

(7) Where a company or banking institution, through a combination of direct or indirect ownership of voting stock and stock acquired after July 1, 1960, and held by trustees for the benefit of the stockholders thereof, is a company which is or would be a bank holding company if the aggregate of such voting stock were either, directly or indirectly, held by the trustees for the benefit of stockholders or members thereof, or entirely held, directly or indirectly, by such company or banking institutions, as the case may be.

Giving effect to the possible number of combinations, there appear to be approximately 22 separate situations in which a company can become a bank holding company. To my mind, the foregoing situations are fairly clear and should not cause any undue difficulty. There is one point, however, which has apparently troubled some people; namely, the provisions with respect to a bank owning stock of another bank. First, such provisions do not authorize a bank to purchase the stock of another bank. Regardless of New York's attitude toward the desirability of authorizing a bank to acquire the stock of another bank, members of the Federal Reserve System could not be so authorized. (12 U.S.C. sec. 334). Of course, State banks and trust companies which are not member banks could be authorized by the Banking Board to acquire directly the stock of other banks. The primary purpose, therefore, is to prohibit indirectly acquisitions, especially by those banks which may still have wholly owned subsidiaries under the grandfather clause of section 97 of the banking law.

Transactions requiring approval

Now, assuming that a company is or plans to become a holding company, only the following transactions require the approval of the banking board:

(1) For a company to become a bank holding company having two or more banking subsidiaries, of which at least one is located in a banking district different from that in which the other or others are located, unless all such banking subsidiaries are located in New York City.

(2) For a bank holding company which is a banking institution to have a banking subsidiary located in a banking district different from that in which such bank holding company is located, unless such banking subsidiary and such bank holding company are located in New York City.

(3) For a bank holding company which is not a bank institution and which has two or more banking subsidiaries, of which at least one is located in a banking district different from that in which the other or others are located, unless located in New York City, or for any trustee or trustees acting for the benefit of the stockholders or members of such bank holding company, to acquire, directly or indirectly, voting stock of any banking institution, if, after such acquisition, such company or such trustees or both will hold more than 5 percent of the voting stock of such banking institution.

(4) For a bank holding company which is a banking institution, if such company and a banking subsidiary thereof are located in different banking districts, unless located in New York City, or for any trustee or trustees acting for the benefit of the stockholders or members thereof, or both, to acquire or hold more than 5 percent of the voting stock of a banking institution.

(5) For a bank holding company to merge or consolidate with, or acquire all or substantially all the assets of another bank holding company.

(6) For any bank holding company, or for any trustees who hold for the benefit of the stockholders or members thereof the voting stock of any banking subsidiary thereof, to vote or cause to be voted the stock of any banking subsidiary in favor of or

against a merger or consolidation with, or the acquisition of all or substantially all the assets of, any banking institution, if such bank holding company has, or will as a result of such merger have, two or more banking subsidiaries, of which at least one is located in a banking district different from that in which the other or others are located, unless all such subsidiaries are located in New York City.

Your attention is called to the fact that those transactions which are prohibited without prior approval generally relate to the holding or acquisition of voting stock. In other words, a company which held nonvoting stock of a banking institution would not be considered a bank holding company, but if such nonvoting stock became voting stock upon the happening of a condition subsequent, e.g., nonvoting preferred stock which is granted voting rights upon failure of the issuer to pay a certain consecutive number of dividends, the holding of such stock would then be unlawful without prior banking board approval. Consequently, in order to prevent the necessity of immediate divestment of stock upon the happening of such condition subsequent, any company which would become a bank holding company upon the happening of such condition subsequent should apply to the banking board for prior approval. I believe that in the rare instances in which this would be necessary, we would recommend to the banking board that it grant a conditional approval, that is, approve the holding of such stock for, say, 180 days after the happening of such condition subsequent, which elapse of time should be sufficient to enable both the company involved and the banking board to consider what course of action should then be followed.

"A banking subsidiary"

You will note that the above-mentioned provisions setting forth those transactions which are prohibited without prior approval frequently mention the term "banking subsidiary." There are five situations in which a company would qualify as a banking subsidiary:

(1) If 25 percent or more of the voting stock of such company is, directly or indirectly, owned by a bank holding company.

(2) If the election of a majority of the directors of such company is controlled in any manner by a bank holding company.

(3) If 25 percent or more of the voting stock of such company is, directly or indirectly, owned by trustees for the benefit of the stockholders or members of a bank holding company.

(4) If at least 25 percent of the voting stock of such company is, directly or indirectly, held through a combination of direct or indirect ownership by a bank holding company and by a trustee or trustees for the benefit of the stockholders or members thereof.

(5) Finally, if a company has any of the above-specified relationships with a bank holding company, it will be a subsidiary of such company.

The act contains certain exceptions, which briefly, are as follows:

(1) No company which would otherwise be a bank holding company shall be such if—

(a) the majority of the stock of such company is owned by the United States or any State, or (b) it is a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation organized exclusively for eleemosynary purposes, if the net earnings which do not inure to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual and no substantial part of its activities involve lobbying, or (c) its ownership or control of voting stock resulted from an underwriting of securities and such stock is being held only for such period as will permit the sale thereof on a reasonable basis.

(2) For the purpose of determining whether there is the requisite ownership of stock in order for a company to be considered a bank holding company, there is excluded (a) stock owned by a banking institution in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, (b) stock acquired in settlement of a loan, (c) stock acquired by a bank holding company in a banking institution in which such bank holding company already owned or controlled a majority of the voting stock prior to such acquisition, and (d) stock dividends, stock splits, or additional stock acquired by a bank holding company in the exercise of its preemptive rights as a stockholder.

Prohibition on loans

In addition, the act contains three prohibitions which were included for purposes of conforming with the State's policy as now contained in the banking law. None of such provisions should cause any undue difficulty. The act declares it to be unlawful for any person knowingly to borrow, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of enabling him to purchase or hold shares in a bank holding company, from any subsidiary of such bank holding company. Loans for such purpose, however, secured by collateral having an ascertained market value of 115 percent of the amount of such borrowing are permitted. The penalty is forfeiture to the State of twice the amount of the borrowing. Section 103(7) of the banking law declares it to be unlawful for a bank or trust company to make a loan for the purpose of enabling any person to acquire or hold shares of its stock unless secured by collateral having an ascertained market value of at least 15 percent more than the amount of the loan. The penalty in that case is forfeiture by the bank or trust company to the State of twice the amount of the loan. In drafting the act, however, it was considered desirable to have the prohibitions read on the individual concerned, rather than the banking institution involved, since the provisions of the act pertain to holding companies which have as subsidiaries not only New York State banks and trust companies but also national banking associations located in this State. In this manner, direct State supervision over a national bank's activities is avoided. Your attention is also called to the fact that the act imposes absolutely no burden on the bank involved to inquire as to the purpose of a loan.

For the same reason, the act prohibits an executive officer or director of a bank holding company from borrowing from any subsidiary of such bank holding company, unless such borrowing has been approved in advance by the board of directors of such bank holding company or unless the specific exceptions now contained in the banking law in regard to loans by a bank or trust company to one of its executive officers or directors are applicable. The penalty again is forfeiture of the State of twice the amount of such borrowing. In determining who is considered to be an executive officer, the department follows the definition contained in regulation O, promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, under section 22 of the Federal Reserve Act, which states that the term executive officer means "every officer * * * who participates or has authority to participate in the operating management, regardless of whether he has an official title or whether his title contains the designation 'assistant' and regardless of whether he is serving without salary or compensation." In the absence of evidence to the contrary, however, the department will proceed on the assumption that only the chairman of the board, the president, the vice president, the secretary, and the treasurer of a bank holding company are executive officers.

Prohibited affiliations

The act further provides that no officer, director, clerk or employee of any bank holding company after October 1, 1960, shall be an officer, director, or employee of any corporation or unincorporated association or a partner or employee of any partnership, or be an individual engaged primarily in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution of stocks, bonds, and other similar securities. The Banking Board is permitted to grant exceptions thereto. In passing, I should like to note that there was great objection on the part of various underwriters to the inclusion of such provision. The reason for such inclusion was that it was illogical and inconsistent to prohibit those engaged in underwriting to be an officer or director, etc., of a bank while at the same time permitting them to be an officer, director, etc., of a company which controlled banks. It is my personal view that either members of underwriting firms should be permitted to be connected with a bank, as well as a bank holding company, or that the present prohibition should continue to apply to both cases. Needless to say, the banking board has permitted members of underwriting firms to be directors of a bank in the past and, presumably, will continue to do so in the case of bank holding companies.

Before discussing the present departmental attitude toward the formation and expansion of bank holding companies, I should like to discuss briefly the sections of the act which relate to purchases of assets and mergers, since, to a large extent, the three are interrelated, and it is only through comparison that the emphasis to be given by the department to certain factors in considering applications therefor can be made meaningful.

PURCHASE OF ASSETS

With respect to the purchase of assets, the act requires the approval of the Superintendent of any proposed purchase of all or a substantial part of the assets of one banking institution by another. In addition, the stockholders of the selling bank are granted appraisal rights under the same terms and conditions as are now granted to the stockholders of a bank which is to be merged into a receiving bank. No appraisal right is granted to a stockholder of the purchasing bank. If the assets of the selling bank exceed 10 percent of the assets of the acquiring bank, however, approval of the stockholders of the acquiring bank owning at least two-thirds of the stock thereof is also required. Specifically, commercial banks and trust companies, industrial banks, safe deposit companies, and investment companies are permitted to purchase the assets of a corporation subject to the provisions of the same article of the banking law as the acquiring corporation. New York City commercial banks and trust companies are permitted to purchase the assets of commercial banks and trust companies located in the counties of Nassau and Westchester and vice versa. Your attention is called, however, to the fact that the act specifically provides that nothing contained in the new section dealing with purchase of assets is to be construed as prohibiting any other purchase of assets which is otherwise permitted by applicable law.

The insertion of the requirements as to purchase of assets was considered desirable since, under the holding company section of the act, a bank holding company could not vote the stock of a banking subsidiary for or against an acquisition of assets without prior approval of the banking board. Under the law prior to the enactment of the subject act, a purchase of assets could be effected without departmental approval if it was not intended to continue to operate the offices being acquired by purchase. As was often the case, however, the parties intended to

continue the offices being acquired by purchase and as a result had to obtain banking board approval. A purchase of assets by banking subsidiaries of a bank holding company, however, had to be subjected to some form of control; otherwise some of the purposes of the act could have been frustrated by a banking subsidiary acquiring another bank and ceasing to operate its offices or by having the acquiring bank be a national bank, in which event New York State would have had no control.

MERGERS

In regard to mergers involving commercial banks and trust companies, the principal change in the enabling section of the banking law is that New York City banks and trust companies may merge with banks and trust companies in Nassau and Westchester Counties and vice versa.

Mutual institutions

For those interested in savings banks and savings and loan association mergers, the provisions in regard to permitting branch banking anywhere in the city of New York, and, in the case of savings banks, in the counties of Westchester and Nassau rather than the county in which their principal office is located possibly could be interpreted as permitting mergers of any two savings banks or savings and loan associations in the city of New York and in Nassau and Westchester Counties regardless of where their principal offices are located. At present, savings bank mergers in a city with a population of over 250,000 are limited to savings banks located in that city and in the same county or borough. Similarly, one or more savings and loan associations may merge with another located in the same or an adjoining county. In neither case, does the statute refer to the location of the principal office but merely to the location of the savings bank or savings and loan association, as the case may be.

Consequently, there is by no means a captious argument that a savings bank or savings and loan association is located wherever it has a branch. As a result, intercity savings bank and savings and loan association mergers might possibly be permitted, since the prerequisite of establishment of a branch can easily be circumvented by each of the two applicants by exchanging existing branches through a change of location application prior to the merger. This matter is, however, still under study by the department. For example, the same problem has existed for quite some time under existing law in the case of savings and loan associations, although no one has ever broached the subject to our knowledge. An interpretation which would permit mergers in any country in which an office of a savings and loan association was located could lead to some unintended results, such as a savings and loan association being able through mergers to have offices located throughout the State.

New York City suburban areas

In the case of both purchases of assets and mergers involving commercial banks and trust companies, however, no branch acquired as a result of such merger or purchase of assets may be continued to be operated after 5 years from the date of such merger or purchase of assets, if such branch is so located that the establishment thereof would not be permitted by any other provision of the banking law. Consequently, if the principal office of the purchasing or receiving bank is located in New York City, branches aquired and not located in the city of New York or in the counties of Nassau and Westchester could only be operated for 5 years. On the other hand, if the principal office of the receiving bank were to be located in Nassau or Westchester County, it would be perfectly permissible to open and occupy branches in the banking district in which such principal office was located. For example, a New York City bank could be merged into a Nassau County bank and branches could be established or maintained by the merged institutions in New York City and the counties of Nassau and Suffolk, but not in Westchester County. Similarly, if the receiving or acquiring bank were to be located in the county of Westchester, branches could be established anywhere within the third banking district and the city of New York, but not in the counties of Nassau and Suffolk.

Prerequisites for expansion

I would like now to discuss the factors which will primarily be considered by the department in recommending to the banking board approval or disapproval of applications to form a bank holding company or to expand an existing holding company, and in approving or disapproving a proposed purchase of assets or merger.

First, however, it might be helpful briefly to repeat the factors required to be considered by the superintendent and the banking board, as the case may be, in reaching a decision. Initially, consideration must be given to the declaration of policy contained in section 10 of the banking law. As you know, the standards therein set forth are, at best, amorphous.

The principal considerations under such declaration are, however, the protection of the public interest, the protection of the interest of the depositors, creditors, shareholders, and stockholders, and the elimination of unsound and destructive competition among banking organizations.

Secondly, consideration must be given to whether the effect of the proposed formation or expansion of a bank holding company or of a proposed merger or acquisition shall be to expand the size or extent of the resulting or acquiring institution beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking and the preservation thereof, or result in a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition.

Thirdly, it must be determined whether there will be such a lessening of competition as to be injurious to the interest of the public or a tendency toward monopoly. Finally, the act requires that primary consideration be given to the interest of the public and the needs and convenience thereof.

When one analyzes the foregoing criteria, they essentially require three separate considerations: (1) protection of stockholders, creditors, and depositors; (2) effect upon competition, and (3) the needs and convenience of the public. Certainly, under almost any applicable standard, both State and Federal, any acquisition or merger which is necessary to preserve the financial integrity of any banking institution would receive speedy approval regardless of the effects upon competition. Such factor, fortunately, is hardly ever prevalent.

Competition—Public need

Consequently, the two principal considerations are the effect on competition and the needs and convenience of the public. It is obvious that in many areas of the State today, numerous local banking monopolies have been created and are being sustained through the device of home office protection. It is an unfortunate fact, but one which must be recognized, that certain of such local monopolies are not being operated in an economic and efficient manner and are not serving the needs and convenience of the public. The act codifies the belief of the department that the needs and convenience of the public should be considered as paramount and that scrutiny of a proposed merger or acquisition should not be limited solely to competitive considerations. Consequently, if the public is not being adequately served, competitive considerations, unless extremely adverse, would not necessarily warrant disapproval of a proposed transaction if, as a result thereof, the public will be adequately served and there is no ready and feasible alternative by which such services may be provided. For example, if there is one large and one medium size bank in the area in which a small inefficiently operated bank is located, the department would prefer to see the latter two merge, but if the medium size bank does not have adequate capital or surplus to permit the acquisition of the small bank or the management to operate it efficiently as a branch, the department might permit the smaller and larger bank to merge. On the other hand, if there is a reasonable probability that in the near future a holding company might acquire such smaller bank and such acquisition would not have adverse competitive effects either from the standpoint of the relevant market area in which the smaller bank to be acquired competes or from the standpoint of competitive conditions existing between the holding company and its competitor, the department might not permit the smaller and larger bank or perhaps even the small and medium size banks to merge.

In some rare situations, it may only be through a small local monopoly that the public may receive the services to which it is entitled. Too, the banking department would not wish of necessity to look with disfavor upon any proposed merger or acquisition which achieved such result. An example of this would be a merger of two small unit banks serving the same village, neither one of which is large enough to serve the needs of the village. On the other hand, if feasible within a reasonable time, the department would naturally favor the two small banks to independently merging with two other banks in that district or being acquired by two competing holding companies, since this would preserve competition which could no longer be fostered if the two smaller banks were to merge because of home office protection.

Aging management

An analysis of the mergers involving non-New York City bank approved by the department in recent years indicates that by far and away the most prevalent factors which led to approval thereof were the aging management of the institution being taken over and the total absence within that institution of any suitable replacement for such management, as well as the absence of any feasible method of attracting new management. It should be readily apparent that if because of factors such as aging or inadequate management, the public does not receive both qualitatively and quantitatively the services to which it is entitled, often because of the umbrella of home office protection, it would make no difference to the department whether the acquisition by means of which such services would be offered is through the holding company device or by merger or purchase of assets. If there is a need for an acquisition, further competition can be fostered at any time by permitting others to enter, since once a banking institution becomes a banking subsidiary of a bank holding company, such banking institution is no longer entitled to home office protection.

Concentration of assets

I cannot stress too much, however, that the department is vitally concerned with preventing any undue concentration of banking assets in various areas of this State in a few large banks or holding companies. There is no magic figure which can be cited as being the maximum figure beyond which an undue concentration in any one institution exists. Much depends on the relevant geographic and market areas involved, the ease of entry of competitors and many other factors.

It is my personal opinion, however, that concentration in excess of 33 percent would

be a most significant factor and that concentrations ranging between 15 and 33 percent certainly require serious consideration. Where there is a question of whether, as a result of a proposed transaction, there will be a concentration of assets in two or more institutions beyond limits consistent with effective competition, the factors involved are so complex as not to permit any significant generalization. Suffice to say that I believe the act can and should be administered in such a way as to cause a diffusion of concentration rather than an increase in concentration inimical to effective competition, unless required by the presence of the most positive and persuasive banking factors.

Federal legislative impact

As is usually the case, a proposed transaction will involve a situation in which it may result in some benefit to the public but which will also involve serious questions as to whether such advantages are more than offset by adverse competitive effects. In this respect, we, in New York State, cannot afford to ignore the current status of proposed Federal banking legislation with respect to commercial bank mergers. I am certain you are all familiar with the provisions of S. 1062, as amended by the House of Representatives.

The criteria to be considered by the appropriate Federal supervisory agency, as set forth in S. 1062, are essentially the same as the criteria the department is required to consider, including consideration of the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly). Under the amended bill, the appropriate Federal supervisory authority cannot approve the transaction unless, after considering all such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest. The House report (H. Rept. 1416, 86th Cong., 2d sess.), accompanying such bill, states that the approval of a merger should depend "on a positive showing of some benefit to be derived from it * * * the burden should be on the proponents of a merger to show that it is in the public interest, if it is to be approved * * *." Under the New York act, however, it is necessary to determine whether the effect on competition is such as to be injurious to the public interest. In other words, under New York's approach, if all other factors are equal, approval will be granted unless it can be shown that the public will be harmed.

Under the proposed Federal approach, all other factors being equal, approval will be denied unless it can be shown that the public will benefit. In the majority of cases, this difference is purely a matter of semantics, but it can become controlling in a few unique situations. Obviously, we in New York in those situations cannot continue to adhere to the present presumption in the act in the event the Federal Government takes a contrary approach. To do so would only lead to the anomalous situation of New York State adhering to criteria which are meaningless, at least as far as the Federal Government is concerned, and thus rendering approval by the State, if given, under such criteria, meaningless.

Speaking personally, I would hope that the House's version of S. 1062 will be amended to remove the requirement that the transaction be affirmatively in the public interest, since I believe it creates an unfortunate inference that banking, unlike most segments of private industry, does not have the right to engage in mergers, acquisitions, etc., unless the public can benefit therefrom rather than showing that there would be no substantial harm to the public through a lessening of competition. In addition, of course, there is the further danger that over the years a more and more affirmative showing that a particular merger is in the public interest may be required by the Federal supervisory authorities either as a result of conviction or political pressure.

That the difference in the approach of New York State and that under S. 1062 would not be too significant, if limited by interpretation of S. 1062 to the question of burden of proof, can best be illustrated by a quote from the statement of the superintendent in approving a recent merger, in which he said: "It is only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances that a proposed merger has a neutral or indifferent effect upon the public interest. In almost every case, a proposed merger will tend to a greater or lesser degree to be either in or against the public interest. It is incumbent upon the appropriate supervisory authority to determine that degree. In the absence, however, of any affirmative showing on the part of the parties concerned that a particular merger is in the public interest, the burden is placed upon the supervisory authority to make a determination that it is not. Such view is predicated on the philosophy that it is the prerogative of stockholders and directors of a profitmaking institution to effect a merger unless inimical to the public interest."

Such approach merely suggests that if the parties do not show that the merger is in the public interest, it is incumbent upon the superintendent to show that it is not, since I neither know of nor can imagine a situation in which a proposed merger or acquisition can have a neutral or indifferent effect. Consequently, it will be invariably necessary for a merger to be in the public interest, if approval is to be given, I can find no case of a merger before the department in which the parties did not attempt to show that it was in the public interest. Needless to say, in many instances after independent investigation the department did not so conclude. I, for one, do not believe the question of burden of proof is to important since in the department's experience, it has always been its independent investigation which has been controlling and not what the parties alleged.

Public interest question

Applications for the formation or expansion of bank holding companies throughout the State may have a slightly easier task supporting a contention that the public interest will be benefited thereby than in the case of mergers or asset acquisitions, since there is now only one significant statewide holding company. I think it would be most difficult to show that the entry of a number of competitors for such holding company would not be in the public interest. Such is not to say, however, that the formation of holding companies in areas in which such holding company does not now compete would necessarily be subject to the same presumption. Moreover, expansion of holding companies by means of taking over sizable institutions which are more than able to compete with present banking subsidiaries of the one significant statewide holding company could not be justified merely on the grounds that such holding company will become a competitor or a stronger competitor.

Similarly, in the case of mergers and the purchase of assets, such transactions may be in the public interest if it is apparent that as a result thereof additional competition will be furnished those institutions which already control a substantial portion of banking assets in the relevant market area. On the other hand, the taking over of a large institution in the relevant market area by a larger institution in an overlapping or different market area would probably not be favored by reason of the sole argument that the combined institution could more effectively compete with the largest remaining independent institution in the area in which the bank to be taken over is located. Lest I be misunderstood, let me repeat that the foregoing examples have been predicated on the assumption that there are no positive banking factors which might warrant approval of a proposed transaction, such as an inadequate financial condition or inadequate management.

For those of you who are interested in the question of savings bank mergers, again, the decisive factor is often whether there is adequate management, a sound financial condition, unsound competition and ability to compete with comparable institutions. If such factors are not prevalent, however, it has been argued that any merger between two sizable mutual institutions which would result in operating economies should be approved. Almost every such merger will result in some operating economies, but, in my personal opinion, it must be shown that the operating economies will be such as to result in substantial benefits to the depositors and that the proposed merger will not adversely affect competition. In addition, in any merger between mutual institutions, in contrast to stock corporations, where stockholder approval is required, it is incumbent upon the department to assure itself that the main benefit to be derived from the merger will not flow to the respective management groups of the institutions involved. I believe the reasons for this should be so sufficiently obvious as not to require elaboration.

BRANCH BANKING

Unincorporated village defined

In regard to branch banking, I am certain that you are familiar with the provisions of the act. One of the principal questions raised by the provisions thereof is one which may be new to many of you. That is what constitutes an unincorporated village. The determination as to whether a community constitutes an unincorporated village is important in order to determine where a branch may be located and whether a banking institution, be it a commercial bank, savings bank, or savings and loan association, is entitled to home office protection. Although on cursory inspection, it might seem that the determination of what constitutes an unincorporated village is the same for both purposes, greater difficulty arises in regard to the latter. For purposes of determining where a branch may be located, the department has continually applied the criteria that an unincorporated village must meet the minimum specifications for incorporation under section 2 of the village law, i.e., "a territory not exceeding 3 square miles or conforming to the entire boundaries of water districts, lighting, fire, or school districts, or an entire town, or two entire school districts, containing in each case a population of not less than 500, and not including any part of a village or city." Adherence to such criteria by the Department was approved in the matter of *State Bank of Kenmore* v. *Bell*, 197 Misc. 97, aff'd 227 App. Div. 924. Consequently, in order to ascertain whether a branch may be opened, it is normally sufficient to show that the community in which such branch is to be established has the requisite population within a 3-mile area. Of course, in line with common sense and the rationale in various out-of-State cases as to what constitutes a village, the department has required that the unincorporated village have some of the characteristics of a village community, such as a reasonably compact nucleus of population and shops and possibly businesses, churches, and schools located therein or adjacent thereto. It is not usually necessary, however, to establish definitively the peripheral limits of such unincorporated village in order to determine whether a branch may be opened and occupied therein.

Home office protection

On the other hand, where the problem of affording home office protection is at issue,

it is incumbent on the department to establish the peripheral limits of an unincorporated village. In highly populated counties, such as Nassau and Westchester, the determination of peripheral limits is somewhat arbitrary at best, because of the contiguous nature of the various communities located therein. For example, should the peripheral limits be based on a square, circle, rectangle, or some other type of geometric figure? Should, wherever possible, a 3-square-mile area be taken as the area of the unincorporated village? What method should be followed where two unincorporated villages, each containing 3 square miles, overlap? What focal point should be used for determining such 3-square-mile area where the proposed unincorporated village contains what might be considered two separate and distinct nuclei?

Peripheral limits

In determining peripheral limits, insofar as possible, the department will attempt to do so on the following bases:

(1) Apply the criteria set forth in section 2 of the village law.

(2) Wherever possible, set the peripheral limits so as to contain a 3-square-mile area subject to following natural boundaries wherever possible and by natural boundaries, we mean, boundaries of incorporated villages or cities, water courses and manmade boundaries, such as reservoirs and highways.

(3) Determine such peripheral limits as nearly as possible on the basis of a circle whose center is the focal point of the unincorporated village. (Subject to (2) above.)

(4) Where there are two or more focal points, select the one nearest the principal office of the bank to which home office protection is being afforded.

(5) Where unincorporated villages are adjoining and lacking in geographic individuality and an absence of a natural boundary between the two, the common periphery might well be approximately equidistant between the two focal points.

(6) Give appropriate consideration to school districts, telephone exchanges, post office addresses, and other indexes which tend to give a community a cohesive character.

In considering whether to grant an application for a branch, first it is incumbent upon the applying party to show that the public convenience and advantage will be subserved thereby. The department generally requires some type of consistent spacing measured on the basis of a normally traveled route, which, for example, has been approximately a mile or a little less for commercial banks in suburban areas. Normally, the department believes that it requires a year around population of approximately five to six thousand persons in suburban areas to support a branch of a commercial bank, such population to be located within a reasonable geographic and market area. For savings banks, the normal population criterion is approximately 25,000. In regard to savings bank branches in suburban areas, I would think a reasonable spacing would normally be from 2 to 3 miles in a suburban area between mutual savings institutions. In addition, the department has generally tried to limit the establishment of branches to a site to which the public comes with a fair degree of regularity. I should like to make it quite clear that the foregoing are merely guides and that, naturally, exceptions have been and will be made if circumstances warrant. In considering whether or not to grant a branch application, normally all other things being equal, the local bank will be favored. Naturally, in all cases it is necessary to determine whether the applying institution has the capital or surplus necessary to support and the managerial capacity to operate a branch and whether it is in a position to offer the services to which the community is entitled. Needless to say, the public convenience and advantage test requires that consideration be given to competitive effects not only as between types of institutions but also as between all competing institutions, subject to the premise that if an area can support only one type of institution, it should be a commercial bank.

In closing, I would like to stress that this act constitutes, in my opinion, a milestone in the development of banking in this State. I think the success or failure under the new act may largely control the future development of banking in this State and in other States, which are watching with interest what occurs here in New York. A great burden has been placed on the department to administer the new act with intelligence and reasonableness. Such can only be done if it receives the cooperation and assistance of those in the banking industry and their legal representatives. Many problems and views will develop which cannot be foreseen at this time, but we would appreciate your bringing such problems and views to our attention, for I am certain that with mutual cooperation such problems can be resolved within the spirit and intent of this act and that the department's policy of administration will be developed into one which is equitable, constructive, and beneficial to this State's banking industry and above all to its residents.

Freedom and the Laws of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid commencement day address at Brookside School, Great Barrington, Mass., by a well-known teacher of the law, and an outstanding attorney in Massachusetts, Dwight B. MacCormack, Sr., of Boston, Mass.:

FREEDOM AND THE LAWS OF CONSCIENCE

(Commencement day address at Brookside School, Great Barrington, Mass., by Dwight B. MacCormack, Sr.)

Let me have the privilege on this beautiful morning of addressing my words to all of you, but particularly to you young men of Brookside School for whom this commencement day has brought us together in one place. Here, under the shadows of Squaw Peak and beneath the Monument Mountain of Hawthorne's "Tanglewood Tales," and of the poet William Cullen Bryant, and of my people's people, we are gathered together to do honor to these youths of ours. Let these young men be assured that those of us who are older than they, and those of us here who have dedicated their lives to the instruction of young men, do in fact possess a considerable amount of understanding and wisdom concerning their mental processes of thought and their physical actions and reactions, which are always so much a part of every young man during the years of his maturing.

At Brookside School you have engaged yourselves in the acquisition of knowledge of academic subjects. You have also engaged yourselves in the acquisition of the knowledge of the difference between those things which are right and those things which are wrong. I know these things because, on numerable occasions within the past decade, I have been a visitor to Brookside School and I have heard some of the words of wisdom that have been passed on to the students who have lived here by your headmaster, Dr. Altaraz.[1] I have heard many words of his which have been spoken in his appeal to your conscience, words put together to constitute his lessons to you in the appreciation of justice and the American way of life. Regardless of whether his appeal to your consciences may have sometimes struck you with awe, or at other times may have eased your fears and tribulations, those are the lessons which I believe you will remember most about Brookside in the years to come.

It has been my very great fortune in life to be a lawyer. It is only natural for one who has been engaged in the practice of the legal profession for a number of years to have acquired the habit of thinking about many things in life in terms of their relationship to law. The things about which I am thinking this morning pertain to law. However, I am not going to talk to you about the kind of law you might expect to hear from a lawyer. Permit me to speak to you primarily about those laws which control our innerselves—which we will call the "Laws of Conscience." And in so doing, let us consider the laws which control our innerselves in their relationship to the freedom of man.

There are many species of law. There are many vocations in life, other than that of the lawyer, which have to do with the practice or use of law in one or more of its many kinds. For example, the doctor, the teacher, the scientist, the clergyman, or the economist—all know a great deal about their own particular kinds of law. Every kind of law under the sun pertains to man. Furthermore, every kind of law relates to man in his never-ending search for freedom. The doctor seeks to free man from disease and to give him health. The teacher endeavors to give man learning and free him from his ignorance. The scientist engages himself in the discovery and use of the physical and chemical laws of nature to broaden the spaces of man's freedom. The clergyman devotes his life to free man from many of his natural fears. The economist works to further the interests of one's security in a world that for so long has been so insecure.

There are the divine laws, the laws of nature, the moral laws, the laws of ethics, the laws of science, and the laws of man. There are what are called the law of averages, the law of continuity, the law of causation, the law of diminishing return, the law of definite proportions, the law of error, the laws of acceleration, or motion, of refraction and of gravity. There is Newton's law and Boyle's law, Farraday's law, the Law of Moses, the Laws of the Twelve Tables, the Ten Commandments, the laws of geometry, trigonometry and of Deuteronomy. The word "law" is a noun. It is an adjective. It is a verb. Once upon a time, it was even an interjection, and, as such, was defined as "an exclamation of mild surprise."

In general, law may be divided for our purposes this morning into three categories. First, there are man-made laws, devised and controlled by man, and by the use of which government exists so that man may live with man in the kind of society his government exists to preserve and improve. Under such law, men often disagree with each other upon the abstract theories under which government and the laws function. Man-made law is not constant. Hence, we have peace and we have war. Secondly, there are the laws of nature, of which the laws of science are a part. Man seeks to discover these laws for his own use. He may use them for his own good, or for his harm, but he cannot change them. These laws are constant. Thirdly, there is the kind of law that governs man's innerself, and by the use of which he is able to reason, to think and to conduct his actions. These are the laws of con-

Footnotes at end of speech.

science to which we have already referred. These laws belong to each man as an individual human being, and, because he has been given them by God, he is man and not an animal. Man's ability to reason, to think, and to act in accordance with his conscience will determine more than anything else his present welfare and future good.

The American democratic form of government was constructed upon the idea of freedom, which comes from the conscience of man. This idea of freedom was transformed into the words of a great Constitution, under which, in 1789, a new Government—with a new ideology—opened its doors to the world. Conceived by men who were strong in their belief that the individual person was endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights, including the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, there was new hope for man on earth. This Government began its functions with only those powers delegated to it by the people. It did not begin its business with the unreasonable assumption or usurpation of powers it did not have. The greatest purpose of our Government has been to secure the blessings of liberty, that is, to preserve the numerous freedoms which were the inalienable rights of each individual citizen before the Government was created.

We have always directed our thinking on the subject of liberty and freedom in a more or less stereotyped manner. By that I mean we have always looked to Government and the protection of our manmade laws to secure those freedoms which were ours in the beginning. We have long been content in our belief that the only restraints to be imposed upon us are those to be imposed under the law of the land—and those restraints upon our freedoms can be only those which the Constitution does not prohibit Government from imposing. But that is not a fact. By our thoughts and actions we often place restraints upon ourselves.

To the young men of America, World War I is a story out of the pages of the history books. Those of us who were then living remember well that the war was fought "to make the world safe for democracy." That was our slogan. After peace came in 1918, the ideology of democracy gained great popularity throughout the Christian world. A number of countries adopted a democratic form of government. Soon, however, other ideas of government began to appear in the thoughts and actions of many peoples abroad. Then came communism, fascism, and totalitarianism. Such ideologies denied to us everything in the way of liberty we Americans and our ancestors had won after centuries of struggle and sacrifice.

There are always hidden forces at work which shape the destinies of a people. Sometimes these forces are good and sometimes they are forces for evil. If the desire for liberty and freedom is not deeply rooted in the consciences of the people of a nation, the seekers after power will shape the destinies of that people according to their own liking. That is why nazism came to Germany.

The kind of government a people will choose for themselves will be the reflection of the free exercise of the collective and individual wills of a substantial number who can think and act for themselves according to the laws of their own consciences—and not according to the dominant wills of others. It man cannot exercise his own will according to his own conscience, there is nothing left but force. The exercise of force without reason brings a people to an unhappy end. That is why nazism failed.

Apparently, democracy has been working well in West Berlin since the end of World War II. The people there have rebuilt their city, their industry, their way of life, and they have prospered. In East Berlin, under communism, that is certainly not the case. In the two parts of Berlin, democracy and communism have been in close proximity to each other. We have there a living and a working illustration of how the ideology of each kind of government affects the people living under it. That is what the Communists fear in Berlin today—the living example of how democracy works.

The advent of totalitarian governments in Europe after 1918, and the spread of communism into many countries of the world, have had their effect upon us here in America. We are no longer a pioneering, agricultural, sparsely settled country. We have been transformed, as if by magic, into a great industrial nation of heavily populated communities and we have been drawn closer to the rest of the world by scientific achievements. In the short space of 170 years our conceptions of how government should function have changed. Government in the scope of its operations has become vastly different than originally planned by our Founding Fathers. We can no longer say, with our old convictions, that—because we have a government which has protected us from the external restraints upon our liberty and freedom—that modern democracy in fact has achieved the true individualism of man for all time. The ideas of freedom have been changing in all countries of the globe, because the ideas of man have changed, and are still changing, and will go on changing. Today the world is crowded. Until the world became crowded, our manmade laws went far to secure the self-assertion of the individual human being. There was not this friction, this fear, this hysteria we have today. The scientist will accept the laws of nature which he is able to discover, because he has no other choice. God's laws are immutable, and men have small opportunity to differ with each other. Man will not always accept the laws made by man, because man-made laws are not immutable. But man has come to expect more from science than science can give to man. Today the people cry out—not enough for their rights to the self-assertion of the human will, but too loudly and too long for the fruits of science and the satisfaction of their wants and desires. Men differ greatly in their philosophy as to these things, and the friction, the fears, the hysteria that follow from these differences have become the new challenges to our freedom. Until men are able to harmonize and reconcile their wants and desires, our freedom will always be in danger.

When we talk about the freedom of the self-assertion of our own will and the free exercise of our own conscience, we are talking about the kind of law that it is our very own privilege to legislate for our own good. That is the kind of law, the proper use of which will determine for ourselves what our character is and what it will become. What is the meaning of "conscience"? The word comes from the Latin verb "conscire," meaning "to know, to be conscious of." Webster defines the word as:

"Sense or consciousness of right or wrong; sense or consciousness of the moral goodness or blame worthiness of one's own conduct, intentions or character, together with a feeling of obligation to do or be that which is recognized as good."

Man is born with animal instincts which he has inherited from ancestors of many ages. These traits of human nature which man brings with him into this world are the products of the inexorable laws of nature to which man has been subjected for thousands of years. During the evolution of man, there came a time when he was born into life with a conscience. It might be said there came a time when the animal became a man. By the use of conscience, man was able to liberate himself from an animal-being completely chained and fettered by his animal instincts. He came to have a choice between doing what was right or what was wrong. Life no longer was a problem merely of survival, but a problem of how far he might progress. The use of his conscience awakened him. He learned to think and to act for himself with reason and became an individual person. It has been written:

"Evolution continues in our time, no longer on the physiological or anatomical plane but on the spiritual and moral plane. We are at the dawn of a new phase of evolution and the violent eddies due to this change in the order of things still conceal that fact from the eyes of the majority. The transition from the ancestral animal, still squirming within us, to man is too recent for us to be able to understand the ensuing conflicts which often seem disconcerting and incomprehensible." [1]

The right to exercise your own conscience, to worship God in your own way, to think and act for yourself on the subjects of morals, politics, education, and every other subject, constitutes one of those inalienable rights with which you have been endowed by your Creator and to which reference is made in the Declaration of Independence. No one person has the right by force to inflict his thoughts and ideas upon any other person. Such restriction upon the liberty and freedom of another individual prevents that individual from the free and full exercise of his own will. Only as long as man will exercise his own will according to the laws of his own conscience can he remain free.

All this makes the work of being free in our modern society, not only a political or an economical problem, but a problem in psychology as well.

Our younger generation has been referred to as the "lost generation" and the "beat generation." Some think of you young men as those who rebel for the sake of rebellion. Some have claimed that you like whatever your elders dislike and dislike many of the things which your elders like. Many of us who are the products of that decade which has been called the "turbulent twenties" never felt at the time that we were turbulent. The word "turbulent" is defined as being "inclined to rebel." I have no doubt that we were inclined to rebel a little. I think every younger generation rebels a little—some more, some less than other generations. But each younger generation seems to rebel in its own inimitable manner. For the most part, we were an optimistic generation, whereas some of us feel that the younger generation of today is unduly pessimistic in its attitudes of mind. However, we had our pessimists just as you have your optimists. F. Scott Fitzgerald in "The Great Gadsby" wrote of the men of the twenties as "leaking sawdust at every pore." T. S. Eliot in 1925 in "The Hollow Men" wrote of men as lost souls in a waste generation in a wasteland. Some present-day writers describe the younger fry as going to extremes in the character of their behavior in order to give vent to their individualism and in their attempt to attract the attention and recognition of those around them. They depict some of you as always seeking "kicks" out of such things as "hot rods" and "souped up jallopies," and as those defying the authority of your parents and the restraints placed upon you by our laws, our customs, and our traditions. However, not all of us of the twenties have turned out to be hollow men stuffed with sawdust, and not all of your generation will grow up to be men seeking little except escape from the dullness of a polite and exacting society.

To call your generation lost or beat is to admit a lack of understanding. Furthermore, such a designation is more picturesque

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

than it is descriptive. There is one characteristics of your generation which is outstanding to say the least. That characteristic is your individualism. The persistent efforts you make in the self-assertion of your own individual wills never seem to abate, nor deter you from your appointed tasks.

You young men know only life in its present state, except what you have read in books, or what you may have been told. Your elders have the advantage of having lived through several decades which they can compare, one with the other, in their appraisal of the value of our way of life. You have been born into a world torn by wars, and the rumors of war, so that it is not strange that you have at times felt the discomfort of disillusionment, bitterness and insecurity. You may be justified at times in your efforts to overcome some of the traditions of our society, not because you think necessarily that such traditions are bad, but because life becomes a little bewildering and confusing now and then. The present day speed with which life seems to pass us by does not always lend itself to taking the time necessary for careful thought, proper reflection and sound judgment. Some of the customs that have come down to all of us from our ancestors may require you to conduct yourselves in a manner of behavior which may at times seem austere. As individuals, you may sometimes champion a cause which has no cause, or you may be tempted to throw a little of your weight around and make a noise. You find some of the classics in the arts to be boring, "old stuff" and for "squares," whereas some of the westerns and mysteries on television and some of the "rock 'n roll" music on the hi-fi really dig you. There are times when everything seems useless, without purpose and you feel alone in a big world that fairly buzzes in your ears and which is bulging at its seams. Suddenly you cry out: "I have my rights. Is this America, or isn't it?"

You want to be free. You want the freedom you feel is yours. You want to assert your will . You want recognition. You want attention. You want your own place in the sun. You want to be independent. You want to give free rein to your own individualism and very often you do not want to be told what you should or should not do, nor what you can or cannot do. At times even mere advice from others seems to be most distasteful.

There is the story of the chicken who wanted to cross the road, for no other purpose than to get to the other side, so he just put down his head and ran. He never survived that short excursion into space. His elders had never explained to him the natural dangers of the modern highway and the chicken was unable to reason it out for himself. Every year there are many chickens who want to cross the road to get to the other side for no particular good reason, who never survive the experience. For such an animal as a chicken, there are no traditions, no experiences taken out of the past from which the chicken might benefit, because his elders do not possess the ability to communicate those lessons to him. A chicken does not have the ability to exercise his own will in accordance with a conscience which could point out to him the good and the bad of one's conduct. I might add by way of a very sad commentary on our own life that there are many human beings who use the highways in such an animalistic manner—without heed to the dictates of reason and consequently to their own extermination.

At Brookside School you have been exposed to psychology. It may be true that at times you have been required to conform to certain technical rules and regulations for the sake of discipline and the orderly process of the administration of school affairs. Today, as you look back upon such times, they do not seem to have the severity that they once appeared to have. However, in this school there has been no force exerted upon you which has restricted the free exercise of your own consciences, no force that has required you to think in any way other than as you yourselves have determined after the due use of your own processes of thought and reasoning. There may have been used upon you a little psychology, but only for the purpose of making you think for yourselves in accordance with the laws of conscience. In this way each of you has remained free as an individual—without restrictions upon the freedom of your thoughts. That is the important thing under our American way of life. Because you have received such instructions at Brookside, two of your teachers have this day been awarded medals by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.[3]

As young men, we are very sure that you have taken seriously the task of finding yourselves. Some men never find themselves; others find themselves early in life. To those of you who find yourselves, the welfare and the future of America is entrusted in the years to come—years which are not so very far ahead of us. When the history of your lives is written, it will tell what you shall have done with the freedoms to which you have succeeded and which today are yours, if you want them. We have great expectations that time will demonstrate that you will have done your job well. We have great hopes that the freedoms we have enjoyed will be preserved through you for our posterity and yours, as they were meant to be preserved from our beginning as a nation. We have great hopes that you will use this individualism, which undeniably you do possess in great abundance, in a way that will be the expression of your own will and the expression of your own free exercise of your own God-given conscience, in accordance with the laws of conscience. By so doing, you will remain free, instead of surrendering your liberty and freedom to the dominant will of those who would destroy you. By so doing you will secure the blessings of liberty for the posterity of all of us. The price of freedom is very great and must be borne by each succeeding generation. This is one of the great prices you pay for living in this world and there is nothing that my generation can do to make it otherwise for you. There will be nothing your generation will be able to do in this regard for the generation that will follow yours.

In closing, let me quote from some of the homespun philosophy of a great American, our beloved American poet, Robert Frost, who once was one of my teachers:

"I have not only hopes for the future. I have hopes for the present and hopes for the past. I have hopes that the past will be found to have been all right for what it was—and the present—this present of ours—I hope will be found to have been all right for what it was, that is, that it will have made its point in history.

"We are going to discriminate once and for all, or once again, between science—what can be made a science of, and what can't be made a science of. Science has been led to expect more of itself than it can perform. But right here and now I'm telling you that the whole half of our lives can't be made a science of—can't ever be made a science of—and we're going to know more about that before we get through this period. That's what it will be remembered for."

As each of you young men go on to continue your education—may you use this individualism, which as I have said you possess in abundance, under the dictates of your conscience—in order that you may remain free and preserve the American way of life.

---

[1] Dr. I. M. Altaraz, founder and headmaster of Brookside School, Great Barrington, Mass.

[2] Lecomte du Nouy, Human Destiny, Longmann, Green & Co., New York, 1947, p. 104.

[3] Awarded to John Paton and James Guimond, members of the faculty of Brookside School.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Is Our Job Completed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. George Daley, chairman of the Rochester Dairy Cooperative, wrote a very wise and thought-provoking editorial in the cooperative's publication, the Milky Way, which I would like to call to the attention of the Congress:

IS OUR JOB COMPLETED?

I don't suppose there is a group of people making a living in our society, as we know it today, who are as far removed from one another in our everyday living and decision-making as we farmers.

You can select any group of people you wish and analyze their operation and come up with very much the same answer. They tend to organize themselves for their own welfare and bargain as units despite actually fierce competition with one another. It is natural for them to agree to limit their output or very mueh standardize their market price for products or services offered.

We, as farmers, have very strong sympathies for each other. We are, in general, glad to exchange ideas with each other about our farming operations—how we look after our livestock, raise our crops, and harvest. We have many things in common that we discuss with freedom and confidence.

The question I would like to raise is this: Why do we stop with our exchange of ideas at the point that other groups start to exchange ideas with each other? Other groups compete with each other with all the resources they have at their command. When it comes to price and output, they do not generally lash out at each other—usually the question is settled along the logical reasoning that there must be a margin on goods and services. This is logical and reasonable. As a matter of fact, the agreement on pricing of goods and services reached the point a half century ago, where it was necessary for the passage of what has been known ever since as the "Sherman Antitrust Law," which protects the public interest.

We go back to the farmer now, and see what the Congress of the United States, representing all of the people, did when it looked at his bargaining position. Let me say here again that the Congress acted in the public interest, and passed the "Capper Volstead Act," which in turn, gave farmers the right to group themselves together and bargain collectively. It was in recognition of the fact that farmers needed this bargaining ability to compete with other segments of the economy of this country, that this law was passed.

Today, in 1960, we have the situation as outlined above. Business and industry have lived with it and prospered. Labor has its

"Wagner Act" along with other laws that allow it to bargain collectively.

Labor and industry, along with professional and service groups, have had a steady increase of the consumer's dollar. The consumer, in this case, being all of us. The farmers' share has declined.

This is where we return to where we started. We, as farmers, are busy people. There are no controls on our time or output, and we have used this freedom to strangle ourselves with.

We have been demanding a good price for everything and with every means we can produce it.

This is an economic contradiction. No other segment of our economy asks for this much or gets it. It is limited by the economic fact that this is impossible to attain. Labor limits its hours and industry its output. These controls are fundamental to the well-being of our economy in this country. These limitations are the reason we have the standard of living we enjoy in the United States today.

The situation we farmers find ourselves in today, which is by averages, comparison of a return on investment and hourly labor return, is low. This situation is one that is brought about by reason of our entire mode of living; our "way of life".

The problem is not impossible to solve. As a matter of fact, it is more one of adjustment, one of reasonable approach, of yielding or compromising a position, if we might call it that—if we as farmers do not shudder too much at this thought. We may have to give up a little of our so-called independence to be a little more independent.

We need to update our ideas on what our cooperatives are doing for us. We need to coordinate our efforts as pertains to our cooperatives and bring them into line with present-day competition. The producers' cooperative, as it was known, which assembled the product, then turned it over to somebody else, has been good—is still good; but it must combine its services, goods, and bargaining power with other cooperatives, which, in turn, it must share in and control, to market the products it produces.

This is where we, as a producers' cooperative, must work with other dairy cooperatives, whether they be creameries or marketing cooperatives that have a service to offer. Keep the farmers' products in the farmers' possession to retain the overages on these products. Demand good management and an orderly, well-developed business enterprise.

We must eliminate our distrust for each other as farmer cooperatives, and work and plan for our mutual advantage.

The New Era of Pope John XXIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I command to the attention of our colleagues the following article concerning the understanding which exists between the Jews and Catholics. The article was written by Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and appeared in the ADL Bulletin.

The article follows:

CATHOLIC-JEWISH RELATIONS: THE NEW ERA OF POPE JOHN XXII

(By Benjamin R. Epstein)

The meeting of the five-man B'nai B'rith delegation with Pope John XXIII was official, the exchange of sentiments warm and sometimes informal.

We were seated in the Pope's private library in the Vatican on the morning of January 18 of this year. Label A. Katz, president of B'nai B'rith, was our spokesman and, as he talked, the Pope interrupted, with a motion of his hand, "Slowly please, slowly." Interpreters were on hand but, apparently, the Pope wanted to see how much English he could understand. Mr. Katz talked about B'nai B'rith and its purposes. Pope John asked the meaning of B'nai B'rith, saying that he knew that the words were Hebrew but that his Hebrew was rusty. When it was explained that B'nai B'rith means "Sons of the Covenant"—the covenant between God and Abraham—Pope John nodded in understanding.

Label Katz told of his appreciation for the Pope's help in the rescue of thousands of Jews, particularly children, when he was Papal Nuncio in Istanbul during the time of the Nazi terror. He also thanked the Pope for his understanding in revising the language of several church prayers considered offensive to Jews. He discussed the wave of synagogue and church desecrations—then at its height—and said that he hoped that, in the long run, these acts of vandalism would help bring men of good will together in defense of "justice, morality, and universal peace."

The Pope, in response, said that he was glad to have the opportunity to discuss matters of mutual interest. What he had done during the war, he said, had been at the direction of the late Pius XII who felt deeply about the fate of those persecuted by the Nazis. Besides, his acts represented the only human thing to do. He said that he has great pleasure when some of the Jews he had aided as children now come to visit him as grown men and women with children of their own.

In talking about the changes in prayers, the Pope reminded us that Catholics daily recite many psalms and passages from the Old Testament. "And you of the Old Testament and we of the New must come closer and closer, as brothers under God, to work for peace throughout the world," he added.

He spoke of recent evidences of anti-Semitism, in Germany and other parts of the world. "These events are deeply painful, not only because they are violations of the human and natural rights of man, but because they tend to divide the children of God."

After the exchange of statements, we spoke informally. The Pope expressed deep interest in America and asked the names of the cities from which we came. He was pleased to learn that one of our group, Max J. Schneider, was a member of the board of trustees of a Catholic hospital; he said that he was familiar with the many philanthropic activities of B'nai B'rith as well as those of individual Jews.

The private audience lasted 20 minutes. We left the library deeply moved. Now, 4 months later, the visit and the Pope's expressions of humanity and warmth are vividly remembered. The memory will be a lasting one.

This B'nai B'rith meeting with Pope John XXIII received a great amount of newspaper attention. It was greeted by many Jews throughout the world as an event of singular significance. But not by all Jews—some said that the event was little more than a ceremonial occasion in which everyone said the correct things.

Behind these different reactions to our meeting with John XXIII—behind any understanding of Jewish attitudes toward the Roman Catholic Church—lies an involved and often tragic history. Many Jews recall hundreds of years of persecution and oppression perpetrated by fanatics under the banner of the Church, as in the case of the Spanish Inquisition. Some Jews recall their own mistreatment in not-too-distant days in Eastern European lands which were largely Catholic.

And many Jews believe that conventional Catholic teaching of the Crucifixion story still represents one of the principal sources of anti-Semitism.

Against this background, it is understandable that many Jews are surprised to learn that studies of social scientists reveal that anti-Semitism is no greater among Catholics than it is among Protestants.

Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, writing in the book, "American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View," points out that this contradicts "popularly held opinion in the Jewish community, which usually regards as particularly marked the hostility between Jews and Catholics." The Rabbi reports that, when speaking to Jewish audiences on Jewish-Christian relations, "someone always inquires into the content of parochial school instruction." Or they ask: "Have Catholics stopped teaching their children that the Jews killed Christ?"

These are the historical reasons that inhibit understanding between Catholics and Jews. There are the practical problems, too, that make for community controversy and tension. Jews often find themselves dissenting from Catholics on many issues related to the separation of church and state. Many Jews are wary of Catholics for their efforts to gain Government aid for parochial schools, for their position on released time, for efforts to deny distribution of birth control information by tax-supported clinics, for their opposition to liberalization of divorce laws, and the like. On the other hand, Catholics find it difficult to understand why Jews see anything wrong with their use of moral power in support of things they believe and why Jews don't recognize the principle of distributive justice—the fairness, for example, of obtaining Government help for Catholic institutions since, after all, Catholics pay the same amount of taxes as other Americans although they often do not make use of tax-supported public schools.

On another level, ADL frequently hears the complaint that it is difficult to find a priest willing to participate in a religiously sponsored brotherhood meeting or service. This reluctance, it should be noted, is shared by some orthodox Jews.

Some Jews also have the notion—held by many Protestants, too, that the Catholic Church is a monolith, a centrally directed army with the Pope its commander in chief. They believe that his word is law, that any order he issues will be immediately carried out by the entire priesthood and by millions of loyal Catholics in every corner of the globe. They are often unaware of the fact that practices vary from diocese to diocese according to the views of each bishop.

This is a stark listing of some of the things that many Jews worry about. Some of the concerns are real, some fancied. Some are based on historical truth, others on misconceptions.

There is need for continuing dialog between Catholic and Jew on these and many other points just as basic. I can allude to some of them here only sketchily.

Some Catholics interpret the New Testament as saying that Christ died to expiate the sins of all mankind and, therefore, all mankind was responsible for his death. Another interpretation of the New Testament places guilt for Christ's death on the Jews of the time. Even accepting the New Testament as a literal presentation of history—which Jews do not—is it not monstrous to use such an interpretation to damn Jews throughout eternity? Yet this is the impact in some cases.

One critic finds that passion plays are filled with intense emotion often mingled with harsh and powerful denunciation of Jews. In view of what we know about latent prejudice, he believes that the traditional type of passion play does grave disservice to the cause of good intergroup relations.

But the Passion Play started in 1633; today it too is a vestige of history.

The concept of the Catholic Church as a monolith is true—but only if the term is confined to dogma and religious truth. There is nothing monolithic about the way Catholics approach other matters, such as politics, social welfare problems, the arts. Personal knowledge of a few Catholic organizations, or Catholics themselves, is enough to shatter forever the concept of the general monolith.

But certainly the personal attitudes and influence of the Pope do create a climate of opinion within and without the Catholic world. A look at some of the statements and works of Pius XII and, particularly, John XXIII, is heartening to Jews and all persons concerned with human rights.

Cardinal Pacelli's opposition to nazism was well known and his election as Pope Pius XII was denounced in the German press. His efforts to help Jews throughout the war have now been chronicled. After the liberation of Rome, while there was apprehension over the fate of Jewish prisoners held in Northern Italy and Germany, he made one of his most fervent pleas for brotherhood:

"For centuries the Jews have been most unjustly treated and despised. It is time they were treated with justice and humanity. God wills it and the Church wills it. St. Paul tells us that the Jews are our brothers. Instead of being treated as strangers, they should be welcomed as friends."

Pope John XXIII has furthered the humanitarian tradition. As papal nuncio to Istanbul during the Nazi period, he personally aided in the rescue of many Jews. The late Chief Rabbi Herzog of Israel wrote of him: "Cardinal Roncalli is a man who really loves the people of the Book and through him thousands of Jews were rescued." One of the directors of rescue work for the Jewish agency during the Nazi period, Chaim Barlas, describes three private conferences with the papal nuncio which resulted in great aid. Barlas also lauded his personal devotion and courage in saving the lives of thousands of Jews.

Pope John's friendship and deep interest in Israel has been the subject of much discussion there. His appointment of the first bishop to Israel has been acclaimed there as another evidence of friendship.

Pope John's revisions of two prayers—an unusual occurrence in the Catholic Church—evoked the warmest expressions from Jewish leadership. In March 1959, the Vatican announced that the Pope had deleted a reference to the Jews as "perfidious" from the Good Friday prayer—a reference dating back to early Christian history. A spokesman said that the Pope's intention was to recognize "a common brotherhood of all men" as well as special ties binding all Christians to "those who were the chosen people."

The second change came 6 months later when Pope John changed the text of the act of consecration of the human race to the sacred heart. In this case, direct references to Jews and Moslems were eliminated. The Vatican said that the Pope had ordered the change "out of respect" toward the other religions.

His statement to the B'nai B'rith delegation was not the only one about the anti-Semitic desecrations in January. Repeatedly the Vatican spoke out against bigotry; the appeals for brotherhood were echoed throughout the Catholic world by clergymen and lay leaders. In the United States, the Catholic bishops of America—speaking through Archbishop Karl J. Alter of Cincinnati, chairman of the administrative board of bishops of the National Catholic Welfare Conference—called on "all citizens, whether Christians or Jews, and all those who love truth and justice, to protest privately and publicly against further manifestation of bigotry. * * * We urge that all right-minded people refrain from any word or deed which might (retard) the advancement of our common welfare."

"Common welfare"—the common good—is the key, the practical goad to better understanding. Jews and Catholics will continue to have different attitudes and approaches to many problems. And they should have, if they are to hew to religious principle. There is always room—even need—in America for differences of religious conviction and opinion.

There will be more irritation and angry words over specific issues. There will be misunderstandings too. But the basic ones—miscomprehensions of purpose and goal—will be fewer. For all men have more in common than they have to separate them. This becomes increasingly clear, to Jews and to Catholics. We see in our literature, our meetings, our homes, that Catholics and Jews feel freer to discuss things about which they sharply disagree.

In this dialog, on this road to greater maturity and less distrust, we are mutually helped by the words and deeds of John XXIII. In today's relations between Catholic and Jew, he is playing an inspired role.

The American Inheritance—Commencement Address by Tomlinson Fort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on May 29, the Honorable Tomlinson Fort, vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., delivered a commencement day address entitled "The American Inheritance," at the New Mexico Military Institute, at Roswell, N. Mex.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN INHERITANCE

(Commencement Day address by Tomlinson Fort, vice president, Westinghouse Electric Corp., New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., May 29, 1960)

General Gay, parents and faculty members, guests of the institute, ladies and gentlemen, to the 206 members of the graduating class of 1960 I extend a special greeting and offer my congratulations and best wishes.

I am deeply indebted for the privilege of sharing this happy occasion with you. It is an inspiring and heartwarming experience to address an audience of young people on a day so important in their lives.

General Gay has suggested that I say something that will prove of benefit and service to you who have reached this time of commencement. It is a formidable assignment, especially because I am aware that I do not have 206 identical personalities out in the graduating class, but rather 206 different and highly complex individual young men. I wish I could try to meet this challenge by talking to each one of you personally. Since that is impossible, I will give you, as a group, such counsel as I can and discuss with you some of the things that I think will be important to you in your future education and career.

I want to begin by telling you some things about a bridge. If you wonder why I am doing this, you will understand in a moment.

Men have dreamed of this bridge for years, but only now do engineers believe that they have the materials and techniques that will make it structurally possible. The bridge is being built across the entrance to New York Harbor. It will connect Brooklyn and Staten Island. It will cost $325 million and will be ready for traffic in 1965.

The bridge will have a center span stretching out 4,250 feet—four-fifths of a mile. It will be 115 feet wide and will have two decks, one above the other, each with six traffic lanes. The two main towers will rise 680 feet above sea level—the height of a 45-story building. There will be two main cables on each side of the deck, each of them three feet thick. This is the longest and heaviest suspension span that men have ever attempted to build.

I would like you to keep the picture of this bridge in your mind for a few moments while I tell you about another enterprise—one which Herbert Hoover has called "the greatest engineering project in the world."

This is a $705 million project for converting more of the enormous energy of Niagara Falls into electric power. The installed generating capacity of the new Niagara project will be the largest in the Western World—2,190,000 kilowatts. If you remember what Major Ellis taught you, you will immediately know that this represents almost 3 million horsepower.

Two hydroelectric plants are being erected in this project. The larger of the two—the largest in the Western Hemisphere—is being built into the side of a 310-foot cliff which forms one wall of the Niagara gorge, 4 miles downstream from the falls. This plant will house 13 identical waterwheel generators, each with a capacity of more than 200,000 horsepower. A massive flow of water will be carried from the river above the Falls, past the city, and on to the powerplants through two enormous conduits, each of them 46 feet wide, 66 feet high, and 4 miles long.

It may interest you to know that the chief problem encountered so far in this monster project has nothing to do with engineering stresses or power economics. The project has been held up by unfriendly Indians. One of the proposed reservoirs occupies the same area as a Tuscarora Indian Reservation, and the Indians are pretty cool about the notion of moving out.

Now, why have I told you about the building of a bridge and of a power project many hundreds of miles from us here in Roswell? Well, I have done it for two reasons.

If you are like the other young people I know, your attitude toward bridges and powerplants is somewhat matter-of-fact. You can take them or leave them alone. The mills and factories you see around you, the roads and airports, the stores and schools,

the railroads and canals, the hospitals and houses—most of these have been standing where they are now ever since you began to notice such things—and therefore they seem to you to have been standing there since the beginning of time. It is only natural that you should take them for granted. I did it once myself.

The point I want to make is that, on the contrary, these things have not always been standing where they are now, and they are not to be taken for granted. Just like the Narrows Bridge below Manhattan and the Niagara power project today, they all had to be built. And building them took years of planning, years of work, a great deal of money, and the combined talents of many, many people.

These are all a part of our national wealth. They are part of your inheritance as Americans.

What I want to say is that this new bridge and this new power installation belong to you. As American citizens, you own them just as surely as you own the Grand Canyon and the Mississippi River, the Carlsbad Caverns, the Lincoln Memorial and the ground at Valley Forge.

We elders are giving you young people many problems to solve. We will leave you much unfinished business—including quite a few bills to pay for the things we have built. But we are also giving you a first-rate physical plant—the best physical plant in the world.

Your national inheritance includes, for instance, 3 million miles of paved roads. It includes almost one-third of the world's railroad mileage; and almost one-half of the world's installed electrical generating capacity. It includes almost 300,000 manufacturing establishments; some 2,000 colleges and universities; 6,786 hospitals; and 4,000 industrial research laboratories—all of these staffed with highly trained people.

To know the value of such an inheritance as this, you need only to live in a country that does not have it. Go among people who are short of professional talent, of investment capital, and of the minimum needs for making life comfortable and productive. You will find that these people do not take such possessions for granted. They know something of the cost that must be paid to earn them.

In all America there is no better example than our own State of New Mexico to show what determined men can accomplish against great handicaps, and the inheritance they can build up through hard work for their sons and daughters.

We know that our culture here is an old one—the oldest, in fact, in the Nation. God gave us a healthful climate and some beautiful scenery, but He left the rest to us. Sixty years ago, only 4 percent of this State's land surface was included in farms, and only one-fourth of 1 percent was classed as improved farmland. Only 203,000 acres were irrigated. Roswell was a town of only 2,006 people, and the territory of New Mexico had fewer than 200,000 inhabitants.

We had one valuable asset, however, and that was the caliber of the people who came to settle here. These men saw the possibilities of this territory if capital could be found to irrigate the land, to reclaim the desert, to extract the minerals, to extend the transportation system, to bring in industry, and to build up our communities.

For example, there was Ed A. Cahoon, who came to New Mexico with a moneybelt in which he carried $25,000 in gold—money which he used to establish the First National Bank of this city. There was Col. James W. Willson, a graduate of VMI who, between 1901 and 1922, did so much to build a struggling little military school of the frontier into the great institution it is today. There was James John Hagerman, who between 1890 and 1900 carried out a dream to make this entire Pecos River country the garden spot of New Mexico. He invested and lost millions of dollars in the effort, and he died a disappointed man, but John Hagerman brought the railroad and irigation to this country, and you see all around you the happy results of the work he started. Here, in the shadow of the building that bears his name, I am proud to pay tribute to a great pioneer.

Closer to our own time, there is the outstanding example of a young man, a graduate of the University of Michigan, who was ill with tuberculosis and whose doctors gave him only a few months to live. Rather than surrender, this man fought to live and to make a notable contribution to society.

Under the virtual sentence of death, with no financial resources, he chose the western country as the best place to recover his health. His choice was not unusual, for more and more good people, including many business and professional people, had begun to come here in search of health. My wife's father, my own father, and the parents of most of my old friends here in Roswell did the same thing.

This young man became a newspaper reporter in Albuquerque. He did regain his health and make a very great contribution to his fellow men. He overcame further setbacks to his health, built up a business, and entered public service. He represented New Mexico as a Congressman. He became a member of the President's Cabinet. In 1948, this man—CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico—became a U.S. Senator. As a Senator, he is making a major contribution to the peaceful harnessing of atomic power—the new and powerful form of energy first revealed in this State just 15 years ago.

It is because of the services of men like these that New Mexico has been able to make so much of its land productive, and is now having an economic growth far above the national average. It is because of them that this is one of the most flourishing and fastest growing States in the Union, both in percentage of population increase and in industrial expansion.

Let me give you quite a different example of what a man can do when he chooses to struggle against odds and is determined to improve the environment in which he lives. This example comes from my other and second home, the city of Pittsburgh.

Probably the most distinguished citizen of our community is a man named Richard K. Mellon. In 1945, Mr. Mellon took his army discharge and, like 10 or 12 million other Americans, returned home. He found Pittsburgh, a chewed-up, rundown, decaying community, hurt in the great depression and worn out with fighting a war. A blanket of smoke hung almost continuously over the valleys. There was an ever-present menace of floods. There were terrible slums—industrial, commercial and residential. The city was losing much of the industry which had built it up. It was very difficult for companies like my own to employ capable young men, for they—and their wives—did not want to live and work in the "Smoky City."

Now, Richard Mellon is one of the wealthiest men in the country, and he could have lived in any of the world's most delightful places. Instead he chose to follow a course of struggle and service. He decided to stay in the city which for 100 years had meant so much to his family, and devote his efforts and his resources to leading a fight against the city's problems.

Today, Pittsburgh is one of the cleanest and most progressive communities in America. We have rebuilt much of our city. A leading magazine said recently of us: "Except for a few war-devastated cities in Europe, probably no city in the world during the past decade has altered its physical appearance so much as Pittsburgh." We no longer have to coax young men to live in our community—they are eager to be part of a vibrant, exciting city of opportunity.

This happened largely because one man accepted a new responsibility and chose to follow the hard instead of the easy path. His action is typical of the demand that our society makes on its best people—on those who have the education, the ability or the means to make a major contribution. You who are being graduated from this institute will be expected to do more than others in future years, simply because you will have the training to do more. If any of you happen to have the talent for public service of a Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, or the wealth of a Gen. Richard Mellon, then your obligation to your fellow men will be so much the greater.

I told you, earlier in this talk, that I had two reasons for describing two great engineering projects to you. I wanted to convince you, first, that you should not take your Nation's physical plant—your own national inheritance—for granted, since men had to build it laboriously, at great cost, over many years.

My other reason for telling you of these projects is that you may feel a pride in them—and may be inspired to live up to what they represent.

To me, these two projects stand as symbols for a dynamic national spirit. They represent daring achievement by a nation of builders—of men who are never satisfied with things as they are and who continually struggle to change and improve their surroundings.

The charge has been made many times in recent years that we Americans have become decadent, or "soft," or both. We are told that we are too rich—"affluent" is the word generally used. We are too fond of gadgets. We ride when we should walk. We are not willing to make personal sacrifice for the good of the majority. We have lost our sense of national purpose. And so on and on.

This criticism is normal, for we are the most self-critical people on earth. But to our young people I want to say, "Don't you believe it." This is a false estimate of our personal attitudes and of our national character. Americans have always been a dynamic and determined people, and they are a determined, dynamic people today.

I think that the people who call us "soft" are not really aware of what is going on in this country. Certainly they do not know or understand the wave of stunning engineering and construction projects that have recently been changing the face of America and are now underway throughout the length and breadth of the land. These are not the works of a soft people. They could be conceived, planned and finished only by men of talent and determination. Let me show you what I mean.

At Denver, Americans are drilling a 23-mile tunnel under the Continental Divide to bring billions of gallons of fresh water to the city. In the Catskill Mountains at the eastern end of the country, the tunnel is even longer—44 miles through mountain rock—and it will carry a river of water to New York City, 100 miles away.

At Baltimore, Americans recently completed a 7,600-foot twin tunnel under the harbor for automobile traffic. There is nothing unusual about an automobile highway that runs under water, of course. There are 16 of them in the world now, and 12 of them are in the United States. A 13th connects the United States and Canada.

The Baltimore tunnel, however, was a tunnel with a difference. It was first constructed on dry ground. It was floated into position in the harbor. It was lowered part by part into place in a trench dug across the

bottom of the harbor. This was a brand-new technique, and if the Russians had done it, they would have shouted at the top of their voices that it was a great victory of the Communist system. We Americans take such engineering achievements for granted.

At Sacramento, Americans are bringing the ocean 61 miles inland to make the city into a Pacific seaport.

At Washington, D.C., men are converting a 9,600-acre site into the world's largest airport. The project manager there supervises operations over a shortwave radio network.

At Pecos, Tex., Americans have sunk the world's deepest oil well—almost 5 miles straight down into the earth. The hole was a dry one, and the next record well may be dry too, but the search will go on.

We are building school classrooms at the rate of 70,000 a year. We are laying down a 41,000-mile network of top-standard, limited access expressways which will interconnect almost all our cities with a population of 50,000 or more.

In West Virginia, we are building a huge radio telescope that contains 20,000 tons of steel and is as wide as two football fields are long. In southern California, we expect soon to begin building the world's largest atomic powerplant—360,000 kilowatts of central station power derived from the fission of the atom.

In Ohio not long ago, I saw a power shovel at work—but what a power shovel. It stood as high as a three-story house, and it needed two operators to run it. Each of them rode to his separate cab in an elevator. It cost more than $2½ million, and when I saw it, it was taking 90 tons of earth from a hillside at a single bite.

A few months ago, Nikita Khrushchev, who is ruler of a country with a standard of living somewhat below most industrialized countries, spoke pityingly of our sad condition here in America and declared, "Capitalism is a wornout old horse." To that I can only say: "Some horse."

We Americans can make small things as well as giant ones. In the Westinghouse laboratories, we are carrying out intensive research and development work in molecular engineering. This is an exciting new concept which is revolutionizing the whole field of electronics. We have already shown a high-fidelity phonograph in which the preamplifier, instead of being the size of a shoe box, is the size of a matchhead, and the power amplifier is smaller than a dime. We believe that within 2 or 3 years we will be able to build a complete radio receiver, for military or other use, no larger than your smallest fingernail.

I say that achievements like these—and I could have named many more of them—are something we can all be proud of. I hope you will be proud of them. I hope you will be more aware of the exciting industrial and engineering developments that are going on around you today, more interested in them, more eager to play, some day, a large part in them. If I have made you feel any of this, then my purpose in addressing you is richly rewarded.

You young people are the inheritors of far more than the fine physical plant I have described. You will inherit a political and economic system that has worked longer and better, and is bringing greater benefits to more people, than any other system ever developed.

Within this system, you will always be free to choose and to change jobs. You will find opportunities to do the work that interests you most in whatever part of the country you like best—and to have some fun in life while you are doing it. You will have a higher standard of living and more leisure time—if you want it—than any other generation of young people in history.

In return for these opportunities and privileges, your country asks only that you make the best contribution you possibly can in your work and in your daily life, up to the full level of your capabilities and your training.

The capabilities of each of you are widely different; but for all of you, your training thus far has been excellent. You have enjoyed the best early education your parents, your teachers, and any State can provide. I know that you will use this training wisely and well.

One of the blessings which goes with your diploma is the privilege of having lived in New Mexico. I know this is true whether you are a resident of this State or have come here from one of the other 49 States. The days you have spent in these historic surroundings will be one of the greatest experiences of your life.

I hope the future for each of you will be a happy and productive one. I wish each of you luck and happiness in the exciting years that lie ahead.

The Intelligence Feat of the U–2 Plane Is Remembered in Oneonta N.Y., Birthplace of the Famous Fairchild Camera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in all the recriminations, criticisms, and expressions of disappointment and dismay which followed on the unfortunate shooting down of an American U–2 plane over the Soviet Union last month there appears to have been little attention paid to the tremendous technical achievement represented by the modern American photographic equipment carried by this plane and the significant contribution to American intelligence operations which modern photography represents.

As the Representative in this body of the 32d Congressional District of New York, which includes the city of Oneonta, N.Y., I am particularly conscious of the surprising and remarkable developments of American photography because Oneonta happens to be the birthplace of Sherman Fairchild, the original developer of the famous Fairchild camera, the very kind of high-acuity instrument which is able to carry out the feats attributed to the U–2 and recently demonstrated so graphically on television by President Eisenhower.

Something of the background of Mr. Fairchild's camera and also Mr. Fairchild himself is contained in two articles which appeared recently in the Oneonta Star, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include these articles for the information of my colleagues. One appeared on May 13, 1960; the other appeared on May 11:

[From the Oneonta Star, May 13, 1960]

FAIRCHILD CAMERA IN SPY PLANE?—IDENTIFIES 2-FOOT OBJECT AT 100,000 FEET

National attention is being focused on an Oneonta native since an espionage plane was downed in Russia.

Was the aerial camera used by the pilot a modern improvement over the pioneer camera invented in Oneonta by Sherman Fairchild?

This question has been fired repeatedly at Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp., Syosset, Long Island.

In addition, newspapers have been calling for reissues of a 1956 public address made on aerial reconnaissance by Mr. Fairchild.

His words, not too seriously regarded then, are now hailed as those of a far-seeing prophet.

The phone call Thursday by the Star to the Fairchild firm at Syosset disclosed both the interest in the aerial camera and the revived interest in the 1956 speech.

It also revealed that Fairchild has come up with an ultranew camera which, from 100,000 feet, will identify any 2-foot cube object on the ground.

Fairchild is generally accepted as the world's foremost authority on aerial photography, and his cameras are in use by the Air Force. It was presumed that the instrument on the espionage plane was a Fairchild but confirmation was not possible.

Jim Moore, public relations director for Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp., said that he and his department had been swamped with inquiries. He said he had no way of knowing, at the moment, whether the camera was a Fairchild.

He also said that security restrictions might be involved.

Two other firms, Hycon and Chicago Aerial, have followed Farchild into the field, but Fairchild is much larger than both, Mr. Moore said.

In his 1959 speech, made before the West Coast Electronics Manufacturers Association in Los Angeles, Mr. Fairchild made statements that now have become highly significant.

At that time President Eisenhower had called for disarmament with aerial inspection. The subject of "open skies" was before the public when Mr. Fairchild told the west coast men:

"Disarmament is impossible without the right to inspect, and I predict that if we continue the advances in technology at the same rate as we have in the past, no nation will ever again be able to build up secret arsenals or military strength without being detected.

"I believe the reconnaissance team of the future, and by this I mean not only the flying crews but the technical ground squadrons composed of photo lab technicians, photo interpreters, photogrammetrists, and electronic experts, will be able to learn everything about a given country regardless of size that is essential to know."

Mr. Moore, the public relations director, added Thursday:

"We just delivered to the Air Force last month a new aerial camera which, from 100,000 feet, can identify an object on the ground that is 2 feet by 2 feet by 2 feet. You can tell whether it is a typewriter or a box of canned gods."

The new instrument is the Fairchild High Acuity Camera, and was delivered to the Air Force at the Wright Air Development Center, Dayton, Ohio.

[From the Oneonta Star, May 11, 1960]

FAIRCHILD RICHEST OF FORMER ONEONTANS—HE HOLDS 99,864 SHARES OF IBM—AND MORE

(By Francis Forrest)

Keeping up with Oneonta's alumni.

The May issue of Fortune magazine carries a full-length feature article about an Oneonta native, the title being "Multifarious Sherman Fairchild."

It discloses that Mr. Fairchild is the largest individual stockholder (99,864 shares) in International Business Machines, a forerunner of which his father founded.

When Fortune compiled its list of 76 richest Americans ("The 50-Million-Dollar Man," November 1957), Fairchild was not even on the list of also rans; currently, however, his net worth is more than $80 million, and his fortune is among the biggest in the land," says the magazine.

"Sherman Fairchild's flow of bright ideas," the article states, "has produced three companies, a number of useful devices, some considerable fortunes, and a legion of breathless executives. There's no sign yet that the flow is diminishing.

"Considering the number of fields in which Sherman Mills Fairchild has achieved distinction—and made himself rich—it is surprising that he is not better known.

"Part of the trouble may come from the fact that the sum total of his activities make him sound like several different people.

"There is, for example, Sherman Fairchild the aviation pioneer, who built the first enclosed cabin monoplane, and participated in all the romance that pictures of old biplanes now conjure up: flying the mail in Mexico and and the Caribbean, and beginnings of Pan American (Air Lines), of which Fairchild was a director for 28 years.

"The Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., which he founded, had its ups during the war when he built the famous PT-19 trainer and the 'Flying Boxcar'; currently it is having its downs building a turboprop called the F-27.

"Then there is Sherman Fairchild the photography pioneer, who devised the first coupled exposure-and-stop camera and the first large between-the-lens shutter, which made aerial mapping possible.

"The Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp., which he also founded, is currently performing as brilliantly as the aviation company is sluggishly.

"Then there is Sherman Fairchild the audiophile, former president of the Audio Engineering Society, whose Fairchild Recording Equipment Corp. lost money for years, in part because its products were too good.

"Finally, there is Fairchild the individualist, a tall, somewhat shy, boyishly enthusiastic man, interested in a wild variety of things. Some of them—notably wines, women and, if not song, music—gave him for years the reputation of a playboy, who was seen at '21' wearing a fresh pretty girl every few days like a new boutonniere.

Being a bachelor, and rich, Fairchild still crops up in the gossip columns, but for the most part apocryphally.

"The Fairchild empire did not grow from any consuming ambition on Fairchild's part to build an empire. Instead it flowered almost happenstantially as a result of his enthusiasm for his various interests. Now, at 64, he steers a course somewhat between executive and scientist; he acts as a kind of technical interpreter in his companies for nontechnical directors.

"He can talk in technical terms with any of the engineers in the companies, and though he has taken an active part in management at several periods (at some point he has been president of all the companies that bear his name), administration is not a role he relishes. As a rule his activity in day-to-day company affairs has been inversely proportional to the prosperity of the company."

Fairchild's gift of quick and deep absorption in some matter of interest was manifest several years back when he returned to Oneonta for the funeral of his Aunt Jenny.

He visited the Star office and asked, somewhat timidly, if the newspaper had one of his engraving machines. Learning that it did, Fairchild eagerly accepted an invitation to see the Star's photoengraving department.

In company with a friend, William Sherman, now Otsego County probation officer, Fairchild spent 2 hours in the Star building and radio station WDOS, talking with a reporter.

He inquired about one of his former school teachers, Dr. Albert E. Fitzelle, Sr., now retired, who had a class in physics which Fairchild attended in Oneonta High School.

The next time Fairchild visits the Star he can see another Fairchild product in action, namely, a Teletypsetter, for he now controls the Teletype Corp. He lives in a house in Manhattan which has ramps instead of stairs and has been known to break business engagements to receive callers from the city of his birth.

Nationwide Insurance Co.'s Policy Position on Health Insurance for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the enlightened action of the Nationwide Insurance Co., with assets of $350 million, as stated in its recent policy resolution regarding the desirability of the social security principle in legislation on health care for the aged of America.

Nationwide is the first insurance company to recognize the point I have made earlier in this vital topic—that the type of legisaltion such as I have introduced in S. 3503 will create opportunities for private insurance companies to offer supplementary protection in addition to the basic benefits provided in such legislation.

This public policy statement by a progressive insurance company management should be given the widest publicity possible, since it affirms my insistence, and that of my cosponsors, that we are not out to destroy the field of private health insurance. Just as the creation of the original Social Security Act 25 years ago established the springboard for the mushrooming of private pension plans to augment OASI benefits, so will the passage of such a bill as S. 3503—for financing basic health benefits for the retired aged—result in an improvement and expansion of additional protection through private programs around the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement of the Nationwide Insurance board of directors, dated May 31, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY ON HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

On April 7, 1960, the Nationwide Insurance board of directors adopted the following policy relative to health insurance for older persons:

"Whereas the Nationwide Insurance Cos. are deeply committed to the principle of helping people to meet their social and economic needs; and the health needs of their older citizens are among the most urgent and pressing social problems remaining unsolved; and

"Whereas most of the health costs of older people are not being met by insurance as evidenced by certain statistics which indicate that 86 percent of couples receiving social security benefits in 1957 had none of their medical care costs met by insurance; and

"Whereas certain statistics indicate that most older people had neither the income nor the assets to meet such expenses as evidenced by the figures that nearly 4 out of 10 couples over 65 years of age had total income of less than $2,000 in 1958: Be it

"*Resolved*, That it be the policy of the Nationwide Insurance Cos.:

"(a) To support the use of the social insurance principle to meet the health needs of older citizens.

"(b) To support the application of this principle in appropriate legislation to provide basic health insurance to those eligible for old-age, survivors, and disability benefits as a feasible and desirable step in this direction.

"(c) To continue our efforts in our own insurance program, in conjunction with cooperative health plans, and as members of the private insurance industry to provide further health care through voluntary coverage in addition to that which may be furnished through Government programs."

The adoption of this policy was based on certain major considerations which are summarized as follows:

PROBLEM

Nationwide Insurance is deeply committed to the principle of helping people meet their social and economic needs. The health needs of our elder citizens are among the most urgent and pressing social problems remaining unsolved.

Understandably, on an issue of this sort many different sets of figures can be cited; in fact, there are as many figures as there are viewpoints. All of them, however, have one thing in common: they all conclude that most of the health costs of older people are not being met by insurance. In Nationwide's approach to a management decision, the figures most often referred to were those provided by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: 86 percent (85.6 percent) of couples receiving OASDI benefits in 1957 had none of their medical care cost met by insurance. Nine out of ten (91.8 percent) of the single beneficiaries had none of their medical care cost met by insurance. Of those who received some benefit and were hospitalized, 44 percent of them had less than 25 percent of their bills covered by insurance and 73 percent had less than half of the bill covered.

Nine percent of the aged couples receiving the social security benefits had medical expense in excess of $800 annually in 1957 and 16 percent had medical expense in excess of $500. One in five (22 percent) had expense in excess of $400.

Most older people have neither the income nor the assets to meet such expenses. Nearly 4 out of 10 (37.4 percent) couples over 65 years of age had total money income of less than $2,000 in 1958. And more than half (55.4 percent) of such couples had incomes of less than $3,000 in that year. Nearly half (45 percent) of the spending units with the head of the household more than 65 had total financial assets of less than $500 and 63 percent had assets of less than $2,000.

It is not surprising that approximately 14 percent of the couples receiving social security benefits in 1957 either increased their medical debts or received charity.

The cost of voluntary insurance policies cannot be borne by older persons alone. Realistically, the most that can be hoped for is that somewhat more than half the aged can pay premiums of about $100 per year. A $100 annual premium cannot cover more than a fraction of the aged medical care needs. The enactment of a bill providing basic hospital coverage for the aged will, in fact, open up markets for voluntary insurance among our older people. Private insurance companies can design health insurance packages to meet the important supplemental areas of medical need not met by the existing legislative proposals.

For example, 20 percent of all persons over 65 who were hospitalized in 1958 remained in the hospital for more than 60 days.

Persons over 65 use, on the average, 4.4 visits annually to the doctor's office and average 1.4 physician calls at home each year. The need for home and office care provides wide opportunities for voluntary insurance to build on the base of bills presently proposed.

DETAILS

The opponents of the social insurance approach stress the potentially high costs of the program. Some estimates place the cost as high as $2 billion. Yet when it is considered that medical care for the aged is one of our most pressing social problems, and that this amount will be less than four-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product in 1960, this seems extremely modest.

The actuarial staff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the annual cost of the Forand bill (one bill now under consideration in the Congress) at somewhat less than a billion dollars ($895,400,000), or 0.428 percent of taxable payroll. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the cost in 1975 will be between 0.49 and 0.62 percent of taxable payroll, assuming a taxable limit of $4,800, which is the current figure.

In a democratic society people decide how much of their incomes they will devote to public services.

The consumer, as a voter, secures a desired balance between public and private services. Through this process, the Federal Government has always provided a national minimum of welfare services for its citizens.

In 1935 the need for a national pension program was fulfilled by enacting the social security system. At that time the medical associations and the life insurance companies opposed the program for most of the same reasons that today they oppose the social insurance approach to health care for the aged. Yet for three decades that program has demonstrated its effectiveness in providing a floor for retirement income. In fact, its minimum provisions have made possible the widespread development of private plans in recent years.

In our opinion, private insurance carriers would have a broader, sounder market for voluntary insurance among our older people by building on the basic provisions of social insurance legislation. With a balance of effort on the part of both industry and Government, a program can be built which will provide for every citizen's health needs in his old age. The social security system can provide the foundation for a comprehensive private-public health insurance system; it is the function and the opportunity of private, voluntary insurance to build on this for completely adequate health care at reasonable cost. On behalf of our 3 million policyholders, we want to do our part.

The need for social insurance in this area has been summarized best by Business Week magazine, February 13, 1960:

"If the Government steps in to provide insurance against catastrophic illnesses of the aged, it will not be moving in where private industry can do the job. It will be assuming responsibility in an area where industry has found it cannot offer the protection needed."

An objective and unbiased article in the Harvard Business Review, "Health Care of the Aged," January-February 1960, comes to a similar conclusion:

"Notwithstanding the considerable technical problems of providing hospitalization and surgical benefits under social security, the very difficulty of cost prediction itself, as well as the essentiality of these benefits, would seem to recommend the social insurance method."

CURRENT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Health insurance for the aged is probably the single most important domestic issue now before this country. There is a growing recognition by all groups that some form of Federal legislation must be enacted. You are undoubtedly aware of the fact that there are a number of bills now before the Congress. The situation is changing constantly and at this time it is impossible to predict which bill or combination of bills may progress through the Congress or whether any bill will pass. The basic point of contention is whether the social security system will be used to provide this protection, or Federal funds will be used to subsidize insurance for older persons who qualify on the basis of a means test. The company policy supports the use of social security.

All of the bills now being publicly discussed have various benefit proposals. It is unlikely that any one bill will emerge unchanged and, for this reason, the bills will not be analyzed in detail.

Under consideration in the U.S. Senate are:

1. The Javits bill (sponsored by seven Members of the Senate) would appropriate Federal funds for grants to the States. Federal funds supplemented by State funds would then be used to subsidize health insurance for older persons who qualified on the basis of a means test.

2. Bills introduced by Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, and MORSE would increase the social security tax to finance health care for the aged. All three of the bills are different in terms of benefits but all would cost about an additional one-quarter of 1 percent for both employer and employee.

Under consideration in the House of Representatives are:

1. The Forand bill would also use the social security system to finance the health care of older persons. Benefits are somewhat different than the other bills. The cost would be one-quarter of 1 percent for both employer and employee.

2. A proposal is being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee to increase the old-age assistance program so that larger Federal grants will be made to the States for medical care for indigent older persons.

(Later legislative developments include (1) submission to the House Ways and Means Committee by the Eisenhower administration of a "medicare program for the aged," and (2) introduction in the Senate of a bill sponsored by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan and 16 Democratic colleagues. Under the administration program the States, with the aid of Federal matching grants, would administer a plan to be offered to those 65 and over who either did not pay an income tax in the preceding year or had gross income not exceeding $2,500 ($3,800 for a couple). Those eligible and accepting the plan would pay a $24 a year enrollment fee. The McNamara bill, like the Forand bill, is based on the social security plan but would provide more comprehensive coverage than the Forand bill. It also makes provision for coverage of people ineligible for OASDI benefits.)

All of the bills in the area of health insurance for the aged have been evaluated on the basis of whether the program will be financed by the social insurance approach or the charity approach with a means test to determine eligibility.

H.R. 12176—Farm Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Fruit Growers League, an organization of some 400 growers in the State of Oregon, has contacted me with reference to their strong interest and support for H.R. 12176, the farm labor legislation reported by the House Committee on Agriculture.

These growers, in a letter dated June 9, 1960, and signed by Mr. Charles E. Henry, their president, and Mr. Robert K. Norris, chairman of their labor committee speak from personal knowledge and experience relative to the need for this legislation which would reaffirm the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Labor has no authority in the matter of wages or conditions of employment of domestic farmworkers and which would extend for an additional 2 years the provisions of Public Law 78.

Their letter is so very helpful to an understanding of the need for enactment of this legislation at this session that I wish to include their letter in these remarks so that all Members may benefit from their views. Because the State of Oregon has been singled out by some as a State which would have no interest in such legislation because, as it was alleged, there is available local labor to meet the needs of agriculture due to the high wages paid farmworkers. The letter and the information therein will be of great interest both to those who so contend and to those who are better acquainted with the facts.

The letter follows:

FRUIT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Medford, Oreg., June 9, 1960.

Re H.R. 12176.
Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Fruit Growers League of Jackson County, Oreg., is made up of some 400 growers who are dependent upon other than local labor for their harvest work. The local work force is so largely employed in packing and storage plants that the balance cannot even begin to furnish the necessary orchard help.

Due to its geographical location, 300 miles from Portland, the nearest metropolitan area, the Medford district is in no position to compete with more adjacent districts for domestic seasonal farm labor. This, together, with a short harvest season (normally about 6 weeks) makes it essential that we have available a certain number of Mexican Nationals, if we are to handle a highly perishable crop within permissible harvest dates.

We, therefore, urge the passage of H.R. 12176 which extend Public Law 78 to June 30, 1963 and restricts the authority of the Secretary of Labor in the regulation of wages,

hours, transportation, and other prerequisites of domestic farmworkers. We request the support of this bill because:

1. We cannot believe that the Congress ever intended to give to the Secreary of Labor legislative power over agricultural labor.

2. The Secretary of Labor has ample authority, under Public Law 78, for the protection of domestic farm labor against misuse, or abuse, of imported foreign labor.

3. The minority report of dissenting committee members is misleading in so many respects that all its statements should be carefully scrutinized:

(a) An average annual wage of $761 per farmworker includes women and children who constitute almost one-half of the seasonal farm labor, and most of whom work locally for only a few weeks.

(b) Harvest work is predominantly piece rate work. If a worker makes only 30 to 35 cents an hour that is a return for the amount of labor they have performed.

(c) The four distinguished consultants, whos recommendations were made a part of H.R. 11211, are undoubtedly men of wide experience, but is extremely doubtful that any one of them has ever had personal experience in meeting a farm payroll, financing orchard production against an unknown market or harvesting crops with domestic migrant labor.

(d) The statement on page 7 paragraph 3, implies that there is no shortage of domestic labor in Oregon and Washington because these States pay the highest farm wages in the Nation, yet the Oregon State Employment Service has had to certify the Medford district for the use of Mexican nationals since the program started, with the exception of a crop failure in 1954. High wages alone do not make more competent workers available.

(e) It states that foreign labor was never used in the United States prior to 1942. The Department of Labor "Farm Labor Fact Book" states that: "Foreign workers have been employed in this country for more than 50 years." Most of these were Mexican wetbacks who crossed the river both spring and fall to work in the border States.

(f) The 300,000 migrant farm work force is undoubtedly a social problem and one that requires attention, but the committee minority imply that such solution of the migrant is the duty of the farmer. They refuse to concede that the great majority of these people belong to the professionally unemployed who either cannot or will not qualify for industrial employment. Others are merely indifferent workers on their own premises or just plain rovers. Naturally, such a condition is made to order for union officials and other well meaning but poorly informed persons who would protect this element of society at the expense of the farmer.

(g) The report states that an increase of 10 percent in farm labor wages would only increase prices one-half of 1 percent. Actually in the Medford district, labor costs are in excess of 65 percent of our total cost delivered to the packingplant. An increase of 10 percent over our present wages (the highest agricultural wages in the Nation) would mean an increase of 6.5 percent at the plant.

(h) It further states: "The consumer would gladly and voluntarily pay this very small extra cost to end labor conditions which blot the conscience of our Nation, according to witnesses." It is quite evident that the committee member who dictated that statement has had very meager experience with the purchasers of farm produce. Certainly it would be regarded as foolish by any informed person. The broker, distributor, retailer, and consumer are all going to buy as cheaply as possible.

(i) The minority report states that "experience has clearly shown that unreliability is not a characteristic of the seasonal farm worker." Here is what happened in Medford in 1959. One hundred and ninety-two domestic worker's from Texas were recruited through the employment service. These men were advanced transportation, housed in a good labor camp, and guaranteed work similar to the Mexican nationals:

Twelve never worked after arrival.

Seventy-nine had left by the end of the first week.

Fifty-two stayed through their 6-week contract.

One hundred and eighteen were recruited on the same basis in California:

Twenty-one left before checking into camp.

Sixty-three left the first week, 29 of whom did not go to work.

Twenty-five left the second week.

Four stayed through the season.

During this time Mexican nationals, working in mixed crews with these people, averaged $1.41 per hour for their full contract period.

4. Agriculture in general, and the fruit industry in particular, requires a large amount of seasonal labor; continuous full employment obviously cannot be guaranteed. However, agriculture as an industry is entitled to able, willing and qualified help. Our force of migrant persons (of which only a portion are actually employable) is not adequate to do the job. Supplemental foreign labor will be necessary to augment the domestic labor supply for some years to come. This is particularly true in the case of pear and apple picking which requires the use of 12- and 14-foot ladders with a 40-pound load in a picking bag. Such work cannot be done by the average woman or child. As a result, family groups will not work since only the man can be employed.

5. One of the misleading statements constantly made by the opponents of this bill is: "Foreign labor is used by only 2 percent of the American farms, hence it is only the corporation farm that benefits." Actually this means over 95,000 farms, located in 37 States. The idea that only the immediate user of Mexican nationals benefits is all wrong. When help is scarce in a district, the relief afforded by Mexican nationals helps everyone since that many other workers are available for nonusers. It is true that it is generally the larger operators who contract the nationals since this is an expensive operatiton unless they can be utilized for some time. This is obviously impossible for the small farmer.

Such arguments merely illustrate the fact that one of agriculture's greatest difficulties in dealing with the Department of Labor is due to so many people knowing so many things about agriculture that are just not true. It is for this reason that it is not to the best interest of agriculture, or the general public, to place too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Labor alone who appears to be influenced by pressure groups, with their own purposes in view, as well as by many emotional, but poorly informed and unpractical people. On the other hand, we believe that the very diversified and complex farm labor problem is much better understood by the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, if regulations, relative to farm labor are to be issued, they should come from the Department of Agriculture.

In conclusion, please understand that the operators, who are large enough to use the national program, are fully aware of the migrant wage and housing problems, and in self-preservation are doing what they can do afford better housing, wages, and living conditions. However, the fact remains, that due to geographical location wide variance in type of crop and perishibility of certain products, any attempt to impose poorly timed or adverse regulations could be disastrous to agriculture.

Very truly yours,

FRUIT GROWERS LEAGUE OF JACKSON COUNTY,
CHARLES E. HENRY,
President.
ROBT. K. NORRIS,
Chairman, Labor Committee.

President Eisenhower Thanks Democratic Congressmen for Their Assurance of Support of Mutual Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of great importance to the security of the United States and the defense of the free world, for we are to begin debate on the bill providing appropriations for the mutual security program.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to be one of a group of Democratic Members of Congress who on May 25, 1960, wrote a letter to President Eisenhower assuring him that, in spite of criticisms we felt with respect to the handling by his administration of the foreign policy of our country, we would oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We told the President of our pride in the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We concluded:

We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of the letter to President Eisenhower to which I have referred:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Democratic Members of Congress, are writing to you concerning the mutual security appropriations bill shortly to be considered by the House of Representatives.

We take note of the letters many of us have received from your Deputy Assistant expressing your gratification and appreciation for our support of the mutual security authorization bill. We take note as well of the action of the Vice President in urging Republican Members of the House Appropriations Committee to resist massive reductions in this program.

We have for the past 7 years been critical of the handling by your administration of the foreign policy of our country and in recent days we have been deeply distressed by the conduct of our affairs before the

summit meeting. Indeed, some of us have just written to you a series of questions concerning the collapse of the summit conference.

We nonetheless believe the mutual security program an indispensable part of our foreign policy and we wish to advise you that we shall oppose any unwise cuts in the mutual security appropriations bill.

We are proud of the support which the Democratic Party has given to the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, point 4 and the mutual security program. We wish to reaffirm the policy of the Democratic Party in past years of resisting the encroachment of communism and stimulating the advance of democracy in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Respectfully,

CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; CHESTER BOWLES, Second District, Connecticut; STEWART L. UDALL, Second District, Arizona; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; CLEMENT W. MILLER, First District, California; CHARLES O. PORTER, Fourth District, Oregon; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, 17th District, Michigan; EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York; GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California; CHARLES C. BIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan; ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Third District, Connecticut; THOMAS J. LANE, Seventh District Massachusetts; LEONARD G. WOLF, Second District, Iowa; LEE METCALF, First District, Montana; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Fourth District, New Jersey; JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District, Indiana; EDITH GREEN, Third District, Oregon; JEFFREY COHELAN, Seventh District, California; JOSEPH KARTH, Fourth District, Minnesota; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Eighth District, Minnesota; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, 19th District, New York; HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania; RALPH J. RIVERS, At Large, Alaska; JAMES G. O'HARA, Seventh District, Michigan; JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland; EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth District, New York; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Fifth District, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland, also asked to be associated with the letter.

Under date of May 31, 1960, I received, as the signatory of the May 25 letter on behalf of my colleagues, a letter from President Eisenhower expressing his appreciation for our assurances of support for this program.

Said President Eisenhower, "It is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD President Eisenhower's letter of May 31, 1960:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 31, 1960.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I hope you will advise the cosigners of your May 25 letter of my appreciation of their assurance, and of yours, that your group will steadfastly support adequate funds for the mutual security program. Of course I am aware that we may differ on certain aspects of the Nation's affairs, but it is gratifying to me, and reassuring, that we are in full accord in respect to this activity so basic to our security and the future of freedom everywhere.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN STRONG ON WORDS, WEAK ON DEEDS

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a personal reference, as I listen to some of the criticism directed at me by my Republican predecessors in Congress because I am among those Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle interested in having more facts about the U–2 incident—as I listen to some of my Republican predecessor's criticisms, I am constrained to point out that the voice of the demagog is once more heard in the land.

For the Republican ex-Congressman who seeks to cover with a blanket of silence an honest and essential discussion of foreign policy events that may deeply affect the security of our country is very strong on words but very weak on deeds in the support of freedom against the menace of communism.

REPUBLICAN EX-CONGRESSMAN VOTES AGAINST EISENHOWER PROGRAM

For, Mr. Speaker, the Republican ex-Congressman to whom I refer on May 14, 1958, voted for the mutual security authorization bill but on July 2, 1958, turned right around to vote against the mutual security appropriation bill. This Republican ex-Congressman thus cast his vote against a program which President Eisenhower has repeatedly insisted is essential to the defense of the free world against the forces of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the mutual security authorization bill and I shall vote for the mutual security appropriations bill as well. The times are too dangerous to be able to afford the doubletalk of voting for the first and against the second.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point the text of a letter to me dated May 17, 1960, from Bryce N. Harlow, deputy assistant to the President, concerning my vote in support of the mutual security authorization bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 17, 1960.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: On Saturday last, as he completed preparations for the summit conference in Paris, President Eisenhower requested me to send to you, in his behalf, this note of gratification and appreciation for your support of the mutual security authorization bill. He stressed once again his profound conviction that this program is indispensable to our own and free world defense against Communist imperialism, and indispensable also in encouraging struggling millions in less fortunate nations in their effort to live their lives in freedom. It is a program requiring, he said, unreserved support by all of our informed citizens and officials, and he feels it would be the height of folly to allow isolated administrative shortcomings and disappointments, or local considerations, political or otherwise, to tempt anyone to jettison or cripple the entire undertaking.

Especially the President voiced this hope, and asked that it be communicated to you in his behalf: that your responsible act of support for the mutual security authorization be matched by a determined resistance to any effort to effect massive reductions in the mutual security appropriations soon to be considered by the House. Massive reductions, he pointed out, can be accomplished only by undermining our own security, free world security, and the cause of human freedom everywhere in the world.

The President asked me to explain that he would have advised you himself of these views had his time permitted before leaving for Paris.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that we Democrats will support adequate funds for the mutual security program. It is in the interest of our country and of the cause of human freedom that we do so.

Some Penetrating Questions on the Subject of Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I frequently have taken the floor of this House in an effort to point out to my colleagues the tremendous impact on the people of my congressional district of the rising percentage of foreign imports and the depressing effect that these imports are having on the economic livelihood and jobs of the people whom I have the honor to represent in this body. Nothing that I have been able to say, however, puts this serious question more dramatically than a letter I have recently received from one of my constituents, Mr. John Blatchford, president of Local 2004, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Blatchford's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LOCAL 2004, IBEW,
Amsterdam, N.Y., May 24, 1960.

To Whom It May Concern:

Our local union, No. 2004, IBEW, has appointed a committee to interpret for rank and file the effects of foreign competition on American labor in general, and on the workers in our area in particular.

To help us in this project we would appreciate answers to some questions asked by your members. May we stress the importance of making the answers simple and direct so that our people will have a fair opportunity to evaluate them objectively and subjectively.

Question 1:

(a) What direct and immediate benefit does the American wage earner derive from low priced foreign imports made possible by our low tariff?

(b) What if there is such a benefit, how do we show it to the person whose job has been eliminated because cheap foreign labor has stolen it from him with the apparent blessing of our Government?

Question 2: If, as we understand, it is America's policy to raise the living standard of the rest of the world to our level, how do you explain the apparent contradiction in the way our tariff laws work? Will not the current trend eventually lower our living standard to the substandard endured in other countries?

Question 3: What happened to the old slogan "Buy American." Is it now un-American to buy American? Is it now un-American to protect American labor?

Here in Amsterdam we are gravely perplexed and concerned. Our community is one of the hardest hit by the blight of cheap foreign competition, and one of the longest suffering. Our future looks very bleak indeed. We are told, in effect, that our situation is necessary to our governments overall policy. Frankly, that sounds like gobbledygoop. Perhaps you can rationalize it for us so that when we find ourselves in the breadline, we can comfort ourselves with the knowledge that we are there in a good cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN BLATCHFORD,
President.

Public Debt and Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union under consideration the bill (H.R. 12381) to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if there is any excise tax that cannot be supported by sound legislative reasoning and justified by morality it is that imposed on communications and transportation. There was necessity and there was justification when we were at war. No one in those grim war years complained of the sacrifices entailed. The wartime excise tax served the double purpose of adding to our war dollars and of discouraging civilian overburdening of the wires and the rails so essential to the war effort.

With the end of hostilities the excise tax, certainly that on telephone calls, immediately should have been lifted. The telephone in the modern world and in the way of life we follow is a necessity. The overwhelming majority of telephone users are little men and little women, composing ordinary families who run their households on tight budgets. To further burden them with an excise tax on their telephone calls in peacetime has seemed to me downright unfair. I have said so many times on this floor and elsewhere. I have said so in many letters I have written my constitutents.

What is the situation in which I find myself today. We have before us a package bill. It carries some $4 billion in taxes, revenues without which our Government cannot function. It also provides for the raising of the debt ceiling in order that our Nation can be spared the ignominy of bankruptcy and not paying our debts as contracted. In this package bill—a very small part of the bill—is the item of the excise tax on communications and transportation. Under an open rule we could have eliminated by amendment the excise tax on telephones, which was relatively small in dollar measure, and retained the parts of the bill that were necessary and which would bring to the Federal Treasury the money needed for the functioning of our Government.

It was clearly developed in the debate preceding the adoption of the rule that the only way open to those of us who were committed to an elimination of the excise tax on telephones was to vote against the rule. I voted against the adoption of the rule. Had the closed rule been defeated, the way would have been clear for the adoption of an open rule, under which an amendment would be in order to strike the telephone tax.

In fairness to the Ways and Means Committee, which has the hard job of writing tax legislation, and nobody wants to be taxed if he can avoid, it should be pointed out that the reason given for retaining the Federal telephone tax was that State governments were preparing to pick it up so that the taxpayers would still have the burden to carry. The Ways and Means Committee I am sure has the deep respect and confidence of every Member in this body. Certainly there is not a harder working group of American public servants or private citizens anywhere in the country. The workload is terrific, and I wonder how the members of the committee are able to carry the workload, week after week, month after month.

Nevertheless, on the matter of the excise tax on communications and transportation I have felt ever since I have been in the Congress that it is so unfair in its very nature that in my own evaluation I could accept as valid no excuse for its continuance. I have so voted on every occasion given me. I so voted earlier today in voting against the adoption of the closed rule.

As to the bill now before us and upon which we soon shall be voting I doubt very much if a single Member of this body would cast his vote in opposition if that Member knew that his vote would be decisive. Regardless of my strong objection to an excise tax I believe to be most unfair and unjustified, I have too keen a sense of fiscal responsibility to throw away $4 billion of needed revenue and to invite financial chaos by voting no on the only tax measure upon which under the circumstances existing we shall have the opportunity to act.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

President Eisenhower's Address in Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the withdrawal of the invitation by the Japanese Government for President Eisenhower to visit that country is a cause for deep concern to the free world.

We recognize, of course, that the Government of Japan maintains its friendly attitude toward the United States. Moreover, I am confident that a large majority of the people do not endorse the anti-U.S. activities—agitated and directed by the international conspiracy of communism.

Nevertheless, the fact that the long arm of Moscow and Peiping could reach into Japan, disturb internal affairs, result in riots that wounded many, and, yes, killed one student, and required the government to reverse its diplomatic policy—this is indeed a serious matter.

Realistically, this is aggression by "agitation and subversion." We can expect, of course, that there will be gloating in the circles of communism.

The fact that this could happen—despite a postwar policy in which we have attempted to build up and reconstruct Japan, however, requires a need for a reappraisal of our policy.

The President's tour of the Far Eastern countries reaffirming our dedication to peace, as well as pledging cooperation and friendship to the people of Asia, will constitute, I am confident, a major antidote to the spread of Communist influence in that area of the globe.

As in the past, the President, wherever he goes, leaves a wake of good will toward our country.

Following the President's return home, however, I believe that we need to reappraise the effectiveness with which we are getting across, not only the ideas of freedom, but with which we are countering, or failing to counter, the Communist ideological offensive.

Yesterday the President laid the groundwork for realistic, ideological recognition, and countering the menace of communism to the Asian people in a speech in Manila.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two items—first, a partial text of the Manila address, and, second, a splendid editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Nationalism in Asia"—reviewing the significance of the President's presentation.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF IKE'S MANILA ADDRESS

MANILA, June 15.—The following is that part of President Eisenhower's address to the Philippine Congress which dealt with communism:

Communist leaders fear constructive nationalism as a mortal foe. This fear is evident in the continuing efforts of the Communist conspiracy to penetrate national movements, to pervert them, and to pirate them for their own evil objectives.

To dominate—if they can—the eternal impulse of national patriotism, they use force and threats of force, subversion, and bribery, propaganda and spurious promises. They deny the dignity of men and have subjected many millions to the execution of master plans dictated in faraway places.

Communism demands subservience to a single ideology, to a straitjacket of ideas and approaches and methods. Freedom of individuals or nations to them is intolerable. Freemen, free nations make their own rules to fit their own needs within a universally accepted frame of justice and law.

Under freedom, thriving sovereign nations of diverse political, economic, and social systems are the basic healthy cells that make up a thriving world community. Freedom and independence for each is in the interest of all.

AIM OF U.S. ASSISTANCE

For that very reason—in our own enlightened self-interest, in the interest of all our friends—the purpose of American assistance programs is to protect the right of nations to develop the political and social institutions of their choice, rather than having to accept extremist solutions under the whip of hunger, or the threat of armed attack and domination.

We readily accept the fact that there is a great variety of political, social, and economic systems in the world; and we accept the further fact that there is no single, best way of life that answers the needs of everyone, everywhere.

The American way satisfies the United States. We think it best for us. But the United States need not believe that all should imitate us. What we do have in common with the free nations in Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America are basic and weighty convictions, more important than differences of speech and color and culture.

Some of these convictions are: That man is a being capable of making his own decisions; that all people should be given a fair opportunity to use their God-given talents, to be worthy heirs to their fathers, to fulfill their destiny as children of God; that voluntary cooperation among groups and nations is vastly preferable to cooperation by force—indeed, voluntary cooperation is the only fruitful kind of effort in the long run.

True enough, in a too lengthy period of history, some European nations seemed convinced that they were assigned the mission of controlling the continents. But always powerful voices within those countries attacked the policy of their own governments. And we of the American Republics—21 independent nations, once European colonies—denied in arms and in battle the validity of the assumed mission. Colonialism died there because true nationalism was a more potent force.

WHO ARE COLONIALISTS?

Since 1945, 33 lands that were once subject to Western control have peaceably achieved self-determination. These 33 countries have a population of almost a billion people. During the same period, 12 countries in the Sino-Soviet sphere have been forcibly deprived of their independence. The question might be asked: Who are today the colonialists?

The basic antagonism of the Communist system to anything which it cannot control is the single, most important cause of the tension between the free nations in all their variety on the one hand, and, on the other, the rigidly controlled Communist bloc.

One purpose of the Communist system's propaganda is to obscure these true facts. Right now, the principal target is the United States of America. My republic is painted as an imperialistic seeker of limitless power over all the peoples of the world, using them as pawns on the chessboard of war, exploiting them and their resources to enrich our own economy, degrading them to a role of beggarly dependence.

The existence, the prosperity, the prestige of the Republic of the Philippines proves the falsity of those charges. You, as a people, know that our Republic is no empire of tyranny. Your leaders repeatedly have so testified to the world. But for a few minutes I should like to speak to you on what America stands for: what it stood for before I became President and what it will continue to stand for after I have left office.

More important than any one year, any one incident, or any one man is the role we have played through our whole history—the role we shall continue to play so long as our Republic endures.

Two hundred years, lacking 16, have passed since our forefathers proclaimed to the world the truths they held self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with unalienable rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness; that governments are instituted to secure these rights, deriving their just powers only from the consent of the governed.

SEATO IS CITED

Beyond the guarantees of American strength, we seek to expand a collective security. SEATO demonstrates what can be accomplished. Since its inception, not one inch of free southeast Asia territory has been lost to an aggressor.

Collective security must be based on all fields of human endeavor, requiring cooperation and mutual exchange in the areas of politics, economics, culture, and science.

We believe in the expansion of relations between nations as a step toward more formal regional cooperation. In accord with this belief, we support the initiative taken by the Government of the Philippines during the past several years in establishing closer ties with its neighbors.

Patience, forbearance, integrity, an enduring trust, must characterize our mutual relations. Never, I pray, will the United States because of its favored position in size and numbers and wealth attempt to dictate or to exercise unfair pressure, to forget or to ig-

nore the Republic of the Philippines—its equal in sovereign dignity. And never, I pray, will the Philippines make a whipping boy of the United States. Each of us proudly recognizes the other as a sovereign equal.

And, my friends, at this point I just want to interpolate one simple thought on the cooperative efforts for our own security, for advancing the standards of living of peoples, for everything that we do together. There are of course differences in the ability of each nation to make contributions.

MORAL LEADERSHIP

Each of us as an individual is different from every other individual. Physically, mentally, and in the possession of the world's goods, we are somewhat different. But I submit, Members of the Congress, that there is one field where no man, no woman, no nation, need take a secondary place, and that is in moral leadership.

The spirit of a people is not to be measured by its size or its riches or even its age. It is something that comes from the heart, and from the very smallest nation can come some of the great ideas—particularly those great inspirational ideas that inspire men to strive always upward and onward.

Therefore, when I say that our two nations are sovereign equals, I mean it just in that spirit, in the sense that you have just as much to contribute to the world and to yourselves and to freedom as the greatest and the most powerful nation in the world.

In the great cause of peace and friendship and freedom, we who are joined together will succeed. The eternal aspirations, purposes, ideals of humanity inspire and hearten and urge us to success.

But we face repeated challenges; endless temptations to relax, continuous campaigns of propaganda and threat. Let us stand more firmly together against them all.

With God's help we shall march ever forward toward our destiny as free nations and great good friends.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1960]

NATIONALISM IN ASIA

President Eisenhower's speech to the Philippine Congress was a pointed reply to the noisy elements who are trying to distort the nature of his good-will mission to the Far East. His thesis was the antithesis of the imperialism everywhere attributed to the United States by Communist agents seeking a cover for their efforts to impose a new form of tyranny on mankind. The President found only satisfaction in the fact that 33 lands once under Western control have peacefully achieved self-determination since 1945. Americans of all political faiths like to think that, in some measure these liberated peoples are following the U.S. example of 1776.

The President made it unmistakably clear that the United States has no interest in imposing its way of life on any people. On the contrary, it recognizes that freedom for all peoples is the only sound basis on which peace can be built. The hullabaloo that has arisen in Japan is based on the Communist-trumped-up charge of American domination over friendly countries in the Far East. Actually, the United States welcomes diversity in the free world and encourages genuine nationalism that respects the dignity and rights of the people.

History and bitter experience fully sustain the President's assertion that communism is the real enemy of national aspirations. It is Moscow that is trying to sap the freedom of young countries striving for independence and higher standards of living. "The basic antagonism of the Communist system to anything which it cannot control," the President rightly said, "is the single, most important cause of the tension between the free nations in all their variety on the one hand, and, on the other, the rigidly controlled Communist bloc."

The first tragic error of the rioting Japanese students lies in their failure to see that the only hope for a tolerable future lies in freedom and respect for the individual. Their second tragic mistake is in assuming that national aspirations, freedom and better living conditions can be attained, in the face of the Communist threats and pressures, without cooperation among the free peoples. The basic truth of our age is that the forces of freedom and human dignity must be organized and work together in order to survive the assaults of the monolithic force that is trying to destroy them.

In a spirit of candor the President also acknowledged that many evils still persist in the free world. Sometimes free men are misled; sometimes they dissipate their energy; they bicker over trifles; they may be fearful when they should be bracing themselves for more vigorous effort. Nevertheless, he maintained, "the resources of free men living in free communities, cooperating with their neighbors at home and overseas, constitute the mightiest creative temporal force on earth."

The message is one that should have an appeal throughout Asia. The choice of the millions who have been disadvantaged in the past is not between communism and colonialism but between the new imperialism of the left and a mature nationalism that can be harnessed to the general welfare and disciplined to the necessities for survival in the atomic age.

Tabulation of Annual Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of many Members, I am happy to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the tabulation of answers obtained through a scientific sampling of the current opinions within the 13th District of Illinois on 31 leading issues, as expressed in my 1960 annual poll.

Signed returns, representing a percentage of response of 17.4 percent, gave the following results:

Annual public opinion poll tabulation from Marguerite Stitt Church, Representative in Congress, 13th District, Illinois

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Is it essential to balance the national budget?	81.2	13.8	5.0
2. If a budget surplus develops next year, do you prefer:			
(a) Payment on the national debt?	73.6	6.5	19.9
(b) Tax decrease?	29.5	23.9	46.6
3. If a budget deficit develops, do you prefer:			
(a) Tax increase?	15.5	29.5	55.0
(b) Increase in the national debt (now $290 billion)?	6.2	33.1	60.7
(c) Elimination of nonvital Government programs? (If "Yes," what programs?)	73.6	2.7	18.7
4. Do you favor gradual transfer back to States and local communities of complete responsibility for local needs (education, slum clearance, sewage treatment plants, etc.) assuming a transfer of some tax sources from the Federal Government?	78.0	16.7	5.3
5. To meet education needs, do you approve:			
(a) Continued reliance on local and State support of education?	74.0	9.0	17.0
(b) Federal grants to States for school construction?	25.6	39.2	35.2
(c) Federal grants to States for teachers' salaries?	17.6	45.9	36.5
(d) Federal aid for scholarships?	32.3	31.9	35.8
(e) Providing some method, perhaps through tax benefits, for individuals and business to finance expanded education?	50.5	16.8	32.7
6. If new programs increase Government spending, do you prefer:			
(a) Increase in personal income and corporation taxes?	24.0	38.6	37.4
(b) New Federal sales or manufacturers' tax?	43.3	29.1	27.6
7. Where economic changes cause loss industrial activity and unemployment, do you prefer:			
(a) Federal funds to solve the problem (aid to depressed areas)?	25.3	34.5	40.2
(b) State and local efforts?	74.0	7.2	18.8
8. Would you prefer medical and hospital care for the aged through:			
(a) Private, low-cost medical and hospital insurance programs?	69.0	9.7	21.3
(b) Increased social security taxes on employees and employers to cover social security beneficiaries only?	14.6	42.9	42.5
(c) Federally supported voluntary medical insurance program?	22.2	37.2	40.6
9. With Government investment in farm commodities now over $9,000,000,000 and storage and other expenses approximately $1,000,000,000 each year, should price supports and controls be:			
(a) Increased?	2.4	39.8	57.8
(b) Decreased?	44.8	11.5	43.7
(c) Unchanged?	5.0	30.0	65.0
(d) Abolished?	55.3	11.9	32.8
10. Would you favor a plan to use surplus crops instead of cash to pay farmers for taking land out of production?	65.9	12.5	21.6
11. Should cooperatives be taxed on same basis as other businesses?	78.7	8.7	12.6
12. Should the interest rate on Government loans to REA cooperatives be increased from 2 percent to the higher rate paid on Government bonds?	64.3	9.9	25.8
13. To provide for adequate defense should we:			
(a) Attempt to match the Russians in every phase of defense, regardless of cost?	15.0	45.9	39.1
(b) Continue our present level of defense spending for a balanced deterrent program?	58.5	10.7	30.8
(c) Make every effort to reach a workable agreement with the Russians for disarmament?	66.3	9.5	24.2
14. Do you believe sufficient emphasis is placed on our missile and space programs?	64.3	22.5	13.2
15. Should United States transfer nuclear weapons and material to friendly nations?	25.0	58.8	16.2
16. Without guarantee of a reliable inspection system, should we permanently abandon atomic tests?	11.4	81.7	6.9
17. Do you approve a firm stand on Berlin at the summit conference?	88.6	4.9	6.5
18. Do you favor the repeal of the Connally amendment, which reserves to the United States the right to decide whether issues brought before the World Court are essentially within our domestic jurisdiction?	28.1	44.1	27.8
19. Do you favor diplomatic recognition by the United States of Communist China?	26.8	62.1	11.1
20. Do you favor an increase in repayable U.S. loans, rather than grants, for foreign aid?	84.5	6.7	8.8
21. Do you favor U.S. aid to Communist-satellite countries?	11.6	77.7	10.7
22. Should the buy America policy, adopted by the Development Loan Fund, be extended to other U.S. foreign aid programs?	46.1	18.6	35.3

Annual public opinion poll tabulation from Marguerite Stitt Church, Representative in Congress, 13th District, Illinois—Continued

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
23. Should the differential in wages and working conditions between this Nation and foreign countries be taken into account in formulating our foreign trade regulations and policies?	72.0	14.3	13.7
24. Should Congress change the Sugar Act under which Cuban sugar is now imported at above world market prices, so as to:			
(a) Reduce the commitment?	19.2	16.1	64.7
(b) End the commitment?	34.6	15.5	49.9
(c) Give President discretionary authority to make such changes?	55.6	12.3	32.1
25. Should more immigrants be allowed to enter the United States annually?	28.0	56.0	16.0
26. Do you favor stronger civil rights legislation?	52.6	33.0	14.4
27. Do you favor a change in the minimum wage law to provide:			
(a) Extension of coverage?	37.3	23.7	39.0
(b) Increase to $1.25 an hour?	33.4	28.2	38.4
(c) Increase to not more than $1.15 and hour?	20.1	28.6	51.3
28. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to put the Post Office Department on a self-paying basis?	65.0	27.7	7.3
29. Do you favor legislation to preserve wilderness areas in our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and other public lands?	90.6	4.4	5.0
30. Should the Federal Government be given greater authority to regulate radio and TV programs?	30.6	61.2	8.2
31. Should GI benefits be extended to our peacetime veterans?	20.5	71.5	8.0

Address by Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, at 58th Annual Session of Inland Empire Education Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD before the 58th annual session of the Inland Empire Education Association in Spokane, Wash., on April 8, 1960.

This address, entitled "The State of Our Foreign Relations," reflects the exceptional understanding, analytic ability, and constructive outlook of the distinguished assistant majority leader. This address should have a wide reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

(Address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, 58th annual session of the Inland Empire Education Association, Spokane, Wash., April 8, 1960)

An invitation such as you extended to me is an invitation to come home. It is an invitation to think through old questions in the fresh but familiar perspective of this wonderful part of the Nation.

Of these questions, that of foreign relations is most compelling. As Americans, we need to understand the problems of foreign relations because none of us escapes their consequences. As teachers—I am still one of you although my membership in the club has temporarily lapsed—as teachers, we need not only to understand these problems but also to stimulate the capacity of others to understand them. We need especially to convey something of their meaning to the young people who must live in the world which our foreign policies now are doing much to shape.

Let me say, at the outset, that foreign relations are not the products of alchemy. They are the consequences of human acts. As such they are not beyond normal human comprehension. To be sure, the conduct of foreign relations is largely in the hands of specialists and that is as it should be. But in a Nation such as ours, the work of these specialists needs the understanding and broad guidance of our people if it is to be done most effectively.

Foreign relations arise because each nation in the world, as it comes into contact with others, has its hopes, its interests, its fears. Each expresses these national drives in its foreign policy: If the policy is effective, it advances the hopes and interests of a nation, not at the expense of others, but by the process of reconciliation and accommodation. In so doing, it mitigates the fears on all sides. In so doing, it acts for peace.

To put it briefly, an effective foreign policy is one which serves national needs in a complex world, a world of many nations, and many needs, by methods other than those of the jungle.

How do we grasp the essence of these matters? How do we convey an understanding of them to others? These are questions which have preoccupied me for some time, particularly in anticipation of this meeting with you who are specialists in the process of understanding the complex and helping others to learn to understand it.

It seems to me that we do not begin to appreciate the dimensions of the problems of foreign relations, if we employ as yardsticks such familiar terms as isolationism or internationalism. These are ambiguities of the past and they do not help us in the present. As far as isolationism is concerned, I think that, as a nation, we have long since recognized the impracticability of a policy designed to insulate ourselves or even the Western Hemisphere from the massive currents which flow through the world and the storms which beset it. The military conflicts, three in the lifetime of some of us, have dispelled the illusion of isolation. As a more recent reminder, if any is needed, I call to your attention the Soviet test rocket which dropped into the Pacific some weeks ago. It landed about an hour after it had left a launching pad almost 8,000 miles away.

I do not think it is necessary to labor the point. It is clear that, for better or for worse, we are in and of this world or, in these days of space exploration, perhaps I should say in and of this universe. It is obvious that it will be for worse rather than better if we close our eyes to that fact or try to pull the cover over our heads to shut out that fact.

I do not say that the urge to isolationism, this urge to escape from reality, is gone entirely from the Nation. It is there to some degree, but it is no longer the principal source of our difficulties in foreign relations. The present problems come more, I believe, from a rather widespread belief that all which is classifiable as internationalism has, per se, a special claim to virtue.

The fact is there are no panaceas in an indiscriminate embrace of internationalism any more than there is escape in isolationism. That is the point I wish to stress most strongly. Let me illustrate it by a story which, since you are teachers, may shock you, but a story whose meaning will not be lost on you. As teachers we know, I think, better than most, of the immense value to our relations with other nations, of improving our abilities in foreign languages. In recent years, the teaching profession has given great emphasis to the study of languages and the Government has taken steps to encourage it. That is a most desirable development. What we may overlook in our present enthusiasm for this great tool, however, is that it is only a tool. It is not a foolproof guarantee of effective foreign relations. The story with which I wish to illustrate the point is that of an American diplomat in Latin America some years ago. He made public statements which did a great deal of damage to our relations with that part of the world. Yet he spoke these statements in perfect Spanish, of which he was a master. The Latin Americans were astounded by his knowledge of Spanish. They were even more astounded and, in addition, were infuriated by what he said in Spanish. Obviously, here was a case where our relations might well have profited from someone with rather less capability of communicating in that language.

As it is with languages, so it is with policies of internationalism in general. It by no means follows that if 5 American military bases abroad are helpful, 10 will be doubly helpful. It by no means follows that an aid program which costs $5 billion a year will be five times more useful than a program which costs $1 billion. It by no means follows that if 20 American representatives are doing an effective job in a country in Asia, 200 representatives will increase the effectiveness by a factor of 10. It by no means follows that each additional agency added to the United Nations system will increase the total contribution which that useful system makes to peace. In short, in any category of action, not excluding international action, it is possible not only to go beyond the point of diminishing returns but even to the point of increasing loss.

What I am suggesting, then, is that we need to divest ourselves of the notion that all policies, all acts automatically are to be sanctioned if they are classifiable under the general heading of internationalism. There can be illusions no less misleading, no less dangerous to the hopes and interests of the Nation in this generalization than those which appeared at an earlier time in the guise of isolationism.

The basic problem of maintaining effective foreign relations and of building peace, insofar as we can contribute to it, lies not so much in more policies or more machinery but in giving fresh direction to existing policies and in refining the machinery by which these policies are now pursued. If we would meet this problem we need, first, to see the world as it is. We need to see it as it is now, before we can reasonably hope to see it as we should like it to be. We need to see our present policies as they are, rather than as we imagine them to be.

No illusion in our present understanding of the world is more misleading than that which assumes that there has been peace since a truce was signed in Korea in 1953. To equate the present situation in that country or, indeed in most parts of the world with peace, may well be to equate it with the period of 1940 in Europe, the period of the so-called phony war just prior to the German drive into the lowlands and France or with

the state of Japanese-American relations on the eve of Pearl Harbor.

If it is enough to define peace as the immediate absence of gunfire then I suppose the present world situation, on the whole, may be so regarded. But if peace means to you what it means to me, a reasonable assurance that the young people whose education is now in your charge shall have an opportunity through that education to develop their potentialities and to grow into constructive maturity without the ever-present prospect of sudden and immense devastation being visited upon them, then the present situation cannot be defined as peace. We have a long way to go to peace. To create the illusion that we have already arrived at it, is to do a grave disservice to the Nation. That, may I say, is one of the principal dangers of goodwill tours and meetings at the summit, whatever advantages they may offer.

We shall not achieve peace by studying the applause meters or the comparative Hooper ratings of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower in India or France or wherever else they may visit. The road to peace does not lie in the winning of international popularity contests. Rather, it lies in the reduction of the fears which push nations and systems of nations toward military clash. It lies in a frank recognition of conflicting national interests and ideological hopes and, if they cannot be reconciled at this time, in turning them away from the channels which lead to the nuclear destruction of a recognizable civilization in the world.

If we scan the principal regions of the world we shall be able to discern quickly that there is no peace in this sense, but, instead, a series of points of potential conflict. In the Far East, these points are to be found in Korea, in the Formosan Straits and in Indochina. In each of these areas, a truce written or unwritten prevails. The truce conceals but it does not heal the ideological and political divisions which plague the Korean people, the Chinese people, and the people of Vietnam and Laos. In the case of Korea, the 38th Parallel is still guarded 24 hours a day on both sides. In the Formosan Straits, Chinese Communist guns fire from the mainland at the outpost islands of the Nationalists—at Quemoy and Matsu—every other day. In Indochina—in Laos—there was a narrow escape from a large-scale conflict just a few months ago and the situation remains unstable. In Vietnam a rigid division separates the Communist north from the free south and shows no signs of closing in peace.

In short, throughout the Far East, there exists, in excess, one of the most common precipitants of war—unnatural political divisions of peoples who are in reality deeply united by culture, by geography and by history. I shall not review the circumstances which brought about the divisions. All of them, to be sure, are overlaid with the ideological schism between communism and freedom. But each division, too, has its own local characteristics. It is to these characteristics no less than to the broader ideological question which we must look if there is ever to be a full understanding of the situations, and, hence, a chance for them to evolve in the direction of a stable peace. That refinement of the problem in policy has yet to begin.

Until it begins, a basis does not exist upon which to proceed toward peace. Any suggestion that our policies have actually produced peace in these areas is gravely misleading. It obscures the problems which sooner or later, may well engulf in conflict not only those peoples immediately involved but the world and ourselves as a part of it.

What our policies have done so far is to buy time in the Far East. We have spent billions through the deployment of our own Armed Forces in that region and through aid programs to hold the line against a Communist advance. Thousands of American and other lives were sacrificed to the same end in Korea. But I repeat: All we have done so far is to buy time in the Far East.

If we look elsewhere in Asia, to China, we find still another common cause of conflict. We find a nation recently revived from a long slumber which had been induced by an inner decay and by outer pressures upon it, now being revived under the forced draft of a militant totalitarianism. This revived China tests its new-found strength in an aggressive and brutal probing into territories of its neighbors. The China of today is a China which is vastly different—so far as we can judge, for our information is all second hand—from the China to which we were allied during World War II. It is a China in which tens of millions of young people are coming of age with no direct knowledge of Americans but with an induced hatred of this country and its institutions.

Let no one underestimate the long-range effect of these years of animosity between ourselves and China. It is, to say the least, illusory to talk of peace while the animosity is present in virulent form. It is illusory to talk of peace with a China on the march, not in the paths of progress by accommodation with other nations but in the ancient way of empire under a canopy of modern totalitarian trappings. I do not say that this development—this emergence of a new and bristling China—in the heart of Asia must lead inevitably to war. I do say that I see little in it or in our policies with respect to it which warrants the assumption that we are at peace.

Moving westward to the Middle East, here, too, we find a situation which by no stretch of the imagination can be identified as peace. Rather, it is a situation of suspended war. On repeated occasions in the past, the suspension has all but ended in grave border clashes. On two occasions, at the time of the Suez crisis, and in connection with the Lebanon crisis, the world dangled with one foot over the brink of disaster. Our political intervention at the United Nations in connection with the Suez crisis may have forestalled a total collapse in the Middle East. Our military intervention in Lebanon may have had the same effect. But Communist peneration of that area—economic and political—has not been curbed nor has a basis for peace been established.

The Eisenhower doctrine on the Middle East was intended to help achieve both objectives. So, too, have the enormous sums of public funds which have been spent on various kinds of aid to that area. Yet both have proved remarkably ineffective.

It is conceivable that we may have helped to hold back the floodwaters of conflict in that region by our acts of intervention and by our aid, but we have done little if anything to disperse or to rechannel them constructively. And behind the barriers which our policies have tried to build, the floodwaters are accumulating in a dangerous fashion. Each outbreak in the Middle East appears less controllable than its predecessor. In these circumstances it is, to say the least, illusory to talk of peace.

If there is grave instability in the Middle East, the same is true for Africa. New forces are at work in that continent which we are just beginning to recognize in policy, let alone understand.

For decades Africa was preponderantly a region acted upon rather than a region which acted in international relations. Since the end of World War II, however, seven new nations have come into being in Africa. This year, an additional five are scheduled to achieve independence and more will follow in due course. This enormous and rapid political change alone is sufficient to bring about massive problems of readjustment. But it is not only a political upheaval which rumbles through that great continent. Other forces common to all the underdeveloped nations, from eastern Asia to Latin America, are felt no less strongly in Africa. The urge is there, for human equality and for a continuing and rapid modernization, with its promise of economic and social benefit to all peoples. The urge is there, but the means to satisfy it adequately in peace have yet to be devised either by the African nations themselves or in concert with others.

Again, Africa is in danger of being more acted upon rather than acting itself in international affairs as it finds itself increasingly the focal point of rival ideologies and systems. This competition for African favor may be flattering to the Africans for the moment but it contains accumulating dangers to them and to peace. The dangers will be curbed only as Africa, increasingly, finds its own way in the world, largely by its own genius and efforts. I venture to say that if the continent is not sidetracked by the blandishments from outside during this transition, if it does not become careless with the strong new wine of national independence, it will in due course make an enormous and unique contribution to the progress of mankind and to peace.

I should note in this connection that with the political transition in Africa, the composition of the United Nations General Assembly is changing in a fashion which assures a decisive voice to the Afro-Asian nations. As you know, it is in the General Assembly that expression is given to world-wide aspirations. We can hope that the Afro-Asian nations and this Nation will more and more see the problems of peace and freedom in similar perspective and that their voice will be raised in harmony with our own. That is, however, by no means a certainty. If much depends on the manner in which the African nations develop and use their newly achieved freedom, much also depends on the wisdom and the sensitivity of the policies of the older free nations toward the changes which are taking place in the emergent African Continent.

Much closer to home are the problems of peace in Latin America. Notwithstanding the President's recent good will tour we are still faced with the need for harmonization of Latin American interests with our own. Beneath the facade of hemispheric unity there are deep divisions and much dissatisfaction particularly in economic matters. Fortunately, the present state of our relations with Cuba is not typical of our Latin American relations. But, then, neither was the very warm welcome extended to President Eisenhower in any way typical. As a man of good will, Mr. Eisenhower invariably evokes a response of good will. A firm basis for sound relations, however, is not conjured up out of ceremonial journeys of less than 2-week duration. Such journeys may open doors but the problem of keeping them open is one of followthrough in policies.

It seems to me that the need now in inter-American relations is a broad movement forward to new and higher grounds of hemispheric understanding and cooperation. We need this development in inter-American education and cultural exchange no less than in defense. We need it in economic matters no less than in political questions. And if our great neighbor to the north, Canada, is so inclined, we should welcome its participation in any and all matters of hemispheric interest. Unless this movement forward begins soon and in earnest, I am afraid we may anticipate in this hemisphere whose solidarity is an essential of peace, at worst, more sharp clashes in the present Cuban pattern and at best, a steady erosion of hemispheric intimacy which will increasingly drain inter-American ideals of their substance.

Turning next to Europe, we find there, too, an illusion of peace which masks deep and dangerous divisions. That is particularly

the case in Germany but it is also true of the entire continent which is split asunder by the ideological cleavage. Across the chasm only rickety bridges of contact are maintained.

If there is a need for progress toward unity in the divided countries of Asia, there is a compelling need for progress toward unification in Germany and for a growing reconciliation between Eastern and Western Europe.

Until recently, at least, our policies on Europe had remained unchanged in essentials for a decade. We have been engaged in a vast holding action in the fear that the Russians might attack Western Europe, a fear which was intermingled with the hope that sooner or later the Russians would withdraw from Eastern Germany and Eastern Europe. To that end, we spent billions to rearm Western Europe and to maintain our forces in that region. The Russians, similarly, have engaged in a vast holding action—an action in the expectation that Western European freedom would fall prey to communism and an action to hold on to a dominance in Eastern Europe which they had obtained in consequence of World War II. To that end they have kept military forces in the Eastern European nations and rearmed those nations and, until the advent of Mr. Khrushchev, minimized contacts between East and West.

It is increasingly clear that these policies have not led to the achievement of the aims of the one side or the other. The Communist grip shows no signs of weakening in Eastern Europe and freedom has come back with great vitality in Western Europe.

Certainly, the policies now pursued have not led to peace. They have been, on both sides, holding actions which have produced, at best, an unstable truce based upon a Germany split inside the larger split of Europe. That the truce is highly unstable was indicated by the first German crisis last year. This crisis arose out of the mere announcement that the Russians intended to change one factor in the situation: that is, to withdraw from Berlin and the routes of access to the city in favor of the East German Communists. It is ironic that a Russian announcement with a withdrawal, of all things, should produce a crisis; yet it did so, for the move threatened to upset the present delicate balance which depends, with equal irony, on the continued Russian presence in Eastern Germany.

In the round of good will tours and conferences, the Russians were persuaded to remain a while longer in Berlin and Germany and the crisis eased. The source of crisis, however, remains in the outdated policies of both sides in Europe. In short, the tours and conferences have served as safety valves but I need hardly emphasize the danger of relying indefinitely on safety valves. Sooner or later, it will be necessary to come to grips in a practical fashion with the problems of a divided Germany and a divided Europe. The visiting back and forth, notwithstanding, the promise of peace will be illusory until the divisions in Germany and Europe begin to close in peace on the basis of policies attuned to today's realities rather than yesterday's expectations.

In the same fashion, the problem of control of armaments—armaments of massive destruction in particular—must begin to yield to tangible solution before we can talk of peace in any meaningful fashion. We have watched the mathematical progression in the development of the megaton power of these weapons since the end of World War II. The Russians, the British, no less than ourselves, have advanced from a capability of destroying cities to a capability of destroying nations, to a capability of destroying civilization. The number of nations able to produce such weapons has increased from one in 1945 to four in 1960 and is subject to further increase if other countries who have the capacity decide so to deploy their science, technology, and energy. The missiles of delivery have improved, from the crude but destructive V-bombs which carried devastation to London in the closing days of World War II to those which encircle the moon and the sun in 1960.

All the while the wisest humans among us, the most compassionate humans among us have warned the world of what it is about in this deadly race for greater and more certain means of human annihilation. All the while, there have been disarmament conferences in which these words of the wise have been echoed with a remarkable unanimity by all nations. Yet a decade and a half has passed and we have yet to achieve a single agreement, signed and sealed, for the control of armaments. I do not wish to minimize the difficulties involved in this process but surely there is something amiss, something illusory when all endorse the warnings of wisdom, when all agree on the extent of the danger to all and yet agreement is not achieved which makes possible even the beginnings of a beginning of substance on this critical problem.

In 1955, I suggested that a summit conference be held on the one question of ending the testing of nuclear weapons. Five years later, we may be on the verge of such a conference. If it can now produce this one achievement it will mark a major, if long-delayed, step forward. Important as it would be, however, this achievement will be but the start of a long road. Until there exists a firm pattern for the progressive extension of international control over armaments we will do well not to speak of peace as prevailing in the world. This pattern, moreover, is not likely to be established until the political differences and divisions which I have been discussing begin also to yield to practical and progressive solution. In this connection, I may be wrong and I hope I am wrong but I see little likelihood that the current session of the disarmament conference in Geneva, anymore than its innumerable predecessors, will lead to any agreement of substance.

If I may summarize, then, let me say that the United States has made, in the past decade, a vast international effort. That effort has helped to keep open the prospect for peace but it has not yet begun to produce conditions of peace in any significant degree. In no single instance is this more evident than in foreign aid. We have made available for such purposes, funds approaching $100 billion since the end of World War II. The great bulk of this aid has gone to restore the damages of war or to hold by military means existing situations against deterioration. The positive aspect of aid as it is currently expressed in the point 4 program of technical cooperation and in loans for modern development has a relatively small part of the total aid program ever since the Marshall plan came to a successful termination. In the current year, for example, the President has requested $4.1 billion for foreign aid. Of this total, however, only $200 million is for point 4 aid and $700 million for development loans. By contrast $2 billion is for military aid and $700 million for military-related defense support.

In short, we will do well to recognize still another illusion in our policies; namely, that the vast amounts of aid now being spent is of a kind which necessarily builds conditions of peace. By far the larger share, as I noted, serves primarily to hold existing situations as they are and only a relatively small proportion goes into the constructive effort which is essential in Asia, Africa, and Latin America if we are to have a reliable peace.

Many Members of Congress who recognize the importance of foreign aid in the conduct of our foreign relations have been pressing for years to bring about reforms and refinements in this program. We have sought and we will seek again to consolidate fully the functions of the aid agency with those of the Department of State. We have sought and we will seek again to give added emphasis to economic aid as contrasted with military aid. We have sought and we will seek again to substitute as far as possible long-term loans on easy terms for large grants of aid. We have sought and we will seek again to protect and advance the point 4 concept, that is, the people-to-people type of technical assistance. We have sought and we will seek again to bring about a united aid effort which draws increasingly on the cooperation of Western Europe and Japan, whose recent progress has been such as to enable them to assume a much larger share of the initiative and the cost of assisting the less favored nations.

Discriminating changes in any major governmental undertaking such as foreign aid are hard to bring about by action from Congress. We can alter legislation as we have done, or pass new legislation, but in the last analysis, effective change depends even more on the administration which has the responsibility for giving effect to the law. In this connection, I would call to your attention the fact that on two separate occasions in the past Congress voted to abolish the aid agency and turn its functions over to the Department of State and the Department of Defense. And two times this action was reversed by the administration which, on each occasion, reconstituted the aid agency under a different name. Despite such setbacks, some progress has been made in streamlining and improving the administration of the aid program but much still remains to be done.

The aid program is, in may ways, typical of our foreign policies as a whole. The problem of bringing about effective foreign relations lies not so much in new policies and new machinery as it does in sharpening existing policies and refining existing machinery. The absence of clear-cut, attainable objectives and the moribund administration of the aid program—as a recent Senate study of the program in Vietnam made clear—are principal weaknesses in foreign aid. So, too, are these factors of weakness in our foreign policy as a whole. I have no desire to minimize the tasks of the President and Secretary of State in these matters. Theirs is an exacting responsibility. Nevertheless, it seems to me that there is a great need to look beyond and to act beyond the expensive holding action in which we are now engaged throughout the world. We need to see anew the facts of the divisions in Asia no less than those in Europe. We need to think anew the costly and ineffective effort merely to keep the situation as it is in the Middle East. We need to recognize fully the defects of the aid effort in Asia, no less than in an emergent Africa and in Latin America. We need to sharpen the policies by which we deal with these problems, in the hope that the problems may begin to yield to practical solution. In short, we need a new determination and a new approach to foreign relations which will move the Nation forward from this costly, lackadaisical and dangerous illusion of peace toward the reality of peace.

A "Bad Tax" Has No Sanctity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, recently when the House of Representatives was considering the ex-

tension of the transportation tax, I voted against the same. I notice the Finance Committee of the Senate has refused to extend this excise tax. I am hopeful the Senate will follow the committee's recommendation.

The transportation tax works to the disadvantage of the Western States. The Denver Post, on Monday, May 23, 1960, in the following editorial, gives excellent reasons why this tax should be repealed:

In this time of cold war and staggering expenses for space exploration, any talk of making a general tax reduction is sheer folly.

But that does not mean there can be no readjustment of the tax structure to eliminate bad taxes, provided the loss in revenue is made up in some more equitable way.

Last year Congress voted such a readjustment when it passed a bill to reduce from 10 percent to 5 percent, effective July 1, 1960, the Federal tax on the transportation of persons.

President Eisenhower has asked that the reduction be repealed so the tax may continue at 10 percent for another year. At 10 percent the tax would raise $310 million next year. At 5 percent, it would raise half that or $155 million.

Neither amount is impressive nor would it amount to more than a small fraction of the national budget.

It seems likely that the net benefits to the Treasury are nil if all side effects of this transportation tax are considered. For example:

The tax, by discouraging travel, affects the amounts railroads, buslines, and airlines pay in income taxes.

Some of the receipts of the tax are illusory in that persons who travel on business are allowed to deduct the cost of such trips, including the transportation tax, in making out their income tax returns.

By discouraging travel, the tax makes it necessary for the Government to pay more on subsidies to feeder airlines than it otherwise would have to pay. Federal payments to air carriers next fiscal year are expected to amount to $69 million.

The transportation tax is not absorbed by the carriers. The traveler pays it as an extra and separate charge when he buys his ticket.

The transportation tax, it should be remembered, was a wartime measure. One of the reasons for imposing it was to discourage unnecessary travel at a time when the transportation facilities of the country were strained by their duties to the military.

This is a tax which raises but little money, discourages tourism and adversely affects an important industry.

Congress would do well to repeal it entirely or, at least, let it drop to the 5-percent rate which was approved last year.

National Harmony, Not Conflict, Key to Future Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an age when our security—yes, our survival—is threatened by an international conspiracy of communism, we, as a nation, need to adhere more closely to the concept that domestic harmony, not conflict, is the key to future progress and success.

The effort toward greater cooperation must include labor, government, industry, and all others in the economy. Unless this is done, the Nation will suffer—to an unnecessary degree—from a dissipation of its energies and resources.

We recognize that the spirit of cooperation can best be achieved—not by laws—but by instilling in our people the kind of understanding and perspective to realize that harmony is the best policy.

As a splendid example of this kind of cooperation, a special supplement to the New York Times, entitled "On Wisconsin—A State of Power and Plenty" included an article, "Business Teams Up With Wisconsin Government," by Joe E. Nusbaum, commissioner, department of administration in Wisconsin. Another example is reflected in an article from the Milwaukee Journal by Richard H. Leonard, "UW Aids Labor, Management." I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS TEAMS UP WITH WISCONSIN GOVERNMENT—SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIP

(By Joe E. Nusbaum, Commissioner, Department of Administration)

Business and government are partners in the job of making government more efficient and responsive to the needs of the people of Wisconsin. Cooperation is close and friendly, with mutual recognition of the advantages of collaboration. They feel a community of interest that is stronger than other considerations.

Wisconsin's government is close to the people, and in the formulation of laws, each segment of the population has its voice. In the administration of laws, government has sought out business leaders for advice and participation.

The latest example of government-business cooperation is the formation of the Governor's advisory committee on business practices. It was assummed that businessmen, spurred by the force of competition, had developed techniques and practices that well might be emulated by governmental agencies in the interest of efficiency. It was also assumed—an assumption that proved to be correct—that businessmen were as interested in doing something to improve the efficiency of State government as were those in charge of government operations. The result was the formation of a committee of business executives; this group has attacked the problem with enthusiasm and determination.

The Governor's committee has formed seven subcommittees to review seven management functions such as data processing, personnel management, and purchasing. Each subcommittee is composed of specialists from business, State officials, and a legislator. After reviewing practices, the subcommittees will make recommendations for improvements to the Governor's advisory committee, which, in turn, will recommend administrative and legislative changes to the Governor and the legislature.

The newly created Department of Administration, the State agency with the major responsibility for the State's business management functions, is working closely with the Governor's advisory committee.

The Governor's Advisory Committee on Business Practices is only the latest of many advisory groups with business representation. The Natural Resources Advisory Committee, the Unemployment Compensation Advisory Committee, and various subcommittees of the Legislative Council are policy review groups which make valuable use of the talents of business executives. When it became apparent that the State needed a long-range tax revision, a 19-member blue-ribbon committee was appointed to help the State chart in course; the Governor leaned heavily upon leading business executives, along with leaders in other fields, to formulate policy.

Those who do business in Wisconsin can depend upon competent, honest, and equitable administration of laws. There are no hidden costs in dealing with public officials. Wisconsin has a deep-rooted tradition of clean Government and a well-established merit system in public employment. The taxpayer is sure that all costs are shown on the public records and that he will receive a full measure of public service for his tax dollar.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Apr. 1, 1960]

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AIDS LABOR, MANAGEMENT—UNION SHOP STEWARDS ARE ALERT IN SPOTTING TERRIBLE GRIEVANCE IN COURSE AT BEAVER DAM; EXECUTIVES ATTEND INSTITUTES

(By Richard H. Leonard)

It is night in Beaver Dam. Lights burn brightly in just one room in the junior high school—the room where union shop stewards at industrial plants in the area are learning from a University of Wisconsin instructor how to present workers' grievances to management.

The instructor reads a sample complaint written by a worker:

"A while ago the foreman illegally transferred Charles Swedberg to the first shift. He doesn't have the seniority that I do and it's not fair to move him up. I think the foreman has it in for me and shouldn't be allowed to get away with it. They ought to put Swedberg back where he belongs."

"What do you think of that one?" asks Prof. Robert W. Ozanne, director of the UW school for workers.

"BURN THAT ONE UP"

"Burn that one up," shouts back one of the men in the class. "It's no good."

"Right," agrees Ozanne, "it's terrible—and that's why shop stewards have got to learn how to write up grievances for the workers."

Another class was underway in the UW extension division's program to educate labor. On the other side of the labor-management hyphen, the extension division's management institute presents 150 or more programs a year in the field of management training. Both operations are part of the famed Wisconsin idea of extending UW services to everyone in the State.

"GOOD ONE." "WHY?"

But let's get back to Beaver Dam and the quarrel over Swedberg's transfer to the first shift.

Ozanne pointed out that the grievance written by the worker did not give enough facts, made the issue a personal one with the foreman, drove Swedberg and the foreman into each other's arms and made no request for a proper settlement of the dispute.

Paper was passed out and the stewards—28 are enrolled—wrote grievances they thought were better than the one under discussion. Then Ozanne read each to the class and asked for comment. One struck the fancy of a plaid-shirted steward.

"Good one," he shouted.

"Why?" asked Ozanne.

"It's clear, precise," was the reply.

"Right," said Ozanne, "but don't try to get too specific and start acting like a lawyer."

REASONABLE ATTITUDE ASKED

The subject shifted to the steward's role in defending an employee against company charges, and most of the stewards indicated they would go a long way in fighting for the worker.

"Are you going to represent a man whether he is right or wrong?" asked Ozanne.

"Until he is proven wrong," shouted a steward.

Ozanne spoke briefly in favor of a reasonable attitude toward the employer. He emphasized that one of the steward's main responsibilities was to see that an employee got a good, fair hearing.

The university's school for workers, in continuous operation since 1925, is said to be the oldest university labor education program in the Nation.

EXCLUSIVELY FOR LABOR

Its philosophy, as outlined by the extension division, is that:

Workers are entitled to educational services based on their needs.

Longrun industrial relations harmony is best achieved through making available to labor union members and officers all possible information and training.

Labor education is educationally more efficient when classes are reserved exclusively for labor.

Extension classes, such as the one at Beaver Dam, are given in steward training, contract administration, arbitration, collective bargaining, time study, job evaluation, labor law and related subjects.

Weekend and weekday conferences on these subjects are also held out in the State, and summer institutes are held on the UW campus. About 1,500 workers attend the evening classes each year; 800 go to the summer institutes and 1,300 take part in the weekend and weekday conferences.

IT IS QUITE ESSENTIAL

Has the school for workers been of value to labor in Wisconsin?

"Oh, yes, without any doubt," said Jacob F. Friedrick, president of the Milwaukee County Labor Council. "We think it has had a very great value. It gives instruction to members of the organized labor movement in subjects in which they are interested as officers or rank and file members of local unions. We feel it is quite essential."

UW was also a pioneer in management training, entering the field in World War II when thousands of workers had to be promoted to supervisory positions to meet wartime needs. In answer to requests, the extension division and the school of commerce set up a series of evening courses.

PROGRESS WITH STABILITY

In its first year, 1944–45, a total of 23 programs were presented with 28 companies participating and 386 persons attending. The 1959 figures were 133 programs, 668 companies and 5,275 participants.

"Progress with stability" is the motto of management institute (MI) and its announced objectives are:

To help improve the performance of management personnel.

To help prepare selected management personnel for increased responsibilities and promotion.

To achieve these ends, 3-day executive seminars are held on topics such as long-range planning, marketing and sales functions, and management development. One-day management conferences are offered on subjects such as labor relations management, plant management, and office management.

WORTHWHILE CONTRIBUTION

MI also offers workshops for specialists in such fields as sales supervisors, budgeting and traffic management. Supervisory institutes are held for foremen.

Management response is reflected in these letters received by MI:

"I thoroughly enjoyed my brief visit to the university, and I feel that you are making a worthwhile contribution to industry," said H. W. Fulton of Continental Can Co., Inc.

"Yours was the most informative session of its kind I haev ever attended. The men who attended had a wealth of experience and ideas, and you ran the program with a deft touch," said R. R. Featherman of the State Farm Insurance Cos.

"An excellent, well-conducted series of meetings. The discussion leaders were outstanding. I feel I have greatly benefited from the series and hope to be back to attend more of these fine sessions," said P. S. Joyce, of General Mills, Inc.

"The progress we have made in the field of human relations is much to the credit of the guidance and inspirations we have received from management institute," said John Esch of the Leverenz Shoe Co.

CENTER IS BUSY

Many of the institutes are held in the Wisconsin Center building on the UW campus, a $2 million gift to the university from the University of Wisconsin Foundation. The center, three stories high, is situated on the lower campus.

The 19 meeting rooms in the center vary in capacity from 14 to 230 persons. Last year a total of 82,342 persons were recorded as attending 700 different events in the building. Actually, there weren't this many people because the attendance was added up daily and, consequently, a person attending a 3-day event was counted on each of the 3 days.

In laying the cornerstone for the Wisconsin Center in 1957, Gov. Oscar Rennebohm made this statement concerning the Wisconsin idea:

"The strength of Wisconsin is in her people; talents, skills, and know-how are, indeed, her greatest resource. And it has been the good fortune of both State and university to have a vigorous and steady working relationship between State government and university to extend and enhance this most prized resource."

Rayburn Declares Burleson "In Clear"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in Life magazine an article purporting to expose certain alleged irregularities in congressional expenditures some 2 years ago. One of our colleagues, OMAR BURLESON in particular, was severely criticized because of some items that appeared in an expense account turned in for expenses for the committee of which he is chairman. I feel that this criticism was unjust. I do not believe there is anyone who is more concientious and scrupulous in handling funds under his supervision than OMAR BURLESON. I have absolute faith in his honesty and integrity and I am not alone in my viewpoint. I include the following articles appearing in the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex., and the Stephenville Daily Empire, Stephenville, Tex., with regard to this matter, in the RECORD:

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, June 4, 1960]

RAYBURN DECLARES BURLESON IN CLEAR

(By Elizabeth Carpenter)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Texas congressional delegation, from House Speaker SAM RAYBURN on down, is indignant at any unfavorable reflection on Representative OMAR BURLESON created by the Life magazine stories of congressional expense accounts, it was evident Friday in congressional cloakrooms.

Speaker RAYBURN told the Reporter-News, as he left to fly to New Mexico with Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, "I have checked into the matter. OMAR BURLESON is absolutely in the clear and you can quote me."

Part of the Texas indignation here arises from the real explanation of the $1,379 which BURLESON received from committee expenses in 1958, an explanation which he has refused to use, but is known to his Texas colleagues.

"The irony," one Texas member told me, "is that while OMAR's expense account was very modest and completely justified, most of the money reportedly paid to him actually went to an assistant for committee work."

This is the inside story which members of the Texas delegation say is accurate: In 1958, the House Administration Committee, of which BURLESON is chairman, employed a legal expert to do a special research job on election practices of the Hatch Act. The simple and practical way to allow him to draw expenses was to apply for it in the chairman's name and per diem was paid him for about 44 days which he worked."

This accounted for most of the $1,379 mentioned in the Life story; the rest was drawn by BURLESON for committee studies.

Members of the delegation have urged BURLESON to give this explanation but he has refused to, stating he would rather "just sweat out" the present situation. It has cost him several sleepless nights.

Asked about this explanation given by his colleagues, BURLESON replied, "I'm not making any further explanations. My conscience is clear."

"Another irony," one Member told me, "is that BURLESON, who has power over all the committee expense money, probably taps it less than any other member."

Another said: "It is pretty ridiculous for a magazine to try to expose him for making committee studies to save money at home when there are so many who use it to see how they can give it away abroad."

[From the Stephenville Daily Empire, June 7, 1960]

Bad judgment: When Life magazine sent staff reporters to Washington, D.C., to look into some of the infractions of Members of Congress it seems that they took an unfair advantage of some of the most scrupulous men in the Capitol. Regardless of how anybody feels about OMAR BURLESON we happen to know that he is a man of honor and integrity. It is going to take something stronger than a feature story in the big magazine to convince us that OMAR BURLESON ever committed a single indiscretion as far as any irregularities with money is concerned. If all the other Members of Congress would take a lesson from the pattern of this good man we would be far better off—both in matters of legislation as well as finance. Too bad that these things have to happen. However, they come along every few years and frequently with penalizing results. Frankly, we are firmly convinced that it is going to take some influence stronger than a feature writer in Life magazine to cause the voters of the 17th Congressional District to turn their backs on OMAR BURLESON.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, in his wonderfully lucid manner, Walter Lippmann has set forth the essential differences between the administration's hastily contrived medical program for the aged and the bill introduced by Senator MCNAMARA, with which I am proud to be associated. A great deal of material has been printed on this important problem now facing the Congress, but none better states the issue than Mr. Lippmann's column in today's Washington Post and Times Herald. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED
(By Walter Lippmann)

Almost everyone realizes that a great mass of the old people do not have the savings, and cannot depend upon their children, to pay for the doctors, hospitals, nursing homes, and drugs which, because they are aging, they need more than do younger people.

There are a few eccentrics, professing to be conservatives, who think that in a truly rugged individualism these ailing old people would do without medical care if they can't pay for it, or would make their children mortgage the future to pay the medical bills.

But the country is not that ruggedly obtuse to the facts of life, and accordingly both the administration and the Democratic opposition are agreed that the need, which is obvious and urgent, must be met by Government measures.

Thus, this administration has prepared a program which the Director of the Budget, Mr. Stans, says will cost $1.5 billion by 1964 and $2.5 billion by 1970. For the Democrats, Senator MCNAMARA and some 19 Senators, including KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, and HUMPHREY, have introduced a bill that would add medical insurance to the existing old-age insurance. After the first year, the cost of this program would be $1.5 billion. Thus the two programs are approximately of the same size.

But between the two programs there is a basic issue of principle. On one side are the President and his advisers. On the other side are the preponderant mass of the Democrats and also a considerable minority of the Republicans led by Governor Rockefeller. They differ essentially on how the program shall be financed.

Shall it be financed by compulsory insurance, which means that throughout a person's working life he and his employer will be taxed to provide an insurance fund for his medical needs when he is retired and is no longer earning an income? This is the principle of the McNamara bill in the Senate, as it was of the Forand bill in the House, and it has the support of the leading Democrats and of Governor Rockefeller.

Or shall the program be financed, as the administration proposes, by charitable doles to the very poor, paid for out of compulsory taxes collected by the National and State Governments?

For reasons which he has never explained, the President regards compulsory social security taxes as unsound, socialistic, and rather un-American; on the other hand, he regards compulsory taxes to pay for doles based on a means test as somehow more "voluntary," sounder, more worthy of a free society, and more American.

Under the McNamara bill, medical insurance would be added to the existing old-age insurance system. During his working life, each person covered by the social security system would contribute an additional amount, as would also his employer, to supplement his retirement income to include medical services.

It is true that during the first few years benefits would be received by persons who had not contributed because the system did not exist when they were earning their living. These benefits would be paid for by the younger people. But as the younger people would be buying their own insurance, there is little inequity in this. Nobody will lose anything although those who are already too old to have been contributors to an insurance plan will benefit. In a few years everyone receving the benefits will have paid his share.

Why does the President feel so strongly opposed to the principle of compulsory insurance for medical care to supplement the insurance, which already exists, for old age? What is wrong about its being compulsory that a man should insure himself against the needs of his old age? What is so wonderful about a voluntary system under which a man who doesn't save for his old age has to have his doctors and his hospital bills paid for by his children or public welfare funds? There is nothing un-American in the principle that the imprudent shall be compelled to save so that they do not become a burden to their families and the local charities, so that they can meet the needs of their old age with the self-respect which comes from being entitled to the benefits because they have paid the cost out of their own earnings.

The President has been led to think, he says, that compulsory insurance is "a very definite step in socialized medicine." Why? In a system of compulsory insurance the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would administer the program, could and should use as its agents private organizations like the National Blue Cross Association in negotiating with hospitals and nursing homes and in dealing with claims and complaints. The system would be financed as insurance. But it would be worked not by a new Government agency but by the kind of private voluntary association which the President otherwise believes in.

In this connection it is interesting to remember that in the early 1930's when voluntary health insurance plans were inaugurated, our old friend, the American Medical Association, was declaring that they were communism and socialism and socialized medicine. Today, the American Medical Association is pointing to these same voluntary insurance plans as the solution of our present need and the proper alternative to compulsory old age medical care insurance.

Among the opponents of medical insurance there seems to be a vague and uncomfortable feeling that it is a new-fangled theory, alien to the American way of life and imported, presumably, from Soviet Russia.

The Founding Fathers were not subject to such theoretical hobgoblins. In 1798 Congress set up the first medical insurance scheme under the U.S. Marine Hospital Service. The scheme was financed by deducting from seamen's wages contributions to pay for their hospital expenses.

If that was "socialized medicine," the generation of the Founding Fathers was blandly unaware of it.

Schedule of Grassroots Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant desire to serve my constituents in the best way possible. During my service here I have made it my regular policy to keep in close touch with the people of my district so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

I have considered it my duty, as the representative of this great district, not only to be well-informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Nine years ago I initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences throughout our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the U.S. Post Office Building in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year, during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these grassroots conferences throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton Post Office, room 314, September 6 and 7, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Germantown City Building, September 9, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Phillipsburg City Building, September 10, 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Brookville City Building, September 10, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Middletown American Legion, September 13, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Miamisburg City Building, September 14, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Oxford Municipal Building, September 15, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Fairfield City Building, September 16, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Hamilton Courthouse, September 19, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

I have been greatly encouraged by the increased attendance at these conferences each year. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of mutual concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through these grassroots conferences will help me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of our important Third District as their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Statement of Al Hayes on Strikes at Missile Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of attention called to the work stoppages which have taken place in recent days at various plants throughout the country which are engaged in missile production and testing. In the papers which I have been reading, at least, little space seems to have been given to presenting the employees' side of the case.

I do not pretend to have sufficient knowledge about these current disputes to make any judgment as to where the blame for the breakdown in negotiations lies. But I do feel that the workers' arguments as well as the employer's as regards the work stoppages merits equal coverage and attention.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a statement by the President of the International Association of Machinists, Al Hayes, on the strikes at missile bases, as delivered on June 6, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AL HAYES' STATEMENT ON STRIKES AT MISSILE BASES

IAM President Al Hayes today issued the following statement on the strike by members of the International Association of Machinists against Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp.:

"Today's work stoppages at the missile bases and test sites have taken place with the full knowledge of both management and Government officials on the highest level.

"Only the most routine efforts have been made by our Government to effect a settlement of this dispute. Negotiations have dragged along since early March when proposals for modest improvements in our working agreement with Convair were submitted.

"IAM negotiators have been meeting with management representatives up to 6 days a week since March 14 in an effort to work out a just settlement. During this period, management representatives have made no substantive attempt to meet the legitimate proposals of the union. Instead, the representatives for management have challenged the membership by insisting on taking away benefits that our members have enjoyed for several years.

"Termination date of the agreement between IAM District 50, San Diego, and Convair was May 8. It is usual for IAM members to refuse to work in the absence of a contract.

"However, because of the critical nature of the work being performed for Convair by our members, a 30-day contract extension was obtained in a further effort to work out a settlement without any interruption of work.

"During these past 30 days, everything possible was done to arrive at an honorable settlement with this company. On May 14, following a meeting of our joint coordinating committee with the UAW, I issued a public statement explaining the situation and warning that it could not continue indefinitely.

"On May 17, I personally called on the Secretary of Labor at his office and reported the seriousness of the situation. At that time I urged him to send a team of the Nation's top mediators into this dispute.

"When no movement was forthcoming from management and little interest evidenced by Government, our members took strike votes. Management was fully informed on the outcome of those votes.

"At no time has there been any evidence that anyone was greatly upset by the prospect of a strike. It is apparent to me that this company is trying to exploit its position as a prime defense contractor in an effort to impose substandard conditions on its employees.

"For those who are not familiar with the ecenomics of the aircraft and missile industry, let me say that the weighted average being paid by this industry is $2.68 an hour, including overtime, as of February 1960. Yet, Convair in line with the rest of the industry, is attempting not only to deny its employees a justified wage increase but is also attempting to weaken the cost-of-living escalator that has given some measure of protection to our members.

"Aircraft and missile employees have little job security. Yet not only does Convair refuse to discuss severance pay, it is demanding contract language that would permit indiscriminate layoffs without regard to seniority.

"Convair has refused even to discuss with union negotiators an improvement in its pension program, although other companies in this industry are negotiating pension improvements at this moment.

"This strike is a result of mistakes by management on the one hand and either unwillingness or inability within our Government to face up to the realities of legitimate union activity."

East Coast Shipyard Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is the 146th day of the strike in the eight east coast shipyards.

It is unbelievable that this strike could continue this long.

However, due to the neutral attitude of the present administration this strike has been prolonged to a point where the defense program of our Nation has been seriously impaired. Of course, this neutral attitude, while it may sound very lofty to some, in reality is nothing more than a case of ducking and dodging of responsibility.

The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, has been so silent on this important issue that it causes one to wonder whether or not he realizes a strike is in existence. The Vice President who accepted the accolades for settling the steel strike has remained in an insulated shell and has shown no interest whatsoever in the problems of maintaining a shipbuilding program so vitally needed at this time.

With the entire world in an explosive state, we find this administration has its head in the sand. Yes, the administration is sitting idly by hoping that this shipbuilding stoppage problem will vanish.

A short time ago, 105 Members of this Congress sent an appeal to the President asking for the establishment of a factfinding board. The White House sidestepped this request with a rather willy-nilly answer about policy of the administration being one of waiting for both sides to make the request. The unions requested the President to establish a factfinding board and said they would abide by any recommendation made. The company refused to request a factfinding board to be appointed by President Eisenhower. Why the company officials will not trust the President is rather surprising. They apparently have their own reasons.

I would like to include an article which appeared in the New York Times, Thursday, June 16, 1960, reporting on the warning issued by Vice Adm. Wallace M. Bleakley, head of the Navy's ship construction program, about the peril to the security of the national defense being caused by a continuation of this strike:

SHIPYARD STRIKE DECRIED BY NAVY—BETHLEHEM AND UNION HEAR VICE ADMIRAL'S WARNING OF PERIL TO DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, June 15.—The Navy warned union and management negotiators for Bethlehem Steel Co. shipyards today that the 5-month strike on the east coast was a "black day" for United States defense.

Vice Adm. Wallace M. Bleakley, head of the Navy's ship construction program, said the strike at the eight yards had tied up work on one-fifth of new Navy ships. He urged a speedy settlement.

He made a special appearance before the negotiators for management and the shipbuilding workers union who met with Federal mediators in an attempt to settle the dispute.

Vice Admiral Bleakley told the negotiators that the United States could not be permitted to get "soft."

"Every day we lose puts the Russians that much ahead," he said.

He mentioned specifically the importance of two nuclear surface ships under construction at the yard at Quincy, Mass., and four new destroyers.

The vice admiral told both sides that the Navy planned to rush ahead with its shipbuilding program for the fiscal year 1961 and would not put any orders for ships in "struck yards."

Vice Admiral Bleakley said he considered the construction yards at Quincy and one at Sparrow's Point, Md., "national assets." Other Bethlehem yards are used mostly for repairs.

He indicated before the session that the Navy might withdraw the nuclear vessels from Quincy because "we can't leave them there forever." They are the cruiser *Long Beach* and the destroyer *Bainbridge*.

The main point in the dispute has been seniority clauses in the contract, which expired last July. It affected 18,000 workers.

The union has offered to let an independent fact-finding board or arbitrator rule on the dispute. The company has declined.

National Driver of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, safe driving is a national problem of interest to all Americans.

In the same manner, courage is a quality universally admired.

In recent days, a young Texas truckdriver, who is also a minister, received national recognition for not only his safe driving ability but his bravery as well.

Russell R. Brown, an ordained Baptist minister who also drives an oil company tank truck, was named national Driver of the Year by the American Trucking Associations.

Mr. Brown who has driven approximately 900,000 miles without a chargeable accident, also received recognition for his courage and quick thinking that resulted in the rescue of a drowning 6-year-old boy.

The full story of Mr. Brown's achievements are detailed in a statement released by the American Trucking Associations, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTER WHO RESCUED DROWNING BOY NAMED AS TRUCKDRIVER OF YEAR

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 10.—A young Texas truckdriver-minister who rescued a drowning 6-year-old boy was named national driver of the year today by the American Trucking Associations.

One of the highest awards offered to professional truckdrivers in the United States went to Russell R. Brown, 31, Mount Pleasant, Tex., an ordained Baptist minister who drives a tank truck for the American Petrofina Co. of Texas, with headquarters in Dallas.

Mr. Brown won the coveted title for his record of 14 years of professional truckdriving without a chargeable accident, as well as his heroism in diving into a 12 by 12 foot concrete pit filled with muddy water to locate and rescue Charles Ray Schedule, 6, of Alvin, Tex. Mr. Brown was forced to dive twice to locate the unconscious boy. He then used artificial respiration until breathing was restored.

Mr. Brown has driven close to 900,000 miles without a chargeable accident. In addition he has been an ordained minister of the Baptist church since 1953 when he was 24, and has been pastor of three churches in Texas. After his ordination, he was given a special shift so that he could study at the Texas Bible Institute, Henderson, Tex., and perform his pastoral duties at the Liberty Hill Baptist Church, near Mount Pleasant, while still working full time.

He later was pastor of the Corinth Baptist Church in Timpson, Tex., and the Fellowship Baptist Church in suburban Houston. Medical and family expenses forced him to return to full-time truck driving.

Mr. Brown, and his wife, Robbie Louise, have four children: Gary, 5; Mary Lynn, 7; Ronnie, 8; and Jimmie 10.

Mr. Brown's rescue deed came last July while he was working for the Groendyke Transport Co., of Houston. While delivering a cargo of gasoline in Alvin, near Galveston, he saw three small boys screaming and running into a house nearby. They emerged with an elderly man and soon disappeared from view. Mr. Brown soon heard the man's cry for help and upon investigation found him bending over the side of a concrete pit or tank, filled with about 7 feet of muddy water. He was told a boy had fallen into the water.

Without hesitation, Mr. Brown dove into water and searched vainly for the boy's body. Rising to the surface breathless, Mr. Brown dove again, and finally came up with the Schedule boy, who apparently had drowned.

With the help of the elderly man and the small boys, the youngster was lifted to the side of the pit where Mr. Brown immediately started artificial respiration. Before long, little Charles Ray drew a feeble breath. He was taken to John Sealy Hospital in Galveston, where he recovered.

Without his "alertness, bravery, and immediate action" the Schedule boy would have drowned, the chamber of commerce, agriculture, and industry of Alvin said in commending Mr. Brown for his heroism. He also was cited by the Texas Department of Public Safety and was chosen "Most Representative Knight of the Road," an award given annually by the Hobbs Trailer Co. to a Texas truckdriver.

Russell Brown was the youngest in a Mount Pleasant family of 14 children. He began earning his own way at the age of 9 after his father died. Soon he was driving a small truck on his brother's poultry and egg farm. He first went to work for the American Petrofina Co., then the American Liberty Oil Co. in 1949. Following his pastorate at the Fellowship Baptist Church and his employment by Groendyke Transport Co., in Houston, he recently returned to his hometown and the driving job with American Petrofina. His run takes him from Mount Pleasant to Dallas and Fort Worth.

Professional truckdrivers from many States, nominated by their State trucking associations, were in competition for the annual driver-of-the-year award. Judges in this year's competition were: Congressman Kenneth A. Roberts, of Alabama; Gen. E. H. Qualls, director of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, Interstate Commerce Commission; Arthur C. Butler, director of the National Highway Users Conference; and Richard O. Bennett, secretary-treasurer, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

Hazleton's Can-Do Program—Jobs for Displaced Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue, June 1960, of the VFW magazine there appears an extremely interesting and highly important article entitled: "Operation—Jobs for Displaced Workers," written by Mr. Dominic A. Antonelli, assistant editor, the Plain Speaker, Hazleton, Pa.

As Hazleton is the place of my birth and my hometown, I am particularly proud of the truly magnificent job that the people of Hazleton have done in their long fight for economic survival. It is an amazing story, a marvelous example of "Operation Bootstrap" accomplished successfully in the best American tradition.

The writer of this article, Mr. Antonelli, is widely known in our region as one of the most talented and hardest working reporters and writers, a gentleman dedicated to the progress and well being of his community and a leader and organizer in civic programs and affairs. This article could not have come from a better pen.

The success of Hazleton's can-do program is in great measure due to the guidance and counseling as put forth by Attorney Louis G. Feldmann, the present commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who has served in the capacity of legal adviser for the campaign organization.

It is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that all those in the forefront in this program are veterans of past wars in which this country has been involved.

They are veterans who have won many military victories over implacable foreign enemies and now they return to their homeland and attack and defeat an economic enemy in their own backyard, with the same espirit de corps that they displayed so magnificently on foreign soil and battlefields.

It has often been said, Mr. Speaker, that the Lord helps those that help themselves. The Hazleton can-do program is a perfect example of the meaning of this phrase.

There is no doubt the expression "can-do" was derived from the classic American military term when an order was given to carry out a mission that seemed to be an impossible one. The unhesitating reply always comes forth, "Can-do," in response to a difficult assignment.

It gives me great personal pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include as part of my

remarks the excellent article by Mr. Antonelli from the June 1960, issue of the VFW magazine:

OPERATION—JOBS FOR DISPLACED WORKERS

(By Dominic A. Antonelli)

When World War II ended, thousands of soldiers, sailors, and marines who had won the battle for survival in the jungles of the South Pacific, and the hedgerows of Europe, went home to the hard coalfields of Pennsylvania. The joy of their homecoming was soon tempered by the discovery that the homefront had become a "third front," and that they had yet another battle to wage—a fight for economic survival.

Like many of his human counterparts, King Coal had been toppled from his throne. The anthracite industry, which had provided the basic wealth of the area for nearly a century, was dwindling rapidly. Thousands of jobs were sliding down the empty coal chutes.

Gaunt abandoned collieries, rusting machinery, and gaping mine pits were grim reminders to the ex-GI's of the foreign areas that lay devastated in the wake of their recent campaigns.

The veterans soon exhausted their 52-20 benefits. Many of them registered in trade schools to train for jobs which did not exist. They left their homes in droves to seek work elsewhere.

As King Coal fell, it seemed he would drag down entire communities with him. Many despaired of ever seeing the region make a comeback.

But hopelessness was not what had just won a war for the United States. Nor were most of those who fought in the war ready to lie down and accept defeat in their own hometowns.

And so the lines were drawn for a battle which has amazed the entire Nation. This is the story of the battle fought by the Can-Do city which won its own bright, new future through community courage, cooperation, and self-help.

The city is Hazleton, Pa., the home town of Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann. Actually, the title of its recovery organization, Can-Do, tells the dramatic story. It is a tale of vital interest to numerous towns and small cities throughout the Nation, and to countless thousands of veterans. Not because Commander in Chief Feldmann has been one of the principals in the drama. Not because veterans of the community were prominent in the fight. But primarily because it is a story of what any red-blooded American town can do for itself if it has enough get up and go to do so.

It was no idle gesture that brought the Secretary of Commerce of Pennsylvania to the VFW National Convention in Los Angeles last summer. Secretary William R. Davlin, of the Governor's cabinet, made the long trip to Los Angeles to give recognition to Can-Do through its vice president, Louis G. Feldmann, who was about to be elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Among the 50 States, Pennsylvania has been setting the pace for industrial development. Hazleton and Can-Do are examples of how it can be done.

Since 1947, acting without Government subsidy or handouts, the community of greater Hazleton has secured new industries which have put over 2,000 men to work. New plants under construction will soon push the total number of new jobs well over the 3,500 mark.

But let's go back to the dark days right after World War II when the returning GI's found their homecoming dreams threatened and the old hometown on the verge of becoming a ghost town.

In those days the commander of VFW Post 589, Hazleton, was an energetic exmarine sergeant just returned from the Pacific theater. His name was Louis G. Feldmann. He was a young attorney who felt that the veterans had to attack their homefront problems with the same vigor they displayed on the battlefronts. He organized what was truly a unique group for those days, an association of all the veterans groups in the area. It became known as the Greater Hazleton Veterans Association. It included the VFW, American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, AMVETS, and Disabled American Veterans.

The Greater Hazleton Veterans Association provided the basic cohesion needed by a community which had begun to lose its spirit and its will to fight. It indicated that the ex-GI's were ready to unite in any project which would lead the way back to economic stability—with jobs for all who wanted to work. The opportunity to do so soon presented itself.

Early in 1947, a committee of the Hazleton Chamber of Commerce headed by Victor C. Diehm, a prominent radio executive, made contact with officials of the Electric Autolite Co., of Toledo, Ohio, and interested them in locating a new plant in Hazleton. There was only one catch. The community would have to come up with $500,000 cash within 60 days to help finance construction of the million-dollar plant which the firm would have to build.

Surprising no one but themselves the people of Hazleton and its suburbs, encouraged by the cooperation shown by groups such as the veterans, took the challenge and proceeded to make history at a fireball pace which has continued unabated since.

In the 60-day time limit, the people put up in hard cash, not the $500,000 asked, but a total of $659,000. Contributions, which had to be paid in cash immediately, ranged from the nickels and dimes of bootblacks to the thousands of dollars donated by commercial establishments.

Hazleton learned a good hard cash type of lesson with that project, too. Because once its commitment was paid to Autolite, the town had no more funds to go after another industry. The Autolite money was well spent, however. Over 300 men have been employed at the plant which manufactures wire for bombers and other electrical uses. Just recently, 10 years and 7 million miles of wire later, the company wiped out the mortgage to its plant and revealed its total payroll since coming to Hazleton had been over $11 million.

Now the community sort of sat back and wondered where to turn next. Meanwhile, some of the textile mills moved to States in the South. The last big coal operation was crippled by the flood waters of hurricane Diane in 1955, offsetting the intial gains.

Again, the VFW played a role in setting the stage for the next big act in this life-and-death drama of a community. A series of open meetings sponsored by VFW Post 8253, West Hazleton, and VFW Post 589, Hazleton, resulted in the formation of a help committee to mobilize the support of all organizations—veterans, service and social clubs, fire companies, farternal groups, church bodies, etc.

Simultaneously, an estimate of the situation made by chamber of commerce leaders who had young, versatile Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, veteran of the Midwest war theater and a VFW member, at their head, indicated that further progress would depend on acquisition of a site for an industrial park, and the development of a revolving fund to finance the construction of industrial buildings.

The first step was accomplished by an "operation jobs—dime-a-week" program. Lunch boxes were placed on restaurant counters, bars, and in other places for the collection of dimes. A "mile of dimes" was donated on the city's main street where a tape was rolled out for several blocks and people were invited to place dimes on it. Over $5,000 was raised and immediately used to buy a 500-acre site for the industrial park.

The community leaders then went to the people, through the veterans organizations, service clubs, and so forth, to explain what was needed. They pointed out that industry was expanding rapidly, that firms were looking for modern buildings ready for occupancy. They proposed to raise money, build an industrial shell building of standard size, find a prospect and finance it to his specifications. It was pointed out, "We no longer give money away to get industry. The funds will be revolving. Eventually all money spent on new buildings will be returned."

A goal of $500,000 was set. It seemed to be a tremendous amount for a community that just had put up $659,000 in cash for one industry. This time it was decided to sell 15-year, 3-percent debenture bonds in $100 denominations to individuals and to seek what cash donations were available from business and established industry.

"You just can not do it," many citizens insisted.

"But we can do it," just as many more insisited. Thus a name was born. The new industry group was labeled "Can-Do" and words were found to fit the letters: Community Area New Development Organization.

A 4-week drive was launched in the spring of 1956. Lou Feldmann was in charge of bond sales and William Deisroth was head of cash solicitations. Dr. Dessen served as general chairman. In 4 weeks aproximately $200,000 in cash, and $540,000 in bonds, were raised for a total of $740,000—almost 50 percent more than the goal which some had claimed could not be reached. All this was done in an area with a population of less than 60,000 people.

A significant feature of the drive was that 3,000 people bought the bonds, most of them working people who could not come up with $100 in cash but who signed payroll deduction plans. Employers deducted $2.50 a week from their salaries until the $100 bonds were paid for.

A classic example of community solidarity was set when the Can-Do board of directors was organized. In addition to chamber of commerce representatives, labor groups were given representation, as well as banks and any group which had sold $25,000 or more bonds. The West Hazleton Lions, with only 40 members, qualified for 5 seats with sales of $125,000.

Can-Do then went to work. A site was cleared and a 60,000 square foot building shell erected. In a few months, General Foam Corp., manufacturers of foam rubber products, signed a lease for the building which was financed with Can-Do putting up 20 percent, local banks 50 percent, and the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority loaning 30 percent.

Under these arrangements, Can-Do was getting $5 worth of industrial building for every $1 raised in the community.

In quick succession, Capitol Products Corp. took Shell No. 2 to manufacture storm doors and windows; Lewis Steel signed up for No. 4 to make steel cabinets while No. 3 was built specifically for Highway Trailer Co. This last, a huge plant of 143,000 square feet, now employs 700 people and the company has announced plans to expand at Valmont Industrial Park, which the Can-Do site has been named, by constructing an adjacent facility of 160,000 square feet.

Just a short time ago General Foam, the first Can-Do industry, announced it will

build another 62,000 square foot plant adjacent to the first.

Once these first four industries had been established, Can-Do found that its reputation for vigorous action and solid financing was bringing in more prospects than its treasury could handle. Again it was time to go to the people for funds.

As before, and perhaps to a greater degree, there were those who said it couldn't be done. "You'll kill the goose that lays the golden eggs," and "you can press the people just so far" said the doubters about the new drive.

But Can-Do had heard all that before and, in early 1959, opened its second cash-and-bond campaign. The same leaders, including Lou Feldmann and his fellow veterans, went to work. When the final results were tabulated, the first drive had been exceeded and another $850,000 was in the Can-Do till. This brought the total raised in less than 3 years to almost $1,600,000.

The building committee went to work, and soon shells were going up for New Moon Mobile Homes, to employ 300 people; for Lone Star Boat Co., to employ 300; Spaulding Bakeries, to employ 200; Foldes Shoe Industries, 100; Utrilon Shoe Corp., 860.

As the shiny, new buildings spring up in an area once dotted with open mine pits and refuse banks, they represent a historic change for the hard coal region. No longer are black diamonds the basic wealth of the community. The name of Hazleton now goes forth on highway trailers, steel cabinets, pleasure boats, trailer homes, shoe cartons, rubber products, and other items which indicate diversification of the industrial base.

It might be added that established firms, such as Tung-Sol Electric with two plants in the area; Dorr-Oliver, which manufactures industrial filters, and Barrett-Haentjens, manufacturer of pumps and similar machinery, have been expanding their facilities in the prevailing spirit of progress which now permeates the community. Beryllium Corp. has placed its nuclear division in abandoned railroad shops and a roundhouse nearby.

There is a lot more to the story—of men who work long, hard hours without compensation except their own satisfaction; those who supervise site developments; those who travel from bank to bank arranging financing; those, like Commander in Chief Feldmann, who handle the multiplicity of documents, negotiations, and other legal matters, and those who receive prospects and show them the community.

Also part of the story is how a little community like Hazleton doggedly fought and won scheduled airline service; how it is fighting for early completion of two scheduled interstate superhighways to pass near there; and how it is planning parks and recreational areas to fit its new outlook on the future. The community was recently described by one visiting European economist as "a classical example of what can be done to strengthen the national economy at the community level."

The project's growth has been so tremendous that all can-do funds, and what the area banks can loan, are tied up to the hilt. Did can-do go looking for a handout? No. Can-do officials went to Washington but, instead of asking for something for nothing, asked Congress to pass a bill authorizing the Government to rediscount the mortgages on the buildings so that funds can be freed for additional building—a deal which would pay a handsome profit to the Government. Does this seem like a strange outlook in these days of subsidies and simpering for handouts?

It is not so strange when you know what can-do's motto has been in its fight for community survival:

"Where there is no vision, the people perish" (Proverbs 11: 29).

Foreign Aid and the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, figures furnished me by the Department of the Treasury speak for themselves in demonstrating just how badly this Nation's economy has been jeopardized by its present foreign aid and trade policies.

In 1949, the United States had gold reserves totaling $24.6 billion, against which there were $6.4 billion in foreign claims. Today, American gold reserves have shrunk to $19.4 billion, while foreign claims against them have risen to a staggering total of $17.9 billion.

While the American citizen cannot redeem his dollar in gold, there is no bar to foreign governments and citizens demanding redemption in gold for dollars they hold. Thus, it is obvious from the figures I have cited that should all foreign claims against American gold reserves be pressed at one time, it would be impossible for the U.S. Treasury to pay them off and maintain the required reserve of 25 percent of the total of circulating currency which, at the present time, runs to $11.7 billion. If these claims were presented for payment, our Government would have only two alternatives: One would be to default on the payment; the other would be to devalue our dollars.

The relationship between this alarming situation and American foreign aid and trade policies has been the subject of a careful study by Georgia's distinguished Congressman, J. L. PILCHER, following an around-the-world tour of foreign aid projects, last fall. Congressman PILCHER returned convinced that policies governing foreign aid must be drastically and realistically revised if our economy is to be preserved.

The Albany (Ga.) Herald, in its issue of June 11, 1960, featured an excellent editorial setting forth Congressman PILCHER's views about, and conclusions on, this subject which should be of great concern to every American. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR'S OUTLOOK—JOHN PILCHER TALKS SENSE

In summing up his criticism of the administration's foreign aid bill, Representative JOHN PILCHER of Georgia's Second Congressional District made some telling points, not the least of which was his reminder that lack of know-how in this respect was dangerous to the American economy. Mr. PILCHER's words were listened to carefully by his colleagues because of his intimate knowledge of his subject. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, the man from Meigs traveled some 42,000 miles and visited 22 countries on 6 continents. What he saw, he saw through the keen eyes of a businessman who made his success the hard way; and much of what he saw he did not like. It smacked of prodigious waste and bureaucratic tomfoolery. It made a jest of the administration's plea that "self-help" is the key to its foreign assistance program.

Among other things Mr. PILCHER's arguments raised the issue of the need for study of America's system of extending credit to other countries to see whether more of the money sent overseas could not be used to buy American products. The Development Loan Fund has already announced that it will require that credits extended to other lands be spent primarily in this country. Should this policy be applied to all Government lending and giving agencies of our foreign aid program, it will be not only a departure from the way in which we have dispensed some $63 billion since the end of World War II. It will also inevitably stir some questions about a change in direction of another main principle of our foreign policy, which is the gradual banishment of trade barriers.

The Development Loan Fund's policy is frankly restrictive, but the reasons for it were plainly cited by Mr. PILCHER. One is that the United States does, indeed, need to find a way to increase its exports. Its balance of payments is pretty much out of kilter. Another is that the economy of other Western countries has improved so much that the United States has a right to expect them to carry a share of the burden of aiding underdeveloped lands; the United States must take some steps to see that some of the dollars we spend overseas come back to us for goods bought from us. A third reason—and probably the chief one—is that a great many countries have foreign monetary restrictions aimed mostly at the dollar.

The continued outflow of gold has concerned Washington officials, and there is no question that the new policy of tying loans to purchases of American goods is a lever to induce other governments to loosen their own restrictive practices. But none of this really gets to the heart of the trouble. If our aid programs are to be blamed for our export deficits and our gold outflow—and they are certainly not altogether to blame, for our high taxes and high labor costs have made us unable to compete in some markets—it is not because they are aid programs. Mr. PILCHER says it wisely when he assails not the concept of foreign aid but its conduct.

Unfortunately, we have not restricted aid to actual need, or to countries where aid can be a realistic help, or to countries where our own self-interest indicates aid would be valuable. We have spread it about the world without regard to any of these things. Our policy has been based more on a belief that the dollar can produce civilization in a short time, democracy in even less time, and allies overnight.

If our policy of giving aid had been realistic, there would be no need now for the restrictions being applied to trade matters by the administration. And unless something is done about the amount of aid and the uses of aid we give, these restrictions are likely to prove only a temporary solace.

Mr. PILCHER believes that the United States can no longer support the rest of the world indiscriminately. This is certainly true. It may be that rearranging the burden a little will seem to help for a time. But in the end an overloaded United States can only be helped by reducing the burden to what can be carried usefully, realistically, and in our own interests.

Salary Increases for Postal and Other Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, our Government has a tremendous responsibility today—greater than ever before. The quality of the discharge of this responsibility depends to a very great extent upon the 2,200,000 civilian employees of the Government.

There are a number of ways in which pay scales can affect the quality of the work the Government receives from its civilian employees: First, by attracting more and better qualified candidates for Government service; second, by encouraging experienced employees to remain in Government service; third, by providing incentive and increasing morale. We cannot afford today to have a demoralized civil service.

There has not always been a crisis. We have been fortunate to have employees of quality and dedication. We could have continued to underpay our employees and would still have had many who were dedicated and qualified—and only considerations of the justice of it all would have made us pay them more. But today, we are forced to consider more than justice.

We need to make Government service attractive to young people who will make it their career. Young people today are not so much interested in the things that are going to happen to them in 20 to 30 years from now as they are in the immediate present. They think not in terms of some future date, but in terms of today, in terms of present-day food and clothing and shelter, and education for their children. Unless the wage of postal and Federal employees is made and remains sufficiently attractive, the postal service and the Government generally are going to be unable to attract and, perhaps even more important, retain the best type of young people. Low pay scales force the prospective employee to choose between responsibility to his job interests or his loyalty to his Government and responsibility to the economic well-being of his family.

The "Report on Civilian Compensation in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government," compiled by the steering committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Civilian Compensation in November 1957, stated in summary:

Personnel turnover is increasing and quality is decreasing. Many jobs remain unfilled. Quality and quantity of applicants is inadequate.

Why are we failing to attract qualified applicants? Why are dropouts increasing? The committee hearings on Federal and postal pay raise bills are full of figures indicating that pay of Government workers is lagging seriously behind rates for comparable jobs in the private sector of the economy. For example, during the period between July 1951 and November 1959, post-office clerks received wage increases averaging 38½ cents per hour, or approximately 20 percent, while production workers in manufacturing industries received wage increases averaging 70 cents per hour and in excess of 45 percent. In July of 1951, after the enactment of Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress, the entrance rate for a substitute post-office clerk was $1.61½ per hour. This was about 1.8 cents per hour above the industrial average. By November of 1959 the entrance rate for a post-office clerk was 27.2 cents per hour short of the industrial average.

The purchasing power of many Government employees today is substantially behind that of 1939. For G–5, G–7, G–9, G–11 and G–13 employees, a percentage wage increase of from 5.2 percent to 20.3 percent would be necessary to give them the purchasing power they had before the war.

A study of pay scales for policemen and firemen in large metropolitan centers, where 40 percent of all postal employees live and work, reveals that the lowest wage in 10 of 17 cities studied was greater than the highest wage which a letter carrier or clerk can receive according to the national postal salary schedule.

The evidence presented to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service clearly shows, according to indicators such as purchasing power and comparative wages, that our Government and postal employees are underpaid.

A pay raise for Federal employees has been criticized as a contribution to inflation. We do not know if rising wages are a cause of inflation. Even if they were, merely equalizing wages of Federal employees would not push up other wages. Those wage demands which endanger stability are not the ones which equalize, but those which are excessive and unnecessary. It is definitely not excessive and unreasonable to ask that Federal employees be paid at rates "reasonably comparable" to those in private business. The administration cities reasonable comparability as a basis for judgment of Federal wage scales. If this is so, why do they not help us to make the wages comparable?

The administration suggests that we should wait for further studies of comparability. Many of us would like to see a comprehensive plan for coupling Government and postal pay increases to increases in the rest of the economy. But we cannot wait. Should we postpone a raise in salaries, we will have increasing difficulty in finding qualified applicants for Government service, increasing numbers of resignations, and increasing demoralization. Do we have the right to say once again to our Government and postal employees: "Just wait another couple of years and keep up your good spirits. As soon as we finish all our studies of the problem we will all agree on a comprehensive plan to provide regular salary increases. We're sorry, but we just don't know yet how to give you the salaries you deserve."

We need qualified workers in Government service. There, employees are performing functions which are crucial to the national defense, safety, economy, and welfare. Large numbers of them act in direct support of defense activities or in other equally important tasks wherein failure might adversely affect the entire Nation. Not only do we have a responsibility to our present employees, but it is necessary that we have a Government service which is efficient and up to the enormous responsibility which faces it. I would feel responsible to neither my fellow citizens who are Government workers nor to the citizens of the country who demand and deserve good government, if I did not continue to support a just rate of pay for Federal and postal employees. H.R. 9883 will go a long way toward making their salaries what they should be.

Enslavement of Peoples of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently, I received a copy of a letter which, in my opinion, expresses the true hope of the enslaved people of Czechoslovakia that some day they may get out from under the yoke of communism.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARMA, OHIO,
June 12, 1960.

Mr. CYRUS EATON,
Arcadia Farms,
Northfield, Ohio.

DEAR MR. EATON: In May 25, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on page 18, you were quoted as saying in Prague, "In Cleveland, where I live, there are many people of Czechoslovak origin. They are fine people. Unfortunately there are some people in the United States who want to make them unfriendly toward Czechoslovakia."

In reading this statement—I know from experience that you are a victim of Communist propaganda. I spent 3 weeks in Czechoslovakia last summer, and the most asked questions were: Do you like Czechoslovakia? Why is there so much propaganda against Czechoslovakia in the United States?

Being of Czechoslovak descent, I presume I would be more aware of any such propaganda against Czechoslovakia in the United States. And then I would explain—that we know their circumstances—that they are under Communist rule, not necessarily by choice. The democracy that once existed in Czechoslovakia is well known history. And believe me, their hope is to some day get out from under the yoke of communism. You would tear down what good I could do as an ordinary American.

And they know they are a satellite of Russia. You said in another statement that the "satellite" countries did not like to be called "satellites." Who did you speak to—Communist leaders—and whom else—certainly not an ordinary citizen?

Your intentions may be what you consider right—but somehow you're getting mixed up. Why don't you spend more time preserving democracy—rather than tearing it down? Just where would you be in a Communist country? And do show appreciation of freedom—for even my 8-year-old son could feel the difference between a free country and a slave state.

Sincerely,

MRS. WILLIAM J. KALL.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD portions of a letter I received from Chas. M. Fuller of Redelm, S. Dak. His 8-page, handwritten letter contains some of the best philosophy, best commonsense, and best judgment I have read in a long time. His letter reads in part as follows:

I have been following what has been done in Congress with the farm question. I am disturbed by the apparent support given the Poage-McGovern bill. It has all the bad features of the present farm laws, that have not solved the surplus problem or raised farm income. It includes higher supports, more restrictions on farmers, more redtape, bigger temptations for chiseling with two wheat prices and will only make a bad mess worse.

A farm law, a labor law, or business regulating law must consider not only the people it regulates, but the taxpayers, the consumers, the Government financial position and last but not least, does it lead us toward or away from communism?

All of these controls and regulations lead us closer to communism by setting up a system all organized for a few dictators to take over and operate. With Mr. K. barking and snarling at us, I think every law and regulation affecting our economy and Government should get us back toward free enterprise and political freedom. We should not spend billions to fight communism and then set a system that they could easily operate.

I am proud to be a member of the stockgrowers organizations that have opposed Government help and regulation. I would like to see the farmer take the lead and stop leaning on the Government for economic advantage and then hope that others would follow, and all be governed by supply and demand. Labor should be ready and willing then to bargain downward instead of forcing layoffs, so that farmers can buy labor's products. Then we can all compete in world markets.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." We farmers and laborers, also, are saying "Give me some dollars and you can have my liberty." I am sure that with free enterprise we would all be better off economically.

The Government is in serious financial trouble, and every bill passed by Congress should keep that in mind. Government spending more than it takes in and giving I O U's for the difference raises prices and helps price us out of world markets. Inflation also steals from those who save for retirement. What we have been doing there is also playing into the Communists hand, and it is time we reversed the trend before it is too late.

Protest Against Small Business Administration Policy and Matters Pertaining to the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I know this session is about to end and adjourn sine die.

Even so, I must call to the attention of the House a serious matter and one that will effect every nook and corner of our country, our economy and our national well-being.

Recently at the request of a fellow Member of Congress, my friend and associate, FRED SANTANGELO, of New York, I had luncheon with an American small businessman.

The story he told about certain interpretations and rulings made by the Small Business Administration astounded me and caused me to do a little checking into matters that I believe should be checked by this Congress.

The case I present is only one of many that will be uncovered if a committee of this Congress will take the necessary steps to set up a proper and vigorous board of inquiry into the whole area of foreign influences and impacts upon our domestic economy.

The question herein involved is one that goes deeper than the setting aside of congressional intent and is intermeshed with the whole picture of foreign aid, trade, imports, exports, intrigue, collusion, national defense, national welfare, quotas, migration, immigration, and the complete gamut of greed, avarice, and exorbitant profits.

It spells out the serious impact upon national thinking by a new and powerful group, the foreign importers, foreign investors, and special interest groups whose influence is felt in legislative action in the many acts creating and perpetuating money lending, credit giving, concession granting agencies. The opening wedge covered in this case can be the pry needed to unlock the bolted doors that have kept Congress from the whole truth of deceit, profiteering, kickbacks, and other questionable practices that have been fed to the American public as an excuse for foreign relations in the better part of the past decade.

You may wonder why I bring in the whole field of trade and aid, in a simple little case involving less than $5,000.

I do so because in this case we may find the straw that is breaking the camel's back. If an agency of Government created by the Congress for one specific purpose can circumvent the pronounced and spelled out will of the Congress of the United States, then maybe other agencies spending millions, even billions of taxpayers' dollars can be operating in the same mistaken area of disregard not alone for Congress, but in the main, for the people of the United States.

The invitations for bidding upon Small Business Administration contracts contain the following langauge:

NOTICE OF SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE

Bids or proposals under this procurement are solicited from small business concerns only, and this procurement is to be awarded only to one or more small business concerns. This section is based on a determination by the contracting officer, alone or in conjunction with a representative of the Small Business Administration, that it is in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, in the interests of war or national defense programs, or in the interest of assuring that a fair proportion of Government procurement is placed with small business concerns. A small business concern is a concern that (1) is not dominant in its field of operation and, with its affiliates, employs fewer than 500 employees, or (2) is certified as a small business concern by the Small Business Administration. In addition to meeting these criteria, a manufacturer or a regular dealer submitting bids or proposals in its own name must agree to furnish in the performance of the contract, supplies manufactured or produced in the United States, its territories, its possessions, or Puerto Rico, by small business concerns; provided, that this additional requirement does not apply in connection with construction or service contracts. Bids or proposals received from firms which are not small business concerns shall be considered nonresponsive.

Further, let me quote from title 13—Business Credit and Assistance—chapter 1, Small Business Administration—121.3-8—Definition of small business for Government procurement:

(a) Small business definitions. A small business concern for the purpose of Government procurement is a business concern, including its affiliates, which is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation and can further qualify under the following criteria:

(1) General definition. Any business concern (not otherwise defined in this section) is small if: (1) Its number of employees does not exceed 500 persons; or (2) it is certified as a small business concern by the Small Business Administration.

(2) Construction industry. Any business concern in the construction industry is small if its average annual receipts for the preceding 3 fiscal years do not exceed $5 million.

(3) Food canning and preserving industry. Any business concern in the food canning and preserving industry is small if its number of employees does not exceed 500 persons exclusive of agricultural labor as defined in subsection (k) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (68A Stat. 454, 26 U.S.C. (I.R.C. 1954) 3306).

(4) Petroleum refining industry. Any business concern in the petroleum refining industry is small if its number of employees does not exceed 1,000 persons and it does not have more than 30,000 barrels per day crude oil capacity from owned and leased facilities.

(d) Definition of a small business nonmanufacturer. Any concern which submits a bid or offer in its own name, other than a construction or service contract, but which proposes to furnish a product not manu-

factured by said bidder or offerer, is deemed to be a small business concern when:

(1) It is a small business concern within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section, and

(2) In the case of Government procurement reserved for or involving the preferential treatment of small businesses or one involving equal bids, such nonmanufacturer shall furnish in the performance of the contract the products of a small business manufacturer or producer which products are manufactured or produced in the United States: *Provided, however,* If the goods to be furnished are wool, worsted, knitwear, duck, webbing, and thread (spinning and finishing), nonmanufacturers (dealers and converters) shall furnish such products which have been manufactured or produced by a small weaver (small knitter for knitwear) and, if finishing is required, by a small finisher.

It would seem clear to any elementary school graduate that up to this point anyway, the set-aside provisions for Government procurement were established for one purpose and one purpose only, namely, to keep small business in America ready and producing in times of peace to be ready in times of war, coupled with the compelling need to keep all segments of our productive security economically sound and participating in the benefits of tax dollar spending by Government.

To think or act otherwise is contrary, in my humble opinion, to both the will of Congress and the welfare of our Nation in both peace and war.

In the face of the above plainly stated requirements, the Small Business Administration ruled in favor of an import firm against an American producer on Invitation Bid DA–Eng–11–184–60 B/E 485 JD dated April 15, 1960.

At this point, allow me to put into the record facts pertaining to this particular case that I believe will show to the Congress the utter disregard for the intent and will of the Congress involved in this decision.

Quoted below is an excerpt from a letter of protest from Union Instrument Corp. on the decision by the Small Business Administration to award a contract for foreign-produced goods:

The low bidder on the invitation was Geo-Optic & Paper Corp., who offered a price of $2,876.50 against our offer of $3,570. Since Geo-Optic & Paper Corp. is an import firm dealing mainly in foreign products, it has been determined that they plan to have steel blanks made in this country, and then forward them to Germany for the major and important part of the production—that is, calibrating, engraving, and finishing of the end products.

This matter was discussed in a lengthy meeting with Mr. James Mills of your office, attended by our Mr. Scavuzzo, and Mr. Q. Johnson, and Mr. Arthur Chodosh, attorney for our company. Mr. Mills did not give us any satisfactory explanation for disregarding the small business set-aside procurement provisions of the invitation and the provisions of the statutes and regulations governing such procurements.

Mr. Mills cited a case of a foreign produced cable imported to this country to which was attached a tip representing about 4 percent of the value of the finished product, which was qualified by the Small Business Administration as a product and manufactured in the United States. Mr. Mills took a box of pencils from his drawer and stated that in his opinion the pencils and box could be manufactured in a foreign country and could qualify as a product produced in this country if the importer simply sharpened the pencils in this country prior to sale. These were cited as the basis for the interpretation applied to our case.

At the end of a long discussion, starting in the morning, and finishing after lunch, Mr. Mills stated that he thought that an error might have been made, but could not offer any means of rectifying this error. This error, of course, is at our expense.

If our interests were to be protected, and to avoid a repetition of such strange interpretations, we felt that we were left with no alternative but to refer this matter to our Congressmen for clarification. We discussed this with a number of Members of Congress, and were referred to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business. After numerous discussions, we are now firmly convinced that this decision of yours is in violation of the terms of the invitation covering the small business set-aside provisions, and the statutes and regulations covering such procurements.

May we have your early reply to our protest?

Yours very truly,

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.

After reading the protest, I asked the Union Instrument Corp. officials to send me a report on the whole matter which I now make part of the RECORD.

A

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.,
Plainfield, N.J., June 6, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: My meeting with you on Thursday, June 2, was an honor and a pleasure. Your grasp and understanding of the problem concerning a decision made by the Small Business Administration procurement as to foreign-made products was most gratifying.

Enclosed you will find a copy of a memorandum covering the facts in the decision which we are protesting. This decision, if allowed to stand, establishes a serious precedent particularly in view of a pending proposed change contained in Release No. 617, dated April 21, 1960, issued by the Small Business Administration, a copy of which you will also find enclosed.

Release No. 617 states that the major proposed change in this definition is to "bar firms from preferential treatment under the Small Business Act if the products they propose to sell to the government consist of more than 50 percent of foreign made materials." The inference is that the regulations now allow foreign products of more than 50 percent. Actually, the reverse is the truth since none is now allowed as the regulations clearly state.

Under the terms of this proposed change, every procurement under the Small Business Set-Aside could be lost to foreign competition. This change does not protect 50 percent of such procurements for small business in the United States. It proposes to practically destroy the purposes of the Small Business Set-Aside program. Only a small portion of procurements are made by the Government under Small Business Set-Aside provisions, and now it is proposed to practically eliminate the last measure of protective regulation left for the small businessman.

The proposed change in Release No. 617 will take away one of the last remaining protections against disastrous competition and can only result in further hardship to small businessmen in this country. It is difficult to understand how such a proposal can come from an agency established to help small business in this country. The only small businesses which can benefit from this change are nonmanufacturers; importers, brokers, etc., of foreign produced products, at the expense of manufacturers and taxpayers in this country who have to pay for such procurements in their taxes.

Our industry has been seriously affected by foreign competition. Manufacturers in this country cannot compete with foreign labor costs. The history of the drawing instrument manufacturers in the United States illustrates the effects of lowered protection. At the end of 1945, there were at least 12 manufacturers of drawing instruments in this country. Now only two remain, and these two only because they make instruments of a quality and character with limited markets. The import duty in 1945 on drawing instruments was 45 percent, now it is 18 percent. Buy-American protection originally was 25 percent, and is now 6 percent. The net result is that 95 percent or more of the drawing instruments used in this country are of foreign make, chiefly German.

One of the stated purposes in Defense agency small business set-aside procurements is "that it is in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, in the interest of war or national defense programs." Should the Government be faced with an immediate need for large quantities of drawing instruments for engineering purposes, and if the German source of supply were cut off, it would be faced with a serious problem.

The originally announced purpose of giving vast aid to many countries by lowering protective tariffs, was to help build strong allies and friends. The rebuilding of these countries is more than complete. Germany is the main competitor of our industry on many manufactured items. It is now enjoying tremendous boom prosperity. Enclosed are two releases, one from the New York Times, dated May 11, 1960, and the second from the German American Trade News, dated March 1960, describing Germany's booming economy has been attained at tremendous cost to manufacturers in this country, some of whom have been forced out of business, and has caused unemployment in many areas with an adverse effect on our economy.

The importer, broker, etc., is now only affected by restrictions in small business set-aside procurements, not by the Buy-American differential of 6 percent. We recently quoted Weems Systems of Navigation on a requirement for 12,000 proportional dividers with special markings for the U.S. Air Force. This is an extraordinarily large requirement for this item. Our price of $9 on an American made instrument could not compete with that of a German importer's price of between $6 and $7, with only a protective differential of 6 percent in price. While this may seem a savings for the Government, when the losses in taxes to the Government are considered, it is doubtful that anything has been saved. The loss to the manufacturer, and the American worker is serious. In addition, American business and American workmen have to pay for this procurement from a country booming with prosperity. This is particularly ironic in view of the fact that this item was designed by a domestic firm for use by our Air Force.

SEC. 2. (a) of the Small Business Act states in part as follows:

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government * * * be placed with small busness enterprises."

It is respectfully submitted that the present regulations of the Small Business Administration granting preferential treat-

ment to products manufactured or produced in the United States are in complete harmony with the purposes and intent of the Small Business Act, and any deviation from this regulation or any change in the regulations permitting the furnishing of foreign made merchandise to the U.S. Government, is contrary to, and in violation of the purposes of the law itself.

We respectfully urge you to oppose the changes proposed in Release No. 617, for the reasons outlined above. We are gravely concerned for our existence and the welfare of our workers if these changes become effective. This matter is being acted on now, and if you agree with our position, we ask you to take whatever steps you can to prevent these changes from becoming effective.

Your interest in this matter will be greatly apreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

S. SCAVUZZO,
President, Union Instrument Corp.

B

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.,
Plainfield, N.J.

SECTION 121-3-8 of "Definition of Small Business Nonmanufacturer for Government Procurement, paragraph (b)(2), dated May 1, 1959, provides that in the case of Government procurements reserved for or involving equal bids, such nonmanufacturer shall furnish in the performance of contracts, the products of a small business manufacturer or producer which products are manufactured or produced in the United States. The same provisions are contained in "Definition of Small Business" as amended June 1, 1957. Photo copies of both are enclosed.

Because the provisions of the invitation and the regulation require that a nonmanufacturer shall furnish in the performance of this contract, products of small business manufacturer or producer in the United States, Union Instrument Corp. took this matter up with the Small Business Administration Office in New York, and was advised that under the terms contained in the invitation, an award could not be made to a nonmanufacturer offering foreign products or production, to inform the SBA office in Chicago, and to immediately file a protest with the U.S. Army Engineers office in Chicago, against any award to Geo Optic & Paper Corp. A visit was made to the small business office in Chicago who also advised the immediate filing of a protest and who also said that under the terms of the invitation, and the regulations, an award could not be made to a firm offering foreign products or foreign produced products.

A protest dated May 4, 1960, against any award to Geo Optic & Paper Corp. was filed by Union Instrument Corp. The contracting officer of the U.S. Army Engineers office informed Union Instrument on May 18, 1960, that the Small Business Administration office in Washington, D.C., ruled on May 5, 1960, that the product being furnished by Geo Optic qualifies as a domestic product. Since the contracting officer is bound by interpretations of the Small Business Administration on Small Business "set aside procurement," an award was made to Geo Optic & Paper Corp.

This interpretation is contrary to all previous rulings of the Small Business Administration on items in which Union Instrument Corp. has had business, including a previous case of a proposal on the same item by Geo Optic & Paper Corp. and contrary to the decisions of the New York and Chicago offices of the SBA.

Union Instrument Corp. protests that the interpretations of the Washington office of the SBA is in violation of the terms of the invitation for bids. Also, that it is a violation of the SBA "small business set-aside" regulations. The language of the SBA "set-aside" regulations are clear, concise, and definite: and we cannot see how such an interpretation can be put into the regulations as stated.

DECISION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ON SMALL BUSINESS SET ASIDE PROCUREMENT

Union Instrument Corp. of 1447 East Second Street, Plainfield, N.J., submitted a proposal to the U.S. Army Engineer Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill., on April 15, 1960, on Invitation No. DA-ENG-11-184-60-B/E-485-JD, for (95) graduated steel straight edges at a total price of $3,570.00. A competitive bid in the amount of $2,876.50 was submitted by Geo-Optic & Paper Corp. of New York, N.Y., a firm dealing in foreign import products.

Since Geo-Optic & Paper Corp. is an import firm, it was determined that they planned to have steel blanks made in this country, and then forward them to Germany for the large and important part of the production, that is, the calibrating, engraving, and finishing of the item.

The invitation contained the following provisions:

Notice of small business set aside

"Bids or proposals under this procurement are solicited from small business concerns only, and this procurement is to be awarded only to one or more small business concerns. This section is based on a determination by the contracting officer, alone or in conjunction with a representative of the Small Business Administration, that it is in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity in the interest of war or national defense programs, or in the interest of assuring that a fair proportion of Government procurement is placed with small business concerns. A small business concern is a concern that (1) is not dominant in its field of operation, and with its affiliates, employs fewer than (500) employees, or (2) is certified as a small business concern by the Small Business Administration. In addition to meeting these criteria, a manufacturer or a regular dealer submitting bids or proposals in its own name, must agree to furnish in the performance of the contract, supplies manufactured or produced in the United States, its territories, its possessions, or Puerto Rico, by small business concerns: provided, that this additional requirement does not apply in connection with construction or service contracts. Bids or proposals received from firms which are not small business concerns shall be considered nonresponsive."

This matter was discussed in a meeting on May 26, 1960, with Mr. James Mills of the Washington office of SBA, with Mr. S. Scavuzzo and Mr. Q. Johnson, of Union Instrument Corp. and Mr. A. Chodosh, attorney for the corporation. After a long discussion, Mr. Mills conceded that an error might have been made, but could not offer any means of correcting this error.

C

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.,
Plainfield, N.J., June 10, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN H. DENT,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DENT: Enclosed you will find a copy of our official protest of a decision of the Small Business Administration in a case involving a nonmanufacturer who has been certified as entitled to preferential treatment under the Small Business Act, in spite of the fact that this nonmanufacturer proposes to furnish material which is manufactured in major part in a foreign country. This decision apparently contravenes paragraph 121.3-8(b)(2) of the regulations issued under the Small Business Act of 1958. A copy of the pertinent regulation is enclosed.

Existing regulations provide that a nonmanufacturer, in order to qualify for preferential treatment as a small-business concern, must agree to supply end items manufactured in the United States, its territories, its possessions, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia. No specific provisions concerning foreign source materials are contained in these laws or regulations with respect to manufacturers or producers who furnish material to the U.S. Government; with the result that the Small Business Administration has in interpretive decisions ruled that:

(a) Nonmanufacturers must, for preferential treatment, supply items wholly manufactured or produced in the United States, its territories, its possessions, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, by small-business concerns. (To this interpretation there has been at least one exception, in which the Small Business Administration ruled that a nonmanufacturer was qualified for preferential treatment by furnishing the product of a firm which proposed to send materials to Germany for manufacturing and finishing operations.)

(b) Manufacturers or producers can qualify for preferential treatment if any part of what they propose to furnish is manufactured or produced in the United States—e.g., a manufacturer who imported cable, and whose sole operation in the United States consisted in cutting this cable to required lengths, was accorded certification by the Small Business Administration for preferential treatment under the Small Business Act—and an official of the Small Business Administration has stated that pencils made in Japan and sharpened in the United States also would be qualified for such preferential treatment.

In a proposed amendment to the definition of small business concerns (Federal Register, April 16, 1960, p. 3341—copy of which is enclosed) the Small Business Administration recommends the addition to their regulations of a paragraph defining a "domestic product" as one in which the cost of foreign materials does not exceed 50 percent of the cost of all materials used; and recommends revision of these regulations to allow preferential treatment to both manufacturers or nonmanufacturers who offer "domestic products" as so defined.

The effect of this proposed change would be to relax existing restrictions imposed on nonmanufacturers with respect to foreign-made items, while limiting manufacturers or producers who receive preferential treatment to end items which are 50 percent or less of foreign origin. Thus, the door to American subsidization of foreign manufacturers and producers is to be opened with respect to import brokers; while the door which has been opened by administrative interpretations of the Small Business Administration with respect to importing manufacturers is to be fixed open at 50 percent.

Since the provisions of the "Buy American Act" already afford protection to domestic products at the 50 percent level proposed by the Small Business Administration, the only real change which would result if this amendment is accepted would be to permit nonmanufacturing concerns to furnish end items which are 50 percent foreign in origin, rather than domestic as required by existing regulations. The net effect will, therefore, be a reduction in the degree of protection now afforded American manufacturers and producers.

The Congress may wish to deliberate the matter with this in mind. Your comments and suggestions are solicited.

Very sincerely yours,

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.
S. SCAVUZZO, *President.*

D

LAFAYETTE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1960.

Proposed changes in the definition of small business for purpose of Government buying.

designed to give preference to products containing chiefly United States-made materials, and other minor amendments, were announced today by the Small Business Administration.

The proposed changes apply only to the definition of "small business" under which firms may qualify for contract awards on Government purchases reserved for bidding by small firms, or involving other preferential treatment for small businesses seeking to sell their products or services to the Government.

Generally, under the present definition of a small business for purposes of selling to the Government, the Small Business Administration has considered a nonmanufacturing firm as small if it is individually owned and operated, not dominant in its field of operation, and has no more than 500 employees. If a firm is a nonmanufacturer it must in addition to the foregoing, supply a product manufactured in the United States by a small manufacturer.

The major proposed change in this definition is to bar firms from preferential treatment under the Small Business Act if the products they propose to sell to the Government consist of more than 50 percent of foreign-made materials.

Other changes require that concerns must be organized for profit and must be located in the United States in order to receive assistance from the Small Business Administration.

Persons wishing to comment on the proposed definition changes will have approximately 30 days in which to file their comments with the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, may I state at this time that if this new regulation becomes the law, the need for a Small Business Administration will no longer exist.

This country cannot regulate the size of the foreign manufacturer or the ownership of the foreign manufacturer who will produce the products sold by an American based firm whose ownership may also be foreign, under the protective covenants of the Small Business Administration Act.

Let us not fool either the American manufacturer or the American taxpayer. Let us face the true facts and at least save the taxpayer the taxes required to operate this administrative bureau and at the same time save the American manufacturer both embarrassment and money.

Just in case any crocodile tears are being shed for our worthy and friendly allies, the foreign producers, let us look at what is happening in defeated, devastated nations, our former mortal enemy, Germany, as well as others who benefit from our lending, spending programs financed by our American taxpayers including the under-bid American small businessman.

E

WHALEY-EATON SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.

DEAR SIR: Obituaries for world inflation are just a bit premature, in spite of the optimism of such authorities as Monetary Fund Chairman Per Jacobsson. He thinks the inflation danger is about gone. But many skilled observers in West Europe aren't at all so sure. Pressures have certainly eased off dramatically in the United States, but Europe is riding the upside of a major boom.

The feeling is getting around that the sky's the limit—that expansion can continue almost indefinitely without a blowoff. So far West Europe's governments have shown luck and skill in their efforts to keep the boom from blowing up. But the roughest test is still ahead.

Pressure is building up in Europe at two strategic points—productive capacity and the labor supply. Most countries, but particularly Germany, simply cannot build new plants fast enough to cope with current and anticipated demand. At the same time, the labor supply is being stretched to the breaking point. Again, Germany feels this the most, but is not alone.

Competitive bidding for labor supplies is becoming common. This has an inevitable effect on wage costs. Employers aren't inclined to quibble about such things when they're confident of being able to market all their output and more—and to pass on higher costs to customers.

Typically, we've heard of a U.S. owned firm in Germany which is putting new plants in remote villages chiefly because untapped local labor was available. There are now about 10 vacancies for every 4 unemployed workers in Germany as a whole. Thousands of Italians have been brought in and an effort is underway to recruit others in Greece and Spain.

In Britain, job openings about equal the number of unemployed. Allowing for "frictional" unemployment and turnover, this means some areas are in for a worsening pinch. Even Italy has been hit by a shortage of trained technicians and engineers, though not of unskilled labor.

Switzerland reports more than twice as many vacancies as unemployed. The proportion of foreign workers (10 percent in machinery industries and up to 60 percent in construction) is rising fast. The Swiss, like the Germans, are out trying to recruit more labor, chiefly in Spain and Portugal.

The effect of labor shortages on wages is obvious: wages are heading up. Even in Germany, the redoubtable Dr. Erhard is saying that the climate is very favorable to wage increases. He says, too, that the economy is elastic enough to meet the needs of vigorous growth—provided, of course, that people don't lose their sense of proportion. That's the big question.

Conservative economists are worried over the danger that the boom atmosphere will prove too intoxicating, that restraint will be forgotten.

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1960]

WEST GERMANY ECONOMY BOOMS, SAYS KRUPP AID VISITING UNITED STATES

(By Joseph Carter)

The West German economic boom is continuing virtually unabated, Berthold Beitz, second in command of the Krupp industrial empire, said on his arrival here yesterday.

He said there was full employment and that the West German economy was still able to absorb the flow of refugees from Communist-ruled East Germany.

One of the main purposes of his visit, Herr Beitz said, was to talk with leaders of American finance and industry. "You always go back a little more intelligent and better informed on industrial procedures and methods," he commented.

Herr Beitz emphasized that in his talks with businessmen here he would seek ways to collaborate with them in advancing the economies of underdeveloped countries.

"Such development programs are the job of private enterprise," he declared. "We at Krupp, and other West German industrialists, regard them as extremely important."

The 46-year-old chairman of the executive board of Krupp of Essen arrived on the liner *Bremen*. He said he planned to stay in this country about 10 days. With him was Count Claus Ahlefeldt Laurvig, representative in Britain and the Commonwealth of the industries headed by Alfred Krupp.

Herr Beitz said he planned to visit Washington, Detroit, and Richmond, Va. He added that he would talk with executives of the Ford Motor Co., General Motors Corp., Reynolds Metals Co., and the United States Steel Corp., among others. He indicated that he hoped to meet with officials of the Federal Government.

The industrialist emphasized that he was not here to sell steel but to exchange ideas with American leaders. He said he wanted to see the latest steel production methods here because "in that field you are the leaders."

Herr Beitz said that Krupp's relations with organized labor were excellent.

[From the German American Trade News]

GERMANY'S PERSISTENT FOREIGN EXCHANGE SURPLUS

That it may be harder to spend money than to make it, is currently a problem of major economic significance for Germany. The condition arises out of the Federal Republic's persistent foreign exchange surplus. Internationally, this situation is viewed with misgivings by Germany's trading partners. Domestically, the surplus endangers the balanced development of the economy.

In an effort to remedy the situation Germany's Federal Bank has in recent months sharted a course designed to meet national necessity on the one hand and to avoid likely foreign criticism on the other, in decreeing higher minimum reserve requirements for German banks as well as a reduction in the rediscount quota (see GBW, Feb. 24). The bank did not resort to raising the discount rate, the common remedy, because such a move would have only served to create an influx of foreign funds attracted by higher interest rates.

TEMPORARY SOLUTION

In large part the surplus problem was solved by prepayments on foreign debt obligations, allocations to the World Bank, and so forth. Because these payments will not recur regularly Germany is faced in 1960 with the task of planning a program for the possibility that a surplus in the balance of trade in goods and services may be permanent. Writing in London's Financial Times, Dr. Hermann J. Abs, one of Germany's leading bankers, said: "It must not, however, be overlooked that it is a moot question whether the era of such surpluses is going to last for any great length of time. The position of Germany's oversea trade is not as strong as it might appear in the relatively favorable course of German exports during recent years. Even comparatively slight changes in the terms of trade might well—at least if the present high level of business activity recedes—cause a notable deterioration in the Federal Republic's position in world trade."

"Be that as it may, a progressive liberalization of imports will in any case be among the tasks with which Germany will have to cope."

On the other hand, what is Germany's position in regard to promoting export of capital? There are many who are prepared to support such a move particularly in the form of aid to underdeveloped countries and recommend therefore government guarantees, cheaper loans, and other facilities. However, Dr. Abs feels that there might be some complications in this respect because it is difficult to differentiate between capital exports promoted by governmental action for political and economic reasons, and capital exports undertaken strictly in consideration of economic factors without any artificial supports. "Presumably," said Dr. Abs, "the Germans would with certainty come in again for heavy criticisms on the part of other exporting countries if their capital exports were generally to be stimulated through government action."

Exports of German capital in various forms have been steadily on the increase in recent years. In regard to the future, Dr. Abs

stated that West Germany's main concern is to assist underdeveloped countries in which conditions are sufficiently stable, however, such investments should not be undertaken with the intention to engage in a bitter competitive struggle with other industrial nations, but should conform to the scope of Germany's economic and financial potential and the tasks to be fulfilled in the underdeveloped countries.

What about the intensification of German investments within the Common Market?

"In my own view," said Dr. Abs, "it cannot be desirable, either economically or politically, to accord a general privilege to capital export within the European Economic Community. There are only two respects where certain privilege treatment might be justified. The Rome Treaty provides for capital contribution on the part of member governments toward helping economically weaker regions within the European Economic Community or its associated areas, this contribution to be channeled through the European Investment Bank. Provided this bank, as its bylaws proclaim and its management is clearly striving to do, models its activities on the excellent example of the World Bank, it might indeed produce a beneficial contribution toward strengthening the Community, which no outside party could look upon as discriminating."

SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

"Moreover," continued Dr. Abs, "a complete liberalization of money and capital transactions, by agreements among governments, bankers, associations, and other parties concerned, may possibly come about in the European Economic Community more rapidly than could happen in a much larger area." In that event, however, it would be desirable, according to Dr. Abs, that the example of the EEC countries be imitated, that is to say that other nations should be prepared to free their capital exports and imports of restrictions in the same measure at the earliest opportunity.

No matter how these programs develop in detail, it is most important, said Dr. Abs, "that just as the European Economic Community must not be allowed to segregate itself under the aegis of monetary policy, so there must not be any obstruction of capital imports and exports of the partners to the Treaty from and to other countries. It seems to me that in this respect things have so far been going quite satisfactorily; the favorable trend in the foreign exchange reserves of all EEC countries during the past year has served to facilitate this."

TRIPLE PLAY

At the government level, plans are now being developed to solve the problem of Germany's foreign exchange surplus. These plans aim toward the establishment of a government-guaranteed fund which would perform a triple function:

1. In providing aid to underdeveloped nations.

2. In being financed through the sale of low-cost shares to the public which would have the advantage of draining money otherwise available for domestic spending and thus remove a stimulant for inflationary tendencies. The shares would pay progressively higher interest, starting at a level above that paid by savings banks. Banks would not be allowed to participate in such a subscription.

3. In exporting Germany's foreign exchange surplus the fund would realize its primary goal.

While these plans have been merely advanced in the form of ideas, they do reflect the current concern in Germany for the persistent foreign exchange surplus.

Mr. Speaker, in order that this Congress may have some idea of just how badly an American producer will fare if the proposed regulation goes into effect, let me quote from letters received from American small goods manufacturers who are now facing annihilation from foreign imports.

It is important to note that one recent news item really ought to awaken the sleeping American conscience—the one concerning a strike in Virginia and the demand of the union for protection against foreign production financed by the very same employer being struck here in the United States.

F

A. G. SPALDING & BROS., INC.,
Chicopee, Mass., May 24, 1960.

Mr. JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALBOT: It was good to talk to you on the phone the other day, and I shall look forward to receipt of the proposed tariff changes as soon as it is off the press.

I have recently received my copy of the 1959 Industry Census Report, and I want to tell you it shakes any American sporting-goods manufacturer right down to his heels.

We are preparing a formal case along the lines you suggested when I was in Washington with you and your associates on April 5. However. I want to expose you to a few quick figures drawn from the Government's own import data, and the sporting goods industry's 1959 census report, which shows the sales of domestic made sporting goods only.

Tennis rackets sold in the United States

Country of origin	Quantity 1959	Quantity 1958
Belgium	70, 437	40, 239
Japan	362, 456	198, 748
Pakistan	223, 668	146, 714
Others	65, 848	75, 480
United States	642, 930	659, 957

It is immediately apparent, then, that:

1. Tennis racket sales are increasing as the game gains in general popularity.

2. The gain in 1959 over 1958 was a substantial 21.9 percent.

3. The imported rackets now have over 50 percent of the total market.

In fact, imports had 52.8 percent of the total U.S. tennis racket market in 1959 as against only 41.5 percent in 1958.

Obviously, then, in the midst of a growing tennis racket market, with sales up 21.9 percent in the past year, U.S. manufacture of tennis rackets was down 2½ percent.

I have repeatedly said to you and your associates that United States businessmen are aware of world problems and in the interest of furthering the worldwide economic goals of the United States, most American businessmen would be willing to share the growth of our markets with other nations—this has, however, reached the point where the imports have all of the growth and part of the original body.

Warning: Every indication is that 1960 will make 1959 look like a real good year for U.S. tennis racket manufacturers. Production is way down for 1960 and further declines are forecast for 1961.

Badminton rackets sold in the United States

Country of origin	Quantity, 1959	Quantity, 1958
West Germany	46, 132	91, 405
Belgium	428, 631	377, 063
Japan	1, 029, 145	3, 855, 161
Pakistan	213, 719	721, 477
Others	192, 251	159, 481
United States	734, 139	852, 895

It is immediately apparent that through the past several years, the badminton racket business has gone into the hands of imported rackets.

Let's look at some of the quick facts.

1. Badminton racket sales are up in the United States. The game's popularity is increasing.

The gain in badminton racket sales in 1959 over 1958 sales was over 43 percent.

2. Imported badminton rackets had over 91.6 percent of this total in 1959, as against 86 percent of the total market in 1958.

3. In the middle of a sensational 43 percent gain in badminton racket sales in the United States, the U.S. manufacturers' share of this market fell from 14 to 8.4 percent.

The U.S. badminton business, which has for years been plagued with imports, now finds itself making 16⅔ percent less badminton rackets in a year when the sales of badminton rackets are up 43 percent.

Warning: Every indication is that 1960 will be much worse and that 1961 may well see the abandonment of badminton manufacture in the United States unless very fast and substantial relief is granted the American manufacturers.

Baseball gloves and mitts sold in the United States

Country of Origin	Quantity, 1959	Quantity, 1958
Japan	1, 283, 959	557, 466
(Other countries not known)		
United states	1, 962, 168	2, 309, 436

1. It is apparent that the total sales of baseball gloves and mitts in the United States went up from 2,866,902 pieces in 1958 to 3,245,127 in 1959. This is an increase of 378,225 mitts and gloves, or 13.2 percent increase.

2. In this period, gloves and mitts imported from Japan increased by 726,493, or 130 percent.

3. In this period, the sales of U.S. manufactured gloves and mitts declined from 2,309,436 in 1958 to 1,962,168 in 1959, or a decline of over 15 percent.

4. At the end of 1958, Japanese imports accounted for 19.4 percent of total baseball glove and mitt sales.

At the end of 1959, this had become 39.5 percent.

In 1 short year the imported baseball gloves and mitts took another 20 percent of our total U.S. market.

American production fell off over 15 percent while total sales went up by 13.2 percent.

The conclusion is absolutely obvious.

Unless the Escape Clause is invoked very quickly the U.S. manufacture of tennis rackets, badminton rackets, and baseball gloves and mitts will cease; those people now engaged in their manufacture will join the hundreds already forced out of work by the imports in the ranks of the unemployed and another segment of the American industry will have been sacrificed on the altar of "world trade."

Is this going to happen?

Yours very truly,

EDWIN L. PARKER,
President.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS., INC.,
Chicopee, Mass., June 2, 1960.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DENT: I hope you will take the time to read the attached copy of my letter of May 24 to Mr. Joseph E. Talbot, Chairman of the Tariff Commission.

I am sending it and this letter to you as the president of the largest exclusive sport-

ing goods manufacturer in the world, and as the chairman of the Import Committee of the Athletic Goods Manufacturers Association.

I want to emphasize here, as I do in my letter to Mr. Talbot, that ours is not a radical group, demanding that imports stop, etc.

So sure are we that our American welfare and world-at-large welfare cannot be fully separated that we are ready to share part of our industry's growth with manufacturers from other countries.

It is when we lose so much of the existing market that we find ourselves making and selling less units of sporting goods items in important, rapidly growing areas such as baseball, tennis, and badminton that we begin to realize that this has gone much too far.

Our economic health and the employment of our personnel are seriously affected when we not only are completely excluded from the market growth but actually lose a substantial part of the original smaller market.

Ours is a peculiarly vulnerable industry due to the high percentage of hand labor unavoidably necessary in our production.

Besides the items listed in my letter to Mr. Talbot, U.S. golf ball manufacturing industry is 100 percent vulnerable and is being very hard it in 1960.

Our own governmental agencies, which bought Japanese tennis rackets in 1959, bought Japanese golf balls this spring.

I urge your immediate serious consideration of these important problems affecting this industry.

The very minimum relief our industry needs for survival is the invocation of the escape clause in the Tariff Act.

Your help is needed—urgently.

Yours sincerely,

EDWIN L. PARKER,
President, A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc.

Mr. Speaker, if we need any more proof, let us hold hearings, tear apart the shrouds of secrecy on foreign spending under mutual security, investigate foreign loans, check on who gets profits from foreign production, the effect on our employment, the extent of our enmeshment with private capital and profits in foreign countries, and check on whether we are buying peace or war with our trade-and-aid programs.

No man wants peace more, but no man wants to know for sure if we are getting peace as a harvest or reaping the wild wind.

Following are just a few samples of the results of our policies.

The protest I attach concerns me greatly for as a young man I worked in the plant in my hometown of Jeannette, Pa., that produced the largest U.S. production of tennis balls.

G

JEANNETTE, PA., *June 14, 1960.*

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In negotiations by U.S. Government under 1958 Trades Agreement Extension Act we feel the proposed items listed on schedule 15, more particularly subparagraph 1502, would do considerable amount of damage to our company. Domestic competition has already created unfavorable atmosphere for athletic balls and tennis balls. Granting further concessions to importers could more adversely affect production and tend to reduce employment in our factories. Any assistance you can render toward defeating this proposal will benefit economy of area in which our factories are located.

THE GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER CO.,
P. C. MATHEWSON.

JUNE 15, 1960.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.:

On advice from the General Tire & Rubber Co., manufacturer of tennis balls in my district, I am protesting any action that would in any way reduce tariffs or grant further concessions to foreign-made tennis balls. This industry is very vital to the health and welfare of my community. Serious economic consequences to all concerned will follow any action by GATT and the Tariff Commission that will, in any way, make it more difficult for domestic industry to compete with low-wage, low-standard producers. Statistical data will follow.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Automatic Warning Signal Devices for Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill requiring the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards for certain automatic warning signal devices for automobiles. These devices would flash a warning light when the motorist takes his foot off the accelerator to slow down his car. We do have on all cars a brake light to show when the brake is applied, but there is absolutely no warning device for the traffic behind a car that slows down abruptly by deceleration rather than the brake.

Back in the old days when I learned to drive, it was customary to stick the left arm out the window and wave it up and down as a slowdown or stop signal. Since turn signals have been installed this practice seems to have died out and with traffic as vicious as it is, no one can really be blamed for hesitating to stick his arm out the window to signal a slowdown or stop. I really doubt that I have seen the up and down slowdown signal for 5 years.

The idea for this legislation is not original with me. It came from an Indianapolis columnist, Mr. Lowell Nussbaum, but I will cheerfully admit that I grabbed it quickly.

Traffic in my home town of Indianapolis is bad enough, but it is a picnic compared to Washington rush hours and of all the hazards of traffic today, especially in city driving, nothing is so nerve wracking as a sudden deceleration by the car ahead.

I used to welcome my 45 minute drive in to work every morning as a chance to plan the day's work. But after nearly climbing over the backs of cars that suddenly reduced speed, I gave up these intellectual activities and concentrated on the necessity of getting to the Capitol in one piece.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple piece of legislation that should require little engineering effort by the automobile manufacturers. It is my honest opinion that this legislation would help reduce the appalling accident rate on the streets and roads of this Nation.

Annual Flag Day Program of Lodge No. 102, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Altoona, Pa., June 15, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive Flag Day programs in Pennsylvania was sponsored by Elks Lodge No. 102 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa., on June 15, 1960, at 8:15 p.m.

It was a privilege to participate in the Flag Day program and to deliver the following address:

FLAG DAY, 1960, ADDRESS BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL FLAG DAY OBSERVANCE OF LODGE NO. 102, BPOE, ALTOONA, PA., JUNE 15, 1960.

Since the foundation of our order, the Elks have identified themselves with the cause of American patriotism, and have paid constant and conspicuous honor to the flag.

In addition, the BPOE has been in the forefront of the popular movement for national and public observance of Flag Day.

We of the Elks have made it our business to know the meaning of the Flag, and to fulfill our obligations of respect and love for the flag.

And finally, to give the flag's message of patriotism to all the citizens of our country, particularly the youth.

At this moment in history, when the disgraceful performance of Premier Khrushchev in canceling the scheduled summit meeting has offended America and damaged the prospects of international peace, it is a particularly appropriate time for Americans to rally, with enthusiastic unanimity, to the observance of this festival of our national unity and strength.

The flag, like the President of the United States, stands before the world as the symbol of the Nation.

The flag, however, is an impersonal symbol, nonpartisan, above any political dispute or disagreement.

It stands, in essence, for the spiritual ideals of America, for the virtues displayed by America's founders, and intended to be fostered by the Constitution.

Primarily, the flag stands for our national independence, and for the individual freedom of each citizen.

In our flag, we can read the basic meaning of those famous "checks and balances" written into our form of government.

This is the principle that each man's liberty is under the rule of law—that no man's liberty can be freedom to oppress another or invade his rights—that government itself, the guardian of our liberties and preserver of our rights, must be held back from invasion and injustice.

This is the principle of the rule of the majority—qualified by the important restriction that minority rights, and individual rights—must not be violated.

But the flag, this tangible, visible symbol of our country, stands for something more solid and perceptible than the ideals of freedom and justice that inspire us.

It represents the land itself, and its people.

Each of us, looking at the flag should bring before his imagination his own home, his family and friends.

He should think of, and visualize, the people and the surroundings he loves best, for there is the focal point of his patriotism.

Patriotism must spread out from self and family, from home and hometown, to encompass the multitude and the broad lands and waters of America.

A man's love of country, thus rooted in his native soil, and fostered by his relations with kin and community, stays real and practical and vivid as it grows to take in the scope of America.

The faces, and the landscape, that mean most in his life, should be firmly connected in his mind and imagination with the idea of the United States, and with the image of the Stars and Stripes.

He may think of a hero and a mountain, of his wife and a tree-surrounded home, of a child and a seawave on the shore.

To some people, the fact that the flag means America may be brought home most forcefully in the experience, actual or remembered, of seeing it bravely flying in some foreign land, or on the broad expanse of the ownerless ocean.

Not only our land and people of today are represented by the flag however.

This vast expanse of land, this great variety and number of people, is not enough to exhaust the depth of symbolism in the flag.

All the history of America lies in those folds, those red and white strips, those white stars in the blue field.

In the 13 stripes—in the 13 stars—with which the flag was provided when it first met the breezes of the earth and the light of heaven—we preserve at once the memory of the Thirteen colonies, so long ago established.

We recall their existence before they rose to demand their independence.

We preserve at once that memory of long ago, and the present existence of those same colonies as sovereign States in our great Union.

We of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are justly proud of our place among those Thirteen Original Colonies.

As we look at the flag we see our own colony—with its heritage of religious faith and toleration—with its memory of William Penn and his even-handed justice—with its strong central position in the establishment both of the confederation and of the Union.

It was in Philadelphia that the delegates from the colonies signed the Declaration of Independence.

It was in Philadelphia that the delegates from the States signed the Constitution.

Thus, Pennsylvania has played a major part both in making us free, and in making us one.

The Brandywine, the Delaware, and Valley Forge, will live in American history as long as the hearts and minds of men remember the youth of our country—and the sacrifices brave men made that they, and their sons, might be free.

Here in our flag is enshrined our political structure—what Chief Justice S. P. Chase, in 1868, defined as an "indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

Each State is represented by a star, though we do not assign a special, numbered star to one named State.

Here, in physical, visible form, is shown the fact that our Nation is composed of many distinct political entities.

The flag is, in a sense, a pictorial representation of the ancient motto of our country: "E Pluribus Unum."

By a triumph of political wisdom, and by agreement forged out of a great conflict of keen minds and strong wills, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention worked out a system of government.

This system of government has stood the test of well-nigh two centuries of time, of civil and foreign wars, of prosperity and financial disaster, and of tremendous growth in territorial extent and in population.

The amendments we have made to the Constitution have not been real alterations, to the structure of the document, and to the structure of the government envisioned in the document.

In the flag today, as it represents our Government under the Constitution, we see the working of the structure envisioned by men of high philosophic thought and earnest devotion to principle.

Their efforts brought into being the cooperation of practical politicians, businessmen, and lawyers, who, through the years, have plugged the gaps and smoothed the rough places in this bold device for harnessing liberty and justice in one ordered team.

From our childhood, we have connected the red of the flag with the thought of the blood of heroes.

Certainly no American patriot can look at the flag without some thought of those who have died, on their native soil or abroad, on land or at sea, fighting under the flag and in its defense.

That banner waved over the victory of Yorktown as over the brave defense of the Alamo.

Men have bled for it in the mountains of Korea, as on the plains of Kansas.

In that flag we find the idea of courage, courage to live and die for our country, and for the ideals that make our country great.

The red is the red of our hearts' blood, whether poured out in brave sacrifice on the field of battle or surging in a living tide of hope and ambition for the service of the Nation in a time of peace.

We are inclined, too often, to forget our youthful idealism and enthusiasms, and, in particular, not to think of the flag except when it is brought forcibly to our attention by some official occasion such as the present.

Each of us needs, I am sure to think over his way of life, and see if patriotism and the flag that is the visible symbol and token of patriotism, plays a sufficiently large part in his home and daily routine.

Each citizen should have a flag—that goes without saying.

But, having a flag, it is incumbent upon him to show it proper respect and reverence in all ways.

He should keep it clean and covered when it is not flying—to protect it from any indignity or neglect at all times—and to raise and lower it, on appropriate occasions, with solemn though simple ceremony.

A man should go out, early in the morning of a national holiday, to put his flag out, not in the casual manner of one getting the morning paper or taking in the milk, but with some slight ceremony.

I know one man, for example, who makes a point of having his little children go out with him, and then, when the flag is flying, they recite together the pledge of allegiance.

It is a simple matter—easy and not at all time consuming—but it is likely to give the little children a memory that time will not erase from their minds.

At home—in school—in youth organizations such as the scouts—respect and honor for the flag must be taught with constancy and enthusiasm.

Our children must come to manhood and womanhood with a sure understanding—a confident resolve—so that they will be ready to serve their country in time of need with earnest devotion.

One of the most essential elements in the education of American youth is education in the meaning of the flag—and in the loving service that is due from each of us to the flag—and the country for which it stands.

When a woman comes to be a wife and mother, when a man is called to be a soldier, sailor, or airman—then it is too late for this basic training in patriotism.

If a person's heart and head are 4-F in this matter of patriotism—a healthy body and mental keenness will do us no good.

Last year and this year are great times in the history of the flag, and we should do our best to emphasize, in our own consciousness and in the public mind, the importance of the tremendous events that have changed the look of the flag, twice in 2 years.

We have acquired, as of last July 4, a star representing a vast new State—a land of magnificient scenery, great variety of climate, and a people of vigor and ambition to match the resources and scope of their land—the great new State of Alaska.

Tonight I have the honor to present to the Elks of Altoona a flag, not yet legally the flag of the United States.

It is the flag of the United States of the future—in this case definitely the foreseeable future—since it is established by law that this 50-star flag will become officially the flag of the United States on July 4, 1960.

The 50th star, thus to be added to our flag, and now visible in this preview, is a star of many particular glories.

The State of Hawaii, for which it stands, shares with Texas and California the distinction of having been an independent nation before seeking annexation by the United States.

Hawaii, too stands in an unusual position in being far overseas from the mainland of the United States.

We warmly welcome to our union a sovereign State of romantic history—of well-developed culture—of a high standard of education—of thriving agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial prosperity.

This independence day will be a day of special joy and pride for those most deeply concerned with the relations between America and the Orient—for we have—by welcoming Hawaii to the society of equal States, accepted the equal partnership of a people predominantly, oriental in ancestry.

I am sure that our Altoona Local Lodge No. 102 of the Elks will boldly continue its long-established custom of furthering, by word and example, the strict observance of flag etiquette.

These are forms, as you and I are deeply aware, of vital inward meaning, and of importance in forming the character of the citizen.

I think of the casual word spoken to me the other day by a young man:

"You know, maybe it's my military training, but I just like to see the flag folded up the right way."

These matters are not so small as they look.

The man who has learned a particular way of folding the flag, in scouts or military or anywhere else, has a routine in mind, but a routine with meaning.

There is a practical meaning—the flag folded up the right way when hoisted on the pole, will unfurl properly at the top.

When the flag is folded, it is in the shape of a compass, and easily stored.

By showing a portion of the union, it is instantly identifiable as the flag, and cannot be confused with striped bunting.

Finally, each of us owes to the flag the affection and respect that he owes to the persons nearest and dearest to him.

For after all it is those persons, themselves, who are at the heart of the symbolism of the flag we honor on this Flag Day of 1960.

Labor Chieftains To Fete Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the 37 years I have been privileged to work on Capitol Hill, I have seen Sec-

retaries of Labor come and go. I recall no Secretary who has enjoyed more respect from the leaders of both labor and management, and our people generally, than the current Secretary, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey.

I was pleased to read the following story in today's issue of the Washington Post:

LABOR CHIEFTAINS TO FETE MITCHELL

Organized labor's top leaders, almost all of them Democrats, will toast the Republican Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at a dinner here June 29.

The unique testimonial is being sponsored by the AFL-CIO unions, and the independent United Mine Workers.

A dinner committee headed by AFL-CIO President George Meany said the affair "will demonstrate the high personal regard of American labor for Mitchell." The dinner also will be a pointed remainder to the Republican Party that it could do far worse than pick Mitchell as its vice-presidential nominee.

Views of Various Aspects of the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, now and then, those of us who represent strictly agricultural districts receive a letter dealing with the problem in agriculture from a constituent which deserves the attention of our colleagues.

A few days ago I received a letter from a farmer in my district expressing his views on various aspects of the farm problem—the causes and effects—and some recommended cures.

Mr. Earl Emmerson, of Osborne, Kans., has in my opinion, clearly and ably exposed the economic difficulties with which our farmers presently have to deal. I am in wholehearted agreement with him that a simultaneous reduction in price and acreage under a program of controls is no solution to the surplus problem.

I hope all my colleagues will take a few minutes of their time to read Mr. Emmerson's letter which follows:

OSBORNE, KANS., *June 12, 1960.*

Hon. WINT SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I've tried twice before this, during this session of Congress, to write a letter expressing my views to you, but each time I got the letter too long and discarded it. It may be too late for many matters now, but perhaps not for everything, so I'll try again.

So far, I've never heard of the bill regarding the conservation reserve of the soil bank coming out of committee, so there may be a chance of something yet being done on this subject. Personally, I feel that this may be the best piece of farm legislation which has yet been written. The acreage reserve was of little value, in my opinion, but the conservation reserve can accomplish something worthwhile. Check me if I'm wrong, but I understand that following the war, the Government gave help to many factories which had converted to war production, helping them to reconvert to peacetime production. I think it was right to do so, and it seems to me that this is the real purpose of the conservation reserve.

The demands of two wars have caused many thousands of acres of land to be broken out of sod to fill our needs for grain crops. Much of this is land which is not ideally suited to cultivation, and since it appears that in the foreseeable future, livestock production can be more readily consumed than grain crops, it seems to me that it will be well to have more of this land returned to grass to fulfill the need. It will not entirely solve the surplus problem, although it will help. Much of the land which should be so used is not the top-producing land, but it presents a problem in erosion, and cultivating it tends to waste the resource. Many farmers who own such land are not economically able to return it to grass by themselves, and I think this conservation reserve measure is a wonderful thing to help.

I do feel, however, that after the Government makes the investment in returning such land to grass or other natural cover, there should be some restrictions on plowing it up again after the 10-year contract is completed. I would suggest that future contracts require that such land must remain uncultivated for at least another 10 years without payment, unless some new national emergency should arise which should cause the Government to think it wise to allow it to be broken again.

Probably by the time you receive this, whatever is to be done with a wheat bill will be done. It's a hard problem to solve. My honest personal opinion is that the farm surplus problem never would have arisen, or at least reached a size to be a real problem, if we had not had so many economic restrictions in other areas of our economy. There are many of these; I suppose they began with tariff protection. Perhaps some was good. I think every voting relative of mine voted in favor of tariff protection when it was an issue.

However, each restriction which is created to help someone does so at the expense of the consumers of the particular article involved. I feel that labor and industry, being better organized than agriculture, have managed gradually to gain an advantage from it. Restricting the imports from countries which might normally be consumers of our agricultural surpluses, naturally makes them unable to buy from us, or encourages them to look elsewhere where they may make a more favorable exchange. Another thing, step by step we have raised our wage and price levels until we are far above most of the other countries with which we should normally trade. Increases in industrial prices naturally raise the cost of our agricultural products until we cannot compete with producers who can buy their supplies from cheaper sources on a basis of price.

All in all, I feel that agriculture has received the poor end of the bargain. It does not mean that I think trade restrictions should be removed entirely, but I do feel that if we had never had them, we probably never would have had a farm surplus problem.

Check me on this if I'm wrong, but it has been my understanding that many manufacturers, having considerable control of the selling price of their products, have made it a practice of filling the domestic demand for their products at one price level considerably above the world level, which they could do due to tariff protection, and then selling any surplus they had in foreign markets at a considerably lower price. It has seemed to me that this is essentially what the domestic parity plan for wheat proposed to do, except that the Government was acting as an agent for agriculture because we are not able to set our price as others do. I know this plan is pretty much dead, bit is has seemed to me to be entirely fair. I know you supported it, and I appreciate your efforts.

Farm income results from a simple formula—units times yield times price, minus operating costs, equals net income. It has been claimed by many that if we reduce price, we automatically reduce production. I don't think this is true at all. Most of us have definite costs to meet. If price and units are restricted, we must try that much harder to boost yield to make it up or face disaster. This is the reason so many attempts to reduce the surplus have failed. Really, I feel that we have been hurt worse by the operating costs factor. I feel that here is an area really outside farm bills which is probably more important to agriculture than the farm bills themselves. Something needs to be done to check the steady rise of wages and prices. Some interesting figures appeared a few months ago in the Kansas Agricultural Situation, an extension service publication published in Manhattan which you may be familiar with. In spite of the declining number of farmers in Kansas, net income per operator seems to be some 32 percent lower during the last 5 years of the last decade than during the first 5 years. Much of this is probably due to the rise in operating costs which they give as 62 percent and 74 percent of gross income for these respective periods.

I want to praise the present administration for their efforts to reduce Government costs and balance the budget. I feel that excessive government during the past 30 years has resulted in part of our national problems. Conversely, anything which can be done to cut costs is good, for this, I feel, is a major economic problem for all of us.

Yours truly,

EARL EMMERSON.

Imported Mexican Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 15, 1960:

IMPORTED MEXICAN LABOR

The time has come for the Nation to consider the termination of the iniquitous Mexican farm labor importation program authorized by Public Law 78. Under it some half million braceros are brought into this country every year to harvest crops, with shockingly low wages and poor working conditions, and in competition with domestic farm labor.

Public Law 78 is due to expire next year, but the Gathings bill (H.R. 12176), approved by a reactionary Republican and southern Democratic majority of the House Agriculture Committee, would extend its life for 2 years more. It would also take away certain powers which the Secretary of Labor now has to protect domestic farm workers recruited through the United States Employment Service.

A countermeasure, however—the McGovern bill (H.R. 11211)—will be introduced

when the Gathings bill reaches the floor of the House. It provides for the termination by stages of the Mexican labor program over a 5-year period, and during that time it would amplify and make more specific certain ambiguous and ineffectual provisions of Public Law 78 designed to give protection to American farm labor from unfair Mexican competition.

The Gathings bill should be decisively defeated and public support given unstintingly to measures designed to protect and improve the recruitment, wages, and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

Address by Former Governor Caldwell Before Southern Student Government Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague in the House and former Governor of Florida, Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, recently addressed the Southern Universities Student Government Association at its annual conference held at Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg, Miss.

Governor Caldwell entered the Congress at the same time I did and served with distinction and ability for 8 years. He was Governor of the State of Florida from 1945 to 1949, serving as chairman of the National Governors' Conference in 1946 and 1957. In 1950 and 1951 he was the Federal Civil Defense Administrator. He is an outstanding attorney, presently practicing in Tallahassee, the capital of Florida.

I commend to the attention and consideration of the Congress, Governor Caldwell's very forthright remarks:

I am pleased with the privilege of speaking to the representatives of student government in major southern universities. Your group is of first importance to the future of the South, and, although presently and primarily interested in student governmental affairs, you will, in the short course of events, be even more deeply concerned in State and National affairs.

I will not presume to discuss such subjects as campus politics, entertainment, campus traffic and student discipline—you know far more about these problems than I will ever learn. I want to talk with you about certain social and governmental transitions which have occurred—the current contradictions and trends—and then I should like to ask you to think about where those transitions, contradictions and trends are leading your Nation.

In this discussion I should like us to avoid the negative attitude of just being against. I hope that our approach to decisions will be a positive one—that we will stand for those principles we think are sound and necessary to the welfare of the Nation rather than merely in opposition to the unwise and the unhealthy.

Because I will touch upon several facets of life and government in America I must perforce touch each of them lightly—I shall have to depend upon the assumption that your natural intelligence, as sharpened by your academic experience, will permit you to fill in the vacant spots—to round out the implications and to supply the conclusions.

I want to remind you of several basic principles and policies as they were prior to the Democratic New Deal and the Republican Super-New Deal and then refresh your memory as to what has occurred in the last three decades, leaving to you, as your problem, the determination of whether you approve or disapprove those drastic changes—whether you will encourage the ideological revolution or try to reverse it or just ignore it.

Before you conclude to ignore what's happening to this country just bear in mind that the chief enemy of America, the one force which can destroy you, is indifference—not communism. An informed American citizenship, spurred to concern on the streets, in the homes, and at the polls, can defeat all the Communists, the pinks, the do-gooders, and the bleeding-hearts; but indifference is tantamount to surrender.

And so I suggest that as I discuss these various questions we decide where we stand, on one side or the other, but never in the middle. The middle-of-the-roader, the compromiser, and the moderate are the excrescences of indifference.

First, because it has accomplished so much in undermining constitutional government and, briefly, because so much has been said about it already, let's take a quick look at the Supreme Court where, for our first 150 years, the Presidents placed the best legal minds available—but where, in the last 30 years, when able judges died or retired, they were replaced with pseudo-sociologists who could "rise above the law" and decide controversies on the basis of socialistic dogma. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower all stacked the court with disbelievers in the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution. Where do you stand—with the watered-down philosophy of the new thinkers—or do you prefer your judicial decisions straight from the Constitution?

The 10th amendment of the Constittuion reserved in the States all the rights and powers not granted by the States to the Federal Government, including the right to control education, to police themselves, and to conduct their own elections. The Warren Supreme Court judicially repealed that amendment.

The Congress, during the first Reconstruction, attempted to circumvent the Constitution by the enaction of a force bill which gave the do-gooders of the last century legal authority to supervise, referee, and fix the elections in the South—but the results were so nauseous and blatantly corrupt the effort was soon abandoned. Nevertheless, the Congress, in this second Reconstruction, is about to enact another force bill, patterned after the first, as recommended by the President's Civil Rights Commission.

The question you and I have to decide is whether we agree with the Nixons, Rogers, and Butlers in their position that the backward people in the hinterland of the South cannot be trusted with the ballot—that a Federal commissar of elections is necessary—or whether we agree with the Constitution as it was written.

For some hundred-and-seventy-odd years and 50-odd Supreme Court decisions it was held that, under the Constitution, education was the peculiar responsibility of each State. But the third legislative chamber, sometimes referred to as the Warren Supreme Court, has enacted a new law, the Brown decision, predicated upon the assumption that the authors of the Constitution, notwithstanding the clear language used, never intended the benighted yokels of provincial States to control education—that so important an adjunct of civilization should be left to the omnipotence of Federal bureaucracy.

The ambitious politicians and all of the pinks gathered the philosophical mush of the Brown case to their bosoms and proclaimed it to be the law of the land. But, fortunately, the able bench and bar of America has discredited that driveling misconception and pinpointed the decision as an unconstitutional usurpation of a sovereign right of the States. Where do you stand—do you like the Constitution the way it was written, or do you prefer it as the Supreme Court said how it should have been written?

I'll not labor the point—there's no need to discuss the case in which the Supreme Court prohibited the firing by New York State of a Communist schoolteacher on the theory, perhaps, that one Communist more or less in New York, headquarters for the subversives, made little difference; or the case in which Pennsylvania was denied the right to arrest and try a Communist; or the California and Arizona cases in which the Supreme Court forced those States to admit two suspected Communists to the practice of law—on the theory, I suppose, that there is no conflict in the Communist dedication to destroy America and the lawyers' oath to protect it. What is your preference—is it that the States should enjoy the rights reserved to them by the Constitution or do you prefer that local matters be administered by the Supreme Court in the Constitution's Washington mausoleum?

Before leaving the Supreme Court let me remind you again that both political parties are responsible for, as some of us see it, the undermining of the constitutional safeguards or, as others see it, a vast improvement in an outmoded and archaic system. The Democrats laid the groundwork by the appointment of such people as Justices Black and Douglas and the Republicans supplied the capstone by the appointment of such as Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Your question is whether you prefer lawyers or amateur philosophers as Justices of that Court.

To those of you who may believe in constitutional government I suggest that the one hope for a return to sound ground lies with State courts which are and have been stanch and rugged in their support of the Constitution and the liberties and freedoms guaranteed by it.

But let's leave the judiciary and pass on to something else. In the pre-Roosevelt-Truman-Eisenhower era it was believed that Government should pay its way as it goes, that the budget should be balanced and that deficits should be avoided as the plague. When Mr. Roosevelt became President, the national debt was some $15 million, and the country regarded it as a debt which should and would be paid. We now owe, in direct obligations, some $300 billion and, in indirect obligations, as unknown sum estimated to be in the neighborhood of $1 trillion—all obligations created by the FHA, FCA, FHLBB, HHFA, FNMA, and a myriad other agencies and governmental corporations, the obligations of which are endorsed by the Federal Treasury. And now, of course, we know that in all likelihood that debt will never be paid.

Most of the States have followed the Federal example on matters of expenditure, budget balancing and deficits. Florida, for example, has moved up from $16 million of appropriations for the 1937–39 biennium to more than $700 million for the 1957–59 biennium. Although that State has only doubled its population in the last 20 years, it has multiplied its spending 43 times. Perhaps that is an extreme example but the trend is rapidly upward. Where do you stand? Do you believe, as some contend, that wild Federal, State, and local spending leads to ruinous taxation and inflation or do you agree with the new apostles that such spending is the way to permanent prosperity? It's not too early to reach some conclusions

because as quickly as you reach a taxpaying status you will have to pay your money and take your choice—or, at least, you will have to pay your money.

Next, let's ask what has happened to our foreign policy, or lack of foreign policy? What has happened to the policy of no foreign entanglements, established by President Washington, and the Monroe Doctrine? It was Washington's belief that we should not meddle in the affairs of other nations. When certain European powers tried to muscle in on South America President Monroe blasted them out and announced the doctrine which, until recent years, has kept them out. Prior to the ascension of the one-worlders we were bound by long-established policy to maintain a hands-off attitude toward the internal affairs of foreign governments.

But we've changed all that—we have now concluded that it is our duty to provide the food, shelter, and moral suasion for the rest of the world. To tell Great Britain how to run its business, to tell South Africa how to handle its racial problems, and we now contemplate the instruction of our less enlightened brethren in how to use contraceptives.

Perhaps that is as it should be—perhaps we are divinely endowed with the omnipotent right to guide the other nations spiritually and politically, the obligation to feed them, the power to dictate their internal political policies. Maybe we do have and should enjoy the prerogative of being a Nosey Parker or Meddlesome Mattie.

But let's take a position, one way or the other. Let's ask ourselves if it's possible that we, in sowing our whirlwinds of foreign meddling, are not certain to reap the tornado in the guise of communism in Cuba and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. It is my belief, archaic or not, that I have no right to interfere with my neighbor, that Florida has no right to try to correct the bad government in Philadelphia or the stench of New York City; that America has no right to poke its long finger into the affairs of Great Britain or South Africa.

But everybody seems to be doing it—even the churches. The churches and the clergy, of whatever denomination, in America, were content, for some hundred and seventy years, with the preaching of their religions, ministering to the ill and unhappy and the persuading of people to a belief in God. But in the last 20 or 30 years many of the clergy have broadened their fields of activity to include the general area of politics. Some ministers have played with the Communists and been listed by the Attorney General and FBI reports as subversive. Others have wittingly or unwittingly contributed to the current racial misunderstanding. But, fortunately, still others have continued to be preachers of the divine Gospel. But, there again, we must take a position—if we like our wine in new bottles, we may have it.

But somehow or other I do not believe that the cause of religion is served when a minister of the gospel encourages racial demonstrations and lunch-counter sitdowns. It is the law of the several States that private property, whether it be a lunch counter or a front yard, is subject to the owners' control, with the right to say that he will serve none other than one-legged Chinamen at his lunch counter and will permit none other than frock coated Englishmen to sit on his front lawn. It is a violation of law to trespass upon an individual's private property against his wishes.

I incline to the belief that preachers would do well to avoid the fostering of class and racial hate. I agree with one of the South's greatest Episcopal ministers, Dr. Jeffery Alfriend, when he said the other day, "I question the motives, or the intelligence or the good judgment of any who encourage demonstrations which obviously will lead to increased racial hates and probable violence."

Let's move on to the changes which have occurred in the schools, colleges and universities of the land. They used to be devoted to education but, in recent years, the curriculums have been expanded to include other facets of human endeavor. Many institutions have adopted the John Dewey philosophy which makes their aim and end "education without work", a state of euphoric "life-adjusted, well-rounded living". Some universities have gone into the country club business, others have become training grounds for the demonstrators, the sitdowners and the troublemakers. And still others, influenced by working scholars, have continued to teach and to train students to think and to work and to be worthwhile men and women.

Using one State University as an illustration of the change which has occurred in education, let me say that that institution was, until 2 or 3 years ago, when it experienced an attack of social consciousness, one of the good schools in which emphasis was placed upon academic excellence.

Although a large majority of that institution's teachers have remained primarily interested in academic education, some of the faculty is no longer so hampered and devotes much of its time to the advancement of new and far-fetched social and political aims.

In the middle of a recent racial crisis, while local officials were seeking to avert violence, a professor of the institution spoke to a mixed group and in the course of his discussion asked how we could hope to achieve justice if we stay within the law and went on to tell them that "if you always obey the law and the law is no good, you get nowhere."

The university invited such people as Linus Pauling, the scientist whose loyalty was questioned, Mr. Atlee, Britain's former socialistic prime minister, characterized by Winston Churchill as "a sheep in sheep's clothing", and Mr. Justice Douglas, of the Supreme Court, who has ruled with the Communists in 66 out of 69 cases, to speak to the student body. When taxed with having overdosed the students with rosy liberalism the university authorities pointed out that they had balanced the program with Mr. Romulo, the Philippine Ambassador and Mr. Eric Johnson, the movie mogul who spent so much time in Russia trying to do business with Mr. Khrushchev.

Perhaps that trend is as it should be—perhaps the measure of a university's standing is its social consciousness as distinguished from academic accomplishment. The decision is one which you must make, not for yourselves, but for your children, because within a few years you will be furnishing the money to run those institutions and furnishing the children to attend them.

However, I should caution you that, if you take the position that educational institutions should devote their efforts to education, should teach obedience to the law and should not use the time of the teachers and the students and your tax money for the training of potential troublemakers in how to create strife and start riots, you will be clobbered as old mossbacks. And if you assume that the governing authorities should manage the affairs of the institution and, in doing so, prohibit subversive activities, you will be accused of having interfered with academic freedom. On the other hand, if you agree that the future of the institutions should be left to the tender mercies of the pinks you will be in step with the times.

If it suits your mood to be frank about the present situation, you will admit that the responsibility for the current trend falls upon the shoulders of the individual citizens of this country. They elected their Governors, the Governors appointed the boards of control or trustees or regents which, in turn, selected the presidents and approved the faculties of the several institutions. If the Governors and the boards encourage the spectacles of unlawful assembly, such as have occurred in the South recently, it is the responsibility of the citizens.

I do not want to leave the impression with you that Florida is by itself in playing footsie with the Paul Butler anti-South attitude. Virginia's Governor Almond launched the States rights battle roaring like a lion, but, after a brief flurry with the do-gooders, he retreated, squeaking like a mouse. And of course North Carolina's Hodges never even barked—he squeaked from the beginning. But let's decide where we stand—perhaps we prefer squeakers—it may be that we agree with the apostles of new thought in saying that our forefathers, who were willing to stand on their hind legs and fight for right, freedom, and independence are well forgotten.

If you are curious as to how all these great changes came about, I suggest you give credit to the movies and TV programs, spawned in the Red entertainment world, to such publications as Life, Ebony, and Look, such people as Mrs. Roosevelt, Paul Butler, Senators JAVITS and HUMPHREY and to self-proclaimed southerners of the hue of the Ralph McGills—to such organizations as the ADA, the NAACP, the Communist Party and various biracial committees and societies. But the greatest credit of all must go to the individual citizens of America who either approve the infiltration of Reds or are indifferent to the plight of the Nation.

I am not sure to what extent the average citizen is interested in the trends I've been discussing. Whether they are concerned with the implications of those trends—whether they are so concerned as to try to reverse them, are open questions. But, logically, they should be interested in vital public questions—they should be interested in the future of their children and grandchildren and in the future of their Nation and civilization.

But I would like to say to all of the people of the South and particularly our new citizens, the refugees from such septic centers of liberality as New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, that this is still their America, that this is still their Nation and that they still owe the debt of good citizenship.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that the modern inclination is to think liberally, to compromise differences and to be tolerant. But I should like to point out to you that in all the history of mankind not one single noteworthy advance, whether in religion, science, medicine, human welfare, or government, has ever been accomplished by the timid middle of the roaders. All that the conformists, the moderates and the compromisers have ever been able to do was to maintain a status quo—to yield and sway with pressures and to put off the day of reckoning.

This land of ours is in trouble—in trouble at home and abroad. The Communists are carving great chunks out of the free world, our natural allies have little confidence in us and we stand on a perpetual brink of war. On the domestic front we are teetering between depression and inflation. We are disturbed by the clash of racial ideologies. The Congress and the White House are growing weaker and a despotic Supreme Court is growing stronger.

For some unaccountable reason this era has produced no great leaders—we are just drifting along, changing course with the wind. We need, and I look to your generation to provide, great leadership—men of opinion, conviction and courage—men who believe in and are willing to stand for the dignity of mankind.

Compromise is a factor in everyday living—and it's perfectly all right to compromise immaterial questions. But compromises are like narcotics—they can be overdone. Some things, some principles and some beliefs are and should be above compromise. One either believes in God or one does not—there's no compromise. One either believes in stealing or he does not—there's no such thing as token honesty. One either believes in freedom or he believes in slavery.

And I hold it to be true that we either believe in the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution and in constitutional government in general or we believe in some other form of government—that we either believe in government by law or in government by man.

And now, in closing, I remind you that the very existence of America, as a democracy and as a bulwark of civilization, is at stake. The thoughtful people of this country can either wrest governmental control from the drooling Liberals, reestablish the ideals and principles which made it a great nation or they can watch the United States descend to a socialistic mediocrity.

The Social Security Inverted Pryamid—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to vote on social security amendments of 1960 which will further increase benefits, expand coverage, and add a whole new concept of Government-controlled medical care for the aged, I would like to call to the attention of the Members some pertinent thoughts by W. Rulon Williamson, the original actuary of the Social Security Board. In a letter, dated June 11, 1960, as a preface to an analysis of the social security program, Mr. Williamson declares:

The 16-fold increase in taxes under OASI from 1937 to 1959, and the 10,000-fold increase in the benefits over the same period seem to me like an inverted pyramid with the appex shallowly in the sand, and the yearly larger burdens of sporadic enlargements, demogically arranged, plus the wearing out of the earlier denials of benefits make for increasing instability.

Following are some of Mr. Williamson's thoughts on the 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, research actuary)

The Congress is being pressured to add to the social security portfolio a new account, called "Medical Care for the Aged" and to go through the motions of rationalizing calling the process insurance, and thereby raising the status of the recipient from pauperism to dignified right. In 1929 or 1930 there were apparently housed in our poorhouses some 1 percent of the population of 65 and over. Today there is an expression of joy that we have stopped the parade to the poorhouse by the inventions of social security. Under that invention we have public assistance, with needs tests—liberal needs tests in some States—paying benefits to 2.4 million aged with Federal subsidy, and 10.1 million 65 and over drawing benefits from OASI, cheerfully called insurance. There is some overlap here, but apparently nearly two-thirds of our population of age 65 and beyond now get benefits which represent very little personal earmarked taxpayment toward them.

In our caste system, perhaps the poorhouse and general relief is plebian relief, the old-age assistance is bourgeois relief, and OASI benefits aristocratic relief. The parade is not to the poorhouse, but to Federal near-doles or federally subsidized local doles.

The original name of the Federal benefits was old-age benefits, as carried in the Social Security Act of 1935. The 1939 amendments made some radical changes in the 1935 act—some of the reestablishing goals of the staff servicing the Committee on Economic Security of 1934, some adding benefits to dependents of retired ex-OASI taxpayers, some adding benefits to the survivors—family dependents—of nonretired decedents among the OASI taxpayers. This last-named change gave more surprise than pleasure to the life insurance companies, but having waked up to the reality rather tardily, a surprising degree of resigned tolerance followed the heavy inroads into their business.

The World War II kept all but rather nominal amendments from passage until 1949 and 1950. Those amendments were monumental in scope and set the pattern for the biennial enlargement of the system from which we have since suffered. Again the tolerance of the citizen has been astounding. After five changes of 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, and 1958, there has been a sort of stunned and cynical recognition that perhaps this was the essential consequence of allowing the bread-and-circuses doctrine to take possession of a Congress, suffering from actuarial anesthesia. As with Hamlet's comment on the drinking habits at the court of Denmark, the custom of biennial overloading of the OASI craft would also be more honored in the breach than the observance.

Two Passaic Girls To Live With French Families Abroad—Join 1,200 College Students for Summer Experiment in International Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an interesting program to promote good will among nations and peoples is revealed in a splendid article written by Arlene Logioco and appearing in the June 14, issue of the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News. The article follows:

TWO PASSAIC GIRLS TO LIVE WITH FRENCH FAMILIES ABROAD—JOIN 1,200 COLLEGE STUDENTS FOR SUMMER EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING

"When in France, do as the French do." This expressive slogan will become a way of life this summer for Misses Jane Siegendorf and Ruth Zimbler, Passaic college girls.

They sail June 28 aboard the MS *Aurelia* for France where they will become unofficial ambassadors of good will for the United States.

Participants in the experiment in international living program, they join 1,200 other collegians who are traveling to 28 countries on 5 continents this summer. Each of these experimenters will live for a month as a member of a foreign family, and will spend another month traveling about the country.

Well versed in the language, customs, history, and culture of France, the young women will attempt to see the country as the inhabitants see it. To do this, they will "go to work with the father, market with the mother, and do what a French girl would do," says Miss Zimbler.

The program operates on the principle that the individual plays an important part in creating mutual understanding and respect among peoples of the world.

TO SEEK FAMILY FRIEND

Miss Siegendorf, daughter of Commissioner Hyman Siegendorf and Mrs. Siegendorf, 75 Reid Avenue, will stay in Nantes.

Her mother calls her assignment "an amazing coincidence." During World War I, Mrs. Siegendorf's brother, Melvin Spitz, was killed there while serving with the "Fighting Irishmen" under Father Duffy. Before his body was brought to this country for reinterment, his grave was cared for by Martha Lisez, a resident of Nantes, whom Jane will try to contact.

Miss Siegendorf, a junior at Vassar College, is studying French and English. Last summer she studied for her 5th year of French at the New School for Social Research. This is Miss Siegendorf's third trip abroad, but this one is different—"it's the first one without my parents!"

She likes the idea of staying with a family rather than at a hotel, because she "gets a kick out of people," and adds, "it will be good for my French."

BORDEAUX FOR MISS ZIMBLER

Miss Zimbler is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Philip Zimbler, 11 Idaho Street. On the dean's list at Douglass College, she is a political science major with options in French and philosophy.

As vice president of the International Relations Club, she feels that this sojourn will afford her the opportunity of applying what she has learned all year. She is an avid reader and Dostoevsky is her favorite author, but in preparation for this trip, she is reading French histories and dictionaries exclusively. A family in Bordeaux will be her hosts for the first 3 weeks.

Both young women are looking forward to their second month in France. They will spend 3 weeks bicycling through the countryside. They will travel in groups of 10 French and American students with a mature guide specially trained by the experiment.

At the end of their stay, they plan to spend their week of independent travel on shopping sprees in Paris.

The Social Security Inverted Pyramid—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to have a full understanding of the social security program before we vote on the proposed amendments for 1960, I include further remarks on the social security system by W. Rulon Williamson, the original actuary of the Social Security Board.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, research actuary)

The dogmas growing up under OASI include:

1. It is an insurance system. Insurance is dependable, actuarially sound, fiscally solvent. Therefore this system is dependable, sound and solvent.

2. While we do not know how to read the future, we can make assumptions. We will make low-cost assumptions and high-cost assumptions. Although there are scores of factors involved, we can hold many of them constant, as we vary the rest. This simplifies the work.

3. We can extrapolate two sets of cost assumptions—the low and the high—right out to infinity. We can also produce an intermediate assumption to infinity.

4. It is insurance. We can therefore know that for deferred benefits in life insurance there is fund accumulation, and under its assumptions we balance the present value of benefits against the present value of premiums, over the insured's lifetime. So in this insurance, social and open-end in nature, running out to infinity, we will discount taxes and benefits at presumptive valid interest rates, and show a balance, too. This discount reduces infinity to finite proportions.

5. There are well-established actuarial techniques in some types of life insurance. Actuarial techniques in use here for 25 years must also be well established.

6. Using these well-established actuarial techniques, the periodical surveys show actuarial balance.

7. Given the balance, we can call the system self-supporting.

8. Compound interest, in reverse, used as discount factors, maintain the balance, aided by any necessary increase in the tax rate as it seems to be needed.

9. It is an achievement of social insurance that the overpowering need of the citizens, with their incapacity for personal budgeting, with pauperism threatening almost all, which originally triggered the creation of social security, has in 25 years created the miracle of a self-supporting system.

10. A further miracle is that the Congress has been cost-minded all this time and may be expected to remain so.

Memorial Day in Hawaii a Soul-Stirring Occasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, five members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, led by Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, had the privilege of spending the 1960 Memorial Day weekend in Hawaii for the threefold purpose of: (a) Holding hearings and meeting with various veterans' groups in our 50th State; (b) representing the Congress at the dedication of the beautiful new carillon presented by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea at the site of the Arizona disaster in Pearl Harbor, and (c) attending the Memorial Day services at the Punchbowl National Cemetery in Honolulu.

The last of these was an occasion which everyone present will remember as long as he lives and, in beauty and in depth of feeling, it recalled the colorful patriotic observances which used to be so much a part of American life and which have, unfortunately, fallen into comparative disuse in recent years.

The Punchbowl National Cemetery has been created in a huge, extinct volcanic crater overlooking the city of Honolulu. In it are buried almost 17,000 men and women of all races who fought to preserve our freedom, and the freedom of all men of good will everywhere on earth, during the hostilities in the Pacific theater.

The magnificent resting place for the brave which has been created here was a breathtaking sight on Memorial Day. On each of the 17,000 graves a small American flag was fluttering in the soft Hawaiian breeze, and on each was a lei of orchids which had been put together with loving care and placed in position by Hawaiian schoolchildren. The ceremonies, in which all branches of the armed services and all veterans groups participated, were brief and extremely moving. The principal speaker on this occasion was Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell, of Honolulu, and the chairman of the proceedings was Spark M. Matsunaga, a leader of the 100 Club, a prominent Hawaiian veterans group.

World War II is a vivid and living memory in our 50th State and Memorial Day is an occasion of deep personal meaning. None of the visiting delegation will ever forget the sight of, literally, tens of thousands of Hawaiian citizens climbing the hill to the Punchbowl Cemetery in car or on foot, carrying their own flowers to lay upon the graves of the heroic dead. And, I am sure, that each of us felt a twinge of regret and remorse that here on the mainland the emphasis at Memorial Day has gradually been placed more and more on the holiday aspects of the occasion rather than on the sacred memories which it should arouse in every American heart.

Previous to these rites, the congressional group attended the ceremonies at the site of the *Arizona* disaster. This was indeed an occasion for heartbreak and deep thought. The platform on which we stood was erected upon a turret of the sunken battleship in which 1,102 American boys lie forever entombed. The outlines of the noble ship are still clearly discernible beneath the blue, translucent Hawaiian waters. Indeed, on a beautiful May morning such as was this Memorial Day at Pearl Harbor, it was difficult, if not impossible, to envisage the horror and the brutal savagery which ravaged this Pacific paradise on December 7, 1941, and which plunged the United States into 4½ years of global warfare.

The AMVETS carillon represents a first step in the construction of a magnificent national memorial at the site of the disaster. In presenting the carillon to the U.S. Government, Harold T. Berc, national commander of the AMVETS summed up the feelings of all veterans everywhere in the following address:

DEDICATION OF AMVETS MEMORIAL CARILLON OF THE PACIFIC, MAY 30, 1960

(By Harold T. Berc, national commander, AMVETS)

Men of the *Arizona*—We in AMVETS have come to memorialize your sacrifice on that infamous 7th day of December 1941. We commit ourselves to this act by the dedication today, aboard this gallant vessel, of a carillon. We devote ourselves to the language of its inscription, which says, "While these bells toll, safely rest; freedom lives."

In your moment of truth on that gray December morning about 19 years ago, you had already marked yourselves with the honor of serving your Nation's flag. But the swiftness of the enemy's assault prevented you from knowing the course of history which would flow from that day of surprise.

You could not know that your day marked the beginnings of World War II, and that 12 million brothers of yours would rise up to defend against the lust of Tojo, the avarice of Mussolini, and the madness of Hitler—that thousands of them would follow your devotion by being shattered in the skies, sunk below the seven seas, or lost on battlefields around the world—that thousands more would be returned to hospitals around our Nation, wracked in mind or broken in body, and that millions more of us on whom God's grace was shed would return with determination to atone your sacrifice—not alone by dedicating ourselves to concern for fellow veterans, their widows and orphans, but also to the highest acts of citizenship which would insure a healthful nation working toward a world of peace with justice.

You could not know, men of the *Arizona* that the days following World War II would be marked by the unlocking of the secrets of atomic energy revealing a force which could be either effectively used to accomplish men's destruction or used to bring the well-being of the peoples of the world to a state of peace and material good.

No, you could not know that the powerful nations of the world would gather in San Francisco for the organization of a body called the United Nations which would, for all time, commit the peoples of the world to an order of life which would minimize nationalistic abberations and provide a forum for help in bringing colonial peoples of the world into a day of independence, and which would cooperate in stamping out disease, in improving economic development, in advancing educational opportunity, and in making the elements of adequate food and shelter available to all.

You could not know that the Soviet Union which participated in the creation of this model tool, would fear and distrust the honest directives of that forum and would weaken its purpose by obstructionist vetos, by belligerent declarations, by an inordinate hardness in provoking an airlift at Berlin, and finally by the sponsorship of a limited war technique resulting in the Korean war * * * that the substantial part of the world would unite for peace and under U.S. moral leadership would resist this aggression by piecemeal technique through the fielding of a U.N. military force. Nor would you know that Soviet Union political opportunism would cause her to inject herself into Hungary for the purpose of suppressing the free will of its people and then to exceed this cynical intrusion by an even more cynical refusal to accept an impartial inspection of the Hungarian scene by a properly constituted committee of the U.N.

You could not know that the Soviet Union would pursue a course of purposeful espionage, and by industrial advance bring itself to a position of high nuclear war potential, the effect of which has been to commit the world to life on a diplomatic tightrope of terror.

And so we find ourselves on this Memorial Day remembering your sacrifice in the wake of surprise and concerned that from such a repeated surprise, in this day of nuclear power recovery potential would be minimal.

We do not raise for you the detail of the events of today. But we do say that the

act of overflight by the U–2 which caused such violent Soviet verbal reaction was a better reason for getting on with the summit conference than for torpedoing its potential. The cancellation of that conference was not an assault on the United States alone but on all the peoples of the world who looked hopefully to the summit conference as a means of controling the dangerouisy mounting tensions of the world.

From the White House we have today received the President's Memorial Day Proclamation in which he asks all Americans to make this a day of prayer for permanent peace. We now make this prayer on this hallowed site and we let you know that we bear witness to your sacrifice by dedicating ourselves to the essence of the words "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and we expect to perfect that dedication by insuring that our Nation's strength continue to be second to none in the world.

At the same time, the essential truths of our aspirations for a world of peace with freedom will continue to be sought by us through every honorable means available—not as a matter of lip service, but as a matter of reality; that we seek this world of peace with freedom not alone for ourselves, but for all those people of the world who look hopefully toward this goal. We declare in ringing terms our decision to stand fast to the principle that all such peoples be free of dictatorship, free of oppression, and free of attack because of race, color, or creed. The terrible lesson of surprise is vividly portrayed by your mighty *Arizona*. But for all time, rather than let this be a symbol of tragedy, we shall make it stand as a signal of freedom through vigilance. And it is with this lesson in mind that AMVETS formally tender this carillon.

Mr. Speaker, before laying a wreath on the site in the name of the Congress of the United States, Chairman TEAGUE of the Veterans Affairs Committee expressed himself in the following remarks which, I feel, should be read by every American:

SPEECH BY HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE—DEDICATION OF THE AMVETS MEMORIAL CARILLON AT PEARL HARBOR, MEMORIAL DAY, MAY 30, 1960

This is really an occasion—not for speech, but for silence. It is an occasion for quiet memories, for prayer, for thanksgiving, and for great resolve.

Here, as we dediacte this carillon as a memorial to those 1,102 Americans who lie forever entombed within the shattered hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*—we must be impressed by the fitness that lies in the fact that this has been made possible by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea. For the AMVETS are typically and completely a product of World War II—and, among all the battlefields and memorials of the world, Pearl Harbor is the most representative of the same war that gave the AMVETS birth.

I single out the AMVETS because of their part in making this memorial possible. However, the thoughtfulness and patriotism which motivated this gesture are typical of all our veterans' organizations. In my opinion, the growth and development of our veterans' groups has been one of the healthiest developments of 20th century America and we all owe a great deal to each and every one of them.

Pearl Harbor is unique. Few nations care to memorialize their military defeats. The French do not keep Waterloo green in the memories of their people; the English have no special reverence for Yorktown and Saratoga; Mexico does not glory in San Jacinto; the Spanish do not sing of the Armada.

But Pearl Harbor is different. It represents a physical defeat but a moral victory. It symbolizes the ability of free men to rise and conquer the forces of oppression, even when they have been crushed to earth.

Pearl Harbor will always serve as a reminder to future generations of the moral differences between freedom and totalitarianism. It will always serve as a perpetual reproach to all who would be slavemasters—and a testimonial to the invincibility of the human spirit.

And Pearl Harbor serves another essential purpose as a reminder that this must never happen again.

In all the history of humankind there has never been an instance in which freedom has been lost in a single day.

The positive act of snatching a people's freedom away from them may have been of short duration, but always the period of apathy and carelessness, of laziness, of complacency, and even of moral corrosion which made the act possible has been long and protracted.

This is something we must always remember. As we stand here today we are troubled—deeply concerned—by the reverberations resulting from the capture of the U–2. Certainly the conditions which surrounded this event are unfortunate in the extreme since they have given the Soviet demagogues a useful implement of propaganda. But we must remember that as long as we have for an international antagonist a closed society, such as that of Soviet Russia, then espionage must be a way of life, a necessity for national survival. If we had been as vigilant in 1941—if we had known as much about what was going on in Japan as we know about Russia in 1960—we would not be mourning our heroic dead here today.

For the free world can never afford another Pearl Harbor. If we are ever again caught so unprepared there will be no ceremonies to be conducted by the survivors—there will be no buglers, no tolling of bells, no flags, no memorial wreaths—for there will be no survivors. There will only be the long silence of destruction and universal death.

I have just one thought to add before the bells of this carillon ring out for the first time over these historic waters. We mourn, with aching hearts, the 1,102 Americans who lie entombed before us—young men who died in a war before they even knew a war existed. We mourn all the others who have died in this and in every other war in which we have been engaged—those who lie, as these do, with an ocean across their hearts—those who died in mudbank or cloudbank or who lie with the jungle roots entwined about their feet in the green hells in which they were forced to fight.

But mourning is not enough. Not nearly enough.

A generation of Americans gave their noondays to us so that we might enjoy a handful of tomorrows. They have made us the trustees of their sacrifice, the legatees of their suffering.

They have been most generous.

It is not sufficient to mourn them. They will be satisfied only if we can give them assurance that their sacrifice has not been in vain, and that we are worthy of their sacrifice.

This calls for self-dedication—for a firming-up of our faith—for a regrouping of our moral forces. We are all faced with troubled years ahead. The maintenance of peace is going to call for many things from many people—courage, unselfishness, stamina, sacrifice, wisdom. The challenge is enormous now and it will grow greater. We must meet that challenge every day of our lives or we shall be overwhelmed by it.

So—when these bells throw their gentle message across the harbor today—let us rededicate ourselves to this cause of maintaining liberty—the cause for which these 1,102 Americans gave up their lives. Let us swear in our hearts that we shall devote our lives—each in his own way—toward making certain that liberty—that torn and tattered document, signed by Christ and His angels and a most impressive list of sponsors, great and small, shall never be committed to the flames.

Thank you and God bless you.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day 1960 in Hawaii was an occasion to remember. I wish every Member of Congress and, indeed, every American had the opportunity to attend these dual ceremonies.

Japanese Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an editorial from the Thomasville (N.C.) Times, June 13, 1960:

JAPANESE INVASION

"Remember Pearl Harbor" was the battle-cry of Americans only 15 years ago. The Japanese cried back "Banzai."

Today another battle with the Japanese is taking place. The American textile manufacturers criers "Remember foreign aid" as he tries to compete with cheap Japanese goods flooding the American market. The Japanese now cry "Yankee go home."

During World War II the Japanese infantrymen never set foot on American soil. But now Japanese textiles have staged an invasion that no army could compete with. The goods have infiltrated into every port, traveled by the courtesy of American transportation, found their way to every market, invaded every home, and all this is sanctioned by Washington as "Japanese rehabilitation."

Yet the Japanese cry "Yankee go home," as their invasion of goods flows across the Pacific more than ever and American dollars continue to fatten our conquered foe.

Prelude to the President's visit has even worsened the Japanese outcry. Now it's "American murderer, go home" and "Ike, don't come."

Yet the "American murderers" continues to purchase a blouse, tablecloth, underwear, a pair of stockings, or other goods manufactured by our humbled foe.

The Japanese invasion of the textile market continues to move from one victory to another through the American market with success never attained by the fanatic "Banzai" charges made by the Japanese Army 15 years ago.

Today plans are being made to close a textile mill in High Point employing 295 people who paid taxes to help restore Japan. This is the third Burlington Mills plant closed because of cheap foreign goods in the last 2 years. The millhand seeks another job to feed his family. The Japanese cry "American murderer, go home."

About 18½ years ago the American people were filled with hate after learning of the "Death March." Today the Japanese have devised another death march, the "Textile Death March."

This death march does not have the Japanese soldier prodding the victims with bayonets and the captured do not scream out in anguish. But this march is to the employment office accompanied by the screams of children crying out in want and hunger.

Who will join this death march other than the textile people? The merchant who

marks up Japanese goods from 50 to 100 percent? Bankrupt people buy no goods, no matter how cheap. The automobile manufacturer who is competing with foreign cars from rehabilitated Europe? Unemployed people walk. They do not buy cars, gasoline or other goods, except food, and perhaps they will not have to buy this when the breadlines of the thirties reappear.

War is much like poker. It's the man who wins the big pots who walks away from the game with the money. Perhaps World War II was the ante and economic stability the "big pot."

Now is the time for the American manufacturer to "Remember Pearl Harbor," gather his fighting forces, and meet the enemy in the big battle—the battle for economic stability.

He should bear down until the defiant cry of "American murderer, go home," becomes a plea of "Uncle Sam, come back."

BOB CLOANINGER.

Southern Students Oppose Civil Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of unrest, with the conflict of ideologies throughout the world, the press is full of reports of rebellion, revolution, and attacks upon the existing order, particularly among the students of the world. While it is true that the modern isms appear to be making headway in certain areas for the capture of the minds of the youths of the world, I am sure that this is by no means to be construed as uniform.

However, because of the prominence given to these incidents, like the Communist agitations by Japanese students and the sit-in lunch counter demonstrations, it is refreshing to those of us who believe in the constitutional and traditional philosophy which has made this country the envy of the world to note that there are still untold thousands—yes, millions, who still believe in the traditional and constitutional American system.

As an instance of this, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a resolution which was adopted by the students of Mississippi Southern College located in my own congressional district at Hattiesburg, Miss. As one who is dedicated to the southern way of life which, after all, is the American way of life, I am proud of these young people and of the institution which they attend.

The resolution follows:

A BILL TO COMMEND THE UNITED STATES CONGRESSMEN IN THEIR EFFORTS TO DEFEAT CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

PURPOSE: TO SHOW THE SOUTHERN CONGRESSMEN THAT THE YOUTH OF THE SOUTH SUPPORT THEIR EFFORTS TO PRESERVE THE TRADITIONAL SOUTHERN WAY OF LIFE

Whereas there is a current effort by certain factions in the United States and abroad to disrupt the peaceful coexistence of all people in the United States; and

Whereas political pressures have forced action to be taken by the U.S. Congress to further the cause and actions of these agitant groups; and

Whereas certain Congressmen, especially from southern United States, have fought this legislative action known as civil rights in every possible way available to them despite ridicule and discrimination from other parts of the United States and the world, and have proven themselves to be working in the best interests of the South and the southern way of life; and

Whereas the young citizens of the South should voice their support and approval of the efforts of these Congressmen: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Mississippi Southern College Student Senate, That these Congressmen be commended for their efforts and endeavors to preserve this traditional characteristic of our society. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Congressman who cooperated and worked to achieve this goal.

Adopted April 25, 1960.

LARRY E. BRADLEY,
President, Student Government Association.

Adlai Must Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, earlier this week one of America's wisest, ablest, and most experienced statesmen, Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, issued a statement concerning his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States.

While Governor Stevenson made it clear that he was not seeking the nomination as an active candidate, he made it equally clear that he was willing to accept the nomination if the convention should choose him.

It has become increasingly evident in recent months that while he is not an active candidate himself, Adlai Stevenson, is nonetheless, the candidate of millions of Americans who believe that he is best equipped to lead our Nation, and, indeed, the entire free world, in these troubled times.

Despite his reluctance to once again campaign for nomination to this high office, a tremendous and widespread grassroots support for Adlai Stevenson has grown to amazing proportions throughout the land. This support is, in my opinion, a phenomenon in American politics. It is surely a healthy sign that Democrats at least are gravely concerned that our Nation should settle for nothing less than the most capable and best qualified of all Americans as our national leader.

Hundreds of thousands of American citizens are each day giving their time and energy to the task of placing Adlai E. Stevenson in the White House. They are making this effort despite the fact that they know they will receive no encouragement from that great man in whose behalf they are working.

They are making this effort because they recognize as rare indeed a man who already sees with great vision the shape and the problems of the New World and whose mind and wisdom they know is equal to the terrible task of bringing our Nation to a safe passage through these troubled times.

A number of America's leading newspapers have given editorial voice to the need for Adlai Stevenson's qualities of leadership, joining with the growing chorus for the Democratic National Convention to nominate this great and this good man as its presidential nominee once more.

I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star, June 3, 1960]

ADLAI MUST BE HEARD

The future of the American Republic is in the making. We as a great Nation do not face "a critical hour"; we do face a critical period; it may be for months, it may be for years.

Whatever the length of time, we cannot submit our destiny to the partisan emotionalisms which for selfish interests ignore the serious elements of destiny.

For that reason it is now a positive requirement on every citizen to reflect with critical, not with a party emotional mind, on what sober, patriotic, intelligent leaders have to say. It matters not whether those leaders are Democrats or Republicans.

One of those leaders is Adlai Stevenson. By political creed he is a Democrat. By and in personal character and intelligence he is a patriotic citizen who in the convictions of his mind is first of all an American.

No self-respecting citizen can laugh off, nor dismiss for partisan reasons, nor charge to political softness toward communism these words by that genuinely distinguished citizen:

"There is no question of national unity in a time of crisis. But errors must be corrected, and we must not forget that the opposition also had an obligation to our country and to our allies whose security is also involved.

"It is the duty of a responsible opposition in a democracy to expose and to criticize carelessness and mistakes, especially in a case of such national and world importance as this. We must see to it that we profit from such grave mistakes."

Language does not mean anything which attempts to conceal the plain fact that even unnecessarily President Eisenhower and his advisers gave Khrushchev a propagandist advantage. That only is what the Anniston Star has charged.

It remains still that Khrushchev broke up the Paris Conference. We gave him the immediate means for doing that. The Western leaders were left confused and distracted by our contradictory confessions. The American people are in confusion now.

But the very confusions have at once been turned into an attack on the Democratic Party, and especially on Adlai Stevenson. Luncheon club resolutions, and Republican Senators like DIRKSEN, and outmoded Democrats like James Farley are all united.

They are by partisanship, by provincial outlook, and affectations of patriotism, the historical name for which is chauvinism.

The American people are united and they can only be divided by a leadership which is soft on responsibility and complacent with departmental mistakes and errors.

Real patriotism needs real and honest intelligence and forthrightness—that is what Adlai Stevenson has, not as a Democrat nor as a Democratic politician, but as a thoughtful citizen.

[From Newsday, Garden City, L.I., N.Y., May 31, 1960]

NOMINATE STEVENSON

At this critical time in world history, the Democrats owe it to all Americans to stop their feuding and fussing and nominate the best possible candidate for President of the United States. By virtue of his experience, his wisdom, and his ability, that man is Adlai E. Stevenson.

He is qualified for many reasons but the one overriding reason is that he would be able to deal with the totalitarian powers. He knows and understands the suspicion, the deviltry, the ruthlessness of the Russian bear with his smile and his smite. The formidable opponent must be handled with skill if ever we are to lift the clouds of terror that lie low over the world. There is no other issue so important as the one of peace or destruction. Wars are no longer fought by chivalrous knights on white chargers. The Four Horsemen of the next war ride from the Apocalypse and their names are War, Famine, Death, Pestilence.

The present administration has tried to quiet our fears of a nuclear holocaust with reassuring words and optimistic predictions. But this is no time for tranquilizers; this is the time for vision or we perish.

If we have made mistakes we should speak out instead of mesmerizing ourselves that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Stevenson did speak out on the summit collapse and was immediately set upon by Senators DIRKSEN and SCOTT. It took fortitude to say "We cannot sweep this whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We cannot and must not. Too much is at stake." But Stevenson has always spoken out. In 1952 he told the American Legion that "surely intolerance and public irresponsibility cannot be cloaked in the shining armor of rectitude and righteousness. Nor can the denial of the right to hold ideas that are different—the freedom of man to think as he pleases. To strike freedom of the mind with the fist of patriotism is an old and ugly subtlety."

We need a fist now to strike a blow for freedom. We also need the intelligence to deal with the Russians and to combat the serious problems created by mounting international unrest (i.e., Turkey, Japan, Korea). Stevenson can provide us with both. As he said: "I think the trouble is not in the Nation's energy, its will or its nerve * * *. The root of the trouble lies in this: The Nation faces a series of massive changes in the world scene; they call for new ways of looking at the world; for new policies; for increased efforts."

"But he is a two-time loser" will cry those who oppose him. This is fallacious reasoning. Stevenson lost not because of what he was but what Eisenhower seemed to be. Americans like heroes and father images. Eisenhower supplied both, packaged in ribbons of peace and prosperity. Unfortunately today our peace is precarious and our prosperity perches dizzily on the mountain of inflation.

There is still time for Americans to choose the right man to cope with these and other pressing problems in the world's biggest battle, the battle of ideas. This is a time to call for greatness. It is the grave responsibility of the Democratic Party to nominate the man who measures up to such a call.

He is Adlai E. Stevenson.

KENNEDY FOR VICE PRESIDENT

Next to Stevenson, Senator JOHN KENNEDY is the ablest Democratic candidate. He has shown a remarkable vote-getting ability in the primaries; his energy and forthrightness have won the hearts of many Americans. But his youth and relative inexperience in dealing with world leaders could be a handicap at a time when we must have the best possible man—or else. He would make a strong running mate in the second spot on the ticket. For the sake of this country, the Democrats should choose a Stevenson-Kennedy slate in July.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News, June 3, 1960]

STEVENSON'S "GRAND STRATEGY"

Adlai Stevenson may keep on insisting he's no candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, but his recent speech setting forth "a grand strategy for peace" belies all denials.

The Nation ever appreciates suggestions from its finest minds; but Mr. Stevenson's speech, coming when it does and replete with criticism of the Eisenhower administration, reveals a man with an eye still on the glittering prize.

Yet his sixth speech in 7 weeks, delivered to the Textile Workers Union of America, an organization which has already endorsed Senator Kennedy, is clearly a thoughtful blueprint for international action. His 5-point program includes these:

1. Build up a deterrent power and a limited war capability with NATO allies that does not depend on budget penny-pinching.

2. Strengthen the Western alliance by "building a stronger political and economic community in the free world" and setting up an Atlantic Council.

3. Engage with our allies in planning a long-range aid program for underdeveloped countries.

4. Assert that general and complete disarmament under international control is "an imperative for all of us."

5. Demonstrate the effectiveness of freedom in the United States by meeting needs for schooling, research, health, housing and all forms of public services.

Mr. Stevenson's "grand strategy" contains little in the way of new proposals, except perhaps creation of an Atlantic Council. But it has the value of being put together in coherent form.

Our trouble is not that no one seems to know what to do. Most of Mr. Stevenson's admirable suggestions have been made before. Each one is probably lying around on somebody's desk in Washington. No doubt different individuals on lower levels of Government have forwarded such proposals.

The difficulty is that vision and imagination are lacking at the very top. President Eisenhower has never been able to take these ideas and tie them into a unified, clearly understandable whole. Worse, there has been little disposition to push even those excellent objectives which have been enunciated.

Adlai Stevenson's "grand strategy for peace" is not unassailable. Nor is it completely definitive. But it demonstrates what happens when a brilliant mind looks over the world scene and attempts to come up with a program that fits our needs in the 20th century.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 8, 1960]

STATE'S DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION SHOULD VOTE FOR STEVENSON

Adlai Stevenson for President.

That should be the unanimous choice of the Gov. Edmund G. Brown headed California delegation to the Democratic National Convention which won handsomely at yesterday's presidential primary.

There is every reason why the 81 votes of the State's delegation should go to the former Governor of Illinois, not a single logical reason why they should not.

This is a time of crisis in the affairs of our Nation and of the entire world. The future of the country and the fate of the world will be the paramount issue in the 1960 presidential campaign. Leadership is the prime need of the hour.

To cope with this crisis, to meet the issue headon and to present it to the people in a forthright, truthful and convincing manner, one man in the Democratic Party stands head and shoulders above all seekers after the nomination.

That man is Adlai Stevenson.

Stevenson is a man of mature wisdom, of ability, of great intellectual capacity, of sound judgment and vision. He is a man who has firsthand knowledge of world conditions. And he is a man who has gained the respect and admiration of people throughout the civilized world.

He is a man of experience in the business world as well as in the field of government. He would be the answer to the need for an administration in Washington that would talk sense to the people and work diligently at the complex business of government.

And he would be the answer too for what he himself describes as the need for a "grand strategy for peace" to restore confidence in America's leadership and to take the initiative in the cold war.

Stevenson would make peace and disarmament the key goals of our foreign policy, for as he said last week "peace and general and complete disarmament under international control have become an imperative for all nations."

Stevenson is a profound thinker, a prolific originator of ideas and he has the courage and the ability to project his opinions to the Nation in a clear and forceful English.

In the 1956 presidential campaign, for instance, he fearlessly and eloquently advocated the suspension of nuclear bomb testings. For this he was violently denounced by the Republican opposition. He virtually was called a traitor.

Yet a few months later the Eisenhower administration adopted this very policy but conveniently neglected to give any credit to Stevenson.

Another compelling reason why the California delegation to the Democratic convention should vote for Stevenson is that he is a native son, having been born in Los Angeles, February 5, 1900.

And there is every reason to believe Stevenson would carry California in the general election as he most certainly would many other States.

In fact, Stevenson's nationwide popularity never has been higher even though he is not an announced candidate for the Democratic nomination. This is a tribute to his appeal to the rank and file voters who know Stevenson to be a man who understands that government in the United States is designed to serve the people, not to make them its lackeys. He has the human touch.

Vacillation is a noun that is not in Stevenson's vocabulary.

There is no fluctuation of mind or unsteadiness in the former Governor's makeup. He is a man of action, a straight from the shoulder puncher.

As he has demonstrated in his brilliant speeches and in his writings, Stevenson talks sense to the American people.

And as the nominee of the Democratic Party he would be a dynamic and courageous leader in what he has termed the "long and continuing struggle for peace and freedom which is the destiny of this generation of Americans."

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, May 21, 1960]

NO MAN BETTER EQUIPPED TO LEAD U.S. THAN ADLAI

As a refreshing sort of gentleman-politician, Adlai Stevenson has refrained from thrusting himself upon the Democrats.

He feels, obviously, that it would be unseemly, as a double loser, to make a third bid for the Presidency by frontal assault upon the convention. He is hardly in a position to ask immodestly for its third endorsement.

Yet, as it is generally conceded even by Republicans, no Democrat could have won in 1952 or 1956 against the enormously popular Gen. Ike Eisenhower. It was unfortunate that a man of Stevenson's stature should have been chosen by fate to oppose a glamorous war leader.

These facts aren't entirely lost upon the Democrats. There are signs, here and there, that Stevenson's hard-core supporters are attracting large groups of sympathizers. Stevenson-for-President committees are springing up in first one State and then another.

While this is encouraging to the man in the street who believes only a Stevenson can properly represent him in today's tangled world negotiations, the rather amateurish Stevenson committees, substituting emotion in many cases for practical politics, had no great effect on the professionals.

That was changed Thursday night when Stevenson's Chicago speech made it clear that he'll not shy from the nomination if it is offered to him. This was one area in which the professionals had been left in doubt. Having made his position clear on that score, Stevenson went further to indicate that he has strong and definite conclusions on the proper management of American affairs, especially in connection with the Russian question.

Obviously disturbed by bungling attempts at diplomacy on the part of the Eisenhower administration, Stevenson was the old campaigner. Forcefully and effectively, he drew an indictment bound to impress Americans with his concern for them.

Having heard Stevenson, it is disturbing to contemplate the complete trust the Nation placed in the competence of a war hero. Teetering on first one brink, then another, the administration has dealt clumsily with crisis after crisis. Lacking Stevenson's background in government and untouched by Stevenson's understanding, the President has permitted himself to be guided by the profit-conscious businessmen who have advised him during two terms. These men simply aren't equipped to deal with the shrewd negotiators for Russia.

Stevenson is. During his visit here, Khrushchev himself appeared to be a trifle awed by the Stevenson intellect. We noted with interest that Khrushchev dominated all meetings except the one with Stevenson. On that occasion, Stevenson took polite and diplomatic charge.

Stevenson's Thursday speech indicated that, if asked, he is willing to take charge of American affairs as President. We can't think of a better equipped man for the job.

The Mexican Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I present to the House a letter that I received today from Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell regarding H.R. 12176, to extend the Mexican labor program:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, June 15, 1960.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: I am informed that a vote may soon come up on a bill to extend the Mexican labor program, commonly referred to as Public Law 78. The bill for this purpose is H.R. 12176. I understand also that some question may exist as to the position of the Department of Labor and of the administration with respect to this bill.

In order to dispel any possible uncertainty on this score, I am writing to make it clear that the administration and the Department of Labor are opposed to passage of H.R. 12176. After mature consideration, the administration has concluded that improvements in the Mexican labor program are necessary, and that legislation should be delayed until the administration's proposals for improvement can be made available. The highly controversial problems in this field may be made even more difficult by undue haste in consideration and decision.

Since the existing law does not expire until June 30, 1961, there will be ample time for consideration of the administration's recommendations in the next session of the Congress. Please let me know of any further assistance that I may be able to offer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

Private Affluence and Public Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William White, one of the leading citizens of my constitutency, has shown a very penetrating interest in the affairs of our Government. He is concerned, and properly so, over the manner in which the government is directing funds to certain segments of the populace which I might call pressure groups.

I enclose an article which Mr. White feels—and I agree with him—is very trenchant and worthwhile in the light of our present fiscal position and the future well-being of the country.

The article follows:

[From First National City Bank Monthly Letter, New York, June 1960]

PRIVATE AFFLUENCE AND PUBLIC POVERTY

In recent years it has become fashionable to say that the United States presents a shocking contrast between private wealth and public poverty. Private citizens are pictured as so affluent that they really don't need all the money they have. On the other hand, it is argued that Government is "poverty-stricken" and urgently needs more money. Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith's presentation of these views in "The Affluent Society" made the best-seller lists and became a provocative topic for conversation. Now the issue has been taken to Washington.

A recent New York Times dispatch by Edwin L. Dale reported that: "More and more people in the Capital are convinced that the most important continuing issue of American policy and politics over the next decade will be the issue of public spending—what share of America's total resources should be devoted to public as distinct from private purposes." Mr. Dale summed up the view on "private affluence and public poverty" as follows:

"Our society has reached a level of private wealth never before seen on this earth.

"Yet at the same time there is poverty in the public sector of the economy. Education is underfinanced. Streams are polluted. There remains a shortage of hospital beds. Slums proliferate, and there is a gap in middle-income housing. We could use more and better parks, streets, detention facilities, water supply. The very quality of American life is suffering from these lacks—much more than from any lack of purely private goods and services. The share of Government in the total economy has been stable or even declining, while private affluence grows."

This is quite an indictment of the free society that has given the masses of the American people wealth and living standards admired the world over.

ANTI-GOVERNMENT FIXATION?

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, addressing a distinguished group of citizens at Arden House last month, expressed the fear that an anti-Government fixation in America might lead to a new anarchy. This is a rather shocking thought. Most people have had the impression that Government was taking on a bigger and bigger role in their lives, digging more deeply into their pockets for taxes, spending so much as to inflate prices, and offering more and more Federal funds for free about the countryside.

The idea that the role of Government should be limited is the central underpinning of American democracy; it grew out of the rebellion in 1775 against kingly power and led to the writing of a Constitution of limited powers designed to protect the freedom and sovereignty of the citizens. This was, perhaps, the old anarchy, under which, fired by individual enterprise in a land of opportunity, a group of agricultural colonies clustered along the eastern seaboard expanded into the most prosperous Nation on earth.

Senator CLARK's fears seem rather farfetched. The trend of events has been in the other direction, toward assumption by Government of more and more responsibilities. If there is anything that could be called anti-Government fixation today it is only a small voice in the wilderness protesting against burgeoning Federal bureaucracy and the tax confiscation of the greater part of the fruits of enterprise. In April 1957 we presented a calculation that if total Government civilian employment continued to expand at the same rate as in the preceding 25 years we would all be working for Government by the year 2069.

It is hard to see evidences of the alleged shriveling of the share of Government in the total economy. Such evidences do not appear in statistics of Government employment, tax revenues collected, or funds disbursed. As the table shows, there has been no lack of spectacular increases in outlays for social welfare, highways, sanitation facilities, jails, and the rest.

If we are headed for a "new anarchy," symptoms might be expected to appear in refusals of people to pay what they might regard as unconscionable tax levies. It is true there has been talk that some $8 billion of income is not reported for tax purposes; nevertheless the fact remains that, with voluntary filing and reporting by tens of millions of individuals and hundreds of thousands of employers, the Federal Government is enjoying a bigger flow of cash income than any other government on earth, a cool $100 billion a year. If the Federal Government is indeed impoverished, the

cause must be profligacy of expenditures rather than stinginess of the citizen. The amazing thing is how so much money can be disposed of so fast.

	Mid-1920's	1940	Late 1950's
Government expenditures and gross national product (in billions of dollars unless otherwise noted):			
Federal cash expenditures	2.8	9.6	94.8
State and local government expenditures	7.7	10.3	48.8
Gross national product	97.6	95.6	463.8
Percent: Government expenditures to gross national product	10.8	20.8	31.0
Selected public expenditures (in millions of dollars):			
Social insurance benefits	----	1,215	15,975
Highway expenditures	1,819	2,177	8,702
Aid to other transportation	257	377	1,629
Public welfare and assistance	161	1,314	3,777
Police	290	386	1,769
Fire protection	203	235	873
Sanitation	312	207	1,505
Local parks and recreation	153	162	685
Jails and other correctional	68	105	573
Health	84	195	806
Hospitals	347	537	3,849
Education	2,243	2,827	16,836
Other measures (in millions unless otherwise noted):			
Number of personal income tax returns [1]	4.2	14.8	59.8
Government employment	2.8	4.2	8.1
Educational enrollment [2]	30.7	32.1	46.3
High school graduates, total number	(3)	25.7	51.6
College graduates, total number	(3)	3.9	8.1
Paved rural roads (miles)	.5	1.3	2.1
National park acreage	9.6	21.6	24.4
Visitors to national parks	2.1	16.8	65.5
Social security coverage as percent of paid employment	0	64.5	90.5
Public housing units (thousands)	0	60.9	444.7

[1] Includes returns of estates and trusts which numbered less than one percent of individual returns in 1940 and 1957.
[2] Includes public and private schools from elementary to university level.
[3] Not available.

Sources: Figures are taken from U.S. Census Bureau's Surveys of Governmental Finances in the United States; U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Health, Education, and Welfare Trends; and other official publications.

NO STINGINESS HERE

How generous the citizen has been with government, compared with what he has kept for himself, is shown in the chart. [Not printed in RECORD]. There has been a 20 times multiplication of the Federal Government's cash intake in the past generation. Personal disposable income—the money people have left after income taxes to support themselves and pay other taxes—is not much more than four times the level of 1927. The rise for corporate profits (after taxes) would parallel the retarded gain for personal disposable income.

One excuse given for enlarging programs of financial assistance from the Federal Government to States and municipalities is that people cannot or will not provide the latter with enough money. No doubt the weight of Federal income taxation leads many people to vote against costly State and local government projects involving still more taxes; nevertheless, State and local government income has risen to more than five times the level of 1927.

THE SANTA CLAUS SCHOOL

It is difficult to see in any figures such as these support for the idea that government is poverty stricken. Nevertheless, it is a fact of record that the Federal Government has had a lot of trouble keeping its budget balanced. The reason emerges when one looks around at the bewildering variety of spending programs. Washington is the natural destination of people and local communities wanting money, as it has been since the advent of what the late Jesse Jones, former RFC Chairman, characterized as the "free-spending, Santa Claus school of Government reformers." Meanwhile, the purposes for which funds are sought have come a long way from the emergency relief programs of the 1930's. Encouraged by Federal help and example, the States open their purse strings. Only a few months ago, a New York State Supreme Court decision held that public housing projects open to individuals and families with annual incomes of as much as $6,200 to $14,000 were legally entitled to be built under New York State's low-income housing program.

It might be asked on what principle government should subsidize normal living expenses for people with incomes double the national average. Who but themselves will pay the bill—with freight charges to and from Washington tacked on. A good deal of manpower gets wasted, collecting taxes and doling out benefits in the paradoxically poverty-stricken affluent society.

The truth seems to be that we are caught in a vicious circle in which people's abilities to take care of their own needs are hampered by the burden of taxes. Paying so much in taxes, the citizen is tempted to think it only right to get something back. Hence the needs government sees for more and bigger subsidy programs which in turn require to be financed by still higher taxes or inflation. And inflation, hitting the weak and helpless hardest, creates still more needs.

MATTER OF TAIL FINS

The preachers of the affluent society doctrine are fond of using tail fins on automobiles as the ultimate symbol of unnecessary private extravagance. They are not so apt to mention the wheat bins holding surplus grain for which taxpayers have put up more than $3 billion and which, converted into bread, would provide 450 loaves for every man, woman, and child in this country. They say nothing about misconceived public works projects and the common abuses of social welfare programs. On May 16, Budget Director Maurice H. Stans found it necessary to revise Federal travel regulations to encourage more flying by coach or tourist class instead of first class by Government employees:

"These revisions are issued to call attention to the fact that the use of first-class air travel by Government employees far exceeds in proportion its use by the general public, and to urge greater consideration of less costly facilities."

Tail fins on automobiles are supposed to prove that people are foolish in their spending decisions and cannot be trusted with their own money. There are two schools of thought about tail fins but it is quite clear that millions of people have preferred them; otherwise the finned vehicle would not be so common. Perhaps the surrey with the fringe on top was similarly condemned in the Gay Nineties, as a symbol of "conspicuous consumption."

Yet it is one of the proud distinguishing marks of a classless democratic society that any citizen with enough money or credit can have a car, suit, dress, or home with some seemingly useless ornamentation; he does not have to be somebody in an official sense. People work hard so that they can enjoy these things and be individuals rather than the drones of a master state.

The New York World-Telegram & Sun, on May 23, commented editorially on the subject:

"There is much scornful talk of "luxury living," the implication being that people are so stupid they throw their money away on gadgets instead of essentials. Actually, this national growth has been widely spread. The significant effect has been to raise millions in America from a level of bare subsistence to modest comfort that remains far short of luxury.

"Older citizens can remember when the "full dinner pail" was an effective political slogan, meaning the worker should have enough to eat. Today's trade unionist is no "simple working man" to be patronized with a few beers at election time. He's a substantial citizen who probably owns his own home, auto and TV set, with children in college.

"It seems obvious to us that it would be the height of national irresponsibility to trade a system which has worked so well for a Socialist-inspired experiment, especially at a time when the early European sponsors of socialism are abandoning it for free enterprise."

The author of "The Affluent Society" has been characterized as an iconoclast although nothing has become more common and conventional than asking government to take over more powers and responsibilities from the citizen. It is notable that another member of this school of thought, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, does pause to recognize that:

"Without individual decision and inventiveness, without widely dispersed centers of authority and responsibility, the social order grows rigid and centralized. Spontaneity withers before the killing frost of public conformity. Individual citizens with all their varied relationships, as parents, neighbors, churchgoers, workers, businessmen, are reduced to the single loyalties of party and state."

THE SCHOOL PROBLEM

Perhaps the most widely used illustration of alleged public poverty is our school system. We are told that while the American people drive around in mauve and cerise, air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobiles, their children's schools are old and overcrowded. The charge is that the States and local communities, which in the United States are responsible for education, just haven't been doing their job. What is needed, the critics say, is Federal money for education, with some proposals running to $4 billion a year. As a speaker at the convention of the American Association of School Administrators put it: "The Federal Government, that's where the money is. And that's where the money must come from."

No country comes close to rivaling American spending on education. Total public and private expenditures for education in the United States reached $22 billion in 1959, almost triple their level 10 years earlier.

To say that the Nation's schools are old and overcrowed collides with the fact that the States and local communities have built 680,000 classrooms since World War II, more than half the 1,330,000 now in use. The classroom shortage, supposed to justify Federal intervention, has been shrinking steadily. Back in 1955 predictions were heard that we would be 600,000 classrooms short by 1958. When 1958 arrived, the U.S. Office of Education estimated the shortage at 141,900. Although the peak demands for high school and college facilities lie ahead, we have passed over the hump of elementary school enrollments. The job of building to make up for the deferral of school construction during the war, and the bulge in births immediately after the war, is largely past.

Some educators suggest that the trouble with U.S. education is excess emphasis on money and too little emphasis on what we are getting for the money; excess emphasis on elaborate new plant and to many idle hours for existing plant; excess emphasis on quantity of education and too little on quality. Schools which slight subjects with intellectual content in favor of "life adjust-

ment" type courses are not going to be improved by more money. The problem is one of purpose, as Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, indicated in January: "Our public schools and far too many of our colleges have virtually abdicated their functions in society because they are content to give their students little more than an opportunity to have pleasurable social experiences." Prof. Richard M. Weaver, of the University of Chicago, has put the same point even more strongly:

"Education here today suffers from an unprecedented amount of aimlessness and confusion. This is not to suggest that education in the United States, as compared with other countries, fails to command attention and support. In our laws we have endorsed it without qualification, and our provision for it, despite some claims to the contrary, has been on a lavish scale. But we behold a situation in which, as the educational plants become larger and more finely appointed, what goes on in them becomes more diluted, less serious, less effective in training mind and character; and correspondingly what comes out of them becomes less equipped for the rigorous tasks of carrying forward an advanced civilization."

SOME FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES

One trouble with the idea of turning our affairs over to the dictates of wise men sitting in Government offices is that it clashes with the traditional beliefs of our people. The right to be different, the right to live according to our own lights is rooted too deeply in the American soil to be passively given up. The citizen has no reason to believe that public officials are exempt from human frailties. As Mr. Stans, speaking before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said last month: "We must not be charmed by the notion that Government is a wiser manager of our economic fortunes than is private enterprise."

It is hard to see how political freedom can survive if economic freedom is denied. When people spend their money they are casting ballots for what ought to be produced. They all make mistakes, as Government does in its procurement, but they may be a bit more careful because, after all, the money they are spending is their own. Moreover, the mistakes of individuals are small mistakes, never the billion-dollar variety.

Tens of thousands in graduating classes this month, going out into the world, inevitably will make mistakes and profit thereby. This is an essential part of education, building wise and responsible citizens. As we all should know, the best remembered lessons are those learned in the school of experience.

Life would get very dull if we had to conform to some fixed pattern and deny ourselves the precious possessions that distinguish life in the free society. Surely, effort would wane and with it the means for supporting the vast Government Establishment.

There are beyond doubt some Government programs suffering from lack of sufficient funds. If this is so, it is hardly because the people are too rich, or inadequately taxed, but because Government is trying to do more things than it can handle with real competence. The real point at issue is how much further—if at all—we can safely go toward discouraging individual initiative, self-reliance, and industrious habits. The barrage of complaints over inadequate economic growth would seem to suggest that we need to concern ourselves more, rather than less, with the human aspirations that make the economy go.

A Sensible Public Policy for the Employment of Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is still time and I most earnestly hope we will be granted the opportunity to act before adjournment on one of the many bills, including my own, H.R. 12106, which have been introduced and are designed to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

I would like to extend my own appreciation to the Fraternal Order of Eagles, who have certainly earned the gratitude of the Nation, for their original and persevering projection of the basic purpose of this proposed legislation, which is to set forth a public policy, in one vital area of the country's economy with respect to discrimination in employment because of age, where the reasonable demands of such employment do not require this age distinction.

A brief summary of the facts and the statistics involved distinctly reveals the national importance of the problem.

According to the Department of Labor our population, by 1970, will total 220 million. They estimate that during this time the number of people now between 25 and 44, totaling 46 million, will increase only to about 48.2 million. Their further estimate is that in this same period, the total number of people over 45, now 50.2 million, will increase to approximately 61.8 million.

The problem becomes quite obvious when we realize that while the national economy must be kept expanding to meet the needs of our increasing population, the preferred working group, between 25 and 44, will become relatively scarcer. Although the present and growing need, in such an economy, for the services of the older workers is self-evident, it is equally apparent they are not getting their fair share of employment opportunities.

The reluctance or refusal of employers to engage older workers is a national handicap. The report by the U.S. Department of Labor, conducted in 1956, disclosed that 58 percent of job openings had some upper age restriction; 52 percent barred workers 55 and over; 41 percent barred those 45 and over; and 20 percent barred those 35 and over.

The practical commonsense and the economic wisdom of this employer attitude is certainly open to question when we examine the figures developed from studies made by the Department of Labor in the matter.

For example, they found, in 1951, that of 3,000 employers interviewed 93 percent rated the work performance of older employees as equal to or superior to younger workers. They further found that older workers have a 20 percent better attendance record than younger employees; that employees 45 and over had 2.5 percent fewer disabling injuries, and 25 percent fewer nondisabling injuries than the younger workers; that voluntary turnover rates are less among older employees; that the older worker is very likely to possess more skills, training, and all-around knowledge than younger people. Even further than that, a recognized group of experts reported that under pension and insurance plans most prevalent today, there is no significant increase in costs for new employment of older workers.

In summary, with admission of certain exceptions, study and experience has demonstrated the economic wisdom of hiring older workers, not to mention the great contribution that would thus be given to the national welfare and the personal health and happiness of the individuals concerned.

There is then, Mr. Speaker, the obvious need for the establishment, now, of this public policy, and approval of this legislation ought not to be further delayed.

All of the measures proposed are in full accord with our basic American tradition; they are all economically feasible, and they are all in the best national interest. The impact of this proposed legislation is entirely reasonable and includes provision for formal hearings, judicial appeal, and the exercise of Presidential discretion.

In patriotic consideration of the national welfare and in Christian concern for our older workers, I sincerely hope that this proposed legislation will soon be placed before the Congress for action.

Postponement of President's Visit to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I have received from the executive secretary of the American Committee on Japan, in regard to the postponement of the President's scheduled visit to Japan.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 16, 1960.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

While deploring reasons that forced Kishi government to request President postpone scheduled visit to Japan, we believe such action necessary and proper under circumstances to protect President and preserve

Japanese-American relations. At same time, we continue in our conviction overwhelming majority of Japanese people favor continued close relations with United States and ratification of treaty mutual cooperation and security. Most Japanese, we feel, will be ashamed of what their government had to do regarding presidential visit after 15 years of American help and friendship. We anticipate revulsion and reaction by most Japanese against Communist-inspired violence. Therefore, we urge Senate ratify treaty overwhelmingly this afternoon to demonstrate that neither Congress, nor Government, or people of United States will be intimidated by mobs and demonstrations directed by Red China and Soviet masterminds, that we support representative government and constituted authority, that regardless of what the Japanese may now do we will at least live up to our solemn commitment and ratify bilateral agreement for mutual benefit both nations to replace current unilateral arrangement promulgated prior effective date of peace treaty. To do less would add to victory of anti-American elements in Japan, increase prestige of Sino-Soviet agitators, and further embarrass our friends in Japan who believe in future of democracy and representative government.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON JAPAN,
MIKE MASAOKA, *Executive Secretary.*

The Strongest Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Strongest Tickets" from the magazine, the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation, Apr. 23, 1960]

THE STRONGEST TICKETS

All the palaver about polls and primaries is diverting public attention from a point of cardinal importance in the preconvention phase of this year's election. The point is this: The national interest would best be served if both parties were to nominate the strongest ticket each can name. To the extent that either party fails to do so, for whatever reason, the greater will be the likelihood that the campaign will be fought on minor, divisive, or extraneous issues. Fortunately, it is within the power of both parties to name tickets that would be so evenly matched that the nominees could do nothing but stand there, toe-to-toe, and fight it out—squarely, fiercely, directly—on the main issues.

These ideal tickets are easy to name. Everyone agrees that NIXON and Rockefeller, in either order, would be the strongest ticket the Republicans could field. It is almost as widely conceded—by everyone, that is, except the candidates—that the strongest Democratic ticket would be Stevenson and KENNEDY in that order. Rockefeller and KENNEDY are, so to speak, political twins: rich, attractive, knowledgeable, charismatic; both are excellent campaigners and fine public servants. For the Vice Presidency, Senator KENNEDY would be an ideal nominee; that he would not be the Democrats' strongest Presidential nominee is most convincingly attested, perhaps, by the consistent, highly suspicious efforts of Vice President NIXON to give him a leg-up for the nomination. In 1952 and 1956, Stevenson faced insurmountable difficulties not merely in the fact that his opponent was General Eisenhower, but also in the temper of the times and the unavoidable inheritance of the Truman-Acheson cold-war policies and their consequences. But in 1960, and against NIXON, all of Stevenson's finest qualities would shine to advantage; his special strength, for example, is with independent voters, few of whom admire the Vice President.

In the key States—California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New York—Stevenson and Kennedy versus Nixon and Rockefeller would be a battle royal between evenly matched antagonists. Apart from individual ambitions and petty vested interests, all that delays widespread recognition of the strength of these tickets is the popular assumption that neither KENNEDY nor Rockefeller could ever be induced to accept nomination for the Vice Presidency. But there is really little basis for this assumption. Both are honorable men, devoted to the public interest, with a keen sense of their political and personal responsibilities. The Vice Presidency, after all, is the second highest elective honor within the power of the American people to bestow; it is not to be declined lightly or out of personal preference or pique—particularly by men who can well afford to serve the public interest. Let both parties name their strongest tickets and this year's campaign could turn out to be a dramatic and meaningful debate on the major issues.

Next in Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I include an editorial from this morning's edition of the Washington Post. This commentary is particularly interesting in view of the recent action by the Inter-American Peace Committee with regard to the Dominican Republic. When regarded against the background of tension attributable to activities of the Castro government, this account of Castro's latest executions should leave little doubt about which nation is next in line for scrutiny by the peace committee.

The editorial follows:

FULL CIRCLE

The drumhead trial and execution of three rebels in Cuba signify that the island is only a half step from rule by terror. Capt. Manuel Beaton and his two companions were not Batista war criminals. Instead, they were the first of Fidel Castro's original supporters to be put to death for supposedly counterrevolutionary activities. The trial was a mockery of justice; the five-man military court took only 17 minutes to find Beaton and his comrades guilty of treason. And all this took place only 4 days after Beaton was captured in the Sierra Maestra, where his insurgent group had been hiding out.

It is instructive to compare the treatment of Beaton with that given Castro himself in 1953 by the "monster," Fulgencio Batisto. On July 26 of that year, Castro led an armed attack on the Moncada barracks in Santiago de Cuba. Caught, imprisoned, and subsequently tried, Castro received an opportunity to defend himself—a right wholly denied Beaton. The Havana Bar Association offered legal assistance, and in court Castro was able to speak for hours and make his case before the Cuban people.

Even so, Castro was outraged by the procedure. "Never, against an accused, has there been committed so many overwhelming irregularities," Castro charged. Though he urged revolutionary opposition to Batista, Castro was sentenced to 15 years in prison and subsequently released in a general amnesty.

One wonders what the old Fidel Castro would have said about the kangaroo court that doomed Manuel Beaton. In 1953, Castro justified his armed onslaught because the government then was unconstitutional. "We have promoted rebellion against a single illegitimate power that has usurped and united into one man the legislative and executive powers of the nation," he cried.

No doubt this is precisely the case that would now be made against Castro—if his victims had any opportunity to speak in their own defense.

Adlai E. Stevenson Would Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, following the endorsement of Adlai Stevenson for the Democratic nomination by Mrs. Roosevelt on Friday, June 10, 1960, Governor Stevenson issued a statement concerning his willingness to run once again for the highest office in our land.

I should like to quote from Mr. Stevenson's statement as follows:

I think I have made it clear in my public life that I will serve my country and my party when called upon.

The complete text of Governor Stevenson's statement was printed in Mrs. Roosevelt's column of Monday, June 13, 1960, and I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Roosevelt's column of that date be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON EXPLAINS AVAILABILITY—MRS. ROOSEVELT RELEASES ANSWER TO QUERY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

On Friday of last week I telephoned Mr. Stevenson because of a misunderstanding which seemed to exist, both on the part of Professor Schlesinger and Professor Commager and of Chairman Butler of the National Democratic Committee as to whether he would be a candidate or not, and I asked him to clarify his position for me. I quote his statement:

"I am deeply affected by what you have said of me but I do confess that your request that I clarify my position presents some difficulty. I realize that under present circumstances even a restatement of what has been said before may be given unintended and unwarranted interpretation.

"I have, as you know, taken no part in presidential politics for the past 3 years. And I do not now intend to try to influence

the nomination in any way by endorsing anyone, or trying to stop anyone, or seeking it myself.

"I have not made and will not make any deals with anyone.

"I am not, as you recognize in your statement, a declared candidate. This leaves only the question, again in your terms, of shirking public responsibility.

"I have declined repeatedly to comment on questions about a draft. I think I have made it clear in my public life, however, that I will serve my country and my party whenever called upon.

"I believe the Democratic Convention will select a man fully competent to lead the country in these dangerous times; I expect to support its decision with all my heart and energy."

From this statement, I think you will find it clear that Mr. Stevenson is a candidate, since there is a sizable number of people who are asking him to accept the responsibility of being the candidate for the Democratic Party in the next convention.

After all, in 1952 he was not a candidate either, but he did not refuse when the convention and President Truman asked him to run as a candidate. To many of us this seemed an impossible situation, for we knew that a war hero, particularly one who told the women of the country that he would bring the war in Korea to an end, was going to be elected by the vote of the women and the young people in the country. The glamour of the war hero plus the feeling that many women have had that President Eisenhower, because he was a general, would somehow keep us out of war more easily than a civilian would, gave them a greater sense of security. I think Eisenhower won the 1956 election because of this feeling before the votes were even cast.

Now we have an entirely different situation, and I think there is a ground swell in the country. People feel the need of maturity and have confidence in Adlai Stevenson, and are asking him to run again. I will have to confess that I personally would not ask him to run because I think being defeated twice and now running in all probability against a man who will make the campaign as disagreeable as possible, is something no one can ask a person to do. But Mr. Stevenson has answered my query for clarification of his position in exactly the way I thought he would, and stress again his words: "I think I have made it clear in my public life, however, that I would serve my country and my party whenever called upon."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, within hours after Mrs. Roosevelt's column appeared in the Nation's newspapers stating that "Mr. Stevenson is a candidate," Governor Stevenson issued another statement in which he said that he said that he was not a candidate.

This exchange between Mrs. Roosevelt and Governor Stevenson caused a great deal of speculation in the country. Many people felt that perhaps the Governor had withdrawn himself from the possibility of accepting a draft at the Democratic National Convention. Such an assumption is simply not the case.

There is no question that, while he is not an active candidate traveling around the country seeking delegate votes, Governor Stevenson if called upon by the convention would nonetheless accept the Democratic nomination.

On Tuesday, June 14, 1960, the Washington Post carried an editorial entitled "Barkis Is Willin' " which clarified this situation. I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1960]

BARKIS IS WILLIN'

The little controversy between Adlai Stevenson and Mrs. Roosevelt over whether or not he is a candidate for the Presidency is more amusing than confusing. It all depends, of course, on what is meant by the word "candidate." Webster says that a candidate is "one who offers himself, or is put forward by others, as a suitable person or an aspirant or contestant for an office." Mr. Stevenson is certainly not a formal candidate; he is not going about asking people to vote for him. But his name is being put forward by others who believe him well qualified for the Presidency, and he has not closed the door to these efforts on his behalf.

In his letter to Mrs. Roosevelt the other day, Mr. Stevenson left no doubt about his intention, regardless of how much controversy there may be over the meaning of the word "candidate." He wrote: "I will serve my country and my party whenever called upon." In other words, Mr. Stevenson, though not a declared candidate, is and always has been available if the Democratic convention in Los Angeles next month should want him.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, last Sunday one of America's most respected, alert newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, announced its editorial endorsement of Adlai Stevenson for the Democratic nomination.

The editorial was entitled "The Democrats' Best Candidate."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 12, 1960]

THE DEMOCRATS' BEST CANDIDATE

The consequences of the summit crisis have posed an imperative for both political parties. Now, more than ever, the national welfare demands the best from Republicans and Democrats alike. We welcome, therefore, Governor Rockefeller's challenge to Vice President NIXON, and hope it develops into a serious contest at the Republican convention. We believe the Democrats, who already have a healthy contest going, can choose their best candidate by nominating Adlai E. Stevenson.

Of all the Democratic candidates, in our opinion, Adlai Stevenson is the ablest and best fitted. He possesses the firmest grasp of a world situation that confronts our nation with the supreme challenge of its history. He has had successful executive experience as the Governor of an important State. He has undergone rigorous training in Democratic leadership by heading his party for 8 years and in two national campaigns. To buttress his valuable experience in the United Nations, he has traveled widely and studied at firsthand every part of the world. Beyond doubt he is the one Democratic candidate who commands the deepest confidence of our allies. He is mature, tested, responsible, intelligent, and creative.

Mr. Stevenson's superior qualifications are, in fact, generally conceded among Democrats. The principal argument against him is that, because he lost to President Eisenhower twice, he could not win against another opponent. This is a myth of expediency which has no basis in history or logic.

William Jennings Bryan ran for President three times—1896, 1900, and 1908—and was defeated three times. But the circumstances of his era cannot be compared with ours; and in any case one precedent does not establish a law of politics. It is now quite evident that no Democrat could have prevailed over the personal popularity of Dwight Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956. Authoritative studies, such as the recent one by Louis H. Bean which is being circulated by Senator MONRONEY, suggest that Mr. Stevenson lost, not because of any voter dissatisfaction with him, but because of the impressive stature of a military hero who seemed above politics.

Thus the argument of political expediency so often heard against Mr. Stevenson is unsound. But even if it were sound, the Democratic convention could not justify making this the criterion of its choice. The party faces a more solemn responsibility than merely trying to calculate the safest way to win an election.

A presidential campaign is a national educational experience. This year above all, both parties have a duty to nominate candidates who will face the issues and debate them. For the Nation, illuminating the issues could be more important than who wins. And it is the people, in the end, who alone decide which candidate can or cannot win. All the polls and all the soothsayers cannot take the ultimate choice away from the voter in the voting booth.

We do not take seriously Harry Truman's criticism of Mr. Stevenson as "indecisive." Mr. Stevenson has demonstrated ample capacity for decision, both as a successful Governor and as a presidential candidate who dared to grapple with great issues as few candidates do. We suspect that what Mr. Truman mistook for indecisiveness in 1952 was a healthy unwillingness by Mr. Stevenson to run as the President's captive candidate. Mr. Truman has never forgiven him that independence, but millions of voters respect him for it.

Much of Mr. Stevenson's popular strength today, in fact, arises from the striking resemblance between the present political situation and that of 1952. Now, as then, Mr. Stevenson refuses to campaign for the nomination. Now, as then, if it comes to him it will come with a minimum of political obligations. As a drafted nominee he would need to grant few of those concessions to the political managers which made his 1956 campaign in some ways a disappointment. Naturally the political managers do not like this. We suspect the voters do.

The Post-Dispatch believes that foreign policy should be the central issue of the campaign. After the fiasco at the summit, America faces the hard task of deciding how best to renew the search begun by President Eisenhower for disarmament and a peaceful accommodation with the Soviet Union. That the search must go on is beyond question; it is the inescapable alternative to an arms race which nobody can win. Where lies the path to a secure peace? The decision cannot be made by sloganeering, by appeals to emotion, by demogogy, by campaigning against Khrushchev. It requires of the candidates patient exploration of alternatives, steady clarity of mind, a capacity to probe beneath the surface for the controlling realities of international life.

Mr. Stevenson has demonstrated, at some political risk, his readiness to draw the issues sharply on foreign policy. While President Eisenhower was in Paris, Mr. Stevenson loyally supported him, but when the conference had ended he spoke his mind boldly. We think he was right in his criticism, but whether one agrees or disagrees it is highly important that those who differ from the administration should say so. To blur the issues, to envelop debate in a fog of misplaced calls for unity, to equivocate on problems which might determine the very future of mankind, would be a grave disservice to the American people.

In 1956, Mr. Stevenson was attacked for advocating a voluntary suspension of detectable H-bomb tests coupled with serious efforts to negotiate an internationally inspected ban on all tests. That is precisely the policy the Eisenhower administration is now following—but following in response to Soviet initiative rather than our own, as Mr. Stevenson advocated. This kind of farsighted and constructive contribution to foreign policy is needed this year as never before.

It is needed, of course, from Republicans as well as Democrats. This is why we welcomed Governor Rockefeller's statement last week, which we hope will be supplemented by further development of his foreign policy views. Though the political facts just now appear to work against an open contest for the Republican nomination, we believe the Nation would be well served by one. If a contest develops, we will express our opinion on it as we now express an opinion on the Democratic contest. As an independent newspaper, the Post-Dispatch is not committed to support either party's nominee in the fall.

Not until the candidates of both parties are known, not until they have drawn the main lines of their campaigns and all the implications of the choice are visible, will it be possible to state a preference for the November election. That choice must be made strictly on the basis of the alternatives and conditions confronting the Nation at the time. On the basis of the alternatives and conditions today, our choice for the Democratic nomination is Adlai E. Stevenson.

Smear Against Congressman Flynt Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., who ably represents Georgia's Fourth Congressional District, is recognized throughout Georgia as a man of character, integrity, and ability. Before he came to Congress, the people of his judicial circuit expressed their confidence in him by electing him solicitor general of the circuit, a position which he filled with honor and credit. His fellow members of the bar elected him president of the Georgia Bar Association, which position he likewise filled with honor and credit.

In his service in Congress he has continued to merit the confidence of the people. An editorial in the June 8 issue of the Metropolitan Herald, published in Atlanta, is indicative of the high regard the people of Georgia have for Congressman FLYNT, and I have asked unanimous consent that it be included in these remarks. The editorial follows:

SMEAR AGAINST CONGRESSMAN FLYNT EXPLODED

The efforts of liberal reporters, cartoonists and a slick magazine to smear Georgia's conservative Congressman JACK FLYNT on charges of using public funds for his own entertainment on a congressional investigation trip have blown up in their face.

Those of us in Georgia who know and respect Congressman FLYNT knew that the charges were false. FLYNT is a man of character, ability and honesty. He is a conservative who believes in economy in government and votes that way. He certainly would not be guilty of using Federal funds for his own enjoyment.

Taking to the floor of the House, after publication of the charges, Congressman FLYNT produced canceled checks and receipts to show that he personally paid for his own entertainment. He won a standing and prolonged ovation from the entire House membership at the close of his speech.

Georgia is fortunate to have in its outstanding congressional delegation JACK FLYNT, representing the Fourth District. For the good of the State and the Nation we hope that the good citizens of the Fourth District keep Mr. FLYNT in the Congress for many years to come.

Sylvester V. McMahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today one of Cleveland's most distinguished and esteemed citizens marks his 87th birthday.

Sylvester V. McMahon was born on June 16, 1873, in Cleveland, Ohio. He was admitted to the Ohio bar in 1899 and actively practiced law with honor and distinction for 52 years in Cleveland. As a young man he served as chief police prosecutor for the city of Cleveland. He was active in Democratic politics and a disciple of the late Tom L. Johnson, one of the greatest mayors Cleveland ever had. Johnson, though a man of wealth, dedicated most of his life to fighting for social justice and standing for the rights of the common people against entrenched power. His statue stands today in the Public Square of Cleveland.

While still a young man, Sylvester V. McMahon was elected county prosecutor for Cuyahoga County. He was the first Democrat elected to that office from the time of the Civil War. He was former president of the Cleveland Bar Association and an outstanding trial lawyer. In his early years he excelled in the trial of criminal cases. He tried many murder cases and never lost a man to the chair. Later he was a leading member of the bar in the trial of personal injury cases.

Sylvester V. McMahon, seeking few public offices himself, has nevertheless been active in politics all of his life. He has always been interested in honest and efficient government and social justice. He has actively supported those candidates whom he believed would make honest, conscientious, public servants. His standards for public office are high and exacting. He has always believed that public office is a sacred public trust.

Sylvester V. McMahon is honored in Cleveland on his 87th birthday. I offer his name to the Nation as one who is worthy of our attention and our esteem.

President's Address Before the Philippine Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in Manila, President Eisenhower delivered a historic statement, the results of which caused great impact throughout those portions of the world that were free to hear it. I take this opportunity to call the particular attention of the House to certain portions of this address relative to the constructive force of honest and rightful nationalism, as it relates to our current international conditions. Living as we and our allies do in lands of freedom, we often fail to recognize the real loss suffered by peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the rightly labeled "captive nations."

To point out this issue, may I, first, quote from the President's address before the Philippine Congress as it appeared in the press today:

This spirit was described by your great leader and my personal friend, Manual Quezon, when he with great eloquence said:

"Rightly conceived, felt, and practiced, nationalism is a tremendous force for good. It strengthens and solidifies a nation. It preserves the best traditions of the past and adds zest to the ambition of enlarging the inheritance of the people. It is, therefore, a dynamic urge for continuous self-improvement. In time, it enriches the sum total of mankind's cultural, moral, and material possessions through the individual and characteristic contribution of each people."

A NOTE OF CAUTION

Significantly, President Quezon had this caution to offer: "So long as the nationalist sentiment is not fostered to the point where a people forgets that it forms a part of the human family, that the good of mankind should be the ultimate aim of each and every nation, and that conflicting national interests are only temporary, and that there is always a just formula for adjusting them—nationalism is a noble, elevating, and most beneficial sentiment."

In these words of clarity and timeless wisdom, President Quezon spoke a message forever applicable to human affairs, particularly to the circumstances of this era.

In addition to the immediate impact, the following words in the President's message as reported by the press will have particular significance during Captive Nations Week, July 12 to 23 of this year, when we reaffirm in behalf of the peoples presently oppressed behind the Soviet Iron Curtain the cherished hope that true freedom will once again be theirs:

Nationalism is a mighty and relentless force. No conspiracy of power, no compulsion of arms can stifle it forever. The constructive nationalism defined by President Quezon is a noble, persistent, fiery inspiration, essential to the development of a young nation. Within its ideal my own country since its earliest days has striven to achieve the American dream and destiny. We respect this quality in our sister nation.

Communist leaders fear constructive nationalism as a mortal foe. This fear is evident in the continuing efforts of the Com-

munist conspiracy to penetrate nationalist movements, to pervert them, and to pirate them for their own evil objectives.

To dominate—if they can—the eternal impulse of national patriotism, they use force and threats of force, subversion and bribery, propaganda and spurious promises. They deny the dignity of men and have subjected many millions to the execution of master plans dictated in faraway places.

Communism demands subservience to a single ideology, to a straitjacket of ideas and approaches and methods. Freedom of individuals or nations to them is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, in studying recent history, it is well for us to note that in the last 8 years the Soviet monster has been prevented by our effective foreign policy from seizing control of any free nation whereas in the preceding 8 years, 1944–52, the following nations and their brave peoples lost their freedom: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria.

We must keep them in mind at all times especially, as I indicated above, in our commemorative occasions in Captive Nations Week. While we have arrested the spread of communism, and have rededicated ourselves to rolling back the Iron Curtain, the nations of the free world have been granting freedom to lands once subject to their control. President Eisenhower, in addressing the Philippine Congress aptly described this as follows:

Since 1945, 33 lands that were once subject to Western control have peaceably achieved self-determination. These 33 countries have a population of almost a billion people. During the same period, 12 countries in the Sino-Soviet sphere have been forcibly deprived of their independence. The question might be asked: Who are today the colonialists?

Certainly, though we may disagree in detail, we are all united in the fundamental principle that the torch of freedom must be carried to the remotest corners of the earth. In these days of increased international tension, the people of the United States are giving their wholehearted support to a Chief Executive who is effectively dedicating himself to true world peace, and who, by his actions and affirmative pronouncements, has carried to millions of people in the nations he recently has visited the true story of the love of freedom and the heart of humanity that is so symbolic of our national foreign policy.

Granting Representation in the Electoral College to the District of Columbia

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 757) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 757 which proposes and amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia by granting representation in the electoral college.

Mr. Chairman, the framers of the Constitution did a magnificent job in providing guidelines and protecting individual rights of the citizens of this great Republic. It is a true charter for freemen living with one another in peace and harmony. No other Constitution has stood such rigid tests or served as well so many men. This Constitution has served this Nation throughout its history with few major amendments. It has been used as a model by our many States and many independent countries. Therefore, I have no criticism to offer about the work of our Founding Fathers in the drafting of this important document. It is possible that the failure to provide a vote for the residents of the District of Columbia was an oversight but it is also possible that the Founding Fathers assumed that anyone working in the Federal city would have permanent residence in some other State. Regardless of the reason for this omission it is time that we take affirmative action in granting the right to vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the proposed constitutional amendment and hope that favorable action will be taken before this Congress adjourns.

Salary Increases for Postal and Other Federal Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 9883, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support and urge favorable action on H.R. 9883, a bill to reaffirm the historic policy of Congress that employees of the Government of the United States shall receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform.

To state the objective differently, the bill recognizes that the high quality of service which is required for the conduct of the Government's business warrants recognition, in terms of salaries and wage rates, at least equal to that which is given to comparable services in private enterprise which is protected and supported by the Government.

As originally reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this bill would provide fair and reasonable compensation comparable to that enjoyed by employees in private industry by giving a 9-percent across-the-board pay increase to those categories of Federal employees consistently included in salary legislation. As now amended, it provides a somewhat lesser raise of 7½ percent, which is certainly not excessive in any event and represents a sincere effort to make sure that this legislation does not end in a stalemate between Congress and the Executive. If this bill is vetoed and the veto is not overridden, then it will be obvious to all that no compromise could possibly have been effected, since those of us concerned with this legislation have more than leaned over backward to try to pass a bill which can become law.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 establishes beyond a doubt that a pay increase is warranted. During its consideration of the various pay bills, the committee was faced with the difficult problem of deciding what rate of increase should be proposed. It is my conviction that this decision should be based on a determination of the amount required to provide Federal employees with pay comparable to that in private enterprise. This view recognizes that all that postal and other Federal employees have ever asked of their Government is fair and timely salary provisions.

My motion in committee to amend H.R. 9883 to provide for a 9-percent across-the-board increase was approved by the committee on a conclusion that this amount of increase would achieve reasonable comparability.

The proposed pay increases would apply to slightly more than 1½ million employees of the Federal Government. The 9-percent raise would have meant an estimated cost of approximately $846 million. The lesser raise will cost about $680 million. It must be recognized that these 1½ million employees are the people responsible for performing the tasks incident to an annual Federal expenditure of well over $70 billion. It seems to me that the estimated cost is a completely reasonable price to pay to assure fair compensation to a group of employees who, in the aggregate, bear so great a responsibility.

The opposition to a pay increase has been based primarily on two arguments, neither of which, to me, is persuasive.

In the first place, the administration has argued that a pay increase at this time would have an unfavorable effect on its anticipated $4.2 billion budget surplus for next year. Certainly, there can be no argument against economical government or against the achievement of a budget surplus by legitimate economies. At the same time, reasonable people will agree, I think, that withholding pay from its work force is too high a price to pay for a budget surplus. This argument against pay increases raises a serious question whether the administration may be seeking to achieve personal objectives and political advantage at the expense of its civilian employees, who are clearly entitled to a salary increase at this time.

The second major argument has been that all efforts to adjust Federal salaries should await the results of a comparative study of Federal and private industry salaries, which has been recently undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This argument, it seems to me, is completely specious in the light of the overwhelming evidence which shows that Federal employees generally are now far below the levels of comparable salaries in private enterprise. Administration representatives who now oppose pay increases have themselves consistently maintained that the Government has extreme difficulty in recruiting and retaining competent employees in the Government because of disparities in pay. In this connection, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on December 4, 1959, stated:

> In contrast, statutory increases in the Classification Act pay schedules have been much less frequent and have usually trailed far behind such changes in industry. The result has been an almost continuing unfavorable competitive position in the labor market for the kinds and quality of white collar employees needed to staff the varied and complex activities of our Government.

It is difficult to understand what purpose, other than mere delay, would be accomplished by awaiting the results of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey in the face of the clear evidence we have before us.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 and a number of companion bills establishes without any doubt that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. The evidence clearly shows that (a) Federal employees are substantially below the level of the national economy; (b) that the salaries paid Federal employees do not compare favorably to salaries paid for comparable work in private enterprise; and (c) that the rates of salary increases for Federal employees have lagged far behind the rates of increases in private enterprise over a period of years.

The following are only a few of the many comparisons which were presented during the Committee hearings and which convince me that pay increases are justified at this time.

The largest single group of employees in the postal service are the clerks and letter carriers. The responsibilities of their jobs have been compared to those of policemen and firemen. Postal clerks and carriers are paid in a salary range of from $4,035 to $4,875 per year. This is generally about $1,000 a year below the pay ranges of policemen and firemen in 60 large metropolitan centers. In one of the largest cities, for example, policemen and firemen are paid in a range of $6,393 to $6,828, roughly $2,000 more per year than postal clerks and carriers.

The average weekly earnings of postal letter carriers is $89.23. A recent Department of Labor publication shows that the average weekly earnings of production workers in various industrial groups ranges from a low of $91.30 to a high of $118.13. In other words, in January 1960 the lowest paid group of industrial workers earned $2 per week more on the average than did the postal employees. The highest paid group of industrial workers earned approximately 30 percent more than the average postal employee.

The same unfavorable comparison is shown between Federal employees in the classified service and employees on comparable jobs in private enterprise. For example, evidence has been presented to show that in 10 selected cities in the country tabulating machine operators earn an average of from $4,487 to $5,321 per year. Federal employees doing the same kind of work are paid $3,814 per year. Draftsmen in private industry earn from $5,686 to $6,443 per annum as compared to Federal pay for the same work of $4,560 per year.

A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that guards in private industry in various cities are paid at rates ranging from $1.80 per hour to $2.45 per hour. The entrance pay for guards in the civilian service in the Government is $1.57 per hour and the maximum rate a guard can earn is $1.84 per hour.

I think these few examples of comparable salary rates are sufficient to show without any doubt that the current rates of pay for Federal employees are substantially below those of comparable workers in private enterprise. Equally conclusive evidence has been presented to show that the salaries paid to Federal workers have not kept pace with the increases and cost of living and as a result it is now necessary for far too many Federal employees to accept outside spare time employment in order to provide their families with the necessities of life.

It has also been shown, and this is admitted by administration representatives, that a great deal of the turnover of technical and professional people in the Government results from the Government's inability under existing salary scales to successfully compete with private industry for the services of those capable and well qualified necessary to perform many of the Government's functions.

I urge favorable action on this bill in order to recognize fairly and equitably the loyal, devoted service of the Government's civilian employees by giving them pay more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by their counterparts in private enterprise. Favorable action would further assure the Government's ability to recruit and retain the employees who have the qualifications and abilities to carry out the important responsibilities necessary to the preservation of the Government.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I was the first Member of the House to join our colleague, Representative THOMPSON, in signing the discharge petition which succeeded in bringing this bill before us, a discharge petition I am glad to say that I persuaded many other Members of the House also to sign. It is unfortunate that we had to take this unusual means of obtaining signatures from a majority of the membership in order to overcome obstructions to the orderly consideration of this bill under normal procedures.

Those of us who favor fair treatment for Uncle Sam's rank-and-file employees have had to wage a constant battle against an unsympathetic administration which flatly opposes pay raises for the average worker. This has been the policy from President Eisenhower on down. Week after week, we sat in Committee listening to the pros and cons on this legislation, and throughout the period of the hearings there was a constant drumbeat of administration propaganda against any pay increase whatsoever.

At this moment, we are being told that if we reduce the size of the proposed increase even further—say to 5 percent—and perhaps add higher postal rates to it, there is a possibility, or a remote outside chance, that the President may sign such a bill. It is all very nebulous. Yet, all of the time we were considering this legislation in Committee, the administration laid down a flat rule of no raise at all for the rank-and-file of employees.

On the other hand, no administration has ever worked harder at trying to obtain pay increases for the policymakers of the Government—particularly those in politically appointive offices. The top level of Civil Service, in these recent years of the Eisenhower administration, has been changed almost entirely into a patronage pool for the Republican National Committee. Career Government employees are given to understand that it helps to have Republican ties if they expect to obtain promotion to the top posts in what is supposed to be the career service. I am sure if it could find a way to provide pay increases only for Government employees in so-called policymaking jobs—and under this administration that covers a multitude of employees with political sponsorship—the administration would gladly support such a bill. But this bill—to reward the entire classified and postal services—is bitterly opposed on grounds that the cost of living has not risen enough since the last pay raise to justify the proposed increases so why enable any Government worker to get ahead?

When organized labor was fighting for the principle of wage escalation to meet increases in living costs, many of the same people now deciding policy for this administration bitterly opposed the idea as something right out of Moscow. Actually, of course, collective bargaining as we know it is the farthest thing away from the Russian system, but you would not think so to hear some of the complaints about unions—all unions.

It is now an accepted part of our industrial economic structure, of course, that cost-of-living increases should be reflected in wage settlements. But that is by no means the only measure of justifiable wage settlements in industry. Industry and labor also agree on increases reflecting increased productivity, on increases based on increased complexity of the work, on increases based on higher educational requirements or longer periods of training and so forth.

Now why should none of these things be taken into consideration in determining the wages of our Government employees? According to the adminis-

tration, the only gauge should be living costs. I disagree. I do not believe we must have a static wage structure in Government since we certainly do not have one in any other field. It is not enough, under the American system, that a worker stay even with his earning power of 10 or 20 years ago in terms of real income. Our economy has prospered because most workers steadily, over the years, have been able to improve their standard of living—which requires increase over and beyond living cost increases.

In the postal system, I can say from firsthand knowledge that low wages are a major cause of poor employee morale and much turnover in personnel. We are forcing out good people who had intended to make their careers in the postal service. They cannot afford to remain. Those who take pride in the service, who have long years of seniority, and who grew up in the post office and have developed a dedication to the public service, have suffered real financial hardship in recent years as workers in other fields obtained, through collective bargaining, far better pay scales than the postal employee. Many postal workers are on double duty, taking other off-hour jobs in order to make ends meet. This is not fair to them or to their families, and it is not fair to the taxpayer who wants and expects alert and wide awake and conscientious service from the post office.

This is not the time, perhaps, to go into the other problems of the postal people under the weird operational policies now in effect, but the combination of low pay in comparison to other workers plus the aggravations of trying to keep up with the razzle-dazzle of post office directive and guidelines and experimentation in mail routing policies—policies which seem to be based on a program of change merely for the sake of change—make the postal service a most unhappy place these days. A wage raise will help, at least, to make it a little pleasanter until we can get rid of bungling and chaos in the Department.

For the career classified employee, the situation has not been quite as unhappy as it has been for the postal employee in recent years. The people brought in by the Eisenhower administration to run the other Government departments nearly all started out on the assumption that Government workers were drones and morons, but gradually changed their opinions after discovering to their surprise the quality of work done by the career employees and their conscientious devotion to duty. So it has not been fashionable lately in most agencies—as it has been during the past 7 years in the Post Office Department—to regard the Government employee as a brainless, slipshod, disinterested worker. Nevertheless, Government employment has not yet been restored to the professional prestige it enjoyed prior to this administration, and pay scales have not kept pace with the rates paid to people with similar skills in industry and the professions. This bill now before us will help t ocorrect some of the inequality.

It is on the whole a good bill. We on the committee worked long and hard on it. It deserves not only the votes it will receive to assure its passage here today but sufficient additional votes to show we can overcome a veto. I hope every Member who sincerely believes in the importance of the work done by our classified and postal employees will make his convictions meaningful by supporting this bill. Regardless of our politics, we all know how devoted our postal employees have been in the past—how careful and conscientious and dedicated to service. That spirit is now unfortunately going out of the postal service—has been going out of the service—because of the way the career people have been treated by their top bosses in Washington. Many postal workers more and more take the attitude of "What's the use?" This trend must be reversed. The place to start is on pay scales—right now. I hope with new leadership in the Department in Washington we can take care of the other side of this problem—the operational chaos and bungling. Congress cannot solve that problem right now—the voters must act first. But we will solve it, I hope, next year.

Thank you.

Medical Payments for Elderly Citizens Legislation Must Be Enacted by the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, points out in his article in the Washington Post today that there is nothing un-American in the principle that Americans shall be compelled to save "so that they can meet the needs of their old age with the self-respect which comes from being entitled to the benefits because they have paid the cost out of their own earnings."

In my opinion, this statement goes to the heart of the issue of medical payments for the elderly. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended a plan under which elderly persons will be given medical benefits coverage under the social security system. I certainly hope that this legislation is soon brought to the floor for debate and that it is enacted by Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "A Challenge That Can't Be Ducked" which appeared in the April 16, 1960, issue of Business Week. The article points out:

The problem basically is that the aged are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young, or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem, therefore, is to spread the risk and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly. By comparison with the heavily subsidized schemes, this approach has the advantage of keeping old people from feeling that they are beggars living off society's handouts.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of elderly citizens in my congressional district who have written to me or talked to me personally about their concern over the costs of possible hospitalization. They worry about the day when they might suffer from an injury or require an operation, the cost of which would wipe out their savings of a lifetime, or place them deeply in debt. The Congress must fact up to the realities of this problem facing our senior citizens.

Lame Duck "Lameducks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Palm Beach Post, June 3, 1960]

COLLINS POOR CHOICE TO HEAD CONVENTION

(By Drew Pearson)

If Paul Butler, the "lameduck" chairman of the Democratic National Committee, wanted to curry favor with the South by naming Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, as the permanent chairman of the Democratic National Convention, he failed badly.

Governor Collins, delightful and charming as he is, does not rate as compared with Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.

In fact, many southerners are describing the action of Butler in putting across Governor Collins as the appointment of a lame duck by the "lameduck" chairman of a "lameduck" committee.

Here is the lineup of the lame ducks:

Governor Collins himself is soon retiring as Governor of Florida and failed to elect his choice as his successor.

Chairman Butler has just been made a lame duck by the Democrats of Indiana, who have elected Alex Campbell, former assistant attorney general, to be national committeeman from Indiana.

Peggy Ehrmann, the Democratic committeewoman from Florida who nominated Governor Collins, was defeated for reelection to the Democratic National Committee the same day.

Camille Gravel, Jr., Democratic national committeeman from Louisiana, who failed to back Boggs, was defeated a few days later by the Louisiana State Democratic Committee at Baton Rouge by a vote of 100 to 1. The only vote cast for his reelection was that of Gravel himself.

The irony of the situation lies in the fact that in 1954, when Butler was first made chairman of the Democratic National Committee in New Orleans, he was nominated by Congressman Boggs. Two years later Adlai Stevenson was determined to kick Butler out as chairman. He came to Boggs with fire in his eyes and some unprintable

things in his language regarding Butler. Boggs at that time stepped in and saved Butler. He got Speaker SAM RAYBURN to help him.

But the other day it was Butler who swung the Democratic committee against Boggs for permanent chairman. As a sop to Gravel, who failed to support Boggs, Butler turned around and made Gravel chairman of the credentials committee to decide on what Democratic delegation shall be seated in Los Angeles.

[From the Birmingham News, June 4, 1960]

BUTLERIAN BOO-BOOS

Several moves of Paul Butler stand sharply revealed. They do him no credit and indicate further that the national Democratic Party is in sore need of somebody with a good political head on his shoulders.

Butler was instrumental in throwing the permanent chairmanship of the convention to Governor Collins of Florida at almost the same time that Collins' "moderate" candidate for Governor of Florida was being voted down; Collins himself goes out of office soon and his future political weight in his home State could be in doubt.

Butler himself after the current term ending with the convention's close is being replaced as national committeeman by Indiana Democrats.

Peggy Ehrmann, Democratic committeewoman from Florida, who placed Collins in nomination for the permanent chairmanship, the same day she made the formal Collins nomination was defeated for the post she has held.

Camille Gravel, of Louisiana, previously booted out of national committee status by his fellow Louisianians but kept on by Butler, was made cochairman of the national convention credentials committee. This man who is to help run the meeting deciding who gets convention seats a few days later was thrown out once more by the Louisiana State Democratic Committee by a vote of 100 to 1.

A wide variety of Democrats—and not just southerners—from time to time over the past year or two have openly expressed disgust with the Butler approach, maneuver, and decision. It seems to us, and not just from a Deep South point of view, that national rank and file Democrats would have done the party a service to have replaced Butler with some middle-road political thinker of capacity quite a while ago. Butler just doesn't seem very smart.

With a Stevenson, a Kennedy, a Symington, a Humphrey seemingly key Democratic policymakers on a campaign basis, enough national Democrats apparently felt Butler would be in step.

Evidence grows that the whole situation may have resulted from a misconstruction of the true national Democratic temper, and the temper of the people.

Hon. Henry J. Latham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to advise my colleagues of an honor bestowed upon a former Member of this body, and a very dear friend of mine, Hon. Henry J. Latham. On Sunday, June 12, 1960, St. John's University, New York, conferred upon Henry J. Latham, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation reads as follows:

"A wise man," wrote Bacon, "will make more opportunities than he finds." Fortunately for us Americans the existing ones suffice. In the field of education, for instance, how fruitful are the opportunities for professional education available in our evening schools. Those who take advantage of such opportunities are to be commended for their preceptiveness, perseverance, and intellectual energy. Exemplifying these qualities is Henry J. Latham, who completed his preprofessional and professional education in the evening: he studied prelaw at St. John's University and obtained two law degrees—the LL.B. and LL.M.—at Brooklyn Law School of St. Lawrence University. For more than 25 years thereafter he has practiced law and gained a broad experience in all fields of law. In 1940 he was elected a member of the State legislature, a position he left to enlist in the U.S. Navy during World War II. While still serving overseas, he was elected to Congress in 1944, and was reelected for a total of seven terms. This fact alone is ample evidence of his effective and conscientious performance of duty. As further testimony to his ability, proven character, and the high regard he inspires, he was elected in 1958 a justice of the supreme court on a bipartisan slate. Esteemed American, Congressman, and jurist, Henry J. Latham merits honoris causa the degree of doctor of laws, because he illustrates the achievement of one who, in passing through life's pilgrimage, has converted the common dust of servile opportunity to gold.

Salem, Mass., Captain Nicknamed "Old Glory"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper article by Hedrick Smith of UPI and which appeared in the Beverly Evening Times of Beverly, Mass., under the heading of "Originator of 'Old Glory' Nickname Captain Driver of Salem, Courageous Seadog." The article follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN.—The man who nicknamed the American flag "Old Glory" was a salty skipper from Salem, Mass., who once had his pet flag sewn into a quilt to keep it hidden from Confederate soldiers.

A few years before that, the skipper, Capt. William Driver, outfoxed a British ship captain who ordered him to lower his flat ("take down them duds") while his crew was celebrating July 4 in a British-held port in India.

On a third occasion, he threatened to blow down his house with cannon shot if anyone dared lower his original "Old Glory" from a window of his home in the Confederate city of Nashville.

Captain Driver was a man of physical and moral courage those unswerving loyalty to the Union developed at sea.

Born March 17, 1803, he was only 13 when he ran away to the sea one morning on his way to Sunday school. At 21, he became a master mariner of a ship and later circled the world twice.

NAME COINED AT SEA

It was during his rugged seafaring days that Driver named a ship's flag "Old Glory." Legend is hazy on when he actually first coined the nickname. But most historians think it was in 1831 when Driver was master of the brig *Charles Doggett*.

The flag was christened at a special shipboard flag-raising, but the nickname "Old Glory" didn't gain much currency until the Civil War.

Driver moved to Nashville in 1837. His flag was hung from a locust tree outside his home on special occasions—July 4, Washington's birthday, St. Patrick's Day and during presidential campaigns—and became the source of good natured kidding.

Secession made his well-known Unionist sentiments unpopular in this city and Driver, fearing for his proudest possession—"I love it as a mother loves a child"—had the original "Old Glory" concealed in a quilt. Twice Confederate parties came looking for it.

Once Driver turned a group away simply by asking for a search warrant. The second time, approached by a band of rebel guerrillas headed by an old neighbor, Driver paced the porch with worry after their demand for the flag.

Finally, he spun and faced the men. "Dick," he said to the leader, "I have known you all your life. If you want my flag, you'll have to take it over my dead body."

The guerrillas left and the flag remained hidden in the quilt until Union troops captured Nashville February 25, 1862. It was a black day for the rebels but a day of glory for Driver and his pent-up Union sentiments.

Pandemonium greeted the Yankee arrival. Driver rushed home, ripped the flag from the quilt, and, escorted by a squad of Yankee soldiers, took "Old Glory" to the State capitol.

The old ship flag was raised amidst cheers of soldiers and a sprinkling of citizens. From those who knew the flag there were cries of "Old Glory."

Baltic States Freedom Council's Town Hall Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, it was my privilege to address the Baltic States Freedom Committee's Town Hall Rally in New York City, marking the 20th anniversary of Soviet invasion of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a copy of my statement and the manifesto of the 20th anniversary of Soviet aggression against the Baltic States issued by the free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE BALTIC STATES FREEDOM COUNCIL'S TOWN HALL RALLY IN NEW YORK CITY, MARKING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET INVASION OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA, JUNE 12, 1960

We meet here both in sorrow and in hope. In sorrow we commemorate the anniversary of the darkness that engulfed the Baltic countries in June 1940; in hope we rekindle

the torch of liberty to light the way out of darkness.

The enormity of the tragedy which befell Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia by unprovoked Soviet aggression, can only be fully realized by an awareness of the remarkable contributions made to the world by the peoples of these sovereign nations during their years of independence and freedom.

By their culture, arts and crafts, science and education, literature and the theater, and an ever-rising standard of living, these countries made their lasting mark on the world community. Expanding travel and commerce established deep and lasting links with the Western world. Between these countries and the United States there existed the bonds of mutual respect and love of freedom.

When the hammer struck it corrupted all human dignity. In violation of a series of nonaggression treaties, the Soviet Armies engulfed three sovereign states, purged their governments, rigged their elections and forcibly incorporated them into the Soviet Union itself. Not even nominal sovereignty was retained. The economies became subject to the central Soviet plan and their institutions came under Soviet ministries. There followed the usual reign of terror in the pattern of dictators—mass deportations, mass arrests, conviction without trial, collectivization of agriculture, industry and the like.

Many of you here tonight lived through these events and there is little that I can tell you that you do not know far better than I from personal experience.

Let me say this much, however, about personal experience. When Hungary rose and struck back in the glorious October revolt of 1956, I had the opportunity and the moving experience, as the representative of the Attorney General of the United States, of witnessing the events from the edge of freedom. In the course of helping to establish our Government's participation in the relief of Hungarian freedom fighters and their loved ones, I stood night after night at the Andau Bridge and other key points along that dark border and saw the faces of those who marched from darkness to light. It is one thing to discuss a blood-letting in the abstract; it is another to see it in the faces of women and children, with the rumble of tank treads and the rattle of machineguns echoing out of the morning mist.

So these things bear restating. Let us remind ourselves that our friends and allies, your mothers and fathers, brothers and children, remain under the oppressor's boot and cry to us for help. As an American and as a Representative, I wish to tell you that your cause is our cause. It is a cause close to our minds and hearts. But we may not rest on this. What is needed is a restatement by the free world of our determination to achieve freedom and independence for each person and each nation. The pressure of organized public opinion is a powerful weapon, but like the fight for freedom everywhere, it is not self-sustaining. It requires recognition, leadership, and restatement. Free countries everywhere must articulate their obligation toward those who died for the cause of freedom or who hold on to life only in the hope of freedom. Their cause must be highly placed on the agenda of international convocations. Otherwise the statesmen of the free world negotiate on a basis of expediency rather than principle.

The United States must adhere to principle. In 1892, both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms saw fit to condemn the Russian Czarist Government for the mistreatment and oppression of its non-Russian peoples and asked for equal rights for all. The principles of self-determination by all peoples were proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson in 1917 and the Baltic Republics were welcomed into the family of nations shortly thereafter. The United States gave its enthusiastic welcome. There followed the Sumner Wells declaration on July 23, 1940, on the occasion of the Soviet aggression in June 1940. This declaration condemned predatory activities of one state against another. It condemned the use of force or the threat of force by nations against each other. It condemned the interference of one sovereign power into the domestic affairs of another. The declaration said in conclusion that unless these principles are followed, law and justice cannot be preserved and, indeed, the basis of modern civilization cannot prevail. Thereafter, the United States consistently refused to recognize the present absorption of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We refuse to recognize the regimes that the Communists have established and maintained by force and by fraud in these countries. We recognize only the representatives of the independent Republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and that is how it will remain.

All Americans should read the report of the Kersten committee—a select committee of the Congress under the chairmanship of Charles J. Kersten—which in 1953 and 1954 took evidence in two continents of the international crimes that had been committed by the Soviet Union against the Baltic States. The final report of and the documents assembled by the Kersten committee constitute the most definitive record that we have of a history of Soviet perfidy and of Soviet offenses against mankind.

Finally last year by congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation—the Captive Nations Resolution and Declaration—we restated our demand for the restoration of independence to these nations of Europe. This is our goal.

The United States must rekindle the fires of freedom. On the international scene everywhere we must be the image of enlightened concern for the principles of freedom and human dignity upon which our own country was founded and for which we have fought.

We must do this by demonstrating our concern for human worth in every community, at home and abroad. Let us not, as Americans, neglect our own institutions or fail to recognize our own problems and shortcomings where they exist. Where, and to the extent that, we ourselves fail to accord full rights to every man in our own Nation, so we fail in our own effort to stop the spread of communism abroad. Where we face up to our shortcomings, so we strengthen ourselves in the battle for the freedom of other peoples. We do nothing in a vacuum. Everything is interrelated. And so it will be, more and more, in the challenging years to come.

Thank you very much.

MANIFESTO OF THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty years ago, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the protection of this occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic nations. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. Thus, the beginning of today's international tension and threat to peace may be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration embodying the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signatures of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, placed their hopes in the Western world. Their trust and reliance in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States of October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and continued recognition of their diplomatic representatives; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the still continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our people smaintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet occupant will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 20th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be pressed to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and toward history. At this 20th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, undertake all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right of self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic countries and to support the efforts toward the restoration of the liberty of these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We express to our peoples behind the Iron Curtain our deep conviction that the Soviet system—as all tyrannies throughout history—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction; that it cannot and shall not prevail;

We pledge to intensify our joint organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We, finally, declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to ensure

the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Chairman, Lithuania; Alfreds Berzins, Deputy Chairman, Latvia; Leonhard Vahter, Deputy Chairman, Estonia; Jaan Tiivel, Estonia; Eduard Vallaste, Estonia; Adolfs Blodnieks, Latvia; Vilis Hazners, Latvia; Dr. Vilis Masens, Latvia; Juris Siesers, Latvia; Msgr. Jonas Balkunas, Lithuania; Col. Jonas Slepetys, Lithuania; Dr. Antanas Trimakas, Lithuania, Members.

The Social Security Inverted Pyramid—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following are additional remarks on the social security system by W. Rulon Williamson, original actuary of the Social Security Board. Mr. Williamson's discussion here is a further exploration of some of the dogmas which have grown up around the social system:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, Research Actuary)

These dogmas have been voiced with some hesitation, "actuarially," but quoted and requoted they have been successively applied to:

1. The retired old age of workers.

2. The deferred greater dependence of family dependents of workers, after the worker retires.

3. The deferred greater dependence of family dependents of workers, following the death of the unretired worker.

4. The deferred premature old age—called permanent total disability—of workers between the ages of 50 and the minimum age of "age retirement," 62 for a woman, 65 for a man.

5. The deferred greater dependence of family dependents of workers, following the disablement of the worker, between age 50 and ages 62 and 65.

6. The current congresional discussion of the addition of further benefits to the first category above for certain special "potential needs" within the field of medical care.

The succession of designations for the systems runs: 1935, old-age benefits; 1939, old-age and survivors insurance; 1956, old-age survivors and disability insurance; 1958, old-age survivors and disability insurance; 1960, (?) old-age survivors disability and medicare insurance.

Mr. Ray M. Peterson, pension actuary, examining this evolution and commenting on the blithe assertion that the system is "a blend of equity and adequacy," remarks "the blend is so bland as to blind us to blunders." He uses the subtitle "Actuarial Anesthesia" to supplement the mouth-filling title "Misconceptions and Missing Perceptions of Our Social Security System." This 1959 paper to the Society of Actuaries had discussions from 12 other actuaries. It marked a break in the long overtolerance on the part of the profession.

DISCUSSING THE DOGMAS

1. Insurance: Bismark, the British, and other European "social engineers" by prefixing the word "social" to insurance, had developed a new blend that attempted to make the liabilities of an open-end account that never balanced, seem to be the assets that had made so effective the business of individual life insurance, when the individual expected to meet his share of the costs. The prudence of the citizen who was trying to be self-sufficient was even claimed for the citizen who was to be subsidized as an essential part of the scheme.

Hayek called the German system the "Road to Serfdom." Cecil Palmer called Britain's experiment "The British Socialist Illfare State."

Individual life insurance, looking ahead for the lifetime of an age cohort accepted by cautious underwriters to care for extending family care beyond death and personal provisions beyond the termination of earned income has been a remarkable invention (H. H. Jackson). I agree with the late Senator Taft's reply when told that OASI was different from "private insurance" that it was "social insurance." Taft said "It isn't any kind of insurance and you know it."

2. Assumptions: Marx made assumptions, too. He assumed "negation" and "the negation of the negation," and then a "new synthesis." A lot of his negations have been adopted (see Admiral Moreell's "To Communism Via Majority Vote") putting new chains upon the citizens. But the "new synthesis" was never clarified.

Some 50 actuarial studies have been made in the division of the actuary in the Social Security Administration. Over 100 "Analytic Notes" have been issued by the Division of Program Analysis within the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. A large number of studies and reports have evolved within the Division of Program Research of the Social Security Administration as well as a monthly social security bulletin (dating back to 1938). Other reports from fund trustees, from special advisory bodies or commissions, and sporadic additional studies for congressional information from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bring this material well beyond the compass of a 5-foot shelf. Much of this material can be called "anesthetic" in its unwarranted assumption that all is well, and that the various members of the bureaucracy see matters eye-to-eye.

As Ludwig von Mises has so comprehensively demonstrated, when "the free market of free men" is left behind, the accounting sense of profit and loss is apt to disappear. He demonstrates that generally the planned economy is but planned chaos.

The 5-foot shelf is available, but men without professional apprenticeship, are usually lost when they enter it. They are like the unfamiliar chap—ignorant of birds—who takes a walk hoping to see the 30 varieties his Audubon Society neighbor sees on his trip. He comes back with a score of four—robin, cardinal, bluebird, and grackle. In OASI prediction the number of assumptions on separate factors might run to scores—some of them in demography, birth rates and immigration, death rates and emigration, some in the labor market, involving obsolescence and imagination, women's work, men's second jobs, date and age of entering the market, time of leaving it, wages, family size and stability, the tempo of mortality improvement, and so on and on.

Projections can be forced into the far-distant future as an academic exercise—but they cannot be dependable guides to the actual course of events. Currently we are paying out some eight times the amount shown in the projection of 1935 for 1960. The psychology of collectivism we are learning all too slowly.

Bard of the Wallowas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Wallowa County, Oreg., recently honored one of its most beloved and outstanding citizens, Mr. Ben Weathers, known to east Oregonians as "the bard of the Wallowas." In tribute to Mr. Weathers and to his long record of service, I consider it a privilege to insert at this point in the RECORD the following news item from the Wallowa County Chieftain and an editorial reprinted from the Portland Oregonian.

[From the Wallowa County Chieftain]

TESTIMONIAL DINNER PLANNED TO HONOR BEN WEATHERS

The many friends of Ben Weathers will gather to pay tribute to his services to Wallowa County at a testimonial potluck dinner sponsored by the Joseph Chamber of Commerce at the Joseph Civic Center Monday, June 6, at 7 o'clock. Ben is considered to be one of the best informed historians on Wallowa County where he has been active in business, civic, and fraternal organizations for 58 years.

Ben, as he is affectionately known by most of the people in this area, came to Enterprise in May 1902 and went to work for Carl Roe, publisher of the Wallowa Chieftain taking subscriptions and traveling around the county writing stories about its people and events. He purchased the paper in 1904 when Roe sold out and went to Baker. From 1904 to 1908 he was editor and publisher of the Chieftain, and in the latter year took in a partner after receiving an appointment as postmaster of the post office at Enterprise.

The partnership resulted in a consolidation of two local papers under the name of the Record Chieftain which continued to be the name of the paper until it was changed to the Wallowa County Chieftain in 1942. Ben and his partner sold out to George Cheney in 1911, and the Chieftain was published by Cheney until the present publisher, Gwen Coffin, took over the paper in 1941.

Ben served as postmaster for 25 years—from 1908 until 1934. Upon leaving the postoffice he went into the insurance business which he still manages.

About 1924 Ben started milking cows and sold bottled milk around town and in the stores until 1942.

In 1936 Ben ran for the office of county judge and was elected for a 6-year term. He was reelected in 1942 and served another 6-year term, retiring from this office in January 1949.

Over these many years Ben has served as secretary of the Enterprise Chamber of Commerce, president of the local sportsman's association and president of the Enterprise Chamber of Commerce. He has been a member of the Elks Lodge since 1920 and the Knights of Pythias for 56 years. He was given a 50-year jewel and a life membership in the latter organization in 1954.

Ben recalls that Wallowa County was a quarter of a million dollars in debt when he took office as county judge in 1937 but was out of debt when he completed his first term. This achievement and the graveling of many miles of county roads he considers his principal achievements while serving as

head of the county government. "We got a lot of people out of the mud," Ben reflects.

Ben was married on June 21, 1908, to Alta Haggerty. He had purchased a house on west Main Street in Enterprise shortly before they were married, and they have made their home in this same place for 52 years. Ben doubts whether any other couple in Enterprise have lived in the same house this long. Mr. and Mrs. Weathers had no children of their own but raised their niece, Pearl Justice, from infancy and regard her as their own.

Ben has written hundreds of poems, jingles, and rhymes during the last half century and has been called upon at most of the important civic functions to compose poems about individuals and events on the local scene to enliven public meetings. Many of these poems have ben assembled in book form and have just been published under the title of "Fellers and Things."

Mayor Ab Daisley has proclaimed Monday, June 6, 1960, as Ben Weather's Day.

[From the Oregonian]

BARD OF THE WALLOWAS

We are told that Wallowa County is turning out June 6 to do honor to its first citizen, Ben Weathers. There is a moral in the Weathers story.

A native of LaGrande, Ben moved into the lush valley of the Wallowa when it was still in its pioneer era and the tortuous Minam grade took its tolls of horses and wagons. For almost 60 years, since he joined the staff of the Wallowa Chieftain in 1902, Ben has been one of the men who saw to it that wheels turned in Wallowa County. He has been editor of the Chieftain, postmaster of Enterprise, county judge, president of the Enterprise Chamber of Commerce and of the Wallowa County Chapter of the Izaak Walton League, and a directing force in virtually every community endeavor. He was 78 in February, and he's still running things. Moreover, he is the bard of the Wallowas, having published hundreds of ballads, among them Snake River Steve.

The marvel of it is that Ben Weathers' loaded career is exceptional but not without a match in other communities over the State. In several of them, large and small, there are or have been men who, like Ben Weathers, have carried the burden of community leadership in a wide range of activity for a lifetime. Their character has been stamped on the community, which, itself, is their memorial. A community is fortunate to have such dedicated leadership and scarcely a community at all is without it.

U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure, at the invitation of the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, to attend a most memorable ceremony in honor of the Army veterans in the 86th Congress on June 12, 1960, at the Washington Monument grounds, at which the U.S. Army presented the 1st Battle Group of the 3d Infantry—"The Old Guard" in a retreat parade.

An Army retreat ceremony, for the benefit of those Members of Congress who have not been privileged to attend, is a most moving and traditional display from the furling of the U.S. flag to the "pass in review." It portrays the symbolic "all is well" as another day closes.

Under Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Hugh M. Milton II, acting as host for the occasion paid tribute to those Members of Congress who have served in the Army.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN of Rhode Island acting as spokesman for the many Members of Congress present was most eloquent in expressing his appreciation for the honor paid. He was on the reviewing stand with Senators THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa and RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas, and Representatives CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma and DANIEL K. INOUYE of Hawaii.

This ceremony has become something of an annual tradition in this Capital of the United States and I want to express my appreciation on behalf of the Army veterans of the 86th Congress for the honor paid us by the U.S. Army.

The Military Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in reducing by 20 percent the President's request of $2 billion for military assistance has caused grave concern to Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

Secretary Gates on June 15 issued an urgent appeal that the cut in the appropriation be restored when the House debates the appropriation measure on June 16. The Secretary reviewed brefly in a news release the importance of military assistance, stating that Department of Defense witnesses appeared and testified before the House Appropriations Committee as to the soundness of the President's request for $2 billion to finance a necessary and effective program.

We have a sensible, sound, well administered program. Yet the House Appropriations Committee recommends that the appropriation be reduced by 20 percent.

Said Secretary Gates.

At this point I wish to incorporate in my remarks the news release issued June 15, 1960, by the Department of Defense which I have mentioned in quoting Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

I am deeply concerned over the fate of the military assistance program.

The President requested a $2 billion appropriation for military assistance for fiscal year 1961, to provide weapons and military equipment to strengthen our alliances and to promote our own national security. The Joint Chiefs of Staff all stated that they would not take $1 away from the military assistance program in order to augment the funds for their own services. Military assistance is just as much a part of our own national defense as are the appropriations for our Army, Navy, Air Force, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have testified before the Congress, as have other Defense Department witnesses, in support of the $2 billion request. We have discussed frankly every aspect of the program. We have responded to every question and criticism. We have a sensible, sound, well-administered program. Yet the House Appropriations Committee recommends that the appropriation be reduced by 20 percent.

In spending military assistance funds, it is necessary first to maintain existing allied forces in good working order and conserve the investment already made. Therefore the proposed reduction must come from cutting down on force improvement; that is, postponing indefinitely the newer weapons. Eighty percent of any cut below the budget request must be absorbed in equipment for force improvement, which includes missiles, electronic equipment, modern aircraft and ships, modernized tanks, and combat vehicles and the like.

The impact of the proposed cuts would fall most heavily on NATO, which also bore the greatest weight of last year's appropriation cut.

We must lead the free world without hesitation.

We must contain the Communists, but we cannot do it with imaginary weapons.

We must continue to sustain the capability and determination of our allies to defeat both aggression and internal subversion.

We must provide for the military assistance program as an integral part of our national defense required by our national interest.

Before departing for the Far East, the President said in telegrams to House leaders: "This (cut) cannot but jeopardize our own security and the defense of the free world."

I urge the House of Representatives, when it debates this appropriation on Thursday, to restore the full $2 billion intact.

Annual Father and Son Communion Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be guest speaker at the annual father and son Communion Breakfast of Our Lady of the Lake Church, Lake Mohawk, N.J.

Our Lady of the Lake was established in 1935 as a result of the creation of Lake Mohawk. From a very small parish it has now grown to over 425 families. Our Lady of the Lake has served Lake Mohawk area for 25 years.

The great growth of this area with its many problems has had the fortunate guidance of a wonderful priest and an outstanding man, Msgr. John F. McKenna. He worked as a longshoreman and freight checker so he could earn a Catholic education that led to his ordination as a priest in 1935. Monsignor McKenna served in World War II and was awarded the Purple Heart along with several other medals. He has supervised the construction of the

parochial and high school of Our Lady of the Lake. Monsignor McKenna is deserving of much praise because of his splendid efforts on behalf of the youngsters. He has won the high esteem of all who know him. He has done this with a humility that has endeared him to people of every religious faith.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the article which appeared in the Newark Sunday News June 5, 1960, commemorating Monsignor and our Lady of the Lake Church in their common bond—that of 25 years of religious service keyed toward success. I would like to add my very best wishes for continued success and for the good health of Monsignor McKenna.

The article follows:

PRIEST, CHURCH SHARE BOND—LAKE MOHAWK PASTOR AND PARISH HAVE ANNIVERSARY

(By Bob Mitchell)

LAKE MOHAWK.—Msgr. John F. McKenna and his church, Our Lady of the Lake, Upper Lake Mohawk, share a common bond, 25 years of religious service keyed toward success because of the waterfront.

For Monsignor McKenna, it was the rough New York waterfront that provided work as a longshoreman and freight checker so he could earn a Catholic education that led to his ordination as a priest in 1935.

Our Lady of the Lake, his church for the last 6 years, was established in 1935 as a result of the creation of Lake Mohawk. In fact, lake dwellers paced Sparta Township's growth so steadily that the small church, overcrowded and destined for renovation or replacement, became the hub for Sussex County's first parochial grade and high schools.

BEGAN AS MISSION

The 346-seat church, which began with 77 families, was originally operated as a mission of Immaculate Conception Church of Franklin and later of St. Thomas of Aquinas Church of Ogdensburg. It wasn't until 1949 that Our Lady of the Lake was made a self-sustaining parish by Bishop Thomas A. Boland of Paterson, who named the late Reverend George A. Brown as its first and only pastor prior to Monsignor McKenna.

The parish now has 425 families and swells to more than twice that number each summer.

But the extra summer load is nothing new to Monsignor McKenna. The 52-year-old prelate recalled that he spent many summer hours working on the New York docks "to earn money to put myself and my sister (Mrs. Edmund Duffy of Flushing, Long Island) through school.

"I wanted a Catholic education and I had to work for the tuition or go to public school," Monsignor McKenna said. "The tuition was $120 a year and that was a whole lot of money then. I took the jobs on the docks because it was better pay."

WORKED FOR EDUCATION

Monsignor McKenna worked his way through St. Patrick's and St. Peter's Preparatory Schools in Jersey City and Seton Hall College, where he was graduated in 1931. He studied for the priesthood at Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington.

Upon his ordination, Father McKenna served 5 years at St. Anthony's Church, Hawthorne, and then 2 years at Sacred Heart Church, Dover. At the outset of World War II, he volunteered as a chaplain and won the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and three battle stars with the 29th Division in Europe.

Monsignor McKenna recalled that things sometimes got so hectic that he was "afraid a lot of non-Catholics got the last rites too." He said chaplains "didn't have time to look for their dog tags."

After the war, Father McKenna was assigned as pastor of St. Simon the Apostle Church at Green Pond. During his tenure there, he helped build a new church and another, St. Thomas the Apostle, at Milton.

At Our Lady of the Lake, he helped finish the parochial grade school and convent started by Father Brown and supervised the construction of Our Lady of the Lake Regional High School. He was elevated to monsignor in 1958.

"It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to be able to put education in the path of so many of these youngsters after having to get mine the hard way," Father McKenna said. "Everything is laid in these kids' laps but I'm afraid their appreciation is lessened by the fact that they don't have to work for it."

Transcript of Questions and Answers Submitted to Vice President Nixon on Television Program "Open End"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of questions submitted to Vice President NIXON and his answers, on a television program "Open End" broadcast May 15, by WNTA–TV in New York City as reported by U. S. News & World Report.

Mr. President, the interview is another example of the full and free discussion of issues by the Vice President of the United States and as always it discloses his comprehension of national and international issues, his wisdom and judgment.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 30, 1960]

WHAT VICE PRESIDENT NIXON SAYS

(Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON was interviewed on a television program, "Open End," broadcast May 15 by WNTA–TV in New York City, with David Susskind as moderator. Following, from a transcribed recording of that interview, are excerpts of Mr. NIXON's comments:)

RED CHINA AND THE U.N.

"Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Should it be recognized by the United States?"

Mr. NIXON. In my opinion, admission of Red China to the U.N. at this point, and its recognition by the United States, could well set in motion a chain of events in Southeast Asia which would result in the communization of that area.

DICTATORSHIPS

"Should United States sever diplomatic relations with governments headed by dictators?"

Mr. NIXON. No. I feel that we have to have diplomatic relations with dictatorships. For example, we have to continue to have diplomatic relationships with Mr. Khrushchev. We have to continue to have diplomatic relations with Mr. Gomulka in Poland. They are dictatorships—dictatorships as rigid, as totalitarian as any in the world. • • • But we have to have diplomatic relations with them. • • •

The United States should make clear that we favor the development in the Americas toward democratic forms. • • •

But to break relations with countries because they had dictators would mean that we'd have to break relations with about half the world today.

LATIN AMERICA

"On Mr. NIXON's trip to South America—was it well advised and constructive?"

Mr. NIXON. From a personal standpoint, probably not. It's not very easy to sit in the car and be stoned. It isn't easy to see your wife's new pretty red suit completely covered with spit, or to see a man spit directly into her face and not be able to do anything about it. But I would say, from the standpoint of the country, probably on balance it was good, because it served to bring forcibly home to the American people, to our Congress and to our Government the fact that there was a lot of discontent in Latin America with some of our economic and political policies. And so we have taken steps to deal with those policies.

"What about Cuba and Fidel Castro?"

Mr. NIXON. Obviously, sometimes in cases like this a person in my position, particularly in an election year, might be tempted to make a flag-waving statement about the terrible things that Mr. Castro is saying about the United States, his threats at Guantanamo (U.S. Navy base in Cuba), the fact that one of his gunboats fired on a submarine, and the like.

But I think that there are times when • • • it's best to have the statements that are made come from the responsible people in the State Department or from the President himself. I can only say this in general: I've been to Cuba on two occasions officially. The Cuban people are basically pro-American. I think that Mr. Castro, of course, has tended to turn some of them—many of them, perhaps—against us.

But I will say that, as far as those people are concerned, they certainly needed a revolution. They were not getting an adequate share of the tremendous wealth of that lush island. And so, as far as the objectives of Castro's revolution—providing, for example, a better life for his people, a better division of the land and the like, and particularly that objective which he also stood for at the beginning but since has completely departed from, of freedom—freedom of press, freedom in every respect, freedom of assembly and the like—as far as the objectives of the revolution, we certainly can support them.

And we would hope that Mr. Castro and the Cuban people themselves would change the present direction of the Castro government back to the objectives of the original revolution from which it has grievously departed, particularly with regard to freedom.

CONSERVATISM AND LIBERALISM

"In regard to Mr. NIXON's description of his political philosophy as one of progressive conservatism: Is this a political contradiction in terms?"

Mr. NIXON. No, I don't think so. I believe that, historically, conservatism at its best has always been progressive. And may I say, incidentally, that the use of the words "conservative" and "liberal" I think generally should be avoided these days because the two words have been distorted by definition through the years. Some people have attached the word "liberal" to themselves that perhaps are reactionary in the extreme, and others who call themselves "conservatives" certainly don't deserve that appellation as well. • • •

I believe that a conservative is an individual who opposes bad change but who favor good change. He favors that kind of change which will conserve the best of the past and build on that.

Now, the difficulty with those who do not take a conservative point of view in the sense that I have referred to is that they see a problem and they look at the present system and they want to scrap everything that we're presently doing in order to solve the problem. I think that (1) this is inefficient, and (2) it isn't the best way to solve the problem.

WELFARE STATE

"Should such things as social security, the Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal deposit insurance be regarded as 'welfare state-ism'?"

Mr. NIXON. No. I regard these programs which you have referred to as consistent with the kind of dynamic economy private—enterprise economy—which I believe will provide the most goods and services for the American people.

My point of demarcation is this: Whenever the individual, acting alone or with other people, either in a partnership or a corporation or some other group activity, can do a particular job or render a particular service more efficiently and less expensively than Government can do it or render it, then I believe that should be the course of action we should follow. Whenever the individual, acting alone or with others, is unable or refuses to render the kind of services that the people need or want, then—and only then—should Government step in. And I believe that, as far as Government is concerned, we should start at the lowest level and work upward to the highest rather than start at the highest and work down. We should first see if the local government can do it, then the State government, and finally, and only as a last resort, the Federal Government.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

"Should Federal aid be given toward paying teachers' salaries? Why did Mr. NIXON vote against the Clark amendment which would have provided such aid?"

Mr. NIXON. Because I believe there is a better approach, and that's the approach that the administration has supported and continues to support—of Federal aid for school construction, $2 billion worth of schools to be built over a period of 4 years, financed over a period of 20 years, with the Federal Government paying half of the debt-retirement costs and the State governments assuming the last half. * * *

Because I am convinced that, when the Federal Government aids in the construction of schools, there is no possibility whatever of Federal control. If the Federal Government gets into the business of subsidizing generally throughout the country the operation of our schools, including the payment of teachers' salaries, inevitably we will move into greater and greater programs in this area.

INFLATION

"To control inflation, will some control of wages and prices be necessary?"

Mr. NIXON. I would hope not, and I would certainly resist any attempt legislatively to go to controls. That is one of the reasons why, for example, when the recent steel strike was going on, I completely disagreed with many leaders in this country who said that we had to have compulsory arbitration—compulsory arbitration of labor disputes affecting the national interest. * * *

If you go to compulsory arbitration, this means wage fixing. If you have wage fixing by Government, you have Government price fixing. If you have Government wage and price fixing, the stimulus to the free-enterprise economy—and many think that's a bad word, but I do not—the stimulus to the free-enterprise economy, which has made the American productive machine the wonder of the world, will have been destroyed. We will have taken exactly the wrong step, and I think we should resist it at all possible times.

TAX REFORM

"How would Mr. NIXON cut taxes?"

Mr. NIXON. Well, now, let me say first of all that, with regard to tax reform or reduction, I emphasize that, throughout this campaign, I do not intend to promise the people that if elected they can have either categorically, because, in my opinion, before we can talk about either tax reduction or tax reform, both of which will result—even in the second case as well—in a reduction of revenue, we have to be sure that we have met our national-security responsibilities adequately. * * *

Now, in the event, after meeting all of our national-security responsibilities adequately, there is a surplus which will enable us to have a tax bill, I believe that that tax bill should emphasize tax reform—tax reform which would have as its purpose stimulating economic growth. Now how do you stimulate economic growth? You stimulate it by encouraging people to invest their savings in industrial plant, and to encourage them—one of the ways that we do that is through our tax system.

Now, I cannot on this program, and will not until the campaign comes along indicate specifically what ought to be done, but you move on the depreciation front, for example. Accelerated depreciation can be most constructive in stimulating economic growth. You move on the area of what I would call the counterproductive higher income bracket taxes—counterproductive because, at the present time, we have what I would call an expense account economy. I think you know what I am talking about here where people, because the tax rates are so high, live in effect off of expense accounts, and companies, of course, have to pay their top officials in terms of expense accounts as well as in terms of their adequate income.

Now this, I say, is counterproductive and inefficient.

By reducing these rates you lose relatively little revenue. And, by reducing these rates, you release capital for investment in industrial plant. That investment in industrial plant produces progress, it produces more jobs, it produces economic growth.

Now may I say finally in this connection that what I have just suggested has no political sex appeal in it whatever. I'm aware of this. The British were aware of it when they did the same thing a couple of years ago. But I feel that economic growth is essential in this country, and I think the way to economic growth is through expanding primarily the private sector of the economy rather than the Government sector. I think Government has a responsibility, a proper climate, seeing to it that our economy remains competitive through enforcement of the antitrust laws. But, also, we can do a great deal through reforming our tax system and thereby encouraging and stimulating maximum investment in the new plant which produces more progress and more jobs for Americans.

LABOR LEGISLATION

"What about the Landrum-Griffin law as a way to deal with labor abuses?"

Mr. NIXON. This is a terribly complex area and it's very difficult to develop labor legislation which will deal with an abuse without injuring the organization itself. Nobody wants to damage legitimate organized labor in this country—at least I don't, I want to make that clear. What we want to do is to get all unions to follow the good unions and the honest practices that many unions follow today.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was designed to do exactly that. And I believe that, as far as it goes, it did a fairly adequate job. But we aren't going to solve the problems entirely with legislation. In the final analysis, the problem of control of abuses within unions will be solved only when union members themselves recognize that it's their responsibility to assert a fact which they should be aware of, that they run the unions.

"Should wages be geared to the cost of living?"

Mr. NIXON. I think that the gearing of wages to the cost-of-living index has, of course, obvious appeal because it puts it in terms of the need of the workers rather than in terms of productivity. On the other hand, I think we also have to recognize that, over a long period of time, wages must also be geared to increases in productivity as well as what may be the increase in the cost-of-living index.

Now, as far as the guaranteed annual wage is concerned, I think it's been very constructive that many enlightened firms throughout the country are now moving toward that objective as well, and certainly it is an objective to which, I think, both labor and management should strive.

MEDICAL AID TO AGED

"Why does Mr. NIXON prefer the administration bill dealing with medical care for older people to the Forand bill?"

Mr. NIXON. I have several reasons: One, because the administration bill covers all of those who need the coverage—are over 65—and the Forand bill does not. The Forand bill covers only those over 65 who happen to have social security. It provides no coverage whatever for 4.5 million people who aren't on social security, and those are among those who need it the most.

The second reason I favor the administration bill is because it is voluntary in its character. It forces nobody to have health insurance against his will, whereas the Forand bill is compulsory in character. All those on social security are brought in under the system.

A third point that I would make is that the administration bill, leaving as it does this choice in the people over 65 to buy private group insurance if they want or to buy no insurance whatever, I think is more consistent with our ultimate objective of keeping the medical profession—which at the present time provides the best medical care in the world for the American people—of keeping it free of Federal control.

AGRICULTURE AND MR. BENSON

"What about Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture?"

Mr. NIXON. I think that Secretary Benson has been as dedicated a man in working for the interests of the farmers as he saw it as any Secretary we've ever had. I can say that—I think Secretary Benson's critics would agree with that.

As far as the success of the Secretary in getting his program through is concerned, it is here that he has had his difficulty * * * and, at the present time, we are still saddled with a program which all agree is not in the best interest of the farmer or the American people.

"The Vice President was asked about his own farm program."

Mr. NIXON. Well, this is not the time to announce it. I say, first of all, that the Congress has in its committees at the present time a message from the President giving the Congress a great deal of discretion in this area of the farm program, indicating what the President would favor, but also indicating that, within certain guidelines, the President would sign a bill which did not conform with his specific recommendations.

If the Congress fails to act on this bill, I believe that it is then the responsibility of both candidates for the Presidency to present to the American people farm programs which will break the present stalemate.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DESEGREGATION

"What about the lunchcounter sit-in strikes in the South?"

Mr. NIXON. I would say that these strikes should not be looked at as primarily constituting a legal problem. * * * To me, the problem is not legal. The problem is essentially moral. * * *

Now, what does this mean? Since it is a moral problem, it means that we've got to develop leadership from the very highest level down through the community level which will deal with the problem. * * *

Let me say this—I think it (the strike movement) is very understandable. I think, on the other hand, that we must recognize that the Negroes and others concerned about making progress in this field do avoid, and should avoid, when they can, activities which could prove to be counterproductive—counterproductive by going to extremes, which might set the cause back.

"Is Mr. NIXON satisfied with the civil-rights bill passed recently by Congress?"

Mr. NIXON. The administration favored a bill that would have contained one specific provision that I felt very deeply about, and that the Congress rejected. And that was the one that would have given statutory authority to the committee on equality of opportunity on jobs involving Government contracts. This provision was included in the administration bill, and the Congress rejected it. In addition to that, there was another provision in the administration bill dealing with the matter of schools on Government property, involving this area in which the administration did not get the provision it wanted from the Congress.

But I would say that, as far as the bill which was passed was concerned, that it was a historic bill of great importance, and it was as important a bill as it was and effective as it was because the Attorney General developed the voting-referee proposal which will provide a historic breakthrough in voting rights for Negroes, provided they move in key States—and I mean the Negroes themselves—move in key States to assert those rights.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

"What about the President's veto of a bill to provide Federal aid for depressed areas?"

Mr. NIXON. The difficulty with the bill was that it was a very bad method for meeting an urgent need, and would not, unfortunately, have provided as much and as effective aid to the real distressed areas of West Virginia—western Pennsylvania particularly—that the administration bill would have provided.

This is clearly apart from the cost. The difference in cost was 50 million for the Eisenhower bill—the Eisenhower administration's bill—and approximately 250 million for this one. The difficulty with this bill is that it included a number of areas in this country—because of a very bad and weak standard of what a depressed area was—that would have made it a political grab bag, in effect, rather than, again, using the rifle to deal with the specific problems.

May I say that there is a real problem in these distressed areas and it has not been met, but the Congress can meet it by passing the bill that the President sent down, or one closer to it than the one they did pass. And I hope they do.

POLITICS AND THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

"Why is the Republican Party the minority party in this country?"

Mr. NIXON. Because the Republican Party has not effectively identified itself with the policies of this administration, and because the Republican Party, in addition, I think, has failed at the local and State level, in many instances, to develop the organization and the attractive candidates that are needed in this 20th century when politics has become a science—although many could call it much worse names.

"Is there any validity to the description of the Republican Party as the party of 'big business'?"

Mr. NIXON. I would say that no administration has a more effective record in the field of antitrust enforcement than this administration, which indicates that our interest is not in big business or little business but in good business—good, competitive, American business.

And may I say that, as far as business is concerned—just as I feel about labor—that I feel that any administration should not be either antibusiness or antilabor. You should be "pro" good business, "pro" good labor, and "anti" bad business, and "anti" bad labor.

"About Mr. NIXON's campaign methods in the past—would he change those methods?"

Mr. NIXON. Every man obviously changes through the years, and I would not say, certainly, that, through the years, I have not made mistakes. But let me emphasize my philosophy with regard to politics generally.

I believe that, in campaigns, you must have hard-hitting discussion of the issues. I believe, also, that a candidate must expect his opponents to examine his record—as mine has been examined time and time again with a microscope—and he must expect to be attacked on his record—everything that he says, every vote that he has cast, every deed that might affect his conduct of the office. It's fair to discuss it, and discuss it vigorously and in a way that will bring it home to the people. Now, I would say that, when we get into personalities, there is where the line should be drawn.

"What about Governor Rockefeller as Republican nominee for Vice President?"

Mr. NIXON. Well, let me say first of all that the agreements that Governor Rockefeller and I have far outweigh the disagreements—and, as far as foreign policy is concerned, that is particularly the case. * * *

Now, what you have raised, of course, is a hypothetical question, because Governor Rockefeller has indicated that (1) he does not want the nomination for Vice President, and (2) he has said that he will not attend the Republican Convention.

May I say that I think that that statement on his part is one which is responsible and a proper statement. * * * So I think this decision by the Governor is one that should be respected. * * *

"If Senator Kennedy is the Democratic choice for the Presidency, will it be a political necessity for the Republican Party to nominate a Catholic as Vice President?"

Mr. NIXON. I would say that ticket balancing of that type, for that reason, would be such an obviously cynical act that it would be resented, and properly so, by people throughout the country. It happens that there are people of the Catholic faith in our party who are eminently qualified, may I say, to serve in the highest offices in this country. But those people, if they are to be considered, should be considered on their merits and not on the basis simply of balancing the ticket because the other party might have selected somebody of that faith.

An Index to Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader on Tuesday, May 31, 1960, entitled "An Index to Conservatives."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDEX TO CONSERVATIVES

In the course of the past 8 or 10 years, many of us in the pundit business have fallen into errors of political hypothesis that now are happily subject to some revision and correction. An Index has just come to hand, prepared by Americans for Constitutional Action, that provides for the first time a truly significant insight into the political philosophy of Members of Congress.

One of the errors we had come to accept was an impression that there really isn't much difference between Democrats and Republicans. There is in fact a great difference, capable of being objectively measured. Our thinking on this score will have to be sharply recast.

We also had imagined that Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, and SYMINGTON were like Winken, Blinken and Nod, all identically at sea in the same Liberal boat; and we had supposed that LYNDON JOHNSON was, relatively speaking, considerably more conservative than the others. It isn't so. On the ACA Index, KENNEDY scores 11, JOHNSON 10, SYMINGTON 4, and HUMPHREY 1. These compare with an index of 92 for Senator BYRD. On 38 key questions on which both JOHNSON and BYRD voted, they voted alike four times only.

This index, published by Human Events at 408 First Street SE., in Washington, is a remarkable labor in behalf of political understanding. The ACA editors began by studying 963 votes in the Senate between 1955 and 1959, and 280 votes in the House between 1957 and 1959. After prolonged study, they reduced this mass of material to 77 Senate votes and 40 House votes that seemed to offer clear-cut questions of a conservative point of view as opposed to a liberal point of view.

Doubtless no two political observers would agree that these 117 Senate and House votes are the exact 117 that should have been chosen for a study of this sort. Reasonably minded men, regarding themselves as conservatives, might well object to the minus charged against their spokesmen on a few issues. But in a study as large in scope as this one, such objections cancel out. In broad outline, the ACA's dispassionate brush paints a picture too clear to be denied. And the index is just as valuable, of course, in rating liberals as in rating conservatives; the percentages need only to be turned upside down.

One popular impression is abundantly supported by the ACA's study: The South is indeed a bulwark of conservatism. Of the 15 most conservative Democrats in the Senate, 13 are from the South; the others are LAUSCHE of Ohio, with a rating of 81, and FREAR of Delaware, who scores 62. But Republicans, as a group, are far more conservative than even the southerners, as a group. The most liberal Republican is COOPER, of Kentucky, who nevertheless scores 27 on the ACA Index; no fewer than 44 Democrats are more liberal than he.

Substantially the same picture obtains in the House. If it were not for their unfortunate predilection for accepting Federal handouts, southern Representatives would rank up top on the conservative index. When it comes to questions of States rights, individual liberty, private property, and sound money, southern Democrats scarcely can be

distinguished from typical stanch Republicans.

Among Virginians in the House, Congressman POFF, Republican, of the Sixth District, is the most consistent conservative, with a rating of 98. His 10th District colleague, Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, is in second place with 86. Then come the State's eight Democratic Representatives, led by Richmond's J. VAUGHAN GARY, at 78; others are TUCK 77, HARRISON 75, ABBITT 75, SMITH 73, DOWNING 47, HARDY 45, and JENNINGS 25. Remarkably, New York's Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL rates 32.

The ACA study helps to clarify the dilemma that faces southerners in terms of the presidential election. Every one of the potential Democratic candidates appraised in this study is, on the record, a liberal. Messrs. KENNEDY, JOHNSON, HUMPHREY, and SYMINGTON have almost nothing in common with their southern colleagues; they share a party label, that is all. If an opportunity were presented for southerners to vote their political convictions (as these convictions are represented by their own Congressmen), southerners would support BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona (98); or JOHN WILLIAMS, of Delaware (99); or BRIDGES, of New Hampshire (92). Trouble is, GOLDWATER, WILLIAMS, and BRIDGES bear the label of "Republicans."

These gentlemen are, of course, conservatives, and if the Republic ever comes to its political senses, we will choose up sides all over again so that the national political weight reflected in 30 Republican Senators and 14 Democratic Senators, each with an ACA rating of 40 or better, could be put to more effective use.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The Crisis of the "Golden Sixties"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address I delivered before the 21st general convention of the System Federation No. 41 of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway on Wednesday, June 15, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS OF THE "GOLDEN SIXTIES"

I appreciate the honor of being with you here this morning. I appreciate the opportunity, too, of being able to discuss with you some of the major issues facing America today.

You undoubtedly remember that on January 1 of this year the newspapers were full of predictions that we were entering what they called the "golden sixties"—that this decade was one of glorious promise for the people of the United States. Less than 6 months have passed. But I wonder how many Americans are finding things so golden right now. Our position in world affairs is more precarious and more dangerous than it has been since the days of Korea. Here at home the problems of unemployment, the welfare of our aged, the education of our children, and other problems equally pressing, are going unsolved.

You have a right—and a duty—to ask why this is so. The answer is that we have a Government in Washington that, in the down-to-earth phrase coined nearly five centuries ago, is following a penny wise pound foolish approach to America's problems. To save a dollar today it is sacrificing America's promise for the future. It is sacrificing our most important resource—the strength and well-being of our people.

As a Senator, and as a member of the Democratic Party, I am disturbed by this. I can assure you that I and many of my colleagues on Capitol Hill are trying hard to do something about it. As you know, constructive action has been difficult because of the ever-present threat of—and the use of—the Presidential veto.

This is a time of crisis for America, both at home and abroad. The issue is not just how to get a chicken in every pot, but how we are going to win the struggle for survival.

There can be no question, the peace issue is predominant. No sane man, regardless of party, advocates the horrors of war. But peace cannot be secured through wishful thinking.

Last December the Democratic Advisory Committee issued its own "State of the Union" message for 1960, in which it observed: "The legitimate debate is not over ends but mesans—the policies which will produce the conditions most likely to secure the just and lasting peace which all Americans seek. The record of the Republican administration in foreign policy reveals erratic policy switches which have sadly damaged America's strength and prestige."

"Our foreign policy," the message continued, "should be far more than slogans, speeches and reassurances. Our foreign policy is basically a matter of our national strength, our national effort and our national will and ideals of human justice."

The conduct of our foreign policy is constitutionally vested in the hands of the executive branch of Government. There is little Congress can do to forestall the blunders. We can, however, urge, investigate and otherwise endeavor to persuade the President to conduct a responsible foreign policy.

I believe the leadership of my party is to be commended for its own responsible attitude and actions on foreign policy questions. It has urged the administration not to rely only on good-will trips, summit conferences and dollars to pave the road to peace. All of these things have their place. But, singly or collectively, they are not a substitute for a well-thought-out, well-executed foreign policy.

Whether we like it or not, the state of our defenses is a basic consideration in determining our position in the world today. Soviet strides in missiles and their successes with space satellites and moon shots have convinced nearly everyone that we should take a close look into how our defense money is being spent—everyone, that is, except the administration. But the Democrats in Washington are asking some searching questions, and the answers have not always been so satisfactory. It is, in fact, because of Democratic action in Congress that our defense posture is as good as it it.

I believe with Mr. Eisenhower that God is on the side of right. But I also believe that God helps those who help themselves. We cannot afford to let our military forces deteriorate while Mr. Khrushchev gloats. We need strength to match strength.

Even on the domestic front we are lagging behind. Look at education. The experts are warning that our children are not getting an education they will some day need to lead our country in its competition with the Russians. There are not enough classrooms. Teachers are underpaid. In higher education, we shall need in the next 10 years a number of new buildings equal to the total number built in the last 200 years. If we are going to meet these needs, the Federal Government must act. Many of us in Congress have long waged a vigorous battle for appropriate legislation. Right now we are fighting, and fighting hard, to get through a bill to aid in school construction.

The administration has finally come around to sponsoring a proposal, too. But this proposal, calling for expenditures carried out over a long period of years instead of meeting costs now, would in the long run be unnecessarily expensive and would still fail to meet the need. It is another example of the penny wise pound foolish attitude which is sapping the strength of our country.

A Presidential veto may be in the offing. But short of that, I promise you we are going to have this school issue resolved before Congress adjourns. We need more and better schools for our children—and we are going to have them.

One of the most serious problems confronting this country is that of creeping unemployment. I have heard a great deal from administration spokesmen about the dangers of creeping inflation. I, for one, certainly do not minimize the problems caused by the rising cost of living. But we rarely hear a word from the administration about the problem caused by rising unemployment. According to the statisticians, 2 years have passed since the start of the recovery from the disastrous 1958 recession. But there are a lot of people around here who do not know that the recession is over, and the economists are already talking about the beginning of the next one.

The facts are blatantly clear, and no amount of hiding can minimize their impact. Unemployment is a growing problem. We have had three recessions since the end of World War II. After the first recession, unemployment dropped nationally to a 3 percent level; after the second recession unemployment remained at the 4 percent level. And now at least 5 percent of the working people of the Nation remain unemployed.

It is little consolation for the unemployed to know that we have reached a half-billion dollar economy. Certainly this is a great achievement, but it does not make hunger and suffering any easier to bear.

All kinds of excuses have been made for the persistence of unemployment. At first it was blamed on the steel strike. When the steel strike was over, the blame was placed on the snow and the rain. Now that summer is here and the snow has melted all we hear is the expression of hope that by and by it will all be better.

Meanwhile, the economy is operating way below capacity, the average duration of unemployment continues to rise, and the number of depressed areas is increasing. We have been warned by leading economists that if our rate of economic growth is not stepped up, we face the prospect of being outstripped by the Soviet Union.

And the administration refuses to do anything. Its only preoccupation seems to be to gather a budget surplus. But I say to you that inaction is the best way to get a budget deficit.

If this were a time for niceties, I would hesitate to say this. But we cannot afford the luxury of smiling pleasantries. I must say that the present administration reminds me of the old Bourbon king: "After me the deluge." Instead of offering a positive program to meet the needs of America, the administration is satisfied with the slogan of "one-third and one." As we have been reminded, this is all that is needed in order to sustain the vetoes of the positive program that the majority party is trying to enact in the present Congress.

Take, for example, the presidential veto stopping aid to depressed areas. To the administration this legislation, so vital to America and to my State of West Virginia, is a squandering of money. This was the excuse given in the veto message.

I find this incredible. The President can talk all day about the necessity of giving aid to underdeveloped and needy areas abroad. This will strengthen democracy, he says. Well, I say it is high time we started strengthening our own democracy here at home.

We have more than a hundred communities in the United States, some of the worst ones being in my own State, which are suffering from chronic and persistent unemployment. In some of these areas unemployment has reached depression proportions.

There are no labor shortage areas anywhere within the United States where these unemployed can migrate and find jobs. Your neighbors can tell you this. The only solution, then, is to try to create additional jobs and bring them to these communities. This is what the depressed areas bill would have achieved. Its major aim was to establish credit funds at reasonable rates of interest to encourage expanding business to locate in depressed areas. The bill would have helped to improve the public facilities in these communities to make them more attractive to new industry. It would also have provided for the retraining of workers, and in some cases it would have paid workers who have exhausted unemployment insurance subsistence payments while they would be undergoing these periods of training.

This, it seems to me, is a constructive approach to some important economic problems, not a wasteful one. Nothing, in fact, could be more wasteful than losing the productivity of a good part of our working force. But the administration has spoken. And there are not enough votes to override the veto.

One major piece of legislation which we were able to get through during the last session of Congress was an amendment to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts. The most important part of this legislation was that it increased retirement and survivor benefits in general by about 10 percent. This is a measure that is of enormous importance to the country and to my State of West Virginia. In 1958–1959 a total of more than $1 billion in benefit payments was paid to people throughout the country. The amount for West Virginia was more than $22 million. Because of this legislation, the amount for the future should be even greater.

But I know, and you know, that this does not solve the problems of the railroad employee. Total employment on American railroads has dropped sharply since World War II. Only 2 years have not seen a decline. In 1956, employment on class 1 railroads averaged just over 1 million; in 1957 it dropped to 985,000; in the recession year of 1958 it dropped further to 840,000. Railway employment declined throughout 1959, and averaged just 816,000 for the year. The November 1959 railway employment figure of 783,995 was the lowest monthly figure in this century.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association has backed a number of proposals which should help to relieve the crisis. One of these is the Passenger Train Service Act of 1960, which would require the railroads, as part of their public responsibility, "to provide reasonably frequent, safe, clean, and convenient passenger service" and to make every reasonable effort to serve the public adequately in their passenger train operations. This legislation, railroad labor believes, would not prevent the elimination of unneeded passenger services, but it would protect the public from the wholesale abandonment of passenger trains even though these trains are still needed to meet our country's transportation requirements.

Other bills of importance to railroad employees are the railroad accident reports bill, the railroad track motor car safety bill, and the railroad track and bridge safety inspection bill. These bills, and others, represent the responsible way in which the railroad employees are trying to improve railroad operation.

The railroad workers, the Democratic Party, and labor in general have joined forces in trying to get through a medical insurance program for the aged. We all know that the problem of how to finance medical care is a critical—almost impossible one—for most of our 16 million citizens age 65 and over. There has been a lot of delay in meeting the issues, but the Democratic leadership in the House and Senate is working hard to resolve them.

Time is running out, and I have not yet had the opportunity to discuss a lot of issues which our Democrats in Congress have been trying to solve. Let me mention some of them briefly.

There is a crying need for a realistic urban redevelopment and public facilities program. Congress enacted excellent legislation in these areas last year, but two vetoes forced the Congress to trim down the program and settle on one which is less adequate. The antipollution bill passed by Congress was also vetoed. Thus our cities continue to decay and our rivers and streams remain polluted.

A lot of us have been asking the administration to undertake studies which would help solve some basic economic problems. Automation, one of our greatest blessings and greatest curses, has created terrible problems in many areas. I myself have strongly urged the creation of a Coal Research and Development Commission, which would have opened new vistas for the use of our important coal resources. A bill which would have done this was vetoed last year.

This Congress is not yet over. If I have painted a black picture, I join you in hoping that it will be brightened before Congress adjourns. I can assure you that I and my colleagues are doing everything we can to push through positive legislation.

What the Democratic Party has stood for during this Congress can be summarized in the famous words spoken by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, at a time when America was still fighting its way out of the throes of the great depression. You know these words, but I hope you will bear with me while I recall them now. The President was discussing the differences between the Democratic, or liberal party, and the conservatives, and he said:

"One great difference which has characterized this division has been that the liberal party—no matter what its particular name was at the time—believed in the wisdom and the efficacy of the will of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority. • • • The other great difference between the two parties has been this: The liberal party is a party which believes that, as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The liberal party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls—to insure to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness."

Salary Increases for Postal and Other Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I add my voice to those who have spoken in support of H.R. 9883, which would bring a long needed and necessary pay increase to postal and other Federal employees.

I also take this occasion to commend most sincerely the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and those members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their effective work in achieving a breakthrough in a most important area of legislation.

As a cosponsor of the Morrison proposal and as a signer of the discharge petition, I join those who point out that a reasonable increase of 9 percent is preferable to that of 7½ percent. However, although the facts are not on the side of the administration, I certainly realize that the original increase of 9 percent would without doubt incur a Presidential veto.

Additionally, I realize that the amendment calling for a 7½-percent increase should make the bill less vulnerable to a Presidential veto. This amendment has been offered in good faith by reasonable men so that such Presidential action may be stayed, and that the issue may be clarified should a veto unhappily occur.

It may well be that the administration will not assume its responsibility in approving the amended bill. I do not think this possibility should deter us from approval of the bill. Our responsibility is to act affirmatively since we must not lose sight of the fact that the provisions of H.R. 9883 are needed and needed now.

It would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" to repeat the extensive documentation, made in committee and on this floor during discussion of the sum and substance of the issue, on the practical need to improve the wage standard of our postal and other Federal employees, and the economic feasibility of doing it at this time.

I not only urge passage of this bill, but I urge that it pass so overwhelmingly—in both Houses—that a Presidential veto, if still forthcoming—can be readily overridden, as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the President would like to see the employees of the U.S. Government on a wage level in line with that prevailing in private industry. I would also hope that he join with the supporters of the increase in realizing that the wage structure of our Federal Government is closely related to the maintenance and attraction of competent personnel. This is sound budget thinking.

Our duty in Congress is clear. Let the record show that the duty of the administration is also clear.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard New Control System Under Attack by Technicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Department of the Navy, by a directive issued last October which is now being implemented, proposed a basic reorgani-

zation of production planning and control for the country's 11 naval shipyards. Whereas we all desire and constantly seek more efficiency and economy in Government, considerable question has been raised as to whether or not the hoped for savings will be realized by the new control plan. Mr. President, there has been little discussion on this subject and, for that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the June 7, 1960, edition of the Concord, N.H., Daily Monitor by its Washington correspondent, Lawrence Fernsworth. This article is one of the best informed discussions of the pros and cons of the control plan and should be helpful to all who have the plan under consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTSMOUTH NEW CONTROL SYSTEM UNDER ATTACK BY TECHNICIANS

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The top technical personnel at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard are seriously concerned over a new production planning and control "guideline," issued by the Navy which they say will create chaos at the yard, lower its efficiency and result in the loss of 450 to 600 jobs.

The question was threshed out in Washington a few days ago at a conference participated in by yard technicians, Bureau of Ships officials, Senator BRIDGES and COTTON, Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, Senators MARGARET SMITH and EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine, Senator SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, and other Members of Congress from Maine and Massachusetts.

The Navy directive, issued last November and now being implemented in the country's 11 naval shipyards, is a basic reorganization of production planning and control. The Bureau of Ships asserts that it is made in the interests of economy and of the increased production of ships. The Bureau estimates it will save about $9 million.

WANT REVERSAL

The civilian technical personnel, including supervisory analysts and schedulers, supervisors, and other technicians, assert it will work out in the reverse order and at the same time strike a serious blow at shop morale.

Among the things it will do, they say, is to eliminate shop level planning, disestablish supporting shops and farm out to private industry work now done at the yard shops.

They also fear that it will mean the downgrading and easing out of many civilian technicians in favor of replacing them with naval officers.

The Portsmouth Naval Shop Analysts and Schedulers' Association, in a review of the directive and its effects, stated:

"Among other things the directive authorizes the establishment of a production engineering division headed by the production officer.

"It also authorizes the transfer of the analyst function of shop level planning to the shopping and estimating division, which abolishes the rating of shop analyst and scheduler. The planning functions remaining in the shop office will be accomplished by the shop planner."

The association also says that last December, "foreseeing the chaos that would be created" by implementing the directive, it approached the Bureau of Ships to ask for a reconsideration, with negative results.

At the Washington conference, just held, attended by Rear Adm. R. K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, and others of his staff, the naval group showed small inclination to revise their directive.

PRAISED BY BRIDGES

Senator BRIDGES pointed out that the Portsmouth yard was one of the best in the country and cautioned the naval men to go slow about putting their directive into force. He wanted to be satisfied that a real and substantial economy was involved, and that there would be no downgrading of the establishment.

"We will need to build many more ships in the future, including nuclear-powered submarines and Polaris-type ships," he said. "It will never do to allow the Portsmouth yard to become unprepared for such tasks. It is now eminently fitted by equipment, experience, and personnel training to do such things."

One of the points brought out by Thomas J. McLin, president of the Supervisory Analysts & Schedulers Association, is that the Electric Boat Co., which has become the biggest private shipyard engaged in nuclear submarine and other naval construction, has recently adopted the very kind of planning system which the Navy seeks to replace in its own yards.

John Devereaux, president of the Analysts & Schedulers Association said that all employee groups in all naval shipyards were in accord with a statement in which the Chief of the Bureau of Ships said:

"Production planning and control must work if the naval shipyards are to have any place in the future building of ships. It must work if we are going to be able, without present funds, to build more ships. I sincerely believe that unless we are able to get more ships with the dollars we are granted, we will have a second-class Navy within the next decade, which, to my mind, means we will be on the road to becoming a second-class nation."

CALLED EFFECTIVE

The Portsmouth analysts and schedulers told the naval men that the existing production planning and control system was "an effective tool which, if properly and sensibly applied, provided the leading man with a complete work package, suitable for assignment to the productive worker. In addition it provided the naval shipyards with a tool by which cost could be controlled."

By contrast, they said, the new instructions, "when fully implemented, will destroy most of the gains made during the last 10 years in production planning; the control also will be lost.

"Planners and estimators, whether former mechanics, analysts or supervisors, because of their physical and mental detchment from the shops, cannot efficiently plan jobs suitable for assignment to the productive worker."

The stand taken by the Portsmouth groups is backed by the National Association of Naval Shop Analysts & Schedulers; the Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense; the East Coast Metal Trades Council.

Maurice J. Murphy, Governor Powell's administrative assistant, also attended the conference.

Among other Congressmen present were EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, THOMAS J. LANE, and WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts, and JAMES C. OLIVER and FRANK M. COFFIN, of Maine.

Others in the Portsmouth group representing variously analysts, schedulers, quartermen, and leadermen, and personnel advisers, were: Wilfred G. Arnold, Roger C. King, George Pope, William Connell, Fred DeRochemont, Harold Rollins, Edward Duffy, Kenneth Robertson, Tom Van Arsdale, and Attorney Donald Murtha.

Ed Pauley Addresses Graduating Class at University of Santa Clara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I take pleasure in bringing to the attention of my colleagues an address by Mr. Edwin W. Pauley at the recent commencement exercises of the University of Santa Clara. Mr. Pauley is a well-known California industrialist and public figure, and a member of the University of California's board of regents.

In his address Mr. Pauley wisely observed that "America's educational responsibility to a free world, in the face of the challenge of communism—is not limited just to the fields of international politics or the race for space. It also involves—and perhaps more importantly—competition for men's minds."

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of Mr. Pauley's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLARA BY EDWIN W. PAULEY, LOS ANGELES, MEMBER OF BOARD OF REGENTS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, JUNE 4, 1960

Your Excellency, Very Reverend Father Rector, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignori, members of the board of trustees, faculty, honored guests, members of the graduating class, their families and friends, let me say, simply and sincerely, that I am deeply grateful—grateful for that most generous introduction—grateful to Santa Clara University for its honorary degree. I am proud to be one of your adopted sons. As I join you in your 109th commencement I am beginning to feel that I and my alma mater—the University of California—are indeed Johnnies-come-lately on the scene of California education. As I looked into the record, I found that your institution can—in a fashion—trace its roots back to a technological school founded by the Franciscan Fathers in 1777. Then, I looked at your Jesuit faculty and found that they are in their fifth century in the business of education—with experience on five continents and in 74 countries.

My dear graduates, a number of semesters have gone by since my own college days, but I feel rather close to you at this commencement because in the past few years I have returned to university work. This time it has not been as a student in the strict sense of the word—however, as I think of it I have been a student; a student in a rather strange school. And I have been learning lessons something like this Jesuit University has been teaching you. It has been my privilege these past few years to serve as a member and as chairman of the board of regents of the University of California. My experience in the school of university administration has been instructive and challenging. Today I should like to compare notes and review with you some of the lessons I have learned as a regent. But what interests you and me most, and all the friends of Santa Clara, is the challenge of the future.

The challenge of the future confronts Santa Clara, the University of California

and every single other college and university in the State. California's exploding population has produced a crisis in higher education which we all must accept and work out together. The University of California is considering the Santa Clara-Santa Cruz Counties area as the location of one of its new major campuses; consequently, I am happy indeed to be welcomed at Santa Clara as a guest and teammate rather than as a potential competitor in the business of education. There is a massive job to be done and I am very happy to have the Jesuits on our team. The problem which forces the University of California into further expansion is one that can never be met by public education alone. It demands the combined and enthusiastic efforts of all higher educational institutions in the State. And be sure, this means private as well as public schools. The population of the United States is not only growing but on the go, and to me it seems as if everybody is moving to California. This, plus our own steadily increasing birth rate, is confronting us with more and more young men and women wanting a college education. Without carefully planned expansion of physical facilities and of teaching staffs at strategic points throughout the State, every collegiate-level school will be under serious pressure, and the quality of the education it offers will be directly impaired.

But we cannot think solely of the reputations of our educational insttiutions, or even of the personal benefit which each individual should achieve from a college education. We must also think of the solid growth and development of California and the entire West. The future of civilization will be shaped not by growth in population alone, but by what is done to create new opportunities through the best training that we can provide. It is basic in our concept of higher education that every youth should be able to get an education up to his capacity. With this as the norm, the massiveness of the problem, the complexity of the solution and the astronomical cost of any adequate solution are obvious.

Recent events such as the U–2 plane incident and the collapse of the summit conference make us ever mindful of the seriousness of the Communist menace and the critical world situation which confronts the graduates of this day.

We should remember though, that when we as Americans condemn actions of the Soviets—we should make it clear that we are condemning Soviet communism and certainly not all Russian people. I've been behind the Iron Curtain and visited with the Russian people. I know first hand that there are countless Russians—many of them Orthodox Catholics—who are hoping for the day when they can live and worship without restriction and fear. We must never do anything that would prompt these unfortunate peoples behind the Iron Curtain to give up hope for a future life of freedom and dignity.

This leads me to another major point—that of America's educational responsibility to a free world in the face of the challenge of communism. This challenge is not limited just to the fields of international politics or the race for space. It also involves—and perhaps more importantly—competition for men's minds.

That is why it is so vital that we plan today to meet the educational requirements of the future. Because the future will be shaped by those who best train and prepare their young people.

This is an area in which the Jesuits have long excelled.

Your own university is a good example of a truly outstanding liberal arts institution. But the Jesuits are also experts in the scientific and technological areas.

In the field of research, the Jesuits have been particularly conspicuous—especially in astronomy and geophysics. As "space technologists" several Jesuits have distinguished themselves. In the United States alone, the seismological stations at Georgetown, St. Louis, Fordham, Cleveland, and Weston College have contributed much to world knowledge and understanding of earthquakes. The recent events in Chile are evidence that we still have a lot to learn in this area. In meteorology, the observations and inventions of Father Algue were of invaluable service in forecasting typhoons and hurricanes in the Philippines and the West Indies.

Jesuits have also distinguished themselves in physics, psychology, and biology.

It is obvious with this background, the Jesuits are well prepared to do their part in meeting the educational challenges of the space age.

The staggering task of providing sufficient educational opportunities for our young people in the years to come will certainly require maximum cooperation and teamwork of all public and private institutions.

The University of California alone will have to take care of 100,000 young men and women by the year 1970. That is more than twice the youths we are educating now. With that in mind, the State legislature in 1959 passed a resolution requesting the State board of education and the regents of the University of California to review the situation and submit a master plan for higher education in California. The State board and the regents recognizing, as I have already indicated, that the future of higher education in California is as much a concern of the private colleges and universities as it is of public education, created a master plan survey team. President Arthur G. Coons of Occidental College was named chairman, with Vice Provost Robert G. Wert of Stanford University and Father Charles Casassa of Loyola University at Los Angeles representing independent colleges and universities.

In brief, the master plan survey showed that California's present population of 15 million persons will be increased to at least 25 million by 1975 and more than 45 million by the year 2000.

The effect of this population explosion on our school systems is staggering. It means that public and private colleges and universities will be expected to expand their combined enrollments from 225,000 to at least 661,000 students in 1975 alone.

Perhaps I should apologize to the graduating class of 1960 for introducing such a worrisome topic into this traditionally happy day. However, I am sure that you must know there is a silver lining in this dark cloud. You may count yourself fortunate in having had less competition in your struggle for a degree than your younger brothers and sisters and your children may have when they knock at the doors of Santa Clara or any other major center of higher education.

I recently had an opportunity to hear the noted author and educator—C. Northcote Parkinson—author of "Parkinson's Law"—expound his latest whimsical extensions of that law in the field of economics. He was speaking to students at the University of California.

According to Mr. Parkinson, it seems we are now entering an age when each employed individual establishes what he should earn by adding up what he thinks he needs to spend. His budget will include funds for such necessities as a new wing on the house, an annual holiday in Europe, a flying saucer for the children and, of course, a rocketship for weekend trips to play on the moon, a fishing cruiser, a Cadillac convertible, and the like. Dr. Parkinson is reported to have said that, of course, no man will actually be worth the salary he will need to buy all of these things but that in the years ahead it will be impossible to live decently on what one is worth.

I have my serious doubts about this version of Parkinson's theory—but I hesitate to be too positive about it. I remember all too well that Jules Verne wrote "20,000 Leagues Under the Sea" nearly 100 years ago. It is quite possible that if Jules Verne were alive today he would see little to worry about—looking into the future—in the problem of educating ever-increasing thousands of young people in an ever more complex and demanding society. Quite possibly he would look at the problem with great interest and enthusiasm. Perhaps he would predict that television is the answer to improving communication between teachers and students.

While I make no pretense of being a Jules Verne, nor a C. Northcote Parkinson, I do hold the conviction that we will find through television an additional means of meeting our educational commitments of the future and that we can bridge whatever voids may exist in physical facilities.

I would like to refer to the recent activities of the University of California in the area of educational TV. As a result of past experimentation and testing as well as participation on NBC's early morning show, "Continental Classroom," we foresee a bright future for television in meeting the problems of rapidly increasing enrollments. Television offers offers the following:

1. Better utilization of faculty resources. Qualified faculty are becoming more difficult to find all the time. Consequently if one can lecture to 400 students at one time and do a good job by using television, it is obvious this is more efficient than making two lectures to 200 students at a time.

2. More efficient use of facilities. If we have an enrollment of 500 students in a course and a lecture hall which holds 400, we have to either cut down enrollment or use the same lecture hall twice. Television would enable us to handle the overflow by televising the lecture to another room.

3. Accelerate the education process. If 100 medical students can watch a patient at one time instead of having to do it in groups of five—we might decrease the time for a course which involved this type of activity.

4. Encourage the improvement of instructional quality in large classes. In large classes, the instruction might be improved in some lectures by providing better visibility via TV, by providing every student with a "front row seat."

Finally, and most important, through television we can make available to large numbers of students—the great scholars—our famous men of the arts and sciences. Students who might never have an opportunity to benefit from the teachings of men like your own Father Patrick Donohoe—Harvard's Nathan M. Pusey—Stanford's Wallace Sterling and California's Edward Teller—could have this exhilarating experience through television.

Just imagine the possibilities of such an arrangemene where the greatest teaching minds of our time are made available to students everywhere.

I must be the first to admit that educational television has some drawbacks. NBC's "Continental Classroom," for instance, appears at 6:30 in the morning. Now, that's awfully early for students under any circumstances, but especially to listen to a physics lecture by Dr. Teller. I've tried it a few times but usually ended up by going back to bed to pursue my morning newspaper.

Although I doubt if Dr. Teller's TV physics lectures attracted many students, I understand that they were extremely popular with college and high school physics instructors. These instructors found that televised lec-

tures by one of our foremost experts kept them up-to-date in a complex and rapidly changing field and helped them to do a better job with their own students.

During the past year, in conjunction with NBC's network show, the University of California's Extension Department offered a two-semester physics course for home study, taught by California's Prof. Harvey White. In the judgment of the instructors, performance of television students was equal to that of resident students.

Television is not the answer to all of our educational problems, but it is one of the many tools which may be applied in the process of finding an answer. The essential point is that we may need every tool we can find if the answer is to be the best that human ingenuity can devise.

One of the gravest dangers of this program of necessary educational expansion is the depersonalizing of the individual student; treating him as a number instead of a person; making him a function of the mass. You at Santa Clara will have an easier time of it than ourselves in this regard, with your manageable numbers matriculating each year. The best we can do in the University of California is to dedicate ourselves to making our university look and feel smaller. Neither of us, big or small, must let that concept of the person escape us or escape the individual student himself. This concept of the individual is the key to our American Constitution and Bill of Rights. It is at the center of our capitalistic system of economics. It is, I think, at the center of Christianity. And we must keep it at the center of our education, the purpose of which is to help each person to realize the full powers of his personality.

If there is one thing America needs even more than scientists today, it is men of integrated personalities, who can see life steadily and see it wholly; men who understand what is happening in the world; men who know enough about the past to understand the present. If Santa Clara and our other colleges and universities deliver such men of wisdom and vision, we may consider ourselves successful. If we do not we shall have failed. I have every confidence in success.

In concluding, I feel I have an obligation to warn you graduates of 1960 that these Jesuits who have been educating you for the past 4 years, are described in the dictionary as a crafty, scheming lot. Certainly it must have taken a lot of craft and scheming to establish 28 universities and colleges and 42 high schools in this country alone. And you might as well be warned that there are 35,000 of these crafty schemers abroad in the world, distributed over 74 countries. I think it might be safely said, even by a regent of the University of California, that the Jesuits are in education to stay and that California is certainly benefiting from the experience.

Finally, I commend to you graduates, a lively interest and continuing loyalty in a distinguished institution—the University of Santa Clara.

Thank you.

A Proposed Series of American Flag Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, based upon a suggestion made by Mr. Carl P. Reuth, editor of Linn's Weekly Stamp News, which would provide for the continued issuance of the American flag series stamps on each July 4, subsequent to the 1960 flag issue—50-star—by the Post Office Department.

Since it appears that no more States will be added within the foreseeable future, I feel that this stamp series should be continued by honoring flags used since the beginning of our Nation, such as the following: National Flag, 1777; Bennington Flag, 1777; Navy Jack, 1775—Don't Tread on Me; Cambridge Flag, 1775; Continental Flag, 1775; Bunker Hill Flag; Pine Tree Flag, 1775; Taunton Flag, 1774; Gadsen Flag, 1775; Fort Moultrie Flag.

Stamps subsequent to July 4, 1970, would be issued as determined appropriate by the Postmaster General with the advice of the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

Portuguese Honor Basil Brewer With Pedro Francisco Decoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the outstanding newspaper publishers of the country is Basil Brewer of New Bedford, Mass. He and his newspaper are known far and wide, beyond the limits of its normal circulation area, because of Mr. Brewer's outspoken policy of candor on the great issues of the day. Because of his outstanding work as a newspaper publisher and as a defender of minority groups, it was most fitting that he should recently have received the second annual Pedro Francisco Award from the Portuguese Continental Union of the United States, an organization of over 10,000 members of Portuguese descent.

Pedro Francisco will always be remembered for his service with Gen. George Washington's army, a service so distinguished that Washington described him as, "the greatest individual soldier of the Revolutionary War."

In making this award to Mr. Brewer, the Portuguese Continental Union of the United States has fittingly honored one of America's outstanding men. Mr. President, at this point in the body of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the account of the presentation as reported in the Standard Times of June 13, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTUGUESE HONOR BASIL BREWER WITH PEDRO FRANCISCO DECORATION—PUBLISHER IS ACCLAIMED BY U.S., LISBON LEADERS

(By Elmer Rodrigues)

Scaling a new pinnacle of honor in a long, distinguished career, Basil Brewer—"a stalwart patriot" and "a true friend"—yesterday was venerated and extolled as "the American who did the most last year to advance Portugal and the Purtuguese."

In a munificent display of gratitude and esteem, the Portuguese Continental Union of the United States—representing 10,000 members in six States—conferred the second annual Pedro Francisco Award and scroll on the publisher of the Standard-Times.

A cross-section audience of approximately 800 persons joined in the acclaim at a banquet in his honor at Lincoln Park.

CONVEY APPRECIATION

Numerous dignitaries in the business, political, and international government fields, clergymen, and plain citizens conveyed their appreciation with laudatory remarks and applause.

Mr. Brewer was selected for the honor by the Portuguese Continental Union, which is concerned with the health and welfare of Portuguese-Americans, for "encouraging Portugal, her culture and traditions" in this country.

Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, received the first annual award at a luncheon last July in Washington.

The award is named for the Portuguese soldier-hero who served with Gen. George Washington's Continental Army. Francisco is permanently enshrined in New Bedford with a square named for him at Weld and Purchase Streets; by statute the Governor of Massachusetts proclaims March 15 as Pedro Francisco Day annually.

PROPOSES STATUE

Audience response was enthusiastic when Mr. Brewer said, "May I suggest on this occasion that a statue be erected in Washington to that great American of Portuguese descent, whom General Washington described as 'the greatest individual soldier of the Revolutionary War,' Pedro Francisco."

The Portuguese Continental Union medal is described as the Cross of Christ, a red and white cross with the Portuguese escutcheon in the center.

Twice decorated by foreign governments—Portugal and Brazil—Mr. Brewer received a standing ovation when the medal was bestowed on him. Earlier, Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, of Massachusetts, and HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts, Portuguese consuls in four eastern cities and other dignitaries joined in lauding the publisher.

Attorney Joseph F. Francis of Fairhaven, renowned afterdinner speaker, was master of ceremonies and introduced the speakers and many guests.

Luis Gomes of New York City, supreme president of the Portuguese Continental Union, before draping the multicolor ribboned Pedro Francisco Cross of Christ Medal around the publisher's neck, observed:

"On the occasion of bestowing due homage to a great American, a journalist and renowned publisher—a man who through the columns of his newspaper, the Standard-Times, has time and again honored Portugal and her sons, residing in and serving this country, with extreme loyalty and deep gratitude, the Portuguese Continental Union adds another page to its resplendent history."

In fervent response, Mr. Brewer's remarks equated the tributes he received.

The publisher, in an analogy, described Browning's "two soul sides," saying that one he had attempted to show was the "hard, uncompromising position I chose against communism.

"The other (side) I choose to present to the Portuguese, present and not present, and to their leaders and their guests; for they have been so kind to me, and for so long, as today. I speak no word of Portuguese, but it was as if I looked into their hearts and they into mine almost from the beginning.

"Therefore, I present to the Portuguese, present and not present, to their leaders and

their guests, who have honored me in their name, the 'face of love' * * *"

Preceding the publisher's remarks, a formidable array of distinguished speakers, such as is hardly ever seen at Lincoln Park or other banquets here, extolled the virtues of Mr. Brewer, his works, and his services.

Senator SALTONSTALL commended the "high-spirited friendship for America and devotion to free world solidarity of Portuguese people at this time of stress and challenge."

The Senator characterized Mr. Brewer as "a stalwart patriot, a dedicated journalist, and a deep believer in the American way of life."

Expressing the appreciation of the Commonwealth for the publisher's dedication to civic progress, the Senator added, "The effects of Basil Brewer's persistent promotion of the social, economic, and industrial interests of New Bedford and Cape Cod long will be felt."

HONOR WELL DESERVED

Representative MARTIN told the gathering that "America needs men of the character of Basil Brewer, the kind that can stand up and be counted when the counting is good.

"This honor is well deserved. He is worthy of it. In the tense years ahead, when there might be doubts as to where America is going, as long as we have men like Basil Brewer the ship will be on an even keel."

Continuing, the veteran legislator said that "countless barriers will be pushed aside and we'll see new horizons with men like Basil Brewer. It's not in Washington, but men like him who make America great—great because the true American is building for a better community and stronger Nation in the villages and towns."

Saying the publisher had "molded an ethnic group in New Bedford" and referring to the major numerical strength of the Portuguese in the city, Mayor Lawler described Mr. Brewer further as "one of the leading, most valued citizens in the community.

"He has molded a vibrant force for the success of the community. His dispensing of news is given in the power of good, not evil, and unlike communism, which dispenses news in the spirit of hatred."

KEITH SPEAKS

Mr. Keith referred to the "outstanding service" the publisher has performed.

"He believes more than any other publisher in States rights and the rights of individuals," the Congressman declared.

Rabbi Bernard H. Ziskind of Tifereth Israel Synagogue described Mr. Brewer as "a craftsman of the written word. It is our prayer and hope that word and the power of the pen will continue. It is more powerful than the sword.

"That word has been spoken fearlessly and courageously on every issue," the rabbi added:

To the Portuguese, for honoring the publisher, Rabbi Ziskind gave praise for their "gifts and contribution. You have laid your offering on the altar of America, which appreciates your gifts—to the dream of America—making it the hope of the world."

BREWER DESCRIBES HEROES

Mr. Brewer bountifully illustrated the progress of civilization, by the deeds and heroic achievements of outstanding men. In sequence, he described some of those who set the pace of history—"direction signs in a confusing world"—from Francisco to Sergeant York, the American hero of World War I.

"What is the meaning of these stories of courage, of deathless devotion to duty?

"1. That all civilized nations, in defense of country, liberty, and duty, share in these moments which belong to history.

"2. That we here now and hereafter must rise to these heroic standards and be willing to follow in the footsteps of the great of the past if we wish to save our freedom and our civilization.

"3. That he who insists on being 'sure to win' is certain to lose; that the only certainty is that we had rather die than not be free."

CITIES DANGERS

The publisher examined the dangers of communism, alluding to his stand against the impossible coexistence with that "land of antifreedom and anti-God, the land of no return—and to all other enemies of our country and our liberty."

Referring to the indomitable determination of the Portuguese, Mr. Brewer observed that the country—in the 450th anniversary of its oversea possessions—has stated it will fight if necessary to retain them.

"In the face of this determination. Nehru has subsided and Communist China also stopped demanding the Portuguese leave Macao," Mr. Brewer noted.

"It has been said about Portugal, 'The Portuguese live in a little country, but they have had all the world in which to die.'

"This example of Portuguese fortitude is in sharp contrast with the supine yielding of their possessions by other European countries, only to have them taken over by communism. Personally, I would like our own country to say more, as we did at Quemoy and Matsu, 'Stop or we will fight,' which often is the best way to prevent war."

ETHEREAL QUALITY

After documenting the armipotence of Portugal in her world-girding discovery age, Mr. Brewer said a determining character of the people is their ethereal quality.

"The strength and endurance of the Portuguese oversea empire came from the fact that, more than any other adventurous, colonial people, the Portuguese took religion with them. Theirs was a spiritual as well as commercial empire," he noted.

District Attorney Dinis, through whose research efforts and initiative the Commonwealth proclaimed March 15 as Pedro Francisco Day, said he was inspired "to have Pedro Francisco's story told, particularly to the children.

"There is no one more worthy than Basil Brewer to be honored with this award," he declared. "Through the years he has demonstrated kindness and generosity to Portuguese-Americans. He has told the story of Portugal and the Portuguese."

FRIEND OF PORTUGUESE

"He is a real friend of the Portuguese, I hope that our government, in sending a representative to Portugal, someday will send Basil Brewer as Ambassador to that country," the district attorney said to much applause.

"I'm sure that because of his close relationships with Portuguese-Americans, he would give that post background and qualifications far superior to any other man this country could choose to send," Mr. Dinis said.

Describing the gathering as American democracy at its best, the Reverend James V. Claypool, pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, said "we are extolling that which means most to us."

The Reverend Jose M. B. Avila of East Falmouth, extended greetings and congratulatiosn to Mr. Brewer on behalf of the Most Reverend James L. Connolly, D.D., bishop of the Fall River Diocese.

COURAGE FOR TRUTH

He cited the publisher for having "the courage to tell the truth about Portugal. Mr. Brewer is a friend of Portugal and is a friend of the truth. Portugal has nothing to fear about the truth."

Father Avila wryly observed that Mr. Brewer does more than "propagate," because the word connotes propaganda, which in turn may connote "untruths, but that is far from the truth as far as Mr. Brewer is concerned."

Bringing greetings from Dr. Luis Esteves Fernandes, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States, the consuls general, and the diplomatic corps, Dr. Jose Manuel Fragoso, consul general of Portugal in New York, said he was impressed with the prestige of the Portuguese Continental Union. He congratulated Mr. Brewer in behalf of his colleagues, noting that he "is a good friend of Portugal" and that the country, its people, and Portuguese Americans "are your good friends."

Daniel O'Connell, chief secretary of Governor Furcolo, brought greetings from the Governor and the Commonwealth.

"There are too few Basil Brewers in our midst," he reflected, who is "by character and by preference a publisher, in addition to a great humanitarian and gentleman.

"GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT"

"To a great publisher and a great public servant, and to a sterling group that saw fit to recognize the sterling qualities of Basil Brewer, congratulations," Mr. O'Connell concluded.

Describing his recent trip to Portugal, where he witnessed the "enthusiastic response of the Portuguese to President Eisenhower in Lisbon," Mayor John M. Arruda, of Fall River, spoke of their love for Americans.

He spoke also of the esteem in which Mr. Brewer is held there, telling how a Standard-Times editorial gained much favor.

"That is why this honor to Mr. Brewer is most deserving. It means more than just an expression of good will. It is an expression of goodness from the hearts of Portuguese in America to a person who has been a true friend of theirs," the mayor said.

J. Freire D'Andrade, director of the House of Portugal, trade and tourist promotion agency for the Portuguese Government in New York, commented that Mr. Brewer "indeed is a worthy friend of the Portuguese. Not once has he faltered in his friendship.

"People do not gain friends without being worthy * * * without having virtues which others admire. And you have in this country many who have gained that respect. As a Portuguese, I am very proud of this and that among so many friends you have Mr. Brewer—it is because he is the best," the governmental representative said.

GIVES INVOCATION

The Right Reverend Monsignor Antonio P. Vieira, pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, gave the invocation. Benediction was by Father Avila.

Head table guests, besides the speakers, included Charles J. Lewin, editor and general manager of the Standard-Times, and Mrs. Lewin; Vasco A. Villela, consul in New Bedford, and Mrs. Villela; Jose B. Henriques, consul in Philadelphia; Mrs. Fragoso, Dr. Antonio M. Colaco, consul in Boston, and Mrs. Colaco, and Comdr. Jose Cabral of the House of Portugal.

Also, Mrs. D'Andrade, Vasco S. Jardim, publisher of Luso-Americano of Newark, and Joao R. Rocha, publisher of the Portuguese Daily News, who was in charge of the banquet committee, and Mrs. Rocha, and William D. Forrester, of the magazine Portugal Today.

Other guests introduced included Superior Court Judges August C. Taveira and Frank E. Smith, of Massachusetts, and Arthur B. Carrellas, of Rhode Island, and their wives.

OTHERS INTRODUCED

Anibal S. Branco of Boston, and Arthur Belao, of Brockton, supreme secretary and treasurer of the Portuguese Continental Union, respectively, and their wives, also were introduced. Mr. Branco assisted Mr. Gomes in the medal presentation to Mr. Brewer, reading the scroll inscription.

Numerous other dignitaries were seated throughout the audience at special tables.

Included were representative Portuguese Continental Union groups of 60 lodges from throughout Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Delegates from various Portuguese-American civic, fraternal, and veterans' groups were represented.

Mr. Rocha was honorary president for the central banquet committee, and president of the local committee. Also on the New Bedford committee were Fernando P. Cruz, as the president's assistant; Antonio Alberto Costa, secretary; Emidio F. Conde, treasurer and ticket chairman, and Jose F. Conde, contact man between the New Bedford committee and the supreme lodge.

The executive committee included Mr. Gomes, Antonio J. Pereira, Mr. Branco, Mr. Belao, and Jose F. Conde.

Also present were Francisco Mendes, president of lodge 4; Manuel P. Silva, president of Lodge 47; Tome P. Cruz of lodge 4, all of New Bedford; Manuel Vaz Morais of Cambridge, representing lodge 2 in Cambridge; Manuel Calado and Francisco Oliveira, both of New Bedford; Afonso Ferreira Mendes of Taunton and Mrs. Mercedes Branco, wife of the secretary general.

The Power and the Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Jersey Boys State, a most inspiring and productive program held each summer by the New Jersey State Department of the American Legion for selected boys interested in Government, is this year celebrating its 15th anniversary.

My good Paterson friend and constituent, Mr. Morris Shimshak, a leader in the field of public education, is editor of "The Statesman" published by Jersey Boys State. In its spring issue, Mr. Shimshak speaks to Boy Staters on "The Power and the Glory of American Citizenship" in the following most interesting article:

THE POWER AND THE GLORY

The American citizen appears as a minute individual among the millions in our country who have the power of the vote. So he is loath sometimes—too many times—to exercise his voice in our political system, even though he must realize that his social and economic welfare very often stems or depends upon the political actions of our legislative councils on the local, State or national levels. Yet, frequently and repeatedly, it can be read about in our history that an aroused group of individuals has changed the course of history and government in its city, county, and nation. Every independent movement, every aroused intraparty opposition, every group espousing a new cause has begun with only a small group of individuals, themselves in turn spurred on by only one man.

There is in America a great deal of power in the individual vote. The outcome of every election in every hamlet of every State is the sum total of all the individual votes. In our own New Jersey, in the recent primaries, we had examples of the power of individual votes upsetting planned schemes of organized political groups. The individual who avoids the ballot box on the presumption that his individual vote matters too little is either ignorant of his country's history or exercising the natural characteristics of laziness, carelessness or disinterestedness. When we miss an opportunity to vote, the default is ours. We are ignoring our responsibilities as citizens.

As statesmen we must never miss the opportunity to vote. Besides, every statesman should pay important attention to his right and obligation to influence others, in whatever way he can, and as every responsibile citizen should, the policies under which he lives in this free society of ours. This means an aggressive and intelligent concern for who is elected, for the issues before the voters, and for the decisions that are made by government at every level. Make the problems of government the basis for public discussion, especially this decisive year.

The glory? It is a simple thing when you analyze your personal feelings. It is not a great miracle that has to be wrought. It is simply the feeling that you as an individual played a part in an important decision, win or lose. It is a feeling of self-satisfaction that you participated and shared in a great undertaking—the making of a city, a State or a President. You have a share in the making of American history when you cast an official ballot. This is a tremendous power, and the glory of it is a self-satisfied conscience.

Threat to Retention of Oversea Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, June 17, a profound analysis of the situation in which this country finds itself regarding our structure of oversea bases. In view of recent international events, particularly the incident in Tokyo, it would appear to be most important that we examine our position as regards the defense of the nations of the free world.

This examination is most pertinent as regards the threat to the continued retention of our oversea bases. Immediately, and of paramount importance, is the use of the oceans in the interests of security. Warfare, as with everything else today, is moving through an era of sweeping changes. Soon no place on earth will be safe from attack by missiles and modern jet aircraft launched from the seas. The mobility and concealment offered by the oceans emphasize the increasing importance of the aircraft carrier and the Polaris submarine.

Mr. President, I think this article deserves the attention of my colleagues and the public, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERODING ALLIANCES—U.S. FEARS A FURTHER WEAKENING OF GLOBAL NET OF PACTS, BASES—JAPAN'S CRISIS MAY BE BLOW TO ALL FAR EAST DEFENSES; NEW AID DEMANDS LIKELY—TROUBLE IN TURKEY, ICELAND

(This analysis of the threat to America's alliances and foreign military installations is based on dispatches from Staff Reporter Louis Kraar, reporting from Washington, and Tokyo Bureau Chief Igor Oganesoff, accompanying President Eisenhower in the Far East.)

American diplomats and military leaders fear the Nation faces grave erosion of its system of foreign alliances and bases—not just in Japan but across great stretches of the globe.

This pessimism deepened yesterday after leftist Japanese mobs succeeded in blocking the President's trip to Tokyo—but it extends far beyond the shock of that event. Many officials predict the new Japanese-United States security treaty, which stirred the islands' furor, eventually will be ratified. But they fear the value of that piece of paper is diminishing with extreme rapidity. They now rate Japan and other nations scattered through the Orient as more dubious defense partners. And official concern for the months and years ahead is broad enough to include such distant points as Iceland and Turkey.

"We simply can't depend on all these foreign bases anymore," warns a Pentagon official who considers them vital.

Much of this erosion may come slowly, as has been happening up to now. The Strategic Air Command, for example, already is committed to being squeezed out of its great Moroccan airfields by 1963. But authorities are aware the losses could now be accelerated enormously if, as they believe, is quite possible, the Japanese crisis sets off a chain reaction.

In Tokyo, the estimate is that Prime Minister Kishi will soon be out of office, whether by violence, vote or intraparty maneuver. He hopes to be able to put the defense pact with the United States into legal form before his exit, and the parliamentary situation is such he may well do this. But even if this happens, any treaty will depend on the next government of Japan for enforcement. The document provides that specific Japanese assent must be gained whenever American forces stationed on the island are required for military operations in other parts of Asia.

Thus, unless the Japanese public registers a major revulsion against the mob and passions of recent days—and that, too, is thought to be a possibility—the effective U.S. use of Japanese bases may have to be written off, and almost certainly will have to be downgraded.

"Certainly there's fear the treaty will be discredited by a new government, even if legally passed," comments a high-ranking American military man in Washington. "And that would be pretty terrible."

HEAVIER RELIANCE ON OKINAWA?

If Japanese bases are lost, the United States will need to place far heavier reliance on a tiny Pacific island base, Okinawa, located about 350 miles south of Japan. But that could be leaning on a weakening reed. Another Pentagon officer contends, "Friction over Okinawa will be inevitable. It's old Japanese territory; the leftists and nationalists already are demanding we hand it back." He also claims that South Korea, too, is heavily dependent on U.S. forces based in Japan for its supply pipeline and air defense.

While it's hard to find authorities who are unworried about U.S. troubles in the Far East, some are much less pessimistic than others. It's argued a loss in one place can often be offset by a gain in another. In the Philippines, it is noted, President Eisenhower got a rousing reception. More than that, he got down to some fairly hard talk about joint action in case of war, and the possibility that U.S. bases on these islands may be equipped with nuclear warhead missiles.

But it's expected any improved cooperation by Filipinos—as has happened elsewhere—will have its price: A call on the United

States for greater military and economic aid. Comments one military officer: "The price we're going to have to pay for any oversea installation is going to get larger and larger."

This way come as a shock to Congress. House Appropriations Committee members, following the habit of recent years, this week knocked $400 million off a $2 billion request by Mr. Eisenhower for foreign military assistance funds for the fiscal year about to begin; they've whacked $390 million off a $2.2 billion Presidential request for other foreign aid.

SPENDING POSSIBILITIES FORESEEN

The gloomier element among diplomats sees plenty of spending possibilities in the future. One foreign affairs authority in Washington pokes his finger at a wall map, showing Pakistan's widely separated halves. "All the enthusiasm for American bases and alliance is here in West Pakistan, where the hill people are natural fighters," he says. He then moves his finger. "Over here in steamy East Pakistan all the sentiment is against any military involvement. With the pressure that's on now, it is entirely possible East Pakistan, sooner or later, may split off and go neutral. Maybe that's all right; our bases are in West Pakistan. But it's the East Pakistanis who have the nation's money, from their jute exports. The West Pakistanis would need some stiff U.S. subsidies to keep running without them."

The threatened erosion of America's system of bases and alliances can be attributed largely to Communist agitation. Prime Minister Kishi and Presidential Press Secretary James Hagerty specifically blame Red agitators for the violence in Japan. Communist money reportedly poured into the islands to finance the trouble-making; Moscow and Peiping radio broadcasts threatened Japan with dire consequences if it received the American President.

But this begs an important question. Russia and Red China have been hotly opposed to American bases for years—years during which the United States has created and expanded its foreign footholds of power. Why is this the moment of history when that system seems to face decay or disintegration?

Some Washington officials who spend their time pondering this question hang their answers on two 1960 dates: April 27 and May 1.

On April 27 Syngman Rhee was forced to resign as President of Korea. He was heaved out not by Communists but by anti-Communists. He was booted not over any opposition from the U.S. Government but with the quiet encouragement of American diplomatic and military representatives on the scene. In Washington, this Yankee "lubrication" of revolt is viewed as having been decent and honorable. Its results within Korea are still viewed as moderately satisfactory, offering the prospect of popular freedom and bureaucratic honesty. But officials plainly say it opened a Pandora's box throughout the world.

BUZZING IN COFFEEHOUSES

"Word got around that governments could be defied and even overthrown," says a top Washington analyst. "The coffeehouses in nation after nation began buzzing with the excited talk of opposition politicians who had previously thought the U.S. marines would storm in to block any assault on the established government. Newspapers which had been docile turned inflammatory. University students, having seen the power of massed kids in Korea, decided to have a go."

Certainly in some countries the crusades of revolt have genuine merit, in the assessment of American officials. "In Turkey, dictator Menderes was drunk on 10 years of power and a decade of American aid," wryly comments one. "And there are other countries whose rulers have been riding along on lots of U.S. money in exchange for bases—finally losing touch with reality."

By this reasoning, some authorities will be expecting trouble, nobody knows exactly when, in such key spots as Iran, Spain, and Saudi Arabia. Even in democratic Japan, some contend, Mr. Kishi had lost touch—underestimating pacifism and nationalism, and making a tactical fumble in linking the scheduled Eisenhower visit to the revision of the defense alliance.

In proportion to their strength in various allied lands, the Communists are doing their bit to stir the spirit of April 27. As for the other factor now moving the world, the mood of May 1, the initiative is entirely in their hands.

May 1 was, of course, the date America's U–2 spy plane was shot down over Russia. It gave the Soviets a pretext for reversing the "Spirit of Camp David," scuttling the summit, and launching a character assassination campaign against the American President. This in itself was a consequential change; it can be measured by the fact that when Mr. Eisenhower had visited Italy before the switch in the Red line, local Communists lined the curbs to help cheer him.

But more than that was involved. The illicit nature of the U–2's mission was an embarassment to the alliance. The plane's asserted flight course, from Turkey to Pakistan to Norway, directly involved the airbases of the Yankee alliance. The flights led to Red threats to obliterate any bases from which future spy flights were made. Before the eyes of many allies there suddenly emerged a new picture of effective Soviet military power versus effective Yankee power.

As a glance at the map shows, most of the lands associated with the United States in defense pacts or base arrangements lie far closer to Russia or to Red China than to America—Canada being the notable exception. The Communists have had that big advantage all along. The nations of the European NATO alliance are perhaps on the U.S. team from real conviction, but most of the others joined up because they figured American strength was vast enough to stand off the Reds close at hand. And now that impression of effective power has suddenly dimmed, say U.S. officials.

RED ROCKET RATTLING

On one hand, the advance of Russian missile technology has brought America's foreign allies within 10 or 15 minutes of possible extinction. Dim awareness of this had been growing; Red rocket rattling since May 1 has made it glaring.

On the other hand, the picture of effective Yankee power has blurred. Logically, perhaps this should not be so. At the Pentagon, generals keep saying that the prolonged success of U–2 flights before the final failure proves that the Soviet—and Red China, too, of course—lack effective defense against U.S. air assault. But civilian analysts say this has been obscured by the foreign impression that America's military power simply cannot be counted on.

The record of contradictory statements out of Washington concerning the U–2, the American humilitation at the Paris summit, and now the abortive Eisenhower expedition to Japan, have in the opinion of some top officials conveyed to multitudes of foreigners the feeling that America is impotent.

KHRUSHCHEV'S SWITCH

This idea of Yankee power incompetently managed is also being fanned by the Communists. "Did you notice how Khrushchev switched his whole method of demolishing Eisenhower's image?" asks one analyst who spends full-time watching the Soviet. "At first he was depicting Ike as dangerous and perfidious. Then he suddenly gave us a different Ike—the bumbling fellow always off the job and on the golf links, the peaceable old gent too incompetent to do anything but run a children's home."

One expectation in Washington—as yet advanced only by a minority of the experts—is that Russia may soon put a reverse spin on the game of foreign bases. Specifically, they suggest Khrushchev and Castro may sign up for Soviet bases in Cuba, perhaps when the bald one makes his scheduled visit to the bearded one. Missile bases, aircraft bases, submarine bases; all these are mentioned as possibilities.

Most officials doubt, however, that Cuba is in fact tabbed for much beyond use as a propaganda and subversion base, which it already is. Russia is too deeply committed to telling the world, "Look, we got no foreign bases," says one expert on the Soviet. One counterargument: Russia would not have to be inconsistent; it would not even have to build bases in Cuba. It could simply sign up for the right to put them there—and then try to barter, offering to stay out of Cuba if the United States will get out of its bases abroad.

IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY

According to one school of thought—sponsored by some of America's top military leaders—the trend of armament technology will sharply reduce U.S. need for many foreign bases within a few years. The intercontinental missile, the Polaris missile-firing submarine, the prospective B–70 bomber which could reach Red targets without refueling, the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier which requires no foreign supply depots, the anticipated reconnaissance satellites: All these are cited as offensive or defensive tools which will tend to make America self-sufficient.

Nobody would be happier than Yank diplomats and military brass if large numbers of our uniformed personnel could be pulled back home. Friction between servicemen and natives of host countries is inevitable and chronic. Even in such a thoroughly Westernized land as Iceland, the local government forces U.S. retrenchments; 1,300 Army troops have been pulled out recently yet there's pressure for further reduction. "In countries with more divergent cultures, the trouble is worse," declares an official. "Some GI is always climbing up a Mosleum minaret and calling the faithful to cocktail hour."

But a great segment of Pentagon and State Department opinion holds that bases will remain essential for the foreseeable future.

To thwart localized Communist attacks, the U.S. needs capacity to wage "limited wars" with conventional non-atomic weapons, it is argued. And this demands land, ground and sea forces in the neighborhood of the possible conflicts. Even the Strategic Air Command contends it needs globally scattered plane and missile bases, to make it more difficult for the Reds to wipe out our retaliatory strength in one coordinated assault.

SUSTAINING UNITY

Beyond that, diplomats contend, a military network abroad has immense psychological importance—helping to sustain the political and economic unity of the Western camp.

In Japan, to be specific, the American businessman and farmer has a stake. Dozens of U.S. firms with subsidiaries on the islands, dozens more thinking of coming in, hundreds engaged in trade, thousands of farms supplying food and fiber, will be affected if Japan switches its allegiance toward Communist Asia—or even, to a lesser degree, if the conservative regime is replaced by a socialist one.

Though a leftist minority has dominated Japan in recent days, and its mob action continues to rage, this doesn't necessarily mean it is close to seizing permanent control. The government has by no means exhausted its resources for quelling rioters;

police can get tougher and the 210,000-man self-defense force (army) can be called into action.

If Mr. Kishi attempts to resolve matters by dissolving the Diet and calling new elections, the outcome is difficult to predict. Judging by past voting patterns, his conservative Liberal Democrats should retain power (they hold 63 percent of Diet seats now).

But the emotions evoked by current chaos may make past voting patterns meaningless.

To the extent that voters prove offended by the American security treaty and by the Kishi administration's "autocratic" political tactics, the opposition socialists could pick up strength. But to the degree that voters are repelled by leftist violence, ballots could switch to the conservatives or to a third party, the moderate Democratic Socialists. One possibility is that none of the three parties would emerge with a clear majority. That would require a coalition of two of them to rule—with a consequent weakening of Japan's anti-Communist position.

Report of National Projects Committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the national projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 47th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 24–27, 1960.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the Congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Representative PHIL WEAVER, Falls City, Nebr., chairman.

New England division: William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, U.S. Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.; alternate: Edward K. Bryant, consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Rear Adm. R. Malcolm Fortson, U.S. Navy (retired), managing director, the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, Jacksonville, Fla.; vice chairman.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Al. Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River division: John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Alternate: Robert B. Crosby, former Governor of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific and Pacific Ocean divisions: Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, U.S. Navy (retired), Washington representative, Oakland, Calif., Chamber of Commerce.

Alternate: Col. Thomas J. Weed, U.S. Army (retired), transportation consultant, Washington, D.C.

Western intermountain region: E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 47TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS MAY 26, 1960

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on May 24, 1960, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 69 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 21 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $284,440,400. Thirteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 30 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find five proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

At the present time, the Congress of the United States is considering enactment of an omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill. The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives held public hearings on various river and harbor and flood control projects previously submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army. At the conclusion of the hearings on omnibus bill, H.R. 7634, was favorably reported by the committee on June 12, 1959, and passed by the House of Representatives on July 16, 1959. A summary of the authorization contained in the bill as it passed the House is as follows:

TITLE I. RIVERS AND HARBORS

Sec. 101:	
36 navigation projects	$86,851,000
2 Beach erosion control projects	371,300
1 monetary authorization (Barkeley Dam, Ky.)	146,000,000
Total, title I	232,952,800

TITLE II. FLOOD CONTROL

Sec. 201:	
10 new projects or project modifications	$45,357,700
7 increased basin authorizations	379,000,000
Total, title II	424,357,700
Grand total	657,310,500

The Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate held public hearings on August 4 and 21, 1959. Additional public hearings were held on April 19, 20, 21, 25, and 26, 1960. Approximately 60 projects not included in the House-passed version of the bill were heard by the Senate committee. Also, increases in river basin monetary authorizations are being considered. It is expected that action on the bill will be taken by the Senate in the near future.

The projects included in the pending bill are of great important to the Nation's expanding economy and should be provided at the earliest practicable date. Your projects committee recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to take early action on the bill and that consideration be given to early appropriation of funds for construction of these proposed projects.

Since our meeting a year ago, serious floods have occurred throughout the Nation, most notably in the Missouri and upper Mississippi River basins, and on major streams in New England, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. The human suffering and costly damages caused by these floods are dreadful reminders that much needs to be done to control the waters of our rivers.

While the regulation of the high flows of rivers to prevent floods is urgent at the present time, the need for regulating rivers for all purposes becomes more and more evident as time goes on. The recent succession of drought years in the Southwest, the crowding of industry to river banks in search of

water and economic bulk transportation and the increasing pollution of our rivers indicate the soundness of developing our water resources for all purposes. Your committee notes the trend in this direction indicated by actions of the Congress of the United States, and endorses this concept.

Much also needs to be done to improve our inland waterways, so that the needs of our increasing population and the resulting expanding economy can be adequately fulfilled. New industries are constantly in search of sites offering economical bulk transportation, and the most promising sites are consequently those located on improved waterways. The St. Lawrence Seaway, recently opened to deep-draft navigation, is producing great benefits to both local and national economies; similar benefits can also be realized elsewhere, on a smaller scale perhaps, but none the less important. We must not relax our efforts to have our waterways improved to the end that the industrial growth necessary to our economy can take place in a steady and orderly manner.

Your committee notes that the backlog of investigations authorized by Congress for prosecution by agencies of the Federal Government is at least as large this year as it was last year. These investigation programs are important first steps toward the authorization and construction of urgently needed improvements. We urge that the appropriations for this purpose be increased substantially.

Respectfully submitted.

PHIL WEAVER,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new application. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendations of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

APPENDIX A

Division I—Endorsed

["Endorsed": This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve]

[Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
981-R	Huntington Reservoir	Indiana	Ohio River.
1063-R	Monroe Reservoir	do	Do.
1090-R	Hurricane flood protection of Pawcatuck	Connecticut	Northeast.
1107-R	Abatement works for the District of Columbia, project C	District of Columbia	North Atlantic.
1138-R	Mississinewa Reservoir	Indiana	Ohio River.
1139	Municipal commercial harbor at Dubuque on upper Mississippi River (dredging).	Iowa	North central.
1140	North Branch Park River watershed protection and flood prevention project	Connecticut	Northeast.
1141	Matagorda ship cannel	Texas	Southwest.
1142	Little Dell Reservoir-Jordan River Basin-Salt Lake City streams	Utah	South Pacific.
1143	Flood control project on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul	Minnesota	North central.
1144	Fairport Harbor	Ohio	Do.
1145	Curwensville Reservoir, West Branch, Susquehanna River	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
1147	Millers Ferry multiple-purpose dam, Alabama-Coosa River system	Alabama	South Atlantic.
1148	Salamonie Reservoir	Indiana	Ohio River.
1149	Trinity River, West Fork watershed, flood protection, Fort Worth area	Texas	Southwest.
1150	Big Fossil watershed, Trinity River and tributaries	do	Do.
1151	Richland, Chambers, and Cedar Creeks (Waxahachie Creek watershed), Bardwell Reservoir.	do	Do.
1152	Levee unit 5, Wabash and Patoka Rivers	Indiana	Ohio River.
1153	Mississippi River-Gulf outlet, crossing for State Highway No. 47 (Paris Rd.) high-level fixed bridge.	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1176	Stamford hurricane protection	Connecticut	Northeast.
1178	Trinity River and tributaries (Wallinsville Reservoir)	Texas	Southwest.

Division II—Meritorious

["Meritorious": This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
793-R-7	Flood protection, Cleves	Ohio	Ohio River.
1094-R-1	Rend Lake	Illinois	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1100-R-2	Wilmington Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1109-R	Columbia and Lower Willamette River deep draft ship channel	Oregon and Washington	North Pacific.
1114-R-2	Flint River Channelization, flood control, hydroelectric	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1154	St. Marks River project	Florida	Do.
1164	Rouge River flood control	Michigan	North Central.
1166	Las Vegas Wash and tributaries, Las Vegas and vicinity, flood control	Nevada	South Pacific.
1183	Trexler Dam and Reservoir	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
1184	Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir	Pennsylvania and New Jersey	Do.
1185	Prompton Dam and Reservoir	Pennsylvania	Do.
1186	Beltzville Dam and Reservoir	do	Do.
1187	Blue Marsh Dam and Reservoir	do	Do.

Division III—Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

["Expeditious report on authorized survey requested": This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
876-R-5	Whitewater River, West Fork, Brookville	Indiana	Ohio River.
1092-R	Passaic River Basin, flood control	New Jersey	North Atlantic
1096-R-2	Harbor development, Port San Luis	California	South Pacific.
1126-R	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1128-R	Imperial Beach small-craft harbor (Oneonta Lagoon)	California	South Pacific.
1134-R	East Fork Reservoir; East Fork, Little Miami River	Ohio	Ohio River.
1140-A	Shelter Cove Harbor	California	South Pacific.
1146	Duwamish development project	Washington	North Pacific.
1155	East Pass Channel at Destin	Florida	South Atlantic.
1156	Small-boat channel from the port of Panacea into Apalachee Bay	do	Do.
1157	Waikiki Beach improvement (Kuhio Beach improvement and widening of sidewalks).	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE—Continued

APPENDIX A

Division III—Expeditious report on authorized survey requested—Continued

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1158	Iao Stream flood control project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1159	Wailoa Stream	do	Do.
1160	Waimea River, Kauai	do	Do.
1162	Kihei district, Maui	do	Do.
1163	Palolo and Manoa Valleys	do	Do.
1165	Trenton Channel extension (to deep water in Lake Erie), commonly referred to as All-American Channel.	Michigan	North Central.
1167	Rouge River harbor development	do	Do.
1168	Haleiwa Beach erosion project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1169	Honolulu Harbor, deepening and widening of harbor and channel	do	Do.
1170	Harbors for light-draft vessels, coasts of Hawaiian Islands	do	Do.
1171	Hilo Harbor modification, island of Hawaii	do	Do.
1172	Port Allen Harbor modification, Kauai	do	Do.
1175	Port Jefferson Harbor	New York	North Atlantic.
1177	Hydroelectric dam at Rampart on the Yukon River	Alaska	North Pacific.
1180	Boat basins in the Apalachicola River in the vicinity of Briston and in the vicinity of Blountstown.	Florida	South Atlantic.
1181	Channel from Lynn Haven Bayou, to North Bay	do	Do.
1182	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from St. Marks to the Anclote	do	Do.
1188	Intracoastal Waterway, St. Marks River to Tampa Bay	do	Do.
1189	Ogdensburg West Channel dredging	New York	North Central.

Division IV—Projects recommended for survey

["Recommended for survey": This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government]

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1127-R	Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1161	Kamuela Flood Control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1173	Kahului Harbor, Oahu	do	Do.
1174	Explosives handling facilities within Hawaii harbors	do	Do.
1179	Examination and survey, Edwards underground reservoir and contributing drainage area.	Texas	Southwest.

Operation Crossroads—American-African Student Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced a proposal for a peace corps of American young men to provide a new spirit of youthful enthusiasm and dedication in our technical assistance programs abroad—working directly with young people of other nations and sharing their way of life.

In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, Marquis Childs describes one of the many private, voluntary organizations which is carrying on such a program of people-to-people technical assistance—Operation Crossroads in Africa.

Emphasizing how strikingly Operation Crossroads students illustrate for their African counterparts the role of the people's initiative in a democratic society, Mr. Childs reviews the thrilling and vital fraction of our oversea cooperation program carried on by voluntary groups.

It is this inventive, imaginative, enthusiastic spirit of our American young people which my Peace Corps proposal would channel into our official governmental overseas assistance programs.

In a recent report the Operation Crossroads organizers said:

The problem of the impact of communism upon Africa was not our primary concern. We did not begin by being against something; we were rather motivated by the democratic concepts within ourselves * * * by the firm conviction that the United States has a moral responsibility to develop a positive relationship and to create a large, capable, intelligent and devoted body of experts who would understand and interpret to the American people every area of African life.

Mr. President, I believe this is the firm conviction of all Americans who have had the needs of the peoples of the developing nations explained to them honestly and acurately. The American people not only are generous to those in great need of food, clothing, and shelter, but also I know that they can understand fully and deeply sympathize with the struggle of those men and women around the world seeking independence and recognition for their national aspirations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column entitled "A Student Safari Heads for Africa" by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for June 17, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STUDENT SAFARI HEADS FOR AFRICA

(By Marquis Childs)

Within a few days 180 college students will be flying to Africa to take part in an experiment that owes something to America's pioneering spirit and to the deep strain of idealism that is a part of the American character.

Once there, they will divide into groups and go back into the bush in 10 West African countries to join with African students in working on particular projects such as schools and community halls in new settlements. Living under rugged conditions, asking no favors, they will work long hours alongside Africans of their own age.

In a time of cynicism and the realism of avowed espionage and more and more nuclear arms, Operation Crossroads—Africa has certain simple, direct objectives. One is to spread an idea of what newly developing Africa means through intelligent young people who will come home to lecture as widely as possible about what they themselves have learned. Another is to show that Americans are deeply and immediately concerned with the future of those who are struggling to achieve independence and nationhood.

Crossroads Africa is a wholly voluntary organization. It illustrates one of the great advantages of a free society in which, in contrast to a dictatorship, people themselves may take the initiative and do what government could not or would not do.

The International Cooperation Agency lists 58 voluntary agencies at work in every corner of the globe. It includes the Friends Service Committee, which has sent student work groups to many European and Latin-American countries. Technicial assistance, refugees, feeding the hungry, distributing books—al these and many other functions the voluntary agencies carry on.

The big foundations, Ford, Rockefeller, and the others which are not listed among these agencies, do a great deal of work overseas. The Ford Foundation of India has provided invaluable assistance and advice in helping to formulate India's program of village reform. The voluntary agencies do not suffer from the inhibitions that handicap the Government in its oversea activities.

This is the second year that Crossroads Africa has sent students to work with Afri-

cans. Although the project has had little publicity, more than 700 young men and women applied for 180 places. Represented in the group now undergoing a week's indoctrination in New York are students from 100 colleges across the country representing every religious faith and racial background.

"The problem of the impact of communism upon Africa was not our primary concern," a report by the organizing group states. "We did not begin by being against something; we were rather motivated by the democratic concepts within ourselves.

"Our initiative was not provided by the role of communism, but rather by the firm conviction that the United States has a moral responsibility to develop a positive relationship and to create a large, capable, intelligent and devoted body of experts who would understand and interpret to the American people every area of African life."

In 1958, the first year for Crossroads Africa, one group of 13 students went to the impoverished village of Buel in French Cameroons to help build a two-room cement-block elementary school and a stone chapel with seats for 400 worshippers. Another group went to Ghana and took part in the construction of a seven-room school in the remote Ashantiland village of Safo.

In Sierra Leone, the work project at Gbendembu was to build a village water supply in rugged, hilly bush country. Working without sufficient or proper tools with the ever-present danger of cobras and black mambas—the students killed six during their 6 weeks on the project—they were able to accomplish the greater part of their project.

Long and serious discussions went on, with the African students and the Americans speaking with complete frankness about every subject under the sun. The Americans discovered that Little Rock loomed large, and they set out to convince their friends that this was only one small part of America and that there was an earnest effort in almost every section of the country to find a way for the races to live together in equality of opportunity.

Voluntary help such as Crossroads Africa can be no more than a tiny fraction of the total foreign aid America sends abroad. But it is a thrilling and a vital fraction.

The Sixties—A Decade of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, June 16, 1960, I had the pleasure of attending the graduation exercise of the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

The principal address was delivered by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, retired Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

General Ridgway stands in the forefront of the distinguished American military leaders. During World War II, General Ridgway commanded the 82d Airborne Division in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy. In 1944, he led the division in parachuting into Normandy with the leading elements in the invasion of France.

At the outbreak of the Korean war, General Ridgway commanded the 8th Army in Korea. In 1951 he was appointed supreme commander for Allied Powers as well as the commander in chief of the United Nations Command in the Far East.

In May 1952, he was named supreme commander, Allied Powers, Europe, with headquarters in Paris, where he served until August 1953 when he was appointed Chief of Staff of the Army.

General Ridgway's address was a very inspirational one for the 1960 graduating class of the Army War College and to all of us who were privileged to hear him. It was a dynamic and challenging one which I believe worthy of being read by all Members of Congress and by all citizens of the United States.

It is with personal pleasure to me, and with the express permission of General Ridgway that I include the text of his address, "The Sixties—A Decade of Decision":

THE SIXTIES—A DECADE OF DECISION

General Ennis, distinguished guests, members of the Army War College, their families, and friends, it is a high honor to speak before this audience on this occasion, and a very great personal pleasure for me to have had this invitation extended by General Ennis. I first knew him when he was a small boy and I a first classman at West Point in 1916. I have watched with deepening satisfaction as the richly merited recognition of his character and talent over the years has carried this famous soldier son of a famous soldier father to posts of successively heavier responsibilities. He has discharged them all in a conspicuously superior fashion. Bill, I am proud to be here and appreciate all the honor you have done me.

Here was a problem of decision, and I must admit, momentarily at least a perplexing one. What should I say? That was my problem in selecting a topic for this morning.

So out of semicomplexity I chose to speak this morning on "The Sixties—A Decade of Decision," a decade which may well confront our people, our civilian authorities, and our diplomatic and military leaders with problems of decision of vastly greater significance than even the fateful decisions of the 1860's.

This is neither the time nor the place for dogmatism, declamation, or exhortation. I intend none of these, but rather earnestly and briefly to express some personal convictions concerning one central problem, which, dependent on the way we seek to attack it, may well determine whether or not we survive as an independent free leader of free peoples.

That central problem is to decide upon a general course of action by which to shape our destiny in accordance with our fundamental values, our moral principles, and our basic faith. It is a problem not limited to our elected officials, but one for our people—for an overwhelming majority of our people. For in this great new historical era, the threshold of which we have barely crossed, the power of public opinion will be the determining factor. So it was under Washington. So it was under Lincoln. Public opinion was slow of growth and confused with contrary currents during its formative period. But it congealed as the counsels of great men of integrity and selfless devotion to country brought the issues into focus and illuminated them with the light of their wisdom and inspired leadership.

That, it seems to me, was our form of democracy at its best. It resorted to no authoritarian dictation as to the course to be taken. It relied on the searching of men's hearts through prolonged public debate and earnest examination of all alternatives. It was bulwarked by an unshakable faith that by such processes, and with divine guidance, we would see and choose right from wrong—and having chosen our course with wisdom and intelligence, would pursue it with courage, regardless of the sacrifices involved.

Yet it does seem obvious, if we are wisely to choose a general course of future action, that there must be a goal, an objective toward which that course leads. There must be a great national purpose, clearly recognized as such, and so clearly stated that it will stimulate and sustain our people through whatever trials may lie ahead.

Do we have such an objective? Are our people agreed on what it is we want, what we should try to achieve?

I have long sought satisfying answers to these questions, as no doubt you have.

Let's look at a few facts and the opinions of a few selected nationally known individuals. These opinions were all uttered within the past few months. They are articulate evidence of the growing volume of concern with which thoughtful men and women are viewing this problem.

Walter Lippmann in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, in September 1959, wrote: "The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve."

Max Ways, in Life magazine, in October 1959, wrote: "The United States fumbles its job as world leader because it forgets its own principles of freedom and order—it is up to the people to rediscover and reaffirm them."

Eric Sevareid wrote in Esquire magazine in October last: "Truly there is a quiet desperation among those Americans sensitively aware of what is happening in the world today and of what is happening in America. A great nation cannot stand still, it either moves forward, or it moves backward. It is my belief that we are losing touch with the world; indeed with ourselves. Not only do we not know what we want any more, we do not know what we are. Like old women touching their beads, we endlessly count and recount our blessings in the form of our gross national product, our per capita income, and our production units, whether babies or block long automobiles; and we call to the gods of economy, prudence, and the middle way, trying to believe that this will save us, knowing in our hearts that it will not."

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, in the New York Times in January of this year, was quoted: "This country will not maintain its position in the world solely by possessing nuclear destructive power. Such power must be held by a people united in purpose."

Dr. James B. Conant in the New York Times last November: "Our existence and our freedom are both in danger. This seems to me an obvious if highly unpleasant fact. Yet, as I have traveled around the country, with few exceptions I have sensed no awareness of our peril. For the most part I have encountered little but complacency."

Then last February, as you will recall, the President created a Commission on National Goals, of which Dr. Henry Wriston, president of the American Assembly, is chairman. In commenting on this action the New York Times of February 8, last, editorialized in part as follows: "In what could be a historic step in the development of our free institutions, President Eisenhower has named a distinguished group of private citizens to a Commission on National Goals * * * to identify the great issues of our generation and to describe our objectives in these various areas."

Next, a quote from "Basic Aims on U.S. Foreign Policy," written for the use of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Government Printing Office, November 25, 1959: "Only with a sense of purpose which holds deep meaning for the American people,

but which must be given voice by their elected leaders, can the Government of the United States set the goals of foreign policy and work out the means of attaining them. * * * The responsibility rests above all on the President, who, alone, can command the respect of the entire Nation and marshal nationwide support for the sacrifices which the situation may demand. Preserving and protecting our freedom and interests are at the very heart of the national purpose."

And last, I want to quote from the May 23, 1960, issue of Life magazine: "The words, 'the national purpose,' have begun to sound increasingly throughout the country, stirring up uneasy questions, forcing Americans to examine themselves and their aspirations."

"The debate, of course, cannot be left to the country's leaders. Life invites all Americans to join in. For upon the Nation's purpose depend the lives of all—not in some comfortably remote future, but right now and in the years just ahead."

So much for quotes. Now may I comment on the answers to these basic questions. First on the negative side. What our purposes should not be—what it is we do not want. On this side, there is, I believe, widespread agreement.

We do not seek to dominate other peoples.

We have no liking for world conquest as an objective.

We find the idea of withdrawal to this continent and abandonment of our leadership repugnant to our ideals.

We do not choose to live in selfish blindness on an elevated plateau of relative abundance, if not luxury, while leaving more than half the world's peoples to continue to exist in a morass of misery, ill fed, ill clothed and sheltered, largely illiterate and with scarcely any of the benefits which modern sanitation and medicine could provide.

On the positive side, we want as we so clearly show by our actions, to reduce, not to further increase these enormous imbalances in the world's standards of living.

We intend to discharge in full our responsibilities for leadership among free peoples.

But most important of all, we should want, it seems to me, to single out one simple, positive, and unchanging objective; to describe it clearly; and to set it up as a goal which our people could accept and toward which, with high leadership, they would willingly work.

Admittedly this is an extremely difficult thing to do. In the first place, we need a large admixture of the ideal with the practical, and the ideal is rarely popular. Then before agreement can be expected upon any basic objective or purpose—that is upon an abstract idea—the idea will have to be put in such unambiguous language that it can be readily understood by every reasonably intelligent person.

But even these are only first steps. If the phrasing of our objective is to fire the imagination of our people, and ultimately of others, it must have a tremendous spiritual appeal. It must represent something for which mankind has an ineradicable yearning. Only for such an objective are people willing to work and, if need be, to sacrifice.

Now there is one thing you cannot uproot from the human heart. It is the love of freedom. It transcends self-preservation, the so-called first law of nature. History provides overwhelming proof that under proper leadership men and women value freedom more than life. Not only is the record of every war replete with proof of this assertion but so, too, are the peacetime records of humble men and women in every walk of life, of every color and creed, in every land and age. Barehanded Hungarians against Soviet tanks is a recent illustration, as is Tibet; the history of Christianity, an ancient one.

So, I suggest we take human freedom as our objective. I believe it is the objective included in all the courses we have so far chosen, though often not so stated, and therefore lost to view in the overburden of secondary ideas. It is our first and prime objective now and for however many centuries may be required to extend it throughout this world of ours. Many of our people have said this many times in many ways, but it has yet to be set up as the overriding purpose of a united people.

It has been obscured with statements of other proper but lesser objectives, so that its challenging primal significance is often unperceived.

Peace is an example. It is a noble objective, a worldwide aspiration. But peace could be had in slavery, and must therefore be secondary. Only with freedom does peace take on its full and acceptable meaning and make life worth living.

So why not emphasize freedom above all other objectives, and continue to emphasize it as the objective until it shall have become a worldwide reality, or until God reveals some other and better purpose for mankind?

Why not openly accept as the national purpose, the preservation and extension of freedom, openly relegating all other goals, objectives or purposes, important as they are, to lower priorities?

Now may I address a brief closing remark to you gentlemen of the graduating class, to the faculty who so ably guided you through this academic year, and to your wives who have fully shared, I am sure, all your hearaches and rewards. You will all have the privileged opportunity of participating in the decisions of this decade, some in roles of greater prominence than others, some perhaps in devisive roles.

I wish for each of you a full measure of effective influence in helping to form that sound public opinion which will, we trust, guide our people to choose the right goals; and a full measure of success in assisting our civilian authorities to gain the Nation's support in a determined effort to reach those goals.

Finally, and most earnestly, I wish you success in maintaining the integrity of the military profession, for I firmly believe, that up to the moment of decision by proper authority, your fearlessness in expressing your convictions before the highest councils of the Nation; your honesty in openly adhering to your convictions, regardless of pressures from whatever sources emanating will be of vital value to the Nation.

And now Godspeed.

Len Hall Writes of the Revolution in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I believe it is safe to say that the techniques of political campaigning are particularly germane to the pattern of life of the Members of the Senate. Interest in this subject is only the more pronounced with the approach of national elections and the renewal of political struggles for supremacy. In the light of these facts, I find it timely to draw the attention of the Members of the Senate to a most pertinent and informative article published in Life magazine.

The article is entitled, "An Old Pro Describes How Politics in the United States Has Changed," and was written by a true and masterful political professional, our former colleague in the other body, Leonard W. Hall. Mr. Hall speaks from an impressive background of experience, a background which gives added weight and significance to the observations detailed in the article.

Indeed, Len Hall is recognized by both friend and foe as one of this generation's most outstandingly able and successful politicians. He commands the friendship and respect of members of both parties.

A former State legislator and U.S. Representative, he served as a top aid to Governor Dewey in 1944 and in 1948. Subsequently, as the Republican national chairman from 1953 to 1957, Len Hall was a prime mover both in the Eisenhower decision to run, and in the masterminding of the successful 1956 campaign.

In this electronic age, when new techniques and new opportunities combine to introduce a quasi-revolution in the art of politiking, the present commentary by Mr. Hall is both stimulating and significant. In view, therefore, of the timeliness and general interest of the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine, Apr. 25, 1960]

AN OLD PRO DESCRIBES HOW POLITICS IN UNITED STATES HAS CHANGED

(By Leonard Hall)

(The following article is an excerpt from a book entitled "Politics U.S.A." which Doubleday will publish in June. Edited by James M. Cannon, the book consists of comments and recollections by a number of well-known political figures, including Mr. Hall, who were interviewed and then given an opportunity to correct or enlarge upon their tape-recorded, transcribed remarks.)

In the 35 years since I joined the Republican Club in my hometown of Oyster Bay, Long Island, I have seen a tremendous change take place in American politics. The change has come about because people everywhere are up to date about what goes on in politics. Today people make up their own minds. Nobody takes them by the hand and leads them to the polls. I think television and radio have made the biggest impact on the voter's mind, but the newspapers and magazines also deserve a major share of the credit. Newspaper coverage of politics is far better than it used to be. Magazines do much to explain the important people and issues of the day. The overall effect is to give people the facts they need to make their own political decisions. Today you don't even know how your wife is going to vote. She makes up her own mind from reading, from listening to the radio and from seeing the candidates on television. Because people are now thinking for themselves, there is no longer any place for the traditional political boss. He was killed by modern communications.

At the same time television has brought about another drastic change in American political life. It has weakened the local political club, once the rallying point for precinct workers and a training ground for aspiring young candidates. In the old days

you could attract a good audience to the local club just to talk politics. For many people that was good entertainment in itself. But now the club cannot compete with good programs on television, and so it has had to become a social club. You never have a meeting now unless you serve refreshments or put on some sort of a show, or both. And still you don't get the audiences you did years ago.

It is no exaggeration to say that television has brought about a revolution in the country's political life. There is a story about Maine that explains my point. Maine always was a Republican State. People were born Republican, and so they went to the polls and voted Republican. Then suddenly they voted for some Democrats up there—too many from my viewpoint. One day I asked an old Maine man what happened up in his State. "Well," he said, "we can't do anything with this television. Our children were brought up to think that Democrats had horns. Now they see them on television and realize some of them don't have horns a'tall."

Even though we have by now had considerable experience with television in politics, we still have much to learn about how best to use it in a national campaign. In late 1955, when we were talking to President Eisenhower about running for a second term, I told the President that he wouldn't have to travel as much as he had in 1952. I maintained that four or five nationwide telecasts would be all that he would have to do. With the proper advertising and buildup for these programs, I pointed out that he would get the same impact as if he were out meeting people face to face.

As it turned out, we had a chance to try out this theory for him. On January 20, 1956, after the President had recovered from his heart attack, we put on a $100-a-plate Republican dinner in 53 cities with Mr. Eisenhower speaking over closed-circuit television and radio. At each of the dinners we had spotters assigned to examine the effect on the audience of the President speaking from Washington. These spotters reported the response was excellent. A number of them told us that many women at the dinners were moved to tears. The reports helped prove our point: President Eisenhower had the same impact over television as he did in person. So we went ahead with our plans to limit his appearances in the 1956 campaign and to make each one a major event, not only for the party but for the Nation.

WEAR AND TEAR OF CAMPAIGN TRAINS

Another big change has involved transportation. There will still be some campaigning by train in selected areas in the future, but to my mind the great cross-country campaign trains are done. The train wastes a candidate's energy. What we make a presidential candidate do is almost inhuman to begin with, but it is especially tough when he has to campaign cross-country by train.

I think the candidate should move from city to city by air and appear before enthusiastic live audiences to make his national telecasts. Studios lack the proper atmosphere for memorable political occasions. President Eisenhower made his first campaign talk in 1956 in a studio, but after that we decided to present him before audiences. Like many other candidates, he reacts to an audience with buoyant good cheer and visibly draws confidence from the fact that so many people obviously have confidence in him.

There are many advantages in flying from city to city. If the candidate stays in Washington, for example, you can't expect to get 10,000 people out for each of 5 speeches. But if you move around the country and build up each visit, you can get 15,000 people and more in Los Angeles and Chicago and Philadelphia every time. It isn't just the speech that attracts attention to your candidate; it's the film of him leaving one airport, arriving at another, 20 miles of motorcade, an audience of 15,000 people shouting and cheering, and all the other added advantages.

Important as television and new transportation methods are, they don't replace the local organization. There is no substitute for this vital element, and there is no substitute for doorbell ringing and shoe leather. If you want to win an election—national, State, or local—you still must reach the individual voter through your local worker. There have been many changes in politics in recent decades, but one thing will not change: the voter still likes to be asked. He is still responsive to the fact that you think enough of him and his vote to ask him to be for your man.

At Republican meetings I often criticize my fellow members of the party because they are always damning some labor leader who has too many workers in their area. I tell them that instead of cussing the labor leadership we should be doing what they are doing: organizing. That is what we Republicans used to do, but we have got out of the habit.

Yet the conservatives are no more to blame for not voting than anyone else. As people become better informed about politics, you would expect more of them to vote. But the percentage of Americans who actually take the trouble to vote has gone up very little over recent years, if at all. The figures are still discouraging. Even in a presidential election, we get only 60-odd percent to the polls. There is nothing to indicate this percentage will rise. We still have to drag people to the polls.

Though patterns and percentages of voting have not changed much during recent years, I believe that candidates are changing. When I first became a New York State assemblyman in 1927, most of the State legislators were successful businessmen. One would be a big druggist, another a big grocer, and so on—and they had been elected because they were successful in business. But in the late twenties and early thirties candidates began to change. The young lawyer began to take the place of the druggist and the grocer. After radio came in, and much more after television, the fellow who was articulate became the big winner. Personally, I sometimes think being articulate has begun to count for too much, but it is there.

As candidates have changed in local and State elections, they have also changed on the national scene, and the change is for the better. That is not to say that the quality of Congress years ago wasn't high; it was. The point is that everybody is better informed today, and so Congressmen are, too.

President Coolidge wouldn't be a good candidate today. Nowadays a candidate must be able to get through to the people, to the individual voter, and I don't believe that Calvin Coolidge would get through.

Al Smith, on the other hand, would be terrific. Al was very articulate. Maybe he would use "ain't," but that gave him color. It was part of his personality and background. Al always pronounced it "raddio," and people remembered this. It won him more votes than it cost him.

Herbert Hoover would get through to the people as a man of sincerity and dignity. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of course, would probably have been even better on television than he was on radio, and on radio he was certainly one of the greatest. With his smile, his manner and his voice, F.D.R. would have been great political drama on TV.

IKE VERSUS NIXON AS CANDIDATES

For the 1950's it is hard to imagine a better candidate than President Eisenhower. He does the natural political thing as well as any man I've ever seen. With most candidates you tell them to do things that will help them. This fellow Ike will do them naturally. It is instinct with him. He's a natural candidate simply because he's a great fellow. Everybody likes him, and he does, without having to think about it, the things you want a candidate to do.

Vice President NIXON is vastly different from President Eisenhower, but, all things considered, NIXON is the best prepared candidate I've ever come in contact with. For one thing, he has met all the challenges on the way up in politics, and he understands, better than anyone else I know, the part that practical politics plays in our form of Government. NIXON, moreover, has a great mind. He reads prodigiously—history, State papers, philosophy, sociology, law, everything relating to domestic and world affairs. Politically he is the best equipped candidate the party has ever had, and my guess is that he will have more to say about the operation of his campaign than any other candidate in my lifetime.

All presidential candidates are alike in one respect, however. You often wonder why a man will become a candidate for President. They all say, "You're killing me with what you're asking me to do," and yet the next day they are willing to go out and do more than you ask. This was especially true of President Eisenhower. The 1952 campaign train, for example, was rough. It was rough for everybody, but it was particularly rough for the candidate. He would talk six or seven times during the day. The local political VIP's would get aboard at each stop, and Ike would go back to shake hands with them. No sooner had he finished that when another stop would come up. Then Ike usually made a major speech in the evening. Every time the schedule became especially wearing, we would sit down with Ike and say, "All right, it's getting tough. Tomorrow, instead of speaking 15 minutes at each stop, you'll speak only 8 minutes."

"All right," he would say.

Next day, at the first stop, he would be out there talking, and we would, as agreed, start the train in 8 minutes. We would no sooner get under way than Ike would come back and say, "Who started that train?"

A lot of people are going to miss the campaign trains, but the Wright brothers and Henry Ford made a lasting imprint on American political life. The car and good roads, for example, made a difference in voting patterns. It used to be said that wet weather was Democratic weather, because the Democrats, mostly city dwellers, would come out to vote regardless of the weather, while the Republicans in rural areas would stay home because of bad roads. But now that we have good highways and modern automobiles, weather doesn't affect elections much any more.

YOU NEED SPECIALISTS NOW

With better communications, both vehicular and electronic, the management of the campaign has undergone great changes. Politics is like a business now, and you have to get the same kind of specialists that you have in business. I don't think there is anyone in the country today who could manage a major campaign alone. You need advertising experts, research men, financial advisers and public relations men, to name but a few. You need polls and surveys.

Sometimes I think political pools are overrated. I can say that, even though I probably ordered more polls and surveys than any other national chairman did. Polls have a place as long as you run the polls and don't let them run you. They are particularly useful in narrowing issues.

Most of the major plans for a campaign today are really group decisions. When I was chairman of the Republican National

Committee in Washington, I had Lou Guylay to advise on public relations, Bob Humphreys on planning, Fred Scribner and Hugh Scott on legal and legislative matters, and similar top-flight advisers on other specialties. I would call in these men and we would talk out what we wanted to do. Maybe we would not reach unanimous agreement, but out of our talk would come a plan of action. When we got into the 1956 presidential campaign we had Sherman Adams with us too, and sometimes Herb Brownell would join in. We approached our problems just as a board of directors does in business, trying to get all the facts and bringing all our brainpower to bear on the problem. The recommendations we presented to President Eisenhower usually represented group decisions.

On the other hand, there are inevitably occasions when someone, usually the chairman, must make decisions on his own, and alone. I did this right after President Eisenhower's heart attack when I said he would run again.

Two days after Ike had his attack, I had to speak before the Union League Club in New York City. Lou Guylay came along with me and when we got there at noon the television cameras were on the sidewalk waiting. They wanted a statement from me immediately. I said, "Give me 5 minutes."

Lou and I went into the Union League Club, and the only place I could see that was both near and private was the men's room. Lou and I went in there, and that's where we worked out the pronouncement. Five minutes later we came out, and I threw away my earlier spech and talked about Ike and said he would run again.

I will never forget that after the press conference Dick Lee, an old friend and a good reporter for the New York Daily News, followed me out and said, "Len, are you completely nuts?" I said no, and I argued that many people I knew had gone through heart attacks and resumed a normal life. At that time I had nothing to go on, of course, except my own judgment. I had no inside information on the President's condition. I had no way of knowing whether he would ever return to the White House. But I also knew that if he did recover, there would be no reason he shouldn't run for a second term. And for his sake, the party's sake and the country's sake, the best assumption to make was that he would get well and would run.

Generally speaking, the chairmanship of the Republican Party is what the person holding the office wants to make of it. The National Committee itself has lost most of the power it once had. One reason is that the Democrats were in the White House for 20 years. During that time the Republicans elected many Governors, but we were unable to do anything in a national election. In each State, as a result, the State chairman, who worked with the Governor, replaced the national committeeman as the dominant political power.

Another reason is that Federal patronage is controlled from Capitol Hill. The Congressmen insist on handling all postal appointments, and the Senators control the other patronage. The biggest fights I had to settle in Washington were over which of two Republican Senators in a State would get to name someone to a job.

The curious thing about Federal appointments is that the only areas where the Republican national committeeman has any say are where we don't elect any Republicans. It is a ridiculous situation: the Republican national committeeman in Alabama or Georgia is quite a fellow when you're selecting people for appointments, but in New York the selection is made not by the national committeeman but by Senators JAVITS and KEATING.

In some States local patronage is still useful in holding an organization together. In Nassau County where I live, I would guess that 75 percent of our precinct committeemen and workers have town or county jobs of some sort. This means that at election time they are not only working to save the Republican Party, they are working to save their jobs.

As patronage has become scarcer and as people have fallen out of the habit of joining political clubs and attending political meetings, the local organizations have found some compensation in the growing role of women in politics. The women have really taken over. I would trade two ordinary men workers for a woman worker any day. Women have a capacity for ringing doorbells and talking to housewives that men will never have. When they go for a candidate they really work for him. The women were one of the biggest factors behind the tremendous vote given President Eisenhower.

THE RISE OF THE AMATEURS

Another phenomenon of recent years is the independent group—the Citizens for Ike, the amateurs in politics. The Willkie clubs were really the beginning of these independent movements, and I think they are here to stay. With the trend to independent thinking on the part of voters, and with the broader knowledge that everyone now has about politics, there is less respect for professional political leaders. The amateur or independent organizations are useful in getting to the polls those independent votes you must have to win elections.

Personally I don't think it's a good trend. I would rather see two strong, growing political parties. But it appears that the independent groups will be with us for a long time to come. They were a distinct advantage in the Eisenhower campaigns. What you get out of them is enthusiasm. There is nothing wrong with fanfare, confetti, and enthusiasm. In politics, commotion looks good, and the amateurs create it.

In any examination of the changing face of American politics, the national conventions themselves must be included. We built our 1956 convention around television, and we learned a lot from the Democrats. I watched the Democratic convention to learn, and I thought the long, dreary speeches, with the intermittent dead spaces where the chairman would be talking on the platform for 10 minutes, meant that the Democrats were losing their audiences. We planned our convention so that we had no breaks. We set a good pace, and we kept things moving.

When I was out in California getting ready for the convention, I got a memo from the President. He wrote me: "Len, I presume you're getting 1,000 suggestions as to how to run a convention, and perhaps most of them get in the wastepaper basket, and maybe these will, too, but here they are: No. 1. No long, dreary speeches." He then went on with other suggestions, and when he got to No. 14, he said: "I repeat the first. No long, dreary speeches."

Ike had been watching the Democratic convention, too, and he ended up with the same impression I had: too much dull talk and dead space. I think television has compelled parties to tighten up their conventions and to keep something going on at all times. I believe you will never see the time come again when it takes 30 ballots to select a candidate. You just can't bore a nationwide television audience that much.

Television is primarily responsible for another great change in politics, the cost of campaigning. In 1956 the Republicans and the Citizens for Eisenhower spent about $2 million for television and radio alone. While campaign costs have been constantly going up, the traditional sources of campaign funds have been disappearing. At campaign time before the depression we would call about five people along the "Gold Coast" of the North Shore of Long Island, and from these five people we would get all the campaign funds we needed for Nassau County. That ended when the depression came.

During the depression you would go to a farmer for a campaign contribution, and he might give you a bushel of potatoes. You would raffle off the potatoes, and whatever you got would go into the campaign fund. Ever since 1937 we have raised campaign money in Nassau County just as if we were conducting a drive for the Red Cross or the community chest. We give each election district or precinct a quota. Sometimes workers go from house to house to solicit funds, and we will collect, in donations of no more than $2 or $3 each, a total of $175,000. The result is that today in Nassau County every precinct supports itself financially.

THE GIVER BECOMES A STOCKHOLDER

We found out an interesting thing about these political fund drives. If you can get someone to give you a dollar, he becomes a stockholder and will often be a more diligent supporter of your candidate. Without exception, where our campaign workers went after the individual donation and got it, that is where our vote increased. So the decline of big contributions has actually been a blessing in disguise for us. We have broadened the base of our financial appeal, and we have gained new party members and supporters in the process.

The base of political contributions has been broadened not only on the local but on the national level. For instance, Jim Farley initiated the $100-a-plate dinner, but we improved on it. That night in January 1956 when we staged the 53-city closed-circuit TV dinner, we raised about $6 million. The recent trend has been to charge only $10 or $25 a plate just to increase the number of people who donate to the party.

By broadening our base all over the country, we Republicans will be able to meet another major political change, the growth in the political power of organized labor. There is nothing mysterious about why some unions have been so effective for the Democrats. They have simply put more workers and more cars in the precincts. If we are to defend our party and our candidates from the inroads made by the Democratic union groups, then we should learn something from how they operate. We should match them worker for worker and organization for organization.

In my 32 years in politics I have seen many sweeping political changes come about—the disappearance of the boss, the entry of presidential candidates into the living room, the emergence of the average man as a financial angel, and many others. But of all the changes I have seen, none has meant more to me personally than what has happened to my own party. When I first set foot inside a clubhouse door, the Republicans were the majority party. Now the Democrats hold that favored position. So, of course, there is one more great change that I want to see in my lifetime, and that is a resurgence of the Republican Party.

Protest Proposed Extension of the National Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I protest the proposed 1-year extension of the

present National Sugar Act which would give to Cuba an unnecessary and an unfair windfall of some $15 or $16 million worth of sugar.

The House Agriculture Committee on almost a straight party line vote has passed a provision which would extend the National Sugar Act in its present form for an additional year.

Under terms of the act, Cuba is authorized to import into this country 3,119,655 short tons of sugar. This is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, when it is considered that the price Cuba will receive for this sugar imported into the United States is almost twice the world price, but this is only half of the story.

Under the existing law when offshore islands and American possessions are unable to meet their quotas, the quota that is thus unfilled is redistributed. Because of a shortage in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, these countries will have a deficit of some 500,000 tons. Under the law 156,000 tons of this deficit would be assigned to Cuba, and under the law there is nothing this country could do except to assign this additional tonnage to Cuba. It would mean a windfall to Cuba of some $15 to $16 million.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be possible to rewrite the National Sugar Act this year and reduce the Cuban quota, but certainly it is not necessary for this Congress to extend the existing law and give to Cuba 156,000 tons, or a subsidy above the world price of some $6,800,000 at a time when Cuba will be spending that money to propagandize the balance of the Latin American countries against the United States and in favor of communism.

Keynote Speech of Congressman Jim Wright, Texas State Democratic Convention, June 14, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 14, Texas Democrats in Austin, Tex., held the most harmonious and unified convention which has been held in our State in many years. The convention selected a strong delegation of distinguished Texas Democrats who are dedicated to work for the nomination and election as President of the United States the great majority and Democratic leader of the U.S. Senate, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Congressman JIM WRIGHT, our colleague, delivered a splendid keynote address to the delegates assembled at our State Democratic convention. It was enthusiastically received and acclaimed as one of the finest addresses of its kind delivered at any convention.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of that speech:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT, KEYNOTE SPEAKER, TEXAS STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, AUSTIN, TEX., JUNE 14, 1960

One only has to attend a Democratic convention to know what Will Rogers meant when he said, "I don't belong to any organized political party: I'm a Democrat."

A Democratic convention is a spirited affair, any way you look at it.

I can just imagine what confusion such a convention as the one we shall soon have in Los Angeles with its only partially organized bedlam would produce in the mind of the comfortable and fully adjusted Republican, accustomed as he is to the idea of a convention run on the precise schedule of a television commercial, and just about as exciting, with about as much suspense as a recitation of the alphabet and its nominee no more in doubt than the identity of the body in Grant's tomb.

We Democrats, by contrast, must appear to be a weird and motley crew.

STRENGTH FROM DIVERSITY

Yet the more I see of Democratic Party politics, the more convinced I become that out of our disorganization, our diversity, and even our disagreements, comes our strength.

For ours is the party of all the people. We are neither enchained by labor, nor enslaved by business, nor captive of the farmer. We are the party of no one be cause we are the party of everyone.

All are welcome within our gates—the New England fisherman with the salty tang of the Atlantic in his speech, the southern cotton planter with the scent of magnolias in his manner, the midwestern shopkeeper, the western mountain rancher, the wheat farmer from the Great Plains, the stevedore, the coal miner, the factory worker, the teacher, the preacher, the oil driller and the housewife—tinker, tailor, toiler, sailor: it takes no pedigree and very few credentials to be a Democrat.

Here there are no barricades erected against ideas, no fences against individual aspirations. We want no hobbles on the mind, no shackles on the spirit. We impose no thought control, demand no particular orthodoxy and expect no iron conformity.

Occasionally someone may walk out of one of our conventions, but he isn't thrown out. He just leaves when he discovers that he's come to the wrong place by mistake.

When we disagree in convention, we fight with the ferocity of a pack of strange bobcats thrown together in a telephone booth. But it's a family fight—and by November after we've all had our say we shall have joined ranks behind the nominee selected by the majority of us (and at least among those of us assembled here today, I think there's no disagreement as to who we want that nominee to be).

THE PARTY OF INNOVATION

It's a strange and wonderful thing that out of this mixed and heterogeneous group of people who call themselves Democrats have come the great innovations of our Nation's history—the raw, bold and imaginative ideas which have inspired the Nation to new bursts of creative activity and charted the path of our Nation's progress.

And yet it isn't so strange in another sense. Our party is the great shock absorber of American life—the fermenting cauldron in which the clashes and conflicts of individual ideas are distilled and refined.

Composed of so many divergent strands, we offer the Nation a certain cohesiveness that only a party of diversification can—and a certain tough durability that can come only in the alloy of different metals.

It was the party of Jefferson that believed enough in the average man to let him vote, that had the vision to see an expanding future stretching across the broad, untamed frontier for the little nation clustered along the eastern seaboard and to insure that future by the Louisiana Purchase.

It was the party of Jackson that had the courage to assert the power of the Nation and all its people as greater than that of any one financial interest and to break the stranglehold of a little group of men upon the economic windpipe of the Nation.

It was the party of Cleveland that faced the issues of the complex era of our industrial expansion—the party of Wilson that enunciated the "New Freedom," took the children from the mines and mills and put them in the schools, and dreamed a dream of peace on earth.

It was the party of Roosevelt that had the heart to hear the cry of the dispossessed, the disinherited, the disenchanted, the distressed and to lift a desperate people out of the throes of disaster, and his party which generated the dynamic leadership to save the freedom of man in the world.

It was the party of Harry Truman, that tough, plainspoken, fearless man who had the capacity to make decisions and who will be treated with far greater kindness by the historic chroniclers of the future than he was treated by the hysterical chronics of his time.

And it is the party that produced that man of abiding honor and towering patriotism whose dedicated years of inspired and responsible service to his Nation have earned for him a place unique in history and unrivalled in the hearts of his countrymen, SAM RAYBURN of Bonham, Tex.

GREATER TOMORROWS

We could go on and on with a recitation of the programs and personalities produced by this party of innovation. But you did not come here today to hear a recital of past achievements and faded glories. We are not here to dwell upon the imperishable pages of our past, for ours is the party of hope and not of memory. Rather than looking back to great yesterdays, we must look forward to greater tomorrows.

We are here today to choose delegates to our National Convention and to play our part in the selection of the next President of the United States.

It is a great moment, and an awesome moment. New problems call for new solutions. Complex challenges call for creative thinking. The problems and the challenges dwarf the concepts of the stereotyped past.

Gone forever are the days of which William McKinley spoke when he said that every town of 10,000 people in America had at least 10 men who could serve creditably as President.

For the Presidency today is not merely a ceremonial office nor an empty honor to be awarded in the manner of a popularity prize. It is not a place for a campaign pitchman whose only original thought is to question the patriotism of his opponents. It is an office of fateful decision.

In an age of danger and opportunity, when yesterday's dream is today's reality and tomorrow's history, the decisions of the Presidency can quite literally mean the difference between life and death for millions of people. This is what makes our responsibility so great and so grave.

I have the faith to believe that when the Democratic National Convention meets in Los Angeles, it will be not only nominating a candidate but choosing a President.

I feel certain that this will be true if we demonstrate the good judgment to articulate a constructive program for the whole Nation and not just a part of it, and to nominate a standard bearer with the demonstrated capacity to lead our whole party and not just a segment of it * * * and perhaps more importantly still, to set forth a program and

personality that can attract the confidence and enthusiastic support of that great bulk of plain vanilla Americans who are not actively affiliated with either major political party but upon whose decision the results of the election will unavoidably rest.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

There are many of us—and a rapidly growing number of us in every part of the country—who are devotedly convinced that the highly developed skills and deeply dedicated leadership necessary to a truly great President as well as the national stature and universal respect, the organizational prowess and qualities of personality necessary to lead us to an overwhelming victory in November are preeminently present in the person of the great Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas and of America.

I invite you to look with me at the truly unusual qualifications of LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

To serve as a Member of the U.S. Senate is a great honor and an awesome responsibility. This select group of 100 men has been called the world's most exclusive club. Certainly it is the world's most powerful legislative body. But LYNDON JOHNSON is much more than merely another Member of the Senate.

To be chosen by one's colleagues as their leader is an even greater honor and an even more overpowering responsibility. SAM RAYBURN has a saying that the Members of Congress are the most critical jury in the world, that each Member's qualities are shrewdly judged by those who work with him day in and day out. But LYNDON JOHNSON has been much more than just another Senate majority leader.

When elevated to this position of respect and responsibility at the age of 44, he was the youngest man ever so honored by his colleagues in either party. And I think no serious student of history will quarrel with me when I say that LYNDON JOHNSON, by the uncontestable proof of his record of accomplishment, has been the most effective majority leader certainly in the past 50 years, and probably in the entire history of the United States. But LYNDON JOHNSON is more than this.

In a party known for its divergent interests, LYNDON JOHNSON has demonstrated a historically unrivalled capacity to weld together the divergent factions into one united and fairly harmonious whole. He alone with his extraordinary gifts of leadership and conciliation has drawn together in the Senate the forces of city and of farm, of north and south and east and west, and led them together up a constructive path of solid achievement.

This is the unique JOHNSON characteristic, his incredible ability to find solutions to great problems which have baffled others and remained unsolved often for decades.

Here is a man who has placed achievement above argument, solutions above strife, action above oratory, service above sectional discord, and his Nation's interests first and last and above every other consideration.

Is his the kind of leadership the American people want? He, along with Speaker RAYBURN, has authored and directed the record of the Democrats in Congress upon which our Nation's public have three times in the past three congressional elections placed the stamp of their wholehearted approval, electing ever-increasing Democratic majorities each successive time.

And they will crown our efforts with approval if jointly we behave as responsibly in Los Angeles.

DEMANDS OF THE TIMES

The times are demanding the best that we have. They are demanding leadership that can stand up to Khrushchev either in negotiation or in the arena of world opinion, and not come off second best.

They are demanding leadership which can keep our own country from being split into bitterly hostile camps upon the thorns of wicked controversy.

Dangerous times when our very survival is at stake are demanding leadership in whose sinews is the steel of firm resolve, to promise no slick and easy way but to call us to sacrifice if need be.

Unaccustomed times are demanding the imaginative leadership to use our burgeoning surpluses of agricultural commodities to feed the hungry and clothe the naked and serve as an effective instrument of friendship and peace rather than accumulating huge storage bills in the Nation's warehouses.

Careless times where shiny suburbs sprawl into congeries of congestion and cities of skyscrapers neglectfully decay into sickening slums of smog, soot, and urban ugliness.

Contradictory times where behind the angel in the advertisement and the convertible on the screen are concealed the bitter dilemma of the broken home and the stark futility of the unemployed.

Restless times in the world where the underfed, the underprivileged, the underdeveloped explode in emergence, hysterical in their quest for opportunity, humble in their search for decency.

Enlightened times when education becomes not just a school or a book but the essence, the soul, and the spirit of human values.

Tenacious times where the economic fallacies of restricted growth and tight money foolishly prevent the energetic enterprise necessary to enter the new decade.

These times are demanding leadership which can inspire a renewed sense of national vision, of national purpose, and of national effort.

The times are calling to this office a man of height and a man of depth, a man of brilliantly youthful imagination but steeped in mature and seasoned judgment, a man capable both of hardened steel and of gentle velvet, a man of action and a man of reason.

No longer can we think in the old outworn cliches of blocs and groups and factions and sections. America has outgrown this threadbare approach. The Nation's future is one. Its potential is indivisible. It cries out for leadership of a broader vision.

The office is indeed seeking the man. Impressive support is rallying from every part of the country. For we are seeking a President to serve all of America and all the people of America. It is no longer a question of where a man lives, but where he stands. The American people are not concerned about where a man comes from; they want to know where he is going.

And with your help, I have the feeling that LYNDON JOHNSON and a Democratic administration, on a ticket bought and purchased by the American people, are going to the White House next January.

If you should feel slightly cheated in having listened through a Democratic keynote speech that did not beat the bones of Calvin Coolidge and berate the memory of Herbert Hoover: these omissions have occurred because I've felt that there were more important things to talk about.

If you should think it strange that I have not excoriated the so-called modern Republicans for their lack of vision, their lack of direction, their lack of compassion, the loss of momentum we have suffered in the national product, the loss of initiative we have suffered in world affairs, the failures of the present Republican administration: it is because I did not come to speak of failures.

It is not a time for frantic denunciations or superficial solutions or intemperate boasting. It is a time for dedication.

May we think not alone upon how bad they are * * * but upon how good we need to be. Let us not merely pray that we shall win, but let us pray that we may deserve to win.

For in performance only can there be reward; in vision can there be fulfillment; and in service to our fellow men come the victories of life.

Resolutions Adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was adopted by the 47th Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D.C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I had the honor and pleasure of again serving as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, insular possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, made many constructive suggestions, proposed numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached agreement thereon.

The convention was attended by registered delegates from 49 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, in addition to many guests, visitors, representatives of the press, and so forth. Michigan and Texas were tied with 29 delegates each; Florida was in second place with 21; while Louisiana and North Carolina were tied with 13 each; and New York sent 12.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations; and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 47TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 26, 1960

FOREWORD

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress assembled in its 47th annual convention

hereby rededicates its entire effort to the continued development of our great Nation through the development of our two major resources—our land and water. We intend to do our utmost now while it is appropriate and thereby help to strengthen our Nation to enable it to better meet adverse conditions should they ever return. In fact the strength so gained will go far toward avoiding such adverse conditions.

POLLUTION OF INLAND WATERS

This congress for some time has recognized the problem of pollution of our inland interstate waterways and impoundments by boats, municipalities, and industries. Millions are spent to improve the waters only to have them used by improperly equipped marine craft which cause pollution by disposal of sewage and other wastes and also such waters are polluted by improper disposal of industrial waste by industries and sewage by municipalities. We urge the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service and his interagency study group concerned with this major problem to make an early and appropriate report to the National Congress to form a basis for remedial legislation.

DOCK AND MOORAGE STANDARDS AS AIDS TO NAVIGATION

For some time now restrictions to navigation occasioned by structures along our navigable channels have been on the increase. Larger and faster vessels will make the problem more serious in the years ahead if some equitable solution is not found. While it would appear that Federal regulation might provide protection to operating vessels and shoreside facilities, it may well be that local zoning ordinances may provide standards of construction and location to insure that such facilities withstand normal vessel passages without damage. This congress will dedicate its efforts to a resolution of this serious problem.

FLOOD PLAIN ZONING

This congress recognizes the need for some form of regulation to avoid the creation of flood hazards in the future in the flood plains of the rivers of our country. In this connection we strongly support the view of the Chief of Engineers as expressed in his opening statement concerning the fiscal year 1961 appropriation for civil functions. The action proposed by him is appropriate and this congress will support legislation which would authorize the Corps of Engineers to provide flood plain information and advice to communities, to aid them in their planning for regulation of flood plain use. We share his belief that such information will serve as a guide to local development and as a means of avoiding future flood hazards.

LOSS OF RESERVOIR SITES

Consistent with long-range planning for the orderly development of our water resources we subscribe to the principle that definite action is indicated to preserve reservoir sites for that purpose. Major housing developments, industrial expansion, and the highway system have already exacted their toll on the remaining reservoir sites. Natural reservoir sites are a natural resource that should be preserved. Advance acquisition of appropriate estates in land or options therefor will be objected to. However, we urge the committees of Congress to continue to pursue the problem before these necessary sites as preempted for other uses.

THE NEW MAINTENANCE PLAN OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

We are impressed with the plan for improving the maintenance program of the Corps of Engineers which has been devised by the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget. This plan, presented to the congressional Appropriations Committees by the Chief of Engineers in his opening statement in 1960 is an indication that an effort has been and is being made to reduce the backlog of maintenance on flood control and navigation improvements in which the Nation has a large investment. We strongly urge the Congress to implement the program by adequate appropriations. This plan of funding rehabilitation of major rehabilitation projects separately and small projects in a lump sum should give the committees a much better understanding of the problem and the urgent need for such appropriations.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

We are convinced that our continuing opposition to user charges on tolls on waterways is correct. There can be no doubt that such charges will result in a higher cost for water transportation and will produce a shift of such transportation from water to land. The investment already made for waterways warrants their continued full use. User charges will decrease that use and consequently they will provide a lesser return upon this extensive development.

RECREATION

Recreation at completed projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation has become an important asset of these major investments. However, the Congress has not yet defined the extent of the Federal interest in such assets as a function of water resource development. We feel that it is now appropriate for the Congress to do so. In so doing it should establish guidelines for evaluating these benefits and allocating their costs.

OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGABLE CHANNELS

This Congress strongly urges against the construction or erection of any fixed structure on or over any waterway which might possibly result in an unreasonable obstruction to navigation. We further urge that no permit for the construction or erection of such a structure be issued until a showing has been made by the applicant that such structure will not, in fact, result in an unreasonable obstruction to navigation and/or will not operate to deprive waterway users of the protection and safety afforded by such waterway.

FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

The navigable waterways and the water supplies of the rivers and lakes of America are the greatest natural resource of this Nation.

Full and comprehensive development and maintenance of these resources is necessary to insure our national security and future economic welfare. This is a responsibility which must in large part be borne by the Federal Government.

The Congress authorizes navigation and water conservation projects only when the benefits exceed the costs. There are billions of dollars of worthwhile authorized projects patiently awaiting budgeting and appropriation of funds to begin their construction. There are many important projects now under construction suffering from "stretchout" procedures, which means insufficient funds budgeted and appropriated each year to make possible early completion.

This congress is of the opinion:

1. That is to the general benefit of the Nation that a greater percentage of the national income be devoted to development of these natural resources.

2. That a much greater number of authorized projects be budgeted and appropriations made for beginning of their construction.

3. That the agencies of the Federal Government and the Bureau of the Budget should initiate a policy, and make every effort to carry it through, of scheduling completion of projects on the basis of sound construction practice and not on the basis of pessimistic anticipation of low annual allocation and appropriation of funds for such projects.

Such a practice would decrease the cost of interest during construction and hasten the day when the benefits of the project would begin to return to the Government and local interests.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

ACQUISITION AND USE OF LANDS BY THE UNITED STATES

It has been called to the attention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that problems exist in various parts of the country concerning the policies and procedures involved in the acquisition and utilization of land by the United States of America and particularly in connection with water resource development projects or Government installations adjacent to such projects.

It is the desire of the congress to assure:

1. Equitable treatment to those displaced by water resource development projects; and

2. Full exploitation of the recreation potential of water resource development projects by providing ready access to the surface of the water; Therefore

I. The Congress of the United States should enact legislation to establish a commission to inquire into the policies and procedures employed in establishing just compensation for the taking of property for public use as guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to make recommendations for further legislation, if any, that may be necessary to assure equitable payments to owners and tenants displaced by public works projects of the United States and reimburse them for their actual losses.

II. The Congress of the United States and the heads of the executive departments and agencies involved should cooperate to establish a land acquisition schedule that will provide for the acquisition of required lands at the earliest possible date after authorization of a project in order to assist those affected in minimizing their losses and in obtaining available relocation sites.

III. The heads of the executive departments and agencies controlling lands along the shoreline of Federal water-resource development projects should provide ready access to the public of water areas thereof, either directly or through arrangement with State and local agencies for recreational development, whenever such use is determined by the head of the Department or agency involved to be compatible with the Government's use of the water area and adjacent lands.

Msgr. Milos K. Mlynarovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, a host of friends and well wishers paid tribute to the Right Reverend Monsignor Milos K. Mlynarovich, nationally known American Slovak priest, author and poet, in observance of his Golden Jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood.

In 1914, Monsignor Mlynarovich came to East Chicago, Ind., and organized the Parish of the Assumption. Later on he organized the Sacred Heart Parish and built two beautiful churches and a parochial school.

Monsignor Mlynarovich is a celebrated poet and writer and his name and talents are known and revered by thousands outside of the Calumet district of Indiana. I have known the Monsignor personally for about 30 years and have always admired his devotion for religious, civic and charity work which he has accomplished for his people, church, community, State, and Nation.

I am herewith submitting an article from the Bethlehem Bulletin, written by Editor John C. Sciranka who outlines in detail the chronological course of the Monsignor's attainments and accomplishments:

MONSIGNOR MLYNAROVICH CELEBRATES GOLDEN JUBILEE OF PRIESTHOOD

(By John C. Sciranka)

Few people are gifted by the Almighty with rich talents like the Right Reverend Monsignor Milos K. Mlynarovich, noted American Slovak author and poet, who will observe the golden jubilee of his ordination to priesthood on Sunday, June 12, at the Monastery of Slovak Franciscan Fathers, known as the Seven Dolors Shrine, Valparaiso, Ind.

Monsignor Mlynarovich is a talented preacher, popular public speaker, humorist, and above all a prolific author and poet. He excells in all these talents, talking to him or observing his actions even for a little while, you will agree with Wordsworth who wrote that the poet is chiefly distinguished from other men by a greater promptness to think and feel without immediate external excitement, and a greater power in expressing such thoughts and feelings.

Of course, Monsignor Mlynarovich has a lot of fire and excitement especially in his oratory. Although the Gallery of Catholic Living Authors honored him with membership as the first author from his American Slovak countrymen, poetry still fits best his description, for according to a definition of a poet, it is from a Greek poietes, which means "a maker or creator." Poet practices that one of the fine arts which exhibits its special character and powers by means of language; or according to Aytoun, the art which has for its object the creation of intellectual pleasures by means of imaginative and passionate language, and of language generally. It has also been defined as the concrete and artistic expression of the human mind in emotional and rhythmical language.

POET LAUREATE

Knowing Monsignor Mlynarovich and his poetry, he belongs to the latter category of poets, for he possesses that artistic expression of human mind in emotional and rhythmical language which qualifies him to be the poet laureate of the American Slovaks without any question or doubt.

Monsignor Mlynarovich was born on October 11, 1887 in the village of Hasprunk, county of Bratislava, Slovakia. He was ordained to priesthood on May 21, 1910 in the historical city of Bratislava after completing his studies in various historical colleges in Slovakia. After his ordination he was a professor of theology. He also began to write poetry.

In his writings he dreamed about coming to America. In 1912 a well known Slovenian American missionary, the Very Reverend Casimer Zajkrajsek, OFM., visited Slovakia recruiting students and seminarians for missionary work in America. Father Mlynarovich was impressed by his talks of the land of Columbia. On August 2, 1914 he landed on Long Island on the SS *Washington*, which was the last ship to land from Germany as the World War I broke out over the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand in Serajeve, Serbia.

BUILT TWO CHURCHES

After a brief stop in Brooklyn, N.Y., he proceeded to Indiana, where he was accepted by the late Bishop Herman Alerding to labor in the Fort Wayne diocese. He became assistant pastor of St. John the Baptist Slovak parish in Whiting, Ind., and assisted the late Father Benedict Rajcany. On November 29, 1914 Bishop sent him to East Chicago, Ind., where he organized a Parish of the Assumption. From this parish he organized a Sacred Heart Parish and built two beautifuf churches and a parochial school.

Writing books and poems, however, never ceased to be his chief hobby. In spite of heavy duties as pastor and organizer, he had a novel about the American Slovaks published in 1926 by the St. Adalbert (Vojtech) Cultural Slovak Society. He also visited Rome and his native Slovakia, where he established contacts with literary people, many of whom visited him in Indiana.

Fraternalism interested him right from the day he landed in Indiana. There he met Mrs. Helen Kocan, the leading American Slovak fraternalist and the supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union in Indiana, which organization published some of his literary works. Other works were published by the late Father John J. Lach, who died suddenly on May 9 of this year and was a pastor in Whiting for over 30 years.

SUPREME CHAPLAIN

In 1939 Monsignor Mlynarovich was elected president of the supreme court of the Slovak Catholic Sokol at the national convention in Trenton, N.J. Three years later he was chosen as supreme chaplain of this the largest Slovak gymnastic and athletic youth fraternity. At the same time he was elected supreme president of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an affiliate of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which position he held for 5 years during the hard days of depression. He was again elected to the supreme presidency of the federation in 1950 and still holds the office.

In 1931 during the popularity contest held by the Daily Slovak American, he was chosen to the top position. But he kept on writing his books and poetry and his poems "Slavia," also novels, "The Great God of Small," "In the Shadow of Skyscrapers," "The Birds in the Storm," in which he writes about his life in Indiana, especially near the Notre Dame University and visits to Chicago, received much praise in the Slovak literary circles. "The Struggle With Fate," a 160-page novel, is a masterpiece. But his book of poems, "Testament of the King of Hearts," won him the highest award.

Monsignor Mlynarovich was elected to the membership in the Gallery of Catholic Living Authors and also to the International Marianist Academy.

ELEVATED BY PIUS XII

On June 8, 1945, the late Pope Pius XII elevated him to the dignity of papal chamberlain with the title of the Very Reverend Monsignore and on December 21, 1955, the same reigning Pontiff elevated him to the Domestic Prelacy with a title of the Right Reverend Monsignore. During that year he visited the Eternal City with his dear friend, the late Father John J. Lach, of Whiting, Ind., where they established a scholarship for the students for priesthood who would work later in Slovakia, where the Communists are preventing the education of students for priesthood.

In spite of a large parish, he resigned his pastorate and retired to a quiet life in the Valparaiso Franciscan Monastery to devote his life to writing, preaching, and lecturing.

His recent work is a beautiful book devoted to the Mother of our Lord with the introduction and imprimatur by his bishop, the Most Reverend Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., of Gary, Ind., his close friend, who will preside at the solemn golden jubilee mass on Sunday, June 12, at the monastery of the Slovak Franciscan Fathers, at Valparaiso, Ind., and preach the sermon.

Monsignor Mlynarovich is a noted American Slovak fraternalist. He is a member of all the leading Slovak fraternal organizations in America and served as chairman of the literary committee of the National Slovak Society and on other committees during the national conventions of other leading organizations.

The American Slovaks and their brethren in various countries will honor Monsignor Mlynarovich as an outstanding author and poet laureate as they already did in a beautiful biography, which depicts his interesting and fruitful life of half century in priesthood. His countless friends and admirers including ourselves wish him a long and healthy life with a proverbial ad multos annos.

Keeping Grain Storage Costs Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Des Moines Register, June 15, 1960:

KEEPING GRAIN STORAGE COSTS DOWN

We reprinted in the Register Monday an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which raised objections to what it said was a Department of Agriculture proposal to store more surplus grain in Government bins. It said there was no acceptable proof that it is cheaper to store the grain in Government bins.

Now Agriculture Secretary Benson has written a letter to the Journal saying that this was not a Department of Agriculture proposal. He says the Department agrees that private storage facilities should have preference and that it is bending its efforts in this direction.

Benson also agrees with the Journal that the difficulties in agriculture are a result of "too much Government involvement."

It is true that Congress wants the Department of Agriculture to give preference to private warehousers wherever practicable. However, the Department's own figures have shown the cost to be considerably less when the surplus grain is stored in Government bins. A survey by the Department last January showed the average cost of storing grain in Government bins in 1959 was about 5 cents a bushel. This compared with the rate paid private storage companies of 16.5 cents a bushel.

The Government bin cost figure did not include an allowance for insurance nor, of course, for taxes. But if about 1.5 cents were allowed for these charges paid by private warehousers, the Government bin cost still would be far lower.

The rate paid private warehousers is being dropped to about 13.5 cents per bushel. But it seems that the Government could save some additional money on storage costs by making full use of its own bins. The Department of Agriculture reported that

more than one-fourth of its available grain bin space was not used last year.

Even if the calculated cost of storage in Government bins were as high as for commerical storage, we should think it would be more economical to keep full the bins the Government now owns rather than to let them stand empty. The cost of owning the bins will go on regardless of whether they are used or not. If the commercial storage rate can be brought down to make Government storage impractical, then, the Government ought to sell its bins.

The cost to the taxpayer of Government farm programs has been rising sharply in recent years. Most of this is the consequence of the upsurge in farm production and the decline in market prices. Even though price supports have been lowered considerably, the total cost of farm programs has climbed.

However, some of this increase has been a result of inefficient management of the programs and abandonment of acreage limitations for corn. And another part of the increase is the lack of prudence in keeping grain storage costs down.

The Department of Agriculture has a responsibility to carry out the laws of Congress fully but at as low a cost as possible. The congressional preference for private industry does not require the Department to ignore the cost factor.

Heart Association, Tuberculosis Association Issue Warnings on Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, two national health organizations have recently issued warnings to the American public about the hazards of cigarette smoking.

These historic statements—the first by the National Tuberculosis Association, the second by the American Heart Association—emphasize the need for impressing upon the Nation's young people the seriousness of these hazards.

I point out that this need would be met by the program of matching educational grants which the late Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger, and I proposed in bills now before this Congress.

The Tuberculosis Association statement, endorsed by the distinguished chest specialists in its medical section, the American Trudeau Society, minces no words. It flatly asserts that "cigarette smoking is a major cause of lung cancer." It also concludes that parents, teachers, and physicians have "a duty to warn our youth of these facts before the cigarette smoking habit has become established."

While the Heart Association warns that death rates from coronary heart disease, the greatest killer in our society, are much higher for heavy cigarette smokers than for nonsmokers—50 to 150 percent higher in middle-aged men—it, too, recognizes the need for educating the public about the seriousness of these hazards. It concludes, in part, that "these studies concerning cigarette smoking and coronary heart disease should be called to the attention of the medical profession, allied health professions, health educators, and the general public."

These statements once more illustrate the folly of Federal subsidies which support the production of a crop that medical science has clearly shown undermines the general health of the Nation. I commend these statements to the attention of my colleagues. The statement issued by the board of directors of the Tuberculosis Association is followed by a brief documentation which the association drew from key scientific reports to support its statement; this in turn is followed by the Heart Association statement:

STATEMENT ON CIGARETTE SMOKING AND HEALTH, APPROVED BY THE NATIONAL TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The National Tuberculosis Association warns all persons that there is an alarming increase in deaths from lung cancer; cigarette smoking is a major cause of lung cancer; the risk of lung cancer increases with the number of cigarettes smoked.

Giving up smoking reduces the risk of lung cancer.

Recent studies show that cigarette smoking is a factor in such crippling lung diseases as chronic bronchitis and emphysema.

There is no single cause for all lung cancers. Breathing polluted city air may also add to the risk of lung cancer.

No present method of treating tobacco or filtering the smoke has been proved to reduce the harmful effects of cigarette smoking; up to now, these harmful effects can be avoided only by not smoking cigarettes.

All persons should be given these facts. Parents, teachers, and physicians have a special opportunity and a duty to warn our youth of these facts before the cigarette smoking habit has become established.

BRIEF DOCUMENTATION ON RELATION BETWEEN CIGARETTE SMOKING AND HEALTH

Many scientific reports in the medical literature of recent years deal with the relation between cigarette smoking and health.

Two recent summaries have brought together the most important findings.

I. "Smoking and Lung Cancer—A Statement of the Public Health Service" by Leroy E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General,[1] includes a bibliography of 49 items covering statistical, pathological, epidemiological, and experimental studies of lung cancer and tobacco smoking. Dr. Burney's article includes some important but simple graphs in its 7 pages.

The conclusions of this article are as follows:

"It is a statutory responsibility of the Public Health Service to inform members of the medical profession and the public on all matters relating to important public health issues. The relationship between smoking and lung cancer constitutes such an issue and falls within this responsibility of the Public Health Service.

"The Public Health Service believes that the following statements are justified by studies to date. (1) The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer. (2) Cigarette smoking particularly is associated with an increased chance of developing lung cancer. (3) Stopping cigarette smoking even after long exposure is beneficial. (4) No method of treating tobacco or filtering the smoke has been demonstrated to be effective in materially reducing or eliminating the hazard of lung cancer. (5) The nonsmoker has a lower incidence of lung cancer than the smoker in all controlled studies, whether analyzed in terms of rural areas, urban regions, industrial occupations, or sex. (6) Persons who have never smoked at all (cigarettes, cigars, or pipe) have the best chance of escaping lung cancer. (7) Unless the use of tobacco can be made safe, the individual person's risk of lung cancer can best be reduced by the elimination of smoking."

II. The Bureau of Cancer Control of the New York State Department of Health issued a brochure in 1959 entitled, "Cigarette Smoking and Lung Cancer."[2] It summarizes recent articles and discusses the evidence for the cigarette-lung cancer relationship. This booklet contains 24 references to the medical literature.

One of the most quoted studies in this field is that of E. C. Hammond, Sc. D., and D. Horne, Ph. D.[3] Another important recent article is by Harold F. Dorn, Ph. D., of the Public Health Service, and is titled, "Tobacco Consumption and Mortality From Cancer and Other Diseases."[4] This is a comprehensive analysis of causes of death in smokers and nonsmokers among 249,000 Government life insurance holders.

Most students of the tobacco risk problem are entirely convinced as to the cigarette smoking lung cancer cause and effect relationship. Several studies including Dorn's indicate a probable association between cigarette smoking and other pulmonary diseases such as chronic bronchitis and emphysema.[5] [6] Finally, the possibility exists that tobacco smoking may increase disability and mortality from cardiovascular and other diseases.

There also appears to be a relation between air pollution and lung cancer.[7] [8] A recent comment by Dr. Burney is pertinent in this regard. He stated[9] that, although circum-

[1] Burney, L. E. "Smoking and Lung Cancer—A Statement of the Public Health Service," Journal of the American Medical Association, vol. 171, pp. 1829–1837 (Nov. 28, 1959).

[2] "Cigarette Smoking and Lung Cancer," Bureau of Cancer Control, New York State Department of Health, 1959.

[3] Hammond, E. C. and Horn, D.: "Smoking and Death Rates—Report on 44 Months of Followup of 187,783 Men." Journal of the American Medical Association, vol. 166, pp. 1159–1172 and 1294–1308 (Mar. 8 and 15, 1958).

[4] Dorn, H. F.: "Tobacco Consumption and Mortality From Cancer and Other Diseases," Public Health Reports, vol. 74, No. 7 (July 1959).

[5] Flick, A. L. and Paton, R. R.: "Obstructive Emphysema in Cigarette Smokers," American Medical Association Archives of Internal Medicine, vol. 104, pp. 518–526 (October 1959).

[6] Lowell, F. C., Franklin, W., Michelson, A. L., and Schiller, I. W.: "Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Emphysema: A Disease of Smokers," Annals of Internal Medicine, vol. 45, No. 2 (August 1956).

[7] Stocks, P. and Campbell, J. M.: "Lung Cancer Death Rates Among Nonsmokers and Pipe and Cigarette Smokers—An Evaluation in Relation to Air Pollution by Benzpyrene and Other Substances." British Medical Journal, vol. II, p. 923 (Oct. 15, 1955).

[8] Mills, C. A. and Porter, M. M.: "Tobacco Smoking, Motor Exhaust Fumes, and General Air Pollution in Relation to Lung Cancer Incidence." Cancer Research, vol. 17, No. 10, pp. 981–90 (November 1957).

[9] Proceedings, National Conference on Air Pollution. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1959, pp. 4–5.

stantial evidence relates cancer to atmospheric pollution, the case has not yet been proved. "This legal metaphor is frequently used," Dr. Burney added. "I submit to you that it is misleading. In law the suspect is innocent until his guilt has been proved beyond reasonable doubt. In the protection of human health such absolute proof often comes too late."

A great deal of research is needed to illuminate the dark corners of this complicated problem. There is, however, sufficient convincing evidence to compel action. The increasing U.S. annual death toll (now at 35,000) caused by cancer of the lung permits no more delay. Our population must be informed, especially the youth who have not yet become steady smokers.

CIGARETTE SMOKING AND CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES

(A report by the American Heart Association)

In 1953 the American Heart Association issued a statement on smoking and cardiovascular diseases. Among other things, this statement indicated that the available evidence at that time was not sufficient to justify conclusions concerning a cause-and-effect relationship between cigarette smoking and increased death rates from coronary heart disease. Since then, sufficient additional knowledge has accumulated to warrant a new report on cigarette smoking and its possible relationship to cardiovascular diseases.

Up to the present, a number of medical studies have been made, nearly all demonstrating a statistical association between heavy cigarette smoking and mortality (death) and morbidity (illness) from coronary heart disease. In these studies, death rates from coronary heart disease (heart attacks) in middle-aged men were found to be from 50 to 150 percent higher among heavy cigarette smokers than among those who do not smoke. This statistical association does not prove that heavy cigarette smoking causes coronary heart disease, but the data strongly suggest that heavy cigarette smoking may contribute to or accelerate the development of coronary heart disease or its complications.

Because coronary heart disease is the leading cause of death and a major cause of disability in the American population, the American Heart Association believes that these studies concerning cigarette smoking and coronary heart disease should be called to the attention of the medical profession, allied health professions, health educators, and the general public. The association recognizes the need for more knowledge and will continue to encourage a systematic biological and medical research in order to determine whether a causal relationship exists between cigarette smoking and coronary heart disease and also to determine the effects of smoking in relation to strokes and other important aspects of cardiovascular diseases.

Some Cold, Hard Figures on the Extent of Foreign Glove Imports—Still No Threat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor of this House frequently in the past 2 years to try to point out to my colleagues the increasing economic threat posed by foreign glove imports to our own domestic glove industry and the fine men and women employed in it. But figures often speak louder than words. And nothing, I think, could demonstrate more clearly than some figures recently compiled by the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers and the American Fabric Glove Associates just how serious this threat of increased imports has become. I find it hard, Mr. Speaker, to see how any reasonable person can read these figures and still maintain, as the U.S. Tariff Commission recently held, that foreign glove imports are not coming into this country in an amount sufficient to cause severe harm or injury to the domestic glove industry.

The figures referred to follow:

MAY 18, 1960.

To Members of the Association:

Annual import figures for 1959 have just been released, and we are listing various breakdowns, together with comparisons with previous years.

WOMEN'S LEATHER GLOVES

Chart No. 1

Chart No. 1 shows the growth of the import market from 1952 on. You will notice that we show almost a 50 percent increase in dozens over a year ago. At the same time, we point out to you that during this period the unit value has decreased. If the imports for the first few months are any indication of the volume that is ahead, we can expect another 50 percent increase, or approximately 350,000 dozens, for 1960.

Year	Dozens	Unit value
1952	76,296	$28.15
1953	91,662	26.4
1954	89,189	25.9
1955	94,152	25.95
1956	115,142	26.22
1957	151,329	26.11
1958	173,423	24.90
1959	255,399	24.59

Chart No. 2

This chart shows the exporting countries, the dozens exported, and the unit value for the year 1959:

Country	Dozens	Unit value
Italy	97,037	$19.87
France	93,472	30.35
West Germany	30,465	24.39
Philippine Republic	15,236	21.18
Belgium	6,742	24.91
United Kingdom	5,624	23.90
Czechoslovakia	3,487	17.11
Spain	1,443	18.94
Netherlands	709	26.49
Canada	384	25.75
Japan	282	14.42
Austria	159	25.94
Greece	108	22.67
Switzerland	67	21.63
Peru	41	24.39
Yugoslavia	17	17.41
Sweden	5	62.60
Norway	3	65.33
Rumania	3	15.00

Chart No. 3

This chart is most interesting, because it gives you a 3-year comparison. You will note from it that Italy has now replaced France as the major exporting country. This, of course, was predicted a year ago.

In analyzing the chart, you will notice there is a certain amount of stability in prices over the past 3 years. The top four, namely, Italy, France, West Germany, and the Philippines, retain their positions and account for practically all the gloves that are imported. The volume of the other countries shows very little fluctuation, and it is doubtful if they will ever become important factors in the women's glove market.

Country	Dozens	Unit value
1959		
Italy	97,037	$19.87
France	93,472	30.35
West Germany	30,465	24.39
Philippines	15,236	21.18
Belgium	6,742	24.91
United Kingdom	5,624	23.90
Czechoslovakia	3,487	17.11
Spain	1,443	18.94
Netherlands	709	26.49
Canada	381	25.75
Japan	282	14.42
Austria	159	25.94
Greece	108	22.67
Switzerland	67	21.63
Peru	41	24.39
Yugoslavia	17	17.41
Sweden	5	62.60
Norway	3	65.33
Rumania	3	15.00
Total dozens and average unit value	255,399	24.55
1958		
Italy	52,798	20.40
France	74,339	30.48
West Germany	20,923	24.17
Philippines	12,371	18.83
Belgium	4,270	25.43
United Kingdom	4,180	24.68
Czechoslovakia	2,388	15.94
Spain	1,477	16.54
Netherlands	157	20.81
Canada	38	35.79
Japan	168	21.20
Austria	34	29.00
Greece	148	26.09
Switzerland	13	40.00
Peru	16	29.75
Yugoslavia		
Sweden	5	64.02
Norway		
Rumania		
Total dozens and average unit value	173,423	24.90
1957		
Italy	35,966	20.30
France	73,911	29.80
West Germany	22,733	22.60
Philippines	7,483	18.40
Belgium	2,232	26.00
United Kingdom	4,446	22.50
Czechoslovakia	236	14.10
Spain		
Netherlands	527	25.40
Canada	67	22.20
Japan	350	22.20
Austria	444	22.25
Greece	310	24.40
Switzerland		
Peru		
Yugoslavia		
Sweden	11	40.00
Norway		
Rumania		
Total dozens and average unit value	150,411	25.42

The big volume in the women's glove field is in gloves under 12 inches in length, with PK gloves out in front, overseem second, and lined gloves also making strong inroads in the domestic field. In the longer lengths, the 16 inch glove was the volume leader.

MEN'S GLOVES

Chart No. 1

This chart clearly outlines the progress that has been made in the men's field in the past 8 years and, at the same time, shows the decrease in unit value that has taken place during the same period:

Year	Dozens	Unit value
1952	8,124	$36.00
1953	7,784	35.00
1954	5,820	36.00
1955	8,825	30.27
1956	18,249	31.08
1957	22,654	28.30
1958	30,072	25.61
1959	80,964	24.88

Chart No. 2

Chart No. 2 gives the various countries exporting, together with the dozens exported and the unit value:

Country	Dozens	Unit value
Philippine Republic	40,589	$23.15
Italy	24,946	24.39
United Kingdom	5,118	27.84
Spain	1,703	23.45
West Germany	1,660	40.65
Netherlands	1,561	23.76
Austria	301	6.92
Sweden	249	52.08
Canada	152	26.11
Greece	99	12.30
Japan	68	19.63
Denmark	60	57.61
Norway	48	30.15
Switzerland	40	26.80
Belgium	35	34.40
Argentina	4	33.75

Chart No. 3

The following chart gives you the comparison of the various countries during the past 3 years, including dozens and unit value:

Country	Dozens	Unit value
1959		
Philippines	40,589	$23.15
Italy	24,946	24.39
United Kingdom	5,118	27.84
Spain	1,703	23.45
West Germany	1,660	40.65
Netherlands	1,561	23.76
Austria	301	6.92
Sweden	249	52.08
Canada	152	26.11
Greece	99	12.30
Japan	68	19.63
Denmark	60	52.61
Norway	48	30.15
Switzerland	40	26.80
Belgium	35	34.40
Argentina	4	33.75
1958		
Philippines	10,761	21.03
Italy	10,382	24.08
United Kingdom	3,381	27.01
Spain	239	32.73
West Germany	634	47.58
Netherlands	1,586	15.99
Austria	----------	----------
Sweden	100	76.78
Canada	----------	----------
Greece	66	31.07
Japan	----------	----------
Denmark	29	51.77
Norway	----------	----------
Switzerland	----------	----------
Belgium	----------	----------
Argentina	----------	----------
1957		
Philippines	8,199	22.90
Italy	5,474	25.15
United Kingdom	2,488	28.10
Spain	----------	----------
West Germany	331	35.30
Netherlands	904	22.58
Austria	----------	----------
Sweden	59	74.93
Canada	4	70.25
Greece	20	29.40
Japan	----------	----------
Denmark	----------	----------
Norway	----------	----------
Switzerland	304	34.70
Belgium	92	38.98
Argentina	----------	----------

MAY 19, 1960.

To Members of the Association:

Annual import figures for 1959 have been received, and we are forwarding them to you, divided into various categories, so that you will be able to understand the extent of the import market.

No comparisons with domestic production figures for 1959 are made, due to the fact that the domestic figures are not available at this time.

The overall picture indicates that Japan is by far the leading supplier, accounting for better than 50 percent of all imports—and in some instances the charts will indicate even higher. The balance of production is distributed mainly among the Philippine Republic, West Germany, Hong Kong, and Italy.

Chart No. 1

Single and double woven cotton, of fabric knit on warp knitting machines. Tariff paragraph 915. Commodity schedules 3090–100–110. Duty 30 percent, established September 1, 1955.

Country	Dozens	Unit value	Total value
Japan	428,464	$4.38	$1,880,166
West Germany	152,112	9.37	1,425,624
Philippine Republic	134,212	8.59	1,154,433
Hong Kong	118,621	5.24	622,557
Italy	89,850	7.68	690,627
France	10,103	13.60	137,459
United Kingdom	4,720	7.67	36,228
Portugal	1,678	12.23	20,529
Austria	1,350	17.99	24,292
Malta	850	10.39	8,837
Switzerland	479	10.66	5,106
Belgium	173	10.90	1,896
Total	943,361	----------	6,015,724
Average unit value	----------	6.39	----------

Chart No. 2

Comparative 3-year chart for single and double woven cotton gloves. Tariff paragraph 915. Commodity schedules 3090–100–110. Duty 30 percent, established September 1, 1955.

Country	Dozens	Unit value
1959		
Japan	428,464	$4.38
West Germany	152,112	9.37
Philippines	134,212	8.59
Hong Kong	118,621	5.24
Italy	89,850	7.68
France	10,103	13.60
United Kingdom	4,720	7.67
Portugal	1,678	12.23
Austria	1,350	17.99
Malta	850	10.39
Switzerland	479	10.66
Belgium	173	10.90
Spain	----------	----------
Madeira	----------	----------
Netherlands	----------	----------
Canada	----------	----------
1958		
Japan	341,777	4.70
West Germany	154,271	10.05
Philippines	162,590	8.77
Hong Kong	99,199	5.31
Italy	77,681	8.15
France	9,378	16.10
United Kingdom	9,649	6.03
Portugal	162	17.21
Austria	2,274	10.73
Malta	227	10.90
Switzerland	----------	----------
Belgium	88	15.86
Spain	165	15.52
Madeira	173	16.61
Netherlands	----------	----------
Canada	----------	----------
1957		
Japan	361,955	4.73
West Germany	151,136	9.81
Philippines	192,588	7.40
Hong Kong	48,570	4.47
Italy	105,813	7.62
France	20,725	14.64
United Kingdom	3,838	15.07
Portugal	268	15.30
Austria	170	10.79
Malta	----------	----------
Switzerland	70	11.14
Belgium	735	9.78
Spain	2,080	13.50
Madeira	842	11.24
Netherlands	117	13.67
Canada	469	14.00
Total:		
1959	943,361	6.36
1958	857,634	7.87
1957	891,782	6.82

In the next category, we are considering woven cotton gloves. Japan accounts for approximately 80 percent of the volume, Hong Kong for 10 percent; and the balance is divided among other countries.

Also included in chart No. 3 is a special category "Other Vegetable Fibers," a woven fabric, but not cotton. To date we have not been able to identify this fiber.

Chart No. 3

Cotton, woven. Tariff paragraph 915. Commodity schedules 3090–800. As of July 1, 1959, the commodity schedule was divided as follows: 3090.810 includes gloves of chief value cotton and 3090.820 of chief value vegetable fiber, other than cotton. Duty 25 percent.

	Dozens	Unit value	Total value
Cotton, woven:			
1959	57,536	$3.68	$211,785
1958	40,507	3.56	144,588
Other vegetable fibers (not cotton), woven:			
1959 [1]	27,375	3.10	85,113

[1] Above figures are reported for last 6 months of 1959.

Chart No. 4

Cotton—in part handmade lace. Tariff paragraph 1529(a)(12)(13). Duty 45 percent, established June 1, 1951. Commodity schedule 3090.850.

Year	Dozens	Unit value	Total value
1959	15,370	$4.52	$69,200
1958	7,890	3.34	26,392
1957	5,394	5.74	30,972

In the cotton knit or crocheted classification, which is identified as chart No. 5, Japan accounts for 75 percent of the volume, the Philippines for approximately 10 percent, Italy 13 percent, and what remains is divided among a few other countries.

Chart No. 5

Cotton, knit or crocheted. Tariff paragraph 917. Commodity schedule 3090.900. Duty 40 percent, established September 1, 1955. As of July 1, 1959, the commodity schedule was divided as follows: 3090.910 includes gloves of chief value cotton, and 3090.920 includes gloves of chief value vegetable fiber other than cotton.

Cotton

Year	Dozens	Unit value	Total value
1959	80,282	$2.93	$235,404
1958	73,462	2.70	205,489
1957	119,976	2.94	353,057

Other vegetable fiber (not cotton). None reported.

Chart No. 6 merely gives you a quick rundown of the volume increase, both in units and in dollars, of cotton gloves during the year 1959 over 1958.

Chart No. 6

Cotton

1959		*1958*	
Dozens	*Total value*	*Dozens*	*Total value*
948,361	$6,015,724	857,634	$5,590,164
57,536	211,785	40,507	144,588
15,370	69,200	7,890	26,392
80,282	285,404	73,462	205,489
1,096,548	6,532,113	979,493	5,966,633

NOTE.—Unit increase 1959 over 1958: 117,055 dozens, or 10 percent. Dollar increase 1959 over 1958: $565,480, or 10 percent.

SYNTHETICS

The synthetic glove market shows some extreme fluctuations and a very definite change in areas of production. Japan maintains its commanding lead, Italy takes the second spot in 1959. Hong Kong has made tremendous progress, while West Germany shows an increase over 1958 but a substan-

tial loss from 1957. The Philippine Republic is down from 192,000 dozen in 1957 to 16,000 dozen in 1959. Chart No. 7 gives the imports by countries during 1959.

Chart No. 7

Synthetic seamed gloves. Commodity Code 3840003. Tariff paragraph 1309. Duty 25 cents per pound, plus 32½ percent. This schedule was discontinued as of January 1, 1960.

Country	Total dozens	Unit value	Total value
Japan	611,144	$3.42	$2,091,861
Italy	192,241	3.76	724,203
Hong Kong	144,280	3.23	467,031
West Germany	89,568	5.36	480,131
Philippine Republic	16,373	6.59	107,742
France	2,275	11.64	26,484
Canada	1,150	2.47	2,842
Austria	701	7.90	5,544
Belgium	577	6.52	3,766
Switzerland	316	9.68	3,062
United Kingdom	96	9.75	936
Panama	65	3.30	215
Israel	50	5.88	294
Netherlands	25	12.08	302
Total	1,058,821		3,914,413
Average unit value		3.69	

Chart No. 8

Comparison of synthetic seamed gloves for 1959, 1958, and 1957. Commodity Code 3840003. Tariff paragraph 1309. Duty 25 cents per pound plus 32½ percent.

Country	1959	1958	1957
Japan	611,144	356,059	466,270
Italy	192,241	177,175	137,340
Hong Kong	144,280	118,867	60,971
West Germany	89,568	54,975	153,338
Philippine Republic	16,373	24,798	192,588
France	2,275	1,028	16,069
Canada	1,150		719
Austria	701	339	2,039
Belgium	577		755
Switzerland	316	64	
United Kingdom	96	295	4,121
Panama	65		
Israel	50		
Netherlands	25		117
Spain			2,080
Lebanon			1,169
Madeira			859
Mexico			122

Total dozens:	
1958	1,158,821
1958	733,600
1957	1,014,096
Total dollar values:	
1959	$3,914,413
1958	2,768,610
1957	6,625,054
Average unit value:	
1959	$3.69
1958	3.36
1957	6.53

Chart No. 9

Total fabric glove imports. Includes all cotton, other vegetable fibers, and synthetics:

1953	546,000
1954	664,000
1955	1,330,000
1956	1,613,000
1957	1,822,000
1958	1,719,000
1959	2,155,000

Chart No. 10

Silk gloves

Year	Dozens	Unit value
1959	36,630	$4.32
1958	8,488	11.16
1957	5,876	7.32

National Captive Nations Week Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in accordance with Public Law 86–90, private citizens from every section of the country have recently formed the National Captive Nations Week Committee, with headquarters at 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. This committee of over 250 leading citizens has as its sole purpose the observance by all Americans of Captive Nations Week which commences on July 17. Along with many of my colleagues in the Congress, I am happy to be an honorary member of this committee.

In preparation for the nationwide observance of the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week, the national committee is currently distributing a brochure entitled, "Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, 1960." I hope that copies of this brochure reach every community in this Nation. The guideposts of the National Captive Nations Week Committee are peace with honor founded on a policy of justice and freedom for peace and friendship among all nations, including the many captive and occupied non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

The need for this type of organization is described by its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University in an address delivered before the 1960 women's forum on national security, entitled "Peace With Honor."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from this address which was published in the April issue of Vital Speeches.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTELLECTUAL GAP RE U.S.S.R.

When I authorized the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, little did I anticipate that its able sponsorship and passage in our Congress would provoke Khrushchev to think that this intellectual gap in our country has been spontaneously closed. His actions showed that he fears this deeply, and with good reason. Once this gap is filled, in our eyes and the eyes of the free world, Russia will dwindle to proper size. Russian propaganda, which exaggerates the Potemkin Village achievements of science, technology, economics, and education in the U.S.S.R., would suffer irreparable losses. Our added knowledge, understanding, and perception of the Soviet Union, if skillfully used, could render Moscow indefinitely insecure within the Soviet Union itself. They would eliminate, too, many of our baseless fears.

It is not a stroke of superpatriotic rhetoric to declare that, on the basis of projected current trends, easily within the next 50 years no nation could be compared in total power and capability with the United States. The Soviet Union, factually and historically, is not a nation. In addition to Russia and its approximately 96 million people, the Soviet Union consists of many non-Russian nations which, significantly, make up the majority of capitive nations in the entire Red empire. One of them, Ukraine, with its 40 million people, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. Moscow has its internal satellites as well as its external ones. If the external ones, like Poland and Hungary, are deemed unreliable for Moscow's global purposes, the record of the past 38 years shows that the internal satellites, like Ukraine and Turkestan, are equally unreliable. Without the rich capitive resources of these internal satellites, Russia would be a power no greater than an integrated Germany. Most of us are even unaware of the fact that about 35 million Moslems, many with strong ties with Turkey and Pakistan, are held captive in this primary empire of Moscow.

Give some thought to these fundamental facts and what they signify. These facts are expressed in the captive nations resolution and Khrushchev recognized well their significance and their portent. Unfortunately, many of us still do not. Our economic and military comparisons are drawn on the basis of false and misleading concepts and definitions. There is no more a gross national product in the Soviet Union than there is a gross global product here. A gross imperial product, with phonetic emphasis upon the GIP, is truer to fact. We approach a far more accurate and different picture of relative economic strength by only comparing the total output of Moscow's entire empire, which includes mainland China, with that of the free world alliances. The difference is staggering. Comparing the United States, which is a nation, with the Soviet Union, which is an empire of many subjugated nations, cannot suit Moscow's propaganda mill better. It conceals all the facts of economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself.

For the same basic reasons, our military comparisons are askewed. If we deem the armed forces of the external satellites as being unreliable for Moscow, there are firm grounds for a similar evaluation of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. About 45 percent of these forces consist of captive non-Russians, and these, by basic policy, are largely dispersed from their respective homelands in this substrate empire. Our memories are short, and our perspectives are narrow. Only in the past world war, millions of these non-Russians deserted to take up arms against Moscow. In the Hungarian Revolution, Ukrainians, Russians and others joined with the Hungarian patriots. In Napoleonic times, Alexander I threatened Europe with his armed might; before World War I, Czar Nicholas II scared Europe with the "steamroller," his imperial armed forces; and now Czar Nikita engages in nuclear blackmail. In three major wars in this century, the multinational forces controlled by Moscow disintegrated early in the deadly game. On the basis of these facts and more, one can understand why at the end of the recent 2-day session of the Supreme Soviet, the delegates were whisked away to see a performance of Tolstoy's "War and Peace." Their self-assuring theme song was that "no conqueror will ever again march through Moscow." Contrary to popular myth, both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated not by the empire's forces but by the emptiness of their ideologies. Both had nothing but continued slavery to offer to the Russian and non-Russian nations in Moscow's empire.

We, of course, seek to conquer no one. But we richly possess an ideology which emphasizes that freedom is indivisible. And in the permanent cold war it is the

deadliest weapon against Moscow's totalitarian empire, the Soviet Union. Terms like "the Soviets," "the Soviet people," "the Soviet nation," or Russia as an equivalent for U.S.S.R. are marks of our intellectual lag regarding this basic empire. This lag is shown, too, by the fact that nowhere in our Government is there any continuous study made of the sensitive relations between Moscow and its internal satellites. Our ignorance along this fundamental line is appalling. We're like a football team facing an opponent without the advantage of a scout's briefing on his basic weaknesses. You wouldn't believe it, but two years ago an obtuse attempt was made to eliminate the non-Russian languages beamed by our Voice of America to the U.S.S.R. Thanks to a few alert Congressmen, the peoples there were spared listening to our programs in the language of their Russian captor.

THE WILL FOR FREEDOM

Now, finally, the why of our position on peace with honor. Principles and know-how are mute without the human will to enforce them. Our will for freedom is not just an emotion; it is a certitude, a vision with a rational outlook. On the basis of our principles and the capabilities set by our know-how, this will works creatively to mold that world order allowing for the free and maximum fruition of individual and national potentialities. Our conception of world order, based on rights and law, is the very negation of Moscow's colonial and imperialist totalitarianism. This will for freedom creates, not just preserves; it moves forward, not just rests; it is determined to see things through on the time-honored principle that the best defense is the offense. We are so growth-conscious today about our economy, foreign trade, the underdeveloped counties, space exploration and other fields: the one area we should be most growth-conscious is the state of world freedom.

In this eventful year, you and your organizations can do much to further this will for freedom:

(1) 1960 is a Lincolnian year, the centennial of a Presidency whose immortal words on the impossibility of half free and half slave applies on a global basis today. 1976 will be the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence for which we should prepare with clean consciences and firm hearts. Instead of long-run economic plans, let us initiate in the spirit of our living revolution a 16 year freedom plan for spiritual rededication and a politico-psychological force that would stir the hearts and minds of people throughout the world;

(2) More than anything else, Khrushchev wants our acquiescence and consent to the permanent captivity of the over 20 nations in his vast empire. His sputniks, lunicks, and missilnicks are all diversionary means for attaining this crucial objective. Unless we are bent upon suicide, this we could never allow to happen. In terms of our principles, not to say national strategy, such an accommodation is unthinkable. Your organizations can give full expression to this by preparing now for the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week this July;

(3) The record shows that all recent summits have resulted in grave disadvantages for us. Two years of clever propaganda by Moscow has sucked us into another summit and perhaps a series of diversionary talkfests. Even now Khrushchev is reviving pressure on West Berlin. You and I can urge our President that the summit agenda include the basic issues of the captive nations and an integrated Germany and that our stand on West Berlin, which is only the tail of these issues, be firm and uncompromising. Before long we shall learn that the only self-respecting way to treat a totalitarian Russion is by firmness and confident resolve;

(4) To close the serious cold war gap, your organizations can help immensely in this by supporting the important bills in Congress (H.R. 3880 and S. 1689) proposing the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy; and

(5) We are constantly told to learn about and understand other peoples and nations. By all means. From the viewpoint of our own national security, I believe you will agree that a working knowledge and understanding of the many non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. ranks high in priority. You can develop this important interest which basically is in the interest of our own national security.

By doing what you believe in is the true exercise of the will for freedom. Our will for freedom is the backbone of the will to freedom among the enslaved. This will is at the core of peace with honor. This will is ably represented by you.

The Social Security Inverted Pyramid—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a continuation of the discussion of the social security program by W. Rulon Williamson, original actuary of the Social Security Board:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, research actuary)

4. THE INFINITE—THE PERPETUITY

Each generation fights the influence of the "dead hand" of the past, with varying degrees of success. Perpetual trusts have been established for certain purposes. The custodians of these funds often find it harder and harder to carry out the terms of the trust. Andrew Carnegie established the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, as a perpetual trust. And while he still lived, within 5 years of the founding, the flaws in the system showed up. After 13 years no more entrants into the "century of colleges" were to have the prospect of a pension from the system—but in spite of this curtate coverage, the system is apt to last a hundred years to do all that may be possible to maintain equity. The capacity "to do harm" is tremendous. The OASI system has many of the vagaries of that unfortunate Carnegie impulse to bribe unsuspecting students into a poorly paid profession by the apparent promise of a free pension at the end.

I see no justification whatever for assuming that any system could carry on forever. I believe that nature abhors a perpetuity even as nature abhors a vacuum.

5. WELL-ESTABLISHED ACTUARIAL METHODS

There have been actuarial methods developed for the ordinary level-premium life business and the level-premium annuity business. They go back for 2 centuries at least in their evolution. Industrial insurance—that enterprise of very small policy issuance in tremendous numbers—goes back in England over a century. Our group life insurance has a 50-year history, but in 1935 it had had only a quarter-century of experimentation—with little growth during the final 5 years. The group annuity business and the noninsurance company pension plans are largely an evolution of the last 20 years. To some extent the large growth of these 20 years followed hard upon the punitive rates of taxation on persons and on corporations, with large tax exemptions for approved pension plans. World War I had a similar influence along with the flu epidemic of 1918 in triggering the small start of group life insurance into vigorous growth through the emphasis upon the precariousness of life. In World War II there was also heavy taxation, the feel of inflation, and the underscoring of the rigors of old age to help build all sorts of pension plans. These new plans have not yet proved themselves over the span of a business cycle. There is, as run by private enterprise, a greater sense of costs than has been the case with the Federal Government. The unhealthy labor monopoly affects both systems—but fortunately there is more competition among the separate companies than can be felt in big Government. The know-how in private pension plans is still accumulating, and the techniques are still evolving.

The airy attitude that 2 centuries of step-by-step development of life insurance within closely limited experiments, while mortality rates were steadily improving, could be transferred to open-end accounts of the annuity type with continuous increase of potential burden is completely unjustified.

Social insurance or security has come croppers in country after country. It has helped to develop inflation. It has robbed citizens of basic responsibilities and choices. It has been tried and tested, all right—and found wanting.

6. ACTUARIAL BALANCE

This is pure fiction. The OASI is never in balance, and concern for balance seems never to have kept expansion down. Instead, that favorite budgetary trick of asking twice what one expects and then getting half what is asked and all one expects is treated as cost consciousness, and hats are thrown in the air in celebration. Each temporary reprieve to solvency is promptly celebrated by additional prospective outlay, frequently with no visible hiatus.

7. SELF-SUPPORT

After three decades of deriding the personal desire to be self-sufficient, it is frequently said that a large part of labor has double the real wages of the unlamented past—the pre-New-Deal past. If this is true, the normal expectation of larger self-support is that men should meet their own bills from their increased earnings. The appetite for subsidy seems, on the contrary, to have grown.

The denial of the individual's capacity for self-support, the affirmation that he more and more needs subsidy, leads to the claim that the system has to be self-supporting, to a constant increase in personal taxes, and to employer's taxes without regard to his capacity to pay them. All this has a hollow ring. To add a second income tax to the first, and to call the imposition equity, probably does delude him. Under section 1104, the taxpayer is far from sure of his support from the system. So far the OASI taxes he has paid are merely a gesture toward meeting his individual benefits. If he doesn't know it, he should be told.

Career Key Awards Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the future strength and progress of the coun-

try depend upon how well the youth of today learn and accept the important responsibilities of enlightened citizenship. In planning for a meaningful future, a young person must give careful consideration to the set of values by which he or she will be guided during adult life.

The meaning of a chosen career and the feeling of worth that must accompany this individual choice are indeed crucial for a fuller and more satisfying existence. The Girls Clubs of America and the Reader's Digest Foundation, cosponsors of the Career Key Awards essay competition, realized the importance of this subject when they based this year's content on the topic "What a Career Will Mean to Me."

I am most happy to announce the names of the nine teenage girls who were designated as regional scholarship winners: From my own State of New York, Marcia Czyzewsk, of Schenectady, N.Y.; Margaret Ann Smith of New York City; and Judy Ann Davenport of Birmingham, Ala.; Maryka Ruth Matthews of Franklin, Ind.; Bonnie Nelson of Norfolk, Va.; Catherine Callahan of Wilmington, Del.; Daryl Hymoff of Worcester, Mass.; Maureen Lucille Connolly of Pittsfield, Mass.; and Gloria Olsen of National City, Calif.

These young women have made a great contribution to the building of a more significant future and we recognize and thank them for that contribution. Only through thoughts similar to those expressed in the prize-winning essays which follow can we be sure of strengthening and securing that future.

I ask unanimous consent that the nine essays relating to the subject "What a Career Will Mean to Me," written by the aforementioned girls, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Maryka Ruth Matthews)

A career, to me, is a chance to make a contribution to humanity. It is my responsibility to mankind. I owe a debt for the privilege of being alive—for the sheer joy of living. It is as though I took out an I O U in order to be born. This document would say, "For the loan of one life and its talents, I owe you (humanity) a contribution."

Career comes from the word to run, as to run a race. I will be running that race and my goal will be to pay my debt. With this in mind I can never give up and say, "So what?" For I have been given the supreme gift—the gift of life—and though I can never hope to stamp my I O U and mark it paid in full, I must push on toward the goal.

I can't just work at any job. This career must be the particular thing for which I have a talent and for which I feel a call. As someone once said, "A call is seeing a need and feeling within oneself the ability to answer it." For that I must be prepared—prepared by an education which makes me aware of the world and its ideas.

My career won't be important because of the classes I teach or the lectures I give, but because of the lives I help to mold; it won't be important because of the papers I type, but because of the influence those papers have on people; it won't be important because I give vitamin A, or vitamin B, or prescribe penicillin, but because by giving these I help to rebuild life. It will be the total of my life, my debt, my responsibility—my career.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Judy Ann Davenport)

My career, as a legal secretary, will mean to me the fulfillment of a dream. This dream was so real and vital to me that I made a definite promise to myself to inquire and investigate its requirements and possibilities. This I pursued on and my course was begun in high school. I sought the best that I could to further this innermost desire that I not only had promised myself but likewise my parents, teachers, and friends, and lastly but not least, my God. Therefore, my career is in response to a promise that is sacred to me.

Services will be rendered through my career. It will be work carefully given, with determination to render efficient services. There are innumerable ways in which a secretary may make herself indispensable and further study through college courses would help me find these ways. The full import is in the word confidential; a secretary, in the executive's vocabulary, is his alter ego or other self, a person who commands his complete confidence and can be trusted with the secrets of the business.

A legal secretary must know good etiquette in business life. Good business manners help to open the doors of opportunity, gain the respect and liking of both superiors and associates.

It would not be amiss for me to admit that my career will mean security to me.

My career will be a life of dedication and determination to gain the nearest thing to perfection in finding the answers to all the ways and means of legal secretarial service.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Bonnie Nelson)

I would like to be a social worker and work with people. Preparing for this type of career would better prepare me to serve my fellowman. Further education would better prepare me in giving guidance and help to others. There also seems to be a great future in social work. I am particularly interested in girls club work. Having spent several years in a girls club and enjoying it, I know how much a worker in this field can do for others.

In the changing world of today so many homemakers who used to have only the job of keeping the house, now work in public places. Jobs that only men once could hold are now occupied by women as well. Statistics show that at the present rate of employment, within 5 years, 75 percent of the American homemakers and young women will hold positions in public places. I feel it is necessary to choose a career and prepare for this new role of the American woman. It only stands to reason that if one is prepared she will not only be able to be of greater service but will also receive better living wages.

I feel that higher education for the career I have chosen is necessary. A division of college is not too far from my home. I hope to be able to enter the division and begin my college work in September 1960. However, my father and mother will find it hard to pay for very much of my expense so I hope to be able to work part time. A scholarship such as this would certainly be a blessing to help me get my first year of college work.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Catherine Rita Callahan)

A career to me will be an opportunity to serve my community to the best of my ability and, at the same time, to suuport myself financially.

I have chosen the teaching profession as the career which will be most desirable to me. In this career I can further my own development and growth while I am serving my community by helping others to grow in character and mind.

I will be given the opportunity to help teenagers through the most difficult years of their lives. In doing this, I hope to make school as beneficial and enjoyable for teenagers then as it is for me now.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Marcia Czyzewski)

A career is a dream, an aspiration which lies in the hearts of many. A career is one of my major goals. What will it be? The fulfillment of many hopes and efforts, a product of arduous work and spent energy, yet a proud facet of my personality and a broadened horizon in my immediate environment.

What will a career mean to me? It will mean stability in the busy world. It will be security. A career will be psychological security in that it will provide me with a feeling of being needed. It will be material security founded in the fact that I will receive remuneration for the services my career renders. The career for which I would like to train involves an opportunity to help people to better their lives. In this way I would make myself a useful member of society.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Margaret Ann Smith)

"Climb every mountain, cross every stream, follow your rainbow till you find your dream." The words of this song express my ambition for the future. The mountain represents years of learning and experience. The stream is a steady flow from knowledge to greater wisdom. The rainbow is the azure blue sky visioned through windows of the girls club, the red is the laughter and gaiety on the children's faces, and the gold is the dignity and pride won through development of their character. The dream is the opportunity and privilege of making the world a better place in which to live by guiding and counseling the girl youth of our Nation.

A career in social work presents a challenge in gaining the faith and respect of these children. This, I think, can be accomplished through a genuine liking and enthusiasm for these youngsters and by a generous capacity for caring about their well-being.

During previous years, the girl's club has given me some place to go other than a tenement stoop or a lonely room. It has provided me with the opportunity to participate with old and new friends in a variety of activities. For the past 6 months, I have been employed at my local girls club. Through my work here, I have become more aware of the energy, intelligence, and patience it takes to be a staff worker, as well as, the sincere love the staff have for the girls. This has strengthened my desire to pursue a career in social work. It has also served as a beacon, for I now realize the necessity of a college education in fulfilling my dream. Through the courses offered in social work, I hope to learn more about what motivates children's behavior, and also learn leadership methods to guide me in my work with them. Through an expanded education, the knowledge which I acquire will give me a better understanding of society, and thus, a greater capacity to be of assistance to the children with whom I shall work.

The attainment of my goal will be reached only when I know that I have instilled in girls the principles of good citizenship, sound values, and respect for humanity. I am sure there is no greater gift than the deep satisfaction acquired in helping people to give fuller, richer, and happier lives as mature and self-sufficient individuals.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Gloria Olsen)

Time is an element which has changed many factors in life. Not many years ago, a woman was not seen behind a desk nor in a factory, but in a home as a housewife.

As time progressed, women were accepted into the world and took on many roles. They found a need, as I have, to gain knowledge through education.

My life's dream has always been focused on children. My experiences as a summer staff member at the girls' club have definitely proven to me that I want to succeed in a related field of social work. But today this cannot be accomplished without a higher education.

To me, education means a gain in knowledge which can never be lost, and a step forward to my life's work.

"There is gold, and a multitude of jewels: But the lips of knowledge are a precious vessel."

A gambler can win a million dollars and lose it by a spin of the wheel. A student, however, gains knowledge through education and never loses it regardless of how successful.

I have worked as a cashier, a salesgirl and have done office work in school. I learned many interesting things in these jobs, yet when I worked as a counselor with children, I found that service to others was my choice.

I plan to work for an associate in arts degree in social studies. This curriculum is a basic preparation for students going into public service. It feel that it will undoubtedly motivate me on to higher education.

I am earning my way through college to fulfill a desire to gain knowledge through education. To apply myself to helping children is the goal which I hope to attain successfully. Therefore, I feel that it is a privilege to compete for this scholarship.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Maureen Lucille Connolly)

When the word "career" is mentioned, most people immediately think of a means of earning a living. Nevertheless, to me it has a much more involved connotation. A career is my way of serving the people of my community. I have been presented the basic tools, my public education and training; now it's up to me to pay them back in worthwhile service.

My career, physical education, is one of the best ways I know of serving my community. There will soon be much leisure time in the working world due to automation. If I can prepare young people to derive pleasure and health from physical activity in this world of tomorrow, I will be helping, in my small way, to solve a problem of paramount importance. Therefore, at this time, it is necessary that I work as hard as I can at school, and take advantage of every available opportunity in school and in my community.

My girls club has offered me many of these opportunities. By working with the children, I was able to ascertain my aptitude in my chosen field of physical education. If these girls gain so many benefits and derive such enjoyment from their club activities, why shouldn't all girls do likewise? My ambition is to plant this desire in the younger generation, so that in following it through, they may become well-rounded, happy citizens, when they have to take on the responsibility of their adulthood. If, in any small way, I can feel that I'm helping someone reach this goal, I, in turn, will have reached mine.

I have not decided yet exactly where I wish to teach upon completing my education, but if it is in a school, rather than a girls club, I would still be able to give volunteer service to such an organization. Not only would I be able, but it would be a privilege to repay the club for all it has done for me.

WHAT A CAREER WILL MEAN TO ME

(By Daryl Hymoff)

All over the world people are interested in the conquest of space. While they aim for the moon, I gaze about the earth for a suitable position, my place in this universe. Many of my contemporaries have had, since elementary school days, aspirations for a definite career. One has hopes of becoming a geologist; another expects to startle the world with her paintings; and a third wishes to become a dental hyglenist. For me, however, there has been no particular dream. It is not that I have never considered my future. At the age of 7, I wanted to be a nurse; at 10, I had visions of being a fashion designer; and at 13, I was content to be a medical secretary. I have taken every opportunity to investigate vocational fields. In school I have noted the various positions in education. Through religious group activities, Girl Scout camp training, and active participation in the girls' club program, I have obtained a broad view of social service work. My latest endeavor, a part-time office job, will give me a picture of the business world.

With this background, I shall enter the 1960 class at a university. Here, after one year of broad subject matter, I hope to see which door beckons me. Once I have completed my college education, I shall be ready to venture forth. Whatever my work, I shall look for intellectual stimulation as much as for social and financial advantages. I hope to be able to make some return for all I have received: the patient, understanding helpfulness of my family, the encouragement of my friends, the inspiration of my teachers. Settled at last in my position in this world, I hope my abilities will prove to be an asset to my country.

Flag Day Program Sponsored by the Altoona Little League, Inc., Altoona, Pa., June 15, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many Flag Day observances in Pennsylvania was that sponsored by the Altoona Little League, Inc., at the Little League baseball field located in Altoona, Pa., on Wednesday, June 15, 1960, at 6 p.m.

The officials of the Little League headed by Joseph J. Riley are doing a tremendous job in fathering the six-team little baseball league which has the interest of some 90 little leaguers. The league schedule involves 40 games during the months of May, June and July after which an all-star team takes part in State competition among little leaguers.

It was my privilege to present the Altoona Little League with a 50-star flag at which time I delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT FLAG DAY PROGRAM, SPONSORED BY ALTOONA LITTLE LEAGUE INC., LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL FIELD, JAGGARD STREET AND LOGAN AVENUE, ALTOONA, PA., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

It is a pleasure to participate in the observance of National Little League Week and to appear on this special Flag Day program sponsored by Altoona Little League Baseball, Inc.

The flag of our country provides one of the most dramatic chapters in U.S. history.

The emblem of the Stars and Stripes has always been a colorful reflection of American progress—yesterday, today and tomorrow.

That is why this is a very special occasion.

It marks the presentation of a new 50-star flag which may be officially flown for the first time at 12:01 a.m. on July 4, 1960.

It is my hope that each one of you will remember for a long time the significance of this occasion and what is done and said here.

History tells us that Betsy Ross, an expert needlewoman living in Philadelphia, made the first stars and stripes flag.

According to the popular story, in June 1776, shortly before the Declaration of Independence was signed, Betsy Ross received a call from three American leaders—George Washington, Col. George Ross and Robert Morris.

Those men told Betsy Ross that they were a committee from Congress and that they wanted her to make an American flag for them.

She replied: "I don't know whether I can, but I'll try."

George Washington then showed her a rough sketch for a flag.

After some changes were made Betsy Ross began sewing together some bright colored red, white and blue coth.

When she finished it the flag had 13 stripes—7 red and 6 white stripes—and a circle of 13 white stars on a field of blue in the upper lefthand corner.

George Washington and his committee approved the flag and Congress adopted it as the first official emblem of the United States on June 14, 1777.

Now, not all historians agree on the details of the Betsy Ross story but the fact remains that the Stars and Stripes flag is more than 180 years old.

The flag has changed as our country grew.

At one time it had 15 stripes instead of 13.

And as each new State came into the Union a new star was added to the flag.

Today the flag has 49 stars—and 13 stripes.

Within a few weeks or on July 4, 1960, the flag will have 50 stars denoting the latest new State—Hawaii.

Every detail and every color in the United States flag has a meaning.

Our flag tells a stirring story.

Each star is an emblem of struggles and toil, danger and hardship, suffering and privation to win a new State from the wilderness.

The 13 stripes, representing the Thirteen Original States, recall the history of the bitter 6-year struggle in the Revolutionary War during which the Colonies stood side by side and fought for freedom.

They won that war, so the 13 stripes tell us that in union there is strength.

There have been many interpretations for the colors in our flag.

Some people say that the red stands for the courage with which Americans have always defended the United States—our way of life.

The white in the flag has been likened to the purity of our ideals—freedom, liberty, justice, and the right of every American

to worship God according to that person's own convictions.

And the blue color has been described as symbolizing our loyalty and strong desire for peace.

The flag is very much a part of our lives.

It is displayed in our courts and schools and churches.

It flies proudly from our buildings.

It is in our homes.

Every one of our ships sailing the seven seas carries the U.S. flag.

We can never forget the flag.

We should always respect it because it stands for everything we have, everything we are, and everything we hope to become.

These are some of the reasons in my capacity as your Representative in Congress that I am presenting to you this new and beautiful 50-star flag.

It is a proud moment to be paying you the highest honor possible in this free land of ours.

That honor is presenting to you this gift—the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America,
And to the Republic for which it stands,
One Nation under God, indivisible,
With liberty and justice for all."

Cross County Banks Provide New Service to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the May 1960, issue of the Arkansas Banker contains a most interesting article on the work of the banks in Cross County, Ark., to increase their services to agriculture. The Arkansas Bankers Association, through its agricultural committee and through its membership, has taken the lead in improving and expanding its services to agriculture, and I commend these fine citizens of the banking profession for their splendid work.

The article published in the May issue relates to another service—a Farm Recommendation Information Center—which has been set up in the banks of Cross County in conjunction with the Cooperative Extension Service. The article will be of interest to Members as an example of how banks may better serve their customers and improve the economy of agriculture in their areas:

CROSS COUNTY BANKS PROVIDE NEW SERVICE TO FARMERS

The Cross County banks have provided a farm recommendation information center as a new service to all their customers in cooperation with Troy Jennings, county agent.

Banks providing this service to Cross County farmers are First State Bank of Parkin, Bank of Cherry Valley, Cross County Bank at Wynne and Hickory Ridge, and First National Bank of Wynne.

The banks have purchased attractive aluminum display racks and placed them in the lobbies for free distribution of new and timely leaflets provided by the Extension Service. The racks are 2½ by 3½ feet and will display 12 different bulletins. The information furnished will be kept current by the Extension office.

The idea of this service originated with S. N. Green, cashier of the First State Bank at Parkin, and Howard Beasley, executive vice president of the Bank of Cherry Valley, in a discussion with the county agent on soil testing information. After getting good response to this service they decided that additional information would be of great help to their communities.

Some of the leaflets being displayed now are: Instructions for taking soil samples, fertilization recommendations, recommended crop varieties for 1960, cotton insect control, cotton diseases, chemical weed control on cotton, calibrating farm sprayers, rice disease, chemical weed control on rice, soybean production, beef cattle production, and controlling parasites of livestock.

Cardinal Spellman Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were made at the ceremonies at the Spanish Embassy when His Excellency, the Ambassador of Spain, Maria de Areilza de Motrico, presented the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabel la Catolica to His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York.

The cardinal is known and admired by Americans of all faiths and is to many of them "our cardinal." His devotion to our country and his patriotism have always been an inspiration.

The Ambassador made very special mention of the cardinal's Christmas visits to our servicemen overseas.

These ceremonies were impressive and dignified and as the cardinal's remarks were extemporaneous I am especially grateful to Father Joseph Thorning for having copied them at the time and having allowed me to use them:

In presenting the gold-and-white decoration the Spanish Ambassador spoke as follows:

"Today is a day of special joy and honor for this Embassy, because we are paying public homage to an outstanding figure of the Mother Church of Christianity. Your Eminence is not only a Prince of the Church, but also the archbishop of New York, that great city that has so many links with Spain. Indeed, the first Catholic church that was built in your city, St. Peter's, was a gift from King Charles III of Spain, and a seat of honor for his royal successors is still preserved there today.

"It was the Spanish Queen Isabella whose feminine intuition led her to help a man of vision, Christopher Columbus, to realize his dream. When other European sovereigns, after listening to the plans and pleas of Columbus, had let him depart with empty hands, Queen Isabella gave him her confidence and the sufficient funds for him to equip the ships needed for his historic voyages. Consequently, it is fitting that the name of this far-sighted, magnanimous monarch should be given to Spain's famous decoration and that the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella the Queen should honor the broad-visioned, brave Francis Cardinal Spellman known as the pastor of soldiers. My own first memories of the United States of America revolve around the moving scenes at Christmas when Your Eminence traveled to American servicemen overseas. They were soldiers of deep religious faith. Your Eminence's presence and payers encouraged them by your symbolic gestures of peace and friendship. Always, Your Eminence stood for human freedom against the menace of atheistic communism.

"It is my joyful privilege to present to Your Eminence the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, in the name of my Government."

In expressing his thanks for the award, Cardinal Spellman made the following remarks:

"Your Excellency may be sure that I am happy about the ceremonies today. It is true that, in my travels, I have visited practically all the important cities and regions of Spain. The faith of the Spanish people, the same faith that inspired Queen Isabella to send Christopher Columbus on his explorations, impressed me favorably in the course of my observations in the Iberian Peninsula. It was this religious faith that won victories for the Spanish people in their struggle for victory over the forces that would have enslaved the nation. Thanks to the triumph of Spain, this country is a loyal friend today.

"I am pleased about the references made to my native State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, although it seems to be getting smaller. You understand, of course, that I brought my Boston accent to New York. Nor do I want to lose it. One year when I, as a young priest took a trip to Europe, I prepared carefully a Sunday sermon I was asked to give on the boat. When I concluded, one of the passengers who listened to my sermon complimented me by stating that I 'spoke English with hardly any accent at all'.

"Please extend to the Spanish Chief of State my expressions of happiness and gratitude for this decoration. I would also like to thank most cordially Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella, who made the recommendation to his Government. I am proud to accept this honor in the name of Queen Isabella because, without her, none of us would be here."

Growers Say Foreign Workers Are Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to an article that appeared in the June 9, 1960, issue of the Fresno Bee, which points up the need for extending Public Law 78:

GROWERS SAY FOREIGN WORKERS ARE NECESSARY

Two leaders of farmer organizations today contended Mexican nationals are needed for work on California farms so consumers are assured of "a plentiful supply of high-quality, low-cost food for their tables."

George H. Hobbs, the chairman of the California Growers Farm Labor Committee, and John V. Newman, the president of the Council of California Growers, said in a statement following a meeting of farmers

and farm representatives in the Fresno Hacienda Motel that a "work force of reserve agricultural workers" is needed to assure the harvesting of the State's crops.

This reserve is assured through the program of importing workers from Mexico, they said. If the program should be discontinued, as has been suggested by some persons, they asserted, "the farmers will be faced with a genuine catastrophe due to a drastic shortage of farm labor and the people of this country would experience a serious shortage of food."

Proposed Return to Rigid Farm Supports a Disservice to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the more thoughtful observers in America have reached general agreement on one thing regarding agriculture: we cannot perpetuate or accelerate old farm programs that have demonstrated their futility.

The taxpayers of the country, including the farmers, are fed up with price supports that only stimulate production and frequently depress farm incomes and production controls that do not work.

The program is a costly boondoggle that is unworkable and—except for its devastating reality—unthinkable.

Yet, we discover that some leaders of the opposition party still want to hang on to the failures of their own design rather than consider the bold and enterprising approach offered by the Republican administration.

Some Democratic spokesmen still advocate doles and controls instead of greater freedom wherein farmers may prosper.

My views on this are strengthened daily as I read the editorial comments of the Nation's ablest analysts. One such article appeared recently on the editorial pages of the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, and I now ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD—the title being, "Proposed Return to Rigid Supports a Disservice to Nation":

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, May 13, 1960]

PROPOSED RETURN TO RIGID FARM SUPPORTS A DISSERVICE TO NATION

The proposal of the farm policy committee of the Democratic Party that a return to the programs of the Roosevelt-Truman eras would win farm votes this year has been taken apart by a man highly qualified for the job.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson, commenting on the decision of the Democratic planners to submit their proposal to the national convention in Los Angeles, branded it as a "sellout to servitude."

That's exactly what it would be. A return to rigid price supports to 90 percent of parity would be going right back to the breeding place of the bureaucratic disease that has plagued the entire agricultural industry ever since.

Secretary Benson said:

"It is a shocking commentary on the present confused thinking among some so-called experts. It is tantamount to a doctor prescribing for his patient more of what caused the illness."

Everything that the Eisenhower administration has done within the limited area in which it could move within the circumscriptions laid down by Congress, would be undone if the Democratic planners have their way.

The Eisenhower administration inherited the programs which Congress has refused to improve or modernize except to a very limited degree. The administration is not responsible for either the programs or the high cost of keeping them in operation. But it has fought to get the most for the farmer that it could and at the same time try to bring relief to the rest of the taxpayers.

Critics of Secretary Benson have been highly vocal, but this decision of the farm policy committee to turn back to the beginning is startlingly clear evidence they have not been able to devise anything better than what the administration has sought.

The administration policy has been to back away from rigid price structures and high parities, gradually to reduce them to the point where they could be done away with altogether, the farmer restored to independence and the market to the law of supply and demand.

That policy has been opposed at every turn by the same men who now admit failure to devise anything that has any semblance of success, and in their failure are asking that the old New Deal and Fair Deal policies be dusted off, policies created by depression and later geared to wartime needs.

There is no depression now, and no sign of one. There is no war either, of the kind we fought under Roosevelt and again under Truman. There is fear, there is tension, true. But there is no war.

It would be extreme folly to believe that the basic principles of the New Deal and Fair Deal as applied to the farmer can be resurrected and straighten out the mess.

Deportation of the Lithuanian People in 1940

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians are the most numerous of the Baltic peoples, and among these they are the best known in the West. These 3 million rugged and sturdy souls endured the oppressive alien yoke in their homeland for centuries, and in 1919 they succeeded in regaining their independence. But the independence thus earned did not last long, for during part of the time when they were masters of their fate, they were surrounded by aggressive dictators—in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. And the treacherous designs of Communist Russia proved fatal to the freedom of the Lithuanian people.

Early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked, invaded and occupied by the Soviet Red Army. The country was then incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the people enslaved. But the Soviet authorities did more than that in their effort to subdue the Lithuanian people. They arrested more than 100,000 Lithuanians and deported them, under indescribable circumstances, to distant regions of the Soviet Union. That inhuman act was performed by Soviet authorities in June of 1940, and it is that event which is being observed today.

Area Redevelopment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the June 14, 1960, edition of the Tribune-Democrat, Johnstown, Pa.:

AREA BILL BLOCKADE "DISTURBING" TO IKE

In a letter to West Virginia's Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, made public last Saturday, President Eisenhower said he was "disturbed" that hearings have not been scheduled on the $180 million compromise area development bill proposed by the administration following the veto of the $251 million House measure.

The administration bill is aimed at relief for the hard-core areas of high and long-continued unemployment, in contrast to the House bill which would have spread the Federal money over not only a larger number of industrial areas, but some 600 rural areas with no previous history of industrial development. Both, of course, included the Johnstown area; but, as Under Secretary of Commerce Philip A. Ray pointed out last week, this and other regions of chronic high unemployment would have higher priority under the administration proposal.

There is still time to pass an area development bill before Congress adjourns early in July, but the time is growing short. Since the new administration proposal is a more limited version of bills which have been reported from committee and passed in both this Congress and its predecessor, however, its study in committee should require little time. And its quick signature by the President would be assured.

There is, however, an apparent lack of interest in the fate of this measure on the part of the Democratic liberals who were so vocal and so insistent only a short time ago in demanding the passage of a bill President Eisenhower was certain to veto. That includes Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK of this State, whose interest in the passage of a bill seems to have evaporated now that it can no longer be made a partisan political issue.

For the first time in the last three Congresses—the 84th, the 85th, and the present 86th—there is opportunity to obtain bipartisan support for area development legislation, and to get the program started promptly in the areas which have had the largest percentage of labor surplus for the longest period. The compromise administration bill contains more than enough money for the first year of such a new and untried program; and the experience during that year could, if it shows the feasibility of such a project, furnish the basis for larger appropriations next year.

If, however, the Democratic Congress refuses to act, in the weeks remaining before

adjournment, on a plan which could be started this summer, the only possible conclusion is that its Democratic sponsors were interested in their partisan political advantage—not in the fortunes of the people in the genuinely depressed areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, and other coal and industrial States.

This could indeed become a political issue in the November elections, but we think it will backfire on those who are now blocking a bill in Congress which the Republicans would support, and the President would sign.

The U.S. Flag in Taos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all of my colleagues the historic achievement of the town of Taos, N. Mex., in the continuous flying of the U.S. flag 24 hours a day since 1861.

The flag of the United States was first hoisted in the Taos Plaza when New Mexico was occupied by American forces in the summer of 1846. Upon the outbreak of the Civil War, southern sympathizers tore it down whereupon Kit Carson, Capt. Smith H. Simpson, Col. Coran St. Vrain, and Lieutenant Boggs nailed the flag to a pole which they erected in the plaza and stood guard over it day and night. The daughter of Captain Simpson, Mrs. Margaret Simpson Gusdorf, related the following story to the Taos Girl Scouts on February 4, 1952:

As you know, the Territory of New Mexico was invaded by Confederate soldiers and sympathizers at the beginning of the War Between the States. The Stars and Stripes had flown from a flagpole in the Taos Plaza from the time of the occupation of the Territory by the United States in 1846. I do not know the exact date that my father put up the flag to stay, but it was in 1861, when it had been taken down several times.

My father was Capt. Smith Simpson, commissioned during the Mexican War, who had come to Taos to reside after the brief revolution when Governor Bont was murdered in 1847. He was greatly enraged by these "Rebel instrusions" and devised a plan to prevent further violations. He took some helpers to Taos Canyon and had them cut down the tallest cottonwood tree that they could find and they brought it back to the plaza. It happened to be slightly crooked, but it was sturdy, so they trimmed it and prepared it for a flag. Father always kept a fine large flag or two at home, and choosing the current best one, he called Kit Carson, Colonel Coran, St. Vrain, and Lieutenant Boggs to assist him, and he nailed the flag securely to the pole, and they set it up in the plaza. Then they retired to St. Vrain's store where the Taos Theater is now located at the corner of the plaza, and kept a guard posted there for several days, and my father told everyone within hearing distance that anyone who interfered with the flag would be shot.

There was no further difficulty, and as one of the major battles in New Mexico was fought near Santa Fe within a short time where the Confederates were defeated, there were no more demonstrations in the Taos Valley. Father kept the flag flying, and since there were no ropes or pulleys attached to it, it was there 24 hours a day. When the military officers in Santa Fe heard what father and his friends had done, they permitted him to keep it up.

When the first one wore out, Father replaced it and continued to do so throughout his lifetime, and asked me to continue the custom when he passed on. Now we have a little ceremony on Memorial Day or the Fourth of July and put up a new flag so that now, as in all the 91 years, it flies as a memorial to his courage and foresight in a crisis that threatened our community.

I am sure all Members of the Congress will want to join in paying tribute to the memories of the great scout and explorer and the brave soldiers who, with their comrades, sought to insure that the flag of the United States should fly, not only over Taos, but over all of this great Union, always.

A Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the past few months have seen the United States confronted with crisis after crisis in world affairs. Each crisis has mounted in severity and difficulty with the events of the past few days shocking the world.

It is the desire of every American that the United States adopt and administer a foreign policy which is the best and the strongest the combined and unified political forces of America can produce. For that reason I have been, and am, a firm believer in a bipartisan foreign policy. Today as an expression of that belief and with the hope that an expression of approval of this Congress will result in the adoption of such a policy, I have introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of the restoration of the principle of bipartisanship in American foreign policy.

The idea is not, of course, original with me. The idea of a bipartisan foreign policy dates from World War II in the United States. It is difficult to isolate a precise moment or source of beginning. The idea of bipartisan foreign policy support played an important role in the wartime planning of postwar foreign policy by the Roosevelt administration. There is no doubt but what the failure of the Senate to ratify the League of Nations Covenant after the First World War loomed large in the thoughts of those planning the new United Nations. It was during this time that a number of Republican leaders, notably Senators Arthur Vandenberg and Wendell Willkie, pressed upon their party a foreign policy position fundamentally in accord with that of the administration.

Bipartisanship was given its first major test in the San Francisco Conference of 1945, establishing the United Nations. Great care was taken to make the U.S. delegation representative of both parties. John Foster Dulles, closely associated with Thomas Dewey, then titular leader of the Republican Party, served as a representative of the Department of State. A bipartisan congressional delegation also participated. The apogee of bipartisan foreign policy perhaps was reached in the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1951 which was largely drafted and negotiated by John Foster Dulles appointed by President Truman.

I believe we are living in the most critical moments of world history. In the face of these crises and the external challenge which confront us our Nation must unite. Yes, "politics stop at the water's edge." These are times which demand that we stand together—demonstrating the power of our inner strength to our friends—and our enemies.

All Americans should be assured that partisan considerations are neither controlling the formulation and administration of our foreign policy nor are partisan considerations dictating the criticisms of that policy. The world should know that our great objective is the advocation of the cause of freedom and to make and preserve a just and lasting peace.

A Noteworthy Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the period immediately after the summit conference, the Russian news agency, Tass, sent out a tirade criticizing our colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, for his comments on Cyrus Eaton. Such propaganda is normally written off as typical communistic palaver but Charles McGill and his editorial staff of the Bridgeport Post, a Connecticut newspaper, added a sagacious observation. The Tass statement, said an editorial from the Post on Wednesday, shows the true Russian reaction to truth and that is fear. Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include the editorial:

HOW TASS FEELS ABOUT DODD

For years, Senator TOM DODD has been one of the prime targets of the Kremlin gang's hatred. In the past they have called him all sorts of things, such as an unfrocked clergyman, and other things not quite as humorous.

Tass, the Communist news agency which we permit to operate in Washington with as much freedom as, for example, the Associated Press, has continued to heap vituperation and libel on the Connecticut lawmaker. The Senator has been so alert and so vigorous in showing up the Communists that Tass has developed a positive hate for him. Which means, of course, that they fear him, knowing that he tells the truth about them and their slippery hoodlum masters.

The Russian "news agency" actually sent a statement to Moscow, in English, without any censorship, blaming U.S. "military and

imperialist extremists" for wrecking the summit conference.

Then Tass attacked Senator DODD as "the notorious enemy of peaceful coexistence and rabid cold warrior," for his opinions on the activities of Cyrus Eaton, the industrialist who holds the Lenin medal. "The American obscurantist (DODD) was particularly enraged by Cyrus Eaton's consistent struggle to improve America's relations with the Soviet Union for the benefit of world peace," wrote Tass, also scoring Senators GORE and HICKENLOOPER, who agreed heartily with what Senator DODD had to say about Eaton and his pro-Khrushchev, pro-Communist activities.

Just imagine what would happen to an American reporter or news agency in Moscow, if either attempted to write junk like that for home consumption. Of course, they wouldn't do it in the first place, but simply for telling the truth, which Tass almost never does, Americans have been bounced out of the Soviet.

Aside from the fact that strained relations have made the situation serious, this latest attack on Senator DODD is very, very funny. But it does show how scared they are when an American tells the truth about them.

The Social Security Inverted Pyramid—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALGER. As a help for better understanding of the whole social security program, I am including additional observations from the original actuary of the social security board, W. Rulon Williamson.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, research actuary)

8. INTEREST

The pay-as-you-go philosophy, better called owe-as-you-go, or little-go-little-pay, then more-go-more-pay, then much-go-much pay, save for the accident that Secretary Morgenthau demanded twice the starting tax of one-half of 1 percent and one-half of 1 percent, making it 1 percent and 1 percent, does not pile up funds of any magnitude to earn interest.

The postponement of making benefit payments to meet evident need has accumulated a trust fund of $20 billion (once $23 billion, but shrunk to $20 billion as the fortuitous gain from the Morgenthau caution ran out). In an uncertain world, where apparently the Parkinsonian law that outgo rises to use up income seems to hold, the possible future payments to present covered persons not yet retired and to the retired primary beneficiaries and their family dependents could run to $683 billion, or $663 billion beyond the token $20 billion trust fund. That is, a trust fund of 3 percent of potential needs for past service, and that potential may well be growing at the rate of $30 billion a year, with tax collections not much beyond $10 billion.

That pays no attention to the possible death losses before retirement. Last year they reached over $1.1 billion, or twice the interest collections on the fund. There is no evidence that the interest will anywhere near meet the prior death benefits. It certainly is not expected to compound to aid in meeting the long-deferred age grants.

It may also be noted that the other part of social security—the Federal grants for public assistance, had they been charged against the trust fund would have exhausted that fund in either 1958 or 1959. The dual outlays for the fully Federal (National) and the Federal (National) subsidy to State and local governments for public assistance nearly reached 110 percent of the taxes reported as paid through 1959 as OASI earmarked taxes.

So I see no justification for discounting at compound interest rates from a perpetuity to make infinity finite. It is a farce to pretend that these tax-hungry systems will forever go unchallenged.

9. NEED

It is not the need of the citizen that has so far secured the acceptance of OASI. It is rather his gullibility and his cupidity. Seven and one-half million primary citizens may have paid some $3 billion of taxes against payments already made to them and their dependents, and yet to be made, to the potential amount of $120 billion. That means "2 bucks" of benefit against a nickel of tax. The figures are not available to validate these figures with any exactness, but the kick-in has been personally ridiculously low. And all the way through the lower benefit where the need is apt to be real is less than a third of the top benefit where need is improbable. Also, the truly needy year 1937 paid out one ten-thousandth of the benefits of the affluent year 1959.

10. COST FEELING

I might be glad to hear that folks in HEW regard the Congress as cost conscious. Having watched the biennial benefit boosts—to be paid for by posterity—I have not witnessed any very effective cost consciousness on the part of the Congress. Of course, traditionally, this should be none of their business. We can admire an amateur spirit and deplore amateur bungling.

OASI taxes in 1937 were one-half billion dollars. Twenty-two years later they were $8 billion. OASI benefits (and administrative costs) in 1937 were $1 million. In 1950 they were $1 billion. In 1959 they were $10 billion. The taxes grew 16-fold. The benefits grew 10,000-fold. The tax growth was 2 to the fourth power. The benefit growth was 10 to the fourth power. It is a queer cost consciousness that has allowed that sequence.

Navy Ignores Pearl Harbor Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions, I have raised my voice in strong protest at the failure of the Navy to deploy our active combat naval vessels so that there is not a heavy concentration in any single location.

Yet, as so vividly pointed up in the following editorial of the Seattle Times of June 8, 1960, the danger of a second Pearl Harbor has not been avoided by using the excellent geographic advantages of Puget Sound as a base for a part of the ships presently home ported in southern California:

NAVY IGNORES PEARL HARBOR LESSON

On the morning of December 7, 1941, 86 vessels of the U.S. Pacific Fleet were snugged down in Pearl Harbor. This concentration of naval strength enabled an enemy aerial force—light by today's standards of warfare—virtually to wipe out the Navy's retaliatory power and logistic support in the Pacific.

America learned several bitter lessons on that disastrous Sunday morning. One of these, we though, was the necessity for dispersing ships over a wide area rather than bunching them into a convenient and inviting target.

That lesson, though severe, obviously is being overlooked. The years following the second World War saw the Navy's "top brass" submit to the blandishments of southern California chambers of commerce, and unit by unit the Pacific Fleet has been withdrawn into sunny southern waters.

On a single day in April, for example, an official naval report showed no fewer than 129 ships of the Pacific Fleet berthed or at anchor in San Diego's harbor.

Arguments of defense-minded Congressmen and other Government officials have not halted the disappearance of ships from other west coast ports. Despite these warnings and the hardships suffered by communities whose economies historically have been tied in with naval installations, the inexorable move to warmer latitudes continues unchecked.

It was at San Diego that a U–2 reconnaissance plane—undetected by the Navy—took from high altitude the aerial photograph exhibited by President Eisenhower on a recent television broadcast.

The Navy was fortunate that this was not a hostile plane over its massed berthing of ships.

Why a National Fuels Policy Is Urgently Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following, entitled "Why a National Fuels Policy Is Urgently Needed Now":

Energy is America's bulwark of defense and its only hope of growth and development. Our country has been one of the richest in the possession of fossil fuels which make that energy possible. It is still rich in fuel resources, but today the future ability of our domestic oil, gas, and coal industries to supply our needs is being threatened.

The warnings are clear, and growing. The world glut of oil is causing serious concern among domestic American petroleum producers as prices are slashed and high costs make new exploration and drilling in the continental United States unprofitable. The natural gas industry, hampered by rigid controls, rising exploration and pipeline construction costs, and the swelling importation of gas from Canada, is facing an uncertain future. And coal, America's most abundant fuel and her main dependence for the tremendous growth expected in electric power and industrial capacity, is existing today at little more than a standby production level—a level that is dangerous for national security and threatens our future industrial growth.

America's other two potential sources of energy offer little hope in the near future. Hydroelectric power supplies only 4 percent

of our present total energy needs, and its potential for further expansion is sharply limited. Atomic power as a source of domestic energy is now admitted to be many years in the future due to its extreme cost and still undeveloped technology.

All of these facts point to the very critical need for development of a sound national fuels policy, a need that must be met at once if America's essential domestic fuels industries are to prosper and continue to serve the Nation in the critical months ahead as well as in the years of the future.

Forty-three U.S. Senators and 29 Members of the House of Representatives have introduced concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to make a thorough study of America's fuels and energy picture, leading to recommendations for a national fuels policy if such is found necessary. The National Coal Policy Conference strongly endorses these resolutions.

Lack of a national fuels policy and the failure to plan for our current and future fuel needs have brought us close to a crisis in these great domestic sources of energy.

OIL

On May 10 spokesmen for domestic oil producers from 13 States held an emergency meeting with the Undersecretary of the Interior to seek reductions of foreign crude oil imports which they reported are making new domestic explorations unprofitable and threatening to bring chaos to the petroleum industry.

Among their statements, as reported by United Press International:

Sam L. Robertson, president, West Central Oil & Gas Association of West Texas: "Unless imports are reduced soon, conditions in the domestic industry will become chaotic."

Paul Schulty, president, Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association: Warned that the United States would begin running out of oil "when the independents lose their incentive to explore for new sources of oil," and that "it is not now economic" to drill oil wells.

R. S. Cockel, president, Ohio Oil & Gas Association: Independent operators "ask for no subsidy, but believe that imports should be cut or an equalizing tariff be put on them."

On May 25, the Wall Street Journal reported:

"The Nation's petroleum producers, badly shaken by sliding prices and disappointing demands are taking drastic measures to pull out of a deepening industry slump.

"They're cutting payrolls, reducing exploration and drilling activities, and turning increasingly to automation and other new technology to pare costs. Plagued by overproduction, many are throttling refinery runs. * * *

"While the industry scrambles for solutions to its mounting problems, many small financially hard-pressed producers are quitting. And industry suppliers, including steel, cement, and automotive firms, are glumly watching sales skid."

The plight of U.S. domestic oil producers is a new development that has come about following a number of international happenings in recent years. These include:

France has found rich new deposits in the Sahara Desert which are now coming into the West European market; Russia has entered the world oil export picture in a big way, and is now exporting heavily to such nations as Cuba, Iceland, Finland, India, and other European and Asian countries.

Other nations are basking in new discoveries of domestic oil, seek to become self-sufficient soon or even to become exporters.

As a result, capacity of present world oil wells is estimated at 26 million barrels per day—current demand for oil only 19 million barrels per day. In the United States, according to the U.S. News & World Report, there is an excess capacity of 2.5 million barrels per day from domestic producers.

This large and complex problem involves domestic security, the economic interests of millions of American investors, the relationship of oil and other domestic fuels, tax revenues of the Federal Government, cities, school districts, and States, as well as questions of international relations, foreign aid, support of our allies and competition with Iron Curtain nations for economic supremacy.

The answers are far from easy. But the plain fact remains: America does not have a sound, unified national fuels policy to help supply them.

GAS

The domestic gas and pipeline industry, now supplying an important segment of our energy needs, is faced with new problems that will require the greatest skill and planning to surmount. Some of these also seriously affect the economic strength of domestic coal and oil production.

With well-head prices controlled by utility type regulation under the Federal Power Commission many gas producers are finding it less profitable to continue new explorations which are off sharply.

In a desperate effort to increase gas use in off-peak months, both pipeline and gas distributors have frequently resorted to rate tilting, or "dumping" excess gas for steam boiler use at less than actual costs in slack seasons. This has resulted in the usurpation of the market for millions of tons of coal, without appreciably solving the long-term problems of the gas industry.

Such "dumping" practices spread much broader through the economy than their adverse effect on the coal industry. Frequently, they result in higher prices to domestic consumers, as has been widely publicized by recent congressional hearings. They also tend to create conditions of uncertainty in the market for all fuels, to the ultimate disadvantage of each, as well as to consumers.

Now, U.S. gas, oil, and coal producers are faced with an influx of natural gas from Canada, imported to compete with domestic fuels without any duty—although Canada charges American producers a 50-cent tariff for every ton of U.S. coal we ship to that nation.

Perhaps even more serious than the immediate economic impact on American domestic fuels industries is the danger of our industrial economy becoming too dependent on natural gas from abroad—even from such a friendly neighbor as Canada. We cannot forget that some Canadian leaders vigorously opposed these exports before the National Energy Board of Canada, as well as in Alberta where much of the gas originates. We have no assurance that changes in political fortune or economic development would not mean these sources will be severly curtailed; certainly, in case of war, Canada would have to look first to her own energy needs for production, and the amount of natural gas she could afford to export could be drastically reduced overnight. What would then happen to U.S. industries, apartments, and homes that had grown dependent on Canadian gas, while the sources and transport facilities of U.S. domestic fuels had withered away?

The problems of the domestic gas industry are serious, and are growing more critical each day, and the solution is not simple. But the plain fact remains: America does not have a sound, unified, national fuels policy to deal with them.

COAL

The American coal industry today looks to a steadily expanding demand for its product in the years ahead, although currently it is operating at little more than a "stand-by" production level. This level must be increased quickly to prevent deterioration of existing mines and coal transportation facilities if coal is to be able to meet its responsibilities for American energy in the future.

In recent years technological developments have resulted in the loss of two of coal's former major markets—home heating and railroad steam engines—but the industry recognizes these as logical marketing developments. It is responding with greater productivity, high mechanization, and product control to insure dependable fuel tailored to most exactly suit each users needs. And future prospects are for more than making up these losses in other markets—particularly electric utilities for which coal is the most important energy source.

However, certain current market practices (and the lack of a consistent national energy policy) meantime are causing the loss of millions of tons of production and consumption annually. These include the excessive imports of residual oil from abroad, priced to sell along the Atlantic coast at any figure necessary to undersell domestic coal, and the wasteful "dumping" of valuable natural gas for steam boiler use, often at less than cost. These practices have cost the domestic coal industry many millions of tons of sales and thousands of jobs each recent year. The result has been widespread unemployment in some major coal producing areas, sharp cuts in railroad coal freight traffic, and serious damage to tax incomes and the general economy of many states.

Loss of skilled workers in the coal mines, now largely operated by highly complex, modern equipment, is particularly serious for the future. To remain vigorous, as well as to meet the necessary growth requirements, the industry needs a steadily growing force of trained men; instead, its work force is being depleted and there is little incentive to bring new and capable young men into the mines, preparation plants and allied vital industries, such as the railroads.

As a corollary danger, today's level of coal production is insufficient to guarantee that the industry could meet demands it would face in case war shut off the import of oil and gas from abroad. To supply the energy fuel that our nation's defense production would require in an emergency, the coal industry would need a basic operating level of at least 500 million tons per year from which to start. This is about 80 million tons more than it is expected to produce in 1960.

Thus, coal, as does domestic oil and gas, faces problems whose solution is vital to America. But the plain fact remains: America does not have a sound, unified national fuels policy to deal with them.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND A SOUND FUELS POLICY

In war, as in peace, America must depend on its domestic fuel sources for survival.

Just recently, the international situation has deteriorated, while Russia is moving more and more into the international fuels export picture. Both these happenings are warnings that America is being dangerously remiss if she fails to adopt a policy of planning for the future, as well as for instant emergency, as far as her production capacities are concerned.

No one can foretell what might result from an all-out nuclear war. But wise planning must realize that instead of an ultimate Armageddon, the present cold war may be marked in the years ahead by limited conflicts, political and economic pressure moves and even contained major wars in which both sides avoid destruction by the bomb.

Considering the havoc wrought by Nazi Germany's submarines on allied shipping in World War II, we must realistically appraise the danger of Russia's huge fleet of modern, snorkel-type long-range subs, and recognize

that overnight they could cut the imports of all oil products into America to a trickle.

We must be certain that, in any such emergency, our domestic fuels industries are capable of not only taking over the markets now supplied by imports but also of expanding to meet the vastly increased needs of a wartime economy. Under present conditions, this would be very difficult to achieve. If prompt action to sustain all our fuels industries is not taken, tomorrow it could be impossible.

The American Legion clearly recognized this threat when its national executive committee on May 4, 1960 adopted a resolution declaring that a national fuels policy study—"in our opinion, is vital to the national defense—it is vital that we assess the future civilian and military needs of our Nation in this field."

WHAT ABOUT "END-USE CONTROLS"

Opponents of a national fuels policy study have charged that such an inquiry by the Congress of the United States would soon lead to Government controls of fuels consumption, or as it is often put, "end-use controls." One giant international oil importing company has charged that a national fuels policy study would mean that the Government would tell the homeowner what kind of fuel he must use to provide domestic heat or order the housewife to burn a certain fuel in her kitchen stove. These assertions are, of course, nonsense.

The proposal made by the concurrent resolutions is for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to study the fuels industries of the Nation and make recommendations that may eventually comprise a national fuels policy—a single, overall guideline for this vital segment of our economy. This, however, is going to be a sizable undertaking. Current estimates are that the study itself will occupy some 2 years' work. It is, therefore, unthinkable that anyone could suggest at this time what substantive provisions might or might not be included in the final statement of policy.

All that coal seeks in urging the speedy approval of the concurrent resolutions is an atmosphere of fair and open competition between fuels industries and a national awareness of the importance of energy to America and its security.

THE CASE IN BRIEF

To sum up—America, unlike most of the other great nations, does not have and has not had a planned national fuels policy to insure the greatest benefit to all from its great national fuels resources, for the present and in the future.

Forty-three Senators and twenty-nine Members of the House of Representatives have sponsored concurrent resolutions to authorize a joint committee of Congress to make an exhaustive study of America's energy and fuels picture, and to determine the need for a national fuels policy. These resolutions are now awaiting action by the present Congress.

The domestic fossil fuels industries are facing very serious problems, problems of such magnitude that they pose a real threat to our economy and to our ability to survive if war should come.

The national coal policy conference, speaking for the coal producers of America, the coal carrying railroads, the utilities, coal mining equipment manufacturers and the United Mine Workers of America, urgently believes that a national fuels policy is critically needed, and that the study proposed by 72 Members of Congress should be authorized and started at once.

A congressional study of the need for a national fuels policy would:

1. Thoroughly investigate all factors affecting America's fuel needs and supplies, giving full consideration to the national welfare, the defense of the Nation and the economic well-being of all domestic fuels industries.

2. Make such recommendations to the Congress for remedial legislation as the committee concluded were necessary. Any action then taken would be a matter for decision by the whole Congress.

Newspapers Should Not Be Government's Whipping Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, a free press is indispensable to the preservation of representative government. This is the primary reason why I oppose an increase in postal rates covering second-class mail at this time. Any rate hike would impose a tremendous hardship on the small daily and weekly newspapers throughout the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a cogent editorial on the subject, dated June 14, 1960, by Fred Koehl, vice president of the Ashland Times-Gazette, a fine daily newspaper published at Ashland, Ohio, in my congressional district:

[From the Ashland Times Gazette, June 14, 1960]

NEWSPAPERS SHOULD NOT BE GOVERNMENT'S WHIPPING BOY

Like many of the smaller daily and weekly newspapers in the United States, the Times Gazette will be faced with a severe problem if the proposed second-class mail increase now being considered by a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Post Office Committee is favorably reported in its present form. This proposal would increase the average postage cost per subscriber per year from $1.20 to $3.58, or 298 percent, and would affect the 2,110 families who receive the Times Gazette by mail.

Much has been made of the so-called subsidy that the newspapers are supposed to be receiving as a result of the second-class mailing privilege which has traditionally been granted to newspapers. The losses attributed to this source are in reality grossly exaggerated because other types of mail are lumped in the second-class category and the Post Office Department has consistently refused to break down and separate the actual cost of newspaper distribution through the mails.

Newspapers have consistently agreed to pay their share of the mailing cost but we do not feel that we should also pay the distribution costs of other types of publications which are included as second-class mail. We object to being the whipping boy for the Post Office Department.

As an example—Times Gazette drivers travel over 150 miles per publishing day delivering bundles to the post offices in Ashland County so the newspaper can be delivered the following morning. We feel that this not-inconsiderable expense should be taken into consideration in figuring the costs of distribution by mail. This is not now being done. If these bundles were distributed by star routes out of the Ashland Post Office they would not be delivered before the second day after publication. This is in no way a reflection on the operations of the local post office as it is being operated very efficiently.

To further show the effect of this proposed increase the annual cost of the newsprint and ink per subscriber is $5.94. This figures does not include any of the publishing costs of the Times Gazette. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to determine that the proposed postal rate of $3.58 per subscriber per year with the newsprint and ink cost will total $9.52 per subscriber per year. Since our yearly subscription rate is $9 in Ashland and surrounding counties by mail, one can easily see what this exhorbitant postal increase will do to our costs.

Such a situation leads to only one obvious result—the costs will have to be passed along to our customers. For several years we have heard a great deal about creeping inflation—his is a good example of how our Washington bureaucrats talk out of both sides of their mouths at the same time. All that we ask is a fair determination of our postage costs based on realities and not imagination. If you are interested in this situation we suggest that you communicate your thoughts to ROBERT LEVERING, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., who is a member of the House Post Office Committee.—F. W. K.

Which Is the Tight-Money Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a very able editorial recently appearing in the Christian Science Monitor. The people who have forced the Federal Government into the short-term money market by refusing to give it the flexibility of financing the Federal debt in the long-term money market should pay attention to the economic damage they have created. Attention has been directed to the cutback in home building. This, in turn, is directly related to the great sums of money that were funneled out of the savings and loan institutions when the Federal Government offered its fabulous fives in order to finance in a short-term market.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 14, 1960]

WHICH IS THE TIGHT-MONEY POLICY?

Those who resist raising the ceiling on Government-bond rates vow they are trying to protect the small businessman and the homebuilder or buyer from burdensome interest rates. But what is the result?

Limiting the Government to the short-term money market means, as Charles E. Walker, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, points out, that short-term interest rates become higher than they otherwise would be and that this pinches consumers, small businessmen, and farmers who rely on short-term credit.

Mr. Walker further notes that the distortion in the public debt structure can contribute to severe drain on savings institutions and thereby restrict the flow of savings into home construction.

Confirmation of this is given by W. O. DuVall, president of the U.S. Savings & Loan League. He says:

"Never before has the thrift business operated in an economy which must support

such a tremendous public debt with such short maturities as we have today. We may, therefore, expect the Treasury to be constantly in the market for funds to meet its refunding and cash needs. * * * Thus, we have a new competitor and we expect this competition to increase."

If Congress would remove the archaic 4¼-rate ceiling and let the Treasury attract long-term money from individuals and institutions by paying a going price for it, some of this pressure on the short-term money market would be relieved. Political leaders would do well to examine whether they are helping or harming those they mean to befriend.

The Twilight of Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting article by George E. Sokolsky in the April 9, 1960, issue of National Review.

I would refer the readers to my speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 2, 1960, pages 8492–8497, titled "Lobbying and Reporting: The Future of Representative Government in the United States" where I am discussing the same subject from a somewhat different approach.

The article follows:

THE TWILIGHT OF REPORTING—OBITUARY NOTICE: DEAD, OF COMPLICATIONS, OLD-TIME AMERICAN REPORTING, VICTIM OF AUTOMATED NEWS-GATHERING TECHNIQUES, HIGH COST AND THE RACE FOR THE ADVERTISING DOLLAR

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Americans are supposed to be able to read because general education has been compulsory in most parts of the country for more than a century. In recent years, youngsters have been required to remain at school in some places, willy-nilly, until they are 16 years of age; 18 in others. Surely, in so many years almost anyone would learn something about something.

The fact is that most Americans are badly informed, particularly about their own country. In a recent conversation with an Asiastic visitor, I had to explain this phenomenon by saying that we have become a nonpolitical people, that up to World War I, our people, all over the country, were deeply concerned about politics, but that since we have become prosperous and have moved up to a high standard of living, we have lost our interest in politics.

If one were to take a look at the newspapers, say for any year between 1900 and 1917, he would find exciting, controversial, fighting reporting of the news. William Randolph Hearst, a tendentious socialist, associated with Arthur Brisbane who was brought up as a Fourierist by his father, Albert, battled for the socialization of the means of communication and for a broadening of public welfare. Joseph Pulitzer, a Hungarian Jew, a refugee from the battles for freedom in Europe, was fighting corruption in government in this country. Lincoln Steffens and Charles Edward Russell, radical idealists, were bringing the truth about the exploitation of the people into the press. Upton Sinclair joined them.

The list of competent, hard-hitting independent, unafraid reporters is legion. They had to live, too—and they managed well because their employers were as fearless as they were. Stories were not suppressed out of fear of economic pressure. In 1907, William Randolph Hearst, wrote: "* * * When there are faults in our unions and combinations, let us correct them, but not deny the value of united efforts." He was not afraid that antiunion employees would withdraw their advertisements, just as Adolph Ochs would not join organizations that might become pressure groups.

THE ADVERTISER TAKES OVER

The newspaper sought circulation. The assumption was that if a newspaper had ample circulation, the advertiser would be forced to do his pitch in that newspaper. In fact, so rigid was the separation between the editorial and reporting side of a newspaper and the business side that people on one side hardly spoke to those on the other. Interference by the business side was regarded as an intolerable intrusion. It was not that men were more moral than now; it was rather than the advertiser had not yet become so important. He was an indivdual, not an organized high-pressure group handling perhaps $100 million a year of business. He came in with his piece of copy, a comparatively small merchant, hat in hand, to ask for space from a notable figure in the land.

Men such as Greeley, Dana, Hearst, Pulitzer, and Ochs had no fear that J. P. Morgan or some such person would cut their credit or even their newsprint supply, which must come from a Canadian cartel. From the standpoint of the independence of the press, the radio, or television, Madison Avenue has been the worst influence in the United States. Any large agency possesses too much economic power. It represents not one firm but many, not one advertiser but many. It can give a newspaper several million dollars a year of advertising or nothing at all. It can switch advertising from newspapers to television, from television to newspapers. It recognizes that as many Republicans as Democrats use detergents, smoke cigarettes, and buy automobiles. Even Communists are consumers.

When the newspaper switched from being circulation-conscious for the sake of circulation to circulation-conscious for the sake of advertising, the character of American journalism was altered. Editors who had always ignored the business office as something inferior, became aware of the importance of Henry Ford or General Motors.

Columnists usually ignore newspaper policies because if a man's copy appears in 200 or 300 newspapers, he cannot possibly know the policy of each one. But it soon becomes noticeable to him that references to the absurd or indecent conduct of big advertisers are not too welcome. He also notices that the President of the United States is not as protected as a big advertiser. This represents a significant loss of independence of the press.

Another factor in this situation is the emergence of trade unionism in the newspaper world. Reporters do not report. They do not compete for a story. They go in packs. The press conference has become an instrument for the avoidance of individual reporting. The press conference and the mimeographed handout are a stultification of reporting. It makes the reporter a creature of the individual who is reported about. In the high noon of American journalism, the reporter dug out his own material. Can one imagine Sam Blythe digging up a story as one of a heterogeneous mob of American and alien reporters seated like school boys at a high school convocation?

President Eisenhower has followed a procedure which lowered the status of the reporter. To the stag dinners which were given to advertise favorites and as a "payola" for those who reciprocated, he invited publishers rather than reporters. His assumption undoubtedly was that, as a soldier salutes a general, so a reporter obeys a publisher. This, of course, his experienced press agent, Jim Hagerty, should have told him is not so. Jim's father, for instance, would not have written a lying word in his entire life nor would he have been asked to.

There are a few publishers who can write their own copy but not too many. Most of them come up on the business side, and the smartest of them avoid involvements in writing jobs. However, a publisher can set a policy but he has to be an extraordinarily watchful man to prevent his policy from being voided by willful reporters or every headline writers. Eisenhower's partisanship for the bosses has not helped him with the correspondents or the cartoonists as much as he believes that it has. RICHARD NIXON is smarter; he talks to anybody. But then, he is not yet a President.

NO NEWS, ALL GOSSIP

The high cost of reporting, the inadequate results, have forced many newspapers to fill their inside pages with features. It is unbelievable how many features there are and how little newspapers pay for them. Advice to the lovelorn; advice to parents about children; to children about parents; what to eat; how to prepare it; what to drink; where to go to get food better than the wife can cook. Gossip—endless gossip about nonentities; item after item about unknown persons who, like ships that pass in the night, shine once and disappear. Columns of every kind and description. It is all ike the filling in a cake—something that goes between the first page and the editorial page. Much of it is useless. I recently examined half a dozen medical columns and wondered why the American Medical Association did nothing about them. Absentee medical care can be a very treacherous activity, even if, at the end of a curbstone activity, the medical columnist says, "Consult your physician."

The space filler is no substitute for the reporter but what I am advocating would put many smaller newspapers into bankruptcy. They have to depend upon syndicates, wire-services, and other cooperative means to overcome the enormous costs which now face them. That is why so many newspapers are disappearing; why so many amalgamations take place.

When only one newspaper exists in a city, the residents could be limited to one partisan point of view. Actually, their newspaper may have no point of view or all points of view. It is a conveyor of views. For itself, it may reach a common denominator of views.

Sam Newhouse, the most recent and successful of publishers, is a businessman who operates newspapers without regard to views. In Syracuse, N.Y., for instance, he operates a Republican and a Democratic newspaper. Both are ably edited. Each is independent of the other. Both are independent of Newhouse. This is a new conception of newspaper publishing, in the sense that the owner stays in the counting house and keeps out of the editorial office altogether. But what will happen should Newhouse ever develop a profound sense of right and demand that his newspapers support his cause? He says that it could not happen, that he would never make such a demand on his editors. Never is a very, very finite word!

What Newhouse is trying to do is significant. He is trying again to separate the editorial from the business office. He is also trying to eliminate centralized overhead and thereby to make chain newspapers realistically profitable. Thus far, his efforts have been financially successful, but whether he can manage an empire of newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations without

any editorial supervision is to be seen. At present the Newhouse newspapers have no editorial supervision by Newhouse.

Nothing has yet come into existence which adequately replaces proper and complete reporting. U.S. News & World Report comes very close to it. Life and Look make no attempt at reporting; they are feature publications, like the inside pages of newspapers; Time and Newsweek are too limited in their scope. The radio and television, as they relate to news, do no reporting in the sense of exacavating news which governments or other instruments of power wish to suppress.

Curiously, where one finds good reporting, albeit belatedly, is in the small, biased, partisan papers and newsletters. Some of these exist only to support hate causes. Some are financial tip sheets. Some are house organs. Some are even blackmail papers. One does find in them, often badly done, gems of information not elsewhere published. Such weeklies as the New Leader, National Review, the New Republic, and even the National Guardian sometimes pick up an important item which the daily press misses.

The revival of adequate reporting presents an emotional problem. It used to be that boys went in for reporting at $10 or $15 a week because they felt the call. When they earned $25 a week, they bought a cane so that they would look like reporters. "Lightning Louie" Zeltner, one of the best leg men New York ever knew, earned a very hard living but he never missed a story, and his children were proud to go into the business.

Reporting was a profession, and men were proud to be part of it. It was not a trade; it was not a job; it was not a steppingstone to becoming a radio announcer or a television script writer. It was a proud profession and the final goal was to become an editor, which was a noble status in any community.

Can you name the editor of the newspaper you read today?

Text of Letter Addressed to "Fellow Liberals"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the New York Times the text of a letter from a number of outstanding Americans who have addressed an open letter to "fellow liberals."

These 16 distinguished Americans feel, as they have indicated in their letter, that it is essential the platform of the Democratic Party this year pledge executive and congressional action in support of the Supreme Court school decisions and the assurance of full voting rights to every American citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this open letter to "fellow liberals," together with the New York Times news story on the signers of the letter, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the news story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF LETTER TO LIBERALS ON KENNEDY

DEAR FELLOW LIBERALS: Until recently liberals have divided their support for the presidency among Hubert Humphrey, John Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson. All three men have demonstrated the kind of effective leadership which would make them great Presidents. The purpose of this letter is to urge, now that Senator Humphrey has withdrawn from the race and Mr. Stevenson continues to stand aside, that the liberals of America turn to Senator Kennedy for President.

We are impressed by the fact that Senator KENNEDY has won the primaries, but even more by the way he has campaigned in winning them. Day after day he has expounded with force and clarity the great issues of the 1960's and has given overwhelming evidence of his deep commitment to liberalism on the widest possible range of issues. We are now convinced Senator KENNEDY's adherence to progressive principles which we hold is strong and irrevocable. He has demonstrated the kind of firmness of purpose and toughness of mind that will make him a great world leader.

We are as determined as you that the Democratic platform of 1960 meet the issues of the day head on. We are convinced that Senator KENNEDY shares this determination. In particular, some of us have discussed the question of a strong civil rights plank with him, and he has assured us he favors pledging the Democratic Party to congressional and executive action in support of the Supreme Court desegregation decision and to whatever measures may prove necessary to making voting a reality for all citizens.

We think that the real struggle at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles will be not only between liberals and conservatives but, equally and importantly, between the "idealists" whose major interest is in substantive goal, and the "professionals" who are mainly concerned with party control and political office. Senator KENNEDY has repeatedly shown his willingness to sacrifice short-term political gains to advance the cause of liberal idealism.

All of us supported Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956, and hope that he will be a leading foreign affairs figure in any new Democratic administration. But he insists he is not a candidate in 1960, and Senator KENNEDY, a man of whom liberals can be proud, is an active candidate who has proved his appeal to men and women of all ranks and creeds. The time has come, we suggest, to unite behind JOHN KENNEDY as the candidate of the American liberal movement and to work with him to defeat NIXON in November.

STEVENSON GROUP BACKING KENNEDY—16 URGE LIBERALS TO UNITE BEHIND SENATOR—CITE HIS ASSURANCES ON RIGHTS

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Sixteen former backers of Adlai E. Stevenson issued an open letter to fellow liberals tonight urging them to unite behind Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts as the Democratic presidential nominee.

Their letter took Mr. Stevenson, the party's nominee in 1952 and 1956, at his word that he was standing aside and was not a candidate for a third nomination. They expressed hopes that Mr. Stevenson "will be a leading foreign affairs figure in any new Democratic administration."

The group, including several eminent historians and authors, called Senator KENNEDY "a man of whom liberals can be proud" and a candidate "who has proved his appeal to men and women of all ranks and creeds."

The group emphasized the importance of a strong civil rights platform plank, opposed by Southern leaders. They claimed assurances from Senator KENNEDY that he "favors pledging the Democratic Party to congressional and executive action in support of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision and to whatever measures may prove necessary to make voting a reality for all citizens."

Signers of the letter were James M. Burns, political scientist at Williams College; Henry Steele Commager, Amherst College historian; John P. Frank, Phoenix, Ariz., lawyer; J. Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard economist; Arthur J. Goldberg, Washington lawyer and attorney for the United Steel Workers of America, and Representative Edith Green, Portland, Oreg.

Also Gilbert A. Harrison, Washington, publisher of the New Republic; Lt. Gov. Philleo Nash of Wisconsin; Allen Nevins, San Marino, Calif., historian; William P. Patrick, Jr., Detroit councilman; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Washington attorney and long-time leader of Americans for Democratic Action, and John L. Saltonstall, Jr., Boston lawyer.

Also Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard historian; State Senator Monroe M. Sweetland of Oregon; Roger Tubby, Saranac Lake, N.Y., editor, and John D. Voelker, former Michigan Supreme Court justice and author.

West Virginia Wesleyan College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as an educator and one who believes that education is vital to our national security, I am proud to call attention to the recent achievements of West Virginia Wesleyan College at Buckhannon, W. Va., and to discuss some of its accomplishments.

To my mind, West Virginia Wesleyan is a good example of the way our smaller, independent liberal arts colleges can share in the tremendous growth in the number of college students which is now taking place, and yet not sacrifice the intimacy, the ability to give special instruction and individual attention, and the pleasant small-college atmosphere.

West Virginia Wesleyan has a recent history of orderly and well-planned growth. Its student enrollment has doubled over the past 7 years, rising from 502 students in 1953–54 to 1059 in 1959–60. Yet the annual increase has never totaled more than 176 students in any one year, enabling the college's administration to make responsible plans for the increased student load. This is a far cry from the picture in some colleges, which have accepted a swelling tide of new students without making adequate plans for their training and care. Wise future planning envisioning a maximum student body of 1,250 also has been undertaken and approved.

The college is making serious efforts to attract the higher caliber student who can benefit most from the type of training West Virginia Wesleyan has to offer. Of 561 applications received for the 1960–61 school year—compared with 371 the year before—344 have been approved. Of this number, 53 of the students ranked in the top 10 percent of their high school class, and all but 54 in the top half. The school is hoping to add a special admissions counselor this year to insure even better screening and selection of future applicants.

As with most such institutions, this growth has created a strain on physical facilities. But the college is meeting this challenge with an excellent long-range

plan which envisions renovation, and enlargement of the physical plant, which I might point out is one of the most beautiful in the entire State. An active campaign to raise funds on a national basis for a new athletic and physical education center is underway, and I feel certain that this drive will be successful, for the college has enjoyed a reputation in sports far beyond its small enrollment in the past.

Most importantly, however, West Virginia Wesleyan is recognizing the fact that more teachers are needed to cope with the growing student body. This year, 17 new faculty members have been added, and the total faculty now stands at 57 members. This figures to a student-faculty ratio of 20.5, a very commendable figure, and a reduction from 25.0 in 1955.

The college is busy with other plans also. A projection has been made to bring the first graduate-level courses to the college by establishment of a graduate school of religion. Since 140 of Wesleyan's students are enrolled in preministerial study or religious education, this is certain to improve the level of training and the service to the Methodist Church, which controls the college.

A special project also is underway to encourage faculty members to publish more papers and research projects, and to stimulate undergraduate students to assist in their preparation. This program has been highly successful in its 2 years of existence, with more than 35 publications coming from the college in that time. In addition, Wesleyan students were responsible for 8 of 17 papers read at the recent West Virginia Academy of Sciences conference.

These are only a few examples of the well coordinated program that is taking place at West Virginia Wesleyan. I feel certain that this excellent little college, now in its 71st year of existence, will continue to prosper under the able leadership of its president, Stanley H. Martin, and will bring continuing credit to its administration and to the State of West Virginia.

Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the June 20, 1960, edition of Newsweek:

ECONOMIC GROWTH—PICK YOUR STATISTICS

The great debate over how fast the economy is and should be growing—especially in view of the Red challenge—should become fierce this election year. Many an American will ask: "Are they all talking about the same economy?"

A few hints on how to weigh election-year evidence came last week from W. Allen Wallis, special economics assistant to President Eisenhower. One important thing to remember, said Wallis, is that it all depends on where you start.

A favorite technique of the politically minded experts is to compare a recession low with a boom peak to make their favorite party look good. Thus, the real gross national product grew at a yearly rate of 3.9 percent in the Democratic years 1947–53, which started in a recession, ended in the post-Korean boom; the rate was only 2.2 percent in the Republican years 1953–59, which started in a boom, ended as the economy was coming out of a slump. Yet if the periods are moved just a bit, comparing 1945–52 (Democrats) with 1953–60 (Republicans), the latter looks twice as good. "You pick your party, and then you pick your period," said Wallis.

But no amount of economic sleight-of-hand can change one important trend, Wallis said firmly: "There is no possibility that the Russian economy will overtake ours any time in the visible future—certainly not in this century."

An Inspiring Service Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a young Oklahoman named Floyd Eugene Goines probably owes his life today to the alertness and humanitarian spirit of two great services—the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Navy.

An Air Force veteran who is a skin-diver by profession, Young Goines was hastened to a Tahlequah, Okla., hospital early this week, suffering from acute decompression sickness as a result of an accelerated return to the surface after an 85-feet dive in Tenhiller Lake.

The physician attending young Goines, Dr. Herbert Masters, of Tahlequah, soon concluded that it was imperative to transport the young man immediately to a decompression chamber to avert death or possible permanent paralysis. At the time of Dr. Master's diagnosis Goines was paralyzed on one side and in acute pain.

The Tahlequah doctor telephoned the Navy's submarine base at New London, Conn., where doctors speedily agreed that the decompression treatment was urgently needed, and offered Navy decompression facilities to the young veteran.

The immediate problem was emergency transportation from Oklahoma, with physicians in agreement that even minutes of delay could be critical in young Goines' chances for survival.

At midnight on last Monday, I was called by long distance telephone from Muskogee, Okla., by County Attorney John Luton, who told me of the emergency and asked for help in obtaining a night flight to New London.

A call to Dr. Masters confirmed the urgency of the matter and also brought news that the plane provided would require pressurization, oxygen supply, and medical attendance, since Goines' condition was becoming increasingly critical.

I then placed a call to Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity at Tinker Airbase in Oklahoma City, and advised the general personally of the emergency.

General Gerrity's response was immediate and heartwarming. He said he would endeavor at once to assemble a crew with a doctor and a nurse for the mercy flight.

This was at midnight, e.d.s.t.

At 1:30 a.m., c.s.t., an Air Force plane took off from Tinker with young Goines aboard, after a 170-mile ambulance trip from Tahlequah to Oklahoma City.

At 9:57 a.m., e.d.s.t., the patient was in the decompression chamber at the Navy School of Deep Sea Diving here in Washington, under the expert care of Navy doctors and hospitalmen familiar with his injury.

Hospitalman 1/c Roger Christenson was in the tank with him on a 38-hour assignment that later was to send Christenson back to decompression for 4 hours himself, with a mild case of resulting "bends."

Under the watchful eyes of Comdr. J. C. McNicol, USNR, Lt. Comdr. Emmett W. Carpenter, USN, and a team of three Navy doctors, Goines was carefully moved through the critical stages of compression and decompression to dissolve the painful air embolism creating paralysis.

Thirty-eight hours later, he walked out of the tank, with only a slight weakness in one hand as a souvenir of his harrowing experience.

His recovery is the direct result of the generous and humanitarian service, beyond the call of duty, of our Navy and Air Force officers and men. We can be very proud of what they have done.

One of the splendid and commendable customs of our armed services in general is their demonstrated willingness, and generous readiness, to lend assistance to people who are the victims of disaster.

I believe every American is proud of this humanitarian custom, which is in the highest tradition of our country and its great heritage.

My personal thanks and congratulations are extended to all who helped to continue this tradition, in the case of Floyd Eugene Goines.

Yates Amendment Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News, May 23, 1960:

SENSE IN STORAGE

The scandalously high cost of storing the mountains of surplus farm products held by the Government has been well publicized. For fiscal 1960, the charges will run around $612 million—more than $1.5 million a day.

The Government itself has built storage bins for the millions of bushels of grain and bales of cotton that it acquires under the price-support program. But Representative YATES, Democrat, Illinois, uncovered the fact that Government-owned facilities were only 65 percent utilized, while many millions were paid out for other space.

At the very least, reason would require that storage capacity paid for with public funds would not remain empty while rent was paid for other space. Representative YATES has sponsored a policymaking amendment to a farm bill requiring maximum utilization of Government-owned storage.

The saving could run into hundreds of millions a year, the while it introduces at least a breath of reason into the whole farm policy madhouse.

Khrushchev's Campaign Thrust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following perceptive remarks of Ralph McGill who seeks to warn us, Democrats and Republicans alike, in the campaign months ahead to debate the real domestic and international issues and avoid the spurious and dangerous issue of Khrushchev.

Ralph McGill, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, is an outstanding commentator on the American scene whose great writing has won him wide recognition—including the 1959 Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing.

I hope Ralph McGill's observations are soberly read and taken very much to heart.

[From the Washington Star, June 13, 1960]

KHRUSHCHEV'S CAMPAIGN THRUST—BID SEEN TO INFLUENCE U.S. POLITICS, PUSHING US INTO AGGRESSIVE POSITION

(By Ralph McGill)

On that stormy and perhaps Monday when he wrecked the summit conference at Paris, Nikita Khrushchev thrust himself into the American presidential campaign.

This duly was noted at the time.

Since that hour he has served as a sort of unofficial and uninvited Republican campaign manager to assure the nomination and election of Vice President NIXON.

Mr. Khrushchev has done this by the very simple device of saying that he does not like Mr. NIXON and hopes the American people will not elect him.

This potential influence of Mr. K. poses a very real danger to our country. It serves to make him appear even wiser and more shrewd than he is. It suggests that he understands that he can weaken us by causing us to become involved in another senseless and debilitating argument about which candidate or which party is "soft" on communism. The Soviet Premier can surely but slowly push this country into a position as an aggressor or as one which does not fail to see the purpose of his participation in our politics.

There are tremendous issues which we must solve.

Whatever the final effect of Governor Rockefeller's eloquent manifesto may be, he has called attention to what confronts us.

It is no exaggeration to say that if we fail to give due attention to such issues and demands of foreign policy, national defense, education and medical care for the old, we very well may commit slow national suicide.

Khrushchev knows this.

Therefore, if he can so intervene as to cause Mr. NIXON and the candidate who will run against him to wrap themselves in an American flag and campaign on emotions aroused by Mr. K., he will have won a major victory without bloodshed.

If we commit the supreme idiocy of permitting the shadow of the late Joe McCarthy's fear and divisive tactics to become an integral ingredient of the 1960 Presidential campaign, then indeed will communism advance itself in Europe and Asia.

It is a dangerous oversimplification to say merely that communism wishes to conquer the world. That is true. But it ignores the method. Communism cannot conquer the world with war. Not now, at any rate.

Communism can conquer the world only when, and if, it obtains control enough of the people and resources to become invincible. Mr. K. knows this. This is what Mr. K. meant when he said he would bury us without war.

Knowledgeable men in many departments of our Government know this and are concerned by the progress made. They are troubled by what goes on in what is left of Asia and in the new states struggling to independence in Africa—lacking trained men and resources necessary to stability.

How mature are we?

This is an important question.

But even more important is the question of how politically mature are our candidates. They and their campaign managers can protect the Nation from the grievous results of allowing Nikita Khrushchev to be a personal factor in this campaign. Communism is. Russia is. But we must not permit Khrushchev shrewdly to arouse our angers and resentments so that we allow him to manipulate our votes. He would like nothing better than to divert our eyes from the real issues—and focus them instead on him.

Here is not merely an opportunity, but a duty, on Mr. NIXON and the Democratic candidates. Let them warn us by their own words and example not to fall into Mr. K.'s net.

Edward R. Devlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, the Honorables WILLIAM A. BARRETT, JAMES A. BYRNE, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, ROBERT N. C. NIX, and myself, I rise to pay tribute to the life and works of a good friend, a great public servant, and a dedicated American, the Honorable Edward R. Devlin. He was only 43 years of age when he passed away on June 12, 1960, in the Nazareth Hospital of Philadelphia, Pa. He was buried on June 15, 1960, in the Resurrection Cemetery, Cornwell Heights, near Philadelphia.

At the time of his death Ed Devlin was first deputy State secretary of revenue, having been appointed by Gov. David L. Lawrence in March of 1959. Prior to that time he served as deputy register of wills of Philadelphia. He served in the Army of World War II and was a member of the American Legion. Since 1957 he had been the leader of the 57th ward.

Ed is survived by his wife, Mary Devlin, a sister of the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., chairman of the Democratic city committee of Philadelphia and Member of Congress from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania. He is also survived by four sons, Edward R., Jr., John Patrick, Terrence, and William, and a daughter, Mary, all of the home address, 8301 Algon Avenue, Philadelphia. In addition, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Edward R. Devlin, Sr., and four sisters.

Ed was an amiable and faithful public servant and was extremely well liked and respected by the citizens of our city. He will be greatly missed by his family, his friends, and the community he served so faithfully.

Coleman May Become National Chairman of Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a feature article appearing in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen Journal on June 11. It is a most refreshing article in this respect that the author uses many lines to set forth the sterling character and deep-seated religious motivations of a man who may be selected to become the national chairman of the Democratic Party. Regardless, whether the selectee be for either party, it is most enocuraging that men of this caliber are being sought and that they are active in and influenced by civil and religious endeavors.

The article follows:

COLEMAN MAY BECOME NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Coleman knows about the talk that has quietly been going on among the Democratic chieftains. "A lot of people have talked to me about the job, but I've never given the idea much consideration," says Coleman. He did reveal that four U.S. Senators, whose names he wouldn't disclose, had invited him to talk it over late last year in Washington. But he didn't take the subject seriously enough to make an appointment. Later, he did go to Washington on other business and talked individually to the Senators.

Would Bill Coleman, the refreshing type of straight-forwarded politican that county chairmen instinctively trust, take the job. "I'd be very reluctant. I like to stay home with the family (his wife, Rose Anna, and six children, aged 5 to 17) too much," says Coleman.

"You know I took on the State chairmanship very reluctantly," he adds.

DiSalle?

"I'd be for him, of course. I'm very fond of Bill," says the Governor who became so

impressed with Coleman's utter frankness and honesty that he tagged him with the State chairmanship.

Of course, DiSalle would benefit by the switch from Butler, whom he dislikes, to Coleman whom he trusts implicity.

Some even go as far to say that DiSalle would then not only control the State Democratic machinery which he does now, but also would be Coleman's mentor in the administration of national Demo affairs, no mean political coup.

The only thing they fail to note is that while Coleman is intensely loyal to DiSalle, there is a little stubborn thrust of his jaw that frequently keeps him from seeing eye to eye with the Governor. He's no kowtower.

Coleman is accused of being a political novice, of being completely naive. But most county chairmen trust him, like him. "You never have to worry that someone can buy Bill Coleman," says DiSalle. "Go on up to Marysville (Coleman's hometown) and you'll never hear a bad story about him. Coleman himself says, "If trying to tell the truth is naive, then I am naive."

In Union County or Columbus, Coleman has no private interests that benefit by his place of influence with DiSalle's office or other State offices.

His law practice at Marysville is largely probate. Companies that he represents in court do not bid on State business. One of his clients formerly did. When Coleman became chairman, they quit.

He and his wife are pillars of civic and religious life in the small Ohio hamlet which some day may produce the next Democratic national chairman.

They regularly attend Trinity Lutheran Church, belong to every organization that substantial smalltown citizens belong to. An intensively loyal Democrat, Coleman sees as his only political duty the building of the party. Of warring factions in it, he says: "I'm not mad at anybody." But he still can stick that jaw out when he feels the majority mandates are being ignored or undermined.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Osmers Presidential Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the results of the Presidential poll, which was part of my 1960 questionnaire, have now been tabulated. More than 9,800 replies have been received to date from the 46,000 constituents to whom questionnaires were mailed on May 2.

Of those replying, 30 percent indicated they considered themselves Democrats; 37 percent Republicans; 33 percent independents. This percentage division, among Democrats, Republicans and independents follows very closely the voting patterns of the Ninth New Jersey Congressional District over the past decade.

Each constituent to whom a questionnaire was sent was asked to mark a first and second choice for President from among the seven best known prospects listed or to write in their own choice. Possible candidates who received less than 1 percent are not shown on the chart. Bridges, Dirksen, Goldwater, Halleck, Lausche and Meyner received a number of votes each but under 1 percent. Lodge, who was not listed, received 3 percent of the Republican votes as a second choice—see footnote on chart. Because of the national interest in the July nominating conventions and in the candidates, I ask unanimous consent to include the tabulated results in percentages in the Appendix of the RECORD. Answers to the other questions in my 1960 questionnaire appear on page A5045 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 15, 1960.

The chart follows:

	Democrat, 30 percent of total		Republican, 37 percent of total		Independent, 33 percent of total		Combined, 100 percent	
	1st choice	2d choice	1st choice	2d choice	1st choice	2d choice	1st choice	2d choice
Humphrey	1	3	0	0	3	0	1	1
Johnson	9	20	2	5	6	9	6	11
Kennedy	55	23	8	11	18	16	25	16
Nixon	3	12	71	18	46	36	44	20
Rockefeller	4	12	16	60	15	18	11	33
Stevenson	22	23	2	2	9	18	10	14
Symington	6	7	1	1	3	3	3	4
Other	0	0	0	[1]3	0	0	0	[1]1

[1] 3 percent of the Republicans wrote in Lodge as 2d choice.

Temporary Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, from the April 30, 1960, edition of the Palm Beach Times, West Palm Beach, Fla., sets out clearly and simply the problem of the transportation tax. Since the question of extending, reducing, or eliminating this tax is now before the Congress, I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD for the information of all Members:

TEMPORARY TAX

It seems there is nothing quite so enduring as a temporary tax. We should live so long.

Back in early World War II days the Federal Government levied a temporary transportation tax. It was designed to keep civilians off public transportation and provide additional revenue for the war effort.

The war ended, but the transportation tax didn't. Six years ago it was reduced from 15 to 10 percent—a rate which still obtains even though the U.S. Senate has twice voted for full repeal. The House has refused to go along, unbending last year to the extent of agreeing to a reduction of 5 percent.

However, the President in his budget message asked Congress to retain the 10 percent levy, and Congress is now considering whether or not it should rescind last year's reduction, which was to go into effect July 1, 1960.

It should not. It should, in fact, repeal the entire tax if it is to keep faith with the people.

The tax served its wartime purpose; now it is discriminatory and a discouragement to legitimate travel. It discriminates against common carriers—railroads and airlines—and it discriminates against travel in the United States while exempting travel aboard.

The temporary transportation tax has neither justice nor logic to recommend it. Tell your Congressman so.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills for Federal pay raise, flood control, Labor-HEW appropriations, and took up debt limit and tax extension bill.

House passed Mutual Security appropriation bill.

Senate committee reported appropriation bills on general Government matters and independent offices.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 12041–12061

Bills Introduced: 6 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3690–3695. **Pages 12045–12046, 12252**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2388, a private bill (S. Rept. 1608);

S. 3421, relating to payment of death benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act (S. Rept. 1609);

H.R. 11389, fiscal 1961 appropriations for general Government matters, with amendments (S. Rept. 1610);

H.R. 11776, fiscal 1961 appropriations for independent offices, with amendments (S. Rept. 1611);

S. 3650, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project (S. Rept. 1612);

H.R. 8186, omnibus amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, with amendment (S. Rept. 1613);

S. 1342, to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons, with amendment (S. Rept. 1614); and

H.R. 10, proposed Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act, with amendment (S. Rept. 1615).

Page 12045

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.J. Res. 696, to provide for the designation of the month of September 1960 as "National Wool Month," was ordered to be placed on calendar. **Page 12041**

Federal Pay Raise: By 62 yeas to 17 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H.R. 9883, to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees, after rejecting the following amendments and motions, as indicated:

By 28 yeas to 54 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), modified Carlson amendment providing that increase shall be at rate of 6 percent rather than 7½ percent; by 23 yeas to 58 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Ellender amendment to limit increases to employees whose annual salary is not more than $10,000 per annum; by 19 yeas to 63 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Ellender amendment to eliminate legislative employees from the bill, and to adjust basic compensation of employees in Senators' offices (after rejecting two amendments to this amendment offered by Senator Case of South Dakota (1) to include employees in Representatives' offices in adjustments of basic compensation in Senators' offices, and (2) to eliminate subsection that would adjust basic compensation of employees in Senators' offices); by 22 yeas to 58 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Church amendment to confine the increases to postal workers; by 11 yeas to 70 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dirksen amendment (in the nature of a substitute) to adjust Federal pay rates to those prevailing in private enterprise for similar work; on division vote, Dirksen amendment to readjust postal rates; and by 21 yeas to 56 nays, Ervin motion to commit the bill with instructions it be reported back in separate pieces of legislation, (1) as to postal pay increase, and (2) as to other Federal employees' pay increase. **Pages 12062–12101**

Omnibus Flood Control: By 70 yeas to 5 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendments H.R. 7634, omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, after adopting amendments as follows:

All committee amendments en bloc, which were thereafter considered as original text for purpose of further amendment; Kerr amendments to various parts of the bill on behalf of the committee; Hill amendment providing for acquisition of land for a national wildlife refuge on Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers;

Appendix

Our Youth and Our Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is greatly concerned—and rightly so—over the need for providing the right kind of environment, opportunity, and, yes, responsibility for our youth upon whom depends the future of our Nation.

As I have stressed previously, the creation of youth development programs is primarily the responsibility of the home, of the community, State, and only as necessary should the Federal Government get into this field.

Increasingly, I am encouraged by the splendid way in which individuals, organizations, and local governmental bodies are taking hold of the situation. They are attempting not only to provide antidelinquency programs, but to carry on constructive, realistic, forward-looking efforts for utilizing the talents, energies, and capabilities of the Nation's youth.

A recent issue of the County Officer—with a nationwide readership—published an informative article by Mrs. Stella B. Werner, entitled "Our Youth and Our Counties." The article reviews activities of the recent White House Conference on Children and Youth, particularly as these relate to the particular subdivision, the county. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR YOUTH AND OUR COUNTIES

(By Mrs. Stella B. Werner, councilwoman, Montgomery County, Md.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mrs. Werner, NACO's representative to the White House Conference on Children and Youth, is reporting here on some of the most controversial and far-reaching subjects in our time. Your county will be vitally effected by every word in this report.)

"Our youth now love luxury; they have bad manners, contempt for authority, and disrespect for older people. Children are tyrants; they no longer rise when their elders enter the room. They contradict their parents. They chatter before company, gobble their food, and tyrannize their teachers." Who said this? Socrates 2,500 years ago.

Interest and concern in youth has been continuous through the centuries. Every generation has hoped to improve upon the past, and parents work for a better life for their offspring in the future. A discussion of the subject, "Youth," was organized in the United States by President Theodore Roosevelt under the title "White House Conference on Children and Youth." It has been called since then by succeeding Presidents every 10 years.

The purpose of the 1960 Conference called by President Eisenhower from March 27 to April 2 was to "promote opportunities for children and youth to realize their full potential for a creative life in freedom and dignity."

The subject matter; discussed at the Conference from which the recommendations were made was presented at 18 forums: Environment; Mobility; Support; Nurture; Opportunity; Free Time; Mass Communication; Human Resources; Beliefs; Moving Toward Maturity, Birth to Puberty; Moving Toward Maturity, Puberty to Young Adulthood; The Young as Learners and Thinkers; The Young as Doers; The Young as Citizens; The Young with Mental Handicaps; The Young with Physical Handicaps; The Young in Conflict; and, The Young With Social Handicaps.

As your delegate at the Youth Conference I have scanned the 1,600 recommendations which came from the forums and pass on the following ones to you arranged under appropriate headings as pertinent to a program of action by the local county government.

PLANNING

"Young people should be invited to full participation in community planning, and there should be a special concern for the improvement of conditions affecting children and young people.

"States develop model codes for land use planning, zoning, essential services and facilities, subdivision regulations and housing standards, and take appropriate steps to facilitate their adoption by political subdivisions within the States.

"Better communications and coordination on Federal, State, and local levels, among public and private, lay and professional organizations, and individuals who are concerned with any aspect of the growth and development of children."

EDUCATION

"Through the continual raising of standards, reciprocity between States in teacher certification be expanded for the encouragement of teacher mobility.

"Vocational counselors should be provided with more information on job opportunities and the outlook in specific occupations.

"We recommend and urge that State and local educational authorities diligently pursue the responsibility of locating and enrolling migrant children in schools.

"It is recommended that society, through planning by community, industry, business, government, and educational interests, provide opportunity for specialized training for youth in existing and in newly expanding occupational clusters at the post high school levels, so that they may become more productive members of society.

"Education for family life, with emphasis on understanding the causes of human behavior through discussion and participation in appropriate experience, should be part of the school curriculum at all age levels. We further recommend that teachers of such courses should have specialized training and that the methods used consistently be re-examined to insure effectiveness.

"Schools should give increased emphasis to such educational values and ideals as character, discipline, creactivity, dignity, freedom and responsibility.

"Every school system should operate a school year of at least 180 full days.

"Public and private financial support at the local, State, and national levels for the further development of noncommercial educational television stations.

"Teacher-education institutions should increase and improve courses in TV and radio communications and methods of utilization in the classroom.

"School systems should incorporate, into their curricula, a program of motion picture and drama appreciation.

"There should be greater development of film departments and film programs for children and youth, in public libraries."

"All elementary and secondary schools should provide physical education programs of high quality for all students.

"Community education agencies should stress the fact that a character building program in early childhood will prove less costly than a corrective program in adolescence and adulthood.

"More extensive medical, educational, and guidance facilities should be developed for the preschool gifted child, the mentally retarded child, and the child with physical handicaps.

"All State legislatures should make it possible for State Departments of Education to assume the responsibility of extending public education to include nursery schools.

"Kindergartens should be made an integral part of the tax-supported, public school system in all communities, in order that every child may have the advantages of kindergarten experience.

"In order to allow and encourage the gifted student to develop his capacities to think clearly, choose wisely, perform with exceptional skill and accept responsibility, all schools make special provision for the education of the gifted, talented and creative student.

"The wider use of community resources inside and outside the schools should be planned for the purpose of providing gifted students with more opportunities for seminars and advanced and independent study.

"School systems in cooperation with management and labor should include in the secondary school curriculum educational experience which will provide young people with an understanding of our American economic system.

"Beginning in the elementary school, joint action should be initiated among schools, parents, employers, unions, State, and community agencies to find solutions to the needs of 'drop outs,' minority youth, and any other youth with special employment problems.

"Counseling, guidance and work study programs should be provided with adequate financial support at Federal, State and local levels.

"The school program should be revised for greater emphasis on education for political responsibility by stressing the meaning of democratic values, greater emphasis in the social studies curriculum on current issues, family living, civics and economics, the defense needs of the Nation and present military obligations of youth, and all responsibil-

ities of citizens of the local, State, National, and world community.

"That the schools make adequate provisions for the education of all physically handicapped children, in keeping with the American ideal that every child is entitled to the benefits of an educational opportunity commensurate with his abilities, capacity, and potentials."

WELFARE

"Since migration contributes to the problems of urban areas and since individuals involved require many kinds of public services, State and local government should eliminate residence requirements as a factor for Government eligibility for health and welfare benefits and services.

"Guides (in appropriate languages) should be distributed to migrants at point of departure, listing location and purposes of available resources in the places to which they will travel.

"Child care programs, including foster day care, day care centers, and homemaker services should be instituted and strengthened by Federal, State, and local help, including State regulation of standards.

"Provision should be made for intensive casework services for all families receiving financial assistance.

"More and better adoptive services should be provided for preschool age children.

"Public-welfare agencies should accept responsibility to reimburse private agencies for treatment services on the basis of 'purchase of service' provided by private agencies and not available through public agencies on a child-by-child basis; such reimbursement to be commensurate with cost of services provided.

"Removal of statutory provisions or administrative regulations which restrict or deny public assistance and other public social services to needy children born out of wedlock, and to their mothers.

"That accessibility of services for the unmarried mother not be restricted by residence requirements."

HEALTH AND SAFETY

"Since accidents are a major cause of death in children of every age:

"(1) A renewed aggressive effort be made to support community programs of accident prevention. Such programs should cover accidents on homes, farms, highways, educational and recreational centers.

"(2) Architects and engineers be alerted to health hazards in drawing up plans to build new or remodel old buildings and playgrounds.

"(3) State and local departments of health initiate a crash program for the prevention of accidents to young children; that safety education be included in the curriculum as early as possible; that local and State legislation provide for safety in housing, traffic and pedestrian control, and protected and supervised play space.

"Closer coordination should be established between religious institutions and social, welfare, and health agencies for the purpose of meeting the health needs of mobile people.

"Programs should be developed to educate adolescents to form food habits in this critical period of their life which meet their nutritional needs and lay a good foundation for continued good health.

"A survey be made of the cause of the alarming rise of illegitimacy and venereal diseases among adolescents and that appropriate educational measures sensitive to moral and related emotional factors be instituted.

"In order to improve programs of treatment of emotionally disturbed children, the governmental agencies, local, State, and National, should participate in financing actual treatment services as well as research and training.

"As a means of keeping the family intact, financial assistance be provided for the provision of nursing and medical services for mentally handicapped children, when necessary.

"A uniform way of recording and reporting data on mentally handicapped be developed and adopted to facilitate research.

"In order to evaluate our present methods of prevention and treatment all hospitals, communities, cities, and States put to continuous use the already existing standardized procedures and/or new methods to be discovered for reporting fetal deaths, the occurrence of congenital abnormalities and birth injuries, and the handicapping conditions which are discovered in infancy and childhood.

"That there be developed institutional facilities and community services for the child with multiple severe handicaps who cannot benefit from restorative or rehabilitative services."

HOUSING

"That local communities throughout the Nation be urged to take all necessary steps to give full support to the intent of the Housing Act of 1949 to the end that children and their families of all social levels should have decent housing in an adequate neighborhood. Public policy must also provide in relation to decent housing adequate social services and the opportunity for youth to live in representative American communities."

RECREATION-LIBRARIES

"More emphasis on cultural activities to provide children and youth with creative outlets and increase their appreciation of beauty and their interests in the arts.

"Because of the present lack of recreational facilities and space available for recreational activities we recommend: that State and local governments should include in their budget appropriations for employing or securing professional qualified leadership and financing recreational programs.

"Facilities be provided such as picnic areas, hostels, camps, marinas, boat launching sites, playgrounds, golf courses, athletic fields, recreation centers, libraries, museums, theaters, etc., and that large natural areas such as forests, reservoirs, and defense areas be developed for multiple recreation purposes.

"Youth be given the opportunity to participate in leadership responsibilities at national, State, and local levels as members of boards and committees of such recreational and cultural agencies as libraries, museums, community theaters and symphonies, and other leisure time organizations concerned with youth, with full privileges of membership within legal restrictions.

"Recreation programs, both public and private, make provisions for the troublesome youth and do not bar his or her participation because of occasional offenses or as permanent punishment; give such youth more than one chance to join an organized recreation program."

LEGAL

"All-out effort be made to clarify and strengthen laws concerning marriage, divorce, separation, annulment, and desertion and to move toward uniformity in law among the States.

"All States work toward uniform marriage and divorce laws and that more family relations courts be established and staffed with competent social workers, psychologists, and counselors.

"The use of jails and inadequately equipped and staffed adult mental hospitals for the housing and detention of emotionally disturbed children be condemned, and, separate adequately equipped and staffed facilities should be substituted."

RELATIONSHIP TO COMMUNITY

"Rural people should be encouraged to establish community service councils to study and apply the principles and techniques of community development with emphasis upon 'self-help' and the opportunity for employment of rural youth.

"Youth should be encouraged in their leisure time to participate in civic, social issues, and world affairs.

"Community agencies and organizations, both public and private, should plan cooperatively programs of leisure-time activity to secure optimum use of facilities and resources, including year-round and evening use of schools."

MISCELLANEOUS

"Expansion of the present USDA rural development program, and urge that State and community organizations participate fully in it.

"The salaries or fees of persons providing services to children and youth be commensurate with the training, skills, and experience and responsibility of the persons involved, and should be such in beginning amount, in range, in increments, and in fringe benefits to attract and retain sufficient numbers of competent personnel and be consistent with standards recommended by the respective professional organizations.

"All professions in health, education, and welfare should continually study changing needs and bring about corresponding changes in curricula needs in the preparation of such professions.

"Additional urgent emphasis should be given to the application of what we know or can find out to the prevention of conditions harmful to children and youth as a means of conserving personnel. Examples for action include urban renewal, fluoridation of public water supplies, parent education, and immunization.

"Child-serving interests in the community work together on a continuing basis to meet the unique needs of adolescents with programs to fit the needs of families and individual children, with emphasis on assisting parents rather than supplanting them in their primary responsibility for their children.

"Active programs should be locally implemented to improve relations between the civilian community and the military personnel.

"It is imperative that those working with youth operate democratically so that youth will learn the principles and practices of democracy through participation as well as by precept.

"Communities undertake the responsibility of establishing and increasing the services already in existence concerning youth employment opportunities, and that they actively publicize the existence of such services to the youth of the community."

Over 50 percent of the recommendations dealt with human rights.

A good way to close this summation of the President's White House Conference on Youth is to give you two proposals which repeated themselves in many forums:

"We reafirm the recommendations of the 1950 White House Conference that each State take steps to establish youth councils or committees. We also encourage youth to take the initiative in establishing these youth councils to initiate, coordinate, and extend youth activities and participation by individuals, both professional and lay, be urged to support such projects with funds, services and interest.

"We shall welcome leadership by political figures at all levels who recognize explicitly and support increased appropriations and taxation by equitable means to support the program development and expansion envisioned by this conference."

Pending Old-Age Health Benefit Legislation—How the States Would Share Federal Cost and Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Amendments of 1960 (H.R. 12580) include a proposed new title XVI of the Social Security Act which would authorize Federal payments to the States toward the cost of providing certain health-care benefits to elderly citizens classified as medically indigent.

Table "A" on page 11 of the committee report on H.R. 12580—House Report 1799—breaks down by States the estimated annual amounts of Federal funds which would become available to the States under the proposed title XVI for provision of medical services to the aged not covered by the old-age assistance program.

As we prepare to consider this legislation in the House, it is of interest to compare this breakdown with estimated State-by-State contributions to the Federal cost of the program as computed by the formula used by Tax Foundation, Inc., in its allocation of the Federal net budget tax burden, published in "Facts and Figures on Government Finance."

I include a table presenting these shares in rounded dollar amounts and percentages:

Estimated annual shares of the States in the Federal cost of the proposed medical services for the aged program (title XVI)

State	Percent of total estimated to be payable	Percent of Federal tax burden borne by State [1]	Federal share estimated to be payable	Estimated share of Federal cost borne by State [2]	State	Percent of total estimated to be payable	Percent of Federal tax burden borne by State [1]	Federal share estimated to be payable	Estimated share of Federal cost borne by State [2]
United States	100	100	$165,450,000	$165,450,000	Missouri	0.34	2.31	$567,000	$3,821,895
					Montana	.02	.31	35,000	512,895
Alabama	.02	.97	39,000	1,604,865	Nebraska	.88	.61	1,455,000	1,009,245
Alaska	.0006	.12	1,000	198,540	Nevada	.037	.20	62,000	330,900
Arizona	.008	.56	13,000	926,520	New Hampshire	.76	.32	1,264,000	529,440
Arkansas	.018	.45	29,000	744,525	New Jersey	8.84	4.28	14,624,000	7,081,260
California	4.8	10.39	7,956,000	17,190,255	New Mexico	.006	.37	10,000	612,165
Colorado	.29	.91	477,000	1,505,595	New York	30.76	13.56	50,885,000	22,435,020
Connecticut	4.8	2.20	7,992,000	3,639,900	North Carolina	.57	1.41	95,000	2,332,845
Delaware	.02	.60	38,000	992,700	North Dakota	.19	.22	314,000	363,990
District of Columbia	.086	.68	144,000	1,125,060	Ohio	3.32	5.85	5,501,000	9,678,825
Florida	.23	2.48	386,000	4,103,160	Oklahoma	.61	.99	102,000	1,637,955
Georgia	.009	1.31	15,000	2,167,395	Oregon	1.87	.86	3,101,000	1,422,870
Hawaii	.035	.30	59,000	496,350	Pennsylvania	2.81	7.22	4,655,000	11,945,490
Idaho	.021	.25	36,000	413,625	Rhode Island	.82	.53	1,355,000	876,885
Illinois	11.5	7.23	19,008,000	11,962,035	South Carolina	.0036	.61	6,000	1,009,245
Indiana	3.7	2.35	6,699,000	3,888,075	South Dakota	.0048	.21	8,000	347,445
Iowa	.14	1.15	241,000	1,902,675	Tennessee	.014	1.16	23,000	1,919,220
Kansas	1.0	.99	1,684,000	1,637,955	Texas	.097	4.34	161,000	7,180,530
Kentucky	.0097	1.09	16,000	1,803,405	Utah	.02	.36	39,000	595,620
Louisiana	.085	1.20	141,000	1,985,400	Vermont	.03	.18	55,000	297,810
Maine	.3	.43	488,000	711,435	Virginia	.41	1.68	679,000	2,779,560
Maryland	.72	1.90	1,196,000	3,143,550	Washington	2.85	1.54	4,718,000	2,547,930
Massachusetts	8.5	3.47	14,077,000	5,741,115	West Virginia	.087	.76	144,000	1,257,420
Michigan	2.0	4.74	3,227,000	7,842,330	Wisconsin	3.96	2.08	6,552,000	3,441,360
Minnesota	3.02	1.65	4,999,000	2,729,925	Wyoming	.044	.17	73,000	281,265
Mississippi	.004	.45	6,000	744,525					

[1] Based on allocation of the Federal net budget tax burden, Tax Foundation, Inc., formula.

[2] Tax Foundation, Inc., formula applied to estimated Federal cost of program.

The foregoing figures may have some interesting individual comparisons. Connecticut and California each will draw about $8 million for medical benefits, but Connecticut's share of the tax contribution is $3.6 million, whereas California's share is $17.19 million.

New Jersey contributes 4.28 percent of the tax burden, and Michigan contributes 4.74 percent of the same burden. Yet, New Jersey will receive 8.84 percent of the benefits and Michigan 2.0 percent.

Four States will receive more than half of the money payable for medical benefits:

	Percentage of benefits	Percentage of tax costs	Dollar benefits	Dollar tax cost
Connecticut	4.8	2.20	$7,992,000	$3,640,000
Massachusetts	8.5	3.47	14,077,000	5,741,000
New Jersey	8.84	4.28	14,624,000	7,081,000
New York	30.76	13.56	50,885,000	22,435,000
Total	52.90	23.51	87,578,000	38,897,000

Four other States which contribute in the tax burden about the same as the foregoing favored States receive a great deal less.

	Percentage of benefits	Percentage of tax costs	Dollar benefits	Dollar tax cost
California	4.8	10.39	$7,956,000	$17,190,000
Michigan	2.0	4.74	3,227,000	7,842,000
Ohio	3.32	5.85	5,501,000	9,679,000
Missouri	.34	2.31	567,000	3,821,000
Total	10.46	23.29	17,251,000	38,532,000

The six States of Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Wisconsin get 68.36 percent of the benefits while paying 41.01 percent of the proportionate taxes.

New York, which contributes 13.56 percent of the tax burden, receives 30.76 percent of the benefits, which, percentagewise, is more than nine times as much as 28 States and the District of Columbia, which receive a total of 3.35 percent of the benefits and contribute 28.24 percent of the taxes. New York gets $50,885,000 in benefits, whereas all 29 of these jurisdictions get $4,758,000 of benefits. The 29 are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Mighty Fleet Watches Over Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 18, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the President has just arrived at Taiwan from Manila at the center of a Navy task force. The Washington Evening Star for June 17, 1960, has a most informative article on this portion of his trip and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGHTY FLEET WATCHES OVER EISENHOWER—PRESIDENT STEAMS TOWARD FORMOSA ABOARD CRUISER

(By Marvin Arrowsmith)

En route with Eisenhower, June 17.—The mighty U.S. 7th Fleet kept an unflagging vigil today, ready to meet any Chinese Communist show of force as President Eisenhower steamed north toward the Nationalist Chinese island fortress of Formosa.

Vice Adm. Charles D. Griffin, commander of the fleet guarding Mr. Eisenhower, told newsmen the Chinese Reds "might well do something" in an attempt to further mar the President's Asian tour, already blighted by cancellation of his visit to Japan.

Admiral Griffin conceded there was no evidence so far of any unusual preparations for Communist mischiefmaking. But he added:

"We are ready and we would contemplate that the Chinese Communists might well do something. It is for this reason we have our fleet deployed this way."

UNHAPPY OVER CANCELLATION

Mr. Eisenhower slept late this morning aboard the heavy cruiser *St. Paul*, flagship of the fleet. He worked for awhile on his revised trip schedule, then planned an afternoon of relaxation. He had appeared weary and grim as he boarded the cruiser last last night in Manila Bay after his tremendous reception in the Philippines and the disappointing cancellation of his visit to Tokyo.

White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty told newsmen the President did not believe the blowup of his Tokyo visit had marred his prestige or hurt U.S. national interests. He has been in touch with the State Department but has received no messages thus far from U.S. congressional leaders, Mr. Hagerty added.

It was no secret, however, that Mr. Eisenhower was unhappy that he was not going to Japan because of Communist-inspired violence.

But he could look forward to an extremely warmhearted reception from the Chinese Nationalists and similar outpourings of friendship in South Korea. A steady rain was drenching Taipei, the Formosan capital, but thousands were hoping it would stop before tomorrow so they could greet their stanch ally.

DUE IN KOREA SUNDAY

Dropping of Japan from the itinerary caused revision in the President's tour plans.

Mr. Hagerty said Mr. Eisenhower will arrive in Korea on Sunday—3 days earlier than originally planned. He will spend more than 24 hours there instead of the 8 hours previously scheduled.

From Korea, the President's big jet will take him to Hawaii for several days and then on to Washington. Mr. Hagerty said the plane would refuel en route to Hawaii, but not in Japan. Presumably it will put down at Okinawa or Wake Island.

Weather permitting, a helicopter will whisk Mr. Eisenhower from the deck of the *St. Paul* to Taipei's Pine Hill Airport tomorrow to start his 24-hour Formosa visit. If rain continues on Formosa, the *St. Paul* will land the President at the port of Keelung, and he will be driven the 15 miles into Taipei.

The President spent the morning with his staff revamping his travel plans. Mr. Hagerty said he was calm and unruffled despite the international furor resulting from cancellation of his Japanese trip. Asked how Mr. Eisenhower felt about the turn of events, Mr. Hagerty replied:

"He expressed his attitude yesterday. He squarely placed the blame for the postponement of the Japanese trip on those elements controlled by the Communists under external (meaning Moscow and Peiping) direction and control."

Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II was reported to have sent the President quite a few cables telling of his latest talks with Japanese Government leaders.

Virtually the entire 7th Fleet—125 warships and 500 planes—was on patrol to guard Mr. Eisenhower as he sailed through the South China Sea toward Formosa. At one point on the 780-mile voyage, his route lay within 125 miles of Red China's coastline.

SPEEDING AT 30 KNOTS

Admiral Griffin, meeting with reporters in the wardroom of the escorting aircraft carrier *Yorktown*, proudly called his array of ships and planes "the mightiest peacetime navy the world has ever known."

Fighters from the *Yorktown* and the carrier *Ticonderoga* kept a round-the-clock vigil overhead as the *St. Paul* sped along at 30 knots. A shield of destroyers and radar planes hunted for any submarine intruders.

Admiral Griffin said the 30-knot speed was about twice as fast as his ships generally moved in the area.

"Speed is our best defense," he commented.

He declared that if any submarine made a hostile move or action, "we would do our best to destroy it under the circumstances."

But he explained later that in such case his first order would be for the *St. Paul* "to get out of here as fast as it could."

WARNING ON FLIGHTS

He said the only unusual development in recent days was an increase in warnings by Peiping against flights over the Paracel Islands. They are a tiny chain midway between the Philippines and Hainan Island, off the South China mainland. They are claimed by Red China, Nationalist China, and Vietnam.

He estimated Red China has 20 Soviet-built submarines in the Pacific but said only a few had been sighted. The Soviet Union, he added, keeps about 100 subs in the area and these were sighted often in international waters.

Manila returned slowly to normal today after President Eisenhower's 2½-day state visit—marked by the greatest outpouring of friendship and adulation ever showered on a guest.

Manila newspapers reflected the good will and affection for the United States that abounded in the wake of the visit.

FIRM UNDERSTANDING

The Manila Daily Bulletin said in its lead editorial:

"He leaves behind millions of friends whose understanding of America has been made all the more clear and firm because he has been here."

Said the Manila Times:

"Not the least of the benefits from the Eisenhower visit is the chance it gave both Filipinos and Americans to realize how deep is the friendship the two peoples share.

"The tumultuous acclaim for Eisenhower from all sectors of Filipino society • • • proves how false is the often-made charge that hatred for American has become a principle of Filipino thought and Philippine policies."

Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the attached article, by Donald C. McGraw, president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., one of a series prepared by the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics to help increase public knowledge and understanding of important nationwide developments:

RECENT ECONOMIC GROWTH—THE NUMBERS GAME

If it truly portrayed recent rates of economic growth in the United States, the report on employment, growth, and price levels recently issued by the staff of the Joint (congressional) Economic Committee would point up scarcely less than a national disaster. Among other things, it would document impressively Premier Khrushchev's crack that "the capitalist steed the United States is riding • • • is worn out."

One of the major findings of the Joint Committee's staff (in the Eckstein report, named for its staff director Otto Eckstein) is that between 1953 and 1959 the average rate of growth of physical output in the United States was only 2.4 percent per year. This is scarcely more than half the average annual rate of growth of 4.6 percent the staff found to have prevailed between 1947 and 1953.

Happily, however, the report does not reflect the basic economic realities. Its finding on relative rates of economic growth for the two periods is a statistical tour de force which, by the selection of certain figures and certain dates, distorts the record of America's long-term economic growth.

PLAYING THE NUMBERS GAME

By the selection of appropriate starting and terminal periods it is possible to document almost any rate of economic growth that is desired. The table at the bottom of this page shows you how this can be done. It will also show you how the Eckstein staff worked out its shocking contrast in growth rates. The table is built like a schedule of airplane fares between different cities. The postwar years 1946 through 1959 are put down on two axes. One runs down the left hand column, the other runs across the top of the table. Put your finger on the point where the two axes intersect and you have the average rate of growth for the period covered.

Annual average growth rates of the U.S. economy, 1946–59 [1]

[Percent increases, starting year to terminal year, of GNP in 1954 dollars]

Starting year	Terminal year													
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
1946	------	−0.1	−1.9	−1.2	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.7	3.6	3.4	2.9	3.2
1947	------	------	3.8	1.8	4.1	4.9	4.6	4.6	3.7	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.2	3.5
1948	------	------	------	−.1	4.2	5.3	4.8	4.7	3.6	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.1	3.4
1949	------	------	------	------	8.7	8.1	6.5	6.0	4.4	5.0	4.6	4.2	3.5	3.8
1950	------	------	------	------	------	7.4	5.4	5.1	3.4	4.3	3.9	3.6	2.9	3.3
1951	------	------	------	------	------	------	3.4	3.9	2.0	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.2	2.8
1952	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	4.4	1.3	3.6	3.2	2.9	2.0	2.6
1953	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	−1.6	3.2	2.8	2.6	1.6	2.4
1954	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	8.1	5.1	4.0	2.4	3.2
1955	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	2.1	2.0	.5	2.0
1956	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	1.8	−.2	2.0
1957	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	−2.3	2.0
1958	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	7.0
1959	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

[1] Compound rates of growth.

Following this procedure, you can find growth rates ranging all the way from −2.3 percent, between 1957 and 1958, to +8.7 percent, between 1949 and 1950, along with almost any other rate you would choose for various years and sequences of several years over the postwar period.

For example, if you want to demonstrate that the postwar growth rate through 1953 was less than 4 percent per year, you take off from 1946, include a drop of 0.1 percent between 1946 and 1947, and come up with a growth rate for the 1946–53 period of 3.9 percent. But if you want to show it was quite high, you take off a year later, from 1947 (which drops out that dismal −0.1 percent for 1947) and come up with a fine growth rate of 4.6 percent for the 1947–53 years.

STATISTICAL HOCUS-POCUS

That's what the Eckstein staff did. It took off at one end from a year when there was just about no growth, went to the Korean war boom year of 1953 at the other end, and got that average growth rate of 4.6 percent. Then it took off from the Korean war boom year of 1953 and ran to the year 1959, when business was recovering from a recession and suffered through a steel strike of 116 days, to come up with its 2.4 percent growth rate for the second postwar period. As the table indicates, by taking off a year later (1954) the average growth rate would have become 3.2 percent, and if the take-off had been 1949 it would have been 3.8 percent.

There are those who, in nontechnical terms, would characterize this as statistical hocus-pocus. There are also those who would see in it an element of political hocus-pocus, too. This is because the years 1947–53, when the Eckstein staff found there had been the healthy 4.6-percent growth rate, were roughly years when we had a Democratic President, while the anemic growth rate of 2.4 percent it calculated for the subsequent years was for years of a Republican Presidency.

Actually it can be shown that the civilian part of our economy has had more rapid growth during the Republican administration than it had during the Democratic years. If military expenditures are subtracted from the national output, the resulting growth rate for 1953 to 1959 is slightly higher than for 1947 to 1953.

However, we do not question the bona fides of the Eckstein staff. But we do assert that it has produced a statistical picture of the postwar growth of the American economy which is dangerously misleading both at home and abroad.

Abroad, the report appears to give official documentation to the propaganda line that the Soviet economy is running rings around the U.S. economy in growth, and that it is communism a country should choose if it really wants to develop rapidly. Building on a much smaller economic base than the United States of America, the Soviet Union—as well as almost every less advanced nation in the world—is bound to show a larger percentage increase in output than the United States of America. But the Eckstein staff calculation gives the Communists ammunition they don't deserve.

ARE WE FACING A CRISIS?

The contrast drawn by the Joint Committee staff in postwar U.S. growth rates suggests that we are facing scarcely less than a crisis through paralysis of our economic growth which calls for drastic remedies. But this, as the full 1947 to 1959 growth record set forth in the table makes clear, is very definitely not the case. Our overall postwar rate of growth, as measured by the gross national product in physical terms, has been 3.5 percent per year, a rate nearly double the long-term growth rate of 2 percent per year between 1909 and 1939. In the continuing fluctuations in the rate of growth which more or less inevitably characterize a relatively free economy, we have had some downs in recent years. But our economy is now on the upbeat again. And at the end of this year, the U.S. economic growth rate for the postwar period can be expected to be 3.7 percent per year.

It is extremely important for the United States to continue to maintain this rate of economic growth or even to surpass it. Upon this effort depends our capacity to meet our defense requirements without dangerous strain, to provide an adequate margin for foreign aid, to improve our own productive facilities, and to continue to raise our own standard of living.

How not only to maintain but possibly improve upon our postwar pace of economic growth will be the subject of strenuous debate in the months ahead. However, the debate will have a much better chance of being constructive if the postwar growth record is seen in proper perspective. To this end one of the first things to do is to junk panic rousing statistical portrayals such as that in the Eckstein report.

National Space Sovereignty Dogs World Legal Circles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the exploration of space requires of man a new perspective—an ability to extend his thinking beyond the known frontiers, to the unknows of outer space.

To meet the challenge, our scientists and technologists are creatively producing instruments and vehicles for space exploration.

As man explores the new frontier, however, a great many complex problems emerge. Within legal circles, for example, new and serious questions on the operations of vehicles occur, such as: "Where, and how, may satellites and other space vehicles travel without violating the national territories and air space?"

In determining the boundaries of national sovereignty, such additional questions arise as: "How high is up? How far upward does national sovereignty extend? Where does air space end, and outer space begin?"

As the nations of the world move forward in exploring and operating in space, it will be ultimately necessary to find answers for these questions.

Why? To assure protection of national rights and interests in rights; to prevent conflicts of interest, without a foundation of laws or regulations upon which to determine those interests; to prevent misinterpretation of the intention of flights; for example, the ability to know whether a space vehicle may be aloft for military or peaceful purposes.

Despite these complex questions, in the absence of guidelines, the nations of the world, somehow, someway, will need to find more and more answers, to assure orderly utilization of, and protection, of rights within, the areas of outer space.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an informative article by Nobuo Abiko, reviewing a few of the challenges in this field. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 16, 1960]

NATIONAL SPACE SOVEREIGNTY DOGS WORLD LEGAL CIRCLES

(By Nobuo Abiko)

How high is up?

How far upward does national sovereignty extend?

Where does air space end and outer space begin?

These are but some of the many complex questions which promise to demand the increasing attention of international lawyers in the days ahead.

The questions, however, are not new ones.

Although the much-publicized U–2 plane incident has probably served to dramatize the issue, the problem of a legal regime of space is one which legal circles have been discussing for some time.

U.S. VIOLATION SEEN

In fact, the one clear legal question involved in the U–2 flight—the alleged U.S. violation of Soviet air space—already appears to be obsolescent. Legal consensus regarding the question seems unanimous.

"Without exception," says a professor at the Harvard Law School, "we would say the United States violated international law in flying the U–2 over the Soviet Union."

If the matter were referred to an international tribunal, comments Roger Fisher, lecturer on law, "we would get an adverse decision."

Professor Fisher explains that legal precedent for such a decision lies in a long series of mutually tolerated acts and implicit agreements among nations which by now have hardened into customary law.

As far back as the Paris convention of 1919, states in the international community were arriving at the conclusion that "every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory."

One legal writer even asserted that such sovereignty reaches "to an unlimited height."

The Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed at Chicago in 1944—which many consider the basic text of the legal status of air space—made little if any change in the stipulations of the Paris convention.

In fact, annexes to both conventions, as Professor Fisher points out, defined aircraft as "machines which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air."

Coming in an era when sputniks, satellites, and other man-made space craft were but wild dreams of scientists, the Chicago convention made no effort to distinguish between air space and outer space. Indeed, there was no need to.

Present-day rereading of the Chicago convention, therefore, assumes that air space—in the absence of a clear definition—designates those parts of the atmosphere where the gaseous air is sufficiently dense to support airplanes and balloons.

It further assumes national air sovereignty to be limited to those areas.

FIRST SPUTNIK LAUNCHED

It was, of course, the electrifying launching of the first sputnik on October 4, 1957, that shocked international lawyers into a serious study of the distinction between air space and outer space.

Previously, however, developments on the international scene had given them some direction for their deliberations.

In 1956, the United States, followed shortly by the Soviet Union, announced programs of planned satellite flights in conjunction with the International Geophysical Year.

Neither nation, however, Professor Fisher comments, felt it necessary to ask formal permission of other countries in order to place the proposed satellites into orbit—orbits which would pass over the territory of these other countries.

And no country recorded objections to these planned flights.

"If, on the first flight, someone had protested," says Professor Fisher, "that would have been one question."

In the absence of any protest, says the professor, "one can say that there is worldwide recognition that it is not a violation of law to send scientific satellites up in the air."

A well-known expert on international air law, Prof. John C. Cooper of McGill University, Montreal, has put the matter succinctly. In an address delivered in November 1957, he declared:

"International conduct since the satellite flights were first announced is consistent with no theory other than the acceptance of the principle that 'outer space' is not part of the territory of any state and may be used by all states as freely as the high seas are now used for surface shipping."

The task for international law for some time has been to define the boundary between territorial air space and universal outer space. The urgency of the task, of course, has been heightened by the recent launching of the U.S. Midas, early warning satellite and continued testing of other military satellites.

WHERE TO DRAW LINE?

But how and where to draw the line?

Legal thinking has offered several proposals.

Some legal writers have suggested basing an arbitrary horizontal boundary on a supposed physical constant, such as "the point where the earth's gravitational effect ceases."

Others have sought to determine the height at which there ceases to be enough air to support aircraft.

Still others have talked in terms of the actual physical control which any nation can exert over space. In other words, the top limit of air space would be the greatest height at which any national can effectively control space due to its scientific and technological progress.

The difficulty of dividing space into fixed boundaries, Professor Fisher says, has forced many legalists to turn from the question of physical boundaries to that of activities.

This approach itself runs into the necessity of delicate judgments. For it would require lawyers to distinguish "peaceful" or "scientific" satellite ventures from "military" ones.

COMPLEXITY INCREASES

The assumption is that the former would be legal. On the other hand, as Professor Fisher puts it, "no matter how high up it is, a satellite using your territory for military purposes would be deemed in violation of international law."

The complexity of the scientific-military criterion is immeasurably increased by what some writers have termed "the extraordinary interdependence of scientific, military, commercial, and other objectives that may be advanced by the same activities in space."

Los Angeles County Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a letter dated June 14, 1960, from the Bureau of the Census, Regional Operating Office, Los Angeles, Calif., with accompanying figures. It itemizes the population as just determined by the 1960 decennial population and housing census of the major cities and towns in Los Angeles County, in which the great 23d Congressional District is located.

The material follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
REGIONAL OPERATING OFFICE,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 14, 1960.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: The 1960 Decennial Population and Housing Census is now completed and we take pleasure in presenting you with the attached copies of the preliminary census count for the city and county of Los Angeles, Calif.

These preliminary figures are subject to some revision when the official count is released later this year by the Washington, D.C. office of the Census Bureau.

Very sincerely yours,

LEONARD C. ISLEY,
Regional Field Director,
Bureau of the Census.

CENSUS COUNT FOR LOS ANGELES CITY, 1960

The population of the city of Los Angeles is 2,451,862 according to preliminary results of the 1960 Census of Population announced today by the Los Angeles regional office, Bureau of the Census. This represents an increase of 481,504, or 24.4 percent, over the 1950 census count of 1,970,358. It is an increase of 207,961, or 9.3 percent, over the 1956 special population census count of 2,243,901. According to these figures the rate of growth has increased from about 46,000 per year during 1950 to 1956, to about 52,000 per year for the past 4 years. The preliminary 1960 figure is based on field counts and is subject to some revision when the official count is released later this year by the Washington, D.C. office of the Bureau.

PRELIMINARY 1960 CENSUS COUNTS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY

The population of Los Angeles County is 5,987,246 according to preliminary results of the 1960 Census of Population announced today by the Los Angeles regional office of the Bureau of the Census. This represents an increase of 1,835,559, or 44.2 percent, over the 1950 census count of 4,151,687. This preliminary 1960 figure is based on field counts and is subject to revision.

Of the total county population, 4,890,101, or 81.7 percent, resided within the 68 incorporated cities as of April 1, 1960. Attached is a tabulation showing the distribution of the 1960 preliminary population for all incorporated places together with available figures from the 1950 Decennial Census and more recent special population censuses conducted by the Bureau of the Census. This table also shows that 1,097,145 persons were counted in the unincorporated areas of the county.

Los Angeles County, 1960 preliminary population, 1960 decennial census

City	1950 population	Latest special population census		1960 census preliminary count
		Date	Population	
Alhambra	51,359	Sept. 25, 1953	53,558	54,464
Arcadia	23,066	Jan. 12, 1957	37,271	41,044
Artesia				10,013
Avalon	1,506			1,536
Azusa	11,042	Dec. 31, 1956	18,579	20,350
Baldwin Park		Dec. 7, 1957	32,334	33,608
Bell	15,430	July 1, 1957	18,415	19,371
Bellflower				45,609
Beverly Hills	29,032	May 11, 1956	30,443	30,563
Bradbury				613
Burbank	78,577	May 7, 1957	90,966	89,764
Claremont	6,327	Apr. 15, 1958	10,651	12,641
Commerce				8,840
Compton	47,991	Mar. 7, 1955	63,670	70,882
Covina	3,956	Apr. 28, 1958	16,890	19,864
Culver City	19,720	Jan. 19, 1956	31,367	31,870
Duarte				13,914
Dairy Valley		Nov. 27, 1957	3,931	3,505
Downey				83,828
El Monte	8,101	Oct. 10, 1957	11,507	12,861
El Segundo	8,011	Nov. 14, 1957	13,778	14,014
Gardena	14,405	Sept. 12, 1957	30,576	35,885
Glendale	95,702	Oct. 22, 1957	114,460	118,330
Glendora	3,988	May 15, 1957	15,033	22,155
Hawthorne	16,316	Nov. 20, 1957	31,504	33,204
Hermosa Beach	11,826	Nov. 23, 1955	15,274	16,123
Huntington Park	29,450	June 11, 1958	29,495	29,687
Industry				734
Inglewood	46,185	Nov. 7, 1957	61,001	62,811
Irwindale		Feb. 28, 1959	1,649	1,320
Lakewood				67,023
La Puente		May 4, 1957	20,066	24,386
La Verne	4,198	Jan. 7, 1958	5,907	6,474
Lawndale				21,903
Long Beach	250,767			323,996
Los Angeles City	1,970,358	Feb. 25, 1956	2,243,901	2,451,862
Lynwood	25,823	Nov. 4, 1953	28,124	31,172
Manhattan Beach	17,330	Aug. 15, 1957	32,535	33,745
Maywood	13,292	Apr. 29, 1953	13,483	14,551
Mirada Hills				22,368
Montebello	21,735	Sept. 5, 1957	30,019	32,089
Monterey Park	20,395	Mar. 24, 1958	33,045	37,573
Monrovia	20,186	June 5, 1957	25,286	27,555
Norwalk				88,643
Palos Verdes Estates	1,963	May 20, 1958	8,416	11,238
Paramount		Nov. 22, 1957	25,127	26,552
Pasadena	104,577			114,942
Pico Rivera				49,078
Pomona	35,405	May 12, 1958	62,138	66,587
Redondo Beach	25,226	Aug. 17, 1956	41,723	46,810
Rolling Hills				1,659
Rolling Hills Estates				3,932

Los Angeles County, 1960 preliminary population, 1960 decennial census—Continued

City	1950 population	Latest special population census		1960 census preliminary count
		Date	Population	
Rosemead				15,015
San Fernando	12,992	Oct. 13, 1956	15,668	16,039
San Gabriel	20,343	Sept. 22, 1954	21,755	22,458
San Marino	11,230	Apr. 21, 1954	12,924	13,486
Santa Fe Springs				16,351
Santa Monica	71,595	Nov. 4, 1953	75,132	82,845
Sierra Madre	7,273	May 15, 1956	8,752	9,669
Signal Hill	4,040	Jan. 12, 1958	4,592	4,608
South El Monte				4,822
South Gate	51,116	Nov. 10, 1952	51,293	53,521
South Pasadena	16,935	Sept. 17, 1957	18,881	19,357
Torrance	22,241	Apr. 25, 1959	96,993	100,603
Vernon	432			228
Walnut				974
West Covina	4,499	May 16, 1959	47,486	51,605
Whittier	23,820	Apr. 4, 1956	32,217	34,976
Total, all cities				4,890,101
Total unincorporated				1,097,145
Total, Los Angeles County	4,151,687			5,987,246

The Important Participation Which Louisiana Had in the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to incorporate at this point in the RECORD an address recently delivered under the auspices of the Louisiana Society of the Sons of the American Revolution by the distinguished Louisianian, Hugh M. Wilkinson of the New Orleans bar.

The title of the speech is "The Important Participation Which Louisiana Had in the American Revolution." I found the address of tremendous interest and I think other people in our country will also have interest in these historic facts which have not been too well publicized in our country.

I commend Mr. Wilkinson's address to the attention of all of our Members. Mr. Wilkinson himself is a member of a famous American Revolutionary family.

The address follows:

THE IMPORTANT PARTICIPATION WHICH LOUISIANA HAD IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Very appropriate, and most timely, is the use of the theme selected for this dinner meeting, and carried out in the program, by these lovely decorations and place-favors, and especially by the colors chosen. Here we see, in brilliant combination, the crimson derived from the lions rampant on the escutcheon of Leon, with the gold of the triple towers of Castile, heraldic symbolism dating back beyond the voyages of Columbus and coloring predominant in the flags and standards of our revolutionary ally, Spain.

I emphasize that this is indeed a timely tribute, because 179 years ago this week, on Sunday the 18th day of March, in the year 1781, there was performed one of the most gallant, one of the most heroic feats in all American history—but a heroism, I am sorry to point out, which has never had adequate recognition by historians of the American Revolution.

The scene of this act of gallantry was the broad channel of the sea pass leading from the Gulf of Mexico, between the western extremity of Santa Rosa Island and the Florida mainland, and connecting the gulf with the lower Pensacola bay.

In this area, supported by a fleet of transports and ships of war from Havana, Bernardo de Galvez, the 33-year-old Spanish Governor of Louisiana, had invested the well-fortified city of Pensacola, principal British port and military headquarters on the Gulf of Mexico during the American Revolution, and a haven of refuge for many Tories, who had fled from the Atlantic Colonies.

Having captured from our enemy, after Spain entered the war in 1779, the posts of Manchac, Baton Rouge, Natchez, and Mobile, Galvez once before, by a hurricane, had been turned back from this, his most important military objective of Pensacola.

And now Captain Calbo, the senior naval officer from Havana, jeopardized the fortunes of this expedition by refusing to order his vessels to cross the bar and enter the uncharted pass in the face of the artillery fire of the British fort which the Spaniards called Barrancas Coloradas, or Red Cliffs.

The delay threatened disaster. By amphibious landings, Galvez's soldiers had already been put ashore on Santa Rosa Island, and if, in that unpredictable season of the year, an equinoctial storm blew up, and drove the supporting fleet away from the coast, those men would be left destitute of munitions or food, and, in such circumstances, could fall easy prey to the British defenders and their savage host of Creek Indian auxiliaries.

In this tactical dilemma, Governor Galvez asserted his habitual enterprise and daring. Captain Calbo, it was true, was in command of the navigation of the Havana naval contingent; but, fortunately, Governor Galvez had complete authority over four comparatively small craft from Louisiana; two armed launches, a sloop, and the brig *Galveztown*.

After first bitterly taunting his naval colleague for the latter's reluctance to force the passage into the bay, Galvez ran up a broad pennant on the *Galveztown* and fired a salute of 15 guns so that no one, friend or enemy, would have any doubt who was aboard the brig.

It was a bold gesture of defiance to the British artillerymen, a dramatic touch borrowed from feudal times, when each Spanish knight sought to carry his own colors high and into the thick of the battle.

Thus, with his flags and standards flying, his crews stationed as though on dress parade, himself and his staff in the most exposed posture, Galvez sailed this little Louisiana squadron through the vigorous cannonade from the Barrancas Coloradas, and brought his ships safely to the weather-protected anchorage of the lower bay in the lee of Santa Rosa Island.

Then it was, as Professor Chambers in his history tells us that the Spanish naval commander "came to realize that inaction meant dishonor; that this young and provincial commander was winning for himself the fanatic adoration of his men and the undying glory which heroic courage, dramatically displayed, is ever ready to confer" (Henry E. Chambers, "History of Louisiana," p. 333).

The next day, therefore, the Havana ships likewise safely ran the gauntlet of the Barrancas fort's fire. The necessary stores and supplies were landed, the siege carried forward, and after about 7 more weeks the British commander, General Campbell, surrendered Pensacola to Galvez on May 10, 1781, which was just 5 months and 8 days before the capitulation of General Cornwallis to a Franco-American attack at Yorktown, Va., concluded the War for American Independence.

Substantial tokens of the Spanish King's appreciation of the heroic conduct of Bernardo de Galvez quickly followed the subjugation of the important British Province of West Florida.

Carlos III made Galvez a count, promoted him to the rank of lieutenant general, and conferred on him the commission of Governor of West Florida, as well as Louisiana.

And finally, "to perpetuate for posterity," as the royal order read, "the memory of the heroic action in which you alone forced the entrance of the bay, you may place as the crest on your coat of arms the brig 'Galveztown' with the motto 'Yo Solo.'"

Yo Solo: I alone.

What more impressive testimonial to the courage and determination of a splendid leader, a gallant soldier, a dashing and romantic figure of Louisiana's colonial history—but, alas, a man who in the prime of his life, 5 years after the event I have described, perished at the age of only 38, from yellow fever, while continuing to serve his King as viceroy of Mexico.

My time to speak will not permit of a review in detail of the several military campaigns, during the American Revolution, of Galvez and his brave Louisianians, many of them ancestors of members of these Louisiana chapters of the DAR.

I prefer to take as my text this one act of conspicuous gallantry at Pensacola, and from that text to ask the question: Why is it that every American schoolchild is taught such things as, for example, what John Paul Jones said about "I have just begun to fight;" but there is little or no popular education, in Louisiana, or elsewhere, regarding Galvez's heroism in forcing the entrance to Pensacola bay?

John Paul Jones, in the exploit for which he is given his greatest fame, captured a whole British province, and did it at a time when such attrition was weighing heavily against Britain's ability to reinforce Cornwallis in Virginia, and thus continue the war.

And yet, in all but local history books, that valuable contribution, by Louisianians, to the victorious termination of the War for American Independence, is persistently ignored.

In the historical accounts which were chronicled on the Atlantic seaboard, of the progress and events of the American Revo-

lution, there would seem to have been a conspiracy of silence against anything connected with the Revolution that occured or originated in Louisiana.

Fame, perhaps, is more a consequence of able propaganda than reliable historical fact. Witness the South Carolina epic of the sergeant named Jasper, who replaced a flag on the parapet of Fort Moultrie; New Jersey's Molly Pitcher, who was said to have served a cannon when her husband suffered a sunstroke during the Battle of Monmouth; the Philadelphia myth of Betsy Ross and the first flag; Paul Revere's poetic credit for a nocturnal horseback ride which a man named Prescott actually completed; the familiar painting of George Washington in the unlikely position of standing up in a rowboat buffeted by a snowstorm on the Delaware River.

Americans also are taught that Robert Morris of Philadelphia financed the American Revolution; and that France smuggled supplies to the patriot armies through Beaumarchais, author of the "Barber of Seville."

But how often do we read of similar Spanish help dispatched from New Orleans? Or how often is credit given by historians to the New Orleans merchant Oliver Pollock, who pauperized himself shipping Spanish gunpowder up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Virginia's troops of the Continental Line, and by underwriting personally the expenses of George Rogers Clark's conquest, from the British, of the huge territory now comprising Ohio, Indiana and Illinois?

It is perhaps quite a compliment, to the substance and integrity of this Louisiana businessman of those early days, that the traders of the Illinois district, from whom Clark had to purchase supplies to sustain his army, were unwilling to receive from him the paper money of the Continental Congress, but readily accepted drafts in any amount that he drew on Oliver Pollock at New Orleans.

In a biography of Pollock, published about 20 years ago, Professor James Alton James of Northwestern University said that in providing the financial support for the winning of the West by Clark, this New Orleanian, Pollock, made "the greatest money contribution of any individual to the Revolutionary cause."

And yet Robert Morris of Philadelphia generally gets the credit in the Yankee history books for being the great financier of the American Revolution.

Pollock himself perhaps put his finger on the sore spot when, in a plea to the President of Congress for reimbursement, some time after the victory had been won, he wrote:

"It has not been my fortune to move on a splendid theater, where the weary actor frequently finds in the applause of his audience new motives to exertion.

"I dwelt in an obscure corner of the universe alone and unsupported."

Separated, by hundreds of miles of Indian-infested wilderness, or equally hazardous ocean waters, from the then centers of publicity and propaganda on the Atlantic seaboard, Louisiana was a redheaded stepchild in the sisterhood of American communities. Her aid and assistance in the American Revolution was most valuable where and when it was worst needed, but seems to have been speedily forgotten when the time arrived for giving out the medals, the bouquets, and most important, the historical and literary credits.

But there is no reason why these educational slights and oversights should continue to be tolerated.

As I occasionally travel in the United States, or talk to visitors from other sections who come here, I am appalled at the almost universal ignorance—and often among people of a cultural background who should know better—concerning the important part which Louisiana played in the American Revolution.

In fact, due to what I think are deficiencies in our own method of requiring the teaching of the comparative history of the period, the average Louisianian, young and old, is not much better informed on the subject than are persons domiciled elsewhere.

There is no task, in my humble opinion, more important, to which the Louisiana chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution can dedicate themselves[1] than an unceasing and untiring educational campaign, to make the people of America, and essentially the people of Louisiana, teach, know, and understand that Louisiana did have a participation in the American Revolution, and how important that participation actually was.

The general society, admittedly, took a great, practical stride in this direction when it provided for the admission of descendants of the soldiers of Galvez; but there still remains much to be done, with the aid of its Louisiana chapters, toward achieving for Louisiana her proper status in the Nation's correct and accepted historical accounts of the Revolutionary period.

The American Revolution, we must understand, was more than just a war. It was one of the effects—as the revolution later in France was another—of a great sociological movement, for which mankind was ripe and ready by the middle of the 18th century, and which provoked consequences, in Europe and in America, that were not stabilized for several generations afterward.

As John Adams once expressed it: "The Revolution was effected before the war commenced. The Revolution was in the hearts and minds of the people."

The era of enlightenment, so-called, which preceded the outbreak of the War for Independence, furnished its intellectual nourishment, and these sources were as available—perhaps more available—to Louisianians, as to persons in the English colonies. Writings of Voltaire, Montesquieu and Jean Jacques Rousseau on the European continent, and of John Locke in England, were then being widely read and studied, and influenced the arguments and documents of the revolutionary upsurge which soon took place across the Atlantic.

To this reaching for political freedom, the French and Indian War was the curtain-raiser, and the War of 1812 was the epilogue. It was a process of social adjustment which embraced more than half a century. The cycle can well be said to have started with Wolfe's conquest of Quebec in 1759, and to have finally run down when Pakenham's failure to capture New Orleans in 1815 demonstrated the futility of further attempts at monarchial aggression in North America, and thereby set the final seal of military confirmation and ratification on our continental solidarity achieved by the Louisiana Purchase.

At the height of his power, Louis XIV, the Grand Monarch of France, had laid out a fortified arc from Quebec to New Orleans, contemplating the overall strategy of confining England's Thirteen Colonies between the Allegheny ridge and the Atlantic beaches.

But Wolfe's brilliant reduction of the northern bastion of this line severed Canada from Louisiana, and gave George III, ridden by war debts, the political latitude to so abuse by taxations, and restrictions the economy of his American subjects, that, within a decade and a half, they were provoked to rebellion.

Contemporaneously, cession to Spain of thousands of French subjects in Louisiana, like a sale of cattle, fostered a rebellious spirit on the Mississippi which Spanish ruthlessness, in 1769, put down for a time, but never stamped out the spark.

Louisiana French colonials and English colonials, who had opposed each other at the headwaters of the Ohio between 1753 and 1758 in the French and Indian War, made common cause against the British king in the Revolution from 1779 to 1781—under Washington and Lafayette and Rochambeau on the Atlantic shore, and under the Spaniard Galvez on the lower Mississippi and the coast of Florida.

And, finally, it was French and Spanish Creoles together, with Anglos from Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky, who, shoulder to shoulder, delivered the coup de grace at Chalmette in 1815 to lingering British pretensions of reviving Louis XIV's grand strategy of encirclement, by means of a new British colonial empire based on the ancient fortified line from New Orleans via Detroit to Quebec.

Louisiana was therefore, at all times, very much a part of this revolution in America.

At the beginning, she was part of those events which precipitated its causes.

Her soldiers served in the French forces which ably defended the forks of the Ohio, now the site of Pittsburgh against the successive expeditions of Washington, Braddock, and Forbes.

The names of Jumonville and Coulon, for example, are well known among Louisiana colonial families.

Jumonville de Villiers was killed by Washington's troops near the Monongahela in 1754, and his brother, Coulon de Villiers, avenged him by capturing Washington in Fort Necessity on July 4 of that year—the only man to whom the Father of his Country was ever obliged to yield his sword and put pen to terms of surrender.

Aubry, the last French Governor of Louisiana before the Spanish cession, was recommended for the Cross of St, Louis for repulsing a British attack on Fort Duquesne in 1758; and when, for lack during the Seven Years War in Europe of adequate support from across the seas, the Louisiana Colonials had to abandon Fort Duquesne, Captain Aubry brought his troops safely to New Orleans.

Louisiana was likewise closely concerned in the effects of the revolutionary process in America.

A population which had lived under the French flag, amidst colonizing privations and hardships of decades, did not receive agreeably the news that Louis XV had tossed Louisiana way to Spain so unceremoniously; and let us observe the interesting parallel of events, on the Mississippi and in the Thirteen English Colonies, which followed.

By the time the first Spanish Governor, Ulloa, arrived, in 1766, at New Orleans, George III had attempted to impose on his American subjects the obnoxious stamp tax, and Patrick Henry had voiced his famous speech, reminding the British monarch of the fates of Tarquin, Julius Caesar, and Charles I.

In those days Louisiana also had its Patrick Henry.

He was the colonial attorney general, Nicolas Chauvin de Lafreniere, and it was his oratory that aroused the Louisianians in 1768 to resist, by force and violence, the transfer of Louisiana to Spain.

In Virginia, a 1,000 miles away, Henry was then asserting the doctrine of government by compact between the people and their ruler, and that a violation of the compact by one party had the legal effect of discharging the other. A king, by injustice, he affirmed, from being the father of his people degenerated into a tyrant, and forfeited all right to the obedience of his subjects.

Compare that philosophy with Lafreniere's speech to the Superior Council at New Orleans on October 29, 1768, as quoted by the historian Gayarre (vol. II, p. 208).

---

[1] The same observation can be applied to the Louisiana compatriots of the SAR.

"In proportion," said Lafreniere, "to the extent both of commerce and population, is the solidity of thrones; both are fed by liberty and competition, which are the nursing mothers of the state, of which the spirit of monopoly is the tyrant and stepmother. Without liberty there are but few virtues. Despotism breeds pusillanimity, and deepens the abyss of vices. Man is considered as sinning before God, only because he retains his free will."

Strong sentiments were these in the 1760's, whether addressed by Henry to the absolute monarchy of England, or by Lafreniere to the absolute monarchy of Spain.

And when a mission to Paris failed, in the desperate efforts of the Louisianians to petition Louis XV to rescind his cession to Carlos III, Lafreniere and his associates formulated the plan of a republic on the banks of the Mississippi. Even the historian Gayarre, who, because of his Spanish lineage, favored the Castilian annexation, admits the existence of this early republican movement in Louisiana, and he has said: "There is no doubt that the colonists would have eagerly adopted this form of government, had it been possible at the time, for it must be recollected that, from the earliest existence of the colony, almost all its governors had uniformly complained of the republican spirit which they had observed in the inhabitants" (vol. II, p. 281).

Writing many more years after the event, the French-descended historian, Fortier, said: "Our ancestors were evidently mistaken in their noble efforts, and their plan was but a dream; for how were they to resist the power of the King of Spain?

"But they gave Louisiana the glory," Professor Fortier exulted "of having thought of establishing a republican form of government in America several years before Jefferson wrote his immortal Declaration of Independence, which gave birth to our United States" (vol. 1, p. 208).

The first Spanish Governor's expulsion from Louisiana, in the revolution headed by Lafreniere, took place at New Orleans exactly 1 month after red-coated soldiers were quartered by George III on the citizens of Boston to try to intimidate his colonists in America.

Carlos III of Spain acted against the Louisianians with even greater ruthlessness. He sent General O'Reilly, with an overpowering military force, and on October 25, 1769, almost 1 year after Lafreniere's inspiring speech, the attorney general and four of his compatriots, for having advocated the same principles of human rights and liberty upon which our American Revolution was founded, were executed in New Orleans by a firing squad in a barracks yard next to the Ursulines Chapel, where their sorrowing kindred heard the volley that killed them, while the sisters of the order attempted to comfort their grief.

A little over 4 months later, on March 7, 1770, the musketry fire of British soldiers killed other American martyrs in what we known as the Boston massacre.

A year after that, in 1771, occurred the rebellion in North Carolina of the "regulators," for which six victims were condemned to death by the Royal Governor. The last words uttered by one of these doomed patriots can well be applied to such sacrifices as were thus being made in the cause of freedom throughout North America.

"Our blood," he said, "will be as good seed in the ground."

The blood of the Louisianians, Lafreniere, Villere, Marquis, Milhet, Noyan, and Caresse, mingled as "good seed in the ground" with that of patriots who made the supreme sacrifice in Boston, in North Carolina, and later at Lexington, Saratoga, Yorktown, and everywhere that men have stood up and fought and died for what they believed was right.

This heroic French colonial, Lafreniere, expounding in Louisiana the same fundamental principles of human dignity and individual freedom as Patrick Henry was asserting then in Virginia—but which brought to Lafreniere death instead of liberty—was a shining example in our American revolutionary era of the fact that the virtue of patriotism is not bounded by nationality nor circumscribed by sectionalism, and that Louisiana was indeed in the forefront of America's political awakening which history calls the American Revolution.

Lafreniere, the martyr: our first evangelist of freedom, from whom came the inspiration.

Pollock, the benefactor: whose unbounded generosity sustained the revolutionary cause.

And Galvez, the soldier: the personification of gallantry in action, the commander of Louisiana's military contribution to the War for Independence.

What monuments to these three have a grateful people reared?

What garlands have we hung on their memories?

Or how forgotten have we let them be?

Daughters of the American Revolution in Louisiana: There were, of course, many others who as devotedly served the cause, but these are the symbols—these were the three stalwarts of that period in our colony's history which your Society represents.

Teach America what they did; and you tell the story for all.

Urge unceasingly the true record of their service, and it must follow, as night shall follow day, that our posterity will better appreciate the extent of the important participation in the American Revolution which Louisiana had.

The Social Security Inverted Pyramid—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks conclude the analysis of the social security program by W. Rulon Williamson, original actuary of the Social Security Board:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE CONGRESS

(By W. Rulon Williamson, research actuary)

THE 1960 SCENE AGAIN

The Forand bill, the White House Conferences' concern with youth and aging, the three congressional committees—the Ways and Means, the Senate Finance, the Labor, and Public Welfare—engaged in study, have as yet evolved no clear definition of the scope and limitations of the American welfare state—the Federal takeover of personal responsibility for a citizen's own welfare and that of his family.

To me it is clear that the more interference, and dictation, the less freedom; the more subsidy, the less self-reliance; the bigger the State promises, the less the personal equity; the bigger the handout checks, the bigger the mortgage on the common property.

When the proponents of bills that call relief by fancy names demand adding medical care handouts to something called insurance, and say it is tested and tried, but leave out the phrase "and found wanting," I am willing to admit ignorance as an excuse. But were I—knowing what I do about these systems—to remain silent, I lack that excuse. We cannot know what men who biennially promise more and more benefits, with a deferred steady rise in taxes in the future, will continue to do to this beleaguered system.

Director Stans has outlined other built-in rising tax demanders. All of his items taken together seem less than this one item of OASI accrual. In the inflated values of today I expect our goods and chattels may top a trillion dollars—perhaps $1.2 trillion. I seem to remember a built-up mortgage of $750 billion without the OASI item. Were this $650 billion (with a $30 billion annual extra as we move along) added, it would seem to be a possible $1.4 trillion mortgage against a $1.3 trillion property. This is, of course, a fantastic situation—but no parliamentary body should have that amount of responsibility.

PERORATION

I contend that in thinking along these lines, for the 1960 legislators, apprised by their own instincts of the error of so much collectivism, to consider piling on top of this unstable OASI program and the disability program I cannot evaluate at this point, save that I view it with alarm, the further provision of State-run medical care, with a camel's-head-under-the-tent-flap approach would be fiscal irresponsibility to the point of madness.

I agree with Mr. Peterson that so far the Congress has been fed "actuarial anesthesia." At the same meeting that he presented that paper, there was no actuary willing to argue for the addition of medical care benefits. "The Devil's advocate" was Leonard Lesser. I heard no one say he was convinced by said Devil's advocate.

Even though Mr. Peterson's plausible recommendation for a study by fresh, untainted minds were followed, there would not be time for the studies, essential to the men required, before the fall election.

We are looking for more than Diogenes sought. He would have been satisfied with an honest man. We need a man or a group of men not only honest, but also technically informed. Their number is not legion. I believe they exist and that they should be found. Then they need time, and recognition that they need time.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

5180

Appendix

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today a 15-member task force of the House Republican Policy Committee has released a report—"American Strategy and Strength"—which is so vital to our national survival that it deserves special note in the RECORD and the serious study of all Members of this body.

I shall describe some of the background of this study, and then the actual report summary will be presented.

At the outset of my remarks, I should point out that this document is nonpolitical. I wish to emphasize that attempts to make it appear political could destroy its usefulness and lead the United States ever deeper into the mire of international miscalculation.

I consider it a great tribute to the 14 members of this body who worked with me and the task force staff in evaluating the papers upon which the report is based that they so effectively shunned partisanship temptations. This is particularly commendable in an election year when the very subject at hand is likely to be one of the most bitter political controversies.

The report is based upon study papers prepared on a full range of subjects dealing with national and international strategy by distinguished experts on diplomatic, military, scientific, economic and psychological phases of the conflict between the free and slave worlds.

In addition, still other authorities from academic and professional life were called on for comments and suggestions. Altogether, more than 50 evaluations by task force staff members, authorities in the fields concerned, and Members of this body, went into the report.

I believe the hundreds of crises which have arisen between this Nation and its allies on the one hand and, on the other, the countries of the Soviet bloc in the past 30 years are ample proof of the need for such a study.

In the consideration of this age-long struggle, those who worked on the report and the study papers upon which it is based have neither sought the solution to an individual crisis nor suggested a course of action designed to meet any particular conflict which may arise. Rather, they have attempted to outline an overall strategy which could be expected to preserve our freedoms for all time.

No one concerned in this project considers the study or its report the complete, or final, solution to all problems at hand. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, such a thing obviously would have been impossible of attainment in the short period which has been devoted to the subject.

The studies were begun 4 months ago under the direction of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], who is chairman of the policy committee, and my able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the study group.

At the outset, those who took part in the project fully considered the problems which would be presented by time limitations and the question of producing something more than a superficial study with the small staff we had available for the task.

The task force recognized that the strategy followed by the slave world in its conquests thus far has not been limited to any particular sphere or spheres of influence, but rather has been as varied as the governmental interests of its opponents. We were aware that mere military deterrents, economic blocs, diplomatic approaches, propaganda techniques, and scientific and industrial development could not, in themselves, halt the spread of world communism or long defend the freedoms Americans consider more important than life itself.

Instead, an articulated strategy, or what we have called a public strategy, in which every area of enemy onslaught could be defended through the coordinated efforts of our entire people, would be necessary.

The ultimate strategy arrived at, of course, should spell out in bold letters the difference between our national survival in freedom and our enslavement.

In a world where every compromise of vital interests work out only to the benefit of our opponents time obviously is not on our side. For this, and other considerations, it was determined to have a report ready prior to the adjournment of this session of Congress. We felt that, if we could enlist the aid of experts in the more vital fields of consideration, we could produce something with which to work. This, we were and are convinced, would be a start.

It perhaps could develop in all of us, a better sense of direction and coordination. It could channel the thinking of Americans everywhere into the streams of a coordinated and well-articulated strategy with which to meet alien onslaughts on our civilization.

An an example of this desire by those responsible for the studies and the report at hand, I should point out that the recommendation for a coordination of vital public information media under the direct supervision of the White House was arrived at before the recent U-2 incident. In this respect, I think it is significantly important to reemphasize that such a strategy as is put forth would not be limited to a particular crisis, but rather would preclude American loss of prestige or power because of them.

In an effort to produce the best possible report within our time limitations, the task force enlisted the aid of the best available experts in all fields concerned. Volunteers were used wherever possible and the cooperation of faculty members at America's leading universities, scientists, diplomats, military leaders, economists, psychologists, legislators, and others was overwhelming.

Now, briefly, here is how we proceeded:

Last February it seemed to certain Members of this body that the then-current debates over the so-called missile gap reflected a lack of real depth and appreciation—both of our national strategy and strength and of how to build upon our present strategy and strength constructively for the decade just entered.

It was shortly after this that the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee appointed a task force of Members to study the total strategy and strength of this Nation in relation to its conflict with the Sino-Soviet bloc. Initially, there were but six Members in the group, but as study progressed, the Members became increasingly aware of the broad-gage approach needed for the problems involved. Consequently, the task force was enlarged to an eventual 15 Members drawn from vital House committees.

It also was felt that the study should be broadened by viewpoints of experts outside of Congress, especially those of academicians and professional people. As a vehicle for initiating this, background papers were sought not only from the staff and some of the Congressmen of the task force, but also from outside authorities on the subjects at hand.

To further enrich the study, the papers are being circulated in the academic community, and remarks and comments thus elicited were are are being considered. Naturally, some of the conclusions and comments differ, and this is good. The report soon to be presented is thus a result of the task force's evaluation of the more than 50 viewpoints available.

The members of the task force, with the increased depth obtained from these viewpoints, papers, and discussions, have consolidated into this task force report summary of conclusions the ideas, concepts, and recommendations which they felt especially needed congressional and public discussion before the close of this session of Congress.

Many equally important problems are considered in the study papers which merit greater discussion for a future task

force operation. But we think we have made a real beginning.

As coordinator for the task force, I wish to make grateful acknowledgment to my colleagues on this task force, to the staff members who assisted us, to those who prepared the study papers which were considered and evaluated by our group, and to those in private fields who gave time and effort to assist Members of this body in their assessments.

Mr. Speaker, first, I will list my colleagues who participated in this study and acknowledge their particular contributions to the project. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] appointed the task force and especially participated in recommendations for improved policymaking within the Congress. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the minority whip and the ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee, has lent overall advice to the preparation of the report and has contributed valuable background material. Of the study group itself, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was chairman and particularly devoted attention to the review of national objectives. The other members of the task force specialized in portions of the report as follows: The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS], scientific aspects; the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], diplomacy and awareness in approach to undecided and captive nations; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], appraisals of our forces in being; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], economic aspects; the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], national policy; the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], psychological aspects and deterrence; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], Sino-Soviet characteristics; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], military aspects; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], responsible political partisanship; the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], individual responsibility; and the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON], implementing public strategy.

The staff members of the task force also deserve special commendation for the long and arduous hours spent in assimilating and preparing material. Working under the able direction of Dr. David M. Abshire on the staff were Dr. Donald Ackerman, Guy Waterman, and Priscilla E. Turner.

Now, I wish to express the appreciation of the Policy Committee and the task force to those who prepared the background study papers. The papers and those who prepared them are:

First. "National Character as an Element of Power," by Prof. William Y. Elliott of Harvard University widely known both for his academic and governmental experience.

Second. "Fundamentals of a National Strategy," by Dr. David M. Abshire, task force staff director.

Third. "How Democracies Die," by John H. Stambaugh, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

Fourth. "An Appraisal of Soviet Economic Capability," by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, ranking minority member of Joint Economic Committee.

Fifth. "International Tension and National Defense," by Prof. Robert W. Newmann, director of the well-known Institute of International and Foreign Studies at UCLA.

Sixth. "Key Factors in Future Military Planning," by Adm. Arthur Radford (retired). The distinguished former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Seventh. "U.S. Defense: Policies and Posture," by Dr. Donald H. Ackerman of the task force staff and special assistant for Defense Affairs to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Eighth. "The Requirement of Deterrence," by Prof. Paul Peeters of Iona College.

Ninth. "Science and Foreign Affairs," by Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, the distinguished special assistant to the President for science and technology.

Tenth. "A History of Ballistic Missiles," by Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, ranking Republican member of House Armed Services Committee.

Eleventh. "The Cost of National Security," by Prof. Arthur E. Burns of George Washington University.

Twelfth. "The Economics of National Defense in a Free Economy," by Guy Waterman of the task force staff.

Thirteenth. "The Economic Challenge of the Soviet Union," by Dr. Don Paarlberg, special assistant to the President for economic affairs.

Fourteenth. "The Impact of Inflation on America's Balance of International Payments," by Dr. Rita Hauser, author and lawyer.

Fifteenth. "An Extension of National Security Council Machinery," by Prof. William Y. Elliott, his second paper.

Sixteenth. "Some Psychological Aspects of Soviet Propaganda," by Malcolm Smith, of Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL'S staff.

Seventeenth. "Civil Defense Policies," by Dr. Donald A. Melnick, of Scientific Planning Associates.

Eighteenth. "Disarmament: Problems and Prospects," by Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, member of the Joint Atomic Enery Committee, and Arthur Peterson, of the University of Wisconsin.

Nineteenth. "Soviet Subversive Forces," by Ralph De Toledano, well-known author, lecturer, and syndicated columnist.

Twentieth. "Soviet Strategy and Free World Defense," by Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, of the Notre Dame faculty.

Twenty-first. "An Examination of Partisanship and Bipartisanship in National Security Matters." A symposium of political scientists: Prof. James Atkinson and Prof. Karl Cerny, both of Georgetown University; William Y. Elliott, Harvard University; George Grassmuck, University of Michigan; Ivan Hinderaker, University of California, Los Angeles division; Karl Lamb, University of Michigan; the Reverend Stanley Parry, Notre Dame; Howard Penniman, also of Georgetown University; and Robert Loevy, John Hopkins University, who served as secretary for this symposium.

I should like to say at this point that we especially respect and appreciate the advice and assistance which we received from these individuals: Professor Penniman, Dr. Malcolm Moos, Father Parry, Dr. Cornelius P. Cotter, and Prof. Franklyn Burdette.

In behalf of the task force, I also wish to express appreciation to Karl Hess, John Patten III, and Patrick Anderson, for their invaluable voluntary assistance to the staff; and to the following distinguished participants for their evaluation and assessment of studies and other helpful suggestions:

Prof. Vaughn David Bornet of Santa Monica, Calif.; Dr. W. Glenn Campbell, executive director of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Leland Stanford University; Prof. George O. Comfort of Butler University; Prof. George Grassmuck of the University of Michigan; Alfred de Grazia, director of the Center for Applied Social Research at New York University; Neil H. Jacoby, dean of the Graduate School for Business Administration, University of California at Los Angeles; Prof. G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia; James K. Pollack, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Michigan; Jackson A. Ransahoff, president of Neutron Products, Inc.; Prof. Wilson E. Schmidt of the School for Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University and of George Washington University; Prof. Joseph L. Sutton of Indiana University; Prof. Paul Van Riper of Cornell University; and W. Allen Wallis, dean of the School of Business at Chicago University.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that we have made every attempt to avoid partisanship in the preparation of this report and that it is intended only as a basis for further study and consideration of the articulated strategy necessary for our national survival. The study papers concerned in the report should provide all Members with a valuable foundation upon which to build future policy and bring wider participation into these efforts.

That our work has been nonpolitical in nature, is attested, I believe in one of the recommendations made: That the policy committees of both major political parties continue these task force studies in order to provide the Government and the people of the United States with sound, well-considered recommendations for a national strategy to deal with the greatest challenge our country ever has known.

Time, as I pointed out earlier, is on the side of the opponent, but we can make it serve us through just such an approach as this task force report.

This task force report summary, submitted by the task force membership, covers the full range of national-international strategy involved in the conflict between the free and the regimented sectors of the world. This report includes diplomatic, military, scientific, economic, and psychological strengths.

The purposes of this task force report are: First, to increase public aware-

ness by offering a clear course for national policy; second, to furnish Members of Congress with a comprehensive viewpoint as an aid in their specialized committee activities; third, to identify American political dilemmas fomented both by the Sino-Soviet protracted conflict and the nuclear age; fourth, to offer specific recommendations, especially in regard to policy machinery, party and personal responsibilities.

OUR OBJECTIVES

Short-cut objectives for military victory in two world wars ignored long-range policy, lost the peace, and created conditions for the present conflict with the Sino-Soviet powers.

In this cold war, a panic-inspired objective of survival only might destroy free civilization.

Survival only is not a policy. It is the delusion of a nation marked for social suicide. It is the sure graveyard of human dignity. Captive nations survive, but only in slavery.

Free nations with no objectives beyond survival are prone to panic at times of artificial as well as real crisis and to engage in the piecemeal surrender made inevitable by seeking "peace at any price."

"Survival only" seeks glittering substitutes for facing crisis with a courageous and firm will. Cold war medicine men are daily peddling panaceas with stereotyped plans for economic growth, for fluctuating military organization, for legislating leadership, for unilateral disarmament, for another summit regardless of conditions, for appeasing Khrushchev by apologizing to Khrushchev unnecessarily.

Equally negative is the objective of merely opposing communism. Sparta, resisting external challenge, destroyed internal freedom and creativity. Mere opposition to communism could do the same, erecting in the name of expediency the sort of central, Socialist tyranny it had meant to oppose.

The real challenge to the United States is to reevaluate the methods by which a republic can meet its challenges without renouncing the spirit of liberty. Our concern should center not so much on freedoms from, as on freedoms for a better, more creative life for all the peoples of the earth.

Proper, positive objectives are:

PROMOTION OF WORLDWIDE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ORDER

Anywhere in the world, stability, law, and order work in favor of America's best interests. At home and overseas, the Vice President has spoken of the rule of law. The virus of communism can infect people only in a climate of disorder, discontent, and instability. Mutual security, the Development Loan Fund, the Food-for-Peace program all support stability. Associations such as the common market serve as independent obstacles to Communist expansion.

Emergence of other peace-loving centers of power in Europe, Asia, and Africa reduces the possibility of Soviet attack and eases the tensions inevitable when only two power centers exist in the world.

INCREASING INTERNAL STRENGTH

The free society is being tested by trends in both science and government toward amalgamation into large, more complex systems. But excellence in both derives not from monolithic but from decentralized organization. From outer space to the hometown, America's challenge is to produce scientific creativity and local government responsibility without overreliance upon central support and authority. The consciences of the States, as an example, must be stimulated to revise tax structures and leadership concepts and carry greater burdens in such fields as education and civil defense.

OPEN SOCIETIES

Closed societies constantly pose the possibility of secret preparations for surprise attack. Thus, President Eisenhower has set as a major American objective a world of open societies. The objective can be achieved. Open societies, although frequently not scoring initial successes, have greater staying power, flexibility, originality, and loyalty within. Open societies can harness science for the cause of freemen. The lack of walls in space antiquates the Iron Curtain. The Midas satellites proclaim the doom of the closed system.

OUR STRATEGY

To accomplish these objectives, a strategy is needed for the maximum use of our resources. In the cold war battle, the resources are political, military, scientific, economic, and psychological. National strategy must embrace and employ the task force approach, which uses these resources in combinations, mutually complementing rather than competing.

Psychological objectives, especially, can be reached by interchangeable means.

While a massive satellite might have great psychological impact, an exportable cancer cure, or salt-water freshening method might have greater long-range impact among less favored nations.

Since the 1958 reorganization, the military services have placed increased emphasis on the task force or functional approach. Each military service has the mission to provide forces to command, respectively, on the land, sea, or in the air. The mission of actual victory, however, in anything short of all-out war, is assigned the unified theater command in task force organization.

Elimination of rivalry, duplication, and harmful competition depends upon such clear viewpoints of overriding objectives.

A PUBLIC STRATEGY

A national strategy should not be tucked away in a national security document. To be a public affair, it must be readily understood and enthusiastically supported by the scientists, the educator, the reporter, the engineer, the Congressman, and the housewife. Such an understanding would enormously refortify our present position of strength, and enable a real cold war victory.

The framework of a public strategy can only be built upon the timber of past success. This means understanding why war has been deterred since 1953 and why the Communists have not increased, at the expense of our allies, their territorial expansion one square inch since 1954.

Workable alternatives to the strategy that has achieved this success have not been formulated or even proposed. Yet, some critics would pull national strategy to pieces without replacing it by something better—this is like demolishing your house because you assume the roof might leak.

The Monroe Doctrine is an example of a public strategy understood and supported by Americans of both parties, enabling successive administrations to preserve the integrity of the new world.

To develop an equivalent public strategy for the 1960's, Americans must not tear down proven success, but must erect an even better structure upon it. Small but vocal minorities must not be allowed more destruction than construction. Men of both parties working together can transform our present strategy to a public strategy with which a united people can deter war and advance liberty for a century or more—until the final world triumph of the open society.

THE CHARACTER OF THE SINO-SOVIET CHALLENGE
INDIVISIBLE, PROTRACTED CONFLICT

Communist strategy is total, with war and peace merging into a completely flexible conflict system designed to seek victory, regardless of how long or what means it takes.

The Sino-Soviet strategy aims to divide the United States from within and from her allies without, to sap her ability to resist, to undermine her will to act, and to monopolize the initiative over an entire historical era.

STRATEGY OF TERROR

Nuclear blackmail, in which Soviet propaganda relentlessly emphasizes the devastation of atomic warfare, is used in an attempt to weaken the fiber of persons seeking "peace above all." Probing maneuvers are used to keep the West off balance, particularly during such politically sensitive periods as national elections. Soviet exploitation of the Suez crisis in 1956, the Quemoy-Matsu crisis of 1958, the U–2 incident of 1960 are examples. A new propaganda probe, possibly in the space field, may be expected, also, prior to the November election.

The Communists shifted from the direct penetration of the Korean limited war to a proxy penetration of peripheral gray areas such as Indochina, and then in 1955 shifted to a leap-frog strategy into the Middle East. Now, Communists are shifting to a forward strategy aimed more directly at the new world—in Cuba, in South America, and in the internal politics in the United States.

Pavlov, the father of Russian psychology, trained dogs to respond by automatic reflex to certain stimuli or signals. By changing the signals enough to produce confusion, he drove them to frustration, neuroticism, and eventual collapse. The Russian psychological strategy aims at conditioning the West to neurotic frustration, guilt complexes, and conscience destruction. The prin-

cipal conditioner is sharp alternatives of friendship and bellicosity. The result sought is to make the West react reflexively, in terms beneficial to Soviet power, to each Soviet gambit.

Examples of zig-zags: the 1955 summit "Spirit of Geneva"—the Czech arms deal with Egypt; Khrushchev's smiling 1959 tour of the United States—Khrushchev's 1960 summit frowns; stormy threats of immediate settlement of the German problem one day—quiet insistence on patience the next; threatening Pakistan with missiles one moment—proposing disarmament the next.

SUBVERSION

The knife of Communist subversion is in its most deadly form aimed at the national will-to-resist. No modern revolution has succeeded without the destruction of that will in legitimate government. Lenin had the half-hearted Kerensky government efforts in his favor. This erosion of will employs inevitability and wave-of-the-future concepts, downgrading national achievements, upgrading enemy achievements, and use of the strategic minority. This last group, once will is undermined, takes over in a time of crisis.

Three Communist parties infiltrate America today: The open party or card carriers; the underground party, having more than 75 percent at work in industrial plants; and the "sleepers," or most dangerous group, with no recorded history of affiliation, now hard at work muddying policy whenever possible.

DECEPTIONS AND DISTORTIONS

Soviet scientific achievement is a principal weapon, not technically but as propaganda, to batter Western confidence. In this respect, it is not required that the Soviet be actually superior but only that they focus on areas where vocal and uneasy spokesmen in the West will, in panic, concede Soviet superiority on Soviet word alone. An example is Western inferiority statements about the Russian moonshot despite Russia's admission, after many official statements to the contrary, that the famed moon photo was merely a retouched composite.

Soviet economic claims, taken at face value rather than with grains of statistical salt, are used in the same way, to induce Western feelings of inferiority and the fright of panic-proneness that follows.

Actual Soviet strength is vastly inferior to our own. Our steel production, much below maximum capacity, exceeds that of the Soviet, running at full capacity by 60 percent. We have 3 times the number of hydroelectric plants, 9 times the shipping, 20 times the number of cars and trucks, and a standard of living 4 times as high.

Our industrial manpower exceeds that of the Soviet by some 10 million due to the fact that Russia's backward agricultural system keeps half the entire working population chained to the demands of collective farms.

The plight of the United States would be serious if she exchanged places with the U.S.S.R. In the military, we would have a one-weapon strategy based on a handful of first-generation ICBM's, and several hundred bombers less than enemy bombers operating from Bermuda, Hawaii, Alaska, Venezuela, and Newfoundland. We would face thousands of fighter aircraft and IRBM's from bases scattered through Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean islands, and an enemy capability to fly across our country despite our best air defenses. While our ground troops were dispersed over a restless satellite empire, the enemy would have a quarter million nuclear-armed troops and reliable alliance systems to the east, south, and west.

EXTERNAL ACTIONS AND INTERNAL STRESS

Internal stresses result from domestic imbalance, power struggles, discontent, and rivalry with Red China for Communist leadership. Competent studies suggest that Soviet threats actually cover internal Soviet weaknesses, whereas a real prelude to overt military action would most likely be in the form of a concentrated "peace offensive." This is ample reason for never dropping our guard during such periods, and is one reason for the U–2 flight before the summit.

DANGER POINTS

The protracted conflict could only culminate in general war as a result of, first, Soviet miscalculations; second, Soviet desperation; third, Soviet conviction of possessing the strength to emerge victorious. The national strategy of the United States is designed to prevent these three conditions. But one actual threat to world peace is the possibility that the Soviet could be deluded into thinking it has sufficient power to win a contest of arms.

An example of the difficulty faced, however, in substituting fact for fears is that the administration easily could have countered critical charges of a missile gap by revealing information gathered during 4 years of U–2 reconnaissance. But to do so, before the Soviet revealed its knowledge of the flights, would have seriously shortened the duration of the overflight project.

THE COMMUNIST TOTAL STRATEGY OF DIPLOMATIC, MILITARY, SCIENTIFIC, ECONOMICAL, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MEANS CAN BE MET ONLY BY AN EQUALLY TOTAL STRATEGY, STRENGTHENED BY THE UNITY AND CONFIDENCE OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC. FOLLOWING ARE WHAT THIS TASK FORCE CONSIDERS TO BE KEY ASPECTS OF OUR NATIONAL STRATEGY: A FOUNDATION OF POSITIVE NATIONAL POLICY

BACKGROUND

Following World War II, the United States tried to build a containment dike around communism, and yet confined her one strong capability-in-being to strategic A-bombing. This containment policy centered upon the European area, NATO, and the Marshall plan, to the neglect of worldwide dangers. The exclusion of Korea led the Communists into a miscalculated attack. Fear of Russian aggression in Europe restricted the response to the Korean aggression to defensive measures and permitted a privileged sanctuary.

Russia had engaged the free world through a pawn. A continued opposition to Communist limited wars with a purely negative strategy would have worked through attrition in favor of a shifting of global strength to the Communist bloc.

DETERRENCE THROUGH INITIATIVE

In 1953 and 1954, speeches by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff intentionally announced that the United States no longer would play into the protracted conflict design by meeting aggression according to the ground rules of the aggressor, but would punish aggression at the time, place, and with weapons of our choice.

Thus the gap was spanned between unlimited nuclear retaliation against Moscow and defensive containment on enemy terms. This policy of calibrated retaliation achieved a total deterrent effect, and confronted the aggressor with unacceptable risks on each level of military aggression.

AVOID WAR THROUGH MISCALCULATION

The new national strategy sought to avoid Korea-type miscalculations by communicating in advance our intentions to punish aggression. The new administration in 1953 warned the Chinese Communists that the United States would not continue to tolerate a Manchurian privileged sanctuary and that the fighting might, to the aggressor's peril, soon spread beyond the limits and methods of his selection. The armistice followed.

It is essential that an opponent be convinced of firmness through public and private expressions by our Government. Prior to the proposed 1960 summit meeting, the State Department, on April 4 and 20, strongly reiterated that under no conditions would the free world retreat over the Berlin issue. Summit hopes were inconsequential as compared to avoiding Russian miscalculations leading to war. Similar examples of announced firmness are found in the Eisenhower Middle East doctrine, as well as in strong statements that the United States would resist any attempts of a Russian takeover in Cuba.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

The third element of national policy has been collective security buttressed by self-help and mutual aid. An enlargement of what was begun in the Marshall plan and in NATO, the Eisenhower policy expanded the alliance systems so that aggression could be punished through a legal system formed in free world interest.

The 1954 Indochina crisis illustrated the need to expand globally the legal basis for U.S. intervention to halt aggression. A Far East alliance system had not been established and thus collective deterrence was lacking. To avoid a repetition of other indirect aggressions, the United States led in forming various security treaties and the SEATO alliance, constituting for southeast Asia and the Pacific area what Senator George called "the Monroe Doctrine formula."

The Eisenhower doctrine, a unilateral declaration, authorizes the United States to assist economically and militarily nations which want such assistance to preserve their independence. If the independence of a Mideastern nation is declared to be vital to international peace and the national interest, the United States will act when necessary and with

initiative. The commitment of the Middle East resolution, as well as the commitments functioning in the Middle East through NATO—Turkey, SEATO—Pakistan, and CENTO—Iran afford a framework of deterrence which indeed worked, as proved in Lebanon.

Virtually the entire free world now stands in unity against Soviet aggression.

MILITARY CONCEPTS AND CAPABILITIES FOR INITIATIVE

RELATION OF THE MILITARY STRATEGY TO NATIONAL POLICY

Military strategy must be tailored to serve national policy developed to fulfill basic national objectives. Yet, some have considered military policies as if in a vacuum, isolated from a policy foundation.

Present national strategy is translated into military capabilities through five concepts. The long-pull concept is covered in the economic section.

MIXED FORCE CONCEPT

To meet aggression at the time, place, and with the weapons of our own choosing, our military forces need flexibility, selectivity, and variety in weaponry which takes best advantage of our geography and the capabilities of our allies. We seek a comparative military advantage in the decisive areas of deterrence. This eschews the dangerous, defensive concept of exactly matching an opponent in weapons or divisions, but poses for an aggressor risks that outweigh any gain. The mixed force concept was supported in the report of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in this session of Congress.

Important is not only the "mix" of limited war capabilities in current needs, but also the increasing search for more effective future capabilities such as gases for disarming troops. At the same time, any concept of limited war strategy which disavows the possibility of using tactical nuclear weapons when opposed by Russia, Red China, or their pawns, would return us to the "wall of flesh" strategy, encourage Korea-type wars, and lose us our freedom of action.

SHIELD AND SWORD CONCEPT

The shield is largely composed of the conventional war forces of the free world alliance; the sword, massive mobile striking forces of the United States. This means getting more defense per taxpayer dollar by aiding allies to build conventional and limited war forces to meet creeping aggression and brushfire wars, while supplying through our own efforts the missile and nuclear weapons capability which is beyond the economic reach of most allies.

Ways must be sought to strengthen our allies with modern weapons. For example, the mobility and economy of the Polaris or Pershing missiles, on land and floating mounts, however, could add to the shield forces an independent deterrence capacity.

The shield and sword concept vastly enlarges the limited war capabilities of the free world. Mutual security helps to support, and our military missions help to train, over 200 divisions.

MOBILITY CONCEPT

Essential to our national policy is the capacity to react quickly to enemy aggression. Not merely a matter of more planes, airlift, and ships, mobility also is a matter of staging bases, of logistic followup, of improving equipment, of paring down requirements to basic minimums in order not to destroy the mobility sought.

Because of the vast comparative expense of airlift for a number of divisions, and the fact that only Western Europe has adequate airfields for landing a massive airlift anyway, the divisions of the common alliance system remain the primary limited war land deterrent. We must seek ways to improve the airtransportability of the combat division and the airlanding facilities around the globe. At the same time, sealift remains the primary means of large limited war troop movements, as demonstrated in Lebanon.

Mobility of missiles is necessary for protection of deterrent capabilities. This administration is giving top priority to mobile missiles invulnerable to surprise attack and thus explointing a breakthrough in solid fuel missiles. Because missile launching sites, unlike airbases, can be dispersed more widely, and given additional mobility on rails, roads, beneath the seas and under the polar ice cap, the missile age will complicate vastly the task of the aggressor.

INVULNERABILITY OF THE DETERRENT

Another component of mobility relates to the indestructibility of the deterrent forces. So great is the destructive power of the megaton missile warhead that it is not in numbers of missiles, but in the invulnerability or the inability of an aggressor to destroy our retaliatory capability, that our true deterrence lies. A potential aggressor will calculate no benefit in aggression if he knows he cannot destroy the opponent's ability to destroy him.

Until we fully enter the solid fuel missile age, the invulnerability of our deterrent will rest not only in hardened liquid fuel missile sites, but more so in our Strategic Air Command. The present dispersion of SAC bases throughout the world, just-announced plans for further dispersion among civilian airfields, and our early warning systems, render SAC indestructible today. As the Russian ICBM capabilities increase, our ability to place a substantial portion of SAC on a sustained airborne alert will increase. Meanwhile, the President can, if necessary, overspend the budget and has standby powers to put SAC on airborne alert during an emergency period. The capacity for the alert in terms of, for example, spare engines and trained crews, is provided for in current budgets (fiscal year 1960 and fiscal year 1961).

FORCE-IN-BEING

Capabilities-in-being are the heart of deterrent power. This demands a new look at the traditional roles of stockpiling, of transport facilities—air, sea and land—and of the Reserves and National Guard. Instead of being wedded to World War II concepts, our forces, services, and industries must seek new roles identified with the forces-in-being concept.

While Russian military might has been concentrated in their heavy reliance on the intercontinental ballistic missile, the United States has included the ICBM as one element in an overall military capability which takes account of our control of the seas, our advanced bases and system of military alliance, our vastly superior bomber force and other strong points in our position. Thus, while Soviet military strength has been forced into a single and obsolescing channel, due to their lack of carriers, oversea bases, and sound alliances, the United States has built up a force-in-being which concentrates on variety, flexibility, continual modernization, and dispersion of our weapons systems—a truly balanced force.

RÉSUMÉ OF U.S. FORCES-IN-BEING

Actual U.S. military might includes: 2,000 long-range strategic bombers, each with the destructive potential of several ICBM's, with a sizable proportion of them on 15-minute alert.

Sixteen wings of tactical aircraft, each with nuclear capability, deployed on bases strategically located in advance positions around the world.

Operational Atlas missiles now ready for launching from the west coast.

Snark missiles with a very large warhead, difficult to detect through defense radar.

Four more operational tactical missile squadrons equipped with a mix of Matador and Mace missiles which are all to be replaced with the Mace by 1962, each exceeded by far the total explosive power expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during the whole of World War II.

Intermediate range ballistic missiles, the Thor, stationed in Allied Forces' hands in the United Kingdom.

Two cruisers and five submarines equipped with the Regulus I, a surface-to-surface weapon.

Fourteen aircraft carriers, several of which are deployed around the periphery of the Soviet Union, able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force and capable of nuclear strikes into almost any area of the Communist bloc.

Our naval alert forces also include 9 antisubmarine carriers, 14 cruisers, 269 destroyers, 115 submarines, 81 minecraft and more than 7,000 operational aircraft; augmented in the future by nuclear attack submarines, destroyer-escort vessels and other high priority efforts in research. They will provide an aggressive antisubmarine warfare program.

Fourteen Army divisions, eight overseas and six in this country, all at the highest state of readiness in peacetime history.

Three divisions of Marines, always prepared to move quickly and effectively to trouble spots anywhere in the world.

Allied nations provide the United States with some 250 strategically located bases, and contribute to our collective defense more than 5 million men, air forces of over 25,000 planes, half of which are jet powered, and help insure free world control of the sea with their 2,200 combat vessels.

Near-future strength will be even greater. Added this year: two atomic-powered submarines each equipped with 16 operational Polaris missiles, with

more to be added progressively at a minimum rate of three per year—the House approved Polaris program would soon add 336 missiles to the strategic forces of the United States—IRBM's soon placed in Italy and Turkey—Atlas ICBM forces to be expanded to 13 squadrons by 1963, all but the first squadrons in hardened, underground sites—the Titan ICBM in hardened bases next year, with 14 squadrons available shortly after 1963. The Midas satellite system will double our warning time—the target date for the Minuteman solid-propellant ICBM will be reached earlier than expected, thus giving our missile force the mobility to roll the length and breadth of our country before 1963.

Our striking power, by the dispersal of bases, the mobility of new nuclear missiles and warning systems, is now sufficiently invulnerable to deter use of surprise attack. It is only by exercises of science-fiction fantasy that critics can say Russia might destroy our retaliatory power. These critics are not, in fact, able to say that Russia actually possesses such power. Such criticism characteristically says that Russia could do such and such if Russia had such and such—that Russia could destroy our SAC bases if they had hundreds of missiles, if they had the sites from which to launch them simultaneously, if our bombers had no warning, if they all were on the ground, if every missile hit. The "if" bomb thus becomes one of Russia's greatest propaganda weapons.

Thus we see that there is no deterrent gap and that our forces today are capable of carrying out their assigned roles and missions. This capability will continue, aided by future procurement policies and research and development work. As General Twining has stated, "the impression in some quarters that the Soviet Union has overtaken or even outdistanced the United States in military power is simply not supported by facts."

BROAD-GAGE SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

The Communists seek superiority in a few key scientific fields for international prestige and power. Totalitarianism can concentrate upon selected areas and probe for technological breakthroughs.

Following World War II, the Soviet Union commenced intensive efforts in the field of high-thrust ballistic missiles and gained a 5- or 6-year head start over the United States. Although their lead in propulsion is waning and the scientific value of their space efforts is inferior to ours, they nonetheless gained a psychological advantage through Sputnik I and other spectaculars.

Russian scientific discoveries could produce special advantages on a short-term basis. Yet, if we narrowed our own research and development efforts into special-purpose crash programs, we would provide neither the lasting scientific reserve, stability, and flexibility to last out the protracted conflict, nor the most reliable end product for any 1 year of the contest.

By wise management of resources, the United States holds far greater basic advantages in terms of capital, productivity, labor skills, and scientific resources, all in combination with an atmosphere friendly to the spirit of free inquiry so essential to scientific progress. Our accomplishments in science have been more broadly based. While maintaining at least parity in the development of missiles and in other areas of military science, we have achieved preeminence in such fields as chemical research, especially in polymers and pharmaceuticals; molecular biology, with its intriguing advances toward an understanding of the real origins of life; medical and health research, so meaningful to the world's people; and solid state physics, which have yielded the transistor.

SCIENTIFIC POWER THROUGH PURPOSE

The real danger confronting the United States is not Russian science, but a lack of our ability to integrate scientific perspective into our national purpose. In 1947, when Stalin overflowed with enthusiasm over the theories of the German scientist Sanger about big rockets spanning continents, the United States still thought, scientifically, in World War II research and development terms. Plainly, the Soviets moved into a new field ahead of us, not because of any general superiority, but because they identified the particular field with their national goals.

The establishment in 1957 of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the post of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology has already created a new relationship between science and government at the policy-making level. Additional progress for focusing responsibility for technical decisions at policy levels has resulted from the appointment of executives for research and development in the military services, the establishment of a Director of Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, and the establishment of NASA and clarification of its responsibilities.

SCIENCE AND PRESTIGE

Correct choices must weigh contributions to general scientific data, to national security, and to international prestige, as well as technical feasibility.

The psychological purpose can be accomplished by timing with international events and dramatizing the achievements we do have. Nevertheless, it would be a tragic mistake to upset sound scientific programs for purely psychological goals. It is poor psychological technique, and not any failure in scientific progress, which has made uncommitted nations more aware of who launched sputnik than who invented the Salk vaccine, who produced the recent breakthroughs in molecular electronics, who developed atomic submarines capable of traversing beneath the ice cap at the North Pole or rounding the world completely submerged, or who has communicated farthest into space. Scientific articulation and appreciation is the American lack.

ADEQUATE FLOW OF EFFORT INTO BASIC RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

There is a continuing temptation to bring research resources to bear on the areas where immediate results are being spectacularly achieved. But, if we do not keep the flow of invention and innovation going, if we fail to push forward the frontiers of scientific discovery, the pace of development will relatively and decisively slow 10 years hence. The same long-range importance attaches to education.

Echoing Vannevar Bush's postwar call, Dwight Eisenhower again and again has asserted basic research should be given stronger support. Ultimately, the leader in outer space will be the nation which has made the greatest progress quietly, patiently, and perhaps undramatically on the true frontiers of knowledge—the laboratories of basic research on earth.

Long-range planning essential to scientific research also is essential in our educational process. The nation of schools is the nation of the future.

The strength of our intellectual pursuits will depend upon the ability to improve education and teacher incentives from the bottom up rather than through centralized and federalized education.

We must also recognize that today's and tomorrow's endless frontiers are intellectual ones. We must learn to honor the pioneers of those frontiers as warmly as the pioneers of our territorial frontiers.

FLEXIBILITY IN DECISIONMAKING

Each year compounds the outpouring of research results and at the same time the acceleration of obsolescence. The limitation of any Nation's scientific resources demands of decisionmakers a keener appraisal, selection, and phasing.

No nation has unlimited resources. Superiority in the technological race will go to the power which makes the best use of its resources. In the shifting sea of technological change, wise management demands a courageous willingness to stop and start major programs in accord with changing analyses to fulfill long-range objectives. The pressures of geographical interests, politics, organizational inertia, conflicting claims, and Russian propaganda conspire against the decisionmaker.

An uneconomical crash program is one in which basic understanding or underlying development is lacking. At the same time, it is false economy and unwise timidity which deliberately stretch out a program where the feasibility of the development and production cycle is already assured.

The United States, for example, is the world leader in nuclear research. But a vital next step, the construction of a powerful linear accelerator, has once again failed to pass Congress. Rapidly rising construction costs and, especially, the difficulty of retaining top qualified personnel contribute to the imperative need to push this.

LEADTIME

In recent years the leadtime problem has been practically solved for top-priority projects such as Thor, Jupiter, and Polaris. Thor and Jupiter were available for deployment in about 3 years from project initiation. Reducing leadtime involves the development of production, logistical support, training, test and operation concurrently instead of consecutively. However, in advanced technology, concurrent development can add greatly to the cost in re-

sources of a project because the feasibility of each step in development is uncertain until actually accomplished. The proponent of a system is apt to become very impatient of delay caused because others are not as optimistic as he that the project is ready to move forward. Sound management consists of knowing when to press forward with a concurrent program to reduce leadtime, and when to hold back for further research evidence to avoid false starts and costly waste.

SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO SPACE

An outstanding example of America's broad-gage approach to scientific advance, as opposed to the narrow-purpose pursuits of the Soviet, is our space program.

Russia, with a headstart in space exploration, has been able to maintain a lead only in the field of rocket thrust. This lead could be closed within 2 years. Of the 22 additional earth satellites launched since Sputnik I, three have been launched by Russia, 19 have been launched by the United States. Of the seven space probes launched since October 4, 1957, four have been launched by the United States and have produced far more scientific knowledge than the Russian probes.

Where as the Soviets have accounted for some important "firsts," the U.S. programs have achieved the first detailed photo of solar ultraviolet spectrum, the first photo of a complete tropical storm, the first penetration of equatorial ionospheric current sheets, the first detection of X-rays in high atmosphere, the first identification of the Van Allen radiation belt, the creation of a manmade radiation band around the earth, the first geodetic use of artificial earth satellites to obtain refined information on the size and shape of earth, the first communications satellite.

NASA has instituted a 10-year plan which is not keyed to what Russia does (and is therefore not trapped into a "fits-and-starts" program). Target dates include: 1961 lunar impact vehicle, Atlas Centaur vehicle, and manned space flights; 1963, two-stage Saturn vehicle; and 1963–64, unmanned vehicle for controlled landing on the moon. The U.S. program of long-range objectives will increase scientific knowledge, will be a positive counter-force to Soviet propaganda, and will afford a startling quantum jump over Russia's limited approach to space.

AN ECONOMY FOR THE LONG PULL

During the 1940's, the unrecognized need for a long-haul strategy had resulted in the armed services being "princes today and paupers tomorrow." Despite the Russian peril at the close of World War II, our defense budget ($79.9 billion) dwindled by 1950 to $11.9 billion. Development on long-range missiles was eliminated. Had the Communists delayed aggression a year longer, planned service cuts would have further reduced U.S. combat capabilities.

Crash rearmament by 1953 had raised the budget to $43.7 billion. Such a fluctuating budget policy has a seriously adverse impact on our long-range security posture, and inefficient stops and starts destroy effective research and development efforts. Such policies spell ultimate disaster.

After the Korean armistice, the new administration redesigned national policy to provide indefinite sustaining power for the long haul. This concept of the military need for a healthful economy was, therefore, a basic decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and not, as often described, of the Bureau of the Budget. The decision recognizes the danger of tying defense preparations to magical critical years as predicted dates of future war.

The long-haul strategy has several corollaries:

PLATEAU OF PREPAREDNESS

This entails a planned level of national security outlays which will provide and sustain effective military defenses for the indefinite period of the protracted conflict. Hence, the administration opposed a hasty demobilization in 1953.

Short-range crash efforts of the World War II type often compete with instead of reinforce, the capacity to sustain long-range preparedness efforts. A crash bomber program, as demanded by some critics in 1955, in response to Russian propaganda about an unfounded bomber superiority, would have competed with resources for our missiles program.

Second, the concept seeks stability of military, scientific, and Government personnel levels. A limitation on the future size and effectiveness of the armed services is obtaining and holding qualified personnel in the numbers needed.

The plateau of preparedness concept calls for a national security program on a taxation level: First, which the people and the politicians will support over the long pull; second, which furnishes adequate forces in being for every year; third, which gently rises if necessary to meet increased costs of weaponry. This demands a balanced set of priorities and the ability to shift priorities and funds as needed to meet technological changes. A compromise must exist between too much too soon and too little too late. The request to shift funds this year because of successful Polaris tests is an instance of flexibility.

A PROGRAM FOR FINANCING NATIONAL SECURITY

We can afford all the defense that is needed, if we will soundly finance the full cost. But critics who would increase defense spending should discuss the full price tag. Members of the House or Senate who propose preparedness programs involving major cost differentials from the program in being should introduce bills or make a matter of public record the total cost and concepts of their program.

Responsible suggestions to increase preparedness expenditures should include specific legislation and public statement of the total costs of the alternate program.

There is no painless way to pay for preparedness. Increased tax revenues mean increased tax rates. Deficit financing means inflationary erosion of our overall economic position in world markets at a time when these markets are, in fact, a battleground, and at a time when our own balance of payments position has shifted downward.

Elimination of waste is a goal toward which to work but not a panacea immediately available.

Economic growth will make more tax moneys available but also will require increased expenditures because of vast built-in spending programs. A very serious view must be taken of adding further such spending programs.

Those who advocate a rising GNP as a painless process to increased defense often are the same persons who proposed the built-in spending schemes which have made this impossible.

Without further legislative action, the Nation is already committed to $25 to $35 billion for highway programs, and $8 billion for public works, as part of a total of $455.5 billion in future spending.

The two sound means of increasing preparedness expenditures remain: First, cutting back on nondefense programs; and, second, increasing taxation, with the potential dangers which that course carries. All factors must be weighed to insure that economic policies do not defeat long-range defense efforts or destroy individual economic freedom. In the last session of Congress alone, the 20 major spending bills introduced in the House and in the Senate for new programs would have added $50 or $60 billion a year to present spending and placed in jeopardy nearly all of the national objectives related to the world conflict between freedom and regimentation.

In the formulation of the defense budget, countless decisions must be made in a context of uncertainty, rapidly changing technology and, unfortuantely, political pressures, external and internal. Defense outlays lack the continuous test of the private enterprise market to insure proper allocation. Automobile manufacturers may launch new cars with high hopes, but the market turns in a verdict quickly, ruthlessly, but effectively, and if the verdict is negative, that particular misuse of resources is ended. Lacking this advantage, the managers of the multibillion-dollar defense budget must make special means of improving efficiency and obtaining more defense per dollar, such as stabilization of outlays over a plateau of preparedness.

Significant assistance to the preparedness program could be provided by prompter action each year on military appropriations, developing better budgetary and appropriations techniques in handling military budgets, developing closer liaison between industry and Congress, forgetting local geographical pressures when considering defense matters, and removing legislative roadblocks to efficient use of personnel and patents by defense contractors.

In sum, economic policies for the long-haul contest between freedom and regimentation should be geared to our strengths and not our weaknesses. These policies should foster stable growth and a climate favorable to savings, investment, and capital formation. Also, they should encourage competition in private

markets while discouraging the need for Government intervention which shelters particular groups from the discipline of such competition.

STRENGTH THROUGH PSYCHOLOGICAL AWARENESS

The United States can escape the frustration of Soviet psychological conditioning only through a counterstrategy of her own based on character, purpose, and by articulating freedom to the world. Essential to such a positive strategy is:

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO UNDECIDED NATIONS

Have-not nations, like have-not people, are seeking to find—in the Soviet system or in the free-enterprise system—identification with their own hopes for a better life.

This psychological struggle must not be interpreted as merely a contest between persuasive efforts, either with money or with words. It is the personal approach that is important on every level—from the tours of President Eisenhower to exchanges of technicians and artists, businessmen, and tourist. This is worth more than tons of literature, thousands of words.

In the world of mass communications, the wistful citizen of an underdeveloped nation, in effect, carries on his back a walkie-talkie tuned to all that goes on within the United States—the bickering especially—the mistakes we make here and within our Government services overseas.

He resents our mistinterpretation of his beliefs, his actions, and his needs. He seeks evidence of our real desire to share with him our scientific knowledge, our industrial know-how, and our far-reaching objectives. Most of all does he want to be certain that we care, that our hearts seek to express our interest in his well-being.

APPROACH TO CAPTIVE PEOPLES

This should include: First, continued attempts to break through the Iron Curtain by such visits as that of the Vice President to Russia last year; second, the story of our American free enterprise system which has created the highest level of living in history; third, showing simply and clearly how the American economy serves the individual. If patiently and continuously done this should automatically create internal demands upon the Soviet rulers for liberalization and so further open societies. The Kremlin's determination to torpedo the planned visit of the President to Russia this summer obviously stemmed in part from the telling effects of these visits.

ARTICULATION

We must prove by results rather than by words that America's ideals of political freedom and machinery of individual enterprises have more to offer them than either Russian or Chinese communism. If we truly believe in what is in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights and live our trust in God, this will permeate all we say and do and will be a powerful influence in the decisions they will make. America, therefore, must prove the value of her ideals, her purpose and her goal, not by her words, but by her actions, the visible evidences of her heartful desire to share with them the riches of her understanding of their needs. Men will not choose between what nations say of their ideals. They will choose between what they can see.

DETERRENCE AND PSYCHOLOGY

Deterrence involves a state of mind and will. Throughout history, materially and militarily superior nations with divided will have fallen prey to inferior nations with united will. Without national character and commitment, NATO, SEATO, SAC, STRAC become not deterrents but shambles.

The credibility and respect assigned by a tempted agressor to our military strength depends upon the aggressor's estimation of the manifest will to use those forces. Throughout the 1930's, Hitler, with inferior forces, calculated the democracies lacked the manifest will to use their combined forces. Critics today who assert a strategy encompassing tactical use of nuclear weapons would not be credible to the opponent, actually are saying our will to act would not be credible. They are saying our will to defend freedom would not be credible. If we lacked this will, the Communists would be allowed an overwhelming advantage in their strategy of terror to monopolize the initiative.

Asserting constantly a lack of credibility can indeed discredit deterrence and lead to miscalculated war. Khrushchev knows that the majority of Americans support the present administration's policy of firmness. But Khrushchev's obvious interest is in whether the next President will continue the same commitment to a national strategy which has deterred the Kremlin from military action. Any Presidential candidiate who questions the credibility of the deterrent power in such a way as to discredit the national will to act automatically places in jeopardy that credibility if he is elected President.

Maintaining the credibility of our strength by unified purpose and clear objectives is necessary both to the deterrence of war and to the progressive enlargement of liberty throughout the world.

PSYCHOLOGICAL STRATEGY OF INITIATIVE

Psychologically, we must respond to the Communist challenges not in the areas of their advantages, but with initiative, in the ideological manner and with psychological weapons of our choice.

Freedom is our trump card. We believe in the sovereignty of God, the dignity of man, the right of each citizen to seek his own happiness. In this system, the doctor of medicine who promotes the health of the individual is the highest paid professional, whereas in the Soviet he is the lowest paid.

A positive faith can destroy all effects of the Soviet psychological strategy.

IMPLEMENTING THE PUBLIC STRATEGY

A continuing reevaluation of the machinery to implement national strategy is a constant necessity. This task force, refraining from attractive-looking, impracticable recommendations, has sought a few practical steps capable of implementation without upsetting existing workability, effectiveness, and progress:

PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

It is essential to continue and enlarge upon the policy of the present administration in utilizing the position of Vice President as a vital post in national security policymaking.

PRIORITIES IN RESOURCES UTILIZATION

To further utilization of resources and investment efficiency according to policy objectives, this task force recommends some type of priorities review board for comparative analyses of interagency programs as an adjunct to the National Security Council.

The study paper of Dr. William Y. Elliott proposes that the board consist of a standing group charged solely with studying and reporting on priorities in the allocation of resources—human, military, economic—to maximize national security. These board members, supported by a small staff of top capability, would be unencumbered with other duties and would not be delegates from other agencies. Each member would be an expert with top-level experience in his particular field, preferably with high-level experience in several agencies, the fields being military and foreign assistance defense programs, disarmament problems, NSC mechanism, foreign policy, psychological strategy, basic research and technology, mobilization base, civil defense, national economy, and fiscal policy related to growth factor and inflation.

Because of the advisory relationship of the board to the President, the task force believes that such a board should be established by administrative action rather than by statute, with the President left free to name its chairman and members.

DEFENSE ORGANIZATION

This task force believes that a single chief of staff for all the services would overconcentrate power and decision-making on the wrong level. Such concentration could introduce an imbalance into consideration of our military program as part of, not the whole of, our preparedness program. Also, in the foreseeable future, there will not be present the great balance wheel of a Chief Executive of unparalleled military background who is uniquely trusted by the citizens to exercise independent evaluation in that field.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

This task force believes that the Reorganization Act of 1958 should be allowed time to accomplish the objectives of that act before another major reorganization. Highest praise is due the present Secretary of Defense for building splendid teamwork as an element of maturing the Department of Defense operation. His close consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff is a model for successors.

EXPERIENCED APPOINTEES

The excellent performances of both Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and Gordon Gray in the national security fields points out the advantage of extensive previous experience in national security matters, and sets a precedent for future appointments.

PUBLIC OPINION

Its increased role in the psychological conflict with communism demands a continuing reevaluation of ways to disseminate information at home and abroad. This reevaluation must go beyond the scope of USIA, and fix clear responsibility for coordinating vital information from all departments and agencies bearing on national security or foreign policy. One suggestion is that the State Department be charged with overall responsibility, but the majority of this task force favors such an assignment within the existing framework of the White House staff. At the very top level, the timing and impact of releases can be best appraised.

TOWARDS RESPONSIBLE PARTISANSHIP

Public confidence as an element of deterrence has placed upon political parties new and grave responsibilities. Political parties in the United States must not become the catalyst for the poisonous processes by which our adversary seeks to create disunity and dissension within the free world.

Inevitably, change in government will invite moves to test the national will and upset international balance, unless there is responsible partisanship in national security matters.

In the testing years ahead we must as a Nation cherish this great strength of our political system where the "opposition party" is not forced by political maneuvering to oppose, just because it has a different party level, the sound policies for continuous defense of the Nation. Those many members of the other party in both Houses of Congress who called for unity after the recent summit collapse are to be commended.

POLICY MACHINERY WITHIN CONGRESS

Within the Congress there is a neglected tool the concept of party policy committees, for achieving responsible partisanship for right policies and for promoting a public strategy. This machinery, at the same time, would afford a vehicle for criticisms of existing policies where such criticism serves as a much needed corrective.

During the 79th Congress, the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress recommended the establishment of policy committees "for the determination and expression of majority policy and minority policy." These committees, to be elected by the party conference, were to be a means of strengthening party responsibility and accountability.

The four policy committees would have comprised a Joint Legislative-Executive Council designed to meet with the President "to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and improve relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Government."

In times of crises, both parties could express opinions and criticisms in executive session through these committees. A joint policy committee resolution would produce an ethical limitation, so that criticisms and divisive influences would not destroy the strength of our international position, give potential opponents undue advantage, and lose prestige with the uncommitted nations.

This policy committee legislation passed the Senate, but was never brought to the floor of the House. In 1949 the Republican Members of Congress unilaterally set up their policy committee. The recent U–2 incident, the summit crisis, and Khrushchev's attempt to influence domestic politics refortify the recommendation of this task force to implement such legislation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL STRATEGY WITHIN THE POLICY COMMITTEES

The present congressional committee system affords difficulty in properly appraising national strategy. No one congressional committee represents all interests involved. But both in a legislative and in an opinionmaking role, Congress becomes a vital accessory to the national strategy of the Executive.

If the policy committee machinery were fully implemented, consideration might be given to establishing policy subcommittees of select members from applicable standing committees to assess national strategy. This task force has had such a mission. Dissenting reports of counterpart subcommittees could serve to deepen legitimate debate over real issues, and the joint reports could promote a sound, comprehensible public strategy.

Consideration must be given to streamline and compact regular committee hearings. The Secretary of Defense appears before 10 or 12 committees, often for protracted periods, during one session of Congress.

TOWARD INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

This Republic, and the freedom for which it stands, was born in the decision that how a nation survives is as important as whether it survives.

No circumlocution or rhetoric of special and expedient interest can long evade the necessity for a similar decision today.

This is America's moral responsibility. Virtually all other arguments between our people are matters of individual conscience. This is a matter of the Nation's conscience.

If a nation doubts its mission in the world, it will regress and cease to retain the confidence of anyone.

The outcome of our contest with Russia will depend upon the personal commitment of the American housewife and the breadwinner to the values that made America—values not exclusively ours, but belonging to a common humanity.

History abounds with examples of nations forced both to fight and surrender because of failure to convince an enemy that it will not only live for its ideals, but it prepared to die for them.

No way has been shown to disengage from this responsibility without also disengaging from freedom.

Nations cannot drift into peace. They can only drift into war. Thus, the national responsibility is to unite in purpose, no matter how divided as to technique. Criticism within such a framework of purpose can be constructive Criticism oblivious of such purpose can only be destructive.

It is the heavy responsibility of criticism in a republic that it be accompanied by clear and specific alternatives.

It is the responsibility of citizens in a republic to constantly demand this criticism of clear alternatives and to reject those appeals which are simply to disunity, discontent, and discord. The philosopher Ortega y Gasset has noted that the fall of Rome began when discord outweighted concord.

The decisive battles of history which dramatize the death of nations after centuries of life came as a result and not as the cause of decline and decadence.

Weakness or vacillation in national character can be a nation's greatest weakness, irreplaceable by any amount of hardware, material, or money.

National character is the key element of national power.

First. Survival alone is unacceptable as the objective of American strength and strategy. Liberty, justice, and open societies are the only goals worthy of our heritage, and these are promoted by the rule of law, by a stable world, and by independent, internally healthy republics.

Second. These can be accomplished by a national cold war strategy which becomes a public affair, understood and enthusiastically supported by people in all walks of life.

Third. The first steps of this strategy have already been accomplished: Since 1953, national policy has renounced any defensive method of meeting aggression on the terms of the aggressor, has embraced a diplomacy of firmness which has deterred a Soviet adventure in Berlin, invasion of Formosa, reinvasion of Korea, and Soviet takeover in the Middle East.

Fourth. The military phase of this strategy has achieved effectiveness by the mix of forces, incorporated with a worldwide shield of troops from the free world alliance and a sword of massive, mobile, and indestructible striking power, capable of varying and calibrated responses.

Fifth. In the scientific phase, real progress has been made in integrating scientific and national purpose. American technology, in comparison with Russia's is more broadly based, devoted to the welfare of mankind, and has produced far more solid scientific data from space exploration. If the public and the political leaders will give greater attention to basic research and education, in a climate of decentralized responsibility and creativity, and understand and support efforts such as the new 10-year NASA program, American science will win the resurgent confidence of the world and antiquate Iron Curtains.

Sixth. The "long-pull" policies initiated in 1953 have ended the peaks and valleys characteristic of American preparedness since the Revolutionary War and have given stability within the Armed Forces and within the national economy. No sound economic alternative for the cold war has been offered to this policy, and this task force overwhelmingly endorses it as a basic premise

for both preparedness and the preservation of economic freedom and health.

Seventh. Improved psychological techniques and timing are necessary, but by far the best antidote to the attempted Communist strategy of conditioning is an ideological initiative, not to force beliefs, but to articulate beliefs through purpose and public conscience.

Eighth. Essential to a dynamic public strategy is a continuity of successful policies from one administration to the next, an offering of a real alternative by those who criticize, policymaking machinery within Congress to produce responsible partisanship, and executive machinery for overall evaluation and articulation of our strategy and strength. The foundation of any public strategy is national character, conviction, and confidence.

The task force study papers are inserted elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study paper No. 1: "National Character as an Element of Power," by Dr. William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University:

NATIONAL CHARACTER AS AN ELEMENT OF POWER

(By Dr. William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University)

National character is probably one of the most fought-over fields among sociologists, philosophers, political scientists, and others who occupy themselves with this kind of thinking. The first thing to be said about it is that there is no such thing as a single national characteristic that is enduring and simple and overwhelming in its control of all other factors in any country.

People who have written about this essence of a nation with the grace, for instance that Salvador de Madariaga did in one of his better books—"Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Spaniards"—do nevertheless try to find some identifiable national characteristics. Perhaps the best way to approach the problem is to ask how national characteristics are formed; what the balance is in what might be called defects and virtues; and how they stamp the behavior of a people in responding to leadership, in creating leadership, in supporting it, and in correcting it, if necessary.

This country inherited in its early stages primarily, of course, a British tradition. But it did have ingredients, even at a very early period, from Dutch as well as German traditions. The French influence comes also, both from Canadian contacts and the Acadians, who it will be remembered were resettled in Louisiana. We also have had some measure of Spanish culture from our country's beginnings. But these were all borne along the main stream: until the potato famine in Ireland our immigrants were mainly British.

These ingredients gave us a national political and constitutional characteristic which meant that we inherited, institutionally, a great constitutional framework of law, as well as a conception of government as a limited government.

De Tocqueville noted clearly this concept of limited—and legal—government in "Democracy in America." With French eyes, he saw this as meaning that there was no feudal element really in the United States that was resisting the evolution of the country. Turner, the historian, put this in "The Significance of the Frontier in American History"—and it is still a frontier in every way—as science carries us whizzing into the future. Lord Bryce, too, made some of the most sage comments on our character in "The American Commonwealth."

We cannot neglect these national origins and, above all, the cultural heritage that they brought. They brought, for instance, Shakespeare and the Bible which were the molding influences upon the American epic of Lincoln. They brought as well the Puritans and the Baptists and Episcopalians, the Quakers, the Methodist circuit riders and the Presbyterian dominie and the Catholics in Maryland.

These religious elements of our culture are absolutely fundamental. They are the foundation of our morality—to which we do not attach sufficient meaning. Whatever our defection from them, or our falling away, they have shaped the ethos of America profoundly. These religious values have given us a sense that we are not the creators of the universe. This is our basic challenge to communism and to all other "magic formula" ideologies. They have given us, in short, a faith by which we live—however poorly and however badly we fulfill it. Nevertheless we do live by it.

Whatever else may be said of us, no one will deny that our values are profoundly religious ones, a fact which accounts for one characteristic in our behaviors which is extremely important: It stresses charity or loving kindness in the full Christian sense. It stresses also the concept of duty to offset the idea of rights. And to the degree that we have lost that conception of duty as a balance we have been false to our own tradition. We lose one of the great elements in American character when we stress only a philosophy of "rights" only.

Rights, protecting freedom and the development of responsibility are basic to freedom. We call these "natural rights." But, taken in the debased form of "what I get out of it," they degenerate into self-interest or group-interest—not those of mutual moral responsibility implying equal stress on duties. The rights that are mistranslated into "gimme" or "grab" are the basis of pressure-group activity, of self-interests, of egoism and of the softness that chooses the pursuit of pleasure instead of the pursuit of true happiness which Emerson rightly said was achieved by finding and following principles. Selfish rights that are concerned only with "what do I get out of it" erode the moral character of any civilization. The eye of the soft man cannot confront hardship. It will look away. The man behind the eye will choose evasion, not responsible action, courageously faced.

Character cannot be had without risks, hardship and suffering, as we can observe from a great deal of human history which is difficult to refute. Men decay as men when the going gets so soft that there is no challenge. This, at least, is one problem we do not have to contend with. We are now confronted with a clear and visible challenge to our national life. It is a challenge that embraces not only a military field, though certainly the challenge from ICBM's is serious enough.

It encompasses not only will but what lies behind will. Indeed, self-will will never help us in the struggle in which we are involved, for it is precisely the thing that weakens people. Self-will is generally and easily related to appetite—what Shakespeare called a "universal wolf." If a nation does not recognize its duty and destiny and, therefore, a positive mission, it has lost its character because it has lost its ethos. An ethos is the shaping force of a nation. It is the essence of national character. We are molded from our mother's knees and our father's hands, our great-aunts, our great-uncles, and our grandfathers and grandmothers, our schools, our churches, the discipline of our games with our fellows from childhood on. A great variety of forces all converge on what is accepted as good, noble, heroic, or "what is done." What one "gets by with" in the "softest" manner, and what is "smart" and "slick" is the other, the dark side of ethos as habit. To that degree a nation's character is shaped not only by its leaders as examples (exemplars), by its Washingtons, its Jeffersons, its Jacksons, its Lincolns. It can be undone by an unbalanced diet of dubious TV personalities, bred under glass and klieg lights, to whom a wisecrack or a risque joke is more precious than a good name or a just and firm character.

One can have no doubt after he reviews history in these terms that the great epics that have shaped civilization have shown the trials and the struggles of a hero who represents the highest concept of folk character. The epic of the hero is what the bards sing to the youth and what mothers teach their children to be like. It is what young men grow up by imitating as a model. It is what the Arthurian legends, as treated by Mallory and Tennyson, did for England. It is what Shakespeare did in his great historical plays, too, nurtured on Plutarch's "Lives" and Holinshed's "Chronicles."

These lift the imaginations of all men who read them. Even "Doctor Zhivago" is pulled around in this direction, coming from a very different cultural background in all sorts of ways. It is worthwhile to note that the late author of "Doctor Zhivago" was a great Shakespearean scholar.

This epic tradition of the hero, of nobility of purpose and deed, of greatness and magnanimity—if this is lost out of a nation, how can it have character? How can it wish to serve? Who, but a fool, on any basis of pure self-interest, would ever embrace public office or the duties that carry him frequently to obloquy, certainly to savagely hostile criticism, and possibly to destruction through loss of health as well as wealth.

What is it that makes people recognize and follow true leaders? They may kill them, but sooner or later they acknowledge and follow the great leaders of history. When we put up pictures of Washington, of Jefferson, of Old Hickory or Stonewall Jackson, of Lee, and of Lincoln, and of other great Americans, so that we can look at them, it is because we know that the models of the men we produce shape our characters. We can learn from their weaknesses as well as from their strengths.

This is the essence of the problem of how to continue a great tradition of leadership that is simple, humble and wise in the biblical sense of "understanding," that is rooted in man's turning for guidance and strength to God, his Creator, as Lincoln did. What are our assets and what are our liabilities in these terms?

First, from the religious heritage, we are an excessively amiable and open people.

This spirit is plainly evident in our doughboys and GI's. It is this unfailing sense of "buddy," "partner"—an openness, a kind of

fraternal cooperation, first rooted in the frontier spirit and the openness of our society. This amiability, this trustfulness puts a wonderful stamp on our national character because it means that there really is in us, almost universally shared by Americans, a consensus juris (a universal agreement on what is right as the basis for law) that makes us feel "alike," no matter how diverse the racial strains are. It is this spirit that overcomes differences so we can work together as Americans. We not only close ranks against class and other hatreds from outside lands. We open ranks to all men who believe in true human rights and duties of freedom and justice. We don't believe in leveling down but in freeing and educating to grow up.

But the corollary defect of this openhandedness is that we are extremely unsuspicious people and trustful. Since we are peaceful, we accept all pacifists in good faith, even Lord Russell and "Pugwash" Eaton. We are willing to give Stalin, Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung the benefit of the doubt—in spite of the record of planned deceit and the tactics of terror and subversion, including takeovers by disciplined mob violence, turned off or on. There are times when we should remember the Biblical injunction to be "as wise as the serpent as well as harmless as the dove." It is necessary from time to time in the world we live in, to open our eyes to evil and to discern how to deal with it and not to be overcome by it. This characteristic of watchfulness is not adequately present in our tradition; or at least we might say it is being produced by necessity but very painfully. It is well to state again the basic objective, grounded on a balanced view of human nature, that we aim at as a culture:

Our Constitution is based upon the idea that men are neither angels nor demons but that they have ingredients of both in them. The angelic can be victorious only if the demoniac is controlled. Therefore, we have checks and balances to prevent the usurpation of power or the abuse of it, to limit the Government, to see that men have a right to develop on their own responsibility and by their own choice. That is the only way we can achieve any true morality. All other morality is conditioned—socially imposed by some leader's magic pattern in the manner of Pavlov's trained dogs.

With whatever inscrutable wisdom Providence has put us here, one condition of human life is certain; that we have our own salvation to work out in fear and trembling, that we do have to develop as individuals. The moment we concede that the other "imposed" morality is moral—which is that we are conditioned by our environment like the animals in Pavlov's experiments—we are no longer human. We have retrogressed back down the tree of life—headed back down the evolutionary road perhaps to wind up as completely "adjusted" as the ant heap and the beehive, which are arrested societies. They are indeed in some ways naturally marvelous societies; but they are finished societies: they have no further evolution. They have adjusted themselves to their environment completely. Instinct governs them, not reason. They punish deviation ruthlessly.

How do we show our national purpose? Best of all through the lives, the faces, the families of men and women, bred in freedom, who grow in stature and show it by their faces, by their words, by their deeds. What human race would rather breed Khrushchevs or Stalins or any other such leader than any 10 of the best citizens of any town, city, state or free nation of this world? The ant heap is not humanity's destiny.

The American tradition is a restless, questing tradition, which has the weakness perhaps of being always on the move and looking for new things, sometimes without digesting and settling down in the old: Main Street lies right down the middle of the town, with houses on each side. It marches through and marches on and the people are always on the move. This is disrupting in some ways. Yet it has advantages; it "mixes" us all up in the process so that there are no castes.

But it is a little extreme to compare us to a melting pot or a mixing bowl, or something that shakes us up, that whips us in, and maybe homogenizes us, or sifts us into the sameness of soft flour. We resist this atomizing by our sound habit of protecting the individual and keeping his own richness and flavor.

The great traditions of any society are carried in people who have their roots deep down in home ground, rooted in the unconscious behavior and social heritage of the past as well as the projection into the future. If we do not want to be windblown by all the passing doctrines, we have to have security in our own background, in our institutions, and in the models that have been set us—the old men and the old women we have known who have set a model like that—our parents, our friends, our community, our neighborhood, and traditions. What is considered right is done because in some ways it has been proved to be a good thing for a long time. We are a conservative people, in the best sense, innovating to preserve old values, tested truths, to meet new times and technologies.

One weakness of American character has come from our supreme eagerness to conquer a continent and to push faster the things that we do with our hands—the creative work of the builder. This was good and necessary. But we have sometimes fallen into the trap of regarding success in these things as an end in itself. That is materialism not as blatant as that of communism, which is materialistic in its origins as well as in its ends. But it is materialism, if it looks only to goods. Let us not have ends that are materialistic. We must use our goods for moral good. Let us attempt once more to balance the virtues of the spirit with organic needs—both for individuals and society.

Aristotle's observation, in short, about the nature of virtue—the golden mean between the extremes, which has become a good part of Christian doctrine in various ways—is a true interpretation of real character. It was rooted in the Judaic tradition, too, of the Old Testament. That is something to remember. That is what checks and balances in our system mean. It is what restraint and moderation mean in a man's character. Without it he is a slave to something, perhaps to his lower self, to appetite. He cannot be a free man on that basis. This is equally true of a nation.

Now, how does this bear on leadership? And how does it bear on power?

The ultimate ingredients for real power in any man depend on his capacity to develop sustained support and "contagious" leadership. To help develop others for leadership is to broaden leadership. It is the real aim of education in the broadest sense, along with understanding the need and the way to pick leaders and to support them. We all depend upon this conception of individual responsibility and duty as being a part of human development. But we do not sufficiently recognize the effect of models and the duty of examples, the contagion of courage and devotion. This must in turn reflect itself (and be reflected in) an image of a national ethos; a mission, a model for humanity and for realizing this model in human life.

Everything depends upon morale in any nation. Weapons are only useful to the degree that they can be used and that it is reasonably clear they will be used. A posture of strength is relatively worthless and can become dangerous, particularly if the posture is a purely defensive posture that never anticipates anything except a resistance of the kind that does not punish but that tries only by piecemeal resistance, on grounds of another's choosing, to prevent the Sino-Soviet bloc, often through "stooges" from pushing freedom out of the world. That is what John Foster Dulles fought with the courage of a Christian and a free man—and what, God helping us, we Americans shall always understand and fight.

Morale means, first of all, the faith that a nation has in its destiny and its world position and mission. That is quite important. If a nation loses that faith in its own chosen destiny it has lost its battle of conflicting faiths. And it is exceedingly important that leadership should, therefore, be measured in terms of keeping alive this faith of a nation in its destiny. It cannot be done by leadership alone because leadership is a product of a nation's character which is the best guarantee of morale. A nation's leadership is bound to be reflected by the morale of its people, and limited by it.

At certain periods of our history when we have had no very grave challenges, our leadership has reflected it in the most obvious way. At the times when we have had challenges as profound as the Civil War or as that period in which our revolution was fought and the Constitution was created we have produced leadership that was incredible, that stood as a symbol to the entire world. And we have produced it again at very important periods of history and in our own times. Sometimes, of course, and inevitably, that leadership has been fallible, and is after all human. But it was great leadership measured in terms of growth to new potentials of creating national "tone".

Well, there never was a time in our history more propitious for great leadership than now. We face a challenge beyond any other that this country or probably humanity has ever undergone, certainly since what were in our known past only the dim struggles for human survival against other forms of life in prehistoric periods. At no time before has the human situation been so fraught with really apocalyptic possibilities, both for good and for evil; for evil in terms of the destructive potentialities of weapons systems that we know about.

What is a more important threat perhaps is the possibility of success for a systematic syllogism of terror, practiced openly by Mr. Khrushchev and his Chinese allies. Certainly both of them are now quite bold in resorting to nuclear weapons as a threat, the risk of which is calculated to deter us from any action anywhere in the world. If we accept Khrushchev's assumption that he can and will destroy us if we don't concede his demands, and that this is the only open alternative if we wish to be "allowed to coexist"—then, of course, he doesn't need more than threats—untested. He can take us at will—the richest prize in history, lost through cowardice in the face of a man who plays up his anger and his terrorization with an actor's skill and a tyrant's method.

At the time of the Quemoy-Matsu crisis in 1958 and at odd moments since then, we heard many arguments to the effect that these small islands were not worth the risk of nuclear war, that they are really part of the mainland of China, etc.; therefore we ought to consolidate our position at some point where we have more of the support of the world, perhaps on Taiwan proper. Yet, on this reasoning there is no better title to Taiwan than there is to Quemoy and Matsu, unless one takes the Chinese Republic as being the legitimate Government of China and as being in de facto possession of both. The same logic that would give up Quemoy

and Matsu would, the next time, when the risk of nuclear weapons and the chips are down on the test of who will support us in the showdown, find equally compelling reasons for yielding our position on the new point d'appui. And where does one draw the line on that basis? We have to reject Khrushchev's first thesis—both that he can and that he would destroy us if we refuse his demands.

In any case, we have made this clear enough as our basic belief and policy. Now, more than ever, we ought to prepare ourselves for resisting terror as a tool. Those in positions of leadership in this country should attempt to prepare other people for facing this kind of challenge with an adequate response. As surely as we do not face this kind of challenge with an adequate response and with that firmness that allows no miscalculation on the part of the other fellow, we have encouraged the most dangerous element in international affairs to miscalculate our intentions and our ability to back them up.

There has not been one single iota of evidence on any record of Russian or Chinese behavior that does not suggest that if we stood absolutely firm we would be confronted with a situation which at the moment risks a good deal more for them than it does for us.

This is what the deluded followers of Bertrand Russell and Cyrus Eaton, the Pied Piper of Pugwash, miss: their logic seems to many softheaded and hysterial intellectuals to be overwhelming: "Better be Red than dead." But we might be Red slaves and still dead, through a falling-out among our masters of the Sino-Soviet bloc, or just over who will run the world even within Russia. Our renunciation of nuclear weapons won't control their future employment by others. Indeed, it will make that employment to destroy any centers of courage and freedom, piecemeal, easy—where an all-out struggle would threaten the safety of both China and Russia (by massive worldwide fallout) on the very premises that Russell has popularized. Even if we were destroyed by adequate surprise, this would still be so.

But to disarm unilaterally—the real theme of the miscalled sane nuclear policy, advocates of slavery rather than extinction—would be the surest way to make extinction probable. Khrushchev has lost control of Mao. Indeed, one day Mr. K., or his successor (and he may have one sooner than he thinks), may reckon us as a restraining force on a Red ally, Peiping, grown to the stature of a challenger for world mastery.

Under those conditions, the undoubted capability and the certain will to punish an aggressor in the measure of his aggression remains our surest hope of peace—by restraint through that power. It is not perfect nor is the world perfect. But it is calculably far more a protection not only for liberty but for the life of most of humanity than encouragement of Khruschev and company and Mao to risk a showdown of terror because they felt Pugwash had washed out our national character and crippled our unity of will and purpose.

Lord Russell's politics and history are either cynical (puckish) or naive, maybe both. Wars are bred by miscalculations to which Russell may prove a chief contributor.

In other words, the alternatives to the assumptions are always the things we must look at. Our leadership must teach us to do that because it must be as wise as the serpent in these time; but it can only do so if it convinces the people of this country that firmness—not weakness—leads in the direction of just and lasting peace. When this has been made clear, leadership has done what is necessary to have people take the risks with the fortitude and conviction which will enable us to meet, under God's guidance, this challenge with which we are presently confronted.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study paper No. 2: "Fundamentals of a National Strategy," by Dr. David M. Abshire, task force staff director:

FUNDAMENTALS OF A NATIONAL STRATEGY

(By David M. Abshire, task force staff director)

I. WHAT IS STRATEGY?

This paper explores fundamentals of a strategy designed to promote our national policy objectives. The paper will seek historical perspective—or the big picture—behind these fundamentals which often have explained the rise and collapse of nations.

A sense of historical perspective within the Communist ideology has furnished the fuel for Soviet achievements, whether in space or in a rising industrial output. We think the Communists' sense of history is wrong, but they are right in believing that history is as much of the unwritten future as of the written past. They are right in viewing an age as a whole. This is why Russia and Red China have the most integrated, unified doctrine of military strategy in human history, and this integration maximizes the advantages of her physical strength.

Their principal strategic advantage has resulted from this historical or integrating perspective, and consequently our strategy needs a counterpart historical perspective—except we want our perspective to be true. America traditionally has disunity of policy and a short-range point of view, further fractured by political partisanship. This American disadvantage could enable Russia, although weaker industrially, politically, and spiritually, to overcome the United States, stronger in all these respects.

How is "strategy" defined?

In pre-World War II thought, strategy frequently was understood as the art of moving armies and navies to gain maximum advantage prior to actual battle. Tactics was the art of fighting the battle itself. Some military writers argued, however, that in certain types of conflict, blockade, economic strangulation, or attrition could accomplish the work of battle. Regardless, all agreed that the purpose of the advantage sought was the destruction of an opponent's will to resist, or of a bellicose nation's will to aggression.

Sun Tzu, the ancient Chinese military theorist, wrote in 500 B.C.:

"To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."

Thus, the best of the ancient Chinese militarists recognized that the final objective of strategy lay in the moral or psychological realm, that power is a function of the will, and that if there is no will to fight, there is no power.

Since World War II, strategy increasingly has been translated into an extended time dimension. Indeed, a "protracted conflict" lasting an entire historical era is not a new concept, for the hundred years wars between England and France, and long before that the extended wars between Italy and Carthage are two of many examples of protracted conflicts. But again, the Communists have perfected a "protracted strategy" for the nuclear age through the intensification of the extended pressures by a varying but constant threat of all-out holocaust. This they do through exploiting the dilemma: the struggle with the Sino-Soviet powers could last a century of cold war or could burst into a hot war Armageddon which conceivably could end within a week.

But the protracted conflict alternative is more probable than the Armageddon alternative, since the true Communists believe that "historical inevitability" or the "wave of the future" is on their side, and consequently that they do not have to undertake gambles such as many past conquerors have undertaken. Hence in the present conflict with Russia, strategy may be defined especially as the art of optimum utilization of resources, before hot war is ever commenced, to destroy or block the will of an opponent. For a peace-loving power it becomes a protracted art in which the pay-off may not be in battle that destroys an acquisitive opponent's will to further aggression, but in a superior diplomatic, technological, or economic position, which deters an acquisitive opponent's temptation for aggression. In fact, for either a peace-loving or an acquisitive power, real "victory" would have to be achieved without nuclear battle, nuclear battle being self-destructive of almost any conceivable national policy.

II. ARE THERE FUNDAMENTALS OF STRATEGY?

In view of these new influences or emphases within the strategic equation, can it be said that there remain certain constant fundamentals of strategy? In 1914 and in 1940, the French talked a lot about principles of war and then fought the next war in archaic terms of the last war. The trouble with the French was that they tried to apply to dynamic change static principles derived from certain temporary conditions of tactics and technology.

Our strategic thinking must not be tied down, to say, fleets, armies, or geographical positions, and project static World War II concepts onto the dynamic time-space age. We must seek fundamentals in recurring relationships between humans trying to utilize to best advantage the resources at hand. It is human nature that does not change.

Britain's brilliant military theorist, G. F. R. Henderson, noted:

"The first thing is to realize that in war we have to do not so much with numbers, arms, and maneuvers, as with human nature.

"What did Napoleon find in the history of the campaigns of Alexander, Hannibal, and Julius Caesar? Not merely a record of marches and maneuvers, of the use of entrenchments, or of the general principles of attack and defense. This is the mechanical part* * *.

"No; he found in those campaigns a complete study of human nature under the conditions that exist in war; human nature affected by discipline, by fear, by the need of food, by want of confidence, by overconfidence, by the weight of responsibility, by political interests, by patriotism, by distrust." [1]

In conflict situations, how human beings obtain maximum advantage with material and human resources forms the basis for any true fundamentals of strategy. Those fundamentals, in a way, are merely highest commonsense.

III. THE FIRST FUNDAMENTAL: THE OBJECTIVE

On the field of battle, the unpardonable military sin always has been for the general to forget his objective, or to get a false objective (an unimportant piece of land or a

Footnotes at end of speech.

useless fort) substituted in his mind for the real objective.

General McClellan made Richmond, not Lee's indefatigable army, his objective. Without the destruction of the mobility and freedom of action of Lee's army, the war could not be won. Grant, avoiding McClellan's mistake, devised a strategy that, through his and Sherman's maneuvers and battles, would paralyze Lee. When this was accomplished, he offered Lee magnanimous terms of surrender, in accord with the objective of the war as laid down by Lincoln: The restoration of the South, in spirit and in fact, to the Union. He used unlimited military means to obtain a limited political objective. Both Lincoln and Grant possessed long-sighted views of strategic and political objectives.[2]

The first step toward a public understanding of a national strategy is understanding of clear national objectives. Karl von Clausewitz, in his book, "On War," pointed to the fact that modern war had become "an affair of the whole nation" where all factors—military, psychological, and political—were involved. He asserted that "political aims are the end and war is the means, and the means can never be conceived without the end," or expressed differently, "war is nothing else than a continuation of political transactions intermingled with different means."

A. Failures of two World Wars

Clausewitz, often pegged as a militarist, was saying that war, to follow any rule of reason and be more than a suicidal absurdity, had to be the instrument of policy, the servant and not the master of national goals. This is quite the opposite of militarism. Clausewitz's central truth was grossly ignored in World War I and World War II. World War I did not serve the true policy ends of the Allies, if those ends or objectives aimed at a stable peace. The phrase "a war to end wars," followed up by a policy of victory wrought by unconditional surrender, might have been means to stir the public effort and enthusiasm, but were self-defeating ways toward an objective of stable peace. Instead of achieving stable peace, we bred the depression, fascism, nazism, and a worse war. As already noted, Grant too used "unconditional surrender" as a military means. But at the end of the war, he conformed to the temperate political objectives.

The conduct of World War II, on the part of the Allied Powers, similarly violated true objectives of American interest. The unconditional surrender policy inaugurated at the Casablanca Conference was carried through to the peace policy and made inevitable a postwar European vacuum which Russia would fill. Again, the demands of shortsighted military expedience dictated many of the concessions to Russia at Yalta, concessions which violated the true aims of the United States.[3]

B. Defensive objective of opposing communism

In the cold war, is America pursuing a self-defeating policy as she did in the two World Wars? What are our true objectives, our grand design, our overall concept? Is our aim to survive the Soviet threat? Or is our aim something beyond survival?

For America in the cold war, the real objective must not be opposing Russia and counteracting communism. Communism thrives on chaos, on the vindictiveness of the have-nots against the haves, on the frustrated hope for order and for total, planned solutions in the human soul. Communism is not the cause, but the product of world disillusionment. Communism is but one solution proposed to bring a sort of order and a kind of progress out of disorder and retardation. A policy or an objective of simply opposing communism is self-defeating. In the long run, communism can only be overcome by a different and more satisfactory answer to man's needs, frustrations and longings. Communism is a faith, a religion, and can only be replaced by a better faith, a better religion.

C. The objective beyond survival

Certainly a proper goal beyond survival is the preservation of freedom in America. But what type of freedom? Freedom from fear of Russia? Freedom from the destruction of the atomic bomb? Or freedom toward greater happiness, greater prosperity, greater humanity, greater constitutional liberties, greater rule of law, greater faith, greater creativity and harmony within and between individuals?[4]

Certainly the objective is somewhere beyond survival and framed in freedom at home and compatible values abroad. Through that frame lie still greater values, according to man's particular faith, religion and conviction that become his ultimate concern, to use Theologian Paul Tillich's term.

In the protracted conflict, if we are to follow the principle of the objective, this question must be posed: What do we really mean by a free society based on the foundation of constitutional liberties? When do we reach the point of jeopardizing that freedom? How much are we willing to sacrifice for security? Or rather, how much freedom can we safely sacrifice without violating the ultimate objective—the preservation of freedom?

D. Giving up freedom to preserve freedom

Confronted by the Kaiser's Germany and Hitler's Germany in World War I and II, this was an easy question to answer. Our military expenditures, during fiscal year 1945, were at $75.9 billion. Freedoms were given up. Regulations and controls were instituted in almost every economic phase of American life. Our youth was drafted into the service. There was a temporary abdication of freedom—rationing, higher taxes, price controls, the draft—to fight for the preservation of freedom. We were confident our Nation had sufficient constitutional flexibility to regain that freedom after the war.

But now we are in a continuing cold war, a lasting struggle, a protracted conflict. As President Eisenhower quite clearly explained on May 19, 1953: "We live, as I have said, not in an instant danger but in an age of danger. • • • We must think and plan and provide so as to live through this age in freedom—in ways that do not undermine our freedom even as we try to defend it."

Thus, it becomes not a matter of giving up for 3 or 4 years; it was a matter of giving up for possibly a hundred years.

At the peak of World War II, the Nation spent about 45 percent of our national product on national security, without going bankrupt. As Col. George Lincoln notes in his book, "The Economics of National Security":

"Up to perhaps half our national product, the question is not how much can be taken. It is rather a questioning of what extraordinary economic measures we are willing to institute to enable the efficient expenditure of dollars for defense while at the same time stabilizing the economy. • • • Whatever the proportion, there is a limit beyond which economic controls become necessary. When the budget of the security plan goes beyond a certain level, that budget plan must be associated and coordinated with a plan for exercising the necessary government control (including taxes) over the economy. If the Congress and the people accept both plans, then we can afford a very large budget. If not, then a large budget can be very dangerous indeed to the economy. In chapter I we posed the question, 'How much will you pay to live?'"

This question is on the level of survival only, without guarantees of liberties. Is the young American graduating from school content to just survive—without real choice of where he lives or where he works? That would be his lot under communism or socialism. Indeed, Bertrand Russell thinks the question in the nuclear age should be put on this level of survival only, with or without freedom. In colloquial terms: "Better Red than Dead."

But Colonel Lincoln goes further in his discussion and says: "There is an associated question, 'What Government economic controls will you accept to live?'"

Such a question, posed before the age of space and of cold war, would carry with it the inference that unwillingness to accept the necessary controls and the necessary sacrifices would be a sign of national softness. In the space and cold war age, there must be genuine concern for the permanent loss of freedom in an attempt to defend freedom. When the period of "giving up of freedoms" may run beyond the average lifetime, the "giving up" is permanent. President Eisenhower was quite conscious of this when he said on May 19, 1953: "We didn't want to become a garrison State, we wanted to remain free. Our plans and programs had to conform to the practices of a free people, which meant essentially a free economy."

This objective must be kept foremost in mind. In the forthcoming decades, it will be quite necessary to increase the amounts being spent on national security. There is no amount which can grant us absolute security. The amount selected must be based on balanced judgment of short-range and long-range security and objectives. Then the increased security should be financed not by inflation but by a sound tax program and a cutting back on nondefense Government spending.

E. Reaction to the external challenge

Arnold Toynbee notes that challenges arouse nations to unprecedented efforts.[5] Yet he observes that the stimplus of the blow can be too great, especially if prolonged over a long time, as was the case of the Hannibalic war in Italy.

True enough, the Communist empire could break up within a decade or so, but if the struggle continues over a century, the severity to us could be far more dangerous than one single military blow tomorrow.

Liddell Hart makes an apt comment in this regard:

"The acquisitive state, inherently unsatisfied, needs to gain victory in order to gain its object—and must therefore court greater risks in the attempt. The conservative state can achieve its object by merely inducing the aggressor to drop his attempt at conquest—by convincing him that 'the game is not worth the candle.' • • • Indeed, in attempting more it may defeat its own purpose by exhausting itself so much that it is unable to resist other enemies, or the internal effects of overstrain. Self-exhaustion in war has killed more states than any foreign assailant" (Liddell Hart, "Strategy," Praeger: New York).

One danger of the protracted struggle is illustrated by the case of Sparta. She met external challenge with an internal militarization and statism. This so absorbed her energies that she had none left over for real development.

Negative missions and objectives on the part of the United States in the present protracted conflict could produce a similar effect—deprive us of our rationale of freedom at the time we are opposed by a revolutionary rationale of communism. Historians would write that in the protracted conflict, as in World Wars I and II, our means of conflict destroyed our national objectives.

Footnotes at end of speech.

F. The military objective: Destruction of the will to wage war

In military conflict, the immediate objective is to destroy the enemy's will to continue to fight. To accomplish this, force must be applied to sensitive or decisive areas which will destroy the will.

What constitute the most decisive target areas?

In the past decade, the Air Force has argued for a counter-force strategy, i.e., concentration against the enemy forces which will strike at us. By and large, this seemed an appropriate strategy during the air age. But it appears that the equation may shift during the missile age, where, while still maintaining a mix, primary reliance will be placed on what has been labeled a minimum or finite deterrence strategy as the surest road to decision and the greatest comparative advantage for a defending nation. Gen. Pierre Gallois, recently head of the atomic-warfare planning staff of the Western Alliance, noted:

"Simple arithmetic is enough to show the difference between the means needed for defense and those needed for aggression. If the defending nation, for instance, had 400 missile-launching sites thoroughly dispersed throughout its territory, and if these launching sites were well protected, it has been estimated that the aggressor would have to expend some 22,500 missiles—each with a warhead of 1 megathon—to destroy them. But the defense could wipe out 30 of the aggressor's largest cities with less than 50 missiles.

"And so, in this era of long-range ballistic missiles even more than in the age of the airplane, the advantage lies with the defense. The defense can prevent an aggressor from resorting to force by the threat of a relatively small number of missiles capable of reaching the highly populated areas that constitute their objectives." [6]

Certainly the retaliation would be unwise if he made the missile sites, many of them emptied, his primary targets. Retaliation would be aimed at heartland, population, and production. These would be decisive in destroying the will of the opponent. This price would be too great for the aggressor, and hence deterrence would occur.

There is little logic in arguing that such a retaliatory strategy should be outlawed as a violation of the principle of the objective. From the moral point of view, the United States, right or wrong, already inaugurated the use of atomic weapons against population and industry at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Secondly, the use of unlimited means is necessary to counter the unlimited objective of our opponent—our total obliteration. But at the same time, our unlimited means do not require us to set for ourselves unlimited objectives. We dropped the A-bombs on Japan and then offered conditional, not unconditional surrender, in what became the model peace of human history.

General Grant, as already noted, employed an unlimited strategy to promote a limited political objective.[7]

IV. ECONOMY OF EFFORT

How do we best utilize our resources to accomplish our objectives?

In any conflict, the resources of both contenders are limited, even though the resources of one contender basically may greatly outweigh the resources of the other. Victory has not necessarily fallen to the contender with the greater resources. Alexander, Hannibal, Gustavus, Adolphus, Frederick, Napoleon, and Hitler defeated larger armies and superior nations or alliances. The principle explaining their successful art of getting the most from the least is known in classical military literature as economy of effort.

When this term was first used, the economy part of economy of effort meant the best management of effort, the maximum use of the resources at hand, knowing when and where to spend effort, and knowing when and where to conserve effort to gain a comparative advantage. To gain this advantage in the decisive areas meant conserving in less decisive or lower priority areas. Winning in the decisive, critical area was like cutting the vine at its roots; its branches would wither of their own accord.

The application and misapplication of this fundamental is very easily illustrated by the strategic bombing campaign against Germany in World War II. In January 1943 at the Casablanca Conference, five primary target systems were established: submarine construction yards, aircraft industry, transportation, oil industry, and other industrial targets. This dispersion destroyed effectiveness. In June 1943, a new directive concentrated the air attack on the German aircraft industries. The theory was correct, but the objective was wrong, because the Germans partially nullified the attack by greater industrial dispersion. It was not until May and June 1944, that a new strategic decision was made fully to concentrate on the German oil industry—the key to transportation, a correct and decisive target. Consequently, transportation and resupply slowed towards a halt; the munitions industries were no longer being adequately resupplied.[8]

Here then are two illustrations, first the wrong way: trying to be strong everywhere and ending up with being affective nowhere; and secondly, the right way: economizing in areas of secondary importance in order to concentrate in a decisive area.

A. Flexibility and the mixed force concept

Flexibility is a necessary ingredient for economy of effort. When the Allies chose to concentrate on destroying the German air frame industries, they were applying economy of effort, but they had selected the wrong target. At least the Air Forces had the flexibility to shift to a decisive target. Inevitably, mistakes will be made. As Napoleon said, in war the successful general is not he who makes no mistakes. "No mistake" is impossible. But he is the general who makes the fewest mistakes.

Flexibility allows for correcting mistakes before the opponent can capitalize on them. Flexibility means having alternate plans, or as Bourcet said:

"Every plan of campaign ought to have several branches and to have been so well thought out that one or other of the said branches cannot fail of success."

The 1956 State of the Union Message called for an "effective flexible type of power calculated to deter or repulse aggression and to preserve the peace." This was flexibility for a given diplomatic or military crisis, for a general or a limited war—fixed in time and space. By and large, this flexibility has been achieved through the "mixed force" concept. Rather than reliance upon one weapon with a given characteristic, reliance is placed on a combination of abilities to retaliate: SAC bombers, liquid fuel ICBM's (many in hardened sites), aircraft carriers, hound-dog air-to-ground missiles, IRBM's around the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc, and soon the solid fuel nuclear-tipped Polaris. The very "mix" of the forces tends to add to the invulnerability of the striking capacity.

Economy of effort through a "mix" achieves comparative advantages and especially high returns from our mutual security program. Our own defense budget provides a military establishment of about 2½ million men. The $2 billion the administration requested for military assistance facilitates the effective utilization of over 7 million allied personnel in their military structures. A greater return comes at lower cost.

B. Flexibility and technological breakthroughs

Equally, the administration has stressed research and development flexibility over the decades of the cold war where both blocs of powers will seek to make new technological breakthroughs and weapons advances. The decision of when and where to place the emphasis demands a sensitivity to change and an unusual sense of balance. As the Secretary of the Navy said in March 1954, we often have to choose between "too-little-and-too-late and too-much-and-too-soon"; we have to "buy our security in installments with the most promising weapons of the day."

This especially involves flexibility in regard to Executive-congressional actions on transferral of funds. Before a weapon has proved itself, economy of force is flouted by rigid over-commitment in advance. When a piece of technology has proved itself, however, major reevaluation is called for.

An example of the type of shifts constantly necessary occurred when the President on April 6, 1960, approved changes in the Navy and Air Force budgets.[9] These actions resulted from increasingly favorable technological and strategic estimates based upon tests of the workability and value of the weaponry concerned. By the time action on the defense appropriations bill had been completed by the House subcommittee, still other shifts were made, incidentally, without changing by 7/1000 of 1 percent the dollar increase over the President's request.[10]

Economy of effort, incorporated into a protracted conflict strategy, demands this constant willingness to make changes, to reassess, to shift funds, to make new decisions, to cut back or cancel out-dated programs. Economy of effort becomes the fulcrum of the see-saw, with too-little-too-late on one end, and too-much-and-too-soon on the other, with the point of balance of the fulcrum having to be constantly shifted. As Secretary of Defense Gates said: "It takes courage to change, to cancel an expensive program that has been overtaken by events, to close an installation employing trusted competent people, or to abandon a proven military mission of the past in exchange for a better way." [11]

In regard to the Atlas, for example, economy of effort demands a never-ending series of shifts and reappraisals. The first generation of missiles is enormously expensive and vulnerable and, in accuracy, it has been estimated that from 6 to 60 of them might be required to take out 1 enemy launching site.[12] Any type of effective counterforce capability, therefore, would demand a considerable superiority of such missiles over the Russians. In accord with the dictates of economy of effort, then, every effort is being made to better utilize our resources by (1) speeding the development of the solid fuel mobile Minuteman, (2) improving the "mix" of our overall retaliatory capability, and relying more on Polaris, (3) covering the period of transition by increasing the SAC air alert and hence its invulnerability, in proportion to the increase in Russian ICBM capabilities.

Obviously, the solution—posed by some critics—to match our Atlas missile for missile with the Russian counterpart would gear our national strategy to a rigid numbers concept of matching the Russians man per man, liquid fuel ICBM per liquid fuel ICBM. Indeed, that would escape hard decision of evaluating the cost and capabilities and effective operational years of Atlas with the mix, flexibility, mobility, and economy of efforts possible from the solid fuel generations. But it would flagrantly violate every commonsense idea that makes up the concept of economy of effort.

Footnotes at end of speech.

C. Economy of effort and fiscal management

This principle of economy of effort, with its demand for flexibility and adjustment, applies to our fiscal economy.

Defense spending, if financed by improper means and methods, can destroy the flexibility and mobility within our fiscal structure. To finance spending by inflationary measures is to invite catastrophe, especially if high levels of expenditures are projected over the entire length of the protracted conflict. To finance high levels of expenditures by higher taxation of the type which destroys savings, investments, and incentives—in short, destroys the ingredients for sound growth and a fluid economy—is likewise to court disaster.[13]

The traditional foundation of American military policy had rested upon a sort of three-point concept: a preeminent industrial base for expansion, comparatively weak forces in being, and dependence upon time to move from no mobilization to full mobilization after attack or great peril. The time-space age shattered this three-point concept. Needed was, first, a plateau of preparedness through an age combining perpetually peace and war; second, a design for forces in being prior to any attack of an aggressor, whether it occurred in 1955 or in 1985.

These new needs of the time-space age were not incorporated in our military policy from 1945 through 1952. Our Government, in the face of Russia, dismantled the greatest military force ever assembled within 2 years of the end of hostilities. Our Armed Forces has been reduced from a peak of 12,125,000 men to about 1,500,000. We were still rapidly cutting the residual force in 1950 when the Korean aggression took place. Then started another massive mobilization back to 3,636,000. In 1953 the new administration conducted a reappraisal which recognized that such extreme fluctuation of peaks and valleys, from a 1945 defense budget of 79.9 billion to 11.9 billion in 1950 to 43.7 in 1953, could spell disaster to America if the Soviet strategy actually was a protracted conflict perhaps extending a century. The defense burden and deficit financing, in part, explained the 50 percent loss of value of the dollar from 1939 to 1949, which meant we were getting 50 percent less defense per dollar.

In a speech on April 16, 1953, President Eisenhower inaugurated the long-haul concept. Not only was this demanded by the principle of the objective, but also by the principle of economy of force. Policy was not to be geared to any "magic critical year" but was to be based upon the "sounder theory that a very real danger not only exists this year, but may continue to exist for years to come," and the old policy would be replaced by a new, long-range policy which would avoid "inefficient and expensive starts and stops."

D. The matching fallacy and England's great strategic mistake

Today we hear cries about a missile gap; in 1955 we heard cries about a bomber gap. The simple advent of the solid fuel Minuteman, which many now picture as an absolute final weapon, is not going to stop the constant flow of technological change. There will be gaps and rumors of gaps from now on. To try to eliminate all gaps would be to try to zig and zag with the Communists and copy the particular weapons which offer the greatest advantage to Russia. Military advantage seldom comes from a strategy of duplicating or matching everything an opponent does. It comes from being stronger in certain specific areas of advantage.[14]

Britain, after nearly a century of the Pax Britannica, abandoned her naval strategy of small land armies striking with mobility out of the blue. The German Empire, in the rapid growth of youth, was making startling advances industrially, economically, and militarily. It was within the shadow of the German peril that Britain forfeited her native national strategy and tried to copy and match Germany division for division. She developed and committed vast land armies to the continent where her sea mobility offered no advantage. Whereas previously, Britain had retaliated against an aggressor at times and places of British choosing and with the unique weapons of Britain, in 1914 she met German aggression at the time and place of the choosing of the German general staff, in a strictly defensive policy. The cost was that Britain never regained her world leadership.

E. Economy of effort and human resources

Especially is economy of effort paramount in relation to human resources in the field of research and development. Dr. Mettler, executive vice president of Space Technology Laboratories, pointed this out to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics (March 31, 1960):

"Space technology was obviously a field in which major projects would become increasingly large and complex and expensive and would increasingly tend to take on the character of national and even global undertakings. And to further complicate matters, a rapidly multiplying number of alternate projects became technically feasible. With limited economic and intellectual resources, it was—and still is—very important to distinguish between what is possible, and what is needed—between what could be done and what should be done. A relatively few large projects must be done superbly well."

Our economic effort behind the space program would be limited even if we doubled the space budget tomorrow. The human resources behind the space program are even more limited. For example, thousands of engineers are involved in the present Atlas project. It becomes a very critical decision, then, where this scientific talent should be placed after the termination of the Atlas project. Should it be moved into the space field, or the defense field, or split between both? Such decisions are crucial in maintaining a better economy of effort than Soviet Russia.

V. FREEDOM OF ACTION

Freedom of action, necessary to accomplish economy of effort, implies the mobility to retain the initiative. It means dictating—not being dictated to. In all levels of policy, its application becomes quite evident. The freedom of action or mobility needed for flexibility in shifting scientific, industrial, and economic resources can be lost by political and lobby pressures exerted to maintain the status quo or promote a vested interest. The recognized failure of the so-called containment policy was in its lack of freedom of action on the politico-military level.[15]

How is freedom of action gained in a conflict situation? A boxing match furnishes the answer. The negative or defensive part of the match is an ability of a contender to keep the guard up and ward off the punches. The positive part is his ability to deliver the punches into sensitive areas of the head and body, so that the opponent will lose his balance and equilibrium.

In an all-out missile war, the negative, defensive part would come from a relatively secure or invulnerable retaliatory capacity, such as the mobile Minuteman, Polaris missile systems, BMEWS, Midas, and early warning systems should offer. The positive, offensive part would come from an ability to strike at decisive areas of the enemy's defensive structure, so that the enemy will lose his stability, and eventually his capacity and will to resist.

A. Reciprocity of military action: Limited and unlimited war

The relative success of opponents to strike at each other will be determined by which side has a technology and weaponry "one better than the other." In an all-out struggle, each side chooses its own weapons. A man with his fists only is not going to beat a man with a pistol. The one that chooses the pistol forces the other to try to select an even more effective weapon. This principle, Clausewitz called "reciprocity of military action." He said:

"War is an act of force, and to the application of that force there is no limit. Each of the adversaries forces the hand of the other, and a reciprocal action results which in theory can have no limit."[16]

This does not mean that war must be unlimited. With the two boxers in the ring, the fight is limited because they had a referee and they both agreed to limitations. But limited war can only be a product of limited aims of not just one, but both sides. In the age of chivalry, knights settled the disputes of states. Hoffman Nickerson points to the medieval truce of the church as a successful attempt of the papacy to limit war throughout Europe. In the 18th Century, limited wars were often fought over territorial disputes, a duchy or a province. In all cases, the political policies of the states were limited and were not aimed at the ultimate destruction of the opponent.

When the violence of the French Revolution and Napoleon was unleashed in Europe, the nations accustomed to limited means quickly fell before Napoleon's strategy. Not until the allies abandoned their limited means, and adapted themselves to an all-out struggle, was Bonaparte overcome.

With this, there is an interesting parallel in the age of cold war. The Communists have set off an unlimited ideological struggle which reached global proportions after the defeat of Germany and Japan in World War II. While this does not mean that the Communists will unleash nuclear holocaust, it does mean that they hope to maintain the initiative by constantly operating in all areas—economic, psychological, political and military—with less limitations and consequently relatively more powerful means than we. In the late 1940's, they played this game successfully because of our self-imposed limitation, containment. Like the allies opposing Napoleon, the tide globally did not turn in favor of the allies opposing communism until the new administration in 1953 altered this strategy of containment limitation which played into the hands of the unlimited strategy of our opponents.

B. Graduated retaliation

Dulles realized that deterrence is not just military, that it depends upon conviction and credibility, that power is a function of the will, and that without will there is no power.

The only way, then, that America can maintain its freedom of action is to convince a potential opponent that America will not subscribe to the limitations that an aggressor chooses to place upon war caused by its aggression. The aggressor must know that we will escalate our means or places of retaliation—not all the way to nuclear holocause, but a notch or so—enough to make aggression not worth the cost.

This concept was applied to NATO, at first ineffectively and then effectively. The original North Atlantic Treaty concept in 1949 envisioned no integrated allied defense plan; nearly all the forces were on occupation duty disposed administratively. Nevertheless, these factors furnished a wire to trip off a pyrotechnic which could signal for atomic retaliation in case of Soviet aggression.

With the Soviet A-bomb development in September 1949, and the Korean war in

Footnotes at end of speech.

June 1950, the inadequacies of threatening major atomic retaliation (we had no atomic weapons, only our strategic bombing capabilities) became apparent. Notes Prof. Lincoln Gordon, "From the tripwire extreme, the NATO strategic concept shifted in 1950 to the other extreme of containing the Soviets by conventional defense." [17]

Certainly, continued reliance on conventional deterrence for the defense of NATO would have been a step backward toward World War II strategy. In order to mold NATO strategy and tactics around one unified, flexible force which employed to better advantages than the Soviet the tools of war born in the nuclear age, decisions were made in 1954 and 1955 which produced the shield and sword concept. The sword of NATO includes the U.S. Strategic Air Command, the U.S. Navy carrier striking forces, the U.K. Bomber Command, IRBM's in Great Britain, ICBM's based in the United States, and soon the well-nigh invulernable Polaris. The shield forces, not merely conventional forces as planned in 1950, possess tactical atomic capabilities. Yet their conventional capabilities of ground divisions are adequate to cope with probing or ambiguous actions of Soviet satellites. Their tactical nuclear capabilities are adequate to cope with actions still short of all-out conventional aggression by the Soviet Union. In effect, then, the shield function is avowedly to meet the type of aggression with a response one grade higher in the strategic spectrum.

Thus the ultimate deterrent, the sword, is translated into a flexible deterrent at all possible levels of challenge. By clearly defining the strategy to the Soviet Union in advance, any idea that NATO will tolerate the Soviets setting the limitation or rules of an aggression is eliminated. In effect, the Soviets have no choice in the spectrum of aggression, unless they are prepared and willing to initiate all-out nuclear aggression.

This follows Karl von Clausewitz' concept that war is a reciprocal action and that only a limitation of ends can logically result in a limitation of means. That is, provided the opponent which unilaterally limits his means desires to place himself at a decisive disadvantage and fight with one hand tied behind his back.

C. Credibility of the deterrent

Such a theory has indeed been critized: William Kaufmann comments:

"Our actions should symbolize the intentions of the United States to confine both the conflict and the issues over which it is being fought within the narrowest limits commensurate with the security and tactical initiative of our forces." [18]

He then cites the attrition strategy in Korea as a good example of his policy. But we lost initiative, mobility, and freedom of action in Korea.

Critics assert our strategy of graduated retaliation lacks credibility. In situations of lesser magnitude, it is not credible to the Soviet Union that we would meet a probe against NATO with a nuclear strike at Moscow. But it can be and has been made quite credible to Russia that a Soviet probe, or border raid will be met by full division strength, and that a full division attack will be met by tactical nuclear weapons.

It has been argued that, if we do have such a credible deterrent, then the Soviets might launch an all-out attack on us in advance. If they do, it will not be because our strategy of graduated retaliation has failed, it will be because of the conditions already mentioned, namely, first, because Russia feels she can win in an all-out attack, or secondly, a mad ruler of Russia seeks war in desperation, or thirdly, because of diplomatic miscalculations.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Adm. W. F. Boone, former U.S. Representative on the Military Committee and on the Standing Group of NATO, points out [19] that the NATO deterrent comprises three essential elements: (a) a massive retaliatory force, (b) a shield force, and (c) the manifest will to use these forces. If this third element is lacking the whole srategic theory crumbles. It is this danger which makes some criticisms about our defense posture so dangerous. Such criticisms could reach a tempor that would indicate a lack of national resolve. That could jeopardize not just the NATO strategy, but the entire global strategy of the United States.

If the credibility is so destroyed, then indeed it would be proper for the United States to reverse its strategy and follow a concept closer to that advocated by the critics. The only alternative to graduated retaliation would be geared to meeting every Soviet challenge within the limitation set by the aggressor, and at his place and time. It would demand a much higher degree of mobilization and much greater conventional war forces. It would destroy our freedom of action, our economy of force, and place in jeopardy our ability to develop a national strategy which would further, and not be self-destructive, of national objectives which lie beyond mere survival. It would play directly into the hands of the Soviet strategy of protracted conflict.

D. Limited and unlimited challenges

Some critics have become confused by two different sets of challenges. The first is specifically that of the Sino-Soviets. The second grows, not directly, from Russian or Chinese communism, but indirectly from power vacuums, disorder, and conflicts of nationalism and anticolonialism. Russian and Chinese communism indeed exploit and agonize these latter situations, yet their basic causes lie beyond communism.

The British and French actions in the Suez crisis and the U.S. landing in Lebanon fall into this second category. In these limited actions, no major power aimed to destroy another power. Thus, limited aims called for limited applications of force. During the Suez crisis, British cruisers were ordered not to use 8-inch guns. In the Lebanon crisis, Americans were ordered to land without Honest John rockets, since they had the capability of firing an atomic warhead. In other words, we purposefully avoided resorting to a larger calibration of force. The objective, and therefore, the means were limited.

Once the conflict becomes translated to where Russia or Red China is our opponent, or where their pawn is our opponent, the conflict is basically and potentially an unlimited one in aims. The law of reciprocity of means applies and we would destroy our freedom of action by necessarily using only conventional means.

In the case of these genuinely limited conflicts (not involving Russia or Red China) the United States is restricted to limited war forces. In such cases, limited war forces, whether our own STRAC or marines, need to be capable of lightning response, immediate transportation by sea and airlift, landing facilities, and modern equipment once landed. The British sorely bungled the Suez crisis because their reaction was slow, cumbersome, and delayed. It is the quality, not the quantity of the forces, that count.

Many advocates of so-called "limited or conventional war forces," however, call for an entirely different strategic concept than that just outlined. Some critics advocate massive conventional war forces to engage the Soviet Union or Red Chinese forces and pawns directly. Success of such a strategy would depend, first of all, upon our ability to mass adequate conventional war forces to defeat the aggressor on his terms. Secondly, it would depend upon possible victory not being nullified by the aggressor then upgrading or escalating to tactical nuclear weapons. Consequently, such a strategy appears to ignore the reciprocity of unlimited conflict, the Soviet protracted conflict design, and the need for America to retain freedom of action.

The critical need for limited war forces is greater mobility, and as Admiral Radford often has noted, mobility is a matter of more staging bases, of paring down requirements to absolute minimums, and of developing improved technology. But a type of "wall of flesh" strategy, which met the enemy on his terms, would demand huge conventional war forces which would lack mobility.[20]

VI. FORCE IN BEING

This follows the traditional concept of a fleet-in-being, a concept of great moment during the heyday of Dutch and British sea power. The fleet, without going to battle, had a decisive influence upon diplomacy by the very fact that it was "in being." To exercise this effect, however, the Nation in question had to convince other nations of her unquestioned willingness to go to battle if necessary. During the Pax Britannica, there never was any question as to Britain's willingness to use her fleet. This willingness made the fleet-in-being a credible deterrent.[21] Thus, the objective was accomplished without resort to battle.

Nuclear holocaust in our time can be avoided by the capability of force-in-being, if that force resides upon a superior position so clear and credible that the opponent is deterred from temptation to fight. In the Ulm Campaign of 1805, Napoleon deceived the Austrians while he maneuvered around their right flank, crossed the Danube, and blocked their rear. General Mack surrendered to him without a battle, so convinced was he that Napoleon would fight, would not limit or restrict himself during the fighting, and would win. The Japanese Government on July 1945 sought terms of surrender because Japanese leaders were convinced General MacArthur had drawn up invasion plans that would work, and that the United States had A-bombs which she would use. The U.S. capability had the same effect as a battle-in-being.

A. The necessity of the will

On the other hand, military history verifies that the nation unwilling to risk war for the preservation of its vital interest cannot have peace. That nation can never experience the diplomatic dividends of a force-in-being. The rise of Hitler Germany in the 1930's—the move into the Rhineland, Austria, the Sudetenland, and remaining Czechoslovakia—is replete with examples of the peace-loving powers destroying their own deterrent power and the credibility of their military forces—far superior to Hitler's—by lack of national resolve and unity.

The credibility of our deterrent system is not destroyed by Russia's also having a nuclear capability. But the credibility can be weakened by an American attitude which refuses to consider any chance of all-out nuclear war and passes it off as unthinkable. The deterrence of our forces-in-being will be improved when Russia is convinced that we have the will and capability to fight and survive such a war, that we do not consider it—regardless of how horrible—something unthinkable.

B. Skill always counts

Which opposing power comes out best (even though we could not call it victory) in this court of last resort, would depend upon strategy—skillfully using the means at hand. The makeup of this strategy, unlike the strategy which terminated in the battles of Waterloo, Gettysburg, Sedan, or the Ar-

dennes—will have begun long before the campaign of Armageddon is joined. The strategy, in part, would have to be a product of the research and development field over the decades, molded by scientists, engineers, as well as the military. The strategy, in part, would have to be derived from maximum use of geography, of dispersed bases, of mobile and underwater launchers to give us the most invulnerable striking capability possible.

Even in the court of last resort, where destructive power by nuclear weapons staggers the imagination, strategic ability still will count. It is possible for America to retain a position of advantage over Russia, and for Russia to recognize this in advance. If we possess the physical capabilities and moral will to fight through such a contest, then there is a chance of our force-in-being producing a Pax Americana. For the struggle with the sino-Soviet powers is a battle of wills, and the best safeguard the United States has to all-out war is firmness of will.

VII. UNITY AND MORALE

The importance of unity of national will led Napoleon to form his maxim: "the moral is to the physical as three is to one." Napoleon utilized and appreciated the zeal, morale, and unity of spirit of Revolutionary France as contrasted with the negative, disunified purposes of monarchies like Prussia, Austria and Spain, which were filled with negative purposes, splintered alliances, and limited defensive aims.

Morale and the will to resist continue to be more important than the physical. And determination, unity, and conviction equal morale, or moral force.

This moral force explains the rise of communism in Russia and China; small, disciplined minorities held together by indomitable morale that overcame vast numbers. It was not superior numbers of Communists that took over Russia in the "October" 1918 Revolution, but a small, dedicated, determined group that "found power lying in the street and picked it up."

Today, it is this same unified minority which remains a greater threat than missiles or bombs to America. It is this threat which enables Russia to make inroads into uncommitted nations, with less expense than that of the United States. And this is all by design, for Lenin said, resounding the tactics that won Rusisa for the Communists:

"The soundest strategy in war is to postpone operations until the moral disintegration of the enemy renders the delivery of the mortal blow both possible and easy." [22]

Now the Communists successfully employ this concept globally.

The Soviet psychologists brilliantly use military and space developments as psychological weapons to produce, bit by bit, moral disintegration, confusion, and pessimism within our country. Indeed, sputnik was an enormous Soviet achievement, but the greatest and most lasting part of the achievement was psychological, not technological. Today, the totality of our space program is ahead of the Soviets' despite their superior rocket thrust. The United States has placed more satellites in orbit and derived much greater scientific information.

Secretary of Defense Gates has aptly described the Soviet psyochological and moral success in our reaction to sputnik:

"The United States reacted with self-criticism. Doubt and worry produced little that was constructive. A feeling of inferiority swept across the land, a feeling of being second rate began and persisted. No real sacrifices were offered. People were quick to blame, but life went on as usual. Big expense accounts, short working hours, long vacations, and the easy way remained. Men did not change the normal pattern or orient themselves toward the business of government.

"The role of the United States in its free world responsibility was having growing pains at a time we could ill afford them.

"Certainly we should not have reacted with complacency, but we should not have gone with a sense of guilt into a process of tearing down our fundamental beliefs and institutions. This was the time to comprehend fully our defenses and to realize that sound planning existed and anticipated much of the demonstrated Soviet capabilities. The pendulum swing too far." [23]

A. Role of the opinion makers

Ways to gain moral solidarity and national conviction become, indeed, a fundamental necessity for any U.S. national strategy. Criticism must be channeled into constructive, not destructive avenues. National success must be recognized and dramatized just as much as national failure. The body politic must gain an overall and long-range view, built upon a foundation of recognizing basic advantages of our system of government. For there is no leader who can resist public opinion when it becomes strong enough. As a Council on Foreign Relations report to the Senate noted:

"The Government must be generally responsive to public opinion. It cannot get too far ahead or too far behind. It works under a great handicap if the public is ill-informed on the significant issues or if political leaders choose to play domestic politics with them." [24]

B. Concord

Certainly the formulation of the Marshall plan and the NATO alliance by a President of one party, approved and advanced by a Congress controlled by another party, remains as a shining example of American unity. Initially, NATO, physically, was weak indeed. But the moral support given it by both political parties immediately bolstered its deterrent value far out of proportion to any inherent physical strength.

Ortega y Gasset in "Concord and Liberty" notes how dissent on surface issues promotes progress, but how dissent on the fundamental issues in a society, as in the latter days of the Roman Republic, spells the doom of that society. Concord in the United States will be increased when the individual American develops a sense of mission, and a closer personal identification with the role of the United States in offering world leadership toward free, open societies. And upon this identification within the body politic can spring a national strategy far superior to what the Communists possess.

We have defined strategy and reviewed a set of its fundamentals. A strategy becomes a national strategy when employed by a nation to promote its national policy ends. Hence a national strategy, in terms of the United States, is reflected in National Security Council documents.

But the review of these fundamentals clearly indicates that a national strategy is not enough, and that it is a public strategy which is needed. The term is used in this paper in a context similar to that used in Walter Lippmann's term "public philosophy." A national strategy becomes a public strategy when the majority of the people understand and support it. As already noted, the modern day advantage of the Communist Party members is that they do have a public strategy which furnishes a means of total integration of national effort into clear purpose.

VIII. IS A PUBLIC STRATEGY POSSIBLE FOR A REPUBLIC?

This leads to the question: Can a republic such as ours truly understand and embrace a unified public strategy, achieve continuity from one administration to the next, and one party to the next? Perhaps upon the answer to this question hangs the future of the Republic.

A. First case: Pax Britannica

Historically, Great Britain was able to develop such a strategy, fully understood and approved by the butchers, bakers, merchants, and housewives of England. The protection of Antwerp, a potential naval arsenal for invasion of the island kingdom, and a base from which the Channel could be controlled, became the key to British national security: In strategic defense of Antwerp, Charles II in 1670, Anne in 1704, Chatham in 1742, and Pitt in 1792 took England to war.

In the 19th century, British national strategy became so perfected as an instrument of state policy that the Pax Britannica resulted: major war was deterred from Waterloo to Sarajevo. In unity there is strength, and the strength of the British deterrent sprang from popular English understanding and appreciation of all the elements which made up that national strategy: the uniqueness of the British island position as a springboard for maritime power; the need for a small, highly mobile amphibious army, rather than an attempt to match man per man the cumbersome continental armies; control of the narrow seas and global bases like Gibralter, Malta, Aden, St. Lucia, Cyprus; an integration of military and naval power with economic power of peacetime commerce and industrial supremacy.

Why did the British strategy produce an effective deterrent to war? Because the British did not destroy its workability by internal disunity and destructive criticisms. Germany, France, and Russia fully realized that Britain had committed herself wholeheartedly to the defense of this policy, and was willing to fight for it.

B. The second case: The Monroe Doctrine

There are also encouraging examples in American history of an ability of the body politic to adopt a public strategy. Notably, the Monroe Doctrine was a unique application of a public strategy to the particular American geography, interests, and need for deterrence of European intervention in the new world. Crystallized in 1823 by President Monroe and Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, this initial expression did not make it fully "national policy," it is significant to note. In fact, this doctrine aimed initially at deterring England's greed in America (as Professor Perkins' research has shown) [25] was in turn enforced, from 1823 to 1845, not by the United States, but by England. Finally, in 1845, James K. Polk, in his annual message, grabbed the doctrine back and brandished it at Europe, particularly at England, its recent custodian, to demonstrate that the United States would allow no colonization in California.

Even with this dramatic reassertion by Polk, the doctrine was championed for the next decade by only one political party. Although it became a topic of public conversation, the United States still did not always act upon it: During the American Civil War, with impunity France violated it in Mexico and Spain violated it in the Dominican Republic. Why? To have enforced the doctrine in the midst of our Civil War would have jeopardized a greater objective—the preservation of the Union.[26]

Failing to act, when not to our best interest and when the setting was incorrect, did not invalidate the strategy, as Henry Wriston has commented.[27]

Its validity and force grew, however, with the almost universal public support it received in the United States after the Civil War. American public opinion, Republican and Democratic alike, united behind the "maxims of Monroe," maxims so sacroanct by 1923 that a noted American religious leader typified national sentiment by writing "I believe strictly in the Monroe Doctrine, in our Constitution, and in the laws of God." [28]

Footnotes at end of speech.

C. The third case: Mahan's strategy

The United States adopted a clear, decisive national strategy, beginning with the Manifest Destiny Period of 1896 and blossoming fully during the Theodore Roosevelt administration.

In lectures, articles, and books, Capt. Alfred Thayer Mahan, supported by Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, integrated naval, economic, political, and even religious considerations into a strategy to promote national greatness and prosperity. The question, whether to follow an expansionist course based on trade, colonies, and naval power, reached a crux during the summer of 1898 over the annexation of Hawaii. Arguments were clearly stated on both sides, in the Senate and House, by proponents Senators Lodge, Platt, and Beveridge, and by opponents Speaker Read, Senators Hoar, Vest, and Mallory. Public opinion was truly allowed to crystallize; by and large, it crystallized in favor of the national strategy advocated by Mahan. When T. R. Roosevelt entered the White House, the people and the President, jointly, supported a unified, clearly defined national strategy of international firmness and national preparedness, incorporating our Navy as a deterrent to intervention of foreign powers in the New World, promoting our strategic control of the Caribbean, pushing the construction of a canal to increase maritime mobility, and inviting the public to look outward toward the Pacific. Public debate over real alternatives and issues had made possible a public consensus which led to an acceptance of such a well-defined public strategy.[29]

IX. WHY THE BODY POLITIC HAS NOT REACHED A CLEAR CONSENSUS ON A PUBLIC STRATEGY

Since World War II, sufficient public debate on the long-range issues of the decades has seldom occurred, and hence, neither has there developed a genuine public strategy. Political partisanship and constant confusion from swift technological change has further clouded clear alternatives and at times has led to an onslaught on much constructive thought and leadership.

How the public has been distracted from the true issues is easily illustrated. In the Korean war, the Truman administration, the Congress, and the public were confronted with this fundamental issue of cold war: What type of national strategy is needed to meet a type of Communist aggression where the bases for aggression are located in a major Communist power, but the battlefield itself is located within a pawn of that power. The real questions were: Would America respond purely defensively against the power or would she seek a policy of initiative to punish the real aggressor? Did isolated events—Yalta, Potsdam, the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, the Berlin blockade, the take-over in Red China, and then the Korean aggression—point to a pattern? Were the crises related in some kind of grand design? Could each crisis only be met, not in isolation and panic or in a packaged solution for each emergency, but by a long-range national strategy, prepared, if necessary, for a century of crisis between freedom and communism?

Perhaps such questions could have crystallized had there been the type of debate that took place over the Monroe Doctrine or the Theodore Roosevelt-Alfred Mahan strategy. But in popular discussion, the Korean issue became distorted into secondary surface issues, such as civilian control over the military, or the personality of MacArthur versus the personality of Truman, or the right of the Executive to fire MacArthur.

Although the public did not come to see the need for a long-range national strategy at the time of the Truman-MacArthur dispute, the public, by supporting the 1952 presidential candidate committed to seek a positive solution to the Korean war, did revolt against the indecisive, stalemated Korean war. Thereby, it also revolted against containment policies.[30]

X. EFFORTS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SECRETARY DULLES TO DEVELOP A PUBLIC STRATEGY

Following this electoral mandate, the new Eisenhower administration, in the words of Secretary of State Dulles, notified the aggressor that the new administration would not tolerate a privileged sanctuary in Manchuria, and that "the fighting might, to the aggressor's peril, soon spread beyond the limits and methods which he had selected." It seems reasonable to conclude that this warning—that the United States would follow a new strategy of initiative—had a decisive effect on ending the Korean war.

Next, Secretary Dulles attempted to codify this successful strategy for global use, so that Red China and Russia would not again be tempted into new Koreas in other parts of the world. In a speech explaining the policy before the Council of Foreign Relations on January 12, 1954, Dulles referred to a secure, massive retaliatory capacity. He did not mention a concept whereby the United States would meet any scale of aggression by dropping atomic bombs on Peking and Moscow. His point was that we had abandoned the pure containment policy which forced us into the inflexible defensive position of having to meet any aggression by limiting ourselves to the ground rules of the aggressor. At the same time, the strategy sought to improve the position of NATO, the best product of the containment era. The new strategy amounted to a policy of maximum flexibility, firmness, and initiative whereby we would respond to aggression by going beyond the particular limitations, geographical or weaponwise, set by the aggressor. In terms of Korea, for example, he proposed the possibility of striking at the privileged sanctuary of the Red Chinese in Manchuria, if aggression were renewed.

The subsequent public debate, however, took form around a doctrine of meeting all aggression by threatening general war with Moscow, as opposed to a doctrine of meeting all aggression in kind. In short, the public was not debating the Dulles policy at all. What came to be interpreted by certain segments of the public as the Dulles policy of "massive retaliation" was not his policy.

What is more, administration critics seized upon the Indochina crisis of 1954 as evidence that the administration had failed to follow its own strategy, thereby proving its fallacy. The truth of the matter was that it failed to be in our national interest to intervene in Indochina, just as it failed to be in our national interest to intervene in Mexico or in the Dominican Republic in 1861. Mr. Dulles explained on June 11, 1954, requisites for American intervention, assuming Red China did not openly intervene. Intervention would have to be a collective, not a unilateral effort; there would have to be agreement that Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia would be granted independence. France would have to maintain her forces in the combat. It was not our strategic concept that failed; it was that unilateral action would not have served our objectives. On the other hand, a United Nations Security Council resolution had furnished a legal and common basis for intervention in Korea.

Considering how long it took the Monroe Doctrine to obtain public acceptance and understanding, it is not surprising that the Eisenhower-Dulles strategy is still not fully understood. It is esential, however, that the American public really debate this strategy in its true context of meeting aggression on our terms. Then the public may reach a consensus of opinion and a philosophy of action which will be the first genuine step forward toward understanding an American strategy for the second half of the 20th century. Then the Eisenhower-Dulles strategy could furnish the beginning of a doctrine comparable to the Monroe Doctrine. We will have much less confusion over such things as missile gaps, deterrent gaps, and even about whether to put more emphasis on the Bomarc, the Nike-Zeus, the Polaris, or the aircraft carrier. For the Eisenhower-Dulles strategy coordinates military with diplomatic strategy by asserting we will meet aggression, not on enemy terms, but with the weapons best suited to our purposes. And this focuses on the need to develop the weapons system to our greatest advantage, intead of matching Russian weapons.

XI. STRATEGY REVIEW MACHINERY ON CONGRESSIONAL LEVEL

The policymaking machinery for developing a consensus on a public strategy could greatly be advanced by both political parties in the House and the Senate by following the 1946 recommendations in regard to policy committees of the LaFollette-Monroney Committee on Reorganization of Congress. This committee recommended, as a step toward better party accountability and responsibility, that each party establish policy committees elected respectively by the Members of House and Senate. In matters of great concern to the national welfare, the four policy committees could meet in executive session with the President. While this recommendation was not concerned with a public strategy, the merit of the machinery in this regard is obvious.

What is more, each party policy committee could establish a subcommittee on national strategy. This would bring into one body congressional Members from key congressional committees in a manner they are not brought together now.[31]

Through studies and resolutions from these subcommittees, key issues could be presented to Congress and thereby to the public. Where bipartisan agreement existed between the subcommittees of the two parties in House and Senate, joint resolutions could be issued to articulate aspects of national strategy and unanimity of concepts of deterrence. Differing opinions between the party subcommittees would serve to point up the real issues of debate. As a special benefit of such policymaking machinery, each Member would take back to his particular standing committee (Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, Joint Atomic Energy, Appropriations, Government Operations, etc.) a much enlarged knowledge of the overall requirements of national strategy. This knowledge would eventually be translated into more effective legislative action.

In the century of protracted conflict, it is indeed essential that the Congress and the public reach an understanding of a basic national strategy. When this happens, citizens will begin to view each day-to-day crisis in the larger context of long-range concerns and will surely demand of all politicians a greater effort to see our century, our strategy, and our strength as a whole. Granted, such an attitude would not eliminate the risks. But it would certainly strengthen the national will, reduce the anxieties, and immensely diminish the possibility of all-out war through cumulative evasions of the real alternatives and fundamentals of a public strategy.

---

[1] G. F. R. Henderson, "The Science of War" (London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 174.

[2] The best explanation of Grant's strategy is found in Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, "The Generalship of Ulysses S. Grant" (London, John Murray, 1929).

[3] Hanson W. Baldwin, in "Great Mistakes of the war" (Harper, 1950, pp. 1 and 2) notes:

"The United States has fought wars differently from other peoples. * * * Unlike the British or the Russians, we have had no grand design, no overall concept. * * *

During World War II our political mistakes cost us the peace. The British and the Russians thought and fought in terms of the big picture, the world after the war; we thought and fought in terms of what we could do to lick Germany and Japan now."

[4] To this question, Max Ways has addressed his attention in the book "Beyond Survival" (New York: Harpers, 1959).

"We have been struggling for survival and we have survived. Success? Our condition does not have the look or feel of success. So we turn the statement: we have been struggling only for survival and we have only survived. * * * To test our policies now, in the short years that count, we need standards beyond survival, beyond the particular perils of any month's crisis, beyond the kaleidoscope of news."

William Y. Elliott and his associates in a study project for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation ("The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy," New York: Henry Holt, 1955, p. 383) appropriately point out a larger implication of the objective:

"Security is not achieved in a world of dynamic struggle by mere defense.

"Successful protection of the national interests * * * means also that, given the nature of contemporary problems and values, these protective or preventive objectives are not likely to be realized except as part of a broader concern to create new institutions and relationships in the non-Soviet world capable in time of achieving and maintaining the economic health, political effectiveness, and defense capabilities of the other free countries."

[5] Arnold J. Toynbee, "A Study of History" (New York: Oxford, 1947).

[6] The Reporter, Sept. 18, 1958, p. 25.

[7] Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, in his "Second World War 1939–45" (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1949), criticizes Winston Churchill for initiating a civilian bombing campaign against the Germans. This, he claims, violated British self-interest in maintaining Germany as a counterforce to Russia. The politico-military mistake of the Allies, as Churchill constantly pointed out during the war, was not the bombing, but the failure to occupy central parts of Germany before Russia did. West Germany has certainly revived into a counterforce against Russia.

[8] Observed the postwar Strategic Bombing Survey: "Even if the final military victories that carried the Allied armies across the Rhine and the Oder had not taken place, armaments production would have come to a virtual standstill by May; the German armies, completely bereft of ammunition and motive power, would almost certainly have had to cease fighting by June or July." (U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, "Effects on German War Economy," p. 14.)

[9] Eighteen Atlas ballistic missiles ($226 million) were added to the 130 already scheduled for launching pads by the end of 1962. An additional $86 million was shifted to accelerate development of the Midas, BMEWS warning system, and the Minuteman. $153 million for nuclear reactors and other components needed for six more missile-firing submarines, was added to the Polaris programs.

[10] As Representative GERALD FORD, ranking Republican on the subcommittee explained on the floor:

"Such changes in this fast-moving world are not only necessary but highly desirable. The maintenance of the status quo is indefensible. Adherence to flexibility is absolutely essential for our national security." Commented Representative MAHON, ranking Democrat on the subcommittee:

"The initial request of the President 'was worked out last fall, and in this rapidly moving world it is expected that changes would be made, and we made a number of them, and the Department of Defense made a number of them.' " (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1960, pp. 8592–8593.)

[11] Annual meeting of the Associated Press, New York City, April 26, 1960.

[12] Johns Hopkins Study on Weapons Technology and Foreign Affairs, p. 109.

[13] See "The Problems of National Security," July 1958, by the Committee on Economic Development, p. 20:

"With national security making huge claims on the Nation's resources, it is indisputably more essential to minimize waste in the use of public funds in both defense and non-defense programs, and to retrench public expenditures that are luxuries we can no longer afford. There must be a new look at non-defense expenditure programs of Government. Since we are facing a protracted period of large defense requirements, what is called for is close examination of the size and character of continuing programs, not temporary deferral of necessary expenditures" (p. 20).

[14] It is interesting to note that in 1952 the Joint Chiefs of Staff reaffirmed that they "consider the general period of 1954 to be the most dangerous for the security of the United States in the foreseeable future." (Report quoted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 23, 1960, p. 2917.) As it turned out, 1954 was not a "dangerous year" at all.

[15] George C. Reinhardt, in "American Strategy in the Atomic Age" (University of Oklahoma, Norman, 1955, pp. 16–17) points out the failure this way:

"Containment gives the Soviets no inducement to settle down. It precludes our creation of pressures which they cannot ignore. We are, in fact, precariously containing our opponents but effectively blocking ourselves. * * * Containment does not meet the Communist challenge. They may and can decide to challenge us at any point or time of their own choosing. We are under permanent threat; they are under none."

[16] Karl von Clausewitz, "On War" (New York: Modern Library Edition), p. 5.

[17] Lincoln Gordon, Yale Review, spring 1959, p. 323.

[18] William W. Kaufmann, "Military Policy and National Security," p. 116. See also comments of Bernard Brodie in "Strategy in the Missile Age," Princeton, 1959. Also, Gen. Maxwell Taylor in "The Uncertain Trumpet." Also, Henry Rowen in "National Security and the American Economy in the 1960's" for the Joint Economic Committee, p. 44.

[19] U.S. Naval Institute proceedings, April 1959, p. 24.

[20] Comments Hanson Baldwin:

"Exercise Big Slam/Puerto Pine has stressed, as all troop transportation exercises have done, that any attempt to combine mass and mobility adds up to astronomical aircraft requirements.

"The airborne division has 52 light liaison aircraft and helicopters in its organization. These must be disassembled for air transport and the Army now contemplates using a naval aircraft carrier to transport them.

"In Lebanon, a sea 'tail' of about 25 ships was required to back up and support one airborne battle group of about 2,000 men.

"Thus there are many observers who believe that the Army has set its airlift requirements too high and that the concept of total air transportability—the so-called air transportable army—is beyond achievement now or in the foreseeable future.

"Instead of attempting to move masses of troops and equipment by air, the objectives should be the extremely rapid transportation of fairly small numbers of troops—lightly armed and with limited staying power—to any part of the world.

"These fire brigade forces could then be reinforced and supplied, not only by airlift but also by prepositioned stocks of arms and equipment in various parts of the world and by support from the sea.

"Airlift is essential for speed but sealift is equally essential for mass and staying power." (Hanson W. Baldwin, "The Airlift Problem—II," in the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1960.)

[21] In 1827, during the Turko-Grecian struggle, the allies—Russia, France, and Great Britain—had sponsored a truce between the warring powers. When provoked by the violation of that truce, Admiral Codrington, the allied commander, sunk the Turkish-Egyptian Fleet. Despite the tactical action, no war occurred. Or to put it in another way, war was deterred by the British willingness to take fleet action. See David M. Abshire, "The Battle of Navarino," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, January 1959.

[22] Surveying in turn the decisive battles of history, we find that in almost all the victor had his opponent at a psychological disadvantage before the clash took place. Examples are Marathon, Salamis, Aegospotamoi, Mantinea, Chaeronea, Gangemela (through grand strategy), the Hydaspes. * * * Austerlitz, Jena, Vicksburg, Koniggratz, Sedan." (B. H. Liddell, "Strategy" (New York, Praeger, 1955, p. 163.)

[23] Address before annual meeting of Associated Press, New York City, April 25, 1960.

[24] "Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy": Study prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Nov. 25, 1959, Washington, GPO, p. 19.

[25] Dexter Perkins, "The Monroe Doctrine, 1826–1867," Baltimore, the Johns Hopkins press, 1933, ch. 2.

[26] It is interesting to note that after the war was over it was a Republican Secretary of State, Seward, who issued to Napoleon III a declaration supporting the Monroe Doctrine principles, inaugurated by the Democratic Party. France did withdraw; the doctrine regained renewed respect in Europe; the doctrine in America truly became national bipartisan policy. In 1896, incidentally, both party platforms subscribed to the doctrine. (Julius W. Pratt, "A History of United States Foreign Policy," New York, Prentice-Hall, 1955, p. 344.)

[27] "The Doctrine was not a law, not a fiat, but a desideratum. Occasionally there was no opportunity to act effectively * * *. At other times those in charge lacked the understanding, the energy, the skill, or even the will to pursue our fundamental national objectives. None of these circumstances affected either the reality or the validity of the policy itself." ("Diplomacy in a Democracy," New York, Harper, 1956, p. 74.)

[28] Dexter Perkins, "Hands Off." (Boston, Little, Brown Co., 1941, pp. 370–371.)

[29] Although A. Whitney Griswold, in "The Far Eastern Policy of the United States," (New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1938, p. 32) asserts that the debate over the 1899 Philippines problem largely centered on constitutional and moralistic arguments, and not upon American interests in the Far East; Julius W. Pratt, in "Expansionists of 1898" (New York, P. Smith, 1951, p. 350) observes the opposite: for example, Senator Spooner feared possession of the Philippines might involve us with Asiatic powers. Professor S. F. Bemis has termed this phase of diplomatic history, the great American aberration ("A Diplomatic History of the United States," New York, Holt, 1951, pp. 463–475), opinions echoed by George Kennan in his "American Diplomacy 1900–1950" (New York, New American Library, 1951). See differing opinions in Foster Rhea Dulles' "America's Rise to World Power" (New York, Harpers). Whether or not the policies were carried too far in regard to the Philippines, this national strategy, from 1898, through the Theodore Roosevelt administration, successfully guided our rise to world power, gave us security in the Caribbean and in the Pacific through Hawaii, without which we might have incurred war on our very shores. See J. Fred Rippy, "The Caribbean Danger

Zone" (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940). The second point is, such a national strategy must be based on a conviction of right, a reasonable sense of moral justification. The fact that morals can be turned into hypocrisy does not mean the cure is to abolish morals and conviction. This Admiral Mahan understood quite well. The best account of Mahan's philosophy and its influence is William E. Livezey's "Mahan on Sea Power" (Norman, Okla., U. of Oklahoma Press, 1947).

[20] Samuel Lubell says, in "The Revolt of the Moderates" (New York, 1956, Harpers, pp. 45–46): "In his conduct of the Korean war, President Truman fought to preserve the concept of a limited war, in which atomic weapons would not be used. The political effect of the 1952 election was to repudiate that concept." And, on p. 39: "The angriest condemnations of the Truman administration from traditionally Democratic voters were provoked by the grievances that rose out of the Korean war—higher taxes and higher prices and the drafting of 'our sons' for a 'useless war.'"

[21] See article by Samuel Huntington in Foreign Affairs, January 1960.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study papers Nos. 3 and 4, "How Democracies Die," by John H. Stambaugh, vice chancellor, Vanderbilt University; and "An Appraisal of Soviet Economic Capability," by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, member of the Joint Economic Committee, as follows:

HOW DEMOCRACIES DIE

(By John H. Stambaugh, vice chancellor, Vanderbilt University)

The prominent historian, Channing Pollock, addressing a group of teachers observed that most democracies last for about 200 years. They are conceived and developed by simple, vigorous, idealistic, hard-working people who unfortunately with success become rich and decadent, learn to live without labor, depend more on the largess of big government and end by trading domestic tyrants for foreign tyrants.

With the end of the second century of our democracy a short 16 years away, it appears very much in order to examine its political, social, and economic structure, to ascertain whether it contains a unique character which makes it impervious to the lessons of history.

Are our people subject to the same frailties as the citizens of the democracies that died in the past?

Can we overcome these weaknesses and remain the strongest and most blessed people on earth?

Are we willing to stand firmly with the basic American idea that there can be no substitute for individual initiative and productivity?

An indication of weakness became evident when the Soviet rocketed Sputnik I into orbit in October 1957. A strange state of mind seized the United States. We seemed to question our own abilities. Some Senators and Congressmen screamed for sputniks in their Christmas stockings and an ICBM in each garage. The rest of the world looked on in amazement and seriously questioned whether we would demonstrate the same toughness and dedication that we had demonstrated in past international crises.

Fortunately some of our leaders, and in particular the President of the United States, refused to accept the premise that this great Nation could be overwhelmed by the Soviets' material contrivance. This faith was dramatically justified when in a short 4 months, under extreme pressure, Explorer I soared heavenward. Since that time, the scientific value of American achievement in space has vastly outstripped the Soviets'.

THE BASIC DANGERS FOR A DEMOCRACY

However, there are dangers other than the fantastic space-age weapons, dangers much more persistent and insidious. These dangers are two:

One from without—Communist ideological and economic penetration.

The other from within—the loss of our individual freedoms by a willingness to let the central government be all things to all people.

If we use our resources positively and wisely we have within the framework of free enterprise capitalism all the tools necessary to demonstrate to the world the fallacy of the Communist doctrine of absolute economic and social control by government.

Surely the system which permits our 6 percent of the world's population to produce and consume 40 percent of the world's goods can win this struggle. This system can win, if its exponents practice what they preach while investing our capital abroad and trading throughout the world. It can win if we refuse Government subsidies and protection, welcome competition, and support the sovereignty of the market. It can win the struggle with Communism if its people have the will.

THE DANGER FROM WITHIN

It is the second danger which is the more frightening, the danger from within. Among our citizens an attitude of dependency on Washington has developed. This trend toward "Let Uncle Sam do it" argues in effect that only Federal bureaucrats and their intellectual associates are wise enough to tell us how we attain "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We have come to depend on the Central Government to finance many of our responsibilities which we should assume in the home or at the city and State level. While doing so, the Federal Government inevitably lays down the rules of the game. This trend can lead only to the weakening of the American family and of our State and local governments and hence to destruction of the Federal system.

The liberal editor, John Fischer of Harper's magazine, has pointed out:

"Up till now, at least every nation of continental size has had to be governed in one of two ways: either as a federation or as an autocracy. The coming generation of politicians, therefore, will have to find some way to renovate the idea of federalism and get it back into working order."

If we permit our system to be destroyed, not only will the lessons of history be reaffirmed but Communist Chief Khrushchev will indeed have been a prophet when he said to five visiting U.S. Senators, "I prophesy that your grandchildren in America will live under socialism."

THE WILLIAMSBURG IDEA

The President of the United States, speaking at the Governors' Conference in Williamsburg, Va., in June 1957, gave evidence of his deep concern for the preservation of our way of life. President Eisenhower rang the alarm with the statement, "Those who would be and would stay free must stand eternal watch against excessive concentration of power in government." He then challenged the conference of Governors to join with him in an effort to reverse the trend toward Washington.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee was thus created by the President of the United States and the Governors of the 48 States as a task force for action—a joint committee charged with three responsibilities:

"1. To designate functions which the States are ready and willing to assume and finance that are now performed or financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government;

"2. To recommend the Federal and State revenue adjustments required to enable the States to assume such functions; and

"3. To identify functions and responsibilities likely to require State or Federal attention in the future and to recommend the level of State effort, or Federal effort, or both, that will be needed to assure effective action."

The conference of Governors readily accepted the President's proposal. For years it had concerned itself with problems of Federal-State program responsibilities, the division of tax revenue sources between the Federal and State Governments, and with emerging problems calling for governmental action—Federal, State, and local. Many State Governors were deeply troubled by the same trend which so concerned the President. The conference, accordingly, authorized its chairman to appoint a committee of Governors to serve with Federal representatives chosen by the President on the Joint Federal-State Action Committee.

It is interesting to note that this is the first time in our history that a President suggested action be taken to reverse the growing trend toward reliance on the central authority for services to our people far beyond the responsibilities originally intended for assumption by the Federal Government.

The initial phase of this mission was a limited one. It was to recommend that action be taken to shift a small number of governmental functions and revenue sources from the Federal Government to the States and to define more clearly certain responsibilities that might continue to be shared by Federal and State Governments. The purpose was not to accomplish the whole job, but merely to demonstrate that a long-term drift to governmental responsibility toward Washington is not inevitable.

OPPOSITION TO LOCAL INITIATIVE

Many with overdeveloped senses of Federal responsibility reacted strongly against this move by the President. They protested that the complexity of our society requires the Central Government to concern itself more and more with the welfare of the individual citizen. In turn they argue that State and local governments are poorly organized and unable to finance adequate public services. Yet rather than join in a realistic examination of ways to revitalize State and local governments, these opponents fall back on a familiar plea that the Central Government solve all problems on a crash basis. What these so generous people fail to acknowledge is that each time the Government assumes responsibility for our personal economic and social welfare, we take another long stride away from those principles which have permitted us through individual initiative to become the most privileged of the earth's people.

Unfortunately, even the President of the United States joined by a committee of the Governors of the sovereign States, was unable to do much more than slow down the trend

toward more dependence on the Central Government. Northern Democratic Governors from highly populated and rich States resisted the effort. In spite of the protest of some of the more moderate in that party and the Republican Governors, mostly from the Middle and Western States, the centralist view prevailed. The northern Democrats prevailed because the traditional States rights Democrats of the South had been so seduced by the Federal dollar that they refused to take back to the States the responsibilities which must be assumed at that level if the term "States rights" is to be anything more than just that—a term.

The simple fact is that for every dollar of Federal aid, the citizen who believes in State sovereignty forfeits a dollar's worth of States rights. It is entirely logical that Federal control follow Federal funds. This has to be because when a Congressman from New York votes to support a project for Tennessee, he has a right to say something about how the money is spent. His constituents after all are paying their share of the bill.

OTHER PROBLEMS

There are other evidences of this voluntary weakness on the part of our people. The great moderate masses of our society have withdrawn from the political scene as a consequence of the very abundance which our free system has provided, the blessings of education and the advances of technology. The professional and businessman, the technician, the white-collar worker, the highly trained and productive operator of our massive machines, all enjoy a way of life which leads them to prefer to be left alone. The businessman is restrained from political participation for fear of public criticism or the loss of a customer, not understanding that it is much better to lose a customer than to lose the climate which permits him to make a profit.

In the meanwhile, highly militant and well-organized minority groups control the body politic.

The overwhelming desire for security rather than for opportunity on the part of our young people has been encouraged even by our great corporations. Recruiters visiting the campuses of our universities no longer challenge the young American male with opportunity, but instead with what is going to happen to him 45 years hence. This young American with a mind like a sponge and muscles of steel then is tempted to enter the competitive world looking for a pension rather than a risk, little realizing that his forefathers who developed this great country were risk-takers above all else.

CONCLUSION

The historical cycle of the body politic indicates that man progresses from bondage to spiritual faith—from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance; and then comes the warning, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependency, and from dependency right back into bondage again.

It does not require the talents of the highly trained political scientist to show us where we are in this sycle. It only requires a little serious thinking on the part of any reasonably intelligent citizen.

Certainly all thoughtful people must agree that if the system we cherish is to survive we must learn to understand that democracy is more difficult to maintain than to attain. Only by our individual efforts can we be sure that the lessons of history do not catch up with our Republic.

An Appraisal of Soviet Economic Capability

(By Thomas B. Curtis, Congressman from Missouri)

One of the most vital aspects of the long-run competition between the United States and the Soviet Union is the economic one. With both sides likely to abstain from any all-out and mutually destructive military clash, the more subtle and basic contest of economic strengths comes to the fore.

Following the ancient axiom, "Know thy enemy," it is incumbent on us to appraise accurately the Soviet's economic capability.

THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE'S STUDIES

In November 1959, the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics held panel hearings based upon 31 study papers on comparison of the United States and Soviet economies prepared by some of the leading students of Soviet Russia's economy. The publication of these series of papers by the subcommittee was described by Prof. G. Warren Nutter as "more complete and covers more ground, than any other such publication I know of." These papers and the hearings on them have been widely acclaimed by students of the Russian economy.

However, the subcommittee failed to issue a report to the Congress and to the people of the United States based upon these materials and other materials available to the subcommittee upon the important subject of Soviet economic capability.

The failure of the subcommittee to make a meaningful report to the Congress has left this subject shrouded in unfortunate ambiguity. In some quarters there is shrouded in unfortunate ambiguity. In some quarters there is a tendency to exaggerate the economic progress and potential of the Soviets. Apparently there are those who have found fear of Russia to be an effective emotional appeal to gain popular support for particular political objectives.

IMPORTANCE OF ACCURATELY APPRAISING SOVIET CAPABILITY

Presenting Russia's economic achievement through a false magnifying glass has two extremely damaging effects upon the United States. The greatest damaging effect results from unintentionally aiding and abetting Soviet Russia's own propaganda among the uncommitted nations concerning her prowess and the superiority of the Communist system over the private enterprise system. Indeed, Russia would not dare make some of the extravagant claims of achievement that some Americans make for her in an effort to frighten the United States into a course of action which, in a calmer context, would never be considered seriously.

The second damaging effect is undue complacency in the public mind, when the people find that exaggeration has been employed. It is true that we are in a tough economic competition. This being the case, our people need to know the true picture of the adversary we face. If an exaggerated picture is later discredited, undue complacency is sure to follow.

The best course and the course of wisdom is to seek the truth as best we can. We should neither overestimate nor underestimate an enemy. There is much room for honest dispute even among experts who undertake to appraise Soviet economic capability.

For this reason, it was appropriate that the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics undertake the appraisal of Soviet economic capability inasmuch as one of the greatest limitations we have in this undertaking is that of our economic measuring devices.

LIMITATION OF THE STATISTICS

Even before we examine the limitations of statistics for finding the truth about Russia's economic capability, we must recognize the limitations we face in determining what is the economic capability of the United States. It is generally recognized that the economic statistics of the United States are the best in the world. Yet the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics is constantly confronted with the inadequacy of our own economic statistics in measuring economic factors which are fundamental in determining economic capability, such as total plant investment and capacity; human skills available by accurate nomenclature and number; productivity figures in various industries, and especially for the economy as a whole; convertibility of plant, equipment, and skills from civilian type operation to military oriented operations; and many other data. Even such a simple concept as the cost of living involves problems of measurement which have been often debated by scholars appearing before the Joint Economic Committee.

We in the United States have no statistical series that really measure the industrial, transportation, communications, raw materials, human skill capabilities. There are no series that can measure the extent of the organizations that relate human skills to plants and machinery. There are no real figures that give us a clear insight into productivity. There are some figures of capabilities in a few of our industries. We have some data on steel capacity and capacity to produce some basic metals and raw materials, but these are indeed raw figures and certainly we have little breakdown information for example in steel production as to shapes and forms, grades, etc.

There are some productivity figures by individual industries, but even these are quite limited and before these figures are usable they need considerable interpretation. It is because our statistics in this direct area are so limited that we have resorted to such broad statistical series as gross national product to try to measure economic capabilities.

Certainly we know by just a casual analysis of the gross national product indicator its great limitations in measuring the economic capabilities of a soicety. Yet the gross national product indicator is probably the most meaningful indicator we have.

The limitations of gross national product as a device for measuring economic capability might be partially listed as follows:

1. It measures yearly effort not capability.

2. It measures waste product and economic mistakes equally with sound economic production.

3. It does not suggest the real significance of research and development, education, discoveries, and breakthroughs.

4. It unduly weighs newly built capital plant, heavy industry, and industrial products in relation to other equally important economic factors which go to make up economic capability.

5. Increased productivity can receive a negative weighting (e.g., eliminating a long transportation haul by building plant and raw material source closer together will decrease its contribution to gross national product).

These and other limitations affect our own measurements of gross national product as well as other countries. But when we look at the further difficulties in measuring Soviet capability, the problems increase. Testimony before the subcommittee was quite explicit on this problem.

The statement of Robert W. Campbell, University of Southern California (p. 33, hearings), noted as follows:

"The statistics of any nation have their parochial distinctiveness, but those of the Soviet Union are particularly difficult to compare with those of other countries. Because they are used to glorify as much as to illuminate, the numbers released by the Russians tend to be ambiguously defined and subject to change in meaning over them. Obscurities in meaning might be clarified, were there an abundance of data because of the many interrelationships existing in any fabric of statistical economic description. But the statistical raw materials for the Russian side of comparisons

are unfortunately sparse as well as ambiguous."

Hans Heymann, Jr., economics division, the Rand Corp., Washington, D.C. (p. 31 of hearings), stated:

"In the last 3 years the Soviet authorities have released more statistical information about their own economy than they have in the preceding 20. The new data fill some gaping voids, afford us greater opportunities for checking internal consistency, and provide a somewhat more rounded picture of Soviet economic development. But the new data are still a long way, indeed, from meeting what would be considered in the Western World minimum acceptable standards of statistical adequacy. Thus, despite its recent easing, the restrictive and propagandistic Soviet information policy continues to impose on us a heavy burden of statistical compilation, interpretation, and verification, and seriously impedes our ability to reconstruct a reliable, balanced, and undistorted statistical image of Soviet progress."

Therefore in making any appraisal of Russia's economic capabilities we must do a great deal more than usual in checking internal statistical inconsistencies.

THE TRICKY QUESTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Thus far we have not yet alluded to the further statistical problems which arise when we get into the area of economic growth.

Economic growth rate based upon gross national product figures is an even more dangerous method of estimating economic capabilities and yet it is the growth rate that has become the basis of much present misconception in evaluating Russian capabilities vis-a-vis U.S. capabilities.

The limitations on the use of rates of growth measured in gross national product might be listed as follows:

1. A rate depends upon the base from which it starts. The smaller the starting base the more rapid the rate in the initial stages and the slower the rate in the more mature stages.

2. Economic growth has a real relation to the maturity of an economic society. This relationship has been inadequately studied, but it is nonetheless real. The more mature an economy the less the rate of growth measured in gross national product.

3. The limitations of gross national product as a measuring device listed above become even more limited, indeed, almost antithetical, when placed into the rate of growth measurements. For example, investment in capital plant for heavy industry shows up more heavily than anything else in gross national product and accordingly an emphasis upon growth in this area will make the overall growth rate look high. Yet sustained growth depends upon a broader economic development. It particularly depends upon great sums of investment going into research and development and into education which show up poorly in gross national product and growth figures based on gross national product.

4. Productivity increases upon which much future sustained growth is based, frequently show up as a negative in growth rates. Furthermore, labor efficiency as one of the bases of productivity increase, is dependent upon such things as health improvements, better housing, more education and training, and other things frequently and falsely referred to as consumer items and luxuries.

5. An industrialized country recovering from war damage to its industry will show very rapid growth rates which show up some time after the actual plant replacements. It is more than a coincidence that the industrialized countries of World War II which had extensive war damage are in the countries showing the very rapid rates of economic growth. Russia is merely one of this group.

The economists testifying before the Joint Economic Committee over a period of years have made the valid point that economic growth per se is almost meaningless. The tests to be applied are where is the growth needed for a well balanced economy and where has it been occurring. The U.S. gross national product is higher in one sense than it should be because of unwanted farm production. How silly it would be to have more rapid growth measured in gross national product occurring in that area. Does the United States need more steel production? More oil? What does Russia need? It is in respect to the specific areas of an economy that we are most apt to find our answers to present economic capabilities and meaningful projections into the future.

To the extent that overall economic growth rates are of any value, it is worth noting that as respected and cautious an economist as W. Allen Wallis stated without equivocation recently:

"In short, there is no possibility that the Russian economy will overtake ours, at any time in the visible future—certainly not in this century."

SOME IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

It is clear that the Soviet Union poses to us a challenge, economically. However, any serious appraisal of Soviet economic capability must raise certain questions which have too often gone unasked.

For example, how much of an economic plant did the Communists simply take over from the prerevolutionary regime? Our Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allan Dulles, made an interesting observation on this point during the joint committee's hearings (p. 4):

"The year 1913 is taken as the base for many Soviet studies and claims. The Soviets try to picture prerevolutionary Russia as the economic counterpart of black Africa today. The official myth about the relative backwardness of imperial Russia has been deliberately created so that Communist economic achievements will appear to be even greater than they have been. * * *

"The weight of the evidence, as I see it, would peace prerevolutionary Russia as the sixth or seventh largest industrial power of its time, though it is true it was relatively backward by then existing Western European standards of per capita output."

Another key question is how old is Russia's economic plant? Some of it dates back to the czars, particularly in agriculture and housing. On the other hand much of it is quite modern, particularly that which constitutes a replacement of World War II destruction.

How balanced is its economic plant? This is the area where I believe any fair analysis will show that not only is Russia far behind the United States in gross figures, but even farther behind in the area that must be developed if she is to catch up. She has built the plant that shows up the largest in gross national product indicators and neglected that which does not show up.

It is worth examining three specific industries each of which is crucial to an appraisal of economic capability, especially as it relates to the question of balanced capability. These industries are transportation, communication and power, and housing.

TRANSPORTATION

One of the weak links in the Soviet economy is the transportation system.

In transportation Russia has so throttled her economic growth that her economy can be described as a string of beads. The string is her railroad lines and the beads are the industrial plants strung on it. Move off the main rail lines and you find no industry. Russia's transportation is over 80-percent rails and the rails have no feeder lines or feeder highway system. Even the length of her trackage is a small part of the United States and yet she has three times the distance to cope with. She seeks to overcome her transportation bottleneck by a more extensive use of what she has, but primarily she seeks to overcome it by subjecting the shipper to the needs of the transportation system—a cramp which our producers would regard as unthinkable.

Russia apparently has little plans for immediate building up of her transportation system, weak as it is, except through a stepped-up program of dieselization of her locomotives. The transportation system is so weak that it is doubtful if she can have the production she claims she has in other sectors of her economy.

Such a transportation system renders the Soviet economy brittle. Consider the vulnerability to military attack such limitations and rigidities mean. Furthermore, her usage of her rail system is probably over 100 percent, which means that there is not the shutdown for necessary maintenance. In the long run this eats into the capital investment itself and can only be replaced by calling upon the rest of the economy to produce more rail equipment than would be necessary if proper maintenance practices were followed.

Relate this picture to U.S. transportation. The U.S. transportation system is so widespread and filled with variety that it gives amazing flexibility to the rest of the economic plant, including mobility of labor. It is being used at well below capacity. These characteristics minimize the destruction and disruption that can come from military attack but, even more important, give an economic capability that probably could be tripled in the event of mobilization.

COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

The same story exists in regard to the other lifelines of a modern industrial economy—communications and power. Russia's communication system is not even on a par with her transportation system. U.S. communications system is unparalleled in extent and flexibility anywhere.

The story on power shows a similar vast disparity between Russia and the United States.

In 1958 Russia had a total generating capacity of 53 million kilowatts. The same year the United States had a capability of over 167 million kilowatts.

In 1959 Russia jumped to 59 million kilowatts.

During the same period the United States jumped to 183 million kilowatts.

Russia's announced goal for 1965 is 110-112 million kilowatts.

The United States is expected to have about 245 million kilowatts in 1965.

One of the important aspects of power is its usability, and this depends to a large degree upon transmission lines.

At the end of 1957 the total length of transmission on lines of 35,000 volts and above in Russia was about 46,485 miles.

In the United States the same year the total length of lines 35,000 volts and above was 240,000 miles.

These facts should be viewed in the light of the knowledge that Russia has at least three times the distances to be covered as the United States.

In 1958, 80 percent of the power generated in Russia was devoted to industry and construction. Only about 16 percent went for rural and residential use.

In 1959 Russia produced 1,161 kilowatt-hours per capita.

In 1959 the United States produced 4,481 kilowatt-hours per capita.

The average home use of electricity in Russia is about 400 kilowatt-hours a year.

In the United States the average home use of power in 1959 was about 3,550 kilowatt-hours per year.

But even in utilization of personnel in the power industry itself (which Russia has upgraded well ahead of almost any other

industry) we find some startling contrasts—as we should expect when we analyze the health, housing, and educational standards of Russia. From 1950 to 1957 the number of personnel per megawatt of installed capacity was reduced from 9.6 to 5.6 persons. By 1958 in the larger power stations with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts or over, the number of personnel was 2 to 2.5 persons per megawatt of installed capacity. In the United States, according to the Federal Power Commission, the large coal-burning plants built during the la st decade require from 0.2 to 0.5 employees per megawatt of plant capacity.

Available power is a good indicator of overall economic strength of a society. Certainly it relates to potential use of the overall economic plant, flexibility, and mobilization multiplier.

HOUSING

Adequate housing is not just a matter of nice living—it has a direct relation to worker efficiency and productivity. Worker health also is related. Certainly electric power in the home has real bearing on worker productivity if for no other reason than it permits home study. Vacations and the 40-hour week were adopted in the United States for reasons of increased productivity as well as the well-being of the human being.

It is foolish to speak of America's high standard of living as if it were merely a matter of luxury and were not directly related to worker productivity. It is this high standard of living that produced worker productivity. Furthermore, it is no cliche to state almost as an axiom that freemen have greater efficiency and productivity than slaves.

Furthermore, overall national good housing means greater worker mobility and worker mobility is important in keeping any economy dynamic. It seems strange that all the reasons we have used to persuade our people to increase their standard of living which we have rightly related to economic productivity are completely forgotten by some of our American scholars in their evaluation of Russia's economic capabilities.

LIMITATION OF A CONTROLLED ECONOMY

Shortcomings of the Soviet economic capability in the fields of transportation, of communications and power, of housing—these evidences of gross imbalance tend to blur the image of Russian economic power.

Socializing and economy does not eliminate economic mistakes; it merely buries them from view. The cost of the economic mistake is bound to have its effect somewhere. This is illustrated by the interesting fact that Russia has not cared to develop a realistic system of cost accounting. This stems either from a belief that costs are not real or from a more cowardly and cynical approach which seeks to thwart the truth by hiding from it. We have the same problem in our society in dealing with the Military Establishment. There seems to be an inherent faith that dollars are not devices for measuring manpower, material, and the business processes of putting the two together.

There are those who argue that a dictatorship makes fewer economic mistakes than a free market economy because the dictatorship knows what it wants to do and accordingly can short-cut the economic process. Their misconception arises from two fundamental errors: (1) A misunderstanding of the essence of a free market economy; (2) a misunderstanding of how our own military establishment fits into our free market economy.

The essence of a free market economy is that it is a laboratory, testing new ideas, new products, new processes. It is through this kind of testing that mankind, under our free system, moves ahead into the unknown.

Certainly an observant dictatorship may benefit from the experiments being conducted in the laboratories of free societies. This is a parasitic relationship, however, which will always keep it second best. Furthermore, the very failure to establish a laboratory to test new economic and social ideas which is inherent in a totalitarian government where political and economic power is merged, is fatal.

The second misunderstanding is shared by an altogether too large body of American thinkers. They do not distinguish clearly the fundamental difference between our military institution and our civilian society. The systems are antithetical.

This is in the nature of the case. An effective military organization is bound to be based upon principles fundamentally opposed to those of a free and growing society. And yet, to protect that society we must allow for coexistence of a military organization. Our code of military justice has been in essence a common law code, not a statutory code, evolving from centuries of battle and experience. When, after World War II, we tried to introduce elements of the civilian code of justice, we destroyed a good military code and ended up with something that was neither good for the soldier nor the civilian.

Actually the military institution can exist and should exist as a separate system, restricted to military matters. The difficulties arise when we extend the military jurisdiction into areas where military organization is not necessary to achieve the results.

THE REAL NATURE OF THE THREAT

Russia's economic capability shows severe limitations on close inspection. However, it is precisely because she has channeled her strengths so single-mindedly into certain areas that she constitutes a threat.

In testimony on the last day of the Joint Economic Committee's hearings, in a colloquy with the witness, Mr. Lovestone, I pointed out what I believe is the nature of this threat. (p. 223):

The question is how much of that system which seems to me so lopsided can be set up to transmit power into a military machine which could be a threat and, secondarily, how much of that power can be set up and transmitted through the machine of subversive devices * * *.

"Nazi Germany's system in the long run could not prevail. Yet by channeling its efforts into a military force, it came very close to taking over systems that were better suited in the long run to prevail.

"The result would have been disaster and I think that is the very point to watch for."

Russia is a threat to us, of course, in a military way, just as every man, regardless of his size and physical prowess, became a threat to every other man when the pistol was perfected. In gangster language a pistol is referred to as an equalizer because it made the little runt equal to the biggest and most powerful male. So atomic bombs are in effect equalizers among nations which have atomic bombs and the ability to deliver them.

But should the strong man be afraid of the little man if both have guns? He has to look at things a bit differently, but it is spiritual values that are the test of whether he is or is not afraid, not weapons.

The real threat to America is ideological. If we believe in the private enterprise system then we must understand it and promote its philosophy. The facts of history and of the present day demonstrates beyond much doubt that communism is self-defeating. To the extent that we in this country have abandoned some of the basic features of the private enterprise system by substituting political bureaucratic or industrial oligopolic decisions for the decisions of the marketplace—and we have—to that extent we have weakened ourselves. Herein lies our danger, not Russia's economic capability.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study papers Nos. 5 and 6: "International Tension and National Defense," by Robert G. Neumann, director of the Institute of International and Foreign Studies, University of California at Los Angeles; and "Key Factors in Future Military Planning," by Adm. Arthur Radford, retired, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

INTERNATIONAL TENSION AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Robert G. Neumann, director, Institute of International and Foreign Studies, University of California, Los Angeles)

Tension is the watchword of our times, and it is therefore perfectly natural that much of our thinking should gravitate around the problem of how that tension might be reduced.

In this connection, however, it is sometimes overlooked that tension is not only the result of certain situations and policies, but as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, frequently is policy in itself. Tension favors subversive activities; it encourages conditions in which the wildest rumors flow freely and authority is undermined. Tension favors revolutionary activities in which Communist movements may try to tie themselves to, and infiltrate, revolutionary movements which in themselves may be quite non-Communist and even anti-Communist.

In the realm of diplomacy, tension is frequently and deliberately engendered by Soviet policy in order to place impending negotiations under great pressure. And when tension is then allowed to decrease slightly—in as artificial a manner as it was originally increased—an actual gain for the Soviet side may be made to appear like a concession merely because it is perhaps somewhat less extreme than that which the Soviets demanded at the height of the crisis.

This technique has been invariably pursued before every major international conference, and the exploitation of the U–2 incident and the blowup of the Paris summit conference are merely another evidence of this policy of tension, although undoubtedly not the only explanation for this latest Soviet step.

Because the creation and manipulation of tension is an important Soviet policy, one cannot assume that it will be readily abandoned. No country feels inclined to give up a policy which is clearly in its own best interests. Hence, it must be clear that Western concessions made entirely or primarily for the purpose of reducing tensions are fruitless. The Soviets may indeed permit tension to die down on one issue only to arouse it again somewhere else or even in the same area where and when it meets their purpose. Western concessions to the Soviet Union can be very much in point where they are met by concrete, realizable Soviet counterconcessions. They are a pointless abandonment, however, where they are merely designed to insure Communist good behavior. Such a policy of abandonment without quid pro quo tends to create an unending opportunity for blackmail, making it possible for the Soviet Union to demand in

effect, "What will you pay me for not kicking you around?"

EFFECTS OF STRUCTURAL CHANGES WITHIN RUSSIA

A number of observers have expressed the view that tension in the world might relax as a result of certain important structural changes occurring within the Soviet system, and that it might be possible to return to the more realistic methods of power politics and classical diplomacy in relations with the Soviet Union, free from the pressures and the smokescreen of ideological considerations. Mr. Walter Lippmann, in particular, is to a considerable extent a proponent of this interesting analysis.

Now it is an unquestionable fact that important changes have occurred in the Soviet Union. Since the end of the Stalin era the living standards of the Soviet people have considerably improved, and the coercive machinery of the state, while still formidable, is now less in evidence and its forays less deadly then they used to be. There is also the beginning, or perhaps the potential beginning, of a certain amount of decentralization. In addition the eventual rise of a new managerial class with some relatively independent ideas, lately comparable to a middle class, cannot be excluded.

It is however, in my opinion, a fundamental error to believe that only the Stalinist version of communism constitutes true communism and that all important modifications indicate a departure from communism itself. Just as the capitalistic or free enterprise system of the 19th century, the century of heavy capital accumulation, was very different from the free-enterprise system of the 20th century, so the communism of Stalin's era of capital accumulation and brutal buildup at any price is different from the communism of Khrushchev. For all its structural changes, Soviet communism has given up none of its theoretical claim to infallibility, nor its messianic fervor, nor its unabated desire for world domination.

Nikita Khrushchev has been most explicit on these points, and to believe that he does not really mean what he is saying when he speaks about the aims of communism, is as dangerous as it was to disbelieve the words of Adolf Hitler about the aims of nazism.

There is perhaps this much to the abovementioned theory: It the improvement of the living standard within the Soviet Union is permitted to continue, if the internal security mechanism is further relaxed, if the process of decentralization is pursued, then it is conceivable that at some time in the distance future the Government of the Soviet Union may not be quite so free to embark upon an aggressive policy, because its people may have acquired too much of a stake in a peaceful development and may have acquired some means of impeding such a Soviet Government policy.

But surely nobody would argue that this is the situation now. Whatever the possibilities for the future, the structural changes in the Soviet Union are in their infancy, and the Soviet Government and the Communist Party high command have every opportunity to arrest this development and to reverse the course should they so desire. Hence, these changes in the Soviet Union, whatever their potential future significance, do not have much of a bearing on the present crisis.

EFFECTS OF RELATIONS BETWEEN RUSSIA AND CHINA

Another area of intense speculation is that of the relations between the Soviet Union and Communist China. It is sometimes suggested that these two rash countries are likely to have a falling out before long. From this expectation, some draw the conclusion that we should have a much softer policy toward the Soviet Union in order to separate her from China, while others feel that we ought to ease Red China's road into the United Nations and to general recognition in order that she may speak for herself rather than through Russia.

Now it is quite true that a considerable body of evidence is available, indicating tactical differences between Russia and Red China. During my recent travels in the Middle East and north Africa I have come across quite a number of such instances. It is, however, only too easy to exaggerate these differences.

The evolution of communism in the Soviet Union and China is in two entirely different phases in the two countries. Moreover, due to its size and significance, China never was and has never been treated like a Soviet satellite.

To this must be added the fact that in the Communist family Mao Tse-tung is the last of the remaining great founders and his position in the evolution of Communist theory is more comparable to that of Lenin than to that of Khrushchev. It is also undeniable that Mao's theory and Chinese Communist practice have powerful attraction in Africa and especially Asia, where the Chinese are regarded as fellow Asians, and the Russians, after all, as Europeans. Also Mao's theories on revolutionary warfare have been required reading in areas of revolutionary or colonial struggle, especially in the prisons which have bred leadership of anticolonialism.

The Chinese Communists are feeling their oats, and in their doctrinaire rigidity they often enjoy the support of those Eastern European Communist leaders like Walter Ulbricht who, because of the weakness of their support, instinctively fear and distrust any relaxation of Communist control. Thus there is considerable material for conflict and diversion of views between the Soviet Union and Communist China.

But in their search for expansion these countries need not be in each other's way for a long time to come, and their leaders are far too intelligent not to see that any serious conflict would be bound to benefit that Western World which they both regard as essentially hostile. It would therefore be more realistic to regard the conflicts between Russian and Chinese tactics as comparable to the differences of views which exist between the United States and Great Britain, rather than to indulge in the idle hope of a major conflagration.

IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. DEFENSE POSTURE

For these reasons it might be concluded that while the aspects of the struggle between communism and the free world may be subject to occasional variations, the conflict itself remains unabated. It is a long-range conflict and our policies and defense posture have to assume the same long-range nature.

This means in particular that our defense needs must not be assessed in terms of a given crisis. Certainly it must be clear to everyone that in view of the complex nature of modern military equipment, especially in electronics and rocketry, any step-up in expenditure could have practical results only years hence, and therefore could not possibly have a practical bearing on a crisis which has already broken out.

Our defense needs have to be assessed for a variety of crises. And, as the long-range forecasts must take into consideration the likelihood of continued, though perhaps, intermittent tension, our defense level must be an appropriately high one. In determining the desirable level of our defense effort, we must take into consideration the probable nature of any conflict that might break out. This means, in particular, that we must face the fact that we are politically and psychologically incapable of striking the first blow. Our defense posture is therefore determined not by a pointless counting of missiles, but by our capacity to absorb the first murderous blow and reserve enough retaliatory capacity to strike decisively against the enemy. In other words, our defense, no matter how strong or weak in numbers of missiles and other equipment, can serve as a true deterrent only if the potential enemy realizes that we have the means to protect enough of our weapons, of our means of delivery, and of our population to return to the fray and deal him punishing blows. The very variety of our means of delivery is therefore in itself a strategic advantage which makes it more difficult for a potential enemy to bring us to our knees in one destructive blow.

It is, however, necessary that we take a hard second look, not only at our much publicized, probably too much publicized, missile program, but also at our means of protecting the missiles against a first attack, and in particular at our system of civil defense. Because our ability to protect at least a large portion of our population from possible destruction is an integral part of our defense posture and our deterrent capacity, it seems highly doubtful that this important sector of our national defense should be left to a largely voluntary effort.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISARMAMENT

It is a common saying that an armament race leads to war. Historically this generalization is far from correct, but it is nevertheless true that an arms race does increase tension and make for general fear and uneasiness. It is therefore obviously in our interest to reduce or even eliminate the arms race if that were posible. There is little doubt that the peoples of the world profoundly hope for such a course. And in an era where the struggle between East and West is also, to a very large extent, a struggle for the minds and the decisions of largely uncommitted nations and peoples, this desire for disarmament cannot be lightly dismissed.

But whether we like it or not, we cannot afford to lose sight of an unpleasant, but nevertheless very real fact; that the uneasy peace of our time, the fact that despite all tension and provocation, full-fledged war is not likely to break out, is primarily due to this "balance of terror" which has made it very unsafe for an aggressor to unleash atomic war. If, by the same token, disarmament were to be undertaken in such a way as to gravely upset this balance, either by being too unilateral or by being too uncontrolled, then such action would not be a step toward peace, but would, quite on the contrary, immeasurably increase the fearful danger of war.

Because of the highly complex nature of this "balance of terror," because of the high complexity of modern defense systems, any suggestion toward immediate and total disarmament, such as Mr. Khrushchev proposed, is revealed as unserious and as pure propaganda. The only serious and possible form of disarmament is a gradual and controlled one.

This is also the course of action which our delegation has pursued at the 10-power Geneva disarmament negotiations. We have suggested that disarmament be achieved through four stages, each of which is to be carefully controlled: That (1) it might begin with a system of regulation and control of existing armaments; that (2) these armaments be limited either at their present level or at a lower one; and that (3) a level of armament be gradually reduced until it is possible to reach the final level; (4) namely, that of disarmament proper. The keyword here is "control" in order to prevent an imbalance which might easily and speedily lead to war or to enforced surrender.

In view of the overriding importance of this point, it would seem that the argument that an "imperfect control agreement is bet-

ter than no control agreement at all" is more than questionable.

LESSONS OF THE SUMMIT

Many people had hoped that the Summit Conference of May 1960 would result in some concrete steps toward disarmament. The brutal breakup of this conference by Mr. Khrushchev has therefore filled many people throughout the world with bitter dismay and dark foreboding.

I doubt that these fears are any more justified than was the unwarranted optimism which preceded this conference. One does not have to be any inverted Pollyanna to say with considerable assurance that the Summit Conference of 1960 never had a chance.

When busy heads of government get together for a few days, they can indeed make important decisions and bridge gaps between their positions, if the original gaps had been sufficiently narrowed in previous conferences on lower levels so that a final decision can close the gap. But when, in exceedingly complex and technical subject matters such as disarmament, only very insufficient progress has been achieved on lower working levels, a miraculous solution at a summit conference is out of the question, or can be achieved only if one side blunders badly. It is equally clear that not enough progress had been made on the problem of Berlin to warrant great expectations.

The breakup of the Paris summit conference should serve, at the very least, to discourage the holding of other summit conferences without an agenda and without essential preparatory work. Let us hope that this shocking experience may help to place greater emphasis on the more traditional methods of diplomacy which, because of their quiet and more confidential characters, are further removed from the war of propaganda, and which, because they take place without the pressure of time that characterizes a summit conference, may have greater chance of success.

A return to the more normal ways of diplomacy will also give us an unparalleled opportunity to test the true intentions of the Soviet Union. For if the Soviet Government really desires agreement on a given subject, it will permit its representatives to make at least some concessions and generally to allow some progress to be achieved. If this is not the case, it ought to be pretty clear that even a summit conference could not clear up the issue, but rather that another gigantic propaganda trap would be in the making.

Progress in diplomatic negotiations is usually very slow; it becomes far slower still when Soviet representatives participate, for their disregard for time can take on oriental proportions. They know very well that being in a hurry is a Western, and especially an American characteristic, and that if you are too much in a hurry to reach agreements you are likely to make all the concessions. Progress, if any, will therefore have to be excruciatingly slow. But if any progress can be achieved by these means, it will be far more real than the ephemeral "spirit of Geneva" or the "spirit of Camp David."

Patience and a calm outlook are therefore of the essence. But our diplomats and representatives will hardly be in a position to exercise this requisite patience, if they are constantly pushed by a nervous and impatient public. The cold war takes place on many fronts; one of its most important is the nervous equilibrium of our people. By our realizing and accepting the fact of life, which means the fact that we shall have to live with crisis, we can all add immeasurably to the strength of our country and help to make it truly invincible.

KEY FACTORS IN FUTURE MILITARY PLANNING

(By Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff)

Many factors are involved in military planning, but eight are particularly basic. Their resolution one way or another vitally affects not only our military planning, but our whole military structure.

First, it is well to note what makes a good plan. An effective plan must provide for changes in short-range and even long-range objectives, for shifts in policy as a result of varying degrees of success and failure, for changes in relative strengths and alinements of our enemy and our allies, and for the counterplay of the programs of our enemy and our friends. It must anticipate what a probable enemy can do in the future, and what we will need 2 or 3 years from now. It goes, almost without saying, that it must be both comprehensive and flexible.

Then there are the men who must carry out these plans. This country needs men who are not panicked by problems but men with the wisdom, the intellect, and principle to find solutions rather than faults, to come with aid rather than anger, to encourage and not to discourage, and to do good for the Nation rather than good for themselves.

I believe that today we have such men—in the President, in the Department of Defense, who are making a very real effort to solve the difficult problems with which this country is faced.

I. NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The use of nuclear weapons is what I would call the No. 1 planning factor. Our present military force structures and our war plans provide for integrating nuclear weapons with other weapons in our military arsenal. There has been no change in this policy, nor has there been a change in the conditions which dictated the need for this policy. In fact, if the policy were changed, it would have a tremendous effect on all our forces structures.

General Gruenther has said he feels that if nuclear weapons were banned, it would require our forces to adopt a wall-of-flesh type of strategy. If such a situation can be avoided, it certainly seems foolish to match man for man the regimented military power of the Communist bloc. A would-be aggressor must be made to understand that he cannot hope to carry out any attack, even a surprise one, which would destroy our ability to strike back in a devastating manner.

Briefly, here is how this policy came into being: In July 1953, the President and the Secretary of Defense asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reassess our national strategic and logistic capabilities in the light of foreseeable developments and the world situation. The motif for our study took into account many factors: the armistice in Korea, the changes in the military posture of nations and in the regional defense arrangements around the world, and technological advancements, particularly since 1950. Despite familiar Soviet protestations to the contrary, there was no evidence of any fundamental change in Soviet long-range objectives.

After receipt of the JCS study in August 1953, and following discussions in the National Security Council, two basic decisions were made by our President: First, to base our defense program on "preparations for the long pull"; secondly, to maintain "a great capacity" to retaliate by means and at places of our own choosing. These decisions became national policy and the cornerstones to our strategy. Atomic weapons became part and parcel of our military arsenal.

At the top of my list of myths is the one that assumes atomic weapons will remain locked in the barn. I do not believe it. First of all, there is no atomic stalemate. Nor could there be—so long as wars involve humane traits of cunning and wit, skill, and training, and willpower and determination.

Besides, the Soviets have not hesitated to break agreements whenever it has served their purpose. The Senate Judiciary Committee has studied nearly a thousand treaties and agreements in which the Soviets have been involved. Their staff found that in the 38 short years since the Soviet Union came into existence, its Government has broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise.

A Senator once asked me whether I thought any nation, including our own, would keep modern weapons locked in the barn while it went down in defeat using the equivalent of the flintlock. I had to give him a frank and candid answer: "No, I don't." Atomic weapons, like other weapons, are part of our arsenal. It is imperative that every individual with a role in military planning know and understand that this is national policy.

II. STABILITY OVER THE LONG PULL

Through the decades of American history, our military strength usually had its ups and downs. In case of war, we went all-out for mobilization. In case of peace, we went all-out for demobilization. The peaks depicted our alarm in an emergency; and the valleys depicted our apathy in peacetime. Such is the path charted from Lexington and Concord all the way to Korea. Prior to 1950, the United States liquidated the most powerful military machine in American history, and placed it at such a low level as practically to invite aggression. Even during the first year of the Korean war, we had to more than double our Armed Forces. Again, we paid a heavy price for a swift demobilization, the one that followed World War II.

In the reappraisal of 1953, it was the aim of the administration and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to eliminate forever these cycles of feast and famine. In their place was adopted a defense program based on preparations for the long pull.

Since 1953 strength and defense budget levels have been based on world conditions, on improved military preparedness of other free countries of the world, on improved weapons systems, on better utilization of manpower, on the continued Communist threat, among many other factors. There are, of course, a number of intangibles always to be considered when determining our required force levels. One of the greatest intangibles is just exactly where, when, or how the next shooting war might be forced upon us. If we knew we were going to face a major onslaught in the next 6 months, then we might need additional manpower and appropriations. On the other hand, if we were guaranteed that we were not going to be forced into a war for the next 20 to 50 years, our force levels could be reduced. We cannot guarantee such a course of events and, therefore, must be prepared for the possibility of war.

The provision of adequate military strength is indispensable to our future safety. Moreover, it is imperative that from here on out, our country have a defense program that is reasonably stable—one that is not materially disturbed by every hot and cold effort of an unfriendly nation, or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or a friendly nation. Large upswings or downswings in force levels have disastrous effects upon defense planning, just as they do on business. Not only is this wasteful but it also involves serious risks which militarily we cannot afford to take.

Stability in all the Armed Forces, stability which is being made possible by the Presi-

dent's program, is probably the most important single defense policy we want to see continued. It permits planning, orderly procurement, and efficient operation. It gives us a defensive posture which is readily appreciated and understood by the rest of the world.

III. COLLECTIVE SECURITY

A third key factor is collective security. Most planners believe in collective security; they understand the need for allies. They realize that the Communists are continuing to work for the piecemeal collapse of our friends, and are doing everything possible to undermine Western defenses. National security policy is predicated on our having allies, and on our giving them selective military assistance in building and maintaining those forces of their own which will best contribute to collective military power..

Our collective security and our retaliatory forces give us what might be termed a "two-fisted defense." Like any good fighter in the boxing ring, there is in one glove a defensive fist to meet, parry, and defend against an enemy's blows. This is the collective defense force—the worldwide system of allied forces which constitute the guard or the shield. American forces are part of that shield. By participating in various regional defense pacts, our forces help dissuade a would-be aggressor from a hostile act which would touch off a war. The other fist is the counterpunch—the fist that can retaliate and strike back. The American portion of the retaliatory fist includes long-range air forces, ICBM's, IRBM's, carrier task forces, and our active striking forces of all services.

IV. ARMED FORCES TEAM

A fourth key factor is the nature and variety of our Armed Forces team. Our ability to defeat the major enemy in a global war depends first of all upon our ability to survive the initial phase of such a war, and then subsequently upon our ability to gain superiority over the enemy.

The initial phase, however, could be the decisive phase, since we, the United States, have to assume that we will not be the aggressors and, therefore, may have to survive a surprise attack. At the same time, it cannot be assumed that a next war will be only a short, violently destructive affair, and will terminate in a period of only a few weeks. Hence, our forces also must be prepared to initiate subsequent operations of much longer duration.

We are not, and must not count too much on one weapon, or one service, or one type of warfare. No one weapon, service, or form of military action is sufficient to meet all our security needs. Specifically, the United States needs highly mobile atomic striking forces and strategic reserves in a constant state of combat readiness. We must emphasize forces for defense of our continental U.S. vitals, and for swift offensive counterblows, plus the necessary forms of military assistance to back up and support our allies, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Our national strategy presently requires and probably always will require the combined and varied capabilities of all the Armed Forces.

V. MOBILITY

If our forces are to constitute a real deterrent, we must be willing, and potential aggressors must be made to understand that we are willing to apply quickly whatever power it may take to defend against Communist aggression. To be able to apply power quickly, we emphasize mobility—the ability to move ready forces rapidly into forward areas to reinforce other forces or to fight unassisted.

Mobility needs better definition. We want mobility, and more of it. But all too frequently there is an inference that more mobility is merely a matter of more airlift and airplanes and ships. The advocates of this say that with more airplanes, we could shorten all our time factors for the moment of our divisions and air groups.

This is rather wishful thinking, for mobility is much more than numbers of airplanes or ships. It is, for example, a matter of bases. In addition to the facilities in an area of projected deployment, mobility is also affected by intermediate staging bases and by the status of our petroleum products, both at the end of the line and at intermediate staging bases. Mobility is further affected by the availability of supporting personnel and maintenance personnel, both at the destination and en route, both during the actual movement and during the logistic followup. Finally, mobility is a function of minimum requirements. It is a matter of paring down requirements to basic minimums lest we destroy the very mobility we seek.

The mobility U.S. military planners must seek is the kind that comes first from streamlining the units to be deployed after the technical services have designed equipment that fits into the mobile concept. These comments are applicable to all the services.

VI. TECHNOLOGICAL RACE

Inherent to our mobility is another factor, namely, first-class weapons and equipment. The main danger we must constantly guard against is our tendency to be complacent. In a sense, this is the most insidious weakness a nation can have. Any conclusion based on the premise that the Soviet scientists and engineers are not as well qualified as ours will not hold water. Because of the Communist capability of enforced concentration on technical skills, there is always the grave possibility that the Soviets can develop in some particular field a weapon more radically advanced than one that we may have. No stone must be left unturned to insure that our rate of technological progress is the best.

All political, military and scientific leaders must help other Americans to understand the great influence that technology will have on the future. This is not to spread alarm, but rather to develop a full understanding of the need for a technological base that is without peer in the world. An increasing portion of our young men must be encouraged to become scientists and engineers, good ones, particularly if we are to develop and support the weapons of tomorrow necessary for survival. Skilled men must be used wisely and not wasted on jobs others can do.

VII. TRAINED, CAREER MANPOWER

Our long-range planning has achieved reasonable stability in numbers within the services. The next step must be to achieve stability of personnel within these numbers—to further reduce personnel turnovers, and increase the ratio of career personnel to total personnel. The governing limitation on the future size and effectiveness of the Armed Forces will not be money, nor weapons, nor research, nor production. The governing limitation will be that of obtaining and holding the qualified people in the numbers we need. Our personnel policies, and our national attitude toward the man in uniform, must be shaped accordingly.

VIII. CONVICTIONS

The final factor has to do with the courage of our convictions and our ability to express and explain the reasons for our convictions. It is obvious the Communists have made amazing gains, largely because they know what they believe, why they believe it, and can explain it. They are educated and completely versed in it.

On the other hand, we who are free have many times been incoherent or have lacked the verbal ability to explain or defend completely what our way of life really is.

Our Founding Fathers established the framework in which freedom could flourish. Those who conceived this Nation, and brought it to life, breathed into it a sense of mission, of destiny, and of progress. As representative government grew, Americans realized that our governmental processes would have to be free of dependence on the few, and rest on the informed cooperation and hard work of the majority. We rejected tyranny, and took up democracy. We became, in fact, the living proof that freedom is the most worthwhile heritage of all.

But this is not a heritage we are able to take for granted. Communism continues to be the major challenge to our way of life. At issue is the true nature of man himself. There are voices which say we live in a world which could be destroyed without notice, that our national values have decayed, that we have no great cause to guide our future history, and thus it is futile to try to maintain feelings of true patriotism and self-sacrifice. This leads, of course, to a newer version of an old saying: "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Perhaps this comes from Communists themselves who would like us to think that communism is irresistible.

Yet, the United States, its institutions, its people, and its great progress are refutations of the Communist dogma. Our free system is the complete antithesis of Communist dictatorship. But our Nation must know itself. "We hold these truths • • •"—indeed we hold these noble truths right in our own hands, in trust. If we doubt our mission in the world, we probably will cease to progress. If America ever loses confidence in herself, we will retain the confidence of no one.

Our ultimate strength lies in our faith in God, the same faith that sustained our ancestors against the perils of their time, the same faith that encompasses our greatest hopes for the future.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 7: "U.S. Defense: Policies and Posture," by Dr. Donald H. Ackerman, task force staff:

U.S. DEFENSE: POLICIES AND POSTURE

(By Donald H. Ackerman, Jr., task force staff, formerly on faculty of Western Michigan University, currently on staff of Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.)

AREAS

1. U.S. defense policies, 1945–52.

2. Long-range goals of U.S. defense, 1953–59.

3. Current issues of U.S. defense policies.

4. U.S. military capabilities—1960 and beyond.

[May 1960]

PREFACE

In a study of past, present, and future defense policies of the United States, so much ground must be covered that of necessity selection of inclusions and exclusions

becomes a great factor. The topic has been divided into four shorter papers which can be used either as entities or as part of the organized whole.

The first, reviewing the history of U.S. defense policies and programs since World War II, serves as a background for the present and compares, in a sense, the approaches of two administrations to the defense picture. Recently, President Eisenhower suggested that such a project be undertaken to show how, when, and why certain issues evolved as they did.

From there, we proceed to an examination of the long-range goals of U.S. defense policy today. Frequently, critics of a program will denounce a specific item without critically examining its place in the total picture. We do have a consistent policy today, and perhaps through an understanding of the long-range elements thereof a better critique of plus and minus factors can be made.

Issues evolving from current defense stature range from the need for personnel increases to the alleged missile gap. Recent indictments of one or more of these by Generals Taylor, Lamphier, Kissinger, Jackson and others must be answered by hard and fast examination of each component as well as the total deterrent picture, rather than merely by stressing the infallibility of President Eisenhower and top military experts.

This total picture is represented by American capabilities now and in the future, taking into account intelligence data, future weapons systems, Russian performance and capabilities, and the future of defense in our world to come.

The recent Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Research Center report on "Development in Military Technology and Their Impact on U.S. Strategy and Foreign Policy," concluded with the statement that "a relatively stable strategic-nuclear stalemate and a reasonable degree of protection against nonstrategic aggression can be established, provided the United States equips itself with a secure retaliatory missile force and, with its allies, creates strong dual-purpose defense forces backed by readily available reserves." [1]

A close examination of our past record, present posture and future capabilities should convince the thinking public that this protection exists today and will continue into the future.

DEFENSE POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES, 1945–52

The issues of today are often rooted in the past. While we strive to see present problems in the U.S. defense posture, and look into the future to judge the effect of new weapons systems, diplomatic efforts and defensive developments, many defense policies of our administration are based on lessons of the past—both of a sound or mistaken nature.

On June 30, 1945, the close of the fiscal year 1945, the United States had over 12 million men in its Military Establishment.[2] A war which had cost the treasury around $350 billion,[3] exclusive of later debt interest incurred and veterans benefits paid, was ending. How we came from that point to the isues of today is a fascinating and vital story.

National security expenditures for the period varied from over $50 billion, in fiscal 1953, to a low of less than $12 billion during 1948. Military strength ranged from the aforementioned 12 million to the 1¼ million plus manpower figures at the close of fiscal 1950. Through the passage of 15 years the strength of our Nation bobbed up and down on the waves of world tension and power relationships.

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is always easy to second-guess with historical hindsight and the related temptations to blame and praise. We can see which alternative would have brought the optimum results, while those taking part in the unfolding drama had no such opportunity. However, it is part of our democratic tradition to examine history with a view toward examining performance as well as antecedents of current issues and trends. As examination of American military posture and policy since World War II is made, one can see that, while both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations performed in superb and ragged style at certain times, it was only with the advent of the latter that a sound, consistent, long-range policy evolved with its purpose to build America's strength to keep the peace.

Disarmament, demobilization and disillusion 1945–52

When World War II ended, American policy recognized the new responsibilities of America in compatibility with the basic interests of free people everywhere. Adherence to principles of generous peace treaties, establishment of the United Nations, emergence of colonial peoples to self-government and democratic institutions for former captive peoples were all undertaken with the hope that the powers of the United States and the Soviet Union would continue their wartime cooperation into the peacetime period.

However, even during the war, some military and diplomatic officials having firsthand dealings with the Russians sent warning after warning that the Soviets had not forgotten their long-range plans of world domination.[4] The Soviet was undergoing only a partial demobilization, planned to leave her ground forces superior to those of the Combined Western Powers. By 1948, the Russian actions had caused revival of conscription in the United States, based on enumerated actions such as: [5]

"The Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, the excessive pressure put upon the Government of Finland immediately thereafter, the Soviet diplomatic probings on the Scandinavian Peninsula, the severe and annoying restrictions put upon the American occupation forces in Berlin and Vienna."

It took the explosion of an atomic device by the Russians on September 23, 1949, to wake some up to the comparative capabilities as well as the intentions of the Russian military machine. In February 1948, General Gruenther briefed the White House on our military capabilities and their failure to measure up to our intentions and commitments in foreign affairs.[6] The House Committee on Armed Services had by now realized that 1,384,500 men were not enough to enable the services to meet their commitments.[7]

What had happened, among other things, was that the administration, echoing the sentiments of the American citizenry, gave little thought to the method and effect of demobilization of manpower and instead strove to "get the boys back home." Despite the existence of fairly comprehensive plans for demobilization of European troops, a public clamor for this wholesale return, only natural under the circumstances, along with the unexpectedly sudden end of the war in Asia, led to a dilemma solved by putting off the long-range security of the United States until later. As General Marshall testified: [8]

"The rate of demobilization has been determined by transportation facilities and by the availability of trained personnel to carry its administrative requirements out. It has no relationship whatsoever to the size of the Army in the future."

Results included the loss of the older and experienced men in units, due to the individual rather than unit discharge plan. There thus was a dearth of trained personnel to adequately occupy conquered areas, to keep unit equipment in operating condition, and to impart training and necessary knowledge to replacements.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Especially was the situation critical as far as disposition of surplus war material was concerned. By 1946, the Army had close to $32 billion in surplus property and the Navy about $17 billion.[9] The program had been slow in forging ahead due to changes in administration from the Surplus War Property Board to the Surplus Property Board to the Surplus Property Administration to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the War Assets Administration. Due to the lack of trained manpower, conflicting and complicated criteria and the resultant failure to make an accurate inventory, the goals of prompt disposal on a broad basis with a fair chance for the purchaser, good price for the Government, and avoidance of disruption to the national and world economy alike were not met.[10] It is of interest to note that the value of surplus war property at the end of calendar 1946 exceeded the total military expenditures for fiscal 1949, 1950, and 1951 combined.

On the positive side, our commitments to principles of collective security were both necessary and beneficial. We worked to settle disputes through the United Nations, but a series of Russian vetoes tied the hands of the U.N. Security Council. Through bilateral and multilateral treaties, notably the Rio Pact (September 1947) and the North Atlantic Pact (April 1949), we became fully cognizant that peaceful but free nations must help themselves by promising the assistance of others. Financial, economic, and technical assistance through the Truman doctrine in the Near East, the Marshall plan (economic recovery program) in Europe, and later addition of technical assistance to constitute the Point 4 program all over the world had a great impact on our defense programs and showed Americans that we were in the world to stay.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg perhaps best summed up our foreign policy as related to defense by the so-called Vandenberg resolution, which stated that the policy of our Nation was "to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in common interest. * * * The United States should associate itself with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security." [11]

At the time of signing of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and Protocol (SEATO) in Manila, September 8, 1954, the United States was tied by defense treaties to 42 other nations [12] and by bilateral defense assistance agreements to 51.[13] The implication for future defense policies and expenditures was plain, even though it took a "conflict" to stop the decline of men and money for the protection of our Nation.

On the home front, meanwhile, a special committee under Vice Adm. J. O. Richardson had since 1944 been studying the matter of unification of the Armed Forces under one head. The recommendations of the committee provided for just such a thing, urging a single department with a single commander and civilian secretary. They reasoned that because of the failure of necessary integration in theaters of operation "the theater commander's ability effectively and efficiently to carry out his command decisions is hampered by conditions over which he has little or no control." [14] Admiral Richardson dissented. For those who presently quarrel with the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and the "bickering in the Pentagon," it must be recorded that for over 2 years bickering between civilian and military leaders alike reached a new height back in the postwar

years, and resulting compromises no doubt led to long-range defense policies existing even to today.

Hearings and debates failed to point up the problem more sharply, and it was apparent that the traditional arguments between the services regarding their roles and missions were being continued in this great debate. The advice of Senator Welsh to Secretary Forrestal leading to the formation of the Eberstadt Committee in 1945 may have held back successful unification of the services for another 4 years. The report recommended change of existing departments to War, Navy, and Air; set up the National Security Council idea; but recommended no superior Department of Defense and paved the way for the inadequate National Security Act of 1947, a compromise in that it tried to unite federation and confederation. Secretary Forrestal commented that "good will can make any organization work; conversely, the best organization chart in the world is unsound if the men who have to make it work don't believe in it." [16]

These and other comments on the National Security Act of 1947 seemed to weaken its effect, which was to establish a federated agency to merely coordinate 3 separate executive departments, and showed that unification was still a theory and not an established fact. It was obvious to groups like the Eberstadt Task Force and the Hoover Commission that the authority of the Secretary of Defense to bring about certain reforms and to exercise control over the military departments must be extended. On August 12, 1949—some 5 years after the Richardson Committee began its deliberations, Public Law 216 was adopted to set up the Department of Defense as an executive department, expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense, and give him staff assistance in the Department of Defense and the military departments.

This seemed too late to mitigate the controversy over missions of the Armed Forces, which raged from 1945 on through the end of the Truman administration. Issues such as strategic bombing, amphibious operations and delivery of the atomic bomb separated service from service and often resulted in decisions primarily affecting one service being made by another with less access to pertinent information and more liable to be based on pettiness and jealousies.

While conferences at Key West and Newport in 1948 solved some current issues, no meeting of the minds within the Armed Forces actually resulted. In 1949, investigations by the House Armed Services Committee turned up a dispute which resulted in waste of money and materials, and which has had its effect on the U.S. defense posture down to this day. Those interested in the details of the controversy can find the details of the B–36-Carrier problem in the hearings and report on "Unification and Strategy." [16]" Suffice it to say, the Navy interest in strategic air warfare rather than mere strategic bombing led to opposition of the B–36 as a long-range intercontinental heavy bomber, while Army and Air Force spokesmen felt that the building of the carrier *United States* was a waste of funds, since they saw no logical employment of such a supercarrier in future wars. [17]

Though investigators vindicated the B–36 and never did assure the Navy that carriers would continue to be important, time and subsequent developments have changed the picture to the point where the need for control of the seas is implicit in long-range military strategy. [18] Most budget-conscious citizens felt that the tragedy of this controversy was the cancellation by Defense Secretary Louis Johnson of a project (The *United States*) on which $10–20 million had already been spent. In light of the current efforts of the Navy to build up their carrier force, the far-reaching tragedy may still be felt today.

Following President Truman's recommendation of universal military training, revival of conscription and the Marshall plan on March 17, 1948, the House Armed Services Committee issued a report significant in its contributions to future defense policy. Besides recommending strength to bring the Armed Forces up to about 2 million (something never approved by the administration since our military strength as of June 30, 1950, was still only 1½ million), the committee established the valuable balanced forces principle as a justification for selective service. The committee concluded that "no single military arm can be fully effective unless adequately supported by the other arms" and "a 70-group Air Force is not a substitute for selective service." [19] Since the Army needed "beefing up," a temporary two-year draft was the answer.

Meanwhile, Russia got a taste of America's willingness to use power to promote peace. When a Soviet inspection system of Allied personnel entering the Russian zone of Germany was extended to the halting of all rail, road and waterway traffic between the Western zone and Berlin by August 4, 1958, the Berlin airlift resulted. Were it not for events in Korea, the Truman military policy might well have been judged more favorably, as this would have constituted its high-water marks. Results of the prompt and effective American action included not only a lifting of the blockade the next year, but also a rise of prestige, strengthening of the North Atlantic Alliance, and, ironically, stationing of two SAC B–29 units capable of carrying the atomic bomb in bases in Great Britain.

After the Russian explosion of a nuclear device in 1949 and a growing realization that the Russian threat was on the rise, President Truman announced that he had directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on the hydrogen bomb as well as all forms of atomic weapons. Coming at a time when some scientists felt the atomic bomb to be an ultimate weapon, this decision turned out to be most fortunate. Since, by October, 1953, Soviet explosion of a thermonuclear bomb had been confirmed, Truman's decision no doubt saved the United States considerable embarrassment in future years. It became evident at this point in history that the United States could no longer slacken research and development because of the feeling that we had reached the ultimate in any weapons system—all weapons systems from then on would be relative to Soviet capabilities in the field.

It appeared that actions of the Truman administration would affect weapons systems for some time to come. The decision on development of the H–bomb added to the U.S. capability, but taking the economically easy way out in other matters had violated the principle of balanced forces and placed so much reliance on SAC and the delivery of atomic bombs that other arms capabilities suffered.

Forrestal reported that President Truman proposed a strictly mathematical limit on defense spending for fiscal 1949, 1949, and 1950, which led to respective ceilings of $11, $12, and $15 billion. [20] Rather than stretching out adequate programs and force levels, the decision was made for reduction instead. [21] While the former policy would have been amenable to acceleration in an emergency like Korea, the latter policy proved disastrous. As Secretary Lovett explained, "We have never found a situation before in this country where we are fighting a war in Korea with one rate of expenditure; trying to provide initial equipment for three services as rapidly as possible; and at the same time trying to provide a mobilization system for vastly larger services." [22]

Those who today talk of a missile gap and look back on recent ICBM and IRBM appropriations often forget the early history of the programs. For fiscal 1961, total ICBM and IRBM funding requests total $3.424 billion. [23] This marks an increase of about 36 percent over fiscal 1960, 8,200 percent over fiscal 1955, and 51,778 percent over the total budget requests of President Truman over the period for fiscal 1946–53, inclusive. [24]

From fiscal years 1946–49, the Air Force MX–774 ballistic missile research program operated on total funding of $2.3 million. This precursor to the Atlas ICBM was stunted quite quickly when the budget request dwindled from $1.9 million in fiscal 1946 to .1 million in 1949 to nothing for fiscal 1950.

When Brig. Gen. D. N. Yates submitted the requests and justification for Air Force Research and Development in the fiscal 1952 budgets, the statement was included that "during preceding years, accomplishments in this area for the most part have been minimized due to the pressing requirements for funds in other areas or activities." [25] By the next year, General Craigie was able to state, "this pilotless aircraft program has reached the stage where quantities of test vehicles are required to obtain the data and experience necessary for the development of the ultimate full-scale weapon." [26] Many feel that an earlier start during the critical years 1948–50 would have resulted in either a reduction or elimination of the missile gap facing us today.

In a speech on January 12, 1950, Secretary Acheson had said that "so far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific (other than Japan, the Ryukyus, and the Philippines) is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas aaginst attack." [27] Whatever judgment historians give to this policy of the administration, these facts remains. First, no military guarantee had been given the independent nation of South Korea. This speech obviously meant that in the event of an attack, they would first have to meet it themselves and then hope for help from the United States. Second, our forces were withdrawn from Korea by late summer, 1949. Third, North Korean ground forces invaded South Korea over the 38th parallel on the morning of June 25, 1950.

Whether a deterrent force in South Korea would have prevented this or if a strong declaration by Secretary Acheson in early 1950 might have changed the minds of those who pulled the trigger will never be known. But the facts are clear. The assistance rapidly dispatched to bolster the South Korean forces marked the advent of military as well as economic, moral, and technological assistance to free nations of the world. [28] It started controversies over terms like "limited wars" and "political objectives." It caused a rapid mobilization of an understrength and underequipped Army. Many today still feel that military action had become necessary as a price of political mistakes.

General Wedemeyer's report on Korea hints at similar views. He felt that American withdrawal could lead only to a Korea unified under Soviet Communist direction, and feared as far back as 1947 that such a development could only weaken the American strategic position in the Far East. [29] Some felt that the economic reasoning for our agreement to the United Nations recommendation for a general withdrawal of troops from Korea was a result of a "background judgment about the relatively minor importance of Korea when weighed against the values of maintaining a clear U.S. position in the United Nations." [29]

From a military point of view, Donnelly states that "new measures to rebuild had

Footnotes at end of speech.

been practically countered by the administration efforts to balance the budget and strengthen the Nation's economy." [21] Since the Korean war demanded experienced men, and since the haphazard demobilization of 1945 resulted in recall to duty of those who had served in World War II instead of men who had had no duty, morale was not as high as would have been the case with consistent Reserve and training policies. The buildup of combat effective troops to raise our Armed Forces strength from 1,460,000 to 3,250,000 in a year's time could not be accomplished by mere drafting and training of inexperienced youth. Thus, to many the system seemed unfair, to others insufficient, but to all a haphazard rather than planned policy. To Donnelly, "the effects of the lack of an effective postwar Reserve policy and program became very apparent." [22]

During the period from 1947 on, some progress was made in study and evaluation of the Reserve programs and policies. The report of the Gray board on the National Guard, however, was implemented by a joint Federal-State mission responsibility for the National Guard which set the stage for future conflict between areas of jurisdiction as in the Little Rock dispute. Provisions of the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1952 provided seven components and three categories of Reserve forces. By 1954, it was apparent that insufficient motivation existed for transfer to the Standby Reserve from the Ready Reserve.[23] Weaknesses of the Reserve system eventually were somewhat resolved by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

As history has recorded, the Korean conflict slowly ground to a close as the Eisenhower administration took over. Instead of adopting rapid demobilization policies, the President began an era of searching analysis of defense issues and attempts to find long-range solutions to what had been solved previously only by temporary and inadequate actions.

DEVELOPMENT OF LONG-RANGE GOALS OF U.S. DEFENSE POLICIES 1953-59

After the Korean armistice, the Eisenhower administration set out after an evaluation of long-range defense goals which could be pursued regardless of peaks and valleys in the cold war, economic trends and other variables. Admittedly, the Truman administration had programed such an attempt, but events like atomic explosions, the Berlin blockade, budgetary requirements and finally the Korean conflict upset the timetable.

By 1951, General Bradley came to the conclusion that "we face a period of tension for a long time, and I would think that the only way to solve that is by some long-range policy, military policy, which would provide adequate defense and security forces." [24] However, it remained for President Eisenhower to bring this long-range planning into being, and for the first time the military services could make plans for consistent buildup of forces, research and development programs, establishment of an effective Reserve system and modernization of equipment on a more valid budgetary basis than merely crisis-to-crisis requests.[25]

Over the 7-year span of the Eisenhower administration, events have transpired to indicate that the U.S. defense policy has been channeled into a consistent pattern of objectives and emphases. If we look at the overall picture, we find that these objectives can be classified quite well into five categories, which include:

1. A long-range buildup of forces, based on a capability to defeat aggressors over an extended period of time rather than on critical danger dates. As President Eisenhower said in April 1953, "This policy of ours will not be tied to any magic, critical year • • • but will be based on the sounder theory that a very real danger not only exists this year but may continue to exist for years to come; that our strength • • • must now be made stronger, not by inefficient stops and starts, but by steady, continuous improvement." [26]

2. A flexible and selective posture of deterrent strength. This would include not only the maintenance of strong capabilities for massive retaliation, but also the highly trained and mobile forces equipped with both nuclear and conventional weapons as the situation demands to deal with local emergencies in order to stop their expansion into a general war.

3. The United States must be able to wage war effectively. While we must be able to engage our forces, especially in limited situations, the fact that future wars will differ from those in the past in that deadly blows will be delivered at the outset will make actual warfare a function of both deterrence and continental defense.

4. Establishment of continental defense and warning systems to make the effective destruction of the U.S. retaliatory potential an objective the enemy cannot hope to achieve by surprise.

5. Goals of defense must be coupled with the overall goals of plans for economic expansion. Certainly this is a twofold goal, on the one hand keeping the economy strong and expanding and, on the other, to refrain from letting our military effort interfere unduly with economic expansion.

These consistent courses of action in military circles should lead America to attainment of the national objectives voiced by General Bradley in 1949, when the then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff enumerated them as consisting of:

1. The national desire is for peace and security without sacrifice of individual rights or national severeignty, but not peace at any price.

2. We want the maintenance of our political way of life and our form of government; we do not require other nations to have either.

3. We wish to maintain and raise the American standard of living.

4. We seek peace and security for the entire world.

5. We will work for an effective world organization, based on the United Nations.

6. We hope ultimately for the elimination of warfare as a means for the resolution of international dispute.[27]

The long-range nature of our goals pointed out the fallacy of what President Eisenhower called inefficient and expensive starts and stops. On April 23, 1953, he stated that "for anybody on the defensive position to base his defense on his ability to predict what the exact date of attack would be was crazy."

In later comment about the current issue of personnel, charts show the more steady figures for size of the Armed Forces since fiscal 1955, as presently compared to the rise and falls of previous administrations. Granted that policies of demobilization and rapid mobilization at the onset of the Korean conflict made long-range personnel and fiscal planning difficult, the fact still remains that a drop from 12 million in military forces to 1¼ million and then back to 3¼ million again within 7 years' time constitutes an unbalanced force at best. A sound economy was not aided by national military expenditures ranging from $43 billion to $11 billion and up again to $50 billion within 7 years' time. If practical, a plan based on moderate long-range goals is a key one if proper planning in related fields is to be possible.

This New Look also spread to our international commitments. Early in 1953, our search for revitalization of rearmament led to the North Atlantic Council approving a long-haul schedule of defense planning in April. Again, this did not reflect a relaxation of effort, but rather a firm, continuous commitment of resources as well as a firm distribution of effort throughout the alliance.

Almost all writers on our present defense stature, critic and apologist alike, agree in substance with the goal of a flexible and selective posture of deterrent strength for both general and limited war situations. Definition of terms and practical use of weapons systems to meet this requirement constitute the reasons for debate and difficulties in expressing exact opinions on our defense posture.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor's celebrated outline of 1956, "A National Military Program," showed as the objectives of the national military program "the maintenance of military strength which is capable of dealing with both general war and aggression under conditions short of general war. The military strength of the United States and her allies must be so constituted as to prevent war if possible, limit war if it occurs, and successfully defeat any aggression that may threaten the national interest." [38]

Brodie's work, "Strategy in the Missile Age," propounds this theory in a different way. "Thus it seems inescapable that the first and most basic principle • • • is • • • a great nation which has foresworn preventive war must devote much of its military energies to cutting down drastically the advantage that the enemy can derive from hitting first by surprise attack. • • • It means above all guaranteeing through various forms of protection the survival of the retaliatory force under attack." [39]

The well-publicized study of the impact of developments in military technology on U.S. strategic and foreign policy, conducted by the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of the Johns Hopkins University, emphasized the need for balance in the deterrence by stating that "the overriding objective of such a strategic weapons program should not be that of matching assumed Soviet capabilities in number of ICBM's, but, instead, the early attainment of such an inventory of diverse and relatively secure retaliatory systems that the potential aggressor could not have confidence in his ability to locate and destroy a sufficiently high proportion of them to risk launching a surprise attack." [40]

This flexibility was also expressed by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message of January 6, 1955, when he warned that "undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to another," [41] and also the next year, when the President called for a program emphasizing "an effective, flexible type of power calculated to deter or repulse aggression and to preserve the peace." [42] He later clarified this by saying that we must constantly improve our defense by "substituting power, speed, mobility, flexibility for just men."

In terms of the long-range defense policy of the Eisenhower administration, flexibility means a balanced security, where the United States can choose its time, place and means of warfare. By making security generally attributable to scientific and technological development, by increasing the rate of combat personnel to total strength, and by making the most efficient use possible of weapons and techniques, our concept of flexibility means that within the concept of feasibility our military posture must be relative to the emphasis to be placed on airpower and new weapons, and which will reduce forces in some areas and expand in others, depending on the problems posed by general or local aggression. This is to be preferable over staking preparedness on one type of weapon or one type of situation.

The matter of selectivity of deterrent force is one to which little attention has been paid by critics of the administration defense

Footnotes at end of speech.

policy. When the late Secretary Dulles made his famous speech before the Council of Foreign Relations in New York, January 12, 1953, he stated that "the way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing. * * * The basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capability to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing." [43]

This was not a particularly new doctrine. General Bradley, in 1949, testified that "lacking such forces in being, our greatest strength lies in the threat of quick retaliation in the event we are attacked." [44] But when Secretary Dulles announced this policy, critics were quick to condemn this policy of so-called "massive retaliation" as one relying completely on nuclear-armed strategic forces, as one deterring the threat of conventional military aggression on the same basis as deterring a direct attack on the United States, and as one diverting from the creation of tactical forces which could give substance to a strategy of local defense.

This criticism continued despite assurances by Secretary Dulles himself, along with Admiral Radford, Senator FLANDERS, Secretary Wilson, Secretary Quarles, and others that what some called "massive retaliation" could be better characterized as "graduated, or selective, deterrence."

Brodie fears the assertion that the thermonuclear bomb can do everything, and finds the key question to be in this case finding sanctions for keeping out of action gigantically, powerfully centered military instincts even though we must keep them standing by in order to similarly hobble the opponent." [45] General Taylor feels that limited war forces must be given equal priority with the size, composition and modernization of the atomic deterrent force." [46] He would place main, rather than sole reliance upon conventional weapons. His National Military Program of Flexible Response would contain "at the outset an unqualified renunciation of reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation," and would have the United States "prepare itself to respond anywhere, any time, with weapons and forces appropriate to the situation."

The Johns Hopkins study claims that "the United States and its allies remain in a dangerous position as long as they must rely primarily on the effectivenes of such a form of deterrence (massive retaliation). * * * The precariousness and dangers of these situations will necessarily increase as growing Soviet strategic power diminishes the credibility of the American interest. Therefore, both the United States and its allies have a vital interest in establishing a more reliable deterrent to limited Sino-Soviet assaults." [47]

It must first of all be said that almost all critics have artificial and differing definitions as to what constitutes "limited" and "general" war. Taylor defines general war as being synonymous with a nuclear exchange between the U.S.S.R. and the United States with limited war covering all other forms of military operations. Brodie felt limited war involves deliberate restraint, avoiding strategic bombing of cities with nuclear weapons. The Johns Hopkins study constantly differentiates between deterrents of attacks on the United States and that of attacks upon our allies.

Whatever the definition, and many would say that any difference was purely a matter of degree, the fact remains that the United States has embarked on a program of great diversity involving collective security, foreign assistance, diplomatic leadership, broadcasting truth behind the Iron Curtain, and the maintenance of a powerful military force adequate to cope with the emergencies ranging from limited, local conflicts to total war.

Peeters states [48] that partisanship has failed to prove that the defense program achieved by the Eisenhower administration within the limits of a balanced budget has jeopardized national security because of too much emphasis on air-atomic power at the expense of conventional armaments.

Yet, the criticisms continue. Senator KENNEDY said on August 14, 1958, that "our past reliance upon massive retaliation has stultified the development of new policy", while Senator JACKSON previously had said on February 1, 1956, "up until now, the Soviets have been put on notice that all-out Red aggression could be answered by our air-atomic strength." All these critics had done was to reveal their ignorance of the meaning of so-called massive retaliation and of our overall defense strategy.

Secretary Dulles sought several times to clarify this point. Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he stated in March, 1954, that "the possession of this capacity does not impose the necessity of using it in every instance of attack. It is not our intention to turn every local war into a general war. * * * It seems to have been assumed that we were committed to instant massive retaliation against any form of aggression. That is very far from the truth." [49]

Admiral Radford asserted the same thing when he told the Committee that "our planning does not subscribe to the theory that the ability to deliver massive atomic retaliation is, by itself, adequate to meet all our security needs. * * * I believe that this Nation could be a prisoner of its own military posture if it had no capability other than one to deliver an atomic attack." [50]

The late Secretary Quarles put it on this basis. "If the decision is made to come at our forces, it must be expected that we will at once bring to bear those weapons that will be most effective militarily in the task of repelling the aggression. * * * This is not a program designed to make a big war out of a little one. It is a program to avoid any kind of war through the strength of our deterrent. * * * It is true that the vast strength of air/atomic power may reduce the number of divisions and combat ships we require. It may also reduce the number of combat wings we require. * * * From now on, potential aggressors must reckon with the air/atomic power which can be brought to bear inevitably in whatever strength, and against whatever targets, may be necessary to make such an attack completely unprofitable to the aggressor." [51]

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF LIMITED WAR

Despite the obvious intent of our flexible, selective deterrent policy, critics still ask if we have adequate equipment and personnel to cope with another crisis like Korea or Indochina, and what assurances we have that the use of limited nuclear warfare will not spread into an all-out total war. More detailed data in the next section of this paper on current defense issues should help with these problems.

At any rate, statements and actions of defense officials have emphasized that the United States must and will keep its Armed Forces so organized, equipped, and balanced that it can cope with any emergency, large or small, with the type of weapons and force which the situation calls for.

General Taylor states that "if one regards the force structure of our three services, one finds that nearly all of the Army and of the Marine Corps, much of the Tactical Air Force, some of the Navy's carriers, and large parts of our strategic air and sea lift must be associated with limited war forces and are available in an emergency." [52]

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, Atomic Energy Commissioner T. E. Murray testified on April 12, 1956, that "increasing concentration should be set on the stockpiling of very small weapons. * * * With this diversified nuclear armament, America and her allied military forces of reasonable size would be equipped to handle all the various wartime contingencies that might arise." [53] This limited warfare by nuclear weapons is a possibility for meeting local war threats.

Critics, of course, state that the use of even limited atomic weapons will snowball into the use of thermonuclear bombs. They claim that Suez, Indochina, and Lebanon showed that limited war deterrence was not aided by limited use of nuclear weapons. They will also say that we need more equipment and personnel, more airlift capability, more SAC combat readiness to stop local aggression.

The answer to all this may well rest on the allegations by Peeters that one more division in NATO or one more division in Korea is not the answer. We would not win a ground war in Korea or Europe today because we are not preparing for it. We do want to deter local aggression by what General Ridgeway calls "military power, real and apparent to all concerned," and by application of that power to specific situations as they arise.

We do have such deterrents to local aggression. Besides our general nuclear deterrent, we have tactical atomic weapons. We have over 2 million men, 900 ships, and 35,000 planes which are certainly more than mere byproducts of general war deterrence. In the Lebanon crisis, we moved in with a great determination to do what was needed at that particular time. Our 15,000 soldiers in the area were as overwhelming at that time and place as were millions in the European theatre of World War II. To have committed more planes to an airlift when we had no more airfields or fuel available would have been folly.

Basically, then, our defense policy at present has the determination and ability to deter general war by so-called massive retaliation of all sorts of nuclear weapons of massive destructive capabilities. This "massive retaliation" also has relevance to limited aggression, both in deterrence and in tactical use. In both general and limited war situations, our Armed Forces can cope with any emergency, and will judge on the basis of the situation what action is called for, taking it instantly and successfully.

CONTINENTAL DEFENSE POLICIES

Some will object to the inclusion of a defense goal encompassing continental defense and warning systems. Recent cutbacks in the BOMARC program,[54] and problems created in development of the Nike-Zeus anti-missile-missile system cause doubts that there is a chance of a new weapons generation emerging from development of defensive systems that could nullify progress in the speed and range in the carriers of destructive nuclear weapons.[55]

The Johns Hopkins study cites handicaps of the defense as including the offense's initiative in technological development, in choice of time, place, and method of attack, plus the destructive force of the payload bombers now can carry. Due to the great destructive potential of individual nuclear bombs, an impractically high level of defense effectiveness would be required. The study also concludes that to reduce the impact of the offensive by more than a modest fraction, it becomes more costly than is the price for the offense to take the needed steps to overcome defense measures that have been taken.[56]

However, despite its pessimistic tendencies, the study states that "disastrous consequences could accrue to the side whose op-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ponent first produced a highly effective aircraft and missile defense. * * * The desperate effort to find a defense counter to actual and even potential offensive threats can and must go on." [57]

President Eisenhower, in his budget message of January 17, 1955, announced the creation of a separate air defense command reporting to the Joint Chiefs. Including weapons, aircraft control, and warning networks, the Army antiaircraft and guided-missile battalions, the Navy radar ships and other means of continental defense, this CONAD setup works at constantly detecting, identifying, intercepting, and destroying enemy threats by air. The more practical aspects of this policy will be discussed later. But, as General Partridge pointed out in 1956, "the mere existence of an air defense system in this country forces the enemy to adopt many measures which he would otherwise be able to avoid."

General Taylor's theories for a national military program include reliance upon "a continental defense system, including both active and passive measures, strong enough to prevent an enemy from delivering a crippling blow to the continental United States." [58]

Brodie places emphasis on the defense of our deterrent force, whether by active defense consisting of shooting at enemy planes or missiles or by passive defenses involving hiding, shielding, or dispersing the targets. "Known ability to defend our retaliatory force," states Brodie, "constitutes the only unilateral attainable situation that provides potentially a perfect defense of our homeland. A compromise inability or unreadiness to defend our retaliatory force tempts him (our opopnent) to an aggression he might not otherwise contemplate." [59]

So, although admittedly prospects for an effective missile defense are not too promising, the effort must go on. At the time of the Battle of Britain, a 10 percent attrition on attacking bombers was rare indeed. More recently, however, estimates of the probable effectiveness of surface-to-air and air-to-air missiles range around 50 percent. The theoretical possibility thus envisions a defense which could mitigate the increase in weapons destructiveness and the extended geographic scale of the strategic battle.

Wilcox states that it does not appear possible to create a 100-percent effective antigravity screen or other defense system, especially when man now has the means to "kill every living thing on the earth at a level of biological organization higher than that of insects and plants." [60] However, others, knowing that it is difficult to rule out any possibility over the technological horizons, state that present research may yet turn up an antimissile beam or some other similar defense. [61]

Other aspects of the continental defense system include our comprehensive radar early warning system, which has been commonly misunderstood as to goals. Many criticize this drive for 15 or 30 minutes' warnings of comming attacks as of little solace to those killed and displaced by subsequent attacks. However, the early warning system is but one of several means to insure that the effective destruction of the U.S. retaliatory potential is a strategic objective that the enemy cannot hope to achieve by surprise.

Thus the primary purpose of our air defense is not to shoot down bombers and missiles or evacuate cities, but to deter aggression. Antimissile missiles, early warning systems, and other defensive devices are all mere functions of that goal. The recent developments in radar technology permitting earlier detection of ballistic missiles and faster aircraft are important steps in our continuing efforts to deter attacks. Thus the potential loss to the United States in the event of nuclear bombing is so vast that any measures which tend to deter such an attack are not too steep a price to pay.

ECONOMIC ISSUES OF DEFENSE POLICIES

We must guard not only against the Soviet threat in a military way, but we must also have an America which develops with determination its productive power. As Representative GERALD FORD stated at Mount Pleasant, Mich., "I submit that America can and must face up to the hard fact that if our free society is to be preserved, we as a nation can afford neither the luxury of inadequate defense nor an unsound economy stemming from habitual unbalanced Federal budgets. * * * This Nation must reject the philosophy that our only choice in order to prevent military surrender to the Russians is to spend ourselves into an economic and political defeat." [62]

Many critics whose theory involves merely the spending of more money overlook the total Soviet threat in their concentration on defense posture. In countless ways, the Communist demonstrate that military force is but one of the means that they expect to use to take over the world. Director Allen W. Dulles of the Central Intelligence Agency, stated that "while we must be ever mindful of the Soviet emphasis on the military applications of science and technology in order to anticipate any attempts at a breakthrough which would change the balance of military power, it is most probable that the fateful battles of the cold war will, in the foreseeable future, be found and fought in the economic and subversive arenas."

Despite sharp criticisms of restricted expenditures for defense in his RAND study, Dr. Brodie states that "if the criticism is intended to imply that there is too much concern with dollars in the apportionment of resources, and often it seems to have that character, then it is nonsense. The absence of a deep and constant concern with dollars in military claims between weapons systems would argue the grossest kind of incompetence. It (holding the line on defense budgets) has indeed helped in making some choices, especially where inter-service and political issues were not greatly involved. In a imperfect world, that could be much to be grateful for." [63]

When it was first developed, the first-generation Atlas showed an initial cost of $35 million per missile. To get a picture of that price, if 100 workers, each making $5,000 a year, where to turn over every cent of their earnings for the next 70 years, their total wages would buy 1 Atlas. One submarine, loaded with 16 Polaris missiles, costs over $110 million. The B–52 costs $8 million as compared to a cost of just over $1½ million for the heavy bomber used at the end of World War II. The cost of modern weaponry, of course, is no excuse for not developing a strong retaliatory force, but it is a cause for keeping alert to the damages that could result from extravagance.

The constant criticism that the Eisenhower administration is sacrificing strength for economy and that we were trying to achieve national security in the large, economy size is an inconsistent argument without regard for the overall goals of American defense policy. The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief and Secretaries of the services have been in support of the President's budgets since 1953; in fact, have in some instances complained that we were overstructured. One might want more of the total spent for one item, but by and large the support given by Taylor, Ridgway, Radford, Carney, Twining, Burke, White, and civilian Secretaries have agreed with the policies of Secretaries Wilson, McElroy, and Gates as to the overall adequacy of the budget for carrying out their assigned missions.

Even if they had not, any attack on so-called economy in defense must contend with the fact that appropriation figures are established by Congress, and over all but 4 of the past 28 years the Democratic Party has been in control of Congress. An attempt in 1959, for example, was made to establish a floor of size for the Army at 900,000, and was defeated by a 43-131 division vote. Congressman WEAVER stated that "for nearly $39 billion we are not buying total, impenetrable defense. If we could spend $200 billion or even 10 times that amount, we would not buy a total defense this year. There are too many, too rapid changes in the scientific and technical knowledge at our command and at the command of a potential enemy." [64]

Since the administration has requested the new obligational authority it has deemed necessary in view of a well-established program of procurement and expenditures (leaving, incidentally, unexpended funds from one fiscal year to the next to make available funds far in excess of appropriations) and since Congress has by and large approved these appropriations with a very small fluctuation, [65] and since it will be argued in the next section of this paper that not to make cuts in certain items would have led to intolerable waste, Peeters assumes that "a stronger defense is not necessarily a more expensive defense" and "it is true that the American economy could support greater defense expenditures, but would the few billion dollars that it could thus support make so much difference?" [66]

Donnelly, in "U.S. Defense Policies Since World War II," summarizes the goals of present defense problems and issues (1957) as including "the economy of the United States is to be kept strong and expanding, readily able to convert in support of a war effort." [67] Basically, national security and solvency are indispensable requirements for keeping America strong. Secretary Thomas Gates agreed in 1960 that defense spending through at least 1964 should be in the general area of $41 billion "because I feel that we are in a continuous struggle with those people that may last for the rest of my lifetime. This is going to be the kind of spending that is going to be required to have an adequate defense. Actually, the present level of defense spending is a high one. It is about $5½ billion higher than what it was in 1955, in fact, it's only about $2½ billion under the Korean war peak." [68] When asked by Chairman MAHON if he thought that for the time being we need not be unduly concerned about whether or not we can keep the ceiling constant and level while the price of everything is going up, the Secretary answered, "That is correct." [69]

It is evident that the United States must have not only the military but also the economic strength to induce the Soviets to refrain from all forms of aggression. On May 24, 1957, Khrushchev stated that "we do not intend to blow up the capitalist world with bombs. If we catch up with the United States in per capita production of meat, butter, and milk we will have hit the pillar of capitalism with the most powerful torpedo yet." [70] Thus inflationary pressures resulting from defense spending for spending's sake could cripple our economic and military strength alike, for us and for future generations.

SUMMARY

We have reviewed in this paper the theoretical, long-range goals of the United States defense policy since the advent of the Eisenhower administration. There seems to be little disagreement on those broadly stated goals. Secretary Gates summed it up by stating that "the two principal objectives of our defense program continue

Footnotes at end of speech.

to be: First, to deter the outbreak of general war by maintaining and improving our present capability to retaliate with devastating effectiveness in case of a major attack upon us or our allies; and, second, to maintain, together with our allies, a capability to apply to local situations the degree of force necessary to deter local wars, or to win or contain them promptly if they do break out." [71] This emphasis on deterrence is a logical one, primarily concerned not with the fighting and winning of a war but with the discouragement of Soviet aggression, be it generalized or localized.

Critics of the administration policy have generally failed to assume the need for or advantages of these goals of long-range defense policy. Without understanding at least their basic nature, it is foolish to base an argument on issues like 25,000 men or 6 missile squadrons. An understanding of these goals and their practical application to present defense issues, to be presented in the next paper, can and should make subsequent controversy on the means by which they can be pursued under present and forseeable circumstances of considerably less sharpness and duration.

An awareness of the place that continental defense, personnel needs, and specific issues such as the so-called missile gap, manned bombers, and other play in the current picture must be the next step in this series of papers. If we bear in mind their place as functions of deterrence to the outbreak of general war and maintenance of capability to apply the proper degree of force necessary to deter local wars, they will fall in a much more orderly pattern. Critics must not lose sight of that orientation, nor can they fail to heed the warning of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, when he stated that "second only to our need for security is the necessity for keeping our economy strong, for this is the mainspring of the Nation. We know that the Communists believe that our form of government will destroy itself through economic collapse. Excessive spending by the Government, that breeder of rapid inflation, could contribute to such a condition." [72]

CURRENT ISSUES OF U.S. DEFENSE POLICIES

Since 1953, several critics of the Eisenhower defense policies have kept up a fairly steady barrage against various principles of our defense posture.

One classification of criticisms, chiefly instituted against budgetary restrictions, fails to stress positive values, but instead constantly criticizes subordinating a $40 billion defense budget to principles of fiscal responsibility. They offer no suggestions as to the priorities a $45 or $50 billion budget would entail. Rather, they feel that money expended somehow will automatically be channeled to the proper function of the military forces, and will somehow inspire improvement.

More constructive criticisms have come from those who on the one hand have pressed for increases in our retaliatory atomic capabilities, especially in the way of the so-called missile gap, and on the other have bemoaned our lack of conventional armaments and modernization for limited wars. It is a tribute to most of these that not too many take both means of attacking our defenses. However, it is to the administration's credit when one group can ridicule the overkill capacity of our nuclear retaliatory force and extol preparations for limited war while another group searches for an overwhelming nuclear deterrent that will close the missile gap.

Each year the critics seek to convince Congress that billions should be added for Army and Marine personnel, more and faster manned bombers, speedier modernization and airlift capability for limited wars, faster development and hardening of ICBM's, stronger continental defense systems, concentration on disarmament proposals and better Department of Defense organization. Many of these specific issues will be briefly explored in this paper.

However, the best overall reply to these criticisms is to look at the results of congressional deliberations on the defense budget. Under the present system, overall review and coordination on the service recommendations take place at the Defense Department level before Presidential recommendations. Months of review through hearings before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittees of each House result in a budget markup which is approved before the respective Appropriations Committees, the full House and finally the Senate. A conference committee compromises any differences in the bill as approved in the two Houses, and, after final passage, the bill is enacted after Presidential approval.

With all this analysis and these built-in safeguards, and on the basis of expert testimony year after year of over 200 witnesses annually, Congress has cut $3.5 billion from the Presidential recommendations for fiscal years 1955–60, inclusive.[73] It seems that regardless of disputes over "how the pie is cut," Congress seems satisfied with the cost of the entire pastry despite the complaints of individual Members and outside critics.

PERSONNEL

In our stabilized years of 1948–50, our Armed Forces averaged around 1½ million in personnel, following the peak year of 1945 (12 million) and preceding Korean strength of 3¼ million. Programed for fiscal 1961 is a military personnel of some 2½ million. This marks an increase of 67 percent over the stabilized personnel of the Truman years, and, as we will see, marks an even greater increase due to improvements in the quality of the U.S. personnel due to recent legislation and its factors. Fringe benefits, proficiency pay, and the added legislative improvements have increased the cost of personnel even though they have eliminated the need for excess numbers.[74]

However, attempts are annually made to up personnel figures, especially in the Army and Marine categories. In the hearings for fiscal 1961, we find a typical statement of this philosophy in Representative FLOOD'S remarks on Marine Corps personnel. "I do not want you to have any idea that the Congress of the United States is going to abandon the Marines on this 175,000, because this is not so. We are going to keep at this until you go back to the strength that the Congress and the people think you should be." [75]

These critics cite the low cost of proposed increases—about $50 million to up the Marines from 175,000 to 200,000, and $70 million for an Army increase from 870,000 to 900,000. This is an obvious fallacy, since if proof of a need for such an increase were offered, then the amount of money would not be a serious factor. Congressional sentiment on this point has most recently indicated that such a move has not been justified.

However, the personnel of our Armed Forces is the result, for the first time in our history, of a studied evaluation of supporting the amount and kind of forces necessary in peacetime so as not to jeopardize the Nation's security. Admiral Radford described the plan as "attempting to explore overall manpower ceilings in the various services which could produce major combatant forces, and examined them to see whether they would be adequate. We did not limit—in fact, we encouraged each individual service to do better as far as units were concerned if they could within their manpower ceiling. • • • Under that policy the personnel limitations for the next 4- or 5-year period would be somewhere between 2,800,000 and 3 million.[76]

Contemporary examples of this policy of increasing combat strength of fighting units without raising personnel requirements include the fiscal 1961 addition of two Marine battalion landing teams and two Hawk missile battalions, along with rearrangements that General Lemnitzer described as adding two Army battle groups and European equivalents of two battle groups for fiscal 1961, also without increasing Army size.

Chief reasons for this improvement without increased size have been the fringe benefits and other improvements granted by major personnel legislation since 1955. At a cost of $5.5 billion, estimated through fiscal 1960,[77] legislation such as the Career Incentive Act of 1955, Survivors' Benefit Act of 1956, Military Pay Act of 1958, and seven other public laws has increased improvements far beyond the original hopes of Congress.

Let us take the Army, for an example. Even before the Eisenhower administration some felt that post-Korean demobilization would take the greatest toll on the Army. As of June 30, 1951, the Army strength was 1,531,774. Ten years later its size is planned to be 870,000—a cut which to the eye appears to be one of 43 percent. But is it in actuality?

Improvements in mental standards, health, effectiveness and behavior have made the Army more battle-ready than ever before in its history. The removal of Nike-Ajax batteries to the Army National Guard will relieve about 7,400 Active Army personnel for other duties.[78]. The noneffective ratio is now at an all-time low, and the health of the Army is as good as it ever has been.[79] In fact, the noneffective ratio (excused from duty per 1,000 men strength) has lowered from 21.8 in calendar year 1949 to 11.8 in calendar year 1959—a drop of some 8,700 in an 870,000-man army.

Disciplinary problems have dropped, showing a reduction of 9,000 in the Department of Defense from fiscal 1957 to fiscal 1959. This not only has saved the Army in fiscal year 1960 $816,063 as compared to the 1956 expense for apprehension of deserters, absentees, and escaped prisoners, but has led to the reduction of 85 percent in prison population since 1955 and the closing of 4 disciplinary barracks and 15 Army stockades since 1957.[80] Courts-martials have affected 33,000 less in fiscal 1959 as compared to 2 years earlier.[81]

It is of interest to note that Army reenlistment rates increased 7.5 percent from fiscal 1957 to fiscal 1958 (24.8 to 32.8 percent). During the same period, Marine Corps reenlistments jumped 10.7 percent. This not only led to the retention of more trained personnel [82] but also resulted in the earmarking of fewer Army personnel for the purpose of getting others in battle-ready condition. General Lemnitzer testified that "we are getting better people—more experienced people, who are staying in the service. Therefore, less effort is required for training and more effort is available out on the line." [83]

Enactment of Public Law 85–564, authorizing increases in induction standards, has resulted in substantial reductions of the percentage of new intakes from mental group IV, the lowest acceptable mental group, in all services. In the Army, for example, the percentage of Army inductee accessions in this mental group went from 39.5 to 30.8, a decline of 22 percent in 1 fiscal year.[84]

Some have felt that adding up all the "bodies" saved by Army personnel improvements would more than make up for the 30,000 extra men requested by those critics emphasizing the need for more Army forces. At any rate, the expenditure of over $5.5 billion in 6 years to improve the quality of Defense Department personnel is impressive

Footnotes at end of speech.

when compared to the issue of 30,000 Army troops and 25,000 Marines.

Secretary Gates summed up this point by concluding that "recruitment capability has improved * * * first-term reenlistment rates have generally increased * * * the enlisted force has become more experienced * * * mental quality is definitely higher in all services * * * and there has been a gratifying reduction in disciplinary rates." [85]

Russian troop cuts required Khrushchev to explain to the Supreme Soviet that "the proposed reduction will in no way reduce the firepower of our armed forces and, this is the main thing, after all. * * * This enables us to reduce our armed forces without harming the country's defense capacity." This policy, followed by the United States since 1953, has made us stronger and not weaker.

Critics of personnel policies of the administration forget that the largest army in the world today could not win a war, even if one could be won or lost, without deterrent strength. They forget the changing basis of war, making large military force a waste. Examples of this include Congressman KOWALSKI's disclosure of large numbers of enlisted men performing personal services to generals and lesser officers, and the fact that one man today can fire a machinegun with the firepower that took 1,400 men to duplicate in flintlock days.[86] Personnel cuts do not necessarily amount to combat personnel cuts—under the Eisenhower administration personnel policies have led to stronger, combat-ready military forces.

THE MISSILE GAP

The idea, fancied or otherwise, that Russia is several years ahead of the United States in the production of missiles has led to the defense controversy of our time—the missile gap. In the early months of 1959 and 1960, disclosures by defense officials, Congressmen, and civilian experts that from 1961 through early 1963 the Soviet lead in ICBM's would range up to a 3-to-1 ratio caused a stir replacing the manned bomber controversy as a headline topic.

Joseph Alsop, of the New York Herald Tribune, penned a 6-part series on the missile gap in February 1960, stating, among other things, that "the Eisenhower administration is literally playing a gigantic game of Russian roulette with the national future" and "if these first estimates (American intelligence estimates prepared at the time of the first sputnik) happened to be correct, the Kremlin may already have enough ICBM's to wipe out our nuclear deterrent." Walter Lippmann called the philosophy behind the 1961 Eisenhower budget "deadly, and it will reduce this country to a second-class power."

Secret testimony on January 29, 1960, by CIA Director Allan Dulles credited Soviet missiles with greater accuracy than estimated by Secretary Gates a week before, according to Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington.[87] He stated that "nothing in the briefing warranted taking the risks I think Gates is taking in the missile field." A week or so later, the situation had proceeded to the point where Senator SYMINGTON told the Preparedness Senate Committee that if the administration did not admit the official intelligence estimates shows the future missile gap to look worse than it did in last year's estimate, he would give the true percentage figures to the public.

Even General Taylor, who had a year before testified to the excess of our retaliatory massive deterrent, published a book confessing that he had reluctantly come to accept the "reality and significance of the so-called missile gap. * * * Somehow it must be made clear to our citizens that the Nation will face a serious crisis beginning in about 1961. For a period of years thereafter the balance of military strength will tip dangerously in favor of the Communist bloc unless we take drastic action now." [88]

Experts have fixed the greatest danger as occurring in 1962 or possibly 1963. Gen. Bernard Schriever, commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, said the Soviets could achieve the capability of launching relatively large numbers of missiles in salvo by this date.[89] James Shepley finds that the Soviets are assumed to be capable of 500 ICBM's by 1932 compared with a programed force of some 200 U.S. ICBM's by mid-1963.[90] Alsop, more pessimistically, estimates force levels as 30 vs. 100 missiles in 1960; 70 vs. 500 in 1961; 130 vs. 1,000 in 1962 and 1,500 in 1963. He feels this gap will exist until it closes by mass production of solid-fuel ICBM's in 1965–66.[91]

Former Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy was quoted as saying in 1959 that, "If the Russians build all the ICBM's they can and if the United States produces the number it now plans, the USSR will maintain a 3-to-1 lead through the early 1960's." [92]

After questioning by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in preparation for the fiscal 1961 budget, Secretary Gates submitted a statement to the effect that "on the basis of our current intelligence * * * we do not believe that the Soviet superiority in ICBM's will be as great as that previously estimated." [93]

The picture is thus one of an acknowledged missile gap, with ratios running anywhere from slightly in favor of the Soviet Union to the 12-to-1 extreme reached by Alsop. The probable Soviet lead in numbers of ICBM's during the early and middle 1960's which may neutralize the U.S. strategic deterrent seems to some the greatest danger to its security that America has ever found.

Before the numbers game leads the reader to panic, may I state parenthetically that there are certain characteristics which must be asserted about this missile gap before proceeding further. This gap is not due to the policies of the present administration, and is narrowing, even though the gap is, in a sense, deliberate. It is based on our intentions and the Soviet Union's capabilities. Russia and the United States, due to certain capabilities, cannot be compared in a sense, anyway. Finally, ICBM's are but one of a total picture which shows the United States far ahead in total deterrent and general military strength in 1960, as it will be in 1962, 1965, and for years to come.

The fact that Russian capabilities rather than intentions are taken account of by the missile gap theorists is a critical distinction. Four years ago it was estimated that the Soviet Union could have by 1959 600 to 700 long-range jet bombers in operational units. As we now know, they did not divert the entire energy and scientific capability needed for this and instead built only a fraction of that number. This is why Secretary McElroy last year was careful to define the missile gap as being the difference between the number of ICBM's the United States actually plans to produce and the estimated number that the Soviet Union could produce.[94]

Thus, if the missile gap is supposed to be 300 to 1,000 (a good educated guess) by 1963, there is no reason to assume that the United States could not build more than 300 by that time if it so desired. For example, a new Pentagon order in March 1960 sped up long-range missiles by increasing the number of Atlas long-range missiles on launching pads during calendar 1962 to 12 missiles on each of 6 bases, rather than only 9 on each. This could be done again.[95]

Also, there is no reason to assume that the Soviet Union would reach its potential in ICBM's any more than it had in manned bombers. Secretary McElroy stated that "past experience has demonstrated that the Soviet Union does not always do what the estimates say it could do. * * * It (the missile gap) is not intended to mean that the Soviet Union will actually produce the numbers of missiles that have been estimated." [96]

A glance at the history of the missile program shows why we are still at work catching up with the Russians. IRBM funding, of course, did not start until shortly after the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, with a $4.4 million request for fiscal 1956. Meanwhile, ICBM funding, limited to $6.6 million total budget requests from World War II through fiscal 1953, jumped to a request of $13.9 million in fiscal 1954 through a $2.47 billion original request for fiscal 1961. Total requests in the Eisenhower administration totaled $7.061 billion, or over 1,000 times the rate of expenditure under 8 years of a Democratice administration.[97]

An example of the 1945-type thinking is revealed by the statement of Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, who said that a 3,000-mile rocket was impossible and would be for many years. "The people have been talking about a 3,000-mile, high-angle rocket, shot from one continent to another, carrying an atomic bomb, and so directed as to be a precise weapon which would land exactly on a given target, such as a city. I say, technically, I don't think anybody in the world knows how to do such a thing. * * * I wish the American people would leave it out of their thinking."

Fifteen years later Lieutenant General Schriever was able to tell the following story: "In February, 1954, Dr. John von Neumann told the American Air Force that an operational ICBM could be achieved by this country in from 6 to 9 years, provided that an all-out development effort was initiated immediately. On September 1, 1959, the Defense Department announced to the American people that the Atlas ICBM had become operational. This was just a little over 5 years from the time that the accelerated ICBM program had gotten underway." Atlas had a range of over 7,000 miles (as of May 20, 1960, over 9,000) as compared to a 5,500 range set by the Von Neumann committee, while their hopes for a 5-mile accuracy goal has been by far exceeded by shots within 2 miles of the target.[98]

In his history of the ballistic missile program, Representative ARENDS states that today these programs involve the "expenditure of 10 times as much each day as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952." [99] After showing how skepticism as to the practicability of long-range ballistic missiles held efforts down to low-support studies, ARENDS concludes that "it is hardly remarkable that as of 1960, 15 years after World War II, American long-range rocketry is in some respects matched or surpassed by the Soviets. What is remarkable is how rapidly the ICBM and IRBM programs of the United States have advanced in less than 6 years.[1]

Even the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives, in summing up their study of progress of the Atlas and Polaris missiles, concluded that "the fact is that both projects are progressing at a highly satisfactory rate and that there is no doubt in either the Air Force or the Navy that their respective missiles will be operational on or about their scheduled dates" and that "both the Air Force and the Navy have achieved an outstanding record in the planning, organization and management of their respective research and development missile programs.[3]

Once missiles prove out, the Administration has been quick to expand and speed up successful programs. In March and April of 1960, the Defense Department added $90 million to the Atlas program, $27 million to long-range Minuteman appropriations, and $153 million to the Polaris IRBM pro-

Footnotes at end of speech.

gram; all for the fiscal 1961 budget. For that matter, President Eisenhower, contrary to the notions of his critics, added almost half a billion dollars to the Air Force submission for missile procurement for fiscal 1961, from $2.610 billion to $3.024 billion in his budget estimate.

Clearly, Administration policy has been to rectify past mistakes and errors of judgment in previous estimates, upgrading where the probability exists of benefits accruing for our deterrent program. Our missile program is now at a more than adequate level. General Lemnitzer testified that "there was general agreement on the overall ICBM, or Polaris-type program—retaliatory missile program, let us put it that way," when questioned by Congressman Ford as to the opinion of the Joint Chiefs on the adequacy of the ICBM program for fiscal 1961.[3]

In answer to "numbers critics," General Thomas White said on January 31, 1960, that though the Russians may be ahead in missiles, in the whole defense picture "I don't think we're behind at all. * * * The U.S. missile program and our defense program is a properly balanced one, in my opinion, and will continue to give us the deterrent capability we desire."[4]

The same day, Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, while admitting that Russia will have slightly more missiles until we start catching up in 1962, said "we believe we are in a first rate, first position compared with Russia. We are expanding our missile program * * * putting missiles in our bombing force and bringing into operation Polaris submarines which we believe will offset any so-called missile gap, at least from the point of view of the validity of our deterrent."[5]

Therefore, because of the difference in the needs of Russia and the United States, and because of our concentration on a balanced deterrent force, a numbers game is mere nonsense and, in a sense, our failure to pour money and men into indiscriminate crash programs for missiles is not only due to the unfeasibility and waste of such a program, but is also a measured decision.

In answer to questioning of Representative MAHON, who asked, "is it not correct to say that the so-called ICBM gap has been more or less deliberate in view of the many circumstances in the defense picture?" General White replied, "I think that is correct, everything considered." Mr. MAHON continued, "Would it have been better if we had gone crashing through and been able to match missile for missile in the intercontinental ballistic missile field?" General White replied, "I do not believe that with our lead in really good manned aircraft that it need have been closed. I do not regret that we have not done it.[6]

Why? For one reason, Russia has much more need to build ICBM's than the United States.[7] Since they are by nature most liable to commit a surprise attack, a missile is a more useful weapon for them, but merely one of several weapons systems in our deterrent posture. Russia does not have the advantage of a circling ring of bases from which to launch IRBM's, nor Polaris submarines to lob missiles from underwater onto enemy shores; thus must concentrate on longer-range missiles. The lack of balanced forces and deficiencies in aircraft carriers, manned bombers and amphibious forces has further made Russia a one-weapons-system nation, and spurred them to concentrate on missile research, development and production.

Despite the claims of the missile gap critics, several of our military leaders feel that we have developed an overkill in retaliatory forces. On page 330 of volume I of the House Defense Appropriations hearings for fiscal 1960, General Taylor testified that "when I add together all those vehicles capable of delivering the atomic retaliatory attack, in my judgment the aggregate is excessive to the requirements." This despite his recent conclusion that "there indeed is such a gap which * * * has a most significant bearing on military security."[8] General Pate, Admiral Burke and General Twining agreed in many ways with his fiscal year 1960 opinions in their testimony.

The ultimate answer to the missile gap critics is that you can play the numbers game in many ways and come out with almost any ratio you choose. Do you count the Polaris or not? Do you include the air-breathing intercontinental missile, the Snark? Do you use the capabilities of the Soviet ICBM force, or their actual intentions? Do you include factors like hardening, early warning, mobility and accuracy? Nothing detracts from the fact that any missile gap ratio is a guess based on the assumptions of the guessor.

Even with an agreed ratio, the missile gap, closing though it may be, is a false index of the relative power of two nations with widely divergent needs and backgrounds. We include the ICBM as only one element in an overall military capability which takes advantage of control of the seas, regional alliances throughout the free world, superior bombing forces and other strong points. Thus we limit our first-generation ICBM production and concentrate on the Minuteman and other missiles of the future.

Basically, then, our strength is superior to that of the Soviet Union, changing the critic's quizzing to the more logical question of whether Russia can ever catch up with us in overall deterrent capability.

MODERNIZATION

One of the key issues of modern defense is the problem of modernization, especially in view of personnel problems of today. The Eisenhower administration has consistently planned for modern weapons systems, strategy and transportation devices to greatly increase the combat strength of fighting units.

The Department of Defense has done much to accelerate research and development on a scale which would meet the Soviet challenge in the modern arms race. An Assistant Secretary of Defense was provided for research and development under the reorganization plan of 1953 while a 1956 proposal to provide research and development assistant secretaries for each of the services failed to win congressional approval. We find that in fiscal 1955 only $3.4 billion was spent for overall Department of Defense support of research, development, test, and evaluation work as compared to a request of $5.2 billion in the 1957 budget. This request was over twice the estimated annual expenditure for research and development by private industry. Much use has been made of university and private research organizations on a constant contract basis in pushing this enviable record forward.[9]

ARMY

In the past 6 years much has been accomplished toward the adaptation of nuclear weapons to tactical use, along with development of new conventional weapons, as well. The older "square" division of infantry organization, more suitable for the time of trench warfare, has been converted to pentomic divisions, with five combat groups, organized around five rifle companies. Thus a change has been made in the interest of mobility of movement, especially by air, resulting in a reflection of Army adaptation of tactical doctrines to the nuclear age.

As the Army has become more modernized, its combat-effective ratio has increased greatly. After the Korean conflict, the Army had a total of 567,000 combat troops as compared to 966,000 others, a ratio of 1:1.7. By the end of fiscal 1956, this ratio had been reduced to 1:1.1, almost parity.[9a] This ratio between combat and support forces, almost an exactly balanced force has led to cuts in the noncombat forces and more effective use of Army personnel, even though plans for fiscal 1961 only approached a 1:1.4 ratio.

One of the big issues of defense today is the claim by some Army spokesmen that modernization has been held up by the lack of available funds. In 1960, the Army presented a shopping list of equipment that would be bought to expedite the modernization of the Army if additional funds were made available. Included were battlegroup assault weapons and ammunition, combat vehicles, artillery; air mobility, missiles and rockets (Pershing, Honest John, Little John, Hawk, Redeye, and Davy Crockett), communications and electronic equipment and tactical vehicles. The total cost of the shopping list for 1 year in added funds would be, by the Army estimate, $928 million.[10]

Actually, a sound program has been developed which provides significant quantities of equipment in all of these fields, and which is based on an overall view of modern forces which takes into account needs of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force alike. In this orderly improvement of Army capabilities, both conventional and nuclear Army procurement has been raised to $1.5 billion in recommendations for fiscal 1961, as compared to just over $1 billion 2 years before. It is significant that in the Army ordnance and vehicle procurement activity (the bulk of ground force modernization) the 1961 level is over 300 percent of the 1959 figure. In the research and development account, the gateway to future modernization, almost three-quarters of a $1 billion plus Army R. & D. budget for fiscal 1961 is devoted to support of all problems facing the maintenance of a modern Army.

In looking at what this money is already buying for the Army, we find first of all that missiles have been accented. First deliveries will take place in 1961 of the Davy Crockett (man-carried, nuclear capable rocket for the use of frontline troops), Little John Rocket (lightweight and air transportable) and Sergeant missile (larger and longer-range). Initial procurement of the Redeye is provided for in the fiscal 1961 budget, with that portable missile earmarked for the defense of forces in the field against low-flying aircraft. Finally, new deliveries in the coming year will increase inventory of the Hawk surface-to-air missile, providing field forces with a mobile defense against aircraft and air-breathing missiles.

Small arms modernization has been accelerated to the point where the Army will receive some 180,000 new M–14 NATO-standard 7.12 millimeter rifles and 15,000 7.62 millimeter machine guns in 1961, with the budget also allowing for procurement of another 120,000 rifles and 12,000 machine guns. Acquisition of surveillance drones, modern helicopters, and the Mohawk turboprop observation aircraft will allow for greater battlefield surveillance, while procurement of the lightweight M–113 armored personnel carrier, two types of improved helicopters, and the Caribou transport aircraft, along with 21,500 trucks, tractors and jeeps, will enhance greatly tactical mobility.

A few years back, constant criticism was heard of the World War II vintage tanks and artillery still in use by the Army. During fiscal 1961 alone, 720 new M–60 tanks armed with 105 millimeter high velocity guns and equipped with a longer range diesel engine will be delivered, while the new budget provides for a continuation of this procurement along with first procurement purchasing of a new family of self-propelled artillery pieces.

In addition to this, action by the House of Representatives for fiscal 1961 added some

Footnotes at end of speech.

$207 million to the Army modernization program, which will allow the Army to procure additional quantities of the new M–14 rifle together with ammunition for the rifle and the new 7.62 millimeter machine gun, 600 additional armored personnel carriers, 300 additional battle tanks with supporting ammunition and fire control equipment, additional artillery pieces with necessary supporting equipment and ammunition, over 6,000 additional Davy Crockett weapon systems and 13,000 additional 115 millimeter chemical rockets and multiple launchers." [11]

NAVY

The complexity of Navy modernization was best expressed by Admiral Burke, who stated that "we are going from props to jets, from oil burners to nuclear reactors, from subsonic to supersonic, from TNT to nuclear weapons, from conventional shells to missiles, from atmosphere to space." [12]

Specific examples of Navy modernization include the commissioning of the Nautilus in 1955—bringing a new age of ship propulsion. Since then nuclear power has been used whenever combat advantages justify the additional cost, as in the use of nuclear aircraft carriers. Cruisers and submarines have been equipped with the Regulus I, a surface-to-surface weapon, and more recent improvements of that missile.

The 1960 operational status of the *Polaris* submarine means that our vessels can carry, submerged in the ocean depths, 16 missiles, each capable of destroying a good-sized city. It is relatively invulnerable to ICBM attack and thus forms a great part of our retaliatory capability. While original proposals were geared to progressive expansion of our Polaris force at a minimum rate of 3 per year, recent modifications by the President and by the Department of Defense have led to an expanded Polaris program, completely financing 14 submarines and partially financing 7, and thus providing for a 21-submarine program which will add 336 Polaris missiles to the strategic forces of the United States.

In propulsive power, the Albacore-type submarine with a hull designed for minimum underwater resistance has meant that its speed and maneuverability under water is greater than anything that we have had before. When combined with nuclear-propulsion power, a new field has been opened up for naval vessels to operate under water. Present emphasis in the Navy is on antisubmarine warfare. Secretary Thomas told the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1956 that "this problem receives our highest, our best, and our constant attention." [13] The House took this problem most seriously as well, adding $321 million to the defense budget for fiscal 1961 for ASW in financing three nuclear attack submarines, two destroyer escort vessels, and financing further high priority research efforts in this field.

It is fairly evident that House action in adding some one-half billion dollars to the Navy modernization and development program for fiscal 1961 takes note of the importance of seapower and control of the seas during any future general or limited war. The $293 million saved by their deletion of an aircraft carrier which had been requested may still be reversed by Senate action, and most of those who view the Polaris and carrier as complementary units feel that both are needed even in times of nuclear wars.

AIR FORCE

While the Army has increased battlefield mobility and capability, the Air Force has achieved a similarly spectacular change and adjustment in the art of warfare. "In adaptation of jet power to produce higher speeds and altitudes, development of air refueling to make two-way intercontinental operations feasible, and greatly improved weapons systems in the field of strategic air warfare, modernization of the Air Force has been especially significant." [14]

In 1953, our strategic retaliatory forces consisted of propeller-driven B–36's and some medium-range B–47's. Today the B–36's have been replaced by B–52 jets, and supersonic B–58's are augmenting our B–47 striking power. Since the feasibility of lightweight nuclear warheads became evident in early 1954, thousands of smaller land and carrier-based aircraft also acquired a nuclear capability.

Our long-range bombers are supported by a fleet of refueling tanker aircraft, and are being equipped with Hound Dog air-to-surface missiles which can be launched hundreds of miles from their targets. When the Sidewinder comes into operation, this distance can be approximately doubled. Thus planes can disorganize defenses from a distance, come in with safety, and perform their missions still carrying a payload several times greater than an Atlas missile.

Research and development continue on the B–70 prototype program. Problems of large airframes and propulsion systems at Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) are now being explored with future consideration of this plane as a weapons system, though many doubt its advantage over the B–58 against the ground defenses of 1965, 1967, or 1968, when varied estimates have been made as to the operational date of such a system. By 1965, as well, four systems of ICBM's will be operational, thus raising the issue of weapons systems competition and duplication.

Air Force modernization also looks to the future. Besides expansion of forces equipped with the Atlas, Titan and eventually the Minuteman ICBM, a progressive buildup to three wings is planned for forces equipped with the B–58 supersonic bomber. Our mix of Matador-Mace missile squadrons will go completely to the Mace missile by 1962, completing the operational setup of four squadrons. It should be noted that the Mace missile by far exceeds the total explosive power expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

Thus we see that today an intensive program is underway to expand and improve all elements presently giving us superiority over the Russians, while progressing through the research stage on new projects to continue this. In research and development as in procurement, the most modern and effective techniques and equipment possible are being provided for our Armed Forces here and abroad.

U.S. CONTINENTAL DEFENSE

Obviously, the first line of U.S. continental defense is the deterrence of war through a strong retaliatory force capable of discouraging aggression. An aggressor seeking to destroy the United States would first need to insure that we could not retaliate wih force great enough to cripple his own warmaking potential. Through our primary goals of defense policies, we seek to assure a strong deterrent which will make continental defense an unneeded luxury.

However, for several reasons, the United States finds it necessary to develop a strong continental defense system, both now and in the future. For one thing, the usual assumption is that we will never be an intentional aggressor, making it necessary to provide the means by which our defense can soften blows to the point where we could develop and deliver a devastating counter-attack. Also, the fact is that the first nation that develops a highly effective defense against aircraft and missile attacks would thus have the ability to threaten war without fear of major retaliation.

This may be an impossibility, due to the initiative possessed by the offensive in both technological development and choice of the time, place and method of attack. At any rate, many now feel that there is a possibility of a weapons system to deal with ICBM's, even though these experts doubt mastery of such a system. Certainly the potential loss to the United States through a missile attack is so great that any measures to try to alleviate the damage from such an attack are worthwhile. General Partridge, the commander in chief of CONAD, stated in 1956 that, if air defenses were strong enough, losses to an enemy trying to get through would act as a deterrent other than mere fear of retaliation. It must be borne in mind, however, that he was speaking primarily about manned bombers and defenses against them, though many feel our greatest threat is currently still from this source. [15]

While the search for antigravity screens, antimissile beams, and antimissile missiles goes on in the field of research and development, the United States has also tried to combine the elements of continental defense under one master plan. Establishment of the CONAD (Continental Air Defense Command) has led to a vast complex of radar warning nets stretching across the northern edge of the continent and extending down across the Atlantic and Pacific approaches. One BMEWS (ballistic missile early warning system) station will be in operation during calendar 1960 and another next year. Giving us warning of ballistic missiles on their way toward us will permit us to launch a retaliatory strike. Long-range radars will be able to detect an enemy ICBM at about the midpoint of its trajectory. The MIDAS early warning system, under accelerated development, would be able to detect enemy ICBM's at "blast-off" time, thus giving us 30 minutes warning instead of 15, enabling a very large part of our bomber and missile forces to be on the way with counterstrike force. The evaluation and coordination of information secured from various aspects of our continental defense system by SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) has [16] increased the capability of our air defense system by a factor of something like 5 or 10.

If a manned aircraft attack should come, nuclear-capable surface-to-air missiles, such as the Nike-Hercules and Bomarc, as well as all-weather supersonic interceptors armed with air-to-air missiles (some with atomic warheads) all stand ready to repel the attack. In the case of missiles, of course, the problem has been accented. In efforts to develop an effective ICBM defense, development work has been underway for some time on the Nike-Zeus system, as well as on the Bomarc B and advanced Defender project, which tries to explore detection, warning, tracking, discrimination, and destruction of missiles on a new basis.

Some time ago, the Army established an aggressive antimissile program, [17] under their responsibility for point defense as contrasted with the Air Force area defense concept. Through fiscal 1961, over $1 billion has been provided for our most advanced effort for an effective antimissile defense. As of now, many problems remain. A range of only 75 nautical miles is provided, thus creating the need for Nike-Zesus installations in great numbers. Prospects of the Nike-Zeus, to some, look brightest as far as spot defense of a relatively few vital targets from a relatively primitive missile attack. [18]

Since Nike-Zeus relies on the same general concepts of active terminal defenses as does the Nike-Hercules, skepticism has been aroused as to its effectiveness against swarms of warheads approaching targets at speeds of 250 miles per minute along with confusing and disrupting devices. [19] Though the Army requested $1.5 billion for Nike-Zeus for fiscal 1961, it was cut to research and development money of $302 million by the Secretary of

Footnotes at end of speech.

Defense on the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs, a difference of over $1.2 billion.[20] To go into production at this time was thought impossible by these experts along with the Appropriations Subcommittee and, for that matter, the House of Representatives.

O. M. Gale, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, stated in a letter of April 19, 1960, that "we still don't know whether this system is really going to work, and if it does work, whether it will work well enough to justify the investment of the $15 billion or more that would be required. It seems prudent to withhold our decision until our problems are licked."

However, as stated previously, we must continue to try to find a defensive counter to actual and potential offensive threats, as "desperate and disastrous consequences could accrue to the side whose opponent first produced a highly effective aircraft and missile defense."[21]

Besides early warning systems and supplementary 15- and 30-minute alerts, and over and above the need for active defense against bombers and missiles alike, the administration has concentrated to date on so-called passive defenses such as hardening and dispersal of our retaliatory weapons and civil defense policies to more or less harden our population in an organized fashion in underground shelters.

We plan to expand forces equipped with Atlas missiles to a total of 13 squadrons by 1963. All but the first of these squadrons will be hardened in underground sites and dispersed. In 1961, forces equipped with the Titan ICBM will become operational, with that force built up to 14 squadrons sometime in 1963, all in hardened bases. When "in-silo" launched capabilities and storable fuels are added to the Titan, we will be even better prepared to meet the threat of a sudden enemy ICBM attack.

Recent administration action included planning for 12 missiles on launchers at each of the last 6 Atlas squadrons rather than the previously planned 9. One reason why this is important is the subsequent raising of the number of attacking missiles required for the destruction of our retaliatory force. Murphy estimated in April 1959, that if the Soviets attained an ICBM of high reliability (less than 2 miles accuracy) and a 2-megaton warhead by 1962, at least 13 such missiles would have to be launched at a hardened ICBM site to provide a 90-percent probability of its destruction; or a salvo of 1,500 missiles to destroy the then-programed U.S. force of 110 Titan hardened and dispersed missiles. With a missile accuracy of only 3 miles by 1962, the total number required to take out the Titan force would increase to 6,000.[22] Recent expansion of planned Atlas and Titan squadrons would raise that number to a figure even farther from the scope of reality.

The administration has been careful to disperse and harden Atlas and Titan squadrons rather than merely to try to match numbers with the Soviet. A large number of cumbersome first-generation ICBM's, especially if deployed in fixed, unprotected positions above ground, is hardly the answer to the problem, and would expose the missile to easy destruction by enemy ICBM's.

Thus we will concentrate on second-generation, solid-fuel ICBM's like the Minuteman, which will be moved around the United States on railroad cars, and which will be capable of survival even when deployed in fixed, but well-dispersed and hardened, underground sites. Starting in 1963, forces equipped with the Minuteman ICBM's will become operational, and some hint that it may be much sooner than this.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Our mix of continental defense components were further implemented by action of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee this year. Funds were provided in the bill for both the ballistic missile early warning system, to detect and track missiles once they are well on the way to targets; and for the Midas early warning system to provide almost instantaneous warning through a satellite project to detect mass missile launching. The committee provided extra funds for the Midas, Samos, and Discoverer space projects. On May 24, 1960, a Midas test satellite was orbited and drew attention as a "spy satellite" in light of the then-recent U–2 spy plane incident.

The committee provided an increase in airborne alert funds, not for the purpose of instituting such an alert, but for "the procurement, storage, and distribution of the extra engines, spare part stocks and supplies that would be necessary to sustain the accelerated rate of aircraft operation should it become necessary."[23]

Re-evaluation of the air defense program by the Air Force and Department of Defense in February 1960, resulted in a voluntary reduction of $381.1 million in funds for the Bomarc-B program. Further reductions were instituted by the committee, which were applied in the amount of $215 million to fighter planes as replacements for Bomarc missiles. Combined with continued research on the Bomarc and Nike-Zeus, the procurement of an additional two squadrons of F–106 fighter aircraft, fully equipped and ready for operation, establishes a much more desirable move "from the standpoint of an overall defense posture."[24] Added to this, of course, are the consistent efforts being made by the OCDM and other groups to increase awareness and adequacy of civil defense operations.

Johns Hopkins' report concludes that "a high degree of national security is likely to remain an objective unattainable by military means during the next decade."[25] However, we will continue to emphasize research toward this end, and meanwhile will depend on our ability to deter an enemy from using his strategic weapons, destroying them before they can be used, and protecting our retaliatory power by the dispersal, multiplication, and mobilization of our weapons systems.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

It was definite at the outset of the Eisenhower administration that something would be done about the poor organizational setup of the Defense Establishment. The National Security Act of 1947 had added the will of Congress toward a degree of unification, but had resulted in a unique compromise of a federated agency coordinating separate executive departments. Amendments in 1949 at least converted our National Military Establishment into an executive department and gave the Secretary of Defense more control over the departments and more assistance through an Under Secretary and Comptroller.

Conflicts over the roles and missions of the Armed Forces continued even after the Key West and Newport agreements. Extent of naval air operations, size of the Marine Corps, delivery of the atomic bomb, controversies between advocates of the B–36 and of the supercarrier, and subsequent questions over obvious duplications in the fields of antiaircraft guided missiles and the IRBM led to disputes which exploded far beyond the Pentagon.

A memorandum by the Secretary of Defense on November 26, 1956, angered some but resolved many of the interservice disputes. Based on previous statements of missions and on 9 years of operating experience under the National Security Act of 1947, it clarified and interpreted roles and missions to a much higher degree.

In air defense, for example, the Army was assigned responsibility for point defense (with appropriate missiles such as the Nike-Zeus and Talos) while the Air Force was made responsible for area defense (including the Bomarc system). Operational employment of the IRBM was left to the Navy and Air Force for sea and land systems, respectively, which served to end the duplication of Jupiter and Thor development up to that time, and paved the way for successful work on the Polaris project. Finally, the directive differentiated between the battlefield air missions of the Army (observation, liaison, combat transportation, etc.) and the airlift, tactical reconnaissance, and combat air support responsibilities of the Air Force.[26] These decisions eliminated many duplications and pointed the way ahead for more sure development in the future.

Controversies, however, continued over such matters as tactical air support, the adequacy of the airlift for Army ground forces, antimissile missiles, control of IRBM's, and carrier versus land-based aviation, much of it caused by elements that resulted from the failure of many to accept the new order. This served to bring into clearer, sharper focus the need for new legislation spelling out details of a more effective, reorganized Department of Defense.

Launching of the Soviet sputnik served to bring matters to a head, as did recommendations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee on January 27, 1958, which called for reorganization to prevent duplications; complex, unrealistic civilian controls; and interservice rivalry against the public interest.[27]

On April 3, the President offered Congress a plan for defense reorganization that would unify strategic planning, form our fighting forces into unified commands, streamline military command channels, give the Joint Chiefs professional military assistance, and expand control by the Secretary of Defense over research and development. Among the specific recommendations made by President Eisenhower included several Executive actions as well as legislation to remove obstacles to the full unity of our commands, remove limits on the size of the Joint Staff, remove the restriction on voting by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, remove any statutory authority vesting responsibility for military operations in officials other than the Secretary of Defense, eliminate provisions for separate administration of the military departments and reduce the Assistant Secretaries in number from nine to seven.[28]

It is interesting to note that the President's legislative request included mostly negative things, while his Executive orders were aimed at strengthening and broadening in a positive way. His specific legislation was introduced as H.R. 11958 and S. 3649, while H.R. 11001, on the other hand, expressed the views of Chairman Vinson and two other members of the House Armed Services Committee. Differences between proposals concentrated around the powers to be given to the Secretary of Defense, the separate entities of the military departments, and the type of military staff to be furnished the Secretary of Defense.[29] To some, the issue devolved into a fundamental checks-and-balances problem. The resulting legislation was a compromise, but a forward-moving one.

The President got much of what he had requested, but Congress gave in most reluctantly on points hinting at transfer of constitutional authority of the legislative branch, or at weakening of the ties of the separate services. The Secretary of Defense was strengthened in many ways: for example, the services did not have to be separately administered but had to be separately organized. However, Congress did not re-

peal section 202(a)(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 which permitted any Service Secretary or Chief of Staff to present to Congress any suggested recommendation—an avenue, incidentally, which General Taylor never chose to use, despite its availability.

Provisions of the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958[20] plus the directive issued by Secretary McElroy on December 31, 1958, put into effect several changes coordinating and tightening our defense establishment. In hearings held on the defense budget in each House during the early months of 1960, Secretary Gates, General Twining, and other top Defense Department officials expressed cautious satisfaction over early experiences with the new organization, and announced no requests for changes at that time, preferring to let the new law and directives operate for more than a year before offering new suggestions. This is in sharp contrast to the suggestions of some who would change the new establishment before the new ideas were given adequate testing.

One result of the 1958 reorganization was a greater accent on research and development work, with the establishment of the office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering as the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were given a staff similar in organization to that of the unified commanders instead of the old system of committees, groups, and working teams. Thus the cumbersome command system has been channeled into a direction which would leave the JCS to deal with matters of command and would leave support and administration to the military departments. Formation of ARPA (Advanced Research Projects Agency) and creation of a Director of Guided Missiles showed the emphasis on space and the attempts to eliminate previous duplication on missile and rocket projects.

As is usual with such orders and laws, some were convinced that the change had gone too far, and many felt that there still remained too much rivalry and too little coordination. In retrospect, it seems that the resulting changes were most beneficial and marked a true legislative process compromise wherein executive and legislative differences resulted in functional effects. Donnelly states that the result was to "amend the original Key West-Newport agreements to bring them into consonance with the latest concepts and laws for organizing and insuring our national defense."[21] This major change is over and above the usual improvements in defense financing, procurement policies, fiscal policies, and national stockpiling, which have gone on through the entire Administration.

Criticisms continued, however. General Taylor has particularly suggested changes in his "Uncertain Trumpet," despite his favorably worded testimony on the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.[22] However, all his suggestions would interpose more persons and committees between levels of present administration ,or would change the defense organization which has not as yet been given an adequate test.

Secretary Gates has already put into practice several improvements in organization by gradual implementation, though in office less than a year. Other suggestions, less earth shaking than General Taylor's but perhaps sounder in practical effect, have been offered. Most experts recognize the need for a sort of review board to choose ultimate priorities and budgetary guidelines on a level separated from control by the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, or congressional pressures. However, to place such a board in the chain of command, as would Taylor, merely would lead to more confusion and disorganization, as well as the probability of added duplication of authority and responsibility.

Speaking before the Electronics Industries Association "Defense Market Planning Seminar" in Washington, D.C., ranking minority member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., suggested, among other things, "the establishment, by legislation if necessary, of an independent and continuing National Defense Planning Group, which would encompass or have within it knowledgeable representatives from industry, from the executive, and military branches of the Government, and the legislative."[23] Others have suggested that such a group could be part of the staffing of the Joint Chiefs. At any rate, thoughts such as this and such as the ideas of Secretary Gates that he take more responsibility in screening industry claims in the choice of products for procurement and in meeting with the Joint Chiefs on knotty subjects and problems, are positive steps in the process of evolution of Defense Department organization to the point we are all striving to reach.

With the legislative and executive mandates we have had since 1953 for this purpose, and with the suggestions now being offered for change within these basic frameworks, we may be sure that Defense Department organization will continue to keep up with the times, balancing unification with service identification, and service rivalry in its healthy aspects as against duplication and overlapping on the other.

U.S. MILITARY CAPABILITIES—1960 AND BEYOND

In summarizing American defense posture and in comparing it with Soviet capabilities now and in the future, it seems that the basic orientation depends upon what book your interests dictate or on what authority you study. The reader has the choice among those who criticize our defense policies today and see a rosy picture from 1964 on; those who downgrade both our capabilities and our potentialities; and those who feel our defense is adequate as a deterrent to war today and that it will be in the measurable future.

A reason for this difference in both direction and shading of thinking about defense might lie in the fact that for unclassified details on U.S.-Soviet comparisons today the student must roam far and wide. Even classified estimates rarely attempt predictions beyond the next 4 or 5 years.[24] Perhaps the best method of comparison would be to sketch the present capability of American and Soviet forces in both general and specific terms, and then to detail as much as possible new systems now undergoing research and development in our military planning.

ARMY

The Soviet Army today is composed of roughly 2½ million men, organized into about 175 line divisions. On January 13, 1960, Premier Khrushchev announced that Russia would cut its conventional armed force one-third as a result of their buildup in nuclear rocket striking force. "Khrushchev set present strength of the Soviet armed forces at 3,623,000 men and said they could be slashed by 1,200,000 because of what he called Russia's growing rocket superiority."[25]

Though the Soviet divisions (tank, mechanized, and rifle) range in size from 12,500 to 15,000 men, not all are maintained at full strength. Some estimates credit the Soviet with 60 percent combat-ready divisions, implying that combat would require substantial personnel augmentation in 40 percent of these divisions.

Committee testimony showed that as of November 1, 1958, Russia had 175 divisions and the Soviet bloc 217, for a total of 392. Their 7,800,000 men compare to our 6 million free world and Allied strength. Some committee members were puzzled as to how we could be within 2 million of Soviet strength with about half as many divisions, but the smaller size of the Russian division coupled with the number of skeleton Soviet divisions were mentioned as explanations.[26]

Further information leads us to believe that Soviet ground forces have been completely modernized since the end of World War II. Army sources claim that the Soviet Army has on hand "modern material to equip its 175 line divisions and to support them in combat. * * * including that required to fight either nuclear or conventional wars anywhere on the Eurasian or Middle East landmass. In quality they about equal our modern equipment—they lag behind us in some items, have drawn even on some, and surpass us in others.[27] General Twining, in evaluating the fighting strength and attack superiority of the Soviet, assured the committee that Russia had a sufficient force to launch an attack and maintain it."[28]

Soviet ground troops are supplied with a group of 7.62 mm. small arms, the identical caliber of weapons with which we now equip our own ground forces. Besides 50-ton-heavy tanks with 122 mm. guns, tactical amphibious vehicles include 15½ ton light tanks with 76 mm. guns, while the T–54 medium tank uses the 100 mm. gun. Of the surface-to-surface rockets and missiles, the Soviets have at least 4, ranging from the "Honest John" type rocket with a 15-mile range to tactical missiles with a range of over 300 miles.[29]

There are some problems the Russians must meet in nonmilitary fields. Drinking water barrels, dishes being washed by hand, men detached to process cabbage, and military men carrying firewood for stoves in their barracks all do little to conserve scarce manpower.[30]

Revisions have been made to possible return to the territorial system of military organization which existed in the Soviet Union prior to 1939. This would mean that the majority of ground personnel would become part-time soldiers—similar to our Reserve or National Guard. This, together with the proposed reduction in armed forces, shows graphically the personnel problems resulting from requirements for farm labor, problems of low worker productivity and the losses in male population due to the staggering toll of death during World War II and the subsequent drop in the birth rate.[41]

As compared to this, our Army needs are substantially different from those of the Soviet. We do not need to patrol our borders with unfriendly nations, nor maintain control of restless satellites. All our ground forces are ready to respond to limited or general war demands.

Our Army and Marine forces of 1,045,000 are equipped with modern, mobile nuclear-capable missiles in addition to a complete arsenal of conventional weapons. A good portion of these forces are deployed in advance positions around the Communist bloc, and are backed up by ready forces in the continental United States, and by Reserve forces ranked at their highest level of readiness in peacetime history. Support by 3 air wings of the Marine Corps, 33 wings of the Tactical Air Command of the Air Force, and by the carrier-based aircraft of the Navy is of higher quality than the Soviet Union, which has no all-weather, supersonic fighter-bomber such as our F–105.

Through our alliances with other nations of the free world, we have access to some 250 bases, and additional forces sufficient to set the free world strength at 5 million men, air forces of 30,000 planes and sea control of 2,200 combat vessels. Most estimates give

Footnotes at end of speech.

credit to the contribution of our allies as being far more significant than that of the Communist satellite armies.

At the end of 1961, our Army will have 14 divisions and 25 other major units including 9 battle groups, 5 armored cavalry regiments and 5 missile commands, one battle group and one missile command more than planned for the end of 1960. By the end of fiscal year 1961, there will be about 500 additional helicopter and 109 more fixed wing aircraft in the active inventory as compared to June 30, 1959.[42]

Committee action coupled with administration requests led to "a substantial increase over the 1960 level in Army aircraft procurement of such modern aircraft as the Mohawk (turboprop observation), Caribou (transport), Iroquois (utility helicopter) and Chinook (helicopter). The bill will also provide for a versatile range of missile and rocket weapons including the solid fuel longer range Pershing; the shorter range Little John, Honest John, Sergeant and LaCrosse; air defense missiles such as the Nike-Hercules, the Hawk and the Redeye; and the Davy Crockett—a man-carried nuclear weapons system. Finally, the recommended funds will provide for significant quantities of such modern equipment as the M–60 tank, M–113 armored personnel carrier, a new family of self-propelled howitzers and the 7.62 mm NATO-standard family of small arms." [43]

Additions of $207.6 million to the Army modernization will have an effect traced in the last section of this paper. Recent maneuvers at Fort Benning with these weapons illustrated the importance and magnitude of those weapons which will be procured with this sum over and above procurement contained in the specific recommendations of the President for fiscal 1961.

The new tactical missiles and rockets compare well with Soviet procurement to date. The Pershing range of 700 miles more than doubles the range of the most powerful Soviet army tactical missile, while the Davy Crockett can be fired in the field by one or two men with a range of 5,500–8,800 yards and a nuclear warhead. Shoulder-fired bazooka-type rocket weapons like the Redeye weigh but 20 pounds but meet Army requirements for use by combat trops against low-flying aircraft. The 1,275-pound Hawk surface-to-air missile has a range of 22 miles and is slated for oversea deployment by the Army and Marine Corps and is to be supplied to our allies.

Development of future systems like the Lobber, Missile A, and Shillelagh continue as well. The latter, intended for vehicle-mounted use against armor, troops, fortifications, etc., will be a surface-to-surface close support guided missile of great promise. Also ahead are decisions to add two Army surface-to-surface and three and one-half Army surface-to-air missile battalions to our oversea deployment, with conversion of seven other battalions from conventional to rocket missile capability.

In summarizing the relative ground forces of the United States and the Soviet Union today, Secretary Gates stated that "the Soviet Union clearly outnumbers the United States, but a comparison of the ground forces of the Sino-Soviet bloc with those of the free world allies, including the United States, is more favorable. It is not necessary to match the ground forces of the opponent on a unit-by-unit basis. Our Army and Marine Corps make substantial contributions to our deterrent strength. The Army furnishes an important part of the shield forces in Europe and Korea which, with U.S. air and naval units in such oversea areas, provide ready evidence of our willingness to contribute our fair share of forces to the common defense and our continued faith in the policy of collective security." [44]

NAVY

There is no doubt whatever that the United States is far superior to the Soviet Union in terms of global naval power. For one example, the U.S.S.R. has no aircraft carriers and they are apparently building none. For the United States, four new Forrestal-class carriers have already been commissioned, three more are under construction, including the first nuclear-powered carrier, and another is still a possibility in the current budgetary process, depending on Senate action. We have a 24-hour carrier task force in both the Mediterranean and in the Far East, backed up by additional carriers in the Atlantic and Pacific fleets. This is equivalent to the advantage Russia would have if they could deploy a carrier task force off California and in the Caribbean. As it is, our carrier task force is a means of maintaining our military presence in critical areas of the world far from our own shores, while the Soviet surface fleet is more of a defense power without the capability of operation at long distances from home bases.[45]

In nuclear power, the Soviets are estimated to be in the process of achieving the first operational capability with nuclear-powered submarines, while we have 32 nuclear-powered submarines either in commission or under construction. While the Soviet icebreaker, the Lenin, is their first nuclear-powered surface ship, it is in shakedown status at a time when the U.S. mix includes the *Savannah*, a merchant ship, along with a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, guided missile frigate, and guided missile cruiser, all under various degrees of construction.

Basically, the Soviet Navy is the second largest in the world, having undertaken a program of naval expansion since World War II to build up to 25 cruisers, 140 destroyers, 400–500 submarines, and an air arm of some 3,500 land-based aircraft. Surface ships are losing their importance in Soviet theory, with no carriers and a halt in the building of cruisers, though some suspect a changeover to nuclear cruiser building. Recently Khrushchev forecast that "in the navy" the submarine fleet is assuming great importance and surface ships can no longer play the role they played in the past.

Since the free world has more than 95 percent of world shipping, these differing requirements led the Soviets to build 400–500 submarines as compared to our approximate number of 120. This "sub gap" has caused us to step up efforts in antisubmarine warfare. One-half the Soviet submarines, it might be added, are incapable of operating in distant areas, while the others are challenged by our Navy, with wartime experience and skill in antisubmarine warfare operations as well as including ASW capabilities in the equipment of almost every naval vessel. Four permanent naval task groups now provide training for destroyers, ASW carriers and hunter-killer submarines. A year ago, U.S. intelligence informed Congress that Russia has slowed down their submarine production, thus leading to the feeling that they would construct new and improved types of submarines (missile and/or nuclear propulsion.[46])

Congress provided for fiscal 1961 the financing of three nuclear attack submarines (one more than the original budget request), two destroyer escort vessels, and finance for high priority efforts in research of antisubmarine warfare to the tune of $321 million additional funding. Inasmuch as numbers of submarines marks the only gap in American naval superiority today, the Navy is giving top priority to antisubmarine warfare. This is in marked contrast to the Soviet Union, which has no ASW carriers, no hunter-killer forces and only limited numbers of the specialized aircraft needed to detect and attack submarines.

Introduction of several new items of ASW will take place in the American military inventory in fiscal 1961. These will include ASROC, a rocket-assisted torpedo and depth bomb; new sonar equipment; the HSS–2, a new all-weather search helicopter; the S2F–3, a carrier-based ASW aircraft, and Dash, a drone ASW helicopter, all of which should be operational by mid-1961.

Perhaps the biggest advantage in the near future our Navy will have is the Polaris submarine missile force. The marriage of the atomic submarine with the Polaris fleet ballistic missile promises to give us one of the greatest deterrent weapon systems yet devised, according to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense,[47] which also characterized the atomic submarine with its performance capabilities together with advancements in armaments as "the most formidable naval warship yet devised." [48]

Budget adjustments proposed by the Secretary of Defense on April 6, 1960, led to approval of a Polaris submarine program of 21, with 5 fully funded in fiscal year 1961 and 7 partially financed. This program, added to the 9 already funded, will result in an addition of 336 Polaris missiles to the strategic forces of the United States as already stated. While the Committee recognized the capability for massive destruction of the Polaris to be less than the ICBM's and admitted that it is a costly weapons system ($241 million extra for full funding rather than partial funding of two submarines) and that it has not been fully tested as yet, the report called the Polaris weapons system "because of its almost complete invulnerability to enemy ICBM attack and its other capabilities, of great importance to the nation's deterrence in the ICBM era." [49]

Two Polaris submarines will be operational by the end of calendar 1960, and thus it will be possible to more accurately assess their performance. Since Secretary Gates testified that "if the Polaris proves out sooner than expected, a reconsideration of the program would be undertaken," [50] good performance in the operational submarine will no doubt lead to further expansion of the program.

For the near future, the active fleet will be maintained at a level of 817 ships, of which 382 will be warships. In 1961, the Navy will receive from construction 29 new ships representing more tonnage than was received in any 1 year since World War II. Two Forrestal-type aircraft carriers, the first nuclear-powered carrier, 9 nuclear submarines and 7 guided missile frigates are included. Heavier and more powerful modern naval aircraft are being introduced into the force. Meanwhile, Congress provided funds for fiscal 1961 to institute a ship-building program of 31 new ships; to continue the fleet rehabilitation program for 14 more World War II destroyers; and to procure advanced aircraft such as the A3J (supersonic), F8U–2N and F–4H.

Significant missile procurement will continue. Included will be fleet air defense missiles like the Talos, Terrier and Tartar, plus additional quantities of the air-to-air missiles Sparrow and Sidewinder. As examples of our lead over Soviet naval forces, the Terrier is a good example—a solid-propellent surface-to-air missile, it can be launched from a cruiser and has a range of 10 miles, with an advanced version with greater range in production. The Sidewinder is now operational and has been supplied to several allied air forces, and features a range of up to 11,000 feet at 50,000 foot elevation, along with accurate infrared heat-seeking guidance. Development of the Eagle long-range (100 mile plus) air-to-air missile will some day mean a new departure since it could be launched from long, slow patrol type aircraft. The Corvus will serve as an air-to-surface stand-off missile of su-

Footnotes at end of speech.

personic speed and range of over 100 miles, while the Astor, Subroc and Asroc will fire at submarines from other submarines or surface ships.

As a summary statement on U.S. naval forces today, we turn to Admiral Russell, Vice-Chief of the Navy, who said that "the United States has the strength to maintain control of the seas today. This strength embraces a versatile and diversified capability for limited and general war on the one hand, while on the other it permits a selective demonstration of strength in the cold war as may be required in support of our national policies. Naval forces, due to their mobility at sea, might comprise the major residual capability following an all-out nuclear exchange." [51]

AIR FORCE

Other than the "missile gap" commented on in the last section, Soviet aviation itself includes but 20,000 modern aircraft plus about the same number of obsolete planes in reserve. The tactical command contains about one-half of the total air strength, continuing the traditional emphasis on the importance of ground combat.

However, there has been a recent emphasis on long-range aviation capability in the Soviet Union. From a copy of our B–29, the Soviets have increased their posture in this field to the point where their strategic manned bomber force is second only to our own. Both their Badger (medium jet bomber) and Bison (heavy jet bomber) are capable of delivering nuclear weapons.

The Badger has a maximum speed of about 600 miles per hour, and an unrefueled combat range of 1,500 miles, while the Bison, of about the same speed, has a range of about 2,700 miles. The use of bombers as tankers to develop refueling capabilities has cut into the number of bombers available for long-range bombing missions.[52]

At one time, General Twining reported to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that by 1959 Russia could have 600–700 long-range bombers. Reduced estimates of Soviet bomber forces by January 1959, were explained as either meaning that Russia had experienced technical difficulties in the operation of these planes or that the drop was a matter of policy in concentration on other weapons such as missiles.[53] Thus the Bison, with a general performance somewhat similar to our B–52 but with a somewhat shorter range, has been downgraded in Soviet intentions as contrasted with capabilities.

In contrast to this picture, the United States has four to five times as many intercontinental jet bombers and somewhat more medium jet bombers, supported by a large fleet of refueling tanker aircraft. The U.S. long-range bombers are being equipped with Hound-Dog air-to-surface missiles which can be launched up to 500 miles away from the target. This force is manned by experienced crews, capable of delivering night or day with pinpoint accuracy bombs whose individual explosive power is greater than all bombs dropped by all bombers, enemy and Allied, during the entire course of World War II.

We are continuing to improve the tried and proved manned bombers. The budget for fiscal 1961 includes funds for B–58 supersonic medium bombers, B–52 H heavy bombers with the new turbofan engines, and the associated KC–135 jet tanker. Hound Dog missiles and Quail decoy missiles are provided in the budget to be carried by the B–52s, improving greatly the penetration capabilities of our manned bomber force.

Funds are available to continue development work on the B–70, designed to fly at 3 times speed of sound. Two prototypes of this advanced bomber will be available for flight testing, so that the Air Force will be in a position to determine the future course of its development. Many have felt that the $5.5 billion program scheduled for the bomber to be operational by 1965 was optimistic both in terms of cost and time period, especially in view of its duplication of 4 strategic ICBM systems and its questionable advantages over the B–58. Meanwhile, the B–58 supersonic bomber program is progressively being built up to three wings. Protected by the capabilities of airborne alert, ute 15-minute BMEWS and research on the MIDAS 30-minute system, a SAC manned bomber program will continue to form a major part of our deterrent strength.

A brief summary of our future ICBM capabilities shows the Atlas as now operational, with additional missiles becoming operational within the next several months. The Titan will be operational in 1961, with the Minuteman scheduled to be operational on or before June, 1963. The Atlas will be built up to 13 squadrons and the Titan to 14 by 1963, with all but the first few Atlas squadrons hardened. The Minuteman, of course, promises mobility rather than hardening alone, and progressive expansion of this solid-propellant missile will go on after 1963.

Though the program for the Air Force in fiscal 1961 shows a reduction of 2 wings because of the phase-out of aging B–47 medium bombers, the House subcommittee feels that "total retaliatory capability will continue to grow despite this reduction as B–58 medium bombers and additional B–52s with their Hound Dog and Quail missiles are delivered.[54]

Delivery of the nuclear-capable F–105 attack aircraft and more tactical missiles, plus procurement of 760 aircraft, an increase of 200 over the quantity purchased in 1960, insures an improved aircraft program for 1961. Included are additional quantities of the improved B–52 H heavy bomber, the B–58 medium bomber, the KC–135 jet tanker, all already mentioned, plus the supersonic F–105 fighter-bomber, the supersonic, all-weather F–106 interceptor and the C–130 and C–135 type transports.

Among the missiles still in development, the Skybolt would double the range presently achieved by the Hound Dog, hurling at hypersonic speed 1,000 miles to its target from B–52s and B–58s. The Longbow has now supplemented the Crossbow as a development antiradar missile, designed to home on enemy sites as defense measures for incoming U.S. bombers. Slam (supersonic low-altitude missile) will have a range of over 6,000 miles under a nuclear ramjet power system now being developed.

Air Force comparisons were best summed up by Secretary Gates, who stated that "manned bombers are still the primary means of delivering heavy nuclear weapons in the volume and with the accuracy needed to strike a decisive blow. In this category, the United States far excels the U.S.S.R. We have several times more intercontinental jet bombers and more medium jet bombers. We enjoy a marked qualitative advantage and can claim credit for the most experienced bomber crews in the world. We are well ahead of the U.S.S.R. in air-to-air refueling capabilities, air-to-surface missile development, and other important air warfare techniques.[55]

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Our overall research and development program includes over $200 million a year for projects assigned to the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA). Among ARPA projects are included ballistic missile defense, which takes up approximately half the appropriation for fiscal year 1961; solid propellent chemistry; materials research; communications satellites; navigation satellites and tracking.

All services have some space development occurring at a rapid pace, attempting to do things in space that will permit the services to better do their respective jobs on land, on the sea and in the air. The Navy, for example, is taking over the transit space system from ARPA, as the Army takes over Notus and the Air Force Midas, Samos and Discoverer. This is in line with the theory that more interest and enthusiasm will occur where projects are placed in the service that has a substantial interest.

Some of the more amazing accomplishments planned for the future include for one the Navy Typhon, which will be effective against submarine-launched ballistic missiles, tracking down and shooting these missiles when they are coming out of the sea. As Representative FLOOD said, it was like "knocking down one bullet with another bullet." [56]

The Army has design-tested an armored vest with a ballistic collar to decrease neck wounds—it is expected to reduce wounds in this vital area by 11 percent based on Korean war experience figures.

Meanwhile, the Air Force will test next winter an ice-jet snow and ice removal vehicle which would not only melt the ice and snow on runways, but actually evaporate the resulting water.

In the area of CBR warfare (chemical, biological and radiological) appropriations have been raised from $35 million in fiscal 1959 to $57 million in fiscal 1961. In hearings on the fiscal year 1961 budget, Dr. William Summerson, Deputy Commander for Scientific Activities, Research and Development Command, stated that "with this budget we expect to have in the time from 1963 to 1965 a program to give us for defense the following items: an improved alarm for the rapid warning against chemical agents; vaccines for defense against these biological warfare agents where vaccines are known to be satisfactory at the present time; and we expect to have adequate nerve gas treatment." [57]

In summarizing our research, development, test and evaluation at present, Dr. H. F. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, said, "I believe that the R.D.T. & E. program presently underway and planned for fiscal year 1961 by the Department of Defense is in proper balance with the other important defense programs and that it is adequate to support our national military objectives." [58]

SUMMARY

Former Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil used to graphically illustrate the differences in our economy with Russia by suggesting that we imagine swapping our economy with that of the Soviet Union. At present, this would entail our abandoning three-fifths of our present steel capacity. We would have to destroy two out of every three hydroelectric plants and get along on about one-tenth our present amount of natural gas. We would rip up about 14 of every 15 miles of paved highway and 2 out of very 3 miles of railroad tracks. We'd sink eight out of every nine ocean-going ships, scrap 19 out of every 20 cars and trucks, and shrink our civilian air force to a fraction of its present size. In reducing our standard of living to one-fourth of what we presently enjoy, we would destroy 40 million television sets, 9 out of every 10 telephones and 7 out of every 10 homes.

Even if the goals of the Soviet 7-year plan are attained in total, a remarkable achievement, Soviet economic capacity in 1965 would still be significantly below that of the United States today. Their crude steel capacity by that year would reach 90 million tons—our pre-Korean level. Even conceding the Soviet Union a 6 percent growth rate in gross national product to our 4.4 percent, the gross national product gap would grow to $345 billion (630–285), a rate of over 2 to 1 and an absolute gap of over $90 billion in excess than the difference today. In

Footnotes at end of speech.

light of the close relationship between economic policy and military posture, the Soviet Union must give great weight to the problem of alternative uses of limited resources in military as in economic progress.

Perhaps the best military summary would be a similar exchange of military capabilities with the Soviet Union:

In ICBM production, we would have an operational ICBM, but so would the enemy. If we went ahead with first-generation ICBM's, we would have more in a few years, only to be faced with successful enemy development of second-generation ICBM's and submarine missiles, flexible and reliable. These would be moving into the enemy arsenal while we still sought to achieve mathematical first-generation ICBM supremacy.

As previously recounted, our jet bomber force would be faced with a nuclear force four to five times as large. Our continent, virtually defenseless, would be faced with enemy bomber forces operating from bases in Bermuda, Hawaii, Alaska, Venezuela, and Newfoundland. We would have nothing comparable to the power of thousands of fighter aircraft, bombers, tactical missiles, pilotless aircraft, and IRBM's at dozens of bases scattered through nearby Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands.

Remember that in air defense we would have a few ground-to-air missiles clustered around our metropolitan centers and elsewhere would have only antiaircraft guns. The enemy would have a worldwide system of radar warnings, a powerful all-weather fleet of jet interceptors, substantial ground-to-air missile based and promising developments in antimissile missiles.

On the ground, lest we forget, we would face one-fourth million nuclear-armed enemy troops in Mexico and Canada and these would be allied with large and powerful forces of other nations in our own hemisphere. Our large ground troop array would be required to maintain internal security, to defend our borders and to maintain our domination of a restless satellite empire.

On the sea, enemy naval forces would be cruising a few hundred miles off our coast, with aircraft carriers capable of launching nuclear bombers, and Polaris submarines, soon to join the fleet, ready with 16 missiles each. We would have nothing comparable.

Finally, let us not overlook collective security. With our tinderbox of satellite nations subdued by military dictatorship, we would face enemy allies of freemen banded together in collective organizations and treaties ringing us with 250 strategically located bases for planes and nuclear missiles in addition to ground forces.

As President Eisenhower outlined the force some would be willing to swap. "This is a force not unduly dependent upon any one weapon or any one service, not subject to elimination by sudden attack, buttressed by an industrial system unmatched on earth, and unhesitatingly supported by a vigorous people determined to remain free. Strategically, it is far better situated than any force that could be brought to bear against us."[89]

---

[1] United States Foreign Policy: "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on U.S. Strategy and Foreign Policy." Prepared by Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, the Johns Hopkins University, Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 118.

[2] Office of Secretary of Defense, Office of the Comptroller, "Progress Report and Statistics," p. 22.2, Nov. 28, 1956.

[3] Manning, Raymond, "Cost of U.S. Wars." Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 1956, p. 26.

[4] Deane, Maj. Gen. John, "The Strange Alliance." New York, Viking, 1947.

[5] Selective Service Act of 1948, "Report No. 1881," p. 1.

[6] Millis, Walter, ed., "The Forrestal Diaries." New York, Viking, 1959, pp. 374–377.

[7] Selective Service Act of 1948, op. cit., p. 3.

[8] "Demobilization of the Army," hearings, S. Doc. 90, 79th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[9] Donnelly, Charles, "U.S. Defense Policies Since World War II." H. Doc. 100, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 7, footnotes 12, 13, and 14.

[10] See Public Law 78–457, ch. 479 (H.R. 5125), enacted Oct. 3, 1944.

[11] S. Res. 239, 80th Cong., 2d sess., June 11, 1948.

[12] The Republic of China became the 43d on Mar. 3, 1955.

[13] Appendix B and C, Donnelly, op. cit., pp. 78–80.

[14] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 84 and S. 1482, p. 415.

[15] Hearings before the Senate Committee Armed Services on S. 758, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947, p. 23.

[16] Hearings on the National Defense Program before House Armed Services Committee, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 1949, and Report by same committee, 81st Cong., 2d sess., Mar. 1, 1950, H. Doc. 600.

[17] Ibid, pp. 472–473, 529–530.

[18] See statement of Secretary McElroy, Senate Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal 1960, pp. 11–12.

[19] Selective Service Act of 1948, Report No. 1881, p. 5.

[20] Based on one-third of the national budget less national debt interest.

[21] Air groups were reduced to 55 for fiscal year 1950, along with Army material support and deferral of important parts of the Navy program.

[22] Defense appropriations hearings, House, fiscal year 1952, p. 14.

[23] House hearings, fiscal year 1961, vol. III, p. 133.

[24] Ibid.

[25] House hearings, fiscal year 1952, Air Force, IV, p. 650.

[26] House hearings, fiscal year 1953, Air Force, p. 315.

[27] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 20, 1950, pp. 672–5.

[28] Semiannual report of Secretary of Defense, Jan. 1–June 30, 1951, p. 2.

[29] Report to President: Korea. Senate Armed Services Committee Print, 82d, 1st, p. 8.

[30] Brookings Institution, U.S. Foreign Policy, 1945–55, p. 77.

[31] Donnelly, op. cit., p. 29.

[32] Op. cit.

[33] See second report on Interim Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dec. 28, 1954.

[34] "Military Situation in the Far East," hearings, Senate Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees, 1st sess., 82d Cong., p. 884.

[35] See statements by Secretary Wilson and Admiral Radford on the so-called New Look, House appropriation hearings, fiscal year 1955, pp. 2, 120–122.

[36] White House press release, Apr. 30, 1953.

[37] Hearings, "Unification and Strategy," op. cit., p. 14.

[38] Taylor, Maxwell, "The Uncertain Trumpet," Harper, 1959, p. 31.

[39] Brodie, Bernard, "Strategy in the Missile Age," Princeton, 1959, p. 394.

[40] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 11.

[41] CR, Jan. 6, 1955, p. 123.

[42] CR, Jan. 5, 1956, p. 138.

[43] Department of State Bulletin, Jan. 25, 1954, pp. 107–9.

[44] National Defense Program, op. cit., p. 522.

[45] Brodie, op. cit., pp. 305–57.

[46] Taylor, op. cit., pp. 98–99, 145–6, 149–51.

[47] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 112.

[48] Peeters, Paul, "Massive Retaliation," 1959, p. 132.

[49] Hearings before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 2d sess., 83d Cong., pp. 4–5.

[50] Ibid., p. 50.

[51] DOD, Office of Public Information, news release No. 999–56, pp. 5–7.

[52] Taylor, op. cit., p. 150.

[53] CR, Apr. 16, 1956, A2993–4.

[54] Announced by the Defense Department in Mar. 1960.

[55] See ARPA estimates on Nike-Zeus, House defense appropriation hearings, fiscal year 1960, VI, pp. 94–7.

[56] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 69.

[57] Ibid., p. 70.

[58] Taylor, op. cit., p. 33.

[59] Brodie, op. cit., p. 185.

[60] Wilcox, Howard, "Weapons, Science and Civilization," Astronautics, 4:8, August 59, 81–2.

[61] Sanger, Eugene, "The Photon Rocket and the Weapon Boom," New Scientist, Sept. 49, 147.

[62] Page 3 of unpublished speech, "U.S. Defense: $41 Billion or More," April 17, 1959.

[63] Brodie, op. cit., p. 364, p. 389.

[64] CR, June 2, 1959, p. 9661.

[65] Defense bills for the past 5 fiscal years have varied less than 2 percent from Presidential requests—and that was a downward revision.

[66] Peeters, op. cit., p. 132, p. 140.

[67] Donnelly, op. cit., p. 70.

[68] House Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 27.

[69] Ibid, p. 28.

[70] Quoted in "Meeting the Challenge of the Sixties," excerpts from addresses to the House, Jan. 20, 1960, by Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., p. 15.

[71] House Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 137.

[72] Senate Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal year 1960, p. 3.

[73] The House Appropriations Committee increased fiscal year 1961 proposals by 2.8 million, an increase of only 7/1000 of 1 percent.

[74] The Air Force, with 100,000 fewer men, has added $300 million in their personnell budget—the Navy $150 million for 57,000 fewer men, all in the past 5 fiscal years. (See House Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal year, 1961 II, pp. 136, 329.)

[75] Ibid, III, 309–10.

[76] Study of Airpower, op. cit., p. 254.

[77] House Defense Appropriations Hearings, fiscal year 1961, III, p. 173.

[78] Ibid., III, 211.

[79] Ibid., vol. III, p. 313.

[80] Ibid., III, p. 257.

[81] Ibid., II, 298, 503.

[82] Ibid., vol. III, p. 502.

[83] Ibid., II, p. 500.

[84] Ibid., II, p. 504.

[85] Ibid., I, p. 143.

[86] President Eisenhower made this statement on Aug. 9, 1956.

[87] Washington Star, Jan. 30, 1960, p. 8, and Feb. 9, 1960, p. 1.

[88] Taylor, op. cit.

[89] Hearings, House defense appropriations, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 24.

[90] Shepley, James, "Life and Death Debate Over Missile Program," Life, Mar. 9, 1960, pp. 116–117.

[91] "After Ike, the Deluge," Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1959, p. 17.

[92] John Norris, Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1961.

[93] House defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 24.

[94] Senate defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, p. 20.

[95] Wall Street Journal, Mar. 30, 1960, p. 1.

[96] Senate defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, pp. 9–10.

[97] History of ICBM and IRBM funding, fiscal years 1946–61. House defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, III, p. 133.

[98] See Loosbrook, John, "Imagination, Brains, and Guts," Air Force/Space Digest, April 1960, p. 6.

[90] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 28, 1960, p. 1490.
[1] Ibid.
[2] House Report 1181, "Progress of the Atlas and Polaris Missiles," 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 5.
[3] House defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, II, p. 440.
[4] Interview on College News Conference.
[5] Taped interview with Senator BUSH, reported in Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1960, p. A2.
[6] House defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, II, p. 270.
[7] Drummond, Roscoe, Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1960.
[8] Taylor, Maxwell, op. cit., p. 131.
[9] Senate Defense Hearings, fiscal year 1957, p. 239.
[9a] Army, Navy, Air Force Journal Sept. 29, 1956, pp. 1–3.
[10] House Defense Hearings, fiscal year 1961, p. 29.
[11] House Defense Committee Report, fiscal year 1961, p. 54.
[12] Department of Defense News Release, No. 353–56, Apr. 17, 1956.
[13] Study of Airpower, op. cit., p. 1390.
[14] Donnelly, op. cit., p. 52.
[15] Study of Airpower, op. cit., p. 268.
[16] Ibid., p. 254.
[17] Ibid., p. 726.
[18] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 70.
[19] Burgess, Eric, "The Anti-Missile Missile—A Myth," Interavia, XIV, Nov. 2, 1954, 170–2.
[20] House Defense Hearings, fiscal year 1961, II, p. 498.
[21] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 70.
[22] Murphy, Charles, "The Embattled Mr. McElroy," Fortune, Apr. 1959, p. 147.
[23] House Defense Report, fiscal year 1961, p. 12.
[24] Ibid., p. 14.
[25] Johns Hopkins, op. cit., p. 80.
[26] Donnelly, op. cit., p. 46.
[27] Senate inquiry, pp. 2429–30, part 3.
[28] See House Document 366, 85th, 2d.
[29] Donnelly, Defense Policies in 1958, p. 51.
[30] Public Law 85–599.
[31] Donnelly, "Defense Politics in 1958," p. 55.
[32] See hearings, House Armed Services Committee, 85th, 2d, book 4, pp. 6294–6344, especially statements on 6321–2.
[33] Weekly report of the electronics industry, p. 9a, vol. 16, No. 12, Mar. 22, 1960. The speech was given on Mar. 15, 1960.
[34] Estimates of Soviet ICBM capabilities, for example.
[35] UPI dispatch, Jan. 13, 1960.
[36] House appropriation defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, I, pp. 33–4.
[37] House defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, and Senate fiscal year 1960, p. 933.
[38] Ibid., House, I, pp. 33–34.
[39] Speech by Henry Glass, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (comptroller) at Kalamazoo, Mich., Mar. 21, 1960.
[40] General Belyayev, "Red Star," fall, 1959.
[41] Over 24 million lives were lost as a result of World War II in the Soviet Union, while a loss of 11 million occurred in the age group born during and shortly after World War II.
[42] House defense report, fiscal year 1961, p. 29.
[43] Ibid., pp. 30–1.
[44] House defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 5.
[45] Glass, op. cit., p. 18.
[46] House Defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, I, p. 546.
[47] House Defense report, fiscal year 1961, p. 15.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid., p. 11.
[50] House Defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 9.
[51] Senate Defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, p. 194.
[52] Glass, op. cit., p. 13.
[53] House Defense hearings, fiscal year 1960, I, 18–19.
[54] House Defense report, fiscal year 1961, p. 33.
[55] House Defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, I, p. 3.
[56] Ibid., VI, p. 401.
[57] House Defense hearings, fiscal year 1961, VI, p. 292.
[58] Ibid., VI, p. 18.
[59] Speech of February 21, 1960.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 8: "The Requirements of Deterrence," by Prof. Paul Peeters, Iona College:

THE REQUIREMENTS OF DETERRENCE

(By Paul Peeters, Iona College)

1. National strategy is not developed in a vacuum. It has to fulfill many tasks. It is subject to variable conditions, and its success depends on an environment which is economic, political as well as ethical.

The complexity of the challenge now facing the United States is best understood when stated in dialectical terms: the dialectic of peace and power, of collective security and leadership, of economic and military strength.

Partisan criticism follows a dialectic of its own. It appeals to idealism when national policy ought to be realistic (nuclear testing). It advocates political realism when a question of principle is involved (Berlin). It opposes unilateral action by the United States when this country must act alone (Taiwan). It calls for decisive leadership when the situation facing us demands evasion (Suez).

The purpose of this paper is to redefine some of the fundamentals of successful deterrence while distinguishing the proper dialectic of national policy from the fatal dialectic of partisanship.[1]

I. PRINCIPLES

2. The Communist threat is presently centered in the growing military power of the Soviet Union. As an ideology, communism is failing. It cannot make decisive advances without using force. If it were not identified with Soviet power, communism would soon lose control over what it has conquered, and slowly cease to be itself. To maintain our military posture is, therefore, the first task of national policy, not only because our survival is at stake, but because peace is the true antidote to communism.[2]

In our partisan debates, we have denounced this interpretation as a naive description of Soviet objectives. We have said that communism in essence was not a military problem, but a great social movement. We have pressed the United States to launch "the greatest political offensive in history," to get out in the marketplace of ideas, to compete for the minds of men, and to tackle the "real" problems of poverty, sickness, and illiteracy. When the time came to resist to Communist probing, however, we made frantic pleas for an all-out military build-up. The balance of power had supposedly shifted to the Communists. We were not ready. The hour was late, and the agenda of the things we had failed to do was long. A war was going to break out. The Communists were not bluffing, but we found ourselves in the straitjacket of past policies, at the brink of war, and alone.

National policy considers Communist power as the core of a many-headed threat. Dialectical partisanship, on one day, denounces national policy as narrowly militaristic. On the next day, it speaks as if we only faced a military threat.

3. The U.S.S.R. has specific strategic assets and specific needs. So does the United States.

By developing our own assets, we can do much to strip the Soviets of their assets and increase their needs. One of the tasks of national policy is to prevent the Soviet Union from doing the same to us. One of the pitfalls of partisan debates is to measure our assets in terms of Soviet needs, and to evaluate our needs in terms of Soviet assets.

4. We do not think in terms of national defense alone, but rather in terms of the total defense needs and capabilities of the entire free world.

Dialectical partisanship seeks to thrust upon us the full responsibility of defending allied countries, but it denies us the right to draw from their capabilities. These countries may refuse to support us, but we are forbidden to do anything alone.

5. Our present strategy is a strategy of total deterrence and graduated retaliation. It is based upon our massive retaliatory power and complementary forces that we must be able to maintain indefinitely for global as well as for limited war.

So defined, national policy leaves no room for partisan controversy. First proclaimed by Secretary Dulles on January 12, 1954, this complex strategy has been consistently enforced by the Eisenhower administration ever since. It has been completely successful. The fact that it survived revolutionary technological changes is a further proof of its fundamental validity.[3]

6. The world is now approaching a condition generally called "nuclear stalemate." The interpretation of this term is of paramount importance.

In our partisan debates, we have often alluded to the administration's "Maginot line" mentality, its reliance upon strategic weapons, and we have denied that there was any balance of terror in existence. Yet we have also claimed that war was now impossible. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union could initiate an attack, no matter how provoking the other side would become. The balance of terror thus existed, after all, and it amounted to signing a nonaggression treaty with Russia, and the only alternative was coexistence.

This again is a dialectical inversion of what national policy truly is. The thought that war is impossible can be a counsel of despair. As President Eisenhower said, on September 30, 1953, there is a tragedy "greater than winning a war," and this "would be losing it." We must be ready to defend if need be by life itself, the values and interests for which we stand. Any willingness to abandon our values would only give to the Communists the hope of achieving their goals without war.

National policy also holds that military superiority is a notion that has lost much of its meaning in the atomic age. Since we occupy a defensive position, however, and we want to deter the aggressor, this depreciation of military power benefits us.

Finally, the administration never said that the very existence of nuclear weapons created a reliable balance of terror. A nuclear stalemate is not a static condition. It is in our power to develop a strategy and the

Footnotes at end of speech.

means to implement it that would give us global superiority over Russia in spite of a numerical inferiority in some sectors.

7. The adequacy of our military posture is under constant review. The opposition has legitimately disclaimed major responsibility for defense planning, and the administration has never claimed having discovered any magic formula for achieving perfect security—a formula that would never have to be adjusted to changing circumstances.[4]

No fundamental change in our present strategy has proved to be necessary yet. Even if we did not have the will nor the means to implement it at this time, our defense policy would still be valid and necessary. Doubts concerning the adequacy of our military means have induced many to believe that long agreed national strategy had suddenly become controversial or even that it had been discarded. Such assertions are simply not founded.[5]

II. THE DETERRENT

8. "Any orderly balance sheet of military strength must be in two parts," President Eisenhower said on January 9, 1958. "The first is the position as of today. The second is the position in the period ahead."

A. Forces in being

9. Deterrence is achieved, at any given time, only by existing forces. Weapons still in development are no deterrent. Conversely, if weapons in being are adequate, deterrence has been achieved, and we can act accordingly.

This simple point had to be made because it is so often inverted in partisan debates. We often speak as if deterrence today had to be achieved with weapons we did not yet have—the weapons of tomorrow—and as if we had to rely, for future deterrence, on today's weapons—which we know to be already obsolescent.[6]

10. "What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate," President Eisenhower said on February 3, 1960. "A deterrent has no added power once it has become completely adequate." But what is adequate power to deter the Communists from general war? This question must be answered dialectically.

11. "Major aggression is unlikely unless the aggressor has the advantage of surprise and can hope to strike a blow that will be devastating because it is unexpected" (J. F. Dulles, Nov. 10, 1955).

National policy must emphasize the feasibility of a surprise attack upon us, and so undertake whatever measures are necessary to protect the country against it. Now surprise attack is feasible because of the nature of modern weapons and because of the relatively small number of targets to destroy by the enemy in order to cripple our retaliatory capacity. Dialectical partisanship asserts, in contradistinction, that there is no evidence that Soviet planning is based upon a surprise attack against the United States. In other words, we would be preparing ourselves for an attack that would never come.

In order to achieve deterrence, national policy also proclaims the unfeasibility of surprise. A surprise attack is unfeasible because of the countermeasures we take, such as intelligence, warning, dispersal, and hardening; because of our mixed deterrent concept, and also because the enemy can have no advance certitude that our retaliatory potential will be effectively wiped out. For in order to be successful such an attack must strike all targets at the same moment. It must destroy most of our retaliatory capabilities. A surprise effect measured in terms of minutes must be achieved. Unless these three conditions are actually met, a surprise attack is suicidal.

Dialectical criticism of national policy holds that a Soviet surprise attack is feasible. Striking at a time and with tactics of its own choosing, the U.S.S.R. would quickly recover from the damage inflicted by a small, uncoordinated American force, operating in a postattack environment against a fully altered enemy and evacuated Russian population centers.[7]

12. "Wars have a way of coming about in circumstances that have not been fully foreseen by humans," President Eisenhower said on August 27, 1958. He added that he did not see any reason for saying that "we necessarily have to take the first blow." Consequently, we are not basing our requirements on just bombing the Soviet Union for retaliation purposes. A valid deterrent thus includes the capability of attacking the enemy's military power before he has the possibility to bring complete destruction upon us.[8]

The critics have disassociated themselves from the suggestion that we must contemplate striking first. Having so ruled out the possibility of any preemptive action from our part, they have exaggerated both the destructive power of our strategic forces—for they assumed that these forces would be exclusively used for retaliation purposes—and the relative weaknesses of our retaliatory capacities—since they assumed a postattack environment.

The validity of national policy on this point is not open to question. The application of counterforce will be necessary in situations where the national survival is at stake in order to blunt the forthcoming attack upon us. The secondary aim of a preemptive action will be to paralyze Soviet postretaliatory operations. We are not going to prevent war unless we have the capability to initiate a war and the power necessary to engage the enemy.

It is not in the national interest, however, to make the distinction between retaliation and counterforce any clearer than necessary to deter a potential aggressor.

13. "No responsible person would contend that our present defenses are inadequate to our needs," Senator L. JOHNSON said on February 23, 1960. "The real issue," he added, "is whether the course we are following will continue to build our defenses at the needed rate. In other words, in the foreseeable future, will we have enough power to meet the anticipated power of a potential enemy? This is of vital importance, because today defense requires a leadtime of a number of years. The decisions we make today will set the limits of our power for some time to come."

B. The foreseeable future

14. The progress accomplished in stabilizing military planning and procurement during the two Eisenhower administrations contrasts strikingly with the chaotic decade that preceded his tenure of office. The principles that guide our present policy for the long-range outlook cannot be reasserted too strongly.

15. Mr. Robert Sprague has testified on February 24, 1960, that "the idea that an increase in spending for survival will bankrupt us is, to put a plain word on it, silly." The question—as he saw it—"is whether we are willing to use a small fraction of our increased wealth for the defense of our way of life." We would rather be safe than sorry. If we increase our defenses and if they are not needed, all we lose is money.

The emotional simplicity of this argument is apt to deceive. No matter how much we spend, we will not have absolute security. In addition, the critics are satisfied with simply begging the question. They assume that increased spending is needed for survival; that the administration has claimed that such an increase would bankrupt us; that the American people would not consent to it if it were proved that it is needed—the very points that the critics had to prove.

The truth of the matter is far from simple. The long-range outlook is for an endless series of attempts on both parts to achieve a certain military balance at one's advantage, and to unbalance any balance temporarily achieved by the other side, with overall costs and danger projecting upward. Continuous technological advances and the inflexibility of military procurement mix up with budgetary limitations that cannot be removed just by brave talk and wishful thinking. As Secretary of the Navy, R. B. Anderson said on March 9, 1954, we must choose between "too little and too late and too much and too soon."

In that connection, it is well to remember that we ought to be able to move quickly into any breakthrough in good and reliable weapons that we can get; that we often have to reserve judgment as to what we might want to do about weapons still in development, and yet have the capability to decide at a later date, to procure them. This is being done by the administration. Funds are being requested by the Department of Defense to exploit promising developments and to expand or accelerate programs, such as Polaris, when progress achieved proves this wise. Finally, the administration has repeatedly stressed that it would not hesitate to depart from its long-range programs in an emergency and to take any necessary measure.

16. To give to the world at large the impression of a country that does not know what it wants is the one thing that we cannot afford. "We want to keep adequate forces and we want to keep as strong in our hearts and our heads as we do in our military," Mr. Eisenhower said on March 11, 1959, "and then carry forward our policies." It would be foolish indeed to be pushed off the plans we made "time and again by something suddenly described as a crisis. What we have to do is to stand steady * * *, to be alert, to watch what we are doing, and to make certain that we know how and where we would have to produce action, if action became necessary."

17. The administration has tried to achieve what George Washington called "a respectable military posture." Our defense policies should not induce the enemy to overestimate his own needs. Such a prolification of weapons would only increase the dimensions of our own task. The position of relative superiority that we should attempt to maintain should be measured and rational. One of the greatest merits of our present strategy is that it allows us to reconcile the principle of relative superiority with a nonprovocative defense effort.

As long as our deterrent remains adequate, the U.S.S.R. would do well to act in conformity with the basic law of a nuclear stalemate instead of wasting its resources on first generation ICBM's. It has no reason to engage into crash programs, but should rather tailor its own defense effort to the size and nature of our forces. And for the same reason, we should consider what the Russians actually do as closely as what they are supposedly capable of doing.

18. It remains, however, that we have now entered into a period of transition. When we have hardened and mobile missiles and a mixed deterrent, we will find ourselves in a condition that will be much more stable than the one in which we are today. As General Power pointed out, we will then reach a point where even surprise attack would not substantially minimize the risk of retaliation.

The point is that we will soon have the possibility to build up a relatively invincible deterrent. The issue is whether we should do so as rapidly as we know how and without stretchout. There is no question of whether it should be done—and it will be done.

Footnotes at end of speech.

19. A potential aggressor primarily needs counterforce capabilities, and we need a deterrent which is indestructible. If our deterrent cannot be destroyed, the enemy is not in a position to calculate that aggression is a paying proposition.

The size and composition of our deterrent is mainly determined by its counterforce function. If we possess a mixed, flexible, and numerically adequate deterrent, the enemy would be forced to develop a retaliatory deterrent.

If counterforce on either side is neutralized by retaliation on the other side, the notion of deterrence would undergo a qualitative change. Together with large land armies, attack submarines, and air defenses, the ICBM would be relegated to a role of passive deterrence. This weapon might be well suited for the initiation of a strike, but it can hardly be fired on the basis of warning. Before retaliating, a country that feels threatened must make sure that it is attacked. An important advantage would then accrue to the country that could engage in active deterrence.

Active deterrence refers to weapon systems that can be deployed without automatically unleashing general war, and it also refers to diversified deterrence: Manned aircraft armed with ballistic missiles, aircraft carriers, missile submarines, reliable alliances, nuclear stockpiles in allied countries, and national deterrents.

Obviously, the United States is in a much better position than the Soviet Union to develop active deterrence.[9]

20. The United States enjoys, at present, a global strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. But we can assume, for argument's sake, a Russian numerical superiority in strategic missiles. SAC's ability to penetrate Russian territory does not need to be proved any longer. Recent events have served to illustrate that the nuclear balance is more stable than generally believed in the sense that it cannot be upset by any single advance or temporary superiority, even in a weapon as critical as the ICBM.

If it were to materialize, the missile gap would not be a deterrent gap. Under the cover of adequate deterrence, we can develop our own programs without engaging into wasteful emergency measures or investing heavily in interim weapons. This only applies, of course, to weapon systems that are known to be of limited or temporary value; and we should keep in mind that we are dealing with one of the most unstable empires in history.[10]

21. If followed, the principles now guiding national policy will enable us to maintain our deterrent posture in the foreseeable future. "If you will take the things that the Soviets could probably do 3 or 4 years from now, and then we sit like we are now and do nothing, well, that's a different story. Now, as we go ahead, they will go ahead," President Eisenhower said on February 3, 1960. "Three years from now, if we are working as hard as we do now, we are going to be in the same relative position." [11]

III. COMPLEMENTARY FORCES

22. From 1953 to 1956, the Eisenhower defense program, achieved within the limits of sound budgetary practices, has been criticized on the ground that national security had been placed in jeopardy because too much emphasis had been put on air-atomic power. Advocating a conventional strategy, the critics demanded more Army divisions, more airlift, more of everything.

The controversy then shifted to the B–52 program. The critics suddenly became the apologists of a supermassive retaliation concept. They demanded an overwhelmingly superior deterrent.

A year later, the B–52 was described as a major blunder in view of Soviet concentration on the ICBM. The Russians had supposedly led us to believe that they were building a great long-range bomber force, and we had fallen for it.

The grave inconsistency of such an approach was disgused by accusing the administration of having placed economy ahead of security. The limits set by budgeteers had caused reductions in conventional forces as well as the inadequacy of our retaliatory forces.

Taken as a whole, the partisan argument is fraudulent. The adequacy of our conventional forces is a problem that must be treated in context, but separately. As we shall see presently, the critics have taken it out of context by failing to discern that local defenses and conventional forces were complementary to the deterrent; and they have refused to discuss the problem on its own merits by failing to distinguish it from the problem of deterrence.

23. The conventionalist argument generally proceeds in two parts. It is first said that "massive retaliation is a two-way street." The deterrent cannot be used. In case of war, we will have to fall back on conventional forces which are said to be utterly inadequate as compared to Russian forces. The critics secondly refer to ever-renewed cuts in military personnel, to the aging of the fleet, to the obsolescence of MATS planes, and so forth.

24. This obviously relates to the hypothesis of total war. Now if a general war started with a massive surprise attack and counterattack, neither the United States nor Russia would possess the ability to move large amounts of personnel and materials; nor would they be in a position to engage at once in large-scale operations. In that first phase of a general war, a fraction only of our conventional forces—airlift, for instance—would directly support our retaliatory actions; the balance would be used for operations that can be called, at best, holding actions.

Our present defense program recognizes the criticality of the initial period of a conflict. It is tailored to assure the full combat capability of the primary forces at any given time.[12]

Would the enemy ever start a full-scale conventional action, daring the United States to use its deterrent? By doing so, he would lose the benefit of surprise and expose himself to a preemptive action. Such an extreme provocation as a direct offensive against us is inconceivable in the atomic age. It means all-out nuclear hostilities.[13]

25. Our inability to relay upon conventional forces for deterrence of general war does not stem from a lack of will or a lack of means, but from the very nature of the problem. The advent of nuclear power has forced us to revise not only the size and composition, but the very character of security. The critics often seem to consider nuclear weapons as conventional weapons of unusually large yield. They still seek to integrate the notion of deterrence into the strategic patterns of the past.

If conventional forces are to be increased considerably, we would need a defense effort that would amount to mobilization. Now, mobilization would not reduce world tensions; it would not diminish the risk of Soviet attack; and it would make sense only if we were able to predict when the attack would come. But, as the President said on April 23, 1953, "for anybody on a defensive position to base his defense on his ability to predict the exact date of attack was crazy."

The opposition was careful enough never to determine the levels of force that should be set up to meet its own criticisms. It was satisfied to pretend that the ideal Army should have 925,000 men instead of 870,000, or to propose an increase in military expenditures of $3 billion "for immediate defense needs." None of the changes ever proposed in this fashion would justify scrapping our present defense plans or shifting to a conventional strategy.

Such gimmicks are all of doubtful honesty, but none is more unworthy of us than the assertion that, if more imagination had been displayed, we would have long found the solution to our problems. The grandiloquent, amateurish call for fresh ideas always leads to the accusation that the arms race and the cold war are the only grand strategy we have.

The fact is that a workable alternative to our present strategy has not yet been formulated and that the critics are most vulnerable on this point. Whatever can be said to rationalize such an abuse of the democratic process, it is unpatriotic and irresponsible to pull national policy to pieces on such a vital point without replacing it by something better.[14] The debate on the adequacy of our complementary forces thus limits itself to the limited war problem.

26. In a typical inversion of national policy, we have spoken derisively, in our partisan debates, of "massive retaliation," and advocated "graduated deterrence." But the notion of graduated deterrence is nonessential. It is in the nature of deterrence to be total or not to be.

Any aggressor must be put on notice that his aggression will be met with appropriate retaliation. If war breaks out, in spite of our efforts to prevent it, deterrence has admittedly failed, but only to a point. For it remains necessary to stop the aggressor effectively, and to prevent the conflict from spreading.

Graduated retaliation means that a variety of responses to military aggression is feasible. It refers to the flexibility of striking power that we possess. We do not have to resort to the most destructive weapons.

The gap that existed between the largest TNT weapon and the tactical nuclear weapon of the smallest yield has been largely eliminated. The small yield of tactical nuclear weapons makes their use in local hostilities more likely. And the continuity that exists between chemical and nuclear firepower allows us to use nuclear escalation. The means of retaliation are thus available. They are credible. They are graduated.

It has been said that anything that has to do with atomic power is too dangerous because the enemy would retaliate in kind; weapons of a larger and larger yield would be used on both sides, and the conflict would eventually graduate into total war. This is another dialectical interpretation of national policy. Partisan criticism believes in escalation in reverse—a crude notion that combines lingering ignorance of nuclear tactics and neurotic self-criticism. For nuclear escalation tends to limit retaliation and it makes it feasible to achieve total deterrence with tactics of limited warfare.[15]

27. Many say that local war is more likely than total war. This truism is relative to the insanity of total war. Under a total deterrence policy, local war is irrational because retaliation is certain and because the aggressor's limited objective does not justify his taking great risks upon himself. If the expected gain is small, the risk is comparatively large.

The perpetuation of a well-planned aggression in cold blood and with considerable means as in Korea seems almost unthinkable today. If it were to break out, however, it would justify some strategic bombing of the enemy and certainly call for the instant use of tactical nuclear weapons. Aggression would then cease to be a paying proposition.

Let us repeat that any discussion concerning our present or future ability to wage limited war must start from the realization that our deterrence policy tends to reduce the scope of any likely limited war. Local situations likely to develop fall into the following categories: (1) War situations in

Footnotes at end of speech.

which the United States cannot intervene (Hungary, Tibet); (ii) civil wars or very limited outbreaks calling for what President Eisenhower has called "police actions" (Lebanon); (iii) preventive deterrent actions which do not actually lead to hostilities (Syria, Quemoy).

Considering the nature and the scope of likely situations, the forces that we possess—both conventional and nuclear—are ample, even if their mobility and general effectiveness could be much improved. And they are supplemented by substantial allied forces.[16]

28. The United States shrunk from employing the atomic bomb in Korea. Our allies apparently opposed its being used during the Dien Bien Phu crisis in 1954. The fact that it can be used, however, must be included in the equation of any potential aggressor. In addition, it is not so certain that past indecision deserves praise. Declarations have been made since that time, which clearly intimate that the United States would make a decisive use of its atomic potential right at the outset of any clear-cut aggression of the Korean type.

In view of the risks involved and the limited gain to expect from local aggression, the Soviet Union would be well-advised to deter its own satellites from committing aggression by refusing to promise to supply them with atomic weapons of sufficient yield and in sufficient numbers. And it is entirely safe to assume that it would never surrender nuclear weapons to its European slaves, nor allow them to fabricate these weapons under national control. It might not be able to impose the same restrictions on Red China. Now, the position of the United States vis-a-vis Red China is exceptionally secure: atomic weapons are well fitted for the type of retaliatory actions as would be needed against Red China. Finally, to threaten atomic retaliation in order to deter local aggression does not impose any obligation upon us to do so in actuality. We must and can decide in the light of circumstances and according to our own interest.

29. We do not have to be 100 percent ready for any kind of military emergency that could possibly arise, particularly those local situations which do not directly threaten our vital interests. As President Eisenhower said on December 15, 1954, he would, as Commander in Chief, "rather improvise and resort to expedient in little wars than he would in big wars. He would rather cast and mold his security arrangements to meet the great threats to the United States, and take the others, as far as he could, in his stride." Most of our forces could be used in limited wars. Any effort to categorize the various elements of our power is, generally speaking, arbitrary.

30. No strategy would be more unpopular in this country than a strategy necessitating the commitment of ground forces. President Eisenhower's defense policy conforms to our idiosyncrasy.

IV. CREDIBILITY

31. The Soviet Union is well-informed of the reality of our military power, and real power is always credible. Therefore, when we ask ourselves the question whether our deterrent policy is credible, we seek a moral alibi. The real question is whether we believe in it, and this is also the only question the Russians ask themselves. In both cases, the question is about ourselves.

The dialectic of partisanship suggests that we cannot threaten the U.S.S.R. with total destruction if, by doing so, we threaten our own existence. Either we do not mean what we say, or we resign ourselves to the folly of nuclear war.

This dilemma is obviously deceitful: It excludes the alternative of successful deterrence which is, to say the least, as valid as bluff and madness. If our threats were not credible, who would be to blame? Is it too much to expect from Americans that they denounce, in the same manner, Russian bluff and bluster? But if Russian threats are not credible, we have achieved deterrence; and if ours were not, we would have to use graver threats still.[17]

32. The balance of terror is often considered as precarious because the risks of upsetting it are catastrophic. Some people have said that our deterrence policy was irrational because of the degree of rationality it required.

If the risks of upsetting it are great, the balance of terror is relatively stable, and not precarious. For the same reason, the rationality expected from a potential aggressor is elemental. If he does not possess the degree of rationality needed for the success of our deterrence policy, he is insane.

There remains, of course, the possibility that he might challenge us in a fit of madness. Any proof of irrationality in Soviet conduct might force us to change certain features of our present defense program, and to gather more strength for an emergency. It would not be a reason to weaken in our determination to deter a potential aggressor.

33. Much of the debate concerning the credibility of deterrence is academic. We must make it clear that, in case of general war, the U.S.S.R. cannot count upon the effect that a wavering public opinion would exercise upon national policy. Our actions would be instant and long under way before the impact of Soviet destruction would be felt.

The decision to intervene in certain limited war situations can prove to be agonizingly difficult, but no less difficult than the decision not to intervene. In both instances, public opinion will exercise no immediate effect on policy-making.

The study of our recent debates conclusively proves that the noxious effects of partisanship on national policy begin to appear long after the country has already been committed to a policy of resistance and, not infrequently, when resistance has already paid off. This was particularly evident during the two Quemoy crises.

34. National policy suffers most at the hands of domestic public opinion in situations where the enemy is just probing. This is the paradox that we create by our divisive controversies. Our deterrence policy seems to be at its worst when its credibility is actually greatest and where its success ought to be complete and painless.

It is safe to assume that the Soviet Union would not advertise any impending strike by grand maneuvers on the cold war front. Conversely, the Byzantine labors of Soviet diplomacy are wasted as soon as we unmask the threat that they intend to communicate.

The dialectic of partisanship tends to take any Communist threat at face value. Something must be done about it, or a thermonuclear disaster would ensue from our failure to act. The administration is accused of waiting, like Mr. Micawber, something good to turn up.[18] At the same time, Soviet motives are scrutinized again and again. The crisis is traced back to some of our blunders. And self-appointed augurs divine, from their prejudiced standpoint, the erratic movements of world opinion.

Any credibility is also denied to national policy. As recent history so clearly demonstrated, the need to deter is taken as the proof that deterrence has failed. "Why did policy go so wrong," the critics ask, "that we have to use threats, land troops, and display such a bellicosity?"

Using the same reasoning process, we would put the blame for broken families on social workers, and claim that the very existence of physicians proves the failure of medicine.

Partisanship finally transforms the reasons why we should be firm into reasons why we should fear. The Government then attempts to counter public pressure. It is inclined to overstate the seriousness of the crisis. The more it does, the more public opinion has an excuse to indulge in hysterics and in self-righteousness. The need to deter and the risk of resistance to Communist probing come to be so exaggerated that a certain gratitude is experienced toward the Communist leaders when, sure enough, they decide to relax the tension, at their own time, by announcing that the attack has been postponed or by acting better than expected. Everyone knows that there was no crisis until they created one. Yet the Communists are given the semblance of a moral initiative in promoting peace, and their recklessness is never penalized. These are the true crowbar and sledgehammer that we always again hand over to the Russians to wreck national policy.

Deterrent threats are most effective, insofar as the potential aggressor is concerned, when they are stated in general rather than in precise terms, with relative bluntness rather than rarefied complications.

This salutary vagueness often serves as an excuse for public opinion to pretend that our warnings are too vague to be credible. Once more, we analyze the effect produced upon ourselves by our own threats. Such an introverted behavior leads to paralysis, and not to action. It does not fit the powerful leader of the free nations.

V. COLLECTIVE SECURITY:

35. The Indochina crisis of 1954 has dramatically illustrated the need and the usefulness of treaty commitments. The declarations that were made at the time by the United States did not meet with a full measure of success because the juridical basis for intervention was lacking.

In absence of a commitment that is legally binding, we must resort to improvisations and expedients. Indecision and the caprices of public opinion combine to ruin the effectiveness of stated policy, and the enemy's diplomatic moves achieve maximum impact both upon our allies and upon ourselves. Once we are committed, we must either back down or stand firm.

The Eisenhower administration has successfully completed the legal arrangements required for global deterrence. It has been accused of "pactomania." Fearing an overcommitment, the critics have compared our treaties to ominous sight drafts that could be presented in payment at any time.[19]

The fear of overcommitting ourselves is not founded. It is the same enemy that we face everywhere; it is, therefore, in our power to devise a global strategy to oppose him in every place at once. But if we shrink from committing our support to defend any free country threatened with Communist aggression, we would simply invite the enemy to attack that country. Finally, none of the treaties we have concluded since 1953 creates a legal obligation for us to send troops. They just make action possible if and where we freely decide to intervene.

36. The various security treaties concluded by the United States for the defense of the Pacific area and of Southeast Asia reproduce the Monroe Doctrine formula. The United States declares that Communist aggression would endanger its own peace and safety, and that it would be met according to the constitutional process.

Mr. Dulles compared these treaties to the fingers of the hand. Each commitment is independent from the others; the United States is thus able to maintain a bilateral relationship with every one of its partners. But the fact that it has given the same commitment to all gives cohesion and unity to the various parts.

Footnotes at end of speech.

It is for that reason that we have decided not to earmark forces for particular areas of the Far East (except Korea), but to develop what Dulles called, on September 15, 1954, "the deterrent of mobile striking power, plus strategically placed reserves." Such forces would be able, he added, to strike at an aggressor "by means and at places of our choosing. The detrerent power we thus create can protect many as effectively as it protects one." If we attempt, however, to be strong everywhere, we would be strong nowhere.

This strategy is peripheral. It insures great flexibility of tactics. It presupposes disengagement.

37. The same complexity, unity and flexibility characterize our commitments in the Middle East. The Eisenhower doctrine is a unilateral declaration of policy which "authorizes the United States to assist economically and militarily nations which want such assistance in order to preserve their independence."

Aimed as it is at Soviet imperialism and military aggression, the doctrine has been denounced as illusory in view of the fact that Soviet aggression in the area seemed unlikely. But if the United States had not aimed at that target, shadowy though it might be, it would have had to foresake the restraining use of its power east of Suez. The fact is that, far from being useless, the resolution was successfully invoked not less than four times in 3 years.

Acting pursuant to the Middle East resolution, the United States concluded special defense arrangements with Turkey and Iran. These two countries acted through Cento, even though the United States was not a party to it. This osmosis effect again proved the usefulness of the doctrine as well as of Cento.

As in the Far East, our strategy is peripheral, and it requires disengaged forces. It is different on a very important point. The two Quemoy crises have shown that, in some instances, maximum deterrence is achieved by insisting upon the feasibility of powerful, albeit, limited, retaliatory actions to which Red China is particularly exposed and for which the type of power we have is well suited. The reverse must be said of the defense of the Middle East. In this case, no deterrence is fully credible unless we refuse, in principle at least, to limit retaliation arbitrarily. The same is true of the European theater.

38. The parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have agreed that "an armed attack against one shall be considered an attack against them all." They also agreed that, if such an attack would occur, each one of them would take "forthwith such action as it deems necessary." The "one for all, and all for one" principle is thus set in opposition with the restrictive character of the commitment; for the parties are not obligated to do more than what they deem necessary. The time has come to resolve this structural antinomy.

Every new crisis produces aspirations for greater allied unity. These are generally short-lived. They cannot stand against the realities of allied policy. The reality of NATO is diversity: the special Anglo-Saxon partnership versus the continental bloc; peripheral positions and the central front; the Bonn-Paris Axis and European integration; the Sword and the Shield; the long overdue renascence of European national pride. An entirely new climate would be created in the Western Alliance if these basic realities were considered as assets to be developed rather than as liabilities to be eliminated as soon as possible.

Allied solidarity is always desirable and constructive, if it is genuine and if it can be achieved without entangling us in hopeless dilemmas. Any unqualified, doctrinaire insistence for increased interdependence and integration would only deprive us of our leadership. Being an association of free nations, NATO must steer a cautious course between the Charybdis of stifling unity and the Scylla of disunity.

This means that the Western Alliance must establish its own rules for mutual independence as well as coordinate the execution of tasks and policies that can be fulfilled best by integrated effort.[20]

39. A national deterrent policy is now pursued, with inadequate means and intermittent determination, by France and the United Kingdom. A separate NATO deterrent has also been proposed We have, in the main, opposed national deterrents with passive resistance.

The advantages of diversified deterrence are manifold, and they are decisive. The idea of a Europe devoid of any deterrent of its own, entirely dependent upon our own deterrent, and fully exposed to Soviet nuclear attack is inconceivable in the long run. Europe must have a capacity for independent action. National deterrents would face the Russian aggressor with the impossible task of destroying everything before doing anything and they would do much to relieve the European nations of their anti-American obsession, and thus lead to greater allied solidarity. This point must be shortly explained.

It is believed that the diffusion of nuclear weapons would greatly increase the danger of accidental war, and that "a stray bullet could blow up the town." This idea is the fetish of our present approach to the problem. Not only have European countries equal reason to fear an accidental war being started by us, and any war that would be started because of our actions would be accidental as far as they are concerned, but we must recall the distinction that H. A. Kissinger has made in his "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy" between the "nuisance" character that nuclear weapons can have in the hands of a foreign country, and the sophisticated apparatus without which they would have no strategic effectiveness. The number of countries that can achieve strategic nuclear power is very limited indeed.

In addition, a national deterrent is a deterrent under national control, but it is not a deterrent that can be used in actuality for a purely national objective. The only decision that a country possessed with a deterrent of its own can make alone is the decision not to use it. Such a decision might be unwise, from the standpoint of our own interest, but it would have no catastrophic consequences. And if it were used against our will, it would be that our will had become so perverse that we would prefer to be Red than dead.

40. The Western Alliance must be disengaged from the nadir of frustrated nationalism. If this were done, the Allies would naturally seek to improve the effectiveness of their defensive shield. We all agree that there should be a force of all the allies in Europe to confront the aggressor with the necessity of raising violence to such a level that nuclear retaliation would become unavoidable.[21] This force should be integrated so as to engage the whole alliance into the conflict. If disengagement makes no sense for the United States, we can say, with stronger reason, that it is inconceivable for any country so directly threatened as France and Germany.

Integration is a shibboleth today because we consider it as the opposite of national sovereignty. It would make more sense to oppose integration to waste, to inefficiency, and to procrastination.

The fact is that integration is most needed in sectors where a sacrifice of national control is the least difficult to consent. Certain defense tasks—such as logistic support and air defense—cannot be fulfilled at all except on an integrated basis, and as far as they are concerned, national sovereignty is a myth. In other areas—research and procurement, for instance—the myth is that a true sacrifice of sovereignty is at stake. And the same can be said of most diplomatic problems confronting the West at present.

VI. CONCLUSION: THE NATIONAL SELF

41. Like individuals, nations tend to develop a complicated rationale of their own self, and they marshal their best talents to draw a picture of themselves. This picture contains attractive as well as ugly features, both of which gratify the national ego.

Self-accusation is one of the commonest tricks we use to fool ourselves. Unjust, unsincere breast beating does not hurt, and it does not help. But a true insight into what we are, would hurt us. It would also liberate the great, the indispensable force of genuine self-love.

Unless this is recognized, a debate on the national self is worse than useless. It would only serve to undermine national confidence still further.

Let us start, then, from the realization that our national character comprises specific qualities and destructive patterns.

Our weaknesses are not better than Prussian militarism or French chauvinism. They are just different.

There is much room, indeed, for intelligent debate and for self-criticism. At no time of our history was it more necessary to stress that an informed public opinion is essential to the conduct of government in a modern, pluralistic society.

All political philosophers have stressed, however, that injustice begins with meddling. There is no validity in the notion that systematic criticism is a sign of democratic validity. It is a sign of the moral decadence of a free country.[22]

As a people, we have a pernicious inclination for abstractions, particularly those abstractions that put obstacles in the way of moral progress.[23]

The great moral issue of the coming election campaign is whether we will continue to hold a pessimistic view of the national self while ignoring our true faults or taking them much too lightly. Are we going to continue to display a naive confidence in Americanism and to deprecate constantly our illusions and complacency, and materialism? Or will we realistically defend the national interest of the United States and love what we truly are.

42. The principle of separation of powers which is so fundamental to our constitutional system can be dangerously misconstrued. If the separation of powers were to give us the right to demolish executive actions while refusing to commit ourselves to national policy, it would destroy our system more effectively than Khrushchev can do it, and Khrushchev knows that well. One of the paradoxes of the present situation is that our enemy—and some of our allies—have well understood the laws that rule our political behavior and that we, in our pride, have decided to ignore them.

There is no alternative, in a democratic country, to a full commitment. This commitment should be actual. It must be given in concrete situations. It is particularly needed when and where a multiplicity of reasons can be invoked for refusing it.

Is it not true, however, that, even in the face of the most vulgar, most extreme provocation, our commitment has the hollow ring of insincerity? We rally—so we think—behind the government. We warn the Russians not to interfere with American politics. We defend the President of the United States against Communist abuse, and immediately proceed to indict Mr. Eisenhower

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

at the bar of opinion. For there is too much at stake, of course, to sweep the whole sorry mess under the rug in the name of national unity. We pretend that our Government has left to the Russian leaders no choice but to act as they did. We instantly call for an investigation of executive actions, in due time or otherwise, as if the national survival depended on the immediate revelation of a great scandal. There is nothing much to reveal, however, and the dust soon settles. The investigation ends at the moment when it should have started. There is no room left for sensationalism, and we can praise for one another for the mature fairness of our investigators.

The time might come when this double talk could have treacherous implications. To paraphrase Mr. Stevenson's much repeated slogan: "We do not succeed in deceiving the enemy, but we cannot succeed better in deceiving ourselves."

43. A nonpartisan, common quality runs through the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the creation of NATO and SEATO, the Formosa resolution and the Eisenhower doctrine.

The actions taken by the Eisenhower administration which have been the most vocally denounced by a concerted opposition are the actions that the American people have most overwhelmingly supported.

The gap that exists at present between the true opinion of the American people and the picture that America projects in the world is the gravest of our domestic problems today. Mass communications have caused a divisive atomization of political consciousiness instead of political wisdom.

44. The dialectic that saps our national strength at home also works against us in our relations with the rest of the world.

We generally take a much too lenient view of the insanity of anti-Americanism. We seek to excuse rioting and hostile behavior toward us in terms of our own faults. We report faithfully reckless accusations levelled against us, as if they were expressed in good faith by responsible people. At the same time, we seem anxious to force some of our ideology upon others, with a capricious pendantry that verges on contempt for their cultural tradition and in a manner that is legitimately resented.

Instead of claiming that we have been the source of the revolutionary concepts of human freedom, we would do well to consider that some of our values are not good, and that the true values from which our national strength is derived are not American values, in the sense that they are common to all humanity.

It is our appointed place in history—and also the greatness of our country—to protect, by our strength and power, the spiritual heritage of mankind. And if we do our duty, we will also be respected.

45. We are now concentrating our energies against a cataclysmic holocaust and confronting a total ideological challenge. We cannot, as a nation, fail to ask ourselves the question: What is the purpose of human existence?

Like totalitarian socities, we would like to find our national purpose in some great role to seize and to pursue "with passion." We cry for "leaders."

The democratic state exists for values higher than itself. It makes a direct appeal to our individual conscience. It is based upon the belief that, if our mind is clear and our will upright, we have the ability to distinguish between honest dissent and self-seeking partisanship, boldness and importance, political courage and personal ambition.

---

[1] Partisanship refers here to a certain type of criticism, and not to the party affiliation of the critic.

[2] As Albert Wohlstetter wrote in the New York Times of June 16, 1960, "we need not sound excessively disdainful about the value of keeping alive. Physical survival is necessary to achieve our other widely shared purposes, even though it is not enough."

[3] Most Americans, including noted specialists, have chosen to overlook the complexity of the Dulles-Eisenhower strategy. In spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, they obstinately asserted that the United States had no strategic plan other than knocking down a number of Russian cities in case of war.

One of our favorite techniques of debate consists in pushing national policies into a Procustean bed—making the administration say more and say less than it actually did—and then we proudly announce that such policies have been abandoned and largely forgotten. In 8 years, the critics have proved unable to move away from the pitiful oversimplifications they had fabricated.

[4] See, for instance, J. F. Dulles' article in Foreign Affairs, April 1954.

[5] As H. W. Baldwin wrote in the New York Times of Feb. 14, 1960, "we have not really outgrown the Victorian age of our security. Despite nuclear weapons, jet planes, and missiles we yearn for and half believe in the possibility of a return to the security of yesterday."

In 1954, the Dulles-Eisenhower strategy was described as stillborn. With the advent of tactical nuclear weapons in 1955, the critics declared that the policy had been finally interred. In 1956, some merits were recognized to it, but only for the pre-Bison era. The same was said in later years of the pre-sputnik and the pre-ICBM periods. In spite of its many lives and in the eyes of those who criticized it so relentlessly, the policy was never good.

[6] To give to the American people what he later called a "ballpark feeling," Gen. T. S. Power, SAC's commander in chief, said on Jan. 19, 1960, that "with only 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes." He never meant to say that the Soviet Union had the means to do so. He had said, on the contrary, that "if the Soviets decided to launch a surprise attack on this country today, they would have to rely mainly on their long-range bomber force," a force that was, in his own estimation, inferior to SAC in every respect. If, God forbid, we should ever fall behind Russia militarily, it would be soon enough to adopt what Senator KENNEDY once called the "underdog strategy," then, and not a single day before. But if we are strong, why should we act as if we were weak? Nations seem to have as much difficulty as individuals to live in the present.

[7] As Secretary Gates noted on Jan. 13, 1960, we are dealing here with "a complex situation under changing circumstances." The Soviet Union could have more missiles than we have, but numbers alone are misleading. "Factors that deal with time of warning, relative hardening, dispersal, mobility, and most important, accuracy must also be considered. If you change any factor in this formula you change the result."

[8] To quote from the House Appropriations Committee's recent report on the Defense bill, "this is an element of deterrence which the United States should not deny itself. No other form of deterrence can be fully relied upon."

[9] Active deterrence does not nullify passive deterrence, of course. Assuming a condition of stalemate, critics have often ascribed this active deterrent function to defensive weapons—such as the antimissile missile—and to conventional forces. This problem is partly discussed below. Mobile forces for intervention in local war situations are part of an active deterrent, but conventional forces as such are not. Active deterrence has also been confused with counterforce.

We must also keep in mind that in a general nuclear war, missile forces cannot "destroy their enemy counterpart without destroying the corporate body of the enemy state itself" (Adm. A. A. Burke, Feb. 20, 1959). This also tends to reduce the difference between retaliation and counterforce.

[10] As a matter of fact, the administration's decision to bank on second generation ICBM's has already proved to be right. It is not a matter of speculation any more.

[11] See the statesmanlike speech of Representative MAHON in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1960. "If we continue to maintain our bomber strength, our oversea bases and military personnel, and our fighting ships, and if we move forward as planned with our long-range missiles, and if we develop a strong and thoroughly dependable airborne alert, and if we move along with our ICBM detection systems as planned," the Representative said, "I see no reason why there should be a deterrent gap during the next 3 years. I believe we will move forward. Therefore, in summary, I would say there should not be a deterrent gap during the next 3 years."

[12] The administration has never claimed that a general nuclear war would be short and that it would not necessitate the engagement of ground forces. The term "primary forces" is not synonymous, therefore, to strategic forces. It refers to those forces that will be primarily employed during the first, short, and most violent phase of a general nuclear war.

[13] The same remark applies to the various things the Soviets might do to alleviate their military problems before a general war starts, such as the destruction of our Polaris submarines one by one.

[14] The critics may think that they have made a constructive speech when they list a number of things that could be done to strengthen our defenses without explaining how and why these things should be done. This practice is dishonest and also unintelligent. The classic doctrine that all requirements for assured security must be met is long bankrupt. Balanced security obviously involves some calculated risks. And the reasons why we must deliberately forgo some military capabilities are not all budgetary.

[15] This must be understood in the light of the two following paragraphs. I certainly do not mean to say that escalation suffices for achieving total deterrence. It is one of the elements that makes it possible to achieve total deterrence with means of graduated retaliation.

[16] In all fairness to the opposition, we must recognize that there are limitations to the shrinkage process which has affected the effectiveness of our ships, planes, and military personnel. But the urgency of this problem is relative to the fulfillment of essential tasks, and, except for the limited force we need for coping with peripheral aggression (a force which already is in a fine state of readiness), the problem will never have absolute urgency, as the critics seem to claim.

[17] The dilemma of bluff and madness is as fraudulent as the two alternatives of nuclear war and peaceful coexistence (as the Communists understand this term).

[18] As the Berlin crisis proved it, nothing could be done, except to stand on our positions, and nothing would happen, except if we fail to stand firm.

[19] Curiously enough, our treaty commitments were also denounced as parts of a general pattern of policy followed by the administration to lower the level of our military effort.

[20] Some of the administration's critics have long flirted with the idea of disengagement, and they have deprecated the bipo-

larity of East and West. As I tried to explain elsewhere, NATO needs a psychological disengagement of American diplomatic influence in Europe, and a multipolar deterrent. Our role in Europe has many parts, and the problem for us is to keep it fragmented. We hold the sword, but we also provide the core of effective landpower. We are the keeper of Franco-German friendship, and the special friend of England, and so forth. In other words, we should not play one big role, but several partial ones.—Cfr. Malcolm W. Hoag, in "World Politics," April 1960, p. 389: "The current trend is toward both a primarily nuclear shield for NATO and independent strategic retaliatory forces. We might get the worst of all worlds."

[21] As Dean Acheson so truly said in his great speech on the Berlin question in November of last year.

[22] "I want my country to be strong, to be safe, and to have a feeling of confidence among its people so they can go about their business," President Eisenhower said on Feb. 11, 1960. The deep wisdom of the President's political philosophy is anathema to the busy-body democratic man. "Government is the people's business."

[23] For instance: "We believe in Soviet backwardness," so Soviet advances can never be exaggerated enough; "Vital information is withheld from the people and the people have the right to know," so we can always accuse the Government of withholding information; "Pessimism has always been distinctly un-American," so we will always be complacent; "A suspension of criticism would be a disservice to the Nation, however appealing such a moratorium on partisanship can appear as a short cut to national unity," so criticism will always be permissible. And we make these idols untouchable by warning the iconoclast that he does not understand American democracy.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 9, "Science and Foreign Affairs," by Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, special assistant to the President for Science and Technology:

SCIENCE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By George B. Kistiakowsky [1])

The theme of this paper is the impact of science and technology on foreign policy.

The proposition hardly needs to be demonstrated that the advances of science gradually, sometimes suddenly, are altering the relations between nations and peoples. Of course, it is the technology which is the carrier of change, but it is the basic science, the acquisition of knowledge that constitutes the seed from which man makes technology grow.

After World War II, the advances of science made our political isolation from the rest of the world impossible just as they earlier made economic isolation impossible. In military affairs, perhaps, are visible the most dramatic and fast-moving changes, as technological developments took us from TNT to H-bombs, from artillery to bombers to ballistic missiles, from cavalry patrols to early-warning radar, all with the significance of shrinking the world and of increasing the mutual dependence and vulnerability of nations. Public policy, whether domestic or foreign, must recognize this transformation, cope with the problems it generates, and use it as appropriate for the goals of our society.

If, for a moment, this writer may revert to the language of chemist days, humanity but a century ago was in the condition of a steady state reaction, whereas now it is in the midst of a nonsteady branching chain process and science is the chain carrier.

The need to adjust public policy to changing human conditions, of course, isn't new. What is new today is the rapidity with which the developments of science are altering the human conditions, the rapidity with which policy, particularly foreign policy, must adjust to the changes being wrought by the pace of scientific advance. Not only adjust—policy must prepare for, must predict, the impact of scientific discovery, and must also in some sense attempt to guide it.

This paper will discuss several important aspects of the relation between science and world affairs; then we shall mention the present governmental organization for developing public policy in the field of science; and we conclude with some thoughts on science and public policy in the future.

First, however, let us review briefly scientific developments of the last decade.

A DECADE OF PROGRESS

Ten years ago, Dr. James B. Conant, as Chairman of the National Science Board, concluded his foreword to the first annual report of the new-born National Science Foundation with this urgent warning: "Until such time as disarmament becomes a reality, the free nations must be deeply concerned with finding and developing scientific pioneers, for on their efforts we must rely as much for increasing national security in a war-torn decade as for industrial progress in periods of peace."

Clearly audible today is the echo of Conant's warning—"until such time as disarmament becomes a reality." The reality then—and now—was that temporary comrade in arms became an intransigent foe, reaffirming the subservience of the individual to the state, ruthlessly engulfing unwilling neighbors as satellites; threatening the freedom of peace-seeking peoples throughout the world. The science of the United States had no choice but to focus on the needs of national defense, and this it has done well.

History began to record the early years of a quasi-peace we have come to call the cold war. From time to time its temperature climbed to boiling point, and sporadic outbursts of "hot" war flared up in places distant in miles from our shores but, measured in time, now our next-door neighbors—Korea, Suez, Taiwan, Vietnam.

Science found no release from its association with arms and armament, nor did it seek any, so long as its help was needed to safeguard the liberty of the world by ensuring the strength of our defenses.

Unprecedented funds were unloosed that we might maintain our leadership in weaponry. Corporations, big and small, and even universities, entered into contractual relationships with Federal agencies involving very many dollars, to undergird our defenses. Science and its offspring, technology, flourished and prospered as never before in our history. Under the impetus of this massive Federal support, our scientists and engineers contributed vastly to our storehouse of knowledge and its applications.

Working closely with military people on military problems, scientists and engineers supplied the elan for one of the most striking technological developments to emerge from the postwar period—automatic data processing, using the high-speed digital computer. Most of the stimulus behind this development came from the military sources seeking fast methods for processing data on military tactics, logistics, flight simulators for testing and training, or any other end-product which required the speedy reduction of a vast input of data.

Fortunately for our long-term leadership, more basic aspects of science were not forgotten. High-energy, elementary-particle physics is a field in which vast progress has been made since World War II. Similary, radio astronomy has pushed rapidly ahead in the last decade, using advances in electronics born out of military-related work. Molecular biology made spectacular advances and brings us near the understanding of the origins of life.

Creativity budded and bloomed in a brilliant burst of innovation. Despite their essential preoccupation with developing the defensive strength of the Nation, science and scientist demonstrated the great rewards of research irrespective of the environment to which it was applied.

In retrospect, the decade of the fifties may become known best for its identity with two capital letters, "R" and "D."

Until the midperiod of the decade, economists had to guess the amount of research and development performed within the United States. At that point, the National Science Foundation, on the basis of a thorough survey of the 1953 period, pegged the dollar figure for R and D, not at the estimated $2.5 billion, but at more than double that amount—$5.4 billions. Today it has more than doubled again, the Foundation's estimate being on the order of $12 billion.

The late, great Harvard economist, Sumner Slichter, coined a most connotative phrase for research and development—"the industry of discovery." We might also call it "the industry for tomorrow." None need be surprised to learn, therefore, that those industries which have invested most in research and development, the electronics and pharmaceutical companies, have shown the most rapid rate of growth in recent years.

The industry of discovery cannot be confined. It is as profitable for mankind as it is for the corporation. Although science, no less than any other human activity, was engulfed by the political strife of the cold war, it showed a way to demolish political barriers during the 18-months' period of the International Geophysical Year, even though such was neither its mission nor its design. Scientists supported by their Government, sought simply to map man's physical environment, to achieve a scientific understanding of the earth and its cosmic environs. They succeeded magnificently in accomplishing their scientific mission. From investigations of the universe made or initiated between mid-1957 and the end of 1958, a microsecond on the cosmic clock, will emerge a volume of geophysical knowledge greater than any theretofore assembled.

For its scientific value alone, the IGY was impressive. But in a world of tensions, it is almost more encouraging as a kind of a breakthrough of its own, to better international understanding. Sixty-six nations, representing the free and Communist world, participated in this exploration of the unknown. They marshaled 30,000 scientists and technicians to work together as a team, although separated across the distance between the poles. With but few exceptions, they shared the knowledge they uncovered.

Similarly in the Antarctic, an area for years dominated by rivalries for territorial

[1] Special assistant to the President (Science and Technology). This paper was originally prepared as an address before the American Physical Society and the American Association of Physics Teachers. Ideas and material from other addresses have been incorporated.

claims and rights, the cooperative efforts of scientists of many countries served as a pattern of international cooperation accepted as valuable by their political leaders. Work started during the International Geophysical Year, including the exchange of scientific personnel, the sharing of facilities and results, and the efforts to plan cooperative schedules and arrangements, is now more than ever developing a broader spirit of cooperation among the scientists of these countries and, perforce, drawing in the political interests as well. The United States is deeply engaged with its scientific personnel in cooperative efforts and is receiving the same type of help from other countries.

Attesting to the value and importance of these scientific efforts led by the United States, the interested nations have recently drafted and signed a treaty for Antarctica which opens all areas freely for scientific research to all nations of the world, places claims for individual territory in abeyance for the duration of the treaty, and assures all that Antarctica shall not become a place for military operations or military rivalries. Were it not for the scientific effort in this area during, and following, the International Geophysical Year, the pattern for cooperative arrangements in Antarctica would never have been established, nor would there have been the impetus for drafting a treaty.

However substantial were the cooperative aspects of the International Geophysical Year, the period was characterized as well by a heightening of international competition in science and technology. The International Geophysical Year literally thrust us into the space age. Our country can justly be proud for first announcing space satellite plans to assist the International Geophysical Year program. However, the sputnik launch provided the thrust, without doubt. Perhaps though, the emphasis should be on the spectacle of immaturity we made of ourselves over this engineering accomplishment. Today, most of us feel a bit shamefaced about our sputnik-provoked anxiety, particularly when we realize that only the one most recent Soviet satellite remains in orbit that is transmitting information, while several of our own still riding through the reaches of space continue to send back most of the scientific information they were designed to uncover. Even the humblest of these, Vanguard I, continues to remit valuable scientific data. Tiros I proved to be much less of a tyro with a camera than we had thought. The quality of its photographs permits identification of individual hurricanes and other centers of disturbance as well as study of the gross features of cloud cover. The amount of useful information transmitted will contribute to a deeper understanding of the earth's atmosphere for the benefit of all mankind.

Let no nation count the United States out of competition in any contest for superiority in science and technology. Though the frontiers of science are endless, the competitive spirit of frontiersmen is a legacy of the American tradition. By compelling the United States to keep its guard up, our antagonists may yet be hoist on their own petard. The competition in armaments into which we have been unwillingly thrust has served as a driving stimulus to scientific creativity. Because we are fortified with a credo which insists on the primacy of the individual, and are not perverted by the drive for aggrandizement of state, our science seeks to serve, rather than master, mankind.

NEW PROBLEMS OF PUBLIC POLICY

Let us explore now some aspects of the relation of science to foreign affairs that are unique to our age (at least their importance is unique) and that provide us with our greatest immediate opportunities, and some of our major problems. These include:

1. The unparalleled and in many ways unexpected political importance to a nation of having the appearance of world scientific leadership (the word "appearance" is used advisedly).

2. The effect international scientific activities have, and can have, on the relations between states.

3. The importance of the technical component of some prospective arms control measures.

4. The relation of science to technical aid for less-developed countries.

Each of these is worth careful consideration, for they are not always understood, and yet must be understood if the Government and the scientific community are to fulfill the obligations and opportunities ahead of us in these areas.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WORLD SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP

First, consider that matter of scientific leadership and its political impact. Scientific and technological progress has acquired status as the symbol of strength because of its obvious relation to military power, as well as of productivity and the good life. This is in evidence within our borders and everywhere beyond. The striving to emulate American scientific and technological progress has become an ambitious and urgent goal for countless millions of people, including, one might note, the Soviet Union.

But unfortunately it is the technological spectaculars which tend to be used by the public at large and, often, the press, as the sole measure of scientific as well as technological prowess, and thus, of military power as well. Achievements in outer space activities are as we have already noted, the prime example of this. Perhaps a few further observations about our space and missile program in this light are in order.

As has been emphasized by Dr. Herbert York, an intercontinental ballistic missile capability is not necessarily dependent on huge rocket booster vehicles capable of sending multiton payloads into space. To the general public, both in this country and certainly abroad, this is not well understood. The Soviet Union, of course, has not been lax in attempting to confuse the issue.

Our development of long range rockets began late because our military planning was founded on air-breathing engines. To move ahead as rapidly as possible in ballistic missiles, we chose to make our missiles as compact as possible to deliver warheads of adequate yield. We could do this with an ICBM with a thrust only one-half that of Soviet ICBM's because of our advanced nuclear weapons technology.

In this we have been successful; first the IRBM's and now the Atlas missile are perfected and are operational. But, the planning and preoccupation with smaller missiles, adequate to do the military job required, led to rocket vehicles with inadequate thrust to send spectacular payloads into space. We did not begin work on large rocket boosters until it was too late to match past Russian performance in outer space. But, it is important to remember that the extra-large rockets are not required for our long-range missiles; hence, our deficiency in outer space payload capability does not indicate an inferior military capability.

We must also recall the important fact already alluded to, that our scientific achievements in space have easily matched those of the Soviet Union. This is generally recognized by the world's scientific community. In addition, we are now making rapid progress toward practical applications of "near outer space" for the benefit of all nations and people.

This is not to suggest that we accept a secondary role in future outer space activities requiring large rocket boosters. We cannot ignore the very real political implications of various spectacular accomplishments in outer space that have come to have symbolic meaning to the world at large. We are indeed moving ahead rapidly to develop boosters for space exploration missions requiring very large payloads and are vigorously pursuing the man-in-space program. But we must accept the technical reality that despite a vigorous national effort to develop such boosters, there are limits on how quickly the gap can be closed and these limits are largely set by technological factors.

In the meanwhile there are for us major opportunities to carry out sound and exciting programs in space science and technology that will redound to our national benefit in terms of enhanced prestige and welfare. For example, the development of meteorological satellites could prove to be of great benefit to all nations and could substantially contribute to our scientific and technological stature throughout the world.

To repeat: We cannot accept a secondary role in future outer space exploration. But true leadership must be seen in the context of far broader efforts. We must be constantly aware that our strength lies in excellence spread over a wide scientific and technological base.

It is a feature of an authoritarian form of society that its government can concentrate efforts in narrow fields. If the total strength of such a society is substantial, as is that of the Soviet Union, then what one might term temporary technological superiority can be achieved by it in selected directions. So long as this superiority is temporary; so long as it does not permit a vital military advantage; and so long as it is not across a broad front, there is no need for alarm, but we must increase our efforts to cancel out imbalances that arise and are significant. On the other hand, we must not permit ourselves to be stampeded into overemphasizing one area at the expense of others. We must constantly bear in mind the sound military doctrine not to accept battle on the field of the enemy's choosing. Rather, we must continue to move across the entire broad front of scientific and technological advance. Thus, as a nation, we will remain a world leader.

EFFECT OF SCIENCE ON RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONS

Let us turn to the second aspect of the relation of science and foreign affairs, the significance of international scientific activities to the relations between nations. Here is perhaps the most important of the roles science and scientists can play in today's embittered and divided world—not a new role in the sense that international activities of science are part of the lifeblood of science; but new in its potential impact on political relations.

Science today is one of the few common languages of mankind; it can provide a basis for understanding and communication of ideas between people that is independent of political boundaries and of ideologies. Over time, these personal relationships, established with Soviet scientists who form a major portion of Russia's intellectual elite, can provide a bridge between our cultures and perhaps bring about a gradual erosion of the militant aspects of Communist ideology.

Science also provides a sometimes unique opportunity for cooperative endeavors that can contribute in a major way to the reduction of tension between nations and, more positively, to close relations between the United States and other countries. All this, of course, in addition to offering a way for cooperative attack on problems of interest to all nations.

This has been recognized many times before. Many activities of the Government and private scientific bodies further these goals. Normal international scientific union activity, the IGY, the exchange agreement

between the National Academies of Sciences of the United States and U.S.S.R., the very recent McCone-Emelyanov agreement, the U.N. Atoms for Peace Conferences, and many, many others. However, the question must be asked whether we are doing enough in this area, and particularly whether the Government is sufficiently active in terms of projects of its own, in support for nongovernmental activities, and in creation and preservation of the necessary conditions for effective international scientific activity.

What are some of the issues that face the Government in this area?

The most obvious is how to balance the resources for international scientific projects against domestic scientific needs. Should the Federal Government be doing more itself internationally, or should it support private efforts only? In either case, can you justify international support when there are good scientific projects lacking sufficient support within the country?

A good illustration of this problem is presented by the scientific program in the Antarctic, mentioned before. The Government had to face the question of setting the level of Antarctic activity in the knowledge that the funds for that program would detract in some measure from the support of deserving programs within the United States. There are few guidelines for the appropriate scientific level of activity in Antarctica, just as there are few guidelines for the appropriate level of activity in specific scientific fields.

In fact, the problem of the Antarctica is not dissimilar from that of outer space (except for the rather wistful observation that we now have a treaty reserving the Antarctic for scientific research). Political considerations are important in setting this program level also. These considerations relate to the stature and scope of our effort relative to that of other countries, particularly the U.S.S.R., and, in the case of Antarctica, the relation of research to possible territorial claims. And so, the Antarctic program is set as an orderly, sound scientific effort, but with political awareness that there are other attributes to the scope and excellence of the U.S. effort there.

The appropriate means for carrying out international activities comes up time and again. Can it be handled through the scientific community in the way that ICSU planned and organized the IGY? What is the appropriate role for the U.N., UNESCO, for NATO? Should it be a government-to-government project because of the resources required? And if so, are bilateral or multilateral arrangements to be preferred?

A recent example may be illustrative, referring to space science once again. When establishing the U.N. Outer Space Committee, the suggestion was made that the Committee should be responsible for conducting outer space research itself, or at least planning research on an international scale. Notwithstanding our strong desire for international cooperation in space, this was thought to be clearly inappropriate. Because of the large resources required to provide boosters for space exploration, it was considered necessary to keep the final decisions regarding space flights in the Government's hands. On the other hand, international scientific planning and cooperation was clearly desirable at the scientist level, without the complex governmental machinery of the U.N. that would inevitably have to face political issues. Therefore, the U.N. Committee will be concerned with the mutual exchange and distribution of information, the study of legal problems of outer space, the conference on outer space exploration, and the general encouragement of space science. NASA will make formal agreements with foreign governments for scientific cooperation, but both the U.N. and NASA will look to the Committee on Space Research of ICSU for the scientific cooperation and planning to bring about effective international scientific collaboration.

The issue of bilateral versus multilateral agreements is of major interest at the present time, in view of the recent United States-U.S.S.R. agreement in peaceful uses of atomic energy. Notwithstanding the very real gains we may achieve through increased contacts with the Soviet Union, we must avoid any series of moves that would create a United States-U.S.S.R. scientific axis. Thus, it was carefully stated in the agreement with the U.S.S.R. that any joint projects would be carried out under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency where all member countries could participate. Clearly, what may be now the finest high-energy physics facility in the world—CERN—should be included in activities under the agreement.

A receptive climate for international scientific activities requires Government action too, or in some cases, lack of Government action (in a positive sense). Science must not be sacrificed to political expediency, or ignored for political expediency, because to do so would be like cancelling one's life insurance on account of temporary financial straits. We must be ever-certain that science is adequately represented in those areas where policy will impinge on science, so that considerations of science will be included in policy formulation. International scientific activity, for example, has moved historically without regard for political boundaries and this is one of its great strengths. This traditional nature of science must not be neglected or forgotten, as it all too often is, in the application of restrictions to be placed on the free movement of individuals among nations. Nothing will erode our basic traditions and our scientific leadership, and our influence, more quickly than a willingness to sacrifice basic long-term beliefs for short-term political consideration.

In the same vein, the needs of science must be adequately represented in international as well as domestic-policy formulation. Radio-astronomy recently almost came to an untimely end, simply through negotiation of an international treaty on frequency allocations without adequate recognition of the needs of this young science for listening windows. Through the good offices of the National Academy of Sciences, it was possible to bring scientists and the appropriate Government officials together in time to establish a U.S. position for the Geneva ITU conference compatible with the needs of the radio-astronomers.

International scientific activities thus carry with them many problems for Government, but their benefits far exceed those problems. To achieve the benefits, however, requires that we be alert to the opportunities and that we be prepared to make some of the necessary policy decisions and commitments of resources.

SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF ARMS CONTROL

A third new element in the relation of science to foreign policy is the importance of the technical components of prospective arms control measures.

The negotiations on nuclear test cessation have shown the importance of scientific and technological factors for the formulation of national policy in this area. These factors had to be evaluated by ad hoc groups that found a dearth of experimental data on which to base their conclusions. A similar ad hoc approach had to be employed regarding certain phases of the conference on the problem of reducing dangers of surprise attack. The fact that scientific advice and evaluation were used in both these attempts to reduce military tensions is, in itself, important. It is a sign of the changing attitude and the growing awareness on the part of policymakers that technical considerations and knowledge are essential for the formulation of sound concepts for arms limitation measures—just as they are in formulating development plans for military hardware.

The success of future negotiations to relieve tensions by arms limitation agreements will depend in some measure on the understanding of the capabilities of proposed multilateral monitoring systems and on the understanding of inherent limitations of any monitoring system in a world of rapidly advancing technology. The limitations of technical analysis need also to be fully understood. There is no doubt, for instance, that the reliability of monitoring systems is largely a technical question. But the adequacy of such systems, from the point of view of national security, is not. It is a politico-military one. And we must realize that political issues or disagreements cannot be resolved by technical agreement on facts; the political questions of national interest remain. It is well that these issues be understood by the public as they are being understood by the policymakers. Especially we, as scientists, must understand that we can contribute but one of several inputs that are essential for the formulation of sound national policy.

SCIENCE AND U.S. TECHNICAL AID

The relation of science to technical aid for less-developed countries is the fourth, and last, of our list of new relations of science and foreign policy.

The foreign aid programs supported by the United States are powered by a matrix of motivations made up of altruism, a belief that it is to our best interest to strengthen independent nations, and a desire to contain menacing philosophies. Motivation notwithstanding, it is evident that any program, any experiment, will fall short of success unless it is soundly conceived, soundly planned, and soundly executed.

In helping to achieve a sound aid program, we, as scientists, must not think in terms of developing only the more advanced scientific capability of other nations, which is often a reflection of our own standards and comfortable abundance. We must try to strike a balance between basic needs and sophisticated development.

This requires an appreciation of how science and engineering develop within a nation. The history of science in many lands has not been written beyond the prologue. We must, for instance, be aware of the long-term relation between primary and secondary school education and advance research institutions.

We do little good to provide only for esoteric research facilities when a nation lacks roads, general practitioners, and machine operators. Of course, we do a disservice also when we ignore the advanced educational institutions that set a nation's standards, provide its teachers, offer a future for gifted citizens, and bring prestige to a nation or a region.

An important report was recently prepared by the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council for the International Cooperation Administration, entitled "Recommendations for Strengthening Science and Technology in Selected Areas South of the Sahara." This report is an outline of how assistance of a technological type should be designed to be properly utilized. It is an intelligent and realistic attempt to strike the necessary balance between the basic needs and sophisticated wants, within a framework of limited resources from within and without an area. It is also an attempt, a very successful one, to show how a scientific approach can be used in the early planning stages of aid programs.

The reading of the report will have a sobering and disturbing, if not a frightening effect, on thinking individuals. It treats with selected areas of sub-Sahara Africa, a land mass equal to that of the United States and with a population one-half that of our Nation—and this is only part of all of sub-Sahara Africa. It is an area which, within our lifetimes, will be transformed into a multiplicity of independent nations which, collectively, will greatly influence world affairs. What is particularly disturbing about this study are the revelations of extreme shortages that still exist in this region; the nearly complete lack of public health measures and medical service; of communications and transportation; of the means for earning an income; of even the most elementary educational facilities.

Clearly, these embryonic nations need educated people in large numbers to provide not only civil servants, but an understanding electorate to carry them along the path to democracy. But how can the needs for higher education, for doctors of medicine for education, for doctors of medicine, for engineers, for political scientists, for so many other specialists be properly balanced against the needs to provide even the most primitive health measures, to provide teachers for the many millions of illiterates, and to train artisans and skilled laborers without whom the standard of living cannot rise? Against these multiple desperate needs, indigenous efforts, our aid and the aid of others, appear so utterly inadequate that one becomes fearful lest decades will pass before the level of education and the standard of living will rise enough to make democracy viable.

The question then comes to mind, will the awakening of latent desires permit democracy the time—that is so inherent in its evolutionary nature—or will this region fall prey to the legerdemain appeal of the revolutionary authoritarianism, especially Communist ideology?

For a research scientist this report will have a sobering influence: It will impress upon him that he is a luxury that can, and must, be afforded by an advanced Nation like ours. But in Africa, south of the Sahara, a nurse, an elementary schoolteacher, a technician, these are the luxuries.

Science impinges on aid to technologically more advanced nations also. Various Government departments have for many years supported research overseas. By and large, these programs have been well run. Such programs raise some serious issues for consideration, however, for outside support of science in a given country affects the relationships between that government and its citizens and universities. Some programs, even those in support of basic research, are welcomed by many foreign scientists, and yet cause affront to others. We must therefore, consider the effects of such programs on all who are concerned, and especially on the natural growth of the scientific communities in the recipient countries.

Does such support, for instance, actually retard the development of a healthy relation between science and government in other countries? What commitments for continuity of support are we making once foreign scientists have become dependent on U.S. support, commitments from which it may be impossible to withdraw or which may cause hardship should withdrawal be necessary? What is the effect of our support on the pattern of research in a given country? And is the manner in which our support is given in this area, best calculated to further good relations between the scientific communities of other countries and the United States?

We are not the only ones who are aware of these problems. In its most recent annual report, the United Kingdom's Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, addressing itself to just these questions, had this to say about U.S. research support:

"Whilst we warmly welcome this substantial financial support for research in this country, we recognize that research grants, and particularly specific contracts, of this magnitude (one and a quarter million pounds annually) must have a considerable influence on the general pattern of research undertaken. We, therefore, consider it desirable that the various bodies concerned with the financing of research in our universities and other institutions should be aware both of the extent and the purpose of these numerous U.S. research grants and contracts. We are glad to be able to record that the U.S. authorities have fully appreciated the position and have shown themselves ready to cooperate with us."

Of course, there are no general answers to most of the specific questions raised, for they vary with the country concerned and with the manner in which our support is given in each country. But these questions need to be asked—and answered—before support is provided. These programs cannot be operated independently of foreign policy considerations.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION FOR PUBLIC POLICY IN SCIENCE

It is worthwhile to review some of the measures Government has taken in order to bring these problems into focus, and thus to help bring about corrective action. These steps were taken for a wide variety of reasons, of course, not merely to serve the requirements of foreign policy.

In two speeches during November 1957, President Eisenhower emphasized the need for strengthening science education and bringing our overall scientific and technological effort to peak performance levels.

In the first of these speeches, in which he called for an all-out effort to mobilize the best resources of science and scientists in support of the national security and welfare, the President announced the creation of the office which it is now my privilege to hold. He also reconstituted on the White House level the Science Advisory Committee. Later, in his 1958 state-of-the-Union message, President Eisenhower stated: "In both education and research, redoubled exertions will be necessary on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times."

The office of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology did not exist before November 1957. Nor had there been, except for the wartime National Defense Research Committee, a science advisory committee directly responsible to the President. The NDRC had large operating responsibilities. The present committee and the special assistant do not. Their function is advisory, making scientific advice and analysis available wherever they are needed in the formulation of national policy. The committee also endeavors to insure that science and technology contribute their maximum to the welfare of the United States by seeking ways—

To enhance the excellence of U.S. science, both basic and applied, and to add to our effort, relatively, in basic research.

To extend the recognition of science as a creative activity that augments man's dignity and understanding and affords him intellectual adventure of the highest order.

To recognize that outstanding accomplishments in science appeal deeply to the hopes and aspirations of men everywhere, and contribute to the prestige and good will of nations.

To demonstrate that the democratic environment of the free world is the best environment for achievement in science.

To improve the ways in which our Government uses and supports science and technology.

To apply technology more effectively to improve our national security, to strengthen our economy, to enhance the health and welfare of our citizens and other peoples.

To promote international understanding and good will.

These are broad and ambitious objectives. Even small progress in each area would be a significant achievement.

The organization that works toward these goals comprises the 18-man committee proper, numerous panels involving members as well as consultants, the special assistant, and his small full-time staff of technical aides. The committee's members are representative of those fields of science and technology especially important to the Government. The membership rotates, most of the new appointments being on a 4-year basis. This practice brings to the committee fresh points of view and representation from different fields of science and technology. To discharge its responsibilities, the committee has established panels, some on an ad hoc, others on a continuing basis. First Dr. Killian, and then this writer was elected to the chairmanship of the committee, which knits the whole organization together.

The panel structure has consistently been a distinctive feature of the committee's work. It has made possible intensive studies on problems that could not have undertaken by the committee because of its limited membership. At the present time, over 100 scientists and engineers are associated with the committee and my office in part-time capacities, thus providing a wide range of expert advice. Committee and panel members are selected not only because of their expert knowledge and achievement, but also because they possess something which might be called wisdom in a broader sense. Partnership in this organization means work and, therefore, some sacrifice of personal careers. it is willingly undertaken in the spirit of national service. The magnitude of personal involvement is indicated by the fact that more than 500 man-days of work were needed recently for the study of certain problems in the classified area and the preparation of one short summary report.

A major concern of the committee is how to bring the young generation of scientists and engineers into panels and other types of advisory services to the Government. We need to explore every way of making their services, skills, and fresh ideas available without handicapping their professional developments, or curtailing their contributions to science.

The special assistant, as a member of the President's staff, is invited to attend meetings of the National Security Council and of the Cabinet, and—when appropriate—to present the views and findings of the Science Advisory Committee. He is also a member of, or attends the meetings of, special Cabinet-level interdepartmental committees, such as the Radiation Council. He is the Chairman of the new Federal Council on Science and Technology, consisting of representatives, at the policymaking level, of 10 departments and agencies.

Some of the panels of the Science Advisory Committee deal with unclassified fields of interest to the Federal Government and a few of their activities have led to reports and statements which were published under the imprint of the White House. The titles indicate the broad scope of these activities: "Introduction to Outer Space," "Scientific Information," "Strengthening American Science," "The Argus Experiment," "High Energy Accelerator Physics," "Education for the Age of Science," and "Food Additives."

Other panels' activities result in detailed recommendations to various agencies of the executive branch of the Government, which are not suitable for public dissemination, such as the work of several panels dealing with classified matters pertaining to the national security.

The creation of the Office of the Special Assistant and of the Science Advisory Committee is, however, but a small part of the actions which the President and Congress have taken recently to strengthen American science and technology and to make the Government process more responsive to a world of rapidly changing technology. These actions include:

Expansion of the National Science Foundation program and a threefold increase in its appropriations for support of basic research and education in the sciences.

Enactment of the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, reflecting the impact of modern weapons technology and systems engineering on the Military Establishment.

Establishment of the Office of the Director of Research and Engineering and the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Assignment of engineers and scientists at policymaking levels in the offices of the Secretaries of the three services.

Establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to provide a civilian space-science and exploration agency.

Reactivation of the Office of Science Adviser to the Secretary of State, and the appointment once again of science attachés to overseas posts.

Establishment of the Federal Council for Science and Technology as a means of bringing together for common planning policy-level representatives of agencies having major scientific programs.

Enactment of the National Defense Education Act, designed to aid education generally, with specific provision for strengthening science education.

In the Congress, the House of Representatives established a standing Committee on Science and Astronautics. The Senate, also, has created a new standing Committee on Astronautics and Space Science. A number of important actions have been taken by the Congress, and by the executive branch, to improve the status of scientific personnel in the service of the Government.

In addition to these national efforts, there have been important advances in international cooperation which have been mentioned already.

SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY IN THE FUTURE

We have attempted to outline some of the ways science can contribute to foreign policy, the effect of policy considerations on science, and some of the governmental machinery which has been built up to assist policy formulation. But to integrate the scientific with the political, economic, military and other factors that make up foreign policy operations, requires above all, competent people who understand the relationship of science to these other factors.

If we appreciate our responsibilities, we, as scientists, may well have an important role to play in the future in the policy-making process. It will be a different role than the one to which we have become accustomed. It will demand a new breed of public servant, although the appropriate name for him is not immediately clear. The term "political scientist" has been preempted for a very different use than this. None of us would want to be called scientific politicians, and few indeed would dare to lay claim to scientific statesmen. But there is a significance here that is far more important than finding the right name. The role demands that this new breed of citizen-scientist be continually aware that the scientific community must accept its appropriate share of the responsibility for the intelligent and successful resolution of the challenges facing the world.

Another kind of individual must be recruited, too: an individual with training in science in addition to the usual disciplines of the foreign service. The general presumption is that science is so specialized that the only way to provide scientific inputs to policy formulation is to obtain advice from practicing scientists on an ad hoc basis as needed. But as valuable as such advice is, it does not fill today's requirements for a continuing and intimate involvement in the policymaking process of competent people who also understand science and its significance to policy, and who could therefore work effectively with the practicing scientists supplying the specialized ad hoc studies.

Perhaps science and engineering graduates should be attracted for regular careers in the Foreign Service and in our other oversea programs. We must also provide a better scientific background for nonscientists in the international affairs field. This, perhaps, is the most important measure of all. Essential to these efforts is the development of an academic field of teaching and research in the interrelationship of science and foreign affairs, to be able to educate properly and to understand better the underlying significance and opportunities of this relationship.

These are not easy tasks, nor ones that can be accomplished overnight. Unlike toasters, automobiles, and television sets, we cannot push a button to mass-produce diplomats in striped pants and laboratory coats.

In discussing international relations, the American historian, Julius Pratts, states: "Neither the tools of diplomacy nor the tools of force can be suddenly improvised for use in crises. They must be kept in a state of readiness for use. The success of a nation's foreign policy will depend, in part, upon the efficiency and the readiness of the instruments with which the policy is pursued." We, as scientists, must do all we can to help keep the tools of our diplomacy and the tools of our force in efficient readiness.

We have entered a new era, a scientific revolution, as C. P. Snow terms it, in which science and technology are transforming our way of life and the relations between nations. We cannot stand aside and simply watch this process, regardless of where it takes us; we must and we can use science and technology to achieve the humanistic goals of our free society.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study papers Nos. 10 and 11, "A History of Ballistic Missiles," by Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, member of the House Armed Services Committee; and "The Cost of National Security," by Prof. Arthur E. Burns, George Washington University.

A HISTORY OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

(By LESLIE C. ARENDS, Congressman from Illinois)

Major military weapons never spring forth full bloom overnight. The first operational B-17 took a decade to develop. The B-29 and B-52 are likewise the outgrowth of years of effort.

Similarly with modern rocketry. Though it began in America 17 years ago, rocket development turned seriously to long-range ballistic missiles only 7 years ago.

Not until fiscal year 1953 were expenditures in any one year on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars. Since then, these programs have advanced with impressive speed. Today, they involve the expenditure of 10 times as much each day as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952.

In the early postwar years, military studies slowly advanced American ballistic missile knowledge. Propulsion, guidance, heating and weight problems appeared very difficult. Their solution obviously was costly. Yet, the level of effort remained low and sporadic.

Moreover, critical data controlling warhead weights were unknown. Until 1953, the operational feasibility of long-range ballistic missiles seemed far distant to those in authority. As a result, these programs were deemed unworthy of major effort. To be sure, one such program, the forerunner to Atlas, was started as long as 14 years ago, in 1946, but it died 3 years later in the 1949 defense cutbacks. The program was revived in 1951, but even then only as a component development effort.

From World War II to 1953, due partly to this skepticism as to the practicality of long-range range ballistic missiles and due also to emphasis on strategic bombers, our missile effort, such as it was, went mainly into air defense missiles such as Nike-Ajax, Terrier I, and Falcon. Some short-range ballistic missiles and some relatively slow nonballistic aerodynamic type long-range missiles did receive some support. Long-range ballistic missile efforts, however, were held down to low support studies.

Viewed in retrospect, therefore, it is hardly remarkable that as of 1960, 15 years after World War II, American long-range rocketry is in some particular respects matched or surpassed by the Soviets. That result was foreordained by years of low-priority attention and lack of funds while the Soviets evidently were advancing their rocketry full blast.

What is remarkable is how rapidly the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) programs of the United States have advanced in less than 6 years. The speed of this advance in so short a period augurs well for the Nation's security. It is convincing testimony to the competence of our scientists and engineers.

It is the purpose of this paper to outline the history of ballistic missile development during the past two decades.

THE WORLD WAR II PERIOD

The year 1942 marks the beginning of our World War II rocket program. The work was principally on solid propellants, which burn like cigarettes within the rockets. It was carried forward, with military support, by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. From it evolved our World War II artillery rockets, air-to-surface rockets, rocket boosters for airplanes, other special rocket motors, and our first serious efforts to propel rockets with liquid fuels. During the summer of 1945, this work produced the Army WAC Corporal, a rocket fueled by nitric acid and aniline.

When World War II ended, the Allied Nations placed scientific teams in Germany to analyze that nation's technical accomplishments in rockets and missiles. A number of the best German scientists and engineers were induced to go to Russia and to the United States. The United States, however, pressed this effort less aggressively than the Soviets.

In the latter part of 1946, the Russians identified other scientists and technicians associated with German missile programs. Hundreds of them were removed to Russia. German research facilities and production plants were stripped of machinery, instruments, blueprints and missiles or missile components. These, too, were shipped to Russia. Thus, the Russians were able to exploit German missile technology. The indoctrination of Soviet scientists and technicians was thereby facilitated, and they acquired faster the know-how to bring uncompleted German ideas to practical realization.

The advantage the Soviets achieved due to their early decision to develop and extend this German missile technology is evident.

THE EARLY POSTWAR YEARS

The years immediately following World War II constitute a period of halting, low-level efforts on long-range ballistic missiles. In 1946, several potentially useful programs had been started. While some of these programs contributed advances during the 1946–50 period, the level of effort and results was meager by today's standards.

For instance, in 1946, the Army arranged to rebuild the German V–2's. In the so-called bumper program, the V–2 was converted into a first-stage booster rocket. It carried a second rocket, the WAC Corporal, which, in turn, carried scientific instruments to high altitudes. Maximum speeds attained during these later tests was about 5,200 miles per hour; maximum altitude was about 250 miles. These represented significant improvement over the standard V–2 performance (3,600 miles an hour and 100 miles maximum altitude).

The year 1946 marked also the Air Force's first attempt on the ICBM. The program, known as the MX–774 at Convair, was intended to advance long-range rocket techniques. It turned out, however, to be rather short-lived when the defense slashes of 1947 terminated this program. For the next several years Convair used corporate funds to carry on MX–774 weapons studies, but at low financial levels.

In 1946 the Air Force also established the Snark and Navaho programs. These were long-range, airplane-type guided missiles, not the ballistic type. However, from the liquid propellant rocket booster to be used with Navaho grew the high thrust liquid propellant engines for today's major missiles, such as Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter.

Also, in the late 1940's the Navy developed the first version of its Viking, a high altitude scientific research rocket.

THE KOREAN WAR PERIOD

During the Korean war, missile development at length began in earnest. Even in this period, however, progress was slow as most official attention was devoted to the immediate problem of Korea.

In the design of long-range ballistic missiles, weight is critical. Generally speaking, it takes about 200 pounds of launching weight to place 1 pound of warhead on a target several thousand miles away. Because the first atomic warheads weighed 9,000 pounds, clearly a major reduction was required in nuclear warhead weight for missile use. Ever since the end of World War II, the Atomic Energy Commission had been working on atomic weapon improvement which resulted in lighter and higher yield nuclear warheads. However, during this entire period the significance of warhead improvement was not applied to the problem of long-range ballistic missiles. For this and other reasons, long-range ballistic missile development languished. During this slack period in the United States, the Soviets appear to have gone full speed ahead with their own long-range ballistic missile programs.

Missile feasibility studies, started in 1949 by the Rand Corp., were completed in the fall of 1950. These studies confirmed the military worth of long-range ballistic missiles.

In October 1950, as one result of the Korean crisis, Mr. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corp., was appointed Defense Department Director of Guided Missiles, with authority to institute a Manhattan-type project for missiles. However, after analysis of the missile programs, Mr. Keller decided against a Manhattan-type project on the grounds that it would take a year to institute such a program. In 1953, Mr. Keller was asked to remain with the new administration, but resigned late that year at his own behest.

In 1950, the development of the Army's Redstone, a 200-mile tactical ballistic missile, was begun. However, not until 1953 was the first Redstone fired, a flight test that was only partially successful. Much of the information obtained from this and subsequent firings was applied later to the Jupiter, when that program was initiated in late 1955.

In January 1951, the decision was made by the Air Force to resume studies of the old MX–774 weapon, redesignated "Atlas." This program, however, was given only a long-term, low-priority objective—that of determining whether a large 5,000-mile ballistic rocket was then technically feasible. Six months later, in June 1951, the Atlas project was formally reactivated.

THE VON NEUMANN COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

On June 16, 1953, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson ordered a review of the guided missile program to identify and eliminate duplication. He stated that "a continuous effort should be made to standardize on one missile for production and use by all military departments, wherever, within the employment limitation of each type of missile, standardization appears to be practicable." As a part of this review, a group of civilian scientists, headed by Dr. John von Neumann, which later came to be known as the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee, was requested to review the strategic missile programs.

The Strategic Missiles Evaluation (von Neumann) Committee reported in February 1954 the highly significant possibility of achieving a major technological breakthrough on warhead size, and expressed its conviction that other technical problems associated with the development of ICBM's could be resolved in a period of a few years. The committee also recommended the formation of a special management organization to assure early ICBM availability. As for technical factors, the von Neumann Committee recommended that the ICBM project be completely reoriented to take advantage of the advancing warhead technology, thus permitting relaxation of guidance tolerances and propulsion requirements. The committee also noted the potential desirability of an IRBM.

Nine days later the Assistant Secretary of Air Force (R. & D.) approved the broad reorientation of the program recommended by the committee. The Air Force set up a group to study the von Neumann report and define the organizational realinement required to accelerate the ICBM. From June through August, major management and procedural changes were placed into operation. A streamlined organization under the Air Force Research and Development Command was set up. It was known as the Western Development Division (WDD) and became an autonomous group responsible for directing and coordinating the effort toward primary objectives. Under the command of Brig. Gen. B. A. Schriever, Atlas became WDD's basic mission.

The soundness of the von Neumann group's recommendations was confirmed during the CASTLE tests in the Pacific through the period of March to May 1954, when the feasibility of developing a smaller lightweight, high-yield thermonuclear weapon was proven.

MILITARY REORGANIZATION TO ENCOURAGE MISSILE DEVELOPMENT

Further indications of the potential importance of missiles led to additional changes. In 1955, advisory committees of scientists urged (1) that two ICBM's be developed concurrently in order to assure earliest attainment of success, and (2) that along with the ICBM effort, an IRBM program be initiated to develop a missile of 1,500-mile range.

In November 1955, shortly after the President had assigned highest priority to ICBM research and development, the Secretary of Defense ordered organizational changes in the military departments to handle the ICBM and IRBM programs. At the same time, he approved a program of two 1,500-mile intermediate range missiles. The first, Jupiter, was to be launchable either from land or sea. It was intended that the second, Thor, would be based upon experience already gained in the Atlas program, while Jupiter would be based on experience gained by the Redstone Arsenal team from the V–2 and Redstone missiles. To provide the desired multiple ICBM approach, the Titan project was established in supplementation of the Atlas program.

The Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force at once implemented the new organizational program, with over half a billion dollars of defense funds reserved to carry them out.

The Air Force placed its ICBM and Thor programs under the already established WDD, now renamed the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

A joint management committee was established by the Army and Navy for the Jupiter program. The Navy created the Office of Special Projects and assigned to it responsibility for the technical development of the seabased IRBM. As a corrolary to the Jupiter program, which employed a liquid propellant, the Navy also began studies of a solid propellant version to reduce shipboard logistical problems.

Later, land-based IRBM's were assigned to the Air Force and ship-based IRBM's to the Navy, and the Navy withdrew from the Jupiter program.

On January 20, 1956, in order to assure a common interchange of technical information, as well as provide competent guidance for all the programs, the original Von Neumann Committee, now called the Scientific Advisory Committee, was transferred from the Air Force to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. On the same date, this committee presented certain recommendations to assure that the long-range ballistic missile programs would proceed at maximum speed. The office of a Special Assistant for guided missiles to Secretary of Defense was established, first with Dr. Murphree and later Mr. Holaday occupying this key position.

TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS ACCELERATES

Meanwhile, in the years immediately following the Korean armistice, the tremendous military potential of ballistic missiles began to advance toward practical realization.

In February 1956, the Army activated the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. B. Medaris.

In September of that year, the Jupiter C, a multistage test vehicle, was fired. It went 3,300 statute miles, rose to 680 statute miles, and reached a maximum velocity of 13,000 miles per hour. During the same period, Air Force reentry test vehicle flight tests

clearly demonstrated that the reentry problem was solvable.

In October 1956, the Scientific Advisory Committee recommended initiation of a new, smaller, solid-propellant IRBM with improved capability of being launched from a submarine. As a result, the Secretary of Defense approved the development of the Polaris program, including six submarines.

POST-SPUTNIK DEVELOPMENTS

The shock of the Soviet sputnik in October 1957 produced, of course, a major effect on U.S. ballistic missiles development.

The President reaffirmed the highest national priority for both Jupiter and Thor systems, aiming to obtain an IRBM capability at the earliest practicable date and provide for continuance of both missiles until one proved successful. The Army was authorized to produce the Jupiter at a rate of five missiles per month. Four Jupiter 15 missile squadrons were to be established with the operational date of the first squadron to be December 1958. The same target date was set for the first squadron of Thor, with three more 15-missile squadrons scheduled later.

A schedule was approved for four squadrons of Titan in hardened bases. Components of the missile system were delivered and a few of them tested.

Research and development of the Minuteman were begun. Minuteman is to be a solid propellant, three-stage ICBM and will carry a nuclear warhead up to 5,500 nautical miles. It will be guided by a self-contained, all-inertial system.

During 1958, major progress was made on the Thor guidance system, permitting an average impact accuracy better than that originally specified. By the end of 1958, Thor was meeting its production schedule with operational missiles being shipped to England for deployment.

The initial increment of the first Jupiter squadron was also ready for deployment in December.

The President, in November, approved a nine-submarine Polaris program. The initial operational capability date of the first Polaris submarine was advanced to late 1960. Later, it was again advanced to early 1960 with four more following at 3-month intervals.

Meanwhile, flight tests proved the performance of the Atlas guidance system and the integrity of the airframe. Among the successful test flights in the development series, one Atlas was placed in Earth satellite orbit in December 1958. Other flights demonstrated the operational radio-inertial guidance system.

PROGRESS IN 1959

All the major missiles programs moved ahead during 1959. A survey of the field shows this progress.

Atlas: Flights of the operational prototype Atlas which began in April had little initial success and the planned date for achieving a limited operational capability was changed from June to September. Considerable effort was devoted to determining the causes of the malfunctions that resulted in the explosion of four out of five Atlas missiles launched before June 30, and how to correct them. Since June 30, causes of the malfunctions have been corrected and the first launch by the all-military team on September 9 at Vandenberg AFB was successful. A plan to improve the system's survivability and provide a faster reaction time was approved. Beginning with the third squadron, the complexes, each with three missiles and three launch positions, will be about 18 nautical miles apart, and, to shorten missile launching time, all squadrons from the third on will have individual missile launchers. Beginning with the fifth squadron, each missile will be dispersed to a separate firing point.

Titan: Progress to date on the Titan resulted in approval of an increase in the number of squadrons from 4 to 11. Each squadron will have 10 missiles. The first six squadrons will be organized into three complexes, each with three launchers and the missiles will have radio-inertial guidance. The complexes will be about 18 nautical miles apart. In the 7th through the 11th squadrons, the nine launchers will be at least 18 miles apart and guidance will be all-inertial.

Minuteman: Prototype Minuteman missiles were fired from silo launchers, verifying the feasibility of launching Minuteman missiles from underground launchers of the silo type.

Thor: The total planned Thor force was reduced from nine squadrons to four, all deployed in England. In January, it became evident that the construction, installation, checkout and modification effort in England would require more time and personnel than was originally planned. This caused about a 4-month delay in turning over the first squadron to the RAF. In June, RAF–USAF representatives drafted preliminary procedures for declaring the U.S. squadrons "satisfactorily operational" in conformance with a governmental agreement.

Jupiter: The operational version of the ablating nose cone for Jupiter was flown on all missiles fired this year, and has proved to be completely satisfactory. Two operational type nose cones were recovered with all their payloads in perfect condition. One of these carried biomedical experiments in support of National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs. A site for two Jupiter squadrons was selected in southern Italy. Each squadron of 15 missiles will be deployed in five sites, with three missiles at each, all launchers to be more than 11 nautical miles apart.

Polaris: All major objectives of the Polaris program to date have been achieved. The launching system for the first Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *George Washington*, passed its tests. The launcher for the next submarine class entered development; it will accommodate the 1,200-mile missile as well as the 1,500-mile missile planned for 1962. The sixth submarine will have several improvements, one being a greater operating depth. On July 1, contracts were let for the seventh, eighth, and ninth submarines. The first submarine launched in June, will probably become fully operational in late 1960 and the remainder will follow at 3- or 4-month intervals.

SUMMARY

Today, and for the near future, our deterrent and retaliatory capabilities depend largely on the ability of current Air Force and Navy jet bombers to survive enemy attack on the ground and in the air, and to deliver nuclear weapons. However, with passage of time, potential enemies' ability to destroy jet bombers on the ground and in the air may be improving faster than the jet bombers' ability to survive, thus weakening their deterrent qualities. Therefore, in 1955 we gave highest priorities to our IRBM and ICBM programs.

The Atlas, our first ICBM, started in 1946, canceled in 1949, begun again at low priority in 1951, accelerated in 1954, finally became operational in 1959. This missile is the beginning of the ballistic missile phase of deterrence. We can strike a large portion of the earth with 5,500-mile range Atlas missiles launched from this country. On the other hand, potential enemies have Atlas-type missiles also, and our Atlas missiles are vulnerable to surprise attack by them. Therefore, we are hardening and dispersing our newer Atlas launching sites and developing other ICBM's, Titans, and Minuteman, which will be in even harder sites. Titan was begun in 1955 as a backup in case Atlas failed. Minuteman, a smaller, solid-propellant, 3-stage rocket, was begun in 1958. These newer missiles, widely dispersed, will be capable of launching on shorter notice, so that some of them could be launched before enemy missiles destroy the sites, assuming we got sufficient warning.

The least vulnerable deterrent seems to be our Polaris-launching submarines, because they are hard to find. Polaris, begun in late 1956, will be operational late in 1960 with the availability of the first submarine.

From an expenditure of one-half million dollars in fiscal year 1951, programs for IRBM's and ICBM's will reach almost $3 billion in the current fiscal year. Missile programs in the research stage quickly overtake and obsolete those in production. Therefore, programs are designed so as to meet current needs without stockpiling missiles that will soon be outdated. Furthermore, our skilled research and development manpower is being taxed to the fullest on existing and scheduled missile programs. Both because of the evolutionary stages of missile development and the utilization of technical manpower, it is unfeasible and uneconomical to pour more money and men into "crash programs" that might disrupt the sound and orderly missiles program now intended to give the United States full deterrent power.

Department of Defense—Obligational program for missile systems,[1] fiscal years 1946–60

[Millions of dollars]

	IR/ICBM programs	Other surface-to-surface missile programs	All other missile programs	Grand total, all missile programs
Fiscal year 1946 and prior	(2)	$19	$51	$70
Fiscal year 1947	(2)	20	38	58
Fiscal year 1948	(2)	36	45	81
Fiscal year 1949	(2)	45	53	98
Fiscal year 1950	(2)	65	69	134
Fiscal year 1951	$0.5	185	598	784
Fiscal year 1952	.8	239	818	1,058
Fiscal year 1953	3.0	403	760	1,166
Fiscal year 1954	14.0	336	717	1,067
Fiscal year 1955	161.0	398	911	1,470
Fiscal year 1956	515.0	387	1,368	2,270
Fiscal year 1957	1,365.0	603	2,502	4,470
Fiscal year 1958	2,077.0	639	2,391	5,107
Fiscal year 1959	2,959.0	685	3,269	6,913
Fiscal year 1960	2,952.0	509	3,173	6,634

[1] Program data reflected in this table cover the developmental and capital costs involved in missile programs; i.e., the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

[2] Excludes $2,300,000 programed in fiscal year 1946–49 for the Air Force MX–774 ballistic missile research program which was a precursor to the Atlas ICBM.

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to minor revision due to program adjustments.

THE COST OF NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Arthur E. Burns, professor of economics, George Washington University)

No amount of money can guarantee this country complete security. This uncomfortable fact is a consequence of the ballistic missile with its nuclear warhead. For whatever comfort it may bring, the Soviet Union faces the same problem. Since offensive-weapon technology has vastly outstripped the defense, security rests on retaliatory power. Specifically it rests on a highly invulnerable, diversified strike force whose capability is known. Such a force costs enormous sums which augment the growing costs of conventional arms. Rapid changes in technology promise only more complex, more destructive, and more costly weapons systems for the future.

This year the United States will spend about $46 billion in its effort to gain some measure of security. Of this the military services will spend about $41 billion, and related security programs the remaining $5 billion. Some 9 percent of the Nation's output of goods and services—the gross national product—will go into these programs. These absorb over half the huge Federal budget. In more manageable terms, national security expenditures will average $255 per man, woman, and child, or nearly $1,100 per family, this year.

Small wonder then that national security is a major item in political discussion, in economic affairs, and in the personal welfare of the people of this country. It is the most complex business of Government today, as well as the most costly. It is also one of the most contentious issues of the day. The contention that swirls around this matter finds expression in such questions: How much should we spend for national security? Are we spending too much, or too little? Are we spending it for the right things? What do we get for these vast outlays? and could we get more for our money?

These questions cannot be answered definitively. Here we are in the realm of judgment, formed in a context of great uncertainty. Uncertainty surrounds the effectiveness or capability of our own new weapons systems, the weapons systems of the enemy, and his intentions. Judgment on these matters is subject to controversy. Political leaders, professional military men, engineers and scientists, the press, and other less qualified witnesses, differ widely among themselves. Whatever the President might recommend for the military budget and whatever the Congress might appropriate, the fact is that no one is wholly satisfied with the result, and some are deeply dissatisfied.

This paper first considers the underlying reason for these differences and then goes on to examine some of the cost-increasing elements in the defense budget picture.

THE BASIS OF CONTROVERSY

National security poses a basic but familiar economic problem: In this uncertain world we have an urgent need for security against aggression; the resources available to meet this need are scarce and have alternative uses. It is the business of the military to use these limited resources to satisfy this need, or want. The sense of security is the product it produces—the capacity to deter aggression or defeat transgression.

The resources required to produce this service or product can also be used to produce the innumerable other goods and services wanted by the public at large—educational and health facilities, TV sets and household appliances, other consumer goods, industrial plant and equipment, and so on. A larger defense budget and therefore more security comes at the expense of other things—unless there is some slack, or idle resources, in the economic system. The real cost of national security, or anything else, is the alternative that must be sacrificed to get it. If we should double our defense budget, some nonsecurity wants would necessarily go by the board. If taxes were raised to finance the increase, taxpayers would spend and save less. If government borrowed the funds, capital for private purposes would shrink. If it were financed by credit creation, inflation would cut the consumption and savings of many. Thus we cannot avoid the necessity of choice and the sacrifice of alternatives.

There is no clear-cut, objective criterion for choosing to commit more or less of our resources to national security. The military capability and the specific intentions of an enemy can only be assessed by the exercise of judgment. Similiary our own military capability or effectiveness is a matter of judgment. Rapidly changing technology on both sides injects great uncertainty in this process of assessing relative capabilities. The economic impact of a defense budget, including the alternatives to be sacrificed, enter into the determination of the size of the defense budget. Internal political considerations and foreign policy objectives play their part in the decision.

By way of contrast, consider the budget problem of a business firm, say General Motors. How large an annual budget should it set up? This depends on what the public "wants" from General Motors, measured by the amount the customers are prepared to spend for its products. Judgment and hunch enter into the calculations to be sure. But as the year unfolds GM adjusts its budget and production schedules to meet the public's wants for its products. Here there is an objective, measurable, and simple criterion to guide the firm, to answer the basic question: How much?

Defense planners have no objective, comprehensive measurement of what we need and what we get when they put together the defense budget. The product produced by the military—national security—cannot be "valued" and the need for it cannot be measured. Hence controversy is endless and inevitable—as it is with practically all governmental programs.

Whatever the size may be, the military budget is finite and therefore limited. Again, choices must be made and alternatives sacrificed. How much should go to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force? One thing is certain: each gets less than it wants. Once the budget pie is sliced in three parts, other choices turn up. The more that goes to SAC the less there is for TAC. Funds spent for Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman cannot purchase B–58's. New tanks compete with self-propelled guns, and both with tactical nuclear weapons. More Polaris submarines may cost the Navy another carrier, or antisubmarine welfare facilities. And so it goes, endlessly. Each choice involves a cost; alternatives are sacrificed.

If the military effectiveness of the alternatives could be measured with reasonable precision, division of the defense budget would be relatively simple. But can the effectiveness of the B–70 in 1966 be measured against the effectiveness of, say, the Polaris submarines, or the Minutemen, that might have been purchased instead? Estimates, of course, are made, but no common unit of measurement is at hand. And none can be devised. Professional military judgment, together with service and political pressures, decides the outcome.

Again by contrast, the allocation of the business budget is relatively simple. The General Motors budget must be allocated among its many divisions for the production of a considerable array of end products. The divisional allocation is based on objective criteria: the estimated cost of each product, its price in the market, the prices of competing products, and consumer and commercial purchases of GM products. The effectiveness of the dollars allocated is measured by the financial return. Budget and production plans are quickly altered to avoid, for example, a surplus of Pontiacs and a shortage of Chevrolets. The military lacks this objective criterion which might signal, say, a shortage of airlift planes and a surplus of fighters, relative to need. Compared with the military budget process, business budgeting is child's play.

This, of course, is familiar enough. The lack of a comprehensive measurement of effectiveness, and the vast international and technological uncertainties, make military planning and budgeting a stupendous task. To be sure it is complicated and made more costly by service rivalries, the weight of tradition, business practices, political pressures, budget limitations, ordinary human frailty, and the sheer size of the whole operation. A brief consideration of these comes later. The basic point right now is this: there are no definitive answers to the questions, How much? and What for?

All budgets, therefore, are inherently controversial. And controversy is fed by the fact that each service, and all professional military leaders, usually get less than they want from the budget. This is inherent in the logic of choice; with scarce resources some needs cannot be filled. Every military budget therefore is "too small." This is not to argue that one budget is as good as another, or that the present defense budget is adequate. The purpose of this paper is not to assess adequacy but to bring out the underlying problem. Another $3 billion, or $5 billion added to the present budget would mitigate, but not eliminate, controversy.

THE BUDGET-MAKING PROCESS

The 1961 military budget illustrates the complexity of the budget-making process. The President requested $39.3 billion of new money for the military services. This request culminated 20 months of work and perhaps tens of thousands of man-years of effort. Each service built up its estimates, piece by piece, based on "what it really wanted," and then on several more probable and smaller amounts. The President, the National Security Council, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff then began the complex job of fashioning a "balance" among the services and weapons systems and a total amount for submission to Congress. The pressure from the bottom is always upward; restraint comes from the top—the President. The result is a vast compromise, achieved by cutting estimates, readjusting programs, dropping this, stretching out that, and adding something new. For each service this is an exercise in frustration, compounded by interservice rivalry.

Budget consideration by the appropriations committees of the Congress is a searching affair. The Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs, and other senior civilian officials and military men lay out their defense of the budget, together with their qualified doubts, uncertainties, and differences in judgment. This is a serious business in which the informed judgment of committee members plays a crucial role.

House committee action increased the total requested by $121 million, and changed some $4 billion in specific budget items. For example, the Polaris program was increased and a new carrier dropped out; the Bomarc program was drastically scaled down; funds for the airborne alert were increased, as were those for military airlift; Army modernization was accelerated and travel funds reduced; proposed reductions in Reserve forces were restored and procurement funds were cut across the board.

Many considerations enter into these changes. Maintaining the reserves is not without political overtones. Increasing the Polaris program at the expense of carrier

forces is an exercise of military judgment. Across-the-board cuts in travel and procurement were economy measures intended to reduced alleged waste of funds. Each service, and the branches within each service, has its congressional protagonists and this weighs in the final decisions. And each service has earned the justifiable irritation of some Members of Congress which helps fashion the outcome. Over it all, we have here an exercise of judgment by knowledgeable committee members and an expert staff.

The Senate Appropriations Committee takes up the budget where the House left it. Similar considerations shape their work. The summit collapse led the Senate to add $1 billion to the House bill. Among other things it restored funds for the Bomarc program, approved the carrier, provided additional funds for the B–70 development, added more money for the Samos satellite, for Army modernization, and for other programs. Again we have the exercise of informed judgment, with a leavening of political and economic ingredients and service loyalties. In the end, the House and Senate compose their differences, usually with prompting from the executive branch.

Budgetmaking is a tortuous, time-consuming process. The end product is not the creature of the Bureau of the Budget, or the Department of Defense, or even of the President. It is the creature of Congress for only Congress can appropriate funds. But the end product is a joint budget, the joint responsibility of two constitutionally separate branches of Government—something some critics overlook. In a sense, the process moves from one arena to another—within and among the services, in the Bureau of the Budget, and the White House. The main event takes place in the most important area of all, the Congress.

This process is not efficient; it was not designed for efficiency but for the balance of political power. In any event it cannot be efficient in the sense of matching returns or effectiveness against the dollars spent. We have no objective, measurable criterion for doing so. The military budget is a product of professional military judgment, service competition, fiscal limitations, political and economic considerations, the assessment of threat, hard work, imagination, and compromise. As with all budgets—personal, business, and public—more results could be gotten from it. And like all other budgets, it is smaller than its managers would like to have. Its adequacy is attested only by results—its capacity to deter and to win should deterrence fail.

COST ELEMENTS

Before discussing some of the elements which account for large military budgets, a few sobering contrasts are worth noting. In the century before 1935 the average annual cost per man in uniform increased about fourfold. Output per man in industry increased far more than this. In the quarter century since 1935 cost per military man increased another fourfold, while output per man at work did not quite double. These rough estimates take into account price changes; real military costs are accelerating, both in relation to their past behavior and to output per man employed. However, military productivity (destructive potential) is rising faster than military costs; that is to say, military technology has greatly reduced the unit cost of its output. The big bombs are getting cheaper and their delivery systems more costly. We face the bleak fact that over the past 25 years the increase in military outlays and the capacity to destroy has far outpaced the growth in capacity to produce and replace.

High and rising costs of national security stem from many causes—some are remedial; others are not. Some of the excessive or needless costs are internal to the military; they result from its organizations, procedures, and interests. But the main causes of high cost lie elsewhere. These are due to political policy, strategic considerations, technological change, and uncertainty. By no means is this a complete catalog, but it suffices for present purposes.

First, consider the internal elements that tend to inflate cost needlessly. These come under the general rubric "waste". Committees of Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, the Hoover Commission, the Comptroller General, groups within the Department of Defense and the separate services have probed deeply into the "business" end of the service programs, personnel practices (e.g., flight pay), travel, and the cost of service amenities. On all counts the investigations point to instances of excessive cost. This is particularly true of the business operations: the systems for computing supply requirements, contracting, the cataloging and storing of items, distributing these items, and disposing of surplus. The main criticism is lack of integrated, businesslike operations, with consequent waste of funds.

These operations are sizable. Currently the Department of Defense purchases about $24 billion a year in weapons and supplies. This takes nearly .7 million procurement actions. The personal property inventory of the Department is valued at $118 billion, made up of 3.4 million items, and stored in nearly 600 million square feet of space throughout this country and in foreign depots. Nearly $27 billion of this inventory is surplus. Under present plans some $10 billion of surplus is to be disposed of yearly, at a yield of about 2 percent of acquisition cost.

Examples of waste and inefficiency in the handling of this business are legion. A recent estimate places the annual excess cost at $2 to $3 billion a year. The estimate is probably exaggerated; but, whatever the figure is, it could build up the military effectiveness of the services. This answers an earlier question: Could we get more security from present appropriations?

Defense is the Government's biggest business. Yet DOD has still to take a practical, businesslike first step toward increased efficiency; namely, to establish requirements on a comprehensive, coordinated basis. The remaining phases of the supply cycle are only partly coordinated. Under the prodding of Congress the services are moving toward more efficient supply management operations for items common to two or more of the services, such as single department procurement, cross-servicing of assets, single manager plans, uniform cataloging and standardization. The results are encouraging but not impressive. DOD in time will face the choice: to coordinate the present service supply programs more effectively, or to accept an integrated supply system in the hands of a single agency.

The first choice is difficult, the second is unacceptable to the services. This is so for a number of reasons: service rivalries, different procedures and ways of doing things, organizational interests that clamor for protection, the weight of tradition and inertia. As impediments to efficiency, these elements gradually give way, partly from outside pressures and partly from pressures generated within the services. But progress is slow; the do-it-yourself attitude is deeply embedded in each service. There is a basic and traditional urge for self-sufficiency, for the linking of control with responsibility. Each service is responsible for its mission; it wants a control commensurate with this responsibility. This is understandable and may be worth some added cost, but not the present excess cost. Far better results can be achieved by persistent, practical efforts at comprehensive coordination of the supply function and the overhaul of procedures.

Another aspect of cost internal to the military services receives much attention—the costs of rivalry and duplication in research and development. The Navy is said on occasion to obtain from Aviation Weekly information withheld from it the week before by the Air Force. The same source avers it works both ways. With the enormous emphasis on scientific research and development, and with rapid changes in technology, much is at stake in terms of service prestige and roles. Some duplication and therefore loss of scientific talent undoubtedly occurs in these service programs.

But there is another side to this coin that critics rarely notice. Rivalry in trade, in the military, within the professions, in love, and in the arts produces innovation, drive, and stirs the imagination. Rivalry has its costs, and its advantages—on balance perhaps a net advantage over time.

The maintenance of standby facilities and stores is another practice which frequently evokes complaints of waste. Heavy stores are frequently the result of inefficient supply management, but the need for readiness is the underlying cause. At times the Navy may charter private tankers and lay up some of its own tanker fleet, or contract work out to private shipyards while its own yards are idle. Commercial planes may be called upon to do work that could be done by service planes. At times contracts are let to aircraft companies for planes of low priority. In the short run practices of this type cost substantial sums and at the time appear needless. But commercial fleets, sea and air, are auxiliaries; war production facilities are essential in case of emergency. But for these facilities the military would need to build its own. Probably in the long run the standby arrangement with its annual subsidy saves money.

The military is by no means the only source of its excess costs. Some are imposed upon it. Identical bids from suppliers, the loading of costs under negotiated contracts are among the sharp business practices that inflate costs. Legislation requires the payment of prevailing (i.e., the highest) wage, and limits the purchase of cheaper foreign goods, thus adding to total cost. Political influences have their effect, for example, when a DOD-recommended reduction in Reserves is opposed by Congress, or the closing of an airbase or other installation is resisted. Some procurement programs are prolonged to avoid political trouble. Restraint on the one side and a practical realism on the other limit these costs. Often such propitiation merely shifts the geographical incidence of the outlay without increasing the total materially.

Budget ceilings in the face of rising production costs, and the burgeoning of new weapons systems, add to excessive costs of national security. Ironically, the effort to save money by the imposition of budget ceilings may actually cost money. Fixed budgets are squeezed from below as labor and material costs rise, as more complex equipment is introduced, and as new weapons systems vie for the limited funds. In the face of this squeeze some new programs are stretched out; by the time they reach the production stage the weapons may be obsolescent. Short run effectiveness is sacrificed on the one hand while costs of obsolescence rise in the other. Or the squeeze may work another way. Airlift planes may be sacrificed, ship repairs may be slighted, and Army modernization may be slowed up while the new glamor items are vigorously pushed. Some of these may be in the developmental stage with uncertain prospects of success. Imbalances thus develop at the cost of military effectiveness.

This problem will grow as time goes on. Research and development spawns ever more costly new weapons systems. Meanwhile existing equipment and weapons, if not displaced, require replacement. Naval ship repair and replacement highlights this prob-

lem. Most of the ships of the Navy, built in World War II, need replacement soon. This need must compete with the new technological developments. The tighter the budget ceiling the greater the cost in terms of effectiveness—replacement is delayed or new programs are stretched out, or cancelled. This again underscores the fact of limited resources, the necessity of choice and the sacrifice of alternatives. As the alternatives continue to grow in relation to available resources, the sacrifices tend to create imbalances. For this reason efficiency in supply management is a growing imperative.

The pace and uncertainty of technological change add heavily to national security costs. This year the research and development budget approximates $6 billion. The uncertainty of such work is evidenced by the fact that some $4 billion of R. and D. contracts have been canceled in recent years. In other cases the new item in production faces obsolescence—much of the hardware ages almost overnight. In some cases the services have stayed too long with a dubious development. The costs of change and uncertainty are heavy and will doubtless grow.

In retrospect many of these costs seem needless. But the advantage of hindsight is not present when the decision to commit resources is made. We have here the familiar distinction between ex post and ex ante costs. The ex post costs are those incurred; they can be compared with whatever results they bring. If the results are poor, the costs are excessive. The ex ante costs are those projected into the future to produce an expected result. The expected result justifies the decision to spend; as the result materializes the cost, now ex post, may or may not be justified. If not, criticism falls upon the military planners, and often unfairly, for in this field rapid scientific changes, and uncertainty loosen the link between expectation and realization.

Strategic considerations and defense policy likewise make national security a costly affair. Our policy is moving rapidly toward the creation of a highly invulnerable mixed attack force. Soon there will be four different ICBM weapons systems in operational status. Diversifying the attack force and giving it mobility increases the problems of a potential enemy and reduces his chance of knocking retaliatory power out with the first strike. That is to say diversification lessens vulnerability and thereby provides a formidable second-strike capability. Since invulnerable retaliatory capability is the presumed goal it assumes forces large enough to withstand the first strike. Hardened ICBM bases, mobile ICBM's, a Polaris submarine fleet at sea, a sizable airborne alert, and possibly airborne ballistic missile capability fit this specification. The cost of achieving this is enormous.

But such capability is designed to deter general war. Mobile forces to deter, or handle, local war and to be ready in cold war situations add other elements to the mixed attack force, add greatly to costs. Furthermore, oversea support to allies expands the U.S. deterrent capability through geographical dispersion. This increases cost.

Conceivably retaliatory capability on both sides might be achieved in such degree that neither side could be reasonably certain of success. Such a stability, or equilibrium of force, might level off the growth in arms expenditures. But this is by no means certain. New developments in delivery systems, or in detection and defense, could upset an equilibrium; in any case such developments themselves are costly.

And finally it should be noted that national security is not only a matter of building a highly invulnerable mixed attack force. The threat is not limited to armed aggression. Nonviolent forms of aggression are widely practiced and may grow in severity. The costs of countering these forms of aggression must be charged to national security.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

The range of choice in allocating the national security budget is widening inexorably with the rapid pace of technological change in offensive weapons and in means of defense.

The choice among alternatives is an extraordinarily difficult matter owing to the lack of an objective, comprehensive measurement of effectiveness. With a quiescent military technology this problem is more manageable than it is when, as at present, technological change and uncertainty are the rule.

Choosing among alternatives involves a real cost, which is the effectiveness of the alternatives sacrificed. The basic objective in military planning is to minimize these real costs. In practice, there is no objective and general measurement of them. Tests and evaluations provide a range of partial measurements to guide the exercise of judgment.

However, it might be said that inefficiency is an alternative with zero effectiveness. Any reduction here is a net gain to military effectiveness, or alternatively a net saving to the taxpayers. When the military absorbed only 1 percent of the gross national product annually, the cost of inefficiency was not so pressing a matter as it is at present with an absorption rate of almost 10 percent.

Two general principles to guide the selection of alternative weapons systems may be stated. The first is to choose that mix or combination which maximizes invulnerability. The second is to choose that combination which maximizes the capability of handling the varied situations described as a general war, or a limited war, or an aggravated cold war. This calls for a varied mix with heavy emphasis on weapons systems having at least a dual capability. The general acceptance of these principles in national security budgeting would probably add considerably to present levels of expenditure.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 12: "The Economics of National Defense in a Free Economy," by Guy Waterman, task force staff:

THE ECONOMICS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE IN A FREE ECONOMY

(By Guy Waterman, task force staff)

1. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF MILITARY POLICY AND ECONOMIC POLICY

To be complete, the overall design of a nation's policies for achieving national security must include economic policy, as well as military, diplomatic, and other policies. The fundamental interrelationship between military and diplomatic policy is widely recognized. More often we fail to recognize, or fail to act on the basis of, the equally significant interrelationship between military and economic policy.

In the world in which the United States has assumed leadership today, a strong national defense is imperative. Without adequate military preparedness, our leadership position would be lost. Furthermore, as the possibilities of space exploration become actualities, the requirements of our international position extend to the space race as well as more purely military matters.

The United States' position in the world today carries with it another imperative: A strong national economy. A vigorous, adaptive, expanding economic system is itself a key element in a strong international posture. A healthy growing economy makes it possible to meet the challenges of economic and trade competition. It also forms the base which makes it possible to carry a strong military defense program. A nation which lacks economic strength cannot be militarily strong for any period of time. As former Air Secretary W. Stuart Symington stated in 1950: "The Nation can be defeated by economic disaster as well as military disaster." [1]

Military power and economic strength are mutually reinforcing. They are complementary, not competing goals. They are fundamentally interrelated. This point was expressed well by the Republican Committee on Program and Progress (the so-called Percy committee) in the following words:

"We must realize that national security and the maintenance of a stable economy are not antithetical ideas. Indeed, should we be successful in providing defense on the military front and, at the same time, allow our economic system to collapse, we would thereby be sustaining defeat by communism." [2]

Our policy in the economic sphere, however, has broader purposes than just that of serving and enhancing military strength. We seek a strong economy because of other benefits it brings, such as material progress in the form of rising real incomes. Beyond economic strength, we also seek to advance the goal of economic freedom. Freedom is the highest value which we, as the relatively new leader of western civilization, are now called upon to protect and enhance. We seek to survive for a purpose—the maintenance of a civilization which exhalts the dignity of the individual, his freedom, and his opportunity.

The growing importance of economic policy

Strong national defense, a strong economy, and an underlying dedication to the maintenance and spread of economic freedom—these have always been among our important goals. The context in which we pursue these goals, however, has changed radically since the end of World War II. The main difference in the new international situation which we face today is the long-range, almost open ended, nature of the challenge.

In World War II, we confronted an all-out, unlimited war. We mobilized our national war capability to something like the maximum. The conflict lasted a finite period of time and then was over. Having won the war, we converted back to a peacetime economy.

But the peacetime to which we were restored began to be shaken, as the fall of Czechoslovakia, the Berlin blockade, and other events began to show. In 1950, the Korean crisis presented us with a different problem. Again we mobilized for a specific conflict which lasted a finite period of time. However, war was not unlimited; nor did we mobilize our full strength; nor, on the conclusion of the fighting, did we reconvert to a wholly peacetime economy.

What we have settled down to since the cessation of open hostilities in Korea is something new to this country. We are not at war; yet we face a threat to our national security which is perhaps more dan-

Footnotes at end of speech.

gerous than any past wars. We know that we must maintain a strong military posture; yet we know that we may have to hold our military strength for decades perhaps—and may never have to use it. We also know that the challenge we face is not confined to military power, but is being hurled at us from every side—political, economic, and even psychological.

George A. Lincoln has described the security program which this new situation calls for as "a sustained high plateau of preparedness," [3] as distinguished from "full mobilization" (e.g., World War II) and "limited (or partial) mobilization" (e.g., Korea). Lincoln quotes a vivid statement of the problem by Bernard Baruch in a speech before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on June 28, 1949:

"Both as a nation and as individuals we grew up accustomed to regard war and peace as distinctly separate states, like night and day. Today we live in an around-the-clock emergency, a twilight of neither war nor peace. Reared to think of war as a brief emergency to be rallied to temporarily, we find ourselves confronted by a continuous threat of war, which requires something Americans have habitually lacked—a see-through constancy in action between peace and war." [4]

This new and different situation—"between peace and war"—requires that economic policy play a more important part in our national thinking. In a situation of full mobilization, economic problems were enormous, but there was no difficulty in deciding exactly what our broad economic policy objective was: it was simply, and almost exclusively, the support of an all-out military effort to win the war. Furthermore, our concern for economic freedoms was modified by a willingness to sacrifice certain values during the war with the clear understanding that the sacrifices were temporary. The phrase, "the duration," was commonly used; it expressed the concept of a temporary emergency after which the economic policies of a peaceful world would be restored.

In our new situation, however, economic policy is more complex and more central to the problem. If we are not to enter full-scale mobilization, then we must make certain decisions as to how much of our economic capability we will devote to military defenses. If we are to maintain adequate military defenses over a long time period, we must pay attention to the effects of alternative defense budgets on economic growth and efficiency, since growth and efficiency will make possible better defense later. If this sustained time period is one of rapid technological change, we must make difficult decisions on the allocation of defense effort between weapons now feasible and the development of new ones. Furthermore, if the challenge during this period extends to far more than military strength, economic strength becomes an end in itself as well as a support for military policy.

Finally, the new situation raises troublesome issues with respect to our larger goal of maintaining and enhancing economic freedoms. We may be willing to regard certain freedoms as expendable during a conflict which has a perceptible beginning and an end. But in an "open-ended" conflict, how much are we willing to give up?

2. PAYING OR MORE DEFENSE

Recently there have been several significant proposals for increasing defense spending by usually unspecified but substantial amounts. If such proposals are being considered, it is important to examine the question of how a large increase would be financed.

In addressing ourselves to this question, we are not passing judgment on the need for such an increase. For purposes of this discussion, we will simply assume hypothetically that an increase is to be made. We will look only at the choices which must be made on how to finance this increase in defense spending.

A number of ways of financing higher defense spending may be dismissed before we turn to the basic question of what choices must be made if we are to reallocate resources in the direction of a large defense effort.

Financing defense via inflation

We should mention, first, the alternative of financing a defense spending increase via a deficit. A deficit does not, of course, increase the country's total resources; it merely shifts the burden. Oversimplifying a bit, this alternative would amount to paying for more defense via inflation.[5] The price level generally would rise and the cost of the increased defense spending would be diffused throughout the economy, with the usual undesirable effects associated with inflation.

This way of financing a greater defense load is not seriously advanced as a responsible policy alternative. While the catchphrase is sometimes expressed that, "national security is more important than a balanced budget," [6] it is generally conceded in serious discussion that if an increase in defense spending is necessary, it ought to be financed in some way other than a deficit. In principle, at least no political figure would favor a planned deficit except as a tool of fiscal policy in time of economic slack. The only danger would be that deficit financing of increased defense spending might result out of an unwillingness to face up to the problem of revenue. However, in this discussion we will assume that some method of financing other than inflation would be desired.[7]

It is to be hoped, therefore, that we may dismiss inflation as a legitimate way of financing higher defense spending.

"Painless" sources of higher defense spending

Several more quasi-serious proposals for ways to finance a higher defense budget should be mentioned, since they are advanced prominently from time to time. Four such proposals might be mentioned:

1. To finance more defense by cutting the "fat" out of the defense budget.

2. To finance more defense by cutting the "fat" out of other parts of the budget, especially the multibillion dollar farm program.

3. To finance more defense by raising more Federal revenues via closing certain tax loopholes.

4. To finance more defense by raising more Federal revenues via a more rapid expansion of the economy than has recently occurred.

These proposals all have two important points in common.

First, they are each based on an important "grain of truth." That is, each of the four suggestions could command almost universal approval if properly restated—yet, is usually so distorted as to invite grossly misleading conclusions.

Second, each of these proposals holds out the hope of a costless increase in defense, financed by means which are virtually painless, at least to the average taxpayer. That is, when closely examined, each turns out to be a more or less sophisticated promise of something for nothing.

(1) Cutting the "Fat" Out of the Defense Budget

One leading advocate of more defense has been reported as saying that present Defense Department procedures are wasting $10 billion. According to one headline, this advocate, a candidate for the Presidency, pledges: "More Defense for Less Money." [8]

The idea of increasing effective defense spending simply by making the Defense Department more efficient is an appealing one. There is ample evidence that the Defense Establishment is not a model of efficiency. Bureaucratic rivalries and interservice jealousies undoubtedly generate inefficiencies. Horrible examples of waste have been repeatedly dredged up. Beyond that, many studies, notably those of the two Hoover Commissions, have outlined specific and, from many standpoints, practical plans for eliminating wasteful and costly practices.

There is, therefore, far more than a "grain of truth" to the suggestion that a serious effort should be made to tackle the problem of efficiency. The urgency of adequate military power over the years ahead gives added emphasis to the value of eliminating defense "fat," a point to which we shall advert again, later in this paper.

It is fallacious, however, to jump from this point, on which there would be little disagreement in principle, to the conclusion that we can now up our military spending plans by X billion dollars, and pay for it by cutting "fat" by the same amount. Yet this is often implied.

It is always appropriate to cut "fat" out of the defense budget. It is always difficult, too. In fact, while optimism may be a virtue, there has never been much dramatic evidence of progress in eliminating waste, progress of the kind which might suddenly free up two or three billion dollars without damaging the effectiveness of existing defense programs. If elimination of waste proved difficult for a commander in chief as experienced as an Eisenhower, and a corporation executive with the credentials of a Wilson, it would appear doubtful that anyone else would produce a magic key for unlocking a problem on which everyone would like to see progress but on which the best efforts have produced only meager results thus far.

At any rate, the important point is the separability of the twin goals of more defense and greater efficiency in defense spending at whatever level. Why gear efficiency only to a need for greater defense? If we can improve efficiency, we should do so not only if we want to strengthen our power, and not only if we want to retain roughly our present strength. The goal of greater efficiency would still be important even if the remote possibility of limited disarmament materialized.

It is, therefore, somewhat irrelevant to promise to finance a specific increase in military power out of unspecified efficiency programs.

(2) Cutting the "fat" out of nondefense budgets

Many of the same considerations apply to a variant of the above argument. This variant promises to finance higher defense spending, by cuts in unnecessary nondefense portions of the budget.

A frequent tack here is to point to the multi-billion-dollar Agriculture Department budget. It is fairly easy to secure agreement that the dollars spent on the farm program are not solving the farm problem, are of little benefit to the farmers who most need income, and should be drastically pruned. It is tempting, therefore, to propose that we reduce farm subsidies by X billion dollars and apply the savings to an increase in defense outlays.

Other frequent targets are veterans' benefits, the burden of interest payments on the public debt, rivers and harbors "pork," questionable stockpile purchases, and subsidies in general.

The point on these matters is similar to that on cutting defense waste. Again there is a considerable grain of truth. Certainly economists would agree almost without dissent that the volume of dollars flow-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ing into farm subsidies is only adding to, not solving the farm problem—a conclusion with which the harried low-income farmer would immediately agree.

But just as certainly, no one has produced a simple way out of the predicament. And if practical means are found to reduce unnecessary and undesirable spending on farmers, veterans, bankers, or subsidies of any kind, surely we ought to institute the savings immediately, whether defense needs are rising, constant, or falling at the time.

It is meaningless to say that we should cut farm subsidies by X billions and apply the money to more defense. If we need more defense let us have it now, not when we finally figure out the farm problem. If we find out how to cut X billions off the Agriculture Department budget, let us do it now, and not necessarily shuttle all the money over to the Defense Department (unless we simultaneously radically revise the relative value we attach to military activities).

(3) Closing Tax Loopholes

Another means of financing higher defense spending is to raise more revenue by revision of the tax laws. This proposal envisions closing of what are called loopholes in the tax structure, through which it is estimated several billion dollars of tax revenues go uncollected.

It is vital to distinguish between raising revenue by closing loopholes and raising revenue by a general tax increase. (We shall discuss the latter alternative later in this paper.) The idea behind closing loopholes is that more revenue can be raised without adjusting tax rates generally. Again the hope is held out of financing a considerable increase in defense or other spending without any sacrifices being required (at least not by anyone who can't afford it).

The specific loopholes which are ordinarily introduced for consideration are: (1) The dividend credit and exclusion features; (2) depletion allowances for various minerals, notably oil; (3) lack of withholding procedures on dividends and interest payments; (4) lax policing of expense accounts; (5) loose interpretation of what constitutes a capital gain; (6) preferential provisions in estate and gift taxes; (7) exemption of cooperatives; and (8) inadequate enforcement generally.

The bulk of public discussion of closing loopholes centers around the first two in this list: specifically, the dividend credit and the oil depletion allowance.

There are severe limitations to relying on closing tax "loopholes."

One problem is implied in our repeated use of quotation marks around the word. The two loopholes which are most prominently mentioned are loopholes only to those who oppose these provisions in the code. To those who support these provisions—a majority of the Congress at the time of their adoption, at least—they were fully intended to have a part in the code. Some writers have argued that the term "loophole" ought to apply only to features of the code through which the Government loses income which it intended to tax. Such a loss can occur either because Congress did not write the law carefully enough or because the Treasury Department does not administer the law carefully enough. Under this concept, however, neither the dividend credit nor the oil depletion allowance constitute a loophole.

Semantics aside, however, there is honest disagreement among policymakers and economists as to the value of these two tax provisions. Many would argue that the dividend credit instituted in 1954 is justifiable on grounds of equity, beneficial to economic growth, and basically more of a reform (i.e., good) than a loophole (i.e., bad). The oil depletion allowance would probably command less support from economists, but certainly more from policymakers.[9] In the case of both provisions, economists would generally argue that the effects of repeal would be shifted, in greater or less degree, so that the income distribution effects of repealing these provisions might not be as different from the effects of a general tax rate increase as might popularly be supposed.

What destroys the practical value of these loopholes as a source of financing higher defense outlays is the improbability of Congress acting on them. It is fairly clear that until major tax reform is undertaken—which will not be in 1960—the major provisions cited above (and particularly the oil depletion allowance) are here to stay. This being the case, it appears that no painless source of financing higher defense spending is available from this source.

With respect to some of the minor loopholes listed earlier, there is less disagreement. Generally speaking, better enforcement of the tax laws would indeed yield more revenue. Here the relevance to increased defense spending is no closer, however, than it is in the case of "waste" on the spending side of the budget books. In both cases, more efficient governmental administration is a meritorious end in itself and in no way can be tied directly to higher defense outlays.

Again, however, as in the case of proposals for reducing "fat" in defense or nondefense budgets, we may note an important grain of truth. That the tax code badly needs reform on a major scale is a proposition on which wide agreement can be found. In the interests of equity, of efficiency, and of growth, the day when genuine tax reform can be accomplished ought not to be long postponed. The demands on our economy of a high level of defense activity add to the urgency of this problem, which, however, would exist under any circumstances.[10]

(4) Revenue From Economic Growth

Yet another "painless" source of financing more defense, increasingly advanced in circles somewhat more sophisticated than those from which the above suggestions emanate, is economic growth. The thesis is that as the economy grows, the tax base grows and more revenue becomes available to the Federal Government, even without any change in tax laws.

In a study for the Joint Economic Committee, Henry Rowan stated this thesis concisely:

"Consider a $10 billion increase in the defense budget. If the increase took place over several years, there would be scarcely any problem with inflation from the extra defense outlays. In 3 or 4 years, growth of the economy would bring in extra revenues amounting to $10 billion annually." [11]

The Joint Committee itself, in the concluding report of its "Study of Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," asserted: "Economic growth in itself, therefore, is a major source for financing improvements and expansion in necessary Federal programs without increasing tax rates." [12]

The "grain of truth" in this increasingly popular position is obvious. A vigorously expanding economy can carry a rising load of any category of expenditure with greater ease than a stationary economy. It is also true that with a Federal tax system based largely on progressive income taxes, rising incomes will tend to generate even more rapidly rising Federal tax revenues.

Nevertheless, it is not logical to proceed from these generalizations to the conclusion that the phenomenon of economic growth provides a growing fund of tax revenues available for financing an expanded defense effort or other public programs (or a tax cut for that matter).

The basic difficulty is that a growing country requires higher Government expenditures just as surely as it produces higher revenues. The hope that economic growth will make more revenues available is based on clear recognition of the automatic expansion of the revenue side of the Federal ledger, but tacitly takes as constant the expenditure side. Yet, as a moment's thought will recall, the forces tending to automatic expansion of the expenditure side are probably at least as powerful as those on the revenue side. The reference here is not to political pressures or tendencies to initiate new Government programs—although these too may be very much a part of the picture. The reference here is to the automatic institutional expansion of existing programs. These are increases in expenditure which can be anticipated in the next few years, just as we can anticipate increases in tax revenues.[13]

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans, has recently alluded to these automatic expenditure increases with growing frequency, calling them "built-in increases in existing programs which are now producing a continuing upcurve in expenditures." Stans estimates that we already face future commitments of $25–$35 billion for the interstate highway system, $8 billion for public works projects already started, $6 billion for public housing, $4.4 billion for shipping subsidies, and a variety of other obligations.[14]

Built-in cost increases are particularly predictable in the defense field. As weapons technology advances, costs rise (entirely apart from the effects of inflation). Defense Comptroller John M. Sprague recently gave these examples of "the increased procurement cost of these new and more complex weapons. The cost of a fighter airplane, for example, has increased by over 30 times since World War II; the cost of a submarine (Polaris), twentyfold. A modern supersonic bomber costs nearly one hundred times its World War II predecessor, the B–17. The Navy's nuclear-powered carrier which is currently under constructon will probably cost eight times as much as the carrier which fought the Battle of Leyte Gulf." [15]

Sprague also pointed out the certainty of rising costs for military personnel:

"More directly, even without a general pay increase, the cost of military personnel goes up about 2 to 3 percent a year. This comes about from a somewhat higher grade structure; increased longevity pay; an increased number of dependents and, therefore, dependents' allowances; the new program of enlisted proficiency pay; and a steady increase in military retired pay." [16]

Dr. Otto Eckstein, then of Harvard University and later staff director for the Joint Economic Committee's Study on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels, in a paper prepared for the Committee on Economic Development (CED), drew some protections of rising public expenditures over the next decade. Eckstein projected rising expenditures from $79 billion in fiscal year 1960 to $97.1 billion in fiscal year 1968 (as a medium assumption), or as high as $105 billion or as low as $87.1 billion.[17] The significance of these projections is that, at present tax rates, most of the increased revenue from economic growth will be eaten up by increased spending under present programs. Under the high projection of spending, about all of the increased revenues will be required.[18] Illustrations of built-in increases in nondefense programs include the Veterans' Administration (pension mostly) from $5,098 million in fiscal year 1958 to $6,375 million in fiscal year 1968; urban renewal and other housing programs from $199 million to $2,040 million; highways from

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

$8,300 million to $13,300 million; Department of Interior programs (reclamation, Indian affairs, national parks, etc.) from $666 million to $1,110 million. In the defense budget, simply continuing present evaluation of security needs, and in the author's words, assuming "continuation of economy policies," the projection runs from $39.1 billion in fiscal year 1958 to $51 billion in fiscal year 1968. Space, AEC, and other defense-related programs also are expected to eat up revenues simply extending the present approach.[18]

Economic growth, therefore, provides no freely available revenue for use in expanding our defense effort. Economic growth produces more revenue, but it also produces more expenditure. We must conclude again that we have failed to uncover a costless source of revenue for higher defense outlays.

The basic question

Reluctantly we come to the conclusion that if we wish to spend more on defense, we are going to have to face the cost. While everyone would like to see elimination of unnecessary spending; while genuine tax reform is desirable on its merits; and while economic growth will strengthen the economic base which supports an adequate defense—while these considerations are all true, we must conclude that none of them offers a free ticket to a costless increase in defense spending.

This fact has been acknowledged by some of those who advocate higher defense spending. There have been several hints that some of the advocates of higher defense spending favor a tax increase to pay for it. However, these indications have always been in most general terms. No major political figure has presented his program for a general tax increase. Nor has anyone indicated which needed nondefense programs should be cut or postponed. But having rejected the possibilities of a something-for-nothing increase in defense outlays, we are forced to analyze specifically what the cost of any substantial increase would be.

3. THE COST OF MORE DEFENSE

The cost of an increase in defense spending may be viewed in one of two ways: Either as more dollars to be spent—in which case, the question becomes: How do we raise the money? or, what do we spend less on in order to spend more on defense? or as more resources to be allocated—in which case, the question becomes: In real terms, what relative shifts must take place in other sectors so that more resources, relatively may be allotted to defense?

If we are going to increase the defense sector, where will the money (or resources) come from?

It is sometimes inferred that an expansion of the defense budget must be financed by foregoing enjoyment of consumer goods, with the implication that this is the only area in which sacrifices must be made. In fact, however, an increase in the defense sector might be expected to be drawn from many different places, including:

1. Consumer expenditures of many kinds, not just luxuries or frills.
2. Savings and investment expenditures.
3. Nondefense Government programs.
4. Lower-priority sections of the defense programs.
5. Defense spending on the part of our allies.

These sources of financing higher defense outlays are discussed in more detail in this section.

(1) Effects on Consumption

When speaking of higher taxes, it is popular to speak as if the tax would cut only into consumption—and indeed, only into less desirable forms of consumption at that. Often, in reply to the rhetorical question, "Can we afford more defense?" the response is that we speed too much on frills now. Our affluent society, it is contended, certainly can afford to forego self-indulgence in luxury consumer goods in the interests of meeting social priorities, including defense. Tailfins and television are especially fair game. Among more sophisticated audiences, advertising budgets are a favorite target. ("Surely the real waste is not in the public sector.")

The implication running through discussions in this vein is that if we are forced to a tax increase, the tax will reduce consumer spending only in areas which don't really matter. The implication is that when consumers' disposable income is reduced, consumers will reduce spending only on goods which have a lower social importance, like tailfins.

To bring out the fallacy of this approach, it is only necessary to make explicit what is usually treated, albeit in polished phrases, by implication and inference. Clearly, if a tax increase reduces disposable personal income by, say, $5 billion, we do not know what industries would be affected. The only things we can be reasonably sure of are that consumption expenditures generally are very likely to fall, and that the decline will probably be felt along a wide range of consumer products. It may be comforting, but it is not realistic to assume that only "frills" would be adversely affected.

(2) Effects on Savings and Investment

We also can suppose that a fall in disposable personal income would probably reduce not only consumer expenditures, but also personal savings to some extent. While the marginal propensity to consume is thought to be lower going down than going up, it would still be positive, barring some exceptional circumstances.[20]

A reduction in personal savings would put downward pressure on private investment. This would tend to have an adverse influence on economic growth, since the volume of private investment is surely a key factor, if not the main determinant of the rate of economic growth. (Certainly the same amount of dollars spent through private investment would be quite likely to have greater growth effects than the same amount spent on national defense.) If we see economic growth as essential for long-range defense needs, as well as for the economic aspects of the international challenge, then we would want to recognize that a tax increase would probably have some downward effect on growth.[21]

If the flow of personal savings were reduced because of a tax increase, the capital markets might become slightly more difficult for State and municipal governments to secure credit from. In this way, a Federal tax increase could reduce State and local revenues (bond issues) in absolute as well as relative terms. Because the effect is indirect, however, it would probably be small.

(3) Effects on Nondefense Public Programs

As we have seen, it would be unrealistic to suppose that an increase in defense spending would come solely out of certain categories of consumption (those of a low social priority). It is more realistic to expect that a tax increase would come out of consumption expenditures of a variety of types, and further that some of the increase would be likely to come out of savings and investment, with downward effects on growth.

We may go further, however, and raise the question of whether an increase in defense spending should logically be financed entirely by means of a tax increase.

Put in terms of resource allocation, the question is: Should a greater relative defense effort be taken entirely from the private sector? Or should part of it come from the public (nondefense) sector?

In dollars and cents, if we have to raise the defense budget by $5 billion, why raise taxes by the full $5 billion? Why not take $1 or $2 billion (or more) from other sections of the Federal Budget?

It is rather important to distinguish between this point and the suggestion, discussed earlier, that we can finance defense increases by eliminating waste or unnecessary Government spending. The inference in that suggestion is that no one will be hurt by such cuts, that the wasteful spending has little or no value anyway. As pointed out before, wasteful or unnecessary spending should be cut anyway, whether we want to increase defense spending, hold it constant—or even reduce the defense budget, too. If a practical way can be found to save money by eliminating military duplication and interservice rivalry, or by substantially reducing agriculture payments, or by cutting the interest burden of the debt—if practical ways can be found to make such cuts, surely they should be instituted immediately, independent of decisions on the adequacy of the present defense program.

The point we turn to now involves not wasteful spending which should be cut anyway, but rather Government spending which is not wasteful, which we do value, and which would not be reduced were it not for the hypothetical decision to raise defense spending. Logically an increase in defense spending should be financed by drawing resources from all other sectors, not just private sectors. This implies some reduction in the nondefense public sector.

The newsletter, Economic Intelligence, commenting on the heightened interest in defense and space following sputnik, brought this point into perspective well, as follows:

"Since there seems to be no obvious reason why the relationships previously existing between the social valuations of expenditures in the private and nondefense public sectors should have been radically changed by sputnik, it would seem that the brunt of increased defense should be borne by both of the other two sectors." [22]

In specific terms, this could mean that a decision to expand the Defense Department's budget, or NASA's, should be associated with other decisions involving, let us say, a slowdown in highway construction or suspension of new public housing units or reduction in the agricultural support price for some commodity.

(4) Effects on Defense Budget

To press this point further, if we want to increase defense spending in certain types of weapons, we not only want to reduce private and nondefense public sectors; logically we should also examine other phases of the defense sector. If the value of modern weapons systems has increased in our minds, then presumably the value of some other phases of the defense structure has relatively declined.

(5) Effects on Allies

If ours is a mutual defense, presumably a decision that more defense spending is needed would be a decision agreed to not only by our own people, but by our allies as well. That being the case, the expansion of defense spending would logically be shared by us and them.

Conclusion

This discussion has attempted to point out the impact which an increase in defense outlays might be expected to have. We have attempted to point out that a shift in resources in the direction of a greater relative defense effort would imply relative shifts away from all, not just some, of these sectors:

1. Private consumption.
2. Private investment.

Footnotes at end of speech.

3. Nondefense public spending.
4. Low priority defense items.

Consideration of possible increases in defense spending ought to be undertaken with a full awareness of the implications for private living standards, economic growth, and the progress of public programs other than defense.

4. COMPARISON OF WORLD WAR II AND THE KOREAN WAR

It is instructive to look at the cost of World War II and of the Korean war in the terms in which the cost of national defense has been analyzed in the preceding discussion. In these terms we ask the question, What relative shifts out of other sectors made possible an enormous expansion of defense spending in World War II and a significant, if lesser, rise in the Korean war? After answering this question, we can better judge the impact of current and proposed levels of defense spending. In making these judgments, however, we will also have to note carefully the difference between the new situation and the earlier ones.

The cost of World War II

In table 1, the national income accounts are classified in such a way as to bring out what shifts took place in nondefense sectors to make possible a huge increase in defense spending during World War II. (Note: Items do not add to totals due to rounding, and due to exclusion of net foreign investment, a relatively minor item.[25])

TABLE 1.—*World War II*

Year	Gross national product	Consumer expenditures	Private investment	Nondefense Government	Defense
Dollars (billions):					
1940	100.6	71.9	13.2	11.9	2.2
1944	211.4	109.8	7.1	9.1	88.6
Percent of total GNP:					
1940	100	71	13	12	2
1944	100	52	3	5	42

Source: Council of Economic Advisers.

This table shows that in 1940 we devoted only 2 percent of our gross national product to national defense. In 4 years, this proportion was raised by 42 percent. The table shows that, in order to do this, all other major sectors were scaled down. Private consumption expenditures fell from 71 percent of gross national product to 52 percent. The biggest impact proportionately was felt in private investment which was cut from 13 percent to 3 percent. Government spending for purposes other than defense was also cut way back, from 11 percent to 5 percent.

It should be noted, of course, that a very large part of the defense effort, in absolute terms, came from resources which were unused in 1940. Much of the defense manpower, for example, came by reemploying unemployed workers, expanding the labor force, and increasing the workweek substantially.

The cost of the Korean war

The shifts which took place for the limited mobilization of the Korean war were less pronounced than for the all-out World War II effort.

TABLE 2.—*Korean War*

Year	Gross national product	Consumer expenditures	Private investment	Nondefense, Government	Defense
Dollars (billions):					
1953	284.6	195.0	50.0	24.9	14.3
1953	365.4	232.6	50.3	33.9	58.0
Percent of total gross national product:					
1953	100	69	18	9	5
1953	100	63	14	9	16

Source: Council of Economic Advisers.

Here again we observe shifts away from all other sectors—vagaries of the statistics hide a minor shift out of the nondefense Government sector—to make possible a relative increase in the defense sector from 5 percent of gross national product to 16 percent. Again, it is private investment which falls most, relatively.

Current sector shares

For purposes of comparison and conjecture as to the appropriateness of our current allocation of resources it might be added that the 1959 gross national product was divided as follows:

	Percent
Gross national product	100
Consumption expenditures	65
Private investment	15
Nondefense Government	10
Defense	10

Similarities and differences: World War II, Korea, the present

The all-out defense effort of World War II and the more limited mobilization of 1950–53 show that this country has an enormous capacity for arming itself, if it decides to do so. We are now devoting roughly 10 percent of our gross national product to national security purposes. In World War II, we committed 42 percent and in Korea, 16 percent of our gross national product to these purposes. Clearly this affords us a substantial margin of extra effort should we decide that it is needed.[24]

While the World War II record is some indication of what we can do in a full-scale effort, it is crucial to avoid the fallacy of supposing that it even suggests a measure of what kind of effort can be sustained on a plateau of preparedness for a protracted national security posture. Similarly, the Korean war is no guide to the present problem.

It probably is superfluous to point out the essential difference between a defense effort designed for a temporary war and the kind of long-range challenge we face today. The principal difference is in the timespan involved, what CED has termed the "perspective" of our present position, which is "not merely the crisis of the moment, but the continuing situation of constant danger with which we apparently must live for many years."[25]

The wartime mobilization was impressive, but it would clearly not be an appropriate course to pursue today. During World War II (and to a lesser extent, this point applies to the Korean war as well), our goal was immediate production, and we achieved it. But the spectacular increase in output was not on a sustainable basis. The reasons for the spectacular rise in production included:

1. The wartime expansion started from an extremely low depression base, a fact which exaggerates the magnitude of the upswing;
2. Millions of persons were called into the labor force who do not normally work and most of whom (but, significantly, not all) retired from working after the war;
3. The workweek was fairly generally 6 days instead of 5;
4. Patriotic appeals made some extraordinary measures possible which could not have been done in anything less than a shooting war;
5. To an amazing extent, our effort was channelled into the huge current production effort, with little attention to capital formation—we were, as a Nation, "living off capital;"[26]
6. Production was expanded, but not productivity—output was raised almost entirely by an increase in man-hours, while output-per-man-hour was largely ignored.

An important point to observe with respect to the World War II step-up in defense spending is the drastic cut in private investment. In dollar terms, private investment fell by $6.1 billion—more if changes in the value of the dollar (due to inflation) were considered. In the relative share of the economy, the drop was most spectacular—from 13 percent of GNP in 1940 to a mere 3.3 percent in 1944. In other words, when all-out defense spending was necessary, the sector which had to go was private investment.

The significance of this observation is that private investment is the essential element in economic growth. A rapid growth rate comes about fundamentally not because the labor force works harder or longer hours, nor because Government programs are expanded, but because the labor force expands and, most important, productivity is raised, primarily as a result of capital formation—investment in new machines and methods, modernized plants, replacement of obsolete facilities and techniques with more efficient ones. While many public services contribute to the growth process—certainly, education has an important role[27] the really big factor is investment.

Without a high level of capital formation, economic growth cannot be sustained. A society that diverts resources from investment either to current consumption or to military defense—however, enjoyable the former or essential the latter—pays a penalty in terms of relatively slower expansion of productive capability over a period of years.

Thus, many of the reasons for a successful war record, while entirely appropriate in that context, suggest that a short-range all-out war effort and long-range economic growth may be competing, not complementary goals.

Preoccupation with long-range growth considerations would have limited somewhat the success of the war effort. The corollary of this point, however, in the present situation, is that excessive preoccupation with immediate defense needs could limit our long-range growth potential, and thus hamper our long-range national security capability.

The lessons of World War II and Korea are helpful largely as indications of what we could do if the present international situation radically changed (for the "worse"). Those experiences, however, are

Footnotes at end of speech.

poor indications of what to do if, as most observers would suppose, our current posture must be maintained for a long drawn-out response to the challenges of our international adversaries.

5. ECONOMICS OF NATIONAL SECURITY ON A "PLATEAU OF PREPAREDNESS"

As we indicated at the start, economic policy on a "plateau of preparedness," plays a more crucial role than it does in perhaps any other international setting. When national security needs make large and continuing demands on the system, economic growth and efficiency are at a premium. When the Soviet challenge takes, as one of its many channels, the form of economic and trade competition, our response must be swift, strong, and sustainable. As George A. Lincoln put it, "Peace must be waged by economic power." [2]

Anticipating that the demands of national security will remain high for the indefinite future, we need to consider how these demands affect the economic system and what overall policies will enable us to satisfy these demands best. We need to place a very high value on economic efficiency and on economic growth. We also need to insure a stable, expanding system and a free one.

National security and economic growth

Economic growth, valuable on many counts, makes a strong national defense easier to finance. The growth of resources and know-how that accompanies economic growth permits a more efficient defense effort. Because of the long-range nature of our security needs, growth must concern us.

For these reasons, it is imperative to retain and strengthen the dynamic, growth-giving elements in the system. It is also important to make some meaningful progress toward removing roadblocks to expansion.

The importance of economic growth suggests that short-range emphasis on defense spending should not be permitted to detract unduly from capital formation and private investment. It also suggests that research and development in purely military technology must not be permitted to detract unduly from research which is more directly related to advancing productivity, from basic research, or from science education. It is axiomatic in economic development that future growth depends on partially foregoing current consumption. In an analogous fashion, it might be argued that future security depends in part on balancing current defense efforts with long-range strength.

An added consideration affecting growth is the question of how national security expenditures are financed. The tax system is important from two standpoints. First, the structure of taxes must be examined in light of whether it facilitates or needlessly obstructs growth; most economists argue that effective tax reform could significantly improve the impact of the tax structure on growth. Second, the overall level of taxation must be considered in terms of the effects on incentives. The impact of the tax level on incentives has never been agreed on. There probably is some level at which the disincentive effect would become pronounced. We cannot know where that breakingpoint is, other than that we do not appear to have struck it yet.

Furthermore, we may suspect that it changes over time: in World War II it was surely higher than it is now. It is precisely the indeterminacy of the incentives effect which makes it doubly important to bear in mind.

National security and economic efficiency

Aside from economic growth over time, the demands of security also suggest that we should be concerned about how much we are getting out of the system at any point in time.

There is ample reason to examine closely the effects of a high rate of defense spending on the efficient performance of the economic system. Defense spending is not subject to the market test. One of the chief functions of competition is the pressure it puts on competitors to keep costs down and find more efficient methods of production. The market ruthlessly punishes or even eliminates the inefficient producer.

In the defense field, as in most public programs, the discipline of competition is lacking. The resulting laxity regarding costs is one of the major disadvantages of public management. The problem is thought to be especially acute in the defense budget.

Concern with efficiency suggests a careful eye on results being achieved from dollars spent on defense. It also suggests, of course, attention to a host of built-in or pushed-in inefficiencies in the private as well as public sector—lack of competition in some product markets, government subsidies and special advantages for particular producers, union activities from featherbedding and encouragement of slowdown all the way through to crippling industrywide strikes capable of closing vital production for a period of months, and other obstacles to effective functioning of the system.

Effects of defense spending on research and development

It is a widely held view that defense support of scientific research and development is a beneficial side effect of a high level of national security expenditures.

Certainly the volume of research and development generated during World War II must have stimulated the pace of scientific advance. One obvious case is the development of atomic energy, but there would be many less dramatic instances. The aggregate figures suggest that the war must have very favorably affected scientific developments. It is estimated that total spending on research and development, as late as 1940, amounted to less than $500 million. As a result of the great surge of Government-supported research during the war, research and development spending rose to an approximate $2 billion level in the early post-war years. It is safe to conclude that the wartime military effort made a major contribution to the pace of scientific progress.

Evaluating the impact of post-war defense spending for research and development is more difficult. Undoubtedly, defense-supported research continues to contribute to scientific advances. But that is not the question. The question is, if the military were not supporting this research, what would happen? Would the net scientific progress be greater, the same, or less than it is at present? Merely listing scientific discoveries which originated in a laboratory doing military contract work does not enable us to compare what would have happened under different circumstances.

The research performed by and supported by the Defense Department is in part competitive with other scientific efforts which might have greater overall scientific significance. The gobbling-up of scientific talent and resources for strictly military purposes (even granting some nonmilitary side products) may in some measure prevent the use of those talents and resources for more productive uses. This is not to contest the priority of defense needs; it is simply to caution against assuming that a high level of military-supported research and development may not necessarily accelerate technological advance as a whole, and may actually retard it.

One way to focus the problem is by an illustration. Consider three alternative hypothetical levels of defense support of research and development from 1946 to the present: (a) For the first, assume that the military supported no research at all from 1946 on, leaving all of the country's scientific resources to find their way into other uses; (b) for the second, assume that the proportion of scientific resources used by the military remained at the peak war-time level from 1946 on; and (c) for the last, take what actually occurred from 1946 on, which would lie somewhere in between (a) and (b), and a fair distance from either extreme. Now ask the question: Would the Salk antipolio vaccine have been developed at the same time under each of these three assumptions? Only conjecture is possible, of course. Furtheremore, to consider the question fully, we would need an agreed-on measure of scientific progress.

Another consideration is that the bulk of defense-supported research is on the development end of research, rather than basic research. Many informed observers have contended that the ratio of basic to applied research should be raised. If proportionately more scientific resources were channelled into basic research, the pace of progress over the long run might be quickened. In this respect, too, the military's research support may have a retarding rather than accelerating effect on scientific advance.

On the other hand, one other effect of the research activity stimulated by the defense program should be noted. While military research competes for the available supply of scientific manpower, it also adds to the total supply. The high demand for scientists and engineers on the part of defense-related research and development activity unquestionably exerted a major influence in expanding the total number of scientists and engineers, especially since 1950.

National security and inflation

A high level of national security expenditures, sustained over a period of years, imposes on policymakers an added reason for vigilance concerning inflationary pressures. If care is taken with the financing of large defense spending, inflationary pressures can be dampened, though they will still very likely be a threat. Arthur F. Burns has noted that, "huge Government spending, even when it is fully met from tax revenues, is likely to release inflationary forces in the economy." [3] Wise fiscal policies, featuring restraint in nondefense spending, together with firm and flexible monetary policy and debt management offer much promise for holding the line against serious inflation. The last few years have provided encouraging evidence. It would appear, however, that should sizable increases in national security be contemplated, one of the costs to consider would be the inflationary pressures which any increase in their present high level would imply.

National security and freedom

Ultimately, perhaps the most important concept which ought to underlie our national thinking about security in a protracted conflict is the relationship of survival and freedom. As we mentioned at the outset, it would be tragically self-defeating to forget what it is that makes national defense worth billions of dollars—or, enlarging the frame of reference, what makes mutual security worth while for all of Western civilization, as well as the emergent nationalities seeking a goal which has to do with liberty.

This question needs to be thought out on two levels. The first must carefully evaluate specific controls and restrictions with the question as to whether the contribution each proposal makes to national security is "worth it" in terms of the freedoms given up. The second must look beyond the specific series of proposals currently under consideration; the second and broader level must constantly reappraise

Footnotes at end of speech.

how effectively we are balancing the twin requirements of security and liberty.

With defense spending at a high level, some measure of specific economic controls and restrictions appear inevitable. They are part of the price of security. It will be noted that when defense spending consumes 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product, the proportion must be markedly higher in certain product lines. And when the Federal Government sits over a large share of particular product markets, controls—for example, allocations systems for private users of the product—become very tempting if not actually necessary. The continuing debate over patent policy in defense-supported research and development is one indication of how growth-inhibiting controls tend to be associated with high defense activity.

The problem of economic controls is especially relevant in thinking about a long-range security posture. In World War II and Korea, we took on an extraordinary burden of defense—but, note the controls we incurred also. In World War II we had—

Allocation of scarce materials.

Curtailment of plant expansion without approval.

Prohibition against use of certain scarce materials.

Limitation on use of certain materials to military contracts.

Priority orders for producers.

Centralized scheduling of war-related production.

Ceilings on prices, wages, and rents.

Rationing of many consumer goods.

Comprehensive direction of production, refining, treating, storage, shipment, and distribution of petroleum.

Complete authority over manufacture of rubber.

Priorities over food imports.

Production quotas for farmers.

Control of shipbuilding.

Operation and maintenance and allocation of all shipping.

Regulation of civilian hiring.

Employment ceilings for employers.

The draft.

Jurisdiction over labor disputes.

Consumer and real estate credit controls.

Authority to require temporary rearrangement of electrical facilities.

These comprehensive controls applied only during World War II. However, it is instructive to note that during the Korean War, when our total defense effort was not a great deal larger than it is today, many of these same controls were invoked. It is also instructive to note how certain steps undertaken in wartime become well rooted and remain after the war. Experience with consumer credit control in World War II and the Korean war has left many people interested in reinvoking it today. A classic example was the Government control and operation of the synthetic rubber industry. This was launched in World War II, but it was 1953 before a program was developed to get the Federal Government out, and several years later before the deed was accomplished.

Constant vigilance with regard to specific controls appears to be necessary as long as a high level of national security is required. Beyond that, there needs to be a broader evaluation of the relationship of economic freedom and survival.

Public spending as a whole, including national defense, can be differentiated from private spending in one important and relevant respect.

In the case of public spending, decisions to spend are taken collectively and then enforced on a compulsory basis—in the nature of the case, not because of any alleged evils of bureaucracy or anything of that kind. The mechanism for assuring democratic control is the political process.

In the case of private spending, decisions to spend are made individually and remain voluntary and always subject to change at the individual's discretion. The mechanism for assuring democratic control is the market.

Neither the political process nor the market work smoothly at all times; but we tend to accept them in the spirit of Churchill's celebrated comment, until anything better turns up.

There is an essential difference between the public and private sectors in one key point.

In the public sector, when the political process has made its decision, everyone including a minority of as many as 49 percent must accept the decision. If, through the legislative process, we decide to have a $10 billion highway program, then everyone enjoys that highway program, whether or not 20 percent of the taxpayers would have gained greater satisfaction from an alternative use of that $10 billion, such as school construction.

In the private sector, when the market has made its decision, everyone exercises his fairly free choice as to what kind of product he buys, where, and when. If 51 percent of the consumers want to buy a General Motors car, this in no way requires the other 49 percent to do so. They may splinter their dollars among many other brands, while some buy no car at all and others buy two or three.

These examples may seem a trifle pat. But they do help to bring out a point which is too often overlooked. The political process as we practice (or at least preach) it and the market as it is (or should be) prevalent in most of the private sector—both are essentially democratic. But clearly the market provides a far better defense of individual rights, safeguard against the tyranny of the majority, opportunity for the nonconformist. Of course, many expenditures most logically fall in the public sector for practical reasons. Our concern for freedom, however, ought to give us a constant bias in favor of the private sector as against the public sector, whenever hard choices must be made.

This kind of framework is helpful in relating the needs of national security to the underlying objective of maintaining, enhancing, and enriching individual freedom.

---

[1] New York Times, Apr. 25, 1950.

[2] Task Force on National Security and Peace, 1959.

[3] "Economics of National Security," 1954, p. 21.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

[5] Except under certain assumptions which it is not reasonable to anticipate would be borne out fully in the present situation.

[6] As stated, of course, this catch phrase would be endorsed by nearly everyone. Clearly, however, it misstates the alternatives.

[7] An interesting analysis recently by Boris P. Pesek compared the relative impact of inflation and higher taxes on income distribution. Pesek found that, as a means of financing increased Government spending, inflation was the most regressive of the alternatives. The most progressive method, of course, was the income tax; next, a sales tax with food exempt; next, a straight sales tax; and finally inflation. This conclusion would presumably lessen the political attractiveness of financing higher Government outlays for defense (or other) programs via deficits and inflation. (See Pesek, "A Comparison of the Distributional Effects of Inflation and Taxation," American Economic Review, March 1960.)

[8] "Washington Post and Times Herald," Apr. 3, 1960.

[9] One Senator, as recently as Sept. 5, 1959, was perfectly candid during debate on the Senate floor. He stated: "The reason why it will not be possible to * * * (cut) the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance is that there are not enough votes in the Senate to do it. It is just that simple." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 5, 1959, p. 16738, temporary RECORD.)

[10] The House Ways and Means Committee, in which all tax legislation must originate, has underway a full-scale study of tax reform. It is widely hoped that this study will ultimately produce the major overhaul of the code which all observers agree, on principle at least, is needed.

[11] "National Security and the American Economy in the 1960's," Jan. 30, 1960, p. 69.

[12] P. 27.

[13] See, for example, Kenyon Poole, "Public Finance and Economic Welfare."

[14] Address before the Tax Foundation, Dec. 1, 1959.

[15] Address before the Electronic Industries Association, March 15, 1960.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Eckstein includes a "very high" projection of $115 billion.

[18] Eckstein projects receipts, with present tax rates, to a level of $104.6 billion in fiscal year 1968.

[19] "Trends in Public Expenditures in the Next Decade." April 1959.

[20] Under exceptional circumstances, a reduction in disposable personal income which resulted from a tax increase could be associated with an absolute increase in consumption expenditures. This would occur if the tax increase was coincident with a bad inflation scare, or with public anticipation of controls and rationing. An international crisis precipitating a boost in defense spending and therefore a tax increase could conceivably be tied to either or both of those two effects. They, however, appear to be remote from the present discussion.

[21] The adverse effect on growth referred to here is entirely apart from possible effects of a tax increase on incentives, a matter discussed later. The effect discussed here is almost a technical function of a tax increase, as opposed to the more intangible effect on incentives.

[22] February 1958.

[23] This breakdown of gross national product is rather crude; for example, in terms of our analysis, it would be more appropriate for housing to appear as a consumption rather than investment expenditure. However, the general points stand.

[24] It might be observed that 42 percent of our current gross national product might exceed the total Soviet gross national product, were safe, comparable measurements available.

[25] "The Problem of National Security," July 1958, p. 2.

[26] The value of industrial construction actually declined after 1941, reaching a low in 1943 and not regaining the 1941 level until 1946.

[27] During World War II, of course, education was also set back. The gap in classroom construction has still not been made up.

[28] Op. cit., p. 4.

[29] "Prosperity Without Inflation," p. 75.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD study papers Nos. 15 and 13: "An Extension of National Security Council Machinery," by Dr. William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University; and "The Economic Challenge of the Soviet Union," by Dr. Don Paarlberg, Special Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs:

AN EXTENSION OF NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL MACHINERY: THE CREATION OF A HIGH-LEVEL CONTINUING ADVISORY BOARD TO REVIEW NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR POLICY PRIORITY TREATMENT

(Summary of paper by William Y. Elliott, professor of government, Harvard University)

The progress that has been made in the National Security Council machinery is generally admitted, even by its critics. Yet, many of the participants in NSC procedures have recognized that in the absence of a high-level reviewing staff to relate programs of an interagency import to policies, and to establish priorities for support and follow-through, the Council machinery ground out policies that were too much the product of people who acted as the interested spokesmen for agencies rather than as a unifying policy staff for the President. The problem of getting a high-level staff review always presents, however, the danger of second guessing the responsible high officials whom the President alone controls. To substitute the judgment of any staff for review of basic national defense and foreign policies or programs runs the risk of delaying or of undoing costly programs before they can bear fruit; or alternatively, of encouraging inaction until the review group has given its sanction. It is arguable that the only feasible preclearance is by the Bureau of the Budget plus congressional authorization; and that these hurdles are hard enough to operate under with efficiency and speed, without adding another. Yet the fact remains that the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees almost never ask and never answer the basic positive question: Are the programs in the national security area which affect and depend on several agencies getting the right priorities of attention to see that they effectively carry out the President's national security objectives and policies?

The very substantial achievements for improving the National Security Council mechanism and procedures have introduced occasional reviews by groups of outsiders. This method of getting independent high level advice to help the President, as suggested in Eisenhower's first campaign, could be improved by getting some continuity for a single group, and by the selection of people who were more nearly insiders in terms of past experience. This would mean creating a regular program review board to advise, rather than a whole series of ad hoc groups, like the Draper Committee. Many of the same people appeared from committee to committee; so that the experience was not entirely wasted. But there was no continuity through a permanent staff such as there would be in any kind of adaptation of the wartime model of a continuing requirements committee for program review such as we developed in the War Production Board. Priorities set by the Board were translated into allocations by the program vice chairman after the hearings by this requirements committee.

Furthermore, the very necessary effort to see that the sum total of programs would not be beyond the capacity of the country to bear would seem, particularly in this era of advanced costs because of the complexity of technical improvements, to require even closer attention to a discriminating treatment of weapons systems—in terms of time phasing as well as of enemy capabilities and some concern for policy priorities as well as investment efficiency.

Professional political scientists generally underestimated, until after World War II, the degree to which any basic national security policy must transcend party politics. If an agonizing reappraisal is to be made by a change of parties, or if we must, at every change of party control, "pull up by the roots" every basic policy in order to reexamine it, we do have an impossible situation from the point of view of the continuity of policies and of the type of planning that has to be made when we are expending something around two-thirds or three-fifths of the national budget on the long-term security sectors of policy. The machine cannot be reversed without chaos, even though it must be flexible enough to change direction, or take a new tack. Enormous waste is possible through either over insurance or the bad habit of building on existing, though obsolescing programs that should be phased out in favor of new ones.

The contribution of the agencies to the formation of national security policy must transcend jurisdictional and departmental attitudes, and their spokesmen, both in the Council, in the Planning Board, and in the Operations Coordinating Board, which follows up programs, must be kept under continual pressure, both by the President and by their own sense of national responsibility, to achieve this attitude.

However, it is clear that no Department can, of itself, be expected to exercise the necessary self-criticism to make a fair assessment of its programs in relation (a) to other programs, or (b) to be really aware of or frank enough about the shortcomings in its own achievement of programs.

What seems to be lacking is something in the nature of a sort of continuing and expansible "Requirements Committee" which could be called an Advisory Review Board for the Special Assistant (NSA) that could do a comparative evaluation job before the budget ceilings were set. It would have the requisite powers to obtain the necessary supporting data to criticize both the voluminous programs and unscreened financial appendices submitted by the agencies; and the status reports to the Operations Coordination Board that are ordinarily put in on a unilateral basis, and get no real NSC scrutiny at an effective level helpful to Presidential decision.

If it proved to be possible to enlist the part-time services, with periods of concentrated sustained effort, for special evaluations and studies by a half-dozen leading figures, broadly experienced in high governmental responsibilities, preferably through training at the top policy posts in several agencies, these board members would really be insiders to the problems of the five or six major areas concerned. These areas are the broad policy priorities as applied to defense, diplomacy, and foreign programs, fiscal and economic policy, mobilization and procurement programs, psychological and cultural programs associated with the cold war, the basic research needed and technological phasing of programs to the areas of pure and applied science in their application to growth as well as to defense policies. The Review Board should be headed by someone familiar with the entire organizational programs of the Federal structure and with the procedures for achieving staff integration. The Special Security Affairs Assistant to the President, with the help of advisory recommendations for emphasis by such a Board, might present something more simple, selective, and useful than unilateral or ex parte evaluations of the many separate reports to the President and the Council.

It should also have the additional sanction of having its opinions probably (and in practice ordinarily) affect the allocation of budgetary support and other resources to the programs of the interested agencies. It should, therefore, have the power of recommending, through symbolic priority systems or other methods of comparative evaluation involving time-phasing and orders of magnitude, an overall judgment on the importance of major programs. This evaluation should necessarily stress the essential elements of programs that must be given top priorities and the downgrading or phasing out of other aspects of programs which will keep them in balance with the total framework of national security policy.

This evaluating function for allocations by priorities explains why such a group is spoken of as a sort of requirements committee on the analogy with a well tried and highly developed wartime method of reviewing programs to assure both efficiency in the investment of resources, and conformity to policies. If programs cannot be worked out to support policies, policies must be revised. Its members must be sufficiently sympathetic and acquainted with the areas that they are treating to realize the practical problems confronting the Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads. Otherwise they will be treated simply as ignorant meddlers. They must have been high-level operators. They must understand the difficult management component of the struggle to give sound administration to these areas, and yet be able to take the kind of broad overall view which will assist the President in his own superhuman effort to hold all this great apparatus to a single stream of unifying purpose and policy.

It is in this light that a review of the framework and the evaluation of national security policies in relation to budgetary and other resources would afford the necessary and helpful guidance to the Budget Bureau for a task for which it is presently unequipped, namely, for the presentation of a selective frame for the implementation of policies through fiscal support. In the process after policy guidance has been established, the Budget Bureau can furnish a large part of the continuing staff mechanism of scrutiny and support for the Program Review Board (proposed) as can the OCB and the other institutional staff arms of the President, including the National Security Council staff itself.

The great advantage of this approach to extending the range and effectiveness of the National Security Council's staff support is that it could bring in people who are acceptable to both parties in Congress in the light of service to previous administrations and their independent attitude as public servants.

Free from the pressure of departmental duties and controls, these advisers could furnish that long-range view of national security policy that has to take into account, above all, balance and importance for the essentials. They should be able to assist the President first of all in his own formulation, and then in his control and followup of policies, by really comprehensive, critical and simple reporting of the main issues with which the President must be concerned. In this way they might restore to the National Security Council the overall integration and evaluation which has, so far, been sought, not always successfully, by multiplying new agencies or adjunct committees for specific problems.

No mechanism, of course, can do more than assist the President to make decisions in time and in anticipation for the prevention of crises. But it can help to escape the dead hand of merely multiplying administrative mechanisms at levels which tend to delay decisions until crisis action is the only remedy, or to provide a framework in which remedial rather than preventive action becomes, through sheer volume of crises, the

principal preoccupation of the Secretary of State.

Immediately after the presidential elections, the incumbent President should invite his elected successor to all Security Council meetings. With no change in party control the transition is natural and simple because of the Vice President's experience with the Council. But the dangerous interregnum of breaking in a party out of power would require special efforts. It would appear also possible to expand the consultants staff of the NSC to bring in designees of the incoming President for the sort of requirements committee appraisal of programs previously projected to meet NSC policies. An indoctrination course by bringing in such assistant-secretaries as had not previously served, to learn the ropes as part of a training in office prior to January 20, would also help.

This country could ill afford an interregnum of even a few months after the period of cramp and added strain to which it has necessarily been subjected by the fact that this is the year of presidential elections.

The new Vice President would be a useful person to preside over the proposed Program Review Board. It would be the best way quickly to bring him up to date and to broaden his education for the responsibilities which Presidents must increasingly devolve on the only other official of super-Cabinet rank who naturally presides in the absence of the President both over Cabinet and NSC meetings. The job is one for decisions by one man; but it is of such a complex magnitude today that a wise President will have to find someone, or perhaps several men, to share the framing of the issues on which he alone must decide. If his Vice President has been well selected, both because of his sharing the only national mandate, and because his future, too, depends on the success of the administration, he ought to be as useful as anyone available for chairing this very important advisory Program Review Board, loyally taking a great load off the President. But his effectiveness, like that of the Board, will depend on his own caliber experience and ability to learn.

The Economic Challenge of the Soviet Union

(By Don Paarlberg [1])

Among the many economic problems which we have confronted in past years a few have been of great importance and high visibility. They dominated a considerable span of years before we finally overcame them, wore them out, or learned to live with them. These dominant problems differed in their nature, their intensity and their duration. In a manner convenient to the historian, they have roughly associated themselves with 10-year chunks of history.

During the thirties, the dominant economic problem was depression and the fear of secular stagnation.

During the forties, preparation for war, the waging of it, and its aftermath were the overriding features of economic life.

The fifties were characterized by efforts to lift the level of material well-being, both at home and abroad.

What will be the dominant economic problem of the sixties? A number of subjects have been nominated for this role:

Efforts to achieve further advances in living levels and a broader sharing of the fruits of technological change.

The curbing of concentrated economic power, and a better harmonizing of group objectives with the public interest.

Cushioning the sometimes harsh adjustments in economic life which flow from the onrush of technology.

An attack on inflation, with something approximating the diligence and resourcefulness that was employed in combatting depression three decades earlier.

Efforts to aid the underdeveloped countries, in a manner similar to the recently accomplished rebuilding of wartorn Europe.

There are other economic problems which might be appended to this list.[2] But there is one which in a broad sense includes within it all of the foregoing; that is our response to the economic challenge of the Soviet Union.

Everyone has heard of the challenge issued to the United States by Chairman Khrushchev—his frequently stated goal of first equaling and then exceeding the United States in the output of goods and services. "We will bury you," he has said, and there can be little doubt that he means it.

U.S. and Soviet Economic Comparisons

Much has been said and written comparing Soviet economy with our own.[3]

Any economic comparison is made difficult by the inherent awkwardness of measurement, by the uncertainties which surround Soviet statistics, and by the lack of comparability between the two economies. To chart accurately the size of our own product is itself a difficult statistical operation. How does one add together such unlike things as crude oil and college training? To compute the output of the Soviet economy from the fragmentary and unquestionable figures available is far more difficult. To compare these two approximate quantities is to run the risk of compounding the errors in both.

Once economic output has been estimated, the calculation of trends in the growth rates inevitably follows. Once trends have been computed, the urge to project them into the future is irresistible.

The projection of trends is one of the most fascinating and hazardous occupations known to man. The first year of my life I gained 20 pounds. If I had gained that much each year, I would now weigh half a ton.

Despite all the difficulties of making comparisons of the two economies, comparisons of of some sort must be made. Lengthy hearings have been held during this past year by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and the most expert people in the country have given testimony.[4]

Well-qualified people differ in their estimates of Soviet capabilities. But a composite of the testimony of able persons perhaps would reach the following conclusions.

The gross national product of the United States, the sum total of all goods and services produced, is presently at least twice that of the Soviet Union. But our rate of economic growth, in percentage terms, is much less than theirs. During the last decade or so the best computations show that our economy has been advancing at rate somewhat in excess of 3 percent annually. The consensus of informed estimates is that the Soviet Union has been growing at something like twice that percentage. In absolute amounts, say those who have studied this problem closely, the yearly increment of growth in this country is roughly comparable in volume with that of the Soviet Union, though greatly different in composition. Our own economic output is weighted heavily by consumer goods and services; the Soviet economy is heavily weighted by capital investment and military outlay.

Last year the rate of economic growth in this country, in real terms, was 7 percent, this being larger than usual by virtue of the fact that we were emerging from a recession. In 1960 the American economy is generally expected to advance by an additional like amount, reflecting full recovery. While we are very happy to have them, these favorable figures are related to a particular phase of the business cycle and are not to be interpreted as the long-run prospect. The problem of dealing with the business cycle is related to but different from the problem of promoting long-term sustainable economic growth, with which we are concerned here.

The Importance of Economic Growth

What is the meaning of growth rates in this country and in the Soviet Union? Are differential rates of growth a matter of real significance? Or is this just some sort of numbers game?

The rate of economic growth has great meaning. For one thing, it is from increments in economic growth that a country achieves improvement in the well-being of its citizens. Our people aspire to further advances in the quantity and quality of goods and services available to them; if the economy grows these will be forthcoming. Advances in living levels have to do with better education, improved health, and better housing for larger numbers of our people. Thus, a high, sustainable rate of economic growth is for us a desirable thing, good in itself, apart from any consideration of what goes on in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union also wishes to lift the living level of its people, and has recently emphasized this aspect of economic life. Since the average person in the Soviet Union has available only about one-fourth of the goods and services enjoyed by the average American citizen, the drive for improvement is probably greater there than here.

The rate of economic growth is also important in that it is a measure, though not by any means the sole measure, of the growth of military potential. The greater the greater the total output of goods and services, the greater can be the military effort. Our military effort amounts to about 10 percent of a large gross national product; the military effort of the Soviet Union is a much larger percentage of a much smaller product. Our present economy is well capable of supporting such military effort as our needs prescribe. A marked and sustained advance in the Soviet economy would lift the level of that country's military capability and hence is of concern to us.

Finally, there is an element of prestige and leadership involved in having a high economic output, and in having a high rate of economic growth.

One-third of the world presently enjoys free government. One-third is regimented. The remaining third is to some extent uncommitted on this issue. This third, including parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, presently underdeveloped, aspires to lift its level of living. Many underdeveloped countries, anxious to advance themselves, may be more inclined to embrace a regimented system if one of its attributes is a rapid rate of economic growth.

To an underdeveloped country, a high level of economic output, such as we have in the United States, is not as impressive as one might think; such a high level is often viewed as simply unattainable. A high rate of economic growth, however, beginning from where they are, is more readily translatable into meaningful terms.

---

[1] Special Assistant to the President (Economic Affairs). This paper was originally prepared as an address before the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business.

[2] An interesting panoramic view of the range of candidates for the role of dominant economic problem in the years ahead was put together by the Committee for Economic Development. See "Problems of U.S. Economic Development" (two volumes).

[3] This paper is concernd exclusively with economic comparisons, not military capabilities, though the two are related to a degree.

[4] Background studies and hearings of the Joint Economic Committee are available. No report was issued.

For these obvious reasons, we wish to have a high rate of sound, sustainable economic growth. There may be much that is odd and ludicrous in computations and discussions of economic growth, but our interest in a high growth rate is wholly clear.

If the Soviet Union were to use its increments of economic growth for advances in the well-being of its people, we would, of course, be happy. But if it uses them to threaten us militarily, or to subvert the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations, then the matter is a serious one indeed. The significance of economic advances in the Soviet Union depends upon Soviet objectives. The counsel of history is that we consider the Soviet Government as not being exclusively concerned with the living level of its citizens.

MEETING THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

For a long time there was little attention paid to the economic challenge laid down by the Soviet Union.

It is not surprising that this would have been the American reaction. The enterprise system of the United States has made us the most productive country on the face of the globe, and has given us the highest level of living ever enjoyed by any people. It is a deep-rooted American belief that the enterprise system is able to outproduce a regimented economy.

It is true that we have had periods of time, as during World War II, when we temporarily and partially regimented the American economy, and thereby much changed and increased its output of basic items. But our whole history has been such as to cause us to question the idea that a regimented economy could seriously challenge the economic supremacy of this country.

However, the economic challenge of the Soviet Union has reached such proportions that it must be taken into account. This appears from such statistical comparisons as we have. Even if we totally discount the statistical comparison, the economic advance of the Soviet Union is evident in judgments made by visitors to that land, who compare present conditions with the remembered circumstances of former years.

AVOIDING THE WRONG APPROACH

Those who characterize the economic challenge of the Soviet Union as a serious threat may be classified in two broad groups.

First, there are those whose primary interest is in other matters, but who use the rise of the Soviet economy as a new rationale for the promotion of programs they have long held dear. Chief among these are the proponents of pet spending schemes. Their programs have, during the past 30 years, been successively rationalized on the basis of overcoming the depression, winning the war, and expanding social services. Now they are rationalized on the basis of promoting economic growth so as to match the Soviet standard. These pet schemes are hooked onto whatever is the prevailing public concern. They should be discussed on the basis of their merits or demerits, not on the basis of some alleged association with whatever is currently regarded as a problem. These over-rationalized proposals are therefore not discussed here.[5]

Second, there are those who endeavor, from honest motivation, to deal constructively with this problem. These people and their proposals merit consideration.

Whereas formerly the tendency was to play down the economic challenge of the Soviet Union, some people now overplay it. They counsel us to accept the Soviet challenge on whatever terms it is laid down. If the Soviet Union generates a certain rate of economic growth, we are told that we should strive to equal or approach it. If they set up specific objectives, industry by industry, we are told that we should adopt a similar approach. If they issue an economic challenge in any field, it is said that we should automatically accept it and try to outdo them. "Whatever you can do, I can do better."

This form of strategy would have the leaders of the Soviet Union selecting the area of competition, choosing the issues they wish to raise, and naming the field in which we are to contend. Inevitably they would choose such objectives and name such areas of competition as were advantageous to them, as had for them a natural competitive advantage.

To accept a challenge in this form would be like playing cards in a game in which your opponent always names trump.

If we allow the Soviet Union to name the area in which our two nations are to compete, we would in effect make their objectives our own. We would in time take on their image.

The reason for our rivalry is that we don't want to be like they are; if in order to overcome them we become like them, then our cause is lost as soon as the issue is joined.

The rapid rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union is a matter of concern, and it is a foolish man indeed who would shrug it off. But it would be an even more foolish man who would accept the Soviet objectives and emulate the Soviet technique of regimentation in an effort to beat them at their own game. Such an effort is not likely to win, and if it were, the fruits of victory would have been foregone bofore the battle began. Far more is at stake than merely to see which country can post the largest statistic, measuring the annual rate of growth.

There are various ways of trying to register the larger percentage increase in the rate of growth. We could lengthen the workweek, recruit millions of women and old people for the labor force, reassign half of our clerks and waitresses to other duties, squeeze down the level of consumption, dispense with certain of our frills, and forcibly extract savings from the people to spend on capital investment. This is what the Soviet Union does. But if we were to imitate them, we would lose our character as a free and independent people.

The rapid growth rate achieved by the Soviet system with its regimented system is accomplished by the suppression of individual rights, a technique made easier by the fact that their people have never known freedom to the degree we have. They went from autocracy under the czars to regimentation under the commissars.

Our people have a heritage of freedom. Individual rights in this country will not easily be relinquished. The point of the matter is that any attempt at central direction of this country's economy will encounter political, economic, and sociological obstacles unknown to the Soviet Union. We cannot succeed with their system.

This kind of argument is being made: By central direction of its economy, the United States vastly increased its output during World War II. Now, it is said, we are faced with a similar challenge. We should, it is maintained, prune away, by government action, some of the frivolities of our free economy, adopt a program of austerity, and by some form of central direction channel a greater share of our resources to capital investment.[6]

Let us examine this argument carefully; there is a persuasive sound to it.

The United States temporarily adopted central direction of its economy during the two great wars, firm in the belief that freedoms temporarily surrendered would be taken up again at the close of the war. The first war lasted 2½ years; the second one lasted 4½ years. The desire for freedom was kept alive during these relatively short periods; when the wars were over we again took up our freedom, only slightly impaired by its temporary and partial eclipse.

What is the probable duration of the economic rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union? This may be a rivalry whose duration is to be measured in decades or generations rather than in years. No man can say how long it will be; no man would predict that it will be brief.

Could we put freedom aside for decades, and then reinstate it? If a whole generation were deprived of freedom or had its freedom substantially impaired, would freedom be sufficiently cherished so that we would return to it? Would we remember the rewards of freedom? Would the desire for freedom be strong enough to shatter a pattern of regimentation, laid down and congealed over a period of decades? Would looking to Central Government become so habituated that local government and indeed the capacity for local governing would whither and die? To put these questions to the test would place in jeopardy our most precious heritage. It would demonstrate that we hold in low esteem the capabilities and the merits of our free system.

We need to be reminded that economic freedom, extended to all the people, is a relatively new concept in the world's history. It has emerged only in recent centuries, only in parts of the world, and only at immense cost. It is not the kind of system which can be put in escrow. It must be practiced if it is to be kept alive. This system, which has rewarded us beyond our brightest dreams, deserves better than that we should voluntarily impair it through fear of a still-distant competitor.

While we should recognize and respect the economic capabilities of the Soviet Union, we should not underestimate our own capabilities and our own strength.[7]

Put into the terms of a baseball game, the situation is somewhat as follows: Early in the game, we are ahead four to two. In the next inning, each team adds a run. For us this additional run was a 25-percent addition to our score; for our opponents it was a 50-percent increase. Some clever fellow might calculate that if the visitors kept increasing their score by 50 percent every inning, while we increased ours by only 25 percent, then in time they would be ahead. No sensible manager would basically change his strategy on the basis of such a computation. Least of all would he adopt the strategy of the opposing team. He would follow the best strategy he could, and make as many runs as possible. He would not underestimate the strength or the threat of his opponent, but neither would he underestimate his own strength.

POLICIES FOR GENUINE ECONOMIC GROWTH

To promote the right kind of solid growth is a shared responsibility, a responsibility which rests upon private persons and local and State governments as well as the Federal Government.

The Federal Government cannot long force a high rate of economic growth upon us unless basically the people want it. And if we want it, which we should, there are many ways to bring it about besides making it the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. These include:

[5] For a full discussion of this controversy, see Max Ways, "A New Mark for Big Government," Fortune, April 1960.

[6] For an exposition of this argument, see Leon H. Keyserling, "Is Inflation the Problem?" New Republic, Feb. 9, 1959.

[7] Presently more than twice those of the Soviet Union.

The business community can enhance economic growth by adopting new techniques, by more competitive pricing and by a more open stance with respect to the entry of new firms.

Labor can promote economic growth by acepting the consequences of technological change and by accepting the responsibilities as well as the benefits of size and power.

Local governments can promote economic growth by providing adequate education and community services.

State governments can help equalize educational opportunities, provide better roads, and better social services.

The Federal Government can help provide a climate within which enterprise and economic growth can flourish. It can round out and supplement the efforts of State and local governments in the development of human and natural resources, being careful in the process not to preempt, substitute for, or discourage local and State efforts. It can pursue sound fiscal and monetary policies. It can develop realistic price and production-control policies in agriculture rather than perpetuate nonsensical and costly distortions. But the Federal Government cannot, singlehanded, take responsibility for producing a specified rate of economic growth.[5]

Our capabilities have made us the most productive and most powerful Nation in the world. They have given us the highest level of living ever achieved by any nation at any time in history. They have given us a measure of individual freedom unmatched anywhere on the globe. We should be heartened by this tremendous accomplishment.

Great though our performance is, we should not be satisfied with it. The key to improving the performance of the American economic system is to be found in the preservation of the initiative, vitality, energy, and resourcefulness of our people. We can improve our economic system through the development of our human and material resources, through better and broader education, more research, inducement for saving and investment, better use of the incentive system, less indulgence of special interests, and responsible fiscal and monetary policies. Enhanced economic performance comes from these solid sources, not from politically motivated spending in behalf of ever-greater centralization of governmental power and authority, and certainly—most certainly—not from the adoption of techniques alien to our system.

MORE THAN AN ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

This final and major point: We would be terribly wrong if we accepted the Soviet view that the contest between us is solely an economic one.

Theirs is a philosophy of dialectical materialism. They count materials goods to be of overwhelming importance. In fact, history is explained in terms of one discipline only, economics. Human rights are considered wholly subordinate, God is said not to exist, and human life itself is considered a luxury indulged by the state.

Our country, on the other hand, was founded on belief in the sovereignty of God and the dignity and rights of man. The marvelous economic productivity of our system is essentially a byproduct of these strong beliefs. If we should now forget the central theme of our country, and be persuaded to defend its byproduct rather than its substance, we could be terribly and tragically wrong. It is time to reexamine fundamentals.

What are the major attributes of the American system? What are the things to which the American people truly aspire? Despite our occasional preoccupation with other matters, respect for the individual, for his fulfillment, for his capabilities, his rights and aspirations, for his freedom and responsibility, for his efforts to achieve an understanding with his God, these are the distinguishing features of the American system.

In these matters we excell the Soviet Union by so wide a margin as to be completely unchallenged. Freedom is meaningful not only in the United States, but in any country in the world. We have so long enjoyed this great blessing that we have come to take it for granted. But in many countries of the world it is not taken for granted; it is greatly desired and much sought. Freedom is still the most revolutionary concept on the face of the earth.

Freedom, indeed, is our trump; we ought to recognize that we have a strong hand and bid so that we can name trump.

We should strive constantly to improve the performance of our economic system, but we should do this within the framework and not to the detriment of our free institutions. We should do it without depriving the individual of his rights or of his responsibility. This is not to be accomplished simply by appropriating more money, launching more bureaucratic schemes, or trying to match the Soviet Union in competitive areas of its choice. Nor will it be done by taking on the image of the evil we would like to overcome. It will be done by cultivating the creative energy of people, which our system is uniquely capable of doing.

In the last analysis, the rivalry between the Soviet system and our own is not merely economic, it is also ideological and spiritual. If we remember that, we can win.

[5] See Economic Report of the President, January 1960, pp. 4–8.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study papers Nos. 18 and 14, "Disarmament: Problems and Prospects," by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and Arthur Peterson, of the University of Wisconsin; and "The Impact of Inflation on America's Balance of International Payments," by Dr. Rita E. Hauser, author and lawyer:

DISARMAMENT: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

(By CRAIG HOSMER, Congressman from California, and Arthur Peterson, University of Wisconsin)

The problem of regulation, control, and reduction of military power took its place at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy following World War II. American leaders clearly foresaw the consequences in the development of nuclear energy without international control and inspection. A distinguished group of American scientific, legal, and industrial leaders, in consultation with U.S. congressional committees on atomic energy, developed a series of comprehensive proposals for international development and control of nuclear energy for peaceful uses. These proposals contemplated the establishment of an International Atomic Development Authority whose functions would have included:

1. Control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security.

2. Control, inspection, and licensing of all other atomic activities.

3. Fostering of the beneficial uses of atomic energy.

4. Research and development activities enabling the Authority to comprehend and detect any misuse of atomic energy.

5. Power to control nuclear raw materials and primary nuclear production plants.

"Immediate, swift, and sure punishment" was to be assured violators through the organization of an inspection and enforcement team of international civil servants.

Under this proposal the manufacture of atomic weapons would have ceased, all existing weapons would have been destroyed as weapons, and the useful nuclear material transferred to the international agency for peaceful purposes.

This offer, at a time when the United States alone possessed the atomic bomb, could have meant the removal of the nuclear threat at the very beginning of the nuclear age. Unfortunately, the offer was rejected by the Soviet Union.

The failure to get the Soviet Government to negotiate seriously on the overriding problem of atomic controls in the years immediately following World War II inhibited any real efforts in the area of conventional armaments as well. The Soviet Union maintained its conventional military forces at a high level: The United States, on the other hand, reduced its forces from a World War II peak of 12,124,000 to a total force level of 1,459,000 by May 1950.

Then in June 1950 the Communist aggression against the Republic of Korea was launched. Unilateral conventional arms reduction by the United States had been answered by the Communist world with the aggression against Korea. Korea thus became a grave reminder that would-be aggressors are often tempted by thoughts of what they assume will be sudden and easy conquests.

To many it appeared that the Soviet answers, in word and deed, to all serious disarmament efforts had rendered any further negotiations in this area futile. And yet the phenomenal growth of firepower capability and the ever-increasing efficiency of the means of delivering this firepower upon a target did give rise to the hope that even the Soviet leaders would be forced to give more serious thought to a reasonable system of arms control. Upon this hope was based our continuing efforts in the disarmament field.

In 1955 President Eisenhower, concerned with the increasingly difficult problems time and technology have raised for arms control, called for a thorough analysis of the problems, requirements, and methods involved in achieving an international arms limitation system fitted to the existing situation.

After long and intensive study the newly appointed White House Disarmament Staff recommended a set of principles to serve as a guideline for U.S. disarmament policy. These principles were:

1. The United States should not accept an agreement for arms limitation or control unless provision is made for effective inspection of each phase of the agreement.

2. The United States should never agree to make any reductions or accept any controls in regard to its own armaments unless other signatory powers agree to carry out comparable reductions or controls in regard to their own armaments.

3. In the existing state of scientific knowledge, there could be no safe agreement to

eliminate nuclear weapons. It is not possible by any known scientific or other means to account for the total previous production of nuclear weapons material. The margin of error in existing methods is sufficient to allow for clandestine fabrication or sequestering of enough nuclear weapons to constitute a devastating power advantage to the possessor.

4. The problem of controlling nuclear weapons would be complicated enormously, if not made impossible, once the capability to produce such weapons spread to many additional countries.

5. Widespread fear of nuclear surprise attack exacerbated international tensions and was a principal motive for a continuing and accelerating competitive arms buildup.

6. The United States should never cease searching for a sound agreement and should always be willing to enter serious discussions in pursuit of such an agreement.

7. Because of the development of missiles of intercontinental range and the proliferation of the means of nuclear production, the need for a solution to the armaments problem was increasingly urgent.

Based upon this set of principles the present administration has at every opportunity advanced specific proposals designed (1) to help prevent war by relaxing tensions and fears created by armaments and (2) to provide for a balanced and coordinated progressive program which would avoid any aggression-inducing disequilibrium of power.

Among the specific plans advanced was President Eisenhower's proposal in 1955 of "confidence through disclosure" or what became known as the "open skies" plan. The heart of this plan was unrestricted but monitored reciprocal aerial inspection by visual, photographic and electronic means. Mr. Molotov, for the Soviet Union, rejected the President's plan.

The years 1956–60 have seen the United States and her allies continue to advance concrete bases of discussion for disarmament negotiations. These specific proposals have generally included as interdependent, beginning steps:

1. Cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.
2. Cessation of testing of nuclear weapons.
3. Reduction of existing nuclear stockpiles.
4. Proposals for specific force and armaments levels.
5. Inspection safeguards against surprise attack.
6. Agreement not to use atomic weapons except in situations of self-defense.
7. Measures to control the outer space missiles.
8. Development of a system to regulate the import and export of armaments.
9. The creation of an international control organization.

At times during these years it has appeared that the differences between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union on various of the disarmament proposals have narrowed. These periods of seeming progress, however, have ultimately all proved illusory. The record is indeed disappointing from the standpoint of the Soviet response to the Western intention and hope that international accord on the limitation of armaments can be reached. And yet we must not overlook the fact that during the past few years the Allies have welded into one unified and practical policy their individual proposals for arms control. Never before in history have so many nations of such great military power joined to make such far-reaching proposals.

But it also must be remembered that the drive for disarmament, no less than the armaments race itself, is a reflection of the intricate power relationships among the major nations of the world. And though the control of armaments is an indispensable step in a general settlement of international conflict, it cannot be the first step nor can it be conceived apart from the other weapons used in the waging of the peace.

It must be established at the outset that men do not fight because they have arms. Rather they have arms because they find it necessary to fight.

In the past disarmament efforts have too often been based upon the assumption that if men would give up their arms all fighting would be impossible. History clearly demonstrates, however, that if we do take away their arms men will then either fight with their bare fists or find new weapons with which to fight.

Reducing the quantity and quality of weapons available at any particular time thus is no sure guarantee that war will not come. And yet disarmament efforts nevertheless can contribute much to the improvement of the political situation by lessening political tensions and by helping to create some confidence in the stated purposes of the respective nations. Moreover, weapons-control efforts in our time could well determine the very nature of a future war.

For these reasons the decade ahead must see intensified efforts to achieve an international arms agreement. Our approach must be geared to the realities of the nuclear age and must include periodic reevaluations in the light of changing political and military conditions brought about by the vast growth of technical and scientific knowledge. At all times we must proceed on the premise that any disequilibrium in total military power vis-a-vis the Soviet Union might prove fatal to the free world.

The task of remaining strong enough to deter aggression while striving to reduce, stage by stage, man's ability to destroy himself is obviously one of utmost complexity.

But we have no other choice than to continue on our pathways to peace. For as President Eisenhower said in his second inaugural address:

"We know clearly what we seek and why.

"We seek peace, knowing—as all ages of man have known—that peace is the climate of freedom. And now, as in no other age, we seek it because we have been warned by the power of modern weapons that peace may be the only climate possible for human life itself."

The Impact of Inflation on America's Balance of International Payments

(By Rita E. Hauser, author and lawyer)

Few economists will disagree with the premise that continued deficit spending will, in the long run, produce an inflationary situation domestically which, in turn, yields higher prices for export as well as other goods.[1] Nor will many economists take issue with the statement that a higher price level for export goods will, in a competitive world market, greatly reduce the salability of these products. This paper is concerned with the extent to which the world market for most American export items has become more competitive in the last few years, and with the impact of higher American prices (or lesser ability to compete in world trade) on our balance of international payments and on the solidity of the dollar as the major world currency.

I. Increased world competition

The first 10 years of the post World War II era were marked by one dominant economic phenomenon: the absolute supremacy of the dollar in world trade. The formerly great mercantile competitors of the United States—Western Europe and Japan—found their economies in 1945 either in total shambles or nearly so, with production at a standstill and with capital markets destroyed. Because a healthy world trading situation was necessary not only for the well-being of America but for continued world peace, the United States early adopted an unprecedented economic policy destined to facilitate the recovery of Western Europe and Japan. The tale is so familiar that one need only cite the organizations and programs created to achieve recovery and the picture immediately comes into focus: the Marshall plan and its counterpart, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor bodies, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the point 4 program, the Development Loan Fund—these are but some of many.

These various programs were markedly successful—much to the surprise of many an American who, suddenly, in 1958 found that his dollar bought less and less abroad as the dollar gap slowly closed or that his once secure export market was lost to the West Germans, French or Japanese. Indeed, by 1958 the former needy nations were not only able to end most restrictions on dollar-area products as their stock of dollars and gold reached substantial proportions, but they also witnessed an enormous spurt of economic growth that surpassed our own. Concomitant with this growth were far-reaching measures taken to prevent the return of inflation in order to ensure continued expansion both at home and abroad. And further, rather bold measures to promote increased expansion were inaugurated in Western Europe in January 1959 with the advent of the European Common Market which, in itself, poses the most serious economic challenge American business has faced in recent years.

The European Common Market, or European Economic Community as it is formally named, grew out of various movements to achieve a politically strong, united Western Europe, or as some people have termed it "the United States of Europe"; its immediate predecessor is the European Coal and Steel Community (Schuman plan) which makes one the market in coal and steel of West Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, Holland, and Luxembourg—the member nations.

In a strict economic sense, the immediate purpose of the European Common Market is to obviate all impediments to trade among the Six by the elimination of tariffs, quotas and other restrictive practices. When this purpose is achieved, the goods produced in each member State will move freely in a market much greater in size than the territory of any member—the total area of the Six or the heartland of Western Europe. As a consequence, the goods of France, for example, will sell more cheaply in Italy because the current Italian tariff now added to the base price will be eliminated. Similarly, many more French goods will be sold in Italy because all quotas will be removed. In effect, the Six hope to create a trading area similar to that existing among our 50 States as a result of the constitutional prohibition on any State from affixing export

---

[1] This is true even if the Government exercises the utmost prudence in the management of its debt and borrows in the least inflationary manner, e.g., through the sale of Government securities with supporting revenue derived from higher taxes. Sooner or later, and the time depends on the general state of activity of the economy, the Government's continued competition with private enterprise in the money market will, by the lessening of available capital for private investment purposes, produce an upward price cycle. And needless to say, the amount of Government securities that can be issued at reasonable rates of interest is limited as is the demand for them; at some point, then, resort to the easier, but more inflationary avenue of created bank reserves will occur.

or import duties. Steps have already been taken by the Six to achieve this complete trade freedom, for in 1959 an across-the-board reduction in tariffs was effectuated as well as the conversion of all bilateral import quotas into global quotas available without discrimination as to any member. Further reductions are expected shortly.

The immediate and natural effect of the operation of the free trade provisions of the European Common Market is a discrimination against American goods entering its territory. While tariffs and quotas will be dropped on Italain or German goods, they will still remain on American goods entering the Common Market area. Indeed, the very feature of the Common Market that distinguishes it from the Free Trade Area sponsored by Britain is that a uniform tariff wall vis-a-vis the outside world must be maintained; Belgium and West Germany both were thus forced to raise the tariff on many of their goods in order to meet the higher common level set out in the Common Market Treaty. As a consequence, many American goods greet the Western European consumer with a higher price tag on it than its counterpart Common Market product. This higher price tag is due both to the initial fact that the cost of producing an item in the United States is greater than the cost incurred in producing a similar item abroad, mainly because of higher American wage levels, and to the added cost imposed in the form of a tariff when an American good enters the European market.

This natural trade discrimination hits hardest at the American manufacturing community whose goods, in general, face high duties in Western Europe (this as distinct from exports of food and raw materials which now largely enter duty free or at low duties). These same manufactured items also bear the highest costs of production among American export items, and to add further to the competitive situation, the production of these items constitutes Western Europe's economic forte.

While it is true that at present regional markets in areas less economically developed than Western Europe would not pose as stiff a competitive situation at least for manufactured goods, the tendency to group regionally into one trading unit of fairly large size is most prevalent in the more highly industrialized nations. If, for example, the free trade area comes into being, its members, although not bound to a common external tariff, will afford each other mutual benefits by virtue of a reduction, if not a total elimination, of tariffs and quotas inter se. This, again, places American goods at a natural competitive disadvantage. Moreover, it should be noted that the Common Market Treaty calls for the eventual coordination of labor, fiscal, investment and antimonopolistic policies. If and when this total economic unity comes about, presumably reinforced by uniform commercial laws, then the price of these various factors of production will decrease as their supply is more readily assured by the elimination of artificial impediments to their mobility. And with a declining cost for these factors, the competitive situation will shift even further in favor of America's trading partners. As is now becoming clear, disfavorable terms of trade will reduce America's trading competitiveness not only within the area of the regional markets but elsewhere in the free world. West Germany, for example, has now replaced America as the leading exporter of certain manufactured goods in both the Middle East and in Brazil, just as Japan is duplicating this pattern throughout Asia.

It can, then, readily be seen that the free trading world in 1960 is infinitely more competitive for American business than it was but a few short years ago—and the trend will continue. This hard, sober fact of economic life has recently been appreciated by the administration. Under Secretary of State Dillon, at a meeting this year of the OEEC, offered suggestions to expand the scope of operation of this body and to permit a limited affiliation or participation by the United States. The latter measure was intended to prevent the application of any possible discriminatory measures against American goods and to erode the natural discriminatory effects flowing from the operation of the regional markets. Dillon called for a greater reduction of current tariffs and quotas for all trading nations. In effect, the administration is working toward the promotion of greater free trade on a worldwide basis.[2]

Since world competition has so sharply developed in recent years, it is obvious that any further increase in the cost of production of American export items brought about by a general rise in the domestic price level (inflation) will add further to America's trading disadvantage.

II. THE IMPACT OF INCREASED PRICES ON AMERICA'S BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS

Because America is both a substantial importer of foreign products and an exporter of dollars through investments, tourist spending, defense and other Government expenditures, a large number of dollars flows out of the United States each year. If income from American investments abroad and foreign spending here, as well as from American exports to other nations, equaled the outflow, America's total position would be that of equality in its balance of international payments. As a matter of statistical fact, however, at no time, save for 1957, did America's balance of international payments show an equal position; to the contrary, we ran a deficit of slightly over $1 billion a year from 1950 to 1956.[3] This deficit was considered salutary because it was due, in large part, to our defense spending and economic assistance abroad and was not correlated to any adverse trading situation. This small deficit was but a way of aiding our trading partners to build up needed dollar reserves; America's payment of this deficit barely reflected itself in any gold loss since our creditors were quite contented, if not anxious, to take dollars as payment.

As of 1958, however, America's balance of international payments showed a marked increase on the deficit side. The balance of payments for that year looked as follows:

U.S. balance of international payments, 1958

[Billions of dollars]

PAYMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES	
Purchase of goods and services	16.7
Income on foreign investments in United States	.6
Unilateral transfers	2.3
Private capital outflow	2.9
Government capital outflow	1.0
Military expenditures	3.4
Total	26.9

U.S. balance of international payments, 1958—Continued

[Billions of dollars]

RECEIPTS OF THE UNITED STATES	
Sales of U.S. goods and services	20.2
Income on U.S. investments abroad	2.9
Errors and omisisons	.4
Long-term capital inflow	
	23.5
Deficit	3.4
Settlement of the deficit was made by:	
1. Transfer of gold to foreigners	2.3
2. Foreign acquisition of short-term dollar assets	1.1

Source: Committee for Economic Development, 1960.

The source of this deficit can be readily seen by glancing at the following table:

[In billions of dollars]

	Average			
	1951–53	1954–56	1958	1959[1]
Net U.S. receipts for goods and services	2.6	3.0	2.8	0.5
Net U.S. payments for grants and investments	3.8	4.2	6.2	4.6
Deficit	1.2	1.2	3.4	4.1

[1] Estimated figures.

As the table shows, while American grants and investments abroad increased in 1958, to the contrary the rest of the world did not increase its purchases of goods and services from us. Indeed, in 1959, as compared with 1951–56, it reduced its purchases from America. Thus, America continued to make greater payments to the rest of the world while its payments to us decreased—hence an increased deficit over earlier years.

In 1958, our total external deficit equaled $3.4 billion; in 1959, it grew to a record of $3.7 billion. As illustrated by the charts, America's increased deficit was due largely to a decline in American exports abroad. This decline, according to several recent studies, may be attributed to the following causes:

1. The recession of 1957–58 cut capital expenditures in Europe as well as here to a far greater extent than consumer spending. Thus, while America maintained its general level of imports from abroad, which consist primarily of consumer goods, Europe reduced its imports from the United States since capital goods make up a good share of America's exports. The recession also caused a decline in the earning power of raw material producing countries, such as the Latin American nations, which in turn caused a drop in their imports from the United States.

2. American investments abroad have generally been more directed to the purchase of foreign securities than to the direct establishment of a subsidiary company. Indirect or portfolio investment is not likely to result in an increase in American exports, whereas the establishment of an American subsidiary abroad does produce exports since a subsidiary generally "purchases" equipment and other goods from the parent and other American companies. In 1958, indirect investment in Europe alone jumped to $1.4 billion a year from the prior $400 million annual figure for 1954–56.

3. American competitiveness in certain items has fallen generally, resulting in their replacement by local products or products of other exporting nations. A recent Department of Commerce study bears this out. It showed that if in 1958 the United States' share of world markets for the export of manufactured goods had been as large as in 1954–56, America would have exported some $500 million more in 1958 than it did.

[2] The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, in its last annual report issued in April 1960 urged Western European nations to open their doors to American imports to prevent a worsening of America's negative balance of trade. Concern was reported over the constant drain of American monetary reserves which will, in turn, produce a loss of confidence and declining liquidity for the dollar.

[3] In 1957 we had a small surplus chiefly because of the Suez crisis when Western Europe turned to the United States for certain basic products, such as coal. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven, then, represents an abnormal year not at all representative of the general pattern of post-1950 trade.

Moreover, if one traces the direction of the international flow of dollars, it clearly appears that in 1958–59 a large part of the dollars received by Asian, African, and Latin American nations have not been spent or deposited in the United States; rather, the dollars appear to have moved primarily to Western Europe from which these nations are now purchasing a large amount of their imported goods and services.

In sum, then, it is clear that the recent marked increase in Americas external deficit is due primarily to a fall in exports. While a part of this drop had unusual causes engendered by the recession of 1957–58, it seems evident that even absent these circumstances the deficit would still have shown a marked rise. This is borne out by the fact that America's exports in 1959 exceeded its imports only by some $900 million, whereas in earlier years the excess was running more than $6 billion. During this same period, American imports remained at a relatively stable level, so that the narrowing of the excess is largely attributable to a decline in exports.

A continued large-size deficit reflects itself ultimately in a loss of gold for America. In 1958 alone we exported over $2 billion in gold to make up part of our deficit of that year. When America's deficit was small, the rest of the world was willing to incur dollar liabilities to fill the narrow gap since most nations were anxious to build up their dollar reserves. As the deficit increases, these nations will want to balance their dollar and gold holdings and will be inclined to take less dollars and more gold. Moreover, this shift to gold is accentuated by a growing loss of confidence in America's continued willingness to convert all dollars into gold, and indirectly into foreign currency, without restrictions and at a fixed price. As confidence fails, more foreign dollar holders convert to gold or other currencies, such as the deutschemark or the Swiss franc, which they now feel are safer, and therefore stronger currencies. Thus, were America to permit a serious increase in its external deficit, the dollar would be gravely undermined and so too the effective operation of the existing international gold exchange standard. This standard is necessary for an organized international payments system, and at present it rests primarily on the continued strength and stability of the dollar which is the world's trading currency. Should the dollar and the gold exchange standard be undermined, there undoubtedly would be grave political consequence for the free world.

If these rather drastic results are to be avoided, the United States must decrease its current international deficit, or at the least, prevent any further increase. This, of course, can be achieved in many ways, and it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the policy implications of the various alternatives. But for the sake of analysis, the author presumes that current levels of Government spending for defense and economic assistance abroad will be maintained. With this assumption in mind, it is obvious that a reduction of the deficit will come either from a diminution on the payments side (reduced imports or investments and tourist spending abroad) or by an increase on the receipts side of the Balance of International Payments (increased American exports or greater investment and tourist spending by foreigners in America). It should be noted, however, that any reduction on the payments side will have a counterpart effect, for the reduction translates itself in reduced income for other nations which, in turn, obliges these nations to diminish their purchases of American goods and their investments in American companies. The end result of this pull-in is a general reduction in world trade in which no nation benefits as each attempts, in the words of Joan Robinson, to beggar-his-neighbor. This was the situation which existed between the two World Wars, and few would wish to see the return of this period.

Efforts to reduce the deficit and thereby to avoid the erosion of the dollar, should, then, be made on the receipts side of the international ledger. This means, essentially, that America must increase its exports abroad. And only by maintaining, rather than diminishing American economic assistance to other nations, especially to the less-developed countries, will the ability to expand American exports without undue harm to our trading partners come about. Continued economic assistance, if properly used, should cause the economic expansion of the less-developed nations and lead eventually to their greater ability to both import and export—thereby bringing about higher levels of world trade.

How, then, can American exports be increased? Part of the task is, as the ad man would say, a "harder sell," that is, a more aggressive attitude on the part of American exporters who must, as the European has learned, acquire language and other skills in order to compete effectively. The President recently recognized this need to sell more, and announced a new program to stimulate exports by expanding the activities of the Commerce, Agricultural, and State Departments and by establishing oversea trade centers in order to better assist American firms selling abroad. But, fundamentally, American exports will compete well abroad only if their prices are rigorously held down. The first and major line of defense against a continued rise in America's external deficit, pregnant at it is with serious political dangers to the free world, is a domestic anti-inflationary policy. The maintenance of production costs and prices is the essential ingredient in any effective export program for American business. This, as well, is indispensable if the erosion of the dollar is to be prevented.

By a full return to our opening premise, we can now conclude that continued deficit spending, which results ultimately in an inflationary situation, will undermine the dollar as the world's major currency. This will, in turn, destroy the international gold exchange standard the maintenance of which is essential for the continuance of free trade, economic prosperity and, in the final analysis, the political integrity of the free world.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study paper No. 16: "Some Psychological Aspects of Soviet Propaganda," by Prof. Malcolm Smith:

SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOVIET PROPAGANDA

(By Malcolm Smith, office of Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, formerly on faculty of Leland Sanford University)

One must have a great deal of temerity to undertake to write about a topic of such vast dimensions within a few pages. In order to get into this topic as quickly as possible, let me state by way of preface a few postulates about the topic, which should serve to delineate the principal areas of discussion with which we are concerned.

First, we are dealing here primarily with the techniques used by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc countries to influence the minds of men throughout the free world. While important, and highly desirable, we cannot direct our attention to the use of propaganda within the territories occupied by the Soviet Union and Communist China. Our major interest is directed to the use of propaganda by the Sino-Soviet bloc throughout the free world, and the as yet uncommitted nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Secondly, the author has approached this subject with certain preconceptions about communism, and the use made of communism by the Soviet Union in particular, as a tool for the achievement of certain ends. There are, as lawyer friends are wont to say, points about which reasonable minds may differ. Thus there are several leading scholars in America whose special field of study has been the Soviet Union, who still maintain that Soviet aggression and the use of Communist parties throughout the world are merely means of insuring the Soviet homeland against aggression.

The invasion of Finland in 1940, the annexation of the Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in 1940, the partitioning of Poland in 1939, the Postwar occupation of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania—the satellites—Tannu Tuva in 1944, Sakhalin Island, and Kurile Island—are justified in terms of historic Russian interests, essentially defensive in nature. Even the bloody suppression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956, and the earlier uprising in East Germany in 1953, are rationalized by this school of thought as being defensive moves only. Let me hasten to state that the author totally rejects this particular interpretation of Soviet foreign policy. No doubt, many of those who still adhere to this convenient view of Soviet policy, do so out of honest conviction. At least I feel more secure in holding this belief about some high level Foreign Service officers and ICA officials (all on active duty) who have expressed this interpretation of Soviet actions privately.

Third, for our purposes, it may be well to restate what are probably very simplified observations about communism, generally understood, I trust, by most Americans. Nonetheless, a fairly short restatement at this juncture may be helpful. Within this third point, I will discuss in ever so summary a fashion, communism in terms of doctrine and deeds, its growth and present physical resources.

Communism is both a theory of history and a revolutionary movement, whose purpose is the overthrow and replacement of the present world economic and political structure.

This theory, originally formulated by Karl Marx (who borrowed extensively from others, notably Hegel), claims to be scientific. Because it is "scientific" it is an "infallible" guide to the future. In the words of Friedrich Engels, Marx's longtime collaborator, this theory was "destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology."

Marx was by no means the first Communist or advocate of economic change. Many reform movements appeared in Europe in the early 19th century. Some of the movements led to the establishment of the "utopian communities," in Europe and America—societies in which all property was owned communally. Other movements (some of which borrowed ideas from Marx) became modern Socialist Parties—Christian Socialists, Social Democrats, Labor Parties, and so forth.

The majority of these parties diverted from the action program of their more militant cousins, at least insofar as total overthrow of existing institutions was concerned. Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist theoreticians demand a total overthrow of the existing economic and political system everywhere. Violence, the use of terror; these are the means to achieve the end of revolution. Lenin's comment 1 n1918 following the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, that now there would be time for consolidation by terror, indeed a necessary adjunct in Lenin's view; complete control of the machinery of the state.

The relation of action to theory among Communists was begun early in the second quarter of the 19th century when a secret revolutionary group with branches in London, Paris, and Brussels met to draft a program for revolutionary action. The resulting Communist manifesto has been the basis for Communist action groups ever since. Written by Marx and Engels, the document contained two basic theories: The labor theory of value, and the economic interpretation of history. The scientific theory cannot detain us long, except as it relates to the later uses made of it.

According to the Marxian theory, the political, social, and cultural characteristics of any period in history are nothing more than a reflection of the existing economic system—the manner in which goods are produced and exchanged. Thus, what a society does depends upon who owns the property in that society, which came to mean the means of production.

History then is simply a record of endless struggle between different economic classes, with one economic class replacing another. History does support, or at least can easily be made to support this facet of the Marxian doctrine in a general way. For example, no great ingenuity is required to show that in the Middle Ages the chief source of wealth was certainly land; and it was obvious that the great land owning aristocracy was the ruling class. Nor is any great ingenuity required to show that political, social, and religious customs and ideas of that time were suited to maintaining the political and economic ascendancy of the aristocracy. Likewise, it is fairly obvious that during the last three centuries land has gradually been replaced by capital as the chief source of wealth; and the history of the time may easily be regarded as a struggle between landowners and capital owners, as a result of which the latter have replaced the former as the ruling class and have substituted, in their interest, a net set of institutions and ideas—representative government, individual liberty, popular sovereignty, free competition—for the old.

Marx of course went on to predict that the final struggle in the evolution of civilized society would be the struggle between capitalism and the new proletariat societies. While this struggle has been, and will be, a violent struggle, it will ultimately free "society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions, and class struggles."

Marx maintained that the capitalist regime would by its own nature destroy itself. Its nature is to be ruthlessly competitive, so that in any industrial society the tendency is for wealth to be more highly concentrated in the hands of a few, while the mass of the people tend to fall into the condition of wage slaves, or so runs the Marxian argument. When this process reaches a certain point, the system breaks down. Moreover, when the system ceases to work the people will necessarily take control, and since it is their interest to do so, they will establish a classless society based upon the common ownership of the means of production, and a more equitable distribution of the product. This was the social revolution Marx predicted.

Of course there was one condition central to the achievement of the ultimate utopia. In order to insure a rational transition from the "socialist" period to full blown communism there would be a temporary dictatorship of the proletariat. A one-party, closed society, would be necessary, so Marx thought, in order to effect the consolidation of the state, and to prevent counterrevolutionary activity.

Of course Marx's prediction went astray at the outset. The revolution did not come in a highly industrialized society like pre-World War I Germany—a nation that had one of the largest, most articulate Marxist Parties in the Reichstag. These same Marxists were persuaded to vote for the German naval and military appropriations increases in 1913, on the ground that they were going to have the opportunity of fulfilling an old prediction of Karl Marx—they would help to overthrow the czarist government and free the Slavs.

But the revolution occurred in Russia, that is to say, not the most highly industrialized society but the least highly industrialized society. The social revolution clearly occurred before its time in Russia. Whether providence, or dialectic materialism, or military defeat, or whatever it is that regulates such social changes, certainly performed a strange feat in bringing the revolution to this agrarian society before it brought it to more highly industrialized countries, like England, Germany or France. But the cataclysmic event of the Russian revolution doesn't do anything to verify the predictions of Marx; what it does indicate is that in a country in which the people were accustomed to being ruled by a dictatorship, a country moreover in which the prevailing form of dictatorship was especially corrupt and incompetent, it was very easy to establish a dictatorship of a different sort.

But there is a more fundamental basis for questioning Marxian doctrine than the Russian accident. One is that it is extremely difficult to predict the future of the basis of past experience; or rather it is extremely easy to find in the past support for diverse predictions of the future. The other difficulty is to understand why a persistent economic class conflict in the past justifies us in predicting a classless society in the future.

This prediction, based upon the "objective realities of the past" as the Marxists might say, takes an idealistic view of the future. During the last 2,000 years, from Jesus' tortured march to Calvary, to the present day, all the saints and sages of the world, deploring greed and strife, poverty and injustice, have looked forward to the time when a more just society would be established. They have many times predicted the coming of a classless society in which everyone would have enough; but the course of events has never yet verified their hopes. In fact, Marx's interpretation of the past, if projected into the future, seems to refute his own prediction.

For Marx's interpretation of the past is explicit and realistic; his forecast of the future is vague and idealistic—utopian. It may be a tautology and a dubious denial. Marx finds that in the past the effective force that has determined a social change is the economic class conflict.

He goes to great pains to point out that this economic class conflict explains the rise of the present capitalist societies. He shows, or at least his disciples claim to show, how this economic class conflict is working to undermine our capitalistic society. From this historic experience, it would seem to follow that there will be in the future what there was in the past—a never-ending class conflict, an endless replacement of one dominant class by another, an endless transformation of institutions and ideas in accordance with the changes effected by the class conflict. But this precisely is not what Marx predicts. What he predicts is the end of the economic class conflict, the establishment of a classless society. What happens after the revolution has established a classless society? Here we are left to our own devices. For after having developed a law of history to interpret the past and predict the future, Marx apparently abandons the law at a fixed determinate point in history. The profound conviction of Communists that the proletariat is destined to establish a classless society on the ruins of the present capitalist regime is not justified by Marxian philosophy: if you interpret Marx in terms of mechanistic determinism, this profound Communist conviction is a pure delusion; on the other hand, if you interpret Marx in terms of free will, this conviction is no more than a splendid hope.

But consider the methods the Communists have chosen as the path to a better world. Using the experience of the second Russian Revolution in 1917, the Communists claim that nothing really worthwhile can be done until conditions are ripe for the application of a revolutionary technique. And that technique, as we well know, is to seize control of the government, forcibly expropriate the bourgeois class, and ruthlessly suppress the expression of all opinion that a dictatorial government judges to be hostile to the welfare of the community. Now this is the central fact of Communist doctrine: the use of force to obtain power and ruthless repression as the means of sustaining it. The resort to force as a means of persuasion, as a means of obtaining consent, this has been the nature of the Marxist theory in practice. Marxist-Leninist doctrine calls, ultimately, for the "withering away of the state", in theory the disappearance of the vast administrative machinery and the institutional devices for controlling the people. The Communists have been willing to justify the most incredible tyranny as the necessary road to utopia. Yet the tyranny of the Soviet Union, especially during the despotic rule of Stalin (and here we have only to read Khrushchev's speech in denunciation of Stalin to the 20th Party Congress to know just how much Stalin had tyrannized over them all) not only has not withered away, but has developed a super state "the mightiest and strongest state power which ever has existed" (Stalin's words).

It is very difficult for the Western democracies, whose essential test of civilized society is the extent to which law and public authority rest on free discussion and voluntary consent, to comprehend how this massive tyranny, justified on a specious philosophy, dependent upon the "big lie," violence and terror to sustain it, can continue to challenge the West in every area of the globe.

The answer lies, I believe, in this: Communism is theory of history (however false); it is a worldwide revolutionary movement; and it is the power resources and strategy in world affairs of the Soviet Union, Red China, and their allies and satellites. And, in the fact that Soviet officials are not inhibited by the use of any method best calculated to achieve a given end. If Paul Joseph Goebbels could say: "Propaganda built the Third Reich," we can say with even greater force: "Propaganda built the present complex of Sino-Soviet power." Not propaganda alone, of course. Behind the propaganda techniques are the solid achievements of transforming their economy into a highly industrialized society in a relatively brief period of time. The transformation, however, has come only at the cost of millions of human lives, deemed expendable in the interests of a presumed better life for the survivors. Yet, even the reconstruction of

society has been dependent upon the skillful use made of every minor, as well as major success in any field, and the willingness of Soviet officialdom to exploit occupied territories until brought under total control.

In support of Soviet objectives, the U.S.S.R. has been able to profit immensely from the organization of Communist parties in 26 countries, including about 20 free countries with a membership of 6 million people of which 3½ million are in "5 mass parties (France and Italy are 2 examples among NATO countries), 2 million in the 20 or so "sturdy little parties," and half a million scattered in very small groups. Each of these organizations includes hard-core professional revolutionaries—paid agitators—trained in special schools which may be fairly elementary or very advanced institutes, technical schools and universities. Their size is no determinant of their significance and ability to take advantage of every crisis, indeed to foment the crisis first. These cadres will vary in size, depending upon the Kremlin's current foreign policy commitments. But they are always in a position to use the facilities of auxiliary organizations, either existing or created to meet a current need.

One of the most exportable items of propaganda used by these organizations to convince underdeveloped countries that history is on the Communists side is the economic growth record within the Soviet Union.

It is this record, coupled with the development of a new capability in rocketry and thermonuclear weapons that has awed the rest of the world. And if the rest of the world were not fully aware of these developments, the Soviet's affiliates overseas have made certain that every last propaganda advantage was wrung from each new development, Sputnik I being a characteristic example.

The Soviet message is simple. To the people of Africa, struggling to form new governments for their new states, to the backward countries of southeast Asia where famine, death, pestilence and disease are life's boon companions, to the have-nots in every country of the world, the Soviets offer new hope. "Look what we have done in 40 years. If we can do it so can you." And the price they ask isn't much, or so the would-be benefactors are led to believe. "Let us show how to organize your State, to produce a new abundance. Join us, and we will lead you into a new world of peace, abundance, and happiness." Communist China, which managed to drive the United Nations back in their first major aggression, is not overlooked, as part of the evidence of what a "temporary dictatorship" and reorganization of society can do.

It is the strategy of the Soviets and the Chinese Communists to concentrate first on the weak and then to encircle us, the strong, by penetrations in Asia, Africa, Latin America. A central part of this strategy is to deprive us of bases, essential raw materials, and any and all military allies in these areas, as well as in Western Europe.

Let's take a characteristic technique which serves the interest of Soviet propaganda in a very effective way: Importation of students from non-Communist bloc countries to be educated in the Soviet bloc.

Approximately 3,000 students from free world nations—mostly from the underdeveloped areas of the Near East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America—and 19,000 from bloc countries attended Soviet and East European satellite institutes of higher learning during the 1958–59 academic year. Some 15,000 of these were studying in the U.S.S.R., which despite increasing attention to student exchanges is still far behind the United States in this field. There were 46,500 foreign students in the United States in 1958–59. Czechoslovakia and East Germany each had some 2,000 foreign students resident last year. Students in Czechoslovakia are divided about equally between those from the bloc and from underdeveloped areas.

Nonbloc foreign students are recruited in three ways: Through scholarship and educational aid offers from the bloc to underdeveloped countries, through mutual exchange agreements between bloc countries and Western nations, and through scholarships offered by the bloc countries to proteges of nonbloc Communist Parties.

The bloc is gradually increasing its mutual exchange programs with Western countries, but the number of students involved is still small—little more than 100 this year. The U.S.S.R. has exchange agreements with the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, and Norway. Poland has exchange agreements with the United States, Britain, and France.

Scholarships and educational aid for proteges of Communist Parties outside the bloc are not reciprocal and in many cases are made without the consent of the student's home government.

Many of the Africans now studying in bloc schools were recruited while at school in Cairo and are "illegal." Such students, as well as a number from Latin America, are chosen initially for their sympathy toward communism and are heavily indoctrinated during their stay in the bloc.

The main type of foreign student program—unilateral offers by bloc countries of scholarships and other types of educational aid—is directed primarily toward the underdeveloped nations of the Near East, Asia, and Africa. Scholarship offers are made through the U.N. and its specialized agencies, such as the World Health Organization and UNESCO, and are also offered directly on a country-to-country basis.

The U.S.S.R., for example, has offered 15 medical scholarships to Nepal and 21 scholarships to Egypt for study in the arts. Such scholarships are for 5 to 6 years of study and cover tuition, free medical care, and free trips during vacations. They include 1 year of intensive language training and, in the case of Soviet scholarships, a year of remedial education if the student fails to meet academic standards. The U.S.S.R. also provides transportation from and to the student's homeland at the beginning and end of his schooling.

Satellite scholarships also are generous, although only a few provide transportation expenses. Soviet stipends granted to nonbloc students are at least double those of Soviet students.

The Soviet Union has also offered some 550 "accommodation" scholarships, mainly to underdeveloped areas. These are reserved places for 3 months to 5 years in higher educational institutions for students whose expenses are borne by their homelands. Few such scholarships are available in the satellites, although there is evidence that Poland may be adding some to its program.

After a full academic year of language training, the students enter their specialized courses of study, the most popular being engineering, the humanities, and agriculture. Fields of major study for exchange students are stipulated in the official agreement, as are those for "accommodation" offers. Some of the unilateral scholarships are made for specialized fields, as in the case of the 15 medical scholarships offered to Nepal. In others the decision as to the field of study may be made by the student's homeland on the basis of its needs.

Living accommodations for foreign students in the Soviet Union are equal to those of the local students.

Foreign students in the U.S.S.R. usually eat with their Soviet fellows. Where there are unusually large numbers of one nationality, a separate canteen may be established and some effort made to serve foods characteristic of the student's homeland.

Social life among the students often reflects the political atmosphere existing between their homelands.

One avowed aim of the program is to inculcate foreign students with Communist doctrine. Typical is the statement of Dr. Ludek Holubeck, chairman of the Division for Relations With Foreign Countries of the Czech Ministry of Education and Culture, who wrote in an education monthly last January that the foreign student program of the universities must support the political and educational activities of the Communist Party and state administration. "We will increase our political and ideological demands in the evaluation of every foreign operation," he said, "so that anything we organize shall by its contents and methods have a distinct socialist character."

Holubeck charged a special institute at Charles University in Prague—set up to deal with the training of foreign students—with "evaluating the methods of instruction, political work, and ways and means of influencing the culture and social life of the students in Czechoslovakia. We want foreign students to return to their countries as dedicated adherents of socialist ideas," he stated.

This training has not been universally successful in creating the desired effect on nonbloc students, for there is evidence that "socialist reality" is sometimes educational in ways Moscow never intended.

An additional problem for the bloc in sponsoring the training of students from underdeveloped areas through government-to-government programs is the instability of the national governments involved. While foreign Communist Party proteges are not affected by changes in the government at home, the 3- to 6-year programs of the government-sponsored legal students bridge potential changes in national attitudes such as have taken place in the U.A.R.

Despite these difficulties, however, there is no evidence that Moscow is sufficiently dissatisfied with results to drop its educational aid programs. There have been some successes.

Bloc offers are gaining in respectability—the son of Nepal's former foreign minister is studying in Prague at the present time—although where offers of stipends and other assistance from the bloc and from the West are equally advantageous, the West is still overwhelmingly preferred. Acceptances of Soviet scholarships in 1958, however, were double those accepted in 1957.

The Soviet Union is directing special attention to Africa. It has recently established diplomatic relations with Tunisia and offered aid and favorable trade agreements. Diplomatic representations were established in both Morocco and Libya shortly after these countries attained their independence. The Soviets have been active with the Communist Parties in these areas, especially in Libya where they have concentrated not only on Libyan Communists, but also on the Italian Communist group. And the Chinese Communists have extended official recognition and offered arms and financial aid to the provisional Algerian Government in exile.

In Ethiopia, a permanent Cultural Exhibition in Addis Ababa disseminates Communist propaganda, offers courses in Russian language, and generally seeks to indoctrinate its visitors—mainly young Ethiopians and students from East Africa. A strong indication of the active Soviet interest in Africa and the heavy selling job being done by the U.S.S.R., are the offers of "aid without strings" to this ancient land. An aid agreement of $100 million was signed between the Soviets and Emperor Haile Salassie last year, and an oil refinery and technical school staffed by Soviet representatives are planned. This month, a Soviet industrial

exhibition will be held in Addis Ababa with high Soviet officials in attendance.

In West Africa, the Soviets are planning to construct a polytechnical institute in Guinea, which will accommodate from 1500 to 2,500 Guinean students. Soviet personnel will comprise the staff. This is a very effective means for influencing long-term economic planning and planting intelligence experts to work with the local Communist Party apparatus.

We may soon expect dramatic moves in our own backyard. For years, the Soviets maintained the largest Embassy staff of any nation in their Mexican Embassy. The Mexican Communict Party has long served as an agency for exploiting the differences in wealth between the United States and Mexico. Every source of friction is kept alive by a continuous barrage of charges, lies, distortions of would-be facts, half-truths, and the theme of "you are poor because you have robbed" repeated in a fashion reminiscent of Hitler's classic charges that Germany was not defeated in World War I, but was the victim of traitors, treason, and the "stab in the back".

But in Cuba, the revolutionary fervor that led to Fidel Castro's victory over Batista, has been directed at fever pitch against the United States. The recent sugar agreement between Cuba and the U.S.S.R. was only the beginning. Khrushchev plans a state visit to Cuba, and no one can be certain what consequences will flow from this visit. In all likelihood, there will be a stepped-up program of infiltration by Soviet agents in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Central America. We may expect a more extensive, centrally coordinated drive against American control of the Panama Canal, a demand that we evacuate the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, as well as demands that we evacuate Air Force and naval installations in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These demands will be conducted by the native populations, and flames of nationalism will be fanned by the agent provocateur. The distinguished Brazilian sociologist, Gilberto Freres, in his brilliant analysis of Brazilian society a few years ago in "Casa Grande and Senzales" ("The Masters and the Slaves") suggests some of the soft spots Communist propaganda may be expected to concentrate on. The ethnic, racial, and cultural groups which comprise the Brazilian population will hear and see distorted scenes of racial discrimination in the United States. To the Amerindian Indian of Brazil, the poor, illiterate Indians of Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Colombia whose marginal existence is barely at subsistence level, this "colossus of the north" is little known, and even less understood.

But the Soviet inspired Communist propaganda comes in simple messages so all may understand through the eye and the ear.

Throughout the free world, to every level of society, to the intellectual, the working man, the white collar worker, the young and the old, the Communists broadcast the arguments for communism from within the Soviet Union, their European satellites and Communist China. Millions of words are spewed out in scores of languages, each broadcast designed to exploit local conditions to the recipient country.

Moscow is highly selective in disseminating propaganda. An infinite variety of types and roles are played by the U.S.S.R. particularly in broadcasts, for external consumption. If it is the Middle East, one propaganda play for a particular audience may be used. If it is to Western Europe, quite another line may be stressed, such as the attempt to arouse French fears of West German rearmament. Or then again, it may be broadcast only to the peoples of the Soviet Union or to the Soviet Union and the satellites.

Then there is the use of literature, particularly technical and scientific publications, which are published in every inexpensive paperback editions, easy to read and yet technically accurate. The importance of these materials to the U.S.S.R. results from the fact, that directly or indirectly, they stress the growing competence of the Soviet Union in the fields of science, engineering, technology, and the Soviet-asserted lead in explorations of outer-space.

It is difficult to compete with these publications because the Soviet Union and Red China not only can produce them at minimal cost, but cost to them is not an object of concern. They are determined to achieve a given end, and their energies can be directed toward that end without the limitations a free, democratic society must inevitably encounter.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate recently published an English translation of Mme. Suzanne Labin's paper, "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda." The author, a graduate of the Sorbonne, a journalist who has published four books, one of which, "Must We Grant Freedom to the Enemies of Freedom," won the French literary award, the Prize of Freedom for this book "which best defends the principles of liberty." Senator EASTLAND'S subcommittee has performed an invaluable service in making Mme. Labin's paper available, and especially if it can have the widest possible distribution.

Mme. Labin uses the name "auxiliaries" to identify people who serve the ends of Communist propaganda by echoing Soviet positions in international affairs. Thus, on page 5 of the committee's translation, the author has indicated some of the variant positions taken by "auxiliaries" in international politics. ("For some, the labels of 'crypto-Communist' or 'fellow traveler' are too mild, for others too strong. In this paper (Mme. Labin's), the more neutral term 'auxiliaries' will be used.")

"The assertion that Soviet propaganda uses auxiliaries as various as they are concealed makes it essential to be able to recognize them despite their concealment and their multiformity. Two traits constitute their distinctive mark: on the one hand, the auxiliary always supports all the positions supported by the Soviets in international affairs and changes them the very moment the Soviets do; on the other hand, toward the Soviet and Western regimes he adopts an attitude which systematically tends to blacken the latter and whitewash the former."

A partial catalog of these positions as prepared by Mme. Labin "with no claim to exhaustiveness" follows:

Against building Europe and especially a European army.

For withdrawal of American troops from Europe.

Against NATO and SEATO.

For the right of veto at the U.N.

For abandonment of Berlin and disengagement in Germany.

Against the Federal Germany of Bonn and the "revengemonger" Adenauer.

For recognition of the Hankow and Peiping governments.

For cessation of nuclear tests and disarmament without further control arrangements.

Against installing missile-launching platforms directed toward the U.S.S.R. in Western Europe, but not against launching platforms directed toward Europe in the U.S.S.R.

Against the "feudal and corrupt dictators" Chiang Kai-shek, Ngo Din Diem, and Syngman Rhee, but for the anti-American dictators of Latin America, Peron and Vargas.

For surrendering Quemoy and Matsu to Peiping.

Against the Franco-British action at Suez, but for the anti-Franco-British action at Baghdad.

Against Israel and for Arab nationalism, against France and for the FLN, against Britain and for the Mau-Mau, but in Moslem Kashmir for India against Pakistan.

For a summit conference at any price.

For "cultural exchanges" but without demanding that book censorship and radio jamming stop in the U.S.S.R.

For total independence of the peoples of Asia and Africa from the West, but for total dependence of Eastern European satellites on the U.S.S.R.

Against free elections under international control in Germany, but for "elections" in Vietnam under the established governments, one of which is Communist.

Against "dollar imperialism" all over the world, but for "ruble aid" to underdeveloped countries.

Against American bases in Europe and Asia, but for freedom of Soviet bases (Communist Parties) in every country.

"It is quite clear that an independent mind can very well come (rightly or wrongly) to the same conclusions as the Soviets on one or another of these points, but it is impossible to be in systematic and synchronized agreement with all the positions of the Kremlin. It is by this kind of agreement that the auxiliary can be recognized."

Most of Madame Labin's "auxiliaries" work through front organizations, some well known, some not so well known. Some of these functions on a worldwide scale, others spring into being for a short time like the "committee to save the Rosenbergs" and to achieve a limited, immediate objective.

While never having tolerated free trade unions in the Soviet Union, the U.S.S.R. has nonetheless sought through the World Federation of Trade Unions to control the trade unions of the free world. Here they have succeeded in controlling some of the largest of the trade unions, for example in France, Italy, Japan, Indonesia, and several other countries. But their claims to have 92 million members through the world are generally discounted by intelligence experts. Nonetheless, they will have many millions of members and this threat to free labor cannot be overlooked.

Another area of intensive cultivation by the Soviet Union is the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a major Communist front which has claimed a membership ranging upward from 86 million in 96 countries. We have already noted the use of scholarships, grants, and courses available within the U.S.S.R. to selected students. The WFDY, working closely with another front in this student field, is the International Union of Students, which produces 2 major publications in 11 languages, together with hundreds of pamphlets, and a weekly radio broadcast in 7 languages from Budapest.

There is the Women's International Democratic Federation to reach audiences of women throughout the world with the theme that the living conditions of women and children, particularly in underdeveloped areas, are far behind those in Russia. This organization has claimed a membership of over 200 million.

A number of other front organizations have been developed to reach and influence particular professional audiences. These include the World Federation of Teachers Unions, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Organization of Journalists, the International Medical Association for the Study of Living Conditions and Health, and the International Federation of Resistance Fighters. Add to this the phony "peace committees" in 47 countries, and one begins to have some idea of the use of organizational devices operating in behalf of Soviet objectives.

Increasingly, the Soviet Union has begun to concentrate on the trade policy as a means of disrupting the economies of largely one-crop, or one-product nations. Tin in

Malaya, cotton in Egypt, coffee in Brazil, and copper in Chile, are examples of commodities which are vulnerable to disruptive trade practices. In this respect, the Soviet Union, with much greater sophistication, is following in the footsteps of Hitler's Germany. The German tactic was to offer to buy all of a nation's principal export commodity—Rumanian wheat for example—at roughly twice the world market price. Hitler's finance minister would arrange a barter-cash deal, but payment was usually delayed. Once the wheat was in German storage bins, payment would either not be made at all, or only token payments would be made. The next year the Germans would come back to Rumania and demand all the export wheat available, at any price the Germans were willing to pay—aspirin tablets, bicycles, sewing machines—but at a rate about one-half the world market place. If the Rumanians protested that they hadn't even been paid for last year's crop, they were bluntly told that their year's crop was all still in storage, and available to be dumped on the world market at one-fourth the world price. Confronted with a Hobson's choice, the Rumanians capitulated. This is the kind of tactic which Khrushchev may have had in mind when he said "we'll bury you—in the field of trade, that is."

And a new dimension to the use of trade policy as a propaganda device has emerged with the serious bid by the Soviets to become the world's leading maritime power. There are two phases of this development: (1) Construction of a modern, powerful navy relying on submarines, cruisers, destroyers and auxiliary craft to penetrate the ocean seaways and support Soviet maritime power; (2) development of a large, modern, fast and, in the future, nuclear powered merchant marine to carry on Soviet trade in ships manned by personnel from the U.S.S.R.

The National Academy of Sciences recently prepared a special report on the U.S. merchant marine in comparison with the U.S.S.R., under the chairmanship of Admiral Radford. The substance of this report is frightening, and indicates how important an immediate change of policy with regard to our own merchant marine is, if we hope to have any merchant ships flying the U.S. flag at all in another 10 years. At the very time the Soviets are launching an aggressive, all-out drive to control the seas, our merchant shipping is declining, with 70 percent of our ships flying "flags of convenience" and manned by foreign crews. While still available for defense, it is doubtful how useful these ships would be. Our nuclear powered *Savannah* will help to offset some of the propaganda gains made by Soviet ships beginning to appear in the major parts of the world, but we will have a hard time competing after 1963 unless the recommendations of Admiral Radford's distinguished panel can be implemented beginning now.

We, with the greatest technology and productive capacity the world has ever seen, have tended to let the Communist bloc countries seize the initiative in areas of the world where we ought to be conducting an offensive for freedom unparalleled in human history. As one example, on March 8, 1955, Stewart Alsop reported in the New York Herald Tribune that the United States would launch the world's first artificial earth satellite in 2 years. His description was most accurate. Unfortunately, the Russians knew our plans and simply determined to score a propaganda victory throughout the world by launching a larger satellite first. Our immediate response was to overreact to this Russian coup. We simply did not equate a scientific development of our own with the impression it would have on other men's minds.

We must not underestimate the appeal of Soviet propaganda to the new nations in Asia and Africa. Their agents are dedicated, they think conceptually, and they never neglect their main objective; ultimate world control, by force if need be, by infiltration, subversion, and treachery if possible. It is difficult at best to explain the complicated devices of a free nation. We are not at liberty to fashion our every move in international affairs to conquer the world. We have never sought to do so. But we can perhaps develop an offensive policy to strengthen and enlarge the free world, to challenge communism everywhere—in the East, in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia. This suggests a new look at our "informational services," at our whole scheme of values in relation to the U.S.S.R. But we will not stop Communist aggression by waiting until they move, before we sluggishly respond.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 17, "Civil Defense Policies," by Dr. Donald A. Melnick, Scientific Planning Associates:

CIVIL DEFENSE POLICIES

(By Donald A. Melnick, operations analyst, Scientific Planning Associates)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Previous impressions

When I began writing this paper I had the impression that there was something lacking in the civil defense program. From the little I had known about questions of fallout and nuclear attack it seemed as if the measures that had been taken were surprisingly short of what was necessary. I had read articles which indicated that score of millions of the American people would be killed in a nuclear attack and that most of these lives could be saved with an adequate civil defense program. I had heard that fallout was a very serious problem for unprotected people but that a minimum amount of protection would save most of the people exposed to fallout who had not been killed as a result of blast and the thermal effects of nuclear weapons. I had also noted that virtually no fallout shelters were being built by either private people, industries, school systems or other branches of local and State governments, but I did not know about the complete failure of the Federal Government to do the same. Because I had received so little information through advertising media and brochures on the civil defense problem, I assumed that the Federal Government had decided that it was not a very great threat or else that nothing could be done about it.

When I decided to study this problem further, I assumed that I would quickly find out that I had misunderstood the problem. Somehow I felt that I would find out that I had miscalculated one of the aspects of the problem—possibly, that either the potential danger was much smaller than I had crudely estimated, or this danger was adequately taken care of by other measures.

However, in performing this study I soon discovered that my initial impressions were not only quite correct but that they understated the problem somewhat. Actually, there is marked agreement that our civil defense program is an important part of our total military posture; there is marked agreement that there is potential threat to the American people in case of nuclear attack in terms of scores of millions of people; there is marked agreement that quite inexpensive civil defense measures in terms of dollars per capita would potentially save a considerable number of lives; and furthermore, that in spite of the necessity for all these measures only an infinitesimal proportion of what must be done is being done.

Although the title of this paper is "Civil Defense Policies," the study is almost completely limited to the shelter and evacuation programs. Although there are other aspects to civilian defense, it is quite apparent that it is in these programs that the greatest needs lie. When the term "civil defense" is used in the text it usually refers exclusively or primarily to the shelter and evacuation programs.

2. Reasons for civil defense

There are three principal reasons for civil defense measures—i.e., evacuation and shelter measures.

1. They increase the margin of deterrence.
2. They make our diplomatic maneuvering more believable.
3. They save human lives.

It interesting to note that because of the first two reasons civil defense decreases the probability of nuclear war. It thereby saves more lives than it would in the event of war.

Deterrent Margin

There is much talk today of deterrence. There is fairly wide agreement that we owe whatever immunity from nuclear war that we presently have to the fact that in the event of nuclear attack our side will be able to destroy more of the enemy's forces than the enemy can destroy of our forces.

In the event of nuclear war a significant factor in our military strength would be the number of civilians surviving the initial attacks. Although it is probably true that the war will not be long enough for the marshaling of weapons production as in World War II, there are many other ways wherein civilian survival contributes to defense. Since there probably will not be time for a military draft, before the attack, the Armed Forces will have to be augmented from civilian and Reserve ranks after the attack. A civil population will be necessary for various functions to aid the Armed Forces, such as communications, transportation, and food preparation, not to speak of military morale. Besides, it is estimated that there would be sufficient capital remaining to provide significant maintenance functions for military equipment. This item alone is an important part of the total defense picture.

Believability of Our Diplomacy

Probably the most important contribution of civil defense is to make our worldwide diplomacy more believable. Primarily, we are able to maintain the status quo against Soviet attacks by the ultimate threat that we are willing to resort to nuclear war if necessary. This necessity could arise in any number of ways. Probably the most likely situation, however, is the Munich-type situation. This could easily happen, for example, over Berlin. The Soviet leaders could announce that they are closing down Western access to Berlin and that if any attempt were made on or part to reopen this access, they would strike with nuclear weapons against the homeland of the United States. The only thing keeping them from making such a

threat is their calculation that we would resist such an ultimatum.

Without civil defense measures, as many as 50 percent of the American population would be killed by a blast and fallout. In the latter part of this decade, close to 90 percent would be killed. It seems very likely that the Soviet leaders might miscalculate and decide that the American people would accept diplomatic defeat rather than to sustain such a high proportion of casualties.

It is quite apparent then that an appreciable reduction in the number of casualties from a nuclear attack would have the effect of reducing the chances for Soviet leaders to make such a miscalculation. As a direct result then, this reduction of casualties would decrease the chances of a nuclear war being started in this way.

Thus, by increasing our deterrent margin and our diplomatic believability, civil defense makes nuclear war less likely.

President Eisenhower was quite aware of this when he said:

"An effective civil defense is an important deterrent against attack on our country and thus helps preserve peace. In the event of an attack upon us, civil defense at once becomes one of our immediate reactions imperatively required for our Nation's survival."[1]

Saving Human Life

It is probably true that a civil defense program tends to save human lives primarily because it would decrease the probability of nuclear war. However, this program could very easily be justified on the sole basis that it would tend to save human lives in the unfortunate eventuality that a nuclear war actually did occur. Even the most optimistic admit that there is a small probability of nuclear war. Of course, some pessimists, aware of the tremendous danger of accidental war, estimate the probability of nuclear war in the next 10 years as high as 60 percent to 80 percent. Such accidents could be an irrational blunder on the part of Red China, or a technical accident such as might occur if a commander on either side went berserk and ordered the firing of a substantial number of weapons. It seems quite conservative to estimate the probability of nuclear war at 10 percent. A typical per capita investment for an adequate defense and evacuation program is $100 per person. Accepting the calculation that this may result in the saving of some 45 percent of the population who would otherwise be killed, the cost per life saved runs to only about $220. Even with the assumption of only a 10-percent risk of nuclear war, this appears to be a reasonable investment in human lives.

3. Practicability

A considerable amount of resistance to civil defense measures seems to lie in the fatalistic attitude that virtually everything and everybody would be destroyed in the case of a nuclear attack and that therefore civil defense measures are like flapping in the breeze. This is an extremely pessimistic point of view. Actually, in the case of an attack made at the present time, civilian casualties could be reduced to as little as 6 percent by the use of adequate shelter and evacuation measures. Such a small level of casualties could be achieved even in the latter part of this decade when perhaps 90 percent of the population would be killed if no civil defense measures were taken. Beside the human survivors there will be enough of other things left to make life worth living. It is estimated[2] that a sufficient quantity of capital would survive the attack so that in the first year after reorganization a per capita gross national product as high as in 1929 or 1940 is possible. There is obviously no rational justification for the fatalistic approach.

B. THE PROBLEM

A thermonuclear weapon will cause a considerable number of human casualties by the effects within the first few seconds after the blast. These casualties are caused primarily by the blast and thermal effects but partially by immediate radiation effects. While it is true that human beings are not easily damaged by the blast, the structures surrounding them are quite vulnerable. The blast effects are the same effects as are caused by any explosion; that is, a shock wave of air goes out from the explosion and it knocks down buildings, trees, and other structures in the vicinity. For example, a 1-megaton nuclear weapon will destroy brick apartment houses up to about 3 miles from the blast point. A 10-megaton weapon will destroy these buildings up to 7 miles. Obviously, most of the inhabitants of these brick apartment houses would be killed in the collapse of the structures.[3] For wood frame buildings the figures are 4 and 9 miles, respectively.[4]

The damage to persons in the open at the time of a nuclear explosion is primarily caused by the thermal effects. The nuclear blast resembles a tremendous ball of fire, literally "brighter than 1,000 suns". The clothes and the skin of a person that is not shaded from the ball of fire are burned. However; since it is expected that most people will seek shelter in the event of a nuclear explosion, this is probably not an important factor in causing death. The other effect of the blast is to set afire easily kindled material, such as curtains and trash. This in turn sets the surrounding buildings afire. These easily kindled materials are ignited as far as 9 miles from a 1-megaton burst and 25 miles from a 10-megaton burst.

There is a considerable amount of radiation which emanates from the bomb in the first few seconds, and this is quite lethal to humans. The lethal distance is only 1.5 or 2 miles for the 1-megaton and a 10-megaton burst, respectively. It will be noted that the distance for blast damage of structures is much larger than this, and therefore the damage by initial radiation is not important since it is expected that anybody who could be killed by this initial radiation would also be killed by the collapse of the structures surrounding him due to blast.

There is no question that if the enemy chooses to attack the civilian population a considerable number of deaths will be caused by these immediate effects of blast and thermal and initial radiation. However, since these reach out to 9 or possibly 25 miles from the biggest bombs that are presently available, they still affect a relatively small proportion of the country's population.

A problem of much more far-reaching importance is the so-called fallout. If a bomb is exploded close to the earth, a tremendous amount of earth is actually sucked up into the fireball and irradiated by the nuclear reaction within the burst. As a result, a considerable number of radioactive products result from the explosion. These are propelled into the atmosphere, are carried by the wind, and may later fall to the ground hundreds of miles from the point of explosion. As a result, people in areas very far from potential targets may be subjected to lethal doses of radiation from this fallout. At the end of 2 days a proportion approximating 50 percent of the land area of the United States would be covered by potentially lethal doses of fallout.[5] Therefore, the major proportion of the population would escape the immediate effects of the nuclear weapon only to die later, in the absence of a shelter, of the fallout effect.

Most of the casualties to the civilian population would occur from this fallout. Fortunately, however, fallout is by far the easiest to protect oneself against. It is quite expensive to build a shelter against blast, but if one escapes the blast effect, a rather simple shelter will go quite far toward protecting against all but the most concentrated fallout.

For the immediate future, fallout shelters are of the greatest importance. However, with the development of larger nuclear warheads and better means of delivery a large proportion of the population would be killed by the effects of blast, if no measures are taken. Therefore, in a few years blast shelters will be important.

C. THE CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Under the terms of Public Law 920 of the 81st Congress, Congress established the Federal Civil Defense Agency as an independent agency. Under the terms of this bill the responsibility for civil defense was vested primarily in the several States and their political subdivisions. The Federal Government was given the responsibility of providing coordination and guidance to the States. In considering this law the Senate Armed Services Committee declared that civil defense "is a problem of survival to be solved by the individual, the community and the State under the guidance and coordination of the Federal Government."[6]

In 1958 the FCDA was combined with the Office of Defense Mobilization to form the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

In order to strengthen the civil defense program the National Plan for Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization was promulgated by the President in 1958. In this plan the responsibilities were shifted somewhat. Whereas in Public Law 920 the responsibility for civil defense was vested primarily in the States and subdivisions, in the national plan the Federal Government was given the primary responsibility for the direction and coordination of the total national effort. The State governments still retained the responsibility for the direction and coordination within the State.

In connection with this national plan the President directed the declaration of the national policy on shelters in July 1959. This national policy on shelters contained six points. The administration would provide (1) information and education programs to acquaint the people with the fallout hazard; (2) a survey of existing structures to assemble definite information on the capabilities of these structures to provide fallout shelters; (3) a research program to show how fallout shelters may be incorporated in existing as well as new buildings; (4) the construction of prototype shelters. An important role of the administration was contained in items 5 and 6. In these, the administration declared its policy to incorporate fallout shelters in new as well as existing Federal buildings. The purpose was to provide Federal example to stimulate State, local government and private investment for fallout shelters. In this national policy on shelters it was stated: "There will be no massive federally financed shelter construction program."

In spite of the President's intention to provide Federal example under point 6 of the policy, the Congress turned down the General Services Administration's request for additional funds for incorporating fallout shelters in all existing Federal buildings. GSA requested $2 million in fiscal 1960 to

---

[1] President Eisenhower, letter to FCDA Administrator Peterson (July 17, 1956).

[2] Rand Corp., "Report on a Study of Nonmilitary Defense," Rand No. R-322-RC, July 1, 1958, p. 26.

[3] Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, June 1959, p. 22.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

[5] Ibid., Chart 4, p. 44.

[6] U.S. Cong., Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950," 81st Cong., 2d sess., S. Rept. 2683, p. 1.

provide fallout shelters in existing Federal buildings in order to set an example for both Government and industry. This request was denied by Congress in its entirety.

An insignificant number of shelters have been built by private individuals in their homes or by private parties in large buildings. A considerable amount of public apathy may be partially traced to the fact that the information and education program which is supposed to have inspired them to build fallout shelters has been nearly completely ineffective. The education program has consisted primarily of radio and television time. OCDM's budget for radio and TV for 2 years has been $871,400. Recognizing the urgency of the program, networks and local stations have donated time amounting to $57 million. Therefore, for every dollar of OCDM money, $65 worth of time was made available. In spite of this multiplication feature the public has not received enough information to make any impression, to acquaint them with the nature of the problem or its urgency, or to stir them to appreciable action.

Although the local civil defense program is not a part of the study, the writer received the impression that there is a marked lack of coordination and that local civil defense is completely spotty. The stockpiling of medical supplies and of strategic materials has gone ahead. It can be reported that the stockpiling of strategic materials has been practically completed and the stockpiling of medical supplies has made considerable progress.

D. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The achievement of an adequate civil defense program has as a prerequisite the congressional realization of the basic importance of such a program in the national defense picture. With this realization, the Federal responsibility should be increased, an adequate shelter program should be instituted, starting with a minimal shelter program, and a thoroughgoing attempt should be made to educate the public on the civil defense problem.

1. Federal responsibility

The present division of responsibility between the Federal Government on the one hand and State and local governments and private individuals on the other must be reinvestigated. Aside from the lack of congressional cooperation, the delegation of the principal burden to the State and local governments and to private individuals seems to be a major difficulty of the civil defense program. This delegation apparently arises from two factors. The first is that local government has an intrinsic role in civil defense. There are certain advantages in delegating the civil defense program to State and local governments. In the event of an attack the carrying out of the programs will have to be performed by the local authorities. Decisions will have to be made locally because the situation will vary from locality to locality. Besides, civil defense after an attack dovetails with the problem of reestablishing civil authority.

The second reason for the delegation to State and local governments, and furthermore to individuals, is historical. During the Second World War, and for that matter, in the early fifties, when the FCDA was first established, the number of civilian casualties expected in the case of attack would have been a small percentage of the entire civil population. In those times, therefore, it was partly a private or local matter as to whether steps should be taken to shelter the individual. That is, it made very little difference to a person in New York City whether a person in Dubuque protected himself against the enemy attack. This was of importance primarily to the person in Dubuque. However, in the sixties, the situation has changed very radically. The percentage of casualties which can be expected in the absence of civil defense measures is of the order of half or more of the population. As is pointed out earlier, the proportion of civil casualties expected is an important consideration in determining our total defense and diplomatic posture. Therefore, it is of grave importance now to citizens from New York as to whether his fellow citizens from Iowa are willing to take measures to protect themselves.

As pointed out in the first section, the ability of the country as a whole to survive a nuclear attack is an important factor in making a nuclear war less likely. There is no question then that this is a matter of national concern. If it were possible to delegate these powers to the individual or to the State and achieve satisfactory results, then there certainly would be no objection to the Federal Government's making the delegation. However, satisfactory results have not been obtained, and there is absolutely no reason to expect them in the future. And we should not consider that we have achieved satisfactory results until shelter has been provided for close to 100 percent of the population.

The writer has a strong tendency to feel that where possible it is a good policy to leave programs to State and local authorities, or to private initiative. However, there seems to be little justification for such a policy in this case.

Starting from a matter of principle, the national defense is traditionally a Federal concern. Any delegation then would be an exception to this principle. The wisdom of this principle is well illustrated in the infinitesimal success of the shelter program. It is not realistic to expect private citizens to evaluate the military, scientific, and geopolitical considerations necessary to decide whether to build a shelter or not. This is clearly a job for experts. As a practical matter, it seems psychologically impossible for people to take personal measures to prepare for war. In doing this they must admit to themselves in a direct way the possibility of their being subjected to the horrors of war. It is much easier for them to participate in impersonal decisions about war such as buying guns and airplanes.

In short, leaving the decision to build a shelter to a private individual makes as much sense as asking him whether to build an aircraft carrier or not. Achieving a shelter program by Federal example may seem like a good idea in a bargain-basement sense. It actually makes as much sense as trying to achieve a nationwide Nike defense system by building merely a Federal example system for Washington, D.C., or as trying to buy SAC bombers by taking up a private collection.

There must be a realization that civil defense is an intrinsic part of the total defense picture. Therefore, the Federal Government should assume the primary responsibility for the execution of the civil defense program. The OCDM should be given the authority concomitant with the responsibility. It should have the power to order its goals accomplished where necessary. For example, it should have the power to order the practice evacuation mentioned later. As part of that increased responsibility, the Federal Government must become the primary source of funds. These should be used for fully supporting or matching funds for its programs. Since it is important for the local governments, who in the event of emergency must exercise the civil defense authority, to have experience at exercising the authority, the OCDM should leave as much authority to them as possible. However, this should only be done where it does not interfere with the accomplishment of the OCDM's programs.

2. Shelter program

(a) Future Goal

The Federal Government should begin a program slated to achieve, later in this decade, an extensive system of blast shelters to house about 50 percent of the population and an adequate system of fallout shelters for the remainder of the population. It is estimated[7] that such a program could decrease the percentage of casualties from the 90 percent that would occur if no protective measures were taken to 45 percent in case of short warning. In case of several hours' warning this could be decreased somewhat more. This program is very expensive, costing perhaps $700 per person. However, a program of this magnitude is absolutely essential for the success of the entire defense program of the United States. It is inconceivable that an enemy would believe us prepared to engage in nuclear war if he knew that 90 percent of our population would be destroyed in such a conflict.

(b) Immediate Minimal Shelter

Meanwhile, a minimum-cost makeshift program of fallout shelters must be instituted. It would be possible to provide fallout shelters for virtually 100 percent of the population on a minimum basis.

For the next few years, it seems reasonable to give up two unrealistic hopes. The first is that private individuals, or local governments, will build enough shelters to protect most of the population. The second is that the Federal Government will appropriate enough money for really adequate shelters. Therefore, a low-cost, minimum shelter program ought to be started immediately that is completely federally financed. The primary idea of this minimum shelter would be to save lives, rather than to make people comfortable while they are being protected. The shelter OCDM suggests for a private family is quite lavish.[8] It provides a bed for each person and an area of 10 square feet per person, and suggested supplies for 14 days.

For a minimal shelter, these features are quite extravagant. A shelter could be built quite inexpensively by (1) putting it in the basements of buildings already in existence, such as schools and churches and other buildings; (2) by having the material ready for shielding the ceiling, but not installed; (3) by providing only enough food for 2 days and providing a rather uninteresting diet for 10 cents daily per person; (4) by being satisfied with shielding to cut down the radiation to only one one-hundredth rather than the one two-hundredths which is contemplated by OCDM; (5) by providing a very uncomfortable 5 square feet per person.

These contemplated shelters would be put in the basement of schools, churches, and other public buildings. The reason for using schools and churches is that these are well distributed in all areas of the country; no residence is very far from a school or church. Besides, at least for schools, people are very likely to know the location of the nearest one to their houses.

A normal basement with an unprotected ceiling cuts the radiation exposure to fallout to less than one-seventh of that received by an unsheltered person. A layer of 25 pounds per square foot (which amounts to a layer of 3.3 inches of earth or 2.2 inches of cement block) has the effect of cutting the radiation to one-half.[9] A layer of 100 pounds per square foot would cut the radiation even further, to one-sixteenth.

Ideally, a protective layer would be added to the ceiling during peacetime. However, in addition to the fallout protection, the school or other building would meanwhile have to be used for normal purposes. Therefore, it would have to be reinforced to take

---

[7] Rand Corp., op. cit., p. 11.

[8] Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, "The Family Fallout Shelter," MP-15 (June 1959).

[9] U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons," June 1957, p. 402.

both the shielding of, say, 100 pounds per square foot plus the normal load, which is usually rated at 100 pounds per square foot. This reinforcement would involve some expense. The proposed makeshift shelter contemplates adding the shielding after the warning, and, if necessary, even after the burst has actually taken place.

Sandbags would be stockpiled in the basement, together with inexpensive racks. Hooks would be provided in the ceiling. These would be the only things installed before the attack.

The sandbag would be hung from the ceiling on these inexpensive racks. It is probably optimal to provide two or three layers of racks. In this way, a thin layer of sandbags, say, about 25 pounds per square foot (averaging 4 inches thick), could be put in in a very short time. Then with this somewhat better protection of the first layer, a thicker layer or layers could be added later. Of course, if there are any windows in the basement, these should be covered immediately with sandbags.

Since the first floor is probably reinforced to support a load of 100 pounds per square foot, such a weight of shielding could now be added to the basement ceiling since the first floor would not be in use. This layer of sandbags would average about 16 inches thick, and would cut the radiation to one-sixteenth. The effect of the sandbags and the protection of the earth surrounding the basement should be to reduce the dosage to approximately one-hundredth of the dose which would be received by an unsheltered person. The shelters suggested by the OCDM reduce the radiation to one two-hundredths [10] of the dose received by an unsheltered person. Actually, the area of the country where a person exposed to one two-hundredths would survive and a person exposed to one one-hundredth would die, is almost negligible.[11]

A minimum amount of space would be provided for each occupant—perhaps only 5 square feet per person. This is the crowding that was accomplished in overnight shelters in Europe. This is somewhat uncomfortable and would require sleeping in shifts.

Minimal food supplies for 2 days would be supplied. One pound of flaxored sugar, plus 75 grams of an inexpensive source of protein would be provided per person per day, giving about 2,000 calories per day. This would cost only about 10 cents per person per day, but would be an adequate daily ration.

One cheap transistor radio would be provided for the entire shelter and an outside aerial would have to be installed during peacetime to pick up Conelrad stations. Since this is a minimal shelter, an insignificant amount of medical supplies would have to be furnished. It seems more important to prevent people from exposure to radiation rather than to repair the damage after it has been done. Reading material could be easily supplied in the form of old magazines.

It is necessary to provide a small amount of light. In order to cut down the necessity for replacing aging batteries during peacetime, flashlight batteries would not be provided, but a few candles and matches would be included. About 10 candles per 100 persons should be adequate.

Reading material could be supplied in the form of old magazines. In addition to the regular reading material, instructions would be provided which concern the operation of the shelter. This would include information on fallout, the theory of a shelter, rules for the government of the shelter, and finally, a shopping list to be used after the food runs out in 2 days.

After the 2 days' worth of supplies is exhausted either evacuation to a safer area will be made, or an expedition will be sent out for supplies. The evacuation will be made if there is a nearby area relatively free of fallout. If there is no evacuation, members of a supplies expedition would be chosen by lot from among the more vigorous occupants. They would, of course, be instructed to run at top speed and to have the list of supplies carefully in mind before they leave the shelter. By this time, the fallout that they would receive would be only 1 percent of the first hour intensity.

One small pick would be provided in each shelter, and a stockpile of bags. With the pick the people could chop through the basement wall and dig a tunnel in the earth with their hands. They could fill the bags with dirt. They could use these bags of dirt for filling the overhead racks if they are not already filled, and also for building vertical partitions in the basement. Vertical partitions will cut down the radiation coming obliquely through the ceiling.

It would be too expensive to provide blankets. It is expected that few people would bring sufficient clothing and blankets for comfort during the winter months. However, they could probably manage to be reasonably comfortable by using each other for warmth, if necessary.

By means of such a crude shelter, the radiation which a person would receive would be markedly less than that received by an unsheltered person. If the entire ceiling shielding had been put up before the arrival of the fallout, persons in the shelter would receive only one one-hundredths of the unshetered dose. If the ceiling shielding is not put up until after a nearby burst, the occupants would receive approximately another one one-hundredths of the cumlative dose received by an unsheltered person. The dosage received by those going outside after 2 days to procure supplies is fairly insignificant.

The writer's estimate indicates that shelter could be provided for no more than 50 cents per person. In some cases the cost would be somewhat less, because of the protection inherent in the structure of the building in which the shelter is located. For example, the basement of a heavily constructed apartment building, with concrete floors, gives so much natural protection tha it is possible to do entirely without the sandbag ceiling protection provided for other shelters.

It is apparent then that fallout shelters can be provided for the most vulnerable 80 percent of the population, for a total cost of less than $70 million. This program must be instituted at once.

3. Evacuation

Very little mention has been made in this report of evacuation, since the evacuation program, though leaving much to be desired, is considerably more successful than the shelter program. However, it is quite essential that the American people be acquainted with the evacuation procedure so that an evacuation would be more effective if it were necessary. An immediate nationwide evacuation test should be ordered. The rules should be carefully publicized in advance, and the evacuation called for a time which is not specifically announced in advance, preferably during the rush hours on a weekday. In spite of doubts to the contrary, this writer is convinced that a city like Washington could evacuate more than 200,000 people per hour if an evacuation were carefully practiced.

4. Education

The present education program is so insignificant in its scope that it is probably contributing to public apathy. Since the average citizen hears so little of civil defense needs, he probably says to himself, "The danger must not be nearly so great as some of my pessimistic friends seem to think; otherwise the Government would make some strong efforts to alert me to these dangers." The education program ought to be enlarged whether or not the Government institutes the minimal shelter program outlined above. However, if the program is not instituted the educational program ought to be increased manyfold. As mentioned before, OCDM spent less than $1 million on TV and radio time in the last 2 years, although the stations and networks contributed some $57 million of time. The writer has found from questioning many alert citizens that even this larger amount of time made virtually no impression on the public. It is time for the education program to stop being a poor relation, having virtually no funds of its own and depending primarily on handouts from the stations and networks. Sufficient funds should be appropriated for a fivefold increase in the use of the radio-TV medium. Assuming the contribution from the stations remains constant, this would require $228 million per 2 years, or $114 million per year.

In addition, short, digest-style articles should appear frequently in magazines, either as paid or unpaid advertisements, and newspaper length articles should be inserted in newspapers. Most of the booklets presently in use are too long to be read by the general public. Short, readable booklets, each on a small aspect of civil defense, must be written and sent frequently to all households.

It is time for the Federal Government to play a commanding role in this important aspect of national defense. The recommended steps, small but vital, should be taken immediately lest it be said of the American people, "For want of a nail, the battle was lost."

[10] Leo A. Hoegh, White House Conference on Fallout Protection (Jan. 25, 1960), p. 18.

[11] See, for example, hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, June 1959, p. 44, charts.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength," I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD study papers Nos. 19 and 20, "Soviet Subversive Forces," by Ralph de Toledano, author, lecturer, and syndicated columnist; and "Soviet Strategy and Free World Defense," by Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, Notre Dame:

SOVIET SUBVERSIVE FORCES

(By Ralph de Toledano, author, lecturer, and syndicated columnist)

If the missile age seems to have eliminated the problem of Communist subversion, pear like horse-and-buggy concepts of civil democracies of Asia and Africa—and a closer look at the United States—will demonstrate the fallacy of this belief. All the revolutionary technology of the nuclear era has not made obsolescent what to some may appear like horse and buggy concepts of civil war and civil disturbance. The recent riots in Japan, financed and directed by trained Soviet operatives, are proof enough that the Soviet Union and Peiping still make full use of them.

The awesome destructiveness of present-day arsenals have, in fact, made Communist subversion one of the main weapons of the Soviet system. Our armies and navies, our air forces—these are vitally necessary in the elaborate process of stalemate which has become the function of Western and Soviet armed might. The use of deterrent power, as a means of holding within bounds the adventurism of Premiers Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, must be a basic element in the strategy of the West. But this Nation is lost if it does not understand, assimilate, and on occasion employ the methodology of applied subversion.

Americans do not understand this methodology—and in fact they resent those who devote their attention to the problem. During the U–2 episode, there were many who felt it somehow beneath America's dignity to take necessary countermeasures when faced by a closed society with a vast espionage and subversive network at its disposal. When the State Department, employing its usual understatement, noted that there were 30,000 trained Soviet agents at loose in the world, incredulity blossomed on some faces. (In fact, there are some 5,000 professional Communist agents in the United States alone.)

But to anyone whose reading of history extends beyond elementary school texts, Civil War and subversion as we know them have been endemic since the overthrow of England's Charles I. Communist revolutionists did not invent the techniques so successful today. Cromwell's seizure of power and the French Revolution, by their controlled interaction of troops and mobs, were brothers under the slogans of Lenin's seizure of the Constituent Assembly. The 18th and 19th centuries were marked by a series of internal upheavals linked by a worldwide Weltanschauung which in 1919 concretized itself in the Communist International. Today, civil war is all about us in a thousand manifestations of subversion and conspiracy, of stupid aquiescence and cynical resignation. It is the toy of millionaires and the self-abuse of intellectuals.

The H-bomb and the ICBM are, in the active sense, significant and commanding only insofar as they are not used. The arsenal of nuclear weapons serves a phychological rather than a military function. For the Soviets, it is designed to destroy the will to resist in the free world, to make American power put its head on the block and ask for a coup de grace which the Soviets cannot deliver.

Nuclear weapons serve to stir the Gargantuan mind and picayune understanding of a Bertrand Russell, who urges us to disarm unilaterally and to accept Communist domination rather than what he chooses to call the end of the human race—and millions of people throughout the world, of lesser comprehension, follow him. They encourage the outbursts of a Cyrus Eaton who rattles his dollars and rushes to Paris to kiss Premier Khrushchev's ring. Otherwise sane individuals support the insanity of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy—and at every turn joggle the arm of our Government as it attempts to face Soviet propaganda on equal terms.

This is the basic fact: Communist strategists know what we do not: that the secret weapon of any state when confronted by internal subversion and disturbance is the will to resist.

It is a prime axiom that no revolution in modern history has succeeded without a concomitant destruction of the will to resist in legitimate government. There is much talk of belly-communism—as if hunger were the only source of revolutionary discontent—which derives from a complete falsification of history and facts. The semi-anarchy in Tokyo has little relationship to economic motives, and it has persisted because the government in office refused to take stern measures against it. The French Revolution, going back to history, is another excellent example.

Generations of school children, since the days of William Wordsworth, have held the passionate belief that hunger and oppression led the mobs which guillotined Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. But the meticulous and inspired reporting of Alexis de Tocqueville (in "La Révolution et l'Ancien Régime"), ignored by the popularizers, shows conclusively that (1) the power of the monarchy was undermined first by the nobles and a rising middle class, and (2) that France was going through a period of great prosperity when sansculottism swept in, and the Bastille (presumably crowded with political prisoners) was literally empty and had been for some time when its walls were "stormed." These points, incidentally, are supported by the eyewitness accounts of Arthur Young and the British historian Lecky.

We forget that Lenin himself described the Kerensky regime which preceded his as the "freest government in the world"—whereas desperate heroism, hunger, ideological fervor, and the desire for freedom could not prevail in Hungary as long as the government's will resisted. The successful revolutionary assault, therefore, is not on the government but on the national will. Fidel Castro won few, if any battles, but he triumphed when the Batista dictatorship lost its nerve.

The immediate function of any Communist Party, therefore, is not in the violent overthrow of the government—in the limited legal sense demanded by the Supreme Court—but in the sapping of allegiances, the dissemination of confusion, the instillment of fear, the poisoning of faith in our institutions, in ourselves, in our God. Its aim is to halt the civil peristalsis. The Communist Party is a paramilitary force, true, but its ammunition is far subtler than bullets and hand grenades.

With this in mind, it becomes important to consider first the nature of the Communist who makes up this paramilitary force. For the sake of precision, let me refer to him as the Bolshevik. The Bolshevik is not a "liberal in a hurry." He is a Marxist only to this extent—that he accepts a general theory of the organization of the state. "Scientific socialism," the totality of a regimented world structure, certain outward patterns and certain semantic stridencies—all these he has incorporated into his thinking.

But the ancestors of Bolshevism are not Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They are two men, one hardly known to the West, Bakunin and Nechaev—two faces merged into the Janus like configuration of Leninism and Stalinism. There is no facet of the Communist world revolution which does not reflect the baleful light of these two Messianic Russians—one self-deluded, the other so obsessively evil that he served as a model for Dostoevski's "The Possessed." The Bolshevik practioners, piling faggots on the world's trouble spots, may think that they were suckled on the Communist Manifesto, but they drew their milk from a forgotten little pamphlet, 2,500 words in all. It is called "Catechism of a Revolutionist"; it was written by Bakunin and Nechaev; this is how it begins:

"The revolutionist is a doomed man. He has no personal interests, no affairs, sentiments, attachments, property, not even a name of his own. Everything in him is absorbed by one exclusive interest, one thought, one passion—the revolution."

The Byronic concept of the revolutionist—or its more intellectualized counterpart in a man like André Malraux—is cast aside. So too is the doctrinaire conformity of the orthodox Marxist. Morals, the accoutrements of culture, the softening decencies of everyday association no longer exist. The revolutionist of the Bakunin-Nechaev school—and therefore the Leninist school—makes a pact with the revolution which prepares him for torture or death (or, far more bitter, ridicule). His enemy is established society, a society he categorizes neatly. Some members of the world as we know it are to be condemned to death and ruthlessly liquidated. Those of the ruling class who contribute to the revolutionary spirit by their acts of brutality are to be encouraged and preserved—which may account for the recent secret rapprochement between General Trujillo and Fidel Castro. They will goad the "inert mass" into unreasoning violence. And, the "Catechism" adds:

"One may conspire with the liberals in accordance with their programs, making believe that one follows them blindly, and at the same time one should take hold of them, get possession of all their secrets, compromise them to the utmost * * * use them as instruments for stirring up disturbances in the state."

The Bakuninist-Nechaevist has a basic contempt for the "doctrinaires" who spend their time "talking idly in groups and on paper." The contempt we have seen in the utterances of Joseph Stalin—and latterly in those Nikita Khrushchev—which utterly disregard the Marxist dialectic. Catechism of the Revolutionist argues that these "Talmudic" debaters of revolution—the anti-Semitism was not unintentional—are to be tugged into the area of force and violence which will destroy most of them but serve as "real revolutionary training" for a hard core which will break loose and join the true faith. Agents in what Harold Laski called the "organization of catastrophe" and makers of despair, these revolutionists are urged to seek out the "bold world of bandits" and to combine with it. Have we forgotten that Stalin, the master technician of subversion, robbed banks?

Here then is the iron law which binds the Bolshevik, reiterated many decades later by J. Peters in his "Manual of Organization," a Communist vade mecum, summed up poetically by Bertold Brecht in that chillingly luminous line, "Sink into the mud, embrace the butcher, but change the world," and chanted in tender ditty by German Communists as the Weimar Republic sank into its own morasses: "Grease the guillotine with the fat of tyrants, blood, blood, blood must flow."

If we are to understand what faces the free world, we must first come to grips with this Leninist concept of the revolutionary. Not every conspirator or subversive is cut from the same heroic pattern or shares the same determination. There are time servers and bureaucrats in plenty, all helping to make up the corpus of international communism. There are weak men and scoundrels and men of soul who defect to freedom. But the weak and the dishonest do not command the paramilitary forces of communism—they are merely a part of them. If military victory were a simple function of unanimous courage, what wars would be won?

We once thought of the Communist as an unkempt type futilely debating in a Union Square cafeteria. It would be an equally serious mistake to accept the stereotype of the steely eye and the commissar manner. Alger Hiss was, and is, one of the prototypes of the Bolshevik. Yet on the surface and in ordinary discourse, he was a man of somewhat mincing step and manner and, behind the charm, a crashing bore. Richard Sorge, perhaps the most effective espionage agent turned out by the Red Army's Fourth Bureau, was hard drinking and hard lusting, yet he plundered the secrets of the very Nazis and Japanese whose whiskey he drank and whose wives he seduced. The leaders of the American Communist Party seem

flabby, even a little fey—yet the incidence of combat decorations among them is startlingly high.

It is from this diversity that communism fills its table of organization. Each comrade has his rank and his assigned role. Each comrade delivers himself to a military discipline. Thousands of intellectuals, to the lecture platform born, in 1948 accepted party orders to join the campaign of industrial concentration, a process of colonization and infiltration of the Nation's key plants and factories.

"Plant you now, dig you later," the Communist Party said. One man held in reserve until the calibrated moment can do more damage than a dozen rioting mobs, just as a single sniper can immobilize a company of troops.

A strategic minority can achieve much with little—on somewhat the same principle. Neither theory is original with the Communists, nor is it exclusively theirs. Walter Reuther, with less than a hundred men, employed the theory of the strategic minority in the 1930's. With this fulcrum he broke management resistance to the UAW and launched a powerful mass union.

Size, therefore, is secondary in Communist organization. When the revolutionary situation comes about, sergeants become colonels as new recruits are trained by the Bolshevik cadres. For those who find the size of today's Communist Party a cause for encouragement, let it be recalled that Lenin disapproved of mass membership in the precombat stages, and that he developed the technique of the continuing purge to keep the party vigorous. Organization must fit the situation, and in the CPUSA that organization is triangular.

There are, then, three Communist Parties in this country, directed by parallel chains of command from Moscow, the Soviet Embassy, and a highly mobile field headquarters. These three parties are: The so-called open party, the underground party, and the reserve or sleeper apparatus. (I have not listed any of the dozen apparatuses, working in tandam, which carry out the Soviet Union's espionage missions. These fall into the category of military intelligence and are directed by the Red army, the secret police, the Comintern, or the torture brigades known as Smersh.)

Of these three parties, the "open party" is the least important. It is made up of the expendables, the old hacks, the swing men of the front groups, the shouters and debaters. It has a double mission: To draw fire and to bring in the recruits. Its membership is estimated at 7,000 to 10,000.

The underground party is organized on Bakuninist lines, concretized by one B. Vassiliev in 1931, under the title "Organizational Problems in Underground Revolutionary Work." This Communist outline runs to five pages. It merits serious study. Vassiliev directed:

"In proportion as the legal apparatus of the party is liquidated, the directing functions will inevitably require a regrouping of party forces and the reorganization of the party apparatus. This reconstruction of the work will pass more and more to the illegal apparatus."

This has been going on, carefully and methodically, since the inception of the cold war. The underground party has been split up into several thousand fragments, the base being a cell of no more than 10, but usually five, members. Maximum security is maintained in liaison between cell, section, district, and national leaders. There is frequent use of couriers—telephones are banned—with the timehonored use of "cutouts" to evade discovery. The party's financial structure has been overhauled to make the millions of dollars previously invested in legitimate enterprises more easily available. Caches of money—one of about half-a-million dollars—are kept.

Each member of the underground party operates like a soldier behind enemy lines. The more important comrades are provided with a false identity, false social security cards, and a false driver's license. For the top echelons, party doctors are available to change the color of hair, shape of eyebrows, size of nose. In Vassiliev's detailed instructions, it was mandatory "(a) to find a building for storing party archives; (b) to organize an illegal printing plant in which it would be possible to print the party organ in case of suppression and closing of the legal party papers and journals; (c) to form an apparatus for distributing illegal party literature; (d) to prepare a definite group of leading party activists to pass into illegality; (e) to prepare addresses and houses for illegal correspondence, for secret sessions of the leading party organs and also for housing the illegal party activists and for conferences between them and the workers who continue to be on a legal footing; (f) to prepare a minimum number of workers who understand the elementary rules of the technique of underground work."

Every one of these organizational plans is now operational. Combat veterans in the party have been organized into hard-hitting flying squads for use in riot work. Beyond this, the Communists have set up a Red equivalent of the underground railroads which existed prior to the War Between the States. The policy of "industrial concentration" has put more than 75 percent of the underground party's mobile effectives into plants and factories where they can mold trade-union policy now and sabotage by slowdowns and flash strikes in times of international crisis. Today, they have successfully infiltrated the largest local in the United Auto Workers union, and have begun the slow recapture of other unions. Less muscular troops have been carefully planted in everything from Parent-Teacher organizations to the grassroots echelons of legitimate political parties—and this includes the Republican Party. For the first time in a decade, spheres of influence have been reestablished in the Congress of the United States.

The third grouping of Communists is the most dangerous and the most potent. I refer to the "reserve" or "sleeper" apparatus. It is made up of people who have never joined a Communist front or identified themselves with a secret party cell. Record of the membership is kept in Moscow, and an approach to one of them may not be made for months or years. The member of the reserve remains on tap for one great assignment which exposes him, or for the small, subtle undermining of the will to resist of the nation.

There is another function of the sleeper apparatus, effective but beyond the reach of counter-intelligence. It operated silently during the Hiss case when—from the bars of Wall Street clubs to the comfortable reaches of Park Avenue—its poison dripped down every day and in every way, never defending treason but always besmirching those who exposed it. Editors and editorial writers on great newspapers, commentators, artists, and entertainers—those responsible for the propaganda fallout which deforms the minds and thoughts of people in these terrible times—are included in the sleeper—part of the three-way drive to destroy America.

This is the paramilitary organism which threatens us. Seizure of power is its ultimate goal, but not by any frontal attack. The civil war to which it is directed has been going on for years; and, despite our smug complacencies, its victories have been considerable and steady. Let me enumerate:

1. In the past 4 years, anti-Communists in this country have been systematically discredited and destroyed. With wise looks and smart sayings, those with specialized knowledge have been driven out of the marketplace of ideas. By innuendo, they find themselves deprived of standing in the intellectual community. They are accused of being hysterical, of seeing Communists under beds, of having lost a sense of proportion. And in time, they are elbowed out of the scholarly projects, the entertainment field, the bookstores. Foundations, which control so much of the Nation's intellectual life, shun them.

This is not accident. It is all planned—the work of the sleeper, but never sleeping, apparatus—and in most cases those who carry out the plan do not know that they are being manipulated.

2. Communists and pro-Communists who were painstakingly forced out of positions of influence in the mass media and the field of communications are returning. They are back on the networks, in Hollywood, in the publishing houses. They are strong enough to keep the paperbook field relatively clean of anti-Communist material. They are back in the teaching profession. Even convicted traitors—like Alger Hiss—are now being renovated by such publications as the Saturday Review.

3. At every point of vulnerability, campaigns are being mounted and are meeting with increasing success: Stop nuclear testing, with or without adequate safeguards; recognize Red China, however it may open the way for Communist domination of the critically important oversea Chinese. Lower barriers on trade with Iron Curtain countries, even if it means stengthening their war potential. Curb the FBI, whatever the cost to internal security. Abolish congressional investigation of subversion. Rip away all forms of Government secrecy, legitimate or not, in the name of press freedom. And most of all, let's not be beastly to the Russians; turn the other cheek.

4. Coincident with these campaigns, voices urge the superiority of the Soviet system—its science, its education, its armaments, even its creaking productive capacity. At every hand so-called experts loudly deplore presumed American inadequacies—till the average citizen believes that this Nation is hopelessly weak and unable to withstand the Communist onslaught. In this context, Bertrand Russell's plea that we surrender begins to make sense.

This is not to imply that every man who raises his voice in behalf of these causes is broadcasting on a Moscow wavelength. No one asks for a nation of tub thumpers. But the fact remains that the agitation over issues which should find unanimity—at least in principle—among the American people lends credence to those who say we cannot stand up to the Soviet subversive and psychological war.

Irresponsible and purely partisan attacks on the President and on the American posture are as much a manifestation of the civil war as the drilling squads of underground party activists. Those squads exist, trained in the use of baseball bats, pickets, sticks, hatpins, and the rest of the close-order drill of riot duty. But they are used seldom—Tokyo is one example, the Peekskill riots over Paul Robeson another. When the order comes to put them into the field, the will to resist has been crushed, the true battle is over, and they become the end phase of a long struggle. The Bastille is already empty.

Civil war and the violent seizure of power are easy to understand. The will to resist is intangible. Once destroyed it may never be recreated. Not all the nuclear weapons, not all the brilliant strategic plans, not all the genius of production and logistics can prevail—once that will is gone.

This is what the Communists understand.

This is what they mean by civil war, by internal subversion.

Karl Marx once wrote: "Neither a nation nor a woman can be forgiven for the unguarded hour in which a chance comer has seized the opportunity for an act of rape." Can there be less forgiveness for those who watch the rapist at work?

Soviet Strategy and Free World Defense

(By Gerhart Niemeyer, University of Notre Dame)

BASIC COMMUNIST ASSUMPTIONS

It is often said that the Communist objective is world conquest. This is true, but in a more fundamental sense than is usually implied. Communists are not people who simply decided one day to conquer the world, and presumably could just as easily drop this objective if it does not attract them any longer. What is called the basic Communist objective is part and parcel of the entire world view in which the Communists see man, society, and history.

Communists believe that the world, as a result of inescapable social and historical laws, is embroiled in an all-pervading and irreconcilable struggle between two hostile "camps": one consisting of the forces of the future age of socialism, the other of the forces of the present age of capitalism. This struggle, rooted in the hostility between social classes, will go on for a protracted period of unknown duration, but will surely end with the total victory of the forces of the future over those of the present. Of those forces the Communists pretend to be the leaders, and the Soviet Union the foremost instrument of power.

Communists therefore assume that in view of this allpervading struggle, men are not now united by anything like common truth, common morality, or common good. Society is essentially a battlefield, the only laws being those of the class struggle. Thus, for Communists, struggle is a condition into which they were born and which they expect to continue for an indefinite time to come. Only a total victory of the Communist forces—a victory of which they do not have the slightest doubt—can put an end to this struggle. As a result of a Communist total victory, mankind supposedly would be redeemed from all the ancient curses of human existence, particularly war, oppressive power, and want. Communists believe that their victory is assured by the laws of history, and that it is the only hope for mankind.

The so-called objective of world conquest is therefore not simply a chosen goal of communism, but the logic of the entire world situation as seen by dialectical materialism. Before Communists could abandon that goal, they would have to give up their world view, a process which is rarely a success in an individual person and well-nigh impossible in a society in which that world view is authoritatively maintained.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Communists, assuming themselves to be engaged in a life-long struggle with a definite and holepful end in view, think above all in terms of strategy. The most fundamental assumption of Communist strategy is that the party is carrying on a power struggle from a position of weakness. The forces of the present age—that is, the forces contending for capitalist society—are supposedly far stronger than those of the future, Socialist, age. This is true even when and where Communists have seized the power of government. Communist strategy has from the beginning focused on the problem of how to destroy the power of a vastly stronger class enemy.

The main principles of this strategy were first conceived by Lenin, further articulated by Stalin, and later expressed in the most consistent form by Mao Tse Tung. Starting from the concept of a small, compact, tightly disciplined party which always would be in the minority, it operates along three lines: (a) The power momentum of large masses led and manipulated by the Communist Party; (b) the dissolution of the bonds of public order among the Communists' enemies; and (c) the multiplier effect of organizational key positions.

Unlike the strategic concepts developed by Blanqui and Tkachev, Lenin always insisted that Communists could not succeeed unless they managed to move and control large masses. They count on being able to mobilize a considerable part of the masses under Communist leadership, although under non-Communist slogans and appeals (e.g., land for the peasants, nationalism, democracy). Other masses they seek to neutralize, that is, to move to indifference with respect to the struggle, thus denying their support to the enemy. These principles are formulated in the concept of "alliances" and "neutralization" which first emerge in Lenin's "Two Tactics."

The Communist concept of "revolutionary situation" focuses on the kind of general crisis which would loosen the bonds of allegiance, loyalty, and order to such an extent that a minority can prevail against an enemy of otherwise superior strength. "Only when the 'lower classes' do not want the old and when the 'upper classes' cannot continue in the old way, then only can revolution conquer" (Lenin, "Left-Wing Communism"). In other words, troops, police, public institutions, laws, and funds are all of no avail when two things coincide: Panicky ineptness on the part of the rules, and lack of confidence and discipline on the part of the masses. A power structure is never stronger than the immaterial bonds holding it together. When the will to rule is gone and the will to obey weakened, power disintegrates.

The multiplier effect of organizational key positions is envisaged in the concept of "transmission belts," organizations existing for ordinary, everyday needs and ends in which relatively small cadres of Communists could wield power over vast parts of society. Without changing the raison d'être of these organizations and their appeal to the membership, the Communists in key positions would use these structures to further the strategic interests of the party.

THE USE OF FORCE

Communists believe that the class struggle can neither be fought nor won except by force. In keeping with their basic assumption that theirs is a position of weakness, however, they have used force sparingly, though systematically. Above all, force is never used apart from political persuasion and organization. A direct frontal attack on enemy positions by force is not in the Communist concept, which is based on the axiom of the adverse ratio of power. The strategy is one of loosening, undermining, infiltrating the enemy's power structure, and force is only one among several factors brought to bear on the loyalties of men to their present society and their present leaders. As Mao Tse Tung put it: "War cannot for a single moment be separated from politics. Any attitude * * * to belittle politics, to isolate war from politics, and to become advocates of 'war is everything,' is erroneous and must be corrected. * * * A gigantic national revolutionary war as ours cannot succeed without universal and thoroughgoing political mobilization" ("The Protracted War").

This principle has clearly guided Soviet practice. The Soviets have seldom sought a direct decision mainly by force. In most cases, they have employed force for its terror (threat) effect. Especially against other nations, the Soviets have preferred to use pressure for which military force provided merely the background. While brandishing a sword, they have nevertheless played on their victims' fears, reason, and moral convictions, and have obtained something like "voluntary" surrender based on such motives as resignation to the inevitable, assent to the values invoked by Communists, and fear of dire consequences.

It should also be remembered that Communist leaders acquire certain habits in the long school of internecine party struggles through which they have to pass before they get to the top. In these struggles, force is invariably used only to cap a victory already won by political means. First the opponent is maneuvered onto the wrong side of a political controversy while the ideological ground is prepared on which he can be made to stumble. By a series of maneuvers, the impression of an irresistible momentum is created, which causes the weight of numbers to shift against him. An open debate is used to force him into an admission of his error. Then, only then, does force enter into the picture. These tactics have only superficially changed since Stalin's death.

One must assume that the habits of these methods condition Communist leaders also in cold war operations, although in international relations, the disposal of an army-in-being introduces an instrument of force which is not available in party conflicts. Khrushchev's performance just before and after the abortive summit conference seemed to be an almost direct application of tactical principles learned in fighting party rivals. He prepared the ideological ground, he thought he had Eisenhower on the wrong side of a controversy, and his only miscalculation was to assume that the world would or could be united in indignation against American aggressiveness.

In general, it would stand to reason that the Soviets would incline not to commit their armed strength to expenditure in a head-on clash, but rather to use it as if it were a bank reserve. In other words, armed power would for them be more useful as an untouchable reserve enabling them to handle vastly more capital of political power than bayonets would yield if engaged directly.

THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

The aim of Soviet strategy has been conceptually formulated by Stalin through the term "overwhelmingly superior strength." This concept should be taken quite literally. It connotes an edge in military, political, and social power which has overwhelming effects on those on whom it is brought to bear. Once "overwhelmingly superior strength" is attained by the Soviet, they would expect to be able to talk other countries into submission, one by one. Their methods in the case of the Baltic Republics are quite instructive as to how they would expect to accomplish this. Stalin also described the strategic objective in terms of converting the present "capitalist encirclement" into "socialist encirclement," which amounts to the same thing as "overwhelmingly superior strength." Since Stalin's death, Khrushchev seems to have come to the conclusion that the "socialist camp" is no longer "encircled," but is not yet strong enough to "encircle" the capitalist world.

CHANGE IN STRATEGY

From 1943 to 1953, the Soviets used a strategy of territorial expansion, pushing into areas which were indifferently held by the West. In response to this strategy, a tremendous strengthening of the Western Powers of resistance occurred. The West rearmed rapidly and effectively and established a series of alliance which led to the deployment of Armed Forces around the periphery of the Soviet orbit. The armed and organized strength of the Western Powers now constitutes the single most effective obstacle to Soviet policy. It is so formidable a power structure that the Soviets, in keeping with their strategic doctrine are not likely to contemplate a direct attack on it.

Since 1953, they have therefore concentrated on methods of indirect attack against the Western Power position. These methods follow, by and large, the pattern of the strategy they have used in most situations: The mobilization of large masses, simultaneously with the neutralization of other masses; attempts to deprive the ruling elements in the West of both will and capacity to govern, and the ruled elements of the will to abide by established leadership; endeavors to occupy organizational key positions.

The appeal to masses of people has been made chiefly under the slogans of peace and disarmament, which proved quite siutable for this operation in the Russian revolution in 1917. National independence and economic development are other mass appeals. The fear of atomic destruction has been the main device by which the Soviets have sought, with considerable success, to promote neutralism, that is, to move both masses of people and national governments to indifference in the struggle.

The will and capacity of the governing elements of the West has been attacked mostly through civil wars, as, e.g., in Greece, Iran, China, the Philippines, Malaya, Vietnam, Algeria, etc. It would stand to reason that the recent riots in Korea, Turkey, and Japan are another phase of the same pattern. Another form of attack against the capacity to rule is the fomentation of international tensions and quarrels in which the Western will-to-power is challenged, as, e.g., in the Near East and Latin America. Each of these attacks aims, in a different sense, at the wills of both ruling and ruled elements, with the objective of producing a process of disintegration resembling what the Communists call a "revolutionary situation."

The occupation of key positions has been the least successful part of Soviet strategy. The Soviet plan for the reunification of Germany by means of a commission composed of East and West German Government representatives is obviously designed to deliver key positions in a unified Germany into Communist hands. So have been their attempts to obtain recognition for Communist China and Communist Germany. Communist infiltration in front organizations as well as governments is, of course, an old method.

THE INDIRECT ATTACK ON WESTERN MILITARY STRENGTH

The armed might of the free world is not any more of an obstacle for the Soviets than was the czarist army in 1917. Insofar as it is strength in being, to be potentially used, it commands utter respect, a respect which no Communist is ever likely to set aside. But Communist strategy is designed to prevent the use of existing armed strength, and, by political means, to disintegrate its very existence.

The indirect attack on Western armed strength would be successful if the Soviet Union could get the key nations in the Western alliance system into one of several moods that would deprive them of the will to contemplate the use of their arms. While these moods would, naturally, vary with the circumstances, they might resemble the following:

(a) The concrete issue at hand is not worth fighting over.

(See France, 1940: "Why fight for Danzig?")

(b) In an atomic age, the use of armed force is immoral.

(c) The enemy is too strong, we cannot win.

(d) Fighting is useless, even if we win, the enemy will prevail in the long run.

(e) We dare not fight, because we have not the right to impose our society on others.

(f) The other side represents the up-and-coming force in history while we, historically speaking, are have-beens.

Once any one, or a combination of such moods would prevail in the governing circles of the key nations, the Soviets could turn to the task of detaching one or several of the minor allies. They would seek to promote any one of the following impressions:

(a) In a showdown, the United States will not come to your help, except when it is too late.

(b) The Western alliance system has already begun to dissolve, sauve qui peut.

(c) Allies are subject to atomic extinction, while neutral nations will be safe in case of war.

If such moods should result in the breaking away of a number of minor allies, the resulting effect of growing isolation could again be used to promote deepening gloom in the key nations and thus to paralyze their will to consider their own armaments as something of potential use.

Another method of indirect attack on free world armed strength is to create the impression that the entire conflict is over, in one way or another. With the cause removed, the possession of masses of armaments in an age of atomic weapons is then likely to be considered a liability rather than an asset. Disarmament would become the preferred policy and might be so eagerly sought that unilateral disarmament and disengagement might appear to some governments the supreme counsel of wisdom.

The impression that the conflict is over could be promoted in one of several ways:

(a) The free world might possibly be persuaded that the changing balance of power has at one moment definitely tipped in favor of the Soviet camp. Such an impression could be promoted by means of spectacular feats of military weaponry, as well as by economic statistics coupled with displays of alleged productive power.

(b) The free world might be convinced that the overwhelming majority of the world's population has definitely embraced the Soviet order, so that the complete communization of the world is only a matter of time.

(c) The impression that the conflict is over could also be created if the United States (or one or several of the other key nations in the free world) should, by establishing an understanding of friendship and agreement with the Kremlin, signify to the world that the days of resistance to the Soviets are past.

IDEOLOGICAL LEVERS

In all these strategies, the Soviets make use of a number of ideological levers with which they hope to pry loose the power structure of the free world. These levers can best be identified in terms of the concepts to which they are attached:

(a) Peaceful coexistence, as formulated by Khrushchev at the XX Party Congress. This includes the ostentatious abandonment of the inevitability of war concept, the doctrine of peaceful competition, the prospect of the peaceful victory of socialism.

(b) Imperialism, or the wickedness of the power of the West. The rule of the West represents supposedly exploitation, greed, selfishness, oppression, and war.

(c) Socialism as the wave of the future. The momentum of history moves against the Western World and favors both socialism and the colonial peoples.

(d) The greater efficiency of the Socialist system. Soviet Russia allegedly has made greater achievements than any capitalist country, as attested by its supposedly higher rate of economic growth and more advanced military weapons.

(e) Disarmament, as the key to enduring peace. Permanent peace between nations is possible and depends only on a universal disarmament pact.

STRATEGIC FOREIGN POLICIES

In order to be able to influence and manipulate world events with the help of these ideological levers, the Soviet Union seeks to create, through its foreign policies, repeated situations which favor the application of ideological leverage. The method can best be characterized as push-and-pull, a violent rocking movement from peace to war, tension to relaxation, accusation to conciliation, with the intent of loosening the fabric of the Western order on which the armed strength of the West depends.

This is achieved by repeated international crises, none of which is an end in itself. The crises, which might of course yield some kind of windfall gain for the Soviets, have the main purpose of shaking the confidence of the West in itself, deepening its sense of guilt, increasing its fear of war, and quickening its desire of final agreement with the Soviets. Each crisis would be followed by offers of settlement, agreement, and relaxation of tensions. The objectives, which in each case (including Berlin) are tactical rather than strategic, could be any of the following:

(a) To maneuver the West into repeated situations where it becomes persuaded that it is defending an unjustifiable cause (e.g., Berlin looked upon as an abnormal situation).

(b) To increase, for a period, and over some concrete issue, the fear of total atomic war, and to put governments under the strain of having to face the ultimate decision. The repetition of such moments could lead to nervous exhaustion.

(c) To repeat the basic moral charges of "imperialism," "militarism," "warmongering," "Wall Street wire pulling," "exploitation," and "colonialism" against the West.

(d) To display publicly the Soviet "will to peace," to insist on the practicality of peaceful coexistence and disarmament.

(e) To move the West nearer to an overall settlement with the U.S.S.R., implying "peaceful acceptance" of the Soviet empire and its interests.

The strategy of Soviet foreign policy consists in the plan to bring about, by a series of such tactical engagements, the gradual self-demobilization of the anti-Communist bloc.

SOME REQUIREMENTS OF WESTERN STRATEGY

At this point, only a few scattered conclusions will be drawn from the above analysis of Soviet strategy.

One conclusion is obviously that Western military policy should not be designed in purely military terms. Given the strategic outlook of the two main antagonists, an alout atomic war is not likely. Defense arrangements are rather likely to have considerable significance in the context of political warfare. A good case can be made for the thesis that the pattern of Soviet military policy has been designed as much for maximum political rather than purely military effect. We could not, of course, imitate the Soviet Union in this, since our political objectives are quite different from those of the Kremlin. But we would do well to realize that a most important, if not at present the most important, utility of our military preparations is their effect in countering the enemy's indirect (political) attack against the political foundations of our defensive strength. In other words, we have to learn something that is quite alien to our way of conducting our national affairs: the strategy and tactics of a special kind of limited war, the cold war.

Defensive cold war strategies include plans to keep our military capability from falling below the balance point, to guard and maintain our fighting will, and to cultivate the solidarity of the free world alliance system.

Offensive cold war strategies would aim at a reduction of Soviet power, at the recuperation of territories and peoples which have fallen under Communist rule, and eventually, at the ousting of communism from all centers of public power.

As we guard our military capability from falling below par, we should remember that political reputation for superior power is, both in Soviet eyes and in the logic of cold war operations, more important than the actual test of capabilities in open warfare. It would therefore seem highly advisable not to underestimate the effect of spectacular achievements suited to keep up the world's respect for our technological prowess.

As this would surely imply a continued arms race, a word may be in order about the contribution of arms races to the outbreak of wars. In both World Wars, arms races played an important role in the timing of hostilities. Significantly, in both cases the armaments of the two sides were not balanced when hostilities broke out. One side still had a considerable advantage, with the prospect that the balance would be restored 2 or 3 years later. The fact that both of these wars broke out before the balance was achieved suggests the possibility that they would have been avoided had a balance of armed strength been maintained. At any rate, neither war supplies evidence that a continued, even though actively competitive balance in armaments must issue in open hostilities.

A far more difficult task is the guarding of our defensive will against deterioration. Under the present conditions of public opinion, it would seem a rather hopeless task to try to get ourselves into a mood where we will bravely face atomic destruction in order to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union. The public has been too deeply saturated with the fear of indescribable horrors which the use of atomic weapons of mass destruction would bring about. Hence our continued fighting will depends decisively on the development of both clean and tactical atomic weapons. It is not so much the desirability of "limited wars" which should prompt us to develop such weapons with utmost speed, but rather the need to regain our own willingness to use modern weaponry at all. The destructive power of fission and fusion exists in our age. The problem is to get it under our control, instead of allowing it to master our will.

Apart from this, our defensive will must be guarded by a continued effort to recognize the Soviet threat for what it is, and to beware of all temptations to enter into a summit agreement that would in fact amount to a "peaceful acceptance" of the Soviet Empire.

In maintaining the solidarity of the alliance system, the deployment of our troops is of decisive importance. Our presence has a deep psychological effect. After all, nations closer to Russia than we continue to be our allies mainly on the strength of their confidence that we will fight at their side from the first day, and on the spot where they may be attacked.

Our willingness to risk a fight may need periodical demonstrations. The action in Lebanon was such a demonstration, and had a powerful effect. Reversely, our inaction in the case of Hungary has done us much harm. What was required was not necessarily a military intervention, but something other than the hands-off attitude we then adopted. Because an important part of the allies on whom we can and must count is found behind the Iron Curtain, where the captive peoples act as a deterrent that may well match the atomic bomb in effectiveness.

Offensive cold war strategies can and should not be discussed in a public document. It may, however, be said that some public preparations must be made before we can think of engaging in offensive cold war strategies. First among these is a reversal of the public sense of historical momentum.

The communist view of history has been allowed a virtual monopoly in the modern world. According to that view, we represent the (already half dead) past and the Communists, together with the colonial peoples, the budding and hopeful future. We must restore to the Western World a sense of historic reality. To this end, we must place the Soviet power itself into the perspective of history and begin publicly to envisage a world that has been delivered from the Soviet threat. We must begin to speak of a future beyond communism, of things as they would be when Communists have been toppled from their dictatorial seats of power, of the development of their social and political legacy toward justice and freedom. We must display public confidence that we shall see tthis day, and see it without total atomic destruction.

We must also publicly develop a concept of genuine peace. We seem to have left this term to the Soviets as their exclusive possession. At any rate, we have not spelled out, in fairly precise terms, under what kind of conditions peace could be restored. We no longer specify certain political terms in Central Europe as prerequisites of an acceptable order. We also should, for our own use, have a list of priorities of things we should like to accomplish internationally, as opporunities offer themselves. Such a list could begin with items like "free access to Berlin" and culminate in items like "non-Communist governments in all satellite states."

We must publicly counter the impression that has been created by a barrage of false and misleading Soviet economic statistics. The Soviet Union has not accomplished anything that can compare with the accomplishments of Western nations, both in the past and the present. Their claim to efficiency as a social and economic system must not be allowed to stand.

Our chances of winning a limited war fought by political strategies and tactics are excellent. But, first, we must develop the will to win this war. At present we have at best a will to survive.

Task Force Report: American Strategy and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Task Force Studies on American Strategy and Strength, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, study paper No. 21: "An Examination of Partisanship and Bipartisanship in National Security Matters," by a symposium of political scientists

AN EXAMINATION OF PARTISANSHIP AND BIPARTISANSHIP IN NATIONAL SECURITY MATTERS

(By a symposium of political scientists: Professors James Atkinson, Karl Cerny, William Y. Elliott, Ivan Hinderaker, Karl Lamb, Stanley Parry, Howard Penniman, and Robert Loevy (secretary))

The problem of opposition criticism tempting the Russians into thinking we are not adequately defended and ready to fight—what might be called the criticism deterrent crisis—is the subject of this paper.

The paper is divided into two parts.

Part I was prepared by Robert Loevy of Johns Hopkins University, who acted as secretary for the symposium.

Part II represents the ideas which flowed out of the discussions and comments, based on Part I.

PART I

Intercontinental ballistic missiles that fly halfway around the world in 30 minutes have rendered as obsolete as the cross bow the American pastime of indulging in great internal disagreements. Gone forever are the happy days when the protective expanses of two great oceans assured the United States a large measure of leeway for internal bickering. Unrestrained freedom of criticism and other political luxuries which could be tolerated during the isolationist period today must be reevaluated to make sure they are not endangering national security.

The psychological deterrent

Irresponsible opposition criticism which casts doubt on the credibility of our military deterrent is one political luxury which could lead to national disaster. The philosophy of deterrence is based on two principles. The first is that the United States must have the military capability to destroy the great majority of Russian military targets and industrial centers should the Soviet Union be foolish enough to start a third world war. The second principle is to make sure Russia knows we have this deterrent capability and that we are ready and willing to use it. This second principle is commonly referred to as the psychological nature of the deterrent or, more simply, the psychological deterrent.

In addition to convincing the Kremlin that attacking the United States would be national suicide, the psychological deterrent serves the function of convincing our allies in Western Europe, the Middle East, and Asia that we are able to defend them from Communist aggression. If these allies should ever come to doubt our ability in this sphere, our vast system of collective security alliances, such as NATO and SEATO, would be in serious danger of disintegrating, thereby leaving the United States to face Russia alone.

The psychological deterrent must also be maintained so that the uncommitted nations of the world do not begin thinking Russia is going to be the eventual victor in the cold war. Such an illusion of U.S. weakness might tempt these nations "to jump on the band wagon" and prematurely join the Communist bloc.

Past failures of the psychological deterrent

History abounds with examples of nations who failed to maintain the psychological side of their deterrent and as a result found themselves in the middle of a shooting war. In 1914, when a crisis developed between Austro-Hungary and Serbia, Russia failed to make crystal clear its intention to come to the aid of Serbia. This failure of Russia's psychological deterrent led Austro-Hungary to expect that Russia would back down if Austro-Hungarian troops were rushed into the crisis area. But Russia did not back down, and the way to World War I was paved through a needless miscalculation.

The successful Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 could have been avoided if the United States had let Japan know of the advanced state of her air-defense radar. Japanese admirals stated after the war they would never have struck at Pearl Harbor if they had known detection would be so easy. It is one of the grim ironies of American history that our radar picked up the incoming swarms of Japanese dive bombers but no one paid any attention to it.

The Korean war was another conflict which the United States could have avoided if full use had been made of the psychological deterrent. In outlining in 1950 the perimeter which America would defend in the Far East, Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State, made the mistake of excluding Korea. The Communists calculated from this that the United States would not intervene if they attacked South Korea. The end result was 100,000 American casualties and billions of American dollars spent to rectify an unnecessary Soviet miscalculation.

Damaging effects of criticism

These historical examples illustrate clearly that it does no good to have deterrent capability if you do not also take concrete steps to see that the enemy knows you have this capability. A serious problem arises here for democracy in terms of freedom of criticism. When the party-out-of-power criticizes administration defense policy in order to agitate public opinion, it gives the impression that our defense capability is not adequate. Such criticism, especially when it is unwarranted or untrue, has the effect of damaging our psychological deterrent and tempting the Russians to begin a nuclear war.

Opposition criticism is particularly destructive when it attacks the administration defense program on a piecemeal basis, pointing out shortcomings in one field without pointing out our advantages in other fields which compensate for these shortcomings. Thus critics dwell on the small size of our ground forces, creating an impression that the United States would come out second best in a limited war on the ground. What they fail to note is that the superior mobility of our war machine—in terms of landing craft, troop planes, and helicopters—is sufficient to make up for the relatively small number of actual combat soldiers. Also the troops of our Western European and Asian allies should be added to ours when making any comparison with Soviet Russia.

In the defense debate in the spring of 1960, opposition critics way overemphasized a leaked statement repeated by newspaper columnist Joseph Alsop that "150 Russian ICBMs could wipe out every American missile base and SAC base, thus destroying the U.S. deterrent." The article failed to add, however, that even if the Soviets had such capability, they would still have to take care of nuclear bombers launched from aircraft carriers and nuclear missiles launched from soon-to-be-operational Polaris submarines.

The problem of unity

The destructive nature of irresponsible opposition criticism is not limited to the military field. It also can destroy the national unity and firmness which the United States needs to maintain on the diplomatic front. Russia would never attack a United States whose people, politicians, and allies were firmly united. But the Soviets would be sorely tempted to attack if the United States erroneously gave the impression that her people are disunited, vascillating, and would be undecided on just how to meet such an attack. Here again recent history provides several examples of when American strength and unity were questioned at exactly the wrong time.

On election eve in 1956 the Suez crisis in the Middle East demanded national unity at home as well as firm diplomacy abroad. At that time Adlai Stevenson launched a violent attack on the Eisenhower program and called for a return to the policies of the previous administration. Mr. Stevenson charged that Eisenhower-Dulles policies had collapsed. He charged that the West was divided and predicted that the President, if he won, would not live through his next term. Naturally, this caused alarm in Europe and hindered unity within the Western alliance.

About a year ago Dean Acheson was the principal author of a pamphlet which painted a picture of disunity within the free world and claimed that our position in the world and our alliances were dissolving "as just a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve." The release of this pamphlet was timed to coincide with the week that the NATO ministers were meeting in Washington to reaffirm unity and solidarity. The Berlin crisis had begun, and it was necessary to our diplomacy to present Khrushchev with the picture of a united NATO. And yet Acheson turned his efforts to propagandize the line of disunity.

This statement by Acheson was described by the Washington Star as "a massive exercise in irresponsible nonsense" and brought the following comment from Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times:

"Since the council includes former President Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson, and a few Democratic Governors and Senators, this bitter attack on the administration's foreign policy that it authorized, for publication in the week the Ministers were gathering, might have had that deplorable consequence in the midst of the Berlin crisis. * * * Yet not only was it authorized for release, and at this time, by the distinguished council. It is the product, specifically, of the group which is the voice of the council in foreign policy matters, and the editor and principal author of this group's pamphlets is Dean G. Acheson, former Secretary of State."

The problem of leaks

Not only does overzealous criticism give our enemies erroneous estimates of our strength and wreck Western unity, but it sometimes results in critical security information being leaked to Russian intelligence. The best example of an improvident leak by a Congressman occurred during World War II. Through the incredible good fortune of breaking the Japanese naval code, the U.S. commanders were able to read every order transmitted from Tokyo. This advance information had much to do with preparing the way for the United States' great victory in the Battle of Midway. But some incautious member of a congressional committee or its staff leaked the information to a reporter, and 30 minutes after the next edition of his newspaper hit the street Japan changed her naval code and all further advantage was lost.

Leaks force out more information

After the irresponsible opposition has spilled the beans and leaked security information to the public and the enemy, the administration is forced to move in and clean up the mess. In doing so it often has to release more security information or clarify that which was previously leaked. This is done so the administration can set the record straight and adequately defend itself. In the process Russian intelligence agents pick up much useful information they might otherwise not have obtained.

An example of this occurred in the spring of 1960 when the administration was under attack for having too few ICBM's in relation to Russia. To defend itself, the defense department was forced to release classified information gained by our intelligence agents concerning the current state of Soviet rocket forces. This information revealed that the Russians were burying their missiles in well-protected underground launching pads instead of leaving them in a vulnerable position on surface launching pads.. As a result of this expensive burying, Russia had fewer missiles than the opposition had irresponsibly claimed. In the process of revealing this, however, the administration had to reveal secret information that should best have remained classified.

Opposition criticism often puts the administration in a seemingly bad position because patriotic public officials refuse to release critical security information in order to defend their policies. Certainly no American administrator would want to give away key national defense secrets simply to maintain himself politically. The bind is particularly hard on the party in power because in many cases you have to know what the security information is in order to understand why it was classified.

The U–2 affair

The recent capture of one of our U–2 intelligence planes by the Russians illustrates this point. During the defense debate in the spring of 1960, the Eisenhower administration could have defended its military policies very adequately on the basis of information gathered by the U–2 in its high level flights over the Soviet Union. To do so, however, would have exposed to the Russians and to the world an aerial surveillance program about which we had to maintain rigid secrecy. The Eisenhower administration thus had to take it on the chin from its critics, unable to defend itself without endangering the entire U.S. intelligence effort.

Problem based in U.S. politics

Any attempt to solve the problem of irresponsible criticism and the psychological deterrent runs into trouble because freedom of speech and freedom of criticism are at the very backbone of the American governmental system. The way we get things done in this country is to use free discussion to mobilize public opinion and thus produce a popular mandate on a particular governmental action. American politics—and this includes the Presidency, the Congress, and State and local government—has been rightfully described as a "gab shop." This dependence on the revelation of information is one of the great strengths of the American political system. At the same time it is the single greatest threat to the credibility of our psychological deterrent.

Most American politicians have a tendency to way overstate political arguments in order to agitate public opinion and thus get Goverment action. This is known as the consensus-building process. Every Congressman is aware that often you have to scare the people with terrorizing overstatements in order to get the consensus going. The endless leaks of secret information are thus not really evidence of blabbermouthed irresponsibility but attempts by the opposition to force an issue to decision or outflank an opposing point of view. Steeped in our traditions and customs, it is these consensus building distortions that do the greatest damage to the psychological deterrent.

Distortions from the compromise system

The U.S. political system is also firmly based on compromse. This has created a tendency for American politicians to overstate their arguments so that the compromise consensus reached is close to the politician's original position. Here again statements and press releases become distorted and shed doubt on the credibility of the deterrent.

The need for security puts a horrible strain on the politician brought up under the American tradition of seeking publicity whenever and wherever possible. Unfortunately, the most critical security information is also that which will get the best press run throughout the news media of the country. The temptation is often too great to bear. Congress and other American legislative bodies simply are not the sort of organizations that lend themselves to keeping secrets and maintaining tight security.

Political campaigns create worst abuses

The worst offenders along this line are not Congressmen working hard in Washington

but members of the opposition party campaigning for political office, especially Senators campaigning for a presidential nomination. The greatest abuses appear in quiet campaigns where the various candidates are searching for jarring announcements with which to draw attention to themselves. In extreme cases, Congressmen who support the administration on the House and Senate floor become critical and indulge in gross overstatements when they hit the campaign trail.

Another group often found guilty of distorting defense and diplomatic criticisms is the opposition party's advisory committee. The party rank and file as well as the party's congressional and senatorial delegations have little control over this independent group's irresponsible statements and is often embarrassed by them. Other offenders are military men and defense products manufacturers who endeavor to increase military appropriations by frightening the country with overdone announcements on the weak state of our defense.

A rare problem but one that does have to be handled from time to time is the occasional Congressman or politician who deliberately fosters a reputation for vindictiveness and has an utterly ruthless disregard for the restrictions of security and the psychological deterrent. Fear, especially the hopeless fear of inappropriate and unreasoning reprisal, is their means to power. These people purposely cultivate the impression they will stop at nothing—even when it means ruining the faith of the American people in their leaders and wrecking Western unity.

Although security leaks by Congressmen hurt the defense effort and help Russian intelligence agents, it is questionable whether rash overstatements by campaigning politicians give the Kremlin any useful information. Soviet intelligence probably compensates for overstatement in American political campaigns just as most intelligent voters do. There is real danger from these overstatements, however, because of the impression they create on world opinion.

Campaign statements do not stop at the American border but are picked up by the various news agencies and sent all over the world. Foreign readers do not understand the U.S. tradition of overstatement in politics, take the distortions seriously, and begin thinking our defenses really are inadequate. This does severe damage to the confidence of our allies in our ability to defend them. It also injures the impression of military strength the United States must maintain among the uncommitted nations.

Also the foreign press, a portion of it biased and state-controlled, does not have the United States reporting tradition of balancing distorted opposition attacks with the administration's defense. Anti-American foreign news media are quick to pick up congressional overstatements, distort them still further, and use them to create the illusion that the United States cannot protect itself. Russian propaganda agencies are particularly adept at picking up overstatements on military deficiencies and sending them all over the world.

Divisive nature of criticism

The greatest danger from irresponsible statements during political campaigns is that they divide the American people on the defense issue and rob them of the self-confidence and unity they need to compete with a totalitarian enemy. The Russians have an active policy of trying to split U.S. public opinion at home and the Western alliance abroad. Their psychological attack is designed to play on our nerves and tempt some fainthearted Americans into advocating appeasement. The opposition plays into Russia's hands when it uses unwarranted criticisms that help foster such a split.

The Communist shelling of Quemoy and Matsu during 1958 was a direct maneuver on the part of the Kremlin hierarchy to divide Western public opinion, both within the United States and within NATO. The opposition played into Russia's hands at this time by calling for the administration to abandon protection of the offshore island defenses of Formosa. An opposition politician, trying to win votes for his party's 1958 congressional candidates, advocated the United States "get out and stay out" of these islands and press for Nationalist Chinese evacuation as well. The false impression of American disunity thus created was probably viewed with elation by Moscow.

In June of 1960 the Soviets attempted to use the U–2 spy plane affair to discredit the United States in the eyes of her allies and the uncommitted nations. Fortunately the initial reaction of the opposition party was to rally to the support of the Government. An opposition Congressman, Representative CANNON of Missouri, rose on the floor of the House and explained that the opposition-controlled Committee on Appropriations had known about the U–2 flights and approved of them. He also complimented the administration for maintaining an excellent intelligence operation and closed with a statement that the entire affair proved the ability of the United States to present a united front against an authoritarian dictatorship.

Problem faced only in democracies

If, as shown above, distortions and overstatements during political campaigns are at the very heart of the American democratic process, then any attempt to restrain opposition criticism that harms the psychological deterrent will go to the very roots of our political institutions. This is a problem that could only occur in a free society. Russia is a totalitarian dictatorship and can use her entire press and Government to convince the world of Soviet military strength.

PART II

This section of the paper presents the general views and comments growing out of discussions by the political scientists on the symposium.

The high degree of danger

Opinion was expressed in the panels of political scientists which discussed this problem that the dangers arising from the criticism-deterrent crisis are very real. The danger is based on the assumption that the leaders of the Kremlin do not understand American democratic procedures and are unable to read the lesson of American history—that the American people stand united in times of a clear external threat. This assumption that the Russians do not really understand us is proven by the recent behavior of Premier Khrushchev.

Permanence of the problem

The panels also felt that the criticism-deterrent crisis is going to be with the United States for many years to come. It will be worth our while to do some thinking about creating permanent institutions designed to lessen the danger of irresponsible political distortions to national unity.

Congress at the middle levels of power

Many political scientists argue that the present international crisis and the resultant need for security is reducing Congress to the middle levels of power. Most of the major policy decisions, they contend, are now made by military experts in the Pentagon simply because security requirements will not permit the matter to be discussed by the Senate and the House. This is a trend which should not be permitted to continue. Any solution to the criticism-deterrent problem must provide for security but at the same time not eliminate Congress from its important job of overseeing all general policy formation.

The crisis of conscience

The criticism-deterrent problem leads to a crisis of conscience among responsible critics of the administration. These people often feel it is their patriotic duty to speak out on certain aspects of our defense or diplomatic program about which they are genuinely concerned, but security requirements forbid them from doing so. Many of our most responsible military and political leaders are pulled apart by this crisis of conscience. An adequate solution to the problem must provide a way for these people to present their criticisms to the President and the Congress without violating security or hurting the credibility of our deterrent.

Any solution to the criticism-deterrent problem will naturally involve giving up some freedoms, but any freedoms given up should be given up knowingly. Continued crises such as the present one have the hidden danger of making the American people accustomed to giving up freedoms, resulting in a slow strangulation of all freedoms that may not be noticed. Thus in any instance where freedom of criticism is to be limited, an apparatus must be provided for constant review of the freedoms given up and the continuing need for doing so.

It is also necessary that any group vested with the power to try to make opposition criticism more responsible must be solidly based in the civilian rather than the military wing of the Government. It should contain members of those groups being acted upon—including Members of Congress and members of the party out of power.

The problem of accountability

Perhaps the greatest danger to democracy in making opposition criticism more responsible is that it could cut down the accountability of the party in power to the people. One of the basic principles of American Government is that the press and opposition party will serve as watchdogs and be the first to ring the alarm bell when the people holding high political office step out of line. Any solution to the criticism-deterrent problem must provide strong institutional safeguards for keeping the executive department accountable to both the Congress and the people.

The danger of drift

The problem goes much deeper than simply controlling distorted criticisms. No one in our Government is in a position to take time out and make overall policy. The end result is that decisions and the opposition criticisms of them are isolated and made on a piecemeal basis.

This hit-or-miss relationship based on handling crises as they come up has resulted in a gross mismanagement of American public opinion. Often public opinion has been built up on oversimplified issues that are not relevant. In other cases good programs are neglected because public opinion is not built up in time. This phenomenon represents the failure of both the administration and the opposition to center public attention on the right issues at the right time. The inevitable conclusion is that we must change the way we make and criticize decisions as a first step in solving the criticism-deterrent problem.

Executive-congressional relationships

The criticism-deterrent problem is also rooted in the relationship between the President and Congress. The separation of powers theory which led to the creation of an independent Executive and independent legislative has partially failed. Designed by the Founding Fathers to protect freedom by having the two segments of Government check on each other, the separation of powers has served in practice only to produce discord and inefficiency in foreign and military affairs.

One problem is that military matters can become involved in executive-congressional fights and get blown out of all proportion to their real importance. Often a military question will be seized upon by dissident Congressmen and used to show the President "who really makes policy in this country." The end result is a highly publicized argument conducted in the military sphere but where military matters are not the real issue.

Separation of powers leads to mutual suspicion between the President and the Congress as to just who should be doing what in the military field. To keep an eye on the Executive, the Congress often goes messing into the minute details of military policy with which it should not be involved. At other times, Congressmen have the feeling that the President is hiding something from them and, in order to protect their jurisdiction, try to force critical security information out of the President.

On the other hand, separation of powers causes the President to become wary of congressional cussedness where military matters are concerned and try to bypass the Congress if possible. President Franklin D. Roosevelt engineered such a bypass in the famous destroyers-for-bases deal with Great Britain early in World War II. Congress had previously demonstrated its jurisdictional jealousy by passing a law forbidding the President to sell military material to a foreign power without first getting congressional approval. Roosevelt ran an end run around Congress simply by making the destroyer deal a trade for bases rather than a straight sale of military material.

Congressional-Executive relations in the military field also break down because of the natural distrust between the politician and the professional policymaker. Defense policy specialists are often regarded with suspicion by the average Congressman. We can conclude, therefore, that any solution of the criticism-deterrent problem must make some provisions for improving presidential-congressional relationships where military and foreign policy matters are concerned.

Possible solution I: Increased party responsibility

Millions of words have been written by political scientists on methods for increasing party responsibility, none of them optimistic. In the United States, where party labels and platforms mean little, Congressmen can easily bolt their party and still survive politicaly. The parties even fail to use what sanctions they do have—denial of committee chairmanships and other seniority privileges—to bring intransigent Members into line. Under our system of geographical representation, Congressmen are beholden only to a narrow section of the population back home rather than national party officials.

Sentiment was expressed in this symposium that increasing party responsibility holds little or no promise of solving the criticism-deterrent question. There is also the problem that both parties contain two wings—liberal and conservative—and it would have to be decided which wing the majority of the party is going to be responsible to.

Possible solution II: Bipartisanship

The idea that enmity and conflict between the two parties should cease when we get to the critical areas of military problems and foreign affairs is an old one in U.S. politics. From time to time, Secretaries of State, like Hay and Root, made a practice of conferring with leading Senators from the opposition party in advance of treaty negotiations. The contemporary development of bipartisan collaboration, however, dates from 1943 when Franklin D. Roosevelt sought Republican cooperation in putting over the United Nations. As much as anything, this was the result of the Roosevelt Administration not wishing to experience a repeat performance of what happened between Woodrow Wilson and a Republican Congress when the League of Nations came up for ratification.

Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress were brought in on the negotiations for the United Nations at the very beginning. Bipartisanshp reached its highest level when President Truman sent Republican Senators Vandenberg and Connally as American delegates to the San Francisco convention which drew up the charter. After that time the practice of consultation and collaboration became rather common—Greek-Turkish aid, European recovery program, North Atlantic Pact, for example—but no means customary. Policies regarding German and Japanese occupation, Palestine, and China were entirely executive in nature.

Bipartisanship is thus a tool which is available but not always used. Its success depends on the existence in the opposition party of a party specialist who is well versed in the particular area concerned and who is able to lead most of his fellow party members his way. Senators Vandenberg and Connally played such a role during the Truman era. As these two men went, so did the rest of the Republican Party, and bipartisanship became an efficient and workable technique.

But bipartisanship has a full share of liabilities. It can be irksome, time-consuming, tiring, and limited by the jealousies, hatreds, and status requirements which infect all human personalities. It works only when the two parties are in basic agreement on the issues concerned and can only be applied to overall policies rather than to detail work. No one put the case more strongly than Senator Vandenberg in defining the limits of bipartison consultation:

"When and where it is possible, in clearly channeled and clearly identified projects, for the legislature, the Executive, and the two major parties to proceed from the beginning to the end of a specific adventure, so that all are consulted in respect to all phases of the undertaking, I think it is a tremendously useful thing. * * *

"But to think that that can be done as an every-day practice in regard to all of the multiple problems of international import which now descend upon the State Department every day, in my opinion is totally out of the question."

Certainly the problem of curbing criticism that harms the psychological deterrent comes under the heading of over-all policy rather than day-to-day business. As a result, any solution of the criticism-deterrence problem should provide for bipartisan cooperation and consultation.

Possible solution III: intraparty cooperation

Even when bipartisanship is unworkable, executive-congressional relations can often be smoothed by having the President work closely with the members of his own party in the Senate and the House. This technique is effective because, like bipartisanship, it lessens the suspicions and antagonisms inherent in the separation of powers principle. Here again the party specialist acts as an intermediary whom the rest of the party's Congressmen trust to do their thinking for them in certain critical areas. Any solution to the criticism-deterrent problem should provide for improved intraparty congressional-executive relations as well as bipartisanship.

Possible solution IV: increased personal responsibility

Much of the irresponsible criticism that damages the psychological deterrent could be curbed simply by appealing to the personal responsibility of Congressmen. An effort should be made to see that all Members of the House and Senate are fully informed on how unwise criticisms could lead to Russian miscalculations or wreck Western unity. Congressmen should be made aware that, whether they like it or not, their campaign statements and distorted criticisms are part of general American propaganda and have all the effects of good or bad propaganda. Congressmen are all good Americans, and the simple act of pointing out the danger to them will probably curb 90 percent of the abuse.

In the field of security requirements and leaking, Congress has proved many times in the past that it can keep secrets and keep them well. During World War II the House Appropriations Committee guarded its private secret that billions of dollars were being spent to develop the atomic bomb. Recently, it was revealed that the same committee knew of the existence of the U–2 flights for more than 4 years and never leaked so much as a hint about it. Thus, it is very clear that Congress can and will keep secrets if the reasons for classification are made crystal clear.

Possible solution V: Counterappeal to public opinion

Should even the appeal to personal responsibility fail, the administration still has one sanction available for encouraging Congressmen to curb distorted criticisms. This is the counterappeal to public opinion in which members of the opposition are chided for letting out security information and making divisive statements that help the enemy. The severe public and press reaction to opposition statements designed to sabotage NATO the day before its 1959 meeting probably did much to tone down the future irresponsible criticisms of this sort.

Many political scientists feel that irresponsible opposition criticism is not so much to blame for national disunity as is the failure of the party in power to make full use of the counterappeal to public opinion. They claim the Republicans have failed to adequately defend themselves and the country against the neutralist-defeatist position of many administration critics. Rather than trying to silence opposition criticism, these political scientists think the administration should take concrete steps to see that all irresponsible attacks are soundly countered and that the positive side of the psychological deterrent is strongly maintained on the propaganda front. In other words, there should be an offensive operation where national unity is concerned rather than just a defense.

It appears logical at this point that four of the five possible solutions outlined above—bipartisanship, improved intra-party executive-congressional relations, increased personal responsibility, and the counter-appeal to public opinion—should be included in any proposed solution to the criticism-deterrent problem.

Concrete Proposal I

This symposium felt generally that the Republican Congressional Policy Committee take upon itself the responsibility of seeing that the psychological deterrent is positively defended whenever possible. It should attempt to do the following things:

1. See that irresponsible charges made by opposition political campaigners which harm national unity and question our defense capability are quickly and firmly answered. In particularly important areas, the committee should appeal to the publicity powers of the President for countering irresponsible criticisms.

2. Endeavor to arouse public opinion against opposition party members who leak critical defense information to further their political ends. It should also arouse opinion against those who spread disunity and defeatism at a time when unity of purpose is called for.

3. Follow a general positive policy of strengthening the psychological deterrent

and maintaining national unity. Thus the committee need not wait for opposition criticism before taking action in this field.

Defense of Proposal I

Conscious maintenance of the psychological deterrent and national unity by the Republican congressional policy committee fits in with the idea that the best defense against irresponsible opposition criticism is a counterblast of your own. This solution also has the advantage that it fits in with the American tradition of the two opposing political parties taking concrete stands on the issues and letting the voters have their choice.

It was pointed out that no Congressman can command the newspaper space or position that is given to the statements of opposition party leaders. Also individual Congressmen are not clearly identified in the public mind as party spokesmen. For this reason it is argued that the policy committee of the party in the White House should appeal to the publicity powers of the President so that the policy committee's answer will have the same strength and publicity value as the opposition charge.

It was argued that what the American people want is not to have the Democrats silenced but to be reassured that their leadership has the courage required in today's international situation. They are looking for a reaffirmation that all Russians are not 10 feet tall. This is not to say that they want soothing sirup, but that they want to be told this tremendous society we have is worthwhile and worth fighting for. The policy committee would take upon itself the job of providing this assurance and rededication to purpose.

It was also argued that the question is broader than simply maintaining the psychological deterrent. It is felt the U.S. Government should realize it is fighting psychological warfare in the most general sense. The concept of just a deterrent gives the idea of a defensive posture when we need to convey the idea that we are taking the offensive as well. The policy committee can help foster and clarify such an offensive attitude.

The discussants noted that our Government must remain responsible in its foreign policy and should never go so far as to stir up international chaos the way Soviet foreign policy is designed to do.

Concrete Proposal II

It is proposed for the future that a joint session of the four congressional policy committees meet with the President (or his representative) to formulate strategy on how the criticism-deterrent issue can best be handled. Such a joint session would have the following duties:

1. Encourage political campaigners not to overstate their criticisms of the defense situation or make distorted statements that would tend to damage Western unity. Foreign policy and defense matters were, by mutual consent, left out entirely of the presidential campaign of 1948.

2. Publicize around Congress the danger of questioning the credibility of our psychological deterrent. Point out clearly to the average Congressman that he is part of the U.S. propaganda machine and should endeavor to strengthen the psychological deterrent whenever possible.

3. Constantly review any irresponsible criticisms being curbed to make sure they are curbed knowingly and that we give up no more freedoms than absolutely necessary.

4. Find ways for military men and Congressmen suffering a crisis of conscience to make their views known to the President, the people, and the rest of Congress without hurting the psychological deterrent.

5. Serve as a permanent organization for producing joint Presidential-congressional national policy when sudden policy crises arise.

6. Serve as a body cutting across several committees that gets above the present piecemeal nature of defense and foreign policy planning. Abundance of time and detachment from detail would permit the joint session to take an overall view and come up with continuous policies to replace the present stopgap measures.

7. Rule on what security information can be leaked. The committee could serve as a clearinghouse for declassification through which all security information Congressmen want to release would have to pass. A code of ethics in this field could be worked out as a general guide for the joint session.

8. See that party specialists from both parties have been informed on all security matters and are kept on the inside of Government policies in the military and foreign affairs fields. In this way the rank-and-file Members of Congress would be assured that trusted members of their party know what is going on and the administration is not "pulling a fast one" on the Congress.

Procedures for Proposal II

Ideally, the joint session of policy committees would meet personally with the President, but since the Chief Executive is already overworked, some provision should be made for having a qualified member of the administration in a policy position take his place.

Both the Republican House and Senate policy committees will be members of the joint session along with their Democratic counterparts. Both the liberal and the conservative wings of both parties should be represented. Also, all party specialists in military and foreign affairs should be asked to serve.

The joint session would meet periodically to discuss overall policies and advise the President. Provision should be made for having it called into crisis session by either the President or the chairman of any two of the four policy committees.

All conferences would be in executive session, although results would be reported to the entire Congress and the people.

Defense of Proposal II

Although the contemporary need for security puts Congress at the middle levels of power, under the joint-session system specialists are kept in the know and at the top levels of power. These watchdog party specialists are an additional means of keeping the executive accountable.

The joint session will satisfy the plea for a group in our Government to make overall policies instead of operating defense and foreign affairs on a hit-or-miss basis. Thus, joint policy committees will have a positive role of building public opinion on needed policy issues instead of a merely negative role of checking for security leaks.

Since the joint session will contain both the President and Congress, it will face the problem of military and foreign policy matters getting involved in executive-congressional relationships.

Such a meeting of representatives of the two most powerful branches of our Government should serve to reduce suspicions, get Congress out of messing with detail, and reduce the tendency of the President to try and bypass Congress. It also should help to reduce the natural distrust between the politician and the administration policymaker.

It was observed, however, that the joint session will be stillborn unless its membership includes the real inner circle of leadership in the House and Senate. It must include people (such as the Senate majority leader) who can get a large majority of their party to support the decisions of the joint session.

The joint session will represent the liberal and conservative wings of each party, provide for bipartisanship, take into account the role of the party specialist, and strengthen intraparty executive-congressional relationships. All these requirements were set up as necessary to smooth dealings between the President and Congress.

Attempts by the joint session to make criticism more responsible will mean much more since they will come from a bipartisan committee rather than a partisan administration. A group representing both parties can apply moral pressure and requests for increased personal responsibility of Congressmen which could never be applied by the President himself.

The need for unity

The great strength of the joint session is that it is a concrete step toward the national unity which is so badly needed in combating a totalitarian dictatorship like the Soviet Union. Previously, the American people have been able to wait for some dramatic event—the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, unrestricted German submarine warfare, the bombing of Pearl Harbor—to create the unity necessary for national survival in a time of crisis. But the time-space age will not allow the time to wait for a dramatic event to bring the Nation together with one purpose. We must have unity now, and the joint session is an institutional step in that direction.

Juvenile Delinquency in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the Public Relations News of May 30, 1960, dealing with a joint project to combat juvenile delinquency in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Philadelphia, the Reverend William Vaughn Ischie, Jr., rector of Christ Episcopal Church, and the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of Zion Baptist Church, joined in a project to fight juvenile delinquency. They organized a nonprofit, no-fee employment agency to secure jobs for teenagers during their free hours. The effort is not only interdenominational; it is also interracial because one of the churches is predominantly white in membership and the other predominantly Negro.

When the project came to the attention of John J. Kelly, president of Kelly Associates, Inc., PR consultants, he promptly offered his assistance. His plan was to get sufficient publicity for the activity to: (1) let underprivileged youngsters know where to turn for guidance and help, (2) stimulate industry to report job openings to the project's sponsors, and (3) possibly turn the attention of some charitably inclined person to the activity. He was successful on all three counts. Kelly called the religion-education editor at the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin and outlined a possible story. The resulting feature was used by the wire services and sent across the country. A national foundation learned of the activity through the pickup by the New York Times, investi-

gated, and offered a grant of $33,600. Philadelphia papers gave spreads, pictures, and editorials which, within a month, stimulated 400 job applications, brought inquiries from 150 companies, and led to the placement of 200 teenagers.

Vision, Patience, and Determination: The Story of the Savannah River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address entitled "Vision, Patience, and Determination: The Story of the Savannah River Development," delivered by Hon. Millard A. Beckum, mayor of Augusta, Ga., before the 47th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 26, 1960.

The address follows:

VISION, PATIENCE, AND DETERMINATION: THE STORY OF THE SAVANNAH RIVER DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Millard A. Beckum, mayor of Augusta, Ga., before the 47th Annual National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1960)

Mr. President, officers, delegates, and distinguished guests, it is a great honor to have the opportunity of addressing this outstanding organization. I appreciate this privilege—the privilege of bringing to you in part, the story of the Savannah River development. Should my talk be worthy of a title, I would give it this label, "Vision, Patience, and Determination" or the subtitle "The Story of the Savannah River Development."

For more than a quarter of a century, leadership of my city, Augusta, Ga., realized that one of its most valuable assets was being overlooked. They set to work to restore to its full use to the people the Savannah River, which had, since the advent of the railroads, lost its place as a means of transportation between Augusta and the city of Savannah.

At the close of the first two decades of the 20th century, Augusta found itself losing its place in the sun as a winter resort city and, recognizing the need for the development of a positive, progressive, industrial program to take the place of the tourist economy, which was so rapidly slipping away, men of vision saw the need of reopening the Savannah River to transportation.

The first segment of success in the program of restoration was the building a lock and dam at a point approximately 12 miles below Augusta, this magnificent undertaking being realized as a result of the Public Works Administration program. When it was completed, the lock and dam was turned over to the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army, Savannah District, for maintenance and operation. It gave us a major important step in our river development plan. It caused our people to work with renewed interest and a conviction that a development of the river was indeed possible and could be justified.

Thanks to able advice and leadership available to us through the Corps of Engineers, our civic leaders of Augusta were caused to see the necessity of developing the Savannah River on a much broader base than first envisioned by our local people. The Corps of Engineers made it perfectly plain that to develop the Savannah River for the purpose of transportation only, was not enough that it would be highly important to the future of the Savannah River Valley to develop the river on a broader scale; soil conservation, flood control, and hydroelectric power, it being pointed out that each of these phases of development was equally important to the future of our river program; that if we were to put the river in a condition to render its maximum value to the people, we must indeed broaden our program.

The 1935 survey conducted by the Corps of Engineers for the Savannah River established the practicability as well as feasibility of need and justification for such a program. Under the remarkable leadership of Mr. Lester S. Moody, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Augusta, a man who simply would not give up in the face of discouragement, and even defeat in many instances, the effort to obtain authorization for the project continued, until success came to us in 1944 with the passage of House Document No. 657 which provided for the building of Clark Hill Dam and powerplant 20 miles above Augusta, at an estimated cost of $35 million. I am sure that you will be interested to know that when the dam was finally constructed, it cost $80 million, $45 million more than was originally estimated. This was due largely to the fact that it was deemed necessary to increase the size of the plant by adding two additional generators; implemented further in cost by the fact that during the years which intervened between the time of estimate and actual awarding of the contract for construction, the cost of labor had increased a great deal over that period of time.

I give you this brief rundown on the history of our river so that I might fully emphasize the importance of the work you do as a well organized and continuing association, serving the best interest of the people of the United States as you make use of the knowledge and prestige of this nationally recognized and respected organization keeping constantly before the Congress the vital need and urgent importance for a full development of the waterways of America, as well as the fallacy of an inadequate and/or dilatory program of flood control and soil conservation, pointing as you do to the fact that to withhold full support to such a program is indeed extravagance in the worst form, as it permits needless waste of our most precious and irreplaceable assets, soil and water.

To give to you and to those at home who have labored long in the interest of waterways development, flood control and soil conservation a full measure of appreciation for the fine and important work being done, and the value of your efforts to the people, not only of my section of this great country of ours, but to the Nation as a whole, let me tell you what the Savannah River program has meant to the economy of the Savannah River Valley. Since the program got underway, more than $200 million has been spent on the Savannah River by the Federal Government. The Clark Hill hydro plant has made available to industry and agriculture 88,000 kilowatts of electric power not previously to be had. The building of the dam and the impounding of that vast reservoir of water, which has a shore line of more than 1,200 miles, has brought to our section a tremendous recreational opportunity not previously enjoyed by our people. It has opened up a great amount of business to those who are engaged in selling outdoor equipment, boats, fishing tackle, hunting equipment, etc. In addition to the recreational value of the reservoir, it brought a change in the temperature of the water, cooling it to a sufficient degree that it gave preferred position to our area in the final decision to locate the Atomic Energy plant which is on the Savannah River below the city in our area. Construction costs of this vast industrial undertaking, calculated to serve our Nation from a standpoint of defense, has run well over a billion dollars. This, gentlemen, was a giant shot in the economic arm for the entire area. The present and permanent employees of that great plant is in the thousands. These employees are highly paid and skilled personnel. They add a great deal to the economy of our section; they add much to the cultural, spiritual and educational value of our area; they are participants in an expanding program of service in many areas of our community services.

A program for the deepening of the channel on the Savannah River from Augusta to Savannah is now underway. The starting of this channel has had much to do with the location of a great new plant by the Continental Can Co. They have selected a site on the Savannah River, just below Augusta, and it is said that the cost of their new plant will run well over $40 million. The building of this new plant has in turn been responsible for the location at Augusta of a second industry, one that will be the component field of manufacturing to that of Continental Can. In other words, gentlemen, the prophecies of those who preached the gospel of river development have come to pass. The Savannah River was, and is the key that unlocks the doors of our golden future of the Savannah River Valley, and when we think of the vast numbers of new jobs that have been created in and around Augusta as a result of the progress obtained today, it is of course easy to understand why our people are so grateful to the Corps of Engineers for the splendid support that they have given to our effort to develop and restore the Savannah River to its full use to the people of that great valley. As a result of their wise counsel and unfailing support, we will no longer stand by and see the rich topsoil of our area flow past the farms of the valley on into the sea. Flood control and soil conservation program as it is a very proper part of our river development has a cash value almost beyond estimate. With the completion of the Hartwell Dam and powerplant, we will have available a firm power availability for the Savannah River Valley that will meet all of the needs of an expanding industrial program.

Gentlemen, a dependable year-round channel from Augusta to Savannah will industrialize many sections of the valley. The payrolls that will come as a result of this new job opportunity will truly open a new economic era for the people of our great river valley. I cannot commend too highly the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for the farsighted and effected work you have done for the people of America, as you have carefully considered each matter that has been brought to your attention, and when found worthy of support by this organization, you have played an important part in seeing that the proper committees of Congress get such facts as will greatly assist them in the matter of making a decision as to whether or not a given project be included in bills to be passed, and if so, the implementation for appropriations that must be made to put such contracts into work. You are indeed adding to the wealth, to the might, and to the strength of America as you carry on the work of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I am sure you are a great help to the splendid arm of Government, the Corps of Engineers, in

that all research done through the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is, I am sure, a great value to the corps.

In closing, may I say in connection with the channel, when work is completed, we will have a 90-foot-wide channel, 9 feet deep the year round. The Corps of Engineers have completed, or have in work, three contracts with a fourth ready for letting. I feel that it would be of interest to you to bring out in my remarks that in providing for the channel it will be necessary to eliminate 28 sharp bends, and more than half of these have been removed by cuts, thus enabling longer tows to be made on the river. The Corps of Engineers have provided in the contract for riprapping, pile dike revetment, and bank stabilization, which, as you know, will of course aid in maintaining a 9-foot channel.

I am happy to state that local interest provided the funds sufficient for all easements and spoilage rights, these being required by the Corps of Engineers for the project. We are happy to add that Waynesboro, Ga., Allendale, S.C., and Hardeeville, S.C., are now anxiously awaiting completion of the channel. These cities are ready to establish wharves on the river as soon as possible. This I give you as another firm indication of the impact that this great economic development will bring as a result of the work on the river. We believe this will affect the entire area, and, gentlemen, let me say that I feel all of this comes out of the vision, patience, and determination of good civic leadership, aided and guided by such highly competent organization as this and that splendid arm of Government, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, whose sound operations have saved our Nation millions upon millions of dollars in construction costs.

Let me thank you for listening to the Savannah River story. To us it is the realization of a long-cherished dream. We are happy and proud that we see in sight the completion of this great undertaking.

Thank you very much.

Wanted: Rugged Individuals Who Like Insecurity and Will Take Chances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the challenges of the 1960's, perhaps more than ever before, will require creative leadership guided by perspective, foresight, and understanding.

Through the years, our pioneers, each in their own way, of the 1700's, 1800's, and 1900's, have built and nurtured the greatest free way of life in the world.

To paraphrase the old adage, however, "History is merely the story of the acts of great men." Whether in science, politics, agriculture, conservation, the humanities, or other fields—the progress and success of any system or philosophy depends upon the individual—and the individuals en masse—who support and carry forward these programs.

Although our modern civilization has provided more comforts, conveniences, and good things of life than previously existed in history, the time has not expired when a social, political, economic, spiritual system—yes, mankind itself—does not depend upon strong, rugged, creative individualistic leadership, reflecting a mind and spirit attuned to the times, cognizant of its need, and irresistibly dedicated to attain the goals that will best serve mankind for the future.

Recently, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, former president of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., and now president of the American Assembly at Columbia University, and Chairman of the President's Commission on National Goals, delivered a lecture at Brunswick, Maine, entitled, "Wanted: Rugged Individuals Who Like Insecurity and Will Take Chances."

Reflecting a recognition of the need for stronger individualistic leadership in all our national endeavors I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the article recently published in the Milwaukee Journal printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, June 16, 1960]

WANTED: RUGGED INDIVIDUALS WHO LIKE INSECURITY AND WILL TAKE CHANCES—A PASSION FOR SECURITY AND HOMESICKNESS FOR THE HERD PREVENT AMERICANS FROM DEVELOPING THE KIND OF LEADERSHIP THEY USED TO HAVE, SAYS NOTED EDUCATOR

There has been a spate of books, articles, and speeches bewailing America's lost leadership. Politician after politician cries out for bold and imaginative action—seldom defined at all and never with any precision. Religious leaders bewail moral decay as preachers have since exhortation began. Publishers dominant in the field of mass media assert that we have lost our sense of mission.

The wailing wall is crowded, and ululations fill the air. When one asks where new leadership is to come from, who is to define the national purpose, and who will summon us from moral lassitude, the answer is an embarrassed silence.

Recently there was a symposium on the national purpose. A number of people gave their view of what it had been when it was lost, and what should be done to recover it. I found it intriguing that not one of the great minds ever mentioned the individual and his responsibility. Every criticism was cast in collective terms, in terms of society. There was a time when the individual was at the core of our political, religious, and economic thought. Indeed, the key to our history is the concept of freedom. One man may chase the dollar and consider it almighty. Thoreau could go to Walden pond in search of his own goals; Emerson could exalt the thinker; Walt Whitman could extol the pioneers and assert that the crowning growth of the United States is to be spiritual and heroic. Franklin, Jefferson, Edison, Theodore Roosevelt—and millions more—could follow their insatiable curiosity. Initiative is decentralized; responsibility is personalized; the individual is the ultimate value. His freedom is the key.

"THREW THE BABY OUT WITH THE BATH WATER"

Somewhere in the 1930's, or thereabouts, rugged individualism became associated with industrial piracy, with defiance of moral checks, with exploitation of one's fellow men. If I may borrow an expression familiar in Britain, when we denounced rugged individualism, we "threw the baby out with the bath water." We went too far, for nothing is more obvious than that leadership is a word which describes a quality of individuals, not of a society.

Surely the century which has known Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, Charles de Gaulle, and Gandhi should not find it difficult to realize that leadership requires not only individuals but rugged individuals.

Temptation to shed responsibility is not unique to our day or to this generation. In a brilliant passage in his famous book "Revolt of the Masses," the great Spanish philosopher-historian, Ortega y Gasset, summed up the tendency and explained in a few words how the dictator rises to power not by his own strength so much as by the weakness of others. "Many men * * * homesick for the herd * * * devote themselves passionately to whatever is left in them of the sheep. They want to march through life together, along the collective path, shoulder to shoulder, wool rubbing wool, and the head down." It was this impulse to escape the harsh task of thought, to avoid responsibility, that made "he will decide" one of the great slogans of the Mussolini era in Italy.

The passion for security and anonymity has not passed America by; as a great jurist said, "They are the defenses against the intolerable agony of facing ourselves. We are in deadly fear of life, as much as our own American scene betrays." To some extent because of eagerness to have others make the hard choices of life, there is loud complaint that "Washington does not give us leadership." But Washington is inhabited by individuals like the rest of the Nation. If the goal of living is to hide in a social group, if we do not want to be rugged individuals, if we consistently decry individualism, why should we expect leadership? Whenever you sell individualism short, you lay the ax at the roots of democratic leadership, though you open the way for demagogs.

This recent denigration of the individual runs very deep and appears in unexpected and seemingly innocuous ways. For example, we demand guidance counselors in school. But what kind of guidance have they been giving?

Students are told to aim for certain jobs because there are plenty of vacancies and therefore not much danger of unemployment. They are advised to train for certain vocations because the pay is good, rather than because such employment of one's talent and energies brings intellectual, spiritual and emotional satisfactions. This kind of defensive counsel will never help to produce leadership.

The Soviets are candid about their central doctrine. Whatever else they keep secret, this is no secret at all. Economic determinism is the professed key to their philosophy and to their policy. They say explicitly that "the material life of society * * * is primary, and its spiritual life secondary, derivative"; "one must look for the source of social ideas, social theories, political views, and political institutions * * * in the conditions of the material life of society." Communists are relentless in their logical defense of that concept, unswerving in their devotion to that idea. Such a doctrine is the complete denial of the historic American dream. It is the precise opposite of the great ideals which shaped American history, proclaimed with such eloquence by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence.

Few Americans therefore, would explicitly avow such a philosophical foundation for their way of life. Yet many, implicitly and in action, exemplify this grossly materialistic premise. Much of the recent advice to young men and women has been cast in the tone, the mood and the framework of economic determinism. Amidst all the noisy chatter about resistance to communism, there has been a silent surrender to one of its central ideas, namely the assumption that economic

interest is primary, while other phases of life are secondary, derivative.

SOME DENOUNCE STALIN BUT LIVE HIS DOCTRINE

Ironically, some of those who have shouted loudest about un-Americanism and Communist infiltration have swallowed this doctrine—and never felt it in the gullet as they gulped down this most un-American of all political and economic dogmas. They clasp Stalin's doctrine to their bosoms while with their voices they denounce him and all his works.

If we have been blind to this fact, others have not. It accounts for the feeling often expressed in the new nations of Asia and Africa that there is little to choose between the avowed materialism of the Soviets and the unconscious materialism that they observe in the United States.

A guidance counselor who has made a fetish of security, or who has unwittingly surrendered his thinking to economic determinism, may steer a youth away from his dream of becoming a poet, an artist, a musician, or any other of thousands of things, because it offers no security, it does not pay well, there are no vacancies, it has no "future."

Among all the tragic consequences of depression and war, this suppression of personal self-expression through one's life work is among the most poignant.

If you wish to speak in social terms, rather than in terms of individual self-expression, that suppression, when effective, is fatal to the concept of leadership. For leadership requires courage, boldness, and the willingness to accept risks. To use the most dreadful word permitted to be uttered in public, leadership inevitably, inescapably, involves insecurity.

The retreat from the effort to stimulate leadership arises in part, also, from a profound misinterpretation of democracy. No political thinker of any stature in all history ever interpreted democracy as equality in all things. What you will find set forth as an ideal is that every individual, however broken his body or limited his mind, shall have equality before the law and equality of opportunity to fufill his own highest potential. That is the American ideal.

EDUCATION EQUALITY LOWERS STANDARDS

In the reaction against rugged individualism, however, this historical and rational concept of democracy gave way to a sentimental and superficial idea that people should somehow be made equal. We can observe this effort all too clearly in education. During the last generation there has been a strong tendency to level requirements down, in order that the slowest, in the words of the sentimentalists, should not have their tender personalities "damaged by failure"—as though failure were not a normal experience of every human being.

With some validity it could be said that security has become "the opiate of the people" in America. You do not get boldness, or dedication to public service, or even responsible citizenship from those who choose as much idleness as possible as a way of life. They cease to be masters of the state, as the democratic thesis demands; they become its wards. When the citizen accepts the Government as his guardian, democracy is in decay.

There is nothing in the Bill of Rights that promises that the freedom there guaranteed can be enjoyed in comfort or in a serene atmosphere. In the long history of freedom, discomfort has always accompanied speaking on controversial matters. There never has been a time when there were not social sanctions against candor. But if freedom is to amount to anything, one must be ready to pay the price. When a man speaks out, he must be ready to receive, if not absorb, criticism. Dostoevsky lived in a land of tyranny; he knew its corrosive effect. With the wisdom that comes from lack of liberty, he asserted that "tragic freedom" is better than "compulsory happiness." It is a lesson we need to ponder.

I am asserting that those who misrepresent the normal experiences of life, who decry being controversial, who shun risk, are enemies of the American way of life, whatever the piety of their vocal professions and the patriotic flavor of their platitudes.

Commencement Day Address at Presbyterian College, Clinton, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 6, 1960, Wayne J. Holman, Jr., delivered a most inspiring address at the commencement exercises at Presbyterian College at Clinton, S.C. The message of his speech is applicable equally to citizens generally as it was to the graduating class of Presbyterian College. I ask unanimous consent that the text from Mr. Holman's remarks be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EQUALITY OF MEN

(Address delivered at the 79th commencement exercises of Presbyterian College, Clinton, S.C., by Wayne J. Holman, Jr., chairman of the board of directors of the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp., June 6, 1960)

I hope you will not think it a mere act of perfunctory civility when I tell you I really feel greatly honored to have been invited by my fellow Tennessean, Dr. Brown, to participate in your commencement exercises. Through a long and firm friendship with the late P. S. Bailey, of the class of 1926, who was one of the most devoted of your alumni, I came to know much about Presbyterian College; and through Mr. Robert Vance, chairman of your board of trustees, I have come to know more. And, in view of the great contributions which Presbyterian has made to the South, and in fact to the entire country, I am especially happy to be here.

Moreover, it always gives me high pleasure and a keen sense of gratification to be in that which has been known historically, and which has been so aptly described, as the independent State of South Carolina. This is so for a number of reasons. South Carolinians have always been leaders in espousing the Southern point of view; South Carolina was the home of him who was perhaps the greatest of all Southerners, a Yale man of the class of 1804, John Caldwell Calhoun; South Carolina was the first to secede just 100 years ago at 1:15 this afternoon, lacking 197 days; and during the War for Southern Independence, with a white population of 291,300, South Carolina put into the field 62,838 effectives, of whom, with the reserves, 22 percent perished in the struggle. What a proud and noble heritage those who stem from South Carolina possess. I should like to add also, the fact I have so many friends here, and the fact I persuaded one of the high-minded girls of Converse to marry me do not cause me to admire the State any the less.

On this bright day in your lives, when with profound relief you realize that your studies as undergraduates are all over, when you are about to receive your degrees with all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining, when you are the object of a vast amount of pride on the part of your parents, your friends, and that one whom you most want to impress, I should like to speak to you briefly on a subject which really is a very old one, but of which we seem to hear more and more of late, and that is, "The Equality of Men."

In the latter part of the 18th century there emerged the doctrine of the equality of men. The motto of the French Revolution was "Liberté Egalité, Fraternité"; and the 33-year-old Jefferson began the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence with the statement, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Jefferson did not explain with great clarity and precision just how or in what way men were created equal, but perhaps some of his meaning may be divined from the remainder of the sentence which is "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.", Prof. Dumas Malone, of the University of Virginia, in the second volume of his life of Jefferson, stated that it was equality in rights, the equality of all men before the law, rather than equality of economic and social condition which Jefferson considered basic.

During the middle of the 19th century there was great discussion about the equality or the inequality of men in connection with the issue of slavery. This was one of the principal subjects of the seven Lincoln-Douglas debates which took place between August 21 and October 15, 1858. And one of the results of that great struggle which occurred between 1861 and 1865 was that one section of our population became a little more equal in some respects than it had been at the outbreak of the war.

In the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Kans.*, handed down on May 17, 1954, the decision was that separate but equal facilities were really not equal, and the implication was that the use of separate facilities tended to make those who were equal perhaps a little less equal.

At the commencement exercises of New York University on June 10 of last year, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of these United States gave the commencement address. During the course of this he said, "The central significance of our American Government is that for the first time in man's history practical political form was given through our free institutions to the conception that all men are by right equal."

As followers of Jesus Christ, we know that all men are equal in the eyes of God for it is written in the 28th verse of the 3d chapter of the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Galatians: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

It is quite apparent, however, that from the viewpoint of physical, mental, and moral qualities men are not equal. They are quite dissimilar. Men are not equal in size, weight, strength, dexterity, and swiftness. Those men who comprise the track team of this college are there because they are superior individuals in their respective specialties. In the Olympic games which will be held in Rome this summer, through competition the foremost track and field athletes in the world will become known. Men are not equal in physical characteristics.

We do have some means, however imperfect they may be, of measuring a man's intelligence, or his ability to learn. At West Point and Annapolis, at the end of each academic year, as a result of the marking system in which a man's knowledge and reasoning ability are determined objectively, the men in the graduating class are racked up from the anchor man at the bottom, man by man, to the cadet or midshipman who receives first honors. Here at Presbyterian College those who excel academically are elected to membership in your scholastic society, Sigma Kappa Alpha. There are differences in a man's intelligence, or in his abilty to learn. Who has equalled Shakespeare in writing sonnets, the illustrious Dr. Samuel Johnson in the art of conversation, or Einstein in abstract mathematical reasoning?

If we had some ingenious way in which a scale of increasing temptation could be devised, we would find that men are dissimilar in their ability to withstand temptation and to observe moral laws. And it is to be noted that even men generally held to be good, sometimes fall from the straight and narrow. It is written in the 11th chapter of II Samuel that David had Joab place Uriah the Hittite in the forefront of the hottest battle that he might be killed. Uriah was killed, and David took his wife, and she bare him a son, and it is written in the 27th verse of the 11th chapter of II Samuel that the Lord was displeased. Judas betrayed Jesus Christ, and Peter denied Him three times. Men are different in their abilities to withstand temptation.

It is said that men are equal under the law. Yet in but very few States today are local laws upheld or enforced when there is a labor dispute. In the steel strike which took place last fall, it was reported that 200 supervisors of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., of the Hazelwood plant near Pittsburgh, were stuck in the plant because the strikers would not agree to let them back in if they did go out. The union arrogated to itself the right to prevent employees from entering a plant, and the police force did nothing. Scarcely a day passes but that we read of a similar incident.

Late last summer there was a teamsters' strike in San Francisco. Although enjoined by a restraining court order, striking teamsters continued to interfere with truck movements, with interstate commerce no less, into San Francisco. A court order was ignored in Little Rock, and the President sent the United States Army in. What happened in San Francisco? Essentially nothing. Where is the law? Where is equality under the law? Mass picketing, rioting, dynamiting, automobile wrecking, and intimidation of would-be workers and their families without any effective action by those sworn to uphold the law are too common in connection with labor disputes to bear repeating.

In his essay "On Liberty," published in 1859, John Stuart Mill stated that all the political changes of the age tend to raise the low, and to lower the high, and the political changes of this age are certainly no different. The poet Robert Frost, in testimony before a Senate subcommittee not long ago, said everybody comes down to Washington to get declared equal to somebody else, and he wanted poets declared equal to big business. This was a facetious remark, of course, but it has been my observation the Federal Government, especially since and beginning with the first administration of F. D. Roosevelt, has made the leveling or equalizing of men in matters financial and social a part of its fundamental policy. This has been the case despite the efforts ot the contrary of some of our own Senators and Representatives, among whom the very able and distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is, at this moment, the newest of your alumni, has been one of the most active.

A number of immunities have been built into our labor laws during the past generation to free labor unions from those codes of conduct which bind the rest of us so as to enable their members to obtain a larger share of the national output. Under our various farm laws, the Federal Government has taken money from the general funds, and in the form of price supports has passed it along to those who raise certain specified crops. This subsidization of the farmer has brought about a condition of Government ownership of cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco which is nothing short of ridiculous.

Of course, where the leveling effect of the actions of the Federal Government is felt most strongly is in the income tax structure. We have been accustomed to think of our economic system as a free enterprise system in which reward is proportionate to accomplishment, and accomplishment is achieved as a result of competition with others. But in our zeal to equalize people, we have gotten away from the idea of properly rewarding the man who does the best job.

If one of you graduates has superior energy and ability so he produces five times as much as a man with much less energy and ability, you would assume that the extraordinary producer would get five times the reward. But no—our tax system is designed to prevent this. It is the essence of our progressive tax system to penalize you precisely for your ability to produce more, and thereby to earn more.

In the McKinsey Foundation lectures delivered at Columbia University year before last, Crawford Greenewalt, of the Du Pont Co., said, "The admiration of the American people for achievement in any field is obvious and cannot be gainsaid." But, "When the rewards of achievement are paid in dollars rather than in honors or cheers, we say 'No, no,' and tax most of them away. We admire success, but penalize the successful; we admire talent, but penalize the talented; we admire initiative, but penalize the initiator; we admire leadership, but penalize the leaders."

The financial processes of the Federal Government extend beyond the income tax to other measures which work toward the objective of equalizing men financially. We level; we equalize; and by this very process we tend to destroy those things which make for real progress in our country. With this equalizing process, the able and diligent man feels he is getting a shabby deal, and the incentive to exert and apply his superior ability tends to disappear.

The leveling of men in a social sense, using the term "social" broadly, is most manifest, of course, in the school integration decisions of the Supreme Court; examples, it seems to me, of judge-made law at its worst. That one day school segregation could be legal, and 24 hours later it could be illegal, without act of Congress, or without an amendment to the Constitution, and in the face of clear and explicit language of the 10th amendment to the Constitution, does not comport with what I conceive to be the system of government entered into when the delegates of South Carolina ratified the Federal Constitution in Charleston on May 23, 1788.

The whole tendency of our times is to cherish and take care of the mediocre and ineffectual, and to penalize those who are able and who possess the habit of accomplishment. All of this has brought about a feeling of irresponsibility among a great many, and, in my opinion, a lowering of the standard of honest workmanship. The new cars which constantly have to be adjusted, the appliances which are not right, the waiters who don't serve, the long coffee breaks, low manufacturing efficiencies with low yields and high waste are common experiences.

Recognizing, however, that men are not equal, and recognizing also there are forces tending to level men, the question which you members of the 1960 graduating class must answer is: What should you do? What is your proper course of action? And my answer to this is that each of you should strive to become more unequal; you should strive to become more uncommon; you should strive for excellence in all that you are and do. It was in 1948 that Herbert Hoover said: "The great human advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women. They have been brought about by distinctly uncommon men and women with vital sparks of leadership."

The very fact that you men and women are here today, garbed in an academic costume which stems from medieval times, is an outward and visible manifestation of the fact that you are already unequal, that you are already uncommon, but what I urge you most strongly to do at this time, which is really but the beginning of your adult lives, is constantly to endeavor to become more unequal, to strive for excellence.

And you may raise the question: Why should I extend or exert myself? Why should I not simply work from 9 until 5, 5 days a week, watch television in the evening, play golf or cards, or go driving or fishing on Saturday and Sunday? And while there are many answers to this question, I shall give you two. In the first place, with conditions as they exist in this world today, it seems quite probable that your survival, the survival of your families, the survival of our country is dependent upon the degree of excellence which we as a Nation cultivate. Dr. James Killian, chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a native of Blacksburg, S.C., when he was special assistant to the President for science and technology, said that some aspects of American education have deteriorated despite the challenge of Soviet science. And the answer, he said, lies in bold and large-scale efforts to raise American intellectual standards to a level adequate to meet the challenge of the times. This goal, as applied to our colleges and universities, cannot be isolated from the quality of our intellectual life generally. What we really must be concerned with is the importance which the American people accord to the factor of excellence in our society, and it is to this factor that I ask you to turn your thoughts today.

When it was announced on the afternoon of Friday, October 4, 1957, that the scientists and engineers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had put a satellite in orbit around the earth, our entire country was amazed and astounded. The common conception of the Russians had been that they were a generally illiterate, uneducated group of peoples, without the innate capacity, the body of learned instructors, or the physical facilities requisite and necessary for a comprehensive educational system. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Adm. Hyman C. Rickover, in a report on Russia before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives last August, as a result of a visit to that country and to Poland, during which he made a special study of the educational systems of those countries, stated the real race we are in with communism is to see whose educational system best prepares youth for the world of modern science and technology. The evidence is very clear that graduates of the Russian 10-year schools are much more thoroughly, intensively, and comprehensively educated than are the graduates of our 12-year school systems, and that there are more of them. It is estimated graduates of Russian secondary schools are about 2 years more advanced than are the graduates of our high schools who have taken the college

preparatory course. In 1957 the Russians had 1,475,000 scientific and professional people, at which time we had 1,330,000. Moreover, in the scientific and technical fields, 30 percent of the Russians hold degrees that are higher than our own, degrees which correspond roughly to our doctorate of philosophy.

The significance of this to you men and women who will be graduated today is that in whatever field of endeavor you decide to go, it behooves you to continue to study, to learn, to prepare yourselves, to strive for excellence. This thirst of the Russian people for knowledge, the avidity with which they go about acquiring it, their success in achieving professional competence, and the uses to which their advanced scientific and technological abilities are being put are things which should motivate us most strongly in this direction.

Mr. Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of the board of the General Foods Corp., went to Russia last year in connection with the American National Exposition in Moscow. The second day he was there, he dictated this note into a portable dictating machine he had brought along with him: "It seems to me I have discovered the secret weapon of the Soviets. It is no secret at all. Quite the contrary: it is the universal willingness and desire to work primarily for the sake of achievement. Everyone takes pride in working and in doing it well." And we, remembering Premier Khrushchev's remarks, "We will bury you," must do even more.

The second answer I shall give you is that the fullest, deepest, richest, most gratifying, and most rewarding sense of satisfaction which can come to you as an individual will come as a result of your having made an uncommon effort, of your having done your very best in your work. Emerson, many years ago, in his essay, "Self Reliance," wrote: "A man is relieved and gay when he has put his heart into his work and done his best, but what he has said or done otherwise shall give him no peace."

Most human beings have, to some extent at least, a feeling of inadequacy, and of insecurity. One of the most effective remedies for these psychological disturbances, it seems to me, is the conscious realization you have exerted all your faculties and capabilities to the full, and that you have accomplished the desired result in splendid fashion.

For doing our best and for striving for excellence we have an adjuration in both the Old and New Testaments. The preacher said in the 10th verse of the 9th chapter of Ecclesiastes, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might—"; and in the 41st verse of the 5th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, it is written, "And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain."

In February of 1941, Dr. William E. Wickenden, a distinguished engineer and president of what is now Case Institute in Cleveland, took this verse from the Sermon on the Mount as the theme of an address before the Engineering Institute in Canada. And in this Dr. Wickenden said that every calling has its mile of compulsion, its daily round of tasks and duties, its standard of honest craftsmanship, but that beyond that lies the mile of volutnary effort, where men strive for excellence, give unrequited service for the common good, and seek to invest their work with a wide and enduring significance. It is the extra mile; the added effort, the fullest exertion which produces excellence.

One of the great Confederate victories during the War for Southern Independence was won at Chancellorsville on May 1 and 2, 1863, when Lee divided his army, and sent Jackson with part of it around to roll up the right flank of the Federal forces under Joe Hooker. Although the Confederates won an overwhelming victory, and drove the Federals back across the Potomac, it was at tremendous cost, since Jackson, that staunch and noble Presbyterian, was shot at dusk by mistake by his own men, and died of pneumonia 9 days later.

General Lee, realizing he must carry the war to the North, brought his men, inspirited and inspired by success, to Pennsylvania. During the fighting of the first day of the battle of Gettysburg, on July 1, 1863, Dorsey Pender's division of North Carolinians was sent by A. P. Hill to clear Seminary Ridge. They cleared Seminary Ridge. And Freeman tells us it was done with the fierce might which always made Pender's charges terrifying. The courage, the resolution, the determination, the indomitable spirit of those men was demonstrated by the color-bearer of the Thirteenth North Carolina. A projectile almost tore this boy's right arm from its socket. Scarcely pausing, he grasped the flagstaff with his left hand and continued to press on with the cry, "Forward; forward."

As you go out from these commencement exercises today, may you go forward with resolution and determination to become unequal, to become uncommon men and women, and as you go, may God be with you in all that you do.

From Where I Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural address entitled "From Where I Stand," made by my good friend and fellow Oklahoman, Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, of Oklahoma City, the new president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, an organization composed of 11 million women in the United States and in 60 foreign countries and territories.

I heard Mrs. Ozbirn give this address Friday evening, June 17, at the Sheraton Park Hotel. I was stirred by her words of vision and challenge, pointing to a magnificent effort for better understanding and friendship among the peoples of the world, beginning in this hemisphere. Under the leadership of this able and forceful Oklahoma woman, I am sure that the great organization of women will be an effective force in behalf of world peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM WHERE I STAND

(Address by Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, Oklahoma City, Okla., president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 17, 1960, Washington, D.C.)

Madam Chairman, esteemed friends, and dear family, this moment is a many splendored one—challenging, inspiring, and historic.

You have just conferred upon me the highest honor that is within your power—the international presidency of the largest group of organized women in the world. And by the same token, you have challenged me with the greatest gift of responsibility that can come to any woman through election to office, exceedable only, perhaps, when a woman is elected a Vice President of the United States.

As your president, you have designated me the leader of the most far-reaching group of organized women in the world—truly an empire on which the sun never sets—with its roots firmly planted in this Nation and its branches reaching into 50 foreign countries and territories.

Although I am grateful to you for the honor you have bestowed upon me, I hasten to say that I am cognizant of the great challenge facing me. Not only the challenge of leading an organization of millions of women, but the challenge of our way of life, yes—even to the existence of life itself on this planet.

This is an inspiring occasion. What could be more exhilarating, than from where I stand tonight, to look out over this magnificent audience—women assembled here from the length and breadth of this organization—and all dedicated to the same noble purpose—to build a better way of life?

What could be more gratifying than to be surrounded, as I am, by my devoted clubwomen and friends from my home State—Oklahoma? And what could be more heartening than to have the members of my precious family sharing this platform with me tonight?

And to you, my predecessors, several of whom honor me with your presence, with each of whom I have had the golden opportunity to serve, I salute you and pay a tribute of gratitude for your more than ordinary vision and courage that gives to us, today, our present heritage—rich, indescribable, and infinite.

Ours is a tradition of statesmanship and foresight we are solemnly obligated to perpetuate.

It has been tradition with us to exercise vision, wisdom, and concentrated effort toward those objectives which we view as necessary to the welfare of our country.

Over and over again, our plans have spanned decades—clearing paths for generations yet unborn.

The general federation worked for international good will and understanding in a period when our country was steeped in the philosophy of isolationism. Our clubwomen have never made the mistake of ignoring our neighbor because it was too much trouble to try to understand him.

Need I remind us that as early as 1896, the general federation was agitating for a bill in Congress that would provide for the settlement of our international problems around a peace table? And it was altogether fitting that the United Nations—our great international organization, dedicated to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the promotion of peace—had among its founding participants a former president of the general federation.

The Federation has always been highly sensitive to ways and means of keeping our Nation strong and free. Thirty-six years ago, the Federation recognized the need for more scientists in a resolution which expressed concern about the shortage of scientists in our country, and supported the encouragement of promising students and the recruitment of able science teachers. This resolution was reaffirmed 4 years ago—a year before the twinkle of Russia's pioneer man-made star—the first sputnik—awakened a drowsy America to the importance of a stepped-up program of nuclear science for its very survival—an awakening that today significantly gives the United States an overall advantage in nuclear ability.

Yes; this is a historic moment—uniquely so. With the beginning of this administration, we begin a new decade—the 10 years that could well be the most exciting of the 100,000 that man has inhabited this planet.

As we plunge into the "soaring sixties"—and what could well be the "sobering sixties of great decisions"—never before have our opportunities been greater, never before have our challenges loomed quite so large as in this most demanding of all decades.

With the boundaries of space, through the ingenuity of men, slipping away with astonishing rapidity—when far is near—we look in amazement upon the world of today.

We are surrounded by material wealth, and suffused in luxuries undreamed of a half century ago. The rich, warm atmosphere of prosperity is ours. Even now a historic moment of economic well-being is being recorded in our Nation. For the first time, the American economy is edging above the half-trillion mark.

It is difficult to believe that "trillion" in the sixties will become a working part of our vocabularies, just as "billion" astonished, awed, and then became commonplace in the forties and fifties.

All of this and more—and yet at no time in the history of our country has our way of life been on trial as it is at this moment.

Throw your mind, momentarily, as it were, around the world, and what do you find? Two nations—representing two ideologies—in a life and death struggle for the minds of men.

The United States of America on the right, a Christian nation—a freedom-loving nation—a democracy—that believes in and respects the right and the dignity of the individual. A nation of free self-government of and by the people—and God help us keep it so—with free enterprise the American way. Yes, a Nation that has a glorious record of standing in the brillance of its own integrity.

On the left—Communist Russia—a godless nation, a government-controlled nation—with no respect for freedom or the dignity of the individual and whose sole aim is world domination.

Yes, the current threat to democracy is genuine and ominous.

What can we do about it? Ours is a call to action—to mobilize the woman power of the General Federation in a dynamic program of "Responsible, Responsive Citizenship" in all affairs of public interest and concern. Beginning where? With you, in your community—the action point of democracy. There it is made and there it will be kept.

As your leader for the next 2 years, I appeal to you to reexamine, to reevaluate the organizational structure of the federation, its programs and its projects—and expediently make adjustments on all fronts to meet the needs and the demands of this day. It is a time when clubwomen must lay aside old rules and customs and unite in giving their best efforts to meet present challenges.

If at this moment I could wave a magic wand throughout the realm of this organization and my wish be granted, it would be that we promptly discard the old method of programing, and that every club would become a "roundtable" discussion group, with imaginatively planned forums, where clubwomen meet to study and engage in free discussion. Do away with the one speaker method. Clubwomen want both sides of the question presented and plenty of time allowed for questions and answers. Develop a "new town hall" in every club, open wide the doors, invite the interested people of your community and extend them the privilege to take a part in the discussions, as well as listen.

So strong is my conviction that it is our responsibility to develop and encourage citizenship responsibility and not in some comfortable future but right now, that in support of this conviction—and with the assistance of the department of adult education at the University of Oklahoma, a questionnaire, accompanied by a letter over my signature, was sent to the Governor and the senior U.S. Senator of each State—and to the president of each State university—with the request that each list what he or she considered the most vital issues before the public today. The response has been most gratifying and each response has indicated careful and studied thinking—and, I might add, strong commendation to the general federation for assuming the responsibility to know the problems and issues of public affairs, followed by suitable action. Many requested to be placed on our mailing list, stating that such study "could be most helpful in furnishing guide lines for governmental study."

At the State presidents' briefing conference tomorrow, the replies will be evaluated in relationship to setting into motion the public issues study program as a part of helping to solve today's problems—before they become the crises of tomorrow—and to aid in developing personal public responsibility.

A program of action of this magnitude highly indicates an enlarged legislative program and plans are now in the making to meet this need.

I am deeply persuaded that one of the greatest contributions this organization can make in the effort to help solve some of our national needs is the immense proliferation of action through dedicated and informed women—acting on a voluntary basis—for this is the core and strength of the General Federation. As an illustration, we cannot turn all the jobs of true welfare over to government, and this list could be added to. We must solve as many of these as possible on the voluntary level. It is apparent, using the General Federation, with our vast membership in this country, as an example, that we women appreciate and understand the value of voluntary action. This is the essence of responsible citizenship and the basis for democracy.

It is also my conviction that we must direct our attention to the business of strengthening our own organization. This is our first allegiance. We must keep a strong sense of purpose—the life in an organization. Recapture—revitalize our role of leadership by accommodating the power we do possess with our willingness to use it. Make all our programs in the name and in the right of the General Federation. The time has come when we need to call a halt to the cooperating and fund raising trend that is dissipating our energies, time and talent. Projects, yes; but limited to those that serve as an important tool for the implementation of our own programs, whether they be at the community and State level—or national and international in scope.

Now on the broader front: Undoubtedly the issue of greatest concern is that of insuring a basis for a just and durable peace, which involves greater international understanding. It is common knowledge that while we have been concentrating on Europe, Asia, and Africa—we have lost friends in this hemisphere. Therefore, the attention, the activities and the international emphasis of this administration will be turned toward the Western Hemisphere—the bulwark of democracy.

We are aware that the heritage of a long history of harmonious Canadian-American relations is being eroded away and primarily because of America's thoughtlessness and unconcern. All too few Americans are aware of this, largely because they know so little about actual Canada itself. The average American knows more about Europe's problems than he does of our neighbor north of the 49th parallel. We need Canada's friendship, support and raw materials. Canada has one of the world's highest standards of living, a literate and progressive citizenry—and a booming economy. Physically she stands between the United States and the Soviet Union on transpolar air routes. In the field of diplomacy, she helps to interpret the United States to Commonwealth neutrals like India. And more trade flows on the Great Lakes every day than through the Suez and Panama Canals combined. In recognition that this easy-going relationship must end and because we desire to keep a good neighbor and to be a good neighbor, it is with keen anticipation that we will have the stimulating personal contact with the Canadian Council of Women's Clubs and the General Federation of Women's Clubs participating in a 3-day seminar, September 30 through October 2, preceded by our own fall board of directors meeting. Both meetings to be in Montreal, and with the members of the board of directors making a valuable contribution in developing a better understanding and strengthening the bonds of friendship.

In further support of our Western Hemisphere solidarity program, immediately following the General Federation Convention, June 5 through 10, 1961, at Miami Beach, Fla., our international convention will be held in Rio de Janeiro, followed by a series of seminars in other Latin American countries, based on the subject of "Participation of Women in Public Affairs."

Why Latin America? Proximity alone provides sufficient reason for us to be especially interested in our Latin American neighbors to the South. In addition to proximity, there is the very important fact of our economic interdependence. Our trade and investments in the Americas, including Canada, are greater than for all the rest of the world put together. During the past few years the United States has annually received one-third of its total imports from Latin America and—at the same time—has shipped one-fourth of its exports to that area.

United States involvement with Latin America is made even greater by the fact of the Cold War. We cannot afford to treat our southern neighbors with the casualness of the recent past. As one authority has put it, "We cannot win the cold war in Latin America, but we can lose it there."

These things and more bind us together so strongly that a common effort to build the Western Hemisphere a true bulwark of peace and democracy seems both necessary and inevitable.

And those with whom we have advised in the State Department highly commended the General Federation for its choice of international emphasis these two years—and are lending full support in planning and implementing seminars both in Canada and Latin America.

And now we are faced with an immediate public issue of serious importance and import—a national election. The time has come when we should discard the outmoded idea that we are a nonpolitical organization, because we are not. We are a bipartisan organization. Politics today is every one's business. We are obligated as responsible citizens to know the issues, the principles involved and the character of the men and women who are seeking public office.

How much do Americans care about their free government? Judging by our voting record, many of us care less than we should. Make your first concern this year's election. I appeal to all of you, as representatives of your clubs and State federations—to immediately set into motion an intensive program in your communities designed to arouse your citizens from their apathetic indifference.

It is not too much to say that the fate of this era, in these perilous times, could well be determined by the next election—for much of our survival depends on the leadership of this Nation.

Who's decade will it be? The answer could well be found in the words of the purpose of this administration, "Responsible, responsive citizenship for survival."

This moment, together, we pick up the pen to write the history of the General Federation in the first 2 years of this exciting demanding decade. Ours is the challenge to write our most significant record.

What will the answer be? It is within you. As you will it, so will it be.

And this our benediction would be:

"Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord, for where the spirit of God is, there is liberty."

Cloudy Defense Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner published a front-page editorial on June 14 concerning the military defense of Alaska and the other States to the south. It evaluates a pattern of contradiction in high-level policy which preceded the removal of the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron from the first line of national defense. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Cloudy Defense Picture," he printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOUDY DEFENSE PICTURE

A study of the numerous Air Force statements, press service news stories and dispatches from our own correspondents in Washington concerning the current Alaska defense picture leaves us—and we'll wager there are others who feel the same—wondering "Just how important is Alaska defense?"

Back in March of this year, Alaskans were told by the Air Force that the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron based here was to exchanges its F–89 aircraft for F–101B's—a superior, more modern faster and more effective type of aircraft. There has no hint in this announcement that the Air Force considered the 449th expendable. The plan to provide this unit with greater defensive punch would seem to indicate exactly the opposite.

Less than 2 months later, however, the situation seemed to take a 180-degree turn so far as the Air Force was concerned when the announcement was made that not only would the 449th not get the F–101B's, but the unit was going to be scrapped.

The reasoning advanced at this time was that the move was being made in connection with redeployment of America's defenses, giving greater emphasis to missile defenses, which, it was felt, could be based more conveniently and more economically in the United States.

Many valid arguments have been advanced against this point of view—a point of view which apparently was inconsistent with Pentagon thinking just a few months back.

Recently, a partial return to the original Air Force evaluation of the importance of Alaska was made—a move totally inconsistent with action to eliminate the 449th in August.

The Air Force statement carried in today's News-Miner declares that the number of F–102 fighter interceptors now stationed in Alaska will be increased and that these interceptors will maintain a continuous air defense alert in the Fairbanks area and in other areas of Alaska.

If a continuous air defense alert is now considered vital by the Air Force, why is the 449th being scrapped?

Why did the Air Force evaluation of Alaska's importance change so radically within a few weeks then change back again?

Why has nothing been said about defending with both missiles and aircraft the $300 million Ballistic Early Warning System station now going up at clear?

Isn't it logical to try to intercept Russian bombers from Alaska instead of waiting until their manned aircraft get over vital targets in the heart of the United States? (It is true as the Air Force has contended, that Alaska is not necessarily the only direct route of approach against targets in the United States—but it is one of the principal routes. Alaskan fighters certainly could appreciably blunt the Russian attack and ease the blow against the rest of America, and naturally, if Alaska's defenses are stripped, the Russians undoubtedly would pick the over-Alaska route as the best possible one for their offensive.)

This military maxim still holds true: The farther away from its target that an enemy invader is intercepted, the better from a standpoint of national security.

The Air Force policy toward Alaska has not been consistent; it has vacillated at least three times in the last 3 months. We hope it will now solidify on a policy which has much support both inside and outside the military; the policy of making Alaska strong instead of weak; heavily defended instead of highly vulnerable.

What's Happening to Our Cities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our fast-expanding population—resulting in greater business, industrial, and residential concentrations, urban expansions, and other far-reaching changes in our economic life—create the necessity for planning ahead effectively. Why? To assure that these significant facets of our economy are deployed to best serve our people.

The trend toward urbanization particularly creates a variety of complex problems. These involve the need for adequate zoning of business, residential, and industrial districts; expansion of educational facilities; expansion of water, sewage, and other facilities; improving road, rail, air, and water access to and from urban centers; and a variety of other complex challenges.

If the Nation is to best utilize its human and natural resources, then we must plan effectively to accommodate and meet the growing urban-community needs for our increasing populace.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal published an informative interview with Victor Gruen, a nationally recognized authority on city planning, entitled "What's Happening to Our Cities?"

Reflecting the complexity of the problems, as well as proposing solutions for more effectively coping with them, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, June 16, 1960]

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO OUR CITIES?—CELLULAR FORM OF URBAN PLANNING IS CALLED THE ANSWER TO METRO PROBLEM

Question. What is the answer to the city's problem?

Answer. I believe in a new type of metropolitan organization which I call the cellular form of urban planning.

Question. Would you explain that?

Answer. This form goes back to the way nature builds all her own creations—by grouping atoms and molecules in cellular fashion.

Question. How would you apply this cellular system to a city?

Answer. By starting from the simplest and smallest module—the human being—building up from there to a family unit, then a group of family units, and then to a small community.

That might be the basic cellular form in the urban environment. A number of such cellular forms—or communities—may then form a bigger one, which may be a town. But each of these cellular forms, or communities, should remain as a definite unit, and should not flow into the others.

Question. How would you keep the communities apart?

Answer. I feel that in our cities of the future we should arrange green spaces and separations between each one of the cellular forms, and should not allow our cities to be converted into the endless, amorphous, suburban deserts which we see today crawling over the entire countryside.

Question. Then how are these communities linked to form a city?

Answer. Cells, clusters of cells, constellations of such clusters, form a planetary system revolving, in their activities, around a powerful solar body in the form of the metropolitan core. In this core, the highest expressions of the economic, cultural, social, and work life are represented.

Question. Would we have to rebuild cities from scratch to develop this cellular system?

Answer. That is not necessary. We could convert the present pattern of our cities with comparatively little effort into the kind of pattern I am talking about. We could do it by using tools at our disposal which we are now misusing.

Question. Such as?

Answer. One of the best means for the purpose are the freeways, highways, parkways, and so on that we are building today. The trouble is that now we are building them from a strictly engineering point of view—simply to connect two points of nonexistent interest in the shortest possible manner.

In building freeways today we are disrupting existing communities, often cutting them apart, cutting off homes from their schools or from their shopping centers.

Question. What should be done with these freeways?

Answer. We should use them to encircle the various cells of which I spoke—these clusters of human activities.

Question. We've been hearing a lot lately about the "downtown mall." Is this a part of your cellular pattern?

Answer. Yes. It is definitely a part of it. I am frequently referred to in the press as the "father of the mall."

Though I do not want to shirk my paternal responsibilities, I must say that I am a little concerned about the kid. I believe that many mistakes are being made in its upbringing. The mall will be a success only when it grows up normally and organically.

Many mall experiments which are now going on—and I have heard about 50 such experimental malls—are like precocious

children. Because it is dramatic to take all traffic out of Main Street and grow trees and bushes there, it has publicity value, it makes newspaper headlines and it therefore is used as a promotional device.

But a mall is only a part of the whole pattern. The question is: How essential a part is it, and when should it be brought into execution?

Question. What is wrong with the mall?

Answer. The mall will be effective only if other things have been done first. Obviously, if we close up one of our main downtown streets to create a mall, then the autobiles that formerly used that street will have to go somewhere else. That means we just add congestion on other streets. The trouble with our downtown areas is not merely that they don't have green spaces and trees and flowerbeds. The main trouble, as I pointed out, is that it is so hard to get to the downtown area, hard to park once you get there, and then so hard to move around after you park. So just by creating a mall and planting grass in it, you haven't really solved an awful lot.

Question. What should a city do first?

Answer. Before you can afford to build a mall, you have to arrange for better accessibility to downtown areas by both private and public transportation.

You have to provide some kind of "retainer basin" for the traffic which flows in from all sides. I usually propose doing this by having loop roads encircling the core area and, immediately adjoining these loop roads, storage space for private automobiles and terminals for public transportation.

Question. Who is going to pay for all this? Isn't it true that the people with higher incomes are moving out of cities, into the suburbs?

Answer. That is not entirely true. In fact, we can observe today the beginning of a return to the city of such people.

I have recently heard some interesting figures that indicate a comeback for city apartments. This may be partly explained by the fact that commuting has become so much of a nuisance. Land has grown more expensive. It is hard to find help to tend suburban lawns and gardens. Provision of public services such as sewage, roads, power, water, schools, is becoming more costly as the spreading continues. The detached house is growing out of the reach of more and more people.

So I would predict that we will see a reversal of the flow, and that the refugees who have left in the last 20 years will come flooding back toward the center of the cities.

Question. Are public funds available?

Answer. We have a number of very practical tools for reshaping our cities, and one of the most important is the Federal redevelopment and renewal program. In the beginning, this was merely a slum clearance program and was concerned only with residences. Even with that limitation, it helped downtown areas considerably, because it converts the slums which surround our city centers into middle income housing.

Lately, through some changes and modifications in the law, it has become possible to apply urban renewal to commercial areas in the downtown sections.

Now it is possible for a community to receive funds from the Government to draw up a plan. The bulldozer approach is not necessarily the correct one.

It may be that renewal, rather than redevelopment, is the answer. Buildings that are beyond redemption may be condemned while those that are still in good condition may be left standing. With the Federal and State Governments putting up three-quarters of the money, the city can demolish the old buildings, put in new sewers and new utilities, then turn the area over to private developers for renewal.

Question. Is the rebuilding of downtown areas actually being done in some cities?

Answer. We are working now on a number of such projects in downtown centers. We are doing one in Stamford, Conn., and another in Paterson, N.J.

One project that is unusual and probably the furthest advanced is that which is taking place in Rochester, N.Y. There the redevelopment is being done by private enterprise.

Question. How did this come about in Rochester?

Answer. Here we had a case of two downtown department stores that came to us, I believe, 3 years ago and said: "We're finding ourselves in quite a quandary. Business downtown is retrogressive. We have considered opening branch stores, as some of our competitors are doing. In fact, we each have one branch store. But we are not very happy with them. We believe Rochester is not a big enough city for regional shopping centers with department store branches. What do you think?"

I replied: "Gentlemen, you're absolutely right."

They said: "Do you believe there is a chance to do something about the downtown area? We love our town and would rather spend our money to give it new life than drain the money off into the suburbs."

I told them: "I think there is something you can do, especially since your city has already taken a number of steps in the right direction."

Question. What has the city of Rochester done?

Answer. Rochester is building a loop road, which I have mentioned, as one of the important ingredients in city replanning. It is about half completed and the other half should be completed in 2 or 3 years.

The city is also building a new civic center, which is important because it creates greater civic pride and interest.

Rochester has a very progressive administration which is giving thought to changes in the whole traffic pattern and has built a number of city-owned parking garages along the edge of the downtown area.

Question. How big is this Midtown Plaza?

Answer. There are about 8 or 9 acres of land involved. The Midtown Plaza is a fusion of existing structures and new ones. The existing ones are the two department stores and a hotel. The new ones are stores, auditoriums, coffeeshops, restaurants, and so on, and an 18-story office building of which the top 4 floors are occupied by a new hotel.

Underneath this complex is arranged a 2,000-car garage on three levels. All the stores, the hotel, and the office building can be reached on two merchandising levels from an air-conditioned, landscaped pedestrian mall two stories high. People can reach the mall by escalator from the garages.

Question. What does the city of Rochester contribute to this?

Answer. The city pays for the parking garage. But the city had already promised to build a garage anyway, and by getting the underground rights from the owners of the property has saved itself immense costs. This project shows what can be done by private investment with the cooperation of the city.

Question. How do loop or belt highways fit into this picture? How should a city lay out its traffic system?

Answer. Let's for a moment use an analogy. Let's compare a traffic system with a river system. A river starts with little springs that flow into brooklets; the brooklets flow into creeks, and the creeks into rivers which empty into the ocean.

The traffic river is similar. Small roads combine into big roads that merge into highways that lead into freeways. The trouble is, there's no ocean for the traffic to pour into. When it finally arrives in the city it finds itself jammed into narrow streets. The result is a flood, just as if you dammed a river.

Question. How can you handle this traffic flood?

Answer. If you want to avoid a traffic flood, you have to provide an ocean, or a retention basin. That ocean can take the form of broad belt highways which distribute the traffic around the most congested areas. Multiple deck parking garages, accessible directly from the belt highway, are an integral part of this retention basin.

Question. Where does rapid transit come in?

Answer. There must still be public transportation, semipublic transportation and rapid transit. This includes buses, subways, taxis, and so on.

Question. What about the monorail which has been talked about a lot in the last few years?

Answer. I am very much worried about the tremendous attraction that names such as monorail hold for so many people. Everybody talks about the monorail. It sounds so modern. Yet, actually, what is a monorail? It's just a third avenue "el" on one rail.

It's just as disturbing to the neighborhoods through which it passes.

That doesn't mean that the monorail does not have its place. But I do not think its place is within a highly developed urban area. It might be used to connect one urban area with another. It might be placed above riverbeds, or between banks of freeways—but not inside our city pattern.

Question. Is it true that in cities that have pretty good rapid transit it is not being patronized—that people are still staying with their automobiles?

Answer. No, it is not. There has been very little done to improve rapid transportation, but where it has been done, it has had immediate effect.

Question. Where has this been done?

Answer. In Philadelphia, they have done something very simple. The city has guaranteed to the commuter railroads a certain minimum income on condition that the fare be reduced and the service improved. The effect has been that the railroads' commuter traffic has increased to a high degree.

Question. What other cities have done anything about rapid transit?

Answer. Chicago has built new rapid transit lines between the lanes of their new freeways, and these new lines enjoy good patronage. Chicago has made it a condition that no freeway can be built within the city limits which does not give the city free right-of-way between the lanes for rapid transit. And a wise measure this is, because it means that with every mile of freeway they also get a mile of rapid transit.

Question. Are you optimistic that the problem will be solved and that the big city will be saved?

Answer. I believe that it must be, and therefore that it will be. I am optimistic because of the change in thinking, the growth of interest in the problem that has occurred in the last 5 years. There are so many forces moving now that I have no doubt that we will see action.

I also believe that, once the first breakthrough is made in any of the approximately 100 cities that are seriously planning redevelopment of their downtown areas—as soon as one of them succeeds—the idea will spread.

Question. Is there any limit to the size of a city that can be rebuilt? How about New York, for example?

Answer. The basic approach is the same. The difference is that the very big city center will consist of more cells than a small one.

Question. Do you visualize the reshaping of cities as being done by private capital or out of tax revenue?

Answer. There will be a mixture of those two things. Only where the combination of private and public action is fully effective will we be successful.

Question. How about rapid transit systems? Will they be operated by private enterprise or by the city government?

Answer. I believe that public transportation is just as much a public service as the police department, the sewage system, the schools or the roads. It is in the nature of public services that they cannot be successfully operated in the framework of the profit motive.

Decline of Basic Values in Contemporary Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 7, James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, made an able address at a testimonial dinner for Col. W. D. Workman in Columbia, S.C. Mr. Kilpatrick spoke knowledgeably of the basic values which appear to be on the wane in contemporary society. His address is well worth the reading for every Senator and Congressman, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By this time next year, the Southern States will be swarming with visitors to our salubrious climes by various centennial observances marking episodes in the late unpleasantness. Up home, where we often are reminded of how the Yankees took Richmond, our retail merchants are happily figuring how Richmond will take the Yankees. After a hundred years, we are about to get a little of our own back.

This wave of renewed interest in the war prompts me to some renewed speculation this evening on one of the oldest flights of fancy in American history. Suppose, I have asked myself, suppose Longstreet had come up in time that summer day, and Stuart had not been out picking daisies or whatever he was doing when Lee couldn't find him, and that Gettysburg had gone the other way. Suppose Lee had pulled off the victory on which he had pinned such hopes; and suppose that Union generals had then sued for terms. Suppose, in brief, that the South had won.

This is a fetching theme to brighten an idle hour, and though it has its lighter aspects it has some serious points worth pondering also.

It is possible, of course, considering the stubbornly individualistic nature of the southerner in political combat, that the Confederate States of America would themselves have seceded one by one from their own Southern Union. Such is the fraticidal temper of our brotherly love that we willingly might have sacrificed a southern constitution—the Atlanta Constitution, that is—at some point along the line. There have been times in Virginia when some of us willingly would have ceded Arlington County back to the District.

But suppose the Confederate States of America had survived as a separate political entity. What then? Well, there would have been no Reconstruction, of course, or at least no Reconstruction as we knew it in Military District No. 1. Doubtless President Davis would have asked some reparations—for enough Union cash to tidy up the Treasury a bit—but he was a man of vision and he would have taken one long, sober look at New York City and said to Mr. Lincoln, keep it, sir. He would have thought about Detroit, and he would have said, keep that, too. By way of reparations, we might have demanded as tribute a lifetime supply of Milwaukee beer, Maine lobsters, and the apple strudel they make in Lancaster, Pa., but there would have been nothing greedy in all this. General Grant would have understood such terms.

And then we would have settled down, the United States of America on one side of the Potomac, and the Confederate States of America on the other, and we would have entered upon those cordial relationships of commerce and industry by which, in our own times, belligerents become the best of friends. And oh, gentlemen, how trade would have thrived. Here in the South we are blessed with at least three necessities of any proper civilization: Beauty queens, bourbon, and Flue-cured tobacco. In these essentials of human existence, the South stands alone. And whenever our late antagonists threatened to get restive, we would have slapped an embargo on Jack Daniels, Chesterfields, and sweet-talking ladies from Mississippi. We would have brought 'em to their knees once more.

It would have been a happy, peaceful, and prosperous time. When automobiles were invented, we would have had the oil to keep up a trade balance. When the time came for prohibition, we would have ministered to the Union thirst; common humanity would have demanded no less. The Confederate States of America, we may be certain, would have spurned an income tax amendment; we would have avoided foreign aid, unless it came our way, and year by year our blissful, thrifty, and solvent land would have become the envy of our brothers and the administration of the civilized world.

Our Constitution, you will recall, provided for not only those individual freedoms and liberties that were to be expected from the sons of Mason, but included many other provisions that the experienced eye of Southern statesmen had viewed as desirable additions to the Constitution of the old Union they had left behind. If I might be serious for a minute or two, on such a festive occasion, perhaps you would let me call attention to a few of these forgotten provisions. There is much to be learned from them.

The Confederate Constitution, opened with a preamble adapted from the preamble of 1787, but with two especially significant changes. The old preamble began, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union," and so forth. The Confederate preamble began in this fashion: "We the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent Federal Government," and so forth. The purpose of these changes is apparent: The revised language made explicit what the framers of 1787, in their rush to finish their work that summer, had unintentionally left ambiguous—ours was never a union formed simply by "we the people," but rather a federation created by the ratifying acts of separate sovereign States, any one of which was free to come in or to remain outside.

From that clear and admirable beginning, framers of the Confederate Constitution proceeded by careful and deliberate changes in the old language to draft a new and more perfect compact. Thus, the legislative powers that were "granted" to the Congress of the United States in the document of 1787 were pointedly merely "delegated" to the Congress of the Confederate States in the language of 1862.

Article II of the Confederate Constitution contained a clause of such clairvoyant brilliance that I invite you to join me in respectful admiration for those of our fathers who thought it up. This clause gave the Confederate house of representatives the sole power of impeachment, with one exception: "Except that any judicial or other Federal officer resident and acting solely within the limits of any State, may be impeached by a vote of two-thirds of both branches of the legislature thereof." Think what a comfort it would have been to you Carolinians a decade ago, when a certain Federal judge who shall be nameless was warring upon your institutions, to have had power to reach him through the legislature at Columbia. Think what a blessing it would be to Virginians today if we could have a man removed by the same deliberate process.

Section IV of the Confederate constitution eliminated a word from the 1787 version that continues to cause trouble today. As you know, the Congress in Washington has power to alter State regulations dealing with the times, places, "and manner" of holding elections. The Confederate congress at Richmond had power to alter state regulations dealing only with the "times and places" of elections; the "manner" of conducting elections was seen as a prerogative of each individual state.

In the sixth section, the Confederate constitution provided for an arrangement that at first glance may seem to violate principles of separation of government, but on second thought is found to have great merit. This permitted members of the Confederate cabinet—the "principal officers in each of the executive departments"—to have a seat upon the floor in House or Senate, "with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department."

Section VII contained the provision Senator HARRY BYRD has so often tried to obtain through the enactment of a bill in Congress, as a useful instrument for Presidents of the United States: The item veto for appropirations acts. Section VIII further attested the prudent wisdom of the Confederate fathers in matters of governmental finance. They rewrote the clause that appears in Article I of the United States Constitution to limit the power of their own Congress to levy taxes for revenue purposes only, sufficient to "pay the debts and provide for the common defence." They deliberately eliminated the vague power to lay taxes to provide for the general welfare. They looked forward, too, to all the trouble inherent in the commerce clause, and they carefully circumscribed the power delegated to the Congress in Richmond to regulate commerce: Except for aids to navigation, the cost of which was to be paid by the steamship lines themselves, no internal improvements of any sort were to be financed in the name of regulating commerce. Mr. Summerfield, the eminent Postmaster-General, would have admired this Constitution of ours; it insisted that the expenses of the Post Office Department be paid from the department's own revenues. The Confederate Constitution provided that no funds could be appropriated without a two-thirds, yea-and-nay vote, unless the appropriation had been requested by a department head and submitted by the President. There would have been no pork barrel at Richmond.

It really is remarkable, how far ahead our fathers looked in framing their own Constitution. They provided for an executive with a six-year term, and anticipating the con-

siderations that led us nine years ago to the 22d Amendment, they provided that no President could succeed himself. Anticipating, perhaps, some of the elaborate rows over civil service hirings and firings, which seem to cause such weeping and wailing on the part of the Washington Post today, the Confederate Constitution authorized the Confederate President, in blunt and unmistakable terms, to fire any civil employee he pleased, at any time, on his own finding of inefficiency or misconduct.

One more provision, and I am done: Our Republic's present Constitution, as you know, can be amended, in practical effect, only after two-thirds of each House of the Congress have agreed to a specific proposal. This means that a large bloc in the House of Representatives, from, say, California, New York, and Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio, able to muster one-third of the votes plus one, can prevent even the consideration of a proposed constitutional amendment. Under the Confederate Constitution, however, it was provided that "upon the demand of any three States, legally assembled in their several conventions, the Congress shall summon a convention of all the States, to take into consideration such amendments to the Constitution as the said States shall concur in suggesting at the time when the said demand is made." And the provision went on to say that amendments agreed to by such a convention would thereafter have to be ratified by at least two-thirds of the States in order to become part of the Constitution.

The Confederate Constitution also provided, of course, for the admission of new States into the Confederate States of America, and we may imagine that the provision would have been frequently invoked. After all, the right of the States to secede from the United States would have now been established. Looking below the Mason-Dixon line, our cousins to the North would have perceived great advantages here. One by one, such excellent States as Indiana, Delaware, and Ohio might have applied for admission: We would have annexed the Indianapolis Star, the home office of du Pont, and a port on the Great Lakes. Politically, it would have been said, as the CSA waxed larger, that no northerner ever could be elected President, but sooner or later Mr. LAUSCHE of Ohio would have proved the maxim inapposite.

So the Confederate States of America would have grown to a rightful place among the powers of the earth, strong at home, respected abroad, and whenever the central bureaucracy at Richmond threatened an excess of bureaucracy, a rumbling warning of fresh secession would have curbed the tendency toward needless expansion. What a paradise was lost when the principles of federalism were rejected a century ago.

But my purpose in coming here this evening is not to lament the vanished glories of the Confederacy, but to reflect instead upon the present-day South, its great strengths, its abiding virtues, even a few of its weaknesses, for these were the characteristics that Bill Workman dealt with in his book, and they are characteristics that need to be better understood elsewhere in the land.

If I were to single out one quality above all others that distinguishes the South, and makes it a political and social entity, I believe it would be the South's obedience to the commandment that appears in many of our State constitutions, "to recur frequently to fundamental principles." This is not, as some would have it, a process of forever living in the past; it is not arch-reaction, or ante bellum stodginess, or a merely static insistence on the status quo. It is rather an instinctive, ingrained approach to change and innovation; it colors all our political and social relationships; it figures in our family life and in our churches; it is part of our public affairs, our education, our business and professional life.

And it is a good and wise thing. One fundamental principle is that, in general, the least government is the best government. Another is that government must operate by the consent of the governed. Still a third is that government must be kept close to the people. And because we of the South inherit a political allegiance to these principles, and recur to them frequently, it may be that we comprehend better than some of our brothers the evils that lie in an overgrown government, enforcing its will by fiat upon an unconsenting people, operating through remote and politically unreachable process upon our daily lives.

This habit of the South, to look backward before plunging forward, has blessed us with an incalculably valuable gift, the ability to resist the impulse of the moment. When it is suggested that Congress, by some grand enactment, can repeal the laws of supply and demand, the Southerner knows better. When it is suggested that a court decree can reverse the laws of evolution, and remand them for further consideration in some lower court, the South says simply, it cannot be done that way; stop, it is not so easy.

This is the long view, gentlemen; it is the long view. It is a view drawn from the soil, from the certain knowledge that some things can't be hurried, that grain cannot be harvested until it is ripened, that it cannot ripen until it has matured by sun and rain and the passing of time, and that much depends upon the seed and the good earth, and may it please the court, on God and His divine plans.

For all the urbanization and industrialization of the South, we are still—and I say it thankfully—a region deeply and almost spiritually touched by an agrarian tradition. What we are most in danger of losing, I sometimes fear, is this capacity for reflection upon the green fields, the golden uplands, the forests that blanket our old and patient mountains. This has always been the blessing of the South, that it has had a Calhoun to sit in his study at Fort Hill, gazing upon the good earth; a Jefferson to look from his mountain top in Albemarle; and today (if you will forgive the pride of a Virginian in a great son), a Byrd to relax of a summer night on the great porch at Rosemont, with orchards and a church steeple and the misty Shenandoah spread before him. So we recur to fundamental principles, the growing seed, the movement of water to the sea, and we hear above the katydids and the tree frogs how slowly ticks the eternal clock.

What I am groping to say here is nothing new. "The world is too much with us," said Wordsworth. "Late and soon, getting and spending, we lay waste our powers." And perhaps all I am really saying is that we are not quite so concerned, here in the South, with the incessant processes of getting and spending. We have known values not for sale in a supermarket: order, and self-reliance, and a sense of tradition, a respect for the wisdom of the great men who have preceded us.

These were the characteristics that Confederate statesmen, a century ago, brought to the writing of their constitution. They are the characteristics that sustained our people through the long and bitter night of Reconstruction, through the lean years at the century's turn, through the terrible grinding poorness of the thirties. And, gentlemen, they will sustain us, yet.

Our purpose, it seems to me, is twofold: It is to stand by the Constitution, and to preserve our society. In these two honest aims, we shall not fail.

How does one stand by the Constitution when every passing Monday sees some imperceptible fragment of it washed away? How does one preserve a society against powerful forces so recklessly, and so ignorantly, determined to impose a new order?

We recur, gentlemen, to fundamental principles. Let us study the Constitution unceasingly, not in the idle memorization of words and phrases, but in the deep, unchanging meaning of the instrument itself. Let us strive to understand and to admire the complex beauty of the relationship devised so long ago for keeping government in check, lest it snatch away the liberties of the people. In our public lives, let us seek to apply these principles to contemporary affairs, and to test every proposition by the Constitution as a good craftsman tests his work, holding it squared to the light. And when we have so schooled ourselves in the disciplines of the Constitution, in the reasons behind it, in the worth of its requirements, in the permanence of its values, we must make of ourselves missionaries to teach others. Once there arose a king, it will be recalled, who knew not Joseph. Just so, a generation has arisen in our country, that knows not the Constitution. Thirty years of progressive education have raised up millions of young and middle-aged Americans who have been taught little or nothing of these old values. They are alseep; let us wake them. And let us never be discouraged in this long struggle. The slow erosion of the Constitution has been a work of many years. It will take many years to build it back.

And just so, we must examine our society, its strengths and its shortcomings, its enduring values, the reasons for preserving it; we must first understand ourselves, and with firmness and good will, and respect for the contrary views of others, we must likewise wage a continuing campaign of education to win others to some comprehension of a way of life that is inescapably different from ways of life elsewhere in the Republic. We must instruct our cousins in what Emerson called "the solid angularity of life facts." On this score, I pass along a reflection for what it may be worth: These past half a dozen years, paradoxically, have been good for many of us in the South. We have been compelled to a reexamination of many things we had taken for granted or scarcely thought about at all. We have been embarrassed, I suspect, at some of the more foolish impositions that had been put upon the Negro people, and a source of our strength lies in the steady progress that is being made—in the midst of some maddening provocations—to remedy these ills. South Carolina's magnificent program of Negro school construction is a case in point, but you will not read much of that case in the New York Times.

We are familiar with this case in Bill Workman's book: The case for the Constitution, the case for a stable society, the case for preservation of those cultural qualities indigenous to our land, the case for an unpopular, minority cause in a country dedicated to the proposition that minorities have rights that must be respected—the case, in brief, for the unbeatable South.

One word more: We speak properly, in the context of the contemporary scene, of this case as a case for the South. It is we who stand politically as tertium quids, resentful lodgers in the house of our fathers, gazing in mounting anger at the abuses of our alien in-laws. It is we, below the Potomac, who have known longest and most intimately the infinite complexities and the unwritten rules that make possible a happy life on the part of two races thrown closely together by fate. In the common parlance of man, we are talking especially and particularly of a case "for the South."

But gentlemen, this is a larger case. The principles of government and of human behavior and of the relationship of man to the state that Bill Workman has set forth,

are not ours alone. They make up a case for free men in a free society, and they underlie every concept of wise change and sound growth. Whatever temporary adversities we may suffer, the case itself in the end must triumph. For this is, as Mr. Jefferson once remarked, the common glory of us all.

Propaganda Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 15, my good friend, the genial publisher of the Pekin Daily Times, was the leadoff guest speaker at the 1960 workshop on economic education at Bradley University. Mr. McNaughton spoke on "Propaganda Analysis," outlining the 6 approaches to propaganda and the 15 techniques employed by the propagandists.

As an introduction to the speech, Mr. McNaughton gave the 39 Peoria area teachers attending the 2-week concentrated course on busines economics a test. The test, which was graded during the speech and the results read back to the group at the conclusion of the talk, demonstrated to the teachers that they are not free from prejudice and perhaps they are easy prey for clever propagandists.

The results of the test for the teachers were very interesting and I should like to have them reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McNaughton closed his speech by challenging the teachers to practice these five rules of mental conduct:

First. We can give up certainty; that being certain is itself a sin, certain to be avenged by life.

Second. We can reach tentative decisions from facts, stripped of propaganda shortcuts and gadgets. These decisions we will hold subject to revision in light of the new.

Third. We can refuse to be stampeded by anyone for any cause.

Fourth. We can urge others to act intelligently in view of the available facts.

Fifth. We can thus maintain the "crackerbarrel" spirit. We can stand on our own two feet in our thinking and help others to do the same.

TEACHERS TAKE TEST

(By Dean McNaughton)

Teachers can take it as well as dish it out.

At the afternoon session of the "Bradley Economic Workshop" yesterday I threw a "test" at the Peoria area teachers.

Why a test?

Well, my assigned subject was "Propaganda Analysis." My first mission was to demonstrate through a test that a large group of intelligent teachers can't agree on any controversial question—including the ultimate destination of the sinful. (They agreed, however, on two questions.)

A lecture on the subtle tricks used by professional propagandists is better understood when teachers realize the wide diversity of opinion in the group.

THE TEST

(Please answer the following questions by circling "Yes" or "No." Let your answers to the questions reflect your innermost feeling (prejudices and biases included), not the way you "ought" to feel.)

1. Teachers in the primary and secondary schools should receive more pay to keep them in line with other professional groups, and the laboring class. Yes, 39; no, 0.

2. Band parents tend to become overwrought about grade schools bands. Yes, 21; no, 18.

3. Organized lobbying should be prohibited in the State and Federal legislatures. Yes, 12; no, 27.

4. Taxpayers with $75,000 or more income should have their income tax lowered to promote "capital investment." Yes, 7; no, 32.

5. I objection to a Catholic becoming President of the United States. Yes, 15; no, 24.

6. More than any other factor, Hoover's ultraconservative program caused the great depression. Yes, 2; no, 37.

7. The Anglo-Saxon race is superior to all other races. Yes, 6; no, 33.

8. Vice President NIXON is a political opportunist. Yes, 16; no, 23.

9. By and large, a person's social position in a middle western community is based on how much money he has (or his father had). Yes, 21; no, 18.

10. Senior citizens on social security should get a free health-care ride. Yes, 15; no, 24.

11. U.S. foreign aid expenditures should be materially reduced. Yes, 19; no, 20.

12. The average politician in local government is accepting some "persuasion money" (let's not call it a bribe) or "extra compensation" not publicly known. Yes, 25; no, 14.

13. Big labor is out of hand and must be restrained by Federal law. Yes, 27; no, 12.

14. African blacks should have equal voting rights with African whites. Yes, 30; no, 9.

15. Big-time college football with its near-professional players and high-paid coaches, should be de-emphasized. Yes, 31; no, 8.

16. Churches in general have gone too far astray from the teachings of the original Christian moral concepts. Yes, 19; no, 20.

17. "Capitalistic Democracy" is superior in every way to the communistic "Peoples Democracy." Yes, 21; no, 18.

18. There is a bit too much pressure on teachers to advocate the "status quo," the stereotyped ideas acceptable to society. Yes, 30; no, 9.

19. Doctors have a schedule of professional charges which are too high. Yes, 23; no, 16.

20. The city manager form of municipal governemnt is superior to the mayor-commission form. Yes, 24; no, 15.

21. Khrushchev won the diplomatic battle at the summit. Yes, 4; no, 35.

22. Current high school graduates spell better than those in the old days. Yes, 15; no, 24.

23. An evil person will go to hell. (Hell defined by church doctrine). Yes, 22; no, 17.

24. Parents as a rule want teachers to pass out more home work. Yes, 7; no, 32.

25. The Communists have had limited success infiltrating the AFL–CIO American Federation of Teachers. Yes, 26; no, 13.

26. Federal aid to education is another step on the road to socialism. Yes, 20; no, 19.

27. The average housewife shops like a bumblebee attracted by brightly colored trading stamps. Yes, 24; no, 15.

28. Stevenson is too intellectual to make a good President. Yes, 4; no, 35.

29. The University of Chicago is a breeding ground for Communists. Yes, 4; no, 35.

30. Sex is here to stay. Yes, 39; no, 0.

The Issue in Japan: U.S. Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph McGill which appeared in the Washington Star June 16, 1960:

THE ISSUE IN JAPAN: U.S. BASES—COMMUNIST EFFORT TO MAKE US PULL ALL OUR FORCES HOME SEEN IN EVENTS

(By Ralph McGill)

Bases are the issue in Japan—not Mr. Eisenhower.

The Comunists, having dramatized the fact of U.S. bases after the unhappy U–2 incident by threats to bomb them, are whittling away at those in Japan.

The treaty, against which the Communists and Socialist groups in Japan are protesting with such violence, gives the United States 10 more years to man and support missile bases.

The Socialists may be sincere when they stridently oppose the treaty because the presence of U.S. missiles and launching forces may again involve Japan in war. But the Communist groups are not sincere. They are acting on instructions. Their purpose is to call attention to the bases and to promote a drive toward either an alliance with the Kremlin or a neutralism which forbids bases.

The Communists apparently believe they can build up enough fear and distrust over the bases to bring about the fall of the Kishi government, even after the treaty becomes official on June 19. The Communists are not popular in Japan. The Americans do have the support of most of the citizens, especially the better informed. But Japan has an instinctive fear of war. This is not too surprising in a country which, alone, has experienced two atomic attacks. Mr. Khrushchev knows this. And so he probes and agitates. And the Communist Party happily accepts the opposition provided by the Socialists and happily exploits it.

Here we have a fine example of how communism rides a horse going their way. The uninformed and thoughtless in this country often are led to say, and believe, that some worthy cause is communistic because the Communists support it. They ignore, or do not know, the Communist technique. Hence, in this country the Communists have scored by causing some Americans to attack the Supreme Court as Communist-dominated because the Communists endorsed the school desegregation decision. The Communists are pleased if they can make us doubt our courts.

The Communists in Japan support the Socialist protest against the U.S. treaty because it gives them, the Marxists, a vehicle they lacked. They would very much like to sabotage the treaty. Failing in that, they would hope to so weaken the Kishi government it can be toppled in the months ahead. We may be very sure they will work to that end. The attack on the President of this country is merely a means to a hoped-for end.

The United States is concerned about this and the bases. The average citizen may have overlooked the fact that we have been deprived of former bases in France. We have been restricted in our use of bases in Norway. We do not quite know what will happen in Turkey, where a military committee is trying to restore the functions of government. Presently this group is very partial to the West and to this country in particular. Happily, it has a long history of opposition to,

and fear of, Russia. But we do not know what will happen.

It is becoming increasingly clear that, whether or not there is some dialectic disagreement between Red China and Russia, they both join to work the same side of the street in urging neutralism in Asia. The Chinese wish India to become more neutral, out of fear, and certainly both Peking and Moscow wish to see Japan driven from her treaty relationship with the United States.

It is a further irony that Japan's desperate need to trade has made her unpopular with certain segments of our own economy and with their representatives in the Congress. It does not require any great vision to comprehend what our position would be in the East if Japan were to declare herself neutral and deny us bases or use of Japanese waters. That our own resistance to Japanese competition may assist the Soviets to bring off a victory in Japanese neutralism is a very serious segment of the complex problem.

So it is that today the Communists ride the anti-Eisenhower sentiment in Japan. Tomorrow they will ride whatever else is going their way. If they can pull down the Kishi government they may bring about a repudiation of the treaty. That's what they actually want.

Union Do-It-Yourself Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, I had the pleasure of calling attention of the House to the most worthy action of Local No. 1031 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago, whose president is Mr. Frank Darling, when this union adopted a plan to provide surgical and hospital care for its retired members at the union's expense. At that time I called this plan a good example to follow.

I am delighted to see that in an editorial on June 14, 1960, the Chicago Sun-Times similarly called attention to local 1031's exemplary action and has praised both this union local and Frank Darling for their action.

It gives me great pleasure today to include in the RECORD the Sun-Times editorial, which follows:

UNION DO-IT-YOURSELF PROGRAM

Recently we have stressed on this page our conviction that there are many fields in which Americans can adopt a do-it-yourself policy rather than rely on the Federal Government to do it for them.

The city of Philadelphia has used city funds to subsidize private railroad lines' commuter service.

Presbyterian-St. Luke's Hospital plans a $20 million expansion to make it one of the Nation's greatest university-affiliated medical centers and physician training institutions.

A group of North Side businessmen and institutions have agreed to spend $35,000 on a neighborhood renewal and conservation plan for the Uptown area; they hope to stimulate private investment and save the neighborhood from blight without asking Government help.

In still another area, the field of medical aid, a Chicago union has just undertaken another do-it-yourself project. Instead of counting on the Federal Government to set up a medical program for the elderly, the AFL–CIO International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 1031, has set up its own program.

The local has insured 106 of its retired members against illness by taking out a policy on them with the Continental Casualty Co. For $11 a month, paid by the local, the members receive these benefits:

Up to 50 doctor's calls a year will be paid for at $5 each for home or hospital calls and $3 for office visits.

Up to $300 for each surgical operation and up to $150 for medicines and X–rays.

Fifteen dollars a day for the first 31 days in a hospital or convalescing nursing home and $10 a day for 29 more days. Patients can choose their own doctors and hospitals.

M. Frank Darling, president of the local, said the plan was put into effect because union officials believe there will be no expansion by the Government this year of the social security program to include hospital benefits for the elderly. Darling is willing to take Federal help but does not count on it.

Instead of waiting on the Federal Government to take care of its older members, the union will dip into its own treasury to do so. This is a good example of what we had in mind recently when we said problems of schooling, health, urban renewal, etc., can be better handled by States, municipalities, business organizations, and individuals than by the Federal Government. To that list we can now add labor organizations.

Monroe Doctrine and Panama Canal—American Legion Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now has before it in both House and Senate important resolutions relative to the Monroe Doctrine and Panama Canal.

Because of their importance these measures have aroused wide interest among patriotic groups including the American Legion.

The national executive committee of this great veterans' organization on May 4–5, 1960, adopted two resolutions dealing with these subjects, and with special reference to the Panama Canal.

The indicated resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine has historically been a keystone in the structure of our foreign policy; and

Whereas we are seriously alarmed and disturbed over increased Communist activities, infiltration, and influence throughout various portions of the Caribbean area, Central and South America, particularly Cuba and the Panama Canal area; and

Whereas we feel that a strong, dynamic, and effective policy toward Latin America should be immediately adopted and executed by our Government, lest the Communist cancer take hold throughout the entire area; and

Whereas any Communist action relative to the Panama Canal would be considered as a most serious threat and a hostile act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., on May 4–5, 1960, That the American Legion call on our Government to reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine and broaden its scope in recognition of the fact that the infiltration of imperial communism is a type of aggression and further to promptly and vigorously use all means within our power, both economic and military, to prevent the establishment or continuance of any Communist or communistic-controlled government within the Western Hemisphere; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government take all necessary steps, both economic and military, to preserve the complete sovereignty of the United States of America, including the Panama Canal Zone.

RESOLUTION 17

Whereas the American Legion is deeply concerned over the situation that has developed relative to the question of sovereignty as claimed by the Republic of Panama over the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Zone, owned and operated by the United States; and

Whereas we believe that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to Panama or any other government or authority, its jurisdiction over and control of the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Zone, in accordance with existing treaty provisions contained in article III of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Executive Committee of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., on May 4–5, 1960, That it is to the best interests of the United States and all nations and peoples of the world, that all powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States, in the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, be continued in accordance with such existing treaty provisions; and, be it further

Resolved, That the United States retain its sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Zone which exists under treaty and that no flag other than that of the United States of America be flown over it.

Surveys Show Air Pollution a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, air pollution is a growing problem in this country. It is a problem that knows no State boundaries.

For several years the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given consideration to the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this field and has sponsored legislation to set up the present research program which is being conducted under the direction of the U.S. Public Health Service with Federal funds.

Members of the House will be interested in a summary of a statement made recently by Drs. Eugene Sawicki, Walter C. Elbert, Thomas R. Hauser, Francis T. Fox, and Thomas W. Stanley, at a meeting of the American Industrial Hygiene Association in Rochester, N.Y.

The summary, with various tables showing the results of a study of air in 103 cities and 28 rural locations, follows:

Dr. Eugene Sawicki of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Public Health Service, reported on measurements made of the 3,4-benzpyrene content of the air in 103 cities and 28 rural locations in the United States. Benzpyrene is known to be carcinogenic to laboratory animals and is suspected of producing cancer in man. Dr. Sawicki reported values averaging about 16 times greater for city areas than in the country. Much higher concentrations of benzpyrene were found during winter periods than in summer, probably because of the increased amounts of fuels used for heating in winter months. In some cities, the quantities of benzpyrene found would indicate that an individual breathing such air would inhale as much benzpyrene as from smoking two or more packages of cigarettes daily.

Benzpyrene in air is of great interest to health authorities because of its possible relationship to lung cancer, a disease which has increased markedly in recent years. Statistical studies do not show any significant correlation between concentrations of benzpyrene in air and the latest available lung cancer mortality data as these vary from one city to another. It is known, however, that benzpyrene is not the sole potentially carcinogenic agent present in community air or in cigarette smoke. One additional possible explanation for the lack of correlation is that lung cancer mortality may be associated with exposures to carcinogenic agents many years ago, at which time the conditions of the air may have been different than those now being studied.

Benzpyrene is a material classified as a "polynuclear hydrocarbon," believed to come principally from the incomplete burning of fuels, waste materials, or other combustible substances. It is normally found as a constituent in many tarry materials.

Significant detailed data on benzpyrene concentrations in air in various locations are attached.

Benzpyrene concentrations in urban sampling sites for January through March 1959

State	City	Micrograms of benzpyrene per 1,000 cubic meters of air
Alabama	Montgomery	24
Alaska	Anchorage	3.8
Arizona	Phoenix	5
Arkansas	Little Rock	1.5
California	Berkeley	2.9
	Glendale	.8
	San Bernardino	2.3
	San Diego	2.1
	San Jose	.56
Colorado	Denver	6.9
Connecticut	Hartford	6.5
	New Britain	5.5
	New Haven	5.3
Delaware	Wilmington	10
District of Columbia	Washington	9.3
Florida	Miami	1.9
	Orlando	11
	Tampa	15
Georgia	Savannah	4.3
Illinois	Chicago	15
	Rockford	7.3
Indiana	East Chicago	11.1
	Indianapolis	26
	Hammond	39
	South Bend	16
Iowa	Des Moines	23
Kansas	Topeka	3.1
	Wichita	2.3
Kentucky	Louisville	16
Louisiana	Shreveport	.65
Maine	Portland	21
Maryland	Baltimore	14
Massachusetts	New Bedford	4.4
	Worcester	14
Michigan	Dearborn	9
	Flint	15
	Grand Rapids	15
Minnesota	Duluth [1]	12
	Minneapolis	14
Mississippi	Jackson	1.2
Missouri	Kansas City	6.5
	St. Louis [2]	54
Montana	Helena	.11
Nebraska	Omaha	3.5
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.4
New Hampshire	Manchester	6
New Jersey	Bayonne	5.5
	Jersey City	6
	Newark	4.5
	Paterson	6.3
New Mexico	Albuquerque	6.3
North Carolina	Charlotte	39
	Raleigh	14
North Dakota	Bismarck	.44
Ohio	Cleveland	24
	Columbus	9.5
	Dayton	7.9
	Hamilton	14
	Toledo	11
	Youngstown	28
Oklahoma	Tulsa	1
Oregon	Portland	8
Pennsylvania	Allentown	3.4
	Altoona [2]	61
	Erie	9.5
Pennsylvania	Johnstown	16
	Pittsburgh	5.1
Pennsylvania	Scranton	6.1
	York	5.6
Rhode Island	Providence	2.9
South Carolina	Charleston	5.6
	Columbia [2]	24
South Dakota	Sioux Falls	4
Tennessee	Chattanooga	31
	Knoxville	24
Texas	Beaumont	.82
	Dallas	1.4
	Galveston	.16
	Houston	1.6
	San Antonio	.86
Utah	Salt Lake City	.52
Vermont	Burlington	1
Virginia	Norfolk	8.4
	Richmond	45
	Roanoke	18
Washington	Seattle	9
West Virginia	Charleston [2]	14
	Wheeling	21
Wisconsin	Madison	4.9
	Milwaukee	8.5
Wyoming	Cheyenne	1.2
Puerto Rico	San Juan	1.2

[1] The concentration of particulates in the air for this city in January to March 1959 was ½ that found in the corresponding period of 1958.

[2] With respect to the cities with benzpyrene levels greater than 11 micrograms per 1,000 cubic meters of air, 5 cities had a concentration of particulates in the air 1.5 to 2 times higher than in the corresponding January to March period in 1958.

Benzypyrene concentrations in nonurban sampling sites

State	County	Location	Micrograms of benzpyrene per 1,000 cubic meters of air
Alabama	Baldwin	Near Fort Morgan, Gulf State Park	0.076
Arizona	Coconino	Grand Canyon Park	.041
Arkansas	Montgomery	Quachita National Forest	.23
California	Humboldt	Trinidad C.G. Station	.21
Connecticut	Lichtfield	Wigwam Water Reservoir	.69
Delaware	Kent	Bombay Hook Wildlife Refuge	.69
Hawaii	Oahu Island	Near Barbers Point	.030
Indiana	Montgomery	In Turkey Run State Park	1.8
Iowa	Clayton	Backbone State Park	.54
Kentucky	Pulaski	In Cumberland Falls State Park	.58
Louisiana	St. Tammany	Near Slidell	.15
Maine	Hancock	Acadia National Park	.18
Maryland	Calvert	On Solomon's Island	.70
Massachusetts	Nantucket	On Nantucket Island	.43
Michigan	Huron	Sleeper State Park	1.2
Minnesota	Cook	Superior National Forest	.66
Missouri	Shannon	Missouri State	.025
Nebraska	Thomas	Nebraska National Forest	.10
New Jersey	Cape May	On Cape May	.95
North Carolina	Hyde	Near Cape Hatteras	.25
Ohio	South Bass Island	Perry National Monument	.90
Oregon	Curry	Near Cape Blanco	.01
Pennsylvania	Clarion	In Cook Forest	1.9
Puerto Rico		Loquillo Mountains Park	.031
Rhode Island	Washington	In Pine Hill Forest	1.9
South Carolina	Richland	Near Pontiac	1.1
West Virginia	Webster	In Holly Run State Park	.89
Wisconsin	Door	Peninsula State Park	.72

Micrograms of Benzpyrene Inhaled Per Year from Ambient Air and from Smoking, Calculated from Mean Annual Concentration

Sampling sites:	*Micrograms of benzpyrene per year*
Missouri State Forest	0.1
Helena, Mont	.8
San Francisco, Calif	14.0
Los Angeles, Calif	20.0
New Orleans, La	26.0
Atlanta, Ga	44.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	79.0
Detroit, Mich	110.0
Nashville, Tenn	120.0
Birmingham, Ala	150.0
London (County Hall)	320.0

The approximate number of micrograms of benzpyrene inhaled per year by the pack-a-day cigarette smoker is 60.

Micrograms benzpyrene per 1,000 cubic meters of air for suspended particulate samples collected July to December 1958 and January to June 1959

City	1958						1959					
	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June
Atlanta	1.6	4.0	4.0	----------	15.0	12.0	9.9	7.4	2.1	2.1	----------	3.6
Birmingham	6.4	6.1	10.0	20.0	34.0	74.0	34.0	25.0	23.0	18	5.9	6.3
Cincinnati	3.9	1.3	2.5	15.0	14.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	26.0	----------	2	2.1
Detroit	6.0	4.1	----------	18.0	19.0	20.0	28.0	31.0	16.0	12	7.4	3.4
Los Angeles	.5	.4	1.2	1.2	4.1	13	6.6	5.3	1.1	.45	.75	.75
Nashville	1.4	----------	6.6	30.0	55.0	40.0	25.0	----------	----------	9	3.4	2.1
New Orleans	2.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	6.0	4.1	2.6	3.3	5.6	2.6
Philadelphia	3.5	19	3.6	7.1	12.0	12.0	8.8	6.4	6.4	----------	3.4	2.5
San Francisco	.25	.38	1.1	----------	3.0	7.5	2.3	2.4	1.3	.75	.75	.88

The National Oceanographic Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very fine address on the National Oceanographic Expedition presented by Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, before the 47th National Convention of National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 26, 1960:

THE NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC EXPEDITION

(By Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey)

I am happy to be with you today at this session of the 47th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. As the director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the U.S. Department of Commerce, it is a pleasure to exchange ideas and information with this distinguished group concerning our mutual interests in the harbor areas and water resources of the Nation.

Our surveys are vital to one of your principal objectives—that is, harbor and channel improvements to meet the ever-increasing demands of the Nation's waterborne commerce and shoreside industrial complexes. We also have an interest in the Nation's water resources program insofar as our geodetic surveys contribute to planning and execution of new projects.

I am with you today specifically to discuss the oceanographic program of the Bureau as recently highlighted by the voyage of the ship *Explorer* en route from Seattle to Washington, D.C. This 10,000-mile expedition which extended over a period of 79 days establishes a landmark in the oceanographic activities of the Bureau. It is the modern counterpart of an historic voyage by the ship *Hassler* in 1872.

The old sailing ship, named for the first superintendent of the coast survey, the great Swiss scientist and engineer, Ferdinand Rudolph Hassler, took 10 months to sail from San Francisco around the Horn to Boston. The scientific operations of this cruise were under the direction of Prof. Louis Agassiz, the Swiss naturalist who also immigrated to the United States from Switzerland. Both ships had San Diego as a port of call during their oceanographic cruises and it was there that kindly old Professor Agassiz endeared himself forever to the people of that great Western port. He was asked to address a big rally then in progress in the town in support of Horace Greeley's candidacy for President. If anyone thought he was going to make a speech in support of Greeley they were disappointed. Instead, his remarks were in support of the ideal climate of San Diego and he paid high compliments to the people of the town for their graciousness to him and his associates. The people learned of his interest in collecting specimens of local flora and fauna and when the *Hassler* departed the city after a 10-day visit he had 12 barrels aboard of San Diego fish, snakes, insects, plants, etc., all immersed in alcohol for future scientific study.

The cruise of the *Explorer* did not generate a counterpart to this episode, but we did have many unique experiences which can be encountered only on a cruise of this type. One of the highlights of the cruise was our investigations on and around Swan Islands when I had the opportunity of being aboard. We accomplished a substantial amount of hydrography in investigating the underwater shelf around the islands. Tides were observed there for 6 days and observations were also made at two magnetic stations. Plants, reptiles, and insects were collected for the U.S. National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution and 18 large land lizards, or iguanas, were captured alive for the National Zoological Park in Washington.

We collected 89 rock samples and made a reconnaissance geological study of Swan Islands for the U.S. Geological Survey. Oceanographers specially trained in scuba diving techniques donned diving gear to study and photograph the coral reefs around the islands. Over 800 feet of motion picture film were exposed in a series of 10 underwater dives. Due to the isolated area of these least known of the U.S. possessions, we enumerated for the Census Bureau the 28 inhabitants of the islands for the 1960 census. The Post Office Department authorized a special cancellation stamp for philatelic mail and over 5,100 commemorative cancellations were made aboard the ship.

Transfer of the *Explorer* to the east coast heralds an expansion of our oceanographic program in the Atlantic. I have high personal regard for this old workhorse of our fleet of survey ships. She was my last sea command before being assigned to headquarters in Washington prior to taking over my present job of head of the Bureau. Even in those days we made significant discoveries pertinent to our present-day accelerated interest in submarine topography. During September 1949, on a course which I laid for the *Explorer* across the Gulf of Alaska, we discovered a seamount 400 nautical miles southwest of Queen Charlotte Islands. This submarine mountain rose to 4,000 feet below the sea surface from depths of about 15,000 feet.

I have just announced the discovery of another major seamount rising 1½ miles to a surface depth of 3,984 feet. This is the 20th peak of a chain extending along the floor of the Aleutian Trench for 600 miles from its terminus 110 miles east of Kodiak Island. Approximately 160 underwater mountains have been discovered by Bureau ships in this vast northwest Pacific area. Operational use of nuclear-powered, deep-running submarines and the development of countermeasures against these, including detection, identification, tracking, and attack, will inevitably require far greater knowledge of the location and definition of seamounts as well as other underwater features.

Reassignment of the *Explorer* to the east coast resulted from the addition to our fleet of a fine new survey ship for west coast and Alaskan operations. On April 30, I had the pleasure of commissioning the *Surveyor* at San Diego where she was built by the National Steel and Shipbuilding Corp. The commissioning of the new ship was especially timely in view of national attention now being given oceanographic operations. This modern ship, among the finest of the specially built ocean survey ships in the world, now becomes the backbone of the Coast and Geodetic Survey fleet.

I like to recall that my first assignment in the Bureau almost 37 years ago was aboard the old *Surveyor*. She was then considered the most modern of surveying ships and was at that time the pride of our fleet, yet her bridge contained only a steering wheel, magnetic compass, whistle cord, and a big brass spittoon. We sold the gallant old lady a few years ago after 38 years of service. At the time of her decommissioning, the bridge of the *Surveyor* contained a steering wheel, automatic pilot, gyrocompass, magnetic compass, automatic whistle, automatic direction finder, two radars, sonar, sofar, loran, shoran, EPI, IFF, three different types of echo-sounding equipment, numerous small electronic gadgets—but no spittoon. Progress is inevitable.

The new ship of over 3,000 tons has all these items on her bridge and many more, all a tribute to the electronic age. She also has the bell from the old ship to prepetuate the honorable memory of her proud predecessor, in grateful recognition of her years of sterling service to the Nation.

The oceanographic voyage of the *Explorer* embarks us on a new and intensified oceanographic program. In view of the part that the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be expected to play in this new program as a recognized world leader in physical oceanographic work, we took the opportunity of the *Explorer's* transfer to develop the cruise into a full-fledged expedition. Our objectives were to examine oceanographic phenomena in collaboration with a dozen or more scientific agencies.

We are indebted to the National Science Foundation for support in this undertaking, which is the first extensive scientific expedition of its kind that the Bureau has conducted since the days of Pillsbury in the early 1880's. Lack of information concerning the oceans or the science dealing with the earth's water mantle has never been more keenly felt than it is today. We must have knowledge if we are to cooperate with the oceans and reap their bountiful harvest—a harvest of increased food supplies,

better weather forecasts, and the future possibility of influencing our weather for better, safer, and more expeditious sea voyages.

We were particularly happy to have had the Weather Bureau participate with us in this undertaking. Dr. Reichelderfer assigned a meteorologist to the expedition for the entire cruise. Extensive probes were made of the atmosphere with high-altitude meteorological balloons which were inflated in a special inflation shelter installed on the stern of the ship. The Weather Bureau scientist sat for hours in the ship's plotting room, working up the data that his balloon radioed back from elvations as high as 130,000 feet above the surface of the ocean. Ultimately it is hoped to control or modify the weather through a more thorough understanding of oceanic phenomena and the interplay between the atmosphere and the oceans. In these and other ways we in the United States can and should lead the way for the benefit of all mankind.

In this time of international tension the contributions of the oceans are equally important to our defense posture. Increased knowledge of the oceans, their physical structure, and the ocean bottom is needed for precise underwater navigation. The recent submerged globe-circling exploits of the Navy's atomic-powered submarine *Triton* dramatizes the need for knowledge of the oceans in greater detail than heretofore realized. For adequate protection, we must somehow make the oceans figuratively transparent. Only research, basic and applied, ashore and afloat, can supply the answers. The future programs of the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be framed to meet these objectives.

Many individual research projects were carried out during the 79 days the *Explorer* was at sea. With the growing demand for information about the oceans we recognized this exceptional opportunity for an intensive oceanographic investigation at a fraction of the cost of equipping an expedition of this magnitude under any other conditions. The commanding officer of the *Explorer*, Capt. E. L. Jones, entered into this unique assignment with great enthusiasm and contributed effectively from his many years of sea duty with the Bureau. Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr., our chief oceanographer, directed the scientific phases of the expedition. The complement of 13 Coast and Geodetic Survey officers, 10 Bureau scientists including oceanographers and geophysicists, 5 guest scientists, and 72 crewmen actually worked on a 24-hour basis gathering pertinent facts on the physics, chemistry, and biology of the ocean waters, the geology of the ocean bottom, and meteorological information on the atmosphere along the route.

The Naval Electronics Laboratory at San Diego made its deep-sea camera available for most of the cruise and supplied their expert who developed the camera. This equipment was used effectively in obtaining a great number of underwater photographs. Of special interest were the photographs that were obtained of rich deposits of manganese, nickel, and cobalt that occurred as manganese nodules on the ocean bottom more than 2 miles beneath the *Explorer's* keel. A huge manganese deposit was discovered in the Pacific Ocean off the southern tip of California. This area was first reported by the Russian oceanographic ship *Vityaz*. Corings revealed that the mineral nodules are so rich that experts estimate that it may some day be the site of an ocean mining operation.

Special nets made available by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior were towed from San Diego to Panama to obtain samples of small creatures that live in the upper layers of the ocean. The floor of the Caribbean and the Straits of Florida were dredged for bottom-dwelling organisms of interest to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

An important phase of the oceanographic cruise was our drift bottle operation. Almost 5,000 bottles were released at the rate of 10 every 2 hours throughout the entire voyage. These specially made bottles carried a message impregnated in bright colors in the glass, in four languages. We hope to learn new facts concerning the pattern of ocean currents by the cards that we have asked to be returned to the Bureau by the finders of the bottles. At the end of April 260 cards had been received. One hundred and fifteen were found along the west coast extending from Vancouver, to Costa Rica. Cards returned from the bottles released in the Atlantic Ocean numbered 145, extending from the Florida Keys to Central America. The bottles were numbered and an accurate record retained of the point from which each was released. As the record of each bottle is received in the Washington office it will be compared with the point of release and these facts correlated to reveal a pattern of circulation for expert analysis. We may continue to receive information from our drift bottles for several years or more.

South of Swan Island, 97 miles northeast of Honduras in the Caribbean, we discovered evidence of a drowned coral atoll. Investigation revealed a previously unknown undersea plateau rising from a depth of 6,000 feet to a least depth under the ship of 90 feet. With the echo-sounding equipment, magnetometer, and bottom sampling equipment working together, the uncharted bank was found to be made up of dead coral with a core of magnetic rock which is probably volcanic in origin.

Studies of this type reveal pertinent facts concerning the geology of that region, but more important they indicate the presence of the uncharted bank, an obvious danger to submarine navigation.

The Scripps Institution of Oceanography provided the magnetometer that the *Explorer* towed throughout the entire trip to make a continuous chart of the earth's magnetic field along the ship's track.

Another unique phase of the oceanographic cruise was the completion of a profile of the water temperature beneath the ship for the entire trip. This profile comprised a graphic record which highlighted a unique discovery off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. This discovery was an area of upwelling of cold water from the ocean floor rich in nutrients important as a food supply for the smaller forms of marine life. Larger forms of fish life feed on the abundant supply of marine life resulting from the upwelling, which creates a large supply of fish in commercial quantities. This is especially interesting to tuna fishermen since tuna congregate in these areas to feed on the smaller fish.

Oceanographic stations were occupied at selected positions off the coast of Oregon, in cooperation with the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and Oregon State College. At each station water samples were obtained for chemical analysis. These analyses will reveal data of importance in determining the oceanographic regime or makeup off the coast of the Pacific Northwest States. In addition, surface water samples were obtained from which it is hoped that suspended sediment will help oceanographers learn what happens to Columbia River water after it enters the Pacific Ocean. The oceanographic stations occupied off the coast of Oregon have extended northward the network of similar stations occupied in connection with the marine life research program of Scripps from Lower California to the California-Oregon border.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has a long and historic interest in the Gulf Stream. Benjamin Franklin first recognized the existence of the Gulf Stream and it is interesting to note that his grandson, Prof. Alexander Dallas Bache, the second Superintendent of the Bureau, authorized the first scientific investigation of this mighty river of the sea. He assigned his brother, Capt. George Bache, the task of making the first scientific investigation of the Gulf Stream in 1846 with the Coast Survey brig *Washington*. This expedition ended in disaster when the ship was demasted in a violent hurricane and Capt. George Bache and 10 of his men were swept overboard and lost. The scientific data collected during the season's work by the *Washington* was not lost, however. The crippled ship finally made port in Philadelphia with all of her records intact. These records are carefully preserved to this day in the archives of the Bureau.

Our interest in this phenomenon of nature has continued throughout the years. During the latter phase of the *Explorer's* expedition we undertook a preliminary investigation of the Gulf Stream off the Florida coast near Miami, and we plan to schedule further detailed studies for future operations.

Final benefits accruing from the *Explorer's* 1960 voyage will not be realized until the huge mass of data has been processed. The record of the expedition includes about 7,500 miles of trackline hydrography, 50 oceanographic stations, 650 salinity samples, 646 oxygen samples, 35 bottom sediment cores, 680 bathythermograph observations, and other data in addition to the Swan Islands developments.

We expect that the *Explorer's* recent accomplishments will be followed by more comprehensive and enlarged programs. The wealth of scientific data obtained on this cruise, supplemented by a constantly increasing flow of new data, should provide important contributions to many scientific studies in oceanography and related fields. As our oceanographic program is stepped up to new levels we offer our experience and background gained over more than 15 decades of sustained effort in supplying some of the answers to the great oceanic riddles.

Shadowy Power Behind Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of June 19, 1960:

SHADOWY POWER BEHIND CASTRO

(The principal idea man and organizer of Cuba's revolution is a "native Cuban" from Argentina with a Marxist record, Maj. Ennesto Guevara.)

(By Tad Szulc)

HAVANA.—Shying away from the crowded and chaotic center stage of the revolution, but not altogether hiding in its wings, a soft-spoken, Argentinian-born physician with Communist propensities, shoulder-length hair, and an indefinably oriental aspect is Cuba's éminence grise. He is Maj. Ernest Guevara, at 34, a professional rebel, itinerant Marxist revolutionary, guerrilla expert, improvisatory banker and, as he put it, amateur economist.

"Che" Guevara, as he is known to everyone here, was the man who negotiated Cuba's

trade treaty with Russia during Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's visit last February. He has followed it with agreement with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, providing for extensive credits for industrial equipment. This growing entente cordiale has now been climaxed by Premier Khrushchev's acceptance of an invitation to visit Havana soon, as if to seal personally a new alliance in the Western Hemisphere.

The title of major—or doctor—Guevara's two jobs in the Cuban Government sound innocuous and incongruous; president of the National Bank and head of the Department of Instruction of the Armed Forces Ministry. But—together with Premier Fidel Castro and his brother Raul Castro, who is Minister of Revolutionary Armed Forces—he is a member of the ruling triumvirate (its enemies call it the "unholy trinity") that is directing the steamroller implantation of a new order in Cuba. Major Guevara is the revolution's principal idea man and organizer, as well as its most potent political influence.

As president of the National Bank, he holds all the wires controlling the Cuban economy. (Significantly, the public reaction to his appointment last November was a run on the country's banks.) As head of the Department of Instruction, he controls the "Peoples' Militias," the civilian army which Premier Castro created at his suggestion. The militias are now nearly 100,000 strong (the regular armed forces total about 35,000) and have become one of the principal political props of the regime.

In a broad sense, Major Guevara's economic and political roles are indistinguishable. With his cool, methodical mind, he is mapping the shift from free enterprise to a pattern of overwhelming state control of the economy. At the same time, he is helping to create the conditions in which this pattern, imposed from the top, can prosper.

These conditions demand the elimination of all overt or hidden opposition to the new order. Consequently, the regime has seen to it that all media of expression—the press, radio, and television—are subordinated to the thinking of the state, that the leadership of labor unions is absolutely loyal to the Government, that a barrage of revolutionary indoctrination is aimed at every segment of Cuban society.

Most observers here see Major Guevara's hand behind all these, as well as other, policies, at least in their conception. His speeches and his book, "The War of Guerrillas," one of the most complete and wide-ranging modern revolutionary handbooks, show him as a fanatic believer in political indoctrination in depth on all levels, and in the need for the tightest possible revolutionary organization of the nation.

While the precise machinery of the revolution's leadership is a mystery to the outsider, Premier Castro doubtless remains the chief figure in the 18-month-old regime. He works in a vortex of pressures, cross currents and contradictions. As in any revolutionary group, there is considerable silent infighting within the top layer of the Cuban leadership, and despite repeated official assurance that "Fidel, Raul, and Ché are like one," each has a private group of followers jockeying for position. Though the aims of the three chieftains seem to coincide at present, the natural dynamics of the situation produce frictions—if not clashes—among their groups. It is a good guess that Guevara is the target of more resentments than the Castro brothers, but if actual opposition to him exists near the top, as is probable, it is well camouflaged.

Public opinion holds that the influence of Major Guevara asserts itself by pushing the Premier to adopt increasingly radical measures. It is taken for granted that Raul Castro and other members of the regime's inner circle actively concur in this strategy, but Dr. Guevara is generally credited with the formulation of broad plans.

The revolutionary government's new official agencies have been reinforced by foreign Communist technicians, individually or in small units, to help ease the acute shortage of Cuban specialists. For example, the National Institute of Agrarian Reform (INRA), Cuba's all-powerful economic organization, has Chilean, Mexican, Guatemalan, Belgian, and French Communist economists and advisers. Their presence is said to have been Dr. Guevara's idea.

His trade pact with Mikoyan was the cornerstone of Cuba's new policy of hitching her plans for industrial development to the Communist states and, thereby, tying her economy to the Iron Curtain. Mikoyan left behind a group of Soviet industrial technicians and cultural specialists. Since the resumption of diplomatic relations between Havana and Moscow in May, this group has been steadily increasing.

They are discreet, but can be occasionally seen at two or three of Havana's less spectacular hotels. Lately, however, the proregime press, with a touch of pride, has begun reporting their activities. The first mention was of a five-man team of Soviet mining engineers in Pinar Del Rio province.

When Cuba began importing Soviet crude oil, it was Major Guevara who wrote letters to United States and British refineries here requesting them to process the Russian petroleum. He delicately hinted that refusal would mean that the national bank could no longer authorize dollar remittances on payments already owed for Venezuelan oil or for new imports.

As his power has grown, the bizarre and retiring Argentine doctor has inevitably made enemies among the general public. There are people here who think that Major Guevara may meet with a violent end. (In his book, he admits the possibility that he and the Castro brothers may be assassinated.)

The greatest objection to him is the belief that he is a Communist. In most quarters, he is thought to be one of the international variety—that is, a Communist linked with and subservient to Moscow or Peiping. Many of the most dedicated supporters of Premier Castro fear and resent him as a dangerous presence in the revolution—and, often as "the foreigner."

This is one of the reasons why Major Guevara, despite his tremendous importance on the Cuban scene, is most unlikely ever to come to power in his own right. Although one of Dr. Castro's first official acts was to declare Guevara legally a "native Cuban," the Premier has refrained from including him in the line of succession. As it stands now, Raul Castro is his brother's designated successor; if he should die, too, the other revolutionary chieftains are to select the new "maximum leader." Major Guevara's strength is essentially that of the power behind the throne.

Lately, however, the major has been making more and more public appearances, as if trying to acquire an acceptable public image for himself. Recently, he took his small daughter to a public affair; at other times, he has been seen with his mother. On one occasion, he was duly photographed with an ice-cream cone.

One successful note of intimacy is the universal acceptance of his nickname, "Ché" "Ché" is an Argentine expression meaning, roughly, "Hey." His frequent use of it during the days of Sierra Maestra gave him the moniker.

Face to face, Dr. Guevara can be a pleasant, even charming, personality. Invariably attired in olive green fatigues and boots—a stunning sartorial style for a bank president—he lets his long brown hair curl gently down his neck. Indoors or out, even at conferences in his modernistic office, he wears a black beret with the golden star of his rank. His scraggly beard and moustache (Raul Castro shaved his beard, cut off his pony tail and trimmed his moustache early this year, though his brother has maintained the hirsute symbols) plus his slightly slanted brown eyes give him his oriental air, oddly reminiscent of a younger, slimmer, shorter Ho Chi Minh.

Dr. Guevara has an easy smile and a soft, persuasive voice, but his eyes are hard. Persons who have dealt with him at the National Bank say that once he makes a decision nothing can sway him. He is said to have an icy ruthlessness.

Suffering from an acute asthmatic condition, the major, who is a heavy cigar smoker between attacks, sometimes has to take to his bed for days. He is an extremely hard worker. His hobby is mathematics; he used to spend hours at a blackboard solving equations. Now the great equation facing him is the basic transformation of Cuba's economy. His failure to guide it successfully—through the spread of inflation, through shortages of food and goods, or through a lack of resources to carry out the ambitious revolutionary programs—could mean the collapse of the Cuban experiment.

The major seldom speaks with strangers of his private political beliefs. But talking to a group of visiting Latin American journalists recently, he lightly dismissed a direct question about communism and Marxism by saying that he lacked sufficient political education to be a Marxist. Yet, in his book, he wrote that anti-communism is a "dialectical position" designed to destroy the Cuban revolution—a rather revealing choice of words—and in a television address not long ago he remarked smilingly, "It seems that, together with Raul, I have the honor of being among the most shocking persons."

Whether or not he is a Communist, Dr. Guevara's greatest obsession is his hatred of the United States in general and of "Yankee imperialism" in particular. It is a constantly recurring theme in his writings and speeches. The destruction everywhere of this imperialism seems to be his foremost goal in life and he has written boastingly that Cuba has shown the way to all Latin America on how to smash the imperialists. In a recent speech, he said that Cubans must "fight to the death" the "Yankee monopolies."

"Our economic war will be with the great power of the north," he said. "Our war is not a simple war, our road toward liberation will be found in victory over the monopolies and, concretely, over North American monopolies."

Then he added: "Cuba is an example of a small nation that defies the laws of a false science called geopolitics * * *. This is the crime * * * that the North American imperialists and colonialists fear."

Such is Major Guevara's enthusiasm for "liberating" other Latin American nations from the "imperialist yoke," that last summer an investigating commission of the Organization of American States formally accused him of organizing an invasion of Nicaragua by Cuba-based rebels.

Very little is known of the major's past and he is reluctant to discuss it. He is said to have graduated from the University of Buenos Aires Medical School in 1953. His earliest political and revolutionary experiences were in Argentina, against the Perón regime, and in Bolivia. In 1953 and 1954 he was in Guatemala, working for the pro-Communist regime of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman.

The sketchy story of Dr. Guevara's relations with Dr. Castro begins in Mexico early in 1956 when the Argentine met the future premier through Raul Castro, Dr. Guevara had been exiled there since the fall of the Arbenz regime in 1954, "looking for a new revolution," as a friend put it.

He found it in Dr. Castro who then was preparing his invasion of Cuba. After an all-night conversation, the two rebels agreed to work together. With his curious blend of Latin American romanticism and Marxist revolutionary spirit, Dr. Guevara fitted perfectly into the Castro conspiracy. He soon became the chief of personnel for the expeditionary force—his first organizational task—and joined with Gen. Alberto Bayo, the exiled Spanish Republican guerrilla expert, in training the men at a remote ranch.

Aboard the yacht *Granma*, tossed mercilessly for several days and nights by the waves of the Gulf of Mexico, Dr. Guevara acted as physician, helping the men, who suffered from violent seasickness, although he was himself undergoing terrible asthma attacks.

After the small band landed on December 2, 1956—attacks by Batista forces had cut it down from 88 to 12 men—Dr. Guevara combined his medical activities with those of a courageous fighter and guerrilla leader. He stressed in his book that it is at such a time a physician "has the most influence over the troops" and his revolutionary preachings can capture the men better than anyone else's.

As the Castro force became firmly established in the Sierra Maestra and began growing in numbers, Dr. Guevara turned increasingly to matters of organization and indoctrination, thinking in far-reaching terms and not just of the day-to-day military situations.

Officers of the rebel army say that, from the very first, he began forming around him a hard-core, Communist-oriented group, as Raul Castro reportedly did later in his "Second Front." While advancing through the central provinces, Dr. Guevara is said to have left behind a trusted man in each town and village to form a Communist cell.

According to other informants, he nearly engaged in hostilities with another pro-Castro rebel group in the Escambray Mountains of Las Villas province late in 1958, when the Escambray fighters refused to enter into a pact with the Communist Party. Such a pact had been signed earlier between the Communists and the Castro "26th of July Movement."

Major Guevara also put together the first rebel industries in the Sierra—a shoeshop and a weapons plant—the rebel radio station, and a network of schools for peasants' children and for the Castro troops. Thus, hiding in the hills, he was already the organizer and indoctrinator that he now is on a nationwide scale.

There was a relatively long lapse between the victory in the Sierra and Major Guevara's open emergence at the top levels of government. The doctor had led the troops that occupied Havana in the first days of January, 1959, and his first job was the command of La Cabaña fortress here. In the months that followed, his influence was exercised only indirectly.

Then, in midsummer, he embarked on a long voyage around the Middle and Far East, concentrating on contacts with "neutralist" governments and groups. On the major's return to Havana, Premier Castro began gradually easing him into official positions of growing importance. When he was named head of the industrial department of INRA, observers realized that he was the economic chief of the revolution. His appointment to the National Bank confirmed his primacy.

The big question asked in Cuba nowadays is how Dr. Guevara persuaded Premier Castro to go along with his policies. Despite the violent anti-Washington posture of the Castro regime, and its growing identification with Soviet foreign policy, the belief—some say, myth—persists here that the Premier himself has no Communist links.

One theory is that Dr. Castro has, consciously or not, become a prisoner of the Guevara and Raul Castro policies, having accepted their reasoning that—since the United States is allegedly conspiring against the revolution—he must take vociferous Communist support for his regime as well as the material aid of the Communist powers.

The other view is that Premier Castro is deliberately using the Communists, including Major Guevara, until he feels strong enough to get rid of them. But this theory has less and less currency in Cuba since Dr. Castro has publicly embraced the belief that anticommunism is "divisive and counterrevolutionary." Dr. Guevara referred to these early hopes when he wrote sarcastically in his book that some people in the United States thought that "this crazy boy, Fidel Castro, could be counseled and led along the right path."

In a sense, Major Guevara's career has come full circle. With his brand of revolution accomplished in Cuba, or nearly so, this restless professional rebel, to whom frontiers do not exist in Latin America, may soon be turning toward new fields of conquest. But this time his post of command is in a country fortress instead of the tropical forest.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress: Report of Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the report of the committee on irrigation and reclamation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 47th National Convention which was held in Washington in May. This report was submitted to the convention by the vice chairman, Mr. J. W. Grimes, State engineer of South Dakota, on May 26, and was unanimously adopted. I again had the honor to serve as chairman of the committee, but much of the credit for this report belongs to Ival V. Goslin, chief engineer and secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and to William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association. I am happy to also include a list of the members of the committee.

The committee's report follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS—COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Chairman: Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado.

Vice chairman: J. W. Grimes, Pierre, S. Dak.

Secretary: Ival V. Goslin, Salt Lake City, Utah. Chief engineer and secretary, Upper Colorado River Commission.

MEMBERS

Arizona: Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Tucson; member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

California: Representative B. F. SISK, Fresno, Calif.; member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Colorado: Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, Denver. Harold H. Christy, Pueblo; director, National Reclamation Association.

Idaho: George L. Crookham, Jr., Caldwell; president, Guffey Water Development Association.

Kansas: Robert V. Smrha, chief engineer, division of water resources, State board of agriculture, Topeka.

Montana: Everett W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Board of Montana.

Nebraska: Pete Badura, Ashton; president, Farwell Irrigation District.

Nevada: Representative WALTER S. BARING, Reno; member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

New Mexico: John P. Murphy, Albuquerque; secretary, New Mexico Reclamation Association.

North Dakota: Fred Fredrickson, Valley City; Washington representative, Greater North Dakota Association.

Oklahoma: Frank Raab, Oklahoma City; president, Canton Irrigation District; represented by Guy H. James.

Oregon: Representative AL ULLMAN, Baker; member, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

South Dakota: J. W. Grimes, Pierre, S. Dak., State engineer.

Texas: Kenneth M. Smith, McAllan; water master, Lower Rio Grande.

Utah: T. W. Jensen, Salt Lake City; secretary, Utah Water Users Association.

Washington: John Richardson, Olympia, Wash.; supervisor, department of conservation and development.

Wyoming: State senator Earl T. Bower, Worland.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

INTRODUCTION

The committee on irrigation and reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was convened for the first time at the 44th annual convention 3 years ago. Since that time the committee has continued to function and to maintain a high level of interest and participation in the irrigation and reclamation program of the United States.

During January of 1960 efforts were made to hold an extra session of the irrigation and reclamation committee for the purpose of reviewing the Federal reclamation program and making recommendations relative to it to the U.S. Congress. Because it became apparent that it would not be practicable to have a majority of the committee members present at such a meeting these efforts had to be abandoned.

PURPOSES OF THE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE

This committee has been directed to deal only with matters of general policy.

At its inception the purposes of this committee were defined as the formulation of a policy and a program for the continued, orderly development by reclamation and irrigation of our water and land resources in the arid and semiarid regions of the West, and to suggest ways and means whereby the National Rivers and Harbors Congress may better cooperate and coordinate its efforts with the advocates of reclamation and irrigation.

COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

The personnel of the committee on irrigation and reclamation are listed on page 1 of this report. This committee is interested not only in irrigation and reclamation, but in flood control projects, rivers and harbors projects, and, in fact, all phases of water resource development.

PROGRESS

In this committee's report for 1957 to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, several policy and procedural recommendations were outlined. These were designed as guides and suggestions for implementing basic principles. The adoption of these recommendations by this organization has contributed greatly to a better understanding

of water resources problems. It is gratifying to note that sponsors of projects are recognizing new possibilities for coordination of efforts and cooperation in developing water and land resources. This new spirit and its resultant accomplishments constitute progress—not because during the past year we feel that the program of project development has been accelerated to the point necessary or desirable—but because future results will prove the wisdom of united efforts.

As a result of cooperative efforts, Congress enacted a public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 that contained many unbudgeted water development projects, of which seven were major reclamation new starts. In addition, four were initiated under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, Public Law 984, and two were loans for irrigation distribution systems under Public Law 130.

RECLAMATION IS A VITAL PART OF AMERICA'S FUTURE

Our committee concurs with the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, who said the the House Appropriations Committee "the continued development of supplemental water supplies for existing irrigated areas and the opening of new lands to settlement through reclamation are entirely consistent with sound, long-term agricultural objectives. Such development provides the most important basic element to a successful regional economy—a stable, diversified agriculture. In addition to improving our existing agricultural situation, reclamation helps to insure adequate future food and fiber for our rapidly growing population.

"The objective of expanding the economy of the West is of prime importance to the whole Nation. The Federal reclamation program has been one of the important tools by which the underdeveloped arid and semiarid regions of the West have been made into a habitable and productive part of the Nation by promoting westward movement of population, business, and agriculture, and providing a solid base for investment and employment where little existed previously. The reclamation program still has these positive influences today.

"With respect to my statement that reclamation tends to alleviate the existing imbalances of agriculture, I have this to say. It is not widely understood that irrigation farming in the West enjoys a complementary, rather than competitive, relationship with the whole of the country's agriculture. Of the major crops in surplus, those that constitute more than four-fifths of the holdings and loan commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation, reclamation farms grew only three of these crops, and the 1958 contribution from reclamation farms amounted to only 1.8 percent of the holdings. The reason why this proportion is so small when the total importance of reclamation in the economy of the West is so great is that the irrigation farmer has been able to shift production from surplus crops to those that are in current demand. The nonirrigated land is largely tied to a 1-crop economy and cannot diversify in response to changing demand patterns. Reclamation has played a large role in facilitating these adjustments and in enhancing the efficiency of the agriculture of the West as a whole. The misapprehension that any extension of irrigation will compound the Nation's agricultural difficulties is not borne out by the facts, either past or present.

"In addition, we are advised by agricultural authorities that our present crop imbalances are merely temporary and that continued efforts are needed in research and the conservation and development of soil and water resources. They emphasize that the capacity to meet the food and fiber needs of the expanding population does not happen automatically. Because major irrigation projects do not reach a fully developed stage until 15 to 25 years after authorization or start of construction, it is essential that reclamation needs be viewed in future perspective.

"The Nation's population is increasing at about 8,600 additional persons per day while the acreage of good cropland diminishes at a rate of 3,000 acres per day due to conversion to roads, airports, and cities. Just how soon our agricultural abundance will give way to shortages depends on what positive steps are taken to overcome the efforts of these incursions."

Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, said at a dinner sponsored by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts honoring the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service:

"It is interesting to note that these additional mouths must be fed; these additional bodies must be clothed, these additional people housed from substantially fewer acres than are now available for cultivation. The fact is we have no new land to bring into cultivation. All we have is land which we can improve.

"Yet, each year we are losing precious irreplaceable soil and water resources due to the encroachments of urban population areas, among other things. Specifically, by the year 2000 some 80 million additional acres of our very finest cropland will be lost to creeping urbanization. Against this 80 million acre loss we can count, on this plus side of the ledger, only about 25 million acres, which we hope to add to our production base during the same period of time. The difference, that is 55 million acres, must be derived from increased productivity—by producing more food and fiber from the same acreage which we cultivate today."

RECLAMATION—KEY TO THE FUTURE

Reclamation is the key to the future. It is a real American enterprise that unlocks the doors to opportunities in industry and business. Reclamation is not to be considered only in terms of agricultural development. Recognition must be given to the industrial and business economies that are directly dependent upon and inevitably follow the development of an irrigated agricultural project.

A productive agricultural economy and the availability of water for domestic and industrial uses, made possible by reclamation, are essential to provide for our expanding populations. Agriculture and industry are complementary.

Reclamation projects are providing millions of Americans with opportunities for recreation and constructive use of an increasing amount of leisure time in a world filled with nervous tensions. Immeasurable as these recreation values may seem, they are real values and contribute greatly to both physical and mental health and productive potential in many vocations. In 1959 the visitor count at reclamation reservoirs of the 17 Western States reached the astounding total of 22,700,000.

Only through continuing the development of our water resources can our Nation meet the future needs of its citizens.

The Reclamation program has proved to be an economically sound and financially feasible enterprise for the Federal Government. Every four years the value of crops produced on Reclamation farms equals the total money appropriated for Federal Reclamation since its inception 58 years ago. The cash value of the crops produced in 1958 was almost $1 billion. Since the Reclamation program was initiated in 1902, $14,265,102,000 worth of crops have been produced. The Federal Government has received nearly $3,900 million in Federal taxes derived from Reclamation projects and adjacent trade areas since 1902.

From a financial standpoint, Reclamation projects repay the investment in many ways besides repaying to the United States all of the costs allocated to irrigation features without interest and the costs allocated to power and municipal water supplies with interest. Reclamation portions of Federal multiple-purpose developments create economic returns in the form of stabilized downstream flows for industrial waters, pollution abatement, and other benefits that are not reflected in the financial feasibility of irrigation use of water. Western Reclamation projects develop floodwater as the irrigation water supply, thereby accomplishing flood control as an important by-product.

IMPORTANT CURRENT PROBLEMS

1. Criteria for evaluating water development projects

There is a definite need for the formulation of modern, consistent and realistic general principles to guide Federal agencies in analyzing and appraising potential water development projects. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress can do a real service to future progress by urging the U.S. Congress to establish the policy to be followed by Federal agencies in the evaluation of project benefits.

2. Protection of water rights acquired under State laws

For many years efforts have been made to persuade Congress to enact legislation that would protect owners of water rights acquired in the various states against the encroachment of Federal agencies. These efforts have been largely unsuccessful. There are several bills for this purpose pending before the U.S. Congress. It is the consensus of our committee that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should join the campaign to inform our legislators of the importance of enacting a States water rights bill that will accomplish the desired purpose of protecting water rights vested under State laws.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations embody principles essential to a well-rounded yet progressive irrigation and reclamation program to be correlated with and complementary to a national program of development, utilization, and conservation of our Nation's water resources.

It is recommended that:

1. Where opposition to water development programs exist, officers, members of, and delegates to, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should act without delay to neutralize such opposing influences with any effective means available at local, State, and National levels.

2. Authorization and construction should not be subjected to a stop-and-go policy. Funds for reclamation portions of multiple-purpose developments should be increased and maintained at a level that would be consistent with the annual gross national product.

3. The Congress of the United States should establish the policy and criteria under which all Federal water development projects will be authorized and constructed.

4. On multiple-purpose projects, wherever practicable, the development of water resources should be preceded by basinwide planning.

5. Power revenues derived from Federal projects should be used on a basinwide or areawide basis to assist in repayment of irrigation allocations on Federal projects.

6. The principle of the interstate compact should be encouraged in order to avoid litigation between and among States and to preclude domination of the development and control of natural resources by Federal agencies.

7. Procedures under which Federal water resources projects are investigated and reported should be simplified.

8. Criteria under which Federal agencies evaluate water resource development projects before submitting them to Congress for authorization or construction should be reviewed and reestablished to include consideration of all future benefits.

9. Basic land and water inventories, soil and water research, snow surveys and stream forecasting should be continued, expanded, and modernized in order to provide adequate data for current and future planning.

10. The use of conservancy-type districts capable of levying taxes on project beneficiaries as agencies to execute repayment contracts with the Federal Government should be encouraged in order to more equitably allocate costs of a project and meet the burden of expensive and complex project construction.

11. In planning and constructing water resource projects the principle of supplying supplemental water to lands presently inadequately irrigated should be given priority over bringing new lands into cultivation.

12. It is further recommended that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, through its executive offices and appropriate committees:

(a) Accelerate its campaign in support of a water-utilization program designed to fully develop our land and water resources placing special emphasis on starting new water development projects that are financially feasible and economically justified;

(b) Continue to bring to the attention of the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government the need for a continuous, progressive, planned program of project authorization;

(c) Urge and actively support adequate appropriations for investigating and planning conservation water-use projects:

(d) Support legislation requiring compliance with and adherence to State water laws by Federal Agencies.

(e) Support legislation to require Federal agencies to employ more liberal and realistic criteria in their evaluation of water development projects prior to authorization and construction.

SUMMARY

In summary, the purposes of the committee on irrigation and reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress shall be to promote the development, control, conservation and utilization of the Nation's water resources, to work for the continuation of the services and the coordination of activities of Federal agencies dealing with water resources, to cooperate with and assist in securing authorization and construction of Federal conservation water-use projects which meet with the approval of States and local agencies, to assist water users of the Nation in the economic development of river basins, to preserve the rights and interests of the States in their water resources, to promote the enactment of legislation favorable to these principles.

A Few Facts Regarding Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the National Foundation for Economic Stability recently made public a few facts regarding agriculture. Because these facts, which are often overlooked, show the disruptive effects which a depressed agricultural economy has had on consumer sales and the entire national economy, I believe them to be of value to every Member of this body. I therefore insert them at this point:

A FEW FACTS REGARDING AGRICULTURE

The 1950 census shows that over 71 million people, or 40 percent, lived in towns of 5,000 and less and their surrounding areas.

This 40 percent of our population depends primarily on farm income for their buying power.

In 1959 agriculture had a capital investment of over $203 billion, or approximately 14 percent of the capital worth of the United States.

In comparison, the total assets of corporations, other than banks, insurance companies, and loan associations in 1959, was approximately $258 billion.

Approximately one-half of domestically produced factory goods is purchased by residents of rural America. This amounted to about $95.4 billion in 1959.

In 1959 agriculture owned approximately 40 percent of all of our productive capital. This investment is the source of approximately 40 percent of the gross income of the Nation.

In 1959 agriculture had a capital investment 15 times greater than the steel industry and employed 15 times as many workers.

In 1947–49 farm prices at wholesale were only 90.5 percent of the base period (1947–49=100), while prices of all products at wholesale averaged 120 percent of the base. Farm prices were off 9.5 percent and all other wholesale prices were up 20 percent.

This means that rural America had only 75 percent of the buying power which this area had in the period 1947–49.

In the base period 1946–50 consumer goods sales averaged 55 percent of the national income, and in 1959 they were only 48 percent of the national income. This means that consumer goods sales in 1959 were $28 billion too low in ratio to national income. This relative loss of consumer sales was directly due to an underpayment of $24 billion for farm production.

As a result of this loss of markets caused by the underpayment of $129.4 billion to agriculture during the period 1951–59, small business suffered a relative loss of $43 billion during the same period.

A Sensible Viewpoint of the Japanese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, many and varied are the comments regarding the cancellation, whether by our Government, or that of Japan, of the President's visit to the land of the Rising Sun.

While events of the past 2 months emphasize that a change is long overdue in our foreign policy, the attitude of the people of Japan is understandable. Some Communists, of course, fomented the display of ill feeling toward the President of the United States.

Desiring no repetition of the terrible destruction that brought an end to World War II, doubtless many thousands of anti-Communists joined in the protest demonstrations. The editor of one of the leading daily newspapers published in my home State, John H. Stauffer of the Kansas City Kansan, clearly set forth the sensible viewpoint regarding the rebellious Japanese action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Stauffer's editorial of Thursday, June 16, as part of my remarks:

THE JAPAN VISIT IS OFF

Cancellation of President Eisenhower's plan to visit Japan is a setback for the United States in its efforts to strengthen its alliances. The President was determined to go to Toyko and to confer with high Japanese governmental officials as a token of assurance that the United States stands firmly behind them in their resistance to Communist pressure.

But events of recent days left considerable doubt as to the Kishi government's ability to cope with the demonstrators who are determined to prevent, if possible, consummation of the new United States-Japanese treaty. Exactly 1 month after Premier Khrushchev withdrew the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit Russia the Kishi government regretfully withdrew its invitation to him to visit Japan. Thus moves the cold war.

But all is not lost yet. The Communists may force capitulation of the Kishi government. But there is evidence the pressure is not altogether against the present government but primarily against the alliance treaty, which many Japanese fear would make Japan vulnerable to attack. They remember all too clearly the bombings of the last war.

Midwestern Railroad and Utilities Commissioners Favor End to Airlift of 4-Cent Letter Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners took a firm stand in opposition to the Post Office Department's airlift program for ordinary first-class mail on an experimental basis or any other basis.

The commissioners represent the following 10 Midwestern States: Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

The resolution expressing the opposition of these commissioners as it was adopted at the annual Midwest Association convention is as follows:

Whereas for over 6 years the Postmaster General of the United States has been conducting an airlift program for transporting by air ordinary first-class mail on an experimental basis and has recently substantially extended the program and has announced plans to further extend the program on a permanent basis; and

Whereas the diversion of first-class mail revenues from the railroads as a result of this program materially impairs their ability to continue to provide the service required of them in the interest of a sound national transportation system to adequately serve the national economy and properly maintain the Nation's defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners hereby go on record as opposed to the program to fly ordinary first-class mail and as favoring and urging enactment of legislation to require discontinuance of the program; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to each Senator and Congressman from the States embraced in the membership of this conference, and to the members of the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Glossary of ETV Terms—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert part 2 of a glossary of educational television terms compiled by Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc.:

GLOSSARY OF ETV TERMS

Monochrome transmission: The transmission of television signals which can be reproduced in graduations of a single color only (black and white).

Monochrome vidicon: A television camera tube of moderate sensitivity, adequate for most educational broadcast requirements (black and white); much less expensive than image orthicon equipment; does not require highly expert handling.

Multiplexer: Any device or curcuit used for mixing signals; in television multiplexers have several applications, the most common of which is the optical mixing of several program sources such as film projectors, slide projectors, etc., for pickup by a single camera.

Network: A group of television stations connected by radio relays or coaxial cable so that all stations may simultaneously broadcast a program.

Picture tube: The television cathrode-ray tube used to produce an image by variation of the beam intensity as the beam scans the raster.

Projection television: A combination of lenses and mirrors which projects an enlarged television picture on a screen.

Radio frequency: A frequency used for radio transmission; the present practicable limits of radio frequency are roughly 10 kilocycles per second to 100,000 megacycles per second.

Radio wave: An electromagnetic wave produced by rapid reversals of current flow in a conductor known as the antenna, or aerial; such a wave travels through space at the speed of light, 186,000 miles a second.

Random interlace: A scanning system based on the 2:1 interlaced broadcast standard which utilizes less precise timing of the sweep frequencies than that required for open circuit broadcast usage.

Relay station: A station used to receive picture and sound signals from a master station and to transmit them to a second relay station or to a television station transmitter.

Remote pickups: Events televised away from the studio by a mobile unit or by permanently installed equipment at the remote location.

Repeater: A device for receiving, amplifying and retransmitting a signal or wave.

Resolution: The blending of picture elements and lines; it may also be used to refer to the amount of detail present that can be resolved into a complete picture; a numerical value to express resolution may be determined by examination of a transmitted test pattern; the number of lines represented by the vertical wedges at their point of blending in this resolution in lines.

Reverberation: Persistence of sound in an enclosed space, due to reflection from the walls.

Satellite stations: VHF broadcast stations located within the area of service of another television broadcast station, licensed by the same ownership and intended primarily to repeat the same program to extend the service to an adjacent area; technical requirements are precisely the same as specified for regular license.

Scanning: The process of deflecting the electron beam in a camera or picture tube so that it moves at high speed from left to right in a sequence of rows or lines from top to bottom, thus changing light and shadows of a scene into electrical impulses to form the image on the receiver tube.

Service area: The region surrounding a broadcasting station in which that station's signals can be received with satisfactory results.

Signal: Information transposed into electrical impulses; two basic signals involved in television transmission—the picture or video signal and the sound or audio signal; each signal contains electrical impulses representing elements transmitted.

Studio control room: The room or location where the monitoring equipment is placed for the direction and control of a television program.

Telecast: A broadcast of both sight and sound.

Television: The radio or electrical transmission of a succession of images and their reception in such a manner as to give a substantially continuous and simultaneous reproduction of an object or scene before the eyes of a distant observer.

Television broadcast signal: A combination of two radio frequency carriers spaced by a 4.5 megacycles per second, the lower one being amplitude-modulated by a standard composite picture signal, the upper one being frequency modulated by the accompanying audio signal.

Television channel: The term "television channel" means a band of frequencies 6 megacycles wide in the television broadcast band and designated either by number or by the extreme lower and upper frequencies.

Television receiver: A receiver for converting incoming electric signals into television pictures and customarily associated sound.

Television transmitter: The radio frequency and modulating equipment transmitting modulated radio frequency power representing a complete television signal (including audio, video, and synchronizing signals).

Translator stations: UHF broadcast stations also intended for repeat service to extend the service from an existing licensed station (ownership may be the same as the station used for program source); highly directional antennas are often utilized and a special set of operating and technical rules are followed, established by the FCC, but much different from standard broadcast requirements; the UHF channel so selected for translator service is based on availability and interference considerations.

Transmission line: A material structure forming a continuous path from one place to another for directing the transmission of electromagnetic energy along this path.

Transmission system: In communication practice, an assembly of elements capable of functioning together to transmit signal waves.

UHF: Ultra-high frequency, normally about 300–3000 megacycles.

Unidirectional antenna: An antenna having a single well-defined direction of maximum radiation intensity.

VHF: Very high frequency, normally between 30 and 300 megacycles.

Video: Of or concerning sight; specifically, those electrical currents representing the elements of a television picture.

Video amplifier: An amplifier having characteristics suitable for amplifying video signals.

Video signal: The frequencies generated by the scanning of a scene or image plus the sync and blanking pulses involved.

Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be transferred to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. Last year I supported the mutual security appropriation, and I believe in many of the things it stands for and many of the things it does. But, I do believe we could be much more selective in the use of military funds abrpad. We give a lot of hardware, a lot of planes and things to countries which cannot use them and do not need them to do things that really are not in the interest of those people. Furthermore, we have seen that some of these military funds are used for political purposes, which is not in the defense of the free world or in fulfillment of the general terms and purposes of this act. We have also found out in recent times that much of the money is being used for implementing nuclear agreements to provide nuclear weapons systems to countries abroad, some of which are not too reliable. I do not believe that is in the best interests of the United States. Therefore, if not so much money was available, we would be more selective as to how it would be used, and we would do much more good with it. Furthermore, the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not have an opportunity to examine the military portion in detail this year because of the nature of the vote on the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I do not have time; I have only 3 minutes.

Therefore, this much money should not have been authorized. By it I mean the $2 billion figure, or even $1,800 million. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee examined the military assistance program in detail this year?

Mr. MEYER. Not the way it did last year.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. MEYER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Expense Payments From the Contingent Fund of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12707 for the purpose of assuring an independent audit by the General Accounting Office of expense payments from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

In proposing this legislation, I am in no sense passing on the purported disclosures made in recent newspaper and magazine articles about committee expenditures from this fund.

I have the utmost confidence in the integrity of Members of this House. Furthermore, I believe we owe it to ourselves to provide for an independent audit of our expense funds as a means of assuring that our activities are reported accurately so the innocent would not suffer with the guilty.

I do not believe we are getting the complete picture from newspaper and magazine stories which are designed to make news but which reflect on the propriety and honesty of Members of Congress. While I fully respect the rights of newsmen to report the news, and even to draw reasonable inferences from the information they are able to gather, I do not believe that such disclosures are the most accurate way of getting at the facts. Too often have disclosures of this type resulted from hasty perusal of incomplete records. When this happens I do not believe believe Members of Congress are accorded the same fair treatment we afford to witnesses before our investigating committees. It would be much better, in my opinion, to provide for regular and thorough study of all payment vouchers by the one agency equipped to do the job, the General Accounting Office.

More than our own reputations is at stake. We have imposed a heavy burden of taxation on the people of this country. They have a right to know how their money is spent. We demand an accounting from the executive agencies of the Government. There is no logical reason why the legislative branch should not also be held to account for its expenditures, down to the last cent.

It is unfair to burden any committee of the House with this responsibility. A committee of our colleagues has a natural reluctance to cross-examine any Member as to the details of his expense account. Fortunately, the Congress long ago established an agency to scrutinize the accounts of all three branches of the Government, executive, legislative and judicial. The General Accounting Office is an arm of Congress. The Comptroller General of the United States, the administrative head of GAO, is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 15 years. So far as I know there has never been any serious question raised as to the independence of the Comptroller General and the GAO. They are as free as human institutions can be of pressures from either the executive or legislative branches. This makes the GAO the ideal agency to scrutinize the expense accounts of House Members and committees.

The U.S. Government Organization Manual for 1959–60, on page 35, describes the GAO as follows:

> The purpose of the General Accounting Office, an agency in the legislative branch of the Federal Government, is to perform an independent audit of Government financial transactions to provide a basis for the settlement of accounts and to determine how well the agencies are managing their financial affairs; in so doing, exercise the power of disallowance based on the finality of the Comptroller General's settlement of accounts and claims, and report to the Congress in special and annual reports its findings as to financial conditions in the Government. In order to accomplish its purpose, the General Accounting Office has responsibility for: performing an independent Government-wide audit of receipts, expenditures, and use of public funds; prescribing principles, standards, and related requirements for accounting to be observed by the executive agencies, and cooperating with the agencies in carrying out their primary responsibilities for the development of their own accounting systems; settling claims by or against the United States; rendering legal decisions pertaining to governmental fiscal matters; performing investigations relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds; reporting to the Congress the results of its activities including recommendations to further the effectiveness of governmental operations; and for other related functions.

Mr. Speaker, the manual, on page 36, contains this additional statement:

> The financial transactions of the executive, legislative, and judicial agencies, including but not limited to the accounts of accountable officers, are audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing statement would appear to indicate that congressional accounts already come under the purview of the GAO. And so they do, except for the contingent funds. More than 70 years ago, in 1888, the Congress passed a law making the administration committees of the House and the other body responsible for final audit of payments from the contingent funds.

The bill that I have introduced today would amend the 1888 law to remove this barrier to GAO audit of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives. I purposely refrained from broadening my proposal to include the other fund because I feel that the initiative for that should come from the other body.

My bill is confined to removing the provisions of the 1888 law, and a similar 1911 statute, that inhibit the GAO from performing its otherwise statutory duty with respect to the House contingent fund. It does not specifically authorize the GAO to audit the contingent fund because the House legislative counsel advised me that the GAO already has all the authority it needs, provided the inhibitory statutes are repealed.

New Honors to John R. Murdock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues enjoy the friendship and companionship of former Representative John R. Murdock of my home State. It pleases me to inform his many friends that a few days ago Congressman Murdock was the recipient of a well-deserved and long-overdue honor. On May 31 he was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree from Arizona State University, where he taught for many years before his election to Congress in 1936.

He is still a leading scholar and historian of the West, and has continued his studies of Western water and river devlopment problems since he left Congress in 1953.

Many tributes have been accorded John Murdock in his lifetime, and I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Tempe Daily News which reviews his many accomplishments and celebrates his attainment of doctor of laws:

TO HIM, ALL HONOR

Tonight, under the brilliant lights of massive Sun Devil stadium, a plain guy from down the street in Tempe will have conferred on him that distinguished cape of doctor of laws.

A degree conferred, if you please, for services rendered.

Services rendered to God, to his country, to his State and to his university.

The ceremony, we believe, must be classed a high water mark in this observance of the diamond jubilee, Arizona State University.

It honors John R. Murdock.

Educator, dean, father, husband, gentleman, neighbor, author, civic worker, lodgeman, churchman, and Member of Congress.

Simply put—

It couldn't happen to a nicer guy.

For the unknowing, and that includes a lot of newer Tempeans, here's a résumé of this man Murdock.

He joined the then normal school faculty at Tempe in 1914, 2 years after he received a bachelor of arts degree from Northeast Missouri Teachers College at Kirksville.

For the next 23 years he was associated with the faculties of the 3 State institutions of higher learning, teaching in summer sessions at the University of Arizona and the then normal school at Flagstaff.

In 1936, while our college dean and a professor of history and political science at what was then Arizona State Teachers College here, he was elected to the U.S. Congress.

He entered the political arena when the late Isabella Greenway King, Member of Congress, retired from her station. He was then, and for the next 6 years to come, this State's lone Congressman.

In 1943, he commenced a fourth straight term. But this time he had a companion for Arizona had been awarded two Congressmen. He was, however, still a Congressman-at-large, a status which continued until 1948, when, beginning his seventh term, he represented District No. 1, Maricopa County.

In 1952, after 16 years as Congressman, he lost election in the Eisenhower landslide. He has been in retirement since, content to lecture and write, two things he does very, very well.

Arizona will long remember his service in Congress much of which was spent as chairman of the vital House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It was John R. Murdock, friends, who was primarily responsible for the establishment of the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation project down in Yuma County.

His efforts, too, on behalf of Arizona water rights contributed greatly to our State's success in obtaining a just share of Colorado River water, and to the recent decision in favor of Arizona's Colorado River water claims.

We'll be in the stands tonight to witness John Murdock's reception of this wonderful degree, a degree cherished by any person listed as an educator professional.

We said it couldn't happen to a nicer guy.

And we mean it.

A man can be a prophet who is honored at home.

John R. Murdock is such a man, for example.

And Tempe is such a place.

Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions, if I may have his attention. I shall be brief.

I know that the gentleman from Louisiana has always considered this program with great care and wisdom, and is literally saving the American taxpayer billion of dollars. I think the country owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gentleman and to his subcommittee.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, Would not the gentleman agree that grant aid, whether under special assistance or the President's contingency fund, should be used sparingly—only in very special and exceptional situations?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am in complete accord with the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. SIKES. May I go one step further and may I ask the gentleman by way of clarifying legislative intent, notwithstanding this situation would it not be the understanding of the chairman of the subcommittee that Guatemala, a country which is solidifying the anti-Communist forces in the delicate Caribbean and Central American area, falls into this exceptional category and that any forthcoming special assistance or contingency fund assistance to that country could well be by grant, particularly in view of the current effort of the Arbenz Communist group, now associated with Castro in Cuba to regain a foothold by force in Guatemala?

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to say to the gentleman that I am certainly in accord with his position. I feel that Guatemala is in a singular position and is deserving of special consideration.

A Breath of Fresh Air in our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the old guard of the Republican Party was confused and confounded with the 12 points enumerated by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY in his recent foreign policy speech.

Some of the more broad-minded members of that party, however, recognized that JACK KENNEDY had the courage to face the facts and that he does not hesitate to state his position. What a White House metamorphosis is in sight. Under the next Democratic administration the American people will no longer be deceived.

A breath of fresh air is sorely needed, Mr. Speaker, in our foreign policy—in fact, it is needed badly throughout the executive branch of our Government. It is certain to come on November 8.

In an editorial published June 16 in the Morning Wichita Eagle the writer recognized that Senator KENNEDY does not intend to follow blindly the established pattern of the status quo, but that he will act boldly and take the people into his confidence. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial be included with my remarks.

The editorial follows:

BREAKING NEW GROUND

While Senator JOHN KENNEDY'S major foreign policy address in Congress Tuesday, sounded for the most part like the standard Democratic criticism of the Eisenhower record, it did appear to break new ground in one direction.

Much of KENNEDY'S speech showed that while the Democrats harp upon the Eisenhower administration's "frozen policies" and the need for "rethinking" our goals, there are precious few specific changes the Democrats care to suggest. Responsible Democrats know that any real changes would either require the Communist leopard changing his spots or else our bartering away advantages we now have.

But KENNEDY may have struck upon one area where our policies are not only outdated but fail to conform to realities—the question of Red China. It doesn't make sense for us to pretend that nothing has changed since 1948 in an aggressive nation whose tremendous industrial growth is fast bringing it into the nuclear age.

The Massachusetts Senator realized that he was playing with fire in trying to use this issue, however. Mindful of how Americans are emotionally committed to our present policy, of nonrecognition of Red China KENNEDY put in the disclaimer that he would not favor recognition "without a genuine change in her belligerent attitude."

He went on to contend the next President must reassess our China policy. As a first step, KENNEDY suggested bringing China into the nuclear test ban talks at Geneva. This would help our side, he explained, by stopping the Soviets from continuing their atomic tests in Red China without inspection.

Indeed, here is the one area where America conceivably could gain by unfreezing its policy. But whether KENNEDY can shape an issue without alarming the public may be something else again.

Straight Talk to the Graduates of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the graduates of 1960 by Tom Anderson, from the Kershaw (S.C.) News Era, of June 9, 1960:

STRAIGHT TALK

(By Tom Anderson)

To the graduates of 1960:

Things I wish I had known when I went out to face the cold, cruel world 25 years ago (or as my teen-age daughter calls it, "in the olden days"):

That sheepskin does not mean you're educated. It means that you should now have enough appreciation of education to make you want to become educated. Your intellectual horizon should now have been arised so as to whet your appetite for knowledge, which you now should know where and how to get.

A successful farmer today must know far more than merely how to farm. He needs to be part scientist, salesman, student, buyer, bookkeeper, tax expert, internationalist, politician, philosopher, veterinarian and weather expert. And, a keen sense of humor helps.

MAKE YOUR OWN BARGAIN

The time has come when, if you have not already done so, you must make your own bargain with life.

Neither your parents nor your Government can do it for you. You can do and be almost anything you want to do and be badly enough to make the necessary all-out effort and sacrifices. Try to decide now what you most want from life. And remember, those who merely chase happiness never

catch up with it. Life has its sunshine and its shadows, its peaks and its valleys.

This is still the only country in the world where anybody who's got what it takes and gives what it takes, can rise from the bottom to the top. Most great deeds are mainly mixtures of courage and sweat. There are few born geniuses.

Your albatross could well be too much opportunity, instead of too little; too much, too easy. Opportunity can make and break. Money and luxurious living are false gods. For hardship builds character, like forging builds steel.

You can't get to the promised land without going through the wilderness. Our Republic was built on individual freedom, individual opportunity, and individual responsibility. Wonder what Abraham Lincoln would have done, if he'd had the opportunity you have?

Lincoln as a boy, read books by the light of an open fire and had only about 3 years of formal schooling. No struggle, no Lincoln; no wilderness, no Moses; no cross, no Christ; no adversity, no victory.

Neither be afraid of change, nor change for change's sake. The only thing that's sure in this world is change. And goodness knows, there's plenty that needs changing. The American way of life has never been equaled. Be sure you have something better before you agree to a change. Some of the progressive ideas such as socialism to replace capitalism; humanism or modernism to replace Christianity, would set us back almost 2,000 years. For it was that long ago that socialism, humanism, and modernism were first proven failures.

My generation—the generation your parents belong to—has done a lousy job for you. We sacrificed great hunks of the individual freedoms your forefathers fought and died for. We swapped them for Government-guaranteed womb-to-tomb security. We ate up not only our seed corn, but part of yours. In the welfare state, the politicians and bureaucrats get well and you pay the fare.

If we ever want freedom from responsibility more than we want freedom of opportunity, we will cease to be a free people. Prisoners have security. Life termers really have it made. You can't have freedom and security.

As you begin your serious bargain with life, never forget that the only security you can ever have is the security within yourself. Security, like happiness, can neither be bought nor given. Each of us has to earn our own. Government can give you nothing which it does not first take from someone else. For government is essentially a parasite. It creates nothing. It lives off of the creation of others. Generally speaking, government is your enemy, not your friend, because it's like a predatory male: It'll go as far as the female will let it. It has already gone far too far. If you want government to be your slave and not your master, you must understand it, participate in it, distrust it, control it. For the bigger it is, the littler you are.

Make all of life's bargains on top of the table, not under it. The best Payola you can get is your own self-respect. Be a sovereign individual, not just a member of the mob. The great things of the world are accomplished by a relatively few individuals, not by the mass. Don't go along with the crowd when the crowd is headed toward the precipice. Going along with the crowd is taking the easy, cowardly way. Is that what Jesus did? Or Moses, Christopher Columbus, Patrick Henry, Robert E. Lee, General MacArthur, or Senator Taft? No. Pontius Pilate went along with the crowd, pleased the mob. In this day of decaying morals, more and more Pilates, VanDorens, politicians, publishers, disc jockeys, businessmen, beatniks and editors seem to be taking the easy way. In the end, somehow and somewhere, they'll pay the price. Like an easy woman, some day they'll find that the easiest are soonest left unloved. Some day they'll learn that you can't lie with the hounds without getting up with fleas. Some day it'll burst upon their consciousness, if not their conscience, that a people who lack the morality to stand on their feet and say "no" will some day have to say "yes" on their knees.

THE THINGS THAT REALLY COUNT

Once a father took his little son with him to steal some corn. As the man prepared to put the corn into the bag, he anxiously looked around to see if anyone was watching. "Son, open the bag quickly," he said. The little boy replied, "Daddy, you didn't look in one direction."

Frightened lest the boy had spotted an observer, the father whispered "Where? Where?"

His son answered simply, "Daddy, you didn't look up."

Character is what you do when nobody but God is looking. The older you get the more you will realize that the things which really count in life are effort, service and character.

Each of us, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, capable and incapable, has a sacred obligation on this earth: To do the best we can; and to make the land we live on, the land we live in, and the world we live with, a better place because we were here.

Glossary of ETV Terms—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a warld where vocabulary is undergoing constant change. If we are to keep pace with progress, we must learn to speak the language.

Educational television is the mark of progress in the field of educating our children. Its language, too, is strange to many of us.

Because I believe Members interested in this important development want to understand more about ETV, I wish to include part of a glossary of ETV terms compiled by Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., which appears in its excellent report, "Design For ETV."

GLOSSARY OF ETV TERMS

Acoustics: The science of sound; the sound properties of a room or space.

Adjacent-channel interference: Interference caused in one radio circuit by a transmitter which is assigned for operation in an adjacent channel.

Amplifier: Electrical device through which a sound or picture signal is strengthened.

Antenna: A structure for sending or receiving radio waves.

Antenna array: An arrangement of two or more antenna elements to form a system that operates as a unit; term especially applied to antennas with more than one element.

Audio: Of or concerning sound; specifically, the electrical currents representing a sound program or the sound portion of a television program.

Band: A range of radio frequencies within two definite limits and used for a definite purpose; for example, the standard broadcast band extends from 550–1600 kilocycles, television from 54–216 megacycles, and international broadcasting uses several bands between 6,000 and 22,000 kilocycles.

Bandwidth: The range of frequencies required to convey the visual or aural information being transmitted; the bandwidth of a television channel in the U.S. is 6 megacycles.

Brightness: The comparative intensity of light which the eye can see as illuminating an object or screen.

Brightness control: Knob on a television receiver which varies the average illumination of the image.

Camera: In television, a unit that contains an optical system and a light-sensitive pickup tube that converts a visual image into electrical impulses when properly scanned.

Camera chain: TV camera plus electronic equipment necessary to deliver a complete picture for telecasting.

Carrier: The transmitted electrical wave that carries the video or audio signals or impulses impressed upon it.

Channel: A range or "band" of frequencies assigned for the transmission of communication signals; in television it is the group of frequencies comprising the transmitted visual (video) and sound (audio) signals.

Channel allocation: The channel or band in the radio spectrum to which a television station is assigned, or the channel space in the radio spectrum to which a communication service is assigned.

Closed circuit: A wire circuit used as one means of carrying and directing a television program for specialized audience viewing.

Coaxial cable (concentric line): A transmission line formed by two coaxial conductors, each insulated from the other by some suitable dielectric material such as air or polyethylene, polyfoam, teflon, etc.

Community antenna system: A master antenna array and the signal distribution system, i.e., the amplifiers, coaxial cable, connecting devices, etc., necessary to effect signal presentation at TV receiver.

Compatible color system: A color television system which permits normal black and white reception of its transmitted signals without altering currently used receivers.

Contrast: The relation of black to white on a receiver or projection screen.

Decibel: A measure of the gain or loss of sound energy, intensity or loudness; each 3 decibel gain in sound measurement doubles the intensity or loudness.

Definition: The fidelity with which the detail of an image is reproduced by a television receiver; also called resolution.

Demodulation: The process of removing the video and audio signals from their respective carrier waves.

Directional antenna: An antenna radiating or receiving radio waves more effectively in some directions than in others.

Fidelity: The degree to which a system, or a portion of a system, accurately reproduces at its output the essential characteristics of the signal that is impressed upon its input.

Footcandle: A unit measure of quantity of direct illumination falling on a surface, measured from the surface toward the source.

Footlambert: A unit measure of reflected or emitted light "seen" by the viewer at the surface being illuminated.

Frequency: Number of cycles per second.

Interference: Disturbance in radio reception caused by undesirable signals or stray currents from electrical apparatus, atmospheric, static, etc.

Interlace: The process of scanning alternate lines of a television picture to reduce flicker.

Kinescope recording: A sound motion picture, usually on 16-mm. film, photographed off the end of a kinescope tube during a television show.

Line scanning frequency: The number of lines of an image scanned each second;

under present U.S. standards it is 15,750 cycles per second, which corresponds to a 525-line picture.

Live talent: Studio or on-the-spot televising of events and people in contrast to the transmission of film material.

Locked interlace: A scanning system where the sweep frequencies used are rigidly timed and controlled. More stable in operation than random interlace.

Master TV control: The point or points at which all TV signal assimilation occurs for subsequent controlled distribution through a closed circuit coxial cable; this includes control of all inter communications signals, TV signals, and so forth.

Megacycle (mc): One million cycles; when used as a unit of frequency, it is equal to one million cycles per second.

Microwaves: Radio waves less than one meter in length.

Microwave relays: Systems used for transmission of video and audio signals by highly directional radio beams at frequencies between 2,000 and 15,000 mc.; distances up to 50 miles may be covered by a single link consisting of a transmitter and receiver; longer distances may be covered by multiple links receiving and transmitting the original signal.

Modulation: The process of impressing audio or video impulses on the carrier wave for transmission through the air.

Monitor: To control the picture shading and other factors involved in the transmission of both a scene and the accompanying sound; monitoring usually occurs in the control room and at the transmitter. Also denotes a type of receiver.

Monochrome image orthicon: A television camera tube so sensitive it can televise (in black and white) any scene the eye can see, even under low lighting conditions; more expensive than vidicon, used for professional studio broadcasting; requires expert handling.

Fourteenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, the Italian people observed the 14th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. I am pleased and proud to bring this anniversary date to the attention of this House and to extend congratulations and best wishes to a nation of friends which has contributed so much to our culture and the culture of the entire world throughout the ages.

It was in 1948 that Italy, for the first time in the exercise of popular sovereignty, gave herself a fundamental law in adopting its republican Constitution. Italy's adoption of its Constitution, and its establishment of a republican form of government 2 years earlier, gave notice to all peoples that it was her intention to become associated with the free nations of the world.

The founding of the Italian Republic was a great landmark in the history of Italy. After the downfall of Fascist dictatorship came a political vacuum, and the Government that existed was in disrepute. It was in June 1946 that the Italian people became masters of their own destiny and chose between retaining their old monarchial form of government, or of adopting a republican form of government.

Over 22 million Italians expressed themselves at the polls on June 2 and 3, 1946, with 10 million in favor of retaining the monarchy, and over 12 million favoring a republic. On June 10, 1946, Italy became a Republic.

A year and a half later, its Constitution was adopted, and Italy began on the road of democratic progress. It is one of the largest and most progressive Republics in the world, and I believe that the many advances Italy has made since the war in all fields of human endeavor has been largely due to its new form of government.

Despite the tremendous advances Italy has made in the short time since World War II, there is still much to be done. But there is no doubt in my mind that under its Constitution, with the freedoms it guarantees to the people, and with the encouragement and help of Italy's friends throughout the world, Italy will continue to grow and prosper.

The United States has close ties with Italy, and despite the intervening actions of hostile Italian Governments, it has always had a high regard for the people of Italy. Italian immigrants have contributed greatly to the growth of our own United States in helping to build this new nation. It was particularly fitting, therefore, for us to contribute toward Italy's recovery after the second world conflict, not only in recognition of the contribution of Italian immigrants to our own growth, but also in a reaffirmation of our friendship and of our faith in the future of the Italian Republic.

United States aid, through the Marshall plan, mutual security, the United Nations, and so many other programs, helped express the American people's friendship for a noble people who had suffered much.

On this 14th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, we can be proud that we were able to extend a helping hand to the Italian people with whom we in America have such close and common ties. We can rejoice in Italy's splendid recovery and its continuing progress, and be happy to have played a small part in assisting this progress.

We can be confident, too, in knowing that the people of Italy have achieved a maturity in government and in governing themselves, and that Italy will continue to play a vital role in the promotion of freedom and peace throughout the world.

Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I desire to associate myself with the interesting remarks and the philosophy expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] during the course of the discussion on foreign aid legislation.

Not only in Afghanistan, but in all parts of the world, Pan American Airways has become a symbol of the American flag. Like any private enterprise, Pan American assumes risks—often far beyond the normal—in tackling an oversea problem.

Pan American's mutual aid history far antedates foreign aid as we have come to know it in the last generation. In 1927 when Pan American began operations from Key West to Havana, through 1928 and 1929, when it built an air link around South America, the history of Pan American has been one of carrying the American flag to all parts of the universe.

This airline, Mr. Chairman, was the first American-flag carrier to fly into Africa, Asia, Australasia and to span the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Of course, Pan American received assistance from the U.S. Government in all these undertakings, but the question is which came first, Pan American or Government assistance? Obviously, one would not have been possible without the other.

We have reached an impasse in our financial dealings abroad. Obviously, foreign aid in the form of outright cash disbursements cannot continue indefinitely. However, until American business enterprises similar to Pan American are encouraged by the Government to go abroad and blaze new economic and technological horizons we must anticipate that Government assistance remains necessary.

I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that Pan American and other American firms should be encouraged to continue their oversea expansion, and I thank him for the privilege of letting me join with him in giving credit where credit is due.

Department of State: Hidden Policymakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in previous addresses to the House on the Caribbean and Panama Canal situations, I have repeatedly asked the question: What are the influences in our Government that have permitted the present crucial conditions to the south of us to develop? But so far there have been no adequate explanations. Certainly, the time is overdue for the Congress to delve into these

matters and identify these influences and the personnel that implement them.

Thus, it was with gratification that I read in the June 14, 1960, issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., an illuminating article on "The 'Hidden' Policymakers" by Mr. Constantine Brown, the distinguished foreign affairs columnist of that newspaper.

The article follows:

THE 'HIDDEN' POLICYMAKERS—SUBSTITUTION OF ONE DICTATOR IN CUBA BLAMED ON BEHIND-SCENES FIGURE

(By Constantine Brown)

Congressional committees are studying ways and means to streamline and modernize our top-heavy diplomatic machine, particularly since the so-called "Paris disaster." It has become obvious to all who follow closely American diplomats' actions and attitudes, especially since the death of John Foster Dulles, that more often than not the right hand does not know what the left is doing.

There are more "hidden" policymakers these days than are good for the country's interests. Their policies may come out as the work of the Secretary of State, but actually he is sometimes merely a front behind which are the "hidden" policymakers. It is difficult to conceive for instance that a man as cautious as Mr. Herter would have been on his own initiative a party to the bringing into office of Fidel Castro. The tragedy of Cuba and the Cuban people was the result of well-conceived and well-calculated actions on the part of a number of "hidden" policymakers from several agencies. The net result of their concealed labors, in which they had been assisted by some of our information media, is that we have replaced the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista with that of Castro. In doing so, we have enabled Messrs. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung to establish political and military bases at our doorsteps. Cuba today is not only the center of action of international communism for South America, but also is becoming a base for Red rocketry and submarines.

Despite the blatant threat to our security, the hidden policymakers now are endeavoring to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic. The pattern follows closely that of Cuba. It started some time ago with acid newspaper stories about the misdeeds and the oppressions taking place in the Dominican Republic.

There is no question that Generalissimo Trujillo is a dictator. We have known this—and have supported him—for the last 30 years. The situation has not changed since. The fact is that despite the dictatorial form of government, the Dominican Republic is better off and more orderly than many Latin American republics which have their own type of democracy. That is immaterial, however. The important factor is that the Trujillo administration is definitely dedicated to keeping communism out of the Caribbean in the same manner as it opposed the Nazis during the last war. And that, under the existing world conditions, is what matters uppermost. Yet, the official slaps at the Dominican Republic are being accompanied not only by propaganda but also by funds channeled from this country—not from officially appropriated moneys but from certain secret funds—to foster Generalissimo Trujillo's overthrow.

Nobody seems to worry about what would happen if this is done or about who would replace the Trujillo dynasty. Objective observers maintain that the vacuum would be filled by Communist dupes of the Castro type. Moscow's and Peiping's efforts to surround us have been successful in Cuba and unless we wake up they may be successful in other countries close to our shores.

What seems to be even more amazing are the reports that there are a number of hidden policymakers who are keeping their ears on the ground in hope of detecting vague rumbles from Spain and helping the enemies of Franco, who operate principally from abroad, to create confusion in that country, which has become one of our most important allies in Europe.

Spain has changed since the end of its civil war from a total dictatorship to a "managed democracy" with only a token, powerless Parliament. But that is beside the point. We are on record that we do not care about the form of government of any country.

Spain has become our main anchor of defense in the Western Mediterranean. This has become particularly true since we are being forced to remove our air bases from Morocco. There is no question in the minds of responsible men in the Pentagon that a political turmoil in Spain will have disastrous results to the defense of the free world. This fact should be obvious to all who are concerned about the tomorrow in the present world situation. Yet ideological hidden policymakers wish us to take a different course.

Soviet Russia's Vodka Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is the speech which I had the honor of delivering last Saturday at the Department of Illinois AMVETS Convention in Peoria, Ill.:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, DEMOCRAT, OF ILLINOIS, DELIVERED AT THE COMMANDER'S DINNER ON JUNE 18, 1960, DURING THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS AMVETS IN PEORIA, ILL.

My fellow Amvets and ladies of the auxiliary, this year's convention of the Department of Illinois AMVETS is being held at a time when the whole world is anxiously awaiting developments in the most crucial period of the cold war.

It is indeed fortunate that you men and women who have made such a great sacrifice in the defense of freedom and survival for democracy should be meeting here today to collectively appraise the situation which is threatening the peace for which you so desperately fought. I hope that before you leave here, you will have agreed on a program of action for our Nation which will represent the collective thoughts of those who have experienced the horror of war and who today so vividly understand the price of freedom.

Your task is not an easy one, but I am confident that because of the leadership which you are fortunate to have in the Department of Illinois AMVETS at this particular time, the program you will recommend for future action will reflect the high degree of responsibility the American people have learned to accept from your organization.

The free world today is locked in a bitter ideological struggle with those who, through despotism and brutality, are intent upon destroying man's God-given right to be free.

Not since the end of hostilities in World War II has the international arena been so fraught with tension as it is today. We are living in an era that demands the highest degree of responsible analysis and understanding so that we can bring the world back to a concept of conduct acceptable to all civilized nations. The situation today demands extremely careful analysis because it is patently clear to all of us that one false move, one ill-conceived decision, could plunge the entire world into a nuclear war that could well set civilization back many centuries.

The free world today, with its high ideals and unyielding determination to preserve peace with dignity, is pitted against a conspiracy emanating from the Kremlin, which has made "vodka diplomacy" the order of the day.

I have no fear that leaders of the free world will do anything sufficiently provocative to touch off a third world war. But, unfortunately, we in the free world are not masters of the situation. Rather, we must endure countless humiliations and retain a degree of patience not even equalled by Job, simply because we know that the Kremlin leaders shift and pivot their own regard for peace commensurate with the amount of vodka they have consumed.

We in the free world are being forced to play "Russian roulette" with a despotic leadership in the Kremlin which has repeatedly shaken the peaceful conduct of diplomatic relations with violent threats of nuclear retaliation. I need not tell you that on any number of occasions at diplomatic receptions in Moscow, after consuming several vodkas, the Premier of the Soviet Union has made not only bold and arrogant insults against the leaders of the free world, including our own President, but also has threatened to destroy our bases in friendly countries with nuclear bombs.

The real threat to world peace is the ever present possibility that these unstable and unpredictable leaders of the Kremlin, in one of their fits of rage or outright intoxication, could very well throw the entire world into nuclear conflict.

Your responsibility, therefore, as leaders of your respective communities, is to constantly help place this entire situation in its proper perspective to our American people, because as never before, our people must understand the complex problems of the world today.

We are witnessing the ugly specter of conventional diplomatic relations being forced to surrender to mob rule. A few weeks ago we watched with horror as a wild and violent mob drove the President of Korea out of office. Only last Thursday we witnessed one of the most catastrophic diplomatic disasters when we saw our own President forced to abandon his plans to visit Japan because the Japanese Government is apparently unable to cope with mob violence in its own country.

It is important for those of us who have learned the meaning of respect and discipline as veterans to be ever mindful of the fact that mob rule is infectious. If it could happen in Korea; if it could happen in Japan; we, as Americans, must go beyond the realm of normal assumption and take cognizance of the ugly fact that it could happen here.

You, therefore, have the challenge to make sure that young people in your own communities recognize the meaning of orderly dissent, if they so wish to dissent, within the framework of standards commonly accepted in an organized society. Let there be no question about this.

The AMVETS has a history of tolerance and respect for diversity. Your organization has attracted many veterans from the armed services because they know that within your framework there is ample provision for free debate and progressive ideas. But you also have a proud history of service to the community to preserve the highest ideals of America in freedom and democracy. Now, more than ever before, you must recognize the fact that through your leadership the people of your community, especially the young people, can have a better understanding of the great complexity of freedom. I am

certain that the young people in your community will not be any party to mob violence—such as we witnessed among students in Korea and Japan—if you properly orient them on the responsibility of their citizenship.

People are moved to mob violence and to forsake law and order only when they fail to understand the complex structure of the democratic process. You, as men and women who have fought so hard to preserve that democratic process in our country, must today become the ambassadors who will carry to your communities not only the meaning of freedom, but also the responsibility that goes with it to those who would enjoy it.

The AMVETS, by the very nature of your organization's charter, have a responsibility to make your collective voice heard on urgent legislation and on policy of our national administration. I hope that before you leave here this weekend, your organization will reemphasize America's national purpose and, having done that, will spell out in a series of resolutions how you believe this national purpose can best be dramatized and implemented among the growing number of Americans who, either through impatience or lack of desire, seem to have forgotten what our national purpose really is. Those of you present here today certainly know what it is because you fought so valiantly to defend it.

Perhaps everyone of us present in this room may have a different opinion on the details of our national purpose. But I trust we can be unanimous in our agreement that the foundation of our national purpose is to remain free.

Freedom is built of many ingredients. In order to be able to preserve freedom, we, as a nation, must be economically strong; and to do this, we must have a normal economic growth which can absorb the increasing number of Americans coming into the labor market. Ironically, in recent years our Nation has failed to maintain a degree of growth which can give us the economic strength we need to preserve our freedom. There are still almost 4 million people unemployed, and we have many areas of our country which have been chronically depressed because of shifting industries and changing times. You must take cognizance of this and give serious thought to this problem, particularly since right here in Illinois we have four counties that are listed by the Labor Department as chronically depressed areas.

In order to preserve our freedom, we must have a strong defense establishment. This does not mean one that would tolerate or condone waste of the taxpayers' money; but on the other hand, it does not mean that in our search for economy we should deprive our military leadership of those sinews which they consider absolutely essential to preserve our Nation's survival.

You, as veterans, have a twofold responsibility. One, to ferret out, wherever you see them, examples of waste and inefficiency. But just as important is your responsibility to explain to the people in your community why the vast sums which we are spending today on defense are so urgently needed.

In order to remain free, we Americans must realize that the two large oceans which have for centuries safeguarded us from the problems of the rest of the world are today but insignificant ciphers on the sliderule of guided missiles.

Our own survival today requires alliances and treaties of mutual security with our allies. Earlier this week there were many voices raised in Congress to eliminate the mutual security program, which in the last 14 years has cost this Nation $103 billion. No one would contend that this is not a serious amount of money, but I dare say no one can deny that this serious expenditure has helped us to preserve the allies on whom we must today rely for mutual assistance should the Soviet Union be foolish enough to disturb even the shaky peace the world is experiencing. It is up to people like you to explain to those in your communities the real significance of mutual security.

In order to remain free, there is a myriad of domestic problems which we must first try to understand and then persuade our neighbors to support legislation which would help alleviate them.

Finally, in order to remain free, you must make your own voice heard in the great debate on foreign policy. This is a subject which under no circumstances should we Americans ever permit to become discussed on a partisan basis. Conversely, if we feel that our foreign policy is not achieving results which would produce better understanding among nations, we would be derelict if we failed to make our voices heard. This is the dynamics of our Republic: the ability to contribute your own views to the great discussion on survival.

Too often I have seen in Washington outright carelessness, inefficiency, or even tragically bad judgment being concealed under the guise of secrecy with excuses that full disclosure might affect our national security. Here again the situation requires extreme responsibility. It is one thing to assail our President or his administration with bitter criticism for demagogic reasons only. It is another thing to point out in responsible tones where you feel our national leaders have erred in their conduct, if you believe they have indeed erred.

I, myself, for instance, very severely criticized our State Department for inviting the Soviet leaders to this country. I said then—and I think time has proven me right—that we were wrong in dignifying them with the traditional hospitality so characteristic of us Americans. But that does not mean that today, when we have recognized the degree of our mistake in inviting these men I or anyone else should engage in reckless criticism of the President just for the sake of criticizing.

This, therefore, is your challenge: Help your fellow man to better understand the complicated world in which he lives. You veterans are the leaders of your community. Do not make the mistake of looking for leadership elsewhere; it rests with you. Through the process of leaving the job of leadership to somebody else, we might conceivably reach a point where but a handful of Americans could actually affect the future of our country. This you must never permit.

I am very disturbed that this Nation for some years now has been tragically slipping into the limbo of conformity. More and more of our people are perfecly willing, often subliminally, to fall into a single cadence; and those who want to speak out on the great issues of a tremendously complicated world are being more and more shouted down by a populace that is growing increasingly impatient with the art of free speech. I need not remind you that perhaps the greatest tragedy to beset our Nation would be to have all of us march in a single cadence and for all of us to think alike. We would then lose that precious characteristic which distinguishes us as free people from those now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

The AMVETS were organized because you wanted a greater voice in the affairs of your postwar Nation. Let us then rekindle the spirit that gave birth to this organization; let us then as veterans go back into our communities and soberly provide that avenue of understanding which we as Americans need if our Nation is to survive. Our form of government is the most complicated form of government in existence anywhere in the world today. Yet, in this complexity we have been able to guarantee our citizens the greatest degree of freedom enjoyed by people anywhere in the world today.

I urge you to exert your leadership to keep our country great. You have fought hard on the battlefields of World War II, and you won the war. Now you must continue to fight to preserve the peace.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate your State department commander, Edwin Fifielski, and his entire staff for the excellent work he has done during the past year and may I wish all of you success in your efforts during this coming year.

Thank you.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of June 18, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas, June 18, 1960)

A pay raise for all Federal employees was voted in the House this week amid confusion which would have been comic had it not pointed up so graphically the power of certain self-serving lobbying organizations. A discharge petition demanded by postal unions and other employee organizations gained the requisite 219 signatures of House Members with almost unbelievable promptness, took jurisdiction away from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which was considering selective pay boosts, and called up for floor debate the straight-across-the-board 9-percent hike sought by the unions. On the day this bill was to come up on the floor, the committee met again and voted out the new and different version calling for a 7.5-percent increase. This amendment wasn't printed up, read or explained to the committee members but it was passed by the committee nevertheless. Later on the floor of the House it was more of the same. Member after Member took the floor to condemn the procedure and deplore the lobbyists' pressure (the galleries were filled with employee representatives who had earlier jammed the corridors and committee room). The bill passed 378 to 40. I was one of the 40. Frankly, I'm content (and I believe that most of the 40 dissenters would agree) that some sensible pay raise for postal employees and other Federal workers is in order. I'm certain, though, that it should be a selective one considering the demands of varying jobs, the increase in the cost of living since last Federal pay rates were adjusted, and other pertinent factors. There was no basis whatever to my mind for any across-the-board increase—no basis, that is, other than the baldly-stated demands of the lobbyists seeking this increase.

The constitutional amendment granting District of Columbia residents the right to vote for President and Vice President passed handily, and I agree that this right should not be denied. This amendment should not be confused with home rule which would grant local control of Washington to locally-elected officials—a control now residing in Congress. After ratification by three-fourths of the States, this suffrage amendment will become law.

Tighter accounting and control of funds covering the necessary additional expenses of Congressmen during the course of official business would be provided by H.R. 11654 in whose sponsorship I joined this week.

The mutual security appropriation (foreign aid) evoked the usual controversial debate. Few new ideas or arguments came to light except as further developments of earlier presentations (see newsletter Apr. 23, 1960). Here, however, are a few thoughts that struck home to me: (1) Foreign aid since World War II totals $103,209 million for mutual security gifts of money and goods, grants and loans under seven separate lending institutions, Public Law 480 (surplus food disposal), and oversea military construction and expenditures; (2) foreign nations are now in a position to demand our gold, if they choose, to the full extent of our holdings of some $19 billion ($12 billion of our $19 billion is earmarked to support our currency); (3) each year part of the funds appropriated are now spent; (4) the Comptroller General in a report on foreign aid states the problems stem from too much money; (5) we continue to support, as a matter of policy, Communist regimes in Yugoslavia and Poland; (6) some of the snafus are hard to believe. Among some new ones: We shipped 421 jet planes to a country with 186 pilots; 255 tanks to a country whose total active tank force is 30 men; 391 jet planes ($70 million cost) to a country which placed 160 of them in temporary storage and 45 in permanent storage. We provided three army surgical hospitals to Ethiopia at a time when there was only one native doctor in the Ethiopian Army; (7) $451 million in counterpart funds have been "discovered," which we apparently didn't know we had; (8) the very name, Development Loan Fund, is a misnomer. The funds provided under it are gifts. Loans are repayable in local currencies which we can't spend without the local country's permission to take the money out of the country; (9) defense support (economic aid) in Vietnam: a highway system to cost $18,300,000, at this point $130 million; (10) we now have 44,000 employees and 10,000 trainees in "mutual security" work in 77 countries.

In the field of economic assistance we have found ourselves only subsidizing our enemies or at best dubious "fair weather" friends while weakening our own economy and pyramiding our own debt. Militarily we have poured money and materiel into a number of nations with no assurance of their military support when it may be needed. Certainly all of us are now concerned as a result of Japan's Communist-inspired student and labor uprisings that we are vulnerable in our oversea bases. Such bases can be neutralized politically before they can be used militarily. This leaves us faced with the realization that our strategic air command may not prove the deterrent force we think it to be in an emergency. Only as we ourselves are demonstrably strong will our allies rally to us.

Imports of Foreign-Made Surplus Military Rifles Into United States as Sporting Guns Is Threatening American Firearms Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during debate last Friday I had planned to offer an amendment, with the support of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], and members of the Connecticut delegation in the House, to the mutual security bill in order to halt the importation in the United States of firearms which were manufactured abroad for military purposes and which are now being dumped upon the world market.

Due to the parliamentary situation at the time of the reading of the mutual security bill for amendment, however, it was impossible for me to offer my amendment because I had been advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be subject to a "point of order."

Mr. Speaker, the dumping of these surplus foreign made firearms is occurring in such increasingly large volume and at such ridiculously low prices that it is causing a serious reduction in the skills and investment of American manufacturers of firearms. The result has been a drop in arms research and development and a slowing down or abandonment of the modernization of small arms plants in the United States. If this trend is not halted, American arms manufacturers will obviously be harmed to an extent which gravely impairs their defense mobilization capacity.

In fact, the defense mobilization base of the United States has probably already been impaired by the dumping upon our markets of surplus military firearms. These firearms are virtually being given away and are dramatically reducing sales by American arms manufacturers. The J. Stevens Arms Division of the Savage Arms Corp. is located at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in my congressional district. This American arms manufacturer, producer of the famous sporting Savage .99 rifle, and other manufacturers located in Connecticut, have been feeling the pinch in sales as a result of the importation of foreign made surplus rifles. They are being sold here as sporting rifles at prices with which the American arms industry cannot compete.

These surplus rifles are coming primarily from Italy, England, Sweden, and Germany. There appears to be no end to the supply abroad; and since the United States is the only major market for these guns, the outlook for the American firearms industry is very grave indeed. European governments refuse to permit their people to buy these military rifles.

Mr. Speaker, under the munitions control provisions of the Mutual Security Act, the State Department has the authority to regulate traffic in arms. Licenses are issued by the State Department for both import and export of arms and ammunition. Under the law, the Secretary of State is authorized to issue a license if he finds that the license furthers U.S. foreign policy, world peace, and the national security. To date, the Secretary of State, applying these standards, has concluded that the mass importation of surplus military rifles does not conflict with world peace, our foreign policy or the national security.

On June 29, 1959, six of the leading American firearms manufacturers filed a petition with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, asking for relief against these excessive imports of military surplus. Unfortunately, however, the OCDM decision will not be forthcoming before autumn. Meanwhile, the American arms manufacturers continue to be threatened by the dumping of surplus foreign-made military rifles which are glutting the American market and selling for prices ranging from $14 to $30 in direct competition with American sporting rifles retailing between $80 and $130.

Employment Potential of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I have the opportunity, through this forum, to bring to the American people the heart-warming story of the successful efforts of a resident of my district, Mr. Eugene T. Turney, Jr., of Bayside, N.Y., to demonstrate the great employment potential of the handicapped. Mr. Turney is president of North Shore Nameplate, Inc., a company which manufactures aluminum foil nameplates currently used by 500 top domestic corporations, plus pressure-sensitive cloth markers and safety signs for industrial use. Many of the employees of this thriving company are physically handicapped.

Through his efforts men and women who once faced uselessness because of physical handicaps are now turning out productive work of high caliber, and at a fast pace.

He is also president and chairman of the board of Anodyne, Inc., a company which is presently completing construction in Miami, Fla., of a 28,500 square-foot plant designed especially for handicapped workers. 100 of the expected 150 employees will be handicapped. The plant will be furnished with smooth-surfaced ramps, extra wide doors to permit passage of wheelchairs, and other special devices to make the employees fully self-reliant.

Starting as a board member of Abilities, Inc., in 1952, Mr. Turney has devoted his efforts to providing opportunities for the handicapped, and has emphatically demonstrated that they are capable of outstanding achievement by setting new records in attendance, safety, and production.

His spare time has been given unstintingly to meetings with American businessmen at which he has described the potentials of the handicapped. "It is not altruism but good business to hire these people," he declares, and the successful operation of Abilities, Inc., and of North Shore Nameplate, Inc., offers dramatic testament to this assertion.

Recently, in the Bayside Times, a weekly newspaper in my district, and in the Christian Science Monitor, there appeared articles describing Mr. Turney's outstanding work in this vital area of human dignity and relations. Under

unanimous consent, I include the articles from these newspapers in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. They follow:

[From the Bayside (N.Y.) Times, May 5, 1960]

PIONEERING INDUSTRIAL CONCEPT: NEW HORIZONS FOR HANDICAPPED THROUGH GENE TURNEY'S OPERATION PALM TREE

The pioneering concepts of a nationally-known Bayside business executive have captured the attention of high-level industrialists around the Nation.

Eugene T. Turney, Jr., a longtime local resident, is building a $750,000 multicolor anodizing and etching manufacturing plant in Miami (dubbed Operation Palm Tree), around a new product and even more significantly, around physically handicapped people.

The working force of Anodyne, Inc.—the parent organization of North Shore Nameplate, Inc., of 214–27 Northern Boulevard—will number 150, and 100 of these will be handicapped.

Steelwork is being completed now at the 28,500-square-foot facility in north Miami. Smooth-surfaced ramps, extra-wide doors to permit passage of wheelchairs, and other special devices will make employees fully self-reliant. Plant occupancy is scheduled for next month.

Turney, board chairman and president of Anodyne, says that experience with hiring handicapped at his Bayside operation proved conclusively that they have top performance records and are more reliable and loyal than workers in the best health.

"This new facility is not a charity operation. Each employee understands the commany is not a shelter and that he must produce a day's work for a day's pay," Turney explains.

Business publications have brought this project to the attention of industrialists around the country, and the foundation of a new approach to employment of the handicapped may have been created by the Baysider.

Turney doesn't claim that his Miami plant and its utilization of handicapped workers was planned overnight. On the contrary, he has been exploring this personnel concept for years.

The localite is a board member of Abilities, Inc., of Albertson (Long Island), the pilot project for industrial employment of the handicapped. Henry Viscardi, Jr., born legless in New York in 1912, started Abilities in 1952 to fill a need among men and women whose employment problems matched his own.

Abilities has grown to a multimillion-dollar business hiring more than 400 handicapped persons. Viscardi's book, "Give Us the Tools," is a national bestseller that details the development of Abilities, Inc. Viscardi's work has served as a continuing inspiration to Eugene Turney.

The expansion potential of Anodyne is limitless, Turney claims, and with its growth the handicapped will have an equally limitless employment potential. Right now, blueprints are completed for a 50,000-square-foot addition to the Operation Palm Tree plant which is still under construction. Groundbreaking for "Palm Tree, No. 2" is slated for early fall.

Those who have followed Turney's meteoric ascension in the business world from modest beginnings right here in Bayside will be the first to realize that the sky is the limit in Anodyne's industrial future.

Right now, the firm manufactures anodized pressure-sensitive, aluminum foil nameplates currently used by 500 top domestic corporations, plus a complete line of pressure-sensitive cloth markers and safety signs for industrial use.

North Shore Nameplate, long a landmark on Northern Boulevard, will eventually be moved to Nassau County (site not yet selected), but a sales office will be established in Bayside * * * and Mr. Turney will continue to maintain his residence at 215–05 27th Avenue. He already has a home in Hollywood, not far from the new Anodyne plant.

Readers will recall that Quentin Reynolds devoted the first chapter in his best seller, "Operation Success," to the story of Mr. Turney's uphill development of North Shore Nameplate. Other business success stories in the book are those of Floyd Odlum and Vic Tanny.

On Anodyne's board of directors are Mr. Viscardi of Abilities, and five other top American exectives including one of Turney's neighbors, William O. Bennett, of 214–15 28th Avenue, research and engineering vice president of Bulova.

The Baysider is married to the former Margaret S. Beale. They have four children; Maury (Mrs. C. C. Nelmes, Jr.), Gail (Mrs. J. Cardeiro), Marine Cpl. Eugene T. Turney 3d, and Susan.

His affiliations include the Bayside Republican Club, Bayside Kiwanis Club (inducted just last month), Little Neck Bay Power Squadron, Coast Guard Auxiliary, Manhattan Rifle and Revolver Association, American Radio Relay League, and the Railroad Club of New York.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 23, 1960]

HORIZONS FOR HANDICAPPED

(By Lowis Carlton)

MIAMI.—Several thousand men and women who once faced uselessness because of physical handicaps are now turning out productive work of high caliber, and at a fast pace.

What once was a personalized crusade to replace charity handouts to the handicapped with employment that provided a living wage has passed its latest milestone. Construction has begun here of a $750,000 multicolor anodizing and etching manufacturing facility for Anodyne, Inc. This plant will have a working force of 150, and 100 of these will be from the ranks of the handicapped.

Smooth-surfaced ramps, extra wide doors to permit passage of wheelchairs, and other special facilities will make employees fully self-reliant. Special machines will enable handicapped men and women to manufacture the anodized etched-foil nameplates and a complete line of cloth markers and safety signs, products of Andoyne, Inc.

The company expects the new plant to make a profit. Here is the striking new concept now gaining acceptance in industry.

WORK REQUIRED

"Each employee understands the company is not a shelter and that he must produce a day's work for a day's pay. That's the secret of his salvation. A man can say to himself, 'I earned this loaf of bread and I can support myself and my family.' It gives him pride and a sense of accomplishment that works wonders," said Eugene T. Turney, Jr., board chairman and president of Anodyne, Inc.

Mr. Turney is president of North Shore Nameplate, Inc., of Bayside, N.Y., which also employs handicapped persons. Experience at North Shore Nameplate provided a basis for planning the Miami facility, its personnel training program and mechanical equipment. Once Anodyne of Miami is in operation, it will become the parent company with the Bayside, N.Y., firm as a division.

For outstanding business achievement under the free-enterprise system, Mr. Turney won an Oscar in 1959. Quentin Reynolds devoted a chapter in his best seller "Operation Success," to the story of Mr. Turney's uphill development of North Shore Nameplate, Inc.

SUBJECT EXPOUNDED

A soft-spoken, decisive and energetic man, Mr. Turney speaks earnestly about a subject that has interested him all his adult life.

"After a maximum of 6 months' training, the handicapped employee is capable of greater productivity, and is more reliable and loyal than the average employee in the best health. Our records prove this. We feel that industry will miss a fine opportunity if they do not recognize the outstanding capabilities of these people," he said.

Mr. Turney is a board member of Abilities, Inc., the pilot project from which grew the whole inspiring program. This was started in 1952 in a grimy, unfurnished garage in West Hempstead, N.Y., under the direction of Henry Viscardi, Jr. It was to fill a real need among men and women who had problems similar to those Mr. Viscardi himself had experienced.

BUSINESSMEN SECURED

The founder secured a group of businessmen as directors of his venture, then worked day and night to turn a dream into reality. He had triumphs and days of despair but today Abilities, Inc., is a multimillion-dollar business hiring more than 400 handicapped people.

Mr. Viscardi maintained that there were no disabled people—only people with varying degrees of ability at varying tasks. Rather than a disguised charity project, Abilities, Inc., offered men and women a chance to earn a living doing useful work without being supervised as though they were backward children. Even the name expressed his positive viewpoint, stressing that handicapped people deserve the right to work.

Every type of handicap was found among the employees. Much of the work was on intricate electronic assembly, demanding fine craftsmanship. Men who could see directed work of those who could not. Those who could walk made deliveries and carried messages for others who had difficulty moving about.

CONTENTION DEMONSTRATED

From the beginning, the workers demonstrated Mr. Viscardi's contention that they were capable of outstanding achievement by setting new records in attendance, safety, and production.

Mr. Viscardi stated his views in his book, "Give Us the Tools." He pioneered for spiritual development, too. A small, interdenominational chapel was constructed at the plant site where employees were invited to worship. Records show how men and women dropped their concern about themselves and became enthusiastic foremen and department heads. Several married and provided homes for their families.

Meanwhile, the company expanded into new quarters. An ambitious lecture and educational program was commenced, with approval of the company's board of directors, to carry exciting news about Abilities, Inc., to businessmen across the United States.

CONCLUSIONS ACCEPTED

Sears, Roebuck & Co. was the first large organization to accept Mr. Viscardi's proven conclusions. Its employment manual was changed to eliminate clauses discriminating against the disabled. Twenty-five hundred handicapped persons were on their payroll within a year. Other companies also acted. Representatives of seven foreign countries came to observe and took home plans for similar programs in their lands.

Mr. Turney, as a director of Abilities, Inc., shared in the difficult founding work and saw the wonders being accomplished. Out of his desire to expand the program, he started North Shore Nameplate, Inc., with Mr. Viscardi as a director.

Now that North Shore Nameplate has been safely gifided through its critical first years

to a firm financial footing, Mr. Turney is hard at work on his project in Miami.

Between work at the new plant site and speeches before groups of influential businessmen and trips to New York to direct his company's operation, Mr. Turney said, "American businessmen need to be advised about the potentials of this neglected labor pool. It is not altruism but good business to hire these people. We are working long and hard to get the facts across but we have barely begun. There is so much more work to be done."

Yet the foundations have been laid, and laid well, thanks to a handful of dedicated men.

Commencement Day Address at Medical College of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 2 the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, delivered the principal address at the commencement ceremonies of the Medical College of South Carolina at Charleston. In this address Governor Hollings charged not only the future doctors to whom he was speaking but also the entire American public to treat and cure the evils that beset our great land. This is a splendid and forthright address. In order that it be available to the largest possible number of people, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it to all the Senators and Congressmen particularly.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS AT COMMENCEMENT CEREMONIES OF THE MEDICAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, CHARLESTON, S.C., JUNE 2, 1960

Hippocrates, the greatest of Greek physicians, warned, "Strong maladies require strong medicine." This forebear of today's medical profession also wrote, "in order to cure the human body it is necessary to have knowledge of the whole of things." With the prophetic greatness of the ancient Greeks, Hippocrates' words have special meaning today.

The transcending malady of our times is the plague of compromise. Insidiously, it eats away at American principle and the free enterprise system in America. The strong medicine we need is vigorous action to reverse this deterioration. The medical profession must play a major role in treating this malady. It will require that you be broad enough in scope, and incisive enough in insight to help diagnose and treat the ills of compromise and equivocation. You must "have a knowledge of the whole of things."

The patient today is the equivocal man—a strange creation who stalks the land in growing numbers. He bears faint resemblance to the American of earlier day who believed in human responsibilities as well as human rights, who wrung personal achievement from his own initiative, thrift, and prudence; who knew that the best governed was the least governed, who believed the American Constitution meant what its noble words said as written, rather than as interpreted by psychological or sociological theory.

This patient is marked by symptoms which are distressing in their potential impact on the welfare of the Nation. His economic pulse is slowing and becoming erratic because he is finding the rewards for personal initiative are being crushed by confiscatory taxation and stifling governmental regulation. Instead of seeking the thrills of achievement and profit through his own creative ambition, he is turning to the seductive beckoning of security. His goal in life is a safe niche in some paternal organization with pensions for old age rather than the risks of building his own future through competitive effort. He finds it easier to drift in groups than to strike out on his own. His instinct for thrift is being chewed to bits by the greedy jaws of loose money and credit. He is caught in the grip of rising costs and deflated value of the dollars he earns. If he is a farmer, he is told what he may plant. If he is a businessman, he is taught that his operations and profits must conform to the dictates of a silent partner—the Government. He learns further that if his profits reach a certain level, then this partner becomes owner of the business. If he is a worker, he is often told his right to work is governed by powerful group forces rather than by his own choice. In short, he is losing his self-reliance and with it fades the vibrant spirit of free enterprise which made this Nation great.

In addition to his weakening pulse, this patient finds himself suffering from cancerous moral fiber. Integrity becames a word of relative meanings. Things which his forebears would never have condoned come easier to rationalize and explain away. Cheating on income tax returns becomes a national pastime and codes of personal conduct become "anything goes" so long as you can get away with it. This deterioration boils out in open sores when payola schemes are brought to light, Government officials are indicted for frauds, and general crime statistics soar. The no-compromise-with-evil spirit of his forefathers grows dimmer.

The mind of the patient is becoming clouded and unsure on fundamentals of self-government. He is told that powers reserved to the States under the Constitution are really meant to be in the hands of the Federal Government—that the original Federal-State balance of power is outmoded. He knows that the strength of the American system of government lies in its three separate but equal Federal branches—legislative, judicial, and executive. But in reality he sees the judicial taking over legislative power through far-reaching political decisions and the executive branch usurping the powers of Congress through the instrument of the Executive order and the preponderant weight of bigness. Legislatively, he sees government by pressure groups. He watches the strength of local government being sapped into the massive sponge of a paternalistic central hierarchy. He is told the great American passion for liberty should be subjugated to so-called equality demanded by groups which have never learned that equality is an earned dividend of liberty.

Internationally, on the basis of unconditional surrender, he wins the war to end all wars, but learns that conditions exacted by our so-called ally have put us in the role of conquered. It is for us to concede. The great victories of World War II have been dissipated by the defeats of Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. He sees his Nation being led to the summit time and time again, each time coming away with less prestige and more concessions than before. He hears his national leaders talk of disarmament agreements with a nation which has never kept its previous agreements. He dreamily plays a game of international diplomacy while the Soviet engages in hard international politics. Because it is polite to do so, he sings the song of peaceful coexistence while he knows, and the Soviets know, that there can never be morally or politically peaceful coexistence between God-fearing democracy and atheistic communism. Because he plays the part of "stupid one" so well, he is treated in kind. From one unarmed reconnaissance flight, the Soviet accuses him of being an "aggressor" and derides his as "liar," "cheat," and "the one who never keeps his agreements." Immediately he responds with an investigation to make sure that there will never be a recurrence of conditions that will cause a summit failure, again pleading guilty as if he caused the conditions, as if he could control the conditions. Again playing the part of "stupid one," what concessions he can't give at a summit, he concedes at home to make sure the world knows that he has conceded. Even his best sellers at home carry this line. He reads in a current Pulitzer prize winning novel that an American Senator "brought down the house" by telling an American audience "he would rather crawl to Moscow than die under a bomb." He wonders what can be the end result of it all.

The very heartbeat of this equivocal man is being slowed by the strictures of conflicting philosophies, haziness of principle, and gray shadows of compromise which surround him. His history books tell him that America has always nobly risen to conquer whatever obstacle beset her, whether it be war against a foreign enemy or breaking through a domestic frontier. The national purpose has always hardened in the face of crisis and national effort has brought victory. But the great giant was brought to its knees in the Korean conflict. Unconquerable America would settle for less than victory. Today our patient is led to believe that peace is more important than victory. He is led to believe that any threat to America in her support or leadership of the free world should be met with peace. The plague of peace has immunized our national purpose. Working for freedom causes "tension," and the great fetish of this decade is to "ease tension." Unwilling to preserve freedom apparently our national purpose is to consume its fruits.

Nothing could be more dangerous. Never has America faced a greater challenge, a greater need for national purpose. Never has our mission been more difficult.

The difficulty lies in failure to have knowledge of the whole of things. The equivocal man, like many medical patients, presents the frustration of improper self-diagnosis. It's no longer considered smart to feel bad and call the doctor to see what's wrong. Fashion, plus our present mania for specialization, requires that the patient know what's wrong so that he can call the right doctor in the first place. This trend, plus the disease of psychiatry, has all of us guessing the malady at the least pain, and mentally treating it. A wrong guess can become so fixed that many times a doctor must dedicate most of the treatment to dispelling fantasies, so that the patient may be conditioned to receive the proper cure. Such is the case of the equivocal man. He has sold himself the idea that changes from fundamentals or compromise of principle are desirable as understanding. The equivocal man must first be conditioned. He must be sobered up from so-called understanding, so that he can receive the cure. Secondly, the difficulty is compounded in the equivocal man's failure to recognize he is in an epidemic—world war III. There are no high fever symptoms in this epidemic. World war III is cold. Rather than the warning of high fever or a Pearl Harbor, today we face a wily, vicious, unscrupulous foe who engages in cold war-

fare on the political, economic and ideological fields. He intentionally keeps this war cool, lulling us to sleep with flights through the free world like a dove of peace, dangling before our eyes visions of sugarplums at the summit.

If we will appreciate these difficulties then we will realize that to win this war we must mobilize every resource at our command. We must close ranks. We must set our national purpose and that purpose must be to so strengthen ourselves in mind and body that we are impenetrable. Such strengthening can only begin at home and in the individual. In short, we must purge ourselves of the Equivocal Man by the strongest cathartic possible—a return to American fundamentals.

You must not only administer this cathartic, you must also take part of the dose yourselves. The very breakdowns and weaknesses—the symptoms of equivocation—which threaten the Nation also threaten the professions. None have been exempt from their influence. In the law, courts and legal procedures are constantly employed to promote and provoke litigation, rather than dispose of it. In the teaching profession, so-called "academic freedom" in certain places has become so "free" as to make un-American a pledge of allegiance to America. In the church, many religious leaders seek inspiration and guidance from a Supreme Court rather than a Supreme Being. And the way for a southern journalist to obtain national acclaim is to bear false witness against his neighbor.

The Equivocal Man has infiltrated the medical profession. No longer is it a simple step from graduation to the treatment of the sick. Instead, the young graduate is swept into the flow of convention and conformity. Although standards have brought much progress to medical training, the tendency to conform has deprived the doctor of a vital element—his individualism. Working relationships must be established with the right hospitals. Professional referrals must be weighed in many balances. The office procedures you follow, the treatment you prescribe, the fees you charge, the office hours you keep, the clubs and civic organizations to which you belong, the neighborhood in which you live, the manner of dress and even other more intimate details of your life will be dictated by forces which deprive you of all individuality. In short, the young graduate finds himself caught in a web of conformity and demands on his time, his talents, his energies even before he can ever get down to his basic mission—treating patients. But the great edifice of Medicine has been built upon pillars of individual achievement—by the Halsteads, the Oslers, the Blalocks and other illustrious men who were not afraid to stand alone rather than follow the line of least resistance.

I believe the best advice any young medical graduate today may receive is this: Remember the patient. Keep all other demands in perspective. Don't allow financial rewards or social status to cloud your sense of mission or your service to mankind. Work actively in your professional organizations toward individual and group progress rather than as drones seeking prestige. Never stop improving yourselves professionally. You must pursue perfection in medicine and mold your lives after the magnificent men you follow and the Great Physician which all men follow. While research has brought us miracle drugs and remarkable recoveries, there will be no discovery which will eliminate the hard work of a doctor. Of all professions, the medical profession still calls for the hardest work. You hold the highest of public trust. You also hold the greatest of opportunities as a profession to help the Nation rid itself of the equivocal man.

Your profession stands as a symbol of the finest achievements of American free enterprise. The American medical profession has brought this Nation the world's foremost record in medical care and progress. This has been accomplished by the personal efforts of devoted men and women such as you and by private and State educational facilities, always doggedly resisting pressures to bring this dynamic system under the deadening anasthesia of Federal control. Our State may well be proud of how she has met her responsibilities in this field, reflected here in this splendid Medical College of South Carolina. You as individuals may render no greater service than to devote yourselves to maintaining and strengthening the standards of your profession, providing the very best in care, and holding fast to the integrity of your profession as a profession.

The French historian de Tocqueville found in 19th century America, "There are men of integrity in almost all parties, but there is no party of integrity." I am sure he would say today that in its medical profession America has achieved both men of integrity in the profession as well as a profession of integrity. Our enemies would like nothing more than to see this noble profession, this symbol of American achievement, compromised by mediocrity.

To you of the high calling of medicine, there is no higher mission today than to help America cleanse itself of its greatest ill—the equivocal man. The malady is strong. The medicine must be stronger. Nothing less than a complete and swift return to American fundamentals can cure the patient.

Contrasting Social Security and Voluntary Retirement Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to explore all sides of the question on retirement plans, I would like to include the following editorial from the GP magazine:

AS OTHERS SEE IT—SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

In January, the social security tax went up—again. Computed on the first $4,800 of earned income, a self-employed person now pays 4½ percent or $216 a year. This is the amount most physicans would pay if they were under the umbrella.

For years GP has contended that the individual might come out ahead if he were allowed to invest the same amount of money without Uncle Sam's assistance. Physicians can still do this, almost no one else can.

People who should know tell us that it's not too difficult to find investments that pay 6 percent (many of the mutual funds have been known to do even better). Armed with this information, we asked a machine what would happen if a doctor invested $216 a year and let the interest earn interest. We considered the fact that most academy members don't retire at 65. The average retirement age is 69—after working 40 years.

Our trusty machine told us that at the end of 40 years, this private, do-it-yourself retirement fund would contain $35,332.31. The doctor could then start to drain off the annual interest, without touching the principal, and have an income of $2,110.94 a year or $176.66 a month. He could still collect this amount even if he continued to work. Unless he were 72 years old, he couldn't collect a social security dime if he earned more than $100 a month.

Or, if he had already established an estate, via life insurance, etc., he could dip into the principal and come up with at least $300 a month for the next 10 or 12 years. The maximum social security retirement income payment is $116 a month.

Best of all, the program would be his, not something dreamed up by short-haired old women and long-haired young men in Washington. If he wanted, he could put in more than $216 a year or vary the amount from year to year. He would also know, and this is important, that he'd probably get back every dollar he invested—and many, many more. Very few of the people who are destined to pay the maximum social security tax, year after year, will get a dollar-for-dollar return. Instead, part of the money they've put in will go to someone else who is, in turn, destined to come out ahead. That's the way the system works to "redistribute" income.

What Reclamation in the Arid and Semiarid West Has Meant to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the address given before the 47th annual national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, by LaSelle Coles, president of the National Reclamation Association. LaSelle is from Prineville in my own district, and he is uniquely qualified to speak on the importance of our reclamation program. There is too often a tendency to lose sight of the fundamentals which he discusses and to forget that our expenditures on such resource development programs as reclamation are in reality investments in the Nation's future.

The address follows:

WHAT RECLAMATION IN THE ARID AND SEMIARID WEST HAS MEANT TO THE UNITED STATES

(Address by LaSelle E. Coles, president, National Reclamation Association, Prineville, Oreg., May 26, 1960)

They say that sentiment has no place in today's world, but I must confess to feeling a little sentimental when I appear before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This organization was formed in the glorious days when the conservation movement was being shaped and proclaimed by Theodore Roosevelt and his group. The very heart and essence of that movement, as Roosevelt saw it, was the development and wise use of the Nation's water resources. This is a fact that many professed conservationists of today have forgotten. The Rivers and Harbors Congress, as its name implies, was created to advance that conservation ideal.

Reclamation, too, dates back to those days. It was a key point of Teddy Roosevelt's conservation program. It still is a key point in any sound and true national conservation program. Roosevelt's successful fight for the original Reclamation Act of 1902 was

one of the proudest achievements of his career. Many of the progenitors of the Rivers and Harbors Congress took part in that fight, and share in the credit of the achievement.

When the 44th annual convention of this congress decided, 3 years ago, to create a special Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, it was keeping faith with the founders of the Congress and with the conservation ideals which it has advocated through two generations. The report of that committee, issued last year, was a worthy addition to the annals of American water resource development. The officers of the committee—Chairman J. Edgar Chenoweth, Vice Chairman J. W. Grimes, and Secretary Ival V. Goslin—and the members representing the 17 Western States, have not labored in vain. They have played an influential part in carrying forward a movement which is vital to the progress and welfare of our Nation.

My own organization, the National Reclamation Association, is considerably younger than the Rivers and Harbors Congress. It was formed in 1933 to save reclamation, at a time when the very existence of the program was in great danger. Looking back, it is ironic and incredible to think that a program like reclamation should have had to be rescued. Surely few programs in all the Nation's history have provided greater blessings to all the people.

Recently we celebrated the addition of two new States to the American Union, Alaska and Hawaii. No one joined in the celebration more heartily than we in reclamation. After all, both those States lie west of the 98th meridian, and hence are potentially in our bailiwick.

Yet, quietly and without celebration, reclamation has added to the Union cultivated acreage more than twice that of Alaska and Hawaii combined; it supports a population 2½ times that of Alaska and Hawaii combined; it has created or sustained about 20 times as many farms as exist in Alaska and Hawaii combined; and it yields to the U.S. Treasury in internal revenue collections each year half again as much as Alaska and Hawaii combined.

Those internal revenue collections are worthy of note, for they are an indication of general production and prosperity, and thus represent a great many kinds of economic progress which otherwise might be hard to measure. Let's look at them a little more closely.

In fiscal year 1957,[1] reclamation project areas yielded $341,607,000 in taxes to the U.S. Treasury. In that same year appropriations for the reclamation program totaled $201 million, and that included everything—operation, maintenance, investigations, and all the rest of it. The appropriation for construction was only $158 million. When a program yields more than twice as much in revenue as it costs for construction, doesn't that seem like a good bargain? Yet I have understated the true case. The bulk of the construction costs are going to be repaid to the Treasury in cash by the water and power users. Hence the project costs in effect are only loans, and the reclamation bargain is even better than it seems at first glance.

And we still haven't considered the value to the Nation of the crops produced—almost a billion dollars worth last year—nor the value of the power and municipal water, nor the economic stability, the extra jobs, the markets, and the recreation; nor the great value to the Nation's health of having a year-round supply of fresh fruits and vegetables grown in former desert regions; nor all the other blessings which together form Reclamation's main reason for existence, and would amply justify the program even if it never returned the Treasury one cent.

We in Reclamation often ask ourselves why such an institution, with such a history and such a record, should have to struggle year after year for adequate subsistence and sometimes for its very life. Yet, Reclamation's existence has been one long struggle. Sometimes it is opposed through ignorance, by people who do not understand the part it plays in the conservation movement or national prosperity. Sometimes it is opposed by special interests which, understandably even if wrongly, may prefer their own advantage to the national good. Some of the most dangerous threats come from people who do not oppose Reclamation as such—people who, acting in accordance with sincere and honest views, would stifle the life out of it with sterile technicalities.

We in Reclamation do not claim that our movement is 100 percent perfect nor that our views are always right. We realize that the great majority of the men who disagree with us are as devoted to the public welfare as we. But whatever the merits of this individual view or that, we believe that when the sum effect of a given line of argument is like that of a slow poison to a healthy organism, then it cannot be a good line of argument.

One of the vital questions now confronting our movement has to deal with the computation of project benefits. This is a technical question, and yet it means everything to reclamation; for if it is decided too mechanically, or on grounds too confining, it conceivably could cause our movement to grind to a halt.

We in reclamation do not believe we can ignore the increased return to a farm operator and his family when adding up the benefits of a reclamation project—not if we want the computation to be realistic. We do not believe that reclamation can be considered primarily as a good program, and valued only in terms of the alternative cost of producing food elsewhere. Instead, we believe that Western cities deserve and need to be supported by their own hinterlands, their own thriving rural areas; and that neither the cities nor the region can thrive otherwise. We believe that there is a real, existing value in spanning the thousand miles of poorly watered land between the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific Coast with oases of settlement, development, and production. We believe that the Nation's population needs water resource development if it is going to carry forward the Westward movement of recent decades, and that the provision of such development is an important economic good whose value should be recognized.

We cannot agree with a viewpoint which places no value on new homes and communities, new schools and churches and stores; no value on new jobs created by the handling of reclamation products; no value on the stabilization, diversification, and flexibility of agriculture; no value on a broadened and increased tax base; no value on an improved national diet; no value on a multihundred-million-dollar annual market for the manufactured products of East and West; no value on balanced Western economy, nor on balanced Western growth, no value on the commencement of projects today which will be needed to feed and clothe the growing population of tomorrow—in short, a viewpoint which places only the most limited value on the present, and no value whatever on the future.

These things are the main blessings which reclamation provides. They form the substance of reclamation's great contributions to the growth of the West and the Nation. If we must close our eyes to these things, if we must wilfully blind ourselves to the living growth which reclamation brings forth, if we must look at a great social and economic institution through darkened lenses which cut off the vision of most of what is there, then the future of reclamation is indeed precarious.

It may seem that I am using this platform to talk about problems and troubles that are ours alone. I do so because these problems are not ours alone. A blow at reclamation cannot help being a blow at water resource development everywhere. Reclamation today is struggling against attitudes and viewpoints that seek to downgrade the value of water resource development in all its forms. Those who see no broad national value in reclamation, will not be inclined to see the broad national value of flood control or recreation or watershed improvements. They do not understand the interlocking dynamics of national growth.

The United States is the most dynamic society known to history. Its spirit of drive and enterprise drove our people across forests and deserts and continental mountain ranges. And it has always up to now been a policy of the U.S. Government to assist and pave the way for economic expansion. The Government explored the West and cataloged its resources. It discovered highways and rail routes. It granted public lands to homesteaders, helped create communications systems, built dams and irrigation developments, and established the basic improvements that would permit American enterprises to open the Nation's resources of wealth. And our Government did these things with full confidence in the national destiny. It did not build this Nation by grudgingly testing each potential benefit, like a pawnbroker biting on a coin, to see which it would accept as the measure of its willingness to help the country grow. Where would we be today if it had?

At each stage of national growth, to be sure, there has been some opposition to the programs of expansion. The do-as-little-as-possible attitude has always accompanied the dynamic spirit, like the other side of a coin. That is why the same old arguments against growth keep reappearing, generation after generation. Our grandparents were told, as we are, that developing the West might create some competition for the East; that growth programs should be put off until other problems were solved; that the risks were too great, and we couldn't afford the costs. But such views have never represented the outward-reaching spirit that up to now has distinguished Americans from other peoples The longer range view has always prevailed—the view of those who could foresee that the development of resources creates wealth which spreads far and wide through commerce and ultimately enriches everyone.

Today, when our country faces the greatest tests it has ever had to meet, when its leadership and productivity are being challenged as never before—this is no time to let the American drive grind to a halt and the national growth creep forward at a limp pace.

When we of the National Reclamation Association ask for an adequate national reclamation program, we are in fact asking for a populated, thriving, self-supporting West. We want to replace emptiness with enterprise; waste, with use; parsimony, with production. We want farms and towns and industries in the West for the same reason that a chamber of commerce wants factories and businesses and modern amenities in its community. The development of economic resources and economic opportunities is needful everywhere—West as well as East, in the country as in town—if our Nation is to maintain its vitality. As a former president of the NRA once said, a nation grows like a horse—not one part at a time, but all at once.

[1] Comparisons are based on 1950 census figures except those for internal revenue, which are based on 1957–58 figures. Figures on Alaska and Hawaii are from the World Almanac; on Reclamation, from Legislative Reference Service report.

The water resources of this Nation were given to us free by the Creator, but they still have to be sold to the American people. That is one of the big tasks before this Congress. Basically the job is to teach our people to have foresight. We must teach them to prepare flood protection projects before floods strike. We must persuade them to provide sound, accessible recreational developments before population growth and spreading encroachments crowd out the possibilities. We must urge them to protect watersheds and preserve soil before costly erosion takes place. And similarly we must teach them the value of providing for their water-resource needs, whether for irrigation or power or municipal use, before critical shortages appear and while the opportunities are still available. This means supporting adequate project development at an orderly rate geared to national needs.

If the people were aware of what they gain by these programs, and of what is at stake in them, there would be no more talk of holding them back. National growth would not have to be squeezed and strained through the small end of a budgetary measuring funnel. This Rivers and Harbors Congress is an important instrument for helping to bring the facts about American water resource needs and programs to the attention of the American people. I assure you that you could devote your energies to no worthier task, and I and the organization I represent are proud to play our part in that task.

Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information received from Mr. Charles McCarthy, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., re their memorial foundation and proposed memorial:

There has been formed in Washington, D.C., a corporation titled the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. Memorial Foundation. This corporation has entered into contract with the Virginia International Center, Inc., of Arlington, Va. The center is to deed a central section of their tract of land on U.S. 66, at Virginia Route 234, adjoining Manassas Battlefield Park, to the foundation for the erection of a memorial to all veterans of World War I. This memorial will be a planetarium and museum building, the planetarium among the largest in the world, and the museum to display thousands of trophies and mementos relating to World War I. Charles A. McCarthy, of Cincinnati, Ohio, who is national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., has been elected the president of the foundation.

President McCarthy stated today that according to present plans there will be a solemn blessing and dedication of the grounds in the near future, to be followed at a later date by the historic groundbreaking ceremony.

This memorial will be only a part of the larger project that is to be a historical, educational, and cultural center. Victor Gruen, perhaps the world's most famous architect and the man who designed the proposed Washington World's Fair, will design and supervise the construction of the planetarium and the museum building.

Other officers of the foundation are F. B. Taylor, of Roanoke, Va., vice president; Wilbur C. Cochran, of Warsaw, Ind., secretary-treasurer. The complete directory of the national advisory committee, men and women, leaders in public, industrial, professional, and educational life in the United States, will be published in the near future.

Amendment Prohibiting Expenditure of Mutual Security Funds in Shipyards Located Outside the United States

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
Friday, June 17, 1960
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, with the parliamentary situation what it is, of course no opportunity is available to present the necessary explanation of and the purpose for the amendment. Briefly, the amendment would prevent what I regard as a continuation of an intolerable situation so far as the shipbuilders is concerned as affected by this program. Under the present law, the administrators of this program allocate these funds to foreign countries; they then can and do authorize the building of ships by one foreign nation to another; sometimes the money is furnished one nation to build ships for itself in its own country. While this comes as no revelation, I wonder how many of our colleagues know that it is practically impossible for American shipbuilders to successfully bid for the construction of these ships. In fact, to all intents and purposes it is impossible. This, for the simple reason that the foreign yards, with their cheap labor and cheaply produced materials can underbid the American yards by as much as one-half and never less than one-fourth. Mr. Chairman, this was brought forcefully to my attention recently when the ICA issued invitations for bids for the construction of a hydraulic dredge for Vietnam. Several American yards bid on this ship. It so happened that the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. of Pascagoula, Miss., was the lowest qualified bidder among the domestic bidders. However, two Japanese firms submitted much lower bids. The Ingalls bid was $1,394,950 but the Uraga Dock Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan, was $916,200.

We have repeatedly had the matter up with ICA officials, but have gotten no encouragement whatever. And it would now appear that this contract will be awarded to this Japanese company.

This presents a pretty difficult picture. It comes at a time when every reputable shipyard in this country is hungry for contracts. They are all engaged in submitting the lowest possible bids in order to have enough work going to keep their yards intact; often bidding below the actual cost of construction. It also comes at a time when the President of the United States and the United States itself are insulted by having the President's invitation to visit that country withdrawn.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all. I am sure the facts are that this very foreign yard was either constructed or materially subsidized by the American taxpayers in its construction. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how the stockholders, the workmen who are being laid off of their jobs for want of contracts, all of whom are taxed to pay for this project, must feel.

Of course, this situation does not apply to the shipbuilding industry alone. It is going on every day in many other industries. And, of course, everyone knows that American industry cannot compete with foreign industry because of the cost of labor and materials.

This amendment should be adopted.

Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12619) making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, how can the administration of the mutual security program be so intermeshed with corruption, waste, and extravagance as is evidenced by the committee hearings? A year ago much the same condition existed.

When the executive branch of our Government takes no cognizance of such maladministration and permits the situation to grow worse, many Members are tempted to vote against H.R. 12619. If the continuance of our free and democratic form of government did not depend to such a great extent upon the necessary appropriations being made for mutual security, this measure would be defeated overwhelmingly.

Possibly the Democratic majority in Congress has been too meek in dealing with the Republican administration. Criticism has been tempered, especially in the field of foreign policy. For this reason we, the Democratic Party, must accept part of the blame for the failure of our foreign policy to stop Communist expansion.

Since 1952 the only semblance of a bipartisan foreign policy has been the failure of the Democratic leadership to criticize—to even criticize constructively. Not since Harry Truman left the White

House—never to be invited to return—has the foreign policy of this country had the advantage of a truly cooperative effort by both political parties. No Democratic leader has had an opportunity to participate in the establishment or administration of our foreign policy.

The bombastic insults hurled by the Russian dictator have apparently succeeded in drawing the American people closer together in support of our President—and therefore in support of a foreign policy that has not been successful. This was no doubt the result expected and intended by the wiley leader of the Communists.

We Americans must not permit our loyalty to the President and our sympathy for him to prevent the piercing of the Communist veil. We must select a President that will not hesitate to depart from the status quo in foreign affairs. We must place a younger man at the head of our Nation—and one who is not tarred with the status quo.

Thankful we should be that the summit meeting was not held. We had nothing to gain and much to lose. Our agreements would have been kept, but only those to her advantage would have been kept by Russia.

With all the sound and fury of the ranting Communist dictator, there is no change in attitudes or objectives. There would have been none if a summit conference had taken place. There will be none.

These events are now behind us, but they and the developing attitudes in other countries definitely establish the fact that friendship cannot be purchased. Billions of dollars have been spent to create good will abroad, while the very men who expend the funds have incurred through their maladministration of them the scorn and illwill of the people of the nation in which they live so luxuriously.

The next administration must revive the bipartisan foreign policy and breath new life and vigor into it. Our people should forever be grateful that only a few months remain for the present confused and bewildered administration.

In the future our efforts should be confined to negotiations through diplomatic channels—and we should pray that we can soon have trained personnel to do the job. We must remain strong as a Nation, but the wasters and the grafters must be eliminated from our foreign aid and defense programs. Morality must be restored to the Government of the United States.

Through the United Nations we might offer Russia the opportunity to assist underdeveloped countries to come into their own. Or in aiding such countries we could offer to work—at arms length—in a cooperative arrangement with Russia instead of the competitive, expensive plan we are now pursuing. Whatever plan we adopt, a constant vigil must be maintained and our guard must forever be held high.

It is possible that when more is learned about the mysteries of space, all countries on the face of the globe may be glad to cooperate in the interest of self-preservation.

No one nor any nation wants to commit suicide and the individual, in whatever country, desires to have a home and food for his family, dignity for himself and his brother, and above all an honorable and lasting peace. An ironclad arms control agreement should be our immediate and primary objective.

Indian Giver: Our Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in nearly 100 years of Statehood, Kansas has never been fortunate enough to have a site dedicated to history established within its borders notwithstanding the fact that many are deserving.

There are several such historical sites in the Second Congressional District worthy of congressional action, Mr. Speaker. One is the old fort, a bastion of the Civil War, located at Fort Scott. Another is the Huron Indian Cemetery in Kansas City, Kans. For some reason, not now clearly discernible, both received rebuffs by the Secretary of the Interior. And his negative action was taken in the face of report by his own representatives that warranted a favorable recommendation to the Congress by the Secretary in each case.

Mayor Paul Mitchum, Commissioners Joseph P. Regan and Earl Swarner, civic leaders, the Wyandotte County Historical Society, that of the State and the Kansas Council of Women, whose membership exceeds 500,000, have exerted every effort to preserve the Huran Cemetery, the ancient burial ground of the Wyandot Indian. All six Kansas Members of the House of Representatives have urged the conversion of the cemetery into a national shrine. Joining us in this recommendation are the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, the Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr., and the Honorable WILLIAM J. RANDALL, our neighbors in Missouri.

Not only is this hallowed ground worthy of the designation as an historical site, but the faith of our Government, set forth in an ancient treaty, morally demands its preservation. The editor of the Kansas City, Kansan, John H. Stauffer, included the observation of Circuit Judge Walter A. Huxman in his editorial of Friday, May 6, which I ask be considered as part of my remarks:

PRESERVED IN PERPETUITY

At the Huron cemetery hearing in Federal court Judge Walter Huxman sharply criticized the treatment of Indians by white people and white agencies of Government in the past. When an attorney in the case stated that there were few recent treaty cases which could be cited as precedent, Judge Huxman observed that there aren't many recent cases because the treaties had all been broken.

Violation of treaties is not one of the proud chapters in the long history of the white man's dealings with the Indians. Nor has the chapter ended. In western New York the Seneca Nation is making a fight for preservation of what is left of its reservation along the Allegheny River. The corps of engineers has planned a power project to occupy the tract, the dam to flood most of the reservation except the steep mountain sides.

The Senecas claim their rights to the land are protected under treaty signed by George Washington, a pact which was to protect their land in perpetuity "as long as the sun shall rise."

The Huron cemetery by tradition is to be preserved while "winds blow and rivers flow."

The Senecas have editorial support of a number of leading newspapers of the area. One claim is that the corps has failed to use the best site available for its flood protection plan for Pittsburgh. By boring a hole through a moraine left by the glaciers—a natural earthen dike which changed the course of the river—a larger reservoir could be created elsewhere and the Seneca land left unmolested.

But that's New York's fight; we have our own Indian affairs.

Jet Flight Between Friendship Airport and Paris, France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 18, Pan American World Airways introduced a new service to the people of Baltimore which is of great interest and importance to our area. Beginning on this date, Pan American inaugurated round trip, jet service between Friendship Airport and Paris, France, marking the first time any scheduled air carrier has ever connected Baltimore with the Europeon Continent. This service is of the highest value to the greater Baltimore area which relishes the opportunity to avail itself of the splendid jet facilities at Friendship Airport for a speedy, uninterrupted journey to the wonders and beauties of Europe.

We are reminded on this occasion of a similar pioneering feat accomplished in the thirties when the first air service to Bermuda was introduced by the famous old Pan American flying boat—the B314—which made history by its flight from Baltimore to the island of Bermuda. I commend Pan American for its pioneering spirit and its president, Mr. Juan Trippe, himself a native of Maryland, for providing this excellent service.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased to note that a most interesting speech was recently made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] regarding Pan American's aid in the Mutual Security Pact by organizing and getting airborne the Afghanistan Airline at the request of our State Department. This is indeed a worthwhile and well managed project.

An Index to Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best analyses of record votes I have yet seen is the Americans for Constitutional Action index. The Richmond (Va.) News Leader of May 31 gave it an editorial:

AN INDEX TO CONSERVATIVES

In the course of the past 8 or 10 years, many of us in the pundit business have fallen into errors of political hypothesis that now are happily subject to some revision and correction. An index has just come to hand, prepared by Americans for Constitutional Action, that provides for the first time a truly significant insight into the political philosophy of Members of Congress.

One of the errors we had come to accept was an impression that "there really isn't much difference" between Democrats and Republicans. There is in fact a great difference, capable of being objectively measured. Our thinking on this score will have to be sharply recast.

We also had imagined that Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, and SYMINGTON were like Winken, Blinken, and Nod, all identically at sea in the same liberal boat; and we had supposed that LYNDON JOHNSON was, relatively speaking, considerably more "conservative" than the others. It isn't so. On the ACA index, KENNEDY scores 11, JOHNSON 10, SYMINGTON 4, and HUMPHREY 1. These compare with an index of 92 for Senator BYRD. On 38 key questions on which both JOHNSON and BYRD voted, they voted alike four times only.

This index, published by Human Events at 408 First Street SE., in Washington, is a remarkable labor in behalf of political understanding. The ACA editors began by studying 963 votes in the Senate between 1955 and 1959, and 280 votes in the House between 1957 and 1959. After prolonged study, they reduced this mass of material to 77 Senate votes and 40 House votes that seemed to offer clear-cut questions of a conservative point of view as opposed to a liberal point of view.

Doubtless no two political observers would agree that these 117 Senate and House votes are the exact 117 that should have been chosen for a study of this sort. Reasonably minded men, regarding themselves as conservatives, might well object to the "minus" charged against their spokesmen on a few issues. But in a study as large in scope as this one, such objections cancel out. In broad outline, the ACA's dispassionate brush paints a picture too clear to be denied. And the index is just as valuable, of course, in rating liberals as in rating conservatives; the percentages need only to be turned upside down.

One popular impression is abundantly supported by the ACA's study: The South is indeed a bulwark of conservatism. Of the 15 most conservative Democrats in the Senate, 13 are from the South; the others are LAUSCHE of Ohio, with a rating of 81, and FREAR of Delaware, who scores 62. But Republicans, as a group, are far more conservative than even the southerners, as a group. The most liberal Republican is COOPER of Kentucky, who nevertheless scores 27 on the ACA index; no fewer than 44 Democrats are more liberal than he.

Substantially the same picture obtains in the House. If it were not for their unfortunate predilection for accepting Federal handouts, southern Representatives would rank up top on the conservative index. When it comes to questions of States rights, individual liberty, private property and sound money, southern Democrats scarcely can be distinguished from typical stanch Republicans.

Among Virginians in the House, Congressman POFF, Republican, of the Sixth District, is the most consistent conservative, with a rating of 98. His 10th District colleague, Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, is in second place with 86. Then come the State's eight Democratic Representatives, led by Richmond's J. VAUGHAN GARY at 78, others are TUCK 77, HARRISON 75, ABBITT 75, SMITH 73, DOWNING 47, HARDY 45, and JENNINGS 25. Remarkably, New York's Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL rates 32.

The ACA study helps to clarify the dilemma that faces southerners in terms of the presidential election. Every one of the potential Democratic candidates appraised in this study is, on the record, a liberal. Messrs. KENNEDY, JOHNSON, HUMPHREY and SYMINGTON have almost nothing in common with their southern colleagues; they share a party label, that is all. If an opportunity were presented for southerners to vote their political convictions (as these convictions are represented by their own Congressmen), southerners would support BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona (98), or JOHN WILLIAMS of Delaware (99), or BRIDGES of New Hampshire (92). Trouble is, GOLDWATER, WILLIAMS, and BRIDGES bear the label of "Republican."

These gentlemen are, of course, conservatives, and if the Republic ever comes to its political senses, we will choose up sides all over again so that the national political weight reflected in 30 Republican Senators and 14 Democratic Senators, each with an ACA rating of 40 or better, could be put to more effective use.

West Virginia Approaches the Century Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 97th birthday of my State of West Virginia.

Back in the days of the Revolutionary War, George Washington remarked:

Give me a hundred men from West Augusta (later West Virginia) and I will plant my feet on the west bank of the Potomac and defy the world.

The mountaineers of West Virginia have lived up to that tradition.

West Virginia was born in 1863 of determination to meet a challenge—the challenge of preserving the Union. This challenge inspired men to daring deeds.

Courage is not new to the West Virginian. In fact, the entire history of the State is a chronicle of challenge and courage to meet each new difficulty.

There were challenges like that thrown down by Gov. Alexander Spottswood when he struck Golden Horseshoe medals for those hardy and brave enough to conquer the vast wilderness that lay within the mountain slopes. Or the courage of Mary Ingles, who faced incredible hardship to cross the State and rejoin her family after she had been carried off to the wild Ohio country in 1775 by marauding Indians. Or of the 29 delegates who firmly opposed secession when Virginia left the Union and even dared to hold a rump session to pledge their efforts to keep the State in the Union in 1861.

It is from this breed of men that West Virginia was born.

Today my State is faced with new, grave challenges.

A decline in coal mining employment has stripped many towns of their source of all wealth. Ghost towns have sprung up.

There are gnawing physical needs within the land. Children go without bread, and are forced to miss school because they have no shoes.

How can we cope with the serious problem of our older workers who have lost their jobs? We refuse to accept the heartless and inhuman solution of those who tell these older workers to pull up their roots and leave the mountains of their homeland.

But even worse is the problem of the flight of West Virginia's younger people, the source of future strength and vigor in any society, who have left the State for a more promising future elsewhere. My attention was first called to this problem by our own young Governor, Cecil H. Underwood, in an address to the Elks Club at Huntington. Governor Underwood pointed out that when the West Virginia State bonus was paid to veterans of the Korean conflict, 43 percent of the checks were sent to out-of-State addresses. This means that the cream of our younger people have left the State for better opportunities elsewhere.

Between 1950 and 1960, West Virginia was one of the two States in the Union which suffered an absolute decline in population. We lost over 158,000 people in this period—the largest decline among the States. We face this stark fact squarely and without self-pity. We recognize the challenge, just as our mountaineer forefathers recognized the challenges they faced.

Mr. Speaker, these are the challenges of today. Are they greater than the massive challenges of yesterday? They are not. Nor are the people of West Virginia going to surrender and abandon hope in the face of such challenges. For we are not a "dying State," as a desk-bound editor tried to characterize us recently. West Virginia, her men, her minds, and her muscle, have a tremendous potential for the future. Already bright glimmers of hope—like heat lightning flickering across a sultry summer sky with the promise of cooling relief to come—are evident in our State's affairs.

In my own Ohio Valley district, a great and diversified industrialization is gathering momentum, providing new jobs for our people. This golden area, which is just awakening to its real potential, can truly become the "Ruhr of America," and offers the true key to the State's salvation.

Our pleasant mountain areas are beginning to realize their great tourist po-

tential, drawing thousands from the heat and pavements of the eastern seaboard.

West Virginia, 97 years old today, thus faces a confident and expanding future, rising to meet the new challenges as we have in the past.

Fishbait Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, our affable and indefatigable Doorkeeper carries his nickname lightly but proudly. We know it has not prevented his performing the more solemn functions of his office with becoming dignity.

Fishbait Miller's fame was extended Sunday, June 19, when Parade, a magazine supplement distributed with the Washington Post and Times Herald and other newspapers from coast to coast, carried an article by Mary Rensselaer Thayer, which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FISHBAIT MILLER: WASHINGTON'S FAMOUS DOORKEEPER

(By Mary Van Rensselaer Thayer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When the Democratic National Convention begins in Los Angeles on July 11, its doors will be opened by a Doorkeeper who is paid $18,150 a year. He is a chunky, soft-spoken Mississipian named "Fishbait" Miller.

Fishbait, who is the House of Representatives Majority Doorkeeper, has been appointed for the third successive time as Doorkeeper of the Democratic National Convention. It's a job paralleling that of the Angel Gabriel in selectivity. It requires the memory of an elephant, the stubborness of a mule and the wiliness of a seasoned politician. Fishbait has all these assets—and more.

How does a Doorkeeper happen to draw such an impressive salary and rate so many VIP chums? It's because Fishbait, who has toiled 28 years under the Capitol dome (he started out as messenger in the House post office), makes an obliging friend and skillfully manages one of the most demanding jobs on the Hill. To a man, Republican and Democratic Congressmen agree that his salary is not a penny too much.

Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN neatly thumbnails Fishbait: "Fishbait purely loves to do favors."

Fishbait describes his duties modestly as merely "taking care of all the chores." Actually he functions as a combination housekeeper, chaperone, and Emily Post to all House of Representative Members. His chores are staggering; under his round-the-clock direction, 250 to 300 employes handle them. His army includes an assortment of teen-age pages, telephone managers and janitors, 38 doormen, 40 custodians.

Fishbait also supervises three barber shops, the snack bar in the Democratic and Republican cloakrooms and the Document and Folding Rooms, where legislative paperwork is prepared for mailing.

But these details are run-of-the-mill to Fishbait, who gets his greatest thrills from announcing VIP guests at Joint Sessions of Congress and—in lesser degree—from a pleasant initiation he sets up for congressional freshmen. Senate and House join forces when distinguished foreign guests or the U.S. President address Congress, and Fishbait arranges for their meeting in the more spacious House Chamber.

On these gala occasions Fishbait, in a blue suit, white shirt and black string tie, takes the honored invitees in tow. After pausing at the Chamber's entrance to sing out their names in a voice that rocks the rafters, he leads them down the aisle.

FIVE-STAR FINAL

Fishbait's most dazzling moment comes when the President delivers his annual state of the Union message. This is a five-star show played to packed galleries. As a curtain-raiser, Fishbait shepherds foreign ambassadors, Supreme Court Justices, and finally the Cabinet members to their seats. Then, as a grand climax, he belts out, "The President of the United States," with such added resonance that radiomen tear off their earphones.

Fishbait has been majority or minority (during the Republican 80th Congress) Doorkeeper since 1947. During this span he has taken hundreds of fledging Congressmen on their first tour of the Capitol. This initiation he calls his "Fishbait Special."

Only 15 Congressmen have been in the Capitol longer than Fishbait, who is so well known that his mail often is addressed merely to his nickname. Recently, a postcard from Mississippi addressed "Fishbait, Washington, D.C.," contained this message: "Dear Fish: I wish you'd send me the name of my Congressman. I've forgotten who he is."

Besides answering his fan and nuisance mail, Fishbait fills in the empty chinks of his 12-to-18-hour day with a wierd variety of unofficial services. They range from producing shrimp for unscheduled congressional luncheons to acting as waterboy for the hilarious Republican-Democratic annual charity baseball game.

Fishbait's most unusual service was at a wedding ceremony. The bride was a Mississippi Congressman's pretty secretary. Fishbait, invited to serve as an usher, noticed the minister totter and turn pale. When Fishbait rushed forward to brace him, the minister handed him the prayer book. Without skipping a word, Fishbait read the service. Then, at the end, the minister recovered sufficiently to pronounce the bridal couple man and wife. (The minister, Fishbait learned later had mistakenly swallowed pills intended for his wife.)

Hardly anyone knows Fishbait's real name (it's William M. Miller) and he even campaigns under his nickname. He campaigns because his job, which was set up during the first session of our first Congress, is elective. Congressmen do the voting, and the election of a Doorkeeper and other House factotums is legalized in the first resolution of each Congress.

Fishbait acquired his compelling moniker in a curious way. At 15 he weighed a trifling 75 pounds. Living in a small Mississippi town on the Gulf of Mexico, he spent much of his time lolling around the waterfront. Because of his small size he was called a variety of names—Alligatorbait, Garbait, Crabbait, Shrimpbait—but Fishbait finally stuck.

OASI Basically Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, since the very inception of the social security program, a far-seeing minority on the Ways and Means Committee has continued to point out some basic weaknesses in the plan. Before we vote to further increase benefits and add new programs, such as medical care, we should review some of the views stated in previous years. Among these views I would like to include some excerpts from the minority report of Carl T. Curtis, then a Member of the House, to the report on Social Security Act amendments for 1949.

MINORITY VIEWS

My dissent from the bill reported out does not stem from opposition to a liberalized social security program; instead it arises from the fact that the bill reported out fails in some major respect to do the very things a liberal and effective social-security program should do.

The old age and survivors insurance program is a grossly unsound and ineffective tool for the social-security purposes it attempts to accomplish. Because it is so unsound and ineffective, I cannot agree that the mere extension of its coverage or a mere numerical revision of its benefit formula, such as the majority of the committee proposes, can bring about significant improvement. Instead, the very fundamentals of the program should be objectively reexamined, and to the extent that such reexamination indicates the need for drastic overhauling of the program, that overhauling should be done, even though it proves necessary to abandon completely those concepts on which the present program rests.

Social security funds are necessarily limited in amount, since they depend upon the amount of economic productivity in the Nation and the possibility of drawing off a portion of this productivity for social-security purposes that is not too large to injure the Nation's economic health. Because of this limitation, it is of the utmost importance that these funds be distributed wisely.

On frequent occasions Congress has voted a very costly program, such as in the field of veterans' legislation or housing. There is an end to such programs. They do expire. There is no end to our social security program. It runs into perpetuity. We bind oncoming generations to pay untold billions of dollars not only 50 years from now, or 100 years from now, but so long as the Government of the United States stands. It is totally unmoral.

Let us permit our children and our grandchildren to decide how much per year they of their generation will pay for social security. We should not bind them by contract to pay untold billions each year, as the present system does. The right of self-government means not only freedom from kings, tyrants, and dictators, but it means freedom from the past.

New York College Youth for Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, evidence that the youth of this Nation is backing Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON for the Democratic nomination for President is shown by the results of a mock convention held recently at Alfred University, Alfred, N.Y. The interesting thing about this university is

that it is located up-state New York, in an area that is predominantly Republican. Its student body consists primarily of young men and young women from all parts of New York State, including a large number from the New York City area, as well as from other sections of the country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD three news items from the Buffalo Evening News, the Hornell (N.Y.) Evening Tribune, and the Fiat Lux of Alfred, N.Y., containing reports of the convention at Alfred University:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Apr. 28, 1960]

MOCK CONVENTION PICKS JOHNSON—CROTTY CRITICIZES GOP'S RECORD

(By Bert Freed)

ALFRED, April 28.—Southern "delegates" held firmer than the Confederate battlelines at Gettysburg and succeeded early today in making Texas Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON the Democratic "nominee" for President.

Second spot on the ticket hammered out by a mock party convention that lasted until almost 1 a.m. at Alfred University went to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Despite his strong civil rights position, the Minnesotan was backed by nine Dixie delegations in his victory on the first ballot.

The mock 6-hour convention was organized by the University's Young Democratic Club with the assistance of Prof. Rene Beauchesne, its adviser and political science instructor.

A serious note was the keynote address of Peter J. Crotty, chairman of the Erie County Democratic Committee.

DO NOTHINGISM CHARGED

The only political leader to address the convention, he stirred the 600 student "delegates" to cheers with a plea for partisans "to accomplish the social unity for which the world cries out."

He scored the Eisenhower administration as being based on "do-nothingism" and "the interests of the economically powerful."

He decried "shameful and stupid lack of emphasis on the crying public need in the fields of education, housing, hospital and medical assistance to the aged and all other aspects of the general welfare."

He declared, "The Republican Party is now, has been, and I dare say, will always be, the interest of the economically powerful. That it stands for big business today, there can be no doubt."

FUND DINNER HELD

He added that "American industry is pursuing a policy of planned obsolescence * * * in the meantime great advances which could have been made in rocketry and space research are being neglected.

"Even the very stability in Government which is necessary to continuous advance is denied the people because Government service has become little short of a revolving door," he said.

He was one of 55 western New York Democratic leaders who attended a fund-raising dinner sponsored by the club in Howell Hall.

State placards, pennants, marching demonstrations, booming floor fights and other elements of a genuine political convention were present.

"Permanent Chairman" Paul Cohen of Great Neck presided with the firmness and aplomb of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

[From the Evening Tribune, Hornell, N.Y., Apr. 28, 1960]

JOHNSON WINS ALFRED NOMINATION

ALFRED.—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON won the Democratic presidential nomination last night in the mock national nominating convention held at Alfred University.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY was selected as his running mate.

JOHNSON won on the second ballot defeating the other major contender, at that time Adlai Stevenson, by a margin of 913 votes to Stevenson's 638. He was then declared the Democratic candidate by a unanimous vote.

JOHNSON swept to victory after Senators HUMPHREY and SYMINGTON swung their support to him. On the first ballot he received 281 votes. KENNEDY received 369½ votes; HUMPHREY, 258½; and SYMINGTON, 115.

Following the rollcall on the second ballot it was close to a tie between KENNEDY and JOHNSON. Then a trend was established for Stevenson who had not been nominated on the first ballot, with KENNEDY throwing his support to Stevenson and many States changing their votes.

With HUMPHREY giving his support to JOHNSON, many other States also changed their votes, resulting in his nomination.

HUMPHREY received 774 votes for Vice President on the first ballot and was declared JOHNSON'S running mate.

This convention was sponsored by the Alfred University Young Democrats Club. Nearly 500 students took part, acting as delegates and convention officials. Preceding the convention, a Democratic fund-raising dinner was held, which was attended by area Democratic leaders.

[From the Fiat Lux, Alfred, N.Y., May 3, 1960]

L.B.J. AND H.H. ARE NOMINATED ON CONVENTION SECOND BALLOT

At the Democratic mock political convention held at Alfred University, Alfred, N.Y., on Wednesday, April 27 the party's nominees were: Senator LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON for President and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

L.B.J. won at the termination of the second ballot after a bitter fight with Stevenson forces. JOHNSON'S total at the end of the ballot was 913. A motion was made to make the vote unanimous and was carried overwhelmingly.

The convention was opened by the temporary chairman, Gary Ostrower, a junior from Woodridge, N.J. Ostrower proceeded to lash out at the Republicans in succinct speech that brought the convention to its feet many times.

The next speaker was the president of the Young Democrats Club and one of the guiding hands behind the success of the convention, Miss Rosemary McGuire. Miss McGuire, in her role of national chairman, introduced the keynote speaker for the convention, Mr. Peter J. Crotty.

Crotty is the Erie County Democratic leader who ran for the post of attorney general of New York in 1958. In his speech Crotty castigated the Republican administration for its lack of leadership and for its conservative views in blocking the United States from again returning to the position as the world's greatest power.

The convention owes a great deal of credit to Prof. Rene Beauchesne for his invaluable assistance in contacting the upstate Democratic leaders and bringing them to the convention, to the able rulings handed down by the parliamentarian, Martin Unger, and to the excellent work done by the rollcall clerk, Miss Kathleen O'Donnell. Also due credit must be given to the tally clerks who had their hands full when States started to change their votes very rapidly.

The convention drew to a close with the acceptance speech of HUMPHREY. All the students who participated in the convention learned invaluable lessons on the importance of a nominating convention and how the American political system works.

Minority Views on Social Security Amendments of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in a further effort to understand how far we have come from the original concept of the social security program, I would like to call your attention to some of the statements made in the minority views to the report on Social Security Amendments of 1954. The report was signed by my good friends, NOAH MASON and JAMES UTT, and points up the drastic departure from the original plan and the threat such departure, which has been compounded every 2 years since, poses to our free enterprise system.

DISSENTING VIEWS ON H.R. 9366

The committee has the grave responsibility of framing social security legislation which will improve and maintain the system on a sound basis, compatible with its purpose and with our system of free enterprise.

Some of the hastily adopted amendments contained in H.R. 9366 are highly questionable and probably would not have been adopted upon mature consideration. The most important of these amendments expanding the social-security tax base from $3,600 to $4,200, are fundamentally wrong and have far-reaching implications. The inflated wage base proposals were adopted with a strong dissenting vote and mark a departure from the basic purpose and justification of social security—that of affording a basic floor of protection—and would directly impair both the ability and incentives of the individual to achieve security through the normal processes of free enterprise.

Private arrangements for security, in contrast with the sterile taxing and spending processes of social security, are an integral part of free enterprise and provide the funds for capital investment upon which our economic system is based. Private thrift and insurance purchases also provide a flexibility of protection adaptable to the particular needs of the particular family. This flexibility is impossible under social security. Furthermore, security privately achieved by voluntary action, as contrasted with unnecessary inflated compulsory social security, is compatible with our traditions and our way of life.

Thus, even though social security were in fact bought and paid for by the individual and his equities, typical of free enterprise, were preserved, it would violate our basic principles to extend its taxes and benefits beyond the levels required to meet its purpose of providing a minimum floor of protection against destitution.

The bill's provisions extending the system's taxes and benefits to earnings in excess of the present $3,600-per-year limit, manifestly raise the fundamental issue of whether we shall progressively depart from the original purpose of the system. The proposal assumes that the $4,200 man requires more compulsory, publicly provided protection than does the $3,600 man. The next step, already proposed and urged, is that of providing still greater Government protection for the $6,000 man than is provided for the $4,200 man. There is no stopping point when one accepts the philosophy of more and more compulsory reliance upon the State, with the corollary of less and less

reliance by the individual upon his private voluntary arrangements.

These amendments are indefensible in our opinion. The proposed superbenefits for the high-income man are incompatible with the purpose of the system. Burdening other social security taxpayers with their payment shocks one's sense of equity.

The powerful drive for expanding the wage base and providing higher and higher benefits, and the lack of public understanding of the consequences of this action, place the committee and the Congress in a most difficult position—particularly in an election year.

But the inescapable fact is that younger people, including those not yet of voting age, and millions yet unborn, must largely support benefits for persons who retire in the next two or three decades. This situation places a special trusteeship on this committee and on the Congress. For not only the purpose of social security, but the welfare of our young people and their children, strictly limits the social security benefits which can be provided for the aged through taxation of the young. We must halt the constant increases in present and future benefits, and in the taxes required to support those benefits.

It is far from certain that the present tax schedule will support the presently scheduled benefits, and still less certain that the proposed increased taxes would support the increased benefits.

It is manifest, in any event, that the proposed wage base extension would provide an unwarranted increase in benefits of persons with high earnings, who least need social security protection. It is also manifest that the unwarranted increase in benefits—and for younger people the lifetime burden of the additional social security taxes—would adversely affect individuals and our economy and would be contrary to the general welfare.

FURTHER DISSENTING VIEWS OF MR. UTT

In addition to the foregoing minority report, I wish to state it is my fearful belief that the social security tax is fast shaping up to become a secondary graduated income tax upon wages and salaries, a tax which, when its full impact is felt, will shake our social security system to its very foundation.

Award to Dr. J. Fred Rippy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I announce to the House the 1960 William Volker Distinguished Service Award for outstanding achievements as a scholar and teacher to Dr. J. Fred Rippy, history professor emeritus of the University of Chicago. A stipend of $15,000 goes with the award.

Dr. Rippy was a member of the University of Chicago faculty for 31 years until his retirement in 1958. He was internationally recognized as America's foremost authority on Latin America. He now resides in Durham, N.C.

It will interest my colleagues to know that this distinguished scholar for years has been a regular reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No matter how busy his schedule, he has found time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his daily must.

The Pitfalls of Personal Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial as it appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 17, 1960:

THE PITFALLS OF PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Let us say at the outset that we think President Eisenhower, having committed himself to visit Japan, was wise not to act hastily in cancelling his trip, hoping the storm would blow over. Since it did not, it was also wise to have called off the trip.

But having said this, we think the whole affair sharpens some very grave questions about this concept of personal diplomacy. Taken together with other experiences of recent months, it drives home a lesson that this country needs to learn.

Consider, first, just this Japanese visit. Its general purpose was to spread good will. Beyond this vague intent there was also a desire to lend a helping hand to the government of Premier Kishi and to impress the people of Asia, notably the Red Chinese, with our prestige and influence in that part of the world.

The results, to put it mildly, are quite different. The Red Chinese are jubilant at the success of the riots they did so much to foment. So is the Soviet Union. The United States has been made to look ridiculous in the eyes of all Asia, with consequences no one can yet see clearly.

Rather than being strengthened, Premier Kishi may well have been destroyed. In any event, we have embroiled ourselves in the internal politics of another country. At the moment there are even some doubts whether the new U.S.-Japanese security treaty, which is the foundation of our Far Eastern alliances, will be ratified by the Japanese Parliament.

So it is too little merely to say the United States has failed to accomplish what it hoped from the President's visit. It is not too much to say that on every point we have accomplished the exact opposite of our hopes.

This is, to be sure, an extreme example of the pitfalls in personal diplomacy. But it is not the only one. Only a few months ago Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev were visiting at Camp David and Mr. Eisenhower was planning a return visit. Only a few weeks ago the heads of state were sitting down together in Paris. The outcome of all that, of course, was the public tongue lashing of President Eisenhower, an insulting withdrawal of the Khrushchev invitation to Russia and a collapse of the summit. Whatever else may be said about that, it too marked a failure for personal diplomacy.

These failures have nothing to do with Mr. Eisenhower personally; he has, indeed, conducted himself at all times with good sense and dignity, so much so that he has in each case salvaged a great deal from the wreckage. The trouble lies in the naive notion that good national relations can be created by friendly personal relations between the heads of States or by friendly visiting.

We suppose the notion is understandable. The President pays a visit, say, to Britain or France or India and there is an outpouring of cheering crowds. In the wake of his visit there is discernible a heightened sense of goodwill.

So it is appealing to conclude that the goodwill is created by the gesture of a visit from the President of the United States or by the personal appeal of the man who holds the office. Why not, then, use the same method to win us friends all over the world?

The fallacy of this, now, ought to be apparent. We have ourselves had many visits from foreign statesmen that had the effect of heightening our sense of friendliness towards their countries. But we have also had visits from Khrushchev and from Castro, both of whom were courteously received by us. Yet who, any longer, shares the illusion that these visits altered anything fundamental in our foreign relations with their countries? Or could?

The lesson in all this is not that personal diplomacy is without its merits. But plainly we had best disabuse ourselves of the idea that, where there are fundamental differences between countries, they can be smoothed over by so simple a device.

More than that, we had better recognize that even where the relationship between the two countries is generally good, as it has been between the United States and Japan these past few years, personal diplomacy is still full of pitfalls.

Adequate Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 20 clearly defines the situation the House of Representatives finds itself in, with the omnibus social security bill coming to the floor under a closed rule. It also expresses the feelings shared by myself and many other Members of Congress who hope, under the circumstances, that the Senate will produce a measure genuinely adequate to the needs of the country's older citizens.

For these reasons, I submit the item for insertion in the RECORD under permission to extend remarks:

ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE

Political as well as social considerations impel Congress to take action this session on proposals to make medical and hospital care available for the aged. All over the country there has been intense interest in these proposals; and in a presidential election year this interest on the part of people who can give it effective expression at the polls can hardly be ignored. What is still more important, however, is the simple fact that medical progress in the field of geriatrics together with the dramatic increase in the cost of medical care has made special provision for the aged a social imperative.

The medical care program approved recently by the House Ways and Means Committee is a complete disappointment. It would provide care for fewer than 1 million of the 16 million Americans over 65 years of age. Even for this fraction, the care would be meager; and it would be available only on the basis of a means test to low-income individuals. Participation would be optional with the States and would involve a complicated Federal grant-in-aid program. Representative AIME FORAND was quite justified in calling this a "pauper's" bill. It is to come before the House for action on Wednesday under an absurdly restrictive rule forbidding any amendments.

The hope for an adequate measure to give health care to the aged lies, therefore, with the Senate. Its Subcommittee on Problems

of the Aged and Aging has conducted extensive hearings and given thoughtful consideration to medical care programs. We hope that the Senate will produce a measure genuinely adequate to the needs of the country's older citizens. Such a measure would be a facet of social security and can best be financed, in our judgment, through an enlargement of the social security tax. It ought to be available, like the retirement benefits of social security, to all persons of retirement age as a matter of earned right and not on the humiliating basis of a proof of indigency. If such a measure is adopted by the Senate and if the House is given a chance to vote on it, there can be little doubt that it will be passed in preference to the piddling bill fashioned by the Ways and Means Committee.

Supplemental Views to the Report on Social Security Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in a further review of the development of the social security system, we find that in 1955 the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House, without holding hearings and with only a limited number of executive sessions, amendments designed to increase benefit payments from the trust fund of $2 billion a year, on the average. While most of the minority members of the committee voted to report the bill favorably, they strongly protested the failure to hold hearings. In the supplemental views to the report on the 1955 amendments we find additional warnings as to the danger to our economy of continual increases in the social security tax and the inequity which it creates. Following are some pertinent statements from these supplemental views:

BASIC PROBLEMS

Cost: In order to finance the multibillion-dollar increase in benefits contained in this bill, a higher tax schedule is provided. An almost immediate increase to 2½ percent each on employees and employer, respectively, is provided effective January 1, 1956. Each of the subsequent periodic increases provided under existing law is also increased by one-half of 1 percent. As a result the ultimate tax rate projected under the bill, effective in 1975, is 9 percent shared equally by employees and their employers. The self-employment tax, applicable to professional individuals, will become 6¾ percent at that time.

As high as these future rates are, the rates themselves do not convey a complete picture of the true burden they involve. The tax on wages is a tax on gross wages without any allowance for personal exemptions, dependents, or other deductions. The tax on self-employment income only permits certain business deductions, such as depreciation. It is, in effect, a tax on adjusted gross income. Therefore, unlike the income tax, the social security tax is not limited to net income. As a result, that tax, as a percentage of net income, is substantially higher than the actual rates would indicate. In fact, the eventual 6¾-percent rate on the self-employed would be the equivalent of a net income tax in the neighborhood of 20 percent and higher in many cases.

Let us take the example of a farmer with a net income from self-employment of $4,200 in 1975. Assuming that he has a wife and two children and uses the standard deduction, his Federal income tax under present rates, will be $276. His social security tax, on the other hand, will be $283.50. In this example, which is a completely average case, the social security tax, as a percentage of net taxable income, would be in excess of 20 percent. If the same individual had three children his income tax would be cut to $156 but his social security tax would still amount to $283.50. In such a case, the latter tax would be the equivalent of a net income tax of 36 percent. We again point out that this would be an ordinary case and not at all an unusual one.

It is estimated that in 1975 the total social security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually, a colossal sum. Moreover, this estimate assumes continuation of existing wage levels and makes no allowance for the increase in those levels which past experience indicates will occur. The $20 billion estimate, is therefore, extremely conservative.

We are concerned over this fact, moreover, because by their very nature, the liberalizations contained in this bill will create demands for additional changes involving further costs.

We are further concerned over these ultimate costs because of the danger that they may eventually weaken or even destroy public acceptance of the social security system. A social insurance program cannot be expected to provide against all insurable risks. It must be designed to provide a basic protection at a cost within the reach of all, especially those in the lower income brackets who are most in need of that protection. Despite this fact, we are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax.

Finally, insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the cost by shifting most of the burden to the future. At that time, the high tax rates may make it very difficult to retain the contributory principle which we believe so essential to the program. However, we would be deluding ourselves should we believe that the general revenue could be depended upon to support the system. We have already pointed out that, under the present schedule, social security tax collections in 1975 will amount to about $20 billion. If such a vast sum were financed through the individual income tax for example, it would necessitate approximately a 50-percent across-the-board increase in that already burdensome tax. These figures show clearly the magnitude of the problem we are so casually creating.

It is our earnest hope that the questions we have raised will lead thoughtful citizens everywhere to search for the answers. The social security system was created to give our people confidence and faith in their future. It should be above politics.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.
RICHARD M. SIMPSON.
ROBERT W. KEAN.
NOAH M. MASON.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
ANTONI N. SADLAK.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Old Glory Flies at Fairless Hills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1959, I addressed the House on the subject of "Flagless Fairless Hills." I related how, in this town about 25 miles from Philadelphia, the deed to every property carried a restriction against the erection of flagpoles. Without flagpoles, the inhabitants could not suitably display the flag. This prohibition was carried to the preposterous extent that the U.S. flag did not even fly over the U.S. post office in the town.

I learned of this absurd situation through Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno, who, in his capacity as vice chairman of the Americanism committee and member of the flag committee of the Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars, had visited Fairless Hills and discovered the conditions which I have described. As soon as Justice Musmanno told me about this state of affairs, I obtained from the Architect of the Capitol a new 49-star flag, which had been flown over the Capitol and I sent it to Justice Musmanno. Musmanno, who is a retired rear admiral in the U.S. Navy Reserve, took that flag to Fairless Hills and, with other officers of the VFW, climbed an iron ladder to the roof of the post office building and there planted it for 10 minutes to show that physically it could be done.

Admiral Musmanno then conferred with Benjamin Fairless, former chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corp., in whose honor the town had been named. In the meanwhile I communicated with the Post Office Department and in a matter of 3 weeks the American flag was flying over the Fairless Hills Post Office.

Admiral Musmanno then continued his efforts to have the flagpole restriction removed from the deeds. The lawyers of the Danherst Corp., which built the houses, first resisted any relaxation in the restriction but eventually the Danherst Corp. announced that they would not hold the householders to the restriction.

In addition, the Danherst Corp. erected a 150-foot flagpole in the center of the town, and, on Flag Day of this year, the flagpole was dedicated and our Capitol-flown flag was hoisted to the top of the pole where it now waves in all its beauty and glory over the town.

I feel certain you would like to know of the successful result of this crusade in behalf of the flag and I am sure that you join with me in congratulating and thanking Admiral-Justice Musmanno in the achievement of his objective. On June 14 the United Press carried the following dispatch from Fairless Hills:

OLD GLORY FLIES AT FAIRLESS HILLS

FAIRLESS HILLS, June 14.—State Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of

Pittsburgh, returned to Fairless Hills today triumphant in his battle against the ban on the flagpole.

The jurist was the principal speaker at the dedication of a flagpole in the center of the community.

Thus ended a one-man campaign that began last August, when Justice Musmanno noted that in all of Fairless Hills not one flag was allowed to fly above a building.

He carried his fight to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, because not even Fairless Hills' post office had the national emblem above its building.

He sought the help of U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Wilkes-Barre; Benjamin Fairless, the retired board chairman of the United States Steel Corp., and the Danhurst Corp., administrators of the town.

Today, while all of Bucks County turned out for the event, the jurist recalled the events leading to the installation of the 150-foot pole and called for greater unity behind the flag of all Americans.

Besides welcoming the rebirth of liberty in Fairless Hills, the justice criticized Japan for its demonstrations in opposition to President Eisenhower's visit.

He called Fidel Castro a "bewhiskered vulgarian" and he cited Nikita Khrushchev as a "barbarian," and said that one of America's greatest mistakes was to invite "this mass butcher of Hungarian freemen" to our shores.

In addition to Justice Musmanno, Charles H. Boehm, State superintnedent of public schools, spoke.

And now, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by Admiral-Justice Musmanno on the occasion of the dedication of the flagpole with the Capitol-flown flag. The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO

Mr. Chairman, officers and members of the VFW, officers of the United States Steel Corp., ladies, and gentlemen, just a year ago I made my first visit to Fairless Hills and discovered to my amazement that the flag of the United States was not flying over the U.S. post office. It was almost impossible for me to adjust my eyes to so incredible a phenomenon. Then I scanned the skyline, hoping that my heart, which had sunk, would leap in my breast, as I might see Old Glory proudly billowing over some other public building or even some private dwelling, but the entire horizon was as empty of the beautiful symbol of our country as some forgotten desert at the antipodes of the earth.

It seemed impossible that in this beautiful little town, the product of the highest American economic and civic ideals, the emblem of liberty and justice should be completely missing.

What was the explanation? I found out very quickly. Contrary to the patriotic impulses and idealistic intentions of the founders of Fairless Hills and its able administrators, there had crept into the verbiage of the town's deeds, almost like a furtive weasel, a restriction against flagpoles.

Immediately I went to see Mr. Benjamin Fairless, former chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., and in whose honor the town was named. I communicated with Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield. I spoke to Congressman DANIEL FLOOD who made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on the subject. My brother officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Comdrs. Edward Boehmer, Willis Bosch, Walter Bolzer, and Eugene Goodman, and myself, called on the able, amiable, and highly cooperative Gordon K. Bolon, vice president of the Danhurst Corp.

And lo and behold, within the space of 2 or 3 weeks, the roof of the Fairless Hills Post Office suddenly burst into bloom like a flower garden, and the sky took on colors and hues which surpassed the beauty of a Mediterranean sunset. Old Glory had taken its rightful place at the summit of the building housing the post office.

I shall never forget that memorable August morning when I saw the flag which had been missing for so long. I knew how Francis Scott Key must have felt when he beheld Old Glory, after a night of bombardment, triumphantly waving over the "land of the free and the home of the brave." I could feel the excitement which must have throbbed in his veins as he penned the immortal words of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

As vice chairman of the americanism committee and member of the flag committee of the Pennsylvania VFW, I want to express the appreciation of the State Veterans of Foreign Wars to Mr. Fairless, Mr. John Galbreath, and Mr. Bolon, for removing the restriction which now authorizes the inhabitants of Fairless Hills to display the American flag at will, so that the whole world can see their patriotic devotion, which no one ever doubted and no one ever will.

I know that the people of Fairless Hills do not and have never treated the flag indifferently or taken it for granted. I know it thrills them, as it does me, every time they see it. And let me say to the schoolchildren assembled here, that this flag should always mean as much to you as the picture of those who are closest to you in your heart.

Let that flag inspire you, not only on Flag Day, but every day. Let us never forget what it symbolizes—courage in the face of danger and courage in confronting every threat against our democratic institutions.

Let us respect those who respect our flag and let us treat as they deserve to be treated those who show contempt for the flag. I confess that I feel a little sick in the stomach over the manner in which our flag is being reviled in various parts of the world and particularly in nations which should be forever grateful to the United States for her magnanimity, kindness and assistance in the hour of their greatest trials.

Japan treacherously attacked us at Pearl Harbor, she sank our battleships, and killed our boys while her ambassadors were here professing friendship. We defeated her in the war which she precipitated and, contrary to the practice of other countries, we exacted no indemnity and we took no land. In addition, we gave Japan financial and other assistance and yet we have seen during the last few days the scurrility she has heaped upon our flag and all that it stands for. I believe that our President should not go to Japan, not out of any fear, but to deny Japan the honor of having the head of this great Nation on her shores, since many of her people lack the courtesy and good manners so traditionally ascribed to them.

Russia participated World War II by joining up with Hitler. Nevertheless we went to her assistance when Hitler showed his fangs to his former ally. Russia would have been wiped out of existence by Hitler's war machine had she not been supplied with American planes, tanks, equipment, ships and food. And yet we have seen how Khrushchev has insultd our President and our flag. One of the greatest mistakes made by America during the last half century was to invite this mass butcher of Hungarian freemen to America and accord him a hospitality which he is too much of a barbarian to appreciate.

I wrote to the State Department urging the Khrushchev be not invited because an invited visit to America should be a reward for good deeds and manifestation of sincerity of purpose, which Khrushchev had never demonstrated. In spite of similar protests from many other people, Khrushchev was invited. He came here and lived at our expense. He was lodged, wined and dined in our most luxurious hotels, he traveled in plush style, he received a generous hospitality and solicitous attention which had never even been accorded to visiting royalty in the past. And now we have seen how he has insulted our President, desecrated the meaning of our flag and otherwise reviled all that it stands for.

Cuba owes her existence as an independent nation to the United States . American sailor and soldiers gave their blood and their lives to liberate Cuba from Spain. If we had followed the example of Russia, we would have retained Cuba as American territory. On the contrary, we withdrew our soldiers and continued to send American educators, architects, doctors and dollars to build up that country. And as a matter of recompense we now look upon the spectacle of the behiskered vulgarian who is at present dictating Cuba to her ruin practically spitting on our flag every day.

But we will not allow these ingrates to force us into war because we know that the very colors of our flag come from the sacred dye of the blood which flowed from millions of wounds of American soldiers in order to give Americans enduring peace.

No, they will not force us into war, but we will hold them accountable for their misdeeds, their insults, and their ingratitude. We will show the world with dignity but with formilable pride; with moderate voice but with invincible military strength; with continued proffering of the olive branch but with unsurpassable stock pile of nuclear missiles, that we will always hold high the ideals which have made this country the greatest—in morals, philanthropy, tolerance, and devotion to humanity—in the history of mankind. And we will continue to cherish the hope, and work for its realization, that the world will return to sanity and accept the precept spoken 2,000 years ago and which is the heart of true brotherhood everywhere, namely, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Highway Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the following article titled "Our Great Big Highway Bungle," written by Karl Detzer, staff writer for the Reader's Digest, which appeared in the July 1960 issue.

I share and have shared in recent years the beautiful dream we all once had to bring to fruition 40,000 miles of interstate freeway that would link all major urban areas of these United States together in the interest of our national defense, and to provide safe and fast transportation to any part of the country for all of us.

Mr. Detzer is to be commended for the work that he has done in presenting a true picture of the waste, graft, and corruption that has now infiltrated the interstate program. I agree wholeheartedly with his statement that now is not

the time to blindly forge ahead on a reckless uncontrolled Government spending binge. It is time to stop and evaluate and take all steps necessary to cut out waste, graft, and stupidity in order that we can realize that beautiful dream.

The Reader's Digest article is most timely and should be read by every Member of Congress now because next year we of course will be asked to again raise gasoline taxes to provide additional funding for construction of the system. We want highways, not expensive pork barreling projects.

Following is the full text of Mr. Detzer's article:

OUR GREAT BIG HIGHWAY BUNGLE

(Haste, waste, mismanagement, and outright graft are making a multibillion-dollar rathole out of the Federal highway program. If you want honest value for your tax dollars that are going into this 40,000-mile muddle, now is the time to make yourself heard.)

(By Karl Detzer)

The American people in 1956 were sold a beautiful $27 billion dream—a 40,000-mile superhighway network that would sweep majestically from coast to coast and border to border. This greatest engineering project of all time would, we were told, be a splendid monument to a free people's wisdom, daring, foresight, and skill.

Its highways would, by 1975, knit together all the States, most large cities and hundreds of smaller towns. Its smooth, gently graded, no-stop-sign roads—four, six, and sometimes eight lanes wide—would speed interstate travel, strengthen defense, reduce accidents, save mileage, cut trucking rates, open new recreational areas, expand tourist trade, hasten produce from factory to consumer and farm to market. The program would create 440,000 new jobs and check the recession that then threatened. What was more, it would pay for itself painlessly out of our Federal taxes on tires and our 3 cents a gallon Federal gasoline tax.

Today it must be reported that the dream has become a nightmare: of reckleness, extravagance, special privilege, bureaucratic stupidity, and sometimes outright thievery.

While the entire network was originally scheduled to cost $27 billion, the Bureau of Public Roads had to admit within 2 years that "unexpected additional costs" had already arisen. The official figure was quietly raised to just under $40 billion. Yet today even this figure is entirely misleading. For one thing, it ignores the proposed $5 billion reimbursement to the States for their previously built toll roads and turnpikes that have been incorporated into the system. For another, it does not recognize a little matter of a billion and a half dollars as the cost of relocating public utilities and railroads that lie in the path of the new roads.

A new official figure is due in January 1961. Already many engineers and builders privately estimate that $50 billion will not touch the total cost. And meanwhile the Federal gas tax has climbed to 4 cents, and Congress is considering another hike.

What has gone wrong? Why?

LOCAL NEED—AND LOCAL GREED

The first trouble is that Uncle Sam is paying most of the bill, with little control written into the law. The Federal Government simply shovels out the money for the States to spend. This has invited irresponsibility and inefficiency. Local self-interest and greed—at the expense of the general good—are in the saddle all over the country.

The Federal Government, out of tire and gasoline taxes, puts up 90 cents of each dollar. Each State adds its own thin dime (12 Western public-land States pay even less) for work done within its borders. Federal engineers help draw a rough, overall map of the system and set minimums—but not maximum—standards. From there on the States take over. They decide how much money they need, how much right of way to buy, where and at what price. They decide on the type of paving, how thick the surface shall be, on how much of what kind of base to pour it, and what types of bridges to build. They let their own contracts. Though Federal engineers are supposed to approve every yard of highway to make sure there has been no waste, the inspections are usually sketchy and infrequent. There just aren't enough engineers in the Government to supervise a program of such magnitude.

So it's hardly surprising that with good old Uncle dishing out the cash, many a community has developed some pretty grandiose needs. Or that many a State official has developed an easy-come, easy-go attitude.

Consider, for example, a lonely, sparsely settled area in Nevada (which pays only a nickel out of each dollar). Three expensive interchanges have been completed in a 3-mile stretch of interstate highway. The cost of the interchanges runs to $358,000. Why were they built? According to the U.S. General Accounting Office, a survey had shown that an average of 89 cars a day entered or left the main highway from the dusty desert roads that intersect it. Now this tiny flow of traffic is handled in style. One interchange leads to a road that serves a railroad shanty and little else. The second gives access to a single ranch.

The third, accounting for most of the 89 cars, leads to some abandoned mines, four or five small ranches, an electric power line, and a bawdy house which has recently shut up shop.

Consider the duplications of existing highways that are popping up everywhere. No matter what broad, safe roads may sweep across a State, other roads are being built parallel to them not far away. In a study of only 11 States, the General Accounting Office found eight planning new highways shoulder to shoulder with existing toll roads. The reasoning in such cases seems to be: since the Government is spending the money, it may as well spend some our way.

Consider the building of city roads at Uncle Sam's expense. In Omaha, Nebr., a superstreet is being driven through the heart of the city at an estimated cost of $42 million, though an alternate route, around the town, would cost less than $15 million. (Local boosters expect to get the alternate route built, too, after the main drag is finished.) Several downtown interchanges with the expressway are planned. The largest will consume about 100 acres. Land purchases alone will cost an estimated $10 million. Some 900 buildings, mostly homes, will be destroyed, and their occupants will be forced to find new places. Loss to the tax rolls will be heavy.

Why this costly local street at Uncle Sam's expense? "We've passed Chicago as a livestock center," one businessman explains, "and we should have good roads leading to the stockyards so that cattle and hogs can be delivered more easily."

That's fine for Omaha, but why should the other 49 States pay 90 percent of the bill?

Although only 12 percent of the interstate network mileage is slated to go into or around cities, at least 45 percent of the network money is being spent on urban roads such as Omaha's. On some of them more dollars go for land than for construction.

Take a look at what is happening in Wilmington, Del. Here bulldozers are driving a 300-foot swath right through town. The six-lane highway will cost $62,432,000—$5 million a mile—and cut the town in two. More than 600 homes are in the path, plus some 50 business buildings, churches, and theaters. Their destruction means a tax loss of $115,000 a year. The city council calls the project a "wasteful, ruinous folly" and demands a congressional investigation. A taxpayers' suit, about to be decided, seeks to halt the work. Meanwhile, the job is going ahead, despite the fact that a route that would skirt the town and cost $17 million less is available. (Much the same situation exists in El Paso, Tex.)

In Macon, Ga., the projected 4½-mile road through the center of town will bisect an attractive residential district containing 28 churches and 17 schools. It will eliminate 400 homes, including some of the city's most substantial, and will fence off the 89-year-old campus of Mercer University from the only direction in which it can grow. It will produce 28 dead-end streets. It ignores the traffic needs of nearby Robins Airbase, and will be a headache for long-distance drivers. A city-county planning board report calls it "blight-producing."

Angry citizens have pointed out the very obvious advantages of a route around town. The present chairman of county commissioners has replied that Macon should not "pass up an outlay of $50 million that is going to be dumped in our laps." By coincidence, a former chairman of county commissioners who, with several other officials, approved a similar layout in 1955 and has been pushing for its adoption, owns a number of acres of land at strategic spots along the right-of-way.

True, the law creating the national network says that "local needs shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce." But too manys cities are giving all consideration to their own needs. Their chambers of commerce, politicians, business groups, real estate operators, and fast-buck manipulators feel than an extra highway never hurt any community. Anyway, a new road means profitable business for contractors, splendid real estate deals, work for deserving labor, and quantities of cement, asphalt, gravel, and steel to be bought from manufacturers and local dealers always willing and anxious to serve.

THE BIG RUSH FOR THE BIG MONEY

The second trouble with the program is that, because of the rush to get at the Federal moneybags, the mismanagement and waste normal to a program so sprawling and vast have been many times multiplied.

For example, the argument that sold the highway network to even the most economy-minded Congressman was that it was a "military necessity." The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 stated: "Because of the primary importance to the national defense, the name of such a system is hereby changed to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." Its proponents claim that it will bolster the national defense by assuring swift movement of materiel and troops in moments of peril.

Yet during the first 4 years of construction, at an expense of hundreds of millions of dollars, more than 2,000 bridges and underpasses have been built that are too small to permit passage of some of our most important weapons. How can such things be?

In July 1956, the Secretary of Commerce and a committee of State highway officials—with no representatives from the Department of Defense—decided that a 14-foot minimum clearance all along the network would be fine. A telephone call to the Pentagon would have disclosed their error. For our military inventories even then included missiles and radar equipment that could not possibly squeeze under an opening 14 feet high, and larger implements were on the drawing boards.

Two and a half years later, after millions of dollars' worth of concrete and steel had been solidly built into the structures, the

military planners at the Pentagon announced that a clearance of 17 feet was necessary.

Did Federal highway officials order work halted until new dimensions could be agreed upon? Not at all. They and the Pentagon brass sat down for a series of informal discussions that lasted from January into October. Meanwhile, the money flooded out across the country, and the builders continued to throw obstructions across the military highways.

Not until January 1960 was a compromise dimension finally decided on. The clearance would be, not the 17 feet that the Army and Air Force needed, but 16 feet—not quite enough for the largest weapons. There was one advantage: the necessary reconstruction of inadequate underpasses and bridges already built would cost, as one western builder put it, "only $730 million".

With such haste, many items—and many dollars—get out of control. In New York, for example, the U.S. Comptroller General discovered that an estimate calling for $25 million to buy up 35 miles of roadway had been decided on in less than a day. In Georgia, an estimate was overstated by $19,700,000—the result of faulty arithmetic. In Ohio, an error of $9 million was made because of a typographical mistake.

Federal policy requires that land must be appraised before it can be purchased by the State. But many parcels of land have been bought first and appraised later. In Nevada alone, the Comptroller General's Office found what it chose to call deficiencies in the purchase of 29 out of 40 pieces of land. Typical was parcel No. 3, project IN-001-1(14). This property was bought on April 26, 1957, for $42,000. On that same day appraisers employed by the State listed the value of the parcel at only $22,000. Having spent almost double the appraised valuation, the State quickly put another appraiser to work. Even he could stretch the valuation to only $38,000—$4,000 less than had already been paid. The files of the Comptroller General are full of such examples.

Mismanagement is evident, too, in the extravagant use of private engineering consultants, instead of State highway employees, in designing projects. Such practice is in violation of Federal policy, and it runs into money. The General Accounting Office has found that the costs of Pennsylvania's contracts with private consultants for preliminary engineering alone have been averaging $1 million a month. In New Jersey, in less than 4 years, eight engineering firms have received $8,219,967 in consultant fees for interstate projects. In Maryland, consultants have received more than $24 million on federally aided highways since 1954.

Usually a consultant is paid a percentage of the cost of the project on which he works. He has a great deal to do with deciding whether the job will be an expensive one or a frugal one. Thus only a highly developed sense of ethics stands between him and temptation. While rich old Uncle is tossing money around, the temptation to cash in on a large scale is frequently great and sometimes irresistible.

HUSH-HUSH DEALS

With hasty mismanagement and local greed has come, inevitably, a third drain—collusion, chicanery, venality, and graft. Nobody knows the enormity of the take to date, but more and more cases are coming to light.

In Indiana, for example, the national president, a vice president, and the treasurer of the Carpenters' Union have been investigated by a grand jury for having bought property near Gary, after being tipped off that a road was going through, and then selling the property for a quick profit of $78,000. The union officers were charged with having paid off a State highway official. The indictments were made in February 1958, but the men were not arraigned until May 1960.

In Oklahoma, on one 13-mile $8 million bypass at Tulsa, grand jury and congressional probes have recently turned up evidence that one contractor, with the knowledge and assistance of State highway engineers and inspectors, used substandard materials, falsified delivery weights, and padded bills. Highway department employees testified that, on orders from their superiors, they actually made up samples of materials in a laboratory, instead of taking them from the roadbed, as proof that specifications were met. Federal overseers of the job discovered nothing amiss at any time. Others testified that overpayments to this one contractor are estimated at $524,000, and that the road, completed in 1958, is already starting to crack up in places.

In Nevada, the interstate road from the California line eastward, as officially planned, will shoulder its way right through the heart of Reno. To do this it will have to bridge the Truckee River four times, plus a ravine 125 feet deep. It will cost an estimated $41 million. An alternate route, for which 17,000 Reno citizens have signed a petition, would bypass the city only 17 blocks to the north, need no bridges, and cost at least $23 million less.

Reno's row over these two routes drew the attention of Nevada's lone U.S. Congressman, WALTER S. BARING, who last year forced the mess into the open. Investigation showed there had been no survey of the bypass before local hearings were held, and that cost estimates for right-of-way on the officially favored downtown route had been $5,600,000 too low. In a letter to President Eisenhower, BARING angrily declared that if the plan for a midtown route was permitted to go forward it would result in "the biggest swindle ever perpetrated in the State of Nevada." He still had received no assurance in mid-May that construction of the route would not proceed as planned.

Meanwhile, BARING has continued to ask questions, not only about Reno but about the whole interstate program. He points the finger at expensive real estate deals and tremendously high administrative costs, and he is urging his fellow Congressmen to clean house.

Scandals are stirring in at least six other States, and investigations now in progress are likely to uncover chicanery on a large scale before many more months have passed.

One other Member of Congress, Minnesota Democrat JOHN A. BLATNIK, heads a subcommittee that is digging deeply into the whole highway situation. With nearly $300,000 voted for the investigation, BLATNIK has put to work several of the toughest investigators who in recent years unearthed pay dirt for the McClellan labor-management corruption committee. The Blatnik committee is already finding substance in the charges of Virginia's Senator HARRY BYRD that the road program is in an "inexcusable mess," and that there has been great "temptation to grab land, hike prices, and profiteer."

When the committee's reports are released, efforts undoubtedly will be made to convince the public that the charges are political. But neither majority party seems more guilty than the other. State and local administrations of both political hues have been reckless of public responsibility, have used roads and real estate to further their individual designs. And the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has been inept.

Some will undoubtedly urge that we proceed full speed ahead, "for the good of the Nation." But perhaps it is time not to go ahead. Judging by the record to date, it is time to stop and evaluate, to make every possible effort to cut out the waste, graft, and stupidity, if that beautiful dream we all once had is to come true.

Let every citizen who has specific evidence of tax dollars going down the highway program's multibillion-dollar rathole report that evidence to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK now. Let us have honest value for our tax money.

Reds' Anti-Ike Campaign in Tokyo Will Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial which appeared recently in the Flint Journal, of Flint, Mich., entitled "Reds' Anti-Ike Campaign in Tokyo Will Boomerang." While I believe the reasons which have forced the Japanese Government to request a postponement of President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo are deplorable, I am in complete agreement with the editorial point of view that the majority of the Japanese people desire continued close relations with the United States. I believe that once the internal affairs of Japan have been settled, and when the efforts of the Communists and the other extremists to deceive and delude these people have been exposed, the President of the United States will again be warmly and affectionately greeted by the majority of the Japanese people.

The editorial follows:

REDS' ANTI-IKE CAMPAIGN IN TOKYO WILL BOOMERANG

It seems inevitable that the Communists, who are bent on making trouble for President Eisenhower on his trip to Japan, will be the losers in the long run.

The form they have chosen for their campaign against his visit and the new United States-Japanese Mutual Security Treaty reveals to the world once more that the heart of communism is hooligan violence.

The Communist-inspired outbreaks in Japan recall the heyday of Hitler. The voices of the mob rise in unison; the bodies move in unison; then come the memorized shouts—all carefully staged by Communist leaders.

The size of some of the Tokyo demonstrations is no indication that large sections of Japanese are violently opposed to Mr. Eisenhower's visit. It only means that the Communists have poured plenty of money into Japan to hire demonstrators to put on their show.

It is clear that the demonstration against the President's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, has filled most Japanese with a feeling of revulsion.

Japanese newspapers condemned the riot in these words:

Asahi: "Shameful"; the demonstration "hurt national pride."

Yomiuri: The demonstrations are "disgraceful to a democratic nation."

Mainichi: "The action arouses in us a deep sense of shame. * * * It was an event which went against all ideas of international courtesy."

Japan Times: "No sensible Japanese will approve of the acts of extreme discourtesy shown him. * * * The vast majority of the

Japanese people are friendly to the United States."

Tokyo Shimbun: "How shameful to realize that such a disgraceful incident occurred in Japan."

It is reasonable to assume that the Japanese people will try to atone for these outbreaks when the President arrives.

The Communist press around the world again tips the Red hand by jumping into the controversy. Radio Peiping said the mob that greeted Hagerty was ony a sample of what Mr. Eisenhower can expect. Moscow's party organ, Pravda, took the same theme and said the protest against Mr. Eisenhower will be "even more massive and formidable." Red Germany's organ, Neues Deutschland, with the trademarked Communist perversion of the truth, termed the Hagerty incident "a powerful Japanese warning for the U.S. President."

No, the Communists won't give up their campaign, and fears have been expressed for the President's safety. The Japanese Government has volunteered assurances that he will receive ample protection.

Furthermore, there are indications that some Japanese elements that have gone along with the Communist demonstrations, will not go so far as to carry them over into the President's visit. A leader of the left-wing labor organization said his group does not plan to demonstrate against Mr. Eisenhower.

And the leaders of the Japanese Socialist Party now fear that the excesses have hurt their cause. As a result, the party chairman has issued a statement urging his adherents to express their opposition to the President in an orderly way.

The head of the committee to welcome the President has said a million Japanese will turn out to cheer Mr. Eisenhower, drowning out the voices of the minority of extremists along the route.

As for the United States-Japanese Treaty which the Communists are so desperately trying to upset, it was an issue in the Japanese election last year. It was negotiated by the Government which the voters put into office. Thus, it has the support of the majority of Japanese.

President Eisenhower has become known the world over as a man sincerely dedicated to the quest for peace. The people of the Far East will see him as such on his current tour. Communist hooliganism will boomerang.

The President is now in the Philippines. The manner in which the Filipinos, by their wonderful welcome, let the Communist world know where they stand, is heartening indeed.

1958 Report on Social Security Amendments Prove Early Assumptions Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in previous insertions in connection with our review of the progress of social security legislation, I have included excerpts from minority views to committee reports, warning that the actuarial soundness of the program was open to serious question. Contained in the committee report, generally, were assurances that assumptions based on future earnings and benefits proved the program sound. However, when we reach the 1958 report, we suddenly find that the assumptions did not prove accurate and the committee had to come up with a recommendation for an increase in the wage base to be taxed in order to reduce the actuarial deficit. To complete the record on a study of the concern of the committe over the soundness of the program, I would like to include the following brief excepts from the committee report on Social Security Amendments for 1958:

The old-age and survivors insurance benefit structure and the contribution schedule by which the benefits are financed have not been revised by the Congress since 1954. Since that date there have been significant increases in wages and prices; also, new cost estimates have shown an increase in the actuarial deficit of the program. In the light of these developments, it is imperative that the Congress take prompt action to assure that the program be kept both effective and actuarially sound.

The latest long-range cost estimates prepared by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program (as distinct from the disability part) is further out of actuarial balance than your committee considers it prudent for the program to be. When the last major changes were made in 1956 the estimates prepared at that time showed an expected long-range actuarial deficit for old-age and survivors insurance of two-tenths of 1 percent of payroll on an intermediate cost basis. More recent estimates show that the old-age and survivors insurance part of the program is now expected to be out of balance by fifty-seven one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. Your committee believes that a deficit of the size indicated by present cost estimates should not be permitted to continue.

Hollidaysburg, Pa., Elicits Nationwide Attention Through the Success of Project 60 Which Modernized the Downtown Business Section, Thus Recapturing the Historic Charm of the County Seat of Blair County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the completion of Project 60 by the businessmen of Hollidaysburg, Pa., in my congressional district, was the source of a community celebration that included a week of festivities beginning June 13, with outstanding leaders in Pennsylvania being scheduled for programs on June 15, 16, and 17. During the week, Gov. David M. Lawrence visited Hollidaysburg and was escorted on a tour of the borough after which he delivered an address warmly commending those responsible for the success of the community effort to beautify the business district of the county seat of Blair County, Pa.

Mr. Frank M. "Bud" Palmer, general manager of WFBG–AM–TV, was the creative genius and the sparkplug in the community effort behind Project 60. Bud found that his ideas received the wholehearted endorsement and support of the community's businessmen and the Hollidaysburg Chamber of Commerce whose president, William Hubler, mustered the support of his group to the extent that more than 75 percent of the businessmen and property owners in the downtown area embarked on a campaign of facelifting for their respective properties. The result was a great success and reflected credit on the sponsors and businessmen who devoted their time and efforts to attaining the common goal.

Special credit is due the Peoples Natural Gas Co., which underwrote the expense of obtaining services of Prof. Milton Osborne, the head of the Pennsylvania State University's School of Architecture. Professor Osborne was commissioned to sketch more than 75 storefronts and buildings in a 5-block section of downtown Hollidaysburg. In commenting on Project 60, Professor Osborne said—

No small Pennsylvania community has attempted downtown revitalization on such a wide scope and with such unified effort.

As an example of the keen interest in the project, representatives of the fifth generation of the descendants of Adam Holliday, founder of Hollidaysburg, donated $400 to the project although they own no property in downtown Hollidaysburg. State Assemblyman Joseph R. Holliday, of Blair County, made the donation on behalf of himself, the last male descendant of the founder, his wife, daughter, and a sister and niece living in Indianapolis, Ind.

Because of weather conditions and the legislative situation on the floor of the House Friday afternoon, June 17, I was unable to leave Washington in time to appear on the Project 60 program that evening when I was scheduled to deliver the principal address. Since I had prepared the following remarks for the occasion, I wish to incorporate them at this time in my tribute to all those who played a part in making Project 60 such an outstanding success:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE COMPLETION OF PROJECT 60, HOLLIDAYSBURG, PA., JUNE 17, 1960

It is an honor to be here tonight with all of you distinguished guests and citizens on this happy occasion to celebrate the completion of project 60 here in Hollidaysburg, the county seat of Blair County.

We have all heard of the marvelous job of revitalizing done on the Golden Triangle in Pittsburgh and similar projects undertaken in Philadelphia and Harrisburg.

These projects have cost millions of dollars in Federal and State moneys.

Project 60, a program of beautifying the main business district of Hollidaysburg, has of course involved a far more modest outlay of funds.

But I am sure that no Pennsylvania community of this size has undertaken a bootstrap operation like project 60—planned and executed on an entirely local level.

I would like to take a few moments to commend the leading figures in this wonderful community effort.

The originator of project 60 and the driving force behind it is Frank B. Palmer, general manager of WFBG–AM–TV.

Mr. Frank Palmer had the idea of beautifying Hollidaysburg in his mind for a long time.

As he himself has said, tearing every structure down and starting over was impossible.

Funds for a project on such a large scale were not available.

However, renovation of existing buildings did seem to him a good possibility.

Bud—as all of his friends know him—next talked with Prof. Milton Osborne, head of the School of Architecture at the Pennsylvania State University.

From an 8-inch by 10-inch photograph, Professor Osborne drew sample sketches of a plan for refurbishing the business district. The rest is history.

Bud then visited the Hollidaysburg Chamber of Commerce. They gave him complete support. Bill Hubler, president of the chamber, and the entire membership became enthused.

Bill Hubler envisioner Hollidaysburg as "one of the most unique and charming shopping centers in the East."

The Peoples Natural Gas Co., under its new program of community development, underwrote Professor Osborne's sketches for renovation of the buildings. In all, sketches were drawn for more than 75 stores and buildings in a 5-block area, and project 60 was underway.

Community response was extraordinary. The county commissioners, whose headquarters are here at Hollidaysburg, have restored some of their buildings along the lines suggested by Professor Osborne.

The borough council has cooperated generously in the project.

The fifth generation descendants of Adam Holliday, founder of Hollidaysburg, donated $400 to the project. Joseph R. Holliday, last male descendant of Adam Holliday, made the contribution for himself, his wife, daughter, a sister, and a niece.

Hollidaysburg's garden club agreed to maintain flower boxes, shrubs, and trees placed in front of many stores.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have been paying tribute to many individuals and organizations who have been moving spirits behind this program to beautify the business district of Hollidaysburg.

We must never forget, however, the many merchants and property owners who have participated in this renewal project by giving of their time, effort, and funds.

To all of these individuals, organizations, and the entire community of Hollidaysburg, my heartiest congratulations.

As I view this charming, quaint shopping center, a symbol of what a body of civic-minded citizens can accomplish on its own, I am certain that Hollidaysburg has fulfilled the destiny which its founder, Adam Holliday, foresaw in 1790—170 years ago.

Today this borough is peaceful, happy, untouched by the scars of yesterday's strife.

In those early years, settlement of this area, then the frontier of our new Nation, was beset by battle after battle with the Indians.

Many a pioneer perished in frightful massacres.

Only through extraordinary sacrifices and superhuman courage could the settlers, banding together, pursue their historic destiny.

Today, at this time of crisis in our national and world affairs, it is imperative that once again Americans band together toward a common goal—the goal of survival of our Nation.

True, we are not assailed by tribes of tomahawk-wielding Indians. Far worse, we are confronted with a totalitarian force which seems bent upon imperiling the peace and safety of the entire world—aggressive and godless communism.

Those qualities which our forebears exhibited during those dangerous years of settlement of western Pennsylvania—the same qualities manifested in perhaps a different way during this year of project 60—represent the moral fiber of which freedom fighters are made.

Following the recent collapse of the Paris summit conference, we may all be called upon to make further sacrifices in the cause of greater preparedness.

As President Eisenhower said in his speech of May 26, "we must keep up our strength and hold it steady for the long pull."

And speaking of America's policy of strengthening freedom President Eisenhower further stated, "We must do far more than concern ourselves with military defense against—and our relations with—the Communist bloc."

"Beyond this," he finally said, "we must advance constructive programs throughout the world for the betterment of peoples in the newly developed nations."

Therefore, the community spirit which made project 60 the tremendous success we see before us here in Hollidaysburg must be infused throughout the entire Nation.

And that sense of destiny, which earlier sustained our Pennsylvania pioneer forebears, must guide our entire Nation in its never-ceasing efforts to keep the free world truly free.

As I close, Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate again each and every one of you who participated so magnificently in project 60.

This undertaking of the citizens of Hollidaysburg is truly a thrilling example to the rest of Pennsylvania, and to the entire United States, of the achievements of concerted action at the community level.

In thanking you for inviting me to participate in this evening's program, let me urge you to keep up the good work because your efforts here are not only helping to build a better community, but also a better Nation.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Address Delivered by Senator Bridges at FBI Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, senior Senator from the State of New Hampshire, delivered at the commencement exercises of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, held in the city of Washington, D.C., on June 8, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, AT THE FBI COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 8, 1960

Mr. Hoover, Mr. Justice Clark, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Morton, Mr. Bartley, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class and your friends and associates, it was just 14 years ago when I had the privilege of giving a commencement address here once before. It's good to be back. This year marks the 25th anniversary of this Academy, one of the very unique institutions in this Nation. Director J. Edgar Hoover is universally recognized today as one of our greatest living Americans—a man whose entire life has been devoted to the single ideal of service to his country without thought of self-interest or politics. His numerous contributions to more effective law enforcement are well known to all of you, but I regard the creation of this Academy, 25 years ago, almost as a stroke of genius and great credit must go to all his associates in the FBI organization and in the hard-working staff that conducts this Academy, who have prepared this course and who have made this Academy world renowned.

I am particularly proud of my own State of New Hampshire which now has 25 graduates from this academy and of Chief of Police Richard Flynn of Dover, N.H., who is a member of this graduating class.

Hundreds of thousands of young men and women are graduating at this time of year from colleges and universities. The great service academies at Annapolis, Colorado Springs, and West Point this month will graduate our future naval and military leaders in colorful and impressive ceremonies. The leaders of this country's continuous war against a crime graduate from the FBI Academy twice a year. Actually, of course, this is really a sort of postgraduate course for all of you in forms of police administration and law enforcement as you are already qualified and trained professionals or you wouldn't be enrolled here. According to Director Hoover, our annual tribute to crime has now reached the incredible total of $22 billion per year. In this sense, crime does pay as it snatches $9 from our pockets for every dollar we donate to churches and religious work. In 1958 our population had increased a trifle less than 2 percent over 1957—but crime in this Nation jumped 9 percent.

According to the FBI figures, we now have a murder, forcible rape, or assault to kill committed in the United States every 4 minutes. Last year, some 271,000 automobiles were stolen and, as you have to deal with the problem of mounting crime, I am sure you are as deeply disturbed with the problem as I am.

We used to believe, you know, that crime was largely the product of poverty, of ignorance, of lack of schooling, of bad companions, and "bad home influence." Now some of our most shocking and senseless crimes are committee by youngsters from fairly good homes, some the very best homes, and the products of the best and most expensive educational system in the world. Some 800,000 youngsters under 18 years of age were arrested in 1958 for crimes other than traffic violations.

Obviously, 800,000 juveniles involved in crimes in one year could not all have come from "broken homes" or "underprivileged families." Most professional men in police work, I think, recognize that that source, at least, is not wholly the cause.

Testifying last February before a congressional subcommittee, Mr. Hoover stated that lewd films, indecent magazines, sensational yellow journalism, and lurid crime-inciting TV shows were in part responsible. Particularly those books, magazines, TV shows, films, and other media which glamorized and glorified criminals rather than the old-fashioned virtues which most of us knew in growing up in this country.

Adolescents naturally like to think they are grown up. So, it is not hard to understand why some of them should ape the manners and morals of what they conceive to be the sophisticated and the "smart" people. They little realize that these ultrasophisticates actually represent the wormy and rotten fruit on the tree of culture.

Just as sex deviates often fancy themselves a third and superior sex, so the intellectual decadent feels quite sure that he represents a new and sparkling elite. I draw a sharp line, of course, between the sex degenerate, who is a psychopathic problem, and the intellectual degenerate, who is harder to detect and expose. This whole problem, menacing our culture and our way of life, has been inadequately studied and reported.

Instead, we have seen that whole new development in this country of the so-called social scientists who tend to blame everything on society or the system instead of the individual responsible for the criminal or antisocial activity. Indeed, there is even a small segment of this new school of behavioral science, perhaps we should call them, prepared to argue there is no such thing as the criminal type. There are only misunderstood problem people.

Today, of course, everything is a problem—even such simple things as lawbreaking or gross breaches of the accepted moral codes. And needless to say, problems can only be studied and treated by specialists and experts. To these problem experts there are no criminals or bad actors—just maladjusted people. Their maladjustment, they say, is never the responsibility of the individual concerned or those who failed to bring him up properly—it is all the fault of organized society. It is as simple as that.

We often tend to go from one extreme to the other in our attempts to solve all the problems of life. Up to 60 or 70 years ago it was believed that severe punishment was the only answer to crime. Until recent times savage prison terms and often brutal treatment in many countries of the world were the answer to the punishment of crime. Today, the concept of crime has had a change. It is probably well known to most of you, but I want to observe that many of us feel that in dealing with crime the pendulum has swung too far the other way.

The Chessman case is probably a good example of the other extreme in giving a condemned, hardened criminal every advantage to be squeezed out of the law.

I am sure you are all familiar with the Mallory case. This was an extraordinary example of stretching the law to the breaking point through the use of a needle's eye technicality. The U.S. Supreme Court ordered the conviction of Mallory thrown out—even though he had admitted his guilt—on the technicality that he had been held for questioning a few hours longer than was considered proper before arraignment. Here we have a case where the Court was more concerned with correcting what it believed to be a minor abuse of police power than it was in seeing that justice was done in a major crime. So Mallory was freed and went on to Philadelphia where you know by the papers he recently allegedly committed the same crime.

Now in 1958 all forms of murder in the United States took 8,182 lives. There were 75,347 armed robberies and 679,000 burglaries. These are disturbing figures. But they are small indeed in comparison with the toll taken by the worldwide criminal conspiracy known as communism.

No accurate figure exists for the total number of human lives taken by Communists all over the world since the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia in 1917. But it is generally estimated, and in my judgment the estimates are correct, as between 30 and 40 million human lives. Five million people perished alone in 1931 and 1932 as a result of Stalin's "liquidation" made possible by a manmade famine.

The horrible part of these Communist mass murders, dwarfing any others in history, is that they were ordered and carried out with complete detachment and in a spirit of absolute righteousness. These Communist massacres were not based on anger, hatred, or even blood lust—the most common reason for most murders. Communists murder entire classes of people and entire social groups solely on the grounds of what they believe to be "socialist hygiene." Their reasons are as impersonal as that of a cattleman or a farmer who reluctantly kills off some diseased cattle lest they infect and destroy the whole valuable herd.

As for the not-so-gentle art of robbery, here too the Communists make ordinary criminals appear softhearted. They never settle for just part of their belongings—they want to take everything as Mikoyan boasted to Castro recently in Cuba. Only in Communist terminology they use the word "expropriate"—it's nicer sounding than stealing or robbery because it comes from Latin.

I did not come here today to deliver another speech against communism. We've been denouncing communism and Communists in this country now over 40 years, and

I'm sorry to say, in many instances, we still have an apathetic public. I mention communism today for two reasons. One, because communism and internal subversion will continue to be a big problem for law enforcement officials for some time to come in the future. This means your profession will have to devote considerable time and study to the ramifications of communism.

Let me remind you that some of the most authoritative information available on communism will be found in the congressional committee reports and hearings which you can obtain by writing your Senator or your Congressman or to the committees directly. You can also turn to Mr. Hoover's book, "Masters of Deceit," which should be a handbook for every well-informed police officer. May I also call your attention to a book written by the former chief of police of Salt Lake City who has published one of the best books on the subject entitled "The Naked Communist."

Almost everybody is against communism, but all to few of us fully understand the nature of the beast, and even fewer of us are prepared to do anything practical to expose and retard it from making further inroads in our society. Merely being against leprosy is not going to do much to stop the spread of that dread disease or to prevent others from contracting it. Communism has been aptly described as leprosy of the human soul. Or, if you prefer, the syphilis of the human intellect. It is most positively not the result of poverty and ignorance as so many well-meaning but badly informed people will still try to tell you today.

During 1947 and 1948 when the House Committee on Un-American Activities Committee was holding its sensational hearings exposing Soviet atomic espionage in this country, a long list of witnesses took the fifth amendment, not only on the question of whether they were Communists, but also whether they had ever engaged in espionage. You can look the list over and you will find, with a few exceptions, that most of them were native-born Americans with exceptional scholastic records in some of the best schools and colleges in this country. That's a shocking thing.

One could also very easily draw up a long list of Americans of considerable wealth and fine educations who have been deeply involved in various other aspects of Communist subversive activity in this country.

Secondly, many leaders of the West still make the mistake of assuming that Communists think and act like normal human beings. They are bent on world domination and the creation of a world Soviet state, and anything they do is predicated solely on the single question—Does this advance the world revolution?

That is why I firmly believe that we are permitting ourselves to be boobytrapped over the so-called summit situation—fiasco, some people call it. Khrushchev knew in advance that Western unity could not be split at Paris. He knew he would get very little or nothing in the way of concessions. Why, then, go to Paris and waste time negotiating with people he despises anyway and have to come back and report to his people and the satellites over the world that he came back empty-handed?

He also knew that President Eisenhower had less than 8 more months to serve and that any agreements worked out with him might be rejected by his successor or the next administration. That is why he torpedoed the conference and said he would be ready to talk again in 6 to 8 months. The U-2 plane incident was made to order for his scuttling act, but had it not occurred, believe me, he would have forced a showdown over some other issue, and charged the West with bad faith anyway.

The lesson of history has been all too plainly written—you can't do business with Communists. It is high time we stopped kidding ourselves that through endless talks with Communist leaders we may be able to find mutual agreement and accommodation that they will keep. We may be able to find areas of mutual agreement sometimes, but if a maniac in your community threatens to kill you and your family and has demonstrated that he means what he says, having killed several people prior to that, what in the name of commonsense would the object be of negotiating with him? You might be able to negotiate for a little more time. You might be able to negotiate the choice of the cemetery where you are going to be buried, but if he persists in threatening to kill you, the real area of any possible negotiation is practically nil.

You would be better advised to have him locked up and put out of circulation, or, failing that, to defend yourself to the utmost against any surprise or treacherous attack.

We learned to our cost that one could not do business with Hitler and the Nazis. Millions lost their lives, their countries, and their freedom as the result of chasing the will-o'-the-wisp hope that if only we tried hard enough and talked long enough, we might persuade that madman from his openly announced designs. Why anybody in his right mind and knowing the facts of history in this late day still believes and asks others to believe that somehow we can work out things with Khrushchev and the Communists is beyond me.

I understand that this academy has graduated close to 4,000 law enforcement officers in the past 25 years. I congratulate Director Hoover and his able staff on the fine work they have done. This postgraduate academy has been very effective. A Federal police force which some people advocate in this country would be a direct contradiction to the 10th amendment to the Constitution reserving to the States all rights and functions of Government not spelled out in the Constitution. It would also create a most undesirable precedent for further expansion and extension of Federal power into every community and village in this country. The manner and the way in which the FBI has conducted itself during the years of its existence are probably the best argument we have against some of the people in this country who have been trying from time to time to create a national policy system.

After some 300 years of local self-government, I think Americans have more than amply proven they can also police their own communities without Federal intervention, and I would be similarly doubtful about any other device directly trying to set up a Federal clearinghouse for local police information and records. I am not so sure that the Federal Government under the 10th amendment should be asked to act in this capacity for States and communities.

I know you have all profited from this course. I know you will go back to your own communities better equipped to face the mounting problems of crime and subversion. We face dark and uncertain days ahead as long as the men of the Kremlin and Peiping continue their plotting against the free world. This is a long-time proposition I point out to you, and may last during your entire lifetime. You may face this problem of outside and inside threats. You will be in the front lines on the home front, and you will need all the courage, all the intelligence, and all the fortitude you can muster. I am deighted to be with you on the occasion of this graduation, and I extend each and every one of you my best wishes and good luck in your chosen profession.

Water Pollution Control and the National Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by L. E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND THE NATIONAL HEALTH [1]

(L. E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

More than half a century ago, at about the time the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was formed, Theodore Roosevelt wrote: "The Nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired, in value."

It is a real privilege and pleasure for me to speak this afternoon to a group which has been responsible for a large measure of the good behavior our Nation can claim in the past 50 years.

I find it interesting to reflect that in a world of ceaseless change, man's absolute dependence on water stands as an eternal constant. Our modern jet-propelled, nuclear-powered society is as dependent on water as were the civilizations which developed 6,000 years ago in the valleys of the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates. Now, as then, an adequate supply of usable water is both a biological and an economic imperative.

Virtually every nation in every age has had a water problem. The characteristics of the problem change as man's uses of water become progressively more diverse and complex. But the fundamental problem remains the same—getting enough water to the right place at the right time, in usable condition.

My talk this afternoon is concerned chiefly with the qualitative aspects—the usable condition factor. But so interwoven are the many strands of the water problem that it is impossible to separate considerations of quality from considerations of quantity. Problems of water supply are inseparable from problems of waterborne waste disposal. Economics and health are indivisible.

All of you are well acquainted with the overwhelming statistics on water usage, both today and in the foreseeable future. The volume of fresh water used daily in the United States has increased sevenfold since the turn of the century, and almost doubled since 1945. By 1980, according to the most reliable projections available, our fresh water needs will have doubled again, reaching the astronomical figure of 600 billion gallons, or 1.8 million acre-feet, per day. A week's ration of water, at this rate, would submerge Manhattan Island to a depth of 1,000 feet.

Meanwhile, of course, the bountiful natural supply on which we must draw remains constant over the years. It has been calculated recently by water supply experts that not more than 515 billion gallons per day will be developed for use by 1980, making optimum use of impoundments and other quantity management methods. It is on this fresh water supply of 515 billion gallons that

[1] Presented at the 47th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1960.

the continued growth and prosperity of the United States depends.

The arithmetic of the situation is elementary. We can develop 515 billion gallons per day by 1980. We shall need 600 billion. A cynic might observe that we are spending water like money. At any rate, something must be done to deal with this deficit financing of our water budget.

Of the courses open to us, two have intrigued scientists for ages—desalinization of salt water and weather modification. Both are under intensive study. But in all candor, the likelihood of practical application of either method, in terms of large quantities, is slight, for economic reasons. It appears that we would be unwise to stake our future upon either possibility.

Major diversions between watersheds, to redistribute water according to our needs instead of nature's whims, offer vast and tempting possibilities. A network of giant power stations and canals fed by excess floodwaters from such rivers as the Colorado, Missouri, and Columbia, or by the world's mightiest fresh water reservoir, the Great Lakes—this is indeed an engineer's vision of utopia. Parts of the dream have already been realized, and more will become feasible with time. But such diversions carry with them tangled legal, poltical, and constitutional questions which, as you know, can be more difficult to resolve than engineering problems.

It is apparent, then, that regardless of our relative success or failure with other methods, a great share of our water requirements must be met through reclamation and reuse of water on a much larger scale than has been achieved up to the present. Already, on many of our watercourses, we are using the same water many times as it flows from the hills to the sea. In the years ahead we must do much more of the same.

It is at this point, of course, that the threads of quantity and quality become inseparably interwoven. And it is at this point that considerations of the national health enter the economic equations.

The three controlling trends of contemporary American life are the upsurge of population, the growth of the metropolis, and the expansion and diversification of industry. We are accustomed to dealing with these as the basis for our quantitative predictions. Let us consider them in the context of water quality.

Since I began talking, a few minutes ago, the population of the United States has increased by 30—not just 30 births, but 30 more births than deaths. At the current rate, we shall have added more than 2½ million people by the time your Congress convenes next spring—considerably more than the entire population of the Washington metropolitan area.

Simultaneously, an ever-higher proportion of us are living in cities. We are already in the age of the metropolis. We are fast approaching the age of megalopolis—super cities stretching along the Atlantic seaboard from Boston to Washington; along the Pacific Coast from San Diego to Seattle; along the Ohio River Valley and the southern shores of the Great Lakes. Note again, in passing, that civilization follows the watercourses. And then consider with me the impact on water quality, and the implications for human health, of these facts of life.

Increased population and urbanization pose a double-barreled problem. The more people, the greater the quantity of high quality water which must be delivered. At the same time, the quantity of domestic wastes which must be disposed of increases proportionately. In most parts of the country, the same waterways must serve both as sources of supply and as channels of waste disposal.

Thus, water supply intakes and sewage disposal outfalls are wedged closer and closer together. Heavier demands are placed upon both sewage treatment and water purification. And the margin of safety against communicable diseases becomes thinner.

Thus our traditional health problem—protection against waterborne disease—is complicated by population growth and urbanization. In the past several decades, the success of our water and sewage treatment methods has been outstanding. It is clear, however, that our precautions must be redoubled if we are to cope successfully with the aggravated threat of the future. One city's water supply cannot be drawn chiefly from another city's wastes with impunity, unless the highest order of vigilance is practiced.

Moreover, there are still a number of unanswered questions in regard to micro-organisms in water. We know how to deal with bacteria, but we know very little about waterborne viruses. We know they are present, and that they may well pass the barriers of present water-treatment methods, but much remains to be learned about their actual and potential significance in the spread of disease.

Thus far we have dealt with two of the three conditioners of our time—population growth and urbanization. When we add the third ingredient—the new industrial revolution of the mid-20th century—we add a whole new dimension to the problems confronting the health professions.

The growth of American industry in the past two decades is almost beyond comprehension. Industries today are dealing with processes and products which were unheard of prior to World War II. Synthetics, plastics, detergents, pesticides, industrial solvents, high energy fuels—the list of new chemicals in the environment can be extended indefinitely without even mentioning the soaring world of nuclear technology.

Two or three examples will suffice to demonstrate the scale of the problem. Since 1940, production of plastics has increased from 150 million to 5 billion pounds; synthetic detergents from 15 million to 3.8 billion pounds; insecticides and other agricultural chemicals from 8 million to 540 million. It hase been estimated that 7,000 totally new chemicals are put to use every year.

The detergent suds and foam which are often visible around sewage treatment plant outfalls are symptomatic of the fact that many of these new chemicals pass unchanged through our treatment process. Some of them actually impede effective treatment. What they do to human beings, cumulatively over a period of many years, is still in the realm of conjecture.

In essence, we are in process of creating a new physical and chemical environment. The water we drink, and the air we breathe, are not what they were 20 years ago. And the challenge to health posed by this new manmade environment differs strikingly from our traditional public health concerns, in several significant ways.

The first of these is the nature of the biological assaults. The health professions and the public are accustomed to the microbial disease pattern. The disease strikes; a period of illness is generally followed by recovery and often by residual immunity. The timespan is relatively short between exposure to the disease and onset of symptoms. The cause and effect are relatively easy to detect.

By contrast, the biological effects of chemicals in our environment, or of low-level radiations, may build up over long periods of time. Relating effect to cause is extremely difficult. A single disease may result from a number of causes. The hazard to the individual is related to the cumulative total of radiations or toxic chamicals received throughout his lifespan, continuously or intermittently, whether their source be water, air, food, or any of several others.

Another way in which the new environmental challenges differ from the more traditional health problems has to do with the complexity of the political, social, and administrative structure within which solutions must be found and applied. Traditionally, the responsibility for environmental health protection has rested with the level of government closest to the people. The local community, aided as necessary by the State, has been the first line of defense.

But the growth of the metropolis has greatly complicated the structure of local government and its relation to the State. Many of our metropolitan areas already sprawl across State boundaries. Each of them is in itself a constellation of governmental and quasi-governmental agencies. What is essentially a common water supply, a common air supply, or a common transportation system is dealt with fragmentarily by literally scores of officials and groups. Successful solutions of these problems must be worked out within these new administrative and political patterns.

Finally, and of greatest significance, the nature of our goals is necessarily different. When we are dealing primarily with microbiological enemies of man, we can in a sense go all-out. We can aim for total eradication. If we can eliminate malaria or smallpox from the face of the earth, everyone gains and no one loses.

But when we are dealing with the possible harmful effects of the byproducts of industry or the wastes of nuclear technology, we cannot seek total victory. We must accept a certain amount of deterioration of our environment if we want an urban, industrial society. On the other hand, it would be the height of folly to develop a shining metropolitan, industrialized, nuclear-powered world for a human race whose health had been seriously impaired in the process.

In sum, the Nation must seek a balance which permits maximum development of our economy at minimum hazard to health. The basic decisions in the water resource field, as in many others, are economic and social. But they must be made in terms of biological reality. There is a limit to what we can accept as progress—a limit imposed by the conditions necessary to man's health and well-being.

Looking to the future, it is plain that we need much more information which can only be developed through research. We need to search for improved, perhaps even radically different, methods of treating sewage and industrial wastes. And in the medical field, we need to accumulate evidence as fast as we can on the long-term biological effects of the new pollutants, singly and in combination.

But these facts, especially those related to health effects over periods of years or even generations, will inevitably be slow in coming. Meanwhile, there is the urgent need to apply what we already know. We cannot afford to wait for final proof before taking action.

In the past few years there has been an encouraging rise in the annual rate of construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities—from an average annual expenditure of $222 million during the period 1952–56 to an average annual expenditure of $360 million in 1958 and 1959. But the cold statistics of population expansion tell us that a still greater annual expenditure—in the range of $575 to $600 million—will be necessary to keep pace with the needs.

Similarly, there have been encouraging indications that a number of industries are becoming progressively more willing to accept their share of the responsibility for pollution abatement. Here, as elsewhere, a tremendous amount remains to be done.

As an indication of the importance we in the Public Health Service attach to these problems, we are presently undertaking a major reorganization of the Service, a prin-

cipal feature of which will be to give added prominence and stature to our programs in water, air, radiological health, and other environmental fields. Meanwhile, plans are going forward for a National Conference on Water Pollution, requested by the President, to be held in December of this year.

Viewing the vast and complex panorama of the water resource problem, from the standpoint of public health, it seems to me that water pollution control is in a peculiarly strategic position. Pollution control stands at the point of confluence between the rivers of economics and health.

Water pollution control, by reclaiming water for reuse, serves the ever-growing quantitative needs of the economy. Simultaneously, pollution control strengthens the barriers against disease and promotes the conditions favorable to health.

Thus, pollution control is doubly imperative. And our efforts to abate pollution should benefit from this double stimulus. We in the public health profession welcome full partnership with all of you who are concerned with water's many services to man. In essence, our joint efforts serve the same goals, which are the goals of the Nation.

U–2: Making the Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the June 13, 1960, issue of Newsweek, as written by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, entitled, "U–2: Making the Points." In this article Mr. Lindley concludes with the statement:

The Presidents' decision to proclaim his responsibility for the U–2 flights, was, I think, sound and forward looking.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U–2: MAKING THE POINTS
(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee's inquiry into the U–2 episode has been conducted admirably. Not the least of its virtues has been speed. It seems unlikely that this committee will reach unanimous recommendations. But Chairman FULBRIGHT has made it plain that, in his mind, the central issue is the President's assumption of responsibility.

For a chief of state or head of government publicly to assume responsibility for espionage is unprecedented. It naturally disturbs those who attach overriding values to the rituals of diplomacy. Perhaps the traditional convention that governments do not admit engaging in espionage has been useful, on the whole, in the past. But conditions and circumstances change. The straitjacket of diplomatic precedent is a poor substitute for commonsense and constructive thinking.

These points, among other, deserve notice:

1. The U–2's (which mapped the U.S.S.R.) and their pilots were not engaged in espionage in the traditional sense. They were not practicing the "black art." They were engaged in what is usually known as reconnaissance or scouting. Pilot Powers was not trained as a CIA agent. His wife and parents had good reason to deny that he was a spy. In the usual sense of the word, he was not. He flew a plane and pushed the buttons that operated its cameras and the other equipment aboard.

2. It is by no means certain that any of the previous U–2 flights were illegal. The altitude above the earth to which a nation's sovereignty extends has never been determined by international agreement. The traditional rule is said to be that a nation's sovereignty extends as high as it can exert effective control. But that rule, the U–2 flights were not illegal so long as the planes flew above the reach of Soviet air defenses. How high these defenses can now reach is uncertain. The President and other American officials have surmised—probably more than surmised—that engine trouble forced Powers below the usual cruising altitudes.

3. The Soviet contention that such flights are provocative appears to be tied to the thesis that they might be carrying bombs. Nobody in his right mind would suppose that the United States would attempt to bomb the U.S.S.R. with one plane. The Soviets themselves had made reconnaissance flights over Pakistan and other nations, above the ceiling of their air defenses. Incidentally, an Indian reconnaissance plane approaching Rawalpindi, Pakistan's command headquarters, was shot down last year. The Indian attitude was that shooting down their plane was unfriendly.

4. The out which Khrushchev offered President Eisenhower was also a trap. Had the President accepted it, he could hardly have avoided apologizing for the flight and punishing those responsible for it, besides promising there would be no more such flights. He would also have fueled the false Soviet propaganda thesis that American military and other subordinates are irresponsible and not under the firm control of the President.

5. When it became certain that the Soviets had the pilot and the plane, further attempts to pretend that this was not an authorized reconnaissance flight became palpably absurd. The best way to restore confidence in the word of the American Government was to tell the truth.

6. Reconnaissance satellites, probably within 2 or 3 years, will make a mockery of the present Soviet thesis.

7. The right course for the United States and all other nations which do not plan aggression, is to keep on pressing for international reconnaissance. That would provide a large measure of protection against surprise attack, hence against nuclear war. The U–2 flights were an interim substitute, compelled by the Soviet refusal to cooperate in mutual or UN inspection. The President's decision to accept responsibility underlines this fact and points the way toward the only constructive solution for mankind.

Deceit and hypocrisy are poor instruments of sound international relations. We may well leave them to the Communists, who, since Lenin, have glorified them. A pretense so diaphanous that it conceals nothing is worse than worthless. The President's decision to proclaim his responsibility for the U–2 flights was, I think, sound and forward-looking.

Good Reasons for Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call of June 16, 1960:

GOOD REASONS FOR DOUBT

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, whose personal Spartan habits were noted by those who have been exposing alleged abuses of congressional expense accounts, has shed some new light on the charges that have been hurled in copyrighted newspaper and magazine stories.

He explained that it was the invariable policy of his own Committee on Un-American Activities, that none of its members or staff could charge personal expenses to a Government account. Other committee chairmen and members have said as much.

The eastern Pennsylvania Congressman, however, went quite a bit further in casting some reasonable doubts on the validity of the stories, if not on some of the ethics that most newspapermen like to regard as part of their craft.

He made it clear, for example, that those who charged his committee with conducting a traveling road show knew that hearings were conducted in various parts of the country for a specific purpose. That purpose was to definitely uncover pipelines Communists have been using to mail their propaganda to various ethnical groups in different sections of the country, to show that there is a pattern.

He noted, too, that the authors of the series knew that the books they charged the committee and its staff with removing from the Library of Congress and never returning, were taken out by the old Dies committee, the predecessor of Representative WALTER'S investigative group.

He wrote into the record other things the authors missed: that when members of the committee and its staff used limousines instead of taxicabs for transportation to hearings in New York and San Francisco, they actually were saving money; that occasional presumably high charges for hotel expenses included rooms used for conferences rather than simply private accommodations.

In respect to his own committee, at least, Mr. WALTER makes quite a sound case for branding the articles as "scurrilous" and "vile." More than that, the answers he has given, his own exposé of some of the quite obvious omissions in the series, surrounds other charges with some reasonable doubt.

Resolution Adopted by the Racine, Wis., Branch of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the deceitful tactics of the Communists, following World War II, have resulted in denying freedom not only to the people within the Soviet Union, but also in the orbital countries.

Despite two decades of being under the heel of communism however, these patriotic peoples have never lost their zeal for, and dedication to the ideals of freedom. Here in this country, the Americans of Baltic descent, also, continue to support, and urge expansion of efforts that will ultimately lead to the freedom of such lands as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as well as others under Communist domination.

Today, I was privileged to receive from Mr. Peter Petrusaity, secretary of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., of Racine, Wis., a resolution adopted at a recent meeting of the Americans of Baltic descent.

Reflecting the way in which this spirit of freedom has been kept alive in these great peoples, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas 20 years ago Soviet Russia forced upon helpless Lithuania and her sister nations Latvia and Estonia a mutual assistance pact whereby it illegally seized these nations; and

Whereas despite the deportation of hundreds of thousands and the absence of freedom for two decades the people are still hopeful of someday being allowed to rejoin their position among the free world; and

Whereas despite recent cultural exchanges with Russia the exhibition by Soviet Premier Khrushchev during and after the summit talks displayed there has been no change in the U.S.S.R.'s bold game of political warfare; and

Whereas the view expressed by President Eisenhower in Manila that those under Communist oppression will "not eternally remain chained" is indeed encouraging; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States look to the enslavement of the Baltic nations to see the true nature of communism's aims; and be it further

Resolved, That the ideological differences between the free world and Kremlin totalitarianism be clearly understood by the multitude of the American people by keeping them better informed of the events of prime importance to all of the world's population; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States step up its role as a world leader in the fight for freedom and justice for all nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the State Department create a study group to plan a course of action to be followed in the event of a revolution in the Baltic States so that immediate assistance can be rendered to assure permanent restoration of freedom in light of Hungary's attempt in 1956; and be it finally

Resolved, That we express our deep gratitude to the Government of the United States for nonacknowledgement of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

MARTIN KASPARAITIS,
Chairman, Lithuanian American Council.

VALENTINS JAUNKALNIETIS,
Representative, Americans of Latvian Descent.

OLGA MALRE,
Representative, Americans of Estonian Descent.

RACINE, WIS., *June 19, 1960.*

North Dakota Girl Discusses American Education in Valedictory Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to read a copy of the address given by Barbara Unzelman, the 1960 valedictorian of the Linton (N. Dak.) High School at her graduation exercises.

The remarks of this young lady indicate to me an unusual ability to analyze our present educational system and some of the serious problems facing this county. Since I have a deep concern over our responsibility of thoroughly educating our young people in a proper appreciation of what it means to live in America, I commend this fine young lady's remarks to my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

AN AMERICAN EDUCATION
(By Barbara Unzelman)

Our graduation this evening represents the end of a very formative period in our lives. We have received the best that our school can give to us. Now we must decide how we will continue our educations. Although we are young, we realize that life is a precious gift, and that there is no substitute for living it. Learning is in parallel with life itself. We cannot live without collecting facts day by day.

We have received a traditional education, one which educates the mind, builds character, increases self-reliance, and develops a competitive spirit within the student. We have been taught to think; to deduce new facts from previously known facts.

Ours has been a traditional education; one whose goal was to teach us through the mistakes of our forefathers so that we would not have to make the same mistakes. Our heritage has been a vital part of our education, but today, a form of education exists which shuns the glorious past of our Nation. This type of education is called progressive education. Its name is deceiving, for progressive education is anything but progressive. Although John Dewey introduced progressive education into America at the turn of the century, many of its ideas have come from men like Thomas Huxley, Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer, and Karl Marx.

Progressive education educates the group, not the individual child. It has been accused of causing the increase in the juvenile delinquency rate in America. Its advocates teach that God does not exist, that it is a waste of time to look to religion for standards of conduct, ethics, and truth. Teenagers who have been brought up under the yoke of progressive education are taught that religion is nonexistent. They are restless and confused. They are uncertain about ideals and standards. According to Professor Sorokin of Harvard University, immorality may destroy this country far quicker than communism.

The originators of progressive education are seeking a socialistic revolution in America. They employ the same methods that the Communists are using in the Soviet Union. They are not concerned with changing the ideals of the older generation, but they concentrate on indoctrinating the children. In a few years these children will be the men and women of America.

An example of this was found in the Teachers' Guide, a magazine used by 5 million children. This question was raised: "Is the United States a land of opportunity for all people?" This answer was printed below: "The United States is not a land of opportunity for all our people, for one-fifth of the people do not earn any money at all * * * The majority do not have any real security."

Sometimes the so-called progressive education tends to border on the ridiculous. In the catalog of Michigan State University, courses are listed for credit in "Beginning Bowling, Canoeing (care and use of, paddling strokes, packing, etc.) and Square Dance and Square Dance Calling."

As we leave our elementary and secondary educations behind, we enter colleges and universities and become a part of the working force our Nation, we must be aware of the value of the right kind of education. It is our duty to fight to keep the educational standards of America where they should be. We must realize that ignorance is not bliss, it is a disgrace.

Americas Respond to Chile's Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a world in which the United States is attempting successfully to carry out its role of leadership—thrust upon it by time and events—we often hear more about the things we don't do—or differences of opinion on what we do—than about our real accomplishments.

Recently the country of Chile, in South America, suffered from one of the most devastating catastrophes as a result of earthquakes in the recorded history of mankind.

In the face of such broad-scope disaster, the United States, as in similar past emergencies, came to the rescue.

In a world in which free and Communist systems are contesting each other, the United States—while Khrushchev was rattling his rockets—has been winging fleets of mercy planes to Chile to help meet the needs of the victims of the quake.

This effort reflects our fundamental concern for humanity—not only among our people but in our national policy.

In addition to the airlift itself, the American people deserve real commendation for such voluntary efforts to help meet emergency needs of a people faced by disaster from natural or other causes.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an article by Claude E. Erbsen entitled "Americas Respond to Chile's Necessity." The article reviews not only the efforts of the United States but of our sister American states to help the Chileans. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAS RESPOND TO CHILE'S NECESSITY
(By Claude E. Erbsen)

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA.—Few events have provided as much of a stimulus to inter-American cooperation as the recent tragic earthquakes in Chile.

The earth still rumbled last month when planes began to take off from airfields throughout Latin America bearing the first shipments of emergency supplies for the victims of the quake. As the magnitude of the disaster became known, a full-size international mercy fleet took to the air, establishing a regular emergency airlift to Chile.

From Argentina came 22 aircraft and 2 Cabinet ministers charged with ascertaining Chile's immediate needs and requirements. Other aircraft came from Peru, Ecuador, Brazil, and Uruguay, and from as far away as Colombia, Venezuela, and the United States.

REACTION IMMEDIATE

Colombia dispatched an Air Force DC-4 within hours after the first tremors, and Venezuela followed suit almost immediately with a civilian Super Constellation.

The U.S. Air Force sent planes from Panama and U.S. Caribbean Command bases on equally short notice, augmenting its contribution daily, until more than 70 giant Globemaster planes were involved in the airlift.

The hemisphere's response to the Chilean tragedy has been immediate and far reaching. Special relief funds have been started throughout the hemisphere, and contributions are pouring in rapidly from all sectors of the population, and particularly from the working classes.

In Colombia collections have been started in most business establishments, and participation has been almost universal. The underpaid Colombian armed forces have voted a day's pay to the Chilean relief fund, and many employee groups throughout the country have followed the example of the military.

CONTRIBUTIONS POUR IN

Cash contributions have been pouring into the offices of the Red Cross, the newspapers, and a special bank account for Chilean relief which has been opened at the Banco de Bogatá.

In addition to their early contributions of emergency supplies, most Latin American countries are now preparing to send Chile additional supplies for relief and reconstruction.

CUBA SENDS CADETS

Every country in South America has made clear its solidarity with Chile by sending rescue aircraft, personnel, or gifts to Santiago.

Peru supplied planes and medicines. Cuba sent aircraft and a detachment of cadets who were in Argentina to celebrate the 150th anniversary of that country's independence when the disaster first struck in Chile.

Even Bolivia and Paraguay, the hemisphere's most backward nations, sent Air Force units to Chile as soon as news of the disaster had reached their capitals.

The Latin American press has hailed the spontaneous response to Chile's plight as "a historic event that may well foreshadow a new era in hemisphere relations."

The contribution of the United States to Chilean airlift has been immense, and it has not gone unnoticed in Latin America.

In Chile itself the people of Santiago have shown their appreciation for U.S. help by greeting U.S. airmen with the same effusiveness they met in Berlin during the blockade or in France and Italy after the liberation.

In the eyes of Latin Americans a new link in the chain of hemispheric cooperation has been forged in the rubble of Puerto Montt and Valdivia.

Hon. Douglas H. Elliott

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, since DOUG ELLIOTT and I were sworn into office together a short time ago, I have felt a special kinship and perhaps a closer relationship with him than most of the other Congressmen. We usually sat together at the sessions, discussed policies and procedures and were mutually concerned with many of the initial problems confronting a new Congressman. With this background of sympathetic understanding, I felt close to DOUG ELLIOTT since we shared the same emotional experiences at the beginning of our congressional careers.

Consequently I was deeply moved and very saddened to learn of Doug's sudden passing. His last 2 days in Congress we spent together discussing our thoughts and reactions to the legislation being proposed. It is difficult for me to believe that my friend will not be sitting next to me to confer further on our mutual opinions and reactions to the bills and amendments as they come to the floor for a vote.

I found DOUG ELLIOTT to be most conscientious in his voting; most studious in his attention to House actions, and I sincerely believe that his potential in becoming an outstanding legislator was unlimited. He had a great future before him in the Halls of Congress and from his initial actions it could be easily determined that he would have done exceptionally well for his constituents, his State, and the people of the United States. He had early gained the confidence and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Doug's wife and family in this hour of shock and bereavement.

Address on June 8, 1960, by Mr. Justice Clark, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States Before the 65th Session of the FBI National Academy, Department Auditorium, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, addressed the graduating class of the FBI National Academy which graduated 59 members.

This year celebrated the silver anniversary of the academy. The 59 members of the 65th session of this school, which includes law enforcement officers from 33 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Dominion of Canada, increases the total number of National Academy graduates to 3,678.

Established in 1935, the National Academy has brought together cooperating law enforcement officers to meet the need of present day law enforcement. Remarkable progress has been made. It is inconceivable that our Nation could now be without the system, and it proves the foresight of the Director of the FBI, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, in inaugurating the academy and the system of cooperation which it engenders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the very fine and able address of the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, be printed in the RECORD:

ADDRESS ON JUNE 8, 1960, BY MR. JUSTICE CLARK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE 65TH SESSION OF THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Director.

Reverend Bartley, Senator Bridges, Mr. Assistant Attorney General, and my fellow Dallasite, Brother King, you know, Mr. Director, this is not only a great pleasure but a distinct privilege to be here today to harken to the beautiful strains of this distinguished Marine Band, to join in this beautiful prayer that the Reverend Bartley gave us, to hear the message of Class President King, to listen to the hard-hitting speech of my distinguished friend of many years, Senator BRIDGES, and to look into the eyes of these graduates of this great FBI National Academy and also to see the sea of people, hundreds of them, gathered here today, many, many standing in the aisles so that they might partake of this ceremony. As for academy graduations, Senator, this too is my second offense.

This morning as I entered the auditorium and met the Director, I felt like an old grad just coming back for a homecoming weekend. You know, I used to meet often with the classes. Sometimes it was in the gym; sometimes it was on the roof during pretty weather; and many times it was with Mr. Meyers, who I am sure has led you in your physical training work on many occasions, a most excellent servant of the people there in the Department of Justice. While I was Attorney General, over 1,000 men graduated from this same FBI National Academy from which you graduate today. For me, I believe, the fondest memory of these ceremonies is the inspiring sight of each of the officers coming up here to this platform, one by one, and receiving his diploma—I understand today from the Assistant Attorney General. Your diplomas are your insignia that you are now members of that distinguished and select company of the FBI National Academy. This is indeed an hour of great distinction for you. That is evidenced the more by the presence of all of these hundreds of people here today to witness your graduation. I am sure, too, that your communities, as they should be, are each proud of your accomplishments. Today you carry home with you a great tradition—the tradition of loyalty, of justice, and of integrity. I know that you will keep that faith.

In fact, Mr. Director, seeing the graduates this morning convinces me, although I have seen many classes, that this is perhaps the most intelligent class that I have had the privilege of meeting with. Now I know you immediately wonder why I say that. Well, I say that because they have elected my fellow Dallasite, Captain King, as their president. What more evidence do you wish? All Texas is proud of you, Captain King, and of the three other Texans who are here in this class. Now, Mr. Director, there are a total of 105 graduates—Senator, I don't want to make you feel bad—all actively engaged in the enforcement of the law in the great State of Texas. Now I ask you, What other State has 105?

This is the silver anniversary of the founding of your Academy. Mnay of us can remember back in July 1935, when the first class assembled here. The Nation at that time was still in the grip of dangerous hoodlum gangs which roamed the country, virtually at will, robbing and kidnaping, and killing. John Dillinger, you may remember, had gone to his death in a blazing gun battle in Chicago just a year before that meeting.

About the time of the graduation of the first FBI National Academy class, FBI agents brought to an end the infamous careers of "Ma" Barker and her son, Fred. Alvin Karpis, the leering criminal and gang leader, was still at large back there in 1935.

Now these were dark, tension-filled days, when FBI agents literally lived in their automobiles with their guns in their hands searching out these hoodlums. They faced danger straight in the eye, unhesitatingly laid their lives right down on the line, and held the banner of law enforcement high at a time when in some areas of Government there was corruption. The rollcall of FBI agents and of the fearless and hardworking local officers back there during those days is indeed a tribute to the valor and the fearless dedication of the profession of law enforcement. Now since those dark days American law enforcement has molded itself—and I hope the Director will not be abashed, as I speak only the truth when I say—it has molded itself in his image and in the image of the FBI. Now I think history can write its own verdict with reference to what accomplishments have been made. Today, thanks to the efficiency, the dedication, and the integrity of police officers everywhere law enforcement, the profession, is a respected one, and it deserves the accolades of all citizens everywhere.

As we view this quarter of a century of progress, we can be proud of its past accomplishments, and we can be optimistic as to those of the future. But some ask why has law enforcement achieved such monumental progress in the short span of 25 years? The answer, I think, lies in the cooperative techniques now used in combating the criminal, the scientific crime detection programs, the fingerprints, the officer training which, Senator, I was happy to hear you put at the top of the list, and the purposeful determination of officers to see to it that law enforcement is done and done well.

We hear today some talk about the establishment of a Nafional Police Agency—a single, all-inclusive law enforcement group, they say, to bring an end to all inefficiency, to all red tape, and to all conflicting jurisdictions. Well, frankly, I heard that same song way back before there was an FBI National Academy. In my humble judgment it is a mistake, and it is also contrary to all of our concepts of the dual federalism that we have created here in the United States. It likewise violates the philosophy upon which our law enforcement system is founded. Let me add, if I might, and I know that I tread on rather, you might say, slippery ground when a justice makes some little remark, particularly of advice or an innocent answer to a question; but I believe that the real answer to the crime problem as it faces us today is not so much the establishment of a National Police Agency or, for that matter, an overall commission, but I believe that it is the intelligent, the energetic, the enthusiastic support that communities and people should give to the present law enforcement agencies that we have here in the United States. Specifically, I point out, by providing the present officers of the law with the tools—the most efficient ones that are available—in order that they may get their job done. Now this includes not only better trained personnel, which I put at the top of the list, but also better equipment, more respect for officers of the law, firmer community support, and, I mention it last—although in the list of necessities it also should be at the top—more pay for law enforcement officers. I hope that no one will forget that last one—Government officials, too, deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

As one who has spent almost a lifetime in law enforcement work, I know that in the final analysis good law enforcement rests on the attitudes, on the opinions, on the mores of each of our communities here in America. In our system of free government, the local citizens themselves determine the quality of their law enforcement. If they want good law enforcement, they can get it. But they must work for it. They must encourage civic interest in it. They must teach respect, as I said, not only for law but for men and women who enforce the law. Every man, I believe, and every woman, yes, and every child in America should be brought to the realization that they cannot enjoy or maintain their rights, their dignity, their freedom, except for the loyal and devoted police officers who protect them in every community of our country. Yes, we have come a long way as I have said, but we have a long way yet to go.

In fact, the little pamphlet, Mr. Director, that you issued only 2 days ago—I think the title of it was "Cooperation—The Backbone of Effective Law Enforcement"—symbolizes, I believe, the challenge that I put to you today. It points out that the FBI has a vast storehouse of information which, at this very minute while we sit here, is being put to work and is actually working throughout the Nation. Take, for example, the 155 million sets of fingerprints that are housed in the FBI's Identification Division. They are truly soldiers of service. They identify the guilty; they protect the innocent; and they render also many humanitarian services. Those black little ridges that you see on small pieces of cardboard, if you go over to the FBI and have the privilege of going through their Fingerprint Division, day after day are unmasking the man who travels under aliases; the criminal who puts on the false fronts; and the swindler, too, who has that phony smile that most of them have. What is encouraging to me is the number of law enforcement agencies—over 13,000 in the United States today—which are utilizing the services of the Fingerprint Division. I think that is evidence of its great contribution to law enforcement. Last year, in fact, almost 17,000 fugitive criminals—45 every day—were identified by fingerprint searches in the FBI, and, since the system began, over 270,000 fugitives from justice have been identified through its facilities.

Another of the FBI's numerous accomplishments, I think, is its scientific work. You, I am sure, were given an opportunity to study and appraise the latest techniques of the FBI's laboratory. I am sure you know much more about it than I do. But, I remember back a quarter of a century ago, perhaps longer, because of my age, than most of you can recollect, that there were some who poked fun at the role of science in crime detection. What, they asked, does a piece of paint or a little hair, or maybe a blob of dirt, or a broken saucer or something like that have to do with a murder case? Well, science taught us differently. We now know that it is a strong right arm of every law enforcement officer. Wherever he goes, he knows that the laboratory at the FBI is working to perform scientific miracles that will make even this smallest little bit of evidence—this hair—tell its true story in the courtroom. During last year it made almost 185,000 scientific examinations, an increase of some 12 percent, and its services—remember this because this is so true of the service of the FBI—are free of charge to law enforcement agencies anywhere in this Nation of ours.

Surely this is the real spirit of cooperative law enforcement when a local sheriff or chief of police or an officer like yourselves needs only invest in the cost of one of Uncle Sam's airmail stamps, or if you don't think it's that important, a 4-center, and you will secure, without any additional cost, the complete scientific advice of this great organization. Your FBI National Academy, also, is a splendid example, as the Senator has pointed out, of the value of knowledge, experience, and esprit de corps—and there is nothing like it anywhere except in the U.S. Marines. It and the FBI are just two peas in a pod when it comes to esprit de corps. Now all of this, my friends, can be transmitted into the flesh and blood of men like you who are giving your lives to the profession of law enforcement.

In your weeks here in Washington, you have accomplished much more than just earn this diploma that the Assistant Attorney General will award you today. You are taking back with you the wisdom gained by an organization—by thousands of its agents—throughout the country working against the criminal. Yes, and against the subversive, too. This storehouse of FBI information, this accumulated experience of law enforcement over years and years is a repository of the highest of ideals and most practical of everyday experiences. We in America, I deem it, are indeed fortunate to have this storehouse working for us on a 24-hour-day basis for the welfare of all of our people.

And now, my fellow officers, because I feel too that I am sort of a member—I hope you don't object—there is just one more thing that I want to mention, and it's this training program that the Senator so eloquently spoke of. I take it from what little experience I've had in law enforcement, although it does cover a lifetime almost, that the most important duty of every officer—every police officer—in the United States is to inform himself of the latest and the most efficient police methods that are available. In this field, as the Senator says, the FBI has erected what, to my mind, is its most imposing and, I know, its most lasting monument. Last year alone it conducted over 2,500 police training schools—all at the request of local officers like yourselves. It sponsored nationwide law-enforcement conferences. Its special agents—and I want to salute them, too, for they are the men who are really out on the frontline—gave thousands of lectures in local communities throughout this country on modern crime detection. The Academy has graduated over 3,800 officers, and after graduation they have gone back home and now enjoy top rank in their profession. One out of every six—just imagine, 1 out of every 6 of the 3,800 who are graduates here—are chiefs of police in their communities. Ninety-four are sheriffs of a county, and almost a fourth of the States have as their top public safety director a graduate of this same Academy from which you become a graduate today. I say that this is a most impressive record.

Now, my friends, Heaven's first law is peace and order. The first one in the administration of justice is a continued observance by police officers of all of those civilized, well-established, and fair rules of conduct that meet our standards of decency.

Upon this first duty every man's liberty not only depends, but the very strength of our country exists and rests. While there is always a time for law, especially now with crime on the rise as it is, still there is never a time in my book which warrants the sacrifice of the inalienable constitutional rights of the individual. We have created courts to protect these rights. The courts, however, you must remember, can proceed only on a case-by-case basis. Because of this, results on a case-by-case basis often appear obscure and are often most disheartening. Courts of course know that. They fully appreciate the difficulties that face you law enforcement officers. But courts, remember, cannot wear blinders. It is the bad case—the Senator mentioned a couple of them, and I agree with the principles stated in those cases—it's the bad case on the facts that makes what we often call the bad law. But, I believe, bad cases teach that law enforcement does not need to cut corners on

the law. The strict observance of the legal rules which the law lays down gets the best results, and that's why the FBI is great today—it has at all times honored and protected the rights of the individual. In carrying out this mandate of the law you too must see to it that every police establishment in the United States does likewise. And the most effective way to insure it is to require your officers to engage in what I call a continuous "in service" training. In that way, you can carry home with you and there transmit the tradition of the FBI that you have learned so much about here in Washington. Through in-service training you can, with the continued cooperation of the FBI, keep your officers advised not only on the requirements of the law, but also the most modern techniques of crime detection.

And so today I salute each and every one of you graduates. And a special one for my old friend and fellow Dallasite, the captain, too. I know that when you return to your respective communities you will take with you the lessons that have been taught you here in this Academy. Through them may you not only increase the efficiency of your organization, but likewise the security of every community in this great country of ours. And so I say: "Good morning, officers, and may God bless you."

Dinosaur National Monument

SPEECH
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

The House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6597), a bill to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], primarily is that the amendment, by striking out certain language, will remove from the bill a perfectly proper and workable provision which merely declares that the Secretary of the Interior must carry out well known constitutional requirements in the acquisition of privately owned lands.

I refer to that portion of article V of the Constitution which provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

The language that would be stricken by the pending amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That in the acquisition by purchase or exchange of any privately owned land within Dinosaur National Monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make equitable and reasonable allowances, as determined by him, for the value of any grazing privileges appurtenant to such privately owned land.

The committee's report—Report No. 1651—describes the meaning of this language as follows:

The second proviso authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in fixing the price to be paid on acquisition by the Government of privately owned lands newly included within the boundaries, to include an allowance for added value arising from Federal land grazing privileges appurtenant thereto. This latter provision, the committee has been advised, is in accord with the standard appraisal practice in public land grazing areas which recognizes that buyers and sellers, in bargaining for the sale of base ranch properties, take due account of the added productivity and value arising from relationship to appurtenant Federal range.

In opposition to this language, in his separate views in the committee's report, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated:

The last proviso of section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in the case of purchase or exchange of privately owned lands within the monument, to make equitable and reasonable allowances for the value of any grazing privileges appurtenant to such privately owned land. This discretion vested in the Secretary, in my opinion, goes too far.

I must differ with my colleague from Pennsylvania on this point. The practice set forth in the language merely conforms to the standard real estate appraisal practice in public land grazing areas. This practice is accepted by the Lands Division of the Department of Justice. It is recognized in decisions of the Federal courts, and I cite as directly in point the case of *United States* v. *Jaramillo* (C.C.A. 10, 1951, 190 F. 2d 300). This case dealt with the valuation of certain condemned privately owned base ranch lands in New Mexico to which were appurtenant certain national forest grazing lands administered by the Forest Service. The court held in part as follows:

In the judicial determination of fair value as just compensation for the land taken, the highest and most profitable use for which it is reasonably adaptable may be considered, "not necessarily as the measure of value, but to the full extent that the prospect of demand for such use affects the market value while the property is privately held." *Olson* v. *United States* (292 U.S. 246, 255, 54 S. Ct. 704, 109, 78 L. Ed. 1236). See also *Boom Co.* v. *Patterson* (8 Otto 403, 98 U.S. 403, 408, 25 L. Ed. 206); *Mitchell* v. *United States* (267 U.S. 341, 344, 45 S. Ct. 293, 69 L. Ed. 644); *McCandless* v. *United States* (298 U.S 342, 56 S. Ct. 764, 80 L. Ed. 1205); *United States ex rel. T.V.A.* v. *Powelson* (319 U.S. 266, 275, 63 S. Ct. 1047, 87 L. Ed. 1390); (2 Lewis Eminent Domain, 3d ed., sec. 707, p. 1233). All rights, easements and privileges appurtenant thereto should be considered in estimating its fair value or compensation to be paid, taking into account also the possibility of their being discontinued without resulting obligation (2 Lewis Eminent Domain, 3d ed., sec. 721, p. 1262). In determining the adaptability of the lands as a ranch, it was therefore proper to take into consideration the availability and accessibility of the permit land as an appurtenant element of value for ranching purposes, provided that consideration is also given to the possibility that the permits could be withdrawn or canceled by the Government at any time without constitutional obligation to pay compensation therefor.

This case has not been overruled or superseded, and is reported by the Lands Division, Department of Justice, as being the rule in effect today.

I trust, even though the pending amendment should be adopted, and the language is not later restored, that the Secretary nevertheless will have authority to observe constitutional principles in the valuation of properties, since in the condemnation of the land, should it be necessary, those principles certainly will be applied by the courts.

Rebuttal of Minority Views on H.R. 12176

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of this Congress legislation vital to the continued supply of food and fiber to the American consuming public will be considered. This legislation has been given careful study by the 33-man House Committee on Agriculture and a report (No. 1642) has been issued covering the history of the legislation and the purpose of the bill, H.R. 12176.

Included in the report was the minority view expressed by three members of the committee.

An analysis of the minority views has been prepared. Because of the element of time, it might not be possible to get this analysis into the hands of all Members, so in order that such information may be made available, I wish to include this rebuttal report as a part of these remarks:

REBUTTAL OF MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 12176

The minority report on H.R. 12176 consists of 6 sections. There is substantial duplication of argument in many of these sections. This rebuttal will therefore, seek to deal with the major subject matter issues raised in the minority report, rather than a section by section analysis.

THE WAGNER-PEYSER ACT

Section VI of the minority report sets forth reasons why the minority favors the Department of Labor's action in issuing regulations governing the employment of farmworkers under the asserted authority of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

The minority report misses the point. Whether the regulations are good, bad, or indifferent is irrelevant and immaterial.

The important issue here is that it is the Congress, and only the Congress which should decide such a policy issue, that the Congress has not at any time enacted any law intended to give the Department of Labor the authority they say they have, and that if the Congress should ever decide to give the Department of Labor such authority, it should be only as the result of proper legislative process involving affirmative and intentional enactment after proper hearings, committee consideration and debate in both Houses.

Each and every Member of Congress should vigorously defend the prerogatives of Congress, whatever his ideas may be as to the type of legislation that ought to be enacted in any field.

Proper legislative process is fundamental to our constitutional concepts, basic to the freedoms of our people, and a right of every citizen.

Executive agencies should administer laws as the Congress actually intended when the laws were enacted. When they depart from

this function and engage in writing laws by the issuance of regulations, it becomes the duty, right and responsibility of the Congress to clearly and unmistakable assert its prerogatives.

EFFECT OF MEXICAN PROGRAM ON DOMESTIC FARM WAGES

In section 1 of the minority report it is asserted that domestic farm workers "earned an average of $761 in 1958 for their agricultural labors." This is a grossly misleading statistic. Hundreds of thousands of farmworkers are people who are not really in, or part of the labor force. They may work a few weeks during seasonal harvest periods picking apples, cherries, berries, cotton, etc. In many cases they are not employed or looking for employment or available for employment during most of the year. In many other instances they are employed at other occupations during a major portion of the year. Thus, to say they only "earned an average of $761 in 1958, for their agricultural labors" is a meaningless assertion that proves nothing.

In section 1 and throughout the minority report selectively culled statistics or unfounded argumentation is used to contend that farm wages are being seriously affected by the Mexican farm labor program. For example in section 1(a) it is said that wages for harvesting cotton in New Mexico have declined 10 percent; in section 1(b) it is said that farm wages in areas where Mexican workers are employed are "declining or remaining the same" in most instances; in section 1(d) that "we must strongly reject the idea that driving farmworkers deeper into poverty is the solution * * *"; in section 6 that "the continuation of the Mexican program would literally increase the destitution * * *" of domestic farmworkers.

What are the facts with respect to farm wages? No one contends that farm wages are high, but they are increasing and increasing in all areas.

First, let us summarize the farm wage situation nationally. In table 1 of the May 19 issue of the "Farm Cost Situation" published by the Department of Agriculture, the index of farm wage rates is shown as follows:

1947–49	100
1950	99
1951	109
1952	117
1953	120
1954	118
1955	120
1956	124
1957	130
1958	134
1959	142
January 1960	147
April 1960	151

Thus, in 1959 farm wage rates had increased 42 percent above 1947–49. The upward trend has continued in 1960, and as of April, farm wage rates were 51 percent higher than in 1947–49.

The Department of Agriculture also reports quarterly in the periodical "Farm Labor Situation" the "composite rates per hour" earned by farmworkers for each State. These rates are substantially lower than real earnings because (1) they do not include perquisites (housing, meals, transportation, utilities, etc.) which are a substantial portion of the total wage paid farmworkers and (2) because they do not include earnings of piece rate workers, who ordinarily earn substantially more than hourly workers. However, they are the best available, and are probably a fair measure of trends.

Here is a comparison of the changes which have taken place in the 10-year period 1949 to 1959. The average annual rates (simple average of quarterly reports) are shown below for the States in which the major portion of Mexican workers are employed:

	Dollars per hour		Increase	
	1949	1959	Cents	Percent
California	$0.891	$1.160	26.9	30.1
Utah	.694	.950	25.6	36.8
Arizona	.633	.878	24.5	38.7
New Mexico	.524	.682	15.8	30.1
Colorado	.633	.856	22.3	35.2
Texas	.534	.725	19.1	35.7
Oklahoma	.621	.839	21.8	35.1
Arkansas	.437	.623	18.6	42.5
Wisconsin	.605	.824	21.9	36.1
Michigan	.585	.823	23.8	40.6
U.S. average	.559	.796	23.7	42.3

NOTE.—Data does not include any valuation for perquisites nor any estimates for piece-rate workers, which are normally higher than hourly earnings.

These are not fragmentary, selected statistics. They disclose the average factual situation. They substantially understate the real wage for reasons stated above, but do illustrate the trend. They demonstrate that the assertion of the minority report, that farm wage rates are declining in areas using Mexican nationals is factually unfounded Farm wage rates are increasing in all areas and the rate of increase is of the same general magnitude in all areas.

EFFECT OF MEXICAN PROGRAM ON EMPLOYMENT OF DOMESTIC FARMWORKERS

Throughout the minority report there are numerous assertions that domestic farmworkers are taking their places. For example, in section 1, it is said that domestic farmworkers "were able to get an average of only 128 days of farmwork" and that the Mexican farm labor program "is a major factor in creating the * * * great underemployment of American farmworkers." In section 1(a) is an assertion that Mexican workers were brought into the United States "even though serious underemployment existed among domestic farmworkers."

These assertions evidence a major misinterpretation of the farm labor situation. There may be underemployed domestic workers, but not at the time or place Mexican workers are employed.

The important and significant thing to remember in connection with the farm labor problem is the seasonal variation. Thus, in 1959 the number of hired farmworkers in the United States was 918,000 in January, and 2,894,000 in September. ("Farm Labor Situation," U.S.D.A.). There may be unemployed workers in the early months of the year, but they are or can be employed during summer and fall harvest seasons, during the period in which most Mexican workers are employed.

The second major factor that needs to be recognized in this connection is the location of underemployed farmworkers. These are primarily in the Southern States. It is no answer to the farmer in California or Colorado to say there are underemployed farmworkers in Georgia or Alabama.

Nor is it necessarily to be concluded that it would be wise to uproot Southern workers from their homes, to move them to California or Colorado for temporary work on seasonal crops, and by such means to create a larger group of migratory workers.

Thus the minority assertion that Mexican workers are brought in despite underemployed farmworkers in the United States is a grossly misleading assertion.

THE USE OF MEXICAN WORKERS ON SKILLED JOBS

The minority report says in section 1(c) that "braceros are increasingly used in year-round occupations. Approximately 20,000 of them are known as specials and work the entire year in this country. This represents 20,000 jobs which should be filled by underemployed American workers."

This is not a complete description of the special program, but in any event the argument is irrelevant, since the special program has been terminated and is not likely to be resumed.

The minority report then goes on to say that "instead of working on only unskilled jobs, tens of thousands of braceros are employed as tractor drivers, vegetable packers, truckdrivers, irrigators, and in other skilled jobs."

In the first place there has never been any supposition that Mexican workers were to be employed only on unskilled jobs, nor any definition of what was a skilled worker. Be that as it may, Mexican workers are not employed as truckdrivers. If they are in an occasional instance, it is a violation of the program. Their employment in vegetable packing would also be a violation of the program, except in those few instances in which produce is placed in a shipping container in the field as an incident to and part of the harvest operation. Mexican workers are on occasion employed as tractor drivers or irrigators, but there is nothing particularly skilled about either of these occupations, and these are often operations that are performed during the time of year in which there is a general shortage of domestic farmworkers in an area.

THE CONSULTANTS' REPORT

The minority report points out that consultants appointed by the Secretary of Labor reached certain conclusions relative to amendment of the Mexican program. The minority would adopt these conclusions as theirs.

We do not believe it is necessary to comment on these recommendations at this time, or that their consideration is pertinent to consideration of H.R. 12176, for the following reasons:

The Department of Labor has received the consultants' report, and has so far made no recommendations for revisions based on this report, or on other recommendations it has received.

The Department in its testimony said it would be prepared to submit recommendations next year with respect to revisions of Public Law 78.

The proposals of the Department, the consultants' recommendations, and proposed revisions from other sources, need to be carefully considered by both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.

A full term of the Congress will be needed for such consideration. In the meantime, the enactment of H.R. 12176 is essential to avoid disruption of the administration of the program, and so that farmers will be informed concerning the labor outlook in making their plans, this winter and next spring, for their 1961 farming operations.

THE FAMILY FARM ARGUMENT

The minority report seeks to establish that a small percentage of all farmers employ most farm workers, that the operators of family farms are competing with cheap labor or corporation farms, and that the termination of the Mexican program would therefore be of advantage to the family farm.

This gives a wholly erroneous picture. Whether or not a farmer employs large numbers of seasonal workers is not determined very much by the size of his operations. It is determined by the crops he produces. In general, farmers who are engaged in the production of grains, of forage, livestock, poultry, and most field crops do not hire many workers, and where they do employ a worker or two, it is usually permanent hired men or members of the operator's family. But a producer of fruits, vegetables, berries, cotton, or sugar beets, small or large, has a substantial labor bill. These are the commodities with the large requirements for seasonal

workers, which employ most Mexican workers.

For these commodities, all farmers, except the very smallest, must hire approximately the same number of workers per unit of production as their larger neighbors.

In fact small- and medium-sized farmers must ordinarily employ more labor per unit produced than large farms. The reason for this is that the large farmer has probably made a substantial investment in mechanizing his operations and by such means has reduced his labor input per unit of production.

It is of vital importance that national policy be based on correct factual understanding in this connection. A tight farm labor situation created by termination of the Mexican worker program, or by arbitrary reduction in the number admitted, would disastrously affect the interest of small and medium sized operators. Large farmers would be hurt too, but not as disastrously. New and revolutionary labor saving equipment is being adopted by farmers at a rapid rate. In most instances the major delaying factor is the cost of such equipment, $17,000 to $19,000 for a modern 2-row cotton harvester, even more for some of the newest vegetable harvesting machines.

The small operator cannot afford to buy this equipment, and even if he could afford to buy it, the costs must be spread over many units of production to warrant its economic use.

This is such a vital point that it needs to be repeated. For crops with a high seasonal labor requirement, as farm wage rates rise, the large farm can usually reduce its labor input per unit of production more rapidly than the small or medium sized farm.

If the increase in wage rates is moderate and gradual, as during the past 10 years, the small and medium sized farmer may be able to adjust to new conditions and costs. One of the important adjustments that comes about in time is the development of custom operators using the more expensive type of equipment. But it is important to avoid drastic and rapid change, if the interests of the family farm are to be safeguarded.

We have gone into this matter at some length because the argument of the minority report in this respect has been advanced many times, and at first glance appears logical enough. Yet upon closer examination it is clearly erroneous.

There is one point in the minority report that is minor, yet so misleading that it should be commented on. The minority report says that tomato production in bracero dominated States was more than 40 percent above the 1949–55 average, while tomato production in other areas was declining.

The State producing most of the tomatoes in the bracero dominated area is California. But California farmers pay the second highest farm wage rates of any State. The reason for the major increase in canning tomato production in California has nothing to do with farm wage rates. The reason is that tremendous improvements have been made in methods of producing tomatoes in California, which have tripled yields in a decade or so and produced a uniform high quality tomato well adapted to canning purposes.

The following wire has been received from the manager of the San Joaquin Farm Production Association, in the center of the tomato producing area in California, "Workers averaged 1.14 per hour picking tomatoes 1959."

IRRELEVANCIES

Section 1 of the minority report deplores the fact that farmworkers are not covered by Federal legislation relating to minimum wages and hours, collective bargaining and unemployment insurance.

These are all issues on which much could be said on both sides. Congress can choose to enact legislation on such matters when and if it chooses to do so. This is irrelevant to consideration of H.R. 12176.

In section IV(c) the minority report sets up a straw man and then proceeds to knock it down. In this section the minority discusses whether or not domestic farm workers are reliable, and reaches the conclusion they are. This is argumentative, and in any event has no relevancy to the issue and is no part of the majority consideration.

Again in section VI(b) the minority report stigmatizes some of the testimony presented to the committee. This was not a unanimous reaction, but in any event is irrelevant and no part of the majority consideration.

CONCLUSION

There is little merit to the minority report. It should have no influence on the action taken by the Congress on H.R. 12176.

Wilkes-Barre Welcomes AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last weekend some 1,200 Americans of Greek extraction from Pennsylvania and West Virginia, members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, known more familiarly as AHEPA, held their 28th annual sessions in the city of Wilkes-Barre. As further recognition of this large event, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, June 18, 1960, which comments upon the meaning of AHEPA and that organization's objectives:

WELCOME TO AHEPA

Back in 1935, Wilkes-Barre was host to 300 delegates and visitors to the district 4 convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, more familiar to the public as AHEPA. Today, some 1,200 Americans of Greek extraction from Pennsylvania and West Virginia descended on the city for the organization's 28th annual sessions which will continue through Tuesday. The P in AHEPA obviously is not without meaning on the basis of its growth and achievements during the intervening quarter century.

AHEPA over the weekend will be in friendly surroundings. A district session also was held here in 1950 and innumerable meetings have been held in this area by subordinate bodies.

AHEPA stresses the fact that it is an American organization, composed of citizens of Hellenic ancestry and dedicated to charity, education, benevolence, religion, and liberty, be it civil, religious or intellectual. It stresses obedience to law and loyalty to the American way of life. Discussion of creeds, politics, and other topics, likely to incite personal animosities, is banned at meetings. It is against the principles of the organization for any chapter to exercise pressure on behalf of legislation. Individual judgment is encouraged in accordance with the dictates of conscience.

Naturally, the organization has, among its principal objectives, a fusion of American and Hellenic cultures. Members are urged to take an active part in community affairs, keeping in mind the exhortation of Pericles to the youth of Athens to "strive to leave our city not only as good but even better than we found it."

It is a privilege to welcome to Wilkes-Barre again visitors with these high ideals.

The Most Dramatic Convention Speech of Them All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a feature article written by Boyce House, a valued personal friend of mine and an extremely gifted writer, which deals with the celebrated speech by William Jennings Bryan at the 1896 Democratic convention.

Since this year is the 100th anniversary of the birth of the Great Commoner, and since we are looking toward the approach of the national conventions, I thought this extremely well-written account of that historic event would be of timely interest:

THE MOST DRAMATIC CONVENTION SPEECH OF THEM ALL

(By Boyce House)

How a 36-year-old lawyer-editor stampeded a national political convention with a speech and became the youngest man ever nominated for President is the greatest Cinderella story in all the annals of American politics.

It was 1896. A panic gripped the land. The farmers, especially of the West and South, in desperate straits, felt that if there were more money, conditions would improve. Silver had been demonetized years before and many came to believe that the country's economic salvation depended on its restoration; so "free silver" became the cry—"the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." Many opposed this bitterly and feeling grew intense.

Congressman Richard P. "Dick" Bland of Missouri had been the leading advocate of the white metal. Others in the race for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency included former Gov. Horace Boies of Iowa, Gov. Claude Matthews of Indiana, Senator J. C. S. Blackburn of Kentucky, Robert E. Pattison of Pennsylvania, John R. McLean of Ohio and former Gov. Sylvester Pennoyer of Oregon.

There was still another, William Jennings Bryan, who considered himself a candidate but this idea was shared by almost no one except faithful friends from his home State of Nebraska. He had been elected to Congress in 1890, re-elected in 1892 and was his party's candidate for U.S. Senator in 1894 but the Republicans won the legislature (Senators were elected by the legislature in those days). During his first term in Congress, Bryan made a masterly speech on the tariff. Then he became interested in the silver question and, during his second term, he made a brilliant address on silver.

Besides his acquaintance with the members of his party in Congress, Bryan had, through a series of speeches in the South and West, come to know free-silver leaders in those sections. He participated in a conference in Memphis to organize the silver forces of the country; he sent out a draft of a free-silver plank for the national platform

and, as editor of the Omaha World-Herald, he mailed copies of his editorials to editors and many other influential men. In addition, he carried on a heavy correspondence. Bryan knew personally more delegates to the convention than any other man.

Yet he was not regarded as a contender. When Bryan told Champ Clark that he held some hope of being the choice of the convention, the Missouri Congressman was amazed. But Bryan was sufficiently optimistic that he persuaded his wife to attend. He brought along $100 to defray his expenses while in Chicago. The Palmer House was full and so they registered at a small hotel close by.

He arrived several days ahead of time in order to help plan the strategy of the silver forces; and, before the convention opened, he went to a Nebraska town to debate the money question. There was a passage which he had used a time or two before and then had, as he himself later said, "laid it away for a proper occasion," and, in this debate, he gave the passage a final tryout.

Bryan had been named a delegate and his Nebraska friends were confident that if the "boy orator of the Platte" could be heard, he would make a great impression. He himself, however, states in his memoirs, "While I had, before the convention met, regarded my nomination as a possibility, I had relied upon what I called the logic of the situation rather than upon the influence of a speech."

There was a serious obstacle to his addressing the convention. The "gold crowd" had sent a contesting delegation from Nebraska. Bryan had hoped to be temporary chairman of the convention and make the keynote address but he had not been seated as a delegate when the convention began. In fact, it was not until 2 days later that he won his fight before the credentials committee. Then he hoped to be named permanent chairman of the convention since this would give him the privilege of a speech; but, by that time, he was receiving some slight mention as an aspirant for the presidential nomination and so friends of other candidates objected that it would be unfair to make him the permanent chairman. Another was chosen for the honor. It appeared, therefore, that Bryan was not to have an opportunity to speak.

And then an unlooked-for development occurred. Senator James K. Jones of Arkansas, chairman of the Resolutions Committee, asked Bryan to take charge of the debate for the silver forces. Afterward, Jones said he made this request because Bryan, alone among the silver leaders, had not addressed the convention; the others had been called on while the delegates were marking time—waiting for committee reports—which was during the period that Bryan had been waging his fight for a seat before the credentials committee and, afterward, had been serving as a member of the committee drawing up the platform.

The only speakers for silver in the debate were to be Senator Ben "Pitchfork" Tillman of South Carolina, and Bryan. Tillman wished to close and, of the hour and a quarter allotted to each side, he desired 50 minutes. Senator David B. Hill of New York, in charge of the debate for the gold side, objected to a closing speech of such length, so Tillman agreed to open. Bryan, therefore, would get to make the final speech of the debate. Thus had fate, after tantalizing delay, fitted the pieces, one by one, into place.

Another stroke of fortune for Bryan came when the convention adjourned until the next day, which gave him time to plan his address. He put into the proper place his definition of a businessman and, for the close, he chose the passage which he had laid away for a proper occasion.

Besides being a delegate and a candidate, Bryan was covering the convention for the Omaha World-Herald, of which he was editor, at a salary of $30 a week. Picture him then in a room, in his shirt sleeves, collar and tie discarded, as he was writing an account of the day's events when a delegation of Senators and Congressmen entered. They came to urge him to support, for the nomination, Senator Teller, of Colorado, a Republican who had bolted the GOP convention on the silver issue. The young man listened courteously, then said that he did not think Teller could be nominated.

"Then who do you think can be?" one asked.

In a mild tone, Bryan replied, "I think I have as good a chance as anyone."

Amazed, the visitors looked at him as though they had not heard aright. One managed the politeness to inquire on what he based his hope. Bryan answered, "I have my own State's delegation and, on the second ballot, "I expect to have half the votes of Indian territory." There was an interruption and he did not finish; though, truth to tell, he had very little more on which to base his prediction.

Back on the sidewalk, the distinguished men looked from one to another and then burst into laughter at thought of a man who hoped to be nominated because he had the small delegation of his own State—and half of Indian territory on the second ballot.

Eighteen thousand packed the coliseum for the debate on the platform. Bryan had his customary feeling before a speech of unusual importance: weakness at the pit of the stomach and a desire to lie down. This of course was not possible so he busied himself with a sandwich and a cup of coffee as he waited for the debate to get under way.

The silver men constituted two-thirds of the delegates and they were confident that Tillman, a forceful speaker, would rise to the occasion. Imagine then how great was their disappointment when, picturing the struggle as a sectional fight, he was actually hissed, whereupon he became angry. After Tillman had finished, Senator Jones went to the platform and rebuked him by stating, "I protest the charge that this is sectional."

Hill then spoke but he could scarely be heard beyond the small area occupied by the delegates. He was followed by Senator William F. Vilas of Wisconsin. Former Governor Russell of Massachusetts, who was to close for that side, complained to Hill that Vilas was taking his (Russell's) time. Bryan, sitting across the asile, heard the complaint and offered to extend the time 10 minutes if a like extension was granted him. Hill and Russell agreed—another fortunate circumstance for Bryan as he needed that much more time for the speech he had planned.

Among those who beheld the unfolding drama was a young newspaperman of North Carolina who was destined to become one of the South's outstanding editors, Secretary of the Navy in World War I and ambassador to Mexico. Josephus Daniels (in his "Editor in Politics," University of North Carolina Press, quoted by permission) said that Russell's speech "was classic; his every sentence was chiseled and he spoke with a sincerity and earnestness that captivated those who heard him." But the thousands in the galleries had to strain their ears to catch his words; and this had been the case also when Vilas was on the platform. Hill, as has already been noted, could not be heard by the galleries at all. (This was, of course, long before public address systems.)

An Atlanta newspaperman, Clark Howell, scribbled on the back of an envelope. "This is a great opportunity" and handed it to Bryan, who wrote underneath, "You will not be disappointed" and handed the envelope back.

As the able addresses of the gold advocates were given, the convention majority sat in sullen and ever-growing frustration. The New York World correspondent had depicted the situation perfectly when, the day before, he wrote, "The silverites have neither machine nor boss; the opportunity is here; the man is lacking." Bryan himself knew what the occasion called for, "All that was necessary to success was to put into words the sentiments of a majority of the delegates—to be the voice of a triumphant majority"—("Memoirs," Bryan, completed by his wife, Mary Baird Bryan, John C. Winston Co., quoted by permission).

And now it was Bryan's turn. The hoped-for moment had arrived. He walked down the aisle with quick tread, climbed the steps to the platform two at a time, turned and faced the audience. They saw one who was every inch an Apollo, young, lithe, with flashing eyes. A faint smile upon his lips, he at once began speaking, "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention,"—the words rolling to the farthest reaches of the auditorium—"I would be presumptuous, indeed, to present myself against the distinguished gentlemen to whom you have listened if this were a mere measuring of abilities; but this is not a contest between persons. The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error. I come to speak to you in a cause as holy as the cause of liberty—the cause of humanity."

Bryan (says Daniels) "did not seem to raise his voice at all. He seemed to be speaking with less effort than anyone who had preceded him. His voice was made for great gatherings." Not only was it an instrument of volume, of carrying power, but there were resonance, flexibility and organ-like melody, perhaps the most superb voice that American oratory has ever known. Truly, the orator of silver's cause was silver-tongued.

His nervousness had left him and he felt as composed as if he were speaking to "a small audience on an unimportant occasion." The silver delegates began to smile and to nod with satisfaction. To one side in the audience was former Governor James Stephen Hogg of Texas, a huge man, and at the other side, equally huge, was Ollie James of Kentucky. The sight of these two, their faces beaming with delight, was very heartening to Bryan throughout the speech.

In the preconvention campaign, Bryan said, the silver Democrats, with a zeal rivaling that of the Crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit, had gone "from victory unto victory until now they are assembled, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment already rendered by the plain people of this country." These militant words were what the majority had been waiting for and there was terrific cheering. Daniels records, "Bryan had not been speaking 5 minutes before he held the convention rapt. I had never dreamed that a mortal man could so grip and fill with enthusiasm thousands of men." The audience seemed to rise and sit down as one man, rising and shouting at the close of a sentence; then, as another sentence began, the auditorium was as still as a church.

Bryan proclaimed, "There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that, if you will only legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, their prosperity will leak through to those below. The Democratic idea, however, has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous, their prosperity will find its way up through every class which rests upon them.

"You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

His closing words were, "Having behind us the producing masses of this Nation and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for

a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

There was silence and he had walked almost to his seat when someone shouted; then bedlam broke loose. A parade around the hall began, led by the Nebraska delegation. Bryan was lifted on the shoulders of admirers. Pale from his effort, he had to hold to keep from falling and asked to be put down. Men hugged him, shook his hand, shouted in his ears. For 30 minutes, the wild demonstration continued.

While the tumult was raging, a delegate said, "You can be nominated if your friends will prevent adjournment." Bryan replied, "If their desire to nominate me will not last until tomorrow, would it last during the campaign?" The platform was adopted, then the convention adjourned until the next day. Bryan was nominated.

And, after paying his hotel bill and other expenses, he had $40 left of his original $100.

The famed editor of Emporia, Kans., William Allen White, a stanch Republican, he recorded that the speech "fired the hearts of that convention and, tingling over the telegraph wires of the land, enthralled the Nation. * * * Up to that moment, probably, no single speech in American history, by any man in any case—not even by Webster, by Clay or by Calhoun in the Senate in their noblest moments, tuned into the will of Americans so much moving emotion as that Bryan speech in the Democratic national convention of 1896." To the present-day reader who wonders how a speech on a money question could have been so stirring and so tremendous, these words of Daniels may be illuminating:

"The truth is, free silver was the expression of the hope for legislation of a people who had been through the panic and hard times and were seeking to strike at Government by privilege. * * * It was a conflict, rather, of man versus money. * * * They believed that Bryan was a young David with his sling, who had come to slay the giants that oppressed the people."

As to the campaign itself, Bryan waged, almost singehanded, the most spectacular fight in the Nation's annals. He traveled 18,000 miles by train and made over 500 speeches to over 5 million persons. No man in the history of the world had ever before spoken to so many in the same space of time. And he polled the largest vote a Democrat had ever received until then—but William McKinley was elected.

Twice more, Bryan was his party's nominee and, in 1912, he played a major part in bringing about the nomination of Woodrow Wilson. No other man was ever the foremost figure in the affairs of a major party as long as William Jennings Bryan, the darkest of dark horses who captured the Presidential nomination with the magic of a speech which, occasion and purpose considered, was probably the greatest masterpiece since Mark Anthony spoke over the corpse of Caesar.

Address by Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am very pleased to include a splendid address made here in Washington a few weeks ago by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., before the annual meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The address follows in full:

REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE 47TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, ON THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1960, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, once again it is my happy privilege to extend a greeting to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

This is the 47th annual meeting of the congress. During 36 of those years, I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, and partially because my own district has been so concerned with the development of our water resources, I have had far more than a casual interest in the work and the objectives of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and I have been pleased to be associated with you as a vice president.

It is not an exaggeration to say that most of the progress that has been made in recent decades in the development of America's water resources has been due to the sense of urgency which has been stimulated by the activity of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The success the congress has had in encouraging and promoting the effective use of water and waterways is due in no small measure to the excellent leadership of such dedicated public servants as our chairman and my good friend, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS. Throughout his career he has been an outstanding exponent of the development of our water resources and his tireless work in behalf of the programs of this organization has made an exceptional contribution to the attainment of our objectives. He has earned the sincere gratitude of all who realize what the full use of water resources means to the progress and prosperity of America.

Organized over a half century ago, this congress has given invaluable assistance to regional, State and local governments in the conservation, development and control of the Nation's precious water supplies. It has always been nonpartisan in character and has never waivered from its singleness of purpose which is the sound and swift development of our water resources.

On the membership rolls of the organization are Governors, mayors, State legislators, water experts from industry, and I am proud to say—many of our colleagues in the House and Senate.

It is not mere coincidence that the period of greatest development of our water uses covers the life span of this congress.

It has been the principal promoter of an ever increasing degree of Federal participation in meeting State and local needs, notably in the fields of flood control, navigation, irrigation and conservation.

Because the organization has no ax to grind except the progress of the national welfare as related to the use of water, it has historically had an influential voice in the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Its close relationships with committees of Congress, with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and some 40 other Federal agencies dealing with water problems have resulted in great benefits to the prosperity of the Nation.

Improvements to rivers, harbors, inland waterways, and the Great Lakes system under the Federal navigation program have now resulted in an all-time high tonnage of more than 1 billion tons of waterborne commerce a year.

Under the Federal flood control program begun in 1936, 343 projects costing $933 million have been completed and 96 others costing $3.2 billion are under construction.

A problem closely associated with the activities of the Congress—the abatement of water pollution—is deserving of our energetic advocacy.

Because it has such serious implications for the health of our people, pollution of our streams and rivers is becoming an increasingly grave national problem.

I firmly believe this menace should be attacked on a broad national front. It cannot be lightly dismissed as wholly a local responsibility. If we do, the desired improvements will never be made.

The plain facts are that in local communities where the pollution problem is most acute, the local governments simply cannot raise the necessary funds to eliminate the sources of infection without Federal assistance. They are already carrying a heavy tax burden. Rivers recognize no State boundary lines and neither do the germs of pollution which too many of our rivers are carrying to the detriment of many communities.

From personal experience, I know of several communities in my own district which will be unable to cope with their pollution problems without Federal aid, and there are several hundred cities and towns in a similar condition.

Nature has endowed our land with an abundance of water, but it is obviously a relatively fixed supply. An increasing population and expanding industry are drawing more heavily each year on the available sources. More water is being consumed and more wastes are being discharged into our streams. These wastes cause the pollution which imperils our domestic water supplies, industrial uses, agriculture, fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreational facilities.

When it is realized that two-thirds of our people get their drinking water from surface water supplies into which disease-carrying bacteria and toxic substances are being discharged, the menace in such a condition to the health of the Nation becomes real.

The cure for this serious situation must be the construction of waste treatment and sewage disposal facilities wherever the problem prevails. I ask you if this is not a real problem for our Federal Government to aid?

Recognizing the fact that additional Federal aid was needed to assist and stimulate local communities to clean up their water supplies, Congress this year passed a law increasing the existing authorizations by $40 million a year. This seemed to be a relatively small price to pay for safeguarding and improving the health of our people through supplies of clean water, especially when American taxpayers are spending substantial sums abroad in Asia and Africa, through mutual assistance funds, for the very same purposes.

The legislation was vetoed and the veto was sustained.

This has not, however, eliminated the problem. Pollution will be a continuing and increasing difficulty. It will not go away by itself.

I hope the Congress will continue the battle and employ the weight of its great influence in attacking this grave problem again at the next session of Congress.

The improvement of our waterways for shipping has resulted in enormous economic benefits to the Nation. We have seen countless instances as proof of this. Personally I am most familiar with one project with which I have been closely associated throughout my congressional life. That has been the development of the harbor at Fall River, Mass., a project which the Rivers and Harbors Congress endorsed. The development of this harbor has made possible the accommodation of ships of greater tonnage, bringing lower transportation costs to the industries in the area and encouraging new industry to locate there.

From my summer home on Cape Cod, I can look out from my front porch to the approach to the Cape Cod Canal. Every day can be seen huge vessels using the canal and materially cutting down sailing distance by avoiding the longer and sometimes hazardous voyage around Provincetown.

On a visit to Germany several years ago, I sat in a hotel on the banks of the Rhine and marveled at the constant flow of commerce which takes advantage of this fine waterway. What the Germans have done with the Rhine, we can do with the development of our own waterways. Without the Rhine, industrial Germany could not have achieved its great growth.

Unfortunately, expansion of the rails is not likely in the future. Railroads are essential and we must not let them decay. But we most supplement their transportation efforts through progress in theexpansion of our waterway system.

History has borne out the economic value of our waterway projects. They will continue to contribute many advantages to a growing country. They will play a major role in the economic destiny of our country. We must do our full share in the greater and more prosperous America that lies ahead.

Social Security Program Discussed in 20th Annual Report of Board of Trustees—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Members as complete a picture as possible of the social security program before we are called upon to vote to further increase benefits and extend coverage, I would like to call your attention to the 20th Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, House Document No. 352 of this Congress. For special emphasis, I ask you to read the following discussion of the actuarial status of the trust funds, as it appears in the report.

ACTUARIAL STATUS OF THE TRUST FUNDS

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefit payments will increase for many years—not only in dollars but also as a percentage of taxable payroll. Long-range estimates are needed to show how much the cost is likely to increase and to indicate whether the scheduled tax rates are adequate. This section presents cost estimates that are revisions of those in the previous report. Revision was made to reflect recent operating experience, especially in regard to the relatively new disability insurance program, and to use the 1959 earnings level (instead of 1956).

The cost of benefits to aged persons, which constitute almost 90 percent of the total cost, will rise for serveral reasons. The United States population cannot continue to increase indefinitely; births cannot continue indefinitely to exceed deaths. When a balance is reached or a reversal in the present trend occurs, the population as a whole will have become relatively much older. A relatively older population will also result because the present aged population is made up of the survivors from past periods when death rates were much higher than they are now; thus, in the future, relatively more persons will attain age 65 and older ages.

The cost of the program is thus closely related to the ratio of the population aged 65 and over (potential beneficiaries) to the population aged 20–64 (potential contributors). At present this ratio is 16.7 percent. In a stationary population with present death rates it would be 24.9 percent, but such a situation would be very unlikely to occur for many decades. It is expected that this ratio will eventually become even greater because of further decreases in mortality.

Another reason for the increasing cost is that the proportion of the aged population receiving benefits will increase. Many of the present persons aged 65 and over were not in covered employment long enough to obtain benefits, or, in the case of widows, their husbands were not sufficiently long in covered employment. Although the system began in 1937, many jobs were not covered until 1951 or 1955. It is estimated that the proportion of the aged population eligible for some type of benefit under the system will increase from the present level of about 73 percent to between 92 and 97 percent by the end of the century.

Because the actual cost could reasonably vary over a wide range, three complete sets of estimates are made—low cost, intermediate cost, and high cost. The cost estimates are based on high employment and 1959-level earnings assumptions. Each provides estimates of such items as taxable and creditable payroll, contributions, beneficiaries, benefit payments, and administrative expenses for every future year. The data are presented here for selected future years. All figures are assumed to remain constant after 2050.

It is considered likely, although by no means certain, that actual costs as a percentage of payroll will lie between the low-cost and high-cost figures. The intermediate-cost estimates of beneficiaries, benefit payments, and payrolls are taken halfway between the low-cost and high-cost figures. The intermediate percentage-of-payroll figures are obtained by dividing total benefit payments by taxable payroll, each on the intermediate basis, and are therefore not exactly equal to the average of low-cost and high-cost percentages.

Table 20 shows benefit payment costs for selected years and the level-premium cost, all expressed as percentages of payroll, under each of the three estimates. The level-premium cost is that constant combined employer-employee tax rate that, together with a tax on the self-employed at 75 percent of such combined rate, would exactly pay for all future benefits and administrative expenses, after making allowance for the effect of the existing trust fund and for future interest earnings. All percent-of-payroll figures are adjusted so that they represent the tax rate that employees and employers combined, and the self-employed at three-quarters of the combined rate, would have to pay in any given year to meet exactly the benefit disbursements in that year. Tables 21 and 22 show, for each set of estimates, the contributions, benefit payments, administrative expenses, amount paid to or received from the railroad retirement system, and the balance in the trust funds for selected years.

TABLE 20.—*Estimated costs of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system as percent of payroll,[1] high employment and 1959 level earnings assumptions, 1970–2050*

[In percent]

Calendar year	Low-cost estimate	High-cost estimate	Intermediate-cost estimate [2]
	Old-age and survivors insurance benefits		
1970	6.60	6.93	6.77
1980	7.49	8.51	7.99
1990	7.69	9.74	8.66
2000	6.90	9.85	8.25
2025	7.78	12.98	9.94
2050	9.86	14.82	11.78
Level-premium cost [3]	7.35	9.61	8.38
	Disability insurance benefits		
1970	0.25	0.41	0.33
1980	.27	.47	.37
1990	.23	.43	.32
2000	.22	.46	.33
2025	.28	.54	.39
2050	.32	.58	.42
Level-premium cost [3]	.26	.46	.35

[1] Taking into account the lower contribution rate for the self-employed, as compared with the combined employer-employee rate.
[2] Based on the average of the dollar costs under the low-cost and high-cost estimates.
[3] Level-premium contribution rate, at 3-percent interest rate, for benefits after 1959 taking into account interest on the trust fund on Dec. 31, 1959, future administrative expenses, the railroad retirement financial interchange provisions, and the lower contribution rates payable by the self-employed.

TABLE 21.—*Estimated progress of old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, high employment and 1959 level earnings assumptions, 3 percent interest basis* [1]

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses [2]	Financial interchange [3]	Interest on fund	Fund at end of year [4]
	Actual data					
1951	$3,367	$1,885	$81		$417	$15,540
1952	3,819	2,194	88		365	17,442
1953	3,945	3,006	88		414	18,707
1954	5,163	3,670	92		468	20,576
1955	5,713	4,968	119		461	21,663
1956	6,172	5,715	132		531	22,519
1957	6,825	7,347	162		557	22,393
1958	7,566	8,327	194	−$124	552	21,864
	Low-cost estimate					
1970	$20,061	$15,576	$197	−$87	$1,396	$50,016
1980	23,821	21,001	242	37	3,024	105,120
1990	28,414	25,695	250	113	4,879	168,779
2000	34,065	27,639	329	113	7,938	275,639
2025	46,142	42,218	467	113	25,096	863,424

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 21.—*Estimated progress of old-age and survivors insurance fund, high employment and 1959 level earnings assumptions, 3 percent interest basis* [1]—Continued

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses [2]	Financial interchange [3]	Interest on fund	Fund at end of year [4]
	High-cost estimate					
1970	$19,951	$16,275	$229	−$207	$1,147	$41,002
1980	22,833	22,872	279	−55	2,099	71,893
1990	25,759	29,511	334	39	2,049	68,327
2000	28,888	33,484	375	39	1,127	36,219
2025	32,655	49,880	493	39	(5)	(5)
	Intermediate-cost estimate					
1970	$20,006	$15,925	$213	−$147	$1,272	$45,517
1980	23,327	21,937	261	−9	2,571	88,833
1990	27,087	27,602	312	76	3,477	118,995
2000	31,477	30,561	352	76	4,550	156,522
2025	39,398	46,050	480	76	9,167	311,219

[1] At 3 percent, except 2.6 percent in 1959, 2.7 percent in 1960, 2.8 percent in 1961, and 2.9 percent in 1962.
[2] Beginning with 1957, the actual figures are somewhat overstated because this trust fund currently bears the administrative expenses of the disability insurance system and is later reimbursed therefor by the disability trust fund.
[3] A positive figure indicates payment to the trust rund from the railroad retirement account; a negative figure indicates the reverse.
[4] Not including amounts in the railroad retirement account to the credit of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. In millions of dollars, these amounted to $377 for 1953, $284 for 1954, $163 for 1955, $60 for 1956, and nothing for 1957 and thereafter.
[5] Fund exhausted in 2008.

TABLE 22.—*Estimated progress of disability insurance trust fund, high employment and 1959 level earnings assumptions, 3 percent interest basis* [1]

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses [2]	Financial interchange [3]	Interest on fund	Fund at end of year [4]
	Actual data					
1957	$702	$57	$3	----------	$7	$649
1958	966	249	12	----------	25	1,379
	Low-cost estimate					
1970	$1,213	$582	$26	----------	$283	$10,013
1980	1,419	743	30	$4	593	20,696
1990	1,672	754	33	5	1,055	36,665
2000	2,002	896	40	5	1,760	60,968
2025	2,714	1,524	59	5	4,853	167,197
	High-cost estimate					
1970	$1,206	$954	$33	−6	$204	$7,127
1980	1,360	1,262	39	−2	319	10,979
1990	1,515	1,290	42	−1	462	15,966
2000	1,698	1,552	49	−1	684	23,520
2025	1,921	2,076	58	−1	1,235	42,283
	Intermediate-cost estimate					
1970	$1,209	$768	$30	−$3	$244	$8,590
1980	1,390	1,002	33	1	457	15,868
1990	1,593	1,022	38	2	760	26,365
2000	1,850	1,224	45	2	1,224	42,312
2025	2,317	1,800	59	2	3,048	104,882

[1] At 3 percent, except 2.6 percent in 1959, 2.7 percent in 1960, 2.8 percent in 1961, and 2.9 percent in 1962.
[2] The actual figures are somewhat understated because the old-age, survivors and insurance trust fund currently bears the administrative expenses of this program and is later reimbursed therefor by this fund.
[3] A positive figure indicates payment to the trust fund from the railroad retirement account; a negative figure indicates the reverse.

Social Security Program Discussed in 20th Annual Report of Board of Trustees—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is a continuation of the discussion of the actuarial status of the social security trust funds from the 20th annual report of the Board of Trustees:

ACTUARIAL STATUS OF THE TRUST FUNDS

Annual benefit payments as a percentage of payroll are less than the scheduled tax rates in the early years (with a few exceptions), but—except under the low-cost disability estimate—eventually rise well above the ultimate scheduled combined employer-employee tax rate of 8½ percent for old-age and survivors insurance and one-half of 1 percent for disability insurance. To measure the extent to which the financing arrangements of the system result in a surplus or deficiency, a level rate equivalent to the actual increasing contribution rates has been computed, taking into account future interest. The level-premium equivalent of contributions minus the level-premium equivalent of benefit and administrative costs, after making allowance for the effect of the existing trust fund, gives the amount by which the contribution rate in all years would have to be changed to put the system in exact long-range balance according to the estimate. A negative figure indicates that an increase is needed. The figures shown below, in percentages of payroll, are computed on a 3-percent interest basis as of the beginning of calendar year 1960:

Item	Low cost	High cost	Intermediate cost
	Old-age and survivors insurance		
Contributions [1]	8.20	8.14	8.18
Benefit cost [2]	7.35	9.61	8.38
Net difference	.85	−1.47	−.20
	Disability insurance		
Contributions [1]	0.50	0.50	0.50
Benefit cost [2]	.26	.46	.35
Net difference	.24	.04	.15

[1] Based on adjusted payroll that reflects the lower contribution rate for the self employed as compared with the combined employer-employee rate.
[2] Including adjustments (a) to reflect lower contribution rate for the self-employed as compared with the combined employer-employee rate; (b) for interest on existing trust fund; (c) for administrative expenses; and (d) for the railroad retirement financial interchange provisions.

In view of the very long-range nature of these projections and the many variable factors involved, the deficiency for the old-age and survivors insurance system under

the intermediate-cost estimate is so small that the system may be considered in approximate actuarial balance; on a 3½-percent-interest basis (well below current market yields on long-term Government securities), instead of the above deficiency of 0.20 percent of payroll, there would be a surplus of 0.04 percent. The disability insurance system is more than in actuarial balance under all three estimates. The estimates contained in the previous report showed about the same results for the old-age and survivors insurance portion of the program. On the other hand, the disability insurance system was shown to be in almost exact balance. The more favorable current status of the disability insurance trust fund arises from a detailed analysis of actual operating experience that recently became available. Further discussion of this matter is presented in appendix I.

If the experience exactly follows the assumptions, the deficiency would gradually increase under the high-cost or intermediate-cost estimate for the old-age and survivors insurance system, while the surplus would increase under the low-cost estimate for old-age and survivors insurance and under all the estimates for disability insurance. Any deficit or surplus in the contribution schedule (as compared with the required level-premium tax rate) gradually increases through the years because of the effect of interest accumulations. In the case of a surplus, the excess contributions actually earn interest, while a deficit grows because of annual interest that would have been earned if the proper contributions had been paid. With continuing study of the emerging experience under the program, there will be ample time to make any changes in the tax rate that may be necessary to keep the system in actuarial balance.

It is important to note that these estimates are made on the assumption that earnings levels will remain at their present magnitude into the indefinite future. If earnings levels continue to rise, as they have in the past, the benefits and taxable earnings base under the program will undoubtedly be modified. If such changes would be made concurrently and proportionately with changes in general earnings levels, the future year-by-year costs of the system as a percentage of taxable payroll would be the same as those shown. However, the existing trust fund accumulated in the past, and its interest earnings, will represent a smaller proportion of the future taxable payrolls than if earnings were not to increase in future years. As a result, since interest earnings of the trust fund will play a relatively smaller role in the financing of the system, the net level-premium cost—taking into account benefit payments, administrative expenses, and interest on the existing trust fund—would be somewhat higher. If benefits would be modified to reflect changes in earnings levels although not in full but rather only in part, or with a time lag, a still different cost situation would develop. Again, the effect of such changes can be observed in ample time to make any needed changes in the contribution schedule.

This analysis includes the benefits and contributions in respect to all persons anticipated to be covered in the future under present legislative provisions. There would be a large deficiency if account were taken only of the benefits to be paid to workers who have been covered by the system in the past and to their dependents and survivors, the future taxes to be paid by such workers, and the existing trust funds. In a private insurance company it is necessary to set up reserves equal to all currently accrued liabilities, since the company cannot compel individuals to become new policyholders and must be in a position at any time to pay all benefits which will become payable with respect to its present and past policyholders using only its present assets and the premiums to be paid by present policyholders. In analyzing the actuarial condition of a compulsory social insurance system which will continue indefinitely, however, the income and benefits with respect to new entrants can properly be included, thus obviating the need to set up reserves for all currently accrued liabilities.

Mrs. Thomas F. Heffernan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I note with deep regret the passing last week of Mrs. Thomas F. Heffernan, widow of the former publisher of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent and mother of that newspaper's present publisher. Mrs. Heffernan was a kindly woman and held in great respect throughout the community. She was a devoted mother and wife and reared a fine family. Mrs. Flood joins me in extending our profound regrets to the Heffernan family in this period of their great loss.

As a further extension of my remarks, I include two editorials—one from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, June 18, 1960, and the other from the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of June 19, 1960, both of which comment upon the death of Mrs. Heffernan:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, June 18, 1960]

MRS. THOMAS F. HEFFERNAN

The death of Mrs. Thomas F. Heffernan, widow of the former publisher of the Sunday Independent and mother of the present publisher, recalls the community's golden era and her own gracious role in it.

Most of Mrs. Heffernan's contemporaries are gone, time having taken its inevitable toll. In death, she joins a distinguished company.

A daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Easen of Plymouth, Mrs. Heffernan devoted herself to her family and friends in keeping with the practices of her generation and the tradition of her English forebears. A self-effacing woman, her domain was the home and her achievements were to be found in good works behind the scenes and in such fundamentals as kindness and hospitality.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, June 19, 1960]

A CHAPTER ENDS

Louise E. Heffernan, widow of the late Thomas F. Heffernan, long publisher of the Sunday Independent, died last week.

If only because of the manner in which she helped provide some of the original financing and a great deal of the original enthusiasm in the acquiring of this newspaper, the passing of Mrs. Heffernan must be noted by those now carrying on.

In addition, however, so long as she was able, she continued to provide the kind of unwavering support and encouragement which only a woman can.

Actuarial Anesthesia—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to determine the actuarial soundness of the social security system, I heartily recommend a paper presented by Mr. Ray M. Peterson before the meeting of the Society of Actuaries in November 1959. That you may become acquainted with some of Mr. Peterson's thinking on this vital subject, I include a few brief excerpts from his paper, "Misconceptions and Missing Perceptions of Our Social Security System":

INTRODUCTION

The report of the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing stimulated the observations in this paper which aim to look beyond the Council's terms of reference as limited by statute and its interpretation of its responsibilities.

The actuaries of the Social Securty Administration and the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board have done skillful professional work in the public interest by furnishing reliable benchmarks to test the actuarial equivalence of contributions and benefits under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. It is no criticism of their activities to suggest that all actuaries have a responsibility to make clear to the public the limitations of the significance of actuarial calculations. Actuarial equations cannot measure the contributor's willingness and capacity to pay. They cannot measure the soundness of the principles of equity between individuals and generations, the readiness of individuals to accept such principles, nor the extent of their understanding. Actuarial balance sheets cannot assure good housekeeping by government in funding retirement programs; they do not reveal the broad social and economic effect of compulsory programs; they cannot control the extent of the obligations one generation places upon another. Actuaries should be the first to warn that actuarial balance, while a necessary condition, is not a sufficient condition. The work of the actuary must not become a soothing agent that unduly quiets a legitimate concern as to the truly successful operation of programs established by one generation which will have powerful effects upon future generations.

Over 20 years ago, there were scholarly debates by actuaries on social insurance financing which are well worth rereading at this time. Those debates between the reservites and the current-costites, probing economic and social aspects of financing old-age benefits, constituted a great public service at the time. While the author has no deliberate purpose to revive that debate, he will not be disappointed if the observations here made stimulate a lively and responsible interest among the younger members of the Society of Actuaries.

Jeremy Bentham, a leading intellectual of the early 19th century, had considerable to say about the fallacy of irrevocable laws in his The Book of Fallacies, published in 1824. Speaking of the sages of a prior generation, he wrote:

It is their prodigious anxiety for the welfare of their posterity that produces the propensity of these sages to tie up the hands of this same posterity forevermore—to act as guardians to its perpetual and incurable

weakness, and take its conduct forever out of its own hands.

If it be right that the conduct of the 19th century should be determined not by its own judgment but by that of the 18th, it will be equally right that the conduct of the 20th century should be determined not by its own judgment but by that of the 19th. And if the same principle were still pursued, what at length would be the consequence?—that in process of time the practice of legislation would be at an end. The conduct and fate of all men would be determined by those who neither knew nor cared anything about the matter; and the aggregate body of the living would remain forever in subjection to an inexorable tyranny, exercised as it were by the aggregate body of the dead.

There is probably no other legislative enactment that commits future generations to greater obligations than our Social Security Act. Although section 1104 of the act makes changes possible, only a major economic crisis would justify a reduction of benefits in the minds of the people, particularly the millions of pension recipients. As a matter of good faith, there is no question but that the benefits promised are intended to be permanent and assured. Some years after the enactment of the original Social Security Act, Franklin D. Roosevelt supported the contributory principle in these words:

"We put those payroll contributions there so as to give the contributors a legal, moral, and political right to collect their pensions and their unemployment benefits. With those taxes in there, no damn politician can ever scrap my social security program."

The author's purpose is to (1) try to attain a greater insight into the nature and significance of the social security financing method, and, to that end, determine whether the operations of the railroad retirement system give us any clues as to what we may expect in the future under the social security financing method, (2) examine the image in the public mind of the social security financing method and its significance, (3) identify some questions as to the social and economic impact of the social security financing method, (4) examine the income tax treatment of social security contributions and benefits, and finally, (5) set down some conclusions.

The author wishes to acknowledge at the outset the indispensable value to this discussion of the voluminous actuarial literature produced by the actuaries of the social security and railroad retirement systems.

NATURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING METHOD

The evolution of the principles underlying OASDI financing is described in Actuarial Study No. 49, Appendix I. Briefly, the financial mechanics are: the primary source of the money for current benefit payments is the current contributions from employees, employers and the self-employed; a fund of "modest" amount is developed which arises from any excess of current contributions over current benefit payments; this fund permits a contribution schedule which progresses in an orderly known amount, acts as a buffer for variations in contributions and benefit outlays, and provides a modest current income source from interest earnings.

Although this system has been termed a "limited reserve" or "modified pay-as-you-go" system, no single technical term for it has been found. Economists usually include social security benefits with what they call "transfer payments." This suggests that since, for the most part, current contributions are merely transferred to current payees, the "transfer method of financing" would be a good descriptive phrase.

In describing the evolution of the financing method, we read in Appendix I of Actuarial Study No. 49:

"As is often the case in this country, the answer was arrived at through a pragmatic political process rather than a theoretical philosophical process. And, as is also often the case, the pragmatic process has resulted in an answer which has, to date at least, worked out satisfactorily. Just as the benefit formula is a blend of equity and adequacy, with much greater emphasis on the latter, so is the financing method of a blend of "reserve" and "pay-as-you-go," with the latter having the greater weight. Both of these blends, with the weight shifted to "adequacy" and "pay-as-you-go," respectively, were inherent in the 1939 amendments and have met the very severe tests to which they have been subjected in the unprecedented conditions of the last 20 years."

Is there danger that we are overoptimistic as to the success of the financing method to date? It has been operating during a period when the system was immature and the contributions modest, when the actuarial or money value of the benefit to a recipient has been many times the amount of contributions made with respect to the recipient.

Has the blend been so bland as to blind us to blunders?

What is the extent of the blend of adequacy and equity? Some idea may be gained from a cost analysis of the OASDI system (as it was before the 1958 amendments) for present members and new entrants appearing in Actuarial Study No. 48. We read:

"The level-premium cost, after allowing for the existing fund, is 16.10 percent for present members as compared with 4.93 percent for new entrants (the latter figure is the normal cost). The sum of the present value of the contributions to be paid under the present schedule by present members and the existing fund is $269 billion less than the present value of benefits to be paid to them and their dependents and survivors; * * *. On the other hand, there is a "surplus" of $228 billion for new entrants."

The level-premium equivalent of the present value of contributions with respect to present members, as given in the study, is 6.74 percent of payroll compared with 16.10 percent of payroll—the value of benefits. In decided contrast, the level-premium equivalent of the contributions with respect to new entrants is 8.30 percent of payroll compared with 4.93 percent as the value of benefits. Present members and their employers, as a class, pay only about 42 percent of the value of their benefits, whereas new entrants and their employers will pay 169 percent of the value of their benefits. The equivalent level contributions of 4.15 percent for employee new entrants pays over 84 percent of the cost of their benefits. It is worse for the self-employed new entrants. Their equivalent level contribution is 6.23 percent of payroll or 125 percent of value of benefits. In this connection, it is important to recognize that, as employee unions have bargained for welfare and pension benefits, they have come increasingly to maintain that the employer contribution is in lieu of wages, that the contribution for pensions is a deferred wage and as a result the line between employee and employer contributions becomes less well defined. Hence, new entrants to the system may come to look upon the total of 8.30 percent as a cost to them for which a 4.93-percent value is obtained.

What is the extent of the blend of "pay-as-you-go" and "full reserve"? During the next decade, when the OASDI trust fund may be from two to three times the annual rate of benefit payments, the interest on the fund will be 6 to 9 percent of the benefit payments, say an average of 7½ percent. For a mature "full reserve" system, interest income would be 40 to 45 percent of pension outlays. It may then be said that the blend is about five-sixths "pay-as-you-go" and one-sixth "full reserve."

We need to know more about the kind of economic organism that we have created in the social security and railroad retirement systems. Legislation enacted today sets in motion forces which reach far into the future. In order to measure the significance of such forces, we need to appreciate that these retirement programs are dynamic economic instrumentalities. They are growing economic organisms. They have built-in features which generate and guide the pattern of growth. We must be able to detect symptoms in their growth behavior which may portend future trouble.

Need for Expansion of Sugar Beet Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the attached news release pursuant to a meeting of sugar beet growers in Grand Forks, N. Dak., is indicative of the feeling of all of those associated with sugar beet production in the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota.

It is interesting to note that in the face of strong feelings that now exist in regard to our relationships with Cuba, these people who are so dependent upon sugar beet production for their livelihood are only asking to be given the benefit of our increased consumption in the United States as our population grows and deficits that may occur because of adverse crop conditions in domestic areas.

Our present Sugar Act expires at the end of December 1960, and it is of paramount importance that Congress make proper provision for the extension of the act before Congress adjourns. Sugar beet production could be expanded tremendously in North Dakota and could be of great importance in stabilizing our farm economy. It is my hope that in extending the Sugar Act, Congress will give due consideration to the merit of allowing our sugar beet producers in the United States to expand their acreage as our domestic consumption increases.

The news release follows:

SUGAR BEET GROWERS MEETING, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., JUNE 14, 1960

At a meeting in Grand Forks, June 14, conducted by North Dakota Economic Development Commission, Minnesota Department of Business Development, and Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce, attended by the membership of the undersigned organization as well as representatives of business and industry closely allied with the beet sugar industry we strongly commend and endorse efforts to secure a renewal of the Sugar Act with such changes as will give the United States producers the following:

1. All of the annual increment resulting from increased consumption.

2. All of the deficits that occur in domestic areas.

We give full and enthusiastic support for such provisions in the pending Sugar Act legislation.

We assert that such redistribution of this country's sugar market is not only in the interest of thousands of growers who wish to produce sugar but also in the interest of securing suppliers from reliable sources within the boundaries of our own country.

We vigorously protest the injustice of assigning to Cuba ever increasing quotas yearly while domestic growers need to expand our sugar production for both agricultural and economic reasons.

Signed:

C. Einar Johnson, Warren, Minn., president, Western Sugar Beet Growers Association.

R. T. Adams, Fisher, Minn., president, Red River Valley Beet Growers Association.

Byron M. Henson, Hallock, Minn., president, Minn-Dakota Sugar Beet Development Association.

Leo Yaggi, Breckenridge, Minn., president, Southern Red River Valley Beet Growers Association.

The Vocational and Prevocational Training Possibilities for the Cerebral Palsied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech delivered by William P. McCahill at the Eighth Institute on Cerebral Palsy, Boston University, College of Liberal Arts, Boston, Mass., June 13, 1960.

Mr. McCahill is the Executive Secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. He is an acknowledged expert in the field of vocational training and well qualified to discuss the topic he chose, "The Vocational and Pre-Vocational Training Possibilities for the Handicapped":

THE VOCATIONAL AND PREVOCATIONAL TRAINING POSSIBILITIES FOR THE CEREBRAL PALSIED

(Remarks of William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, at the Eighth Institute on Cerebral Palsy, Boston University, College of Liberal Arts, Boston, Mass., June 13, 1960)

Were I to be asked to discuss the basic programs and policies of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, I would, naturally, discuss them on a broad front, not covering specific disabilities but, rather, the importance of the hiring of physically disabled men and women in our industries.

However, there has been assigned to me by your chairman the topic of "The Vocational and Prevocational Training Possibilities for the Cerebral Palsied." While I have had the pleasure of addressing United Cerebral Palsy at a regional convention some time ago, my talk at that time was on the program of the President's Committee, rather than specific disabilities, and it has been necessary, therefore, for me to acquire facts from various sources which, I hope, grouped together, will enable me to answer some of the problems involved.

The United Cerebral Palsy associations estimate that nearly 600,000 persons in the United States are affected by the physical impairment of cerebral palsy, of whom approximately 200,000 are under 21 years of age. About 10,000 babies are born annually with cerebral palsy. As you know better than I, this impairment is characterized by loss of voluntary muscle control.

Vocational rehabilitation for persons with cerebral palsy has been a matter of much concern to United Cerebral Palsy associations, and its 342 affiliates located in various cities and towns throughout these United States. They have realized from the start that the first step in the direction of vocational rehabilitation for these people was one of evaluation. They were not altogether disappointed when the record of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation disclosed the fact that only a very small number of persons with cerebral palsy were listed as rehabilitated during these past few years because sufficient funds were not available to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for this evaluation procedure which, in some instances, may take as long as 1 year, whereas persons handicapped through accidents require little or no evaluation.

Congress was aware of these difficulties when Mr. JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, on January 14, 1956, stated: "Now that we are aware of the problem, we shall do everything within our power to stimulate the vocational rehabilitation program so as to provide more help for the victims of cerebral palsy."

On March 5, 1956, the House Appropriations Committee in its report to the House of Representatives stated: "For some years, the committee has been concerned with the fact that the States have not given as much attention as they should to rehabilitation of the more difficult cases, such as cerebral palsy, the mentally retarded, etc."

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation at about the same time gave official recognition to the need of help to persons with cerebral palsy because on March 9, 1956, Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in a memorandum to heads of departments and independent establishments, stated: "There is a special need for your leadership in the employment of the cerebral palsied."

Again on March 13, 1956, in a letter by Miss Mary E. Switzer, as director, to State boards of vocational education and divisions of vocational rehabilitation on the subject of employment of the cerebral palsied, she stated: "The number of handicapped men and women in Federal employment is increasing but we are not sure there has been a proportionate acceptance of the more severely handicapped—the cerebral palsied among others. We want to encourage all appointing officers to make a fair appraisal of each handicapped applicant—whatever his disability and degree of impairment may be—in terms of his employability in the jobs available now and prospectively. It is our hope that this release will help unlock one door to the employment of the cerebral palsied. Your followup is necessary to open other doors for their placement in Federal service. And I cannot stress too strongly the value of personal contact by the State agencies with the appointing officers."

These directives naturally alerted the local offices of vocational rehabilitation and more attention has been given to persons with this handicap.

A cerebral palsy work classification and evaluation project by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled began in January 1955 under the sponsorship of five community agencies. A subsequent grant-in-aid was received from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in June 1955. The sponsoring agencies were: New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, New York State Employment Service, United Cerebral Palsy of New York City, United Cerebral Palsy of Queens, Institute for the Cripled and Disabled.

Efforts were made in this study toward accomplishing the following goals:

(1) To deal in a practical fashion with the immediate pressing vocational problems of the cerebral palsied adult awaiting service.

(2) To attempt to establish a standardized operating procedure designed for the observation and evaluation of each individual in a work setting which would be of practical value to other communities throughout the country.

(3) To start developing a broad work classification system based on the individual's generalized motor organization, including hand and finger control, visual motor coordination, speech, special senses, intelligence, emotional functioning, and vocational performance in the work setting.

As part of the evaluation process at the institute, each client received a complete medical review, including occupational and physical therapy, psychological testing, psychiatric screening, if indicated, speech and hearing examinations.

At the conclusion of the evaluation, a case conference was held with all professional disciplines attending and also representatives from the sponsoring agencies actively participating. At this meeting a total rehabilitation plan was formulated.

The fourth annual report recently issued by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, on the subject of cerebral palsy work classification and evaluation, describes the followup procedure of 168 cerebral palsied persons who were evaluated between April 1, 1955, and October 1958. Of this number, 111 persons, or 68 percent of the total caseload were recommended for direct placement or vocational training, 47 of whom were employable, 28 unemployable, 12 in training, 9 pending training, and 15 in high school.

I don't want to create the impression that 68 percent of persons with cerebral palsy are employable. The fact is that this 68 percent represented a group who were eligible for evaluation for their recognized potentialities but not necessarily employable in the open market.

For the most part, these 111 individuals were considered nonfeasible for training purposes prior to the development of this specialized project for evaluation.

Mr. Martin Moed, coordinator of the adult evaluation project for cerebral palsy, to which I just referred, recently delivered a paper at a program services workshop held in Columbus, Ohio, in which he stated, among other things: "Because of the complexity of the disability, little is known about the vocational abilities of the cerebral palsied. In every community, large or small, the problem of finding a job is overwhelming. A survey of 200 ambulatory adults in New York City revealed that only 42 were employed and a subsequent followup, unfortunately, revealed that only 32 of the 42 were still working. Two studies in Schenectady and Erie Counties in New York State indicated that 61 percent of the cerebral palsied population were unemployed and of the remaining individuals employed, almost half had only part-time jobs. A recent unpublished 10 year study of handicapped individuals who completed a leading New York City college course revealed that the handicapped cerebral palsied was not able to utilize his training to the fullest. The average wage was about $50 per week and 25 percent of the group were unemployed."

I don't suppose it is necessary for me to discuss with you a bill introduced by Congressman ELLIOTT in the House of Representatives to provide evaluation of rehabilitation potentials and rehabilitation services

to handicapped individuals who as a result thereof can achieve such ability of independent living as to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or who can dispense with or largely dispense with the need of an atendant at home; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities and for other purposes.

There is no nationwide program of the type contemplated in this proposed law. Professional people in rehabilitation facilities throughout the country are demonstrating daily that many of the most severely disabled people can achieve remarkable results with the right kind of programs. Rehabilitation services of the kind contemplated in this act are no longer experimental.

Vocational Rehabilitation agencies are best qualified by philosophy and experience to deal with the problems of severe disability on a nationwide basis. The addition of Independent Living Rehabilitation Services is a logical extension of the vocational rehabilitation services they now provide. This act contemplates no new types of services because these agencies already have effective working relations with the facilities and professional groups that may be utilized in the provision of Independent Living Rehabilitation Services.

So you see, therefore, that this problem has been studied from many angles by the various voluntary and public agencies engaged in the work of helping children and adults with cerebral palsy to take their rightful place alongside their more fortunate brothers and sisters—part of the never-ceasing struggle to preserve the concepts we hold dear.

One of the public agencies, the Bureau of Employment Security, is preparing an interviewing guide for the use of counselors and placement workers in assisting persons with cerebral palsy. Current plans call for the publication of this guide, during fiscal year 1961, as an addition to the series of "Interviewing Guides for Specific Disabilities." The guide is intended to meet a long-felt need for such an aid to counselors and interviewers in public employment offices. It may also prove a useful tool to guidance and personnel workers in other agencies.

The guide will follow the format of the other disability guides of the series, with four main sections: (1) Description of Disability, (2) Evaluation of Work Capacity, (3) Definitions, and (4) Cooperating Agencies.

The description of the disability will contain explanations of the various types of cerebral palsy, which are distinguished according to the nature of motor involvement. The major types to be included are: (1) spasticity, (2) athetosis, (3) ataxia, (4) tremor, and (5) rigidity. Mental, emotional, hearing, visual, and speech defects are also described as resultants of brain damage in the cerebral palsied.

The section dealing with the evaluation of work capacity should be especially helpful to those who must perform this function for the cerebral palsied. The varied manifestations of physical and sensory impairments and the mental and emotional disturbances which are sometimes present make realistic assessment of work capacity in persons of this group a difficult problem. This section will list the factors which must be considered in evaluating the work capacity of such persons and points out the significance of each factor in counseling and placing them.

Definitions of terms commonly used by physicians and other specialists engaged in habilitation or rehabilitation of the cerebral palsied will be listed to aid in the interpretation of medical and other reports. A list of agencies and organizations which provide services needed by the cerebral palsied will also be included.

The Civil Service Commission in the near future will issue an informational pamphlet discussing the employment policy of those individuals with residual of cerebral palsy and other neuromuscular (nerve muscle) disorders.

A preview of the content of that pamphlet, through the courtesy of Dr. Chapin, Medical Director of the Civil Service Commission, briefly is as follows:

(1) With respect to cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, and all the numerous and varied disorders classified as neuromuscular, as with all physical defects or deviations from the normal, the Civil Service Commission holds that these conditions alone should not keep a person from being employed in the Federal service if he can qualify competitively and perform all the duties of the position he seeks effectively and without hazard to himself or others.

(2) Proper placement in these conditions is a prime consideration and since most of these persons are visibly handicapped, improper placement is less excusable than in a number of other handicapped groups. In other words, it is important that we do not employ these folks with the objective of having them perform only part of the duties. Since practical experience has taught us that to do otherwise, leaves the employee so hired in the unenviable position, at a later date, of being required to perform duties that he should not have been expected to do in the first place.

(3) In connection with the consideration of applicants with a spastic condition or involuntary movements of the upper extremities the Commission, through test development research, has modified test material without interfering in its competitive nature to the extent of enlarging space for recording proper answers, since these conditions ordinarily would interfere with proper machine scoring and result in these applicants being at a disadvantage in competition.

In several ways, the work of the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation has been directed more and more toward those who have cerebral palsy, dystonia and associated brain damage problems. This has taken the form of services to the cerebral palsied by the State agencies, research into rehabilitation methods by universities, rehabilitation centers and others, the support of new facilities, and the conduct of specialized training courses.

In 1958, nearly 1,000 persons with cerebral palsy were rehabilitated through the State rehabilitation agencies. This, of course, is not a large number in terms of those who need service, but it is important because it represents a sizable increase over earlier years. It is important to note, too, that all of those individuals not only receive various services but were placed in jobs as a final step in their rehabilitation. Ninety-one percent had been unemployed when rehabilitation services began—yet many of these people became professional workers, others entered skilled occupations, some became clerical and sales employees. Where the few who had worked had earned only about $93,000 a year as a group before rehabilitation, these 1,000 cerebral palsied individuals earned more than $1,600,000 in their first year of employment.

These figures promise to increase sharply in the next few years—not simply because of normal growth of State agencies and their services, but because a number of things are being done to insure a better job for more cerebral palsied people. The stepped-up activities of parents groups and other voluntary organizations is being supported by increased activities by the States and by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Research and demonstration grants have been made to 11 organizations, some of them to develop new mehods and procedures in work with the cerebral palsied, others to establish demonstration programs for evaluating the potentials of those who have cerebral palsy. One research grant, to Dr. Irving Cooper in New York City, is especially interesting. As you may be aware, Dr. Cooper has been one of the pioneers in surgery to eliminate the uncontrolled tremors of cerebral palsy. This, of course, makes rehabilitation possible for many persons who could not be helped otherwise, either functionally or vocationally. His project has been devoted to developing and refining some of the postsurgical rehabilitation methods that should be carried out to help the patient recover function as fast and as fully as possible, and to prepare for activity and useful work.

In another phase, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the State agencies have been helping to meet one of the very urgent needs—the need for more and better facilities in which to serve the cerebral palsied. Through grants to voluntary organizations, many communities have been helped to establish the special facilities they need, so that all the cooperating organizations—public and voluntary alike—have at their disposal the special centers and clinics they need to do an adequate job for the cerebral palsied.

At the same time, a program of training grants has been developed, aimed at one of the most serious deficiencies we face today—the lack of properly trained professional workers to serve the cerebral palsied and other persons with handicaps. The shortages of physicians trained in this work, of physical therapists, occupational therapists and others represents a basic obstacle in all our efforts, for nothing else counts unless we have the people who perform this work for the CP patient. Today more than 30 medical schools are teaching the principles of rehabilitation to all their medical students, and many of them are providing residency training in physical medicine and rehabilitation for the physicians coming into this important specialty. Other groups of therapists also are in training, in increased numbers—and most important, all of the professional workers in these courses are acquiring an understanding that disability and rehabilitation call for a team operation, in which many professions must cooperate for the ultimate benefit of the patient.

Seminars such as the Boston University project today are helping speed the day when a larger percentage of the cerebral palsied will find increased opportunity for gainful employment. It remains in the providence of God to say when medical or scientific breakthroughs will come to help speed the day when we can say with confidence that CP's have as much chance as other severely disabled persons.

A quotation which I have on my desk may be most appropriate for my conclusion. It reads: "On the plains of hesitation bleach the bones of countless millions who, at the dawn of victory, sat down to rest, and resting, died."

We may not be at the dawn of victory, but we certainly are not on the plains of hesitation. I know I speak for the President in commending all of you for your dedicated efforts.

Competition Between East Coast and West Coast Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, for some years the Members of the House

representing districts on the east coast in which shipbuilding is a major industry, have been endeavoring to eliminate a provision of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which grants a 6-percent differential to west coast shipbuilders.

In the 84th Congress and again in this Congress, I introduced legislation to repeal this provision. The Merchant Marine Subcommittee has held hearings on this legislation and strong evidence was presented indicating that the differential is no longer necessary to enable the west coast shipyards to compete with the east coast, southern, and Great Lakes yards.

In this connection I would like to insert in the RECORD a reprint from the Baltimore Sun of June 7, of an article written by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of that paper, which I believe strongly supports our contention that steel and other major components are now available on the west coast and that with efficiency of operation the west coast yards are able to meet the competition of the east coast yards without the additional 6 percent subsidy. The article follows:

LAWYER GETS CREDIT FOR BUILDING BIG SHIPYARD

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., June 6.—The man responsible for making a big shipyard out of the former boatyard of National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp. is 37-year-old Milton F. Fillius, Jr., who was graduated as a lawyer at the University of Michigan in 1949.

His title is executive vice president of the yard.

He's described even by Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries, as "The Boss."

Milton Fillius was "The Boss" when National Steel made its first pitch for big ship construction by winning the award for the contract to build two freighters for the American Export Lines from the Bethlehem Steel shipyard.

INTERESTS WIDE

At that time, N.A.S.S.C.O., commonly referred to here as "Nassco" was owned by Charles A. Smith, chairman of the board of U.S. National Banks, a local chain and owner of the San Diego Padres, among other financial interests, including a giant tunafish packing plant. Mr. Smith recently sold out to a combine headed by Kaiser interests, but Mr. Fillius remains at the helm, calling all of the actual operating shots.

As the combine was entering the picture, Nassco became the actual low bidder on another contract to build four freighters for American Export lines.

And it doesn't intend to stop there. National Steel now is to bid on contracts for 12 more ships to be offered by the Federal Maritime Board along with subsidized American-flag steamship lines.

"We are sharpening our pencils so we can bid on these next ships," is the way Mr. Fillius and Mr. Kaiser describe it.

MORE WAYS PLANNED

Although the yard now has only two major ways—both recently installed—it is preparing to build two more as soon as the tunafish plant of Mr. Smith is moved out within the next 2 months.

At this point the shipyard can compete with any other yard on the west coast and intends to become even more competitive, not only with them, but with all the east coast yards as it did in the last American export contract.

Nassco has several advantages. Its average wage of the sheet-metal workers, riveters, welders, and fitters is $2.77 an hour on a 3-year contract. This compares to $2.80 in Baltimore. The craftsmen, such as carpenters, machinists, painters, electricians, receive $2.72 and are due for a raise to $2.79 July 1, on a contract running until July of 1961.

Altogether the yard deals with 11 unions, "but we have a favorable labor climate" is the way Mr. Fillius describes it.

In addition, the Kaiser Steel plant at Fontana, 100 miles away, produces heavy plate and all the heavy major steel components which once were transported from east coast steel plants. This has been a major factor in Nassco entering the big ship field.

Representative SHELLEY, Democrat, of California, made it clear here this weekend that he and all other west coast Congressmen were going to continue to fight hard to make certain that National Steel and other west coast yards receive their share of new ship contracts.

This launching (of the export aid) is a realistic example of what the Congressmen from California have done to reestablish shipbuilding on the west coast and we intend to keep it here," said the Congressman on the Appropriations Committee.

"When it comes to the shipbuilding fight, we have organized a bloc of Congressmen from California, Oregon, and Washington who work together. We do not care where, just so the contracts go to the west coast. This ship symbolizes that the western shipbuilding industry not only has made a real effort to stand up, but to expand and to survive."

AMALGAMATION OF FIRMS

National Steel is a 50-acre amalgamation of several firms that might be considered rather incongruous when thought of in terms of a shipyard. They gradually are being molded into a compact unit to form a modern yard so they can compete with the best of the old-line yards with young men at the helm and using only modern equipment.

The outstanding example is the Linde cutting machine which can cut steel components of the ship in about one-tenth the time it takes by the older method, saving tremendous costs in manpower and time. One operator can make eight cuttings at a time by electrical impulses copying the image off a pattern drawing either to full size or quarter-inch scale.

The original firm was National Iron Works, a steel-fabricating concern when Mr. Smith took over in 1933. He moved it to the waterfront when he decided to build tuna boats to go with his tunafish packing business. During the war, the yard built barges and small naval auxiliary craft.

OTHER INTERESTS SUPPLANTED

Mr. Fillius, who served in the Navy, decided to come to San Diego after he finished his law training as an assistant to Mr. Smith. Somehow, the two got off into shipbuilding on a major scale and now that has supplanted all of the other financial interests of the groups involved.

The tunafish plant is being moved away to make more room in the palmtree surrounding setting for big-ship construction. Already taken over is a small repair yard of Martinolich and the former 28th street mole where naval vessels once docked. This is used for prefabricating and small repairing and outfitting.

Although the entire plant covers 50 acres of ground, none of the land is owned by the plant, but by the Harbor Board of San Diego which owns all the waterfront land in the city limits under a State law. National Steel leases the land as do the major aircraft plants located on the waterfront and employing over 28,000 persons in this metropolitan area of more than 1 million persons.

Why All This Fuss About Braceros?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in a short time the House of Representatives will be considering legislation to extend the provisions of Public Law 78 for an additional 2 years. This is the law, first passed in 1951, that provides for the legal and regulated entry of Mexican farmworkers to the United States during seasons of peak labor needs to work the crops that feed this mighty Nation of ours. These supplemental farmworkers, absolutely necessary if we are to continue to feed and clothe this Nation from our domestic farms and ranches, have recently been subject to all sorts of propaganda utterly fantastic.

As a factual report, the Farm Journal of October 1959, carried an article written by Mr. Charles E. Ball of their field staff. Mr. Ball made personal inquiry into the antiwetback program, and his findings will be of great value to Members seeking a clear answer to the situation and "Why all this fuss about braceros?":

WHY ALL THIS FUSS ABOUT BRACEROS?—MEXICANS ARE HAPPY TO GET JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES, AND U.S. FARMERS ARE GLAD TO HAVE THEM—BUT NOBODY CAN AGREE ON HOW THE BRACERO LAW SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED

(By Charles E. Ball)

Jose Camarillo Torres considers himself a lucky man. He is now working in the United States.

But Jose—one of some 400,000 Mexican braceros—is a hot topic in the South and West right now.

A bracero is a Mexican national, authorized to work in this country by a law passed in 1951. This law gave our Secretary of Labor authority to negotiate a work agreement with the Mexican Government.

But Jose's luck may not last forever. Last year, 432,857 braceros came to our country to help farmers in 25 States harvest their crops. However, the work agreement between the United States and Mexico expired June 30—and has been extended month to month since then because the two governments haven't known quite how to write a new one.

Jose and others like him are at the center of an emotional controversy between farmers and ranchers, the U.S. Department of Labor, labor union officials, and religious leaders—to name only a few.

Last week, Secretary of Labor James F. Mitchell visited, unannounced, some labor camps in Santa Clara Valley, Calif. He called them filthy, closed one down and told farmers there to clean up the rest.

But Jose Torres isn't mad at anybody. He's feeling good. When I met him last month at the Eagle Pass, Tex., Reception Center, he had all his papers approved and was eagerly waiting for a bus to Lamesa where he would pick cotton. He will be here only 3 months, then he'll return to his family.

His job at home was "driving oxen on a corn and bean farm." The pay was 3½ to 5 pesos a day, the equivalent of 28 cents to 40 cents. But he and his wife decided that if he could work 90 days "across the river," for wages of $5 to $8 a day, then maybe they

could move into the village, buy the five children some clothes, and send them to school.

Mexican Government officials like the program, too. They say that braceros learn new farming practices in the United States. From 1946 to 1955, Mexico increased agricultural production 100 percent.

"They see higher standards of living," one Mexican consul told me, "and set their own goals higher."

Last year, the 432,857 braceros that worked on U.S. farms sent an estimated $34 million home, making this second only to the tourist trade as a source of dollars. Then who is unhappy and why? Well, let's look at the unhappy groups one at a time.

Farmers and ranchers need and want braceros, but don't like the way the U.S. Department of Labor administers the program.

"The USDL is dominated by labor unions," farmers claim, "and the unions would like to see the whole program scuttled so they can eventually unionize farmworkers."

"We're skeptical of the new contract, because the last one was weighted in favor of the bracero," says Jim Walsh, a member of the Rio Vista Farm Harvesting Association, Mission, Tex., which now has 1,200 braceros under contract to pick cotton. "He has all the guarantees and we have none."

Here are a few assurances a farmer must give the bracero:

A guaranteed minimum of "the prevailing wage in that area." If it is piece rate work, such as picking cotton or tomatoes, then 90 percent of the workers must receive over 50 cents per hour or the piece rate goes up for all.

Housing and food (for cooking facilities) up to USDL standards.

Insurance including $5,000 accident policy; a $500 nonoccupational (off the job) accident policy; $1,000 for natural loss of life; $2,000 accidental death; and a $350 burial policy. This costs the farmer $4.50 per manmonth, $2 of which can be deducted from the bracero's check for the nonoccupational policy.

A guarantee that he will be employed three-fourths of the time, or that he'll get subsistence if it rains and he cannot work 64 hours per 2 weeks.

To those not up against the problem, all these might sound reasonable, but here's what farmers and ranchers say: "The housing standards are unreasonable," asserts rancher T. A. Kincaid. "In many cases the house that the ranch owner moved out of and turned over to them won't pass USDL inspection."

"The minimum wage is not a part of the law," declares Ed Bush, of the Texas Cotton Ginners Association. "It's the Secretary of Labor's idea—a perfect example of law by administrative edict rather than by congressional intent."

"There's no end to the harassment, and changing of rules," declares C. B. Ray, manager of the Valley Farm Bureau. "In 1 year, they changed the formula for determining prevailing wages three times.

"The 90–10 formula is another example of harassment and administrative edict by the Secretary of Labor," he adds. "It's not in the law. It's just a built-in spiral to raise wages. If you have 10 cottonpickers and 2 sit on their sacks and fail to earn 50 cents per hour, you're supposed to raise the price rate for all. As a result, some farmers already see a slowing down in production of the braceros."

In California, the battle goes on over braceros. The AFL–CIO is attacking the program while trying to organize farmworkers. Backing them up is Gov. Edmund Brown with a proposed minimum wage. "His administration has really antagonized farmers," says one capital observer. "Farmers are taking on the Governor and labor every chance they get."

Ranchers have a different problem from framers. Ranchers must certify that they will pay a minimum of $110 per month, plus room and board, if they get a bracero from the bullpen or $125 if they get a special.

From the bullpen they take any man. A special is a man that they know and request by name.

"This is pretty expensive labor," says Rancher Rick Alexander, "when you figure the fringe benefits—food and housing, processing charges, transportation, insurance, etc.—for men who can't speak our language, can't get a driver's license, can't run into town for supplies."

For several years, ranchers found that to get a special processed, they must pay a "mordida," the Spanish word for tip or bribe to an official.

They squawked, but grew to accept it as a cost of doing business. Officials on both sides of the river—in Mexico and in the United States—deny any knowledge of it. But ranchers insist, "No one can live or work in the area without knowing about it."

Ranchers say mordida is the custom and way of life in Mexico. Until a year or so ago, many ranchers were calling it an advance to the bracero, then deducting it from his first paycheck.

Much less mordida is paid today than in years past, say ranchers, but it still exists.

What, then, would farmers and ranchers like in the next contract?

"We'll just do well to hold our own," says Harold West, president of the Texas Farm Bureau. "But we really don't know what is in a contract until the USDL starts interpreting it.

"Their interpretations sometimes are absurd," he continued. "What we would like is for the USDL to ease the pressure just a little so we can get back to the business of farming."

Labor unions admittedly don't like the bracero program. "It depresses overall wages and drives many of our own farmworkers out of State," says Jerry Holleman, president of the AFL–CIO in Texas.

"If Texas farmers would pay our domestic migrants the 50 cents an hour they pay the bracero, plus the cost of the fringe benefits, the domestics would stay and farmers would have better labor at no more cost."

Some religious leaders are unhappy about the program, too. "It's a national disgrace, the American badge of infamy," charges Catholic Archbishop Robert E. Lucey. He is concerned about the disruption of homelife back in Mexico; about the spiritual life of the men while away; and the depressing effect of bracero wages on other migrant labor.

Of course, farmers heartily disagree. "We've got to have braceros," declares J. B. Kirkland, who contracts 25,000 a year for the Trans-Pecos Cotton Association. "They harvest 80 percent of our cotton in this area. And this is as sound a labor program—for both sides—as I have had experience with in 46 years of farming."

Kirkland and his association have a modern dispersing area that operates year-round in Pecos, Tex., for braceros on their way to local farms. It's a $300,000 plant, including dormitories, a cafeteria, a hospital, a doctor, and nurses.

So the argument rages. Regardless of who is right, there's one result:

"The USDL has harassed us and increased costs until we're forced to mechanize," sums up C. B. Ray. "Farmers in our four counties have bought some 250 cottonpickers in the last 3 years—and are doubling that number this year.

"We're preparing for the day when we won't have to depend on braceros at all."

Is Liberty Possible Without Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American Bar Association Journal recently contained an article entitled, "Our Freedom Based on Law—Is Liberty Possible Without Law?"

The author of this article, David O. Boehm, Esq., is a leading member of the bar in Rochester, N.Y., my hometown. He has been very active in public affairs, and although still a young man, has already become an outstanding community leader.

His article in the A.B.A. Journal eloquently discusses the mission of lawyers and the significance of the rule of law. He concludes, after citing many historical examples, that it would not be possible to have liberty without law, since the two are inseparable.

I know that Mr. Boehm's learned and instructive comments on this subject will be of interest to many Senators, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FREEDOM BASED ON LAW—IS LIBERTY POSSIBLE WITHOUT LAW?

(By David O. Boehm)

In a way, any talk upon the subject "Our Freedom Based Upon Law" seems, at first glance, somewhat paradoxical. For, although much has been said in the past and will be said in the future about law being the safeguard of liberty, nevertheless down through recorded time much has also been said about law and lawyers in a much more disparaging fashion.

For example, as far back as 1621, Burton, in his "Anatomy of Melancholy," quoted the proverb, "He that goes to law holds a wolf by the ear." And the title of Arbuthnot's political pamphlet in 1712 is "The Law Is a Bottomless Pit." Shakespeare was even more direct. One of the characters in his plays urges with great force, "Let's kill all the lawyers."

And yet the satirical comment, the jokes and gibes that continue even today suggest that to men in society the law always has been a familiar thing, a thing which they knew had the capacity for greatness, and which was discussed not for what it could do but what mankind wanted it to do—much as Brooklyn in the past affectionately called its favorite ballclub "Dem Bums."

Through history, the law has been so much a part of man that in early days he incorporated it in all his religious beliefs. In a savage society it became a system of taboos. The Romans made it a goddess and when Moses descended from Sinai he carried with him, as a divinely revealed thing, the Tablets of the Law. It was too well understood even to require comment that God was on the side of the just and thus the first trials in England before the Norman invasion consisted of the ordeals by fire and by water whereby a verdict was established in a supernatural way. Even today we speak about going through fire and water for something or someone.

When the Normans conquered England, there was added ordeal by battle and it was here that the idea of the advocate, or lawyer, first became manifest in the person of the champion willing to do battle for an accused. Ivanhoe battling at the lists for Rebecca is a familiar example of this early type of law court where the judgment was supposed to be resolved not in favor of strength, but of right.

To point out that this may not have always been the case does not diminish the natural urge that man felt for a system of justice that could result in justice. In other words, the belief was equivalent to the fact and though the operation of law, compared to today, may have been crude and primitive, nevertheless it was crude and primitive only because it represented the society that it was in. The instinctive need for law was there just the same.

LAW EXISTS BECAUSE IT HAS TO

And so law exists because it has to. As a societal thing—evolved out of the customs and traditions and experience of a society which became codified—it must develop slowly in the same way that the community about it develops. But to the individual in need of a justice which may take a new or novel form, this very slowness, this painstaking exercise of deliberation before discarding one rule for another is irksome and sometimes infuriating. And so this individual, with a strong belief in the rightness of his cause, invents another proverb about the law, or creates a new condemnation of it. Sometimes this takes the form of calling for its complete abolition—a society without law—where men will live amicably together in a natural state because men are naturally good.

So Rousseau believed—but all the ambitious experiments which he inspired proved only that when men live in anarchy they cannot live together. Whereas man may be good, all men are not good.

But anarchy is not and never has been a formidable enemy of law. It is the opposite extreme, tyranny or absolutism, with which law has bitterly and tenaciously contended through the centuries. It is a demon that says to the individual who cannot find satisfaction in the law—"Eliminate the law's delays—remove the lawyers and their technicalities; with one stroke I can give you what you want because I am above the law."

This is a siren song that has attracted many and even democracies have yielded to it. In times of stress, the early Romans appointed dictators, the Hebrews gave up their judges for a King because of the emergency created by the Philistinian wars, and Abraham Lincoln, during the Civil War, suspended the writ of habeas corpus and permitted the trial of civilians in the various Northern States by Army generals in direct violation of the Constitution.

The times required, it was felt, speedy law, and so the people gave up their own individual rights in submission to the State. In a crisis this may be necessary. We all remember the war emergency powers Congress gave to President Roosevelt during the last war.

IMMEDIATE "JUSTICE" MAY BECOME INJUSTICE

But when the individual demands justice so immediately, so urgently, that he feels it to be injustice to make him wait for its proper exercise, then law's worst enemy grows strong. In the dark of night the lynch mob draws the rope around its victim's neck and strangles him without a trial. The mob is always eager for quick and speedy justice. In the People's Court of the French Revolution, Mme. LaFarge clicks her knitting needles and watches the accused nobility appear before the judges, who are also the prosecutors and the jury, and the accused are condemned almost before they can draw a breath in their own defense. Quick justice—speedy justice. The sharecropper and the aristocrat are both victims of this demoniac urge that whispers "Execute them before some smart lawyer with his technicalities and tricks can save them."

It is when the individual or a group of individuals is most anxious for speed in the exercise of the law that the law must act as the checkrein. How careful was the War Crimes Tribunal to avoid even the suspicion of being a drumhead court. How slowly, and to some, how tediously it examined and analyzed the proofs and accusations. And yet, in spite of the immense care and caution with which it managed its power, there were those among it who still remained uncertain, not as to whether Goering and Himmler and the others were guilty, but as to whether the judges had the right to judge the accused and condemn them as war criminals. This was the first time that such a tribunal had ever sat, the first time men were being tried for crimes of war against nations and people. But this was not a star chamber where confessions were extorted out of the accused, nor where a mob in a turbulent courtroom clamored for brutal revenge. It was an example of law in its endless, cautious search for truth and the principles of justice. Yet, there were and are great judges and legal scholars in many nations who wondered whether even this slow and painstaking trial, with its rigid and careful adherence to all the rules of law and the protection it gave the accused, was not wrong because it was too novel, too new and, therefore, suspect.

In a sense, therefore, it is almost the duty of the law to be unpopular. As someone pointed out "All the world hates an umpire." Frequently it runs against the tide of great popular feeling and emotion. It provides sanctuary to men who are regarded as deadly enemies of the community or of the nation. It restrains and inhibits the floodwaters of popular prejudice and compels them to flow into society's proper conduits. It is a shield not only against the mob, but against the tyrant.

We see it, as Ben W. Palmer points out, in "Demosthenes, defending the democracy of the ancient world against the totalitarian menace of Philip of Macedon; undefended Cicero, standing for the republic and leveling the shafts of his eloquence against an Antony whose aroused assassins menaced him at the doors of the senate house; Papinian, facing certain death for refusing the Emperor's demand that he give a legal opinion justifying the Emperor's assassination of his own brother; Malherbes, during the French Revolution, going to the guillotine because he dared to defend his king; John Adams, in the face of public clamor, defending the redcoats charged with murder in the Boston massacre; William H. Seward, risking his professional and political career by acting as counsel for a poor insane Negro charged with murder."

There was Erskine, almost at the risk of his life in an England fearful and apprehensive of invasion by Napoleon, defending Tom Paine of the crime of sedition for having written a pamphlet which spoke favorably of French republicanism; not only defending Paine, but obtaining his acquittal. And perhaps the greatest of them all, Edward Coke. When King James angrily said that it was treason to affirm that the king was under the law, Lord Coke, defying imprisonment in the Tower of London and the headman's ax, declared that though the King ought not to be under any man, he was under God and the law.

This does not imply that the interpreters of the law—the judges who make the decisions and establish the guideposts—are above it. They, too, are men and capable of error and no one is more aware of this than the judges themselves. As the late Justice Jackson pointed out, the Supreme Court is not final because it is infallible; it is infallible only because it is final.

I have tried to show here by example rather than mere declaration that law does protect and guard our liberties—that without law, there is no freedom. And because by conferring a right upon one man, it may deprive another of his, it must be slow, it must be deliberate as well as considerate. Nor does this mean that the law is rigid or inflexible; but when it changes, when it adjusts, it is to develop with the developing society about it.

As Viscount Bryce said in his book, "The American Commonwealth," everything that has power to win obedience and reverence must have its roots deep in the past. The more slowly institutions have grown, so much the more enduring are they likely to prove.

The law therefore is the slowly reasoned will of the people, rather than the mere momentary willfulness of the king, or even of the majority. As an example, the 18th amendment has come and gone in our time, but the first 10 amendments are still with us and will be with us so long as our democratic form of government exists.

Is it possible to have liberty without law? This can be answered with the words of Charles Evans Hughes: "Liberty and law are one and inseparable."

Common Site Picketing in Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of the interest of this House in proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which would affect secondary boycott provisions, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following report. This study was prepared and submitted to me by Mr. Sar A. Levitan, specialist in industrial relations, who is with the economics division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service.

The report follows:

COMMON SITE PICKETING IN CONSTRUCTION
SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

The Taft-Hartley Act contains a prohibition against secondary boycotts. Section 8 (b) (4) (B) makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to "induce or encourage * * * a strike or a refusal * * * to perform any services, where * * * and object thereof is * * * forcing or requiring any person * * * to cease doing business with any other person."[1]

The meaning of this section has been a source of controversy since the enactment of Taft-Hartley in 1947. Some have claimed that the intent of Congress, and that sound public policy, would require the outlawing of all types of secondary boycott—attempts to influence an employer by exerting economic or other pressures against persons who deal with the employer.

Union spokesmen have naturally opposed this stringent interpretation of the ban on secondary boycotts. They assert that a com-

[1] Before the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act, this ban on secondary boycotts was contained in section 8(b) (4) (A) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

munity of interest exists among workers in a given industry or occupation, and they insist that undercutting of union wages or working conditions by one employer may jeopardize union standards established in other sectors of the industry. Unions, therefore, justify the use of boycotts against any employer who jeopardizes established union working conditions.

This controversy played a major role in the congressional debate of 1959 in connection with amending the Taft-Hartley Act. As finally adopted, the Labor Reform Act of 1959 included some specific additional restrictions upon the use of secondary boycotts in labor-management disputes.

In applying the ban on secondary boycotts, the National Labor Relations Board and the Courts have adopted the position that the prohibition of secondary boycotts contained in section 8(b)(4)(B) must be interpreted to harmonize "the dual congressional objectives of preserving the right of labor organizations to bring pressure to bear on offending employers in primary labor disputes and of shielding unoffending employers and others from pressure in controversies not their own." (*NLRB* v. *Denver Building Trade Council*, 341 U.S. 675, 1951.)

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The application of section 8(b)(4)(B) presents special problems in the construction industry. This is due to the special nature of the industry and the structure of the unions representing construction workers in collective bargaining. According to a U.S. Labor Department publication, the construction industry has been characterized as a "group of related firms whose principal common denominator is the employment of the same labor force in bargaining with the same trade unions." (Labor Management Relations in the United States, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1225, p. 3:09). Eighteen different unions within the AFL–CIO comprising the Building and Construction Trade Department, in addition to the Teamsters Union, claim jurisdiction over various groups of workers engaged in the construction industry. These unions are organized on a craft basis.

The industry is highly organized and according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics about 2.3 million of the 2.6 million employees in the contract construction industry in 1958 belonged to these 20 unions. This estimate may, however, exaggerate union membership since it is based on union claims and also includes unemployed workers as well as some who may have retired but still are maintained on union rolls. (Directory of National International Labor Unions in the United States, December 1959. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bulletin No. 1267, table 7, p. 12.)

The National Bureau for Economic Research estimated that in 1953 union membership in the building and construction industry accounted for 84 percent of total employment. According to this study, union membership in 1953 accounted for 2,198,000 out of the total 2,622,000 persons engaged in the construction industry. (Leo Troy, Distribution of Union Membership Among the States, Occasional Paper No. 56, 1957, table 6, p. 24.)

The construction industry is normally divided into four broad categories: Heavy highway and engineering construction; commercial, industrial and public building construction; homebuilding; and maintenance and repairs. The extent of unionization is highest in the first 2 categories of construction. The extent of unionization also varies according to geographic location and size of community; unionization is more widespread in larger metropolitan areas. Geographically the construction unions are weakest in the South and strongest in the mid-Atlantic States and on the Pacific coast.

Much of the homebuilding construction is done by small contractors employing nonunion labor. As the following table indicates, almost 3 out of 4 workers in the construction industry were employed in 1956 by firms having less than 100 employees compared with 1 out of 5 in manufacturing.

Distribution of employment by size of company—Construction and manufacturing (1956)

Number of employees in company	Percent of total employment	
	Construction	Manufacturing
Total	100	100
1 to 7 employees	23	2
8 to 19 employees	19	4
20 to 99 employees	30	14
100 to 999 employees	21	27
1,000 and over employees	7	53

Source: Health, Education, and Welfare Department, Bureau of Old Age, Disability and Survivors Insurance.

Employer organization has developed much less than union organization in the industry. While employer organizations are organized along national, regional and local lines paralleling the craft organization of the employees, most of the collective bargaining is done locally by the employer craft associations and the unions in each craft. However, in many cases the local construction associations bargain with all their building unions in the same area. A study by Profs. William Haber and Harold M. Levinson found that there is a wide variety of combinations of union-management groups which may engage in bargaining, so that "it is all but impossible to present a simple picture of the industry's collective bargaining pattern." (Labor Relations in the Building Trade, University of Michigan, 1956, p. 40.)

COMMON SITE PICKETING

Normally, any construction job involves a general contractor and a number of subcontractors engaged by the general contractor to perform some specialized parts of the project, such as, installing electrical equipment, plumbing, plastering, or painting. This situation creates the uniqueness of applying the ban on secondary boycotts contained in section 8(b)(4)(B) of the Taft-Hartley Act to the construction industry.

Basically the question revolves around the relationship between the various subcontractors or employers on the site. If it is to be assumed that each employer is an independent entity, then the ban contained in section 8(b)(4)(B), prohibiting a union from engaging in a strike when an object thereof is to force an employer to cease doing business with any other person, would apply to unions in the construction industry picketing a site where many employers are engaged. Such picketing runs the risk of being prohibited by section 8(b)(4)(B) as a secondary boycott within the meaning of the act.

In 1950 the NLRB adopted a set of four basic tests that must be satisfied if common site picketing is to be considered legal:

1. Picketing must be carried on only when the primary company actually is doing business at the common site.

2. The primary company must be doing its normal business at a common site.

3. The picketing must be carried on reasonably close to the place where the primary company is carrying on its business.

4. The picket signs must state clearly that the picketing is aimed only at the primary company. (*Moore-Drydock* (92 NLRB 547).)

At the same time the National Labor Relations Board held that where a union pickets a common site for the purpose of forcing a building contractor to cease doing business with his subcontractors, it is engaged in an illegal secondary boycott. In other words, the contractor and the subcontractors are not "allies," and, therefore, not exempted from the secondary boycott ban of section 8(b)(4)(B) (*Denver Building Trades Council* (82 NLRB 1195).)

The Supreme Court upheld the National Labor Relations Board ruling that picketing by a union is prohibited under section 8(b)(4)(B) if the object of the picketing is to force a contractor to cease doing business with a nonunion subcontractor. The Supreme Court added that the law would have applied even if the union may have had other objects in the picketing. (*NLRB* v. *Denver Building Trades Council* 341 U.S. 675 (1951).)

The impact of Moore-Drydock and Denver Building Trades Council decisions must be considered jointly. In the latter case the National Labor Relations Board and the Supreme Court apparently held that picketing by a union in the construction industry is subject to the criteria laid down in the Moore-Drydock case. Spokesmen for the unions in the construction industry have insisted that the application of the Moore-Drydock tests for legal picketing, which involved a ship repairing company and an operator of a vessel which happened to be docked at the shipyard, should not be applied to the construction industry. The Moore-Drydock case involved two separate employers engaged in different businesses while the construction of a building, spokesmen for construction unions agree, should be likened to a single enterprise. The result of the application of the Moore-Drydock criteria for legal picketing, according to the building unions, has been to effectively eliminate not only secondary but also primary picketing on a construction site.

This Supreme Court decision in the Denver case has been a source of controversy over the past 9 years. A number of attempts have been made to amend the Taft-Hartley Act so as to reverse the Denver decision as far as the construction industry is concerned. In 1954 President Eisenhower recommended "that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against * * * an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott."

The House Committee on Education and Labor (committee print, H. Res. 115, Apr. 29, 1954) and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 1211, Apr. 15, 1954) acted favorably on the President's recommendation, but no action was taken on these proposals. The President repeated the recommendation to reverse the Denver decision in 1958 and 1959. In 1960 the Under Secretary of Labor testified in favor of H.R. 9070.

Congress considered the above recommendation in connection with the labor reform legislation debated in Congress in 1958 and in 1959. But neither the Kennedy-Ervin bill as passed by the Senate, nor the Landrum-Griffin bill as passed by the House in 1959 contained any provisions dealing with exempting the construction industry from section 8(b)(4)(B), though attempts were made to write in such an exemption by the conference committee which ironed out the differences between the House and Senate versions of the labor reform legislation of that year. Several of the conferees in 1959 pledged at that time that attempts to remedy this situation would be made in 1960. The Kennedy (S. 2643 and Thompson (H.R. 9070) bills represent an attempt to reverse the 1951 Denver decision.

These bills consist of only one paragraph stating:

"That nothing contained in clause (B) of this paragraph (4) shall be construed to

make unlawful, where not otherwise unlawful, any strike or refusal to perform services at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work and directed at any of several employers who are in the construction industry and are jointly engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in such construction, alteration, painting, or repair at such site, and there is a labor dispute, not unlawful under this act or in violation of an existing collective bargaining contract, relating to the wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees employed at such site by any of such employers."

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF H.R. 9070

1. The Denver Building Trades decision fails to recognize the realities of collective bargaining in the construction industry. It is based on a technicality that the contractors and subcontractors on any construction site are separate employers. Legally this is true, but cursory examination of the interrelationship between the contractor and the subcontractors would show that their operations are closely interrelated and that any contractor before he bids on a construction job must carefully plan the cost and type of labor that subcontractors will supply him for the various tasks usually performed by them. The intent of Taft-Hartley was obviously to ban secondary boycotts which affect neutral employers. This is not entirely the situation that exists in the construction industry. In defense of the prohibition of secondary boycotts, Senator Robert A. Taft stated in the debate on the floor of the Senate:

"This position makes it unlawful to resort to a secondary boycott to injure the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees" (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4323, April 29, 1947).

Obviously, if we are to follow the Taft reasoning, the ban on secondary boycotts might not apply to the construction industry.

2. In the absence of subcontractors, an employer could not require his union employees to work side by side with a few selected craftsmen who would undercut union scales. In manufacturing, for example, the union would be free to strike and picket an establishment if the employer chose to employ nonunion electricians at rates below union scales. The union would have the freedom to picket the establishment and peacefully advertise that an employer refuses to pay union wages to the electricians, and such picketing would be legal if the majority of the employees in the collective bargaining unit chose to be represented by the union. The structure of the unions in the construction industry, each craft being represented by a different union, prevents this kind of representation. The Supreme Court minority in the Denver Building Trades case characterized this as the "fortuitous business arrangements that have no significance so far as the evils of the secondary boycott are concerned."

The minority of the Supreme Court recognized the realities of the structure of employers and unions in the construction industry by asserting:

"The picketing would undoubtedly have been legal if there had been no subcontractor involved—if the general contractor had put nonunion men on the job. The presence of the subcontractor does not alter one whit the realities of the situation; the protest of the union is precisely the same." (Denver Building Trades Council, 341 U.S. 675.)

3. The ban on picketing in the construction industry, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, undermines the very purpose of the Labor-Management Relations Act, which is aimed in part to "prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers * * *." Evidence presented before the House Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Education and Labor Committee showed that the decision has encouraged open-shop activities in the construction industry with the accompanying undermining of union scales. It was found, for example, that in some cities union contractors have been replaced by open-shop employers in the construction industry. Indeed, it is significant to remember that the nonunion subcontractor in the Denver Building Trades case paid his electricians 42 cents less per hour than the union scale.

The issue, therefore, in approving H.R. 9070 is whether a union would be permitted to protect the economic interests of the members and preserve the union scale or whether the law would continue to encourage nonunion employers in the construction industry and thereby undermine the union standards.

The fact is that contractors employing union labor have supported legislation aimed at overruling the Denver Building Trades decision; the associations of masons, electrical, and painting and decorating contractors of America support the enactment of H.R. 9070. All these associations have, of course, taken a strong position against secondary boycotts which are aimed at an innocent third party. But they recognize that the needs to preserve union standards in the construction industry require that the unions must be allowed to protect the interests of their members by refusing to work with nonunion workers in the construction industry.

Again, in the words of the Supreme Court minority in the Denver Building Trades case:

"The employment of union and nonunion men on the same job is a basic protest in trade union history. * * * The union was not out to destroy the contractor because of his antiunion attitude. * * * All the union asked was that union men not be compelled to work alongside nonunion men on the same job."

4. Experience has shown that the normal union representation elections cannot be held in the construction industry because of the short duration of employment of any worker normally employed by an employer. The only effective means available for the unions in the construction industry to organize employees and to protect union standards is to picket a job site. In any other industry the union can rely upon the processes of the NLRB to protect the right of the employees to engage in collective bargaining. The Denver Building Trades case has denied unions in the construction industry this elementary protection.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF H.R. 9070

1. The major contribution of the Taft-Hartley Act was to limit some of the coercive powers of unions. Section 8(b)(4) restricted the power of unions to engage in secondary boycotts. Senator Robert A. Taft explained the need for this section in the following words: "Under the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it became impossible to stop a secondary boycott or any other kind of a strike, no matter how unlawful it may have been at common law. All this provision of the bill does is to reverse the effect of the law as to secondary boycotts. It has been set forth that there are good secondary boycotts and bad secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have so broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts as to make them an unfair labor practice." (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4198.)

The NLRB and the courts interpreted this provision in light of section 7, which encourages collective bargaining, and section 13, which permits the unions to engage in strikes. The criteria for permissive picketing were laid down in the Moore-Drydock case and in the *Washington Coca-Cola Bottling Works* (107 NLRB 233, (1953)). Construction unions should not be entitled to special privileges going beyond the above criteria. The enactment of H.R. 9070 would turn the clock back and exempt one of America's great industries involving millions of employees from reasonable restriction upon picketing and engaging in secondary boycott.

2. The protector of 8(b)(4)(B) does not extend to allies of the primary employer. Nor does the act, in the words of Senator Taft, "apply to a case where a third party is, in effect, in cahoots with or acting as a part of the secondary employer" (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8709). But the several contractors and subcontractors engaged in a construction project are clearly not "allies" within the meaning of this interpretation. The relationship of subcontractors to contractors is that of independent producers or entrepreneurs; comparable in many respects to suppliers and major producers in any industry. It is therefore only fair that employers in the construction industry should have the same protection from coercive union activities as is extended by the law to employers in other branches of American industry.

Moreover, all construction workers like other workers are protected in the right to join a union or not to join a union. If the employees of the subcontractor have not joined a union they have the right to protection from coercion by unions not of their own choosing.

3. H.R. 9070 would give unions in the construction industry what amounts to an effective control on all the labor that is being done on a site. By picketing the site a union could force the employer to deal only with union contractors or subcontractors and prevent the nonunion employers from securing any work. Legalizing picketing on construction sites would further increase the considerable power of the building trades union in the industry. It is commonly recognized that the unreasonable work restrictions imposed by some of the construction unions have impeded productivity in that industry and have contributed significantly to the high cost of housing in the United States.

4. Nineteen different unions claim jurisdiction over work done on a construction site. Traditionally, these unions have squabbled among themselves, each trying to get the maximum jobs for its own members. Under H.R. 9070 every union, no matter how small its contribution to a construction job, would be able to force the cessation of operations. This would impose great burdens on the construction industry and further increase the cost of construction in the United States. H.R. 9070 would, therefore, add strength and perpetuate the absolute union structure in the industry by granting undue strength to minority groups within the labor force.

STATUS OF H.R. 9070

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the House Committee on Education and Labor held hearings on H.R. 9070 and companion bills during February 1960. In April the full committee reported out the bill by a 19 to 6 vote. The conflicting views on the bill were presented in House Report 1556 (pt. I, April 27, 1960, and pt. II, April 28, 1960, 86th Cong., 2d sess.). As of May 31, 1960, the bill was pending before the House Committee on Rules.

On May 26, 1960 Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY announced on the floor of the Senate that the Senate Subcommittee on Labor will hold brief hearings on S. 2643 (companion bill to H.R. 9070) "within a few days and all necessary steps will be taken to bring this measure promptly to the floor of the Senate" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1960, p. 10405, daily ed.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY—COMMON SITUS PICKETING IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

(By Mary R. Heslet)

Barden, Graham A. The dangerous and unjustifiable common-situs picketing bills H.R. 9070, H.R. 9100, H.R. 9089, H.R. 9123, H.R. 9140, H.R. 9175, H.R. 9373, and all other identical or similar bills now pending bring to life again and would make legal secondary boycotts. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (daily ed.), April 7, 1960, p. A3078–3081.

Denver Building and Construction Trades Council v. *NLRB*, Georgetown law journal, volume 39, January 1951: 340–343; St. Louis University law journal, volume 1, winter 1951: 342–346; University of Pennsylvania law review, volume 100, October 1951: 141–144; Virginia law review, volume 37, November 1951: 1012–1015.

Garland, James P. Secondary boycott—common-situs picketing. Villanova law review, volume 1, January 1956: 63–72.

Haber, William. Labor relations and productivity in the building trades, by William Haber and Harold M. Levinson. Ann Arbor, Bureau of Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1956. 266 pp. (See chs. 2 and 3.)

The impact of the Taft-Hartley Act on the building and construction industry. Yale law journal, volume 60, April 1951: 673–695. (Secondary boycotts, pp. 684–689.)

Kennedy, John F. Remarks on conference report of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (daily ed.), September 3, 1959, pp. 16413–16416.

Meyers, Donald A. "Ally" or "neutral"—the secondary boycott dilemma. Tulane law review, volume 34, February 1960: 343–352.

Segal, Melvin J. Differences among secondary boycotts, and the Taft-Hartley Act. Wayne law review, volume 5, spring 1959: 195–208.

Secondary boycott loopholes. Labor law journal, volume 10, March 1959: 175–179, 202.

Sherman, Sidney. Primary strikes and secondary boycotts. Labor law journal, volume 5, April 1954: 241–253.

Special labor problems in the construction industry. Stanford law review, volume 10, May 1958: 525–553. Contents: The nature of the industry. Jurisdictional disputes. Union security (secondary boycotts, p. 547–552).

Thompson, Frank, Jr. Amending the National Labor Relations Act as to picketing to protest substandard conditions. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (daily ed.), April 28, 1960, p. 8293–8296.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Amendment to section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Report to accompany H.R. 9070. [Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960] 16 p. (86th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 1556.) Additional views, House Report No. 1556, part 2.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Construction site picketing. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations. House, 86th Congress, 2d session on H.R. 9070, H.R. 9089, H.R. 9100, H.R. 9123, H.R. 9140, H.R. 9175, H.R. 9373; bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act with regard to construction site picketing. February 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, and 29, 1960. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960; 363 pages.

Social Security Program Discussed in 20th Annual Report of Board of Trustees—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, to complete the discussion of the actuarial status of the social security trust funds, I include the following continuation of remarks taken from the 20th annual report of the board of trustees:

ACTUARIAL STATUS OF THE TRUST FUNDS

CONCLUSION

Both the contribution income and the disbursements of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund have been increased substantially during the past 5 fiscal years. The increase in the contribution income resulted partly from the rise in earnings levels and the normal growth of the labor force and partly from the increases in contribution rates in 1954 and 1959, the extension of coverage to additional types of employment by the 1954 and 1956 amendments, and the increases in the maximum limit on taxable earnings from 1955 and 1959.

Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund disbursements, however, have risen even more sharply than contribution income. Basic factors in this increase are the long-term growth in the aged population and, more significantly, the lengthening period during which workers have had an opportunity to acquire the quarters of coverage required to be insured. More immediate causes have been the amendments to the Social Security Act during 1950–58, which extended the program's coverage, lowered the requirements for eligibility to benefits for persons who retire (and for the survivors of individuals who die) in the early years of the program, reduced the minimum retirement age of women from 65 to 62, increased the benefits payable, and liberalized the retirement test.

As a result of the rapid rise in disbursements, the outgo of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund exceeded its income by $216 million in fiscal year 1958 and by $1,271 million in fiscal year 1959. The assets of the trust fund were, of course, available to cover this excess of outgo over income in both years. Under the contribution schedule as revised by the Social Security Amendments of 1958, however, total receipts are expected to exceed total disbursements in the 5 fiscal year period 1960–64.

Long-range cost estimates show that the old-age and survivors insurance program is in close actuarial balance. In other words, the system will have sufficient income from contributions based on the tax schedule now is the law and from interest earned on investments to meet payments for benefits and administrative expenses over the long-range future.

Aggregate income of the disability insurance trust fund during the period immediately ahead will continue to be wholly sufficient to meet aggregate disbursements and in fact will build up a substantial fund. Long-range cost estimates show that the disability insurance program is more than in actuarial balance.

In its 19th annual report, the Board of Trustees presented its comments on the report of the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing. The Board expressed full or partial agreement with certain of the Council's recommendations that would necessitate changes in the law. Modified in accordance with the views of the Board, the proposed changes in the law are as follows:

(1) The so-called three times rule (requiring the Board of Trustees to report to the Congress whenever it expects that in the course of the next 5 fiscal years either of the trust funds will exceed three times the highest annual expenditures from such fund anticipated during that 5-year period) should be eliminated from the law.

(2) The law should be amended to state that the Board of Trustees shall meet not less frequently than once each 6 months.

(3) In order to permit the flexibility which occasional special circumstances might require, the law should be amended to allow the purchase of marketable securities only when such purchase would be in the public interest.

(4) The statutory formula fixing the interest rate on special Federal obligations issued for purchase by the trust funds should be changed so that the interest rate on such issues will approximate the average market yield on marketable Federal obligations that are due or callable 3 or more years from the time when the special obligation is issued.

An administration bill (H.R. 9148) incorporating these recommended changes was introduced in the Congress in September 1959.

Steel's Sick City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper article by George J. Church, of the Wall Street Journal. This article appeared on June 20, 1960, under the title of "Steel's Sick City." The 14 steel mills in Youngstown for the past 5 weeks have been working at less than half their furnace capacity; however, this is just part of the story. The recession in 1958, when the steel industry hit a low of 47.1 percent, the plants in Youngstown got to 26 percent and stayed under 40 percent for 9 weeks.

I call this excellent article to the attention of all Members in the hope that some alleviation of the pain and hardships inflicted upon the many good families affected by this work slowdown can be considered:

STEEL'S SICK CITY—THE INDUSTRY'S DECLINE HAS ITS HEAVIEST IMPACT ON YOUNGSTOWN'S MILLS—OLD PLANTS, LACK OF WATER TRANSIT LIFT COSTS, LEAD TO EARLY, DEEP CUTBACKS—CIVIL WAR FURNACE IS IDLE

(By George J. Church)

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.—"I've never seen so much of this stuff piled up in one place before in my life. When we're running right, we use it fast. But working the way we are now, we can't do anything but store it."

Speaking is an official of United States Steel Corp., as he sweeps an arm toward a mountain of what looks like black dust; the mountain towers over visitors in a storage yard of the company's huge Ohio works here. The "dust" actually is iron ore, "sintered" or

concentrated for feeding into the five blast furnaces that rear their smokestacks skyward a few paces away.

But only two of the blast furnaces are pouring red-hot molten iron into the giant ladles placed under them; the other three stand quiet and lifeless. A short walk away in the open-hearth shop, steelmaking fires can be glimpsed through the doors of only 6 of the row of 15 furnaces. The blackened walls of the others enclose nothing but empty air. One or two appear to stand in ruins, surrounded by piles of crumbled brick and lacking roofs and walls; mill officials hastily explain they're being repaired while they're not needed to melt steel.

POINTING UP STEEL'S TROUBLES

With a few minor variations, this forlorn scene could be duplicated this week in almost any of the mills that have given this city of 165,633 folk most of its fame and money. For the pile of sinter and the smokeless stacks stand as symbols of a harsh economic fact usually reported only in the abstractions of statistics. In the midst of what is still a period of general prosperity, the steel industry has stumbled into something that looks suspiciously like a recession—and the steel industry in Youngstown has fallen into a recession about which there can't be any doubt.

It's a recession that so far, even in Youngstown, hasn't been noticed much outside the mills themselves—mostly because the worst of it has come only in the last 6 weeks and its effects haven't had time to spread. Unemployment compensation and the supplemental unemployment benefits paid by mills to their laid-off workers have propped purchasing power so well that so far in 1960 Youngstown department stores are still hanging onto a 4-percent sales gain over 1959. Savings accounts have begun to dwindle at the city's three leading banks, but at the end of May they were still up 1 percent to 2 percent from a year ago. City fathers are worrying that lower collections from the municipal income tax will delay some street-repair jobs, but they have still passed out raises totaling $400,000 annually this year to all city employees.

It's a recession, too, that may not go on too much longer. Steel executives are forecasting an upturn by midsummer, as steel users finish cutting inventories. Already some Youngstown mills report orders from such big customers as automakers are picking up slightly in anticipation of 1961-model production.

LOWEST RATE SINCE 1930'S

It's a recession, nevertheless, that in the mills can't be mistaken for anything but what it is. For the past 5 weeks, the 14 mills in the steelmaking district of which this city is the capital have been working less than half their furnace capacity—the only place in the country where that is true. During Memorial Day week a group of big steel works ringing the city cut back to an operating rate of less than a fourth of capacity, the lowest oldtimers can remember since the depression of the 1930's; layoffs swelled so alarmingly that the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation had to hire a ballroom from a Polish-American social club, increase its staff to 75 from the normal 60, and work them until 9 p.m. three nights to keep pace with the jobless-pay claims.

And it's a recession that has been getting to be a common experience in Youngstown. For at least the last 3 years (official statistics go back only that far) the Youngstown district's steel operating rate has lagged behind the industrywide pace through slump and boom alike. In the 110 nonstrike weeks since the start of 1958, the district's operating rate has exceeded the national average just once (in early January this year) and trailed it 108 times—65 times by a margin of 10 percentage points or more. Meanwhile, the district's share of national capacity has been shrinking for at least the last dozen years—from around 13 percent in 1948 to 10.4 percent now.

Steel slumps begin early in Youngstown. The nationwide steel operating rate did not go below 90 percent of capacity this year until the end of March; Youngstown's rate fell under that mark 7 weeks earlier.

The downturns also go deeper. The low rate for the whole industry in 1958 was 47.1 percent of capacity; Youngstown got down to 26 percent—and stayed under 40 percent for 9 weeks.

And recovery takes longer. Coming out of the 1958 recession, nationwide steel operations crossed the 70 percent of capacity mark in September of that year. The Youngstown district rate did not get that high until February of 1959—5 months later.

BEHIND YOUNGSTOWN'S TROUBLES

What's wrong? In part, of course, Youngstown's mills share the troubles of the national steel industry: Capacity to make steel at least temporarily exceeds the Nation's ability to use it; growing competition from low-priced imported metal; and, especially important now, extreme vulnerability to any switch among consumer-products makers from inventory building to inventory cutting. Plenty of steel men will tell you, too, that Youngstown's troubles of the last 3 years have been a temporary phenomenon.

But there does seem to be at least four reasons for Youngstown's persistent difficulties. And while they don't make very comforting reading, they may be of interest outside Youngstown and outside the steel industry. For they do suggest some of the factors that can cause a segment of a basic industry—and a community—to lag behind in industrial progress. The four reasons are these:

Unbalanced production capacity: "What is happening now can be explained pretty simply," says A. S. Glossbrenner, president of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., the city's biggest employer. "A great deal of our capacity here is in pipe, and demand for pipe has been slower than for almost any other steel product."

While a good many people think the reasons are more complex than that, there's no denying Mr. Glossbrenner has a point. Only about 10 percent of all the steel made in the Nation goes into pipe, but 30 percent of the metal melted in Youngstown does; at Republic Steel Corp.'s works here the ratio at times runs up to 75 percent. What's worse, a good deal of the pipe capacity is in oilfield tubular goods, and a low rate of well drilling has made this portion of the business even less prosperous than the pipe market generally. The oil and gas industry was the only consuming field to buy less steel in the first 4 months of this year than in the like 1959 period.

A hefty chunk of the Youngstown-made steel that doesn't go into pipe winds up in autos; United States Steel's Ohio works is almost totally dependent on this market. And Youngstown's mills make a lot of semifinished steel that's shipped elsewhere to be rolled into final shapes. But they make next to no tinplate, the steel item that often holds up most steadily in recessions; little galvanized steel; few plates and structurals.

Old facilities: The nearby Lowellville, Ohio works of Sharon Steel Corp. has one blast furnace dating back to the Civil War era; though enlarged and rebuilt several times, the furnace is fed via elevator-borne wheelbarrows, rather than by modern skip hoists. The Lowellville plant appears to have become a marginal facility that works only when demand is strong enough to soak up all the steel that can be made anywhere. It was closed during almost all of the 1957–58 recession, and went down again on March 28 this year; there's no word from Sharon when it might reopen.

About 25 percent of the capacity of the United States Steel and Republic works in Youngstown itself is still represented by Bessemer converters, which refine steel by blowing air through molten iron. Nationally, the Bessemers have been on the way out for decades; they represent little more than 2 percent of all American steel capacity today.

Republic insists its Bessemers are still useful. John H. Graft, district manager, says a number of customers still demand Bessemer-grade steel in preference to open-hearth metal, and Republic is working its Bessemers now while some of its open hearths are idle. United States Steel, however, concedes its Bessemers are obsolete and ought to be replaced; it hasn't worked them in 2 years.

When steel companies don't have enough orders to keep all of their plants running at full capacity, they're likely to cut back first at their oldest, least efficient plants, because that's where their steelmaking costs are highest. The fact that Youngstown has more than its share of such facilities tends to sharpen the impact of any steel industry downturn here.

Lack of water transportation: Youngstown is not linked to the Great Lakes by a navigable waterway. So all the iron ore coming to district mills has to be hauled 50 to 80 miles by rail from such points as Ashtabula, Conneaut, and Cleveland, Ohio, after arriving at these lower Lake Erie ports from Labrador, northern Wisconsin, and the Masabi ranges of western Minnesota by boat. "And I've heard the haul from Conneaut to Youngstown costs as much as the haul from Masabi to Conneaut," asserts one knowledgeable Youngstownite.

This situation, like Youngstown's relatively high proportion of older production facilities, tends to raise steelmaking costs. It thus is another factor that tempts steel companies to cut back here when demand declines. Moreover, there's evidence it has held back some needed modernization and construction of new facilities at district mills.

Laurin Woodworth, United States Steel's Youngstown district superintendent, for instance, thinks the company's McDonald Finishing works in the district needs a new rolling mill to produce larger coils, to which customer demand is switching. So far, however, McDonald is getting only what Mr. Woodworth terms a compromise solution—a welding line to weld coils together. Meanwhile, Mr. Woodworth ticks off, with a trace of envy in his voice, a string of new rolling mills being installed at other United States Steel plants, such as a new plate mill at the Gary, Ind., works on the southern shore of Lake Michigan. "We just have to wait our turn, and when facilities are being expanded, there's a tendency to put the new units in a mill on a body of water where you don't have higher raw steel costs to start out with," he says.

DISTANCE FROM MARKETS

Youngstown is what steel men call an export area—meaning not that it ships steel to foreign countries, but that little of the steel made in Youngstown mills is fabricated into end products in this district. Accordingly, it has to be shipped elsewhere to be used. And when total steel demand falls, fabricators tend to concentrate their buying among nearby mills and to cut their purchases from faraway steel works.

This is just the reverse of the situation that obtains in such areas as Detroit, Chicago, and St. Louis. These areas consume far more steel than they produce, and mills there normally operate at rates considerably above the industry average. Last week, for

instance, while the steel industry nationwide was operating at a scheduled 62.3 percent of capacity, and the Youngstown district at 43 percent, St. Louis and Detroit mills both were scheduling output at better than 77 percent.

Youngstown has long recognized its need for more fabricating activity, and the Youngstown Area Development Foundation, a group financed by the town's businesses, has been trying for 15 years to bring in more steel users. It's making some progress; Carl Gangloff, executive director, tells visitors of one pipe fabricator that has all but promised to move in, and several others which are considering Youngstown sites. But the going has been slow.

Why? Town businessmen usually answer that the United Steelworkers Union forces Youngstown fabricators to pay the same wage and benefit scales in force in the steel mills themselves—$3.10 an hour average base pay—and thus to compete on an unequal basis with fabricators elsewhere who pay lower rates.

Many steel fabricators in other major steel-producing centers also are organized by the USW. But fabricators outside such steel centers generally are not unionized by the Steelworkers.

"I know one fabricator who has a plant here and three others in different States," asserts A. E. Adams, gray-mustached president of Youngstown's Union National Bank. "He tells me that he's losing money here, while all the other plants are making a profit—purely because of labor differential. And he also tells me that if his plant here is still losing money by the end of the year, he'll close it down."

USW OBJECTS

The USW, as might be expected, objects bitterly to this argument. Paul Evans, international staff representative at the Youngstown office of the union's District 26, flourishes an Ohio State tabluation of average wages in all the State's counties, based on unemployment compensation tax collections. This shows the average manufacturing wage in the four counties around Youngstown to be $103.36 a week, slightly below the State-wide average of $105.34.

"We won't give an inefficient plant a break to make it more competitive with a plant in the same area," grumbles the husky-voiced Mr. Evans, "but when a company can show us it's really in trouble, we'll let up. I myself negotiated a contract a few years ago with a small pump company near here that proved to us they had to borrow money from banks three times during the year to meet the payroll. The basic steel pattern that year was a 12½ cent hourly raise. We took 2 cents."

With all these problems, what can be done? One thing, of course, is to give the mills new and more modern equipment—and the steel companies are pushing some modernization programs. These programs probably would have been launched sooner if there were bigger steel markets close by, or if Youngstown had good water transportation facilities. But, early or late, the modernization programs promise some improvement in Youngstown's competitive position.

"I get tired of hearing this stuff about Youngstown dying," says a spokesman for Republic. "With the investment we've got in our plants here, we can't let it die."

Republic is backing its position with considerable cash. Though its mills in Youngstown and nearby Warren, Ohio, have only about 29 percent of the company's steel-melting capacity, Republic is believed to be spending there about 40 percent of the $159 million it has earmarked for new equipment at all its mills this year. Key project is a $45 million hot-strip mill for the Warren plant, but Warren also is getting a new galvanizing line. The Youngstown works, meanwhile, has installed and is currently revving up a new $2 million mill for making plastic-coated pipe, a new product Republic is counting on heavily to meet competition from nonsteel materials for pipe that must resist an abnormal amount of corrosion.

A NEW PLANT

United States Steel, though it hasn't yet allocated money to replace its Bessemers in Youngstown or to give McDonald mills the new coil rolling mill Mr. Woodworth wants, has built at the Ohio works a new ore-sintering plant, which started up 2 years ago. This facility concentrates low-cost ores that otherwise couldn't be dumped into a blast furnace in sable form, thus cutting steel-making costs. United States Steel also has rebuilt all the five blast furnaces at the Ohio works in the last few years. "In effect, we have a new blast furnace plant," says one of Mr. Woodworth's assistants.

Youngstown Sheet & Tube this year is rebuilding the 79-inch hot-strip mill at its Campbell works on the outskirts of town to roll larger coils (precisely the project Mr. Woodworth wants for United States Steel's McDonald mills); it also is undertaking what it describes as "an extensive rehabilitation" of the coke plant at its Brier Hill works inside the city.

Youngstownites also have been trying to diversify the area's economy to lessen its dependence on steel, which now accounts for over 40 percent of manufacturing employment, and they claim some progress. Mr. Gangloff's Area Development Foundation claims to have brought in industries which created some 15,000 new jobs since 1945 in such fields as rubber, electrical products, and paper products. Currently it's going hard after distribution warehouses, stressing Youngstown's central location, straddling major rail lines halfway between Cleveland and Pittsburgh, and has scored here, too. Two years ago it swung a new General Foods Corp. warehouse for the city; a month and a half ago Top Value Enterprises, Inc., took over a 110,000-square-foot Youngstown building to store the merchandise it passes out in return for the trading stamps handed out at supermarkets, gasoline stations, and other establishments.

The foundation also has known considerable frustration, however. In the early postwar years it had great success in attracting aluminum extrusion companies, but rough competitive times later caused many either to fold up or move out; Mr. Gangloff can count only 62 in the area today against a postwar peak of 89. One of the foundation's original aims also was to drum up support for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, a $100 million project to be built with Federal funds, that would have allowed ore to come to the district's mills by boat. But opposition from the railroads and other communities long ago killed the scheme. "Its present status? I don't think it has any present status," confesses Mr. Gangloff sadly.

And what once promised to be the foundation's greatest coup is still hanging fire, for how long no one knows. This is an assembly plant General Motors Corp. once planned to build on a 1,200-acre site at nearby Lordstown, with a planned initial employment of 8,000 and a possible eventual payroll of 20,000. G.M. bought the land for the plant in 1956 and still owns it, but it began by postponing construction for 6 months, then indefinitely, and still hasn't turned a shovelful of earth. Just what is holding the auto giant back isn't known; Youngstownites suspect the 1958 recession and current uncertainty about the future production balance to be struck between compact and standard-sized cars have had a lot to do with it.

The Great Need for Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of Monday, June 20, 1960, calling to the public's attention the growing problem of that city's sick, aged, and homeless:

NURSING HOMES—A GROWING PROBLEM FOR THE CITY'S SICK, AGED, AND HOMELESS

(By Richard Pollak)

(Hundreds of Baltimore's aging sick and disabled are receiving substandard care in commercial city nursing homes. The problem is particularly acute among persons on welfare or of moderate means. This is the first of four articles on nursing homes and the life facing many of the people living in them.)

On the third floor of a large, gray building in West Baltimore is a room where six men are waiting.

They are waiting without hope.

They are sick, old, and without a home of their own.

They are 6 of the more than 1,500 Baltimoreans who have been placed in the city's nursing homes. Five of these men are on public welfare, as are almost half the patients in the homes.

In 1951 two city councilmen urged, after hearing testimony before the council's committee on health, that the city's nursing homes be investigated thoroughly before a major public scandal developed.

In 1956 a survey by the Committee on Medical Care of the State Planning Commission revealed that of 1,073 nursing home beds then in Baltimore, 742 were in buildings that did not meet minimum standards for fire safety.

NEED CRITICAL

Early last year the Maryland State Health Department admitted that the need for nursing home beds for welfare patients and persons of moderate means was critical.

The plight of the six men on the third floor of the home in West Baltimore illustrates the situation in some of the city's nursing homes.

In this home, 83 infirm old people linger from meal to meal and day to day, like vegetables in an almost ignored garden. Eighty of them are on welfare.

Shafts of bright sunlight slant through the windows into the third floor room, but there is nothing cheery about the scene these rays spotlight.

SIDE PARALYZED

The youngest of the men in the room is Frank B., a Negro farm laborer in his early fifties whose right side was paralyzed several years ago when he suffered a stroke. Frank has no money and no relatives able to take care of him, so he is a ward of the city.

The department of public welfare pays him $115.50 a month which he turns over to the nursing home.

The department of public welfare also gives him $3.50 a month for clothing and any other needs.

He is a handsome man whose round face is distinguished by the symmetry of a neat, gray goatee and mustache. The stroke left his mind and speech only slightly impaired.

"Since I came here I haven't done a thing," Frank said.

He has been at the home more than 3 years.

"I just sit," he added, after a thoughtful pause.

WORLD DESCRIBED

The world in which Frank sits consists of a wooden chair, a bed and a small, rickety wooden night table that holds most of his possessions. In his present state of health, he could live another 25 years in that world.

Above the bed a yellow raincoat and battered hat hang, apparel now useless to him.

"I would like to be working, but I am unable. I could paint and read a little. I seldom get any books. No one ever comes to see me," he said, staring almost lifelessly at one of the four familiar walls.

"About a third of the people here have relatives that visit them occasionally, but the others depend on outside organizations," said the head nurse at the home.

PRAYER SERVICES

"The Red Cross comes in once a month, and ministers also come by and hold prayer services," she added.

Beyond these organized and infrequent attempts to give a trace of meaning to his life, Frank must depend on the five companions who share his room for conversation. Four of them are senile.

The one who is mentally alert is Charles H., a 78-year-old diabetic who has been sitting in his corner of the room for 4 years.

"Do you ever go outside, Charles?" he was asked.

"If I did they would never get me back," he replied.

"What do you do besides read magazines?"

"Sleep and eat."

Charles' answers, like Frank's, were neither biter nor sympathy-seeking. They came reflexively, with a toneless matter-of-factness.

RESIGNATION COMPLETE

Life, for however long it lasts, will continue to have the strict limitations of a world bounded by bed, chair, and night table unless some outside assistance materializes. Frank and Charles recognize that fact. They are resigned, and their resignation is complete.

But what of their companions in the room?

John R. is 68. He left the home in 1955 after a 2-year stay when relatives came for him. Last February he was returned. He is incontinent and senile. The relatives found it impossible to take care of him. He now spends his day reading ancient issues of a weekly magazine, nothing more.

Robert M. is 84. He has been at the home for 6 years and suffers from extreme paralysis, the result of a stroke. He can barely talk, and leaves his bed only for an hour each day to sit in an adjacent chair.

EXTREME SENILITY

Charles L. is in his fifties. He has arthritis and is incontinent. He is in the extreme stages of senility. When his meals are served he asks how much he owes and demands to know why the other men in his room are not paying.

Douglas W. is 77. He is incontinent, extremely senile, and suffers from heart disease.

While the two coherent men in the room talked one afternoon, Mr. W., sitting in the chair next to his bed, urinated on the floor.

The head nurse summoned an aide, who responded and mopped up the area. Nobody changed his clothing. He remained in the chair, his head bowed upon his bed.

MAZE OF CORRIDORS

The room in which these men exist is 1 of more than 20 in the half-century-old structure. A maze of narrow corridors connects room after room of lonely human beings.

Most of these rooms hold more than one person, some as many as eight. Fluorescent lighting guides one through the catacomb-like passageways, but inside many of the rooms it is perenially dusk.

Tooth brushes are hung on racks in hallways. Toilets are left unflushed in foul-smelling bathrooms. Garbage sometimes remains on trays in hallways following a meal.

Care is given patients by a staff composed largely of nurses aids.

And the subjects of this setting are the sick, old and forgotten.

LICENSED ANNUALLY

The west Baltimore home is 1 of more than 30 commercial nursing homes in the city.

Like the others, it is licensed annually by the Maryland State Health Department.

Officials of the health department admit privately that in many homes violations of regulations are overlooked because strict enforcement would close the home.

Nursing homes vary greatly in size, cleanliness and efficiency.

The greater the number of welfare patients in a home, the more inadequate the care is likely to be.

The fact that more beds and better care are urgently needed for welfare and moderate income patients does not mean that no vacancies exist.

SURVEY CITED

A survey by the State health department last December indicated that 11 of the city's 31 commercial nursing homes had 78 vacancies among a total of 402 beds. Yet the number of walfare patients in those 11 homes totaled only 8 at the time.

Seven of the eleven homes had no walfare patients at all despite 31 vacancies.

And in the city's 3 nonprofit nursing homes totaling 312 beds, there were only 3 welfare patients, although 11 vacancies existed.

On the other hand, the December count revealed that the 575 beds in 9 of the city's other proprietary nursing homes included 364 welfare patients. Twenty-seven vacancies existed in these 9 homes at the time.

REGULAR RATES

The department of public welfare pays $3.75 a day for full nursing care, whereas regular rates in the city's nursing homes range from that figure to $10 a day, and up.

The head nurse at the west Baltimore home, the institution's only registered nurse, freely admits she cannot attract qualified people for her staff.

The home pays its nurses aids less than $25 a week, and the staff's 3 licensed practical nurses receive about $55 weekly.

But low pay is not the only deterrent. "Nurses don't want to get involved with many of the nursing homes because of the conditions," says Ruth Moubray, executive secretary of the Maryland State Nurses Association.

HARD TO ADJUST

"And nurses often find it hard to adjust to caring for the aged because in so many cases there is so little optimism for improvement of the patient.

"Caring for the senile is not challenging," adds Miss Moubray, in trying to pinpoint the general attitude of a nurse toward the homes.

Care and physical conditions vary considerably in the city's private nursing homes. Some of the homes are spotlessly clean, cheerful, and uncrowded. However, the costs in most of these homes put them out of the reach of low-income people.

IN CONTRAST

In contrast to the west Baltimore home is another nursing home on the northern edge of downtown Baltimore.

All of the rooms are sunny and well-lighted. The corridors are wide and the ceilings high. And the home is clean.

Of the 50 patients in this home, only 17 were on welfare. The private patients, of course, pay more than the $3.75 a day total allotted by the welfare department.

But in one essential way it is exactly the the same as its delapidated and unsanitary west Baltimore counterpart: Its patients have little to do. Most of the time is spent waiting.

The man who owns the west Baltimore home has no delusions about the inadequacies of his institution. The poor conditions in the home are due largely to the almost 100-percent burden of welfare patients, he says.

FORTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS PUT IN

"Since I took over this home 7 years ago, I have plowed about $45,000 into it, and that's a conservative estimate," said the manager.

But, conservative or not, his estimate admits of an investment in a profitmaking institution that grosses more than $100,000 a year.

The man who runs the home on the edge of downtown Baltimore said he had, in partnership with another man, recently invested more than $200,000 in establishing another nursing home.

Tribute to Chief Judge John W. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a former member of this distinguished body, Chief Judge John W. Murphy of the U.S. Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, was recently awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by the University of Scranton. In further recognition of that impressive honor, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, June 15, 1960, which comments upon the distinguished career of Chief Judge Murphy:

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE MURPHY

The honorary degree of doctor of laws, conferred on him by the University of Scranton at the commencement exercises, and the accompanying citation, hailing him as a "just and wise administrator of the law and a devoted and well deserving servant of his country," constituted an impressive tribute to Chief Judge John W. Murphy of the U.S. Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. Adding to the distinction was the fact that he was the only recipient of an honorary degree on this occasion.

A graduate of the college and law school of the University of Pennsylvania, a lawyer by profession, an assistant district attorney in Lackawanna County and a Member of Congress before he was elevated to the Federal bench, Judge Murphy has been identified with the law all of his adult life.

Moreover, he had the good fortune, like former Gov. Arthur H. James and so many successful men in the anthracite region, to launch his career as a slate picker in the breaker, as good a place as any in the old days to start the climb up the ladder of success. The fact that he came from a family of 12 children also did him no harm since it taught him responsibility early in life. And his foresight in being born in Avoca provided him with an excellent starting point. His decision to cross the line and set up residence in Lackawanna County was just

a matter of geography, as a glance at a map of northeastern Pennsylvania will establish.

Luzerne County, through the years, has followed the progress of this native son with no little satisfaction. The newest honor that has come to him adds to local pride in his achievements and in the recognition he has received from so many sources.

Will We Point With Pride?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech:

WILL WE POINT WITH PRIDE?

(Speech by GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican, Ohio, at Convention of National Society of Professional Engineers, Boston, Mass., June 10, 1960)

When President Eisenhower took over in 1953, he decided that a new and dynamic highway program had to be brought into being to break the traffic bottlenecks and snarls that were slowly but surely strangling a large segment of the American economy. He decided that our outmoded and deteriorated highway system had to be rebuilt in the shortest possible time to reduce the tremendous loss in life and property which was increasing at an alarming rate.

Those of us on the Roads Subcommittee in the Congress, who in 1954 began the formulation of legislation to make the President's program a reality, at first had no conception of the magnitude of the undertaking, even though we knew that we were embarking on the biggest public works program in the history of the world. We had only a faint glimmer of the difficult and complex problems which would be encountered in the planning and construction of this highway system.

We get some idea of the magnitude of this program when we realize that, if we could have a public works program which would combine the Panama Canal, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the St. Lawrence Seaway into one tremendous construction project, and then multiply it 35 times, we would have the equivalent of this highway construction program I am talking about today.

This highway effort which is now under serious attack from various quarters contains some new, basic, and sound provisions and principles. If we lose our perspective, some of these landmark provisions of the act are going to fall. You men of the engineering profession should be in the frontline of the fight not only because of your own personal interests but also because the basic concepts and principles established in the 1956 Highway Act conform to the general ethics which are a guide to the engineering profession.

Let's take a brief look at the four benchmarks of this historic legislation.

The 1956 act for the first time provided that highways should be built and the money spent where the need exists, where the roads would do the most good for the general public, where they would relieve the terrible traffic congestion which is adversely affecting our whole economy, where they would cut the terrific accident and death toll. In support of this principle, the 1956 act, insofar as the Interstate System is concerned, did away with the old pork-barrel formulas for distributing funds and specifically provided that the money should be spent where the need exists.

Let us move on to a second, basic principle enunciated by the 1956 act. For more than two decades the Federal Government has been going deeper and deeper into debt. During practically all of these years we have had unbalanced budgets and have engaged in deficit financing, thereby feeding and accelerating the ruinous fires of inflation which have devalued Uncle Sam's dollar all over the world and increased the cost of everything we buy and sell.

In the 1956 Highway Act we finally decided to pay for this tremendous public works program as we built it and not pass the cost on to our children.

Third, we provided that the beneficiaries and users of these highways should pay for them in proportion to the use and benefits derived. I, for one, recognize that we must reexamine—and we will—whether or not those who are now classed as users and beneficiaries are paying fairly in accordance with this principle. We must also decide whether or not the tax base should be broadened to include others who may be beneficiaries of this program but are presently contributing nothing to the highway trust fund.

Prior to the passage of the 1956 act the highway program went along on a sort of hit-or-miss plan. Congress appropriated funds every 2 years. The States, highway engineers, contractors, and suppliers were never certain as to the amounts that would be available. There could be no planning ahead. In the 1956 act, as I have said, we provided for a 13- to 16-year construction and financing program. We thought we could complete the entire job in that time. Thus the States, highway engineers, contractors, and others could plan a well-integrated program. They could safely expand their organizations to do the job.

Some will say: "Well, SCHERER, if these are such fine and sound principles, why are we now facing such a crisis in this highway program? Why all the bitter and unpleasant controversy?" Let me tell you.

During the hearings on the 1956 act we were told by the experts that the 40,000-mile interstate system would cost $27 billion to build. Today we know that, in order to complete the interstate system as now contemplated, it will cost $40 billion or more. Of course, the cost of the ABC system has increased in almost the same proportion.

Why almost a 50 percent increase in a 4-year period? Who goofed? Let me tell you five things that happened which put us in this precarious financial condition.

You will recall that sufficient revenues were provided for the trust fund over the 16-year period to pay the estimated cost of this program. Here's what happened.

1. The trust fund absorbed, as was not contemplated, approximately $1.5 billion of highway obligations due and owing on the effective date of the 1956 act.

2. In 1958 Congress, particularly the Senate, got the recession jitters and provided in the 1958 act for an acceleration of the road program by $1.6 billion. This was done without providing the revenue for the trust fund to meet this increased cost.

3. The Senate also added 1,000 miles to the 40,000-mile interstate system. These are often called political miles. Again, no revenues were provided for the trust fund to pay for this additional mileage.

4. Highway standards and requirements were increased to take care of some local needs. Standards had to be increased because, like our population, there was an unexpected and unforeseen increase in motor vehicles. Even since 1956 motor vehicle use on our highways had increased at a far greater rate than was predicted by the experts just 3 years ago.

5. The original estimates of cost on which the 1956 act was based were made rather hurriedly by the State highway departments in 1954. There were some miscalculations. From 1954 to 1958 construction costs and right-of-way acquisitions increased by about 12 percent because of inflation.

We can now understand why on July 1, 1959, almost $500 million then due the States for obligations already incurred could not be paid. We can now understand why the apportionment of the $2.5 billion provided for fiscal year 1961 could not be made, and why this July only a token apportionment of the $2.2 billion for fiscal year 1962 could have been made.

It was apparent on January 1, 1959, and to some of us sooner, that the trust fund was busted. The President immediately asked for and additional 1½-cent increase in the Federal gas tax in order to meet the crisis. This would have made up the deficiency.

The Congress faced three alternatives: pass the 1½-cent gas tax increase; stop the road program for a little over 2 years, which, of course, would have been disastrous for the country and for those industries which had expanded their organizations at the request of the Congress to accomplish this mammoth highway construction job; or, third, borrow the money and go further into debt with all of the attendant evils which I have pointed out resulting.

The majority in the Congress dawdled and politicked for 9 months while the road program started slowly to grind to a halt. Finally in September of last year they provided a 1 cent gas tax increase for 21 months. The balance was provided by deficit financing as a result of diversions from the general fund. Of course, the total amount provided for 1960–61 was far short of the moneys contemplated to be spent under the construction levels provided in the 1956 act. The interstate construction levels for these 2 years have had to be cut back between 20 and 25 percent.

Now there are a lot of people in the United States who either through ignorance or politically motivated, are blaming the administration or the Bureau of Public Roads for these cutbacks, for the so-called contract controls that have had to be put into effect.

This is pure and unadulterated nonsense. The responsibility lies with the Congress for not providing the necessary funds. Furthermore, the Congress enacted the so-called Byrd amendment which in effect says that the Bureau of Public Roads cannot approve contracts unless there will be sufficient money in the trust fund to pay the Federal Government's share when the States present their bills for reimbursement.

Now while we have had a cutback for these 2 years, I feel confident that this program will be straightened out, that it will go forward as contemplated in the 1956 Highway Act. As you know, there are two reports called for by the 1956 act. These will be before our committee next year. These reports, resulting from exhaustive, scientific studies, will enable us to determine the many highly controversial questions that have temporarily stymied the program.

Here is what these two reports will tell us:

1. Should the tax base for the trust fund be broadened to include other than highway users who may receive benefits from our modern highways, such as adjoining landowners, Department of Defense, and so forth?

2. What effect do various vehicles have on the highways and the life thereof, and what standards and costs of construction are made necessary to carry and support the different sizes and weights of vehicles?

3. What is the fair and equitable share of the taxes or charges that each class of highway users should pay?

4. What will be the actual cost of completing the Interstate System?

5. Are highway users paying too much or too little of the cost of building and maintaining highways?

6. Are commercial vehicles paying too much or too little compared to passenger cars?

7. Should standards of construction, right-of-way widths, etc., be increased or decreased?

8. Is the Interstate or ABC System being discriminated against?

9. Should the formula of sharing costs between the States and the Federal Government be changed?

Now you have seen what has happened and what can and in all probability will be done to get this program back on schedule. In the meantime, unfortunately, when the funds ran out, when the construction program had to be curtailed for the reasons I have shown, there were some people, both in and out of Congress, who panicked. There were others who wanted to and did make political hay out of the high crisis.

They looked for scapegoats. The Bureau of Public Roads and State highway departments became the chief whipping boys and so did private consulting engineers. In the short space of a few weeks we developed an amazing number of sidewalk highway engineers and experts on road legislation.

The country was led to believe from the way some people talked that the depleted condition of the trust fund was due to the fact that the highway engineers and others had gone hog-wild with the people's money.

Charges of waste, inefficiency, and even fraud in the administration of the highway program were hurled about with some abandon. State highway departments were repeatedly accused of squandering money on the Interstate System because the Federal Government was paying 90 percent of the cost. It was argued that by raising the State's contribution to the Interstate System, this waste could be stopped.

Now I would be the last to say that in a program of this size, the biggest public works program in the history of the world, one encompassing the whole United States, one involving millions of people, both in government and in private industry, you are not going to have some mistakes, inefficiency, waste, and even fraud.

In speech after speech, as far back as in 1956, I discussed at length the necessity of guarding against waste, graft, and fraud in a program such as this. I pointed out the necessity of having a committee maintain constant surveillance over this program in order to keep these incidents at a minimum.

What some of us wanted was a committee which realized that in a program of this magnitude there was bound to be negligence, fraud, and graft, but a committee that would keep these incidents in proper perspective with the entire program.

We did not want a politically inspired committee which would leave the public with the impression that the whole program was fraught with waste, inefficiency, and fraud. We wanted a fair comparison between the deficiencies in the program and the magnitude of its accomplishments.

We did not want the public misled by charges of wholesale overdesigning, frills, excessively wide rights-of-way, and unconscionable engineering costs unless and until such wholesale charges were proved by competent evidence.

As you know, there was eventually appointed a Special Highway Investigating Committee. Whether we got the type of committee that was wanted only time will tell. I have been highly critical of some phases of this committee because of the political connotations attached to its organizational makeup and some of its activities.

The committee recently completed hearings in connection with the construction of a bypass around Tulsa, Okla. These hearings were an elaboration of a local grand jury investigation which had returned a series of indictments for fraud in connection with the building of this bypass. Both the grand jury investigation and the hearings revealed evidence of gross fraud and chicanery.

Employees of the State highway department, some of them inspectors and engineers, readily admitted that they had engaged in various fraudulent practices. Their conduct was certainly reprehensible, not only insofar as this particular job was concerned, but also because it gave to those who were seeking headlines and wanting to discredit the road program the opportunity to throw an ominous shadow over this great construction effort. For this reason their acts were more reprehensible.

There is no question but that the conduct of these people in Oklahoma weakened the confidence of the public in this great highway effort and hurt it badly.

Frankly, as I have indicated, this is not only a vitally needed construction program in which we are engaged, but to date it has been a highly successful one. We can point with pride to hundreds of fine accomplishments resulting from the competent and dedicated service of the men in the Bureau of Public Roads—headed by that excellent administrator, Bert Tallamy, and his assistants, Frank Turner and Ellis Armstrong—the fine service of the overwhelming number of State highway engineers and their staffs, and of you men in the private engineering organizations.

This unfortunate fiasco in Oklahoma should be a lesson to all of us that we must be extremely careful and scrupulously honest in every phase of this program; that, like Caesar's wife, we must even be above suspicion, because there are always those who for political considerations or otherwise are willing to tear down at the slightest pretext. Unless we follow this course, we can discredit and bring about a dangerous curtailment of this highway construction program. This will be a disservice to the Nation and certainly a disservice to those whose business it is to build highways.

Now let me pass for a minute to another and a little brighter note. All of us are aware of the fact that, as the result of the shortage of money in the trust fund and the charges of frills and overdesign, the Bragdon staff at the White House was about to make recommendations that the Interstate System in urban areas be substantially cut back. The adoption of such a policy would have been a serious mistake. I feel certain that such a policy and such a course have now been averted. But all of us who are interested in highways must keep on top of the efforts that will continue to be made by some to cut back on standards and design.

Let's be sure that such a mistake is never made.

Remember we are building these roads so that, when they are completed about 1975, they will be able to handle 1975 traffic. Traffic like our population is now increasing at a rate far exceeding that predicted by the experts just 4 years ago. We need to build permanence into the new highways to protect this multibillion dollar investment from becoming obsolete at the very moment it is completed.

In the years past the most crucial failure in highway construction has been to underestimate traffic, the potential of the automobile, and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity. We must realize that, if we cannot buy rights-of-way adequate for future widening, we do not have the correct location. As Charles Noble, the former Ohio highway director, said: "We must not allow today's desires and pressures to blind us to tomorrow's needs."

In the Wall Street Journal, we find this quote which pretty well answers the question as to what constitutes real waste: "Some of these plans may look too big for their britches in 1959, but they will fit just right in 1979. It does not make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in 10 years. That is real waste."

Before concluding, I want to discuss briefly the problem with which you here today are most vitally concerned, namely, the use of private professional engineers by Government agencies in the construction of public works.

As I have previously pointed out, when it was found that this great highway program which had started with so much promise was grinding slowly to a halt because of the lack of money in the trust fund, some people began to look for scapegoats, either to excuse their own failures to act or to make dramatic headlines. One of the principal charges was that the Interstate System was overdesigned; that the rights-of-way were too wide, and the interchanges too complex; and that the entire highway layout was adorned with too many frills. It was then that the roof fell in on you consulting engineers and you wondered who had kicked away the supports.

Well, I will tell you. These charges of overdesign were the answer to the professional bureaucrats' prayer, the boys who believe in bigger and bigger government and the paternalistic, all-powerful state. For quite some time these professionals have been attempting to build up and expand the engineering departments of the Federal Government. This is the very nature of the bureaucracy with which we are plagued in this country and, believe me, it is not confined to one department, one agency, or one field of activity.

You private engineers should not get too chesty and feel that you are the only segment of private enterprise that is constantly being given the bum's rush by the professional bureaucrats and politicians who believe that the Great White Father in Washington knows best. This charge of overdesigning gave these boys the club they have been looking for to knock you completely out of government work. So you were charged with overdesigning and overbuilding so that your percentage cut for engineering services would be higher.

Now, as I have indicated, with a program of this magnitude, in all probability we will find occasionally where this charge can be justified. You have some bad apples in the engineering profession, the same as we find in other professions, in business, in labor, and in government—but not quite as many proportionately. However, we cannot tar the entire engineering profession or let the bureaucrats get away with it because of a few bad boys. But, believe me, they are trying.

To say that the taxpayer will save money by having the various agencies of the Federal and State government set up huge staffs and bureaus to perform all of the engineering services required by government for all of its public works programs, including highways, is plain, unadulterated nonsense. I have been around Washington just long enough to know that, whenever it is possible to have private enterprise perform a service, it is done more economically and more efficiently than when government tries its hand.

Let me give you the prize example. As you know, during the 8 years I have been in Congress, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works. I have heard the liberals, the spenders, the proponents of big government and the welfare state, use TVA as an example or yardstick of a successful Government operation. Every time the proponents and operators of the Tennessee Valley Authority come before our committee, they go back to the valley with their arms in slings from patting themselves on the back for their accomplishments.

I am no engineer, I am no businessman, just an ordinary lawyer, but if I could not operate an enterprise successfully if the

Government gave me all the money to start the business, provided additional amounts when I needed to expand it, and did not require me to pay any income taxes, my parents ought to disown me.

Now why do I mention TVA? Simply because it is the best illustration of the point I want to make. Of all the Government agencies, TVA is the only one that has its own fully staffed, engineering department and never uses private consulting engineers in any way. You guessed it—it is at the head of the class—it takes first prize as having the highest engineering costs of all governmental agencies for the type of engineering services required. Need I go further?

The Atomic Energy Commission which has only a skeleton engineering staff of its own to make preliminary studies and to supervise the Commission's construction projects, makes the greatest use of private consulting engineers. According to the Hoover Commission task force report, its engineering costs are 5.23 percent which are the lowest of any Government agency. It is significant that those agencies which make the least use of private engineering organizations have the highest costs, some running as high as 17 percent. In fact, the engineering costs of agencies increase in proportion to the lesser use they make of the services of private engineers.

And don't let those who are crying crocodile tears and looking for whipping boys because of the increased costs of the highway program tell you that it is different when it comes to highway engineering services. The companies and organizations which built most of our toll roads with private capital have used the highest standards of highway construction because they want to be able to handle the tremendously increased traffic loads in the next 5, 10, and 15 years. The toll road people, to be able to pay off their bondholders, had to keep their costs at a minimum. All the engineering work on these toll roads was done by private consulting engineers. These costs, as you know, averaged approximately 8.79 percent. This is considerably lower than the engineering costs for any publicly constructed highways. By contrast, the State of California which has a fine highway engineering department, and does all of its own highway engineering services has a comparable cost of 24.1 percent.

Now don't get me wrong. The various highway departments of the several States are excellent organizations headed by competent and dedicated men who are doing an outstanding job in getting this mammoth highway program underway. To their credit they have used, particularly in urban areas where the design is unusually complex, consulting engineering firms. It is not the fault of these men if their costs are higher.

This always happens, as I have pointed out, when Government performs a service. It is the very nature of bureaucracy. It is the result of the way Government works, the result of political and other pressures, and the fact that the department does not have to make a profit or pay taxes as do your private organizations.

There are peaks and valleys, as we all know, in highway construction. We had a cogent example last year when the highway program ground almost to a halt because Congress dawdled and politicked and for 9 months failed to provide the necessary monies for the depleted trust fund. A great big valley resulted which hurt everyone connected with the highway program. The contractors and engineers who had expanded their organizations and invested large sums of money, some through borrowing, in order to meet this great construction challenge, were left sitting, holding the bag because of the drop-off in awarding contracts they had been promised by the 1956 act.

As I have said, there are peaks and valleys in this game. When a State highway department builds up an organization of sufficient magnitude to take care of the engineering services that are so vitally needed during the peaks, then it has a lot of people sitting around, twiddling their thumbs during the valleys. This costs money—this is waste—and it is not the fault of the State highway engineer if the professional politicians want that kind of operation and adopt that kind of a policy.

In contrast, the private consulting engineer during the off seasons has his organization geared to perform a dozen different types of engineering services not only for other agencies of Government but also for the great private industrial empire in this country.

I am aware of the fact that the General Accounting Office of the Government, which is not entirely free from the attitude of the professional bureaucrats I have been talking about, last year complained about the use of private consulting engineers on the highway program and blamed some of the increase in costs on their use. Now, as I have said, you are going to find an occasional instance where they will be able to substantiate that charge, but I will bet my last dollar that on the thousands and thousands of highway projects, this charge will not stand and that the very opposite is true. In fact, if you read GAO's report carefully, you see that it makes the general charge without substantiating it by competent evidence or reasonable arguments.

Let's look at a few of the excerpts from the report and findings of the task force of the Hoover Commission on this very subject. We find this language:

"The Atomic Energy Commission has the most efficient design and construction procedures of all Government agencies. AEC takes full advantage of the services of private architect-engineer and construction organizations by contracting all phases of its design and construction work. Its small technical staff is engaged in preparation of preliminary plans and budgets and in the supervisory control normally exercised by a client employing an architect-engineering firm.

"If other Federal agencies could attain the operating efficiency of the AEC, the savings to Government in just the cost of design and supervision of construction, on the basis of present volume of business, would be more than $100 million annually."

In another part of its report, we find this language:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority is the only Federal organization of the eight under consideration which does not use the services of private engineering-construction organizations. Its costs for engineering and construction services are abnormally high."

Finally, the Hoover task force makes this recommendation:

"That the Federal design and construction organizations retain in their own organizations only the personnel required for preliminary study, preplanning and budgeting, and essential supervisory management and control, and that they contract to private architect-engineering and construction firms design and supervision of construction to the maximum extent consistent with national security."

In spite of the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission, you are going to have an increasing demand for bigger and bigger engineering departments and for the elimination of private engineering services in Government work. The only way to stop this assault on this particular segment of the private enterprise system is to bring about an informed public opinion through an educational process.

This special Highway Investigating Committee, of which I am a minority member, is going to investigate private engineering costs. I assure you there is a lot of preconceived sentiment for the reduction or elimination of private consultants in highway work. Of course, they will overlook that section of the Highway Act which says:

"It is declared to be in the national interest to encourage and develop the actual and potential capacity of small business and to utilize this important segment of our economy to the fullest practicable extent in construction of the Federal highway systems, including the Interstate System. In order to carry out that intent and encourage full and free competition, the Secretary should assist, insofar as feasible, small business enterprises in obtaining contracts in connection with the prosecution of the highway program."

We must insist that before any action is taken, an unbiased study be made of highway construction engineering costs by both Government agencies and by private engineering companies. In other words, the Hoover task force report made in 1955 must be brought up-to-date. I myself have no doubt as to the outcome of an impartial survey, especially if there is taken into consideration the fact that the private organizations pay taxes back to the Federal Government on whatever profit they make.

Commencement Address by Senator Keating at Pace College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by my colleague the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING before the graduating class at Pace College, which awarded him an honorary doctor of civil law degree. The subject of Senator KEATING's remarks is timely and it is another indication of the distinction with which he serves New York.

The address follows:

I am indeed honored to be here with you today, and to have the opportunity to address you, on this day that means so much in your lives, this day that is at once an end and a beginning.

Many senior classes have gone out from your fine college in the past. None, I am certain, goes out into a world of greater ferment, of greater challenge, and, potentially, of greater opportunity. You do not embark upon a placid sea of history. The tides of change, of evolution, yes of transformation, are running high.

The world of your graduation is no longer the world of your matriculation at Pace. The pressures of events have reshaped it, literally before our eyes, in the immediate past. Yesterday is a land we shall never see again. We stand, all of us, at the threshold of a new and exciting tomorrow—a tomorrow that holds hope as well as danger—but whose immense challenge to the human mind, the human heart, and human energies is unparalleled in history.

The first graduates of Pace lived in the context of America, in the well-bounded confines of their chosen careers and surroundings. In a sense, they were hermetically sealed against pressures from beyond our shores.

It is your destiny, in this year of 1960, to live in the context of humanity, in a world where all men are your neighbors,

where what happens anywhere is something that happens to you—that touches your life, that leaves its mark in your mind and in your heart.

Korea, Lebanon, West Berlin, Ghana, South Africa—these were once names to memorize in a geography lesson. Today they have become names that we live rather then learn—for they are a part of the fabric of the new history—the world-spanning history that leaves no man an island, no man a hermit.

One of the great challenges, therefore, that confronts you today is to equate yourself with this new-dimensional world, to widen the vistas of your intellect and your spirit in order to encompass the full range of the vast human experience in which you are now called upon to participate. Alexander Pope once wrote: "The proper study of mankind is man." Today, we can well paraphrase that historic line by saying that "the proper preoccupation of man is mankind."

Consider for a moment the tremendous phenomenon that is taking place in Africa. After centuries of being locked in the chrysalis of time—whole nations—millions of people—are emerging into the sunlight of a destiny of their own. And as they emerge, into freedom, into self-determination, they pose a challenge which each one of us, as brothers in freedom, must feel, to which we must respond.

It is heartening to know that the Government and people of the United States are, in fact, responding to this monumental challenge. Under our mutual security legislation, we now operate programs in 13 African nations and territories.

By June 30 of this year, we will have about 780 American technicians in all of Africa, and we expect to increase this number to 1,000 in the coming year. This is no more than a first step on the stairway out of darkness—for the challenge of Africa will be a continuing, an expanding one—and it must ever be considered by each of you as a personal challenge to free men. Africa is not remote. It is only a heartbeat away, on the map of humanity.

And no farther, too, are the lands of Asia, of the Far East, of South America—wherever the quest for human dignity, for self-realization, for lives unyoked to degradation or tyranny stirs men to make their own history rather than to have it made for them.

If the challenge presented to us by these emerging nations were confined to the purely economic realm of support and assistance, it would still be of awesome magnitude. But it is a challenge compounded and intensified—because the great drama of this emergence of new nations is being played against the ominous backdrop of a world struggle between freedom and tyranny.

This great silent struggle is precisely the effort on the one hand to extend the area of human freedom and on the other the effort to reduce that area. History shows us how fragile, how perishable a commodity freedom is. Nations once free are no longer free.

They have been manacled by tyranny—or their freedom has slowly, subtly been eaten away by the termite colony of infiltration and propaganda. In Cuba we have the chilling paradox of a nation that lost its freedom while ostensibly fighting for it—that threw one brutal master only to be mounted and ridden by another.

The great and overriding point to remember is that we are not mere spectators wherever freedom loses ground. We are involved — inescapably involved — because whenever and wherever in the world the enemy of freedom gains a yard, we are forced back a yard.

And here is the greatest challenge of all—not only because it is the supreme challenge in point of meaning for our lives—but because it is the easiest to avoid. We are prone to make the defense of freedom a vested interest of government, rather than a personal and deeply felt responsibility of each of us as individuals. Do not, I pray you, catch this fatal disease of apathy. It does not become a young heart. It does not become a young intellect. For apathy is a way of dying, not a way of living—throughout history it has been the suicide weapon of men who mistook freedom for a jewel that could never be stolen.

Stop with me for a moment to reflect on how your freedom came about. You accept it as a birthright—but ponder on how it was born. You didn't have to lift a finger for it—because young men before you—from Lexington through the centuries—whole generations of men your age, yes and even younger—bought freedom with their blood, and left thousands of unlived years on the battlefields of the world—so that we, you and I, might meet here today as free men and women, unchained, unbowed, unmastered.

Thus, the defense of human freedom is more than a challenge to you. It is a sacred and unending responsibility.

We must not wait until it is in jeopardy, or lost, to discover how priceless a gift we hold. For when it is lost, it is the young people like yourselves who must win it back. The youth of Hungary had to meet that historic test—and they met it with a heroism so magnificent, so memorable, that it touched the hearts of free men throughout the world. In other lands, still fresh in memory are the spontaneous marches against oppression—marches in freedom's name—and the marchers, the fighters, the victors, were in the flower of their youth—but old enough to know that nothing in this world is more worth fighting for than human dignity, than the right to think, to speak, to act as free men.

May you never, please God, be put to the test of regaining your lost freedom—but if there is one thought I would leave with you today it is this: Freedom is not an heirloom that is passed on automatically from one generation to another. It is rather a treasure left in trust—a treasure that is kept only so long as it is guarded—and it is best guarded when its irreplaceable value is burned into the hearts and minds of those in whose custody it is left.

There is one last challenge I would touch upon on this day you enter the world of your careers. It is the personal challenge that each of you must feel instinctively, and deeply—the challenge to make the most of your life, to realize to the full your talents and capabilities, to make those you love—and those you will love—proud of who you are and what you represent in their lives. I would counsel you sincerely, as you embark upon your careers, to think more of the giving of yourself than of the getting in terms of money. If you live your life on the gold standard—with everything calculated in salary return—you are missing the true and wonderful adventure of life—which is the growth of you as a person, not the growth of your bank deposits.

I do not suggest that you cultivate insecurity, but I would warn you against a too intense preoccupation with security. Life can be a dull and empty journey if your mind is on the destination rather than on the pleasure and excitement of the journey. Security is not the proper business of young people. Always consider it a fringe benefit of life, not an ultimate reason for diligence and dedication.

And I would counsel you to treasure above all else your personal dignity—the sense of yourself as a God-made individual, distinct, not identical, mindful that you wear nothing more precious than your name. Be zealous to conform, not to each new style in thought and taste, but to the inner compulsions of your own spirit and intellect, of your individual concept of the true, the good, and the beautiful.

Today, this moment, you hold your life-to-be in your hands. The true spending of it is not in the currency of days and years, but in the deeper, richer exchange of the offering of your talents, your energies, your gifts of heart, to making this a world that will be—because you have lived in it—a finer dwelling place for all humanity.

Senator Harry F. Byrd and the National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, Virginians know well the part played by Senator HARRY F. BYRD in the establishment of the Shenandoah National Park and the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Throughout the National Park Service, his appreciation of the Nation's natural wonders and his active enjoyment of the out-of-doors have won him the highest respect from professional conservationists.

It was particularly fitting that Senator BYRD should have been invited as principal speaker at the dedication of the James River Bridge on the Blue Ridge Parkway, June 11, 1960.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of Director Conrad L. Wirth of the National Park Service in introducing Senator BYRD on that occasion:

Distinguished guest, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you greetings from Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, who is unable to be here. He told me that he wanted very much to come, but his many commitments made this trip impossible. He asked me to tell you of his friendship for your senior Senator—the principal guest and speaker here today—for whom the Secretary has great respect and admiration.

This bridge we are dedicating today is just a short span of concrete and steel across a river. But the river it spans and the parkway it connects are both considerably longer, and that fact makes this a rather special bridge in many ways.

The river follows a meandering course eastward across the Old Dominion, through regions rich in American history, through the Commonwealth known as the "mother of States" and the "mother of Presidents." I might add that she is also the mother of the man who has—I believe—the distinction of having represented her people in the Senate of the United States for a longer period than any other statesman in Virginia's history.

It would indeed be a pleasure for me to follow the course of the historic James River through this fair State and relate to you just how closely your principal speaker is related to Virginia history. Such a theme would offer unlimited source material and at the same time give me the opportunity to mention the many National Park Service areas located in the Old Dominion.

Instead of following the James River into Virginia's history, however, it is more appro-

priate today that I stay here on the parkway—amid Virginia's scenic splendor—and talk briefly about the man who is, in large part, responsible for the Blue Ridge Parkway.

In the 1930's, as Senator, he was the first one to suggest the Blue Ridge Parkway to President Roosevelt while riding together to Big Meadows for the dedication of Shenandoah National Park. The President said that it was a fine idea and that the Senator and Secretary of the Interior Ickes should get together on the plan. The Senator was appointed chairman of a committee to obtain the rights-of-way for the Virginia section of the parkway and largely as a result of his efforts, the States of Virginia and North Carolina donated the rights-of-way 500 miles long and an average of 1,000 feet wide.

Secretary Ickes, telling this story in the Saturday Evening Post of December 23, 1933, said: "For one thing, I hope to see the system of national parks greatly enlarged. * * * The other day I listened to Senator BYRD, of Virginia, as he sketched his vision of a road * * * from the Shenandoah to the Great Smoky National Park. The President amplified the picture. He said he would like to see the road (the Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park), sweep down the Blue Ridge, joining the Senator's project."

Thus the dedication of this new bridge today means more than just the completion of another bridge. Far more significant is the fact that it represents, almost virtually, the completion of the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia. Senator BYRD can be justly proud that the ribbon cutting ceremony this afternoon will open 111 miles of continuous driving along the parkway. This means that a total of 210 miles of parkway are practically completed in Virginia. Only 14 miles circling the city of Roanoke remain to be constructed. By 1966 the entire 477-mile parkway from Shenandoah to the Great Smokies will have been completed, and a dream will have become a reality.

Thrilling as this thought is, the finishing of the Blue Ridge Parkway has entailed much more than just the building of a road. Through the Nation Park Service's mission 66 program, many historical, cultural, and educational exhibits are being completed adjacent to the parkway and concurrent with its construction. Complementing the inspirational values which millions of visitors derive from the natural scenes changing each season, consider the Mountain Farm Cabin, with its early 19th century stone fences; Mabry Mill and the old blacksmith shop, both in operation and representing Virginia's old-time mountain industry; consider the nature trails, the campgrounds and the picnic grounds, the comfort facilities. These are just a few of the facilities that have been, and will continue to be provided through mission 66.

A small footbridge will be constructed directly beneath the larger vehicular bridge we are dedicating today. From the parking area, visitors may walk across the footbridge to one of the most unique interpretive areas planned for the parkway. A short trail will lead to one of the old locks of the James River and Kanawha Canal. We plan to restore this lock and a short section of the canal. This will be the only preservation of the James River and Kanawha Canal in existence.

George Washington envisioned this canal and Benjamin Harrison got the project started. It was to have ben 485 miles long and one of the most ambitious canal projects along the eastern seaboard. Although progress in railroad expansion rendered the project obsolete, 90 of the stone masonry locks were built and nearly 200 miles of the canal were completed and used between 1794 and 1880. The end of the era of canals, however, did not make Washington's vision any the less great.

Canals were superseded by railroads, but I doubt that any substitute can come along to supersede the Blue Ridge Parkway and cause it to be of no further value to the American people.

For all of these things—these scenic and historic values—which have been preserved for all Americans for all time, we acknowledge our debt of gratitude to the man who envisioned this magnificent parkway along the crest of the beautiful Appalachian highlands.

But this parkway is not the only evidence of Senator BYRD's service to the National Park System and the welfare of his beloved State of Virginia.

Let's take Shenandoah National Park. How many here remember the Governor's address before the General Asembly of Virginia, January 16, 1928? Here are a few excerpts from that address:

"Large as our tourist stream now is, however, it will reach the flood stage once the Shenandoah National Park is established. Sensible men who have studied the prospects, predict that many millions of dollars will be brought each year into the State and that the revenue from the increased tax on gasoline consumed by these thousands of cars will compensate the State treasury many times over for the appropriation I recommend.

"The U.S. Government will develop and maintain forever the park as the great playground of the East, once it is established. A skyline highway will be built along the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains forming a wonder way over which the tourist will ride comfortably in his car while he is stirred by a view as exhilarating as the aviator may see from his plane.

"The people of Virginia have subscribed $1,011,798 to purchase the land that must be presented to the National Government. On the condition that all pledges be collected so far as possible I recommend that you appropriate $1 million, payable out of the surplus, to make possible the establishment of this park. The appropriation should, of course, only be expended providing the land can be purchased at reasonable prices.

"It should be noted that no increase in taxes is required to make this appropriation as it will be taken from the surplus in the State treasury.

"The entire State will be benefited by locating in Virginia, in conjunction with the Great Smoky Park in North Carolina and Tennessee the only Federal parks east of the Mississippi River. Once established here the eyes of the millions of the East will turn gratefully to Virginia when spring returns each year and the call comes to go to the great out of doors. They will come here from the habit of coming, spend their money here while many will yield to the charm of Virginia and remain permanently with us."

He also was instrumental, as Governor, in getting for Virginia—and for the many travelers who visit this beautiful State—the highly-valued historical markers along your highways.

There are a great many things I could say about my friendship for Senator BYRD. He is a great lover of the outdoors and sincerely appreciates the scenic beauties of the national parks. He believes in people enjoying and protecting our great national heritage of scenic beauty and historic objects. There is no other Senator as widely traveled in the parks. It is expected, around my office, that when Congress indicates it will take a recess I will get a call from Senator BYRD about a trip to one of the national parks he has not visited yet. I'm frank to say, we are running out of parks. Further, I should hurry to add, that all of the Senator's trips to the parks are personally financed trips—not Government financed.

On the evening of April 16 of this year—at the Tuolumne Meadows Ranger Station, at an elevation of 9,500 feet in Yosemite National Park—I appointed Senator HARRY F. BYRD an honorary park ranger. The next morning—Easter Sunday—Honorary Park Ranger BYRD was the only U.S. Senator required to be on duty in a national park, serving as navigator to the pilot of a Sno-Cat skimming over snow covered mountain meadows on an inspection of the park. Monday morning he was up and out at 6 o'clock inspecting the trails and campgrounds as usual.

In writing Ranger BYRD, Superintendent Preston of Yosemite stated that he was glad to know that we now had rangers that could appropriate as well as spend money. I don't think the superintendent knows the Senator desires to reduce the national debt. I could tell you a lot more about Ranger BYRD, such as the time he walked the legs off of me for 3 days in Glacier National Park—tomorrow he is going to drag me over Old Rag—but I must get back to the task assigned to me. It seems a little out of order, even to me, for a Yankee-born Federal official to come down in Virginia to introduce a BYRD to Virginians so I'll just say, here he is, our good friend as all rangers are, the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

Expansion of Classroom Television Hinges on Magnuson Bill Now Before Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, George W. Oakes, a contributing writer for the Washington Star and other newspapers, has done several very interesting and illuminating articles recently on television in the United States and abroad, some of which other Senators have seen fit to place in the RECORD.

His very excellent article last Sunday on educational television in the Star brought back to public attention the Senate's educational TV bill, which was passed a year ago and is awaiting action by the House Rules Committee. His story also describes the accomplishments in this unique field, including the activities of the Oklahoma ETV Authority in my own State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article "Expansion of Classroom Television Hinges on Magnuson Bill Now Before Congress," by George W. Oakes, from the Washington Sunday Star, June 19, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPANSION OF CLASSROOM TELEVISION HINGES ON MAGNUSON BILL NOW BEFORE CONGRESS

(By George W. Oakes)

Educational TV will receive its greatest boost from the Federal Government if the Magnuson bill is passed by the House and signed by the President. It was approved by the Senate more than a year ago.

The bill provides Federal grants of $1 million for each State and the District of Co-

lumbia and Puerto Rico for the establishment or improvement of educational TV broadcasting facilities for public schools and colleges and adult training programs.

The bill is now in the House Rules Committee, where a combination of southern Democrats and Republicans has refused to report it. A vote of 6 to 5 last month stopped it. If the bill does clear the Rules Committee, it is generally agreed, it would probably pass the House.

As reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commierce Committee the Senate figure in the bill has been cut to $750,000 per State and matching State grants would be required to meet the Federal contribution. Also not more than $150,000 would be available for each TV station. This was done to distribute the money as widely as possible.

Federal funds would construct and maintain educational TV stations owned and operated by State TV authorities, public colleges or universities, or nonprofit community TV organizations or foundations. Both open and closed circuit TV stations would be built. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting on the advice of the Commissioner of Education, would be required to approve all requests for Federal funds.

LITTLE MONEY AVAILABLE

The major reason why there are at present only 48 educational TV stations in this country instead of 267 for which VHF and UHF channels have been reserved by the Federal Communications Commission is the fact that too little money has been available to set them up. Commercial interests are pressuring the FCC to release the unused channels.

The Ford and other foundations, as well as nonprofit community efforts, have taken the lead in organizing those educational TV stations now on the air. However, the Ford Foundation, which enabled the first 20 stations to start operations, including that in Hagerstown, Md., is not making further capital grants for this purpose.

A total of $250,000 is needed to buy the basic equipment for such a TV station, considerably more than most local groups can raise. But $150,000 of Federal funds could give the needed impetus to State and local organizations to get the rest of the financing.

Although no Federal funds could be used for programs or personnel, the increase in the number of stations would encourage a greater unification of the material that educational TV stations put on the air. The bill specifically forbids any Federal control over programs.

At present educational TV stations are located mainly in large population centers where financing was available. The proposed bill would tend to spread stations around the country and give people in rural and remote areas a chance to benefit from educational TV programs.

CORPORATION'S SUPPORT

Supporters of the proposed legislation include not only educators and civic-minded citizens but corporations like Westinghouse which operate large commercial TV stations. As Donald H. McGannon, president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., testified before the Senate committee, "industry's future depends on education and the training of its scientists, research personnel and management manpower." Praising this view, Senator MONRONEY, a member of the committee, remarked, "I can remember times when, in some quarters, educational television was anathema to commercial television broadcasting."

Since the fall of 1958 the Federal Government has been stimulating the development of educational TV through the National Defense Education Act. Some $4 million in Federal grants have been made available for research and experimental projects to improve school and college teaching. Many of these educational TV programs have been prepared in cooperaton with local communities who have provided $1.5 million to match the Federal funds. Thirty-one such projects were launched last year.

For example, in Texas 11 colleges and universities are joining together to improve their educational TV operations under one Federal grant program. In Maine talented students in far-off country districts now benefit through TV from superior teaching otherwise unobtainable. In Oregon an educational TV program has been started to meet the growing needs of junior college students. At the University of Miami an open-circuit TV program is operating during the summer session to help bridge the gap students face between high school and college.

POTENTIAL IS GREAT

The experience thus far gained has convinced Office of Education officials of TV's potential to raise our teaching standards and improve instructional methods. They believe that the proposed legislation will, by speeding proper use of this new medium, lift the quality of instruction all the way from the preschool to the graduate school level. Also they have little doubt that the States will match the Federal grants.

These are examples of educational TV operations throughout the country which would serve as patterns for those to be established under the proposed law:

State authorities

Alabama was the first State to set up a statewide educational TV network. The programs, serving 80 percent of its population and under the direction of a State TV commission, range from teaching on nearly all academic levels to those appealing to a general audience. Two hundred and fifty schools participate. The network broadcasts about 66 hours a week from 8:45 a.m. to 10 p.m. weekdays. State legislative appropriations for this service have totaled nearly $2 million.

The Oklahoma ETV Authority was established in 1953. Two major stations in Oklahoma City and Tulsa, owned and operated by the authority, reach approximately 1,770,000 people in the State. Programs include lessons in chemistry, trigonometry, physics, advanced algebra, and geology.

School system ownership

In Denver the public school system, with a capital investment of $410,000, began student and adult programing in January 1956, with the aid of 20 community and State educational organizations in the area.

Other successful school operations are in Atlanta and Louisville. In Atlanta six daytime hours are devoted to in-school telecasting and 2½ hours at night for adults.

University ownership

Some of the outstanding examples of this type of station are those owned and operated by the University of North Carolina, Michigan State University, the University of Illinois and Ohio State University.

Community ownership

Nonprofit ETV stations that have achieved national prominence are those in Pittsburgh, Chicago, San Francisco and New Orleans. Often in such operations civic leaders have brought together all educational facilities of the city to provide the most effective programs—the schools, museums, and public libraries.

The proposed legislation would make more certain the establishment of Washington's first ETV station in September, 1961. This project is sponsored by the Greater Washington TV Association. As it will be on a UHF channel, sets will have to be converted to receive its programs. At present the association conducts on Channel 5 one-half hour elementary science programs 5 days a week. Next September there will be two science courses.

If the Magnuson bill is enacted, the association plans to construct a station and offer four daily hours 5 days a week.

It is doubtful whether the District of Columbia school system will participate in TV classroom programs. Last January School Supt. Carl F. Hansen decided to end the special science TV course which fifth and sixth graders watched this year.

After several years experience with TV classroom instruction Dr. Hansen believes that it is not yet able to be adapted to the District of Columbia school curriculum. For one thing it is hard to gear a TV program to classroom work unless it offers materials and skills not at the command of the teacher. Also he feels there is the danger that the classroom teacher may lose control over what is to be taught and thus be unable to fit the instructional program to the problems of a particular group of students.

Nevertheless Dr. Hansen does not exclude the possibility that, after further study, TV teaching could be successfully used in the District of Columbia school system. The Board of Education will therefore cooperate with any new educational TV station organized here.

Dr. John Vaughan, Crusader Against Cancer, Retiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a man is retiring from the medical profession next Saturday after a lifetime of devoted service to his fellow men. Unselfish and humane service may not be unique among doctors, but this pioneering physician has campaigned against pain and disease with courage and determinattion for 50 years. A crusader against cancer and builder of hospitals as well as an aggressive healer of individuals, this man is a credit to the medical profession of the State of Texas and to the Nation at large. He is Dr. John Vaughan, of Amarillo, Tex., and his story is ably told by Mrs. Jean Ehly in the following article from the June 19 Amarillo Sunday News-Globe:

CRUSADER AGAINST CANCER FOR HALF CENTURY RETIRING

(By Jean Ehly)

There are crusaders against cancer but the fiercest opponents are often today's physicians who battle it as they would a mad bull or a cornered rattlesnake.

That is the way Dr. John Vaughan, 322 Sunset, who retires from the medical profession this month, feels about the disease he has fought during his half-century career.

Dr. Vaughan is a 1909 graduate from the University of Texas Medical School in Galveston.

He began his career as a general practitioner or country doctor in Williamson County. For the past 34 years he has practiced in Amarillo, being the first physician to introduce radium and deep X-ray to this city.

Dr. Vaughan, who has treated thousands of cancer patients from Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and Kansas, relaxes his concentration on the cancer issue only when discussing his country doctor days all over the West, when doctors considered themselves as "specialists in the spin and its contents."

He tells of the hundreds of appendectomies and of the babies delivered in farm homes with only a kitchen table or a door severed from its hinges as an operating table. He sees no fallacy in TV westerns, since he's extracted many bullets from feudin' westerners, sometimes treating the wounded of both factions.

He was the first (and once the only) doctor in Williamson County to own a car, a cherry red Maxwell, which he abandoned for horseback and saddlebag medicine kits when the roads were muddy. As a general practitioner in Liberty Hill he was often reimbursed for his services with portions of beef, hog, and eggs. Sometimes in the cotton country, he wasn't paid till the crop was harvested.

"Country doctors answered every call day or night, even though a supposed heart attack turned out to be a gas pain," he said. "Once in Liberty Hill, I put a notice in the paper asking people to call me at night only in an emergency so I could get some sleep. Country doctors drove miles between patients, often arriving too late for meals, and as a result nearly starved to death."

There were few major instruments then, so the doctor had to ask the patient many questions to determine his ills.

Dr. Vaughan's most TV-thriller-type case involved some backwoods religious fanatics who barricaded a farm house against any medical aid for a woman who'd been in the throes of childbirth for 3 days. The community had chosen up sides. One group was for the doctor, while the fanatics relied only on the power of God to save the woman destined to die without medical assistance.

"To avert mob action, I called in the sheriff and the county health officer and by threats of jail for the offenders, we saved the woman's life," he said.

Dr. Vaughan went from general practitioner into general surgery and in 1920 pioneered in X-ray and radium, being one of the first physicians in the country to so experiment.

This physician's zeal and pioneering spirit for general radiology cost him in his hands. Four fingers are missing.

In explanation he said, "Many early doctors gave their hands in radiology. We operated under the fluoroscope to remove needles, bullets and other foreign objects from the patients. We knew we could be burned by X-ray, but in an emergency, a doctor must get foreign objects from the patient's body lest it be fatal. Doctors exposed themselves to repeated radiation which often causes skin cancer."

"My fingers became so burned and cancerous they had to be amputated," he added.

But this did not slow up the doctor. He simply crusaded more astutely in the cancer cause with the four fingers of his left hand and two on his right hand.

"Today the surgeon does not lose his fingers because there are specialists—radiologists—to do the work," he explained.

This physician has built and owned two hospitals—one at Liberty Hill; the other at Taylor, Tex. His wife learned what nursing she knows under her husband's tutelage and often administered ether and helped him deliver babies in nurse shortages of those pioneering days. He came to Amarillo to practice in 1927.

Dr. Vaughan then as now bitterly condemns the quacks who try to treat cancer. He most stringently advises people to have periodic checkups if the cancer toll is to be diminished.

"We have more skin cancers in Amarillo and its 100-mile area than in any part of the United States per population because of exposure to so much sunshine at high altitude," he said.

As a hobbyist, Dr. Vaughan has hunted big game from Old Mexico through the Rocky Mountains to Montana. In Arizona he found buck deer horns in the death lock. "If their horns become so locked, they starve and are devoured by varmints," he explained. The museum at Canyon now has the horns.

In comparing physicians' habits of today and yesterday, Dr. Vaughan said, "People are treated in the hospitals instead of their homes by the doctors today. If a city physician answered every call of every stranger at all hours of the night in cities of this size, he'd never get any sleep."

"It is wise for people to revert to the family doctor policy. If your physician knows you, he'll come day or night. But if you phone just any doctor out of the yellow pages, he may not come, as he could be run to death by people who may not even be ill."

Dr. Vaughan's story is almost history, since there are only 10 living physicians from his graduating class. The most intriguing thing about this doctor is that there is no sensitivity or bitterness over the loss of his fingers. He simply gave them for science. Mostly, he gets tensely aggressive at the mention of cancer and its toll to others. You feel how tenaciously he has hunted it down and cut it out these many years. You feel that his victories in cancer were the very lifeblood of his profession from which he retires June 25—"at high noon," as he said, with a whimsical smile.

Nixon's Primary Outlay Reaches the Fantastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr Speaker, in these preelection days it is entirely fascinating to watch the ubiquitous Madison Avenue public relations experts working overtime at political facelifting and creating favorable public images for those candidates for national office who can afford to pay their fees.

The wares of the Madison Avenue boys come high, which of course means that only the really well-heeled candidates can take advantage of these special services. This fact and others dealing with the modus operandi of the bigtime public relations organizations, particularly the five firms employed by Vice President NIXON, are set forth in the following editorial from the Sacramento (Calif), Bee, of June 11, 1960, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include in the RECORD:

NIXON'S PRIMARY OUTLAY REACHES THE FANTASTIC

Whatever his party affiliations, the average Californian must have been astonished by the saturation advertising and public relations job done by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, the only avowed serious contender for the Republican presidential nomination, in the primary election campaign.

There were five expert public relations organizations working for him, all trying to convey the impression he was the beneficiary of a great, untutored grassroots surge. NIXON as much as possible tried to assume a role of being above the battle, a statesman too busy to do any electioneering.

Thus he played both sides of the street, the statesman going about his chores of being Vice President while reaping gain from a most carefully planned political campaign.

Just before the primary election a paid political TV program put together to resemble a public service documentary and virtually implying NIXON to be the author of the Marshall plan was shown on many channels. NIXON was billed as "Ambassador of Peace." This commercial certainly could have tricked the unwary into many false assumptions about the magnitude of NIXON'S accomplishments and the void of his mistakes.

And NIXON'S face was shot on the television screen so frequently a few days before election he seemed omnipresent.

The money spent must have been staggering. The whole job makes questionable the implications of the NIXON camp of vast expenditures by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Democratic presidential candidate in West Virginia.

The chief thing NIXON succeeded in accomplishing, so far as the actual presidential campaign goes, was proof that powerful and wealthy influences are behind his candidacy.

Many may ask why a candidate unopposed for nomination should try so frantically and expensively to win votes. The answer is obvious. He was seeking to disprove the assertion NIXON cannot win and thus head off any successful move at the convention to draft Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York. Here was one occasion when the genius of NIXON for understatement was tossed to the wind in his obsessive passion to reach the top.

Just Kids?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial of May 26, the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly, discusses the San Francisco riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I commend to the Members of the Congress this editorial entitled "Just Kids?":

"JUST KIDS?"

In the "Wanderer Forum," several readers report at firsthand their impressions of the student rioting that took place last week against the House Un-American Activities meeting in San Francisco.

That their observations are not farfetched or overdrawn is borne out by reliable information from other informed sources.

The Los Angeles Catholic weekly, the Tidings, called the student rioting a disgraceful spectacle, enough to cause grave concern for all Americans. It quoted San Francisco Police Chief Thomas Cahill's statement to the effect that the students had been infiltrated by agitators "who whipped the group into a mob frenzy." It cited the fact that the notorious Harry Bridges was present at the riot scene and had defended the innocent kids. Also, the notorious longshoreman, Archie Brown, former candidate for public office on the Communist ticket, who added to, if he didn't spearhead, the San Francisco rioting.

Meanwhile Republican Congressmen GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, and AUGUST JOHANSEN, of Michigan, said that the San Francisco demonstrations were Communist-directed.

"Hard-core Communist functionaries," they said in a joint statement, "were in the crowd inciting it to break into the hearing

room which was already filled to capacity."

Scherer also scored Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco for surrendering "to Communist directed mob violence" when Christopher (who put out the red carpet for Khrushchev last September) told the committee not to meet in City Hall the next time it comes. The Mayor said nothing about scoundrels, traitors, and irresponsible hoodlums no longer being welcome at City Hall.

The New York weekly National Review, gave this sequence of the incidents leading up to the student rioting:

1. For months the Communist press (the Worker in the East, People's World on the west coast) cranked up a campaign to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).

2. On January 9 of this year, People's World reported that Eleanor Roosevelt and Frank Wilkinson agreed, in joint conference, to "project" the "historical appeal" for getting rid of the committee. (Frank Wilkinson is a Communist agitator, out on bail for a contempt conviction, who poses as an officer of the Communist-front Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and as executive secretary of a west coast Communist front, the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedom.)

3. Shortly thereafter Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT introduced in Congress a bill to liquidate the committee.

4. The HUAC subpoenaed about fifty witnesses to appear in a room assigned for hearings in the San Francisco City Hall, for an inquiry into communism in northern California. JAMES ROOSEVELT, later reinforced by one of his mother's columns, denounced the hearings as "an attack on our schools."

5. The hearings were held during the week of May 9. Several straightforward witnesses, including Karl Prussion, who operated in the Communist Party under FBI direction, disclosed the subversive pattern. Forty-odd witnesses shouted, screamed, and cursed the committee, refused to accept Chairman EDWIN WILLIS' rulings and took the fifth amendment.

6. On May 13, a crowd of several hundred, most of them students—among them a dozen or so foreign-exchange students on State Department stipends—jammed the entrance to the meeting room, the corridors and the square. They yelled, brandished placards ("Witch-Hunters Go Home"), shoved, groaned, littered up the place. One of them knocked out a policeman by hitting him on the head with a stave. The police, trying to prevent serious trouble, suffered nine casualties against four for the rioters, and finally broke the crowd up with fire hoses.

7. Police Chief Thomas Cahill and other observers noted among the "impetuous" students: the aforesaid Frank Wilkinson; Harry Bridges, Communist boss of the Longshoremen, and his attorney, Vincent Hallinan; Merrill Brodsky, Archie Brown, and other known Communist agitators.

8. On May 15, San Francisco Mayor George Christopher—Khrushchev's most genial host on last summer's visit, and subsequently his most genial and admiring guest on the mayor's return visit to Russia—issued a statement that the hospitality of San Francisco city hall will no longer be extended—to scoundrels, traitors, irresponsible hoodlums and misguided enthusiasts?—No: to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Small wonder that, with student riots starting up in Montevideo, Seoul, Ankara, Trafalgar Square, and now San Francisco, the Tidings opines that the spectacle is "enough to cause grave concern for all Americans."

Sheriff's Resolution on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, among the most patriotic, dedicated citizens of our Nation are the sheriffs who take a commanding role in the maintenance of law and order in our communities and counties.

The National Sheriffs' Association held its 20th annual convention in Colorado Springs, Colo., last week. The attendance was the largest in the association's history.

The convention adopted a resolution that sets forth very clearly the association's thinking on the all-important question of national defense. A copy of this resolution has been sent to me as a former member of the association and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

UNCLE SAM, STOP PLAYING GAMES

Whereas this great Nation is faced with the deadly peril of softness within and from the avowed efforts of destruction from without; and

Whereas the President of all of the people of the United States has been insulted by the dictators of those nations who have sworn to destroy our democratic society; and

Whereas the United States of America was founded and made great by a group of angry, dedicated men who opposed tyranny, both from within and from without the Nation; and

Whereas the threat and danger to the United States and her allies is now: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Sheriffs' Association, in meeting assembled this 15th day of June 1960, at Colorado Springs, Colo., as follows:

1. That the Federal Government stop playing at the game of the civil and military defense of the United States;

2. That both the elected and appointed representatives of the Federal Government tell the people of the United States the hard, cold unvarnished truth and facts about our civil and military defenses;

3. That the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Military Establishment and the Congress of the United States, act now to provide for the common defense of the United States in both the civil defense program and the Military Establishment whereby no nation or group of nations would dare attack either the United States or her allies;

4. That the two great political parties in their forthcoming conventions in debating the issue of peril to the United States demonstrate to the world that the dedication of the people of the United States is first and foremost to the preservation of individual liberty and freedom, and that our Government was and is established to effect the safety and happiness of all people everywhere and that we hold the peoples of other nations—enemies in war, hot war or cold war; in peace, friends;

5. That the sheriffs of the several States hereby reaffirm their dedication to carrying out the objectives set forth in this resolution of giving the people of the United States an invulnerable civil defense program and Military Establishment now.

CHARLEY MEYER,
Beaumont, Tex., Chairman.
C. A. KACKMEISTER,
Saginaw, Mich.
G. L. GORMLEY,
Mays Landing, N.J.
JAMES G. CLARK, Jr.,
Selma, Ala.
JOHN M. GOLDSMITH,
Radford, Va., General Counsel.

Investment of U.S. Firms in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the overwhelming problems faced by many segments of American industry. This is a result of competition from low-priced foreign production and the importation of their products.

While I do not fear true and fair competition, the problem involved results from the low wage scale paid to labor by foreign industry.

The Subcommittee on Europe of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives conducted a special Study Mission to Europe in the fall of 1959. As chairman of the group, I issued a House Report No. 1226.

In this report, recommendations were made concerning this problem on page 3, recommendation 3, as follows:

3. A continuing study must be undertaken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the impact on the American economy of the investment of U.S. firms in Europe to determine the extent to which new markets are being found, the extent to which those firms are looking to third markets, and the extent to which the products of such firms are produced for export to the United States (p. 14).

This recommendation was further explained in the report on pages 12 through 14, and I include several paragraphs:

The division of Europe into two trading blocs warrants a tempered appraisal of the future. Europe's economic upsurge and the division of its principal traders into two groups pose new problems. While each bloc is committed to more liberal trade patterns, the economic and political policies and attitudes they adopt in pursuit of this objective may have serious repercussions for the free world. Should the division result in attitudes and policies perpetuating conflict and discord between the two blocs it may be expected that the Soviet Union will use such division to its advantage. Deeply rooted discords and old traditions should not be allowed to rise again. Our concern is reflected in the statement of the official in one country who expressed the hope that Spain would not be permitted to enter either bloc. When questioned on this statement it was corrected on the basis that it was said jokingly.

Should the United States exert its influence to bring the Six and the Seven together? This is not an easy question to an-

swer. If the two groups pursue independent and mutually exclusive economic policies, the effect on European unity can be fatal to the Continent's continued development.

An encouraging note that European trade policies will continue to move in a more liberal direction is the recent reduction of import quotas. At the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) session in Tokyo this fall our delegation took the position that countries emerging from balance of payments difficulties reduce the use of import quotas. The convertibility of the main trading currencies of the world removed any balance of payments justification for their continuation. Several principal trading countries—the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, and Sweden—have made reductions in this discriminatory practice while others are giving careful study with a view to following a similar course. The study mission believes this is a significant step toward stimulating world trade in general and encouraging, in particular, American exports. It urges that the administration press for further reductions that will result in the removal of all quota limitations originally imposed because of difficulties in foreign currency holdings.

One way by which American industry can enjoy the benefits of either of these larger European trading areas is to establish itself within the borders and become something of an expatriated industry. Or what is more likely, American industry will set up European subsidiaries to meet the demand of that market. Both of these approaches have been used by American companies and others are actively exploring the desirability of establishments in Europe. In any event, the impact of these movements on the U.S. economy, desirable and undesirable, should be the subject of continuing appraisal.

Exporters and importers will have to give serious thought to their place in the European market. The aim of the six Common Market countries is to move toward a common external tariff. The Outer Seven, as a measure of self-protection, have joined together to reduce their tariffs vis-a-vis each other. Exporters of raw materials and agricultural commodities will probably be least affected. Tariffs on these items are either nonexistent or inconsequential. But segments of American industry may well be hurt as competitive European industries strengthen themselves behind a protective wall.

The Department of Commerce has only recently started a study of the extent to which the U.S. imports are the products of American owned or controlled business enterprises overseas. This is a study the results of which will be available in June 1960. It should be kept current so that the Congress can readily determine whether domestic output is adversely affected by this type of import and what measures, if any, should be taken.

The problems raised by the migration of U.S. capital are not limited to a narrow economic range. They encompass basic foreign policy decisions. The attitudes and decisions of foreign governments in matters of foreign trade are interlaced with, and reflected in, their political and military determinations. Many sections of the Mutual Security Act—under which we conduct major aspects of our foreign policy—reflect a concern for the American economy. For these reasons the study mission recommends that the Committee on Foreign Affairs give continuing study to the impact on the American economy of investment abroad by U.S. citizens and business firms.

American exporters will have to do a harder job of selling better quality merchandise that is produced more efficiently. One hopeful sign, though not too imminent, is that more of Europe's wealth will come into the possession of its consumers. Both of the two trading groups are so recent in origin that statistics can give little guidance as to their effect on trade. Some small encouragement may be derived from the trade figures for the first 6 months of this year. Both imports and exports within the two groups and between the two groups have risen.

On the other hand, the following table derived from Department of Commerce figures, shows that U.S. trade with the 13 countries included in the two blocs is marked by a growth in imports and a decline in exports.

U.S. exports

[In millions of dollars]

	Annual			January-June 1958	January-June 1959
	1956	1957	1958		
OEEC countries, total	4,751.6	5,305.8	4,101.8	2,048.2	1,837.3
Common Market countries (6)	2,895.3	3,122.3	2,427.9	1,242.0	1,185.9
EFTA countries (7)	1,616.5	1,756.0	1,431.7	671.3	670.6

U.S. imports

[In millions of dollars]

	Annual			January-June 1958	January-June 1959
	1956	1957	1958		
OEEC countries, total	2,743.1	2,940.1	3,168.2	1,453.4	2,069.0
Common Market countries (6)	1,415.4	1,543.7	1,673.7	747.4	1,120.8
EFTA countries (7)	1,216.5	1,253.5	1,374.7	631.6	863.4

One of the industries which has been involved and hurt, and which will be even more adversely affected in the future, is the clothing industry—textiles.

On June 9, 1960, Mr. Louis Scalise, vice president of Witty Brothers, Inc., in accepting the presidency of the New York Club of Fashion Designers, made several suggestions to combat the problems facing his industry. I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the remarks which were made by Mr. Scalise:

As you all know, I participated recently in the annual convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at Miami Beach as one of their guests. There, much discussion took place about the problem of competition from foreign markets. It is this matter—competition from foreign markets—that makes me particularly aware of the responsibilities which the president of the I.A.C.D. and other clubs must now assume. I welcome this challenge because I believe that we must in the coming year use all our resources to combat this threat to our industry.

Recently some one, in a joking manner, said that Commerce Department officials observe that the man to be pitied is the American industrialist—every time he puts a new product on the market the Russians invent it a week later, and within 2 weeks the Japanese are making it cheaper. But this is really not so funny. Of utmost importance to us would be the passage of legislation curbing such imports through higher tariffs, quotas, or any other possible means. I feel that we must right here and now designate a committee officially to work on this. We must combat competition which is based on impossibly cheap labor.

As businessmen we cannot fail to see the dangers in allowing this condition to continue to exist. We are now buying our fabrics from Japan—yet, throughout the country a large percentage of people who want work in the textile field cannot find employment, and mills are standing idle. Shouldn't we work toward enacting legislation in Washington to subsidize these idle mills so that we can put these people to work and manufacture fabrics at a price where we can compete with the foreign suppliers?

The way things are going today, it is very likely that in the not too distant future Japan, instead of being willing to sell us the fabrics only, will refuse to sell us anything short of the completed garments. We are starting to receive finished garments now. Even though we are an association of designers, we are also businessmen, and as such we must make the competition harder for the foreign markets to meet—we must work harder to make better fashions—and we must make the pace faster. This, together with trying to push through legislation, is what we must do to protect our futures in the men's clothing industry.

The Late Honorable Douglas Elliott

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad occasion of sorrow for everybody in the House, especially for those of us who knew DOUG ELLIOTT. When we were advised of his passing we were shocked, because he had such a bright future ahead of him.

When Congressman DOUGLAS ELLIOTT came to Congress from the Pennsylvania State senate I was more than pleased about it. I had been a speaker at the Lincoln birthday observance at Gettysburg a few years ago when I first heard him speak. I saw the wonderful reception he received when he was finished speaking and what a fine opinion his friends and neighbors had of him. I think the Congress has lost a promising Member. I join in expressing our sincere sympathy to his wife and children.

The Decay in Its Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Richmond News Leader of June 14 is entitled "The Decay in Its Soul." It is one of the most powerful, penetrating and serious indictments of the peoples of the West in their whole attitude and approach to the machinations of the Communist conspiracy and its threat to Western civilization.

The editorial refers to Dr. Charles H. Malik's address in the restored hall of the House of Burgesses. My experience as a Member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for 8 years confirms Dr. Malik's conclusion that "he finds nothing but intellectual and spiritual surrender to the Communists; and that there is no fierce determination to defeat communism to roll back the Communist frontiers, to sell Western ideology; that there is at most a desire 'to contain' Communist imperialism, and that there is an apathetic notion that 'coexistence' is the finest of all answers."

I commend this editorial to every Member of Congress:

THE DECAY IN ITS SOUL

It was almost 6 o'clock Saturday afternoon before Dr. Charles H. Malik began his address in the restored hall of the House of Burgesses in Williamsburg. It was hot in the crowded chamber, and the lights set up for television cameramen added to the discomfort, but for a solid hour Dr. Malik made his listeners forget all this. His address merited a place among the truly great speeches of this century. In phrases that smashed home with the repetitive impact of a battering ram, he summarized the weakness of the West before the dynamic aggression of the Communist East. His indictment was not only surpassing oratory; it was also, may God yet save us, a terrible statement of the truth.

Excerpts from Dr. Malik's address occupy most of today's editorial page. If our readers take time for nothing else in the paper this afternoon, we would urge them to read this. Cold type can convey nothing of the passionate conviction and personal magnetism the Lebanese diplomat brought to the occasion, but even this much of his speech may set our readers to thinking. It is late for the West. We shall be exceedingly fortunate—more fortunate than a decadent people deserve—if it is not too late.

The awful charge he brings against the free world is summed up in a shocking line: "The decay in its soul." He points to the swaggering Khrushchev, who would bury us, who would see our grandchildren under Communist rule. Khrushchev believes this completely. And Dr. Malik glances about the West, searching in vain for a single Western leader who believes in his heart that communism will collapse, that the Kremlin's grandchildren will know political freedom. He finds nothing but intellectual and spiritual surrender. There is no fierce determination to defeat communism, to roll back the Communist frontiers, to sell Western ideology; there is at most a desire "to contain" Communist imperialism, an apathetic notion that "coexistence" is the finest of all answers.

Is it inevitable that communism must expand, that freedom must diminish? Those who accept this hypothesis—and there are millions of American who do—are already Marxists in Dr. Malik's view. They are unwilling to take a moral responsibility for Western failures; they are not agreeable to the sacrifices that must be faced if Western civilization is to survive.

One does not have to search far to find examples of the passive, fatalistic attitude Dr. Malik decries. Among our colleges and universities, it is the liberal organization, with the liberal faculty sponsor, which attracts the greatest prestige. It is the charming apostle of appeasement who commands the students' acclaim. In Tokyo, a hundred thousand militant students, organized and aroused by Communist propaganda, demonstrate against Eisenhower; when Khrushchev visited the United States last fall, a pitiful handful of American students raised some feeble placards—only to be shooed off by police.

The leading media of public opinion in this country, the great newspapers of Washington and New York, the influential monthly and quarterly journals, have an editorial range from soft to softer. They wage war upon communism with beanbags and toy swords; they have rinsed their mouths with Listerine; they would not offend.

This insidious rust eats at the iron that once constituted a hard core of freedom. We temporize. We excuse. We look upon peace, as Adlai Stevenson urged, as "paramount," forgetting that peace without freedom is meaningless. The American people are brave, generous, anxious to please, eager to make friends; but they are lazy, they are politically inert and philosophically illiterate, and they are afraid to make enemies.

Dr. Malik said it all in his moving and eloquent address of Saturday. In a part of his remarks not printed here, he begged Western leaders to adopt a fresh and vigorous attitude, to believe in freedom, to seek the liberation of nations now under Communist rule. Failing this, our institutions must continue to weaken and decline, and our glittering cities, as Eliot once remarked, must look forward to the pitched tents of new barbarian hordes.

Lost Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on June 17, 1960:

LOST FACE

All Americans are relieved that President Eisenhower will not be called upon to risk his personal safety in riot-torn Japan. But their satisfaction is tempered by the knowledge that U.S. foreign policy has suffered another defeat.

For there is no blinking the fact that cancellation of the President's visit was a defeat.

The great majority of the Japanese people are undoubtedly friendly toward the United States and its Chief Executive. Most of the students who participated in the "Ike Stay Home" demonstrations were more anti-Kishi than anti-Eisenhower. But the Reds pushed the riots for all they were worth, and Moscow is trumpeting that Japan has repudiated not only Eisenhower but the whole Western camp.

This kind of half-truth can do enormous harm in Asia and Africa, where many can't tell the difference between propaganda and fact.

Our best hope at the moment is that the Communists will overdo it and cause their strategy to backfire. The United States has momentarily lost face, but most Japanese will feel that their country has lost face even more. The inability of the democratically elected Kishi government to control the actions of an extremist minority raises questions not only of the competence of the government, but also of the ability of Japan to maintain a parliamentary democracy.

If the revolutionary conditions now prevailing in Japan force Mr. Kishi to call for new elections, there may be a popular revulsion against the left and a strengthening of the moderates in Parliament, which would be a serious defeat for Moscow.

But the United States must act with caution as well as dignity, if the situation is to be resolved favorably. It may even prove desirable for us to renegotiate the United States-Japanese security treaty, which touched off the trouble. Although Mr. Kishi's Liberal-Democrats undoubtedly speak for the majority on most issues, many observers think they cannot do so on this. Neutralist feeling is strong in Japan, as it is in most of free Asia. It would be unwise for the United States to demand a greater military commitment from Tokyo than the people will wholeheartedly underwrite. A question has, in any case, been raised.

In the long run the important thing is to conserve the natural good will which Japan feels toward us and the West. We have lost face. But we have not lost Japan. We must play now for the larger stakes.

Southeast Shippers Oppose Airlift of First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Southeast Shippers Advisory Board recently adopted a resolution expressing opposition to the airlift of any class of mail other than airmail and urging passage of H.R. 9488 and S. 3214.

I can report to the House that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee this morning reported H.R. 12595, an amended version of H.R. 9488.

The Southeast Shippers Advisory Board is composed of more than 800 representatives of the principal shippers and users of rail transportation in 9 Southeastern States. The resolution adopted by the board at its 130th regular meeting in Memphis June 9 follows:

Whereas the Southeast Shippers Advisory Board, whose membership is comprised of representatives of the principal shippers and users of rail transportation in the Southeast, is interested in and vitally concerned with the financial ability of the railroads to render economical and efficient service and to maintain an adequate car supply with which to render such service; and,

Whereas for many years the railroads generally have been experiencing deficits from the operation of passenger service and such

deficits have seriously affected the financial condition of the railroads, and the revenues realized from freight operations have been required to offset deficits from passenger operations; and,

Whereas since 1953 the U.S. Post Office Department has been experimenting with the transportation of first-class mail by air, and that bills have been introduced in Congress which would have the effect of allowing the Post Office Department to contract with airlines for the transportation of mail, other than that on which airmail postage has been paid, by air on a permanent basis, all of which has affected and in the future will seriously affect the revenues of the railroads and result in a further impairment of their ability to render economical and efficient service, and provide an adequate supply of freight cars for the users of freight transportation; and,

Whereas there have also been introduced in Congress bills which would prohibit the transportation by air of any class of mail on which postage other than air mail postage has been paid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Southeast Shippers Advisory Board, That it hereby declares its opposition to, and urges defeat of, Senate bill S. 2402, and House bill H.R. 8296, and any and all other bills which would authorize the U.S. Post Office Department to contract for the transportation via air of any class of mail other than air mail, and that this Board declare itself in favor, and urges passage, of Senate bill S. 3214 and House bill H.R. 9488, or any appropriate other bill which would prohibit the U.S. Post Office Department from arranging for the transportation by air of any class of mail other than that on which proper air mail postage has been paid, and that appropriate Members of Congress be advised of the action of this Board by furnishing them a copy of this resolution.

Abuse of Our Patriotic Impulses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the vigorous opposition of all true Americans to the threat of international communism is axiomatic. The awful purposes of this massive conspiracy and its extensive efforts to smother the dignity of mankind are a compelling matter of record for all who care to use their eyes.

The obligation of every American is clear: Communism must be fought and defeated in its efforts to inject a poisonous substance into the bloodstream of liberty. But the battle for freedom cannot be waged, Mr. Speaker, by a people who have been frightened by scare propaganda and who lose all their sense of direction.

A fine example of clear thinking in this field may be found in the following editorial by my good friend Harold Hudson, editor of the Ochiltree County Herald in Perryton, Tex. A stanch foe of communism and all its insidious disguises, Mr. Hudson courageously illustrates a difference between firm opposition to Marxist teachings and a cynical, low-pitched, and frenzied opposition which constitutes an abuse of our patriotic impulses.

The editorial follows:

[From the Ochiltree County Herald, June 16, 1960]

FROM THE SIDELINE

(By Harold Hudson)

There is a growing group of professional anti-Communists who make a pretty good living selling their wares, and all have really nothing to offer except a magazine or newsletter of some kind. We had two such visitors in the office last week and while it was perhaps coincidence, we had the feeling that the anti-Communist field is getting overcrowded. The first fellow called us into our office, shut the door, and in deep secrecy showed us his credentials, consisting of a printed identification card. Said he had our name referred to him as a defender of faith, a foe of subversives, and a man who believed in doing the right thing.

The right thing, in this case, consisted of slipping our visitor and his organization a paltry $15 per month to carry on the work. When we asked what work, he pointed out that his group mailed out circulars by the bale, had the teachers and preachers on their mailing list, and men like him worked tirelessly covering the country recruiting members for the cause, at $15 per month up. He said we had no idea how close we were to going under to communism. Said there was actually a red cell right in Borger, which is mighty close to Perryton and we had better get alarmed about it. Said his organization needed lots of money to carry on the fight.

We never could close in on him when it got down to specifics. Of course his information was classified. All he wanted was to get the money and be on to the next recruit. Seemed downright hurt and disappointed when we declined to join up. We apologized for taking up his time. The other anti-Communist was selling much along the same line. Said he would see that the teachers got a copy of his magazine every month and we never could figure out why the teachers got such close scrutiny. Anyway, we disappointed No. 2 as much as No. 1.

We were so impressed by No. 1 that we followed him down across the street from the Perryton Hotel and saw him get into a new blue Cadillac and pull away from the curb. Since all windows were rolled up and it was a hot day, we deduced that the Caddy was air-conditioned. The other fellow got away before we learned his mode of transportation. We decided that our non-air-conditioned 1957 Chevrolet looked mighty poor in comparison to our visitor's car, and he was right in that it probably does take a lot of money to keep the anti-Communist battle going.

A Veteran Railroader Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, railroading is an important part of the economic life of my congressional district in the southern tier of New York and two major railroads, the Erie and Lackawanna, span the 37th district from east to west. As a result, I have a considerable body of constituents who are railroad men or who have now left the rails to retire.

All of us know the tremendously important role which the railroads played in opening up our continent and in developing the economic life of the country by providing a means of goods distribution from coast to coast. This would not have been possible without dedicated railroad employees, many of whom spend their entire working life in railroading. As a tribute to these men and in recognition of the lifetime of service which they have given to railroading, I bring to your attention a story concerning the retirement of one of the most popular railroad men in New York State—Conductor Tom Tobin of Hornell, N.Y., who recently retired from the Erie Railroad after a career of 51 years with the line.

To Conductor Tobin, no passenger was ever just a fare. They always found in him a willing and sympathetic ear. He shared their joys and sorrows. Parents sending small children to visit grandparents checked with Tom for the date of his next scheduled run confident that he would keep an eye on the children.

The greatest satisfaction of his 51 years of Erie service: "I never had a wreck. I'm glad of that."

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to all retired railroaders throughout the country, I ask that the following story from the Elmira (N.Y.) Sunday Telegram of May 29, 1960, be included with my remarks:

THEY'LL MISS BIG TOM TOBIN—VETERAN RAILROADER TO MAKE FINAL RUN TUESDAY

(By Andy Lamb)

HORNELL.—Life on the Erie Railroad's Susquehanna Division just won't be the same after Tuesday. That's the day Big Tom Tobin will swing out of the depot, cock his conductor's hat for the last time and get train 2 underway with a wave of his arm.

For Thomas R. Tobin, as he was christened more than 67 years ago at Addison, it will be the end of 51 years of railroading, all on the Susquehanna Division. His life for years has been tied to the 224 miles of track between Hornell and Port Jervis.

Through the years he's built and kept hundreds of friendships along the line. His booming voice and crashing laugh are as well known as the railroad itself. There will be many old friends who will miss the year-round arguments about baseball, a subject Tom discusses with authority.

"Say I see that feller Casey Stengel outguessed himself again yesterday," is a common greeting for riders he knows are Yankee fans. "Why I told you all along it will be Cleveland. Why don't you admit you don't know anything about baseball?"

Retirement means just taking it easy for him. He never has been a man to bother with gardening or other hobbies. "I've seen a lot of miles go by and now I'm going to take it easy," he said. "I'm not going to sit in a rocker because I don't have one. I'll ride the trains once in a while to say hello to my friends."

Tobin started working for the Erie in 1909 carrying water when the Elmira, Corning & Waverly streetcar line was being built. The next year he worked with a section gang transferring railroad cars at Addison.

He went braking in 1912 and the pattern was set. He became a conductor about 1920 and a passenger conductor in 1935. Trains 2 and 5 have been his regular run since 1945.

His service was interrupted only for World War I when he served overseas with the 148th Infantry of the 37th Division.

With his wife, the former Mary Higgins of Wellsville, he lives at 17 E. Main Street.

H.R. 8860, A Bill To Stabilize the Mining of Lead and Zinc by Small Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8860, which I have cosponsored, would stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small producers, conserve domestic reserves of lead and zinc, provide jobs for unemployed miners and payrolls for the depressed business communities which serve them.

The measure would authorize stabilization payments to domestic producers of lead and zinc. These payments would make up the difference between the stabilization price of 17 cents per pound for lead and 14½ cents a pound for zinc, and the price received by the producers in the open market. Payments would be limited to "small domestic producers," defined in the bill as those producing or selling up to 2,000 tons of lead and/or 2,000 tons of zinc in a 12-month period.

Current prices (13 cents for lead, 12 cents for zinc) are below the domestic cost of production.

As they have done previously, administration agencies are leading the opposition to this legislation, claiming, among other things, that the import quotas imposed late in 1958 are doing a job. Secretary of the Interior Seaton says the quotas "have already materially assisted in stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industries." As far as the small miners are concerned, they have been stabilized right out of business.

In 1956, U.S. mine production of lead totaled 348,329 short tons, of which 18,610 came from Montana mines. In that same year, we imported 458,553 tons of lead. Preliminary figures for 1959 show that total domestic production fell to 253,260 only 7,520 tons of it mined in Montana. Imports totaled 410,954 tons.

For zinc, the picture is the same. In 1956, domestic mines produced 537,643 short tons, 71,865 of it mined in Montana, and we imported 770,775 tons. Last year, total domestic production fell to 416,965 short tons, of which only 27,560 tons was mined in Montana.

As you can see, foreign producers still dominate the market, as they have for at least 10 years. Imports of lead, 75 percent of U.S. production in 1951, rose to 91 percent in 1958. From 72 percent of U.S. production in 1952, imports of zinc increased to 119 percent in 1958. In the same period, domestic mine output of lead dropped 35 percent and that of zinc fell 37 percent.

In 1956, there were 696 individual mines in the United States producing lead and zinc. By 1958 this number had dropped to 447.

The decline in domestic production of ores and concentrates has brought a depression to our mining centers, among them Butte, Mont. Thousands of men have been laid off. When their unemployment compensation benefits were exhausted, they were forced to turn to welfare agencies. The loss of payrolls multiplied throughout the business community as merchants were forced to cut back in their operations.

Our domestic mining industry is basic in peace, vital in war. We cannot stockpile a mine for emergency use. When necessary daily maintenance ceases, shafts and tunnels shift or fill with water, gas creeps in, supports give way and roofs collapse, machinery deteriorates rapidly, and it may take years to get that mine back into production.

Maintenance of a healthy, active domestic mining industry is in the national interest. This bill would help.

Canada-United States Are Interdependent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Herald, June 19, 1960, under the Canadian Trade and Finance section entitled "Canada-United States Are Interdependent," by Richard B. Wigglesworth, U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

Hon. Richard B. Wigglesworth served as a Member of the U.S. Congress for 30 years. He is a dedicated public official who has the admiration of all who know him. I know many of his former colleagues in Congress are proud of his fine record. I can say that the people of the 13th Congressional District of Massachusetts hold him in high esteem.

Today it is of the utmost importance that we in the United States continue the friendly relations that have existed between Canada and our country for more than 250 years.

Our Government has an able representative in Ambassador Richard B. Wigglesworth. His statements on United States-Canadian interdependence are well worth reading.

As the Congressman now representing the district formerly represented by our distinguished Ambassador I know I echo the sentiments of all of his former constituents when I say "well done":

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, June 19, 1960]

AMBASSADOR CITES UNITED STATES-CANADIAN INTERDEPENDENCE

(By Richard B. Wigglesworth, U.S. Ambassador to Canada)

The most important factor in Canadian-American relations is the great interdependence of these two North American partners whose friendship, cooperation and understanding long have been an unparalleled example for the rest of the world.

Canada and the United States are tremendously important to each other. They do more trading with each other than with any other countries in the world. Canadians use more American goods than any other people, and the United States is Canada's best customer.

In addition, there is the matter of investments. Canada's recent extraordinary growth and economic development is attributable in large part to the investment of private funds from the United States. The Canadian economy is growing rapidly and it imports more goods and services than it exports. This results in a balance of payments deficit. This deficit is, in fact, covered by a continued flow of capital funds from the United States for investment or for lending.

Some Canadians worry about this because they do not like the idea that their country is, so to speak, in debt to another country on so large a scale. They realize also, however, that the capital makes Canada grow, that it provides new employment and other opportunities for Canadians, that it does not interfere in any way in the internal or domestic society of Canada. Consequently, Canada remains receptive to new investment and offers good opportunities to the American investor.

American money invested in Canada approaches $15 billion. On a per capita basis, however, Canadians have invested much more in the United States than Americans have in Canada.

We have in reality in our two countries a common market for investment funds, and these funds move freely from one country to the other, depending on the judgment of the investor.

Canadian-American interdependence in trade and investment is closely paralleled by interdependence in defense. In the air age, national boundaries are quickly crossed. The basic hostility of the Soviet Communist world toward the free world requires appropriate mutual security arrangements with each nation contributing to the common defense.

Canada and the United States are allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). They are closely linked bilaterally by the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). In NATO the Canadians and the United States share their defense problems with their European and other North Atlantic allies. In NORAD the Canadians and the United States have an integrated air defense system in which a combination of Canadian and American officers are in command over all forms of air defense. American planes and Canadian planes, in effect, fly wing to wing in unity.

NATIONS NEED UNITY

This is defense as it should and must be for the times in which we live. Only through unity can we protect our separate national lives and independence. Only through unity can we do our fair share in accordance with our national traditions in the interest of the free world.

In an interdependent environment in economic and defense affairs, the relations between the Canadian and American Governments ought to be good. They are. They are fundamentally healthy, and they are steadily improving. We are moving in the right direction.

However, good relations are neither automatic nor easy. Our two nations are interdependent, but they also compete. For example, both countries sell wheat on world markets. There is competition in metals, in petroleum, in other fuels, and in manufactured goods.

There are instances where people on one side of the boundary wish to use certain natural resources to their own advantage, and possibly to the disadvantage of people

on the other side of the boundary. Care and attention to relations are essential if fair dealing, cooperation, and understanding are to be achieved.

We have an elaborate set of arrangements for keeping the two governments and peoples in touch with each other. We are constantly seeking new ways of improving understanding and of finding solutions to problems as they develop. Canada has an able and effective Embassy in Washington. It is headed by a distinguished Canadian Ambassador Arnold Heeney. Through this channel the Canadian Government can bring directly to the attention of the U.S. Government its views on any problem. The U.S. Embassy in Ottawa is constantly in touch with various departments of the Canadian Government.

JOINT BOARDS

In addition to the normal diplomatic and consular channels, there are certain special joint boards and commissions which handle business between the two countries. There is the International Joint Commission which is responsible for dealing with problems of water and waterways along the boundary. Over the years the International Joint Commission has painstakingly and carefully solved many knotty and difficult problems.

There is also the Permanent Joint Board on Defense. This exists to resolve many detailed problems of defense relationships.

A new type of arrangement was established at the suggestion of President Eisenhower in 1953. At that time it was agreed to set up a Joint Canadian-United States Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. It consists of the ministers of External Affairs, Finance, Trade and Commerce, and Agriculture on the Canadian side, and of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce on the United States side.

This committee meets periodically. The last session was in Washington in February. The immediately preceding session was in Ottawa a year ago January. I had the privilege of attending both of these sessions. I can give direct testimony on the usefulness of this Committee as a means for establishing close personal relationship between high-level officers of the two governments.

The Committee on Economic Affairs is paralleled by a newer committee. It was established when President Eisenhower was in Ottawa in July 1958. This is the Joint Cabinet Committee on Defense. It considers at Cabinet level a number of the important defense problems which our two countries face. The last session of this Committee took place in Washington at Camp David during the autumn. Again I am able to give direct testimony on how useful and effective this Committee is for developing common understanding and effective working relationships between the two countries.

The sale of energy from one country to the other sometimes produces problems. Arrangements under which the United States imports Candian hydroelectric power have been functioning for many years. More recently, other forms of energy such as oil and gas have entered the economic picture in Canadian-American relations.

In 1959, the United States exempted Canadian oil from import restrictions. This action was welcomed in both countries as a contribution to our mutual well-being. Only recently, Canada approved the export of gas to the United States. The flow of Candian gas across the border should be helpful to both our countries and estimates predict it will bring some $75 million annually to Canada within a few years. Details are under continuous consideration by the National Energy Board in Ottawa and the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

CANADIANS DISTURBED

Canadians have been disturbed over restrictions which the United States has imposed on the importation of lead and zinc. The American lead and zinc industry has had serious troubles for the past several years, and the U.S. Government tried a number of measures to alleviate this distress. The effort always has been to find means which did not involve restrictions on imports from friendly countries such as Canada, Mexico and Peru. Finally, however, the United States found it necessary to impose import quotas. These quotas have not been particularly harmful in their application to Canada, and the Canadians have continued to sell substantial quantities of lead and zinc in the United States.

The Canadian Government, however, has understandably been disturbed over the principle of U.S. restrictions on this type of import. Continued contact between the Governments in this connection has tended to promote better understanding, if not complete agreement.

GREAT RESOURCE

A current problem of importance is the question of the development of the Columbia River Basin. This is actually and potentially a tremendous resource for western Canada as well as for the northwestern part of the United States. Arriving at an agreement as to the best way to use the resources of the Columbia River Basin to benefit both countries and to avoid damage to either is extremely complicated and difficult.

Negotiations are now underway, and no one expects them to be easy. Nevertheless, with good will and a proper spirit of give-and-take, a solution to the Columbia River Basin problem can be found.

A proper view of Canadian-American relations must encompass the problems which we face together in other parts of the world. These problems do not separate us; rather they bring us together. Our interests, our objectives and our policies are parallel. Both countries want a world in which trade may occur without discrimination and in accordance with sound economics. Both countries want effective programs of aid for underdeveloped areas.

PROBLEMS NOT EASY

We cannot of course expect to have all problems quickly and easily settled. Nor can we expect to find a time when there are no outstanding problems between the two countries. They occur in the best families. The main point to emphasize is that most problems are solved, in a practical and equitable fashion. When there is a will on both sides to examine any question and to discuss it with a view to finding a mutually satisfactory answer, then close and good relations between the two Governments and a spirit of cooperation will prevail. Relations between Canada and the United States should continue to be to the entire world an example of good neighbors living peacefully and profitably next to each other; an example of good neighbors facing the world overseas with determination to assure the acceptance of the values of democracy and free institutions which both countries cherish in common.

The recent failure of the Paris summit conference has pointed up the necessity for the closest cooperation between Canada and the United States.

This is not a time for discouragement. It is a time for cool and realistic appraisal, for the closing of ranks for renewed determination to do everything in our power to achieve a just and lasting peace for which so many in the world hunger.

The challenge to Canada and the United States as North American partners demands that—

1. We preserve our liberty and strength, and resist the drive of international Communist imperialism;

2. We keep the inescapable struggle to which we have been challenged from exploding into war;

3. We preserve in the long-range search for a world order capable of securing peace with freedom and justice.

Because of our location, our resources, our history and our traditions we in North America are called upon to play a leading part in responding to the challenge. Our failure to do so would be the failure of the free world.

I am confident that we will not fail.

Together with our allies and partners in the free world we can and must meet this challenge.

Actuarial Anesthesia—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following are further observations on the social security system by Mr. Ray M. Peterson:

MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISSING PERCEPTIONS OF OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(By Ray M. Peterson)

3. Can the social security system become an engine of inflation?

The First National City Bank of New York expressed concern about this question in its monthly letter for May 1958. Here is what they said in part:

"There is also the matter of the direct role the social security program would play in generating inflationary forces if it is repeatedly liberalized and financed by constantly rising taxes. By 1975, even assuming the present tax rate schedule is not increased, the businessman will face a payroll tax of 4¼ percent. They were scheduled in 1958 to increase to 4½ percent by 1969.

As this tax burden rises, pushing up operating costs, the natural inclination of the businessman is to protect profit margins by raising prices. Moreover, the heavier tax bite reduces take-home pay and workers want larger pay raises.

As prices go up, social security checks don't go as far, and pressure is put on the Congress to boost monthly benefits to keep up with the cost of living. Taxes are then raised to pay for increased benefits and the spiral takes another upward whirl."

Marcus Nadler, professor of finance at the New York University Graduate School of Business, recently made this statement regarding the relation of an existing inflationary condition and the operations of pension programs:

"Within the next decade * * * the number of people aged 65 and more living on savings, pensions, and social security benefits will increase materially. These people are not likely to sit by and see their economic security further undermined [by inflation] without protesting or without bringing political pressure for remedial legislation.

"Since private pensions, based on actuarial calculations, cannot easily be increased, the greatest pressure will be on the Federal Government to raise social security payments and on State and local governments to raise pensions. This may lead to a material increase in social security and local taxes, in turn reducing take-home pay of employed persons and adding to the tax burden of the employers. Or it may lead to increased Federal and local government expenditures and larger deficits, further feeding the forces of inflation."

In the course of the nationwide debate taking place in Great Britain with respect to its national pension system, the British actuaries have warned of the inflationary

aspects that may exist in overgenerous state programs. In a summary of a discussion by the members of the Institute of Actuaries, the following remarks by Mr. B. Robart appeared:

"The likely effect of an extended scheme on the problem of inflation could take several forms. Any failure to ensure the necessary increase in productivity to enable the benefits to be met in terms of real value would itself be inflationary. That appeared * * * to be a strong argument in favor of a state scheme's being restricted to basic need or of at least partial funding. In that an extension of national pensions requiring higher contributions would act as a disincentive to saving in general, it would be inflationary in effect. Even more would a built-in cost-of-living adjustment be inflationary in effect and would strike a tremendous blow at the existing occupational pension schemes. * * * It seemed to him that the fundamental needs to be kept in mind in any extension of state pension benefits were, first, that they should be framed on sound financial principles and, secondly, that they should be conducive rather than hostile to a stable currency. * * * As a profession they could not emphasize too strongly that a false step in the vital matter of state pensions could do irreparable damage to the economy for years to come, would inevitably continue the reduction in the real value of the currency, and perhaps place an impossible burden on the shoulders of future generations." (Shades of Jeremy Bentham.)

The following wise warning by a prominent Swedish financier seems to have gone unheeded when the Swedish Parliament adopted a compulsory national old-age pension program on May 14, 1959, providing a total state pension of two-thirds of earnings at age 67 with substantial contributions from employers and participants which are estimated to produce a public pension fund of 50,000 million crowns ($10 billion) by 1990. The pension legislation passed the Second Chamber by 1 vote, the Social Democrats together with the Communists having control 116 to 115.

"A serious warning should be sounded against the idea that the required capital supply could be secured by various forms of forced savings including such obligatory pensions as is now talked of in various countries. Such systems would not be effective without giving up basic freedom. Experiences from certain countries show how forced savings have failed to be anti-inflationary as the impact of this measure has been eluded by counteractions taken by people not wanting and not needing to accept the imposed hardships. Such countersteps could include bigger wage demands and diversions of savings from voluntary accounts to forced accounts. On the other hand a country like the Soviet Union has managed to extract forced savings with considerable success but at what price we all know.

"We can—apart from moderating trade union demands and election promises—do no better than limiting the public sector and drastically promoting voluntary savings to invest more to get more goods. This policy would have to include a general overhaul of taxation not to punish savings and productivity as now. Savings would be deductible from tax. It must pay to save and to work."

Barbara Ward, English economist and writer, recently stressed the importance of capital accumulation for world needs in the economic competition with the Soviets and suggested that government could help by offering tax inducements to trade unionists who agree to long-term wage agreements, with a heavy emphasis on deferred benefits which maintain standards in old age—that is, the encouragement of advance funding for privately arranged old-age benefits as distinguished from augmented state pensions on a pay-as-you-go funding basis.

In meeting the old-age income needs of a nation, the author believes in can be done in a way involving a vicious circle which should be carefully avoided or a virtuous circle which should be earnestly cultivated. He would like to have this belief confirmed or concincingly disproved.

Here is the vicious circle.

(1) Generous state pensions with little reliance on private voluntary pension programs. This would arise from political pressures and humanitarian considerations to assure older persons of completely adequate income.

(2) Effects of generous state pensions.

(a) Employee—increased reliance on Government; savings discouraged.

(b) Employer—greater operating costs.

(c) Economy—decrease in productivity and increased government financing of old-age benefits.

(3) Inflation.

(4) Demand for or automatic increase in pensions.

(5) ——— and the vicious circle resumes.

Here is the virtuous circle.

(1) State pensions covering only basic needs with major reliance on private programs and savings. There should be no escalation provisions which aim to grant immunity to inflation to a special segment of the population.

(2) There is a margin for savings and capital accumulation under private programs. Burden of cost of state pensions on employees, employers, and government is not heavy.

(3) Capital accumulation nurtures increased productivity.

(a) Inflationary pressures forestalled with no demand for increased pensions.

(b) Controlled increase in pensions provided as real total product permits. Pension claims are established with cost consciousness of the amount of advance funding required to support them.

(4) Funding for larger pensions again contributes to capital accumulation.

(5) ——— and the virtuous circle continues.

4. Will the willingness and capacity of our working population to pay increased social security taxes be seriously affected by the great financial demands for educational facilities during the next 10 years (to say nothing of the cost of national defense, highways, improved medical care, cultural pursuits, etc.)?

Estimates of population changes by age groups shown below indicate the great increase in the need for educational facilities compared with the small increase in number of working persons who must pay the cost. From 1955 to 1970, the total number of young people, taken as those age 0 to 24, mainly a dependent group, will increase 40 percent or 30 million; the total number of older people, i.e., those 65 and over will increase 42 percent or 6 million; but the middle-age group 25 to 64, largely the producers, will increase only 12½ percent or 10 million. There are already many evidences of taxpayer reluctance to pay the cost of educational facilities and other community needs. In the U.S. News & World Report, May 18, 1959, the situation is evaluated in an article entitled, "Coming: Revolt by Local Taxpayers?" Two paragraphs are quoted:

"Government, at all levels, is hungry for money. Taypayers are grumbling more and more over the cost of government.

"What you find to date is this:

"1. People still are voting for the things they want when payment can be made through borrowing. Between 70 and 80 percent of all bond issues submitted to voters—both in number and amount—have been approved over the past 10 months.

"2. Local politicians are continuing to gamble that the public will go along with steady increases in existing tax rates and imposition of new taxes to provide the money for most of the things the people would like to have.

"3. People are voicing increased resentment at tax increases, but irritation still has not led to actual revolt in most States and communities. Some local politicians, however, look for irritation to flare into revolt by 1960 unless present trends are checked.

Population increase projection from 1955 to 1970

Age group	Increase in numbers	Percentage increase
	Millions	
0 to 4	4	20¾
5 to 14	12	37½
15 to 19	8	68
20 to 24	6⅓	56
25 to 44	1	2
45 to 64	9¼	27
65 and over	6	42

Leading educators are pleading for massive Federal intervention in the educational area involving the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars. How will the demands of social security contributions be accommodated in this tax-ridden environment as it becomes more acute during the next 10 years? With almost domonic precision, we have managed, by a "pragmatic political process," to establish for 1969 the peak of social security and railroad retirement tax rates when the costs of education will, no doubt, be reaching a new critically high point. Is it possible that we are establishing claims on future national income for the older segment of population at the expense of adequate provision for the coming population explosion among our youth?

"Montana Semper" Fights Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Nation has been attracted to the State of West Virginia by reason of the emphasis, and I must state overemphasis, of the living conditions that exist among some of the mining camps of our States, especially the areas wherein the mine itself is no longer working and the people have continued to live in the mining community under substandard conditions. This is a matter which most West Virginians are not proud of, but we feel very keenly that for the most part, the problems that exist in West Virginia in the end must be solved by West Virginians.

Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct privilege of mine to join with the residents of a little mining town which for the past 37 years has had no mining operation to absorb the employment of the community. Subsequent to the closing of the mine, the community fell back—its streets, its homes, and its business community became blighted and the individual citizens had not a great deal of interest. On June 3, I joined with the residents of the town of Montana, Marion County, W. Va. I was the principal speaker at a civic affair wherein that community was awarded first place in West Virginia's country life contest.

This award came about because the people in the community became revitalized. They formed an improvement association and by community effort have improved their homes, their streets and surrounding area so as to make this former mining community an outstanding example of what West Virginians can do to remove part of the blight that exists in these mining areas of our State. So much enthusiasm was placed in this program that it received a $500 cash award in the community life program, which is jointly sponsored by the Monongahela Power Co. and the Agriculture Extension Service of West Virginia University.

To list the many improvements that community cooperation has brought about would take several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article written by Joseph E. Hoffmann which appears in the Sunday Gazette Mail of Charleston, W. Va., which calls the attention to all similar communities the outstanding job that these 75 families of Montana, that I am privileged to represent, have accomplished:

(By Joseph E. Hoffmann)

Montana, a little hamlet of 75 families in Marion County was a few years ago a good place to be from, far away from, but today it has a bustling chamber of commerce of 72 members with a vim and vigor unmatched anywhere.

Yet, Montana officially died in 1923. Montana was a coal mine town and a thriving one with its own train station, town park, streets, and company store. But when the coal mine pulled out the town died. In recent year it was practically buried under tangles of briars, brush, trash, and abandoned buildings.

Those that stayed in the village found work within driving distance, lived on pensions, public assistance, or odd jobs. They raised families and the families called Montana their hometown, but they weren't particularly proud of it. The briars continued to grow, the streets narrowed, the junk accumulated, and the people waited in the forlorn hope that maybe somebody else would do something.

The symptoms of rigor mortis were all around. The Boy Scout troop disbanded, the Girl Scout troop ended its work. The boys who wanted to play on a team went elsewhere to join a ball team. One day the church steps fell through.

Finally, the streets became so bad that a woman fell in a chuck hole and broke her ankle, the Coca-Cola company that had taken the "Coke" to every corner of the world included darkest Africa threatened to stop delivery in Montana. Caskets had to be carried by foot about half a mile to the cemetery because the hearse couldn't get any closer.

The spark that raised Montana from the dead came about rather simply. Frank Spevok, who works as a quality inspector in the decorating department at Owen-Illinois in Fairmont; Donald Curnutte, a finisher at Fairmont Aluminum Co., and Stanley Munza, Montana's postmaster and general store operator, talked it over.

"Let's call a community meeting," they decided, "and see if we can do something about our streets and, maybe, start a Montana Improvement Association."

Montana has a strong religious core. Perhaps someone started the first meeting with the text of "God helps those who help themselves." One thing is sure, Montana reversed its philosophy from "Let's sit it out and see if something happens," to "Let every man do his part and let us all do it together—Now."

Here are some of the things that have happened in the past 2 years:

Montana Improvement Association rented a bulldozer and scraped all of the village streets. Alex Greenlee and the Murphy brothers, Bill and Wayman, members of the road committee, knocked on every door collecting $1 here and $2 there. Truckloads of gravel and reddog, about 350 of them, were hauled and spread on the streets to cover the mud and fill the holes.

Every day became a work day. Crews of neighbors bought, begged or borrowed tile and dug culverts for the streets.

Plats of the village were found someplace. On those plats streets were discovered and these were opened up out of the tangle of brush that covered them.

And, Montana discovered the power of letter writing. Letters went out to State, city and county officials and to influential citizens. And, the letters did something. One result was a $25,000 State road project that resurfaced the secondary road from Fairmont, 6 miles away, to Montana. Maybe nobody said it in as many words, but this project gave Montana the "big lift." You could feel it throughout the community—"Someone does care about Montana," was the feeling, "If, we can show them we care about ourselves."

Montana had learned its letter writing lesson well—a letter of thanks went to State Road Commissioner Patrick C. Graney. His answer came back:

"I appreciate your thoughtfulness in writing to express approval for the works. * * * It is always nice to know our efforts are appreciated."

Letters went to the city of Fairmont. On the road to Montana is located the Fairmont Sanitary Land Fill. Trash trucks had left their litter for 100 yards both sides of the entrance. Now, thanks to Montana's calling attention to it, the litter is gone, the entrance to the land fill is neat and persentable.

When winter came and with it the snows, Montana pampered its "expressway to Fairmont."

At every spot where ice would make the road dangerous, containers of cinders were placed. On snowy mornings, shift workers didn't worry the road commission about cinders. They scattered the cinders themselves on their way to work.

Montana needed street lights. Before, the late homecomer parked his car as close to his house as the streets allowed and scrambled through the chuck holes and felt his way through the briars. But now, with comparatively wide and smooth streets he needed lights.

Doors were knocked on again. This is the system that resulted: Twenty-six lights are placed at all necessary points in the village. These are 200 watt bulbs in reflectors on 15 foot posts. The wire runs from the post to the nearest residence. There it is plugged into a time-lock and into the homeowner's electricity. The homeowner pays for the electricity—Montana Improvement Association puts in the light and replaces bulbs. Workers on the late shift tell their neighbors when they expect to be home and the clocks are set accordingly.

The cleanup spirit went through the village. One resident, Fred Fortney, cleared a lot between his home and the church. It looked so good the owner donated the lot to the church for a parking lot. Harvey Hughes and John Zahora probed into the undergrowth adjacent to their homes, moved 10 truckloads of junk included rusted-out car carcasses and resurrected the village grove where once all community events centered.

The Little League baseball team was organized with Kenneth Lough as coach. The rented bulldozer cleared off a ball diamond in the middle of the village and Coca-Cola, the roads again passable for its trucks, installed a baseball scoreboard.

One lady of the community, Gertrude Clayton, who is now living with relatives in Ohio, turned her vacant house over to the Montana Improvement Association for a community building. The overgrown grounds were cleared, the house repaired, and the once empty dwelling is now the center of activities, ranging from the monthly meetings of the improvement association to engagement showers, receptions, and Little League meetings.

The community cemetery was cleared out. The MIA bought an additional acre of ground, laid it out in lots, and then, for added embellishment decided to get a World War II gun for a memorial. They wrote their Congressman, they wrote the War Department, they wrote the Surplus Property Administration and then, working with Congressman ARCH MOORE and the Fairmont Post, No. 17, American Legion they received a 3,280 pound gun, automatic, 37 mm, M1A1, on mount, combination, M54. This will be silvered, mounted and landscaped in front of the flag pole in the cemetery.

Frank Spevok, president of the MIA, keeps everyone informed with a monthly newsletter. This goes not only to members, but also to the few not belonging and to a long mailing list of out-of-town friends of the community.

After the "essentials" were done the momentum continued. Street markers were erected. Pine seedlings were distributed to all who wanted them. Pine plantings were made in vacant areas. Trees along the streets and in the grove were whitewashed.

Birdhouses were built and placed along the streets. Each house was given a house number by the MIA. Directional markers "To Montana" went up on all surrounding intersections. A Christmas outdoor lighting contest was held and community fairs and socials became regular events.

The atmosphere changed in the community. Stanley Munza puts it just right:

"A few years ago if I saw some guy in my front yard poking around, I'd throw a rock at him. Now, I know that he is either picking up a tincan or on his way in to say 'Hello.'"

Two houses burned in Montana. Money was collected for the families and then Montana branched out into area improvement. The MIA is working with several other communities to organize the Winfield district volunteer fire department. They expect delivery of a $25,000 firetruck in the near future.

The Montana community enrolled in the country life program sponsored by Monongahela Power Co., and the Agricultural Extension Service of West Virginia University.

This is a program for small communities, rural or suburban, and it makes annual awards for community achievement. The program is designed to show smaller communities how they can make progress through community cooperation. Montana naturally enough ranked in the top class in this year's program and will share a third of the $500 award money. The presentation was made at a community meeting on June 3 in the Montana grove.

What's next? The Montana Improvement Association has quite a number of projects ahead, including the first department. They hope to get city water piped to the community, they need another 350 truckloads of gravel on their village streets, and they are hoping that a nearby industrial site, which Monongahela Power Co. controls under option for industrial development, will bring a new plant near them. When this new industry comes, Montana will be booming again, not as a coal mine town, but as a pleasant residential suburb.

A 30-foot cross, lighted by bulbs purchased by individuals and changed in color at intervals as a memorial, burns every night atop a 150-foot slag heap adjacent to Montana.

"The slag heap," says Frank Spevok, MIA president, "is at last redeeming itself." "The cross," he says, "has been an inspiration to all of us and reminds us every night that God helps those who help themselves."

Suburban Rail Transportation Can Save Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1960, I introduced H.R. 11378 to assist State and local governments in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, before Lodge 160 of the Brotherhood in Philadelphia, Pa., on April 26, 1960:

SUBURBAN RAIL TRANSPORTATION CAN SAVE OUR CITIES

(By W. P. Kennedy)

A NEW DAY IN TRANSPORTATION

It has been a long and hard road workers in rail transportation have been forced to travel during recent years when our industry has been undergoing nothing short of a revolution. But we appear now for the first time to be emerging on the main line ahead. Our locomotives have been dieselized, our signal devices made automatic, our switch yards controlled by pushbuttons, our freight cars enlarged, and IBM "brains" are threatening to displace even train dispatchers.

No, it is not the end of automation that is in sight ahead for us. It is a fact that even with all the billions of dollars invested in new technology that takes away jobs, more work on the railroads is in sight. For no matter how many of our tax dollars are used to keep the planes flying or to maintain smooth highways for the trucks to travel, we still need more and more modern railroad trains in freight and passenger service.

Nowhere in these United States has this major fact been brought home so sharply in recent years as in this heavily populated and highly industrialized State of Pennsylvania. For no one can travel the congested highways of this Commonwealth or see the poor use and waste of rail facilities but is convinced that the modernization of freight and passenger services by rail is the main answer to our transportation problem.

It is becoming clear to all that we need more and better train services, that to modernize them is the most economical way to move the added millions of tons of freight cheaper and faster, and the hundreds of thousands of commuters more safely and quickly, than any other way. We need to replace stub-end stations with through stations at platform levels, to unify terminals, to develop continuous flow patterns of rail transportation to and through our metropolitan areas. We need to replace obsolete, unhygienic old rattlers by quick loading-unloading, air-conditioned, cushion shock-absorber cars. It is the public interest that is being served here.

What has been lacking up until now has been a recognition by rail management, regulatory agencies like the ICC, the States, and national administrations that we must turn to the railroads to meet our mass transportion needs in this 20th century, just as we turned to them in the pioneering days when the Nation was first bound together by bands of steel rails which made our progress possible.

Piggyback—Modern way to move freight

It took a long time to come around to piggyback as the modern answer to the need for cheap, fast, efficient hauling of freight. Here is the way to assemble job lots of goods in containers or trailers at some central point, load them on flatcars, carry them to their destination and make door delivery. Here is the efficient way to use the already installed rails, signaling devices, and experienced manpower for intercity and transcontinental movement of all kinds of freight. Here is the answer to the costly construction of more main highways, now overcrowded with slowmoving, oversized, and overloaded trucks that cause such disastrous accidents and such high cost wear and tear on our roads.

When we in railroad labor leadership began pointing out the advantages of piggyback operations, we were lone voices crying in the wilderness. But today there is four times more freight hauled piggyback than 5 years ago. And in this last year alone the gain in piggyback freight was 50 percent. The future of piggyback as a major way of moving freight is now assured.

It must be remembered that much of this is new freight business, not merely a new way of hauling freight that customarily went by flatcar or boxcar. Here is one answer to the competition of the trucks. For piggyback freight moves faster, with less breakage and loss, and much cheaper than by truck, either across town or across the Nation. We of railroad labor stand shoulder to shoulder with progressive management in going out after this new business, for it points the way for the rails not only to regain their position of leadership in freight haulage, but in expanding operations to create new jobs, better pay, and more employment for all rail workers.

The plight of passenger train service

How about the passenger business decline that has seen train after train taken off their runs, the crews idled, and many among our people made permanently unemployed? How about the failure of the railroads to furnish passenger service to commuters and others who now live in our suburbs and have to reach the offices, factories, and shops located miles away in metropolitan areas?

This passenger problem is nationwide in scope and requires National and State as well as municipal action by those in authority. There are over 16 million people in the United States today entirely dependent on some form of public transportation to get from place to place, going to and from work every day. More than 100 million people now live in the major population centers of the Nation. By 1975 it is estimated that 80 percent of the entire population, or fully 172 million persons, will live in these metropolitan areas and most of them will need some form of daily passenger service.

Presently, we are investing $41 billion in a Federal-State highway system. Even before it is built and in use, much of it will prove obsolete, for highway traffic is growing so fast. The amount of money the people will have to devote to a more adequate highway system, if we do not divert much of the present passenger traffic off the highways and onto the railroads, can hardly be calculated. This one feature of public expenditures could come mighty close to bankrupting us. And still it will not provide safe, fast, healthy, and convenient means of transporting our people to and from their daily work and recreation.

If we attempt to use streets and highways to move millions more traveling Americans, we are bound to end up as has Los Angeles already. Ours will be a smog-ridden, hazardous and nerve-racked people, facing each new day more tired and less healthy than the day before. Consider Los Angeles, where in the vain attempt to maintain the city's business activities, 28 percent of the city is taken up with streets, freeways, and serviceways. Another 38 percent of the city's land is used for garages, parking and loading facilities and other installations directly related to the automobile and truck. Fully two-thirds of Los Angeles' valuable land is now covered with concrete. Still the traffic is dangerously congested, moves at a snail's pace during the rush hours, and an entirely new system of transportation is under consideration.

The Philadelphia experiment points the way

Philadelphia has blazed the trail that may become the way to solve such problems of passenger service. In October 1958, your city voted $160,000 to pay the extra costs of operating one commuter line by the Pennsylvania and Reading railroads for a 6 months' trial period. This experiment was on the route to Chestnut Hill, and the number of trains was increased a third while the fares were reduced. The entire program was within the city limits. Later, another similar plan was provided for the northeast section of the city served by the Fox Chase Branch and Reading railroads.

What did these pioneer experiments prove? Reduced fares and better train service can attract people back to the trains. An additional 270,000 passengers rode these lines during the first 6 months' operation. Instead of the 6 percent annual decline in passengers of the preceding years, there was an actual gain of 17 percent in passengers during the experiment.

But even this increased patronage was not sufficient to make up the losses in lowering the fares to a point where travel by train would again prove attractive enough to bring passengers back on the trains. Your own city solicitor, Dave Berger, has concluded from these experiments that low fares, improved service, better equipment on mass transit systems can bring back public transportation and make it an attractive and popular means of commuting to the great shopping and employment centers of our metropolitan areas. But it will do so at first only if part of the cost is met from the public purse.

A new policy for public transportation

We are now reaching a great and revolutionary change in public policy and public thinking about passenger service on the railroads. We have seen more than one example where rail management has sought to discourage passengers from using their trains, seeking abandonment of train service so that they can devote their time and equipment to moving freight that brings in profit.

We have seen the public forced to make big investments in automobiles and load their family budgets with the high costs of their maintenance just to get the man of the family to work every day and the family out for some recreation over the weekend.

We have burdened our Government with the high costs of building and maintaining superhighways that never catch up with the growth of trucks and autos. We pay out more for autos and their upkeep than we do for the education of our children, and see expensive gasoline go up in exhaust fumes that blight our cities with choking smog. Yet right there, already installed, are the tracks

and facilities to move our growing masses of people by train.

A new program for modern passenger service

What is the key to unlocking this complicated puzzle? It has been found in part at least by your own city Mayor Dilworth in the creation of the Passenger Service Improvement Corporation of Philadelphia, a public service corporation. This progressive mayor in this great city recognizes in time that the way to preserve and expand the commuter service which is essential to the city's very life is to put the trains back on the rails to bring the people here.

This program was approved by the Railway Labor Executives Association in a meeting which I attended last July, by which the city will control and operate all rail commuter trains serving the city. It is set up as an independent agency of 15 board members, 11 selected by the mayor, 1 each by the railroads and 2 by railroad labor.

All revenues from fares and other sources of income on these trains will go into the treasury of this new corporation. In return, the railroads will receive an amount covering their direct costs of operation. The corportion will determine train schedules, kind and amount of equipment needed, service improvements to be made, promotional activities and other such managerial functions. The railroads will continue present employment practices and contracts as required by State and Federal laws and collective bargaining.

Here is a beginning step decidedly in the right direction of providing rail passenger services in an up-to-date and modern way as a public service. Here is recognition that we need this service, even though it must be provided in part at least as a charge against the taxpayers, just as surely as we need roads and bridges, streets and sewage systems, schools and libraries. That is what a public service means, the provision of something widely required for decent living which cannot or will not be offered by private industry at a profit, but which the public determines they want to provide for themselves.

The Philadelphia plan contemplates extension as needed to cover the major part of the entire metropolitan area. This will mean extending the program by agreement to other adjacent communities in order to provide a complete passenger service. When once such a program begins and proves successful, it is but a logical step to go ahead and include more areas, more communities within its activities. That is what is likely to take place here. My own belief is that Federal action will soon be required, for this is not strictly a local or even a State problem.

Laggard railroad management abandons passenger train service

Providing adequate up-to-date passenger services for the people of this Nation wherever they may reside has become a national concern. It has become so in the first instance because some rail management is right now trying to get rid of passenger trains rather than seeking ways of increasing their service. They got a provision written into the Federal Transportation Act of 1958 which allows them to make quick moves to abandon passenger services where they could show that any such trains were not profitable. They removed all State supervision of train service by State utility commissions, and tied the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission pretty effectively.

For under this new law they can abandon a train without any public hearing before the ICC, just by putting the Commission on notice, and when the ICC does hold the hearing it is powerless to halt the discontinuance on the railroad's showing that it is losing money. The public's need has been entirely lost sight of in this way of abandoning railroad service. Cities are entirely forgotten by this method, and whole communities can be destroyed merely by the act of rail management bent upon shedding itself of troublesome and profitless business.

The railroads have been quick to make use of this provision in the new law, and slow to try to find ways to maintain service such as the imaginative Dilworth proposal offers. In one case close by, the Lehigh Valley proposed to discontinue all its passenger service. The ICC conceded after a public hearing that the businessmen witnesses had amply demonstrated the need for continuation of such service because of the close connection between industry in the Pennsylvania area with the New York metropolitan area. Yet such is the law that despite the showing made before the ICC and its own finding of need, the Commission was not able to order continuance of all passenger train service.

That is why I say we need Federal legislation based on a new conception of railroad service as an essential public service. That is why we in railroad labor are fighting not only for our own jobs down at Washington and at the State capitals of all our States, but we are making the people's fight for a cheap, modern, comfortable, dependable rail transportation system which individual passengers cannot make for themselves. That is why we gladly join hands with such progressive leaders as the mayor of your great city in seeking practical ways to maintain and increase passenger service on our railroads.

And the future grows brighter every day we continue this fight. Had railroad labor just sat on its hands, and let management abandon trains at will, there would have been few defenders of the people's interest in low-cost passenger transportation facing rail management in public hearings and before legislative bodies.

Had there been no powerful and well-intentioned rail labor organizations capable of exerting organized pressure in high places of government; had there been no political program of supporting candidates for responsible public office such as we have carried on so well for years in the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, we would have seen the Nation stripped of its passenger trains long ago.

Main steps to be taken

Now, having held on during a very rough ride, we are being joined by great cities themselves who see in the loss of passenger trains their own lifeblood of commerce and trade ebbing away. And we have been joined by big taxpayer groups who see in the colossal roadbuilding program underway a tremendous burden of taxation being put on their shoulders for generations to come, with no end of it all in sight, except as we return to the railroads and put a modern passenger system back on the tracks.

Here are the main steps in the program as we in railroad labor see it.

First, we must revise the 1958 Transportation Act which the railroads rushed through the Congress under the pretense that if it were not passed they would go bankrupt. We must take out that section dealing with quick abandonment of trains without proper safeguards of public hearings by the ICC within the localities affected. To do that we are supporting a measure introduced by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate, the able senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON, and carrying the signature of 30 Senators who know this is in the public interest. I refer to S. 3020, and I urge that you write your Congressman and Senators, in support of early hearings and passage of this measure.

Next, I endorse, and we in railroad labor support, such efforts as Mayor Dilworth's Passenger Service Improvement Corp. of Philadelphia. It is my hope and expectation to see these public service passenger corporations spring up all across the Nation. But as they reach out beyond the city limits, they must make compacts and agreements with other incorporated communities, and take up the intervening suburban areas as well. So that inevitably we come back once more to the need for Federal legislation setting up national policies and laying out the guidelines for a national system of passenger service offered as a public service which the privately owned railroads do not believe they can render any longer at a profit to their bondholders.

We might as well face the fact that the railroads are up against an almost unbeatable proposition. The modernization and operation of passenger service in many places is no longer profitable on their heavily watered stock and bond values. Railroads are carrying a tremendous tax burden on their property, something on which their competitors, the trucks and airplane companies, have been given huge subsidies by the public. Several States and localities have belatedly come to realize the need of the railroads for tax relief. But even when this comes, it comes too late to save our passenger service. We need to provide direct aid for that.

We had better face the fact that we will provide far less in direct taxes to make up the difference between a reasonably priced passenger ticket that a worker can afford to pay and what it costs to carry him by rail to his job than if we continue to wreck enough city buildings and pour enough concrete to permit every driver riding alone in his car to take it into the city and park it within reasonable walking distance of where he works.

As for the commuter himself, once he has the chance to use a modern passenger service at low cost, with stops conveniently placed near his home and place of work, he can cut his family budget for operating his auto by two-thirds and raise his standard of living and comfort materially.

The program before Congress

Finally, I can report another great step forward taken by the mayors of 11 cities and the chief executives of 16 railroads meeting in Chicago in January 1959 at the instigation of your own Mayor Dilworth. There they set up a joint committee of rail management and city officials to study this passenger commuting problem on a continuing basis.

In November of last year officials of the New York Central, New Haven, Pennsylvania and Erie and the Association of Western Railroads met with city officials of New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Milwaukee to draw up a program. This committee laid out four steps to be taken by the Congress which these men regarded as vital to the Nation as a whole. Here is the first comprehensive program ever offered by such powerful forces and is deserves the thoughtful consideration of every person interested in railroad operations.

The four steps which Congress should take are:

1. That a national policy should be established by the Congress for a balanced and coordinated transportation system.

2. That the Federal, State and local governments be asked to develop rational tax policies for the railroads.

3. That Federal loans be made available where necessary to municipalities or publicly constituted bodies for new commuter equipment and improved facilities and for the improvement of intracity mass transportation facilities; these to be long-term low-interest loans.

4. That a study be made of grants-in-aid by the Federal Government to communities or duly constituted public bodies which have a sound plan for the permanent improve-

ment of commutation or other intracity transportation facilities, this to be modelled on the present urban renewal program.

Action was not long in coming from the Congress, at least a beginning that can lead to final action. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey and Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania introduced a bill just 2 weeks ago, S. 3278, which embodies most of the recommendations made by the mixed committee of rail officials and city officers.

This bill serves notice on all elements in the Nation that they now have the opportunity to decide whether they want to modernize their passenger services on the railroads. Whether they want to cut their cost of living by eliminating the wasteful and uneconomic use of private autos for travel which good commuting service can provide more conveniently and with so much less strain on their health and purses. The taxpayers can now make the decision to end this subsidizing of highways and superexpressways for the use of giant trucks and trailers that are a chief hazard to life and property.

This bill tells the city officials, owners of city property, businessmen, and civic leaders that there is a way to stop the senseless and costly demolition of useful structures to make way for parking lots and roadways for automobiles that never actually solve the needs of the commuting public and continue to destroy property values and cause more businesses to desert the cities.

This proposal recognizes that the most effective use of Federal funds depends on adequate and comprehensive planning to provide the passenger service needed and solve the growing problems of paralyzing traffic congestion in our metropolitan centers. No longer do we need to go ahead with blinders on, failing to consider the place of cities in our urban and suburban development programs. For Federal funds would become available and put to use as provided in the Housing Act to help determine the transportation needs of metropolitan areas and to program the most efficient use of existing and new facilities to provide such transportation.

Instead of waiting until the problem of commuter service is beyond solution, when billions more of public and private funds have been invested in wasteful ways of getting to and from our cities, this new approach would take stock of things as they are today. A national program would emerge from that inventory, so that we can get on with the job of putting the passenger service of our railroads in first class condition as a public service.

Nor would all this cost the taxpayers nearly so much as the present haphazard way of building more public roads and driving more private autos. For the bill by Senators WILLIAMS and CLARK, S. 3278, provides that the funds of the Housing and Home Finance Agency could be drawn upon to provide loans at low interest rates up to a total in the first instance of $100 million to States and local governments for plans to develop a modern passenger service.

For those among us who still doubt whether the Federal Government should enter this field of providing the people of the Nation with passenger train service as a public service, I want to point out to you that we are doing no more here than we have done and are continuing to do in a wide range of public services. The competing forms of transportation, the trucks and airplanes, have the aid of the Federal and State governments. The Department of Commerce in Washington recently published a lengthy report on the transportation needs of the Nation and recommended that the Federal Government encourage long-range planning and programming to modernize our transport system in which the Federal Government has a great stake both for national welfare and defense.

This is no losing proposition offered in the Williams-Clark proposal. This provides for the rapidly expanding future of rail passenger service. It is not so much a revival of passenger trains, as a whole new era of modern transportation in which we rail workers will play a leading part. Just as I pioneered in the name of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in helping launch the piggyback movement some years ago, so now I am dedicating some of my time and energy to this new and modern program for putting passenger trains on the rails of the Nation. This it what I believe to be constructive railroad labor leadership not only in behalf of our individual members and their families but in the interest of the great public which we serve.

IN SUMMARY

The issue before us is great and compelling. It is the issue of the hour in transportation circles. It boils down to this—shall we keep our economical system of mass transportation by rail up to date and in operation to meet the needs of the public, or shall we bankrupt ourselves in a vain and wasteful effort to provide every motorist with direct and speedy safe access to the heart of our great cities and parking space when he arrives?

The answer is overwhelming that modern railroad transportation of a growing population is the best, the safest, the most economical and the most convenient form of transportation we have as yet devised. The problem of making this into a public service meeting the needs of the people is now on its way to solution. The road ahead is straight and clear, and the throttle of public opinion is being pressed in that direction.

The Failure of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered at the opening session of the 14th biennial convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of the State of New York on Friday, June 17, 1960, at the Hotel Piccadilly in New York City:

Mr. Chairman, my good friends of the Affiliated Young Democrats, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be back with you again. I appreciate very much the invitation of my dear friend and your very able State president, Harold Moskovit, to participate in this opening session of your 14th State convention. May I take this opportunity to extend to you my best wishes for a most successful convention.

Nineteen hundred and sixty is a most important political year for us Democrats. This could very well be a year of great victory, if we show the necessary courage and bring the true facts to the American people. It could be a year of great disaster, for America as well as for our party, if we should nominate the wrong candidate. Knowing you as I do, I feel that I can speak my mind.

For the next 5 months, until election day, you and I are going to be very busy people. It will be our job to help clear up the confusion and the smokescreen of the Republican apologists, who will seek to explain away the mistakes of this Republican Administration with the aid of Madison Avenue tactics and unlimited funds.

And while I am on this subject, may I say that I am strongly opposed to Madison Avenue technique, regardless of which party indulges in it, when it comes to nominating and electing a President of the United States. We are not trying to sell a piece of soap or a brassiere which would make all women look like Miss America. We are endeavoring to sell a man with all of the virtues and shortcomings of a human being, except that he must be the best man this country has to offer for its highest position of leadership.

Time was when we would search for that kind of a man in every nook and corner of the land. He did not have to be rich or have a wide TV grin. You and I know that an Abe Lincoln could not have run for the Presidency in this day and age for the simple reason that he couldn't afford to pay for the television and radio time and the newspaper publicity. Is this good for America? Are we getting the best man in public office? Think about it, if you please.

What are some of the major issues of the day which demand that we nominate and elect, not the richest man or the one with the most charming smile, but the best man that America has to offer at this crucial time?

Take the international situation, for example, which involves such problems as peace or war, the security of our country, and our very survival in the future. When you try to engage the average citizen in a discussion of foreign policy, he will usually shrug you off. It is too technical for him. It is something which is out of his realm of interest, something remote and unreal. But ask the same person whether he would like to see another world war prevented, or whether he would rather see his children marching off to war, his country attacked, his city bombed and destroyed, his whole life disrupted—and he will react promptly and with utmost interest.

It is clear, therefore, that when it comes to foreign policy we need a man of proven ability, one who has demonstrated responsible leadership, if we are to survive as a free nation and as a world power. I cannot emphasize this too strongly for you.

We must remember at all times that we are dealing with the most cagey, the shrewdest, the most unorthodox enemy in all history, who utilizes every phase of human activity in the process to bring us to our knees—political, economic, psychological, technological, cultural, and at the opportune moment also military. A struggle of this type, whether you call it "cold war," "protracted conflict," or by any other name, can be very quickly lost if we are unaware of the tactics of the enemy, or if we refuse to recognize that we are in the midst of a desperate struggle for survival.

Just to show you what kind of an enemy we are dealing with, I want to quote to you from a brochure which recently came to my attention, where the basic guidelines for the Communist conflict against us are stated as follows:

1. Knock off your enemies one by one, as they become exposed.
2. Keep the enemy off balance.
3. Sap the enemy's will to resist.
4. Avoid a frontal assault, a knockout punch, until such time that it can succeed without powerful retaliation.
5. Divide the battlefield into a peace zone and a war zone. Whatever the Soviet Union does comes within the realm of the peace zone; whatever the United States does comes within the realm of the war zone, because the United States represents "warmongering imperialism."

This is not a new concept. It is new to us, but actually it is an old oriental concept which has been practiced in the past by both China and Russia. In fact, it was an

old Chinese militarist named Sun Tzu, who wrote some 2,500 years ago:

"To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."

And that is exactly what communism is trying to accomplish: To break our resistance without fighting. It is using every possible means—diplomatic pressure, economic competition, scientific achievements, propaganda, culture, education, and other ways—to convince us that we are inferior, that our tactics are stupid, that we are doomed, that we should give up the struggle before we start.

Unfortunately, the leadership this Nation has been given during these past seven and a half years has been anything but inspiring and mature, anything but virtuous and honorable, and very often anything but the truth.

The damage done to our prestige abroad is quite evident to all by now. Under the Democratic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman we enjoyed the trust and cooperation of many nations. They were our willing allies in war and peace. They were our dependable friends in the international councils. I leave it to you to make your own comparison of the situation today, where nations all over Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere jeer at us, berate us, condemn us at the least provocation, show disrespect to our highest officials and our flag. Never in my life do I recall witnessing such a "hate America" campaign as exists today throughout the world. I am not going to try to explain it, I am merely citing a fact—no matter how much it hurts.

Who is to blame? Is it President Eisenhower? No. He was a very capable general and a great war hero, but he allowed himself to be captured by the old guard Republicans—as the next Republican Presidential nominee is sure to be. You know what the policy of the old guard has always been: Prosperity at any price; business as usual; get rich quick; and the public be damned.

What bothers me today is the irrefutable fact that this great land of ours is in mortal danger, our very survival as a free Nation is at stake. There have been many warnings, including some from Republican ranks, but the top men of this administration profess not to see any such danger.

To my mind, the most critical indictment of the present administration is the fact that it has failed to ask Congress for sufficient ballistic missiles and manned aircraft to close the growing deterrent gap relative to Soviet Russia in the area of massive weapon systems. Mr. Khrushchev would not be talking as tough as he now does, if we were as strong as we should be.

It is my view that, at this very moment, we are losing world war III for a number of reasons. Let me mention a few of these reasons: lack of a sufficient and timely intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) program; lack of proper defense against a submarine attack; lack of an adequate civil defense program; lack of a weapons program and policy to deter limited aggression; lack of an adequate space program; and, finally, lack of recognition that we are, and for a long time have been, actually engaged in world war III.

I know this to be a fact because, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have learned in these past 2 years that modern weaponry, in the hands of the Soviet Union, can be assumed to have reached a qualitative and quantitative point at which our incalculable power to destroy an aggressor can probably itself be destroyed now in the matter of minutes.

Let me try to make this thought a little clearer. It is by this time a matter of common knowledge that a revolution in the development of arms has taken place on both sides of the Iron Curtain over the past decade. We speak of the most fantastic weapons, but let us not forget for a single moment that the Russians have such weapons, too. We have no monopoly in this field.

The most amazing thing about it is that this revolution in arms is not yet fully recognized or acknowledged at the policy-formulating levels of the present administration in Washington—but you can be sure that it is not only recognized by those who determine policy in the Kremlin, but it is being utilized for every possible advantage it can give the Russians.

I emphasize these things merely to point up the danger which America and the free world are facing. As we look back in retrospect of events in recent years, we must reach the conclusion that we need never have gotten into the position in which we find ourselves today. Certainly we had the resources, the money, the scientists, and the manpower to have retained the supremacy that we enjoyed during and after World War II. But we have neglected to use all this to our advantage, because of the desire on the part of the Republican leadership to balance budgets, to economize on expenditures, and to play favoritism toward certain groups.

We are in this mess now because the Republican Party is, and always has been, the party of a single interest—the party of big business. The Democratic Party, on the contrary, has always represented the interests of all the people, of the entire Nation. The Republican Party was a bankrupt party 8 years ago—not financially—but bankrupt in ideas. It received a temporary respite because its ticket was headed by a national military hero, who first found it expedient to become a member of the Republican Party after he had retired from the Army and had become a candidate for public office.

In conclusion, I wish to State my opinion that the failure of the summit conference, the increased tensions and demonstrations against the United States in other countries, plus the inability of Japan to guarantee the safety of a President of the United States, mark a complete failure of the present administration's foreign policy. This, in itself, calls for a change in administration.

Yet, I must warn you, that we can lose the election next November 8 if we permit Madison Avenue tactics to prevail. The people of America and of the free world will be the losers if the nominee of the Democratic Party is picked by the same pressure methods as those used by the Republican Party in foreclosing a convention fight.

We must allow a free choice to be made at the Democratic convention. All the candidates must have a chance to be heard and to state their views on the major issues, so that the American people may have all the facts. Unless we do this, the people will not have much to choose from in the election.

Address by Chaplain William E. Powers on Armed Forces Sunday, Fort Richardson, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Chaplain William E. Powers on Armed Forces Sunday, May 15, 1960 at Fort Richardson, Alaska. Lieutenant Colonel Powers is Deputy Staff Chaplain in the Alaskan Air Command and a priest of the diocese of Grand Rapids, Mich. The address follows:

ARMED FORCES SUNDAY 1960

Thoughts, reverent and profound, dominate the hearts of Americans today as we pause amid the complex labors of the present to commemorate Armed Forces Day. It is America's expression of belief in the military might of her stalwart sons and daughters joined in a brotherhood of mankind under the fatherhood of Almighty God. Today in so many great metropolitan centers and country crossroads the theme of Armed Forces Day—"Power for Peace"—is consecrated by her appreciative citizens as they pray for peace. Yes, this is God's country—the expression of almost every returning service personnel approaching the shores of the United States. God's country—his concept of home. This idea was in his dreams as he lay sweating in the stinking jungles of Burma. Thoughts of home took the chill from the frost and foggy watches on the Aleutians. It guided his steps as he slugged his way along the frozen reservoir to Heart Break Ridge and Pork Chop Hill. It was his guardian angel of hope as he bailed out over Cho-da and So-ka-ri. Yes, in all these places he was a stranger. To him none of them was God's country—only home, sweet home. Little wonder he prayed that soon he might return home when peace had come to the world. He found in prayer a power so necessary for peace.

On this Armed Forces Day it is well that we consider "Power for Peace" in terms of living in peace. Is our Nation's wealth measured in terms of material progress, our power for peace? No—not the visible trappings of affluent life, mighty cities, the great marts of trade, harbors crowded with the commerce from the four corners of the earth. They never have and never will assure a nation's prosperity in terms of peace. Material things in their very nature are subject to change. Cultures and civilizations constructed on changeable values change with such values. Men come and go as do nations. There must be something stable, something solid upon which to build a program for peace. Such a program of necessity demands the recognition that all men are created equal, with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. This brotherhood of mankind realizes its filial obligation to "Our Father Who Art in Heaven." And in asking "Thy Kingdom Come, Thy Will Be Done on Earth" we must use material things for the purposes for which the Creator of Heaven and Earth made them. Our power for peace comes from heaven. It is the consciousness of Almighty God that will give dignity to the actions of man and empower his relationships with fellow man with the true concept of brotherly love. Then, and then only, will mankind live in peace.

Power for peace must be perfected by prayer for peace. It is not the might of man, but rather the right of God that will bring peace to our day. The propositions of man receive their dynamic impact when indorsed by the dispositions of Almighty God. In building a much better world for tomorrow man must be much better disposed today. This means that definite arrangements be made to recognize Almighty God as the Father of nations. We may well take to heart the warning of the royal psalmist. "Unless the Lord build the city, they labor in vain who build without Him." We must strive to make our way with the blessing of Him who is "the way, the truth, and the life." It is the consecration of this great Nation to Almighty God seeking first his

kingdom and justice. Then we can pray humbly and meekly in possessing the blessings of peace.

Under the fatherhood of God man is spirited to recognize his brother in the great family of nations. As prayer perfects power for peace, charity consecrates a common bond of brotherhood among mankind. For it is in loving that man really lives, just as it is in living that man loves.

We must be conscious of the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness so characteristically the inheritance of all the children of men. This deep sense of consciousness stems from the scriptural reminder that God made man to his own image and likeness. There is, then, an equality that defies reduction through religion, race, or color, whether here or abroad. Hence, at all times we must be prepared to defend our objectives as a peace-loving nation measured in terms of God-fearing citizens.

In using the material elements of the world for the purposes of construction—we must ever be conscious that they also possess the elements of destruction. "Power for peace" must be expressed in terms of living—not the results of dying. This sense of consciousness must sting us today. More than 1 million men have been killed in defending the American way of life. One million men. This is greater than four times the combined population of Alaska—including all personnel. More than 1 million men were wounded in World Wars I and II and the action in Korea. Thousands of these men are patients today in 160 Government hospitals, of whom the Veterans' Administration reports that one-half of them are mental cases. This means the minds of men who go to battle and fight for their lives cannot take the terrific impact of war conceived by fellowmen. This is indeed a very sad commentary on our 20th century civilization. There are more than 1,200,000 men who have served with the U.S. Armed Forces in war combat zones. These know what war really is. But, how few of them are able to know what peace really is? These men and women in the Armed Forces were your personal representatives. And where is the peace for which they so persistently prayed and so valiantly fought? They have seen power used and misused.

It is well—then—to sound a clarion call for caution. Today's display of marshaled militia and mechanical might well remind the world of the possessive strength of the Armed Forces of the United States. May the presence of her military musters signal to the world that the God of the atom and hydrogen is also the God of our fathers. In a wonderful revelation of eternal love Almighty God defended the world with the visible presence of His Divine Son. In that tender hour which heralded His sacred passion and death—the second Person of our Blessed Trinity promised He would send the Paraclete to comfort them and to strengthen them. He told the world of the sanctifying love of the Holy Spirit. This revelation disclosed the secret of the power of God. A power for living, "I have come that you may have life and that in abundance," and a power for loving, "As the Father has loved me, I have also loved you."

Just as the presence of the Holy Spirit imparts the power of the Father and of the Son so also can the presence of the Holy Spirit import the purposeful principles empowered for peace. Peace is a blessing from God—it is a gift of the Holy Ghost. The power for peace must come from God. That power is generated in a dynamo of prayer. The world dreads the secret of nuclear power. The world is afraid of the secrets locked up in the atom and the hydrogen. Strange that the atom and the hydrogen should cause men and nations to cower much more than the fear of the Lord who made the atom and the hydrogen. Could it be that we have grown so cold in our relationships with Almighty God that the fear of reprisals would burn us more than the heat of such nuclear agents or destruction? Just as we are confident in our possession of some of the nuclear secrets so should we be equally as confident that the secret lies in its advantageous use as a powerful prayer for peace. Our help, our strength, our might is not the power and the strength and the might of nuclear energies. Our power and our strength are in the name of God who made the atom and hydrogen and locked therein the very secret that humbles and ingenious mind of inventive man. It is the Holy Spirit with His divine gifts filling the hearts of the faithful that will keep the spirit of America pure and unsullied—the mind of America keen and sharp in truth—the body of America free from the antibiotics of class destruction—the souls of America retentive of the wonderful image and likeness of its Creator—the heart of America loveable and loving—warm in its protective embrace of those seeking our shores, affectionate in her expressions of tender understanding, but uncompromising with those seeking her destruction.

Armed Forces Day is themed "Power for Peace." Members of her Armed Forces are purposed to pray for peace. Our country will go forward and onward programed for peace only when powered with prayer. And may our prayer be that inspired by the liturgy of Pentecost:

Holy spirit—Lord of Light,
From the clear celestial height,
Thy pure beaming radiance give.
Come, Thou father of the poor,
Come—Thou light of all that live.
Come with treasures which endure,
Come—Thou light of all that live.
Thou of all consoler best
Visiting the troubled breast
Dost refreshing peace bestow.
Thou in toil art comfort sweet,
Pleasant coolness in the heat,
Solace in the midst of woe.
Light immortal—light divine,
Visit, Thou, these hearts of Thine,
And our inmost being fill.
If Thou take Thy Grace away,
Nothing pure in may will stay.
All his good is turned to ill.
Heal our wounds, our strength renew,
On our dryness pour Thy dew,
Wash the stains of guilt away.
Bend the stubborn heart and will,
Melt the frozen, warm the chill,
Guide the steps that go astray.
Thou on those who ever more
Thee confess and Thee adore,
In Thy sevenfold gifts descend.
Give them comfort when they die,
Give them live with Thee on high,
Give them joys which never end.
In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Flag Day Ceremony at Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 14, a ceremony at Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. in San Jose commemorated Flag Day, the Army's birthday, and the delivery to combat troops of the first M–113 vehicle manufactured at the Food Machinery plant. The occasion was witnessed by 2,500 FMC employees and 500 invited guests from the San Francisco Bay area.

Principal speaker was Lt. Gen. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, Chief of Ordnance, U.S. Army.

The following are quotations from General Hinrichs' speech. They are found in a news story written for the San Jose Mercury by Norman Bowman:

Even with atomic weapons, it still remains that there must always be a man to fight a man on the ground. Our purpose is to be ready to win such a fight. We must have the best tools possible in such a conflict.

This new FMC lightweight armored personnel carrier which can be air dropped at will, is the best truck I know to help us accomplish such a task.

If M–day comes, this company, this plant, and these skilled workmen have the demonstrated ability to produce for the Nation's military forces one of its strongest muscles.

America's military might is not measured in uniformed men alone—America's fighting men and women are such as you right here today, in this plant.

What About the Other 49 States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents in southeastern Kentucky, Mr. Edgar Ward of Middlesboro, I call attention to an article published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on May 25, 1960, showing that Tennessee, since 1936, received $700 million worth of Federal benefits for an outlay of only $312,500,000 in Tennessee taxes. While Senator KEFAUVER of Tennessee said this was not immoral, I wonder what the other 49 States would say. And if this was not immoral, would it not be very inequitable? If the other 49 States themselves follow this same pattern during the next 24 years, as Tennessee has followed it these past 24 years, then Federal bankruptcy certainly looms ahead and the Congress is right now in the process of robbing all the poor people, the common citizens, the little individuals through infernal inflation until all of those victims will look much worse than the man that fell among thieves as he journeyed from Jerusalem to Jericho.

The article that my friend wants inserted in the RECORD and that should certainly be publicized is as follows:

MILLIONS IN AID TO STATE HAILED BY KEEF—$700 MILLION SINCE 1936

GATLINBURG, May 25.—Eight Federal aid programs have returned to Tennessee more than twice what Tennesseans paid in taxes to support them, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER said today.

Since 1936 the programs have provided some $700 million worth of help, compared to Tennessee tax contributions toward these programs of only $312,500,000, he said.

He cited the figures in defending Federal-local participation projects as "a national responsibility" in an address before the Tennessee Municipal League here.

"Tennessee," KEFAUVER said, "has had no fiscal complaints against the operation of Federal grants. It is true that taxpayers of some wealthy States, like New York and California, in effect subsidize Tennessee taxpayers in this regard."

SAYS IT'S NOT IMMORAL

"I for one see nothing immoral about it. The centers of capital in big States draw wealth from our State—wealth which brings no corresponding flow of taxes to Tennessee or her municipalities.

"Every State is at the limit—or close to it—of its taxing ability. So are counties and cities. The Federal Government, on the other hand, even under the restrictive Internal Revenue Act of 1954, is able to assist in many problems which local communities have no way of solving without help.

"Without Federal help, these problems will simply canker and increase and ruin the life of our communities. And the Nation is only so strong as its many parts."

PROGRAMS CITED

These are the programs cited by KEFAUVER, with the Federal help and the amount of Tennessee taxes that supported them:

1. Water pollution control: Since 1956 Tennessee has got $4,500,000; paid not quite $2 million.

2. Hill-Burton hospital grants: Since 1947 Tennessee has got more than $47 million; paid not quite $16,500,000.

3. Federal airport aid: Since mid-1947 Tennessee cities have got more than $21 million; paid slightly more than $5,500,000.

4. Public housing: Since 1938, Tennessee has got $26,200,000; paid in $7 million.

5. Reserved urban renewal grants: Since mid-1949, Tennessee has got $66,500,000; paid slightly more than $16 million.

6. Urban planning: Since mid-1954 Tennessee got $476,000; paid $66,000.

7. Loans for public facilities: Since 1955 the State has got $13,300,000; paid $850,000.

8. Highway aid: Between 1917–43, Tennessee got $79 million; paid $42 million. Since 1946 when highway aid resumed after wartime interruption, Tennessee got almost $444 million; paid $22,500,000.

OTHER AID GIVEN

This, he added, is apart from other Federal aid programs for which he offered no estimate of State participation. Among the State's benefits from these, he said were:

1. $241 million since 1936 in old-age benefits.

2. $31,800 since 1947 to school lunch programs.

3. $13 million in aid to the blind since 1936.

4. $8 million since 1950 in aid to totally and permanently disabled, and $4 million in grants for maternal and child health care.

5. $3,500,000 for help for crippled children, and $2,250,000 for other child welfare services since 1936.

6. $1,700,000 during the past 2 years under the National Defense Education Act.

KEFAUVER said Tennesseans, as recipients of more aid than they pay in taxes "incur a debt to citizens of other States to be scrupulous about our programs and needs to see that the maximum good accrues from these programs."

A Decalog of Decency for Our Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1960, at the Chapel of the Four Chaplains in Philadelphia, the "First Spiritual Freedom Citation" was awarded to Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

I am pleased to direct attention to the following excerpt from Dr. Eisendrath's remarks made on that occasion, as follows:

What we require today more desperately than aught else besides is in my judgment a decalog of decency for the relationship between man and his brother man which might read something like this:

I. "I am the Lord thy God" who brought not alone the Hebrews out of Egypt but the Ethiopians from Caphtor and the Arameans from Kir, which means quite simply, as both Moses and Amos would have understood it, that I am the Lord not merely of those Americans who believe today that He is their sole possession but I am the Lord likewise of those hundreds of thousands, even hundreds of millions of humble children of the Divine, behind even the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains. I am the Lord not only of the proud and supercilious whites but I am the Lord also of the colored. I am the Lord who cannot be confined into any structure of stone be it cathedral or church or synagogue, but I am the Lord of the heaven and of the earth, one and indivisible.

II. "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me," neither of status nor of success before which men so grovelingly bow down today, nor of mammon nor of Mars, both of which claim man's seemingly undeviating allegiance in our time.

III. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" by stamping "In God we trust" upon your coins and postage stamps and trusting almost exclusively not in Him but in your proud accouterments of war.

IV. "Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy" in order that through decent leisure men may feel again their dignity as children of the Divine, that they may no longer feel as increasing numbers are coming to believe themselves today, to be mere machines and tools, motes of dust on a vast conveyor belt, slots in an IBM calculator.

V. "Honor thy father and thy mother" that thou might safeguard the security and the decency of the home, that there might be peace again between the generations.

VI. "Thou shalt not murder" either the one or the many, either singly or in the mass, either thy contemporaries in impending incineration or the generations still unborn by polluting the atmosphere with the noxious, noisome, nauseating poisons of nuclear fallout.

VII. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" not merely in person but as a society, by adulterating the ether waves, by the cheapening tawdriness that makes the whole of life seem to the younger generation cheap and leads them into the dens of juvenile delinquency.

VIII. "Thou shalt not steal" either outrightly or more subtly by stealing a man's birthright, by making it impossible for him either because of color or creed or station in life to pursue his education or his employment or to live where he chooses rather than in the imposed ghettoes of our vigilantly guarded neighborhoods of the North as well as the South.

IX. "Thou shalt not bear false witness" by misleading innuendos and rumors and gossip against thy neighbor's faith, precluding every opportunity for advancement even to the highest places in our land to a man because supposedly he pursues some other faith.

X. "Thou shalt not covet" not only thy next-door neighbor's house, nor his ox, nor his ass, but thou shalt not covet the distant nation's missiles to the moon but covet instead thine own divinely decreed mission unto mankind.

This is the decalog of decency which I would have our time, our Nation, our people pursue, so that bound together in life as those four chaplains were in their courageous and comradely death, we might in truth usher in God's kingdom in our time. Yea:

> "He prayeth best who loveth best
> All thing both great and small;
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all."

Know Thine Adversary: "Soviet Economic Warfare" by Robert Loring Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Robert Loring Allen, now a professor of economics at the University of Oregon in my hometown, Eugene, believes that it is in our interest to be well informed about the Soviet Union. His recent book, "Soviet Economic Warfare," published by the Public Affairs Press, tells us much we need to know as we attempt to make the necessary adjustments for coexistence.

Under unanimous consent I am including a review of Professor Loring's book by Paul Wohl from the Christian Science Monitor for June 2, 1960:

This book gives more than it promises. It touches upon almost every problem of the Soviet economy in its relation to the outside world. Basic principles of Soviet thinking and the structure of Soviet society also are dealt with.

Because of this overall view and the wealth of material it musters, this book is a vade mecum for those who do not have the time for specialized study. As pointed out in Erwin D. Canham's introduction, it is written in accordance with the ancient precept, "Know thine adversary."

At times the emphasis may be so much on the adversary, however, that the reader forgets about the general and very ancient business of economic warfare, which is not peculiar to the U.S.S.R. In the complex society of mass civilization with its huge production potential and many competing monopolies (private, mixed and state), its public utilities, shipping conferences and cartels, economic and political interests frequently are interlaced. When this happens, the state often becomes the agent of particular interest and uses its sovereign rights to enrich the one or the other group and at the same time to further the national patrimony and to strengthen national defense.

The archives of the League of Nations contain much evidence of this kind of economic warfare practiced on a large scale by member nations at a time when the Soviet Union hardly took part in international economic affairs.

Many of the techniques of Soviet economic warfare actually were developed by Germany and Japan.

Professor Allen defines economic warfare as "the conscious attempt to increase the relative economic, military, and political position of a country through foreign economic relations." This definition covers such "Western" practices as shipbuilding and shipping subsidies keyed to admiralty requirement in case of war, the use of freight rates to boost national ports and the national transportation system and the many

subtle forms of selling cheaper abroad than at home.

The Soviets have added new traits to this technique without necessarily improving it. What makes their form of economic warfare ominous to us is their general political goal which differs from that of other economically aggressive countries. Professor Allen discusses Soviet motivation from many angles and also takes into consideration "possibly unresolved policy conflicts within the Soviet councils."

The book shows up the many controversial questions connected with Soviet capabilities, priorities and growth, gives an overall picture of the Soviet trade organization, familiarizes the reader with current reports on Soviet trade practices and with the inroads which the Soviets have made in the main areas of the world.

In the book's final chapter the author presents his views on the prospects of Soviet economic warfare, the ultimate purpose of which, he believes, is "to dominate and control the world." Despite large capability for economic warfare, Professor Allen does not seem to think that the Soviet's prospects are too good. The reader is warned, however, "that trying to see into the future where the Soviet Union is concerned is particularly hazardous."

The value of the book is enhanced by 18 carefully selected statistical tables covering not only the U.S.S.R. but also China and the East European people's democracies.

Actuarial Anesthesia—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, additional excerpts from a paper on the social security system:

MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISSING PERCEPTIONS OF OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(By Ray M. Peterson)

In order to assure that the public will be willing to pay social security taxes on an initial bracket of gross earnings, it apparently has been necessary to present an image of a close parallel to private insurance. If social insurance were kept at the proper level to meet only social needs, it would have its own merits and distinctive characteristics and it would not be necessary to draw such a close parallel to private insurance in order to gain public acceptance. For the present and probable future level of benefits, however, this private insurance parallel is likely to build up real trouble. If employees are repeatedly told that insurance premiums are being paid by them "and on your behalf by your employer," as Dr. Larson says and Senator PROXMIRE believes, there is a rude awakening coming when younger persons and new entrants come to know (as they should be told now) that the value of combined employee-employer contributions, on the average, is greater than the value of benefits. Congressman CURTIS of Missouri, a prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has introduced a bill, H.R. 7012, "to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social-security taxes." While such a proposal would be virtually impossible to operate, the significant thing is that it has been thought about and the idea proposed legislatively. Such a law would, of course, completely ruin the financing of the social security system, since it must have the subsidy payments derived from the employer contributions with respect to the younger members and new entrants of the future.

If the great socialization of contributions which truly exists is made clear to the public, there may be good reason for concern as to public acceptance of the gross income tax base. The public may well say, "General welfare benefits should be met from general revenues—pay for them by the progressive income tax."

Is there a dilemma developing which will result in eventual public resistance to payment of social security taxes on gross income, no matter which horn is selected?

If the image of social security projected by Government authorities is similar to that of voluntary private insurance, of which we have seen evidence, there may arise a "din of inequity" when it is realized that the value of contributions with respect to current young workers and new entrants is greater than the value of their benefits. If the image projected is the more accurate one of substantial socialization of contributions and not one which parallels the payment of premiums for conventional insurance benefits, a clamor of unfairness may arise over taxing of the initial bracket of gross income—a regressive income tax. The author wonders whether there has been sufficient appreciation of the likelihood of the development of this dilemma. Are we deceiving ourselves as to the successful continuance of the self-supporting principle, or will direct governmental support become necessary? Has the actuarial anesthetic been too powerful?

The author believes that the lesser horn of the dilemma is to be honest as to the true nature of our social security financing method. In lieu of the statement published in the Social Security Administration's booklet previously referred to, "Your Social Security," the author recommends a statement such as the following which does present an accurate image:

"The financing method developed to pay for social security benefits is fundamentally different from that used for private life insurance and pension plans. The money needed to pay benefits to old-age and survivor beneficiaries comes mainly from the current contributions by employees, employers, and the self-employed. For example, for the 10 years from 1956 to 1965, total contributions are estimated as $102.5 billion and benefit payments as $98.5 billion. Contributions have been established in the law so that, over the years, there will be some excess of contributions over benefits. This excess is accumulated at interest in the trust funds. The interest earnings provide money for only 6 percent or 7 percent of the benefits.

"This method is sound and proper for social insurance where the objective is to provide only a basic minimum protection for widows, orphans, and older people. This social purpose makes compulsory participation and contribution fair and proper.

"Under private life insurance and pension plans, benefits are paid for by contributions of individuals, employees, and employers with respect to these particular persons and the benefits secured depend directly upon the amount of such contributions. If we apply the principles of private insurance to social security, this is the way it works out:

"(a) The value of the benefits for most of the present participants is much greater than the value of the contributions made in respect of them by the employee and his employer (or in the case of the self-employed, by himself).

"(b) For present young participants and persons starting to work, the value of the employee's contributions alone will be close to the value of his benefits. Some of the employers' contributions and part of those of the self-employed will be required to provide money for benefits to those now retired and those now at the middle and older ages—that is, those mentioned in (a) above.

"With a clear understanding of this method of paying for social insurance benefits, each generation can be expected to be willing to pay social security taxes in reliance upon similar payments by future generations to pay for benefits to those who are then the older generation."

If this were done, it could well be helpful in keeping social security benefits within the proper limits for covering only social needs.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING METHOD

The Advisory Council on Social Security Financing recognized that, although a social insurance system is a necessary part of economic security—

"Security depends even more fundamentally on the continued ability of our society to produce a large volume of goods and services under conditions of economic stability. The council has not considered it part of its task to evaluate in detail the effect of this system of social insurance on the stability and productivity of the economy."

The council also declared that the social security—

"Trusteeship is so large and the number of people involved so great that the defeat of beneficiaries' expectations through inflation would gravely imperil the stability of our social, political, and economic institutions."

The author of this paper is not qualified to appraise the broad social and economic impact of our social insurance system, but he does have some questions to which he would like the answers. He is concerned that the limited field covered by the unanimous report of the advisory council will not be generally appreciated and that the report can be a tranquilizer, dulling a legitimate and healthy anxiety which we should have as to the future successful operation of our social security financing method. Social security financing does not operate in a vacuum. Here are some questions he would like answered:

1. How will the margin for personal savings be affected by compulsory social security contributions which are scheduled to increase by 80 percent in 10 years?

Is the relation of social security taxes to total personal savings a matter of significance? For the 3 years 1951–53, social security contributions averaged 20 percent of personal savings which, in turn, were 7.8 percent of disposable income. Then, for the 5 years 1954–58, social security contributions averaged 31½ percent of personal savings which, in turn, were down to an average of 6.9 percent of disposable income. For 1959, social security contributions of $9,612 million will be about 43 percent of estimated personal savings of $22,000 million, and the latter has been estimated as 7 percent of disposable income. If the 1969 contribution rate of 9 percent were in effect in 1959, social security taxes estimated at $17,300 million would be 78 percent of personal savings of $22,000 million. If the steadily increasing social security taxes do reduce substantially the amount available for personal savings, we should be concerned about the harmful effect on all forms of savings and, in particular, the voluntary purchase of insurance and annuity contracts. Is this an important field for research by economists of life insurance companies?

2. How will the willingness to save, particularly for purcha of life insurance, be affected when the margin for savings is reduced and there is increased reliance on

old-age and survivor benefits from the Government insurance system?

To date, it has been generally believed that the social security benefits have been a stimulus for the purchase of life insurance by individuals and the provision of old-age benefits by employers and employees. Is there danger of our becoming so anesthetized by this experience that, without adequate justification, we expect it to continue?

Let us note the manner in which increases in social security survivor benefits arise. First, there is pressure to improve the benefits for those receiving old-age benefits and it is established that an increase is justified; next, old-age benefits are increased for active workers; and then, automatically because of the formula, all survivor benefits are increased. There is thus an enormous increase in life insurance benefits (survivor benefits), not because of a demonstrated need for them with proper regard for other life insurance in force, but because the old-age benefits to present recipients were considered inadequate. This approaches being a strange non sequitur. Here is how outstanding life insurance coverage compares with the life insurance equivalent of the social security survivor benefit coverage:

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Year	Estimated amount of life insurance in force as survivor benefits under OASI [1] (1)	Total life insurance in force in the United States (excluding credit life insurance) [2] (2)	Ratio of (1) to (2) (3)
			Percent
1935	0	$98	0
1940	$42	115	37
1951	170	248	69
1953	298	296	101
1955	344	358	96
1957	425	439	97
1958	475	472	101

[1] Actuarial Studies 16, 29, 31, 37, 43, 47 of Social Security Administration and letter from Robert J. Myers.
[2] Life Insurance Fact Book, 1959.

If the insurance equivalent of survivor benefits under the two Government programs of railroad retirement and civil service are included, the total under Government programs is about $500 billion for 1958.

We see a neck and neck race since 1953, but how long can this be expected to continue? The average amount of OASI insurance equivalent for men progressed as follows:

1940	$2,300
1947	2,300
1951	3,700
1953	6,200
1955	6,900
1957	8,000

This is the kind of race where the added strength and speed of one opponent can cut down the strength and speed of the other opponent—they are not free and independent competitors. Is this an area for research for the market specialists of life insurance companies?

Are there seeds of future trouble for the life insurance business in this competition between the tax-favored compulsory governmental survivors' benefits program and the now more heavily taxed life insurance industry? The following statement of 10 members of the Ways and Means Committee is noteworthy:

Individual economic security is now being provided the public by life insurance companies, other thrift institutions, and through the social security system. It is sound public policy to encourage everyone to provide for his own security on a voluntary basis and our tax laws should encourage, not deter, such efforts. This bill, however, makes voluntary provision for one's own economic security relatively less attractive since it increases the tax on life insurance while investment earnings under the social security system are free from either Federal or State tax. This increases the advantage of the social security system over voluntary individual protection offered by life insurance companies, particularly if the latter must absorb taxes of the magnitude provided in the bill. Public awareness of this differential in cost will most certainly lead to increased demand for larger social security benefits and less incentive to build security on a voluntary basis.

Poland's Millenium: Polish American Congress, Western Massachusetts Branch, Commemorates Acceptance of Christianity by Poland in 963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first mention of Poland in recorded history appeared in the year 963. When Poland accepted Christianity in 966, the nation alined itself with European civilization. The one-thousandth anniversary of these events will be celebrated within Poland in the period from 1960 to 1966.

Mr. Speaker, under the sponsorship of the great Polish American Congress, these events will be commemorated over the next few years by fitting ceremonies throughout the United States. The first of these events took place on May 20 and May 29 in Springfield, Mass. An outstanding program under the direction of the Western Massachusetts Branch, Polish American Congress was unfolded to the thousands of Polish Americans who live in this area and to the general public.

These ceremonies were the result of many months of preparation, planning and hard work. The spirit with which the Polish organizations—churches, clubs, fraternities—entered into this gigantic undertaking was reflected in the tremendous success that was theirs. The Polish people's fervor for Christianity, undying love for freedom and liberty, tremendous contributions to mankind—all were remarkably presented in tableau, parade, and speech.

Starting on May 22 with a tableau depicting "A Thousand Years of Polish History and Culture," the ceremonies were climaxed on May 29 by one of the largest parades in the history of Springfield, by an inspiring "Te Deum" religious exercise in St. Michael's Cathedral, and an evening banquet.

The Massachusetts Legislature recognized the grand observance by enacting a resolution congratulating the Western Massachusetts Polish American Congress, Inc., for initiating the celebration. I include with my remarks at this point a copy of this resolution and the names of its sponsors:

(By Mr. Chmura of Holyoke, petition of Stephen T. Chmura, Joseph Garczynski, Jr., Stanley J. Zarod, Walter T. Kostanski and Thomas C. Wojtkowski for adoption of resolutions by the General Court congratulating the Polish American Congress, Inc., for initiating the celebration and observance of the millenium of Christianity and statehood of Poland.)

HOUSE RESOLUTION 3147

Resolution congratulating the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc., for initiating the celebration and observance of the millennium of the acceptance of Christianity by Poland, and the statehood of Poland

Whereas the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc., has voted to observe and to fittingly celebrate the millennium of Poland during May 1960, in the city of Springfield; and

Whereas the celebration of the millennium of Poland marks the 1,000th anniversary of the acceptance of Christianity by Poland, and its alinement with European civilization; and

Whereas the cultural and historical contribution of Poland to our Western civilization, as well as the undying strength and moral determination of the Polish people to resist their oppressors, is firmly rooted and directly attributable to their great and abiding faith in Christianity; and

Whereas despite the many conquests, the tyrants, and now, the Communist yoke, which Poland has had to bear over these 1,000 years, her great religious conviction, and unquenchable spirit have helped her to give to the world such great people as General Kosciuszko, Count Casimir Pulaski, Nicolaus Copernicus, Henryk Sienkiewicz, Joseph Conrad, Frederic Chopin, Ignace Paderewski, Madame Marie Sklodowska Curie and Maria Konopicka; and

Whereas during the observance of the millennium, great anniversaries dear to the heart of every Pole will be observed, including the 150th anniversary of Frederic Chopin's birth; the 550th anniversary of the Battle of Grunwald, when Polish-Lithuanian forces checked the invasion of Central and Eastern Europe by the German Teutonic order; the 600th anniversary of Cracow University; and the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Paderewski, and all these anniversaries will be honored by every Pole for their great cultural and political importance in Poland's history; and

Whereas Poland was the first country in Europe to adopt a constitution establishing a democratic form of government guaranteeing human rights, and civil liberties, to all, while at the very moment this historic document was being written, Poland was under the occupation of a foreign enemy; and

Whereas the parallel between the Polish Constitution, and our National and State Constitutions, is very close and the underlying political philosophies expressed therein revere and cherish the same principles which we here hold so dearly; and

Whereas Poland stands today a shining light as it has been over the past thousand years in the midst of our enemies, who are her enemies, even though under the domination of a godless despot, as a symbol of democracy and true Christian morality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the general court of Massachusetts, that in the next millennium Poland will experience a rebirth; and be it further

Resolved, That the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby congratulates the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc., for initiating the celebration and observance of the millennium of the acceptance of Christianity by Poland and the statehood of Poland; and be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a well detailed news story from the Springfield

Union of May 30 relating the Poland's Millenium events.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND WATCH POLISH PARADE

One thousand years of Polish history were reviewed by an estimated 100,000 persons Sunday afternoon as one of the largest parades in Springfield's history traversed Main and State Streets. The event marked the millenium of Poland's Christianity and statehood.

Not only did Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Gov. Foster Furcolo, and all the mayors and selectmen of western Massachusetts take part, but Pope John XXIII in a personal telegram extended his apostolic benediction to all who took part in preparation of the parade, those who took part in the parade, including the viewers, those who attended the religious ceremony at St. Michael's Cathedral, and even those who attended the banquet Sunday night.

BISHOP GIVES TE DEUM ADDRESS

The apostolic benediction carries with it a plenary indulgence provided the usual conditions of confession and Holy Communion and short prayers for the Pope's intentions are met.

In a stirring talk at the conclusion of the parade in St. Michael's Cathedral Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield, who read the Pope's personal message, said: "It is good for us who are linked with our Polish brothers by faith to be here on this occasion when we review 1,000 years of Polish bravery and adherence to the will of God.

"Although the leaders of the world stumbled and fell 10 days ago at the summit conference, that does not mean that the peoples of the nations of the world have to stumble and fall with them. On more than one occasion the Polish people have overcome adversity. Yes they have risen to victory when all seemed lost simply because they followed the will of God.

"The Polish people have shown the whole world how to live according to the will of God and when they were called upon to shed their blood in order to follow that will, they understood their blood was mingling with the blood of the Son of God.

"We in this country can follow the example of the Polish people by living according to our faith and by bravely carrying our daily cross according to the will of God. Only when we do this can we be called worthy soldiers of God.

POLAND SETS U.S. EXAMPLE

"Poland has adhered to the faith for 1,000 years and, although we are a young Nation, we can imitate the magnificent example of her people by being brave and accepting the challenge of daily life."

The bishop's talk occurred during the Te Deum service at the end of the parade. Before the bishop spoke, Very Rev. Joseph J. Sielski, MIC, provincial superior of St. Stanislaus Kostka, Province of the Marian Fathers of Stockbridge, spoke in Polish.

The highlight of the service was reached when the choirs, clergy, and congregation sang the "Te Deum"—the triumphant song of the Roman Catholic Church. Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament closed the service.

CHICOPEE MAYOR LEADS

The parade started promptly at 1 p.m. as Mayor Lysek, parade marshal, walked southerly in Main Street from Church Street in the North End. The last unit of the parade passed the reviewing stand in front of city hall at 4:20.

Mayor Lysek was escorted by the marching unit of the Springfield Police Department; Mayor Thomas O'Connor, of Springfield; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Wieloch; Bishop Weldon; Bronislaus Wegiel, chairman; Victor Szalankiewicz, president of the Polish-American Congress; Senator Saltonstall; U.S. Representatives Edward P. Boland, of Springfield, and Silvio O. Conte, of Pittsfield; the PAC Executive Committee; the parade committee.

Col. John Stefanik, commander of the fighter-interceptor squadron at Barnes Airport, was marshal for the military units in the first division, which included the color guard, the U.S. Air Force Band from Westover Air Force Base, the 567th Air National Guard Band, the Air Force National Guard of western Massachusetts, District 8 of the Polish-American Veterans, led by Comdr. Ignatius Jaszek; the Polish Drum Corps, of Chicopee, making its first appearance; various auxiliary corps, and the Polish Exile Association, which received applause as it passed the line of march.

SECOND DIVISION UNITS

The second division included units from Chicopee, Chicopee Falls, Willimansett, and Adams. It was headed by the Chicopee Police Department marching unit with Deputy Chief William C. McQueen in charge, followed by the Chicopee High School Band, city officials, the fire department unit with Fire Chief Edward Borowiec and Chaplain Edmund B. Walsh in the lead, the Hampden County VFW Auxiliary. Members of St. Stanislaus parish with the pastor, Rev. Simeon Kaczmarek, in the lead, followed by Boy and Girl Scout troops, the Sodality of Our Lady, and the float depicting John Sobieski conquering the Turks at Vienna, which was sponsored by the St. Joseph, St. Michael, and St. Stanislaus Societies.

The Polish Falcon Drum Corps drew rounds of applause and was followed by Polish-American Veterans, Balut Post, with Stanley Zaleski in command. Next in line were the St. Stanislaus Choir, the Rosary Society, St. Ann's-PRCU Lodge 1275, Queen of Poland Lodge No. 433, and St. Lawrence Society, No. 1311, all of whom sponsored the Frederick Chopin float.

The City of the Immaculate float was sponsored by the Holy Name Society and was followed by the St. George Greek Orthodox Church Band.

MIRACLE ON VISTULA

The next float—the Miracle on the Vistula—was sponsored by the Polish Home Association, of Chicopee Falls. Polish National Alliance Lodge No. 711, Polish Women's Alliance of American Group No. 295, Polish National Alliance Group 2934, Polish Men's Citizens Club, and the Committee of Education.

Joseph Dancewicz, commissioner, led the Polish National Band of Worcester, members of PNA, and the float depicting Queen Jadwiga, sponsored by Council 62, PNA.

Edmund W. Trybulski of his committee led the Willimansett group, followed by the float depecting the coronation of the Blessed Virgin as queen of Poland, sponsored by the combined societies of St. Anthony Church.

The Springfield Quarter Midget Racing Association had two floats, one with young drivers waving winner's checkered flags and the other showing various midget racing cars.

Walter Zepka directed the Polish National Alliance Drum Corps from Adams and was followed by Girl and Boy Scout Troops, officials of various Polish societies of that town with a float depicting former President Woodrow Wilson and the Polish President Paderewski drawing up the constitution of Poland following World War I.

THIRD DIVISION

State Representative Stephen Chmura was marshal of the third division which included units from Holyoke, Agawam, South Hadley and South Deerfield. John V. Czelusniak led the Holyoke group followed by Rev. Leonard Pakulski, OFM, Conv. pastor of Mater Dolorosa Church, State Senator Maurice Donahue, Mayor Samuel Resnic, and Asst. Atty. Gen. Joseph Zajac who were followed by a float reviving the memories of authors Miczkiewicz, Sinkiewicz and Konopicka. The Polish Falcon Drum Corps of Meriden, Conn., brought up the rear of this group.

The Agawam High School Band led the members of the newly organized Polish American Club of that town.

South Hadley had two eye-catching units: the fire department group which sang "Sound Off" as it passed the reviewing stand and the float honoring Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, founder of West Point and "father of American artillery." This float was sponsored by the Polish American Citizens Club. The Holyoke Rosary High School band led the Veterans of Foregin Wars, Knights of Columbus, the fire department and the auxiliary police.

SOUTH DEERFIELD

The South Deerfield unit led off with its float of "Light of the World" with the high school band following and heading the various Polish groups of that town.

The Springfield Marksmen won rounds of applause as they led Governor Furcolo and members of his executive council, Judge Stanley Wisniewski, Judge Harry Dziekanowski, Colonel Stefanik, Cornelius W. Phillips, Jr., Governor's aide, Judge Edward Dobiecki, Dr. Anthony Wojciecchowski, Stanislaus Suchecki, Adam Stefanski, Lucy Wisniowski, Walter Stachowicz and Helen Dancewicz.

Mrs. Kay Furcolo, the Goveror's wife, rode in an open car.

State Senator Stanley Zarod was marshal of the fourth division, which included Indian Orchard, Housatonic, Webster, and Ware. Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Wieloch led the Indian Orchard group which consisted of 60 committee members, the Liberty Drum Corps of Westfield, and a float entitled "The Mountaineers," sponsored by 22 societies of Immaculate Conception Church.

HOUSATONIC DELEGATES

Rev. John P. Skowronski of All Saints Church, Housatonic, led the delegation from that town, which included the Great Barrington Precision Drill Team and altar boys carrying a large cross made of red carnations. The Pulaski Band led the marching unit from Webster.

The Ware delegation was led by Casimir S. Skibinski and included several boys in Polish costumes carrying the red and white flag of Poland, the Gilbertville Community Band, a float depicting the Katyn Forest massacre of 10,000 Polish Army officers during World War II, which was sponsored by the combined Polish societies of that town.

The fifth division included Easthampton, Greenfield, Turners Falls, Pittsfield, and Westfield. The marshal was Stanley Paccha. The Easthampton group was led by Police Chief Frank Skrzyniarz and Rev. Stanislaus Zdebel and Rev. John Chwalek. The high school band provided the marching music and a float depicted Gen. George Washington and Col. Casimir Pulaski conferring during the Revolutionary War.

GREENFIELD GROUP

Frank Skowron and Edward Molongoski led the Greenfield and Turners Falls group with music by the Turners Falls High School Band. Rev. Joseph P. Szczepaniak of Turners Falls and Rev. John Klekotka of Greenfield led the church societies and the Polish-American groups.

Lt. Col. Richard H. Mezejewski was marshal of the Pittsfield group and was accompanied by Lt. Comdr. Matthew Wojcicki, WO Alfred Drenzek, Mayor Raymond E. Haughey and other city officials, the Interstatesmen Drum Corps of Troy, N.Y., and several marching units.

Rev. John Blazewicz, MS, of Holy Trinity Church, Westfield, led the group from that city which included a colorful Polish dancing group, the St. Mary's High School Band, and a float showing a Polish homestead in the "old country."

CATHEDRAL BAND ESCORT

The sixth division included Springfield and Southbridge with Joseph Czaja as marshal. The Cathedral High School Band provided the music for the marchers which included John Boduch, unit marshal, parade committee members, Aldermanic President Arthur J. McKenna, Councilmanic President Michael Lopenzo and several members of the common council, Our Lady of the Rosary Church banner, heading the St. Stanislaus Society group, the St. Joseph Brotherly Society, a float depicting the baptism of King Mieszko I, who introduced Christianity into Poland in 960, the Millers Falls Bugle and Drum Corps and a float entitled "Polonia Semper Fidelis" (Poland Ever Faithful).

The Southbridge unit was led by Rev. Martin J. Hanyz, Rev. John Kochanowski, Adam J. Guzewicz, and Stanley Dudek. The Italian Drum Corps of Worcester provided the music for the marching units.

NORTHAMPTON UNIT

The Northhampton and Hadley division's marshal was Walter Drozdal. The Northampton unit was led by Stanley Steliga and consisted mostly of church societies with music provided by the high school band. A float depicted Nicholas Kopernik, father of modern astronomy, and Mme. Curie.

The Hadley group presented a float of Our Lady of Czestochowa with its "Black Madonna" caused by a fire that destroyed everything but the painting, reputed to have been painted by St. Luke the Apostle.

The seventh division was led by Henry Kugler and included Hatfield and Ludlow. The Hatfield Drum Corps furnished the music and a float representing a cemetery of white crosses, was entitled "The Polish Army, 1939 to 1945."

The Ludlow High School Band led the unit from that town which included a float bearing the legend "Poland Enslaved."

Mr. Speaker, the principal speaker at the banquet was Zbigniew Stypulkowski, 56-year-old attorney and one of the leading officials of Free Poland in Exile. At present he is vice chairman of the executive committee of the Polish Council of National Unity, residing in London. A former member of the Polish Parliament from 1930 to 1935, he was a member of the Polish underground government during World War II and head of the Polish national armed forces. In 1945 he was one of the 16 Polish underground leaders invited by Soviet Marshal Zukhov for negotiations. He was later arrested in Moscow and tried by the supreme court of the U.S.S.R. After emerging from behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Stypulkowski wrote "Invitation to Moscow" which was published in nine languages, and he has devoted all of his time to cooperating with all Poles in the West for the return of freedom and independence to Poland. He is temporarily living in Washington, D.C., as the representative of Free Poland in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point the inspiring speech delivered by Mr. Stypulkowski and the banquet program. It is significant to read these words in the message of the program: "Let us all work together to make this 'Millennium of Poland' a credit to our heritage." I wish to commend the western Massachusetts branch, Polish American Congress, for it certainly achieved that goal.

Your Excellencies, Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, nations differ from people, and particularly from women, in at least this, that the older they are, the more eager are they to admit their age. A nation may indeed do so more candidly, for an admission of long existence is by no means a sign of—or I should say, perhaps is indeed a veritable denial of approaching death.

Conscious of its destiny among this world's family of nations, Poland has completed and lived through a 1,000 years of history. In doing so, it had survived many violent storms of history which repeatedly ravaged its civilizational attainments, its population and its land assets—developed so laboriously and defended so nobly. This nation will live on, for many generations have given it the conviction that while even great nations may suffer disasters, only ignoble ones perish.

The Poles are still a young nation. What better proof of their youth than the fact that within the space of 15 years, they were able to regain their wartime population losses. Let us remember that during World War II, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia murdered every sixth Polish citizen, being in all over 6 million people. Today, within the present boundaries of Poland, there are 30 million ethnicaly pure Poles of whom one-half are below 28 years of age. Beyond Poland's boundaries are more than 9 million Poles who, in many cases, have become loyal citizens of other countries, such as the United States, Canada, Argentina, France, and so on, but as is most natural, have still retained sentimental ties with the Polish nation. Of these 9 million, there are 2 million either living in the eastern lands of Poland incorporated by force into the Soviet Union or in Soviet prisons and forced labor camps. These still maintain their faithfulness to the Polish nation and are anxiously awaiting the day of reunion.

The Polish nation is characterized by vitality and enthusiasm—universal attributes of youth. In 1920, barely regaining an independent existence after 150 years of subjection, it undertook the unequal fight against Soviet aggression and, at Warsaw, achieved a victory which determined not only the fate of its independence but also protected Europe against the threat of general Communist revolt. In 1939 it rejected Hitler's ultimatum and stood first among nations to defy the might of Nazi Germany. Under enemy occupation it organized its own underground state, with its own army, administration, judiciary and even with its own underground educational system and welfare services. The Polish nation then rose to the heights of heroism in the Warsaw uprising of 1944, exposing its beloved capital to destruction and 300,000 of its inhabitants to annihilation—thus, by its sacrifices of blood and city, certifying its right to freedom and independence before enemies and allies alike. These acts of the Polish nation, during the occupation and the Warsaw uprising are unparallel in the history of our times. For 15 years now, the Polish nation has stood firm in its ceaseless struggle against Soviet occupation in spite of complete isolation from the West. The extent of this struggle and its meaning for the West became more evident in 1956 and are still visible for every careful observer of events behind the Iron Curtain.

A nation capable in one generation of such efforts in defense of its existence has no intention of terminating its history and certainly will not descend into any grave—unless it is accompanied by the whole of our Western civilization if such civilization should ever prove to be indeed decadent.

Since Poland had appeared in full statehood on the European scene a thousand years ago, we must admit that it is quite mature in years. Maturity of age means an accumulation of a long series of experiences. These experiences permit the evaluation of one's errors and shortcomings as well as one's virtues and strength. These experiences give a nation a deeper understanding of the duties which Divine Providence has ordained it to fulfill.

I will not speak of the errors and failings of our Nation during the course of its history. It is not because I fear the time required to do so will result in pleas of mercy from my audience, but rather because the world in general knows our errors and shortcomings better than it does our history. The explanation for this is quite simple: The combined might of Austria, Prussia, and Russia forced the world to recognize the partition of Poland amongst these three and ruined all hopes for the success of several future insurrections. In our time, the might of Soviet Russia forced upon the Western Powers consent—let us hope, temporary in nature—to a new partition of Poland after World War II. Those who perpetrated this assault upon the natural right of a nation to be free and independent were obliged to seek justifications for such a dishonorable deed. Those in turn who sanctioned it were obliged to accept such justifications at face value, in order to salve their own consciences. As a consequence, in the world's historiography there were to be found, alongside just criticism, a great number of invented charges against our Nation, and suppressions and distortions of its historical role. During World War II, in the Polish Government in Exile, there was a special department dealing with correcting such falsifications in the encyclopedias of the world. It successfully accomplished its mission in a hundred-odd serious instances.

I will also not speak in this company of the virtues of our Nation. I know I am sincere friends of the Poles and I know that they, to keep up our spirits, are ready to evaluate us higher than we ourselves would.

I would like, however, upon the background of a thousand years of Polish history, the basic date of which is 966 A.D., to delineate briefly the ordained role of this nation in Europe.

In 966 A.D. Poland accepted Christianity from Rome. This fact determined ever after Poland's allegiance to Western civilization. This made possible the establishment of a barrier to further German pressures for expansion to the east at the cost of Slavonic lands. This German expansion was carried on under the pretext of conversion to Christianity. History has dubbed it "baptism by sword." On the other hand, Poland also acquired the role of the eastern bulwark of Christianity for many centuries thereafter—for Poland had quickly to deal with the problem of the pagan nations of the north and also stood face to face against the Tartar hordes which for 300 years had kept neighboring Ruthenia in subjugation.

The thousand-year history of Poland is marked with ceaseless struggles for the preservation of its independence and its civilization. Within the spheres of Europe proper, it was not until the Battle of Grünwald in 1410 against the Teutonic Knights of the Cross that Poland acquired the means for peaceful cooperation with Germany for several centuries on a basis of equal dealing with equal. On the eastern and southeastern frontiers, Poland's fate depended upon constant preparedness to repel the invasions of Tartars, Mongols, Turks, and their vassal nations. From the middle of the 13th century at Lignica in Silesia, when the conquering march on Europe of the Tartars under the grandson of Gengis Khan was

stopped, to the end of the 17th century, marked by the victory of John III of Poland against the Turkish might at Vienna, the future of Europe—and also of the world at that time—depended upon whether Poland would not fail in accomplishing its mission.

The 18th century witnessed the weakening of Poland. Pillaged and decimated for centuries, the nation finally succumbed under the predatory might of its neighbors, Prussia, Austria ,and Tsarist Moscow. Even this, however, did not occur without Polish resistance. Spiritually rejuvenated by the noble sentiments of the constitution of May 3, 1791, the nation attempted to regain its freedom, unity, and independence, first, under the leadership of Kosciuszko and later under the battle standards of Napoleon. When the Congress of Vienna in 1815 sealed Poland's fate, the desperate nation, in almost every generation thereafter, raised itself in gallant but unsuccessful bloody insurrections.

After World War I, Poland purchased its independence with new sacrifices—in three Silesian uprisings, in the War of Eastern Galicia, and finally in the Polish-Soviet War in the years 1918–20. The last chapter of Polish history in the Second World War and thereafter is sufficiently well enough known to us.

This thousand-year course of my nation's life decisively shaped its personality and placed a peculiarly Polish stamp upon its Western civilization. Its dominant characteristic is to be found in the wellsprings of Polish patriotism. It consists of absolute love, selflessness, and in times of crises leading to unlimited sacrifice. This patriotic love is not tied to consideration of personal interest, it is not dependent upon preserving a way of life, it is free of any illusions of superiority or racism, and it has never led to the plunder of other nations. The relationship of a Pole to Poland, which becomes a concept symbolizing for him the very essence of freedom, is somewhat mystical in nature. It is a relationship very similar to that which one feels toward something or someone very dearly beloved—peace of soul depends upon its preservation, and when lost, the soul knows no rest.

The histories of other Western nations did not shape themselves as did that of Poland. They also were marked with great struggles and efforts, they also had their periods of greatness and downfall, but until now they did not know what it means to lose their own state nor what it means to lose one's freedom by foreign invasion of uncommon duration, nor what it means for several generations to take upon themselves the responsibility of preserving national life while enslaved.

Mr. Chairman, it would be most useful, I believe, if, in our circle of friends of the Polish nation, we could perhaps discuss other aspects of Polish history: How in this nation early developed a sense of personal freedom and a system of democratic government; what role of assimilation Poland played in Central and Eastern Europe; how highly developed were its principles of religious and national tolerance; what role Poland played and still does between Germany and Russia—this would indeed help in understanding Europe as a whole within the present international context; and, finally, what Poland had gained from and what it had contributed to our common civilization. However, time will not permit it now.

If I have permitted myself to draw the attention of you, kind ladies and gentlemen, to the role of Poland as the ancient Eastern bulwark of Western civilization, and to some aspects of Polish patriotism it is because of my deep conviction that Poland must regain her freedom and independence not only for the sake of her sons, not only for the sake of historical justice, but also to enable her to accomplish effectively her traditional and ordained mission.

In order to stem a conquest of the West by Communist Russia, or perhaps in the not too distant future by China, such a nation as Poland is indispensable for the common defense of Western civilization. The patriotic idealism of the Poles would serve well in the defense of the West against the fanaticism of the East.

I pose now one question for your consideration: Can Western civilization afford to gamble away in our times an investment which took a thousand years in Poland to accumulate?

MILLENNIUM OF POLAND BANQUET—PROGRAM

Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Czaja.

Master of ceremonies, Mr. Chester T. Skibinski.

"Star Spangled Banner," "Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela," Mrs. Edward Sowa, Mr. Joseph Lezon, accompanist.

Invocation, Msgr. John Wieloch.

Dinner.

Community singing, beloved songs of Poland.

Greetings from the city, Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, Jr.

Greetings from the State, Gov. Foster Furcolo.

Introduction of guests, Hon. Edward P. Boland, Member of Congress, State Senator Stanley J. Zarod, State Representative Stephen T. Chmura.

Greetings, Mayor Edward Lysek.

St. Cecelia's choir, "Czesc Polsce, Czesc Regina Coell," Our Lady of the Rosary Parish, Mrs. Frank Kuczarski, director.

Soloist, Mrs. Joseph Topor, Jr., "Nocturne" (Chopin).

Address, Most Rev. Bishop Christopher J. Weldon.

Mazur Dance, Polish Women's Alliance Group 422.

Address, Atty. Zbigniew Stypulkowski.

Piano solo, "Etude No. 12 in C Minor," "Grande Valse-op-42 in A-Flat," Richard Kozera.

Guest speaker, U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Closing remarks, Mr. Victor Szalankiewicz, president of Polish American Congress.

Benediction, Most Rev. Bishop Christopher J. Weldon.

Boze Cos Polske.

Reception committee, Mrs. Chester Marlowe, Mrs. Frank Kuczarski, Mrs. John Placzek, Mr. Victor Szalankiewicz.

Mayor Wagner, of New York, Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, is a great American and a great Democrat. He is the illustrious son of an illustrious father, the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York, who made a great name for himself as the sponsor and father of many of our labor laws associated with the reforms enacted during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As mayor of the largest city in the world, Robert F. Wagner has given New York a very fine and capable administration under trying circumstances. New York has every reason to be proud of him. The interests of the people are also his interests, and the people of New York City appreciate it.

At the convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State, held over the past weekend, it was my privilege to share the platform with Mayor Wagner as main speakers. On that occasion, Mayor Wagner delivered a fine address in which he discussed the current political situation in the country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert his address in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MAYOR WAGNER TO AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, HOTEL PICCADILLY, NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1960

It is a pleasure to be here tonight amidst so many of my friends in the affiliated Young Democrats. I have had a busy week, a very busy week at city hall, and I know you will forgive me tonight if my speech is not too long. Nobody likes long speeches, including myself. I might add that nobody suggested what I might find my audience interested in, here tonight, so I made what might be called an educated guess, and decided I would talk about politics.

Right now, we are on the eve of a presidential election year—that amazing tournament out of which emerges every 4 years, the man who will be charged with running our Nation, preserving our place in the world, as well as influencing the course of our domestic economy. And, of course, when we elect a President, we are selecting the political party which governs—which will accept the credit, or assume the blame, for the national program in the 4 years next ahead.

To me, and I believe to any thinking man in the field of government, in national politics the party is more important than the personality. I know in advance that I can support, without qualms, the possible nominee of a Democratic convention, while I know also in advance that the Republicans will never nominate anyone of my way of thinking. This may sound like partisanship. If it is, it is justified by a simple look backward into our political history, in which our present lineup of political parties dates back to the Civil War.

It is not exactly a secret that for decades after that conflict, there was a whole generation of our citizens who voted the way they shot—the North and the West for the Republicans—and the South for the Democrats. It was an emotional allegiance, of which the Republicans were the political beneficiaries for years and years and years. The North and the West controlled the Nation, and the Republicans stayed in power.

And what happened is what you would expect to happen to a party that is able to stay in power without doing anything to earn its position of power. It got fat in the pocketbook and it got fat in the head. Its leaders wanted no new leaders to arise to challenge them; its leaders wanted no new ideas to challenge the validity of the status quo.

This was true of the Republican leadership at the time of the populist movement. This was true of the Republican leadership in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, the last man in the Republican Party to present new ideas. They got rid of him as soon as they could, even if they had to rig a national convention and lose the next national election, in order to do it. This was true of the Republican leadership in the twenties, in the time of La Follette and other Republican progressives.

I need not review every decade. Pick it at will, right up today, and you will not find a single new contribution made to our system of government, just one big new idea

worth adopting, which has emanated from the Republican leadership.

This is a nationwide record of voidness. You can look at the farmer in the West, the small businessman in the East, and find equal victims of Republican neglect.

You can scan the record books, the statute books, every book in the public library, and not find anything that represents progress in the field of labor for which the Republican Party can rightfully claim responsibility.

I say to you this is a sterile record, whether presented in the Northeast, or the Midwest. It is a record of a party which has accepted progress only when forced down its throat. It has never led the way.

And this is the party which asks the right to assume national leadership as we enter the new decade, the exciting and important, possibly even fateful years which lie just ahead. I say to you that there is nothing in the Republican record today to indicate ability to develop new concepts to meet new problems, any more than there was in the days of Grant, or McKinley, or William Howard Taft, or Calvin Coolidge or Herbert Hoover.

The very names conjure up valiant defenders of the status quo, whatever it happened to be at the moment, and this we cannot afford today, in a world that changes, and will continue to change, whether we like it or not, and at a pace that is ever more rapid.

Let us look, right now, at some of the Republican remedies for our domestic problems. The present administration came into office pledged to a balanced budget. It was going to accomplish that, it said, by ending the waste of the Democratic administrations which had preceded it. There could not have been much waste, for there has been no balance.

Instead, the present administration, without taking a single constructive step of its own in the field of our domestic economy, has run up the most unprecedented series of deficits in the peacetime history of our Nation. As the President himself has pointed out, it now costs more money to make interest and installment payments on our public debt than it used to cost to run the whole Government.

And as a remedy for inflation, for the rising cost of what we buy, and the lessened value of what we have saved, the administration turned to that remedy hallowed only by its age, "tight money."

I say very seriously that in offering tight money as a palliative today to the menace of inflation, the Republican Party thinking is so obsolete as to approach the asinine. Today, it does not even achieve its goal of cutting the price level. The manufacturer just passes the increased cost of his product, including the increased price of borrowed capital, right on to the consumer, and prices go up, not down. The answer lies, of course, in an economy of full production, to which the National Government is pledged by the Full Employment Act of 1946, but since this might involve some positive action, in new fields, it does not, and cannot, enter the thinking of the Republican Party.

And, as the Republican Party first abandoned the farmer, and then abandoned labor, these groups have switched to the Democratic Party, and were responsible for its uninterrupted series of national successes during the 1930's and the 1940's. The Democratic Party, thanks to this coalition, is the majority party today, in consistent control of the Congress, and out of the Presidency only because of the personality of a national war hero. We could no more have beaten him in 1952 or 1956 than our grandfathers could have beaten Grant in 1868 or 1872.

The next Republican candidate, and I think by now we know who he is, will have to run on his party record, a political handicap he will not enjoy. In fact, he leaks out an occasional word that he is a bit irked about it already. But there will be powerful propaganda forces working in his behalf. And we know that while you cannot fool all of the people all of the time, there are instances when enough of them have been fooled, for the duration of a campaign, to put the wrong party in power.

To counter this we will need the united power of the Democratic majority in this Nation, as represented by agriculture, labor, and the small businesses of our land. Only once in our history, in the case of Woodrow Wilson in 1916, has any other alliance determined an election.

More recently, in 1948, Harry S. Truman showed how the Democratic Party which truly represented the majority of our people could ignore defections from an ultra-radical left and a reactionary right, and still forge ahead to victory, against a Republican Party which stood for nothing but itself.

If need be, we can do it again. In any event, I am sure that we will win the election coming up. I am sure of that because it is vital to the well-being of America that we win. It is vital to the world as a whole that we have in America a Government capable of assessing and meeting the problems of a free world.

It is just as vital to us at home, just as important in our "enlightened self-interest," that we place in full charge of our National Government the party that has proven it can govern, and displace the party that has proven itself incapable of handling the problems of any decade in the lives of ourselves, our fathers, or even our grandfathers. What is the use of kidding? The Republican Party just hasn't got it, never has had it, and never will have it. Let's get with the party interested in the business of preparing America for the decades ahead instead of one still dreaming of political glories that never existed.

Actuarial Anesthesia—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include some further observations on the social security program from the paper by Mr. Ray M. Peterson:

MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISSING PERCEPTIONS OF OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(By Ray M. Peterson)

THE TEST OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING IS STILL TO COME

More questions have been raised here than have been answered regarding the true nature of social security financing. The author hopes he will stimulate others to probe more deeply and to come up with some answers.

This probing of the nature of the social security financing method can be fittingly closed by a statement of a perceptive foreign observer:

"The critical test of the actuarial soundness of the program is, however, yet to come, since up to the present the contributors who have retired—with minor exceptions—have, together with their employers, or as self-employed persons, paid for much less than the value of the benefits they have received and will receive. This is readily apparent from the fact that by 1969 the tax rates for old-age and survivors insurance will have to be raised from the combined rate on employees and employers of 4 percent in 1958 to 8½ percent—to provide the benefits contained in the 1958 amendments. Will the Congress permit these required tax increases to go into effect without from time to time raising the real level of benefits further in the next decade? However justified any such increases may be, one consequence of them will be to require yet further increases in the tax rates or in the upper earnings ceiling or, more probably, in both. Sooner or later voices are likely to be raised in the Congress saying that the burden of contributions for the program is becoming too heavy for a significant fraction of the self-employed, or for the lower income groups. Some will demand a subsidy from general revenues, others a change in the tax structure to reduce the burden on those with relatively low income. When this time comes—perhaps within the next decade or two—the determination of the Congress to keep the program both actuarially sound and self-supporting will really be put to the test."

IMAGE IN PUBLIC MIND OF METHOD OF SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

A study of the report of the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing and the associated actuarial study No. 49 will give the social insurance student an excellent understanding of the method of financing. But what is the image of the method of financing in the public mind? It is far more important that this image be accurate than that of a limited number of social insurance experts.

The image of the method of financing in the public mind will be formed in good part by what is read in the newspapers and magazines. Here is how the report of the council was presented to the public by some important news channels:

Time magazine, January 12, 1959: "Pay now, buy later. * * * Is the enormous social security fund (current reserves, $22 billion) really secure between the time the wage earner is nibbled and the time he begins to get his payments? Yes, reported a Congress-created advisory council. * * * Their summary: The financing of the old-age and survivors' insurance system is 'sound, practical, and appropriate.' "

Newsweek, January 12, 1959: " 'Sound' and costlier. The Nation's many-billioned social security system, often a target of cautious economists, entered a new era last week with a clean bill of financial health from a panel of probers. * * * Surveying the plan, a special 13-man advisory commission drawn from industry, labor, and government found it 'sound * * * [with] adequate provision for meeting both short-range and long-range costs.' While the social security system will be in the red through 1959, partly because of wider benefits voted by Congress in 1956 and 1958, the commission estimated it would be in the black by 1960, and would stay there 'through 2020 or later' under the current schedule of tax increases."

"U.S. News & World Report, January 9, 1959: 'Why your old-age pension is safe.' You don't need to worry about your old-age pension from social security. The money back of it is safely invested, earning a return. That's the verdict of experts who just concluded a thorough review of social security. What they found is told here."

A new official report on social security offered these findings last week:

"Pensions are safe, the old-age insurance system sound.

"In years ahead, the trust fund out of which pensions are paid will grow.

"The recent shrinkage in this fund is temporary, no cause for worry.

"Payroll taxes should go up again in 1960, 1963, and 1966, as now scheduled in law. A

final 1969 increase, already on the books, might be postponed."

Judging by the following excerpt from an editorial in the Wall Street Journal, its editorial staff, as late as January 27, 1959, had little understanding of the method of financing OASDI benefits.

"The boost in social security taxes on January 1, from $94.50 to $120 (maximum), is just a hint of what is to come. By 1969 the tax will be up to $216, an increase of 80 percent in the next 10 years. The original law in 1937, incidentally, called for a maximum tax of $30. The Government, it would seem, believes that by 1969 the cost of living will have risen to more than seven times what it was in 1937. * * * The whole social security system is now operating in the red."

The headline on the New York Times story of January 2, 1959, was "U.S. Old-Age Fund Declared Sound."

These statements evidence confusion as to what it means to be "in the red" or "in the black" and also as to the significance and purpose of the "fund." The seeming reliance on a "fund" and the use of the term "insurance" throughout the Social Security Act create a semantic facade which is a barrier rather than a help to general public understanding of the method of financing. The placing of the word "social" before "insurance" wherever it appears in the act to convey the idea of socialization of costs might help to distinguish the OASDI method of financing from that of private voluntary insurance.

The law itself gives unwarranted emphasis to the "fund" in section 116(a) of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 which establishes the Advisory Council. The Council was established—

For the purpose of reviewing the status of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and of the Federal disability insurance trust fund in relation to the long-term commitments of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program.

Then, parenthetically, section 116(d) provides for the Council to recommend changes in the tax rates:

"The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the tax rates in sections 1401, 3101, and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954). * * *"

The mainstay of the financing system, i.e., taxes on earnings of employees, is referred to with the appearance of an afterthought.

There is substantial evidence that the Social Security Administration and other strong supporters of the social security system believe or want to believe that our social security system is very much like private insurance.

In a booklet published by the Social Security Administration, "Your Social Security," Form No. OASI-35, January 1959, the initial statement reads:

"The basic idea of old-age and survivors insurance under the social security law is a simple one:

"During working years employers, their employees, and self-employed people pay social security taxes which go into special funds and

"When earnings have stopped because the worker has retired, or died, or is disabled and is 50 years of age or over, benefit payments are made from the funds to replace part of the earnings the family has lost."

Exactly the same statement, substituting "contributions" for "taxes" would be more appropriate for a "full reserve" private insurance program.

A recent book, "Know Your Social Security," by Dr. Arthur Larson, projects an image of the social security system which emphasizes the similarities to private insurance and minimizes the differences—a bland selling presentation. He writes:

"Social security is a combination of old-age pensions, disability insurance, and life insurance.

"The 'premium' for this combination of benefits is a payroll tax of 5 percent on your wages up to $4,800 a year. The employer in 1959 pays 2½ percent of this, and the employee pays the other 2½ percent. * * *

"Social security is based on the same principle as private insurance, with variations to accomplish its social purpose and to keep it inexpensive.

"Social security differs in important ways from commercial annuities and private life and disability insurance, but the general idea is the same. This idea is that contributions are made by you (and on your behalf by your employer), in return for which you get certain insured rights, including pensions and death benefits."

He writes that "social security is much like private annuities and life insurance," with three main differences which, summarized, are:

Private insurance

1. Privately handled.
2. Benefits directly related to contributions.
3. Legal contract.

Social security

1. Handled by Government—hence contribution called a "tax," not a "premium."
2. Three disproportions: (a) same as applies to any insurance, (b) initial older entrants favored, (c) low-wage earners favored over high-wage earners—last "kind of disproportion is the only important one."
3. Conditions of payments "somewhat more limited."

In characterizing the benefit formula, weighted in favor of low-wage earners, as the only important disproportion, he does not believe it significant that the middle-aged and older members of the present generation get benefits of much greater value than the value of contributions with respect to them and that this subsidy must be paid for by contributions with respect to younger persons and mainly by new entrants, i.e., future generations.

Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill of 1961, I wish to point out that when the measure was before the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] emphasized the importance of Guatemala to the free world. If Guatemala should ever again fall into the hands of the Communists it would be a tragic blow to the course of freedom in the Americas. The gentleman from Florida is a great student of Latin America and is ever alert to the growing menace of communism in that area. I congratulate both him and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for highlighting the necessity for consideration of Guatemala in the category of those countries which confront serious situations requiring grant economic aid. All of us realize the importance of Guatemala and of the outstanding contribution she is making to the free world.

The Alaska Shipping Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been granting a Merchants Cooperative Association special privilege in competing with a privately owned taxpaying common carrier steamship line from Seattle to Alaska. In other words, safety regulations through exemption from Coast Guard inspection and manning requirements have been waived to this cooperative merchants service.

The result has been that a few merchants have benefited and certain communities have enjoyed dual service which, of course, is popular. Meanwhile, however, the State of Alaska and all its people have not been benefited. Indeed, the competition of this substandard service has hurt the common carrier who, in turn, has been forced to raise its rates for want of sufficient cargoes.

Now there is a threat of a transportation crisis and reduced service. The two editorials from the Anchorage Daily Times which appear hereafter tell of this situation.

The newspaper does not suggest a solution which it seems to me among other things must include an end to political harassment of the Alaska Steamship Co. and discontinuing discrimination against it such as it inherent in the exemption contained in S. 2669.

These editorials speak for themselves:

ALASKA'S MOST CRITICAL TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM

It is shocking to learn that the Alaska Steamship Line may quit operations in Alaska, except those to Whittier and Seward.

Such action, if brought into reality, will leave many of Alaska's oldest and picturesque communities with virtually no transportation, except by air.

The curtailment would mark the close to an era during which Alaska grew as a maritime region. The first settlers came by ship and established communities along the shorelines. Supplies first moved from Russia to Alaska. They were replaced by the routes that may now be abandoned—between Seattle and the many ports that dot the Alaska shores.

More than history and nostalgia for the old days is involved in the impending transportation problem.

Life and sustenance of such old communities as Juneau, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Sitka, and Petersburg are involved. Nome now has only two or three supply ships a year. Will she have none?

The Alaska Line is the umbilical cord that makes life possible in many of these communities. Most of the foodstuffs and virtually all of the other supplies for sustenance are delivered from Seattle.

Fifteen percent of the population of Alaska lives in the southeastern region known as the panhandle. What are those people to do?

The same problem extends through Western Alaska, including such old and colorful ports as Cordova, Valdez, Kodiak, Homer and Bethel.

If the existig service is to be abandoned, something else must be created to replace it. If the big ships cannot operate profitably, perhaps something smaller must be used.

In facing up to this problem, it would be well for Alaska's leaders to do more than sound alarms and urge relief measures that are impossible.

Criticizing the steamship line will do no good. Besides, why should the line be subject to criticism? The service has been maintained for many years after the smaller ports became deficit operations. It may be that the line deserves commendations for delaying the curtailment so long.

It must also be recognized that the steamship line is under no obligation to operate at a financial loss. If competitive conditions are such that there can be no profit, the operators must make changes.

Alaskans may be quick to suggest that the State enter the steamship business and carry on the services that are about to be abandoned. That would be foolhardy. If private operators cannot do it, the State certainly cannot do it either.

The State has no financial resources that could support such a large and costly enterprise. The same thing is being discovered in connection with efforts to get Alaskans to borrow $23 million for a ferry system that private enterprise cannot justify.

It looks as though the first move is up to the congressional delegation to see what relief they can stir up at Washington.

ALASKA MUST PREPARE FOR SHIPPING CRISIS

The transportation crisis confronting Alaska is far from alleviated by the statements of steamship company officials yesterday.

The officials admitted that the reports of an impending curtailment in services were true. They took exception only to the degree of the curtailment. They emphasized the same as the first reports indicated, that the whole thing was under consideration and no final decision had been made.

It was encouraging that the officials denied that consideration was being given to a curtailment so drastic that only two Alaska ports would be served. But they did not reveal the extent of the reduction that is under discussion.

The steamship company has been the butt of so many rawdy-dowdy incidents in Alaska history that there is reason to suspect that some of its officialdom is developing a persecution complex.

The steamship line has been blamed for the high freight tariffs in Alaska. Increases have brought protests from Alaskans. Interruptions in service during strikes have prompted Alaskans to say that the company did not care whether Alaska got service or starved.

The company has been blamed for the offensive provision of the Jones Act which discriminated against Alaska during its years as a territory. It has been accused of a long list of other things—including wrongful policies as an absentee operator, opposition to statehood, and monopolistic practices. Alaskans believe many of these awful thoughts to be true.

The steamship line, in spite of it all, has a long record of service for Alaska. Frequency of steamship voyages increased as traffic grew. Passenger service was maintained for years after high costs had devoured all profits. The service was suspended only after the losses had been announced at $750,000 for 1 year.

The airplane ran the passenger ships off the ocean. Today something is running the freighters off the seas. Economic factors that have been mentioned are resistance to higher freight tariffs, labor contract negotiations and charter costs with the Federal Government.

It is safe to speculate, too, that other factors are involved in the plight of the freighters. Not the least of them is the new barge service that has initiated operations between Seattle and the Railbelt. The new methods of packing and moving freight in vans is another factor. Perhaps the barges have greater capabilities than steamships in moving tonnages under the new conditions.

Any reduction in steamship service must be followed by a new service to sustain life in Alaska's communities.

If the Alaska Line finds it necessary to quit as much as one port, provision must be made to keep that port supplied. It may mean small boat operations, like bush planes connecting with trunkline operations.

If the Alaska Line can serve the larger places along the Alaska coastline, perhaps small boat operators could find it economical to establish a feeder service to the other ports.

Now is the time to think of these problems. The Alaska Line officials obviously are reluctant to quit or reduce their service. But they cannot overcome the laws of economics with sentiment.

Housing Crazy-Quilt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the lead editorial appearing in the Washington Post of June 19, 1960, entitled "Housing Crazy-Quilt." The editorial, which speaks for itself, follows:

HOUSING CRAZY QUILT

The patchwork of housing proposals that Congress is putting together will provide no long-term answers to the Nation's needs in this field, and if the President should veto a bill like that just passed by the Senate, very little of value would be lost. The public housing feature of the Senate bill illustrates how neither Congress nor the administration has addressed itself to the real problems. The Senate would provide authorization for another 25,000 units of federally subsidized homes for low-income families. The administration believes that public housing authority still on the books is ample, that the program has been proved generally unworkable, and that it ought to be allowed to expire.

Yet in Washington alone there are some 5,000 eligible families on the public housing waiting lists. The progress of urban renewal is seriously hampered by the prospect that low-income housing will not be available for families displaced from the slums. And just the other day the Commissioners refused to accept Federal assistance for two new public housing projects and passed up additional Federal aid because proper sites are not available. The Senate has not looked seriously at the site problems and other problems which have slowed public housing to a snail's pace across the country. And the administration has not done so, either. A more imaginative approach is needed.

The same might be said of proposed new urban renewal grant authority. Despite its favored position, Washington has been unable to use all of the Federal aid available to it for renewal. Yet the Capital's need for a vastly accelerated attack on residential deterioration and general central city decay is obvious. Every major city has the same problems. A little more money for programs on the present pattern will not break the logjam. But, again, neither Congress nor the administration has attempted to devise new approaches that might do so.

Some of the Senate proposals are sheer politics. We see no justification whatever for continuing the Veterans' Administration mortgage guarantee program nor for a direct veterans' housing loan program. The regular Federal Housing Administration loan guarantees ought to be—and are, we think, amply liberal for all qualified homebuyers. The House committee proposals for FHA loans on a no-downpayment basis seem to us similarly demagogic. This approach to the Nation's housing needs is as slapdash and frothy as the administration's approach is sterile and hidebound.

We hope the next Congress and the next administration will take time to get at the heart of the country's urban housing problem, to study thoughtfully the often sad results of many of the postwar housing programs and to devise new kinds of assistance. The good thing about the attention to housing in these last days of this Congress is that the Members seem at least to recognize that there are critical problems requiring substantial measures of Federal help and leadership. We hope this campaign will at least ratify that fundamental recognition and point the way toward real solutions in 1961 and beyond.

Actuarial Anesthesia—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine studies of our social security system is the paper presented by Mr. Ray M. Peterson before the Society of Actuaries in November 1959. Included in my extension of remarks is the conclusion of Mr. Peterson's paper and his recommendations:

MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISSING PERCEPTIONS OF OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

(By Ray M. Peterson)

CONCLUSION

The exploration of our social insurance problems reflected in the foregoing observations and questions has led the author to a major conclusion: before any further increase in social security benefits is considered, the broad social and economic impact of the level of benefits and the method of financing should be studied by the best qualified individuals in the United States. The current Report of the Advisory Council is limited to an analysis of the method of financing taken alone—as it might operate virtually in a vacuum. But the broader impact of the system needs study in relation to capital needs, capacity to save, other demands upon our production, and the role of private retirement plans.

The author finds this opinion shared by others. At the 1958 social security hearings, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom gave the following reply to a question as to whether he would favor a

bill providing a 10-percent increase in benefits with tax sufficient to finance it:

"No, I would not. I would say that, if we plan to consider a broad increase in benefits and taxes, I think it ought to be carefully studied by an advisory council, as in the past. In the past, before any drastic changes were made, they were studied by an advisory council who looked at these problems objectively from various viewpoints. Also, since we have the advisory council on financing working on the problem, we ought to get the report of that council before making changes."

At the same hearings, A. D. Marshall, speaking for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, emphasized the importance of recognizing (1) that the soundness of the system "depends upon the willingness of those working in years to come to pay larger social taxes," (2) other demands on the patently limited tax sources, and (3) restriction on ability to save by high taxes and discouragement of personal thrift by high benefits. He recommended:

"In summary, we believe a new Advisory Council should be appointed by Congress. The present Advisory Council has a life of 1 year, and the members were selected to study one area only—financing.

"Consequently, a new Advisory Council should be appointed to study these other areas and to make feasible suggestions for constructive action, consistent with the preservation of individual freedom, initiative, and responsibility."

British actuaries also have recently voiced a vigorous opinion in favor of a major study in depth of national pensions in Great Britain. This view is given in a booklet, dated May 1959, entitled "An Appeal to Statesmanship," issued by the Councils of the Institute of Actuaries and of the Faculty of Actuaries in Scotland. Several paragraphs are quoted:

"There has been much useful discussion about national pensions during the past 2 years but some important aspects are escaping the attention they require. To the actuarial profession, with a century of intimate experience of pension schemes, this causes grave disquiet.

"To fill this gap we are issuing this booklet. It is mainly about costs, particularly future costs—not because we think that costs are the only aspects of importance, but because they indicate the obligations placed on future generations.

"It is the voice of the future which is noticeably absent from present discussion; our responsibility as actuaries is to make that voice heard.

"We have explored carefully to see whether there is any form of discipline which can be incorporated into the proposed schemes to insure that they will not be subject to extension without full public appreciation of all the future financial implications. We are convinced, however, that the nature of the schemes precludes an effective internal discipline. The dangers lie in the very nature of any type of graduated pensions where the promises take many years to come to full maturity.

"It is our strong recommendation, therefore, that with the mutual consent of the political parties there should be set up an authoritative and independent body to guide the country through the financial, economic, and technical aspects of this peculiarly difficult problem. Ultimate decisions must rest with Parliament but only after thorough and quiet examination by an independent body."

A major study of our social security problems should include:

(a) An effort to gain a better understanding of the nature and implications of our method of financing.

(b) Development of a clear national policy as to the role social security should play, including solution of the elusive problem of what constitutes basic need and basic floor of protection.

(c) Determination of the best way by which a correct image of the social security system may be presented to the man in the street.

(d) Examination of the desirability of publishing periodically the entry age normal cost, and, in order to show the burden to be borne by future contributions, the changes in the unfunded liability.

(e) Study of what part of our future national income may be soundly committed for the benefit of the older segment of our population.

(f) An appraisal of the income tax treatment of social security contributions and benefits.

(g) An examination of the question of whether a direct subsidy from general revenues will be necessary to make the financing of the present level of benefits popularly acceptable.

(h) A study of what should be the respective roles of a national compulsory pension system and private pension plans, recognizing that, one way or another, our older age population segment will be provided with adequate living income, and also bearing in mind the fact that a national system is financed essentially on a nonreserve basis and private retirement programs are usually financed on a full reserve basis which provides substantial capital accumulations.

Such an investigation should clear the heads of those who have become anesthetized by actuarial balance sheets.

We may speculate that Jeremy Bentham, with an assist from William Cullen Bryant, would advise our generation that it should—

So shape the commitments to be met
By future generations, and
"So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not,"
with a great feeling of guilt of what thou hast done to future generations,
"but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust"
that thou hast done right by thy grandsons and granddaughters,
"Approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

The Commonweal Discusses Medical Aid for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, how will we meet the national problem of providing medical care for our senior citizens in a way that is fair and dignified? I recommend the following article which appeared in the May 20, 1960, issue of the Commonweal to readers of the RECORD interested in the field of medical care. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I now include it:

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED—THE GOVERNMENT HAS TO RESCUE THOSE WHO HAVE NO HOPE OF PAYING FOR PRIVATE MEDICAL COVERAGE

(By Edward T. Chase)

The other day a letter to the editor appeared in the Wall Street Journal from a doctor stating that "medicine is apparently doomed to be the first major professional area in our country to be Federalized. (We must not say socialized because it offends politicians.)" One could quarrel with the doctor's choice of words. However, the general point of his comment goes to the heart of the tremendous public debate that is beginning to assume a vital role in this election year.

The debate has taken its departure from the so-called Forand bill, H.R. 4700, to provide those over 65 who are eligible for social security benefits with a modest degree of Government-financed hospital, nursing and surgical care. The Forand bill debate is described by such important publications as the New York Times and Life magazine as the No. 1 domestic issue of 1960.

The American Medical Association, the insurance industry, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce don't think the aged are so entitled. Organized labor and an array of professional welfare workers, associations, sociologists, and consumer groups feel strongly that the aged are entitled to aid.

As for Congress, with the exception of its conservtaive leaders, the Democrats by and large are for the Forand bill (named after its sponsor, Rhode Island's Democratic Congressman, AMIE J. FORAND), while the Republicans are against it. The administration also is against the bill. Yet under the tremendous pressure by the public (and by presidential aspirant RICHARD NIXON) for some action on this front, it has offered to devise a counterprogram that will provide some limited degree of Federal financial aid for the aged ill on a "voluntary" basis.

It is a matter of no small importance that a conservative, big business-oriented Republican administration has agreed with its traditional opponents that Federal aid for the ageds' medical care is a necessary step. As the Wall Street Journal editoralized, such a measure as HEW Secretary Flemming proposes "holds a profound and complex change in the relationship between the citizens and their Government."

What the administration plan amounts to is a program for advancing Federal funds up to an estimated $600 million to the States (who must match the grants roughly on a 50–50 basis) so as to enable them to administer a catastrophe-type health insurance program operated by private insurance companies. It is hard to escape the conclusion that the plan is strictly a political gesture, reluctantly taken to ease the politically untenable situation into which sheer negativism had placed the party. As a catastrophe-type insurance plan, the program is limited to those aged with incomes under $2,500 who elect to participate by paying a $24 annual fee. The first $250 of medical costs is on the patient. After that, the Government pays 80 percent of the cost, and a comprehensive list of medical services ranging from hospitalization to dental care is established as meriting payment. An alternative plan, for those over 65 who do not like the State-run plan, calls for Government payments of half the cost, up to $60, of a standard private major medical insurance policy.

Since everyone from the AMA to the AFL–CIO and in between (e.g., Governor Rockefeller for one) has denounced the plan for various conflicting reasons, it has no chance of going anywhere. Even if by a miracle it should go through Congress, it requires approval by each of the 50 State legislatures.

What the President seems to mean in his point about the voluntary approach to aid is that his administration is against the Forand bill and other Democratic proposals that utilize the mechanism of the social security system in a medical aid program since this system, of course, is sustained by a mandatory tax on employees and employers. President Eisenhower has construed use of social security to mean socialized medicine because in some inexplicable fashion tax-derived funds equate to socialized medicine in his mind. This is one of the truly befuddling terms of our time but one the President has used on a number of occasions. It seems a pity that there is not greater understanding in the White House and elsewhere in the Capitol generally that the most businesslike way to fund a medical care program for the aged is to see to it that each of us puts away a regular amount throughout our working lifetime. Of course this has to be compulsory and it has to be done on a population-wide basis and that is why the social security law is the logical, expeditious, cheapest way to handle the matter. Governor Rockefeller seems to be the only Republican leader to acknowledge this fact to date.

The administration's insurance plan to all intents and purposes is a dead duck right now. However, the Forand bill is not the only one under consideration. Presidential candidates KENNEDY and HUMPHREY have introduced their own Forand-type bills in the Senate and so have Senator MORSE and Senator JAVITS. Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA is readying a new bill at this writing. Senator SYMINGTON is on record as supporting FORAND. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has remained pretty vague on the point. He and fellow Texan, Speaker RAYBURN, rather hope to persuade the conservative-dominated House Ways and Means Committee, which has bottled up the Forand bill, to report out some kind of bill.

What this adds up to is the fact that there are a number of pending measures to provide Federal aid for the medical care of the aged and that the debate over these measures is going to continue, probably to reach a crescendo in Congress this month and in June. Whatever happens in Congress, the debate will go on between the two parties and between the contending presidential candidates up to election time and probably for many years to come.

Quite apart from the pressures of an election year, it is not difficult to surmise why the furor over the Forand bill has come about. The pressures are economic and demographic in origin and they are powerful. In the decade ending in 1958, medical costs doubled. Hospital costs particularly have risen alarmingly, about 5 percent each year. The hospital has become the center of medical treatment for all, and of paramount importance to the elderly, whose chronic ills lead to long confinements. Drugs and all the paraphernalia of medicine have also risen rapidly in cost in the postwar period, twice as rapidly as all other basic items in the consumer budget. Doctors' fees, let it be noted, have not risen commensurately, and the general inflation in medicine cannot be laid to doctors' charges alone or even predominantly. But the technology of modern scientific medicine, embracing as it does fantastically abstruse and complicated materials and techniques, is inevitably very expensive. And of course it is saving lives and is pushing back the average age when men die.

Here enters the second factor in the situation. A controlled death rate has resulted in a large, growing population of the elderly at a time when not only are medical costs skyrocketing but our automated industrial production machine and our dwindling numbers of family farms no longer have a place for the worker over 65. Se he cannot earn money, and social security provides him barely a subsistence for life's necessities. We now have 16 million in this 65 or over category and it is the most rapidly growing of all age groups.

Nearly all have extremely limited incomes, with 74 percent of those over 65 having incomes of less than $1,000 annually, according to the New York Times, and only some 15 percent with incomes over $2,000. Naturally only a minority, estimated by the Government at 40 percent, can undertake to pay for any degree of health insurance. One cannot blame the private insurance industry, which is another business, after all, for failing to cover these impoverished older citizens. They can't make a profit on them or even contain the insurance losses caused by them.

But one can question the intellectual honesty of the spokesmen of that industry and of organized medicine (individual doctors and insurance executives speak a different line) in their traditional pretension that there is no real problem; that most of the elderly are soon going to be covered by private health insurance; that anyone who needs medical care gets it anyhow (no matter just how); and that any attempt to redress this problem of the aged ill through use of public funds will, in some mystic way, "destroy the doctor-patient relationship," and plummet us into some kind of (unspecified) totalitarian, collective welfare state presumably like Russia, or anyhow England, which is impossible enough. These are the shopworn cliches that have been preached by the AMA and its business cohorts for a quarter of a century.

The reality is that a major illness now constitutes the biggest economic threat that can face a family and an event that, in the case of the elderly, almost invariably spells financial catastrophe. Furthermore, as we have seen, conditions are such that a vast number of these older people are unlikely ever to afford private health insurance. And without it they have in countless instances had to deny themselves needed care.

If we are not, then, to abandon these growing numbers of the aged to inadequate or no medical care, or to terrible humiliations involving the pauper's oath to qualify for public assistance, what are we expected to do? The private profit system in which both insurance and medicine largely operate in this country no longer is accommodating this situation, if it ever did. Where are we to turn? Official organized medicine and insurance never tell us in positive specifics. Instead, the burden of their message sidesteps the central question and focuses on the evils of Government bureaucracy in medicine and business.

We can return logically now to the plaintive assertion of the doctor who laments in the Wall Street Journal that medicine is doomed to be the first major profession to be "federalized." While the horrors of totalitarianism and the "destruction of the doctor-patient relationship" that are supposed to result from this transformation in medicine's status are unproven, to say the least, nonetheless the likelihood is overwhelming, as the doctor suggests, that the Government is indeed about to intrude in medical practice in a way that it has not in the past, a new kind of intrusion that has not hitherto occurred despite the appreciable degree to which Government funds have for many years now been used to fortify various aspects of medicine. (Chief examples: medical research and education; veterans' care; care of the Armed Forces and their dependents; public assistance for the indigent; TB and mental care hospitals.)

The doctor is puzzled by the disturbing fact that it is the noble profession of medicine, of all professions, that must suffer this historic indignity. As the A.M.A. undoubtedly has impressed upon him, once Federal funds are used to pay doctors' services, it follows that the Government is responsible for seeing to it that such funds are not abused. This means a degree of governmental surveillance of fees and charges, precisely the kind of Government intervention that the medical profession abhors the most. For the political spokesmen of American medicine have always gone out of their way to emphasize that medicine is just like any other private business, with a time-honored right to charge what the traffic will bear.

The dilemma that is being touched upon here was aired thousands of years ago by Plato in his dialogue querying, "Is the physician a healer of the sick or a maker of money?" Though the nod in that instance was given to the healer theory, somehow the question has never been resolved by the spokesmen of organized medicine in a manner to settle the issue decisively. Indeed, in the United States what is implicit in our structure of medicine is that the doctor cannot realize his highest potential as a healer unless simultaneously he is unhindered in his efforts to turn a profit while so performing. The fact that our medicine (though not our population's health) is probably unsurpassed by any other nation's in the world indicates that this has not been a bad idea. Nevertheless, despite the truly astonishing triumphs of American medicine and the selfless devotions of most of its practitioners, our medical system is under mounting critical fire and is changing its organizational framework swiftly year after year.

It is necessary to understand that what is happening in medicine is happening in a number of other basic areas in our national life, in transportation, in housing, in urban rehabilitation, in our welfare services. The profit system is proving to be increasingly inadequate in all these important sectors. Fifty or 25 or even 10 years ago discussion of such changes in our economic structure took its departure from theoretical considerations of the relative effectiveness of socialism, on the one hand, and free enterprise on the other. Politicians today still find it expedient to try to press the discussion into these anachronistic terms. Yet even in welfare-state England, we are witnessing—in the case of the profound ideological debate within the Labor Party precipitated by leader Hugh Gaitskell's plea for a revision of the party's unqualified stand for nationalization of production—the fact that consideration of the proper place of private enterprise and government enterprise or a partnership of both cannot be usefully discussed within the narrow cliches of the past.

A more esoteric but very pertinent example of this trend is offered by the insurance industry. In the case of atomic energy, it is necessary that liability insurance be provided for protection of industrial and research organizations using nuclear reactors and other nuclear materials in case of a serious accident which might devastate a large area of a community. The insurance industry wisely realized it could not provide all the necessary funds on an actuarially funded basis. So it organized an industry-wide pool, able to produce $60 million, with the government coming into partnership to make available $2 billion more to cover the worst possible contingency. No one hears complaints of "government interference," "subsidy," or "socialism." The industry reserves these terms for the Forand bill since in the area of health insurance it still feels it can reserve this domain for itself and turn a profit—so long as it isn't forced to take care of the aged. And, of course, if anyone is upset about "subsidy," ponder the extent to which the Federal Government has had to sustain our agricultural economy in the face of a technological revolution in farming that has thrown the balance of supply and demand quite out of balance.

Meanwhile, the most searching critics of the American scene have been scoring us for allowing the proportion of national resources on a per capita basis that is devoted to private wants (tail-fin cars are the most popular symbol) assume an ever larger role vis-a-vis the resources devoted to public needs. The widening discrepancy between private exploitation of our resources and the percentage channeled into public services is found to occur because the nature of necessary public services is such that one cannot turn a profit from them. The intellectual decries the fact that giving precedence to private gain in our highly specialized, intricate culture, in which the degree of interdependence of all our institutions is so marked, leads to a neglect of vital needs.

Against this background take a look at American medicine. The case of the elderly points up the situation graphically. The evidence is overwhelming that neither medicine nor the insurance industry can make a profit or even break even on them. The Government has to come to the rescue, at least to a defined degree, namely for the hard core of the elderly who have no hope of paying for private coverage. The truth is that the Forand debate is reducible to a very simple question: can the private insurance industry devise means to cover these people? So far they are covering only about 40 percent of them with varying degrees of adequacy, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the likelihood of their covering many more of them in the next decade is not encouraging.

Medical care can well be said to fall in line after food, clothing, and shelter as one of the four material necessities of modern life. It is not a frivolity to be dispensed with, like high-tail-finned cars. The fact that science is rendering it ever more expensive and difficult to acquire does not alter the principle.

It is puzzling to many observers to see in what an uncooperative spirit, and how foolishly, organized medicine has responded to the changes we have been sketching here. One cannot readily find another professional group so addicted to cliché, to romantic evasions, to ignorant provincialisms and stubborn refusals to admit the need to adjust to the realities of a changing world. However, when one scrutinizes the climate in which the doctor lives, several reasons can be advanced to explain this behavior, a behavior that has made the AMA disrespected as self-seeking and obstructionist and has soured the overall relationship of the profession with much of the public and has alienated it from organized labor.

First, the doctor is in a position of enormous power, authority, and prestige, a condition which few human beings can take in stride. Remember, the doctor deals with the individual when he is disabled, a patient. And illness and injury are socially acceptable reasons for surrendering one's responsibilities, for becoming dependent, for regressing, as it were, to a childlike status. The doctor is a species of omnipotent father who ministers to us at terribly anxious times. Small wonder that he experiences a sense of dominance that brooks no interference.

Combine this basic situation with the fact that, while medicine is a science, medical practice is in large part an art, calling upon mysterious and wonderful talents that vary from doctor to doctor, talents which each doctor is naturally proud of and cherishes. He enjoys the prestige of being both of science and art, a scientist implementing his procedures with individual genius.

Furthermore, the area in which the doctor works is one of transcendent importance, matters of life and death. This very fact exerts an immense pressure upon us to give ourselves over to the doctor, to accord him unquestioned authority.

On top of this, the doctor is acutely conscious of the fact that he has had to sacrifice years of hard work and relative poverty before he can enjoy the fruits of his work. He accordingly is not disposed to have the period when he comes into his own as a qualified private practitioner beset with bureaucratic regulations that might conceivably interfere in his winning the traditional monetary and status rewards.

It should be borne in mind, too, that the doctor is trained not in politics, sociology, economics or the humanistic disciplines concerned with value judgments, but in scientific subjects. And the doctor is a harassed and busy professional from the start, with little opportunity to study outside of his field. Thus he is only too glad to turn policy matters of his profession over to the political doctors who constitute the active leadership of organized medicine, those who dominate the county medical societies and the AMA.

Given this set of circumstances, the lamentable political antics of the AMA over recent years are not altogether inexplicable. Organized medicine is supported by major groups in business, notably the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who are similarly addicted to the notion that the profit motive is a dynamic force singlehandedly capable of solving all the dilemmas of the mid-20th century. But an ever larger portion of the medical profession is not being so deceived. The younger physicians and those in research and in teaching will not be bound by the past. They know they must prepare for a rapidly changing future. Government aid, group practice, salaried practice, and fee schedules do not dismay them. Increasingly, we will see them bring to bear upon their social and political and economic problems something of the scientific rigor with which they inform their medical diagnoses. The reason for this is that a great profession, calling upon the highest resources of the human mind and coping with matters of cardinal concern to us all, is bound to adjust itself in a rational way to the social evolution from which none of us can escape.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress: Report of Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the report of the Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 47th annual convention which was held in Washington May 24–26, 1960. This report was submitted to the convention by the vice chairman, Judge J. E. Sturrock, general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., on May 26, and was unanimously adopted. The committee report and list of committee members follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS 47TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 24–26, 1960—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL WATER USE AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee reviewed its report adopted at the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 15, 1959, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles for development of adequate water supplies set forth therein, emphasizing particularly the need for constructive policies relating to conservation, municipal and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, industrial use and other beneficial purposes.

The vice chairman, presiding in the absence of the chairman, invited the attention of the committee to the fact that H.R. 3610, although passed by the Congress, as urged by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, had been vetoed by the President and that the veto had been sustained. This bill, the vice chairman noted, would have increased Federal financial assistance to communities for pollution abatement projects:

The vice chairman further brought to the notice of the committee the fact that the President's budget requested only $20 million to implement the grants-in-aid provisions of Public Law 660 for community pollution abatement projects but that the House Appropriations Committee had recommended the maximum amount authorized by law for this purpose.

The vice chairman referred also to the extensive studies and hearings being conducted by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources in the field of water resources development, including pollution abatement and industrial and municipal water use, and noted that preliminary releases and reports were highlighting the growing seriousness of the stream pollution problem and the vastly increasing requirements for water use, projecting water requirements by 1980 about double present levels.

The vice chairman further informed the committee that pollution of the Potomac River in the Washington metropolitan area is a problem of growing urgency but that pending legislation before the House Public Works Committee would authorize Federal assistance to the District of Columbia in the form of grants-in-aid to permit completion of an urgently needed system of interceptor sewers by the federally established 1966 time limit.

Reports from representatives of various parts of the country presented dramatic evidence of growing water problems. It is clear that the population of the United States will continue to grow rapidly, that the needs of industry, agriculture, and the general public for adequate supplies of water will continue to mount; and that the growth of industry and population will aggravate and intensify the already serious pollution abatement problem confronting the Nation. Accordingly, the committee reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation, control and equitable disposition of our water resources are matters of profound interest to the development of the national economy and the welfare of all the people. It is evident that the water problem will become as vital to the national interest in 10 years as the missile program is today. Clearly, also the increasing pressures of various public demands for water use urgently require long-range planning and effective coordination to assure maximum realization of the public values inherent in our precious water resources.

In view of the growing importance of water resource development, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved:

1. That the committee records its regret that the President's veto of H.R. 3610, providing increased financial assistance to communities for pollution abatement projects, was sustained and urgently recommends that similar legislation be enacted at the next session of Congress.

2. That the committee recognizes the primary responsibility of local and State governments in the field of pollution abatement but further recognizes the Federal interest in this area and, accordingly, recommends strengthened Federal procedures to supplement local, state and regional efforts to deal with this pressing problem.

3. That the committee records its disappointment in the grossly inadequate request of only $20 million in the President's budget to implement the provisions of Public Law 660 for grants-in-aid to communities for pollution abatement projects but strongly commends the House Appropriations Committee for recommending appropriation of the maximum amount authorized by law for this purpose and urges speedy action by the Senate on the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill.

4. That the committee records its vigorous support and approval of the diligent efforts of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources to develop full information looking toward formulation of water resources policies adequate for growing national needs; urges full cooperation by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress with the work of the Senate select committee and urges that most careful and sympathetic consideration be given by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to the recommendations of the Senate select committee upon issuance thereof.

5. That the committee renews its expression of deep concern regarding the long continuing pollution of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia region and reaffirms its conviction that sanitation standards in the area of the Nation's Capital should set a standard for the world and that the polluted condition of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia metropolitan area demands immediate and constructive action by the Federal Government; that the committee notes with gratification that a satisfactory plan for dealing with the problem has been evolved as a result of an enforcement conference held under Public Law 660 and that as a first step improvements in the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant have been completed; that the committee is strongly of the opinion that additional elements of the plan involving construction of a system of interceptor sewers should be promptly undertaken and to that end recommends support of legislation now pending before the House Committee on Public Works which authorizes appropriation of funds in the form of grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia to enable the District to complete the interceptor sewer project by the federally established 1966 time limit; that to expedite action on this legislation the committee urges the Bureau of the Budget to comply promptly with the request of the House Committee on Public Works for a report on appropriate means for financing this project.

6. That the committee records its continued adherence to the principle that provision be made for storage in reservoir projects to increase needed low flows downstream to the extent warranted at present or during the economical life of the project, without reimbursement, where the benefits of such low flows are widespread, general, and nonexclusive.

7. That the committee recommends improved coordination among the agencies at all levels of government for the more effective development and use of water resources.

8. That the committee recommends a more adequate program to ascertain, assemble, and disseminate in useful form basic data relative to surface and ground water resources; and

9. That the committee recommends that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress investigate the feasibility of public information programs by radio, television, and other means to bring before the public the growing seriousness of stream pollution and of increasing water use requirements emerging from rapid industrial expansion and population growth clearly foreshadowed for the remaining decades of this century.

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL WATER USE AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Chairman, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chisholm, Minn.

Secretary, William J. Hull, legislative representative, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Washington, D.C.

Members

New England Division: Walter G. White, chairman, Water Resources Board, State of New Hampshire, Concord, N.H.

North Atlantic Division: George R. Shanklin, chief engineer, Division of Water Policy and Supply, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.

South Atlantic Division: Miles J. Smith, vice chairman, North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development, Salisbury, N.C. Harry H. Saunders, vice president, St. Joe Paper Co., Port St. Joe, Fla.

Southwestern Division: Judge J. E. Sturrock, general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., vice chairman.

Lower Mississippi Valley Division: Leonard N. White, engineer, Arkansas Geological and Conservation Commission, Little Rock, Ark.; Calvin T. Watts, assistant director, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central Division: P. W. Fitzpatrick, president, St. Paul Port Authority, St. Paul, Minn.

Missouri River Division: Milo W. Hoisveen, chief engineer, North Dakota Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Ohio River Division: Laban P. Jackson, commissioner of conservation, State of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.

North Pacific Division: Marshall N. Dana, chairman, Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg.

South Pacific Division: Walter G. Shulz, division chief engineer, Division of Design and Construction, Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

Politics May Serve Needs of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary which appeared in the May 18, 1960, issue of the Christian Century. On Wednesday, June 22, we of this House will consider H.R. 12580, a voluminous bill which amends the existing social security regulations.

In my opinion H.R. 12580 takes but a small step toward solving the pressing needs which face our older citizens. I am hopeful that before this Congress ends there will be approved legislation which meets the challenge before us.

The remarks in the Christian Century are valid. I hope that politics will serve the needs of the aged this year.

POLITICS MAY SERVE NEEDS OF THE AGED

Political expediency has greatly strengthened the possibility that something effective will be done to provide the aged with insurance against poverty caused by the costs of protracted illness when income is reduced or cut off. Politicians are sensitive in an election year, and when millions of voters above 65 are in trouble, or a substantial share of them are concerned about potential trouble, the political wheels begin to spin. The addition of the administration's "Medicare program for the aged" to the three other proposals already before Congress makes the parties unanimous in their recognition of the needs of the aged. It also makes unanimous the admission that helping meet that need is the business of Government. The American Medical Association, in league with private insurance companies, opposes the administration plan, as it does the Forand bill and other proposals. The AMA position is not surprising. Many members of the highest paid profession, whose own medical bills are generally easy to bear by reason of reciprocal professional "courtesy," personally bear the burden of giving unpaid care to persons whose needs surpass their resources. What they lack is sufficient education in social studies, sufficient understanding of human nature or of means by which people, working together, can meet all their needs with dignity and foresight. The AMA reflects the narrowness of outlook induced by the protracted and intensive scientific training of many doctors. The country's deep respect for the medical profession and for individual doctors would be strengthened if something could be done to broaden the understanding by doctors of people in modern society. We believe that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is right in his prediction that "once a need is recognized, it is usually possible to find a solution." The needs of doctors and of the aged are not the same needs, but both must find a solution. This year the aged may find their solution, or part of it, through politics. The doctors of Britain were finally swept by political means into a system many of them disliked. We hope American doctors will make their own decisions so the same thing will not happen here.

Granting Representation in the Electoral College to the District of Columbia

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption by the House and now the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing a constitutional amendment that would permit residents of the District of Columbia to vote in national elections is a most commendable step forward. I believe that the entire Nation welcomes

this measure that would provide for three votes in the electoral college for the District of Columbia.

Those who have long been observers of the national political process will at last become participants when the amendment is ratified by the required 38 States.

Pleased as we all are with the adoption of the amendment by both Houses of Congress, it is somewhat disappointing that the second so-called District provision in the original Senate version of the resolution was not included in the final measure. This would have provided the District with two House Delegates in Congress to represent the views of the more than 750,000 residents of the Nation's Capital. I surely hope that the Congress will consider this feature next year.

Another vital measure that should be brought before Congress for consideration is the so-called home-rule bill. We have broken through the barrier and opened a way for democracy to flow into the District. But, it is only a beginning, since the privilege of the vote has still to be extended to include the election of local government officials and representatives in Congress.

The fact that the District is a "Federal city" in which all the citizens of the country have an interest is not, in my opinion, a sufficient reason for denying to its inhabitants control over their local problems, matters in which the people neither of New York nor California could possibly have any concern.

Those of us who have supported the constitutional amendment cannot assume that our task is finished. Self-government has always been the bulwark of our Federal system and any supporter of States rights should ardently favor the same prerogatives of local rule for the citizens of the District.

The home-rule bill discharge petition before the House requires just a few more signatures to bring the measure to the floor for debate. Action this session by the House can send a bill to the President for enactment into law. I urge that the bill be cleared and that we maintain our momentum to bring to the residents of the District the privileges of democracy.

Welcome by the New York City Chinese Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the recent congressional trek to New York City, the weekend of May 16, 1960, it was the pleasure of the Members of Congress their families and friends, to visit once again New York's Chinatown, where they were made most welcome by the Chinese community.

I am pleased to set forth the remarks made on that occasion by Mon Bak Young, president of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, speaking for our hosts:

Honorable Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a great pleasure for me, on behalf of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, to extend to you our heartfelt welcome. We wish you, each one of you, to enjoy yourselves during your visit to Chinatown. The very fact that you take time out to visit us with such a tight schedule in your New York tour, has impressed us greatly. I want to assure you that everyone in the Chinese community here in New York City feels honored by your presence.

The concept of individual dignity, and a moral obligation to extend it throughout the world, is inherent in every basic American political document. President Lincoln, speaking of the Declaration of Independence, said it meant "liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time." It is, therefore, natural for us to turn our thought at this moment to the relations between the United States and China. For the past 10 years, international communism has imposed a tyrannical regime upon the Chinese people in the mainland; it has denied every basic right and freedom to the Chinese people. We are, for this reason, unequivocally opposed to the Chinese Communist regime in China, and we are in wholehearted support of any policy and means which is designed to bring about its downfall. We hope that the United States will continue to withhold its policy of nonrecognition toward Red China and to bar its entry into the United Nations. We also firmly believe that it is in the interest of the United States to continue providing unstinted moral and material aid to the Republic of China in order to stop the Communist expansion in the Far East. Only by doing so, can we be true to the principles that we stand for.

We, Americans of Chinese descent, are proud of our contribution to the advancement of our Nation, but as an emigrant group, we have problems which particularly concern us. One of such problems deals with immigration laws. A common difficulty facing many foreign nationals in the United States is how to adjust their immigration status to that of a permanent resident. We earnestly hope that Congress would be able in the near future to pass a bill that would provide for the adjustment of status to permanent residents of many Chinese persons whose entry into the United States was based on doubtful claims and facts. In enacting such legislation, there has been precedent in the past whereby special legislation was introduced to permit adjustment of immigration status of other nationalities who entered the United States by the same means.

Aside from our interest in legislation for adjustment of immigration status, we are also concerned with anti-Communist Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. Recently, the House of Representatives has passed a House Joint Resolution 397 which affords immigration privileges to a limited number of refugees from Communist-dominated or occupied territories, within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner. Since anti-Communist Chinese refugees in Hong Kong are not under the Mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, they certainly would be completely excluded from the benefits of this particular legislation. We can't help feeling seriously disturbed because of the discriminatory provision in the present House Joint Resolution 397. We strongly urge the liberalization of that bill by deleting the clause of "within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees."

In closing, may I once again welcome you to Chinatown and wish you a happy visit to New York City and to our community.

Jim Mitchell: Looking for a New Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the June 1960 issue of Fortune magazine, which is devoted to Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell.

Secretary Mitchell has been in the Eisenhower Cabinet since 1953 and has served as the President's top labor adviser since that time. His record is one of which the American people can be proud.

As a fellow New Jerseyite I am pleased that the editors of Fortune magazine saw fit to devote a portion of their June issue to his accomplishments.

The article follows:

JIM MITCHELL: LOOKING FOR A NEW JOB—HE IS NOT CHASING THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION, BUT HIS STRONG PERFORMANCE AS LABOR SECRETARY MAY HELP HIM GET IT

Labor Secretary James Paul Mitchell views all the current speculation about his vice-presidential prospects with mixed emotions. A tall, hunch-shouldered businessman from Elizabeth, N.J., Mitchell wants the Vice Presidency but "has a deep feeling of revulsion at being the nearest handy Catholic." He believes that he should be considered for the job on his record as Secretary rather than on the basis of his religion.

His record has, in fact, been a strong one. He has served 6½ years in one of the most difficult Cabinet positions, and if his performance has frequently been controversial, it has seldom been weak or timid. Mitchell has proved to be a first-rate administrator and a shrewd political infighter. He has not only expanded the power of the Department of Labor, but has also established personal hegemony over the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and several other independent Federal agencies. He has fought repeatedly with the Secretary of Commerce and other Cabinet members to preserve and extend his area of influence. He has differed with the President on some issues—e.g., right-to-work laws. (Mitchell opposes them, while Eisenhower has simply taken the position that they are a matter for the States to decide.) Nevertheless, the President has leaned heavily on him, and Mitchell has emerged not only as a mainstay in the Cabinet but as a possibility for the Republican vice-presidential nomination.

Mitchell has not said that he is running for vice president. He believes NIXON should be entirely free to choose his own running mate. But he is candid about his

own availability: "Anybody who says unconditionally 'no' to the vice presidency is crazy and not being honest with himself."

Mitchell has never agreed with those Republicans who felt that he should be nominated in an effort to offset KENNEDY's great appeal to Catholic voters. Mitchell believes precisely the opposite, in fact: "If KENNEDY is at the top of the Democratic ticket, the Republicans will be ill advised to have a Catholic. If there is a Catholic vote, and I suspect there is one, it will go for KENNEDY and not for a vice presidential candidate."

In any event, he winces at the view of himself as simply a "Catholic candidate." Actually, Secretary Mitchell believes that the addition of his name to a NIXON ticket would have broader significance. "It might," he says with amusement, "give some of my friends in the labor movement a touch of schizophrenia," an enigmatic remark that becomes clearer when his record is analyzed.

The very thought that Jim Mitchell might pop up on the national ticket is enough to send shivers down the spines of some conservative Republicans. For Mitchell has always been a "modern Republican," and ever since he took office he has warred with the old Taft wing of the party. Furthermore, any Secretary of Labor is charged with administering certain laws that many conservatives intensely dislike—the wage-and-hour law, for example. In this situation they expected from the Eisenhower administration a man who would minimize, rather than maximize, the role of the Labor Department. Mitchell has maximized it.

An ambitious, self-made man who in his time has driven a truck and managed his own small grocery, Mitchell rose to eminence as a business executive. An excellent negotiator, his mind is quick and analytical. He presents his case softly, almost diffidently. He has an engaging wit and warmth about him. One severe critic confesses that, on a personal level, he finds Mitchell "a big warmhearted Irishman * * * no nicer guy to get shipwrecked on a desert island with."

NO BACK DOOR TO THE WHITE HOUSE

Yet under Mitchell's easygoing manner there is a basic toughness. Thus from his first day in office, Mitchell made it plain that he did not intend to let conservatives (or anyone else) in the administration take over any functions of the Labor Secretary. He politely but coolly turned down a suggestion by the Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks that the two of them jointly draft the administration's recommendations for revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. ("I didn't agree," Mitchell has explained, "that the Secretary of Labor represents labor and the Secretary of Commerce represents commerce, and that the determination of labor policy was a matter for collective bargaining between them.") Instead, Mitchell holed up for 3 days in a Washington hotel room and wrote his own list of recommended changes. With a single exception, the President accepted Mitchell's list. This was the first big victory in Mitchell's fight to stake out a broad area of independence and authority.

He won a second triumph when the principle was established that there would be "no Steelmans" in this administration. President Truman had maintained John Steelman, a union contact man, policymaker, and troubleshooter, on the White House staff. Steelman channeled information and advice—e.g., about strikes, labor legislation—to the President. The existence of this dual track of influence naturally circumscribed the importance of the Secretary of Labor. The new administration had no Steelman at the time Mitchell was appointed, and he soon made it clear to management and labor that there would be no shortcut or backdoor to the White House. Mitchell alone would be the man to see about labor problems of national significance.

INFLUENCE BY APPOINTMENT

During the Louisville & Nashville Railroad strike in 1955, for example, Kenneth C. Royall, a former War Department boss of President Eisenhower, was retained by the railroad. Royall told Mitchell that he planned to visit the President to talk about the strike. Mitchell warned Royall that he would get no help from the President, that the administration was avoiding intervention in labor disputes, and that if he insisted on going to the White House to present management's case Mitchell would feel obliged to bring over a group of railroad labor leaders to tell the President their side of the story. Royall backed down.

Mitchell's influence has, in fact, been extended outside the Department of Labor, and into four other Federal agencies that deal with labor matters. These are the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Mediation Board (which helps to settle disputes on the railroads and airlines), and the Railroad Retirement Board (which administers pensions and unemployment compensation for railworkers). Shortly after he took office, Mitchell invited the heads of these agencies to meet regularly with him to discuss their problems. This was a remarkable request, since Congress had intended the agencies to be wholly independent of the executive branch. As it happened, Whitley P. McCoy, then director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, balked at Mitchell's request. By November 1954, McCoy had been forced out and replaced as director by a close friend and former coworker of Mitchell's, Joseph F. Finnegan.

Since then, in general, Mitchell has exerted a strong influence on appointments to important labor jobs in Washington. He was instrumental in placing John Fanning and Chairman Boyd Leedom on the NLRB. He also fought a long and ultimately successful battle to make Stuart Rothman general counsel of the board. He handpicked Howard W. Habermeyer to head the Railroad Retirement Board. Meanwhile, he has blocked NLRB appointments of several men identified with the conservative wing of the party; e.g., Michael Bernstein, minority counsel of the Senate Labor Committee, who was sponsored by Senator GOLDWATER. Board member Philip Ray Rodgers, a protege of Senator Taft, was widely thought to be in line for the chairman's job several years ago, but Mitchell blocked him and got the White House to elevate Leedom instead.

Mitchell has stretched the functions of his own department, too. In enforcing the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, and the Davis-Bacon Act, he has construed his powers broadly. Recently, for example, Mitchell issued a set of provisional regulations covering the employment of domestic migratory workers. The provisions were assailed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, some farm groups, and swarms of farm-State Congressmen. Mitchell was charged with having overreached his authority. But out of the dispute came a ruling by the Attorney General that broadly upheld Mitchell's right to act in this field.

It is scarcely surprising that the Labor Department's budget has nearly doubled since Mitchell took over—from $28 million in fiscal 1954 to an estimated $53 million in the present fiscal year, the highest ever.

HOW MUCH IS MODERATE?

Mitchell's success in transforming and enlarging the role of the Secretary of Labor has been aided by the fact that the President has no more than a lukewarm interest in labor matters. Eisenhower wanted—and got—a Secretary who would keep labor problems out of the Presidential lap. In return, he gave Mitchell wide scope. But, in addition, Mitchell has an intuitive grasp of the organizational complexities of the executive branch of Government. One former Commerce official who frequently opposed Mitchell puts it tersely: "He know how to get things done in Washington."

Mitchell's tactical skill was demonstrated most recently in his success in shifting the administration's position on increasing the minimum wage. This is an issue on which Mitchell has taken a number of lickings, but the last round must be credited as a clear victory for him.

In 1955, when the issue first faced the administration, Mitchell tried to persuade the President to support an increase in the minimum from 75 cents to $1 an hour. This was in the face of a strong labor push for $1.25. Inside the administration, however, Arthur Burns, then Chariman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Weeks, and others opposed Mitchell, and the final administration position was for an increase to only 90 cents. Mitchell was thus placed in the uncomfortable position of having to testify for 90 cents even though his personal preference for $1 was widely known. When Congress did boost the minimum to $1 over the administration's objections, Mitchell helped persuade the President not to veto the measure.

The issue did not assume importance again until last year. Then, with the AFL–CIO still plumping for a $1.25 minimum, Mitchell took the stand to declare any increase premature, and to warn that it might create unemployment. Since then an election year has rolled around, and Mitchell has been able to reverse the administration's stand. This time he laid his groundwork carefully. When his Department prepared its latest report on the Fair Labor Standards Act, Mitchell drafted a transmittal letter to Congress in which he stated something that does not appear explicitly in the report itself: that a moderate increase in the minimum would have no adverse effects. He then took the precaution of clearing this transmittal letter at the White House, even though technically he was not obligated to do so. The letter was finally approved at a meeting attended by Mitchell, Commerce Secretary Frederick Mueller, Raymond Saulnier, head of the Council of Economic Advisers, Budget Director Maurice Stans, and Gerald Morgan, Wilton Persons, and David Kendall of the President's staff. The letter did not commit the administration to anything, but through it Mitchell prepared the way for a policy shift.

Next, as it became clear that Congress was likely to vote some increase in the minimum this year, Mitchell played his trump: Vice President NIXON. Mitchell urged NIXON to use his influence in favor of an increase—which both of them thought politically necessary. The Vice President, in turn, persuaded Commerce Secretary Mueller to modify his antagonism to the idea. When Mueller testified on the Hill, he reluctantly approved the general notion of a moderate increase. The capstone of the new policy was laid in place on April 21 when Mitchell himself appeared before the House Labor Committee. Picking up the loose phrase, "moderate increase," Mitchell made it specific. The administration, he indicated, would not oppose an increase of 10 to 15 cents. Mitchell may have been stretching the limit of what his fellow Cabinet members consider moderate, but there

is no doubt that he has moved the administration a long way on this issue.

This was not the first time that Mitchell and NIXON have teamed up. During last year's steel strike Mitchell reached out to bring NIXON into the negotiations in their final stage—and NIXON was a major force in getting the final settlement. Their names were linked in the attendant publicity. In 1958 Mitchell supported NIXON'S unsuccessful move to put the administration on record as favoring a tax cut as an antirecession measure. In controversies like the present one over health insurance for the aged, Mitchell has been part of what might almost be termed a "NIXON liberal" faction in the Cabinet, along with Secretary Flemming, Secretary Seaton, and Attorney General Rogers.

TROUBLE ON THE HILL

Mitchell has, of course, suffered several defeats during his term of office. In 1954, after he declared that he "opposed categorically" State right-to-work laws, the President pointedly remarked that Mitchell "had not represented necessarily the administration views." Eisenhower vetoed depressed-area legislation that Mitchell had wanted badly, and rebuffed him when Mitchell came out in favor of extending minimum-wage coverage to retail employees.

But Mitchell's largest problems have been with Congress. Here he has had to face the fact of Democratic control of the Senate and House Labor Committees. He early made an enemy of GRAHAM BARDEN, formidable chairman of the House Labor Committee, who has repeatedly opposed Mitchell on labor legislation. One result of this antagonism was the emasculation of the 1958 welfare and pension fund disclosure law. The bill originally gave Mitchell discretionary authority to investigate reports and to police its provisions. BARDEN, opposed to any extension of authority to Mitchell, pulled most of these teeth out of the bill. "What resulted," says Mitchell ruefully, "is a monstrosity. It's a waste of money. We can't investigate or even require a uniform report form. The trustees of these funds could send in their report on the back of a piece of wallpaper and conform with the law."

Predictably, Mitchell has had little help from the ranking Republican on the Senate Labor Committee, BARRY GOLDWATER. On the House Labor Committee, Mitchell has had some assistance from Republicans CARROLL KEARNS and PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, but they are not very influential, and their help has been more than offset by the hostility of CHARLES HALLECK, the Republican floor leader in the House (who would also like to be NIXON'S running mate this year). In 1959, HALLECK and his Senator counterpart, EVERETT DIRKSEN, visited the President, talked cold political turkey with him, and got him to televise a speech in which the President came out for labor-reform legislation that went much further than Mitchell wanted in regulating the internal affairs of unions.

Mitchell's difficulties are intensified by the fact that, never having been a working politician, he has no independent base in his own political party. Beyond that, he is beset by problems that arise from the fundamental ambiguity of his role: speaking for a Republican administration that is friendly to business, he must deal with a labor movement that is largely Democratic. It is often forgoten that Congress has entrusted the Secretary of Labor with promoting "the welfare of the wage earners of the United States." It is natural that in fulfilling this obligation Mitchell has made enemies, not only within the administration, and in Congress, but in the business community too. The American Retail Federation, for instance, is vitriolic in its criticism of Mitchell's role in minimum-wage battles. Officials of the NAM and the chamber of commerce speak, in private, as if they considered Mitchell a captive of the labor movement. Meanwhile, as a matter of personal conviction, Mitchell has often felt obliged to take positions that put him out of favor with organized labor. The 1954 Taft-Hartley amendments, of which Mitchell was the chief author, were damned by the CIO as "worse than Taft-Hartley." Even before the McClellan committee hearings had dramatized the need for labor reform, Mitchell used his own bureaucratic authority to tighten substantially the financial-reporting requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act. During the debate on Landrum-Griffin, he infuriated many unionists by calling for restrictions on so-called "blackmail picketing." He has not appointed unionists to important Department of Labor posts.

LABOR NEUTRALITY?

Yet Mitchell has managed to maintain warm ties with many top labor officials, in large measure because, as one union man put it, "He understands our problems. He speaks our language." Consequently, the administration today is getting along more comfortably with the labor movement than many ever thought possible. George Meany has on occasion made a point of toning down staff criticisms of the Department of Labor. Jacob Potofsky of the Clothing Workers, David Dubinsky of the Ladies' Garment Workers, George Leighty of the Railroad Telegraphers are among the many labor leaders who regard Mitchell with respect. Since the steel settlement, Mr. McDonald of the Steelworkers has had nothing but praise for Mitchel (and NIXON).

The Secretary cultivates personal friendships with union leaders. Yet in itself this will probably not help his vice presidential chances, for the odds are heavy that labor will continue its traditional commitment to a Democratic ticket—even with Mitchell as NIXON'S running mate. The unions will certainly not endorse a Republican ticket. However, if the Democrats nominated LYNDON JOHNSON, the unions would face a serious dilemma. They dislike and mistrust JOHNSON as much as they generally admire and like Mitchell. The juxtaposition of JOHNSON on the Democratic ticket and Mitchell on the Republican could, indeed, induce political schizophrenia in many top unionists, and possibly persuade them to sit out the national campaign, a decision that would cost the Democrats a lot of campaign money and manpower.

In the meantime, while he is keeping an eye on the vice presidential situation, Mitchell has other irons in the fire. He was a $50,000-a-year industrial-relations executive for Bloomingdale's department store in New York before going to Washington in 1953. He has been offered twice that amount to return to private employment, but has turned it down. He has also turned down any suggestion that he continue as Secretary of Labor in a NIXON administration. There has been talk that he might run for the governorship of New Jersey in 1961. But Mitchell is not likely to plunge into that race unless he can be promised in advance, that he will not face primary opposition and that he will have an ample campaign war chest. This is a stiff price to exact from his party, and it may well be too high, considering the factionalism among New Jersey Republicans.

However, if the GOP wins in November and Mitchell is not at that time the new Vice President, he would still be in line for high administration responsibility. What that may be it is too early to tell. But it is safe to predict that the Republicans, however the conservatives among them may feel, will be unable to ignore him.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Massing of Colors Ceremony Under Auspices of the Military Order of World Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by me on June 11 at the Peaks of Otter, Va., in connection with the ceremonies opening the James River Bridge on the Blue Ridge Parkway.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ceremony today, opening the bridge over the James River, completes another link in the great Blue Ridge Parkway connecting the Senandoah and the Great Smoky Mountains National Parks. This truly may be called a royal road of our mountain empire in Virginia.

It will soon be completed and the parkway will be 469 miles in length—the longest continuous scenic highway in the world.

If, from this pleasant place, you will let your eye follow the panorama, you will be reminded that half the population of the United States is fortunate enough to be within overnight driving distance from some point on this wonderful drive.

Think of the natural scenery there is to see, the pleasant recreational things there are to do, and the historic sites there are to visit. They are all around us here; they abound throughout Virginia's 41,000 square miles ranging from the mountains to the sea.

It is no wonder that newspapers within the month have reported that Virginia has more visitors than any other State in the Union. And for them to use, we are proud to present our billion-dollar State highway system of more than 52,000 miles.

The State department of highways recently announced that nearly 39 million visitors entered Virginia last year by automobile. Perhaps the total number of visitors approached 45 million. By the most conservative estimate Virginia's visitors are spending "in excess of $600 million a year."

Our attractions for people outside of Virginia are among our greatest assets. And this asset is enhanced by our accessibility. Cross-country highway Route 60 terminates in Virginia, and two other major highway routes—1 and 11—traverse the State north and south.

And this is not all. Nature is our partner. Our temperatures are moderate. Our rainfall is good. Our topography is favorable. We are gifted with the shores of the sea, the rolling country of the Piedmont, and the mountains with their valleys.

Our history is vivid and traceable. Our scenery and natural assets lend themselves to preservation and use. Our progress is sound and steady. Our transportation and facilities are good and safe. And, perhaps, our greatest asset is the hospitality of our people themselves.

The National Park Service has given magnanimous recognition to our scenery, our recreational possibilities and our history in the form of this parkway, the Shenandoah and the Cumberland Gap National Parks, the Colonial National Historical Park, and five national battlefield parks.

The State itself has established a system of nine State parks offering recreational facilities characteristic of every section of the State. Virginia pioneered in marking her highways with attractive signs telling the story of points of interest for the benefit of passing motorists.

And I venture no State in the Union has more to tell, or does it more concisely. We have the cradle of the Republic in Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown. We have the homes of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Harrison, Tyler, Taylor, and Wilson, along with those of Mason, Henry, Lee, and countless more of the Nation's great.

We have the battlefields of the Revolution and the War Between the States. We have one of the capitals of the Confederacy. We have the ports and military sites of World Wars I and II. We have the Tomb of the Unknowns. We have historic churches, colleges, and mansions.

We have some of the wonders of the world, such as the great stalagmites and stalactites of our nine caverns, our Natural Bridge, our Natural Tunnel, our Natural Chimneys, and our Mountain Lake.

We have two great national forests. We have beautiful gardens, wild flowers, and flowering trees. We have waterfalls and beautiful springs. We have the ocean, and our bays and rivers.

Streams come into existence in nearly all areas of the State. We have inland lakes—some natural, and some made—in nearly every section. With our woods and waters, hunting and fishing is unsurpassed.

There are more than 100 good golf courses in the State. Hunt races and horse shows are numerous. We have annual festivals at Winchester, Norfolk, Claytor Lake, Charlottesville, Richmond, and in other places. There is wild pony penning at Chincoteague, jousting at Natural Chimneys, and the dog mart at Fredericksburg.

We have the Barter Theater at Abingdon, and the arts and crafts festival at Waterford. There is the Common Glory at Williamsburg. There is the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, with its mobile units. Virginia is, indeed, a place for the Nation to enjoy.

I think the Nation is doing it more and more. I believe we are seeing only the beginning. Some $26 million was spent in the State last year on construction of about 150 motels. All of us can be for expansion of an industry which makes people happier and healthier and more appreciative of their country and the principles for which it stands.

Equal Rights for All Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Times. This editorial deals with the question of "Equal Rights for all Citizens." It often seems to me that this Nation is so involved in questions of defense and international maneuvering that it ignores a basic problem on our own doorsteps.

There are two paragraphs in this editorial that are especially meaningful to me. The first is:

In the field of civil rights lies the basic difference between American democracy and Soviet communism. The rise of Russian dictatorship is history's greatest challenge to our free form of government.

The second paragraph states that:

Faithful protection of civil rights is worth more in favorable world sentiment, than billions in foreign aid. In the final analysis it may be worth more than squadrons of missiles.

I should like for the RECORD to show that I agree with these sentiments completely. I do not intend to neglect the defenses of this Nation or to slight our problems of diplomacy. But all our efforts to build up a powerful defense and all our efforts to improve our diplomatic position in the world can well be meaningless until we give to every American citizen the rights that are guaranteed to him under our Constitution and under our laws.

The editorial follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, June 2, 1960]

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL CITIZENS

The United States is the first great Government on earth ever dedicated to the proposition that the individual citizen, however humble, has rights which his Government may not deny and must defend.

The Founding Fathers were interested primarily in protecting themselves against the tyranny of a degenerate British king.

But tyranny is a constant menace in any state, whether it be the tyranny of a king, a dictator, an entrenched bureaucracy, or a selfish majority.

To protect against this tyranny the privileges and immunities of American citizens are written into the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, aptly termed the "Bill of Rights," and into further amendments, including the 14th and 15th.

It is these amendments which guard freedom of religion, free speech, free press, the right to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for redress of grievances. They protect also against arbitrary searches of homes and seizures of property, provide that a citizen can't be forced to testify against himself and guarantee trial by jury.

The 14th amendment forbids any abridgments on the privileges of U.S. citizenship. The 15th specifically protects the right to vote, forbidding it to be denied "on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

Through long custom, Americans take these rights for granted, tending to forget that, over a large area of the world, they are denied and held to scorn.

In the field of civil rights lies the basic difference between American democracy and Soviet communism. The rise of Russian

dictatorship is history's greatest challenge to our free form of Government.

Ours is a Government of law, rather than the whims or prejudices of men. In the faithful observance of the law lies the positive answer to communism.

This observance is of primary importance to the future since the tolerated violation of one law sets the precedent for defiance of any law which may be irksome, hence threatens the gradual disintegration of our system with all its protection of rights of citizens.

But, in addition to that, the newly freed nations are inspired in large measure by our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution and the words of our American democratic philosophers. They watch anxiously to note whether the United States means what it says.

Faithful protection of civil rights is worth more in favorable world sentiment, than billions in foreign aid. In the final analysis it may be morth more than squadrons of missiles.

The voter should require sane leadership, as opposed to demagogic promises. But we must move steadily toward enforcement and acceptance of civil rights as guaranteed by the fundamental law of our land—the Constitution.

In judging among the candidates for office, in the election this November, the voter must place great weight on understanding of, and dedication to, the cause of equal rights for all citizens.

Poll for Democratic Candidate for President Conducted in State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I recently received from Mr. Earl M. Curry, Jr., of Pineville, W. Va., together with the results of a poll conducted by Mr. Curry. Mr. Curry polled the members of the Democratic executive committees in the seven counties of the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, and a return of approximately 30 percent indicates that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON led among those persons who responded to Mr. Curry's questionnaire.

There being no objection, the letter and poll results were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINEVILLE FURNITURE CO.,
Pineville, W. Va.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a copy of the poll I took in the fifth district. I sent this questionnaire to the members of the Democratic executive committees in the seven counties of the district. The 1958 West Virginia Blue Book was my source of addresses.

I had approximately a 30-percent answer to my questionnaire. If there is any other information on this poll that I can give you I will be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

EARL M. CURRY, Jr.

In a poll taken of the members of the county Democratic executive committees of the seven counties in the Fifth Congressional District the results were as follows:

[Percent]

	Of those voting		
	1st	2d	3d
Stevenson	19	19	18
Symington	14	19	8
Kennedy	19	18	21
Humphrey	3	30	21
Johnson	45	14	10

These percentages represent the choice of those polled for the Democratic candidate for President, in the order of their preference.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
County of Wyoming ss:

I, Earl M. Curry, Jr., do solemnly swear the foregoing statements are true to the best of my knowledge and ability.

EARL M. CURRY, Jr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of April 1960.

VIRGINIA BUTCHER,
Notary Public.

My commission expires February 17, 1963.

Economic Recovery Does Not Require the Stimulus of Increased Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the other day, in the course of consideration of the tax-extension bill, it was alleged that it required the Korean war to bring the economy out of the depression into which it had slipped during 1949. I replied at the time, using annual data.

Upon my return to my office I happened to pick up an article entitled "Underwriting Prosperity" by Harold I. Lunde, an associate professor of economics at Macalester College, who reviews the economic situation between 1948–49 and 1949–50, comparing the peaks and troughs of 1948, 1949, and 1950 on the basis of quarterly data. Professor Lunde establishes, on the basis of an analysis of the data on a quarterly basis, that there was a $17 billion gain, or recovery, before Korea. His analysis is as follows:

Economic changes in 1948–49 (in billions of dollars)

Gross National Product	−9
Consumption	+3
Private investment	−14
Houses	+1
Factories and Tools	−5
Inventories	−10
Foreign Investment	−1
Federal Government	0
State and Local	+3

High: 1948 4th quarter GNP equals 266.
Low: 1949 4th quarter GNP equals 257.

This was a modest 3½ percent recession. GNP fell $9 billion from a peak of $266 billion. The recession lasted 1 year from top to bottom. Unemployment reached 4.6 million or 7 percent of the labor force.

Business spending for factories, tools and inventories fell $15 billion. Net foreign investment decreased by another billion. This gross decline of $16 billion was offset by a $3 billion rise in consumption, a $1 billion increase in housing, and a $3 billion gain in State and local government spending. Federal spending did not change. The gains add up to $7 billion. Thus the decline in GNP was held to only $9 billion.

1949–50 recovery before Korea

[In billions of dollars]

Gross national product	+17
Consumption	+6
Private investment	+17
Houses	+3
Factories and tools	+3
Inventories	+11
Foreign investment	−1
Federal Government	−5
State and local	0

Low: 1949, 4th quarter GNP=257.
High: 1950, 2d quarter GNP=274.

GNP increased $17 billion in 6 months after the bottom of the recession was reached. This recovery, in only half the time taken by the decline, was almost twice the size of the recession.

Government spending did not bring the recovery. Federal expenditures fell $5 billion while State and local spending remained unchanged. Foreign investment declined another billion dollars. This total decline of $6 billion was overpowered by a $17 billion growth in private investment and a $6 billion gain in consumption.

Mr. Speaker, this reinforces my view that economic recovery did not, and does not, require the stimulus of increased defense spending.

Preservation of the Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, three recent letters to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald have commented significantly on the pending wilderness bill (S. 1123) the comittee print three version of which is now being considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. One of these letters criticized the bill as undesirable by those who may wish to build dams in areas of wilderness. A reply to this justified the wilderness bill. A later comment by the noted land-use authority, Benton MacKaye, honorary president of the Wilderness Society, pointed out the Americanism of preserving wilderness. All three letters were occasioned by an editorial in support of the wilderness bill that appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 2, 1960.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Wilderness Detour," and the letter to the editor appearing in this paper on May 9, 1960, by Secretary-Manager William E. Welsh of the National Reclamation Association, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with the letter in reply to Mr. Welsh that appeared in the May 14, 1960, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary and editor of the Wilderness Society, and also the letter to the editor by Benton MacKaye that appeared in the same paper on May 26, 1960, with the title, "Saving the Wild."

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1960]

WILDERNESS DETOUR

Once again, the Senate Interior Committee is due to act on the wilderness bill, and once again opponents of this basic conservation measure are seeking to confuse, divide, and scuttle. When the committee acts, it will have before it not only a model bill with the broadest possible support, but also an amendment in the nature of a substitute introduced by Senators O'MAHONEY and ALLOTT.

Whatever the motives of the two Senators, their substitute has been gleefully seized upon by opponents of all wilderness legislation. The National Reclamation Association, which fears that wilderness preservation might interfere with dam construction, declares that the substitute is "far preferable to any other wilderness legislation proposed thus far."

Mr. O'MAHONEY's behavior is curious and illogical. Last year, he detected bureaucratic perils in the wilderness bill and announced his opposition. A meeting was then held in his office last January 27 at which the Senator agreed to amendments which met his objections and gave his blessings to the bill. Now he has suddenly introduced a bill fraught with the very bureaucratic complexities he has denounced.

The wilderness areas are vaguely defined in Mr. O'MAHONEY's bill and the U.S. Geological Survey is given a virtual veto power over selection of areas worthy of preservation. These are only some of the defects. The committee ought to repulse Mr. O'MAHONEY's mischievous substitute and report out the bill that offers the best hope of preserving for all time some portions of our unspoiled wild.

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1960]

WILDERNESS DETOUR

In your May 2 editorial "Wilderness Detour" you referred to the National Reclamation Association.

Approximately two-thirds of the members of the association are irrigation farmers. These people have as great, if not a greater reason for being interested in conservation than any other group of citizens. They must have a well-sustained streamflow runoff for the irrigation of crops during the hot summer months in that arid and semiarid region. They cannot survive without irrigation water during that period. Good conservation practices on the watersheds could mean the difference between success and failure for them.

These people live close to the area which would be included in the proposed wilderness systems. They have a thorough understanding of the problem. They believe in conservation as defined by two of the greatest conservationists this Nation has yet known: former President Theodore Roosevelt and our first Chief Forester Gifford Pinchot. These men gave a broad practical meaning to conservation. To them conservation meant the use of the natural resources for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

Wilderness, as proposed in the legislation before the Congress would mean the very opposite. In wilderness areas there would be no roads, no campsites, no use of the natural resources. It would mean setting aside vast areas of our public lands for the benefit of only a select few. Its enjoyment would be limited to those with a strong physique and ample finances.

We believe that the natural resources which are to be found in these great public land areas, most of which are in the West, were placed there by the Divine Creator for the benefit of all mankind. We believe the Forest Service gives us a good illustration of how these areas should be utilized. The protection of the watershed for the production of that most important of all natural resources—water—should be the primary consideration but all other available resources within a region should be used in such manner as not to do damage to the watershed. Yes, there should be use—in fact, multiple use of all these resources—but there must be use without abuse.

The Forest Service areas, with its good roads, and numerous campsites, are always available for enjoyment by the average American family. They are readily accessible, either by the old jalopy or the modern station wagon.

Another point that is often overlooked is the fact that, because of the rough and rugged terrain of much of the mountainous regions of the West, there will always be vast areas that must forever remain wilderness in spite of all that man can do. Former Senator William E. Borah, when he first viewed from across Red Fish Lake the majestic and incomparable Saw Tooth Mountains, is quoted as saying, "Man need not attempt to create a park here. God has already created a park far beyond the ability of man to either add or detract."

Yes, we believe in true conservtaion. We believe in conservation as defined by our two greatest conservationists, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot—conservation as it has been practiced by the Forest Service for more than half a century. We believe that true conservation means the use of the natural resources for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

WILLIAM E. WELSH,
Secretary-Manager,
National Reclamation Association.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1960]

WILDERNESS DETOUR

William E. Welch's May 9 letter in behalf of the National Reclamation Association in opposition to wilderness preservation is an excellent candid statement from his point of view, but it corroborates rather than refutes your May 2 editorial, "Wilderness Detour" in support of the wilderness bill, to which it refers.

Your editorial, I note, identifies Mr. Welch's organization as opposed to wilderness preservation and accordingly cites his support of Senator O'MAHONEY's so-called substitute with Senator ALLOTT's proviso as evidence that this O'Mahoney-Allott proposal is not a wilderness-preservation measure at all but part of what you described as efforts to confuse, divide, and scuttle. Mr. Welch's May 9 letter documents your contention very well.

Mr. Welch in behalf of the National Reclamation Association has been a consistent, candid, and respected opponent of the wilderness bill, for he has stated clearly that he does not want wilderness areas protected from dams and reservoirs and therefore he opposes this legislation. His honorable opposition is an excellent proof of the need for legislation if we are to preserve any areas of wilderness, for we believe there should be a few areas that remain free of such installations.

Those who advocate wilderness legislation do not, however, oppose reclamation. They recognize the interests of the irrigation farmers who are Mr. Welch's clients but maintain that these interests can be served through programs that can be so planned as to provide also for saving some of the land in wilderness.

All the areas presently affected by the wilderness bill are now in wilderness status in the National Park System, the national forests, or wildlife refuges, or ranges. Any areas added in the future would first be subject to a stringent procedure that includes public notice, hearings, and congressional scrutiny.

Altogether, at the best, the area of wilderness that can be saved under the wilderness bill program is only a little more than 2 percent. Its advocates believe that in the remaining 97 or 98 percent of the land there are adequate sites for the dams and water-control and storage structures to serve the irrigators. We believe that reclamationists who are in so many ways the beneficiaries of the Federal Government can afford to allow the preservation as wilderness of at least a 50th of our land.

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Executive Secretary,
The Wilderness Society.

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1960]

SAVING THE WILD

A recent letter by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, takes stock of a stock criticism of the wilderness bill now pending before Congress. The complaint referred to is that, under the bill, too much land would be set aside for wilderness. This is a very good point, because it focuses attention sharply on a basic question of land use; namely, what proportion of land space ought to be devoted, by a patriotically proud Nation, to plain love of country, as against plain living making?

American wilderness is but another name for America. I refer of course to the realistic physical America, with its rocks and rills and templed hills and all the rest that gives real substance to any real spirit claimed by the 100-percent American. All that remains of this original America is what is contained in the wilderness areas.

Mr. Zahniser in his letter states that the areas of wilderness that can be saved under the wilderness bill program would cover a little more than 2 percent of the Nation's total. This would leave at least 97 percent for living making. This much would seem to be ample for a Nation priding itself on its genius in this well-known art. Yet some people claim it is not enough, and that 2 percent is too much for love of country. These folks no doubt make no pretense of being "100 percenters."

Question—could they, by some strain of the mathematical imagination, claim even to be "2 percenters?"

BENTON MACKAYE,
Honorary President of the Wilderness Society.
WASHINGTON.

Defense Appropriations and the Bomarc Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as the conference committee of the House and the Senate meet today to resolve the differences between the House bill and Senate bill on the defense appropriation for fiscal 1961, I call upon the House Members participating in that conference to accept the action of the other body on the procurement of Bomarc missiles.

I do so because the Senate bill reflects the latest and best clarification of the importance of the Bomarc program in the maintenance of a strong continental defense system.

When the other body approved in full the Air Force request for Bomarc funds, it enjoyed the benefits of, and was acting upon, information which was not available at the time the House passed its defense appropriation bill. At the time the House acted on this appropriation, the Bomarcs had not entirely proved themselves to be effective weapons. Even so, the Air Force felt that its Bomarc request represented its best judgment on the importance of the Bomarc missile in the defense of this Nation and our neighbor to the north, Canada. The judgment of the Air Force has since been confirmed by several completely successful performances which the Bomarcs have made in test flights against simulated enemy aircraft, and in the recent Senate action restoring the cut by the House made in Bomarc funds.

In my judgment the Senate action represents the practice of sound economy, because the Bomarc program, as projected by the Air Force, would be less costly than the alternative which the House approved. When the House cut the Bomarc request, it authorized expenditures for the procurement of additional F–106 jet fighters to do the defense job which the Air Force has intended that the Bomarcs do. At a greater cost, the F–106's cannot do the job which the Bomarcs would do, simply because the F–106's cannot be constructed and integrated into a continental defense system as quickly as the Bomarcs can.

If the conferees of the House and the other body reach agreement today on the defense appropriation, their report may reach the House floor tomorrow. I urge not only that the House conferees endorse the action of the other body on the Bomarc request, but also that the House itself concur in this action for these reasons: First, as I have already observed, the Senate action represents the best judgment not only of its Members, but of our military experts on the proper and necessary role of the Bomarcs in our defense program. Second, that the Bomarcs will give us a greater overall defense capability at less cost than would the alternative of using jet fighters which, at the same time, cannot be procured as quickly as Bomarcs. And last, that the approval of the Bomarc request will permit the Air Force to fulfill our obligation to our Canadian allies to provide the Bomarcs to fill the launching sites which the Canadian Government already has under construction.

Forest Products Lab Has 50th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the spirit of stewardship, we, as Americans, have the opportunity to enjoy and utilize, but also a responsibility to conserve the invaluable natural resources inherited in our great Nation.

Throughout our history, fortunately, far-sighted leadership has enabled us to conserve such resources.

About 50 years ago, for example, there was established in Madison, Wis., a forest products laboratory. The purpose of the project was to set up a research program for best utilization, management, and conservation of our forest lands.

During its brief, 50-year lifetime, the research laboratory, under Federal jurisdiction—but often cooperating with private industry—has accomplished a tremendously significant record.

Recently, the Wisconsin agriculturalist published an informative article, reviewing a score of the accomplishments by the laboratory.

Reflecting the outstanding work of the research center in utilization, management, conservation of our forests, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST PRODUCTS LAB HAS 50TH BIRTHDAY—U.S. FOREST SERVICE BEGAN RESEARCH AT THE MADISON LABORATORY IN 1910

This is the golden anniversary year for the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison.

Fifty years ago when it started on the University of Wisconsin campus, it was the only wood research laboratory in the world. Its research workers had but crude tools to work with but they got their work off to a good start. The goal they set was to find new ways of making forest products to serve man.

The pattern began in the late 1800's, when the first stirring of professional forestry began in this country. In Europe, forestry had been practiced for three centuries, but with little research, none of which was of much value to this country.

In 1890 a little forest products research was started in cooperation with a number of universities. The Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture began work on naval stores in the South and did some experimental pulping at Boston. But by 1898 the Forestry Division had only 12 employees.

FOREST SERVICE BORN

The old roughrider, Teddy Roosevelt, appointed Gifford Pinchot head of the Forestry Division in 1898. Later the division was changed to a bureau. In 1905 it became the Forest Service, still with Pinchot in charge.

Roosevelt and Pinchot were conservationists. "Forestry," said Roosevelt, "is the preservation of forests by wise use." He said this at a time when forests were being slashed down ruthlessly. Little was being done to use byproducts which were going to waste, or to insure future forest yields.

Throughout this period of forest exploitation Pinchot, with Roosevelt's backing, was hammering out the pattern of the U.S. Forest Service. As a part of it a branch of Forest Products was set up.

STRUGGLE TO GET STARTED

This was a time of probing for the whole Forest Service. The Forest Products branch was forced to find help wherever it could. The research efforts were scattered. There was no central wood research center where experiments could be conducted under standard conditions.

Feelers sent out in 1909 brought several generous offers. Finally the proposal of the University of Wisconsin, under President Charles R. Van Hise, was accepted. Van Hise offered a new building complete with heat, light, and power. Research workers began their move to Madison before the year was over. The building was finished in the spring of 1910 and opened its doors on June 4.

The Forest Products Laboratory soon outgrew its original building. In 1930 Congress appropriated $750,000 for a new five-story building. The University of Wisconsin furnished 10 acres of land west of the campus for this building, which was built as part of the depression public works program. The building was finished in 1932.

Research work at the Forest Products Laboratory has covered a wide range—from how to make fenceposts last longer to how rocket fuels made from wood will react in outer space. A few of the important research milestones are listed below.

RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS

Semichemical pulping is used by 47 pulping plants today. This process accounts for 2.3 million tons of pulp made into products worth $300 million.

The cold soda pulping process, recently developed, was responsible for the use of 200,000 cords of hardwood in 1959 for which there had been no market. This wood was converted into 208,000 tons of paper worth $25 million.

Prefabricated houses depend heavily on research done at the Forest Products Laboratory. Over 75 percent of the prefabricated houses built today use basic construction developed at the Laboratory.

Many farm buildings, churches, schools, and other buildings use laminated wood arches developed at the Laboratory. Plywood, too, has been improved by basic research in laminated wood.

Lumber kilns for drying lumber are standard in the wood industry. Over 5,000 kilns in use today depend on facts uncovered by Forest Service scientists at the Laboratory. The gross value of the lumber these kilns dry is $300 million a year.

Packaging has had a big boost from research work. The annual packaging cost in this country is $8 billion. Every industry, as well as every individual consumer, depends heavily on modern packaging techniques. Packaging is partly responsible for our high standard of living.

In the future we can see this Nation's population growing faster than the supply of raw materials. The Forest Products Laboratory is seeking ways to use wood that is now going to waste to help stretch our forest resources.

Accounting for Congressional Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative, I believe, that the House take action prior to adjournment next month on legislation to establish a workable and effective system for the public accounting by Members of Congress of their expenditures of public funds.

Only in this way can we help erase the suspicion and cynicism among the people bred by reports of loose handling and inaccurate accounting of public moneys by Members of Congress. Only in this way can we help to restore the confidence of the people in the integrity of their elected representatives—a confidence that is essential to the proper functioning of free, representative government.

In order to encourage the earliest possible action by the House, I have introduced a comprehensive bill which I believe would establish the necessary procedures in the legislative accounting system of the House to assure full, frequent, and public understanding and control of House expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member of Congress who has publicly objected to legislation of this kind or who has maintained that some kind of reform is unnecessary. On the contrary, there is general agreement that present accounting procedures are inadequate to protect the public interest. For these reasons, therefore, I urge the leadership of the House, on both sides, to make it possible for the House to act during this session on expense accounting legislation. Since the House Administration Committee is presently studying this matter, there seems to be no good reason why a bill cannot be reported in time for action this year.

The principal provisions of my bill, Mr. Speaker, are as follows:

No payment could be made from the contingent fund of the House except in accordance with regulations issued by the House Administration Committee and on vouchers approved by that committee.

All such vouchers approved for payment, together with supporting documentation, would be available for public inspection.

At least once every 6 months, the Comptroller General of the United States would audit all disbursements from the contingent fund and within 30 days after completion of the audit would report the results to the Speaker of the House and the House Administration Committee.

Within 30 days from their return from foreign travel, for the purpose of investigation, study, meetings, or conferences, each Member of the House and Senate would be required to file with the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration or the House Administration Committee a statement of expenses including: an accounting of foreign counterpart funds used for the Member's expenses, the number and identity of all persons in the party, and information concerning expenses, if any, paid for husbands or wives of Members from Government or counterpart funds and services, if any, performed by such persons for the Government.

At the beginning of each session of Congress, all such expense statements together with a detailed statement of the manner in which the contingent fund of the House has been expended during the preceding year would be printed as a House document.

Certain provisions of present law, including the "finality clause" which hold that payments approved by the House Administration Committee are conclusive on all departments and officers of the Government, would be repealed.

These Are My Favorite Things—Heart Fund Contest in Alaska

REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, some time ago radio KBYR of Anchorage, Alaska, sponsored a contest in connection with the heart fund drive. A goodly number of prizes were offered to the contestants writing the best essays or poems, 100 words or less, on the theme "These Are My Favorite Things." This theme was adapted from the title of a song made popular by Miss Mary Martin, whose appearance in Alaska on behalf of the Alaska Crippled Children's Association endeared her to the people of the 49th State. Mr. President, the general manager of KBYR, Mr. E. "Doc" Pournelle, has made available to me a few of the entries in the contest. I ask unanimous consent that several of these entries, including the first prize winning entry by Lloyd Slagle of Anchorage and the second prize winner by Elizabeth Tower of Anchorage, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the entries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY FAVORITE THINGS
(By Lloyd Slagle)

The morning sun on a fishing stream,
Hot apple pie with thick, whipped cream,
A baby's sweet smile reserved just for kings,
These are a few of my favorite things.
Winter's first blanket of clean, fallen snow,
A letter from home when spirits are low,
The first flocks of geese on homeward-bound wings,
These are a few of my favorite things.
The unequaled essence of campfire smoke,
Being able to laugh when you're hungry and broke,
Of all the joys each new day brings,
These are a few of my favorite things.

MY FAVORITE THINGS
(By Elizabeth A. Tower)

To fill my lungs with air that's fresh,
To stretch with joy my bones and flesh;
To join with friends beside a fire,
To feel the warmth its flames inspire;
To see revealed as ice-fogs rise,
The world in sugary disguise;
To watch the sunset color change,
On distant snowy mountain range;
To have ideas both new and free,
To make creations come to be;
To give of self and love the giving,
To glimpse a purpose in my living;
My joy in these I here renew,
Where smog and custom hide not view.

THESE ARE MY FAVORITE THINGS
(By Mrs. U. E. Schulz)

I would top my list of favorite things with our great new State of Alaska with its fabulous natural beauty, the genuine friendliness of its people and their desire to help others.

A cow moose with her calf nibbling on a young birch tree at the edge of a clearing, the afternoon sun changing the snowy white mountains to a glorious array of pink, orange, and red; the dancing delicately tinted aurora in the northern sky on a clear winter night are favorites with me.

(By Ickuk Anaktuvuk)

This is my contribution to the Heart Fund. Blueberries and tomatoes and frozen sheefish, whale oil and muktuk and exotic dishes. Filter tip ciggs, and chrome-plated lighter. These are a few of my things favorite. When the wind wails and the power fails I turn on my transistor and hearing old Doc's sound like his mouth full of rocks. Then I head for liquor store.

Tokyo Riots Laid to Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal which I received from Mr. Barnee Breeskin, Barnee Breeskin Enterprises, Washington, D.C., with which he forwards a column by Mr. Lee Mortimer from the New York Mirror of Saturday, June 18, 1960, entitled, "Tokyo Riots Laid to Dope":

BARNEE BREESKIN ENTERPRISES,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1960.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thought you would like to read last Saturday's Daily Mirror, in which Lee Mortimer puts his finger on a major problem that is being lost in the situation all over the world. Please read the words carefully about the type of insidious project of dope infiltration that doubtless was brought to Tokyo by Communist money and could probably be at the root of much of the Cuban situation.

Knowing how fearless and forthright you are, I wonder if you will give some thought and project this idea for close scrutiny. If you think well of it, I would like the insertion to be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

BARNEE.

TOKYO RIOTS LAID TO DOPE

(By Lee Mortimer)

You can blame dope for the almost unbelievable frenzy of thousands of Red-led students whose rioting forced cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Japan.

For weeks before the President's scheduled arrival, the students were hopped up with cocaine, marihuana, and hahish—provided freely behind the scenes by Communist plotters.

I saw the advance planning for the demonstrations in Tokyo only a few weeks ago. Students not old enough to vote tramped through streets demanding that Americans leave Korea.

It did not require an expert to determine that they had been keyed into a state of fury by large and unadulterated doses of dope, in all its insidious forms.

The saddest part of it all is that until Korean and Chinese Reds—working closely with the Tokyo underworld and international mobsters—got going, Japan never had a major narcotics problem.

Now, thousands have been transformed into dangerous junkies—fed by dope-pushers working out of coffeeshops, espresso clubs, beatnik jazz joints, and ginza and Shinjuku beer halls. They are indeed poor substitutes for the delicate and historic tea and geisha houses which other younger generations knew.

What does all this point to? A revival by Reds of the conspiracy since time immemorial by would-be conquerors to weaken a people and a nation with opium.

How much of it has poured into Japan in the past decade?

The United Nations Commission on Narcotics Drugs was informed as recently as April 29, 1960, that an estimated $278 million in dope was smuggled into Japan from Communist China in the past 10 years.

The Communists and international dope-syndicate bosses have found it profitable to work hand in glove to finance the "big dope show" in Japan.

From the fields where the poppy grows, dope is sent by Red Chinese to Hong Kong and then loaded aboard junks and other boats for shipping to the Land of the Rising Sun.

After being processed in Hong Kong, heroin is turned over to gangsters who, through intermediaries get the stuff through to Tokyo.

They use seamen, crewmen aboard planes and even armed services personnel—recruited by bar girls in Hong Kong, Yokohama and Seoul—to carry the deadly cargo of dope to its destinations.

Red North Korea is another major source of supply for Japan. Koreans posses a unique diplomatic status in Japan which enables them to move freely in and out of the big Red Korean colony that lies between Tokyo and Yokohama—not too far from Handa Airport where Ike would have landed had he gone to Japan.

South Korea informed the United Nations that of 700 Red North Korean agents captured in its territory, 40 percent carried narcotics.

The global illicit narcotics traffic picture is indeed a dismal one.

But, it is aggravated by the fact that the United States is now the target of a heroin traffic originating in Red China and other Far Eastern areas. And dope is being smuggled via Japan to our west coast ports.

Thus it is that the Red plotters—who doped thousands of the students who rioted in Tokyo against Ike's visit—are also aiming their dope offensive at America * * * with the connivance of international gangsters.

Tributes to Television Station WGN–TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most important radio and television stations in the Midwest is WGN and WGN–TV (channel 9). It has served the communities within reach of Chicago with many programs of high quality, both on public questions and in the entertainment field.

It gave me real personal pleasure, and was a real tribute to the station's able general manager, Mr. Ward N. Quaal, when WGN–TV recently received two national awards for excellence. Its "Great Music" hour shared the Peabody Award for musical entertainment. At the same time, its news department, under Mr. Tom Foy, received the Sigma Delta Chi Award for distinguished reporting, because of the way it handled the news in regard to an airplane crash.

Notwithstanding the fact that the owner of the station, the Chicago Tribune, and I are known to have differed sharply on many political issues, I am glad to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various newspaper articles describing these awards and the text of the Sigma Delta Chi Award.

There being no objection, the articles and the award were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION FOR THE WGN–TV NEWS DEPARTMENT, CHICAGO, ILL.

For distinguished service in the field of television reporting during 1959, the Sigma Delta Chi award is made to the WGN–TV News Department, Chicago, Ill.

In its coverage of an air crash near Midway Airport, WGN–TV displayed an ability, not only to get the story in the face of obstacles, but to get it accurately, completely, effectively and uniquely.

WGN–TV obviously got to the crash scene quickly and recorded a comprehensive film story under difficult, predawn conditions. A vivid, direct assessment of loss of life, injuries and property damage, an eyewitness account and a unique follow-up interview with injured victims in hospitals were outstanding. Film editing was good both from the standpoint of telling a complete story and furnishing an interesting mixture of air shots, closeups and varying range shots of the aircraft, crowds and damaged buildings.

All in all, the coverage was full, complete, well-rounded and technically excellent.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 20, 1960]

SYMPHONY WINS TOP TV AWARD

(By Larry Wolters)

WGN–TV's "Great Music From Chicago" received the coveted George Foster Peabody Award Tuesday. The "Play of the Week," created by WNTA, Newark, which is carried by WGN–TV Sunday nights, also won a Peabody award.

The winners, along with others, were announced at a luncheon meeting of the radio and TV executives society in New York City by Bennett Cerf, Peabody board chairman. The awards were presented by Dean John E. Drewry, of the University of Georgia's Henry W. Grady School of Journalism.

"Great Music From Chicago" shared the awards under the category TV entertainment, musical, with the "Bell Telephone Hour" presented on NBC.

The awards were set up in 1940 by the Georgia school to recognize the most distinguished and meritorious service to broadcasting to memorialize the late Mr. Peabody, New York philanthropist.

The citation to WGN–TV read: "The George Foster Peabody award is hereby presented to WGN–TV for its distinguished series, "Great Music From Chicago," featuring the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. This prestige program, presented live and in color, with many of the world's outstanding conductors taking turns on the podium, represents an unmatched effort to bring the best in music to the public and contributes vastly toward improving the image of the television art."

Ward L. Quaal, vice president and general manager of WGN, Inc., accepted the award.

Quaal noted that this is the first time a Chicago station has won Peabody awards 2 years in a row. Last year "The Blue Fairy" won the award for the best children's program.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 18, 1960]

NEWS SOCIETY CITES WGN–TV FOR REPORTING

WGN–TV was cited Sunday for its television reporting by Sigma Delta Chi, journalism fraternity. The fraternity also named Saul Pett, Associated Press reporter, as winner of this year's Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished general reporting. Sigma Delta Chi also announced 13 other top awards for work in press, radio, television, and journalistic research performed in 1959. The medallions and plaques will be awarded during the annual banquet ceremony at the National Press Club in Washington, May 18.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 25, 1960]

IT'S THE MOLLOY—PROUD RECORD BEING BUILT BY CHANNEL 9

(By Paul Molloy)

Whenever I speak before a group, the question period invariably produces this beef: "Why don't Chicago broadcasters perk up and do something?"

Well now, just a minute. It may be true that much of Chicago's radio-TV output is patchy and frivolous. But all is not arid. I just happen to have in my pocket, here, some interesting reports on the current scence. It would be unseemly to deny them rousing comment:

Within a 48-hour period last week, Channel 9 picked off a brace of national honors that should remind the country at large that Chicago's video desert still has a refreshing oasis or two. The station snared a prestigious George Foster Peabody Award for its "Great Music From Chicago" series.

(In a notable coincidence, "Great Music" was succeeded at the end of its run by "Play of the Week," which also plucked a Peabody last week.)

Additionally, channel 9's news department won a Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished TV reporting. It's significant when such a nod from the journalistic fraternity goes to an independent station lacking the facilities of network affiliation.

FILM—AND INGENUITY

Over the long pull, channel 9 has reason for pride. Having no access to the ambitious programs delivered by ABC, NBC, and CBS, it must depend solely on syndicated film and its own ingenuity at the local level. It must make do with what it has within its own shop against the Captain Kangaroos, Dinah Shores and "Gunsmoke" of net work competition.

Nevertheless, it has the only women's program in Chicago—Fran Allison's daily forenoon hour. It has the only regular live church origination—Sunday's "Chicagoland Church Hour." It has the only live children's programs of substance—"Treetop House" and "Stop and Go." It has the only local variety format—the Wally Phillips Show. (The fact that this one badly needs first aid isn't important at this point. The fact that the attempt is made is important.)

And in the area of animation, the station has the only cartoons of quality currently on display in Chicago—"Garfield Goose" and "Huckleberry Hound."

Lastly, channel 9 has the only live baseball coverage in town, and it's superlative. On Sunday, local fans watched the Cubs play the Giants. On Tuesday and Wednesday, they will see two Cub duels with the Dodgers. On Saturday afternoon they'll have the Sox-Tigers tussle, followed after dinner by the Cubs-Cards clash.

Channel 9 now delivers home and road games, in the afternoon and in the evening, and in color and black and white. No other baseball city in the Nation can make this statement.

[From the West Belmont Leader, Dec. 23, 1959]

WE LIKE RADIO AND TV

With all of the vicious attacks being carried on against our radio and TV brethren, we feel that it's about time someone came to their defense.

It's our firm belief that both mediums are doing an overall excellent job of entertainment, which is what most of us want out of radio and TV. There are some bad apples, of course, but for every diskjockey taking payola there are newspaper columnists we know who make them look like pikers.

We think that Chicago is blessed with some of the finest radio and TV talent in the country and we know that unbiased house-to-house surveys (not those nutty ratings) will bear us out.

For our part, we think that the finest local job is being done at WGN radio and TV. We wake up in the morning to the cheery patter of Eddie Hubbard and are lulled to sleep at night by the dulcet tones of Franklyn MacCormack. During the day we try to catch as much of Wally Phillips as we can, for in our book he is the funniest man on the air. And if we're wending our way home from downtown during the rush hour, we listen to the traffic advice of Flying Officer Leonard Baldy, corny jokes and all.

As far as local TV coverage is concerned, WGN-TV so far overshadows the others, that no one is second. Their sports coverage with Jack Brickhouse and Vince Lloyd is professional, which is a word that all sports lovers know the meaning of. Their local programing gets right into the communities, such as their upcoming simulcast of the Christmas morning services at St. Andrew's Church, 5447 Addison, and many other community service programs.

There is a naturalness and sincerity about WGN announcing that is felt by the public. Vince Lloyd, Norm Kraeft and Herb Lyon, the conductor of the "Tower Ticker," in the Chicago Tribune, whom we seem to run into more often than some of the others, are all three just as friendly and warm off the air as they are on the air. Which seems to be typical of the entire "Tribune family."

About the only suggestion we have to make to WGN is to get Herb Lyon's "Ticker" program back on TV real pronto at a time when more people can view it. This was brought home to us forcefully last Monday when we watched Herb do a fine MC job at the weekly AGVA talent show at Chez Paree. Herb was at his best, which is pretty good. Herb is one of the "nice guys" of the newspaper profession, and we know the public appreciates his sincerity.

Maybe Herb's "ratings" weren't so high, but it's been our contention that "ratings" need the investigation, not the TV industry. For every one person that watches the "rated" shows we know 10 who have been entertained by Herb Lyons and Wally Phillips. Let's see them back soon.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, April 20, 1960]

"GREAT MUSIC" WINS PEABODY AWARD

Channel 9's Great Music from Chicago was named cowinner of the Peabody Award for TV musical entertainment Tuesday. Sharing the honor is NBC's Telephone Hour.

The American Broadcasting Co. won the Peabody award for television news for its presentation of Soviet Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

Other awards include the nonmusical television entertainment award to WNTA-TV, Newark, N.J., for the Play of the Week and to David Susskind for "The Moon and Sixpence," NBC, and the television education award to CBS for "The Population Explosion," and to WGBH-TV, Boston, for "Decisions."

Winners were announced by publisher Bennett Cerf, Peabody board chairman. Awards were presented by Dean John E. Drewry of the University of Georgia's Henry W. Grady School of Journalism, which administers the awards with the Peabody board.

The awards were set up in 1940 by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia to recognize public service by radio and television in the memory of George Foster Peabody, a native of Columbus, Ga., who became a successful New York banker and philanthropist.

Other winners:

Television contribution to international understanding: Ed Sullivan Show, CBS, and Small World, CBS.

Local television public services: WDSU-TV, New Orleans.

Television special awards: Dr. Frank Stanton, CBS, and "The Lost Class of '59," CBS.

Radio news: The World Tonight, CBS.

Radio public service: Family Living, '59, NBC.

Local radio public service: WCCO, Minneapolis.

Social Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I support the pending legislation because I believe it makes an important contribution toward updating and improving our social security system and permitting that system to be as useful and helpful as possible to the elderly, the retired, the disabled and the dependent.

The economic and social circumstances which affect the lives of our people are constantly changing. It is essential that Congress keep up with these changes, understand the way in which they affect the people concerned, and act accordingly so that social security laws and regulations reflect these changes and are adapted to the real needs of real people.

To a great extent, the present bill does this:

By removing the age 50 eligibility requirement of the disability insurance program, we shall bring badly needed help to an estimated 250,000 insured workers and their dependents who—despite their disability—have not been allowed to qualify for the benefits they need and deserve.

By providing a 12-month period during which benefits are continued for all disabled workers who attempt to return to work, we shall strengthen the rehabilitation features of the disability program and encourage, rather than discourage, workers to overcome their handicaps and resume their places as constructive and productive forces in our national life.

By eliminating the 6-month waiting period for disabled workers who have returned to work and then become disabled again, we shall ease these workers over a particularly trying time when they need help the most.

By liberalizing the insured status requirement, about 600,000 persons will be eligible for minimum social security benefits immediately, and ultimately about 1.4 million will be eligible who would not otherwise have qualified. This liberalization will help especially the older workers who come under the program in the later years of their working lives.

A number of amendments will remove inequities in the present law which have worked to the disadvantage of widows, especially those over 75, and the children and other survivors of insured workers.

The bill will also extend coverage, and protection, to about 300,000 additional people who do not now participate in the Social Security System, including self-employed doctors and domestic workers, thereby making it possible for them to provide necessary survivorship and disability protection for themselves and their families.

In a related field, the bill would provide the authorization for increased appropriations in the important maternal and child welfare programs, including services for crippled children.

The legislation also would improve the existing Federal-State program of employment security by, among other things, building up the fund from which advances to States are made when their reserves have been depleted in times of heavy unemployment. This will further strengthen the whole unemployment compensation program.

In the vital field of medical care, the legislation is designed to encourage States to make improvements in their medical payment programs for old age assistance recipients.

Of all the changes and improvements made by this bill, unquestionably the

most important and controversial is the proposed new program of medical services for the aged. The committee has recommended a voluntary program, similar in many respects to the kind of program envisaged in legislation I introduced earlier this year. Ten million persons over 65 with relatively low incomes would qualify for assistance in the event they incur extensive medical expenses. This program would be voluntary, with Federal and State Governments sharing the cost under an equalization formula in which the Federal share would range from 50 to 65 percent. The medical services which would be included in the program are especially designed for older persons. An estimated 1½ million people over 65 each year require the kind of medical services specified in the bill.

The committee's recommendation of such a program, Mr. Speaker, marks a major step ahead in helping older people meet the often catastrophic impact of serious illness. The problem is universally acknowledged to be one of the most serious which our country faces. The controversy exists only in relation to the best means to meet the need.

Proponents of the plan to make medical care for the elderly an integral part of the social security system will not be satisfied by the committee recommendation. Yet, the House must either accept or reject this program, at this time, as it is. Whatever may be one's views about the Forand bill, the present proposal is a constructive and forward-looking one. For this reason, I support it.

One Out of Five in United States Lacks Bare Necessities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an administration official recently told a conference of social workers that one of every five Americans does not have sufficient income to buy a minimum of nutritional food, adequate clothing, and decent shelter.

His estimates are, perhaps, lower than those of others who have surveyed the American scene during an era often described as one of peace and prosperity. Nevertheless, his words assume particular importance because of the position he holds.

Mr. President, an article in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News of June 7, gives a brief account of the speech to which I refer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OUT OF FIVE IN UNITED STATES LACKS BARE NECESSITIES

ATLANTIC CITY.—One of every five Americans does not have sufficient income to buy a minimum of nutritional food, adequate clothing, and decent shelter, the 87th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare was told yesterday.

William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said that the families of more than one of every four U.S. children live below bare maintenance levels and that today's poor "tend to be concentrated in certain areas and regions and among specified segments of the population."

The speaker told some 5,000 social work leaders that the remedy for the plight of these people is not to be found solely in expanded social welfare programs.

"Social welfare programs have no monopoly on the responsibility for dealing with poverty," Mitchell declared. "We should forcefully and convincingly refute any community or political tendency to assume that they have.

"Measures far beyond the scope of social welfare are needed to bolster the economy in these depressed areas. The situation calls for the coordinated use of many disciplines and many programs.

"However, until we are joined by these other programs, social welfare, I feel, must continue not only to bear a disproportionate share of the burden, but must also serve as the scapegoat for a conscience-stricken public," he said.

Alaska Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to submit for the consideration of my colleagues a much needed clarification of the extension of remarks of Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY of Seattle, Wash., published in the Appendix of the RECORD on Tuesday, June 21, under the title of "The Alaska Shipping Crisis." In speaking of the proposal contained in S. 2669 to extend for 2 years existing provisions of law which exempt from Coast Guard inspection and manning requirements certain vessels operated by a merchants' cooperative association between Seattle, Wash., and Alaska, Mr. PELLY creates the impression that the exempted ships operate throughout the Alaska trade and are ruining the principal common carrier in the Alaska trade, to wit: his constituents, the Alaska Steamship Co. of Seattle, Wash.

In fact, these small vessels are operated to accomplish only two round trips weekly through the inland waters of the Pacific coast from Seattle to Alaska and serve only the communities of the southeastern panhandle of Alaska, wherein live from 15 percent to 20 percent of the people of Alaska. As regards the southeastern portion of the Alaska trade, the Alaska Steamship Co. is without competition from any other common carrier except a minor amount of air freight delivered by airplane. As to these small boats operated by the merchants' association, such competition as they can afford is limited within their small capacity to a few principal ports in southeastern Alaska. The most important function of these small vessels is to deliver cargo to many small towns and villages which are not given any service by Alaska Steam, or only infrequent and intermittent service, thus relieving Alaska Steam of many calls which would be uneconomical for its big freighters.

The bulk of the Alaska trade is to the westward, including the railbelt, and covers about 80 percent of the people of Alaska, and is served by Alaska Steam and two barge lines. This major portion of the trade is not affected in the least by the small vessel operations in question. I can, therefore, say positively that these small boat operations to southeastern Alaska have had very little to do with the fact that Alaska Steam has increased its freight rates 26 percent throughout the Alaska trade during the last 2½ years.

As further clarification, I wish to point out that the first editorial from the Anchorage Daily Times included by Mr. PELLY in his extension of remarks on the subject of a possible widespread curtailment of service to Alaska by the Alaska Steamship Co. has proved to be a false alarm. Under date of June 10, 1960, there was transmitted to me a press release denying the rumor of such curtailment of service, reading as follows:

Alaska Steamship Co. has never considered abandonment of service as reported out of Washington, D.C., by the Anchorage Times. It is true that we face serious problems: competitive conditions, rising operating costs, possible loss of mail revenue, and difficulties in trying to make a reasonable return. However, the thought of eliminating service to all ports but Seward and Whittier has never crossed our minds. Depending on our ability to cope with the problems faced, it may become necessary to consider some curtailment of service. That time has not yet come.

Resolutions of South Dakota American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past week the South Dakota Department of the American Legion held its annual convention in Sioux Falls. It was my privilege to be in attendance for a number of the sessions of the convention, including last Sunday's program at which time I had the honor of introducing the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, as the afternoon speaker.

This particular convention was notable in a number of respects, and one which I wish to mention is the fact that in the selection of the South Dakota department commander for the next year, the American Legion selected the son of a man who earlier served as State commander. The new commander is William Lenker of Sioux Falls. Bill Lenker's father, Dr. Carl B. Lenker of Winner, held this esteemed post of leadership in 1926. This is the second time in national Legion history that a father and

later a son both served as a State commander.

The first was the former Governor of Indiana, Robert E. Gates, who was elected in 1932 as Indiana department commander. His son was elected in 1958.

The American Legion Convention in South Dakota brought forth a number of resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas recruiting costs as estimated for the military services for fiscal year 1959 reached a total of $61,992,100, of which amount the Army spent $20,419,100, the Navy $18,067,000, the Marine Corps $9,876,000, and the Air Force $13,630,000;

Whereas in carrying out its recruiting activities the Army utilized 2,867 persons operating 961 recruiting stations, the Air Force used 2,630 military and 113 civilians in its recruiting activities and operated 871 stations, the Navy operated 975 stations in 1957, and the Marine Corps operated 465 recruiting stations;

Whereas the budget for the fiscal year 1959 for the Selective Service System to operate its more than 4,000 local boards throughout the country was $29,333,848, part of which is used for activities not directly connected with manpower procurement;

Whereas unification of recruiting for active and reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Selective Service System would prove beneficial and economical in that one manpower procurement agency would furnish manpower for the Armed Forces in the same manner as the Civil Service Commission provides civilian manpower for all governmental agencies;

Whereas the more than 4,000 local boards of the Selective Service System are conveniently located throughout the country to better serve the young men and women who may desire to enlist in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas local board clerks at the time of employment are instructed in recruiting matters and the advantages offered by each branch of the Armed Forces; in recognition of their assistance to recruiters, certificates of appreciation have been awarded by all of the branches of service throughout the Nation and its possessions;

Whereas local board clerks have personal knowledge of nearly all registrants' backgrounds and for that reason would be best qualified to furnish the respective Armed Forces with the kind of information they require on prospective enlistees;

Whereas most of the manpower for Reserve and National Guard components is provided by indirect methods through the Selective Service System; and

Whereas the Congress has provided laws for the unification of the Armed Forces and has created unified Armed Services Committees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, meeting in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., this 17th day of June, 1960, That it be recommended to the Congress of the United States that the recruiting activities of all branches of the Armed Forces be consolidated and that the Selective Service System be authorized to develop to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense a manpower procurement plan that will supply required manpower for all services of the Department of Defense.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there was a news item in the U.S. News & World Report publication under date of June 6, 1960, that some New York City jobber was selling surplus 48- and 49-star U.S. flags to the inhabitants of Haiti, and that the folks there were making dresses of them and also using them as they would just any cloth, even making scrub rags of them, and

Whereas the American Legion and its members have always been deeply concerned over the treatment accorded our national colors and continuously urges proper display and honor to our national flag everywhere, indoors and outdoors, in our schools, in our churches, in various organizations, in offices and business places, at public gatherings, at home and abroad, and

Whereas the American Legion and its members strongly opposes willful mistreatment, improper display, or desecration of our national flag: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled in Sioux Falls this 17th day of June, 1960, urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation making any willful desecration of our national colors an offense against the Government of the United States and a person found guilty of such an offense to be liable to a very heavy fine and imprisonment.

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved, That the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in 1960 State convention assembled, vigorously opposes any repeal, modification, or weakening of the so-called "National Defense Student Loan Program Oath and Affidavit" now required to be filed by student loan borrowers from the Federal Government with the U.S. Commissioner of Education in conformity with section 1001(f) of the National Defense Act of 1958; and, which oath in substance requires allegiance to the United States and support of the Constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, and which affidavit in substance provides undersigned does not believe in, is not a member of, and not a supporter of any organization which believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or illegal methods.

RESOLUTION

Whereas readjustment to civilian life and economic problems made it difficult for many veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict to maintain their policies of national service life insurance upon being separated from service; and

Whereas with advancing age and growing family responsibilities, such veterans desperately need insurance protection at a rate they can afford; and

Whereas the right of World War II veterans to purchase national service life insurance was abruptly discontinued on April 25, 1951, and Korean veterans were given only 120 days after separation in which to apply for insurance; and

Whereas it would be simple justice to make national service life insurance available to those veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict who for one reason or another were not in a position to take advantage of previous opportunities: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled in Sioux Falls this 17th day of June 1960, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation in the current session of the Congress, such legislation to give the right to World War II and the Korean conflict veterans to contract with the Veterans' Administration for new policies of national service life insurance, under substantially the following conditions:

1. Only those veterans in good health (except for service-incurred conditions) would be eligible for new insurance, with an overall limit of $10,000 coverage.

2. The right to apply for such insurance should be limited to 1 year from the date of approval of the act.

3. The veterans concerned should pay the administrative cost, such cost to be determined by the Veterans' Administration and added to the regular premium rate for new insurance issued: Be it further

Resolved, That H.R. 11045 now before the Congress with the Long amendment in effect accomplishes what is requested in this resolution and that we favor passage of H.R. 11045 with Senator LONG's amendment thereto.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the act of Congress of the United States of America which provides for direct loans for veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available is about to expire; and

Whereas said law is vitally needed in the areas where other loans are not readily available; and

Whereas over the period of years during which these loans have been made said loan program has been exceedingly successful and has resulted in great benefit to the veterans involved, and has actually been a financial success to the U.S. Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention duly assembled in Sioux Falls this 17th day of June 1960, That every effort be made by the South Dakota Representatives in Congress to the end that legislation be enacted at this session of Congress to provide for an extension of said direct veterans loan program in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, until February 1, 1965, and in conformity with bills now pending before the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Public Law No. 346, 78th Congress, provided for an effective employment counseling and job placement service for veterans of all wars, to the end that they shall have the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment, and

Whereas this service has materially enhanced the economic welfare of veterans, and has contributed substantially to their favorable position in the labor force, and

Whereas there is a continuing need for this service to assist veterans in making proper job readjustment when they become unemployed or find it necessary to change jobs—as is evidenced by the thousands of such veterans who utilize the facilities of the services throughout the country each month: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in annual convention assembled in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., June 18, 1960, goes on record as urging the National Congress to appropriate adequate funds, annually, for the effective administration of the employment security program, including the Veterans Employment Service and the public employment service systems.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled at Sioux Falls this 17th day of June 1960, does hereby commend the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his courageous, steadfast, and uncom-

promising stand at the recent security conference, the failure of which was caused by the prearranged design of Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, and

Whereas the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, commends President Eisenhower in his determination and desire to visit Japan and we regret that such visit and his desires were thwarted by the action of a small organized minority group controlled and dictated to and manipulated by Moscow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of South Dakota of the American Legion compliment and encourage the President in his stand, in his action and in his views and urges him and his successors in office to maintain the strong stand of no appeasement to any would-be aggressor: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States forthwith.

Explosion in Caribbean Could Take Place Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, developments in Cuba and in the Caribbean area are becoming more ominous with each passing day. In line with this progressively worsening international situation, I include a letter of transmittal which I received from Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor, the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., with which he forwards an article that he has written which appeared in the News and Courier on June 12, 1960, entitled, "Explosion in Caribbean Could Take Place Soon":

THE NEWS AND COURIER,
Charleston, S.C., June 14, 1960.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am taking the liberty of sending you an article I have written entitled "Explosion in Caribbean May Take Place Soon." I hope you will find time to glance at it. According to my sources, by the way, the strike against Castro that free Cubans are planning will be staged in Nicaragua.

Let me say again that I read with admiration your many fine statements on the danger in the Caribbean that menaces the Panama Canal. You are performing a truly great service to the country.

Cordially,

ANTHONY HARRIGAN,
Associate Editor.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, June 12, 1960]

EXPLOSION IN CARIBBEAN COULD TAKE PLACE SOON

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Friends of free Cuba may have only 44 days left in which to prevent complete communization of that country.

July 26 is the day on which, it has been predicted, Nikita Khrushchev will land in Cuba to bolster the Red-front government of Fidel Castro. If Khrushchev does reach Cuba and presumably he will do so unless an anti-Castro revolt has started, his visit may end the last good chance to keep the island out of the Red orbit. A Khrushchev visit is likely to mean a Russo-Cuban military pact. This, in turn, would mean sufficient weapons for the Castro forces to crush democratic opponents.

Whether anti-Castro groups, with or without the blessing and aid of the U.S. Government, will attempt a revolt in these 44 days, only time will tell.

All Latin America is watching events in Cuba. What started out as a political upset which the U.S. public little understood, now has become an important battle in the Communist war for the western hemisphere.

If Castro obtains guns and supplies from Khrushchev and subdues all his foes, he undoubtedly will turn his attention to all lands bordering the Caribbean Sea. None of the Central American countries has armed forces capable of dealing with the heavily armed Cubans. Several of the countries have poorly protected coasts on which Castro could land invasion forces.

This is no pipe dream. The Government of Guatemala recently shut down the Cuban Embassy because it was plotting precisely this kind of activity. In each of the Central American countries are leftist groups which would welcome Cuban volunteers armed with Communist weapons. Communist agitators, who maintain headquarters in Mexico City, are poised to invade weak republics between that country and Panama. Not to be ignored is the possibility of a combined Castro invasion and nationalist uprising in Panama, aimed at seizing control of the canal.

The just announced appointment of Lt. Gen. Robert F. Sink, U.S. Army, one of the Army's ablest generals, as head of the Caribbean Command, with headquarters in the Canal Zone, may be taken as evidence that the U.S. Government recognizes the danger in that area.

There is no doubt that big events will take place in the Caribbean before long, events that will affect the United States. Either Castro and the Communists move ahead with their drive against Central America, or anti-Castro liberation groups make an all-out effort to drive the Cuban dictator from power.

One thing is certain: history won't stand still in the Caribbean in the weeks and months ahead. The destinies of nations, the ambitions of the world Communist conspiracy, and the patriotic zeal of anti-Castro Cubans, as well as the interests of the United States, are involved in the Cuban situation. A political explosion with worldwide significance could take place at any time.

St. Paul: City of Noble Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to discover in the current issue of the Catholic Digest, an excellent article about the capital city of Minnesota, St. Paul.

The article by Joseph B. Connors and Maggi Vaughan is entitled "St. Paul: City of Noble Prospects."

I know that all the residents of other cities and States who have had the privilege of visiting our charming and historic State capital and knowing both the city and its friendly people firsthand will enjoy revisiting the city in this fine article. Those who have not themselves visited St. Paul will, I know, be anxious to see St. Paul at their first opportunity after reading the article's excellent description of past and present St. Paul.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "St. Paul: City of Noble Prospects" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL: CITY OF NOBLE PROSPECTS

(By Joseph B. Connors and Maggi Vaughan)

One good way to ignite a lively discussion in St. Paul, Minn., is to say that you think it is a good thing the city's old feud with her next door neighbor, Minneapolis, is dead.

In a representative gathering of St. Paulites, you may be variously informed that (1) you are 100 percent right; (2) you are right in saying that the feud is dead but wrong in thinking its demise a good thing; (3) the feud isn't dead, but should be; (4) it isn't dead, and must not be permitted to die; (5) it never really existed at all, but was a myth manufactured in New York, or possibly in Chicago.

Even a knowledgeable observer has a hard time judging the present status of the ancient rivalry. For rivalry it undoubtedly was. The imported-myth theory won't wash, though it probably is true that many vivid embellishments of the story arose elsewhere. For example, that rumor a few years back about H. V. Morton's Mediterranean travel book, "In the Steps of St. Paul." According to legend, two Minneapolis bookstores refused to stock it.

No myth, though, was the story of the hassle over the 1890 Census. At that time the cities were still close enough in population for the matter to be worth contention. (Totals today: St. Paul, 343,000; Minneapolis, 557,000.) A U.S. deputy marshal from St. Paul charged Minneapolis enumerators with crooking the books to increase their figure. A recount showed that the charge was true: the Minneapolis pollsters had invented more than 18,000 residents.

Unfortunately, the recount also showed that St. Paul pollsters had listed 245 elusive residents for the Union depot and other curious entries for a total of about 9,500 imaginary inhabitants.

A sorry episode, to be sure. But that, after all, was in an age when, during a minor smallpox epidemic, Twin Cities newspapers zealously pelted each other with comparative infection and death rates.

Nothing like that goes on today. In fact, except for certain obviously competitive areas of business and sports—and among a small corps of diehard sentimentalists in each city—really serious antagonism probably did not long survive the 19th century. Thirty-five years ago a Minneapolis writer said, "In all the years I've been going to St. Paul, it never has dawned on me that it was an adventure into an enemy's camp." The cities have drawn together geographically, socially, and economically.

Many reasonable citizens on both sides say that the two should have been one long ago. For a while it looked as if the populations might actually be fused, not by sweet logic but by a common yearning for big league baseball. But the planners could not agree on a centrally located park for a Twin Cities team. They went their own disgruntled ways and built new parks miles apart.

If they had managed to agree, outsiders would probably have been amazed to see two traditionally rival baseball crowds become a united family over night. In the old days, fierce duels between the Saints and the

Millers at Lexington Park in St. Paul or Little Nicollet Park in Minneapolis were likely to erupt into gladiatorial combats among players, with a whirl of flailing arms, fielders' gloves, spiked shoes, and diamond dust. Rival fans were notoriously combustible, too. But even then, many a Minneapolis fan would still make frequent streetcar journeys to watch the Saints against other American Association teams in their superior park.

Once, a Saint fan at a St. Paul-Kansas City game made the joyful discovery that the person seated directly below him at Lexington was a Minneapolitan with whom he had exchanged assorted jibes and threats at Nicollet Park the previous Saturday. Clapping a popcorn-scented hand on the invader's shoulder, he was starting to resume hostilities when the other fellow interposed, "Wait a minute, Mac. I'm for Minneapolis against St. Paul, but I'm always for St. Paul against these guys."

St. Paul has been described as the last Eastern city a cross-country traveler encounters (with Minneapolis the first Western city). Many visitors feel a touch of New England in St. Paul: in her restraint, her sense of the past, her affection for amiably eccentric streets and shady nooks, her closely knit neighborhoods where everybody appears to know everybody else.

Even the most spirited Minneapolis booster will probably grant that St. Paul, though smaller, has more of the look of a metropolis than Minneapolis. The capital city, built across hills and bluffs and up intersecting ravines, has one of the most majestic profiles in the Nation.

A St. Paul resident who wants his out-of-town guests to savor the full beauty of that profile may casually take them for a ride across the high bridge to Cherokee Heights, and then say, "Now look back." Better yet, he may manage to circle about through Cherokee Park to bring his guests out unexpectedly on the edge of the lofty bluff, with the full sweep of his city across the river.

"It feels just like Cinerama," an appreciative little boy said. It does, indeed. Cinerama cameras have focused on few sights more uplifting to the spirit than those two great domes on the skyline. They belong to the Cathedral of St. Paul, "bosomed high in tufted trees," and the State Capitol.

Her unique topography makes St. Paul a city of endless attraction for the person who goes adventuring afoot. And few American cities of comparable size will give a motorist with an hour to spare a more picturesque variety of urban scenery.

There is Summit Avenue, for instance, one of the most charming streets in the Midwest. It stretches westward from the Loop to meet again the winding Mississippi.

The huge copper-domed cathedral looks down on Summit where the street leaves the Loop. Its dedication in 1915 was the consummation of the life work of the first archbishop of St. Paul, the great John Ireland. This world-famous prelate had come to St. Paul as an immigrant lad in 1852. His entire career was given to his city, yet his influence reached far beyond it. More dynamically than any other American churchman, he enunciated and embodied Pope Leo XIII's policy that the church must not isolate itself from the general life of the time.

A few steps away from the cathedral is the home of empire builder James J. Hill. The house is now occupied by the St. Paul Diocesan Teachers College. Hill, the president of the Great Northern Railway, was not a Catholic, but he gave Archbishop Ireland $500,000 to build the St. Paul seminary.

Houses along the older part of Summit Avenue offer a fascinating array of 19th-century architectural styles. Some date from the 1860's. You see buidlings that look like Tudor manor houses, late Georgian townhouses, Greek temples, Victorian public libraries. (A few of them, one observer has suggested, look as if John Wilkes Booth might be hiding in the basement.) All are steeped in the mellow beauty that old stone, brick, and wood absorb from beautiful surroundings. A youngster named F. Scott Fitzgerald, who lived in the neighborhood, used to look long at these mansions and wonder what dramas went on daily within them.

Near the west end of Summit Avenue stand the College of St. Thomas and St. Thomas Military Academy. St. Thomas, which began its life as St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary, celebrates its diamond jubilee this year. It is one of a cluster of excellent colleges in St. Paul. The College of St. Catherine is the largest Catholic women's college in the United States. It is also one of two Catholic colleges to establish a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. Other outstanding educational institutions are Hamline University (the first college in Minnesota), Macalester College, and Concordia College.

Most of the colleges are either in or near a loosely defined area called the Midway district—midway, that is, between the St. Paul and Minneapolis Loops. Outsiders sometimes describe the Twin Cities inaccurately as separated by the Mississippi. True, the river does flow between them for a long, photogenic stretch.

At one time, speeding motorists of either city purued by the law would make a dash for the Lake St. Bridge, like fugitives in British spy movies trying to make it to Switzerland. The cops were likely to call off the chase in the middle of the span.

Throughout the northern part of the Midway district, however, the boundary is as invisible as the equator. A St. Paulite living in a new apartment in a community along an oddly angled edge of his city was informed by a guest, a student of plat maps, that viewed scientifically his kitchen and dining nook were in Minneapolis. At first he thought this amusing, but since then about 15 acquaintances (mainly from the kitchen side of the border) have been separately inspired to remark brightly that they hear he has to go over to Minneapolis to get a good meal. He has decided to move deeper into St. Paul to get peace of mind.

Residents of Midway once had hopes that the Capitol might be built there, on the present site of the Town and Country golf course. Archbishop Ireland liked the plan because it would have furthered union of the Twin Cities. He no doubt would have built the cathedral in Midway if the plan had succeeded.

Some of the old irritations between the cities undoubtedly arose from St. Paul's feeling that the younger settlement, Minneapolis, was a brash Johnny-come-lately. A tiny community called Mendota, which lies between the cities (as the river flows) has a certain right to feel that way about both the Twins. But little Mendota, drowsing on the river bank today like an old voyageur dreaming of wilderness trails, was out of the running too early to be resentful.

Mendota, originally St. Peter, is across the river from Fort Snelling. The fort was established in 1819 at the conflux of the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers. St. Peter was the natural focal point of the fur trade. Here young Henry H. Sibley, representing the American Fur Co., had his headquarters.

Father Lucien Galtier, a young French priest with a face like an image on a Roman coin, came to St. Peter in 1840. He was a missioner to about 180 Catholics in the vicinity—mostly French or mixed-blood voyageurs or refugees from Lord Selkirk's Red River colony. A group of squatters, pushed off the military reservation, settled downriver at what is now the St. Paul business district. In 1841 Father Galtier built a log chapel at the new settlement. He called it St. Paul's. It gave the city its name.

All traces of the log chapel have disappeared but back at Mendota you can still go to mass at one of the pioneer churches of the Northwest, the Church of St. Peter. It was built by Father Augustine Ravoux in 1853. Father Ravoux, a lovable blend of Father De Smet and the Curé of Ars, was vicar general of the St. Paul diocese for 40 years.

From old St. Peter's you can see a long way along the river valley. When Father Ravoux was pastor, Bishop Joseph Cretin would summon his vicar general down to St. Paul for consultation by hanging a flag out his window.

St. Paul, designated territorial capital in 1849, grew rapidly, mainly because it had the best steamboat landing in the region. It was the head of navigation for the Mississippi. During the great homesteading days of the fifties and sixties, upper Mississippi traffic far outstripped that of the lower Mississippi. In 1858, the year in which she became State capital, St. Paul registered 1,090 boats at her wharves. At the same time, the long, noisy caravans of Red River carts traveled back and forth between St. Paul and Pembina.

At St. Paul, the cultured East and the wild frontier were held, for a colorful hour, in a strange balance. Aristocratic young ladies in white satin and flounced muslin picked their way through muddy streets, and were borne off to brilliant balls at Fort Snelling. In 1854 you could attend the theater in St. Paul, read the St. Paul Pioneer, visit the hospital established by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, or browse in a bookstore. But during these early years, St. Paul remained right in the middle of a bloody feud between Sioux and Chippewa Indians. As late as 1861, a Sioux Indian offered a Chippewa scalp for sale in St. Paul streets. A New Yorker bought it for $3.

From the day Father Galtier hewed logs for his chapel, churches have had a profound influence in the development of the city. St. Paul's reputation as one of our friendliest cities (how one graphs friendliness is a poser, but a survey once placed St. Paul at the top) is partly the result of the harmony that exists among men of many faiths. The city has more than 320 churches and synagogues: one church for every 1,000 persons.

St. Paul is usually called a "Catholic city," and the Catholic population, though by no means a majority, is large. In January, 1959, it totaled 137,473. The present ordinary of the St. Paul archdiocese, Archbishop William O. Brady, was formerly Bishop of Sioux Falls. He succeeded the late Archbishop John Gregory Murray in 1956. But he was already an old friend of the community, for he had once been rector of the St. Paul seminary. Archbishop Brady has organized one of the most important building programs ever undertaken in the archdiocese: a great expansion program for Catholic high schools. His Opus Sancti Petri vocations program is unique in the Nation.

St. Paul is still one of the Nation's main transportation centers. It is the third largest trucking center in the United States. The Mississippi, which dominated early history, handles over 3 million tons of cargo annually. Nine railroad trunk lines come into the city. Less than a mile from downtown, Holman Field serves both private planes and industry. The St. Paul-Minneapolis International Airport is 8½ miles from the Loop. A metropolitan commission directs the airport.

Industrially, St. Paul, is a diversified manufacturing center. Products include automobiles, clothing, heavy hoisting equipment, plastics, and electric computers. (Some of the instruments for the satellite Tiros I were made in St. Paul by Remington

Rand Univac.) It is the fourth largest printing and publishing center in the country.

The city is understandably proud of the many small local enterprises that have grown into national and international institutions. Most notable of these is the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., originally famous for scotch tape, now turning out hundreds of products, many in electronics. (Another example, in a quite different field, of the little local institution that grew and grew is the Catholic Digest, founded in 1936 by Father Louis A. Gales, with Father Paul Bussard as editor; they are now president and publisher, respectively. The first print order was for 13,000 copies; circulation now is near a million.)

An apartment-building boom may raise St. Paul's population to 415,000 by 1980. City planners are hard at work with maps and zoning codes. They are determined that the future St. Paul will have all its present winsomeness, or perhaps a little more.

In civic improvement, St. Paul is always at her best when something gets her dander up. Some of her finest hours have been born of indignation. There was a time when the St. Paul system of allowing notorious criminals to find harbor in the city as long as they behaved locally was a reproach to a law-abiding population. The system broke down and the lid blew off simultaneously during the Dillinger days; and St. Paul cleaned house swiftly, thoroughly, and for keeps.

Her most famous festival, the winter carnival, arose from her habit of getting the dander up. In 1885 an eastern journalist described St. Paul as "another Siberia, unfit for human habitation." He said the city was "as near the North Pole as one can get without skates." St. Paul answered by starting a gay midwinter festival and building a magnificent ice palace. The first carnival was held in January 1886.

Whatever vision of the future St. Paul citizens may have, it can't surpass the prospect suggested a century ago by the man who became Lincoln's Secretary of State, William H. Seward. During the campaign of 1860, he made a speech in St. Paul at a Republican Party rally. It was an optimistic time for the local Republican club, the Wide Awakes, for Minnesota Republicans were riding to conquest. The statesman was suitably enthusiastic. He predicted that St. Paul would someday become the Capital of the United States.

St. Paul today has no immediate plans for such a development. But Mr. Seward was a man of long views; a colossal slab of frosty real estate he later picked up for $7 million has become our 49th State ("Seward's Folly," skeptics called Alaska). And the time is young, as prophets reckon.

If the opportunity ever does arise, St. Paul will face a peculiar dilemma. It would hardly be possible for her to be National Capital and State capital at the same time. And if she were to step into the starring role forecast for her, would she have to let that upstart neighbor of hers become the capital of Minnesota?

Truth on America's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Ralph McGill. I have read his keen analysis with great interest and cannot help but feel his evaluation of the subject matter involved is most accurate and informative:

TRUTH ON AMERICA'S STRENGTH—IT'S HARD TO RUN DOWN, BUT KENNEDY TALK IS VIEWED AS MAKING A CONTRIBUTION

(By Ralph McGill)

There is an old story about the fellow who was quite late getting to a country church picnic. When he went to help himself to fried chicken he found only one platter left and on it nothing but wings—a dozen of them.

"I never saw a chicken like that," he said, "but I'll bet it was hard to run down and catch."

The story comes to mind in considering Senator KENNEDY's recent major foreign policy speech. The Senator's view of the Vice President's diet for the American people was something like that platter of wings—the real truth about America's national posture is hard to run down. The Vice President earlier had said that America is the strongest nation militarily and economically, has the best educational system and the finest scientists in the world.

"To feed that kind of diet to the American people during the coming months—to confine our national posture to one of talking louder and louder while carrying a smaller and smaller stick—is to trade the long-range needs of the Nation for the short-term appearance of security," countered the Democratic contender.

The debate, begun by Governor Rockefeller, is joined.

We are a great military power. But we have had a number of top generals resign because they did not believe necessary defensive strength was being maintained. It is no secret that even now our best military minds frankly say that we can outpunch the Russians only because of the Strategic Air Command. They give us 2 to 3 years of this edge.

Our economic production is the best. But it is under increasing strain and our rate of productive increase is comparatively less. Not to say so confuses the picture.

It is conceded that the cold war between tyranny and representative government will be won in the world's classrooms, libraries and university laboratories. We would not wish to imitate the Soviet system, but no American expert who has been to Russia has failed to see what a great secret weapon the Kremlin has in one aspect of its regimented system. The Russians are determined that not even the slightest talent which may serve the objectives of Marxism shall go undeveloped and unused. Our system is not so efficient in behalf of democratic objectives. Their system produces a man lacking in humanities. But we would be fools to fail to see they are creating a huge and dangerous new technocratic power.

As for great scientists, we have our share of them. It is not possible to compare the relative assets. In space they are far ahead. Senator KENNEDY is on sound ground to say we ought not to so gloss over the situation as to rid the American people of any need for serious attention to the tasks at hand and to soothe them into thinking the Nation has no real need to be concerned.

Senator KENNEDY also moved boldly into a field where the Republicans have feared to tread. The Red Chinese will have an atomic bomb within 5 years or so, he said. (If the Soviets choose to give them a stockpile they can have them tomorrow.) Therefore, while we cannot and should not recognize Peiping diplomatically, we should invite them to sit in on the Geneva disarmament proceedings. There can be no disarmament without Chinese participation. Only the woolly-minded will deny the harsh reality of this statement.

He was accurate, too, to say that "so long as Khrushchev is convinced the balance of power is shifting his way, no amount of smiles or toughness, neither Camp David talks nor kitchen debates can compel him to enter fruitful negotiations."

Governor Rockefeller and Senator KENNEDY have provided the essentials of debate.

Report to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by Henry H. Buckman, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, given on May 26, 1960 at its 47th national convention in Washington, D.C.

In making this request, I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Buckman and to his leadership in the development of our country's waterways. He is senior national director of this organization, having served with it over 30 years. He drafted the procedure for examining the classifying projects which has been used by its national projects committee since creation of this committee in 1934.

During the past year, in which Mr. Buckman has served as president, he has made precedent by being the first president who was not a member of either the Senate or House of Representatives since the congress was founded in October 1901 at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md.

An outstanding consulting engineer, whose reputation is nationwide, Mr. Buckman has given inspired leadership in this field of public service. I think the people of the State of Florida are to be congratulated upon his reelection on May 27 by the board of directors, and upon having one of Florida's citizens continue to serve as the active, directing head of an organization of such great usefulness to the State and Nation.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS IN CONVENTION BY ITS PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 26, 1960

Pursuant to the powers and duties vested in its president by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and in accordance with custom followed for more than half a century, this report is submitted to the 47th annual convention of your organization convened in Washington, D.C.

MEMBERSHIP AND FINANCE

During the year which has elapsed since our 46th convention, both membership and receipts from dues have shown an encouraging increase. However, there is little room for complacence on this account. Our duties and responsibilities to the public increase each year. The value of the dollar grows less If we are to expand our useful activities and

more effectively pursue our broader objectives, we must have still larger membership and greater revenue. While we have been able recently to add $5,000 to our reserve fund, bringing the total to $20,000, we have not yet been able to expand our annual budget. I commend this matter to you for consideration and action by each of you.

ACTIVITIES

During the past 12 months, your officers, directors, and committees have been actively and effectively interested in appropriately sponsoring legislation for Federal appropriations for water resources public works in all States of the Union. They have vigorously supported the program of the authorizing omnibus river and harbor bill. They have participated in discussion with the Bureau of the Budget in a continuing effort to assist in developing a wise fiscal policy with respect to the Federal interest in the field of water resources. Your projects committee, when requested to do so by local interests, have afforded appropriate and expeditious procedural assistance to a number of division I projects when time was of the essence.

With the generous assistance of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, the entire list of division I projects has been recataloged in accordance with the present physical, departmental, and legislative status of each. This will provide the beginning of a perpetual inventory from which all concerned may obtain through our Washington office up-to-date information on any of these projects. The system will also aid in facilitating our continuing representations to the Bureau of the Budget and to the committees of Congress.

At this point it is appropriate to estimate the total calculable accomplishment of your organization with respect to projects alone. This is, of course, only a product of our overall endeavor to assist the Federal and State governments in forming and in the timely pursuing of an enlightened and foresighted policy with respect to water. I bring this to your attention now as indicative of the magnitude of our cumulative success over the years.

During the 24 years since the time when the projects committee was created by your directors, that body has recommended, and you have ratified in convention, the classification of 524 projects in division I; that is to say, they have been pronounced sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and their construction justified by the public interest they will serve. Of these 524 projects, 400, or 76 percent, have now been authorized by Congress; 308, or 60 percent, have been completed or are now under construction. The aggregate benefit-yielding wealth thus added to the assets of the Nation is computed to exceed $6 billion. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress may fairly claim an important share in this accomplishment which has recaptured this amount of taxes and plowed it back into the national economy, fruitfully planting it for the public benefit.

THE MONTHLY REPORTER

Late in 1959 the format of our Monthly Reporter was changed and its policy redesigned. The previous format, consisting of a single multigraphed sheet, was changed to the four-page, two-color, printed and illustrated publication with which you are now familiar. The primary mission of this publication, which is a strictly factual and nonpartisan journal, is to educate the public, by illustrated examples, as to the immense importance of water resources public works to our economy and to our defense potential. The Reporter goes regularly to all our members and to all Members of the Congress of the United States, and to selected individuals in the executive branch. In order that it may be completely independent, it carries no advertisements. The Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have been most helpful in furnishing all data and other assistance which they may appropriately supply. This cooperation is gratefully acknowledged.

THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS OF THE ARMY

The Corps of Engineers of the Army have performed efficiency and with traditional fidelity the civil functions assigned to them by Congress. They have continued to merit the high esteem which they have enjoyed throughout their history.

THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Within the limits of the appropriations afforded to it by Congress, the Bureau of Reclamation has done splendid work in its designated field. This agency has made notable progress of a high order in planning and construction, including work in the Missouri River Basin.

IMPORTANT TRENDS AFFECTING THE NATION'S INTEREST IN WATER

Every interest of the body politic is basically related to water. The year under review has seen the further development of both helpful and harmful trends affecting these relationships. Some of the latter are of such importance as to merit your prompt attention and very careful consideration.

RATE LEGISLATION

The past year has witnessed intensified efforts on the part of the rail carrier managements to eliminate their competition, including the competition afforded by the inland water carriers. This movement poses a threat to the survival of the water carriers as a group. The fact that the rail managements are able to wage this campaign under the aegis of law is a matter of grave concern.

Everyone who is informed in the field of transportation is aware that the rail carriers are struggling with a declining economy for the permanent improvement of which there is little hope in their existing equipment and consequent methods of operation. It is equally clear that, in some economical form, a rail carriage system is essential to the welfare and security of the United States. The railroads do need help, but they also need restraint. Their essentiality warrants both. It is to be hoped that the needed restraint will be generated within management, rather than by government. Government ownership might well serve only to exchange one dilemma for another.

But help for the rail carriers cannot be much longer allowed to comprise impairment of our transportation system as a whole. This is to put in jeopardy both our prosperity and our defense.

Two fundamental considerations cannot be indefinitely ignored. These are (1) that it is essential to the well being and security of the Nation that all forms of transportation continue to be developed in proportion to their several inherent economies, and hence (2) that none of these forms may be sustained at the expense of another form having equal or greater inherent economy.

It is a reasonable assumption that the wisdom of Congress will resolve the paradox of legislation appropriating billions of dollars for the development of inland water and highway transportation and legislation which operates to destroy the economics these appropriations are designed to serve.

The railroads would gain much for themselves and would make a tremendous contribution to the Nation if they would abandon their traditional pursuit of artificial aid through legislation, and devote their efforts to an advanced technology which might well hold a purely economical solution of their problem.

THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

During the year, the Interstate Commerce Commission has exercised power implicit in recent legislation to permit the rail carriers to reduce certain rates selectively. While these actions on the part of the Commission are seriously inimical to certain water and highway carriers, it is only fair to say that the legislation in question does comprise what may be reasonably interpreted as a directive to be followed in the consideration of applications for changes in rates, leaving the Commission little discretion. If, for this reason, it is difficult to sustain a complaint against the Commission because of these particular actions, there remains the seemingly fairy godmother attitude of the agency toward the railroads since the time of World War I. The fault probably lies less with the Commission than with its form.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has long advocated a change in the makeup of this agency which would require the appointment of one Commissioner each for rail, water (inland and coastwise), highway, pipeline and air carriers, and two for the general public interest. This type of organization has worked well in the case of municipal government. It would probably operate to prevent development in the Commission of bias with respect to any one form of transportation. It is hoped that Congress will give consideration to legislation which will accomplish this. The agency in question is an essential regulatory body, but it needs overhauling.

THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

The Bureau of the Budget has continued to function as an essential agency in the executive. The Bureau performs valuable service in coordinating the requests for funds made by the several departments. It also assists the President in forming and implementing his financial policy.

Despite these useful functions, the Bureau, with the tacit consent of Congress, has gradually assumed the function of a filter whereby many requests for funds made by departmental heads and deemed advisable by them but disallowed by the Bureau, or which the Bureau has prevented being made, are filtered out and do not reach the attention of Congress.

There can be no question as to the power of the President to forbid requests being made by his Cabinet members, or to disapprove such when made. But in exercising this power the Bureau can perform what is in effect a legislative function, since its actions can limit the information upon which Congress may act. This is a problem of long standing and one not easily solved. But it is suggested that some joint exploration by the legislative and executive branches might be fruitful.

WATER RESOURCES PLATFORM PLANK

We have presented the following water resources platform plank to the national committees of the two major political parties and have urged its inclusion in the paltforms of both.

"The prudent, timely, adequate, and continuing provision for the use, control, and conservation of our water resources becomes increasingly essential as our population continues to grow at an accelerated rate. Erosion, irrigation, reclamation, flood control, pollution abatement, river and harbor development for maritime and inland navigation, and water supply for human consumption and industrial use require the energetic pursuit of an enlightened policy if the gradual throttling of our national economy is to be prevented. Our defense potential rests to an important extent upon the expansion of our internal lines of transport by the development of our inland navigation channels. The wartime necessity for a protected inland barge route from the midcontinent areas to the Atlantic seaboard has been demonstrated, and the interconnection of the barge channels of these two regions across northern Florida as authorized by Congress and which would complete the Intracoastal Waterway from Trenton, N.J., to the Mexican border, should be promptly accomplished. The pollution of our streams and under-

ground water sources must be controlled and minimized in order that suitable domestic and industrial supplies shall continue to be adequate. Flood control, which serves both to conserve our water resources and to prevent the destructive effect of excessive precipitation, must continue to be a principal objective in our water resources program."

INLAND WATER TRANSPORTATION IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the event of war, the modern submarine promises to drive surface craft from the seas. It now appears that we must be prepared to move an enormous tonnage (particularly petroleum) by internal lines—far more than can possibly be moved by our existing rail, highway, and pipeline facilities. Our inland navigation channels, especially the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways, must be connected and improved as promptly as practicable in order that cargoes may be moved by protected inland routes between the midcontinent and the Atlantic seaboard.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President.

Remember Freedom's Source

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently, in the Queens County Times, a weekly newspaper in my district, there appeared a stirring, thoughtful editorial on the meaning of freedom and its spiritual source, God. This stimulating, perceptive essay goes to the core of free government which is its indispensable relationship to God from whom we derive not only our birthright of freedom but the moral strengths that enable us "to harmonize freedom and justice, through the exercise of self-discipline."

In referring to the liberties we enjoy, the editorial states, "Comparatively few men who have walked the face of the earth have enjoyed any considerable degree of freedom, probably not more than 5 percent. Yet, very few Americans have a genuine appreciation of freedom, or clearly understand its source. Thus," it continues, "many are standing by unmoved while the protective structure of freedom is dissipated."

"Freedom can live only when coupled with justice," it asserts, and our power to make the judgments necessary for this to prevail is derived from God. It is in this context, it declares, that our task for the future is to mobilize our great strengths, under God, in the preservation of our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to place before Congress this excellent, succinct summation of the meaning and base of American free government, and under unanimous consent I insert the editorial from the Queens County Times to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

[From the Queens County Times, May 26, 1960]

REMEMBER FREEDOM'S SOURCE

Freedom is every man's God-given birthright. Governments do not have any freedom to give. Governments may restrain or limit or take away freedom—or protect it. Protecting freedom is the basic function of government in the liberal tradition. Comparatively few men who have walked the face of the earth have enjoyed any considerable degree of freedom, probably not more than 5 percent. Yet, very few Americans have a genuine appreciation of freedom, or clearly understand its source. Thus many are standing by unmoved while the protective structure of freedom is dissipated.

Freedom can live only when coupled with justice. Otherwise, the strong take away the freedom of the weak. Justice lives only where men recognize the authority of God. The strong have no other restraint. God alone transcends the principles of both freedom and justice, and it is only when man fears God that he is able to harmonize freedom and justice, through the exercise of self-discipline.

GOD IS INDISPENSABLE

The well-being of every society of mankind over any long period has always been in direct relationship to its respect for God. In no area of society can man ignore God and succeed for long. We like to look on the classic painting of General George Washington, kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge. We likewise can draw from history the scene at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, when the men who wrote the Constitution prayed to Almighty God for guidance. We are impressed by the fact that each session of Congress today is opened with a prayer.

Preceding Washington and our war for freedom, there was the landing of the Mayflower at Plymouth. The ship swung into the bay on Saturday, and there before the Pilgrim's eyes was the shore of their new world. But they didn't go ashore. They remained on board over Sunday and conducted their worship services. Then, before they set out for shore, they drew up the Mayflower Compact. It began: "In the name of God, Amen." Even after 340 years, this is a thrilling moment just to remember.

A GODLY NATION

God was mentioned in every one of the Colonial charters. A church building was one of the very first structures in every new settlement as our sturdy families moved westward across America. Our social standards, our political laws and our religious laws took into consideration the Bible. Our Government has made a conscious effort to preserve through all these years our God-given freedom.

The Nation has expanded much, however. Many immigrants have been admitted. The world has become much smaller with speed of transportation and communications. International relations have become much more complicated, and maintaining freedom has become increasingly difficult. It must become the central task of every American citizen—or else we may lose freedom. Great and powerful forces are at work to destroy it. Unless we mobilize the citizen-strength of America and utilize all our resources, our Nation could fall and the world could be plunged into another Dark Age.

American Civil Liberties Union Chapter Created in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal gave an editorial tribute on June 9 to the American Civil Liberties Union Chapter created in New Jersey during the 40th anniversary year of the ACLU. The editorial gives well-deserved praise to an organization which has continually demonstrated its willingness to work for the protection of the rights of all citizens of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY CHAPTER, ACLU

New Jersey has become the 28th State to have its own chapter in the American Civil Liberties Union. The ACLU frequently has taken a hand in matters in New Jersey in which it believed that practices contrary to its policy were being implemented. The purpose now is "increased defense of civil liberties" in this State.

This year is the 40th anniversary of the founding of the ACLU amidst the torment and suspicions riding the wake of World War I, the Nation's first major involvement in international politics. A group of perceptive citizens feared that the first 10 constitutional amendments, the American Bill of Rights, were being ignored and violated on sundry occasions.

Not everybody likes or even approves of the union, which is testimony to its persistence and its fealty to those principles to which it was committed 40 years ago. That steadfast attitude obviously has provoked many battles in behalf of many individuals and many causes. These often were not popular at the moment, a situation that invoked wrath upon the ACLU.

To claim that time always has proved the ACLU in the right would be wasteful argument. Nothing attains that degree of perfection, but this organization must be credited for its courage and zeal, as well as its dexterity in combat.

Personal Tragedy for Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another article written by Mr. Ralph McGill:

PERSONAL TRAGEDY FOR EISENHOWER—COMMUNIST MOB TACTICS BLOCK EFFORTS FOR PEACE THROUGH NEGOTIATION

(By Ralph McGill)

The perhaps inevitable rumors follow in the wake of the Japanese disaster: Ike will resign shortly after his return home to deprive the Communists of their use of him as a symbol of obstruction to peace. This further will relieve the Republican Party of the need to defend his leadership.

It is a false rumor, utterly without basis of fact.

But that it is reported does point up one of the most lamentable personal tragedies of our time. Until the Four-Power failure at Paris a few weeks ago, President Eisenhower was a worldwide symbol of peace. Not even the Communists were able to attack him. The leader of world communism Nikita Khrushchev, publicly declared Mr. Eisenhower to be a man of good will and one

sincerely dedicated to the search for peace through negotiation.

The sudden collapse of the summit meeting, in which the Russian-downed U–2 reconnaissance plane was employed as the instrument of destruction, precipitated an almost insanely bitter personal attack on the President.

In Japan the Communists again made him the symbol of hate and aggression. Here of late the stupidity of decision and plain bad luck have enabled communism to take advantage of situations not before available. The handling of the U–2 incident was one. In Japan the Kishi government, strongly loyal to the United States, made itself vulnerable to attack by the non-Communist left by forcing through the U.S. treaty with the Socialist Party locked out of Parliament.

The Communists were quick to take advantage of the situation. Every resistance movement in Europe in the Second World War soon found itself largely led and directed by Communists. They were used to carrying on an underground operation. They were valuable allies. At war's end the Communists were in strong positions in most of the governments hastily established in the wake of the German surrender. France and Italy were rescued only by a considerable local effort and by the helpful economic effect of the Marshall plan.

So it was in Japan. The Socialists included a few Communists. There was a Marxist student group. There were other organizations committed to an antimilitary position because of Japan's suffering from war, especially the two atomic attacks.

The Communists were able to provide leadership, street mob organization and tactics, and the propaganda incentives. They were also able to produce the shock troops of street fighting.

For communism it was an unforeseen opportunity. The President, target of Mr. Khrushchev's insults at Paris, could be made their target. It is likely that Red China and Russia both had agents at Tokyo.

There is no blinking the fact that what happened was a severe defeat for U.S. prestige and, since we lead the West, for our allies. It will encourage the tactics of street mobs in other nations. It will incite Communist groups to new activity.

It now is possible our bases in Japan may, in time be lost. Withdrawal of American influence and forces from Japan would leave that country quick prey to communism. The Pacific would become a hostile sea.

All of this is a development productive of much foreboding. It means more trouble for us, an increase in tensions and, unhappily, a stepping up of inflationary forces as we move to increase our military strength.

But melancholy as this is, one cannot avoid a feeling of deep regret for the personal tragedy it is. One of the world's finest, most decent and well-intentioned men has just 6 months away from the conclusion of 8 years of the Presidency, had his hopes wrecked and his position as a world leader and negotiator destroyed.

Ceremony Opening the James River Bridge, Blue Ridge Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Hugh Gordon Miller at Christ St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Norfolk, Va., on the occasion of the Massing of Colors ceremony under the auspices of the Military Order of World Wars, June 12, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HUGH GORDON MILLER, ESQ., AT CHRIST ST. LUKE'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, NORFOLK, VA., AT MASSING OF COLORS CEREMONY UNDER AUSPICES OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF WORLD WARS, SUNDAY, JUNE 12, 1960, AT 4 P.M.

Ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Americans, I shall open my remarks by saying of the Stars and Stripes—the major flag that floats so proudly above all these other standards and colors—what a great southern poet wrote about that glorious emblem and said that:

"When freedom from her mountain height
Unfurled her standard to the air,
She tore the azure robe of night
And set the stars of glory there."

I recently found in an old book an address I made at a convention held in the old Chamberlain Hotel at Old Point Comfort, nearly 60 years ago, which I began by quoting that verse of that great poem. With your permission and the permission of Bishop Brown, I shall take the same text today.

A few days ago Mr. David Lawrence in his column in the New York Tribune said:

"Time was when the Nation found itself in peril, and nothing else mattered. No sacrifice—even of life itself—was too great to make for the honor of our country.

"But things seem to be different now. The President of the United States is insulted and yet some writers continue to furnish aid and comfort to the press of the Soviet Union by denouncing Mr. Eisenhower and holding him culpable for errors he couldn't possibly have avoided and still protect the safety of the American people against surprise attack. He meant, of course, another Pearl Harbor. Then that great editor, from his years of 'summit' view of the great from the Capitol asked this question, which for this section of the country we are answering here today:

"Is this country changing? Is patriotism just an obsolete notion, nurtured only by those of us who have witnessed manifestations of national spirit and pride over a long span of years? Are some of us old fashioned because we cannot accept the modern cynicism which insist that a President of the United States shall be pilloried by political leaders and by some segments of the press of his own country as Moscow papers reprint every bit of captious and carping criticism?"

Before attempting to answer that question, I must pause now, however, to thank you most sincerely for paying me the very great honor of inviting me to take part on this truly great occasion and to express in part the answer to that burning question. I feel very deeply in responding to your invitation, because of the fact that I have been so long an active resident in the North, though like most native Virginians, my heart is always with you.

I realize, if I may presume, for a moment, to be personal, that this establishment by you here in Virginia, in such a situation, of this sacred custom, of the annual massing of colors is being held in this great historic old Christ Church, moved out into your expanding and progressive city and merged with the more modern St. Luke's congregation—a congregation which was so long and wonderfully ministered to by the dear friend of so many of us—Arthur Selden Lloyd—who afterwards, as a bishop, was an honored guest in our home on the New Jersey shore where he would, like other great churchmen, come in the summertime to preach in the beautiful little church of St. Peter's in "Galilee by the sea."

And may I add that all of us here are honored because this celebration is inaugurated here and presented by such an organization as the Military Order of World Wars, whose veterans, many of them here today, have done such heroic service in defending us and all the rest of the free world of today.

We are gathered here to announce by this impressive ceremony the establishing by you of the massing of the colors, invoking in that connection the blessing of the Almighty here in His holy temple.

We are doing so on the basis of loyalty to our common country and flag, regardless of sect, station in life, color, or religious denomination.

In that connection, we quote for the record from a recent New York paper the statement of Joseph C. Anderson, chairman of the Catholic War Veterans:

"The prominent display of flags to salute our President upon his return from the summit conference is a laudable symbol of the way Americans unite into one great and indestructible nation in time of crisis. We stand firmly behind President Eisenhower in his courageous determination to secure peace without humiliation, and we deplore the unruly tactics of Mr. Khrushchev as the representative of communism."

We applaud Martin B. McKneally, the national commander of the American Legion for canceling a scheduled trip to Russia, declaring that "where the President of the United States is not welcome, no American citizen should go." It is evident that all they want is American money to use to help bury us with.

We quote also the words of Dr. Jones, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews:

"This symbolic expression of American unity at a time like this is an inspiration to all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

"With the unfurling of our wonderful Old Glory today, we are telling Soviet dictators and the peoples throughout the world, that the American people stand behind our President in his efforts to safeguard the free world."

Since you concluded to invite the historian of the last 50 years of the New York Southern Society and a member of the Society of American Historians—instead of a minister of the gospel—to deliver this address—I know that you will permit me to quote the words of that great Virginian, Patrick Henry, who declared, in the old church in Richmond when he was calling his countrymen to arms for the American Revolution: "The only lamp I have to guide my footsteps is the lamp of experience."

I hope, therefore, that you will permit me—as a local historian—to invoke the good old ministerial custom of reaching down in the old barrel of sermons and digging up a quotation from that old speech of mine, delivered at old Point Comfort, nearly 60 years ago.

"We have heard often, to be sure, of how the various ensigns of the Original Thirteen Colonies, like 'An Appeal to Heaven' on the flag of Massachusetts, and 'Down With the Tyrants' on the ensign of the Old Dominion which developed into the Stars and Stripes, in 1777, when it was declared by the American Congress 'That the flag of the thirteen United States should be thirteen stripes, alternating red and white, and that the Union be thirteen stars representing the new constellation.

"But, thank God, if the sons of New England and the North in the centuries yet to come, and the children of this section of the country in the generations yet unborn, are what they ought to be, what their birth-

right guarantees and the great God of the universe destines that they shall be, the story of the Star Spangled Banner will never grow too old to tell again, or too old to keep us from singing—

"The Star-Spangled Banner,
O' long may she wave
O'er the land of the free
And the home of the brave.' "

Even at this great naval base, I am not able in the time here allotted me, to follow the victorious course of that banner through the struggles of the Revolution, on land and over sea: or in the wars that have followed since; but suffice it to say, that ever since that first naval engagement in which our flag appeared, when, after the flagstaff was shot away, John Paul Jones was asked by the captain of the British ship "if he had struck his colors." He replied: That he "had not yet begun to fight", until gallant old General Joe Wheeler refused to fall back with the banner at Santiago. The story has ever been the same.

We may add at this point that, from Chateau-Thierry to Hiroshima, and the Korean war, the story has ever been the same. And, to add further, that we are ready to carry on again in the same old way, if it becomes necessary, as the timely massing here of these colors gives notice to the world, and especially to the Communist world.

In that speech at Old Point Comfort—showing how history repeats itself—your present speaker went on to say, and I again quote from the RECORD:

"With the renewal of the old relationships of long ago between the sections and that better understanding between all the people—which has been brought about under the policies and the administration of our late great and glorious President (I was referring of course, to the great President McKinley)—continuing to dominate over and guide the destinies of the greatest Nation that ever existed under the sun, I take your invitation here as a tribute to those who are the only emperors, after all, that this country has ever known or will ever know; as a tribute to those uncrowned kings who at last must grapple with all the problems and confront and master all the dangers that beset this Republic; as a tribute to those who, on this American continent, stand in the path in which not only the Filipinos, the Cubans, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexicans, the Africans, and the Central Americans. But the world's liberties must in part be guarded, for, as someone has said:

"Blot out the beacon that lights the portals of this Republic and the world is adrift again; but establish the light of its beacon over the troubled waters and one by one the nations of the earth will drop anchor and be at rest in the harbor of universal liberty.

"As a tribute to that America of which Theodore Roosevelt, the head of the Nation, is (or was then) the personification—and that without regard to section or to party—will in this 20th century, at the country's call, be found standing ever by the Government and standing by the flag."

But, my fellow countrymen, we are not here today to deal merely with general principles, and I must refer to certain distressing facts of international life. A major American industrialist, Mr. Cyrus Eaton, seems to have become the mouthpiece of the very devil himself, using the prosperity he has enjoyed for so many years under our free enterprise system, in a studied campaign to destroy us and all the free world, if he can. We should get the advice on this of Mr. Hoover of the FBI, the real historian and the best authority of the subject of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. He has many times warned us of this termite menace boring from within.

Mr. Cyrus Eaton—and men like Paul Robeson, who claims Russia as his "second country"—should be forcibly invited to join their fellow Communists and live with them, and enjoy if they can their way of life. If possible, their citizenship should be taken away from them as far as this country is concerned.

On the other hand, we are proud to realize that regardless of politics, the great and evergrowing greater leader of the majority party in the U.S. Senate—who hails from Texas—the great Senator from Georgia, who until recently was chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate (if I recall aright, now chairman of its military affairs), and the distinguished young southern chairman of the Military Committee of the House of Representatives, along with practically every other responsible person from every other section of the country, are standing wholeheartedly back of our President and approving his gentlemanly behavior during the trying provocations confronting him and which continue to be heaped upon him, and the peril which confronts this Nation, ignoring abuse from abroad or disregarding politically inspired suggestions at home.

His report on the torpedoed summit conference was an unanswerable masterpiece. Mr. K. is finding out that—

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again
For the eternal years of God are hers,
While error wounded, writhes in pain
And dies amid its worshipers."

Our great President is but following the motto of another great President, who hailed from the North—Theodore Roosevelt—by talking softly while carrying a big stick.

By the massing of our colors here today, we give fair warning, as Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago, that our President or any future President will use that stick if and when it becomes necessary in the cause of freedom and justice.

Let us recall, and heed the words of the majority leader in the Senate who has advised that "one thing we must not forget is that we are all united against communism—and under our Constitution, the only effective instrument for unity is the President of the United States."

Let us realize, my fellow countrymen, that this Nation and the rest of the free world is not merely confronted by the symbolic old bear that walks like a man of czarist days. That old animal was ferocious but he fought in the open. When we saw the pictures, a few days ago, and repeated more violently since, of a raging maniac drunk with power, ranting for all the world like Hitler used to rant, with threats and denunciations of all the free world, and especially of our great God-serving, gentlemanly mannered President and the United States of America, in particular—we began to realize that the free world was menaced by a modern embodiment of Genghis Khan, one who never has withdrawn his announcement to the world that he and his Communist-followers, intend to bury us, and to take dominion over all the world. To do so in the same manner he and his followers have taken dominion over Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the rest of their captive satellites.

That old devil discloses that he surely knows a lot about hell. For instance, Mr. K., in one of his tirades said that he believes that President Eisenhower wants peace, but "the road to hell is paved with good intentions and he will really get there."

Mr. K., the raving mouthpiece of Satan, will surely arrive there, but he will wait a long, long time for the arrival of our Mr. Ike, a follower of the Almighty God.

The pupil, and final imitator, of the Stalin he deceitfully displaced has, in repudiating God Almighty, become the boasting Communist mouthpiece of the devil himself, whom he decides to follow.

For the first time in American history the representative of the devil himself attempts to openly influence a presidential election in the United States, and has the assistance in our midst of men like Cyrus Eaton. We note, however, that Poland, itself under the heel of massed Russian armies, is Russia's only defender in the United Nations, in the face of a disapproving world.

And so we renew here today our allegiance to the Stars and Stripes and the Republic for which it stands. Men with views and actions relating to that flag—like Cyrus Eaton or Paul Robeson, whom I have mentioned as examples of disloyal Communist fellow travelers in our midst—would not be entitled to take part in this massing of our colors, because they could not do so without lying when taking that loyalty pledge and oath of allegiance.

And now that the overrated U–2 incident and related matters are backfiring with a crash on the enemy, and are being appropriately handled by the United Nations, we can once again proclaim with calmness, hope, and confidence that any President of the United States, whoever he may be, now or in the future, regardless of section or party, will continue to honor these colors and, guarding us all against that promised "burial" day, by way of another and atomic Pearl Harbor, say with us:

"She's up there—Old Glory—where the lightnings are sped
She dazzles the Nation with ripples of red;
And she'll wave for us living or droop o'er us dead—
The flag of our country—forever."

And now, like many others here, a son of a Confederate soldier, I salute once again with pride my old native community, and join with you in exclaiming, God bless America and our indestructible union of sovereign States, and say God bless and protect the President of the United States as on this holy day he, like the apostles of old, starts out on a dangerous mission to further Christian ideals and principles in the cause of peace on earth and good will to men.

Our Unsound Social Security Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the Committee report accompanying H.R. 12580, three of us included our joint statement with respect to the actuarial unsoundness of the present program.

This statement pointed out the actual trusteeship vested in the Congress over the contributions or taxes, and the benefits of the old age, survivor, and disability provision of the social security law.

It is my purpose to provide the Congress and the American people with some of the pertinent information of what is actually happening under existing law, and what is presently proposed that we do about safeguarding these benefits under the pending bill. To this end, I shall not in this statement

make any remarks respecting either the unemployment or the grant-in-aid provisions of H.R. 12580—either those for child welfare services, or those for medical care for the aged.

We have, over the years, done everything anyone could think of to lead the American people to believe that Uncle Sam has established a gigantic and actuarially solvent insurance system on which they can rely for protection against disability, death and retirement.

Back in 1939, first the Ways and Means Committee, and then the Congress assumed a special obligation to the American people when we adapted insurance terminology to the title VIII payroll taxes we had levied, and the title II benefits we had provided under the Social Security Act which we adopted in 1935.

We renamed the benefits which had been designated old age and lump sum benefits. We added dependents benefits. We called these various benefits Old Age and Survivors Insurance benefits in the 1939 law. We renamed the taxes and called them "Federal Insurance Contributions." We renamed a contingent fund that the taxes went into. We called it the "Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund."

When we added disability benefits in 1946, we followed the same procedure. We earmarked an added one-fourth of 1 percent of social security payroll taxes, imposed on employers and the same amount imposed on employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent imposed on self-employed, as belonging to a new account, which we set up in the Treasury and labeled the "Disability Insurance Trust Fund."

We likewise established trustees of these accounts we had designated as "insurance trust funds." These trustees are, first, the Secretary of the Treasury, second, the Secretary of Labor, and, third, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. We likewise have named the Commissioner of Social Security as the Secretary of these trustees.

We have required these trustees to file an annual report to the Congress on both the short- and long-range aspects of these funds we have designated as insurance trust funds.

While Congress has done all this reassuring labeling of "insurance," "trust fund," "trustees," and the like, the Congress has not in any respect abrogated its responsibility to the American people. The Congress itself has the continuing responsibility of prescribing benefits and benefit conditions, the social security wage base and tax rates, and all the other conditions determining the soundness of the system we have officially designated as insurance.

To be certain that the Congress has full and entire control of the entire program, we have specifically reserved the right in section 1104 of the Social Security Act—

to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of this act.

With this entire control of the provisions we have labeled "Old Age Survivors and Disability Insurance" goes the entire responsibility of seeing that it lives up to the "insurance" label we have fixed to it.

This is our inescapable responsibility to the American people. It is a responsibility involving directly or indirectly the economic security of 180 million Americans and generations yet unborn. It is a solemn trusteeship which by nature should be, like patriotism, above political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the great mass of my colleagues, feel deeply the aspersion that is cast upon us by a mere recital of the dates on which we have acted in performing our trusteeship. Count back the years when we have acted to modify the Social Security Act—1958, 1956, 1954, 1952, 1950, 1948, 1946—each an election year. And here we are again proposing to liberalize the benefits in 1960.

I am particularly reminded of the great similarity of today's insurance proposals with our action in 1952—when there was also a major political contest. It is particularly distressing that our critics can point out that we are again proposing to increase our benefit commitments without increasing the social security taxes. We again are acting on the theory that prior estimates have overstated benefit costs and that with some increase in trust fund interest, we can increase expenditures without increasing the presently scheduled taxes.

But in 1952 we had more basis for our action than we have today for the presently proposed liberalization.

Mr. Speaker, in the 3 years before 1952 the OASI trust fund had grown $4.8 billion to a total of $15.5 billion—and grew nearly $2 billion in 1952.

In the 3 years preceding 1960 the trust fund has shrunk some $2.3 billion to $20.1 billion—and last year's shrinkage was over $1.7 billion.

Back in 1958 when the tax base was broadened and the tax rate schedule stepped up, the Ways and Means Committee made a statement in its report that is highly pertinent today. This is the statement:

This year for the first time in the 18 years since benefits were first paid, the income to the old age and survivors insurance fund is slightly less than the expenditures from the fund. If no changes are made, outgo will continue to exceed income in each year until 1965. Your committee believes that a situation where outcome exceeds income for 7 or 8 years is one that should not be permitted to continue. We believe that public confidence in the system—so necessary if it is to provide real security for the people—may be impaired if the trust fund continues to decline.

The committee at that time thought it was correcting the situation by its tax increases—but again its estimates proved low. The trust fund was to be nearly $21 billion at the beginning of this year. It turned out to be $20.1 billion. The recent OASI report estimates that at the end of 1962 the trust fund will be $7 million lower.

But that report estimated OASI taxes for 1960, 1961, and 1962 at $33,958 million while the present report estimates taxes for this period with the proposed additional coverage at $33,221 million—$737 million lower. This would mean that for the period we face not a $7 million, but a three-quarter of a billion dollar deficit without liberalizing benefits.

It seems to me that we are facing at least a billion dollar deficit for the period 1960–62 inclusive, if we liberalize benefits. I do not see how we can rely on the estimate in the bill that with the liberalized benefits the benefit cost will be hundreds of millions less than we were advised would be the cost of present benefits by the trustees report filed in March of this year. Even so, the committee report is that under the bill the deficit will be $554 million—over a half billion dollars further in the red.

Mr. Speaker, this steady and rapid decline in the trust fund for a six or more year period is proper cause for much soul searching among us responsible for the system. I can but again quote from what our committee said in 1958:

We believe that public confidence in the system—so necessary if it is to provide real security for the people—may be impaired if the trust fund continues to decline.

And I likewise wonder, if we enact the proposed liberalizations without adding higher taxes, and make this decline even more precipitous, if public confidence in the Congress may not also be impaired?

If time permitted, I should like to point out how the proposed vast liberalization of the disability system is likewise leading us down this same road—the committee's own report admits that the bill likewise heads these benefits toward a certain red ink future.

In my long service on the Ways and Means Committee, this is the first time I have seen huge unfinanced social security liberalizations knowingly voted out for the consideration of the Congress.

If I had the power to do so, I should like to amend the bill to strike out the word "insurance" wherever it appears and insert the word "politics." Then, at least, we would be honest in what we were voting on.

Metropolitan Area Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the problems facing our metropolitan areas have been described at some length before congressional committees, at conferences of planners and Government officials, and on other occasions. Gradually we have come to understand the size of the overall situation, which has been described as the major domestic problem of our time.

We have also heard some discussion about the responsibility for dealing with

this problem or with parts of it. Shall the Federal Government take it on, or should State and local government deal with it? There is, of course, no point in arguing over responsibility. Already, every level of government is deeply involved. Our problem at the present is to discover workable methods of assigning portions of total responsibility and, while we're doing it, to inform the public as thoroughly as possible about the problem and proposals to deal with it.

A Federal Department of Urban Affairs, if it is ever created, would certainly not have all the resources needed to deal adequately with the crisis of the metropolis. It could work very effectively, however, with other Federal agencies and with government at every level to achieve an allout mobilization of interest and effort in dealing with all the crises caused by urban change.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of June 18, 1960, emphasizes the reasons for citizen interest in the difficulties facing our Nation in the cities and suburbs of metropolitan areas. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS SOON AS YOU GET THROUGH CRINGING

In one of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund studies it was concluded that sprawl, that ugly crisis with the ugly name, is simply the major domestic problem of our time. The characterization is accurate. But to understand why and how it is accurate you'll have to consult a citizen who is an experienced observer of sprawl and also is the only expert who in the long run will do anything about sprawl.

That citizen is you.

If you flinch when you hear the noun "sprawl" or its coarse synonym "the crisis of the metropolis," don't let your conscience be too hard on you. In a sense that's beginning to trouble more and more serious students of the symptoms, it may be that everyone has flinched away from the central truth about the major domestic problem.

That may sound glib and unjust. It isn't. Perhaps never have so many concerned and competent people attempted to deal with a single issue excepting the issue of war. During the last few days the New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders has been dealing, at a convention whose keynote was the rebirth of county government, with hundreds of aspects of the problem. "Budgetary issues excepted," one 1960 study concluded, "no problems ranked higher on legislative calendars than those of urban change." In this year's session of the legislature more than 150 bills dealing with county government were introduced; on only two other subjects were more changes proposed to deal with the flood of change in an exploding society: municipal government and the administration of the State. The universities and foundations have moved up their research task forces. The Federal Government has been implored to intervene. As when the Dutch engineers were brought to show us how to use the meadowlands of the Hackensack, we have summoned the skills of the world to help.

And things do keep happening, from highway building to urban renewal and hospital aid under Federal auspices to the skilled improvisations in public health and public safety devised by the Bergen County Freeholders, from the metropolitan planning of Fresno and Denver and Dade County to the New Jersey plan for railroad preservation and improvement.

But what's happening is not enough, and if we didn't know from the clatter of housing development and the sullen stillness in the heart of the old cities that it's not enough we could deduce this from the census statistics.

Something has to be done. But who'll do it? By this time it must be clear that the Federal Government must take a hand in the major domestic problem of our time. Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat of New Jersey, has proposed coordination, under a Secretary of Urban Affairs, of Federal agencies having anything to do with urban and suburban problems. But we can't ship this one to Washington for solution. Home rule can't do it: the map shows town lines and counties and 50 States, but the aerial camera and the census show great metropolitan complexes that wipe out those cartographer symbols—and that contain nearly two-thirds of the Nation's population. This is a job for all kinds of government, for industry, management, labor, education, the church. And it is a job, as Richard H. Leach said in the magazine America not long ago, that cannot be done once and for all: "Removing urban blight and casting metropolitan America in a mold that will satisfy future generations is a long, perhaps interminable project."

It cannot start, perhaps indeed it should not start, until people themselves have seen the need, said for themselves what it is, and demanded that the start be made.

It is everybody's job and no one's—no one's but yours.

Urgent Need for National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter released on Monday of this week:

K-E-E-N-O-T-E-S

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

One of the big disappointments of the present session of Congress has been the failure to face up to the urgent need for a national fuels policy.

The future security and welfare of this great Nation depends upon the availability at all times—in times of peace as well as in times of emergency—of a dependable supply of fuel to feed an ever-growing industrial plant. Yet, in spite of this stark reality with which no one can seriously disagree, Congress has dragged its feet because, apparently, of a distortion by some groups of the purposes of a study which has been proposed to prepare such a policy.

It simply does not make sense for the United States to squander its vital fuel resources as we have done in past years. We allow low-cost residual fuel oil to be imported into this country and dumped along the east coast at a price that is always just a little below the cost of coal.

We permit gas to be imported into this country and then dumped at below cost prices in slack seasons to fire steam boilers—a most wasteful and uneconomic use of a good fuel. Both of these things result in decreased markets for coal.

Almost all other major industrial Nations have a unified fuels policy. They do not permit a shameful waste of a valuable resource. They have studied their needs and the supply of fuels. They have come up with a cordinated program that uses the fuel supply in the most efficient, economic manner possible.

I am among those Members of Congress who are sponsoring a bill calling for the creation of a joint committee of Congress to thoroughly investigate all factors affecting America's fuel needs, giving full consideration to the national welfare, the defense needs of the Nation and the economic well being of all domestic industries, and to come up with specific recommendations to Congress.

This simple, plain proposal has been opposed on the ground that it will lead to Government control of how the end-use product will be used. Unfortunately, this argument, based entirely upon a misrepresentation of the purposes and meaning of the resolution, has succeeded in blocking consideration or even congressional debate on this vital issue.

It now appears we will not be able to obtain approval of the resolution this year. But I can assure you that when the 87th Congress convenes next year a proposal for the study of a national fuels policy will be one of the first measures introduced.

DEVELOPMENTS IN JAPAN GREAT TRADEGY

The cancellation of the President's trip to Japan because of the inability of the Japanese to control street rioters could be the forerunner of serious trouble in this heretofore stable ally country of the Orient.

It appears that the present Japanese Government has lost control of the situation. Obviously, the President would have been in grave personal danger had he made his scheduled trip to Japan.

This development is doubly tragic. Not only is it a severe diplomatic blow to this country and to the West in general, but it places democracy in Japan in jeopardy. Should the worst happen and a Communist-inclined government take over in Japan, we will have suffered a major defeat.

Japan's resurgence since the war has been miraculous. A genuine democratic government has been successfully installed. The nation has made great economic progress. Japan has been a stanch ally in the fight for freedom which we can ill afford to lose. In fact, the loss of Japan would unhinge our entire defensive system in the Far East.

We in this country simply must not lose patience with Japan as a result of this unfortunate development. We need to encourage and strengthen the forces there which believe in freedom.

Everett Jones Wins Trip to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this week to act as a host to Mr. Everett Jones, a freshman student at Los Angeles City College, who has been awarded a trip to the Nation's Capital for winning the City College All-School Speech Contest. The contest and the trip are sponsored by several

local Kiwanis clubs in Los Angeles, including the Los Feliz Club, of which I am a member.

I wish to add my personal congratulations to Everett on his outstanding achievement. In winning the award, with a speech entitled, "Freedom and You," he competed against 1,200 fellow students.

Everett arrived in Washington last Sunday afternoon and has been very busy visiting various points of interest and seeing the Government in action. I wish him a most enjoyable and educational week, and every success for the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion at this point in the RECORD a news article which describes in more detail Everett's winning of this award:

CITY COLLEGE STUDENT WINS TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Everett Jones, 20-year-old freshman at Los Angeles City College, leaves Los Angeles International Airport by jet airliner June 19 for a week-long all-expense-paid trip to the Nation's Capital. Jones won this citizenship award sponsored by local Kiwanis clubs by outspeaking 1,200 fellow Los Angeles City College students in an all-school speech contest just completed.

In his prize-winning speech titled "Freedom and You," he urged American citizens to appreciate their freedom and their rights; to be alert to the dangers threatening freedom; and to be willing to pay the price in time, energy, effort, and sacrifice to preserve freedom.

The young speaker intends to soak up additional knowledge and appreciation of his country's heritage in and around Washington, D.C.'s, historic highlights. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Congressman from the 24th Congressional District and member of Los Feliz Kiwanis, one of the sponsoring Kiwanis clubs, is arranging special tours to honor Everett and to add special interest and value to his investigation of government in action.

In addition to Los Feliz Kiwanis, the East Hollywood and Los Angeles Kiwanis clubs and the Circle K Club of Los Angeles City College are sponsoring the trip. Representatives of these organizations will be on hand when contest-winner Jones leaves Los Angeles International Airport at 8:50 a.m. June 19 and when he returns at 7:55 p.m. June 26.

The 4-week competition in which Jones participated saw 1,200 Los Angeles City College students speaking on the general theme, "Freedom Is Up to You." The final round of the contest was judged by Dr. Wesley Lewis, professor of speech, UCLA; Dr. James Stansell, head of Los Angeles State College Speech Department; and Mr. John Dobbin, representing the life insurance industry. A similiar contest is conducted each semester by the speech department of Los Angeles City College.

The Scottish Highlanders of the State University of Iowa Leave on European Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today the 73 members of the world famous Scottish Highlanders, all-girl bagpipe band from the State University of Iowa, sail aboard the Queen Elizabeth for England, as the first oversea stop on a 54-day tour abroad.

The Highlanders will perform in London on June 30 and July 6. Then they will travel to Scotland and perform in Edinburgh, Elgin, Aberdeen, Falkirk, and Dumferline during the period of July 7 through July 17. Their tour will take them to Paris on July 18, after which they will travel to Amsterdam, Cologne, Mainz, Frankfort, Rome, and Berne before returning to Paris on August 4. On this same day they will sail from Cherbourg and arrive back in the United States August 9.

As one of the first stops on this year's tour, the Highlanders spent 2 days last week in Washington, D.C. They presented a public performance at Sylvan Theater last Thursday night. On Friday, they were welcomed to the White House and left a memento for President and Mrs. Eisenhower. After a tour of the Capitol and a visit to the Senate, where they were officially recognized from the floor by Iowa's Senator HICKENLOOPER, they were met by Vice President NIXON and members of the Iowa congressional delegation.

The Highlanders captivate audiences wherever they go. They are excellent good-will ambassadors, not only for the Hawkeye State, but for the entire United States. They are first-rate examples of the alert, good-looking, wholesome, and intelligent American college girls who attract attention and praise everywhere. They contribute to the image of America where outright friendliness is one of our greatest attributes.

This group is the largest bagpipe band in the world. Since its formation in 1937 the hundreds of student members of this group have traveled over 80,000 miles and appeared before 5 million persons, not including television appearances.

The Scottish Highlanders have appeared in 32 States, visited both U.S. coasts, performed twice in the Rose Bowl, and have twice—1952 and 1956—toured Europe, including England, Scotland, France, Germany, Holland, and Switzerland.

This unique bagpipe band was formed in 1937 as an all-male military—ROTC—unit. The change from men to coeds came in 1943 when the wartime shortage of men on the Iowa campus threatened the existence of the band. Director Adamson invited the coeds to continue the organization "until the boys come back," but the feminine membership has proved so popular that the girls continue to wear the kilts. No academic credit is given for participation in the Highlanders.

In addition to playing traditional Scottish tunes, the Highlanders are noted for their colorful marching maneuvers, intricate Scottish dances, and a cappella chorus, directed by Judy Croft of Norwalk, Iowa, who also doubles as a piper. In the "Drum Dance," a novelty number originated by the Highlanders, Nancy Henderson, senior in elementary education from St. Joe, Ark., dances the Highland Fling atop a bass drum held aloft on the shoulders of six of her fellow Highlanders.

Making the tour this year are the director of the Highlanders, William Adamson; Mrs. Adamson and their children, Heather and John; Mr. Adamson's secretary, Nadine Thornton; Phyllis Fleming; the drum major, Margaret Ladd, and the following members of the band. Their hometowns are in Iowa unless otherwise indicated.

Miriam L. Avey, Marshalltown; Emilie Blume, Sioux City; Barbara Broholm, Wilmette, Ill.; Beveraly Jo Bruce, Newton; Gale Chandler, Rockford, Ill.; Sharon J. Conger, Riceville; Judy Ann Croft, Norwalk; Virginia Mary Dunn, Columbus Junction; Eleanor Firzlaff, Dubuque; Elizabeth Ann Frew, Dearborn, Mich.; Ruth Carol Guildner, Oxford; Joselyn Hartwig, Clarence; Allene M. Hays, Grinnell; Nancy Sue Henderson, Ottumwa; Nancy Hopp, Glenwood; Jeanne Hughes, Lenox; Jane Ann Jinkinson, Sheldon; Donnia Kempenaar, Oskaloosa; Judy Kelmesrud, Thompson; Margaret Ladd, Iowa City; JoAnn Lesch, Osage; Malinda Jane Baker, Cresco; Ardith Broka, Parkersburg; Barbara Brown, Waterloo; Mary Camille Case, Grinnell; Judith Ann Clark, Cedar Falls; Harriett Dianne Cook, Oskaloosa; Kay Jane Croft, Norwalk; Marcia Kaye Fennema, Mount Ayr; Caroyln Ann Foote, Belle Plaine; Judith Ann Gardner, Waterloo; Martha Harris, Bloomfield; Carol Ann Hathaway, Muscatine; Gail Hemenway, Cedar Falls; Phoebe L. Hewlett, Pomeroy; Brenda Hughes, Iowa City; Mary Kathleen Hughes, Lenox; Janet Kainz, Elkader; Nancy Ann Kennedy, West Liberty; Nancy Kramer, Remsen; Jeannette Laughlin, Harlan; Margaret MacDonald, Chicago, Ill.; Janet Mast, Waterloo; Beth McDermott, Muscatine; Diana Merrill, Ida Grove; Mary Milnes, Burlington; Mary Morrison, Carroll; Carol Nelson, McNabb, Ill.; Sybil Norton, Spencer; Jeane Peckumn, Jamaica; Susan Powers, Melbourne; Suzanne Kay Raymond, Des Moines; Nancy Lee Ross, Marion; Alice Silletto, Des Moines; Mary Ellen Stalcup, Storm Lake; Mary Wlater, Lakeview; Carol Ann Wetzell, Sterling, Ill.; Mary Young, Washington; Sue Mast, Waterloo; Joan Carol McNeil, Sterling, Ill.; Lorranie Miller, Syracuse 6, N.Y.; Myra Jo Mixson, Cedar Rapids; Barbara Munro, Bettendorf; Nancy Nelson, Clinton; Mary Ossian, Shenandoah; Sandy Phillips, Cedar Rapids; Barbara Ratcliffe, Burlington; Rita Rosenberger, Altoona; Brenda Shirley, Perry; Patricia Smith, Elmhurst, Ill.; Patricia Steenrod, Iowa Falls; Kathleen Warren, Leon; Janet Wetzell, Sterling, Ill.

On Understanding Events in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we in Colorado are proud to have a newspaper that attempts to give

adequate perspective to difficult issues in these troubled times. I commend to the members for their serious consideration the following editorial in the Denver Post of June 17, 1960:

THE MEANING OF EVENTS IN JAPAN

President Eisenhower's courageous, goodwill mission to the Far East cannot be considered a total failure, even though Japan has been closed to him.

At 69, after a heart attack, a stroke, and serious abdominal surgery, a distinguished American has shown his willingness to undergo discomfort, strain, and great personal danger in order to make a final contribution to world understanding and peace.

This must surely have been clear to the hundreds of thousands who cheered the president in the Philippines. And it can hardly have escaped the notice of Asia's millions.

The visit to Japan was canceled, not because of the president's fear, but because the Kishi administration decided it could not control the mob.

Mr. Eisenhower's determination to go to Japan, despite the danger, will remain a symbol of our national desire for understanding and good will.

Nonetheless, the events in Japan this week present a serious challenge to American prestige and a threat to our entire position in Asia.

Japan has a pivotal place in the arc of defense bases that stretches like a great sickle from South Korea around southeast and central Asia to Turkey.

No other nation in the region has as much industrial might, as high a standard of living, as great a potential for successful democracy and as much strategic significance.

Yet, after 15 postwar years of large-scale American aid and cooperation, Japan is wavering as an ally.

The president of the United States is unable to land there. The pro-American Kishi government is under attack.

The mob may yet prevent the carrying through of a defense treaty that is highly favorable to Japanese interests.

The indications are strong that the mob speaks only for a minority and that it is being led and manipulated by the Communists.

But the antitreaty movement appears to be deeply rooted in the Japanese facts of life.

Japan is the only nation in the world to have experienced the horror of atomic bombardment.

Japan has been indoctrinated by American teachers to eschew the paths of militarism.

Japan has been warned by the Soviet Union that bases on her territory will be attacked if they are used for U–2 spy missions.

Japan lies in the frightening shadow of a dangerous, aggressive growing Communist power on the Chinese mainland.

Japan knows that the Kishi government rammed the defense treaty through the Diet in an irregular and undemocratic manner.

Even if the new treaty with the United States is ratified, these factors will subject the alliance to persistent strains and tensions.

Under the present circumstances, the treaty can only be of enduring value, if the Kishi government can dispel the suspicion that the agreement does not have majority support among the Japanese people.

The way to do this—and score a counterblow at the Communist propagandists at the same time—is through free elections.

Let the whole Japanese people—not just the Communist-led Tokyo mob—have its say on the treaty. If the treaty wins, the mob will be discredited and the alliance will be on a firmer footing.

The troubles in Japan come at a time when the whole defensive arc in Asia has been rocked by blows, problems, and pressures.

In South Korea, an unstable and uncertain government has replaced the dictatorial regime of Syngman Rhee.

On Taiwan, the aging Chiang Kai-shek watches the mainland grow in power, while the shells land on Quemoy and Matsu.

In southeast Asia, guerilla forces menace weak governments, and to the west Red troops are massed on the borders of India.

In Turkey, a repressive government has been overthrown and a new one struggles to maintain order and stability.

Our role in Asia, in this situation, is in clear need of careful reexamination through the broadest and most forthright kind of public discussion.

Our Asian policy deserves serious attention in the campaign months that lie ahead.

If we are temporarily blocked from developing a deeper understanding with Japan, we can at least pursue a deeper understanding of our own position.

Father Clancy Receives Americanism Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Father Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., of the history department of Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., was awarded the annual "John and Mary Schmelz Americanism Award" for patriotism by the Eastwood Post 1276 of the American Legion, Department of New York, on May 29, 1960.

The citation read in part:

For outstanding work in alerting citizens of the United States to the dangers of communism; for dedicated service toward maintaining a free America.

Mr. Speaker, as long as this country is blessed with men of Father Clancy's caliber, the freedom of America will never be in doubt. I am proud and privileged to call Father Clancy a friend. He is an outstanding man of God, leader, scholar, teacher and author. I know I join my colleagues in extending our heartfelt congratulations to him.

I take pleasure in including in the RECORD an article about Father Clancy, which appeared in the Dolphin, official newspaper of Le Moyne College, on April 12, 1960:

VERSATILE JESUIT ACCLAIMED AS LEADER OF CIVIC AFFAIRS

Civic participation seems to be the password in the life of Father Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., of the Le Moyne College History Department. Having long been engaged in humanitarian and political work, Father Clancy is presently active in several service organizations.

As a member of the board of the Red Cross in Onondaga County, Father Clancy meets once a month with the other directors to plan blood drives and determine whether the supply on hand would be sufficient to cope with a disaster. General Gruenther, former NATO chief, commended this board for their devotion in the preparation for the unexpected.

Father Clancy possesses a personal certificate from the Governor in recognition of his work on the board of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. By direct appointment this organization attempts to see that Negroes are given a square deal with regard to employment, housing, and freedom to enjoy public places of amusement.

Along the same lines, Father Clancy is also a member of the board of directors of the National Urban League for the Advancement of Colored People.

The board of directors of the Foreign Policy Association and the United Nations Association have Father Clancy as a member. Their purpose is to make the U.S. foreign aid program meaningful.

Father Clancy says: "American dollars at best are temporary stop-gap measures. The underdeveloped countries want American know-how; they want the self-respect that comes with being able to help themselves."

Not content with the above four board memberships, Father Clancy is a director of the board of the Polish Arts Society of Syracuse. It is interesting to note that this organization was instrumental in bringing rare paintings and tapestries from the World Fair of 1939 to Syracuse. These works of art now rest in the Le Moyne College library.

Father Clancy's spare time is devoted to the writing of his new book, "The History of the Democratic Party," which is now in its fourth year of preparation. His previous book, "The Presidential Election of 1880" has received excellent reviews in "American Historical Review", "Catholic Historical Review", "World Affairs", and "America."

Glovemakers Union Opposes Campaign by Toothpaste Manufacturer To Give Away Gifts of Imported Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently taken the floor of this House to point out the serious challenge to the jobs and economic livelihood of the employees of the glovemaking industry of Fulton County, N.Y., whose representative I have the honor to be, presented by growing imports of gloves from cheap wage areas abroad. In fact, since coming to Washington 2 years ago I have introduced several pieces of legislation designed to meet this situation.

It is most disturbing to learn now that one of our leading manufacturers, in an effort to promote the sale of his own American-made product, is offering to give away three pairs of imported gloves. Not only does this campaign promote the use of a product which is in competition with a product produced and manufactured by American workers, but the mere fact that these gloves could be given away for a mere box top and $1 more underlines the tremendous gap in prices between domestic products and foreign products which is the real source of the damage that has been occurring to American workers.

A campaign has recently been launched by the Amalgamated Unions of Fulton

County to protest this action, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article from the Gloversville Leader-Herald of recent date describing these actions:

UNIONS BLAST TOOTHPASTE GIFT GLOVES

The local Amalgamated Unions have launched a campaign of protest against the Lever Bros. Co. of New York City in regard to a promotional program whereby the company will provide toothpaste customers with three pairs of imported gloves.

Mayor Eugene S. Grover along with the unions sent a letter of protest to the company and hundreds of members of the unions have sent cards to the company protesting the promotional campaign.

Officials of Locals 1712, United Tannery and Leather Workers, 1714, Consolidated Glove Cutters and Shavers, and 743, Knit Woolen Workers, in their letters noted they were not condemning the toothpaste the customer had to purchase in order to secure the gloves.

IMPORTED GLOVES OFFERED

The Lever Co. has offered the public three pairs of stretch string gloves imported from Italy if they send the box top from the toothpaste along with $1.

The unions in their letters said they thought the company was using poor taste in asking the American public to buy an American made product and to get the people to do this, give away an imported product and further deprive gloveworkers, businessmen, and employers of maintaining employment in Fulton County.

Mayor Grover in his letter said: "You may not be aware of the economic effect such a promotion will have on the welfare of the American manufacturer and workingman."

"Fabric gloves which account for a substantial percentage of the total manufacture within Fulton County, are directly in competition with those you propose to use as premiums. The wage rate in Italy is only a fraction of that in this country.

"Knowing the tremendous response Lever Bros. get to their promotions we would estimate that at least 100,000 dozen pairs of gloves would be required. We have estimated that such an order could displace an alarming percentage of the wages paid by the fine glove industry in Fulton County to say nothing of the profit lost to retailers in the United States, the effect of which would ramify to many segments of the economy.

EFFECT ON COUNTY

Although we hardly expect you to change the character of the promotion we do want you to know the extent of the plight in which Fulton County manufacturers and workingmen will find themselves and the indirect effect it will have upon the economy of the city of Gloversville and the county of Fulton, including tax payments and valuations.

"Should you be curious to know the exact effect of the loss to domestic producers caused by the distribution of foreign hand covering we would be only too happy to supply authentic and up-to-date statistics."

The Glove Cities Area Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America has also asked the public to send protests to the company.

A Declaration of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, on June 4, 1960, to address the 51st annual convention of B'nai Zion, held at Kutschers Country Club, Monticello, N.Y.

B'nai Zion is a national fraternal organization which has grown in stature through the years until today it is recognized as the outstanding organization of its kind in this country, with a membership that reaches from one end of the country to the other.

During the course of its deliberations the convention adopted the following declaration of principles which I believe deserve the widest publicity. The text of the declaration follows:

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

Dedicated to the furtherance of the ideals of Americanism, zionism, and fraternalism, Bnai Zion, in the more than 5 decades of its existence, has adhered steadfastly to the principles laid down by its founders.

In the firm conviction that zionism is consistent with American ideals of social justice and equality of opportunity for all, Bnai Zion reaffirms its support of and affiliation with the World Zionist movement and identifies itself actively with the following goals:

1. Furtherance of mutual understanding and ties of friendship between the United States and Israel.
2. Strengthening of the bonds of fellowship between the Jews of our own country and our brethren in Israel and other lands.
3. Economic aid to the people of Israel.
4. Aid to immigration and absorption of refugees into the state of Israel.
5. The survival of the American Jewish community and the promotion of the Hebrew language and culture.

In reaffirming our adherence to the Zionist ideal we proclaim our position as a nonpolitical body, neither affiliated or identified with any of the political parties in Israel or elsewhere. We welcome into our ranks members of all shades of opinion united under the banner of Americanism and zionism.

We strongly believe in the principle of fraternalism in American Jewish life and will continue our efforts toward the advancement of the human and social welfare of the individuals and families that constitute our membership.

Nixon Text on Farm Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an excerpt from the Washington Post of June 21, which contains that portion of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S address at Minot, N. Dak., dealing with his farm proposals.

In this speech, the Vice President took note of the fact that the American farmer needs real and active help in 1960. The Vice President also faced up to the fact that the real problem in American agriculture is the surplus on hand.

I think we all realize that a part of the answer to this problem is taking out of production acreage which provides for a portion of the surplus. However, far better do we understand the need to further expand our markets to increase consumption of our agricultural products in markets abroad. The underdeveloped countries are the greatest area for the consumption of American surplus products. As one of the authors of Public Law 480, it appears to me to be clearly the path of wisdom. In this last 6 years, more than $9 billion in surplus food has been distributed to hungry people in other lands, people who could not afford to pay for food in the commercial marketplace. One-third of the world's population still remains hungry. Expansion of this human market will not only benefit our farmers, but it will increase good will for America abroad, a valuable contribution to our foreign policy. And I am sure we all realize the need to strengthen our foreign relations today more vitally than at any other time in history, in any and every way we can.

This method of disposal of our surplus additionally benefits in the amounts exchanged in foreign countries for which we receive currencies of those countries. This not only promotes further agricultural market development of definite income return to the American farmer, but it, too, is an important cog in our relations with the free nations of the world. It permits the economic development of such friendly nations through loans to private U.S. and foreign businesses in the currencies of those countries. To so help such countries to expand their own economies and better their standards of living will go a long way in our fight for world freedom and world peace, a long way in erasing the insidious Communist propaganda that seeks to picture the United States as an avaricious power seeking only its own self-aggrandizement.

When we help our farmers, we help ourselves, we strengthen the veritable backbone of our Nation, we bring the nations of the free world closer to our orbit in the cause of lasting peace. Let us not risk damage to this multifaceted program by any curtailment of it. Let us, instead, expand the program within Public Law 480, to our everlasting credit.

The Vice President has hit on the real solution to the American surplus agriculture problem—in everexpanding markets abroad with people who can consume this surplus. Continuation and expansion of this idea will get approval not only at home but also with friendly peoples all over the world.

The excerpt follows:

NIXON TEXT ON FARM ILLS

(MINOT, N. Dak., June 20—The following is that portion of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S address here today dealing with his farm proposals:)

The solution of the farm problem does not lie in simply doing more of what we have been doing, since our present programs have aggravated rather than solved the problem.

We should reject any program which would put the farmer in a Government straitjacket in which what he plants, how much he can sell, and the price he receives is determined by bureaucrats in Washington.

While the parity price program on which we have placed such great reliance in the past has proved useful in stabilizing farm prices, we must recognize that a parity formula at its best treats the symptoms and not the cause of the farm problem.

URGES INFLATION FIGHT

A method must be developed whereby the farmers themselves have a greater oppor-

tunity to choose the kind of farm program they want.

Let us turn now to some of the specific proposals which I have asked the Republican Platform Committee to consider. I want to emphasize at the outset that these proposals are not intended to be all-inclusive. For example, I shall not discuss the problem of parity at this time since it is currently before the Congress. But, the proposals I shall make are ones designed to deal with the causes and not just the symptoms of the farm problem.

To help the farmer to get out of the cost-price squeeze, we must wage an effective fight against inflation. In a period of inflation, with surpluses overhanging the market, the prices of the products the farmer grows are the last to go up and they never catch up with the prices of the things he buys.

There should be a sharply expanded program of research in the marketing of farm products, designed to reduce the gap between what the farmer receives for his crops and what the consumer pays for his food.

To bring supply more directly into relation with demand, we must recognize the necessity for taking acreage which produces crops in surplus out of production. In administering this program, we must take every possible precaution to avoid creating ghost towns in the traditionally agricultural areas.

WOULD EXPAND MARKETS

The rural development program, which has been so successful, should be expanded so that marginal farmers can supplement their income and not be forced to move from the rural communities in which they live.

Our major aim and our major effort must be, however, not to reduce production but to expand the markets for farm products and to increase consumption. There are three proposals in this area that I think are among those worthy of consideration.

First, Governor Rockefeller, in his recent appearance in North Dakota, proposed that a year's supply of food for the Nation be set aside against the eventuality of an atomic attack. This is a sound and constructive proposal, and I would only add that because a 1- or a 2-year reserve would represent an enormous permanent storage burden in its present form, a research program should be undertaken to find economically feasible ways to convert surplus gains into storable form.

Second, I believe the amount of effort we are presently devoting to research for expanding the commercial uses of farm products is inadequate.

It is an established practice in business to allot funds for basic research which bear a proper relationship to the overall magnitude of the problem to be dealt with. It doesn't make sense to spend only $16 million a year on finding new uses for agriculture products when we are spending $5 billion a year in financing and storing surplus farm products.

There is a third area which provides by far the best opportunity for making our food surpluses a national asset rather than a liability as they tend to be today. I refer to the use of our foods in the humane, as distinguished from the commercial, market abroad.

It has been estimated that a third of the world's population, approximately a billion people, go to bed hungry every night. Everybody agrees that it doesn't make sense to have huge surpluses at home and millions of hungry people abroad. How can we bring our surplus food and hungry people together?

NINE BILLION-DOLLAR DISTRIBUTION

The United States has been doing a great deal in this field. In the past 6 years, under Public Law 480, over $9 billion of surplus food has been distributed to people in other countries who could not afford to purchase this food in the commercial market.

There are two potential objections to the program. Since it is unilateral in character, we do not get the credit that we might from our generosity because of the criticism in some countries that the sole purpose of the program is to further selfish U.S. objectives in the cold war.

Second, we have good friends and allies, the Canadians, Australians, French, and Argentinians who produce the same foods that we have in surplus. This means that whenever our surpluses are distributed without adequate regard to the effect on the normal commercial markets, the effect is potentially disastrous as far as these countries are concerned and in the long run would be detrimental to our own interests as well.

Immediately prior to the summit conference, the President, in discussions with his staff in which I participated, developed a proposal which meets these objections and which can lead to a major breakthrough in getting surplus food to hungry people abroad. He was considering presentation of this proposal for the first time at the summit conference in Paris.

The first step would have been to call a conference of all the surplus-producing nations, including the Soviet Union. These nations would then work out a joint proposal for a multilateral program under which the food surpluses of all nations which desired to participate would have been turned over to United Nations' agencies for distribution to the hungry people of member nations.

The recipients of the United Nations food would be those unfortunate people who still are unable to supply themselves with an adequate diet either by their own agriculture efforts or by exchange of goods. The distribution would be handled in such a manner as not to disturb commercial markets.

Since Mr. Khrushchev's actions in Paris have ruled out the U.S.S.R.'s participation in such a program at this time, the only course of action left open to us is to explore with other surplus-producing nations their attitude toward joining us in such a program.

Let me emphasize that I do not suggest that this proposal is a cure-all for the farm problem or for the world's problems. It does, however, have these obvious merits: It will not be harmful to our friends and allies since they will participate in the program. It will not be subject to the criticism directed against unilateral United States aid since it will be administered through the United Nations.

Letter From the American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the following letter is concise and well reasoned and it gives strong substance to the major objections to this measure:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

The Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: We recognize that you are very busy during these closing days of the 86th Congress; however, we hope you will take time to read the attached statement regarding the Poage bill, H.R. 12261.

There can be little question about the need for corrective legislation to deal effectively with the wheat problem. However, the Poage bill moves in a direction that will further aggravate the situation.

The provisions of this legislation are unsound. It not only fails to solve the wheat problem but also threatens to create new problems for the producers of feed grains, livestock, dairy and poultry products.

We urge (1) that you vote against the rule for consideration of this measure; (2) should the House vote to consider this bill, we recommend the elimination of all provisions except subtitle B.

No plan will solve the basic problem or serve the longrun interests of farmers, including wheat and feed grain farmers, unless it encourages market expansion, reduces incentives for the production of unneeded supplies, minimizes economic hardships on wheatgrowers, and avoid shifting the burden of adjustment to other farmers.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12261) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are in a rather unusual situation, because if we adopt the pending amendment that is the end of it; we are then, in effect, adopting the Senate bill which we have never seen. We have not even heard it read. No member of the Committee on Agriculture has spoken in behalf of the pending substitute except the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DIXON].

Conspicuous by his absence from this debate is the distinguished minority leader of our committee, the gentleman from Iowa. At the last minute he comes in and says: "Yes, if you want to have a bill you must adopt the substitute and take the Senate bill." Just how stupid can we be to sit here and adopt a Senate bill that has not even been read?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, but be quick, for I have very little time.

Mr. HOEVEN. The Senate bill has been in the Committee on Agriculture for several days, but the gentleman never held hearings on it.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the gentleman say in the Rules Committee he was not for the Senate bill?

Mr. HOEVEN. I did not. I said I was ready to accept the Senate bill.

Mr. COOLEY. The Senate bill?

Mr. HOEVEN. The Senate bill; yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I understood the gentleman opposed the Senate bill. But he does not have and the administration does not have a bill to offer here. How can we be so naive in voting on one of the greatest problems we have today, wheat, and vote for a bill we have never seen?

If we pass the House bill I will call up the Senate bill and move to strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute the House bill. Then the whole thing goes to conference. We shall work out our differences and bring back a bill that will be acceptable, I am sure, to both Houses of Congress.

We should defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Statement by Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 18, 1960, the Democratic State convention was held in Hartford, Conn. Because the U.S. Senate was in session, Senator THOMAS J. DODD was unable to be present and had his remarks read by his son, Thomas J. Dodd, Jr. I have known young Tom Dodd for many years, and was proud to see how ably he read his father's message. He is a boy of great promise and capacity. The remarks he read will be of interest to the Members of the House:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD TO BE READ TO DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION AT HARTFORD, CONN., SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 1960

I deeply regret that I cannot attend our State convention because of the heavy schedule on the floor of the Senate for Friday and Saturday. Much as I would like to be with you, I think I can best serve by making whatever contribution I can to the enactment of a program that will be good for our country and the building of a record that our candidates can run on this fall with pride.

This is a critical hour in the life of this Congress and in the realm of international affairs. The Japanese Security Treaty, which looms so large in the news of the hour, may be brought to the floor of the Senate at any time. And such vital questions as flood control, adequate pay for Federal employees, medical research, aid to education, and my committee work on the foreign aid and military assistance bill—all are on the agenda for Senate action this weekend. Under these circumstances, I cannot leave Washington.

I am particularly sorry to miss this opportunity to personally tell the convention of the magnificent work done in Congress by FRANK KOWALSKI. He has been an able, dedicated, effective Member of Congress who has served the Nation admirably and reflected great credit upon Connecticut.

During the campaign of 1958, people of our party and of our State soon came to recognize that we had nominated for Congressman at Large an unusually fine public servant. All of the promise which he demonstrated during his energetic campaign has been completely fulfilled by his action of the past year and a half. We do our party a great service when we renominate FRANK KOWALSKI and I am confident that the people of our State will give him the overwhelming vote of confidence that his record in Congress and his lifetime of service to our country deserve.

Each of the other Members of our congressional delegation, who will soon be renominated by our district conventions, has done an excellent job in Washington. The good impression which our House delegation has made has been remarkable. I have heard nothing but good about our Representatives.

I know that Speaker RAYBURN and House Majority Leader MCCORMACK are counting on the leadership of all six of our Connecticut Representatives in the crucial session beginning in 1961 when a new Democratic President, working with a Democratic Congress, will attempt to give the Nation the greatest program of progressive legislation in the history of our country.

In the past 2 years the Democratic-controlled Congress has tried, and in some measure succeeded in, enacting a broad program of good legislation. But the will of the Congress has been frustrated, thwarted, and hindered by an administration which has dragged its feet in every great area of challenge. I believe that the American people have come to realize that the decade of the 1960's must be a decade of action or our country, and the great causes it represents, will perish.

Each of us has a part to play in this crucial election contest. One of the principal national objectives of the Republican Party this year is to recapture the six congressional seats they lost in Connecticut in 1958. We can expect them to put on a tremendous campaign, a campaign which will utilize all the money and resources which are always available to the Republican Party.

It is therefore of vital importance that the Democratic Party of our State make a tremendous effort on behalf of the reelection of each of our Congressmen. In our understandable enthusiasm for the presidential contest, we must never forget for a moment that the capacity of a Democratic President to carry out the platform of our party will depend upon the size of the majority he will have in the next Congress.

The Democratic Party of Connecticut has come a very long distance since 1952. We have gained victories that few thought possible in the dark hours following our defeat of that year. We now have before us the opportunity to complete our victory by preserving our gains in the Congress and in our State legislature and by making a vital contribution to the election of a Democratic President.

I look forward to working with each of you in the winning of a great victory for our party and for the people of America.

The Editors Speak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the June 17 issue of the Lansing Journal, an independent weekly newspaper published in my district, is, I believe, a commentary on a subject of great concern to all Americans, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

THE EDITORS SPEAK?

If some have their way, the predicted Federal budget surplus of $4.2 billion will disappear, and in all probability another deficit will take its place. They would spend money in virtually limitless amounts on new or increased welfare state and similar legislation.

They won't, however, have the support of the Nation's grassroots editors. The American Press recently polled a substantial number of weekly newspaper editors on a list of current controversial subjects. One question asked how they'd prefer the bulk of the budget surplus to be used. The answers: To reduce national debt, 80 percent; to increase defense expenditures, 11 percent; to lower taxes, 18 percent; for greater social welfare programs, 6 percent; for Federal aid to education, 2 percent.

These editors have seen the gradual development of the welfare state in this country, and realize its destructiveness—not only to our wealth, but to our self-reliance, independence, and freedoms. And the great majority want no more of it.

Nixon Enters the Farm Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune and another from the Washington Post and Times Herald commending the Vice President on his timely remarks at Minot, N. Dak., regarding a farm program, and especially his ideas on Public Law 480 and an expanded export of American surplus agricultural products.

Both newspapers take note of the Vice President's belief that export is the major solution of agricultural surpluses. Participation by other friendly nations would bring an international flavor to the job of helping underdeveloped countries feed hungry people.

The export program suggested by Mr. NIXON could have a tremendous impact favorably on our foreign policy.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 22, 1960]

NIXON ENTERS THE FARM DEBATE

In his speech in North Dakota on Monday, the Vice President formally entered the campaign debate on the problem of American agriculture, which is surely one of the most serious domestic problems we face. The farm question is so complex that no solution or set of solutions easily comprehended by the public can be formulated. All that can be formulated are aims.

Broadly speaking, there are two principal aims. The first is to assure the farmers of this country a decent living without the vexations and very expensive structure of controls and subsidies every one now shoulders.

The second is to put to worthwhile use the enormous agricultural surpluses we have accumulated in storage bins and to bring

farming into a balance which will prevent the building up of such surpluses in the future.

We have now had 30 years of elaborate agricultural planning, but there has been no allowance for the extraordinary rise in productivity owing to advances in technology. A farmer today can, at the least, grow twice as much corn as he could in 1930, and while during World War II and the postwar period the world could absorb all he could produce, conditions are very much changed today.

Unfortunately, the price supports which were designed to encourage production then have not changed. They are still with us. So, instead of being encouraged to produce for the market, the farmer is encouraged to produce for storage, and the consumer is paying, in effect, a large and useless tax on his food.

Mr. NIXON made a suggestion in regard to the surplus which he says the President had intended to present at the abortive summit meeting last month. That is to expand our Public Law 480 food program, by which we sell surplus crops to foreign countries for local currencies and in turn invest the money locally, into a system of international distribution through the United Nations.

The Soviet Union would not be invited to participate because of the international atmosphere. However, other countries—Argentina, Canada, France, Australia—would join in consultation because they grow the crops we have in surplus and blind dumping on our part could damage their markets. Some of them have large surpluses, too.

This is a good, responsible idea. There is a danger, once the surplus was dissipated, that the beneficiaries would continue to regard us as an important source of their food. Yet it is unlikely that any reasonable government could afford to put itself in a position of such perilous dependence. The point is that we should think about surplus disposal on this kind of scale. Not only does the surplus cost $5 billion a year, it also depresses our farmers' own markets, and hence their incomes, by its very existence.

In any case, Mr. NIXON is surely right when he says we must not fight the farm policy battle in the same old entrenched positions. Let us not have candidates making absurd promises in the hope of picking up farm votes which do not exist, as such, in any great number today. Nor can the voter who is not a farmer afford to dismiss the whole business as talk he never need listen to.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1960]

SURPLUS FOOD AND HUNGER

The idea of a world food pool administered by the United Nations is a logical extension of the President's food-for-peace program. The United States has already gone a long way in converting its agricultural surpluses into an international asset, with $9 billion worth of farm products distributed abroad under Public Law 480 in the last 6 years. Much more could be done, however, if all the surplus-food-producing countries would join in an undertaking for sending commodities they do not need to the billion persons in many lands who are now undernourished.

It is unfortunate that President Eisenhower did not have an opportunity to present this suggestion at the ill-fated summit conference, as he had planned to do. Vice President NIXON has now tossed it into the political arena as a plank on which he will seek the Republican nomination and the Presidency. But it ought not to be a partisan matter. The suggestion is important enough both to American agriculture and to the hungry people of the world that it could well win endorsement from both parties.

Mr. NIXON has also shrewdly borrowed from Governor Rockefeller the suggestion that part of the country's agricultural surplus be set aside as an emergency food reserve. The Governor had urged that large quantities of wheat and other staples be stored close to centers of population so as to be available "to feed our people in the post-attack period in event of a nuclear attack on this country." Far too little thought has been given to an emergency food reserve of this kind. To be sure, most of the surplus wheat is already in the hands of the Government, but it has not been stored with the object of emergency use when transportation might be very limited.

The Vice President is right in saying that these two items, plus a guarded nod at the soil bank, a boost for the rural development program and a bid for more research into industrial use of farm commodities, do not constitute a complete farm program. But they are constructive elements that ought to have a place in any long-range policy that the next Congress may adopt. The country ought not to get into the habit of viewing its agricultural surpluses as a liability. They can be so regarded only because, when allowed to accumulate indefinitely, they tend to depress prices and to deny farmers a share in the country's general prosperity. Properly utilized, however, they can become a great asset to the free world.

The Vice President also struck a salutary note in urging the two parties not to "dig in and fight the battle over farm policy in the entrenched positions which we have occupied over the past 5 years." Certainly a new outlook is needed, and it ought to be related so far as possible to channeling more surplus food into areas that are struggling against hunger.

Religion Is Steadfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, in these difficult times for all the peoples of the world, it is good to see and recognize the steadfastness of religion, and that people everywhere are turning to God for strength and understanding in their lives.

As an example, last Sunday, June 19, 1960, the Central Methodist Church of Linwood, N.J., celebrated its 100th anniversary.

It is interesting to read the history and note the growth of this typical American small church as recited in last Sunday's program as follows:

This area was settled by Friends in the late 1600's who worshiped one first day on this side of Great Egg Harbor and the next week on the Beesley's Point side. It was called the Egg Harbor Meeting and by about 1720 had built a meetinghouse in the midst of what is now Friends-Central Cemetery. At the time of the French and Indian war a dispute arose as to whether Friends were justified in fighting for their country. Those who affirmed that it was right for Friends to fight for their country were read out of meeting, and went to Bargaintown, by that time the largest community in these parts and organized a new meeting known as Blackman's, named for the man who donated the ground. In 1814 Bishop Francis Asbury organized the weak and wavering group into a Methodist Church and in 1822 Zion Methodist Meeting House was built. As the population grew Methodists along Shore Road continued to worship at Zion, and in the old brick schoolhouse which stood at the corner of Zion and Tilton Roads in Bakersville (now Northfield).

Capt. John Walker Tilton, while absent on a sea voyage, wrote to Jesse Adams that he thought the people of Leedsville (now Linwood) and Bakersville should have a centrally located church of their own. As a result of this letter, and "pursuant to a public notice, a meeting was held at the Leedsville schoolhouse on the evening of the 21st of January, 1860, to consider the propriety of erecting a meetinghouse on the shore."

The Leedsville schoolhouse was located at what is now Van Sant Avenue and Maple Avenue. The Reverend Jonas Chew, pastor of Zion Methodist Circuit, was appointed chairman and Jesse Adams, secretary. The majority present voted to build such a meeting house. Mr. Francis Somers offered to donate land sufficient to erect a meeting house and wagon sheds. The Reverend Chew, Captain Walker and Israel S. Adams were appointed to receive subscriptions. By February 4 Mr. Adams had secured $800 in cash with $195 more pledged. Captain Tilton reported $650. Mr. Somers' offer of land was accepted. On February 20 at a meeting at the old brick schoolhouse in Bakersville the following trustees were elected: Captain Tilton, Israel S. Adams, Jesse Adams, Dr. Samuel C. Edmunds, Lewis S. Franbes, Samuel R. Risley and Andrew Frambes. The name selected was Central Methodist Episcopal Church of the Barbaintown Circuit.

On February 23 the land was surveyed and a deed given. The lumber was brought by ship to what is now Hackney's Landing on the Northfield-Margate Road and brought to the site by teams of horses and wagons. The cornerstone was laid on Sunday, June 19, 1860, and the completed building dedicated on January 10, 1861, with the Reverend A. K. Street delivering the sermon.

The work of God's Kingdom prospered, and in the year 1873 the New Jersey Annual Conference, meeting in Bridgeton, divided the circuit into two appointments, Zion and Asbury, and Central and a new church called Mariners' Bethel. Those were the days of mass revivals, of class meetings of such a rich and glowing nature that every Methodist could testify concerning God's grace in his life and could offer public prayer. In 1910 the 50th anniversary was observed with the Reverend Sanford Nichols, district superintendent, preaching. A few members participated who had been present 50 years before at the cornerstone laying. In the year 1916 there was an outstanding revival during the pastorate of the Reverend Carlton R. Van Hook which has had a lasting influence on our congregation. In 1923 stained glass windows were installed and the church completely renovated. It was at this time that the two paintings in the front of the sanctuary were given us by the artist. In 1924 the church grounds were extended to Marvin Avenue. Central Hall was built in 1926 at a cost of $23,500, largely through the efforts of Mr. Walter B. Van Sant. Mrs. Edgar A. Miller gave $10,000 towards the building in memory of her father, Mr. Israel G. Adams. The annual conference in 1931 separated Central Church from Bethel. Also in that year came the installation of a pipe organ and the remodeling of the front of the sanctuary. The old Amen Corner and curved altar rail were replaced by the present choir lofts, platform and altar rail. In the year 1939, under the pastorate of the Reverend Franklin T. Buck, Central Church purchased the fine residence at 15 Shore Road to serve as the parsonage. In 1950 extensive improvements costing some $12,000 were made to the church building in connection with its 90th anniversary at which time Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, resident bishop of the Philadelphia area of the Methodist Church, preached the sermon.

In recent years we have had a rapidly increasing ministry as the population has grown. By actual count in June 1948, we had 179 active members; now, in June 1960, we have 859 members. The large Sunday morning church attendance worships at three services with one evening service. To provide more adequately for the Christian training of our children and youth we erected a new children's Sunday school building at a cost of $165,000, which was consecrated by Bishop Corson on August 24, 1958. There are plans for a new church building and a youth's and adult's building with a chapel, each to be erected as adequate funds are available. This is the third year we have had the benefit of the services of the Reverend Howard D. Stratton whose home visits have meant much to our people. During the ministry of the incumbent pastor, the Reverend Sheppard Joslin, three young men have entered the Christian ministry: The Reverend Robert B. Steelman, pastor of Leesburg and Dorchester Methodist Churches; the Reverend Daniel R. Stone, pastor of Lower Bank, Green Bank and Weekstown Methodist Churches; and the Reverend David B. Joslin, director of youth activities at the Methodist Church, Summit. During Mr. Joslin's pastorate here he has officiated at 438 baptisms, received 814 new members, conducted 414 funerals, and married 318 couples.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this church, of this congregation, and of my very dear friend to whom I owe so much in spiritual guidance, the Reverend Sheppard Joslin, the pastor and the Reverend Howard D. Stratton, the visiting pastor.

Remarks of Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, at Wheeler High School Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, graduation day is an important day in the lives of all our young people. Those students who graduated from Wheeler High School, North Stonington, Conn., have special reason to remember their commencement exercises because of the fine expressions made by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. I feel that Senator DODD's thoughts are important and instructive:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT WHEELER HIGH SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, NORTH STONINGTON, CONN., FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1960

I am deeply grateful that you have invited me to speak at these graduation exercises. I know the significance of this moment in the lives of the graduating class and of their families and I appreciate the privilege of being asked to come here and share it with you.

For about 10 years I have been spending as much of my time in North Stonington as my public duties permit. I was, of course, born in eastern Connecticut and have spent a large part of my life here. Those of us who have been lucky enough to live in this part of our State and in this wonderful town of North Stonington have much to be thankful for.

We have lived in an area filled with natural beauty and in an atmosphere close to the realities of life, an environment of close family ties and sound traditions, an environment of neighborliness, of honest work, of pleasant homes and good people.

And so the first thing I want to say to the members of this graduating class is that you have begun your lives with the priceless advantage of a good heritage.

This day marks off a great dividing point in the life of each of you. I am sure that you are very much like I was during my school days. Through the years of your childhood, your imagination must have been filled with thoughts on the nature of your life after this day, what you would do, what you would be, what kind of a future you would make for yourself. Now you are about to step into that future.

Up to now you have been largely on the receiving end of all the care and indulgence that your family and your community could bestow. Now you must begin to give something. From this day forward, as you enjoy more and more freedom, and wider and wider opportunities, you must assume deeper and deeper responsibilities.

I would like to discuss today some of the obligations and the opportunities that await you.

First is the tremendous obligation to your families. It has taken years of sacrifice, worry, self-denial, and care on the part of your parents to bring you safely to this day.

I well understand the mixture of joy and sadness in the hearts of your parents as they sit here this evening. I have seen four of my own children graduate from high school and I know what this moment means. It signifies the end of those childhood years so precious to parents. It means that the family circle is soon to be broken as you go away to school or to work or to marriage.

And so as you start to make your own way, remember the devotion and sacrifice and care that have brought you to this point and given you this opportunity. The future happiness of your parents is all wrapped up in you. This is a time to quietly dedicate yourselves to act in the years ahead in a manner that will justify the hopes, the sacrifices, and the expectations of your parents. They ask very little of you. Be faithful to the values learned in your home, be upright, be honorable, be hard working, be conscientious in whatever you undertake and that will be enough.

Another obligation waiting to be met is your debt to your community. The greater part of the activities of any American community is dedicated to the welfare of its young people. I refer not only to such matters as schools, recreational facilities, public health activities, and traffic safety. Almost all of our activities on the local level are really aimed at building the kind of community in which youngsters can grow up in health, safety, and happiness.

It is now the time for you to begin to assume your fair share of the burdens of running a free government at the local level. you must prepare yourselves to take the place of those who spend a good part of what could otherwise be their leisure hours working for the benefit of your town. You must prepare yourself now to take your place in the ranks of these fine civic associations, parent-teachers groups, and church organizations that make our towns pleasant, decent places to live.

You don't have to be a Member of Congress or a delegate to the United Nations or a Cabinet member to make an important contribution to your times. In the final analysis, our free society will stand or fall on the strength of democracy at the local level. Those who carry on the task of making our system work at the community level, those who work in modest ways to make our towns better places in which to live, those who give of their time and effort to dozens of worthy causes are rendering greater service than they know.

This leads me to the discussion of another obligation, the great debt which each of us owes to his country.

You will carry throughout your life an obligation to show a very special kind of loyalty to your country. In this sophisticated age it seems somewhat out of place to speak of patriotism.

In some quarters patriotism is scorned today. It has gone out of fashion. And there is even a fuzzy notion current that patriotism stands in the way of the development of an international order of peace and justice.

When I speak of patriotism I do not mean merely Fourth of July oratory or flag waving, or the hollow veneration of mere symbols.

If this were all there were to it, then patriotism would indeed be a rather empty thing. Our loyalty is not to the symbols, but to the ideals and traditions of our country and to the causes it represents.

Love of country is one of the deepest and most abiding of human instincts. Strange indeed is the man or woman who does not feel a special love for his homeland. As often as not, it is the most humble, the most abused, and the most misgoverned who will, in an hour of crisis, display the fiercest and most selfless loyalty to their country.

So it can be said that the instinct of patriotism is almost universal.

Americans have a special reason for a special kind of loyalty that goes far beyond the love of things that are familiar. I do not say this merely because we have been given more advantages and privileges than people of other lands.

I say it because our country, its institutions, its traditions, its strength today compose the sustaining force which preserves government based on freedom and respect for human decency.

Whatever may be the faults and weaknesses of our people as individuals, and they are many; whatever may be the mistakes and weaknesses of our Government, and they have been many, the United States of America as a nation has historically acted with honor, with courage, with charity, with justice and with idealism.

Perhaps we are too close to the scene to appreciate the significance of the role of our country and of our generation. A distinguished foreign visitor to Washington said recently:

"Washington has become the fountainhead of freedom. We may well say that the road of freedom, of democracy, of self-determination of peoples, and the respect for human personality leads us today to and from Washington and it is to a large degree in the United States that the hopes for the survival of human freedoms rest."

No nation has ever carried such an awesome burden as this. I sometimes think that our entire history has prepared us for and guided us toward this crucial role that we now play.

Surely a sense of national mission and destiny has moved our country from its earliest days. The opening paragraph of the Federalist papers, pleading for the adoption of our Constitution, said:

"It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide whether societies of men are capable of establishing good government. Failure on their part would be the general misfortune of mankind."

All of the forces that have shaped our history, all of the good fortune, all the noble aspirations, all the blessings of material strength, have combined to give us the means and the obligation to preserve the temple of Western civilization from the barbarism of first nazism and now communism.

Why do I say all this? I say it because our country and its ancient ideals are more in

need of the loyalty, the devotion, the understanding and the unselfish help of its young men and women than ever before. Never has a nation been so in need of a generation that recognizes its destiny, represents its ideals and embraces it traditions.

And so I hope that you will carry in the years ahead and throughout your lives a sense of duty and obligation to your country. Don't be ashamed of patriotism. Don't join those misguided college students who are today objecting to pledging allegiance to their country when they apply to their Government for loans to finance their college education.

If you are called upon to serve in the Armed Forces of your country, do so not reluctantly or cynically but willingly and devotedly, with pride in the knowledge that you are carrying out a great and necessary duty in order that our country might remain free and might preserve freedom in the world.

Be prepared to support your Government and not be supported by it. Be prepared to give up your time and your peace of mind and to take part in the political life of your Nation by actively supporting candidates and parties and issues that you feel are in the national interest. And when your turn comes to assume the role of teacher and parent, I hope that you will impart to those under your care that love of country which has been imparted to you.

The final obligation that I would like to discuss is your obligation to yourself, your duty to do full justice to your talents, your training and your hopes.

Each of us has the obligation to make the most of whatever talents and abilities God has given us. If we fail to do so, we not only let ourselves down but we fail in the contribution that we ought to make to others and to those who will come after us.

This is a very decisive time in your lives. The decisions you make now about your future will go a long way toward determining just what that future will be.

Every right decision you make now opens broad vistas of opportunity. Every wrong decision closes off your horizons and closes the door on opportunity.

So this is the time to think things through.

If you do not yet know what you want your life work to be, make it your first object to find out. Don't drift along letting events shape your life until the opportunity for you to do what you really want to do has passed you by.

And if you know what your vocation is, if you know deep down what you really want to do in life, then start to take the steps that will lead you to it. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way."

This is a time in your life when the freedom that we enjoy in America means more than perhaps it does at any other time. You are free to pick out your career. You are free to go wherever you have to go and to do whatever you have to do to develop a competence in that field.

The last written words of Franklin D. Roosevelt were, "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith." Don't allow your doubts or fears to hold you back from doing what you want to do and what you feel it is in you to do.

If you want to go to college but don't have the money to do so, get a scholarship if you can, and if not you can borrow that money at very easy terms under a Government loan program and pay it off several years from now when you are started in your career.

If you can't find the work you want around here, take advantage of your freedom to go where you can find it.

The future belongs to the man or woman who is prepared for it. If you do not plan to go on to higher education, then develop a technical mastery and a special competence in whatever field you do go into.

Give yourself a chance.

The opportunities that await you and the thousands of other young men and women who are graduating from high school this year are greater by far than at any time in history. The young people of today ought to feel a greater sense of excitement and adventure as they enter adult life than any young people have felt since the discovery of the New World in the 15th century.

When I was a boy, the thought of traveling to the moon was the sheerest fantasy. But I have lived to sit on a committee of the U.S. Senate which is today making plans and appropriating money for Project Mercury, a program concerned with the first travel of a human being into outerspace.

The incredible achievements of the past few years in the nuclear submarine mean that within a very short time all the secrets and mysteries of life underneath the seas, which have been the object of man's imagination since prehistoric times, will be solved.

The continuing discoveries in science and medicine mean that you will live in an age in which bodily pain and disease will be largely eliminated, and in which life will be immeasurably lengthened. Twenty years have been added to the average life expectancy since I was a young man. We may expect a similar advance in the decades ahead.

As for labor, you will live in a world in which the burdensome and boring toil of life is done more and more by machines and less and less by human labor. You will work less hours, enjoy more leisure and receive a higher material reward than at any time in history.

A hundred years ago it was not uncommon for a person to live and die in the town of his birth without ever venturing beyond its immediate neighborhood. In your lives you will find that travels to the capitals of the world will be a commonplace occurrence for almost everyone. It will be easier to go from here to Paris or Rio or Honolulu than it used to be to travel from Norwich to Hartford 50 years ago. It is almost that easy today.

Our economists confidently predict that the standard of living enjoyed by the average American will double in the next 20 years. You will some day live in houses elegant beyond your imagining as youngsters. You will enjoy conveniences that you have not believed possible.

All of these developments can make the pursuit of happiness more of a reality for your generation than it has been for any other that has ever lived.

But in themselves, these material advances will not bring happiness to you. As you grow older you will realize that the only thing that brings real satisfaction is worthwhile personal achievement and the only thing that brings real joy is dedication to the welfare of others.

It takes some people a lifetime to understand this, and then their understanding comes only through disillusionment, through despair, through the failure of material things to give them satisfaction. You can save yourself a lot of grief and add immeasurable meaning and significance and accomplishment to your lives if you will accept this truth now.

And this need for personal achievement and for devotion to the welfare of others leads me to another great opportunity awaiting your generation. And that is this:

You are entering the national life of your country at a time when it is locked in mortal combat with a deadly enemy, world communism. Communism today hovers like a great black cloud over the happiness and freedom of two-thirds of the people of the world and the other third it has already enslaved. It has fallen to our country to throw back this tyranny.

I believe that in your time America will bring to fulfillment its great mission, its historic mission of resisting tyranny and extending freedom throughout the earth. You can help in this struggle. You have the opportunity to help our people fulfill the Biblical injunction inscribed on the Liberty Bell so long ago, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Thus the greatest opportunity for service given to any generation is offered to yours. If you fail, a new era of impenetrable darkness will come over the world.

If you succeed, a new age of freedom, of justice, of human achievement will be ushered in. And at last man will defeat his age-old enemies—poverty, disease, war, aggression, injustice. Even natural disasters will come under the control of man.

This is the future that we can have and that, with God's help, we shall have.

Whenever I return to North Stonington from Washington and have an opportunity to spend some time with the people here, I gain renewed confidence that America will meet its challenge successfully. Our people are good. They are strong. They are able. They are just. They have high purposes.

If we remain true to those purposes, if we set our goals high enough, if we get political leadership equal to our tasks, we will win this struggle and we will gain an era of human advancement for all the people of the world such as has never been known or imagined.

I envy your journey ahead. Good luck to each of you.

Vice President Richard Nixon's St. Louis Speech Before the Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid speech that Vice President RICHARD NIXON delivered in St. Louis, Tuesday, June 21, 1960, at the 40th anniversary national convention of the junior chamber of commerce.

There is much meat in this speech for all Americans whether they are Democrats, Republicans or independents. The Vice President received an outstanding round of applause when he appeared to deliver the speech which was overshadowed by the ovation he received at the conclusion of the speech. I believe that anyone reading this speech would agree that the ovation was well deserved.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 21, 1960

We are now engaged in what will become, before this year is out, a major national debate over the subject of economic growth. This is as it should be because this is an issue which points up sharply the difference between two opposing philosophies of government in this country. It is an issue which transcends party lines.

The question is not one of ends but of means. Everybody is for growth. The issue is how can we best achieve it. More specifically, what should the role of government be in stimulating economic activity and growth?

Why are we especially concerned at this moment about our growth? To begin with it is a concept which commands the attention of the greater part of mankind in this second half of the 20th century.

For ourselves it is a question of building a better and greater America with widening opportunity for all of our citizens.

For the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South America, it is a question of emerging from a way of life based on human and animal muscle power to the technological maturity we of North America and Europe already enjoy.

For the Communist states it represents a challenge to catch up with and pass America. This is the goal, the final achievement which Mr. Khrushchev asserts will be the ultimate proof of the superiority of his Communist faith.

We in this country must recognize the serious nature of this challenge. We must never forget for a moment that the Soviets mean business. We must never underestimate their fanatical purpose.

On the other hand, it is no service to America or the free societies to overestimate Communist achievements. The critics of our present economic policies say that the Soviets are achieving their objectives of overtaking us. They claim that we are falling behind and in the foreseeable future will become second to the Soviet Union in economic strength.

They back this up by citing statistics to the effect that the Soviet economy is growing at a rate of 8 percent a year as compared with our own long-term economic growth which has been running about 3 percent a year and now appears to be accelerating toward 4 percent.

The critics argue that if we would just adopt their pet economic philosophy we too would grow like the Soviets. They invite us to join them in playing what is rapidly becoming the most fashionable political parlor game of our time—a game we might well call "growthmanship."

Before playing the game, let us look at the facts. There are, I believe three major fallacies in these statistical comparisons between the Soviet economy and our own.

The first fallacy is the vast difference in the maturity of our two economies. The Soviets, in the first place, have had to cope with an enormous postwar program of reconstructing the damage inflicted on them by Hitler's armies. But even more importantly, their economy is still primitive in comparison with our own. They are still concentrating primarily on building steel mills and the beginnings of a transportation system. These we already have. We are building major new industries around transistorized circuits and synthetic fibers and rearranged molecules.

Comparing their rate of growth with our own is, in a sense, like comparing the rate of growth of a child's body with an adult's brain. The very dimensions are incompatible.

The second fallacy is the fundamental difference between our society and theirs. We are a free people, free to produce and consume what we like and possess what we can afford. An enormous portion of our national capital is represented in the American home. Most of our millions of homes are, in effect, miniature factories, heavily equipped with capital equipment such as refrigerators, television sets, and cars. None of this is revealed as capital plant in comparing growth rates.

It sometimes is argued that this personal capital equipment represents no national asset but a collective self-indulgence of shameful proportions. The epithet most commonly flung out by the growthmanship school is "tail fins."

Without either defending or quarreling with my neighbors' taste, I urge these anti-production economists to be more explicit. What sort of society are they proposing?

Do they want a Federal agency empowered to regulate the design of automobiles? Or are they proposing tax rates which will make the manufacture of new cars academic?

The third fallacy is suggested by the behavior of the absolute gap between our economies. Just before World War II the total production of goods and services in the U.S.S.R. was less than half that in the United States. To be exact, it was 44 percent. Twenty years later, in 1959, the total production of goods and services in the Soviet Union is still just about 44 percent of the United States. In terms of currency, the U.S. lead is substantially larger than the entire value of Soviet production. Mr. Khrushchev boasts that he will catch and pass us economically in 7 or 10 years. By any projection that can be applied, there is no possibility that the Soviet economy will overtake our own at any time in this century.

Mr. Khrushchev has described the competition between our two systems as a horse race. In referring to the American economic system, he said recently, "There was a horse but now it is old and worn out, limping along at half speed. On the other hand, our Communist horse is young and strong, running much faster and certain to catch up and pass the Americans."

Is he right? The answer is no, provided we stay on our horse and don't make the mistake of trying to get on his.

That is why in considering growth the question of means becomes all important. What and how much should the Government do to insure a maximum rate of expansion for our economy?

The growthmanship school argues that the Government should plan and manipulate the economy to arrive at an arbitrary, fixed percentage rate of growth. They believe that any kind of Government activity directed toward this objective is good. Generally, they have greater faith in Government action than in private enterprise as a creative force in insuring economic progress.

For example, they believe the Government should peg interest rates at artificially low levels to assure growth. They admit this would be inflationary but they say "Inflation is a small price to pay for progress." We say that this policy in the long run would wreck the economy, not expand it.

They believe that Government spending regardless of its purpose spells growth and, therefore, is good in and of itself. We say that the way to achieve maximum growth in this country is not by increasing the size and cost of Government but by expanding the opportunities for investment and creative productivity for millions of free American citizens.

We believe that the way in which Government can best promote real growth is by building a sound economic framework in which the private economy can operate at maximum levels.

We must never forget that growth is only one objective of national policy, though admittedly a vitally important one. Among our other objectives are freedom and security. We must not and need not sacrifice either freedom on one hand or security on the other simply to achieve growth.

Under the philosophy of government to which we subscribe, these objectives are not incompatible. What best promotes freedom best promotes growth. What best promotes growth best promotes security.

What then should the role of Government be in promoting growth?

To begin with, Government should avoid, as much as possible, interference with the decisions that are made in the private sector of our economy.

The Government must pursue a sound fiscal policy, so that values remain stable and the upward pressure is toward true growth and not inflation.

Government must act vigorously against those abuses of economic power by management or labor which restrict competition or put roadblocks in the way of increased efficiency and productivity.

Our tax structure must be designed to stimulate rather than frustrate new and creative enterprise. Reform of the obsolete and jerry-built features of our Federal tax system must be a first order of business for a new administration once we have provided adequately for our needs in the national security area.

Government must pursue economic policies abroad which are compatible with domestic philosophy. We believe in freedom, in creative enterprise, and in competition. Our foreign policies should be framed to cultivate a climate favorable to these principles throughout the world.

Finally, government has a responsibility to prevent and correct wide swings in our levels of economic activity by intelligent application of fiscal policies and by sensible provisions against the personal tragedy and national misfortune of widespread unemployment.

These are the things government should do to promote a proper climate for creative private activity.

There are other appropriate areas of government economic activity in what we might call the public sector of our economy. While we put our primary faith in creative private enterprise as the major dynamic force in assuring growth of our economy, we recognize that where private enterprise can't or won't do the job, government activity is not only justified but essential. By government activity, I have in mind not only the Federal Government, but State and local governments as well.

It is foolish to assume, as some of those of the growthmanship school seem to, that government activity is in itself good. But it is just as wrong to assume that government activity is in itself bad.

Many elements of our national establishment are beyond the capacity of private enterprise. These must be kept apace with our overall growth, or the economy would soon develop a lopsided shape.

If we are to grow at a maximum rate, we must recognize the continuing need for investment in the public sector—in our public education establishment, in our national transportation system, in the renewal of our rundown urban areas, in the development of our natural and human resources, in providing imaginative, new leadership for the exciting scientific and technological revolution which will dramatically change the whole character of life in America and the world in our lifetime.

Timidity in these areas would be as detrimental to the national interest as timidity in private investment.

The important test to apply always to investment in the public sector is—will the benefit exceed the cost? Because it is just as easy to waste the public money as it is to squander private and personal funds.

Above all, whether we are considering investment in the public or private sector, let us be guided by these principles:

America must never settle for second best in any field.

We are a young country with our greatest years ahead of us—not behind us.

We will not hesitate to resort to government action where it provides the best road to progress.

But we will always remember that the primary source of progress in America has been and will continue to be the dynamic, creative productivity of private rather than government enterprise.

Too Many Foreign Policy Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there appeared Friday in the Herald Statesman of Yonkers, N.Y., an excellent editorial which cuts through the confused babble of comment on the President's recent Far East tour and points up the general misinterpretation of the results.

The editorial comments that it has compelled the Communists once more to show that they have a frantic fear of the principle apostle of international peace, President Eisenhower, and will do everything possible to prevent him from visiting other nations. What greater proof could there be of his persuasive effect and the importance the Communists place on the President's tours? The Communists will use every means at their command to prevent more nations of the world from being exposed to the powerful pro-Westernizing effect of the Eisenhower charm.

More of this kind of clear thinking would be welcome instead of the recurrent talk of failure:

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, June 17, 1960]

TOO MANY FOREIGN POLICY EXPERTS

If the American people have confused notions about our foreign policy, that confusion has been caused by a proliferation of experts who just are not experts at all.

The news that the Japanese Government had asked President Eisenhower to postpone, or cancel, his impending trip to Tokyo was only minutes old before the air was filled with wordy characterizations of the situations as evidence of the failure of American diplomacy.

Leading Members of the opposition in Congress suddenly decided that the President never should have planned to go to Japan—that, as one of them put it, "he should have known" his plan might be nullified by Communist and national-leftist riots in Tokyo.

All of this, it seems to us, constitutes gross misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the facts—and a very poor evaluation of what will be the probable effects of the Tokyo situation on free world opinion.

To be sure, the President and his advisers knew he might face hostile demonstrations in Japan—just as they knew that, even if the U–2 incident never had occurred, he would have to expect Khrushchev to be truculently offensive at Paris. But the President's course and purpose seem, to us, to have been perfectly plain in each case: he would go ahead in a way he thought right and necessary and thus put on the Communists the responsibility, before the eyes of all the world, for power-mad, reckless, violent interference with every proposal and hope for peace in the world.

Who won a diplomatic victory for decency and justice and peace-seeking intent at Paris and left that city with the heightened respect of all free men? By his courage and dignity, the President of the United States, not the missile-rattling bull-in-a-china-shop head of the Soviet autocracy.

Who must, in the clear vision of reasonable people, be regarded as having again forced the Communists to show their insensately violent hands in Tokyo?

Who has compelled them, once more, to show that they not only do not want peace but have an actually frantic fear of the principal apostle of international peace? The man, of course, whose personal prestige and influence they only too obviously regard as a dire threat to the success of their schemes for world domination.

It would have been a "failure of American diplomacy" only if the President had been able to go to Tokyo as a man whose travels were of no disturbing concern to Moscow or Peiping.

Valedictory Address of John Lightner Burnham at Milton Academy Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one so seldom finds a dossier of Nikita Khrushchev that I am inserting herewith the valedictory speech of John Burnham of Kent, Conn., a young student at Milton Academy, Milton, Mass. It seemed rather a strange subject for the purpose, but it gives such a picture of this man's career as young people see him, that I felt it would be useful to many in the House:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS OF JOHN LIGHTNER BURNHAM AT MILTON ACADEMY GRADUATION EXERCISES

This is the success story of a man born in Russia in 1894: Nikita Khrushchev.

Khrushchev was not successful until 1932 when Joseph Stalin needed someone who would carry out his policies in the Ukraine. Obtuse, ruthless, and cruel, Khrushchev was just the man he was looking for to crush the resistance of the 40 million Ukrainians fighting against the Communist regime. This was to be done by starvation.

So Nikita Khrushchev, the heretofore dictator of the popular party, was sent into the Ukraine, which at this time had enough food to feed its population for 2 years and 4 months. Ninety percent of this food was deliberately exported from the Ukraine and its people left to die. Thus, Khrushchev carried out Stalin's plan for the starvation and death of 7 million people, the population of New York City.

Khrushchev's next step up the Soviet ladder of success was through the incident known as the Vinnitsa massacre. Stalin had decided that this man was to be kept in the Ukraine as dictator of the Communist Party in that region even though the regime there did not welcome Khrushchev's nomination. But the opposition of the 67 men in the Ukrainian Government was to no avail. They simply disappeared or, as the Russians put it, were "physically liquidated."

During World War II, Khrushchev operated behind the Nazi lines in the Ukraine to stir up the nationalism of the people so that the Nazis would become incensed against the Ukrainians and massacre them. In this policy, he succeeded all too well.

Khrushchev had three distinguishing operations after World War II, from the period of 1944 to 1946. One was the elimination of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Before 1945, there were 4,400 Catholic churches in the Ukraine. As of now, there are none. The person responsible for this—Nikita Khrushchev. Secondly, Stalin decided that the Ukraine, which was a constant thorn in his flesh, was to be again physically liquidated. The man in charge of the operation—Nikita Khrushchev.

When Khrushchev came to final power in 1953, he made a speech to the Presidium in Moscow, about the liberalization of the Russian policy. A small group of people took this speech seriously. This was a group of some thousands of inmates in a concentration camp in Kingr in the U.S.S.R. They struck for better conditions. Five hundred of these women were attacked and massacred by orders from Nikita Khrushchev. Such was his liberalization of the Russian regime.

These are the facts of Khrushchev's climb to success. I would like to end by mentioning the story of an internationally known movie and theatrical figure, a man named Dovzhenko, a native of the Ukraine. In 1933 Dovzhenko was warned by Stalin that he must make his movies for Russia or die. He was known as a friend of Khrushchev's. After Khrushchev came to power, Dovzhenko was permitted to return to the Ukraine to make some of his last movies. As soon as these movies showed any touch of Ukrainian nationalism, thus a weakening of the Russian regime, Khrushchev had him sent back to Moscow. This personal friend of the present Russian dictator died of a mysterious disease—Russian style—in 1956.

An interesting quality of Khrushchev's success is that it can last only while he remains at the top of the dangerous Russian power circles. As soon as he topples, he will be a forgotten man, remembered in history only as a coldblooded, ruthless brute responsible for the extermination of millions of his fellows.

Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12261) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in my work on the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I have been intrigued with a few things in connection with our agriculture. The first thing is the tremendous cost of carrying the surplus stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am going to base my opinion in voting on this bill on one thing and one thing only because, with all due regard to my friends on the Committee on Agriculture, and they are a fine group of people on both sides of the aisle, the bills that are proposed and what we are talking about today in my estimation will not solve the farm problem. But when we come to the

matter of costs of the program, I do not believe the taxpayers of this country can afford to put up with a bill that has been proposed in the other body for this reason. It is going to add more stocks to the Commodity Credity Corporation. It is going to cost more dollars. The cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the support prices have not, in a large measure, gone to the farmers. The losses have been incurred after Commodity Credit has taken possession of the stocks. Storage, transportation, handling, maritime shipping and so forth, costs make up the lion's share of the loss.

The most economical way to vote on this bill is to vote against the Senate proposal offered as an amendment by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

New Game—Who's Who in Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled, "New Game—Who's Who in Russia?" which appeared in the June 19, 1960, Los Angeles Times.

The author of the article is the very able Times Washington Bureau chief, Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, who writes against a backdrop of many years of political reporting, including traveling to the U.S.S.R. last year to cover Vice President NIXON's trip.

Mr. Hartmann presents a very informative picture of the various individuals in the upper echelons of the Soviet Communist Party and the Government of the U.S.S.R., which I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

The article follows:

NEW GAME—WHO'S WHO IN RUSSIA?

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—A great guessing game has been going on throughout the Western World—and probably in Russia, sotto voce—ever since Nikita Khrushchev savagely ground his gears in Paris to reverse the direction of East-West diplomacy.

Is Khrushchev on the skids? Was he a virtual hostage of Marshal Malinovsky at the summit?

Is he reading scripts written for him by the faceless men of the Kremlin, one of whom may soon replace him? Are the old Stalinists back in the driver's seat?

For all Americans, and for all but perhaps 50 top Communists who really run everything in the Soviet Union today, trying to figure out "who's on top" in the party presidium is somewhat like being spectators at a chess match without the faintest notion of the rules of the game.

WHO'S WINNING?

As one of the foremost U.S. authorities on Soviet affairs told me: "How can we tell which side is winning the argument at a meeting we don't even know was held, or who was there, or which side anyone was on? Here—take this list of 21 presidium members, shut your eyes and stick a pin in it, and your answer will be just as good as mine."

The peephole into internal Soviet power politics through which American policymakers peer isn't quite that opaque, of course. But nowhere is the Iron Curtain more heavily armor-plated than around the doings of the handful of Communist heirarchy of whom Khrushchev is the current frontman and apparent master. No U–2 has ever penetrated their secrets.

MIGHT MAKE PLAY

On July 13, the full membership of the party central committee will meet to hear Khrushchev report on his stewardship. While there is little or no comparison between this convention and the one that will be underway in Los Angeles at the same time, it is misleading to think of it as merely a rubberstamp. If there really exists any potentially successful power grouping in the Presidium which is fed up with Khrushchev, this is the stage on which they might well make their play to depose him. But all the evidence (especially since the Communists have rewritten history to confirm their claim that the Russians really did win the Pacific war against Japan) is that Mr. Khrushchev will get thunderous acclaim for his global diversion from domestic difficulties.

Khrushchev himself set off these rumors with what may have been (but perhaps was not) a Freudian slip in his angry accusation of President Eisenhower at Paris about the U–2. Such an incident, he said, "deeply involves the internal politics"—some translated it policies—"of the Soviet Union." Back behind the Iron Curtain, he later denied saying any such thing.

THEORY DISCONTINUED

Since the summit collapse—which was immediately preceded by a series of shifts in the Soviet hierarchy—I have talked with a number of the best-informed students of the USSR and their consensus is that Khrushchev's behavior was influenced by internal pressures of some sort, but that there is yet no evidence that this position at home is in jeopardy.

The theory that Marshal Malinovsky went to Paris as Khrushchev's keeper is generally discounted as a face-saving explanation invented on the spot by Western officials and reporters who were dumbfounded by his unexpected abuse of President Eisenhower.

Sober analysis of subsequent events tends to support the contrary view that Khrushchev brought both Gromyko and Malinovsky along as live symbols of the carrot and the stick—negotiation or naked force—and perhaps also as witnesses to the correctness of his communications with the capitalist enemy. The military, however, is believed still firmly under party control (as it has been since Khrushchev replaced Marshal Zhukov wih Malinovsky) despite considerable dissatisfaction over demobilization and reorganization among the professional officer corps.

However, the more anyone knows about the Soviet Union the more modest and qualified are his views. The authentic experts admit that outsiders really know less than nothing about the day-to-day machinations of Communist Party politics, and very little about the individuals involved. But if you want to join the guessing game, get yourself a blindfold, a pin and clip the table of leading Soviet bigwigs which accompanies this article.

The table of Russia's leaders and their role referred to in the text follows:

Russia's leaders and their roles

Name and age	Party position			Government position		
	Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.		Politburo of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic	Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.	Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, U.S.S.R.	Council of Ministers of the Russian S.F.S.R.
	Presidium	Secretariat				
Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeevich (66)	X	X (1st Secretary)	X	X (Chairman)	X	
Aristov, Averki Borisovich (57)	X		X			
Brezhnev, Leonid Ilich (53)	X	X (?)			X (Chairman) Protocol Chief of State.	
Furtseva, Yekaterina Alekseevna (Mrs. N. P. Firyubin) (50)	X			X (Minister of Culture).	X	
Ignatov, Nikolai Grigorevich (50)	X	X	X	X (Deputy Chairman).		
Kosygin, Alekski Nikolaevich (56)	X			X (1st Deputy Chairman).		
Kozlov, Frol Romanovich (52)	X	X	X			
Knusinen, Otto Vilgelmovich (79)	X	X				
Mikoyan, Anastas Ivanovich (65)	X			X (Senior 1st Deputy Chairman).		
Mukhitdinov, Nuritdin Akramovich (43)	X	X				
Podgorny, Nikolai Viktorovich (57)	X				X	
Polyansky, Dmitri Stepanovich (43)	X		X			X (Chairman).
Shvernik, Nikolai Mikhailovich (72)	X	X			X	
Suslov, Mikhail Andreevich (58)	X		X			
Voroshilov, Kliment Yefremovich (79)	X				X	

Table compiled by Times Washington Bureau.

PARLOR PASTIME

In playing this parlor pastime, it must always be remembered that the Communist Party is superior to the Soviet Government. Thus, membership in the presidium of the central committee of the party may be a bigger job than a government ministry, and a party secretaryship is most influential of all

Most interesting of the new names (new, that is, to American newspaper readers) are those of Leonid I. Brezhnev and Mikhail Suslov. Somewhat better known, because of their visits to this country last year, are Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol R. Kozlov.

Brezhnew, 53, last month replaced aging Kliment Voroshilov as the titular "president" of the Soviet Union, a figurehead job that heretofore has been given to old Bolsheviks in their twilight years. Voroshilov's reported request to retire for reasons of health is probably true—he looked pretty bewildered and shaken up last summer as he listened to Vice President NIXON take on Khrushchev in their famed "kitchen debate."

SWITCH JOBS?

But Brezhnev's assignment at the peak of a true Red Communist career is not regarded as a kick upstairs, but rather as an effort to upgrade the job and put him more on public display as a possible Khrushchev successor—it is conceivable they might simply switch jobs.

Brezhnev has spent his whole career in party work since becoming a member in 1931. Like Khrushchev, he made a name for himself in the Ukraine, where he also served as a political commissar in the Red army during World War II. As a party troubleshooter he became first secretary of the Communist organization in Zaporozhe, Dnepropetrovsk, Moldavia, and had risen to candidate member of the top party presidium under Stalin, but was dropped after Stalin's death and put back into his lieutenant general's uniform as chief of political administration of the Red navy and as deputy chief for the ministry of defense.

From the sketchy record available, Brezhnev had had increasingly important assignments under Khrushchev, restoring Communist discipline among the restive "new lands" settlers in the Kazakh "Republic," where since 1954 both party and government functionaries have been thoroughly purged; heading the Soviet delegation to the North Korean "workers party congress" in 1956 and directing Moscow negotiations with the Communist satellite governments of North Korea, East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

MAN OF ACTION

Obviously a man of action despite his quiet and personable demeanor and conservative dress, Brezhnev has held the key job on the party secretariat which Khrushchev once used as a stepping stone to power, the assignment of personnel—what we call patronage. He is rather short and stocky, of swarthy complexion but Russian nationality, and impresses outsiders with an air of competency. In announcing the switch, the Kremlin did not state whether Brezhnev would retain his place on the powerful six-man secretariat of the party, but he continues to administer some of the same responsibilities, which include close oversight of the Soviet armed forces, and perhaps some police powers. He is clearly a man to watch.

There also has been considerable speculation about Suslov, who has the rather desiccated appearance of a monk or medieval scholar, and is in fact one of the top Marxist theoreticians and ideologists. Seldom in the limelight (though his was one of the only six portraits I saw on display in Siberia last year—most have been taken down since Khrushchev denounced the "cult of personality"), the dour 58-year-old Suslov was a Stalin favorite who survived and first made the party presidium in 1955.

UPCOMING "EGGHEAD"

As an upcoming Communist "egghead" in the forties, Suslov directed the mass deportations from Lithuania during the war and afterward was made head of the agitation and propaganda department (Agit-Prop) and succeeded Zhdanov as director of the Cominform.

From this powerful post Suslov took charge of the campaign to read Yugoslavia's Tito out of the party and to purge Titoism whereever it appeared; he showed up in all the Eastern European satellites in Stalin's later years and returned to Budapest in 1956 during the bloody suppression of the Hungarian revolt.

JUST PROMOTED

Suslov obviously has stature of his own, but he has also weathered the post-Stalin shakeups because he is not regarded as personally ambitious.

Kozlov, just promoted to the party secretariat, has been regarded as Khruschev's heir-apparent since Khrushchev confided this to former New York Governor Harriman and other visitors, and dispatched him to open the Soviet fair in New York as the equal of Vice President NIXON. A heavily handsome man of 52, he represents the new generation of Soviet politicians, and could lose himself easily at any U.S. business convention handshaking, backslapping and heartily enjoying a crowd.

But Kozlov's rise in this rough league shows his inner toughness. He went to work in a state factory at the age of 15—remembering little of the revolution—joined the Komsomol and became assistant foreman.

SOVIET SMOOTHY

Kozlov won a place as a candidate member on the top party presidium in February, 1957. By June he was a full member, in December chairman of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic's Council of Ministers, and the following March first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union—a fair promotion record for 13 months, all of it thanks to Khrushchev.

Kozlov is a technician rather than a theoretician and a politician first of all. Like his earthy mentor, Khrushchev, he shows an affinity for crowd-pleasing but he is much more dapper and polished in his style—a sort of Soviet smoothy. However, I have seen his eyes narrow above a fixed smile and he has an excellent record of getting things done. He appears more affable to westerners than most of his colleagues but he is a thoroughly furnished "Soviet man" at heart.

The other members of the party secretariat have obvious disabilities as potential Khrushchev successors. None is a European Russian, and despite all the nonsense about equality of man some Soviet citizens are more equal than others. Being an Armenian, who speaks Russian with an accent, has kept old Bolshevik Mikoyan free of Kremlin rivalries, and the same applies to two of the secretaries, Otto Kuusinen, a Finnish quisling, and Nuritdin Mukhitdinov, who is probably an Uzbek.

Kuusinen is 79, an old revolutionary journalist who aided Lenin by leading a short-lived Communist revolt in southern Finland in 1918 and a founding father of the Comintern. He moved to Moscow when the Finns outlawed their Communist Party in 1930 and returned when Soviet troops invaded Finland in 1939 to head a puppet regime.

FROM RANKS

Mukhitdinov, 43, is one of the presidium's youngest members and something of a mystery man. His secretaryship shows the importance attached to the Moslem world and the national minorities within the U.S.S.R., but not too much is known about him.

He was born in Tashkent, the Uzbek capital, attended a trade and economics institute there and served in the Red army during World War II—already in political work in his early twenties. He rose through Communist Party ranks in the Uzbek S.S.R., becoming secretary of its party central committee in 1950, and in 1954 chairman of the council of ministers, the top government job in the Uzbek "republic." Then he was dumped from this job and reinstated again when Bulganin and Khrushchev visited Tashkent on their way home from South Asia in 1955.

Soon Mukhitdinov became a candidate member of the Moscow party presidium as well, and a full member in December 1957, after accompanying Mikoyan to Red China in 1956. He helped cement Soviet ties with Nasser's Government in Egypt and is thought to be the specialist on Asia and the Middle East among the inner circle, but his minority status would be a handicap in getting the No. 1 spot.

Among the lesser luminaries on the party presidium, certainly the most intriguing is the lone woman member, Yekaterina A. Furtseva. A handsome, pleasant-spoken women of 50 who used to be the top propagandist of the Moscow City Soviet, she recently was made minister of culture and smilingly plied her cultural missionary trade all through the U–2 and summit crises.

HUSBANDS ANONYMOUS

Mrs. Furtseva follows the Communist custom of using her own name rather than that of her husband, N. P. Firyubin, who is about as ananymous as most Soviet officials' wives.

She is regarded as a protege of Khrushchev's, in the classic rather than the ribald Hollywood sense, and her rise has been rapid ever since 1954 when she accompanied him to Peiping as a member of the Soviet delegation to Red China's fifth anniversary celebration. Subsequently she went to Yugoslavia and to England with Bulganin and Khrushchev, and has the distinction of being the first Soviet woman to stand with the real Kremlin bigwigs atop Lenin's and Stalin's tomb for the May Day review in Red Square.

Some western handicappers of the Communist hierarchy have tagged 43-year-old Dmitri S. Polyansky as the second-generation successor—after Kozlov.

Except that he hails from the Crimea, and became a party member at the relatively early age of 21 or 22, not much is known of Polyansky's career in the pre-Khrushchev period. Since then, however, he has held several key party jobs and for the past 2 years has been titular head of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic which comprises more than half the 210 million people of the U.S.S.R.

Also elevated to the party presidium from the No. 1 post in one of the Soviet Union's major "republics" last May 4 was the Communist chief of the Ukraine, Nicolai Podgorny, 57.

His public record is also somewhat sparse, but the Ukraine has always given the Communists trouble and their ablest and most ruthless leaders, such as Khrushchev, are often assigned there to prove or break themselves. Podgorny evidently made good.

MIKOYAN'S UNDERSTUDY

Stepping into Kozlov's top government job as first deputy chairman or first Deputy Premier of the U.S.S.R. (they have two—Mikoyan being the senior) was Alexei N. Kosygin, 56, a financial and production planning expert who has been rated an understudy of Mikoyan and lately has been head of the Gosplan heavy industry program.

Early reports of the recent regrouping had Averki B. Aristov dumped from the presidium, but the best U.S. authorities now believe he was merely taken off the powerful secretariat of the party high command.

PARTY TROUBLESHOOTER

Nikolai G. Ignatov, 59, has a long record of party troubleshooting since he helped suppress the Turkestan independence movement as an OGPU (secret police) functionary in the twenties. He came to the party from the Red army, in which he enlisted during the revolution; he made the presidium in 1957.

When wearing his government hat, Ignatov is now a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and is thought to be in charge of agricultural production—one of Khrushchev's pet themes and sorest headaches. He, also, is on the politburo of the Russian SFSR.

Like Voroshilov, 72-year-old N. Mikhail Shvernik is a former president of the U.S.S.R., dropped after Stalin's death but soon restored to the presidium as an old Bolshevik. He is somewhat less of a popular figurehead than Voroshilov, more of a Marxist elder statesman and relic of revolutionary rectitude.

Among the seven candidate members of the presidium, a status which can mean one is moving either up or down, the name to watch is that of 46-year-old Kirill T. Mazurov, boss of the Belorussian Party and another younger generation comer from the Komsomol ranks.

Barrier Against Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial below set forth from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 8, 1960, titled "Barrier Against Famine":

BARRIER AGAINST FAMINE

The agreement under which the United States will exchange 17 million tons of surplus grain for Indian rupees valued at $1,300 million is more than the biggest sale of its kind in history. It represents the fulfillment of expectations raised by President Eisenhower's visit to India last December, and it stands as an example of a policy this country can and should pursue.

The grain, a fifth of it rice and the remainder wheat, will be delivered over 4 years and will enable India to build the 5 million-ton grain reserve needed as a cushion against famine during the third 5-year plan. The transaction will permit the United States to dispose of a portion of its costly grain surplus as well as to aid another country in accordance with its foreign aid policy.

A few figures show what this will mean to India, which now imports about 3 million tons of grain a year to supplement the 75 million produced by its farmers. Weather conditions cause huge shortages in some years. With the assurance of 17 million additional tons India will be able to keep domestic food prices stable and will have a breathing spell during which to build domestic agriculture. Indians hope to be independent of grain imports by 1966.

The rupee payments will be spread over a long period. Normally in such cases the United States lends back the funds to the purchasing country for development. In this instance some of the rupees will be used to finance U.S. diplomatic posts and to promote educational projects. The grain reserve has been a pet project of S. K. Patil, Indian Minister of Food and Agriculture and one of his country's most powerful politicians. President Eisenhower is to be commended for making the vital project a reality.

Suggestion From Peace Study Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an age in which Communist troublemaking has kept the world either in the cold war, or teetering on the edge of a hot one, all of us are naturally deeply concerned with the need for finding ways and means to dissolve the overhanging clouds of danger and establish peace and order on the globe. To accomplish this will require not only astute leadership but a broad understanding by our people of our obligations and responsibilities. Fundamentally, we need to recognize that if we are to withstand the Communist efforts to conquer the world, if peace and order are ultimately to be established, if the vast resources and manpower now going into armaments are eventually turned to production of products for human use for peace, then the United States—with free world leadership thrust upon it by the events of the times—must provide much of the enlightened programing and leadership that will enable us and our peace-seeking neighbors to accomplish these objectives.

As a nation, we can mobilize the necessary resources only if there is broad understanding of the need among the people of our Nation.

Today, I was pleased to receive from the members of the Study Group on World Peace sponsored by the Commission on Christian Social Relations, Bethany Methodist Church, Madison, Wis., a series of suggestions on the complexities of promoting peace.

Reflecting the constructive way in which individuals and responsibly minded organizations are attempting to better understand and provide suggestions for coping with the difficult international problems threatening peace, I ask unanimous consent to have the series of suggestions—reflecting the concensus of the study group—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the suggestions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *June 13, 1960.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, our study group, after discussion of our responsibilities toward world peace, thought you might be interested in our conclusions and suggestions.

1. Our study group would like to support the work of the Subcommittee on Disarmament and encourage expansion of and implementation of their consideration in this very important field of concern.

2. We support renewal of nuclear weapons test ban.

3. We support disarmament with inspection and controls, preferably under the United Nations.

4. We suggest the reexamination of our refusal to admit to the U.N. and to recognize the Government of mainland China. In view of the fact that this is the accepted government of the people of China, we would like negotiations begun with Red China toward that end.

5. We support more emphasis on foreign economic aid and less emphasis on military aid. In conjunction with this, we prefer greater use of the U.N. and affiliate agencies such as the World Development Loan Fund.

6. We believe our representatives to other countries should be better qualified with better understanding of culture and languages of the countries to which they are sent.

7. We suggest an attempt to increase trade with Communist countries to ease tensions.

8. We approve the interchange of persons and encourage wider use of this method of communication with Communist countries.

9. We support the continuous reexamination of our policies in the eyes of other countries.

10. We suggest a policy involving more humility and less self-righteousness in policy statements.

Also, we thought the following items might be brought up in the Senate soon and would like to give our views on them:

1. We encourage the program suggested for Youth Ambassadors abroad.

2. We suggest a coordinated program among Government agencies to work with management and labor for making the transition as orderly as possible, to an economy less dependent on military expenditures, thus removing fears that steps toward disarmament will result in depression.

3. We urge that the public be given more information in areas as the effects of nuclear testing on health, and the declassification of unnecessarily restricted information.

4. We suggest more study on the effective use of surplus food for distribution in Communist countries and in underdeveloped nations.

5. We suggest seminars and conferences for social scientists and scientists of Soviet bloc and the West. We also commend the State Department for persisting in negotiation and agreement for expanded exchange of persons with Russia. We urge lifting restrictions on the travel of Russians in the United States.

* * * * *

Twenty one members of Study Group on World Peace sponsored by Commission on Christian Social Relations, Bethany Methodist Church, Madison, Wis.:

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Newberry, Mrs. George Calden, Mrs. Fred Huebner, Mr. Russell Hinkins, Mr. Ted Page, Mrs. James Lund, Mrs. Robert Van Meter, Mrs. Clarence Nielsen, Mrs. Eugene Parfitt, Mrs. Charles Reid, Mrs. Stanley Sparr, Mr. Herbert Bird, Mrs. George W. Wilson, Mr. Marvin Beatty, Mrs. Wendell Greer, Mrs. Hubert Ellison, Mr. John Dahlk, Miss JoAnn Dahlk, Mrs. William Shetter, and Mrs. Roy Mita, cochairmen.

U.S. Signal Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, June 21 marks the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Signal Corps. Throughout its long and illustrious history, the Signal

Corps has made many outstanding contributions in the field of communications. It has been no less an outstanding contributor to the refinement of our missile and satellite programs. The Signal Corps, in peace and war, has served the American people well through the research and development of numerous electronic innovations designed to advance the cause of understanding through communications and to serve the cause of peace through national preparedness.

In a recent edition of Dixie Business magazine, which is published in my District, Mr. Hubert F. Lee, Jr., editor, paid a brief tribute to the Signal Corps and several of its commanders, past and present. Pursuant to unanimous consent, I insert this magazine article herewith:

CENTENNIAL

"Student achievement is good prophecy for adult achievement." Ben S. Gilmer made this statement at the Georgia State Chamber of Commerce dinner in introducing Frederick R. Kappel as a man whose career began from the ground up—digging postholes.

This could apply also to the Army Signal Corps, which marks it's "Hundred Years of Firsts" on June 21, 1960.

Maj. Gen. Ralph T. Nelson, the 18th chief signal officer, a "southerner by marriage," who spent 12 years of his career in Georgia, including C.G., from 1955 until 1957, of the Signal Corps Training Center at Fort Gordon, thrilled members of the Atlanta Chapter of the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association with his talk on "Signal Corps Firsts" last fall. The Signal Corps firsts include the weather service, Alaska communication system, military airplane, Army dirigible (we served in the old 32d Balloon Co. at Army Balloon School, Camp Jackson, Camp Knox in the days of Billy Mitchell), American radar, Project Score, communications satellite—which beamed President Eisenhower's 1958 Christmas peace message to earth from outer space—and participation in the development of Tiros I, America's weather satellite circling the earth transmitting photos of the earth's cloud cover for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A.T. & T. Co., headed by Mr. Kappel, the world's biggest with 1,750,000 stockholders, was a pioneer in the satellite program of the Government. Ben Gilmer heads Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph, the South's biggest and best-managed enterprise.

Former chief signal officers George I. Beck and J. D. O'Connell, both major generals (retired), addressed the A.F.C. & E. Association's Atlanta chapter. General Nelson, I recall, came over from Fort Gordon with Brig. Gen. Earle E. Cook, now deputy chief signal officer, when General O'Connell told of the Signal Corps' important role in its power-for-peace program.

Candidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the voters of New York's 17th Congressional District are in for an exciting demonstration again this year of the Democratic Party's priceless asset of attracting new, young, and dynamic leadership. This time our party's nominee is an able and articulate young lawyer, Bill vanden Heuvel. That perceptive surveyor of the New York scene, the New Yorker magazine, has done a biographical sketch of Bill. I submit it for the RECORD as additional proof that the future of the Democratic Party is in good hands:

CANDIDATE

We've discovered, in the line of duty, that 20 minutes of brisk questioning and attentive listening sometimes tells you more about a man than years of social acquaintance. Such proved to be the agreeable case in the agreeable case of Mr. William J. vanden Heuvel, who is to be the Democratic candidate for Representative from the 17th Congressional District next fall—a tall, engaging, brown-eyed young lawyer whom we'd encountered at many a function around town, including his own wedding reception, in 1958. At that time, we hadn't any idea that he was an old Thailand hand, a pig slaughterer, and the son of a boarding-house keeper and a laborer in a birdseed factory. This kaleidoscopic background came to light during a chat we had with him at his law office, in the Seagram Building. We found him in a large, airy room bedecked with busts of Lincoln and Albert Schweitzer; pieces of African sculpture; a photograph of himself, his wife, and their 6-month-old daughter, Katrina; and a photograph of the late General William J. Donovan, inscribed "To Bill, without whom it would have been impossible."

"I always wanted to be a lawyer," Mr. vanden Heuvel said. "I began clerking for the Donovan law firm in the summer of 1951, when I was at Cornell Law School, and I joined the firm as an associate the following year, when I graduated. That fall, I went into the Air Force as a lieutenant in the Judge Advocate General's Department, and in 1953, when General Donovan became our Ambassador to Thailand, the Air Force assigned me to temporary duty with the general, and he took me along as his personal assistant. I was only 23, and it was an extraordinary opportunity for me. He was really not just Ambassador to Thailand but also our representative in Southeast Asia, and I had the privilege of sitting in with him at conferences with Nehru, Syngman Rhee, the generalissimo, and so forth. The first thing we worked on was the evacuation of Chinese Nationlist troops that had escaped into Burma—getting them safe conducts to Formosa. Over 4,000 of them were flown out. In 1954, the general and I returned to the States and, the Air Force having released me from active duty, I rejoined his firm"

We invited Mr. vanden Heuvel to backtrack, autobiographically. "I was born in Rochester, where my mother, whose first husband was killed in the First World War, was running a boardinghouse," he said. "She came here from Belgium in 1920, with my two half brothers. My father was a Dutch immigrant. His family worked on fishing ships in Zeeland. He was 1 of 18 children, from the same marriage. Most of them are still in Holland. He came to Rochester in 1923, got a room in my mother's boardinghouse, and married her. He worked on the trucks of R. T. French & Co., which makes mustard, spices, and birdseed, and then ran the birdseed machines until his lungs couldn't take it any more. It's dusty, dirty work. He never made more than $4,000 a year, but he was very appreciative of what this country had done for him. During the Second World War, he had his children—I have an older sister—sing 'God Bless America' with him every night before we went to bed. We were a very close family. My mother, who is 5 feet tall, was determined that education would be the door by which I achieved whatever I was going to achieve. Neither of my half brothers had been able to finish high school. There wasn't enough money; they had to go to work. One is a postal clerk in Rochester, and the other runs a lumbermill in New Hampshire. Mother gave up the boardinghouse in 1940 but worked as a cleaning woman until she became 70, last year—not because she still needed the money but because she believed work is the constructive essence of life. I recently bought her a house in Nutley."

Vanden Heuvel fils, who is 13 inches taller than his mother, went to public school in Rochester; worked summers—and afternoons and evenings during the school year—from the age of 12 on as an apprentice with the Mellaphone Co., which makes machine tools; and at 15 won a scholarship to Deep Springs Junior College in California. "The college was founded in 1917 by the late L. L. Nunn, a hydroelectric engineer, to give scholarships to young men who had shown an interest in public service and leadership," he said. "It had about 20 students when I was there. It's on a ranch in a desert valley, and it owns 500 head of cattle. I felt terribly homesick as soon as I got there." On his first day at the college, which required its students to work on the ranch, he was called on to slaughter a pig. "You scald a pig after you slaughter it," he said, "and I slipped in the scalding vat and burned one of my legs. It took an hour to get me to the nearest hospital, in the town of Bishop. I was put in a four-man room, and the three patients who were in it with me died while I was there. That got me over the hump of my homesickness."

We asked how big a faculty was necessary for an undergraduate body of 20, and Mr. vanden Heuvel said four or five. "They were college professors on sabbaticals," he said. "Conant was a visiting lecturer. Simon Whitney, the economist, was the director. We studied economics, chemistry, philosophy, political science, languages, and music. I'd never heard of Beethoven till I went to that school. Now I play the piano a little, sing Schubert lieder, and enjoy going to the opera." Deep Springs is associated with the Telluride Association, an endowed educational fund named after Telluride, Colo., where Mr. Nunn began his work in hydroelectric transmission, and this association gave vanden Heuvel a scholarship to the Cornell Law School. The Donovan period followed. In 1958, he left the Donovan firm to become special counsel to Governor Harriman in Albany. "I worked on various pros and cons of legislation, including the revision of the rule against perpetuities," he said. "This is so complicated that I don't think I'll go into it."

We thanked him and asked for a word on his current congressional race. "The 17th is a gerrymandered district, traditionally Republican," he replied. "It is the most sophisticated congressional district in the country and has the greatest concentration of power. It contains Harriman, Rockefeller, and Dewey, and has, potentially, 200,000 votes. In January, I was asked by the reform leaders of the Democratic Party to be their candidate. I'd been campaign manager for the 1956 candidate, Anthony B. Akers, and I knew the odds were against me. At first I refused. Then the party regulars, urged by the reform leaders, also asked me, and I accepted, on condition that I'd be a unanimous candidate. The odds are still against me." He smiled. "My opponent is an attractive young lawyer, John V. Lindsay," he continued, referring to a man 8 years his senior. "I met him in 1956, on a plane going to Hungary, where I helped organize relief operations for the International Rescue Committee. I haven't seen him since. I have no intention of running a vindictive political

race. We're both young, vigorous representatives of our parties, and it's a wonderful chance to debate the issues. I meet with my campaign advisers at breakfast, then try to get 6 or 7 hours of uninterrupted legal work—I generally lunch at my desk—and go to my political office, on East 57th Street, around 3:30 in the afternoon to confer with my workers. I speak several times a week, before any organizations that will hear me, and I exercise by playing squash. I do research on various issues that are important. I raise money for the campaign, organize my volunteers, and prepare campaign literature, and I have just started door-to-door canvassing. Oh, boy, it's the hardest work known to man, but it's enjoyable to articulate beliefs and convictions in such a way that you can rally other people to you."

One of the volunteers this exemplary young man has organized is his wife. "She's great," he said. "She's wonderful. She's marvelous with people. She's going to start canvassing tonight."

Joseph S. Farland, a Native West Virginian, Is Praised in Editorial as "A Representative of U.S. Democracy" in His Important Position as Ambassador to the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a fellow West Virginian who was born in my native county, the Honorable Joseph S. Farland, who has accomplished a splendid record as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic, has been nominated by the President to be Ambassador of the United States to Panama.

Mr. Farland, who was graduated in law in 1938 at West Virginia University, practiced that profession at Morgantown, W. Va., until 1942 when he became a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1944 he was appointed an ensign in the Naval Reserve, attended the School of Military Government at Princeton University and the School of Civil Affairs at Stanford University and then became military governor of Yosu, Korea, and naval liaison officer with the U.S. military government in Korea.

Upon returning to civilian status in 1946 and for 10 years thereafter, Mr. Farland served as general counsel and president of Christopher Coal Co., Christopher Fuel Corp., and Farland Fuel Corp., all of Morgantown. He was also active as a banking director and executive in that city.

From 1956 to 1957, he was consultant to the Special Assistant for Mutual Security Affairs, Department of State. In 1957 he was appointed Ambassador of the United States to the Dominican Republic and as personal representative of the President.

It is noteworthy that the Spanish language newspaper, Diario Las Americas, of Miami, Fla., published in its June 19, 1960, issue a fully merited and significant editorial relating to "Joseph S. Farland, a Representative of U.S. Democracy."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the English translation of the text of that editorial.

There being no objection, the translation of the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH S. FARLAND, A REPRESENTATIVE OF U.S. DEMOCRACY

The American Nation is authentically democratic and projects in the world through its diplomatic envoys, who bear on their shoulders the grave responsibility of doing good to the country they represent or doing harm to it—in some cases unknowingly—depending on the conduct they impose upon themselves in the discharge of their daily work.

It is timely to name here Joseph S. Farland as an envoy who despite not being a career diplomat has ably interpreted the sentiments of the United States by representing his country with dignity, with respect and, in one word, with patriotism when he had to act before the dictatorial government of the Dominican Republic.

In the oppressed spirit of the Dominican people Farland left a gratifying democratic impression which gives prestige to the United States. For the Dominican people, the mentioned Ambassador was a proud representative of the great American democracy, and not one more vassal of the regime. And it is good to emphasize on this because there are diplomats from different countries of the world, including the United States, who have behaved and still behave in a shameful way with respect to the Latin American dictatorships.

Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, without violating the rules of modern international law and even without violating the rules of diplomacy, was vertical in his position as representative of a democracy before a dictatorship. He showed strength of character regarding his ideological principles, and ability to convey to the hearts of the Dominican people the message of solidarity from the people of the United States.

Time for Decision?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the article headed "A Time for Decision" by Roger M. Blough gives one a chance to note again the growing awareness in this country amongst all the peoples of the dangers we face in our trade-aid programs.

Without commenting further other than to say that Mr. Blough points out the results of our present foreign trade-aid policies, I suggest that he draws an erroneous conclusion as to the cure.

He appears to recommend a lowering of American standards by cutting or holding wage levels, measuring production on the same payroll dollar by automated production with less employees, further burdening the ordinary citizen with so-called broad-based taxes by cutting corporate profit taxes.

I am seriously worried that we seem to have failed to understand that this type of thinking and programing by the present administration is responsible for the static, chronic production-worker unemployment we have with us now.

The answer may not be in higher tariffs, but it certainly cannot be in lower wages and concessions to Americans to invest abroad and ship back finished goods to the United States.

I would recommend to Mr. Blough and to Members of Congress the June 18 issue of the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada, and its treatment of the subject of tariffs on car imports both in the lead story and the supplement on page 25.

The Blough speech follows:

A TIME FOR DECISION
(By Roger M. Blough)

What a transformation is going on around the world. Ore boats and blast furnaces in the land of the sacred cow. Steel plants rising in the land of the fig tree and the camel. Strip mills humming on shores once filled with sampans. Strip mills, incidentally, that can compete with the best we have in Pittsburgh or Chicago. The changes taking place around the world since the last great war are revolutionary on a scale that dwarfs all previous conceptions of the word "revolution."

Where do we stand in respect to this economic challenge in this changed and changing world? One way to check our position is to compare our steel capacity with that of the rest of the world. Steel capacity is a fairly reliable indicator of the relative industrial strength of nations. How do we stand?

Although the steel industry in the United States has added 56 million tons of ingot capacity since World War II and is still growing—many foreign countries have already expanded their steel capacity. Total world capacity has new reached almost 450 million net tons of steel.

Where the United States once had more than half of the world's steel capacity, we now have about one-third.

No longer will the United States have the preponderance of world steel production it enjoyed in the past.

Since the Second World War, at least 20 nations have more than trebled their production of steel, and some 17 countries have begun or are beginning modern steel production for the first time.

Many governments are learning the advantage of removing restrictions on the initiative of their own people and providing incentives to enterprise. This encouragement to enterprise is exemplified by such things as freedom for repatriation of foreign capital, more adequate depreciation, other tax inducements, relaxation of hampering controls and the like.

It would be extremely unwise for us in the United States to assume that these developing nations will not one day loom much larger on the industrial horizon. The great industrial strides in Europe since World War II are well known to you.

Japan has also done a most remarkable job industrially in the last 10 years. Its rate of industrial growth has far exceeded our own—a significant accomplishment. We thought we were quite advanced when we installed punched card programing of production in our new structural mill in Chicago. But Japan has an ultramodern steel plant being similarly equipped.

In India, motor trucks of high quality are being turned out rapidly and economically, with modern equipment. As to costs, employees in our country receive more for an hour's work than employees in India receive for a day's work.

Lower cost German-produced steel recently enabled a contractor to underbid all of his competitors on a bridge over the Panama Canal. Japanese steelmakers have underbid American producers on ship plates and sheet for the use of the U.S. Navy Department, and on locomotives for the Panama Canal. And last year foreign producers sold about one-third of all the nails and staples marketed in the United States, while their share of the barbed and twisted barbless wire market was more than 60 percent.

Now competing against lower labor costs is nothing new for us. The United States has always been able to compete with overseas producers. But we have been able to do so by accumulating capital and investing it at a faster pace in more modern tools and machinery—and our superior output of those tools more than offset their lower employment costs. It was the greater output per man hour, made possible in large part by better tools, that, in turn, made possible the payment of better wages in America.

Today, our major foreign competitors have tools as good—or sometimes better—than ours. And, although their raw materials in some instances may cost more, they still pay wages which are only one-third to one-seventh as much as we pay in the United States.

I am certainly not going to question the prediction that the sixties may be sizzling. In fact, I am sure they will be sizzling, especially competitively. I just hope we all realize that it's a part of our job to see that the sixties won't, for us, be fizzling competitively.

But sizzle or fizzle, I am convinced that the decade we have just begun will prove to be, for better or worse, a decade of major decisions for us. I think we are going to have to learn to live in and with a completely new kind of world of competition.

I am also convinced that if we want to keep on aiding a developing world, we must relearn one of mankind's oldest lessons—that charity begins at home. And charity, in the case of low-cost competitive production begins in the plants, in the mills and the other productive facilities and research centers of our land. It begins with the political and economic freedoms that have generated those productive facilities and the wealth they produce.

Now as I said, we as a nation are going to have to make decisions. And we will make lots of them. We can't avoid them. If we try to avoid them we shall find ourselves in somewhat the same predicament as the philosopher's donkey. If I remember correctly, he was placed exactly between two equal measures of oats—and because he couldn't decide which way to turn, he starved to death.

I am sure that all of you have heard many people define our present international predicament as an "unfavorable balance of payments." Now I am not going to try to discuss the intricate concepts of international finance. I will leave that to our bankers and our economists and admire the ease with which they do it. But I still hanker now and then for a little plain, cracker barrel talk. And so, at the risk of seeming simple to sophisticated minds, I am going to stick my economic neck out, in a manner of speaking, and talk about this matter of "unfavorable balance of payments." As I understand it, the only protection a nation has against a loss of its gold reserves is to be steadily receiving from its debtors as much as it pays out to its creditors. In other words, our income from foreign countries must equal or exceed our outgo to foreign countries, lest we have to ship out our gold to pay our debts and so dangerously deplete our gold reserves.

Our international payments exceeded our receipts by $3.4 billion in 1958 and by $3.7 billion in 1959. If we continue to lose gold, the experts say, the international value of the dollar will decline. This, they also say, would require a lowering of the gold content of the dollar, or a lowering of our legal reserve ratio. Whatever else would happen, that kind of result would mean a new and significant step toward more inflation.

If a government wants to persist in operating on an unbalanced budget, it can print the money to make up the difference in its own internal "unfavorable balance of payments." If it wants to subsidize farms and factories, it can do so by exacting the resultant higher cost from the pockets of taxpayers and consumers. If it wants to confer on any minority group the power to impose uneconomic wage costs and thus bring about increased prices for all to pay, it can do so. And, finally, if it wants to appear to be aiding any one special interest group, it does so at the expense of all other taxpayers.

We may imagine we can ignore the inflation brought about by a series of unbalanced budgets, or the depressing effect of a mounting tax burden that handicaps our industry, our transportation, and our agriculture. We may forget temporarily that labor can price itself out of jobs, just as readily as any businessman or farmer can price himself out of markets—forget, that is, until the day we begin to suffer the consequences.

And that day is here. For we have been outstandingly successful in pursuing economic policies which have made our country just about the highest-cost country in the world. In more and more areas of trade we simply are not competitive with the rest of the world—and the trend continues in the same direction.

If a balance of payments is to be achieved, it is business, in one way or another, that balances the "balance of payments." We can and must do our share. We can increase our research, make better products, improve our marketing and work harder at selling—both here and abroad. We can do our best to endure protracted strikes—if they are forced upon us—in order to keep our costs in line. We can work to better our relations with our fellow employees, and to improve our service to customers. I'm all for that effort 100 percent plus.

All of this will help to build our export markets and thus help to restore balance in our international payments. But American business cannot do this alone, and it cannot do it with one hand tied behind its back competitively. Bear in mind that these competing nations are our friends. They want to do business with us and we want to do business with them. That way we will both benefit, because we will both produce more than if we tried to go it alone. Therefore, the solution we work out must be geared to the long pull and must consistently look toward greater production and international trade all around.

One solution, sometimes offered in an attempt to neutralize the effects of oversea competition upon home producers, is to increase tariffs or decrease import quotas. This may offer temporary help in particular industries. But such help is, at best, a temporary expedient which does not go to the heart of the problem. And, at worst, it can seriously narrow our ability to compete. We are, in terms of many raw materials, a "have not" Nation. For example, we have to import all of our tin and natural rubber, most of our nickel, bauxite, and newsprint. Many of our industries would be severely handicapped without imports of such things as manganese. These imports, like the imports of our coffee, tea and sugar, must be paid for by exports, or we will, as I said, get out of balance.

I would like, therefore, to suggest—for what it may be worth—a way of looking at this unfavorable balance of payments problem. If we look at it as a matter of producing and selling—energetically and competitively—I think we will be making a good start toward understanding how to keep in balance.

We cannot continuously buy things produced abroad, as we want to, unless we can provide for the payments involved with a greater production, competitively self-sufficient both in America and offshore. Is it not proper, then, as a start toward making the decisions which will count in the next decade, to look first to see what is really handicapping us in international competition? If we find the political courage—and it will take courage—to do this impartially and confidently, I believe the American people will understand and support the action needed to enable us to compete more successfully with foreign production. After all, the sales contest we are in is simply a contest in making jobs—American jobs—for that is what sales are: sales are jobs. And what can be done to produce jobs?

If corporate taxes are higher than those of foreign competitors, and they are in many instances, and if our depreciation allowances for plants and tools are lower, as they usually are, would it not be wise to reconsider the matter?

Could we, by lowering taxes and treating depreciation realistically, enable American industry to compete better, to make and sell more things at home and abroad, to provide more employment and to produce more revenue for the Government at the same time? This is one of the crucial decisions our country must make.

If, by following what appears, at the time, to be the pursuit of political popularity, we promote the concentration of unreasonable powers in labor unions, does this not result in uneconomic wage settlements and do not these, in turn, result in pricing products out of markets and union members out of jobs? And should not these consequences be examined in the interest of the Nation and of union members themselves?

If, by lack of economic understanding, we suffer a continued attack upon the profits earned by business—if we fail to achieve a popular understanding that profits are the source of our industrial strength and that profit at work in the form of tools and factories is the most inviting sight that a man looking for a job, or a nation seeking industrial strength, can behold—will we not run the risk of undermining the material strength that is necessary to give support to any moral purpose?

These and many other like questions need answering. And none of the answers will be easily found—or, when found, universally accepted. Answers to tough questions never are easy.

But whether we like it or not, this is certainly a time for decision. The choices we make or fail to make in the next few years could determine, for many decades to come, whether this Nation shall decline to secondary influence in the world's affairs, or whether we shall go forward—as I believe we can—to greater achievement in a world that is at peace because our Nation is strong.

Education for the Unforeseen—Address of Dr. Virgil Hancher, President, State University of Iowa, at the University's Commencement, June 10, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this is the month when the welkin rings with the oft-repeated platitudes of the high school and college commencement addresses. Because there is a time-honored pattern into which these exhortations usually fall, it was particularly refreshing to me to read about the address which Dr. Virgil Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, made to his graduates on June 10, this year.

The press reports intrigued me so much that I asked for a complete copy of this address so that I could bring it to the attention of the Members through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address, "Education for the Unforeseen," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EDUCATION FOR THE UNFORESEEN

Members of the class of 1960

Through many past generations commencement day orators have customarily laid down blueprints by which young graduates could plan their lives and direct their future conduct. But I shall not attempt to follow past examples on this occasion.

It is not modesty alone which keeps me from providing you a blueprint. I refrain because I do not know, and I know of no one who really knows, the kind of world in which you will be living in the year 2000. And most of you will live into the 21st century.

Furthermore, I do not propose to tell you that you are the hope of the world. You may or you may not be the hope of the world. Time will tell. Neither should you take undue pride in the fact that you have not made as many mistakes as your parents and elders have made. Your immunity undoubtedly arises from the fact that you have not yet had time enough to make that many mistakes. Be patient. You may yet equal our record.

The reluctance of present day commencement orators to furnish blueprints of the future arises from a change that began a century and a half ago, but which was far advanced before it was clearly recognized. It was a change which fundamentally altered the task of education.

Alfred North Whitehead first called attention to it when he pointed out that for many centuries it was the task of education to prepare young men and women to live in the kind of society and the kind of world in which their parents and grandparents had lived. Except for occasional regional and national catastrophes, social and economic changes came with glacier-like slowness. The required adjustments normally affected a limited number of persons, and even those persons often had years in which to adapt to change. For example, the life of George Washington at Mount Vernon probably more closely resembled that of a rich Roman landowner in the late Republic or early Roman Empire than one in the latter half of the 20th century.

Sometime in the late 18th or early 19th century, a new element entered; social change began to accelerate until today it proceeds with lightning speed and ever-increasing tempo. The transition—from sailing vessels and stagecoaches to diesel trains, automobiles, and jet airplanes; from carrier pigeons and men on horseback to the telegraph, telephone, radio and TV; from hand labor to mechanized farming; from the craftsman's shop to the automated factory; from bows and arrows to intercontinental ballistic missiles; from the wood fire to nuclear energy; from the balloon to the space satellite—defines a revoltuion that has remade our society in all of its physical and in much of its social and economic aspects. Who among us can predict with assurance what the next 40 years will bring? Will this movement suddenly decelerate? Or will the changes which have taken place in the 40 years from 1920 to 1960 be equalled or exceeded by the changes which will occur in the 40 years from 1960 to 2000 A.D.?

Other changes of great significance have occurred. Throughout the 19th century our Nation grew in dimension and power under the firm conviction that we were a people of destiny and that the future was ours. We lived much to ourselves until World War I. Then, after a brief crusade to make the world safe for democracy, we largely withdrew from international affairs until our involvement in World War II.

We emerged from World War II with the atomic bomb and the mightiest military and industrial forces the world has ever seen. Our enemies were vanquished—or so we thought—and our leadership seemed unchallenged. But our complacency has had a short life. Today, only 15 years later, we are the objects of the ideological hatred of two vast peoples, who, by their numbers, are presently powerful and potentially even more powerful. Those peoples believe that they, and not we, ride the "wave of the future," that what we stand for must pass away. If they, or either of them, should decide to use force against us, the aggressor's attack will not come through an intermediate nation, as in World War I or World War II, but it will come directly upon us with no border nation to delay the assault and no warning from the aggressor to alert our defense or to prepare us for a counterattack.

Within the short space of 15 years, there has come a vast change in our posture in international affairs. We have passed from a nation without rivalry in military power and potential to one whose primacy is a matter of conjecture and debate—and whose security is a matter of grave concern to able and patriotic men. So quickly has this change come about that we find it difficult to grasp its reality. Perhaps that is why we seek refuge and forgetfulness in TV westerns, in hobbies, in motion and activity, in recreation and in sports. But we do all these things with the unhappy air of one who fears to look over his shoulder lest he find, in the inimitable language of Satchel Paige, "that something may be gaining on him." We hope to awaken, as from an unhappy dream, and find that what we fear is not true. There is an air of expectancy—half of doom and half of hope—that hangs over whatever we do. We seem to have come to the end of one era without being able to discern the outlines of the next. We recognize the symptoms of the dissolution of an age; but we do not clearly perceive the signs of reconstruction—the foundations of the age which is to come. We know that we stand but a hair's breadth from widespread, if not universal, annihilation; but we also feel within ourselves the potential to build, for the first time in the long and troubled history of mankind, a world of such wealth and leisure and culture and good will and happiness as to make even the utopians concede that their dreams can come true.

It is clear, therefore, that you who graduate today will need an adaptability to changing conditions never required of your counterparts in past generations.

But you will need other qualities as well. For the greater part of our history—from the earliest colonial settlements until the outbreak of World War II—the conditions with which our people were concerned were primarily internal. They involved the conquest and settlement of a continental domain, the absorption of vast bodies of immigrants and their conversion into that unique and recognizable thing called The American, the exploitation and operation of resources, the organization and operation of giant industrial enterprises, the inauguration of a massive educational enterprise, the elevation of a domestic standard of living, and the development of a mass consumption economy quite unique in the history of the world.

All of this took place without too much awareness, or without too much need to be aware, of what went on in the world outside our borders. The problems involved in these developments were uniquely our own. They appealed to our peculiar American genius. It was possible to resolve them by our own means and our own resources.

However, our present-day problems arise in a different context. I have spoken of the emergence of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China. Since World War II we have seen the emergence of India and Pakistan and the Arab nations of western Asia and northern Africa. Now we are witnessing the emergence of the African states south of the Sahara. Nationalism is on the march and no one can foretell its destination.

The United Nations organization was born at the end of World War II with 50 member states. Last fall 82 nations participated in the 14th General Assembly. This is a 60-percent increase in 14 years. How many member nations will there be in the year 2000? It may be 100. It may be more. As things stand now, each state, however new or old, however large or small (and most of the new ones will be small ones) will have one vote in the General Assembly. Each new state will be jealous of its political independence, many will be unfriendly toward the white nations of Western Europe and the Americas; most will be underdeveloped economically, most of them will have relatively few educated people, and most of them will be unacquainted with the processes of Western democracy. Of the 82 member states in the United Nations, it is estimated that 22 are economically developed and 60 are in various stages of economic underdevelopment. That ratio will grow more unfavorable in the years immediately ahead, as new, underdeveloped countires achieve political independence and are added to the member states in the U.N. The tensions arising in such a world cannot be cleared away with the wave of a magician's wand.

This is a strangely difficult and unmalleable world for Americans to face and deal with. Yet we are in it. We are part of it. We cannot escape from it. Modern transportation and communication have so shrunk the world that we cannot isolate ourselves behind two oceans as once we could. The situation is no longer one confined solely to our internal problems; it is not one that we can dominate or control.

How shall we free-wheeling Americans adjust to this world—a world which does not think as we think, and one which we are powerless to alter or improve except in cooperation with other nations who may or may not give their consent? For so long we have been masters of our fate, for so long we have been the creators of our own destiny,

that we shall need new qualities of patience and stamina, of endurance and resourcefulness to accommodate ourselves to things not wholly within our own power to change. For a century and more we have believed that the future was ours. So certain were we of this belief that only recently have we admitted to ourselves that the U.S.S.R. might not crumble and fall apart. And this nostalgic hope, with which for so long we regarded the U.S.S.R. lingers on and colors and perhaps distorts our attitude toward Red China. Slowly and with great mental pain and anguish we are recognizing that this, too, may be a vain hope. How then can we—who 15 years ago were the strongest economic, political and military power in the world—face the possibility that in the year 2000 A.D. first place may be taken by Red China, with the U.S.S.R. second, the United States of Europe third, and the United States of America fourth? Do we have the courage and the stamina and the ingenuity to keep ourselves in first place; or if first place be beyond our reach, can we adjust to a lesser position without mental and moral catastrophe? Have we the skill and ability to cooperate with nations which we cannot control, and to work—when patience is exhausted and tempers frayed—for the maintenance of a peaceful and constructive world order?

I am not now attempting to draw a blueprint of what the future holds. I am merely pointing out that you are venturing into a world whose dimensions and nature will be vastly different from the one into which your parents and grandparents ventured forth. Your education, therefore, is education for the unforeseen. Here you have laid the foundations of that education. Here you have learned—or should have learned—to recognize a fact; to distinguish truth from falsehood; to make wise judgments and wise choices; to take effective action; to feel at home in a society of which you are a part; and to possess the imagination and insights necessary to see the general direction in which that society is moving. Above all you have learned, or should have learned, how to continue learning.

Whatever your dreams for this day may have been—and I hope that they were happy ones—it should not prove to be the day on which your education ended. You may not choose to continue in any formal program of education. But you must continue learning. If you fail in this, you will become obsolete. You will become obsolete as quickly as the automobile that you hope to turn in for a new one in the next year or two. If you stop learning, "you have had it". Your future will be bleak indeed. The young doctor, or lawyer, or dentist, or professor, or business administrator, or engineer, or pharmacist, who believes that he can rest on the knowledge that he learned in college, will soon become a danger to those whom he serves. Knowledge does not stand still. Someone has said that the two most exciting areas of discovery today are the Dead Sea scrolls and outer space. We seem to have reached that topsy-turvy world, described in "Alice Through the Looking Glass," where "it takes all the running you can do to stay in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

But what an exciting world it is in which to be alive. And if the future is darkened by danger, it is also illuminated by hope.

Moreover, you are young. You have never known the orderly, peaceful world of your grandfathers. Therefore you have one priceless asset. You do not yet know what is impossible. It is no accident that many great mathematical and scientific advances have been made when their discovers were young. These young geniuses saw the world with fresh eyes. They accomplished things because they had not learned from their elders or from their own experience that those things could not be done.

The world is illumined by hope. By means of organized attacks upon our areas of ignorance, we are substituting plenty for want, health for disease, knowledge for superstition, safety for danger, security for fear. Perhaps by such means you can substitute truth for falsehood, integrity for chicanery, law and order for revolution and chaos. As I said a few moments ago: We feel within ourselves the potential to build, for the first time in the long and troubled history of mankind, a world of such wealth and leisure and culture and good will and happiness as to make even the utopians concede that their dreams can come true. This, too, may be part of the unforeseen.

But it will be achieved only with effort. It will not come merely with wishing. This university has tried to give you knowledge and skills. It has sought to teach you how to learn. Profit by that experience. Be prepared. Be ready for the unforeseen.

The Deadly Spray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been tremendously interested in seeing a greater amount of research performed by agencies of the Federal Government before an agency embarks on a major pest eradication program. Sports Illustrated, on May 2, 1960, carried an excellent article, setting forth some very dramatic examples of damage to wildlife which has resulted from certain mass pest eradication programs. This article gives support to my contention that it is imperative that the side effects of poisons and sprays be determined before they are used on a widespread basis. The article follows:

THE DEADLY SPRAY

(By John O'Reilly)

In the war against his insect enemies, man has reached the point where his poisons not only kill birds and animals but threaten the human population as well.

In the last 3 years the U.S. Department of Agriculture, warring against the fire ant, has sprayed more than 1,750,000 acres in the Southeast with chemical pesticides far more poisonous than DDT.

In the last few weeks the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has reported finding 59 species of animals, including game birds, dead on the ground in sprayed areas. These animals all contained residues of dieldrin or heptachlor, the two chemicals used.

In the same period the Food and Drug Administration declared a zero tolerance for heptachlor in foodstuffs for human consumption.

Thus man's chemical warfare against his insect enemies has at last reached the point where it threatens the well-being of man himself. The multimillion-dollar campaign waged by the Department of Agriculture against the imported fire ant has brought the whole question of the mass use of pesticides into violent focus. Yet the spray program for fire ant control is only one of several in which scientific investigators have found alarming results. Here are some of the others:

Heavy losses of game and nongame fish were discovered 4 months after DDT was sprayed on a large tract of forest in the watershed of Montana's Yellowstone River. On less than 300 yards of stream 600 dead or dying whitefish, brown trout and suckers were counted, and Prof. Richard J. Graham found fish dying 90 miles below the treated watershed. The fish were found to contain DDT.

On the east coast of Florida 2,000 acres of tidal marsh, traversed by 354,000 linear feet of ditches, were sprayed by airplane with dieldrin to control sand flies. The fish kill was nearly complete, estimates running to between 20 and 30 tons, or about 1,750,000 fish, representing some 30 species.

Robins and other highly desirable birds were wiped out in a number of communities in the Midwest, where spraying with DDT has been conducted for control of the Dutch elm disease. On the campus of Michigan State University Dr. George J. Wallace found original nesting robins were killed and others moving in to replace them also fell prey to the poison.

Damage to birds and mammals was reported by T. G. Scott, Y. L. Willis and J. A. Ellis from applications of dieldrin for control of Japanese beetles in Illinois.

Research conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has shown that as little as one-two hundred thousands of an ounce of dieldrin per day in the food of pheasants resulted in eggs of low hatchability and chicks subject to abnormally high death rates.

Some streams already have been polluted with pesticides, and DDT has been found at the mouths of even the largest rivers, including the Mississippi and the Columbia.

All the foregoing were the results of a program which, according to the pesticide committee of the International Association of Fish, Game and Conservation Commissioners, in 1958 accomplished the following: "Chemical controls were applied to more than 100 million acres of land in the United States, with additional millions more in Canada and Mexico. Mixed with dusts, oils, water, and other solvents, emulsifiers and carriers, the volume totaled between 2 and 3 billion pounds and cost the consumer over $500 million. Currently, one-sixth to one-fifth of our croplands and millions of acres of forest and range lands are treated annually with pesticides in quantities of a few ounces to 25 or more pounds per acre." As for the future, the report added: "Entomologists expect a fourfold increase in the use of insecticides during the next 10 or 15 years."

On March 28 Justice William O. Douglas in effect proposed that the entire problem of mass spraying of toxic chemicals be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States. He stressed the importance of the issue in an indignant protest when the Supreme Court refused to consider the legality of a Department of Agriculture program to spray DDT from airplanes on more than 3 million acres of land in 10 States.

Justice Douglas' action climaxed a 4-year battle by 13 residents of Long Island, N.Y., including Dr. Robert Cushman Murphy, the ornithologist, and Archibald B. Roosevelt, son of President Theodore Roosevelt, to curb pesticide spraying in their area. They had sought an injunction in 1956 against the Department of Agriculture's spraying of DDT to eradicate the gypsy moth, on the grounds that it would poison vegetables, animals, and human beings. While the case was moving through the courts the Department moved through the air and the spraying was done. The Government then said it had no intention of repeating the spraying. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals held, therefore, that the question was moot, or a dead issue, and

the Supreme Court refused to review this decision.

A THREAT TO HUMAN HEALTH

After discussing some of the testimony in the case, Justice Douglas wrote, "The public interest in this controversy is not confined to a community in New York. Respondents' spraying program is aimed at millions of acres of land throughout the Eastern United States. Moreover, the use of DDT in residential areas and on dairy farms is thought by many to present a serious threat to human health, as evidenced by the record in this case as well as by alarms sounded by others on the problem. The need for adequate findings on the effect of DDT is of vital concern not only to wildlife conservationists and owners of domestic animals but to all who drink milk or eat food from sprayed gardens.

"I express no views on the merits of this particular controvery. Nor do I now take a position on the issue of mootness. But I do believe that the questions tendered are extremely significant and justify review by this court."

It is not only the scope of the spraying program but the changing nature of the compounds used that has led to such mounting concern. Since World War II, when DDT was put on the market, the deadliness of pesticides has increased markedly. Insects were found to develop immunity to DDT, and so the demand arose for stronger compounds with a wider killing effect. A long list of new organic pesticides was therefore developed, including the chlorinated hydrocarbons. Now more than 200 pesticides are sold in various formulas under thousands of trade names.

Dr. Clarence Cottam, director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation, Sinton, Tex. (Sports Illustrated, Jan. 21, 1957), and former Assistant Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, is one of the leaders in the campaign against the wholesale and indiscriminate spraying of these toxic materials.

"The magnitude of this problem is tremendous," Dr. Cottam says. "It suggests to me that ultimately legislative action by Congress may be necessary to give more effective protection to man and his resources against overzealous operators. Knowledge needs to be available concerning the probable or possible indirect, as well as the direct, effect of the projected operational program."

The new chlorinated hydrocarbons have many curious properties. As a group they are highly toxic, but some are more poisonous than others and their effects are different upon different organisms. Upon being ingested some of them change form. In the body tissues of animals, for example, heptachlor metabolizes to heptachlor epoxide, which has proved to be more poisonous than the original compound. These chlorinated pesticides are also surprisingly stable and remain in the environment long after they have been deposited. Dieldrin and heptachlor remain lethal to invading fire ants from 3 to 5 years and possibly longer.

In the case of the imported fire ant program, appropriations for eradication were voted by Congress, and it then became the obligation of the Department of Agriculture to carry out the program through its Pest Control Division. Officials administering the program have held that if they were permitted to carry on an all-out campaign the ant could be eliminated and any areas suffering damage to wildlife would be repopulated naturally. It is a matter of historic irony, however, that the entire furor over the fire ant has been concerned with an insect which, on further investigation, has turned out to be something less of a menace than it was originally made out to be.

Not so the poisons. One of the warnings sent out to local residents in advance of the spraying, for instance, says: "Cover gardens and wash vegetables before eating them; cover small fishponds; take fish out of pools and wash pools before replacing the fish; don't put laundry out; keep milk cows off treated pastures for 30 days, and beef cattle 15 days; cover beehives or move them away; keep children off ground for a few days; don't let pets or poultry drink from puddles."

Gradually the imported fire ant seemed to lose some of its viciousness. There were denials that it ate crops.

Health officials said it was not a menace to human beings. Dr. Kirby Hays, an entomologist who was sent to Argentina by the State of Alabama to study the ant on its home grounds, reported that the people of Argentina considered the insect beneficial because it attacked a number of destructive insects. Last week the National Wildlife Federation asked Congress outright to stop or drastically modify the fire-ant control programs, pointing out that "the fire ant is a nuisance, but nothing more." The value of its control, said Louis C. Clapper, acting conservation director, "is more than offset by long-term damage to wildlife, fish, domestic livestock, and poultry and beneficial soil organisms." The department itself cut down the recommended dosage of 2 pounds per acre to a quarter pound per acre, with a second spraying of the same amount 3 to 6 months later.

Meanwhile, biologists were following the trail of the sprayers. At the 25th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference held last month in Dallas, Dr. James B. DeWitt, of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, delineated the results of research he and his coworkers had conducted at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center near Laurel, Md.

It was Dr. DeWitt who listed the 59 species of poisoned animals that had been obtained from areas sprayed for fire ants. The list included songbirds, quail, rails, ducks, rats, mice, raccoons, foxes, snakes, frogs, and fish. Dr. DeWitt also reported that earthworms, an important food of some birds, taken as much as 12 months after treatment of an area with the pesticide, contained from one to ten parts per million of heptachlor epoxide.

The cost of the fire-ant program has been great. During 3 years Congress has appropriated $7,200,000 for the spraying. With additional funds appropriated by State legislatures, the total cost has risen to between $10 and $12 million. Meanwhile, both the spraying and the controversy continue, although some States have reduced or withdrawn financial support of the program.

Most of those who are in violent opposition to such massive spray programs agree that pesticides have become an unavoidable part of the economy. However, they do make strong pleas for a revised approach to the problem. Instead of stronger poisons with wide killing ranges they urge less toxic but more specific chemicals and the use of spot methods of application rather than the wholesale dosing of big areas from airplanes. Above all, they plead for greater cooperation between biologists and those exercising control programs.

A bill to that effect, called the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act, was introduced in Congress on March 31 by Representative LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa. This bill would require advance study of the effects upon fish and wildlife before any Federal program using chemical pesticides could be undertaken. It would require not only preliminary study by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service but also by the game and fish department of the State affected. The Fish and Wildlife Service would be directed to cooperate in developing methods that would achieve the necessary controls while minimizing damages to wildlife resources.

A VIEW OF BLACKEST PESSIMISM

Many of those taking an active part in the controversy feel that this is a good step, but that a much broader appraisal of the mass use of chemical poisons is needed. Dr. Wallace of Michigan State, viewing the drastic toll of robins and other birds after his investigations, expressed a view of blackest pessimism and indictment: "The current widespread and ever-expanding pesticide program poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced—worse than deforestation, worse than market hunting and illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought or oil pollution and possibly worse than all of the decimating factors combined." Dr. Cottam, more temperate but no less positive, argued for "selective and specific pesticides which we can use to control pests without significant detrimental effects to other public values or to other members of the biota which are of high economic, social or recreational importance. It has been done before." Dr. Cottam concluded, "The possibilities are there, and the promised rewards are worthy of our best efforts."

Address of Samuel Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Samuel Rose, Chief Contact Officer of the Veterans' Administration at the National Convention of the Disabled Officers Association on June 23, 1960, at Kansas City, Mo.:

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL ROSE, DISABLED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, JUNE 23, 1960, KANSAS CITY, MO.

I enjoyed my trip to Kansas City and here is the reason.

When I know the end of my journey is the National Convention of the Disabled Officers Association, I get extra pleasure. Two years ago my trip to your Boston convention gave me a great deal of enjoyment. So I came to Kansas City with a happy anticipation of the same kind of warm welcome from the officers and members of your fine organization. I have not been disappointed.

I am proud that our Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, asked me to visit you as his personal representative. It is an honor to represent such an outstanding Administrator, and I shall try my best to see that you are informed about facts that may have some bearing on your welfare as retired officers, and on the well-being of those near and dear to you.

Captain Shaughnessy, sir, it is good to see you. I know you will agree with me that the surest way to keep an organization like this running smoothly along the main track—with no delays or detours—is to have a national adjutant who knows his business and who has the respect of our VA officials. And speaking of one particular national adjutant, they don't come any better than Lt. George D. Tilghman. Working with George is a real pleasure. I ought to know. George has been a dear friend of mine for a great many years. I won't say how many years it has been, because George and I like to think of ourselves as young men.

To all of your members—here at this convention, or wherever they may be throughout the United States—I would like to quote two brief sentences by our Administrator, Sumner G. Whittier. He said:

"Disabled veterans are preferred stockholders in America. You have priority in the hearts of all Americans."

You may frame those words and hang them on the wall in your national headquarters as a motto to be trusted. As long as the VA stays in business, as long as your fellow citizens have a heart and a conscience, you disabled officers who have shed your blood in the defense of our country can count on special consideration. You gave much. You are entitled to much. The people of our country are determined to repay the debt they owe to the veterans of this Nation.

I want to tell you about two current facts in veterans' affairs that put punch and power into the work of the VA in behalf of veterans.

We at VA now have the authority—straight from the President himself—to maintain an authorized capacity of 125,000 beds throughout our nationwide chain of 170 VA hospitals.

That is not all. That same grant of authority, from President Eisenhower to Veterans Administrator, Sumner G. Whittier, gives him the power to shift beds—or to shift hospitals from one type to another—in keeping with medical progress, and in keeping with current changes, and current needs, among our veteran population. "The power to shift beds." Exactly what does that mean? I'll tell you. Tuberculosis is on the decline. The VA no longer needs all the TB beds it required a few years ago. Some 2,800 beds, formerly used for the treatment of TB patients, are no longer necessary. Before the new authority from the President, those beds would have been lost from the system; they could not have been used. But because of this new authority, we have been able to convert them to other uses, where the demand is still so urgent. Yes, 2,800 beds, the equivalent of four entire VA hospitals, saved for veterans who need them, because of a Presidential signature on a sheet of paper.

There is another important fact I want to present to you. It is a number. The number is 6,371. That number is intimately connected with the better health, the greater well-being of every sick or disabled veteran, every veteran who may have the misfortune to become sick or disabled during the months or years ahead.

That figure, 6,371, stands for the total number of medical research projects currently underway in the Veterans' Administration. Explorations into the central mystery we group together under the name of heart disease. Studies of respiratory diseases. Of cancer. Of hardening of the arteries. Of the bone-wrenching pain of arthritis. Yes, and daring VA explorations into the jungle of darkness and despair of that greatest enemy of mankind—mental illness.

In our VA hosiptals, in our clinics and research laboratories, our physicians, our scientists, our technicians are seeking to help veterans to see the dawn of a better day. But even that is not the sum total of what we are doing in medical research. We are working night and day for the health and well-being of every man, woman, and child in America. Every gain our VA doctors make, every inch we progress forward, every ray of light we flash into the retreating darkness of disease, is shared with the entire American medical profession.

I could give you many more figures. I could acquaint you with charts and reports. But in those two figures I have just explained briefly for you—125,000 beds—6,371 medical research projects—rests the ultimate reassurance for sick and disabled veterans of today and tomorrow.

Perhaps, I am unduly proud of VA medicine. Perhaps, I am overenthusiastic. But I can look ahead to the day we may pick up the morning paper and read that cancer has been cured or heart disease is conquered or mental illness defeated. With the help of Congress, and with God's help, the VA medical program will have played a part—an important part in the story behind these electrifying headlines.

I wish I had the time to tell you in detail the story of all the benefits the VA is administering in these days of 1960 under the dynamic direction of Sumner G. Whittier. But rather than take so much of your time, rather than bury you under a mountain of statistics, I'll put it this way:

Veterans' benefits have produced more jobs, more homeowners, more life insurance policyholders, more gross national product, more income tax payments from solvent and self-reliant veterans—which embraces also disabled officers—than any other set of laws of a similar nature enacted in the entire history of the United States. Veterans' benefits wisely administered are an invaluable asset to national strength and security. Just look at that amazingly successful debenture, the GI bill of rights.

VA sent more than 10 million World War II and Korea veterans to school, on-the-job training or college. Consider this roster of greater strength for America: 205,000 trained as doctors, dentists, nurses and other occupations in the health field; 148,000 as lawyers; 111,000 as economists; 349,000 as teachers; 453,000 as engineers and 153,000 as scientists.

And the veterans fused their talents, skills and energies to civilian life. GI education has greatly increased the skills and productivity of our labor force so that today we all enjoy a higher standard of living and greater prosperity because of it. The $18 billion investment in this program was a sound one—to put it mildly.

VA guaranteed $49 billion worth of low interest loans to help buy 5,500,000 homes, 71,000 farms, 235,000 small businesses. The record established by veterans in meeting their GI loan obligations is unparalleled.

What a massive investment in national security.

You disabled officers have earned the heartfelt thanks of a grateful Nation by your leadership and sacrifice.

By honoring its obligations to veterans, the United States has enlarged its own capacity, has fortified its national power, has established its unique position of world leadership for freedom with peace.

The Veterans' Administration is proud of the role it has played in this amazing advance. Under the able guidance of Sumner G. Whittier, we shall carry on to the best of our abilities, as the American people would want us to.

That is our pledge to you of the Disabled Officers Association.

That is our pledge to nearly 23 million veterans.

That is our pledge to the people of America.

Thank you.

Afghan-Pan American Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and others have strongly praised the efforts of Pan American World Airways in helping the Government of Afghanistan to modernize its air transportation system. I would like to endorse Mr. ROONEY'S views and to add my hope that the unique relationship that has been worked out in this instance between an American corporation and a foreign government may be considered as a model for similar agreements.

One of our greatest national assets is the drive and ability of many of our business leaders. It is essential that we develop new means by which this know-how and experience can be used to help new underdeveloped countries to build up their economies.

Under the Afghan-Pan American Agreement, the Government is able to take advantage of the experience of Pan American through a management contract and to offer further incentives through a minority stock interest.

In many cases American companies will invest their own capital abroad in plants which they own and control. In other cases the new ground pioneered by Pan American may help bring to bear American executive skills which otherwise would not be available.

H.R. 12261

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12261) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to propound a question to the ranking Republican member on the committee. Previously, when the gentleman was speaking in the well of the House, I asked him to yield. He did not yield so I thought I would ask this question now. The question arises, if we support the amendment which has been introduced here, what happens to the feed-grain farmer?

Mr. HOEVEN. As I understand it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is a substitute for the entire bill, which, of course, if adopted would be a substitute for the bill and would eliminate the feed-grain section.

Mr. WOLF. The answer to me, as I see it, is if I want to do something for the feed-grain producers in the Middle West in the Corn Belt, I will have to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Not necessarily, because I pointed out earlier during the debate that there was no reason in the world why the Committee on Agricul-

ture cannot promptly tomorrow pass out a bill which can be enacted into law.

Mr. WOLF. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] have such a bill ready to go that would have the support of his administration?

Mr. HOEVEN. I do not have a bill myself. I do have a payment-in-kind bill, which the gentleman knows, but I am handicapped on the Committee on Agriculture, as the gentleman very well knows, being on my side completely outnumbered. We do not have the votes to enact the legislation that we would like to present.

Mr. WOLF. Would it not be a good place, right here and now, to amend the amendment and include your payment-in-kind bill for the feed-grain producers.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is the gentleman's privilege, if he desires to do so. I am just pointing out that the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Utah would supplant the committee bill.

Mr. WOLF. My feeling is that if the gentleman from Iowa truly is concerned for the feed-grain producers, he would introduce it. As the ranking minority member of the committee, his arguments might be quite persuasive.

I thank the gentleman for his help.

You're Getting Stung on Compensation Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Employment Security Commission is faced with a mounting problem of unemployment and an administrative deficit with which to meet this problem. In order to match up unemployed persons with available employment opportunities, a full staff is needed. At a time when the commission needs desperately a full staff, it has been required to give its employees a 2-day layoff withcut pay last week and this week.

The official publication of Associated General Contractors of Iowa, the Central Constructor, on May 19, 1960, pointed up very graphically the cumulative results of this administrative deficit which the Iowa agency has experienced. Other States may be experiencing similar difficulties. This situation deserves the thoughtful consideration of Members of Congress in the hope that some way can be found to avoid a recurrence of similar situations in future years. The article follows:

YOU'RE GETTING STUNG ON COMPENSATION TAXES

Manifest unfairness in the allocation of Federal funds to the State of Iowa could raise the contribution which contractors—and all other employers covered—are required to make to the fund from which unemployment claims are made in this State. The increase in contractors' costs—and those of other employers—will necessarily mean higher prices which the public must pay for goods and services.

It was reported in the press recently that employees of the Iowa Employment Security Commission will be required to take unpaid 5-day "vacations" before the end of the fiscal year because funds to meet that agency's payroll will not be available. That is bad enough but, of course, the overall effect upon the State is much worse.

MORE PAID THAN RETURNED

Iowa employers paid $3,472,000 in Federal unemployment tax for the administration of employment security in this State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The Federal Bureau of Employment Security returned only $2,792,000 to the State for the administration of the Iowa law during fiscal 1959.

That is, Iowa got back 80.4 cents of every dollar the State's employers paid into the Federal fund for administrative costs. Thirty States got back more than they paid in—two of them got more than $3 for every $1 paid by their employers. Iowa employers are helping the employers of those other States carry their load—and it could prove to be at very heavy cost to Iowa.

STAFF WAS REDUCED

The same situation prevails in the current fiscal year. The Iowa Employment Security Commission, in an effort to operate during fiscal 1960 within the restricted budget, cut its staff by 57 employees—making it impossible to provide the service to the employers who pay the tax and to the workers in this State which the Iowa law says it shall provide.

One of these services is returning unemployed persons to work. If the commission is obliged to reduce its staff still further, one of the consequences will be that it will not be able to find jobs for workers, the workers will draw more unemployment compensation for their longer periods of idleness, claims against the contractors' (and other employers') accounts will increase in volume, and the tax rate governing the employers' contribution to the fund must go up.

This is for lack of $43,000 which the commission still needs to carry on its functions for the rest of fiscal 1960. And this is despite the fact that Iowa employers will probably pay over $600,000 more to the Federal bureau than the State gets back to administer the Iowa law.

IT AFFECTS YOU

Iowa employers—including all contractors—should see to it that their Congressmen are informed of this situation. They may reply that no one is affected except employees of the Iowa Employment Security Commission (whose salaries can't be paid in full); that there is plenty of money to pay unemployment claims to workers who have been laid off—so no one else suffers.

This is not true. You suffer. The jobless will get their compensation, as they should. But to make that possible, you will have to pay higher contributions to the fund from which they are paid. Getting those jobless back to work as promptly as possible is the only thing that can hold down the employers' contribution. Iowa Congressmen should be on their toes enough to see that Iowa is not discriminated against in the distribution of tax funds for this purpose.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park. Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Our Communist Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the action of the Communist-inspired mobs in Japan raises once more the question of whether the American people are fully aware of the real threat of world communism. Are we losing all over the world because of the actions of a minority group in various free nations?

We have spent over $70 billion since 1946 on various forms of foreign aid in order to "win friends and influence people" outside the Iron Curtain and I have voted for mutual security appropriations in support of the President's program.

Mr. George Stringfellow, of East Orange, N.J., delivered an address June 10 before the Kiwanis Club of Austin, Tex., which I believe raises some interesting points relating to this subject. Mr. Stringfellow points out that, in his opinion, "the fact that we are tense again" because of the collapse of the summit conference "is not a loss, but a gain." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stringfellow's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURE OF OUR ENEMY

The principle of communism is not new. Some primitive societies practiced it. Marxism-Leninism communism is a little over a century old. "Scientific socialism," as it is called, stems from the writings of Karl Marx who, at the age of 24, became the editor of a leftwing newspaper in Cologne, Germany and launched a tirade against the government. The paper was suppressed. Marx then went to France for 7 years. He then went to England where he remained until his death—at the age of 65.

One of Marx' few friends was Friedrich Engels whom he met in 1842 when he was editor of the leftwing newspaper. They became intellectual comrades. Engels supported Marx financially.

Marx and Engels were atheists and, of course, revolutionists. Marx is known as the "originator" of communism and today his memory is highly respected by Communists everywhere. Engels is appropriately called the collaborator of Marx. Engels had an encyclopedic memory. His extensive knowledge of industrial techniques supplied Marx with important information. Engels also wrote, not only under his own name, but in some instances, under Marx' name. Together they conceived and formulated the Communist doctrine.

Engels lived for years with a woman out of wedlock. Upon her death, he lived with her sister. Years later he married her on her deathbed.

For years Marx was in ill health. He did not have a regular job. He depended upon pittances, especially from Engels. He lived from pawn shop to pawn shop.

It was in this sordid atmosphere that the philosophy of communism was born which today controls two out of five peoples of the world.

The Communist leaders, from Marx to Khrushchev, have proclaimed that capitalism and communism are incompatible, that sooner or later one or the other must be destroyed. Within the last year Khrushchev has boasted that he and his fellow travelers will bury us.

Communism, as we know it today, made little progress until it was recognized by the Government of the United States in 1933.

Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover knew that one of the greatest assets the Communists could have would be for the U.S. Government to recognize the Communist government of Russia. They knew that this would give them freedom to infiltrate our newspapers, radio, moving pictures, schools, colleges, government, church, and labor organizations.

In a letter dated October 10, 1933, to Stalin's stooge, the president of the All Union Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R., President Roosevelt said: "I contemplate the desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relationship between the 125 million people of the United States and the 160 million people of Russia. • • • If you are of a similar mind," said President Roosevelt, "I should be glad to receive any representatives you may designate to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our countries."

Seven days later the president of the All Union Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. replied stating that he agreed with President Roosevelt and appointed M. M. Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to represent him in the negotiations. Following several conferences at which the Russians were wined and dined at the White House and Hyde Park and shown every courtesy, President Roosevelt wrote Litvinov on November 16, 1933 in part as follows: "I am happy to inform you that as a result of our conversations the Government of the United States has decided to establish normal diplomatic relations with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to exchange ambassadors.

Litvinov replied to the Roosevelt letter the same day saying: "I share the hope that the relations now established between our people may forever remain normal and friendly, and that our nations henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world."

You will observe from the foregoing that we, not the Communists, initiated formal diplomatic relations with them.

The Soviets have not kept a single major agreement entered into with us since the establishment of diplomatic relations.

At the time the President gave official recognition to Soviet Russia, the Communist dictatorship, under Joseph Stalin, had not consolidated its hold over Russia. The freedom-loving Ukrainians were resisting collectivism and Khrushchev, Stalin's lieutenant, was conducting a systematic, manmade famine in which 7 million Ukrainians died. The Soviet Union was virtually bankrupt. There was worldwide distrust of the Bolsheviks. The United States recognition gave them respectability, and monetary credit. We gave or sold them much of our industrial know-how, and that which we did not give or sell them, their agents stole.

In 1945 and 1946, Great Britain and the United States became so anxious to maintain their wartime friendship with Stalin that they permitted Soviet Russia, still a second-rate primitive nation, to place its agents in the governments of all eastern European countries. In a short time the Communists had control of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Yugoslavia and were exterminating millions of people who might have resisted communism.

At the Yalta Conference in 1945, the United States permitted Russia to take over Chinese Manchuria. Then the Moscow-trained Communists were supplied with Russian arms. The United States cut off aid to our friend, Chiang Kai-shek, head of Nationalist China, and communism quickly established its control of much of Asia. This was one of the most remarkable actions in the history of the world.

In 1957 and 1958, Cuba fell under the Communists' control—after the United States had withdrawn armed support to the Cuban Government and otherwise aided Castro and his Communist cohorts. The State Department gave official recognition to Castro's military dictatorship before his bearded bully boys had reached Havana in force.

Scarcely any well informed person in America has any doubt now that Cuba is being built into a Communist bridgehead, just 90 miles from Florida. The disturbing factor about the Cuban development is that some important segments of our molders of public opinion helped to turn Cuba over to Castro and his Moscow-controlled agents. Just as our Government helped to turn China over to the Communists 10 years earlier. We do not appear to learn anything from our experience with the Communists.

Respected American publications, in 1957 and 1958, built up Castro as a romantic rebel—a Robin Hood, leading his fight for social justice in Cuba. While their aid to world communism was unwitting, it nonetheless damaged our security. Their widely published complimentary article on Castro went out of their way to dispel any idea that Castro's movement had a Communist complexion—although Castro's record to the contrary was readily available.

Beneath all of the events having to do with the U–2 plane lost in Russia on May 1, are root errors of what appears to be the desire of some persons of appeasing Russia over the last 20-odd years. Since we accepted the untenable military position in Berlin, we have sometimes listened to those having the policy of appeasement, concession, acquiescent, insults, and humiliations that Britain followed so disastrously toward Hitler.

Pressure for this policy has come largely from the liberals and the political leftists.

Khrushchev, like Stalin, has successfully broken every promise and treaty the moment it suited his end to do so. He feigned troop withdrawal from Hungary to give him time to bring in more tanks to machinegun patriots in the streets. Yet we have been urged to negotiate with this monster as if he were a man of good faith, good will, high

character, peace loving, and as if his word or his signature were worth something.

In view of the actual threat we face, the fact that we are tense again is not a loss, but a gain.

We have, I hope, been saved from a worthless agreement at the summit conference, which might have caused us to live in a fool's paradise while Russia built up for a devastating surprise attack.

We should never have agreed to the summit conference. No matter how we may try to disguise the facts, we agreed to that conference under the Khrushchev threat to kick us out of Berlin. We should have told him that we are there in accordance with our occupational rights and there was nothing to discuss.

Let us hope that we are at least through with summit conference dreams. Our appeasement has encouraged Khrushchev to recklessness.

Let us at last launch a real propaganda counteroffensive of our own. Let us expose the nonsensical claims of Communist economic growth instead of swallowing them whole. Let us have the courage to defend capitalism and explain the superiority of economic freedom.

Instead of trying to call off the cold war, which we can't, let us recognize at last that it is being relentlessly fought against us by an enemy determined on world conquest.

Let us realize that our only hope of peace and security is to accept the ideological challenge and seek not a truce but a victory. Then and only then will we be worthy of our heritage. Then, and only then, will we preserve our liberty.

Will T. McKinney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding leaders in the field of flood control and conservation, Mr. Will T. McKinney of Anguilla, Miss., died on Thursday, June 16. For many years Mr. McKinney had been chairman of the Delta Council Flood Control Committee and through that organization had worked closely with leaders in the flood control field throughout the country.

It was my pleasure to work closely with him in all of these activities. One of the great satisfactions I have obtained in my work in this field was to see the Congress approve this year plans for the first construction work on the Yazoo backwater project, work which had been Mr. McKinney's goal for many years.

Mr. McKinney was an active civic leader in many fields.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from the Delta Democrat-Times at Greenville, Miss., and from the Deer Creek Pilot of Rolling Fork, Miss.

[From the Delta Democrat-Times]

W. T. McKINNEY

The varied talents and energies of affable W. T. "Billy" McKinney, as tirelessly applied to his beloved Delta country and to Mississippi have been of incalculable value to this area. His death on Wednesday night is a great loss.

Active in many areas, Mr. McKinney was a merchant, a farmer and a banker. He served a year as president of the Delta Council and was vitally interested in agricultural research. He was one of the guiding lights in the formation of the Delta Research Foundation and headed its board of trustees from the time it organized until his death.

He was a devoted leader of a continuing campaign to keep the rivers and streams from flooding the rich lands of the lower Mississippi Valley and as chairman of the Delta Council Flood Control Committee, he made many trips with the Mississippi River Commission, urging funds for levees and revetment work along main line Mississippi River and its tributaries.

One of his lifelong efforts paid off recently when the Vicksburg engineer district advertised for bids on the first project in the backwater area of the lower delta, a project that will protect thousands of acres that are often flooded by high water on the Yazoo River.

Mr. McKinney was a dedicated leader with a brilliant mind and a soft-spoken manner of getting things accomplished.

[From Deer Creek Pilot]

HISTORY AND MR. WILL

(EDITOR'S NOTE—The following editorial was written last weekend in hopes that it would reach Mr. Will McKinney in time for him to know about it. We were too late, however, because Mr. Will died early this morning. We do feel, however, that somehow, somewhere, Mr. Will will know—and will know also, that history will record him as being one of the area's and the State's most outstanding and valuable citizens.)

A news story crossing our desk last week brought with it the thought that all too often the men and families who have contributed much to not only their neighbors and fellow citizens but the entire area as well, receive too little recognition for their efforts and accomplishments.

The news story in question was one concerning the important work being done on a Mississippi Economic Council committee by Mr. Will McKinney of Anguilla. And it seems to us that although nothing we can say editorially could ever spell out in just measure the thanks and appreciation this entire area—as well as the State—owes to such a man, the least we can do is try.

Of course, the public generally knows of those responsibilities and duties in the public interest accepted by Mr. Will—such as the presidency of such service organizations as the Delta Council and importance posts in the Mississippi Economic Council and on the State Banking Board. But while few may know of his untiring work in expanding the usefulness of buckshot soil and his persistent and active interest in drainage and backwater projects, few also are they who have not benefited both directly and indirectly from his efforts.

These are but the tangible—the concrete and material—things to which one may point in paying tribute to Mr. Will McKinney. However, we suspect that when history marks the record of not only Mr. Will but the entire McKinney family, it will be the intangible, the spiritual, and the emotional manner in which the name itself has been synonomous with the growth of this area almost from the very beginning which will write the most glowing passages.

From the days when Anguilla was known as McKinneyville—the days when, indeed, people used McKinney script as legal tender—there have been McKinneys such as Mr. Will to shoulder even more than their share of the load—to do voluntarily those thankless and unsung jobs always incidental to progress—at the same time setting a pattern of cultured grace in his personal comportment.

Having said all of this—and having recognized the exquisite genuineness of this man with the manners and charm of a Lord Chesterfield—we think that perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of Mr. Will is the breadth of character he displays in dealing with persons with whom he has at times vigorously disagreed—retaining always his soft-voiced friendliness toward the man no matter how firmly he opposed his views.

May we say "thanks," Mr. Will? Thanks on the behalf of the entire area—not only for the material things you have accomplished in the public's behalf, but, more important, for having been the man that you have.

Sheriff Robert S. Moore, of Desha County, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Sheriff Robert S. Moore of Desha County, Ark., was recently elected president of the National Sheriffs Association at the annual meeting of the association in Denver. The association could not have made a better selection. Sheriff Moore has held many posts in law-enforcement groups in Arkansas, and is eminently qualified by training and experience for holding the top office in the National Sheriffs Association.

This is not only an honor for Sheriff Moore, but it is an honor for the entire State of Arkansas. I know that he will carry out his duties in a capable and efficient manner and I wish him every success during his tenure in office.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and a news article from the Arkansas Gazette concerning his selection be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 17, 1960]

SHERIFF MOORE'S HONOR

Desha County's veteran sheriff, Robert S. Moore, has been elected president of the National Sheriffs Association, and with that announcement from Denver this week came the welcome word that the NSA would hold its annual convention at Little Rock in 1961.

Arkansans will hail both developments, the election of Sheriff Moore because it brings national recognition to one of the State's most respected peace officers, and the convention site selection because here again we shall have the opportunity to play host to a sizable group of out-of-State visitors—some 2,000 next June.

Sheriff Moore has held numerous posts and gained many honors within law enforcement groups in his home State. He has served as president of the Arkansas Sheriffs Association and the Arkansas Peace Officers Association. He is today executive secretary of the ASA. In these positions he became active in national peace officer work, and his election by delegates from 26 States at Denver climaxes 10 years service on the board of governors of the National Sheriffs Association.

The esteem Bob Moore enjoys among lawmen nationally and the selection of the

NSA's 1961 convention site must be inextricably bound up together.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, June 16, 1960]

DESHA SHERIFF ELECTED HEAD OF U.S. UNIT

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., June 15.—Robert S. Moore, sheriff of Desha County, Ark., today was elected president of the National Sheriffs Association at the 20th annual Informative Conference here.

The association also selected Little Rock as the site of the 1961 National Sheriff's Conference, an occasion which is expected to attract nearly 2,000 persons from all over the country. The Marion and Grady Manning Hotels were selected as headquarters for the June 11-14 event.

Moore, of Arkansas City, was 1 of 61 persons from Arkansas attending the conference here. They will return to Little Rock tomorrow.

OUACHITA GRADUATE

Moore, who has been a law enforcer in Desha County since 1933, is past president of the Arkansas Sheriffs Association and the Arkansas Peace Officers Association. He is executive secretary of the Arkansas Sheriffs Association.

He was born at Dumas, the son of Mrs. I. N. Moore and the late Senator Moore. He graduated from Dumas High School and Ouachita Baptist College. Moore was chief deputy in Desha County from 1933 to 1944, except for a stint in the Army during World War II, and was elected sheriff and collector in 1949.

He has been active in the National Sheriffs Association for more than 10 years and has been vice president and a member of the board of governors of that group. Moore is a deacon in Arkansas City Baptist Church and is a Mason and Shriner.

The Arkansas delegation to the conference was the largest of any from the 28 States represented except the host State.

It will be Little Rock's second time to host the conference. The event was held there in the early days of the association. It also is the second time an Arkansan has been head of the group. Gus Caple of Little Rock, former Pulaski County sheriff, was president several years ago.

The Gathering Storm in Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article on the total highway program and its principles by Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials:

THE GATHERING STORM IN HIGHWAYS

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, National Association of County Officials)

The fact that our roadbuilding program is under intense fire is a matter of grave concern to our county officials. For about 300 years county governments in the United States have been planning, building, and maintaining the lions share of the American highway system that now numbers 3.4 million miles. Our 3,047 counties employ about 250,000 people in road work and expenditures for roads and highways is a major part of the local budget in nearly every county. This long experience and massive involvement have generated some strong opinion in road matters on the part of our county officials. Briefly we would like to summarize these highway policies found in the American county platform of our National Association of County Officials.

1. It is not possible to finance an adequate amount of road construction at the local level without substantial assistance from State and Federal gasoline and motor vehicle user receipts. Contrary to popular belief the superurban expressways are the least expensive roads to build when measured in cost per vehicle-mile of travel. By contrast the roads which counties build without State or Federal assistance are the most expensive. A study by the Bureau of Public Roads reveals for example, that cost per vehicle-mile on sample interstate expressways is one-half cent; on primary roads three-fourths cent and on secondary roads 1½ cents. The more rural the road the greater the cost per vehicle-mile. At the county level about 75 percent of our revenues come from the property tax. Because one county competes with all others for new business and industry and for a host of other reasons, it is not possible to hike local property taxes high enough to support all the needed road construction in the county.

2. All the funds collected from the highway user by the States and Federal Government should be used for road purposes. Our policy goes a step further. We firmly believe that roads have both an economic and defense purpose and to the extent that they do we have advocated their being financed by general tax revenues. While most of the States are apparently not diverting user fees, the Federal Government diverts an estimated 39 percent of its user revenues to nonhighway purposes. Nondiversion at the Federal level would solve our highway finance problems.

3. We believe in a balanced national highway program that takes into consideration all highway needs. Nationally we have supported the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act. We want adequate funds for interstate, primary, secondary, and urban programs. We have fought strongly for the congressional intent of the 1956 act to expand annual appropriations for the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems by $25 million a year until they reach a level of $1 billion annually. In this session we are fighting for the $950 million that is needed to keep these so-called A-B-C roads on schedule. (The 755,278 miles of A-B-C roads carry more than 66 percent of the traffic generated by our 70 million vehicles.) Since we have major responsibility for them, we are particularly interested in seeing that adequate funds are made available for the 520,000 miles of Federal-aid secondary roads. To freeze Federal appropriations for these roads at their present level in face of an estimated increase to 100 million, the number of vehicles in the next 15 years, would be real folly.

4. We strongly oppose any effort to reduce or eliminate Federal-aid highway construction in urban areas. Our farmers want to bring their products into the heart of the urban areas and not just near them. People who live in urban areas want to get back and forth to the suburbs. People travel from the heart of one urban area to the heart of another. Our system of highways must be geared to meet these needs. Without trying to belittle the tremendous value of mass transit, we still are strongly of the opinion that the initial system of interstate highways envisioned in the 1956 act are needed not only for the movement of people but for the movement of goods. We have not heard of any mass transit system that will enable one of our farmers to pack his milk cans on a bus and roll into the center of his market area. A man who buys a refrigerator downtown cannot take it to his suburban home on a trolley.

5. Everywhere there is, and will be, increased pressure to get the maximum amount of roads per dollar spent, and our affiliated National Association of County Engineers are conducting extensive national research to find ways and means of reducing county road costs and increasing efficiency. We realize that many of our county methods and procedures were developed to meet the needs of the quiet past and are not adequate to present conditions. This research project, involving literally hundreds of county engineers and elected county commissioners, is turning out extremely useful reports that serve as a self-help guide or checklist to improved road administration. Realizing full well that some of the conclusions may be contrary to local custom and practice, our engineers and commissioners have, nevertheless, both unanimously endorsed the research and are standing in support of the conclusions.

6. We have learned to our sorrow that the key to good highways is planning. There is no substitute for a carefully laid out system of highways that takes into consideration existing and future land uses and the needs of the entire area. The problems here are tremendous. We have too few planners in general and too few highway planners in particular. We must plan in the most dramatic growth period of our entire history. Technological change is astonishing. The needs and desires of the people are influx. Highway planning in an urban area is a nightmare. To say it is difficult is not to say it is impossible. We have some of the tools in being or being developed. There is the county engineer's NACO research project that is being developed—there is the excellent work of the National Committee on Urban Transportation of which NACO is proud to be a sponsor—the report of the Sagamor Conference of the American Association of State Highway Officials is a general guide post. There are also 1½-percent planning funds although counties have not been allowed to participate in this program.

7. Counties have a new and decisive role in road construction in urban areas. Counties have been and will probably continue to be the key unit for rural government in most places. The State highway departments are required by law to have a secondary unit and through the years the teamwork between the State officials and the county officials on rural roads has contributed much to our present road system. It appears that this will not be enough in the future. Our counties are in a state of transformation in urban areas and are being called upon to provide a host of new-type services such as planning and zoning; industrial development; urban renewal, and public facility construction such as airports; pollution facilities; ports, and terminals. There is growing realization that the county offers a single agency of contact between the State and a welter of dozens of smaller political subdivisions in a typical urban area. This is also true of highway matters. The county represents all the people in the area, has the broadest tax base, political accountability and other advantages that would indicate a much wider role in all local government matters and particularly highways.

The States and Federal Government have most properly entered urban areas with Federal-aid highway construction. Here is the place where the greatest teamwork and mutual understanding and respect is needed. There must be a genuine partnership of Federal, State and all local government officials if the job is to be done.

It may very well be that on this one point of intergovernmental partnership will hang the future of the highway program as we enter 1961 and the showdown on Federal-aid highways.

Foreign Policy and the Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an election year, our Nation faces the question of determining: What aspects of our foreign policy can be the subject of political debate—without interfering with, or casting unfavorable reflections upon the handling of overall U.S. policies in the eyes of the world.

We recognize, of course, that irresponsible action cannot only damage our prestige, but can aid and abet enemies working day and night to undermine our country at home and abroad.

If irresponsibly handled, this can also sow the seeds of division within our country—an objective which Mr. Khrushchev would like to see furthered.

For the most part, the American people, I believe, feel that essential policies should be examined and discussed, but that any differences should stop at the water's edge.

In this age, however, with enemy eyes and ears focusing upon our international affairs—the task of assuring that differences stop at the water's edge—without being utilized abroad for propaganda purposes against us—becomes more sensitive and difficult.

Recently, the Green Bay Press Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published an editorial attempting to constructively define the areas which can rightfully serve as battlegrounds for debate on foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE ELECTION

Harry Truman's sharp criticism of Adlai Stevenson for the latter's attack on the Eisenhower administration's handling of the U–2 incident and the summit conference shows the wisdom of a man who has occupied the Office of President and who, because of that experience, is aquainted with the terrible decisions a President must make and the awful responsibilities that lie on his shoulders.

Mr. Truman's position is that when a U.S. President, of whatever political party, is dealing with foreign nations he should be supoprted by leaders of both parties at home even though some of those leaders may believe that he is not doing a good job, or that they could do a better one. In view of the severe criticism Mr. Truman underwent regarding his own foreign policy while he was President, and the recently confirmed fact that he holds a personal grudge against President Eisenhower, he deserves the respect of all Americans for the high-minded stand he has taken in this instance.

Yet the problem of what part foreign policy should play in our domestic political debates is not so simple that all we have to do is choose between the attitudes expressed by Adlai Stevenson and Harry Truman. Stevenson's approach, if carried to its extreme, would throw our foreign policy into a turmoil every 4 years if not more often, would make it impossible for leaders of other nations to predict our policies from 1 year to the next, and would offer unfriendly governments an unprecedented opportunity to meddle in American political affairs. On the other hand, Mr. Truman's approach, also if carried to its extreme, would eliminate foreign policy from our political campaigns altogether and therefore reduce them to sterility in this era when international affairs are so important to all of us.

Somewhere between these two extremes rises the right path for Americans of both parties to follow—the path of free but responsible foreign policy debate in our political campaigns. We think Stevenson has been groping to find this path but in his statements on the U–2 and the summit he lost his way. Actually it was not what he said that was so bad as his timing; by loosing his blast before President Eisenhower had even returned to these shores, and when the American people were still in a state of shock at seeing their President so brutally insulted at Paris, Stevenson gave the impression that he could not wait to take political advantage of what he believed to be a Republican foreign policy mistake.

Just as it would have been tragic to have declared a moratorium on criticism of the Roosevelt or Truman regimes regarding foreign policy, it is not in the best interests of our country to insist that Democratic leaders go easy with the present Republican administration when they are firmly convinced that it has failed, either by commission or omission, to give us the best possible foreign policy under prevailing circumstances. Paraphrasing Clemenceau, foreign policy is too important to be left to diplomats, or secretaries of state or, in the last analysis, even presidents. The manner in which we conduct our relations with other nations, both friend and foe, has become the most vital area of operation for our Federal Government; the people must play a part in these decisions for the simple reason that their very lives are at stake. The most important decision the American people will make this fall is whether a Republican or a Democratic administration will best represent our national interests in a world where we are under vicious attack by a ruthless enemy, and the people can make this decision wisely only if they are informed through the processes of discussion and debate. The great problem facing our political leaders today is how to carry on that debate in such a way as to educate and inform, and yet avoid methods and tactics that weaken rather than strengthen us.

Defense Weakness in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's recent stop at Anchorage, Alaska, focused nationwide attention upon our 49th State, and perhaps impressed the President, as Commander in Chief, with the need of continuing at least the present limited scope of our national defense effort in Alaska. In line with my previous protests against the current Air Force plan to inactivate the 25-plane 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron presently on duty at Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska, is the following editorial published in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on June 18, 1960, which editorial includes a reprint of a highly persuasive article from the New York Times. The editorial follows:

LEADING MILITARY EXPERT HITS LADD DEFENSE SLASH

How does the Air Force decision to cut down the defenses of Ladd Air Force Base by eliminating the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron look to the military experts?

One of America's foremost experts on military affairs—a man whose writings are read carefully and with great respect in every major nation of the world—considers the move a foolhardy one.

This man is Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times and author of a number of books on military affairs. His column on Alaska defenses—openly critical of the Air Force move in Alaska—was carried in the June 15 issue of the Times.

It is being reprinted here in full with the permission of the Times.

ALMOST DEFENSELESS: OUR 49TH STATE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

NEW YORK.—President Eisenhower's overnight stop in Alaska focused attention on a region that, in the President's words, "constitutes a bridge to the continent of Asia and all its people."

This traditional description of the strategic importance of Alaska was, however, vitiated by the military weakness of the 49th State. The President's visit to the Anchorage area may indeed have provided an opportunity to Alaskans to impress upon the Commander in Chief the virtual defenselessness of an area that is about one-fifth as large as the entire United States.

The President's own defense policies—particularly his level budget concept—and the increasing tendency of the Air Force toward a fortress America concept—or withdrawal of its principal installations into the continental 48 States—are in considerable measure responsible for Alaska's weakness.

This weakness has been reemphasized recently by an issue that has caused a storm in Alaska and elsewhere—the elimination and deactivation of one of the two fighter squadrons that had been assigned to the 49th State. The 449th fighter-interceptor squadron, operating 25 Northrop F–89 fighters, equipped with missiles armed with nuclear warheads, is to be deactivated within the next 6 weeks.

This squadron—the only one north of the Alaska range, was based on Ladd Air Force Base near Fairbanks. Its elimination leaves Alaska defended by 33 F–102 fighter-interceptors, normally, based at Elmendorf Air Force Base, near Anchorage, where the President spent the night.

ANTIAIRCRAFT BATTALIONS

In addition to these air defense forces—which are part of the 10th Air Division, answerable to the North American Air Defense Command, with headquarters at Colorado Springs—Alaska has two Nike-Hercules antiaircraft battalions—one near Fairbanks, one near Anchorage, and two Army battle groups. Its coastline is ringed with radar, and the scopes daily record the tracks of Soviet aircraft rising from fields just across the Bering Strait.

The value of the fighter-interceptor squadrons in Alaska was primarily for identification of unknown aircraft. There is so far absolutely no substitute for this visual identification of enemy aircraft, and there is no other U.S. territory where it is so badly needed as Alaska. In Alaska—due to the proximity of Soviet bases, and the overflights of many commercial lines, bush pilots and so on—the unknowns, recorded on the radar screens but not identified, are often within the coastline before they can be identified.

It is routine in Alaska to scramble fighter interceptors three or four times each month to identify unknown aircraft before they approach vital centers. Usually, if they are Russian, as they sometimes are, they turn away before the intercept is made.

There is no substitute for this visual method of identification and it is idle to assert that 33 aircraft can do the job as well as 59. Thirty-three aircraft—those that will remain in Alaska—will be able to keep perhaps six planes on constant ground alert.

The Air Force has indicated that the squadron at Anchorage will rotate some of its planes to the Fairbanks area and that Alaska would be defended from the continental United States. Any such arrangements obviously reduce materially the effectiveness of the defense. But this is propaganda, not fact.

The newest reduction in strength of our Armed Forces in Alaska was originally intended to be a modernization. The old F-89's at Fairbanks were to be replaced by modern F-101's. But the strict administration ceiling on defense spending and the Air Force tendency to try to concentrate offense and defense within the United States was the reason for the projected deactivation.

The reduction leaves Alaska and the rest of the United States weaker.

NO SOVIET RANGE

If the F-89's had been replaced by weapons—planes or missiles—with an offensive capability, this would have made great strategic sense. Not a single fighter in Alaska has the range to reach Soviet bases—just across the Bering Strait and in Kamchatka Peninsula—and to return. Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command, has long asked for some offensive capability in the form of a few intermediate range ballistic missiles or even light bombers, or longer range aircraft like the F-101.

The Thor or Jupiter missiles, already proved and in place in England and elsewhere, enplaced in some of the uninhabited wilds of Alaska, could do more to neutralize the Soviet bases across the Bering Strait and in Kamchatka and to defend not only Alaska, but the rest of the United States, than a multiplication of our purely defensive strength.

Moreover, missiles or long-range fighter-bombers or light bombers in Alaska would have a strategic diversionary effect upon Soviet plans; some of the atomic "lightning" would be attracted away from our shores by the Alaskan "lightning rod."

But the Air Force, in its strategic plans, is committed to an isolationist "Fortress America" concept, and Alaska, after the Panama Canal Zone, is the weakest command under the U.S. flag. The impending reduction in the 49th State's fighter-interceptor strength will leave both Alaska and the rest of the States weaker—not stronger.

No amount of the "gobbledygook" and doubletalk by which the cut was justified to a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee can change this fact.

Africa on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 19, 20, and 21, Mrs. May Craig published three columns which were printed in various Maine newspapers.

In the first, she described a visit to Kruger Park in Johannesburg, Africa.

In the second, she recounts the attempts of the newspaper people from the United States to meet with South African Prime Minister H. F. Vorwoerd.

In the third, Mrs. Craig discusses political and economic integration in Rhodesia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these three articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—VISIT TO KRUGER PARK IS HUMBLING, JOYFUL EXPERIENCE

(By May Craig)

JOHANNESBURG.—No nation lives alone in the modern world so closely linked by speed of transport and communication. This apartheid racial policy here may make trouble for the United States in an odd way. Sticking strictly to European and non-European separation, the Union Government lumps "colored" (part white) and Indians and Chinese with blacks. Many Chinese coolies came here years ago, so did workers from India. These Chinese are not Communist Chinese, they are from the days before the Communists took China mainland. You might say they belong to the Nationalist, Chiang Kai-shek government-in-exile on Formosa regime, that is the Republic of China, our ally and a member of the United Nations Security Council.

To follow through on strict non-European segregation, the Government is going to move all the Chinese out of Pretoria, for instance, into "locations" outside, like the blacks. These Chinese are for the most part, now, merchants and solid citizens and this will cause no end of trouble for us, as well as the treatment of the Indian, about which Nehru is always complaining to us and the United Nations.

We asked what about prominent non-Europeans traveling here, and our vice counsul in Pretoria, Paul Eckel, who gave us an excellent and frank off-the-record briefing, said that Bill Gordon, an eminent Negro journalist of Atlanta, Ga., came, was escorated by American diplomatic personnel, was allowed to visit locations and almost any place he wanted, "behaved most discreetly," but this was because he was here as "an American citizen."

Wild animals are dying out almost all over the world. Here in the Union of South Africa, where they have such strange types as elephants, giraffes, hippopotamuses, rhinoceroses, lions, etc., there are several big game refuges where they are protected from extinction, though the natives do poach, to get meat and ivory. We went to the Kruger National Park nearly 300 miles from here—left Johannesburg at dawn, slept in a hostel near the gates and got up at 4:15 in the black starry dark of the next morning to be at the gates by dawn. There are huts in the park, some of them very comfortable, but not enough for our party.

The park includes 8,000 square miles of mountain forest, plains, grassland, rivers, dry creeks which swell to torrents in the sudden downpours. The park is a network of gravel roads, with firebreaks, because of lightning and the careless cigarette of the tourist. We rode three to a car, so each of us had a window, and a driver-guide. Ours, Jim O'Rourke, has been escorting hereabouts since 1921 and was a mine of sympathetic lore of the animals. Each of us watched out a window because the animals are hard to see, sometimes. In our car we did not see any lions, only one car did; they hunt mostly at night, and only in the day if they have not made a kill at night. We came across the huge smoking dung heaps left by elephants who must have crossed the road just before us, but we could not find any until almost time for us to leave the park when suddenly we came across five feeding on trees not far away. Many of us are camera fiends and got wonderful pictures; one of a baboon sitting scratching himself, on one of the park trail signboards. We went down to a river where the hippos were standing or kneeling on shallow-water sandbanks, just heads out, occasionally heaving up and opening their cavernous jaws. They come ashore at night to eat grass and leaves and then the lions try to pounce on them. The hippo makes for the water and the lion has to scramble madly for the bank because he does not like water. There are no rhinos in this park.

We saw many different kinds of deer, the lovely leaping impala, the kudu, the wildebeeste; the horribly ugly wart hog; the elegant jackal, the hideous hyena; innumerable monkeys chattering in the trees, a cobra slithering across the road in front of us. You never get out of the car except at certain spots where the guide takes you.

Then, after we had seen isolated small groups of the tall graceful giraffes, suddenly we came on a herd of them; several stalked haughtily across the road in front of our stopped car, some behind; they stared at us calmly with their large round brown eyes with long eyelash fringes. This being close to wild animals in their natural habitat is something that must be felt. It is a humbling and joyful experience, with the slight bitter taste of danger in the mouth. The zebras are the gaudy ones—a general pattern of stripes, but every one different, like human fingerprints. The elephants knock down big trees to get at the bark of the roots—that's one way you know they are near—trees newly down.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—PRIME MINISTER MAKES AN ERROR

(By May Craig)

JOHANNESBURG.—So we turn northward today on this all-too-short visit to the great continent of Africa, rising from the mists of the past into a great new wave of the future. It is with surprise and some dismay that we leave without seeing Prime Minister H. F. Vorwoerd. We had trouble getting visas to visit the Union of South Africa and did not finally get them until just before we left the United States, though applications were requested several months in advance. Marcel Duriaux, our tour director, looks after all the visas. We sent him three dozen passport pictures and our passports and he does the rest, makes the program. I have never seen my voluminous ticket. He carries the passports and the health cards in a triple-locked leather grip, lest we lose them and cause no end of trouble. He was in constant touch with the Union Ambassador in Washington about our program but we did not see the Prime Minister, nor any high Government official. This is a measure of the resentment of the majority of the government in power, which presumably represents the majority of the white people, since it got a big majority of votes for the National Party. This is partly due, of course, to our racial integration policy. There was more bitterness because at the very moment of our visit the U.S. Senate was locked in a death struggle filibuster on civil rights.

We were not able to make firm engagement to see the Prime Minister before we left and we moved so fast, our program is so close packed, that we have to know approximately what we are going to do. Result: we did not plan to go to Capetown, the capital where Parliament meets 6 months of the year and where the Prime Minister is now. It is a thousand miles away. When we got to Johannesburg, we were met, late at night and weary, with a proposal that we get on a night train for Kruger Park, to see the game refuge the next day, take a night train

back to Pretoria, the administrative capital, go to Capetown for 3 hours, for a look see; and the Prime Minister so busy we could only have a half hour with him. We said we could not do this. We said we would give up the park for a real visit with the Prime Minister and other responsible officials. This was denied. So, we go without the official government position laid out for us, though we got it from many others.

This was a great error on the part of the Prime Minister. This group comes from all over the United States, from Maine to Alaska, from California and Oregon and the Midwest, South Carolina, New York, New Mexico, etc. We represent the community public of our newspapers, radio, and TV stations. We could have given his viewpoint to people all over the States.

Most countries are glad to have us come, make every effort to see us and set forth their side of the issues. King Mohammed V in Morocco, sick with a bad cold, canceled all his appointments except ours, for instance, and in Congo we saw not only the present government officials, but all the candidates for the coming election.

The Union of South Africa is breaking ties with the [British] Commonwealth against the wishes of the minority of whites. While we were here the minister of finance announced that the Queen's head will disappear from the Union coins next year and they adopt the decimal system, instead of pounds, shillings, pence, sovereigns, guineas. The new coins will bear the head of Jan van Rieback, the founder of the European settlement of South Africa. The Parliament also is debating whether to leave the Commonwealth and become a Republic. Opponents who are pessimistic about ability of a white union to survive, say it can last 10 years if they go it alone, 15 in the Commonwealth. The Queen was informed of the coinage design decision of the Cabinet in advance, as a courtesy.

Today's antigovernment newspaper here, the Daily Mail, carried a story about next month's referendum in Ghana to choose if it will become a republic. There is no doubt they will vote for a republic, elect Prime Minister Nkrumah president. He will have all the powers now vested in the Governor General appointed by the Queen as head of the Commonwealth, can appoint judges, command armed forces, can lend money, veto bills in Parliament, but cannot impose taxes without consent of Parliament. Full independence is set for July. This sort of thing ferments against the apartheid racial policy here and alarms the present government of whites. Also, Nkrumah wants all Africa to federate with "one man—one vote" for everybody. The Union of South Africa will never consent to that. It would seem better if the Mediterranean area of Arabs-Moslems of the north might federate, the central black Africans, and the south of the continent decide, perhaps in loose federation of black and white states. A whole continent has never federated. Even in North America we have Canada, the United States, and Mexico. There are 21 American Republics, including the United States.

Recognition that white South Africa cannot continue on the back of black labor shows up in a speech of Cabinet Minister P. M. K. Le Roux. "We must make our children realize today that everything is white man's work, too. We cannot allow others to do all our work." He is for a republic of whites here, with the blacks having their own lands and governments, which might stay in the Commonwealth.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—BRITISH PROPOSE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

(By May Craig)

VICTORIA FALLS.—When the Englishman Cecil Rhodes explored this country he never thought there would be this ferment between the blacks and the whites. It is a vast, rich, troubled loose federation of the self-governing colony of Southern Rhodesia and the protectorates of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It is bigger than the whole British Isles, France, all Germany, and Holland. It has eight times as many blacks as the population of Maine. There are only 292,000 whites. Europeans came the latter part of the last century. Rhodes, in 1890, founded first white settlement that was permanent. There were wars with the blacks. By 1923 the British Government took over Northern Rhodesia from the various British companies which had been running them desultorily.

Nyasaland became a sphere of British influence through the antislavery and missionary zeal of David Livingstone and the slave trade was finally eradicated under the British. Federation came in September 1953, but it is loose. There have been riots by blacks in Nyasaland especially. The federation is not a sovereign independent state yet.

They have an enormous hydropowerplant on the Zambesi, at Kariba—you probably saw the TV and moving pictures of the flight of the wild animals from the big artificial lake created back of the 420-foot dam, when the frightened animals were so dramatically rescued. This power will be used for production of copper. We have copper in the United States and in Latin America, so there may be competition. There are six 4-man American trade missions in Central Africa now, and Ralph Lovell of Sanford, Maine, is a member of the one here. "I was with him at a sundowner (cocktail party) at Salisbury (the capital) last night" said Edward W. Mulcahy, our consul to the Federation, who is staying with us all during our visit. American Consul General Palmer is staying with the trade mission. I will not catch up with Mr. Lovell, with whom I talked in Washington before he left. I did see Mr. and Mrs. George Wood of Rockland in Johannesburg. There were several Maine people in Morocco, but I never found them: Francis C. Prescott of Guilford, Robert W. Chase of Christmas Cove, Bertrand F. Dube of Livermore Falls, all U.S. officials.

"Africanism," "Africa for the Africans," "nationalism, has been fermenting here since 1918 when a Scotch missionary was killed.

The British hold to the principle of integration of the races politically and economically with such measure of independence as they develop to handle. This is different from the strict apartheid advocated and enforced in the Union of South Africa, which seeks to keep the races forever separate, with independence for the black on their own lands as they become capable. But the whites here, hearing Nkrumah in Ghana crying "One man—one vote" see what would happen to them if that came about in independence for the Federation.

They are thinking about leaving the Federation and joining the Union of South Africa here in Southern Rhodesia, the most independent member of the Federation, which even has a minister in Washington by some queer diplomatic allowance. The Union might not take Southern Rhodesia, which would bring along all those 3 million blacks, coloreds, and other non-Europeans as well as the 211,000 whites. There are 72,000 Europeans in Northern Rhodesia and 8,600 in Nyasaland.

Also the Union might take Southern Rhodesia because the whites are British, which would swell the moderate United Party in the Union, against the Nationalist Party, largely of Holland descent, who are dead set against any integration of races and stand with the strictest segregation.

Our consul said he does not think there is much communism under the black ferment. When the riots occurred in 1959 they put through emergency laws, many prosecutions were instituted, many blacks jailed—not that they mind jail too much, they are better off than at home. The leaders who are jailed become elite and get prestige for being jailed for freedom. Some of the black leaders know their people are not ready yet for freedom and are trying to hold back the restless, younger, thoughtless masses, but are overrun. This is the danger. To meet the danger the whites have what is called preventive detention. They can throw a man into jail to prevent his making bad trouble. It is an odd thing that Nkrumah of Ghana, who was jailed for his nationalist efforts against the established British Government, is now exercising preventive detention to keep order in his now free Ghana.

The provincial commissioner for the southern Province of Northern Rhodesia, Mr. A. St. John Sugg, just like a colonial Britisher in a book, was cautious. "Our concept is partnership between black and white," he said, which is the official British position. He admitted that with the enormous majority of blacks, he did not know what the future would bring. "I hope government would be in the hands of responsible people," he said. "The intent of partnership would not be expropriation, driving out the Europeans."

Army Lifts Outlays for Civil Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, military construction and civil works programs of the Army are playing an ever-increasing role in our economy. The funds being spent run into the billions and the construction of rivers and harbors, hydroelectric powerplants, harbor improvements and multiple purpose reservoirs are influencing the life of millions of our citizens and are playing an important part in the development of our Nation and the presentation of our natural resources.

An article by Allen M. Smythe, feature writer of the New York Herald Tribune, dated June 5, 1960, spelled out the outlays for civil works which the Army has been carrying on and the effect that such programs have upon our economy. I am certain that the readers will find this article by Mr. Smythe informative and interesting.

The article follows:

ARMY LIFTS OUTLAYS FOR CIVIL WORKS—RECORD MILLIONS EARMARKED FOR 1960

(By Allen M. Smythe)

A new high of $995 million will have been obligated for fiscal 1960 for the civil works programs of the Army. This amount for river and harbor work will cover hydroelectric powerplants, commercial inland waterways, flood control, harbor improvement, multiple purpose reservoirs, and even recreational, fish and wildlife areas.

More than $200 million of new construction contracts are now being issued for these public works projects in the last 60 days of this fiscal year. This being election year, Army fiscal officials expect a gradual and continuing increase in this contractual activity.

The Corps of Engineers, the largest spending unit of the U.S. Army, expects to have spent more than $2,700 million by the close of its present fiscal year on July 1, 1960.

A generous Congress appears inclined to appropriate more for the coming 1961 fiscal year.

TWO BILLION EIGHT HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN 1961

Slightly exceeding the missile and other Army weapon spending agency, the Army Ordnance, the military engineers are scheduled to obligate $2,891,061,000 for fiscal 1960. Less than one-sixth of this will go for engineering equipment and research contracts.

Military construction contracts will total $1,507 million. Over one-half of this will be for airbases and missile centers for the Air Force. Depending on world conditions, these awards could decrease sharply over the next few years.

Expenditures for the Nation's waterways are expected to increase materially over the next few years. Flood-control projects already established have proved their effectiveness. Billions of dollars will be required to remove part of the remaining danger. Commercial inland waterway traffic has increased fourfold over the last decade. Expansion of capacity on the Ohio and Illinois Rivers will soon be necessary.

Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of Army Engineers, points out that 464 flood-control projects have cost less than $4 billion and have saved over two and a half times that amount in flood damage. To prevent one-third of the present annual flood damage of $700 million would cost an additional $5 billion.

The Army engineers are now constructing 14 new powerplants and enlarging 6 existing ones to add 4.6 million kilowatts to their present 32 projects of 6.1 million kilowatts. Plans are completed for projects with additional capacity of 6.3 million kilowatts.

Expenditures for hydroelectric powerplants on the Columbia River Basin will be $81 million this year. More than $106 million is now being spent on the Missouri River Basin, primarily for flood-control work.

More than $98 million is being spent this fiscal year on the Ohio, primarily for navigation. Traffic on some sections of this river is near capacity. Army engineers are well started on a program to build new dams and locks, widen the channel, and allow for the new large barges of 12-foot draft.

Gold Star Mothers Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, by proclamation of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, today is being marked as Gold Star Mothers Day in New York State. In various ceremonies around my State, suitable honor is being paid to the mothers of those who made the supreme sacrifice in their country's cause.

It so happens that I had the high honor, as a Member of the House of Representatives, to author the original gold star lapel button bill, which provided a fitting symbol for each Gold Star Mother. In this Congress I am sponsoring S. 1463, which would authorize the furnishing of these lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives as the result of injuries or disease incurred or aggravated in our Armed Forces in time of war.

This proposal would amend the present law to make provision for those who survive veterans who not only lose their lives during a war, but whose death resulted from a war-incurred injury or disease. I see no logical reason for drawing a distinction between awarding these buttons to those whose loved ones actually died in wartime, and those whose loved ones died as a result of injuries received in time of war.

I am hopeful Congress will before long act on this bill to fill this void. Enactment of S. 1463 would honor in a small but significant way the survivors who have suffered an irreparable loss in the defense of the United States.

The cost of the bill would be small but its meaning tremendous. It is the symbolic significance of the lapel button, rather than its price, which is the important consideration. I am delighted that this proposal has the backing of the Gold Star Mothers organization and on the occasion of the observance of Gold Star Mothers Day, I again pledge my continuing efforts to gain final passage of this bill.

Because of my deep interest in this particular occasion and all it stands for. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's proclamation of Gold Star Mothers Day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

The Gold Star Mothers of America have an abiding claim on our esteem and affection. On the field of battle their sons made the supreme sacrifice to defend the freedoms we enjoy today. For that alone we are eternally in their debt.

There are additional reasons for doing honor to our Gold Star Mothers. They have helped to maintain the ideals and aspirations for which their sons fought and died. Every year they devote thousands of hours as volunteers in veterans hospitals.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim June 23, 1960, as Gold Star Mother's Day in the State of New York, and I commend it to the attention of all people of the State.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the Capitol in the city of Albany this seventh day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

A New Shrine for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the centennial of the birth of a great Missourian and American, General of the Armies John J. Pershing, will be observed across the Nation on September 13, 1960, and on that date his boyhood home in Laclede, Mo., will be dedicated with fitting ceremony as a shrine by the Missouri State Park Board.

An excellent article concerning this observance, written by Joseph Jaeger, Jr., Missouri director of parks, appears in the June issue of the VFW magazine, the official publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article:

A NEW SHRINE FOR AMERICA

(By Joseph Jaeger, Jr., Missouri director of parks, member VFW Post 1003, Jefferson City, Mo.)

In Laclede, Mo., in the north central part of the State, stands a simple framehouse of the rural Gothic architecture still seen in some parts of the country.

The architecture of this house is not outstanding. It contains no art treasures and, if it were not for one fact, the home would blend into its surroundings without catching the visitor's eye.

Yet this house will be dedicated September 13, 1960, by the Missouri State Park Board as a shrine. Although not his birthplace, this old two-story house with the quaint gingerbread molding around the eaves, was the boyhood home of the great American military leader, Gen. John Joseph Pershing.

The Pershing boyhood home was acquired by the Missouri Park Board in 1952 from a veterans' organization. The veterans had purchased it from a private owner who had planned to raze the building. Missouri made immediate plans to preserve the boyhood home of her distinguished son, the man who led the American Expeditionary Forces so successfully in World War I.

The official dedication of the Pershing shrine at Laclede will be held exactly 100 years after the birth of the AEF leader. Missouri Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., will give the dedicatory address. The Department of the Army will cooperate in the program and a U.S. Army field band and color guard will be present.

When Missouri acquired the Pershing home in 1952 the building was in poor condition. The ancient weatherboarding was rotting and the roof leaked. Such modernities as lighting and plumbing which Pershing never knew in his boyhood had been installed. The wallpaper sagged and the plaster had gaping holes in it.

The first action of the park board in preparing the home as a shrine was complete restoration of the exterior. The rotting weatherboards were replaced and at that time workers noted the unique construction. Between the outer and inner walls of the old building brick had been laid when the house was built.

A new roof was added to the old house and when that was finished the exterior was given three coats of paint and trimmed as it was in the early 1860's when John F. Pershing and his family moved in.

Work on the interior was no simple task either. To keep the building within the 1860–70 period and still make use of the modern comforts of heating and lighting was the problem.

A carefully designed system of indirect lighting was installed to spotlight interiors without telltale electric cords or incandescent bulbs. To solve the heating problem, State park restorers added hot water coils in the ceiling of each room and then replastered over the units. A modern heat-

ing plant pipes hot water to the coils in each room and there are no visible heat vents which might be out of keeping with the 1860's.

Refurnishing General Pershing's boyhood home presented still other problems but they were not insurmountable, only time consuming. Agents of the Missouri Park Board fanned out through the State looking for furniture of the period of Pershing's youth—including dishes and tableware.

They were successful in most of their efforts to furnish the home with homemade wainut furniture such as rope-spring beds and cradles, plus the other necessary furnishings of Pershing's boyhood days.

Results of the painstaking research in the furniture of the period can be seen in the kitchen of the 1860 home. A box of old wooden toothpicks will be placed on a table. The cardboard box is yellowed and the old wooden toothpicks show their age. The label on the box shows the toothpicks were manufactured in 1864. Just such a box could have been used by the Pershing family when John J. was 4 or 5 years old.

The toothpicks were acquired by Leonard Haslag, State park board historian, when the furnishings of an old Missouri hotel were disposed of.

In order to make certain that the repainted woodwork in the old house matched the original, Haslag scraped the woodwork until he found the original paint. The scrapings were analyzed and the color was matched with modern paint.

Although not an exact match, wallpaper was no problem. With a swing in decorating back to early American, many companies now produce the flowered and geometric prints which were popular in the 1860's.

One final touch in refinishing the Pershing boyhood home was a modern sprinkler system. Although the building has survived its first 100 years, the Missouri Park Board felt it could take no chances. It made certain through the sprinkler system that fire would not sweep the old frame structure.

The Pershing boyhood home has 11 rooms, including four bedrooms. One of the bedrooms will be used as a museum to help interpret the military life and career of General Pershing. Several rooms will be used by the caretaker as living quarters. The rest of the rooms will be furnished as they were to enable the public to view the home as it was when Pershing was a lad.

John Joseph Pershing was born just a few months before the Civil War began. He grew up hearing about military life from returning veterans of that war. He fought in three different conflicts before he was called on for his supreme effort as commander of the AEF.

The man who was to become the hero of the AEF was born in a Burlington railroad section house just outside Laclede, Mo. The birthplace has long since disappeared.

Pershing's father was partner in a construction firm which had contracted to build a portion of the railroad. He later was employed as a section foreman.

When John J. was several years old, the Pershing family moved into Laclede to the house one block north of the town square where young Pershing spent his boyhood years. In Laclede, Pershing's father served as postmaster and later as secretary of the school board.

The Civil War ended when little John J. Pershing was only 5. He must have listened with the eager ears of a toddler to tales of fighting at Vicksburg, Atlanta, Gettysburg, and in such western places as Sand Creek and Glorieta. Perhaps he had no idea that he would someday lead American troops into battle but the thought of becoming a soldier must have been implanted at that time.

Schooling and hard work on farms occupied Pershing's early years. At the age of 17 he was appointed teacher at a Negro school. Later he taught at various schools, all the while saving money for a college education.

When sufficient money was accumulated from a grand salary of some $30 a year, he enrolled at the State Normal Training School at Kirksville, Mo. It was while he was a student at the Kirksville institution that he took a competitive examination for appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and won by a single point.

Pershing entered the Academy in 1882. His leadership qualities were recognized early. In his senior year he was named senior cadet captain and president of his class.

His first appointment was on the frontier where he saw action against the Apaches and the Sioux. Then he returned to teaching, this time military science, at the University of Nebraska and at West Point. He resigned to rejoin his old outfit the moment war with Spain was declared.

For the next 14 years, Pershing seldom saw the United States. His career in the fighting in Cuba was efficient and won him a commendation from his commanding officer who termed Pershing "the coolest man under fire I've ever seen."

After Cuba, Pershing was transferred to the Philippines where he won recognition for pacifying the Moros. In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt rewarded Pershing's military and executive ability by nominating him brigadier general over 862 other officers. The nomination was confirmed.

In 1914, Pershing was placed in command of the Southwest Division along the Mexican border. While there, he received word of the death of his wife and three little daughters in a hotel fire in San Francisco where they were residing in his absence. His son, Warren, was the only survivor.

Visibly shaken by the tragedy, Pershing hewed rigidly to duty. In 1916 he led American troops across the border in a punitive expedition against Pancho Villa's forces which had raided Columbus, N. Mex., and killed American citizens. They failed to capture Villa but the Nation agreed that Pershing's leadership had been superb.

At the time, the Nation was seeking military leaders. It was obvious that sooner or later, America would be drawn into the great war. The world was looking to America for vigorous leadership, manpower and equipment.

In John J. Pershing, America and the world found the leadership needed for U.S. forces soon to be called to France. Pershing was appointed commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Force in 1917. He was given full authority by Secretary of War Newton D. Baker to train and lead an army of 2 million men.

After his appointment, General Pershing immediately went to England and France to lay the groundwork for the arrival of fresh American Armies. He was immediately beset by problems. The Allies, their armies tired and dispirited by 3 years in the trenches, wanted American troops to reinforce their own battle units.

Pershing insisted that Americans should fight under American command as much as possible. He won his battle and the world knows the rest.

American troops proved their valor and ability to the world at Chateau Thierry and in the Meuse-Argonne offensive which took the heart out of German resistance.

After the war, Pershing was given the unique title of "General of the Armies of the United States." He was honored by the governments of nearly every nation in the world. In 1921, he was made Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. In 1922, he was asked to run for president but he refused. Retirement came in 1924.

Pershing then turned to the typewriter to tell his life story to the world. His memoirs won the Pulitzer Prize in history in 1932.

When World War II arrived Pershing was one of the first to volunteer. Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President, was quick to accept Pershing as a consultant.

The leader of the AEF lived to see American troops again victorious in world conflict. He spent his last years at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington and died there in 1948 at the age of 87.

More than 10,000 persons filed past his coffin in silent homage to the great American war leader. Some 300,000 persons lined the streets of Washington to view the funeral procession.

Among those who marced in the procession that storm day were General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower and General of the Army Omar Bradley. True to the soldierly tradition of General Pershing, neither Eisenhower nor Bradley changed their pace or military bearing during the 4-mile march through the rain.

Missouri and the Nation will long remember Gen. John J. Pershing. Thousands of citizens will visit his boyhood home at Laclede every year. When the last of the AEF have gone to their reward, their children and grandchildren can visit Pershing's boyhood home to remember the man who so magnificiently did the job he was called on to do in 1917–18.

Our Intercoastal Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, recently the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held extensive hearings on problems confronting our coastwise and intercoastal lines.

Those problems and how to overcome them also have interested Stanley Mantrop, of the Journal of Commerce staff.

In the June 10, 1960, issue of the Journal of Commerce there appeared an article by Mr. Mantrop, based upon our committee hearings and his independent interviewing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING OUTLOOK A GOOD START

(By Stanley Mantrop)

It's heartening, at long last, to see some real interest being shown in the health of the coastal and intercoastal shipping trades, and it is to be hoped that the hearings presently going on in Washington produce some concrete action on behalf of these once flourishing U.S. flag shipping trades.

For the first time in many a moon some real constructive ideas are being proposed for stemming the journey to oblivion for what few ships still ply the coastal and intercoastal trades. Whether or not it is too late to really bring the routes back to life, or even a semblance of their old lofty position, is difficult to say. However, the fact that some of the lines are still willing to invest millions in new ship construction, is evidence that the companies still have faith in the cargo future even if others have not.

One of these is American Hawaiian Steamship Co., a pioneer in the intercoastal trade which was forced in 1953 to suspend its service with its vessels operating at near capacity. The line concluded that war-built vessels of the break-bulk type were obsolete for the trade.

It is quite reasonable for companies such as American Hawaiian, which are interested in reviving the coastal and intercoastal trades, that they should be given some protection for their multimillion-dollar investments. The feeling is that the present system of selective rate cutting by the railways has injected a risk element into any proposed move to revitalize the coastal and intercoastal trades.

The industry contends that it is necessary that the Interstate Commerce Commission publicly reaffirms the proposition that a low-cost water carrier will not be forced out of business by a high-cost competing mode of transportation, but will be permitted to recover its full costs and a reasonable return.

There is no doubt but that the selective system of rate cutting which the ICC has permitted from time to time has been a big factor in the decline of the coastal and intercoastal shipping trades.

However, on the other hand, and in fairness to the railways, it must be pointed out that other forms of transportation, principally trucks, have also cut sharply into the incomes of the steamship lines.

One of the difficulties appears to evolve from the interpretation of the Transportation Act of 1958 which states that rates of one carrier shall not be held up to a particular level to protect the traffic of any other mode of transportation.

Following the passage of the act, the railroads have instituted several hundred rate changes on selective commodities to divert traffic from other carriers, and many of the reductions have been approved by the ICC.

A proposal by the American Merchant Marine Institute that the Federal Maritime Board set up a rate bureau to properly control rail-water competitive rates is one that is worthy of some serious consideration. Another is one which would make domestic water carriers eligible for a construction subsidy differential. There is no question that if the lines still left in the trade are willing to go ahead with building plans in the face of the present outlook they should be given every possible assistance.

The fact that the coastal and intercoastal ship total has dropped from over 400 vessels in 1939 to 70 at the present time is an indication that if help is to be forthcoming, it must come quickly.

There is no doubt but that coastal and intercoastal shipping can operate side by side with the railroads, but to do so it must have Government aid. And if the Government has still enough interest in the trades to conduct an inquiry into their health and future, it should move swiftly to implement some of the sound proposals being voiced by those who still believe the trades can be saved with a little help from all sides.

Did God Attend the Summit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by the Reverend Clay Cooper, president of Vision, Inc., of Spokane, Wash.

Reverend Cooper, from his vast study of past and current international influences, points out a sound and purposeful attitude that Western Christian civilization may accept so as to be alert to the threats that surround us:

DID GOD ATTEND THE SUMMIT?

(By Clay Cooper, president, Vision, Inc., Spokane, Wash.)

May 16, 1960, had long been looked forward to as the world's red letter day. The Big Four heads of state would get together, iron out the wrinkles galling the irritated hide of mortal man, set up a basis for lasting peace—give or take a few hours, days or months—and coexistence of two antithetical ways of life would be a reality. But alas and alack, it was not to be. Three hours on the summit and all was over. The world reeled under the impact of a sledge-hammer disappointment. Gloom shrouded the world and out came the crying towels. Headlines screamed, "Summit Torpedoed." It was labeled, "The Debacle of the Century." Thick and fast flew similar epitaphs over the ether waves. Communism had showed its hand, its true self, and as a result the utopian hopes of the world were squashed as a man would step on a beetle. Anxiety spread across the world with the speed of light. The summit meeting was a failure.

But was it? Maybe it wasn't a failure after all. Perhaps it was a tremendous success. Greater than Yalta or Potsdam or Teheran—or all three put together. Even conceivably greater than Camp David. That the "spirit of Camp David," was more delusive than conclusive, is now quite evident to everybody.

Now, first of all, and perhaps most important of all, and issue should be made of the fact that uncounted thousands of earnest Christian people of many communions in many lands on both sides of the Iron Curtain had fervently prayed about the summit meeting. Not knowing for what they should specifically pray, many simply petitioned, "Thy will be done on earth." Who is going to stand up and say that His will was not done? That He did not hear these prayers? More is wrought by prayer than this world (or Mr. Khrushchev) dreams. It might not be far from the truth to affirm that except for these prayers, the Paris summit might have come to be acclaimed as a tremendous success while in reality remaining a blotch on history's page. The failure of the summit may yet be seen to have been its greatest success. Paradoxical? Talking in riddles?

What happened at the summit may be no cause at all for despondency, but jubilation. This supposition could be based on the fact, proven fact, that man proposes but God disposes. Who dares rule out God, from that 3-hour summit, as though He might have been on vacation, or at best a disinterested spectator on the sidelines. Who among us can say, with proof, that the will of the Almighty was not done as regards His hidden purposes, His eternal counsels and with reference to the long range universal good of being? Who can say, with authority, that what happened was a debacle, a travesty? That's how many a person must have regarded another 3-hour summit meeting a couple thousand years back when the forces of darkness and evil appeared to triumph gloriously when the Best of Men was nailed to a cross and held up to the derision of the world. The hellishness on that summit, Mount Golgatha, the satanic outburst, was just God letting evil raise its ugly head in order that the universe might have an unforgettable demonstration by the master of malignant art; that sin might appear for what it is, exceedingly sinful. Could it have been so at Paris? Certainly not to put any other man that breathes on a par with the Saviour, but if anyone was ever crucified and held up to universal ridicule, without actually being spiked to a cross, it was the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower during his 3 hours on the summit in Paris.

Many a person is asking, "Where was God?" and that's what a lot of earnest people were asking at that other summit in the faraway, bygone day. And the truth of the matter is, he was right there. Right there "reconciling the world unto Himself," through the vicarious sufferings of His Son. What looked like, on the surface, the greatest conceivable tragedy, wasn't at all. God was there on that summit, Mount Calvary, in A.D. 30, and if He wasn't present at the summit meeting, A.D. 1960, there are more perplexing questions to be answered than if we concede He was there.

If God did not attend the summit, perhaps someone will step forward and tell us just who it was that enabled President Eisenhower to maintain poise and calm during the hours when insults and diatribe were heaped upon him. Such a spewing forth of innuendos, but for divine aid insuring self-control, could have precipitated catastrophic results for the entire world. And who do we think inspired Mr. Khrushchev to hold up for all the world to see, to spell out for all to hear, what is the true spirit of communism? What sane and sensible man, and he probably is one, would so completely pull the rug from under his own feet * * * all by himself? Certainly he had help from somewhere, a lot of it. Probably there isn't enough money in all the hated capitalistic world to have hired Mr. K. to burlesque the true character of the men and the system he represents, a system which threatens to enslave the world. If God wasn't at the summit, who was it that played out the rope with the noose at the end? The best laid schemes of men, all men, could not have so skillfully accomplished the wonders wrought for the enlightening of the world in so few hours. God must have been at the summit. Who can estimate the incalculable amount of good accomplished. Why, Mr. Khrushchev's few hours of diarrhetic harangue perhaps did more good throughout the world than thousands of hours of Voice of America broadcasting. It's likely the classic example of all time of a man opening his mouth and putting his own two feet into it. What an example of the fallibility of the strong man of the Kremlin—and of the Communist world. Lacking even the power to exercise self-control—self-restraint. By anybody's standard.

Dare we hold to the morbid idea, for one moment, that what affected so very drastically the good or ill of God's world—as represented by Messrs. Eisenhower, Macmillan, De Gaulle and Khrushchev—could possibly have escaped His notice?

Benjamin Franklin, at the constitutional convention in Philadelphia, said, "The longer I live, the more convincing proof I see that God governs in the affairs of men." Impelled by that conviction, he made a motion that called for daily prayer until divine aid was given in the formulation of what Gladstone called, "The greatest document ever struck off by human hand," the Constitution of the United States. Franklin reasoned that the God who watches over sparrows could not but be mightily interested in the founding of a nation. We can reasonably assume this is true to the international affairs of our time. It is hard to conceive God absent from the summit.

Some hold the view that to have held the summit in the first place was a great mistake. Mistake or no, we need to remind ourselves that without the occasion it presented, the world would be without the

vituperative exhibition of hate, intolerance, and ferocity which the world probably needed. This outburst could have been in the providence of God a necessity for the world. The image on all minds, drawn by Mr. Khrushchev, of communism seizing President Eisenhower by the heels and beating his head against a wall, as an infuriated man might take a cat by the tail and dash its brains out, should be indelibly stamped there. This is a prophecy of what would happen to all the rest who might refuse to knuckle down, should the Communist dream ever become a reality. The summit, therefore, was eminently successful in bringing this to our united attention by the chiefest of spokesmen. Having accomplished this, the summit could hardly be classified as a flop, a debacle. Even if it did not perform the well-intentioned original objectives, it was monumentally successful in others.

With all deference, Mr. K. might be asked, "Who takes who by the tail and beats his head against the wall?" This big talk is reminiscent of that of another Iron Curtain character stepping from the pages of sacred history. And speaking of an iron curtain he was wrapped up in one being covered from top to toe with an iron coat of mail. His name was Goliath. The countryside rattled with his braggadocio. "I will give your flesh to the birds," he shouted to his opponent. And he fully intended to. He carried a spear as big as a wagon tongue. The head on it weighed 25 pounds. The parallelisms are positively remarkable, for the intended victim was to have also been a "David." The ancient counterpart of Dwight David Eisenhower. Midst the barrage of slanders and insults, David, the shepherd, did not lose his head. Goliath did. Quietly and confidently he stood his ground. With trust in God to justify His own cause, a simple smooth stone, hurled from a sling was applied between the joints of the harness, right between his eyes. It was the only exposed part of the giant's iron-curtained anatomy, the only vulnerable spot. He fell stunned, his head was cut off with his own sword and confusion and consternation reigned in his realm. What looked like disaster for David and his people, proved quite the opposite. The meeting of two, at the summit, afforded an excellent opportunity to see just who would bite the dust—the godless braggart, wrapped in an iron curtain, or a confident man of faith.

Call it a failure, if you must, but from most any angle viewed the summit just as it was could turn out to be a God-send for the world—a hilarious success. An eye opener, a new lease on life for the nations, in that what happened there, accidental or otherwise, was certainly not according to the Communist rule book and timetable. According to Manuilsky (the same Dimitry Z. Manuilsky who presided over the U.N. Security Council in 1949), next year, at the latest, was the date for the world coup. In 1931 he lectured the Lenin School of Political Warfare. On that occasion he declared communism's calculated calendar, which at the summit Mr. Khrushchev must have mussed up like a bull does a china shop. He said, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable." (Coexistence being a term of expedience.) "Today, in 1931, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeiosie will have to be put to sleep." (Think how Mr. K. woke us up.) "So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement (who asked for the summit) on record. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate to their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist.' A la Goliath. A la Khrushchev.

Now, but for the crudeness of Mr. Khrushchev in alerting the world, the Communist's basic plan could have eluded us in this age of all sweetness and light. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one, next year, was the ultimate year for the finishing stroke, the smashing by the clenched fist on the heels of communism's unprecedented peace overtures. Who can say it was not God who induced Mr. K. to sabotage the schedule, and is so doing wake us up, in his vitrolic attack on President Eisenhower. If Mr. Khrushchev said or did anything to lull us to sleep in preparation for the coup de grace, nobody is aware of it. Let it be said again, all this could conceivably be interpreted as the goodness of God in alerting us. Unknown to himself, of course, the Soviet Chairman could have been the instrument of God to disturb our daydreams, and for this we can be thankful. If the coup de grace is administered ,at least we won't be walking in a daze down a primrose path on the arm of the executioner.

No, it is not unthinkable Mr. K. did the world a great service, unwittingly, giving America and other non-Communist nations another glorious chance to firm up their defenses and to discover and apply the right solution to the turbulency of the times. Many, who did not know before, at least know now that communism is not that solution, except as the guillotine is a toothache remedy.

But, where do we go from here? Where does all this lead? If God did attend the summit, and if Mr. Khrushchev was prodded by God to toss a monkey wrench into his own machinery, how shall it all be interpreted? What is the next move?

We can be sure whatever else the answer to the question might include, it cannot possibly exclude the timeless, world-embracing commission issued by Christ at the close of the final summit meet with his disciples on the Mount of Olives. Included are His orders to evangelize the world. He said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations * * * to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded * * * and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Teaching men of all nations to observe what Christ commanded, well, if this is not the answer to the complexities of the world, there just isn't any answer. Somewhere within the scope of all that is comprehended in this commonly referred to "Great Commission," lies the hope of the world.

So, for the Christian individual, or church whether within a nominally Christian nation or the professedly atheistic, Communist nation—there seems but one course to pursue to be infallibly safe. It is diligent, wholehearted obedience in the face of all obstacles to the marching orders, "Teach all nations whatsoever I have commanded you * * * make disciples of all nations * * * preach the Gospel to every creature." This is the "light that shineth in darkness, and the darkness has never overpowered it." If it took the failure of a contemporary summit meeting, to give impetus to the nearly forgotten issues of that other in the long ago, so be it. In any case, there are certainly evidences to warrant the supposition that concerning the summit meeting of 1960, God was there.

Harvard's Class of 1910

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a college class which on its golden anniversary could boast of either a Heywood Broun, a Walter Lippmann, or a T. S. Eliot in its numbers could be justly proud of its influence on our Nation. All of these men have had a great impact on American thought and action.

John Herling, in an article in the Minneapolis Star of June 15, 1960, entitled "Harvard's Class of 1910 Rode Comet's Tail to Fame," reports the achievements of this extraordinary class and some of the influences in the recent history of our country and at Harvard which contributed to this record.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article by John Herling from the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD'S CLASS OF 1910 RODE COMET'S TAIL TO FAME

(By John Herling)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—John Herling, who writes from Washington frequently for the Star's editorial page, is himself a graduate of Harvard, class of 1928. Herling studied under Charles Townsend Copeland, the famous "Copey," in the latter's last year on the faculty and as a newspaperman has known many of the illustrious sons of 1910.)

Fifty years ago—in June 1910—an impatient class of 600 men stormed out of Harvard College. They had no time to waste on past glories or on alumni prescriptions for success or failure. In May 1910, Halley's comet had swept into the terrestrial skies. The Harvard class of 1910 grabbed hold of the comet's tail and rode it.

What was so unusual about the class of 1910 that calls forth extravagant comparisons? What is unusual about any group of alumni 50 years after? Usually, little enough. But looking back, the sons of this class of 1910 have won even from the skeptical muse of history murmurs of wonder and appreciation.

In 1910 William Howard Taft was President of the United States, Charles Evans Hughes just edging his way into the Supreme Court for the first time. Teddy Roosevelt was warming up for the Bull Moose campaign by hunting big game in Africa. Woodrow Wilson was leaving Princeton to run for Governor of New Jersey.

Even then, the world loomed uncertainly ahead in a decade of some doubt, little hesitation and great optimism. When they entered Harvard, the members of the class had been told by Charles William Eliot, its president, that the "university's aim is to allow each man to think and do as he pleases and the tendency is to allow this more and more."

Seldom before—or since—in the history of a college did men take advice so literally and energetically.

Here were some of the men in the class of 1910 who took it to heart and mind: Alan Seeger, poet; John Reed, journalist and revolutionary idealist; Walter Lippmann, political writer; Thomas Stearns Eliot, Nobel Prize winning poet; Heywood Broun, columnist and humanitarian; Senator Bronson Cutting, pre-New Deal progressive; Robert Hallowell, portrait painter; Henry Shepley, architect; Clarence Cook Little, university president and cancer researcher; Harlow Shapley, astronomer; William Francis Gibbs, marine engineering genius; John Cudahy, once Ambassador to Poland; Robert Edmond Jones, trail blazer in theatrical design; Chester I. Barnard, president of the Rockefeller Foundation; Stanley Cobb, physician; Stuart Chase, writer; Hamilton Fish, Jr., Congressman; and all these far from the half of it.

What a class this was. The graduates developed at different speeds, in diverse ways. Some maintained a steady gait of accomplishment; others rushed to brilliant, sometimes tragic conclusions.

But the page 1 names represent only the visible part of the class' accomplishment. Judged by inclusion in Who's Who, about 10 percent of this class has won more than average recognition. What makes a class like that?

The climate of the times might have something to do with it. But the weather was not much different a year or two or three before or after 1910. This class was the end product of President Eliot's 40 years of leadership at Harvard. In Cambridge he had assembled one of the greatest faculties of the century.

Harvard's magnificient goad was, of course, William James, great psychologist and greater teacher. He would always remind his students that the main job for a Harvard man was to find an antidote for Harvard. His injunction to them and his age to find the "moral equivalent of war" was both an intellectual and a practical exhortation.

George Santayana, the poet-philosopher, disdainful of everything but quality and beauty, attracted small classes, and as far as he was concerned, the smaller the better. He gloried in mediation as a way of life.

Then there were George Herbert Palmer in philosophy and Hugo Munsterberg in psychology; in literature and writing there were LeBaron Russel Briggs, Charles Townsend Copeland—Copey himself—George Pierce Baker, who soon founded the 47 Workshop, the school for playwrights, and George Lyman Kittredge, who made Shakespeare a man about town, and there were Albert Bushnell Hart and Charles Homer Haskin in history and Frank Taussig in economics.

The intellectual magnetism of such a faculty was bound to attract a certain number of students. The chances are, however, that many of them would have come to Harvard anyway. Nevertheless, the spirit of self-expression had found a center in Cambridge.

This class had been baptized by depression in 1907-08, a small affair when compared with the shambles of 1929-33. But it was enough of an economic earthquake to rock that generation back on its heels. In politics, in arts, and in economics, individual and social experiments were beginning to bubble and burst.

When William James exhorted college students to beware the "Ph. D. octopus," there was a warm answering chuckle among the undergraduates. Even the graduate students began to have second thoughts.

At the top of its form, the class of 1910 divided almost evenly into about two equal parts between the professions and business.

There were 68 teachers, 66 lawyers, 33 doctors, 27 engineers, 24 writers, and related folk, 14 gentlemen farmers, 13 in government service, 12 architects, 11 accountants, 10 clergymen, 5 musicians, 5 artists, 2 legislators.

On the business side, there were 87 bankers and brokers, 66 manufacturers, 45 merchants, 17 insurance men, 16 in real estate, the same number in transportation and 7 in advertising.

Viewed by its contemporaries in college, this class was considered slightly inferior because it provided less than its expected quota of football talent. However, Hamilton Fish, Jr., 1910's gift to football and Republican valhalla, did achieve immortality as a tackle on Walter Camp's All-Time All-American football team, long before he won renown as an early head of the house un-American activities committee.

The poet, Alan Seeger, was the first of the Class of 1910 to win an international reputation with his "I Have a Rendezvous With Death," the perennial of poetry anthologies. As an undergraduate, he lived his own intensive inner life. There was then no inkling that Seeger would die by bayonet on some "disputed barricade."

What was he like as an undergraduate?

"My books were my friends," he wrote. "The opening to me of the shelves of the college library, a rare privilege, was like opening up the gates of an earthy paradise. In those dark alleys, I would spend afternoons entire, browsing among old folios, following lines of research that often had no connection with my courses, following them simply for the pleasure of the explorer discovering new countries."

John Reed drew this half-teasing, half-serious sketch of him shortly after graduation:

"A timid footstep—enter then the eager
Keats-Shelley-Swinburne-Medieval-
Seeger;
Poe's raven bank above Byronic brow,
And Dante's beak—you have his picture
now;
In fact he is, though feigning not to know
it,
The popular conception of a poet.
Dreaming his eyes are steadily alight
With splendors of a world beyond our
sight."

The war had hardly started in 1914 when Seeger joined the French Foreign Legion to protect "the glory and the beauty" of Paris and of France. He said simply, it was for him "of supreme importance * * * not to be on the winning side, but on the side where my sympathies lie."

John Silas Reed was one of the unforgettables of the class of 1910. When William James said, "Our undisciplinables are our proudest product," Reed was the kind of fellow he had in mind.

Reed brought to Harvard the breezy Northwest, and the example of his father, a devoted follower of Teddy Roosevelt, who had appointed him U.S. marshal for Oregon to enable him to crusade against the "malefactors of great wealth."

Almost from the start, his classmates were made aware of the phenomenon called John Reed. Edward Eyre Hunt, the class poet, later a State Department official, says "he had in him something wild and restive and western, a breath and a spaciousness which broke bonds almost as soon as they were set."

Reed's career was jammed into just 10 years; out of Harvard in 1910, dead and buried in the Kremlin wall in 1920, who had always refused to be fenced in by Harvard. When death by typhus overtook him in Moscow, he had begun to fret openly at the deceitful shenanigans of totalitarian politics.

Generous and idealistic urges drove Reed on the road that led him to write "Ten Days That Shook the World," the 10 days of the Bolshevik coup d'etat. He would have squirted scornful laughter at the Soviet rulers who, after his death, purged his book of all facts and thoughts deemed dangerous to the revised history of the Soviet regime. Reed packed a lifetime into the decade of his post-Harvard life.

Reed described himself as an "activity" man. He had a roaring sense of humor which Harvard could not curb. Editor of the college highbrow magazine, the Harvard Monthly, and as Ibis of the Harvard Lampoon, the comic paper, he led cheers in the stadium when the Harvard football team was captained by another classmate, Hamilton Fish, Jr.

After leaving Harvard, Reed bummed his way in part around England and the continent. Returning, he announced his plan to make a million dollars and marry a French girl. He abandoned that project. Instead, he covered the textile strikes at Paterson, N.J., and later on the coal strikes in Colorado.

He reported the Mexican wars, and especially the campaigns and rampagings up and down of Pancho Villa. First suspicious and hostile, Villa soon learned to like the "gringo," would try to stage his battles to suit John Reed's deadlines for the Metropolitan Magazine. He dubbed Reed "El Pugnose."

In the Reed tradition, Heywood Broun first made a brilliant success as a newspaperman. He had come out of the First World War with a mild fame as a sports writer turned war correspondent. He became one of the great columnists of the twentys and thirtys and founder of the American Newspaper Guild. Many of Broun's columns were paeans of praise for Reed and/or Charles Townsend Copeland, the famous Copey, who taught both of them English composition.

Looking backward, an important difference between Broun and Reed is that Broun lived long enough to break clean with the Communists who had tried to hold him captive in the thirties and to pervert into totalitarian channels Broun's generosity and leadership.

When Broun died a few months after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, the New York Times said: "No journalistic personality in our time was more distinct. Heywood Broun disagreed with many people, but no one could ever have hated him. He disagreed with himself. He wandered among ideas, never claiming to be consistent. He was consistent only in the qualities that were born in him—in humor, in courage, in endless and painstaking, kindliness for the poor, the weak and those whom he thought oppressed."

Broun preceded Walter Lippmann on the World, but Lippmann outlasted him. As editor of the World, Lippmann wrote editorially while Broun wrote columns that more often than not conflicted sharply with the paper's official position—conflict which broke wide open on Broun's attack on President Lowell of Harvard during the Sacco-Vanzetti case.

Lippmann was always considered mature, steady as a rock. Even as an undergraduate, he seemed always to have operated intellectually with precision and clarity. Graham Wallas came from Britain to teach at Harvard and exerted powerful impact on many undergraduates, including Lippmann, Broun and Reed. But Lippmann's intellectual preeminence is in a class by itself, probably the most unusual tribute a professor ever paid a student, the world famous Wallas dedicated his book to Lippmann, when the latter was barely out of his teens.

Edward Eyre Hunt called Walter the "Manhattan Zeus."

Lippmann romped through his undergraduate courses in 3 years. By the time graduation time had come for the others, he had achieved an M.A. and had put childish things behind him. He was not yet 21.

Lippmann's position as a commentator on politics and foreign affairs is the summit. How did Lippmann look at 23? In one of Walter's descents to friends in Greenwich

Village, Reed records his impressions in a mixture of pride and exasperation:

Lippmann, calm, inscrutable,
Thinking and writing, clearly, soundly, well;
All snarls of falseness swiftly piercing through,
His keen mind leaps like lightning to the true;
His face is almost placid—but his eye—
There is a vision born to prophesy.
He sits in silence, as one who said:
"I waste not living words among the dead."
Our all-unchallenged Chief. But were there one
Who builds a world, and leaves out all the fun—
Who dreams a pageant, gorgeous, infinite,
And then leaves all the color out of it—
Who wants the human race, and me,
March to a geometric Q.E.D.—
Who but must laugh, if such a man there be?
Who would not weep, if Walter L. were he?

This large-scale ribbing did not deter Lippmann from producing an enormous output which under his surgical eye he has seldom permitted to become a "chaos of clear ideas." The human race is not marching to Lippmann's Q.E.D., but a good part of it does read his luminous columns with almost dedicated regularity.

Thomas Stearns Eliot was the first Nobel Prize winner to come out of the class of 1910. Twenty-five years ago, he wrote wistfully to Leon H. Little, the Boston banker, then secretary of the class of 1910, "I wish I could really write a good play." He has managed.

Fifty years ago, Eliot wrote the ode for 1910 which the class sang at graduation. His heavy emphasis, at the start, was scholarship. After studying for, but not bothering to take his Ph. D. at Harvard, he dropped teaching and graduate studies and went into banking (Lloyd's of London). From banking, he moved into publishing and likes to describe his occupation as a company director.

In 1923, as the byproduct of a breakdown brought on by a double career as a banker and poet, Eliot's "Waste Land" appeared. Eliot was no longer unknown. Ezra Pound had tailored the Eliot poem for publication. But Eliot's undoubted gratitude to Pound did not prevent his impish remark several years later, that "I am obliged to spend a great deal of time answering letters from Ezra Pound, but my firm (Faber & Faber) pays for the stamps." Eliot has been a British subject since 1927.

What did Harvard have to do with his development? He studied philosophy under George Santayana and Irving Babbitt whetted his interest in comparative literature and in oriental religions. But from then on, he was on his own.

The class' outstanding legislator was Bronson Cutting, later Senator from New Mexico. He was studious despite his wealth. He made Phi Beta Kappa. Laid low by tuberculosis during his fourth year at college, he was shipped to New Mexico on a stretcher. He recovered his health and founded a political career as well.

He devoted himself to archaeological research, perhaps the most unique apprenticeship for a political career in American history. Cutting used to carry on a bilingual political campaign in Spanish and English. He considered himself a progressive Republican.

He became a national figure, senator in 1927, before Franklin Roosevelt was elected Governor of New York. With La Follette of Wisconsin and Johnson of California, he welcomed the advent of F. D. R. to Washington and supported new deal legislation.

Cutting got himself elected as a Republican, but his disappointment curdled his relations with Roosevelt, whom he regarded as a parvenu liberal. He died in a plane crash en route to New Mexico. He was an aggressive defender of civil liberties and made a special point of breaking down the social barrier between his American and Spanish-speaking constituents.

This selection of some careers in the fabulous class of 1910 points no moral. Though they attended the same college, many were determined and cheerful nonconformists.

True, they benefited by large helping of mutual aid and esteem, especially in the early days, but they went their own ways. They dramatize the antithesis of organization men. They rejected uniformity. The best of them expanded in vision as they grew in competence.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, I sent 115,000 questionnaires to every household in the 42d District of New York. A memorandum of the issues relating to the questions was also sent. It outlined the facts and arguments pro and con.

A total of 7,800 replies were received. I was gratified with the response to this survey and with the large number of valuable and sound suggestions from the people of this district contained on the questionnaires.

The tabulated results will be inserted in the RECORD in four parts. The first part will contain the questions and the replies to "Foreign Policy—Disarmament"—"Peace"—"Lend Lease," and "Defense—Missiles—Space."

The second part will consist of the questions and replies for the section entitled "1961 Budget and Taxes—National Debt—Interest—Gold—Inflation."

The third part relates to "Castro and Cuba" and "Agriculture."

The final part covers "Education" and "Hospitalization, Surgical Insurance for the Aged—Forand Bill."

The tabulated results for the first part follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOREIGN POLICY, DISARMAMENT, "PEACE," LEND LEASE

1. Do you agree with the U.S. policy that disarmament must be accompanied by a foolproof inspection system? Yes, 6,497; no, 181.

2. Do you believe that the Soviet has permanently abandoned world domination by communism as a basic goal? Yes, 239; no, 6,467.

3. Do you believe that the exchange of visits by the various heads of states (personal diplomacy) is in the interest of world peace? Yes, 5,333; no, 1,225.

4. Do you believe that the United States should remain firm on retaining the present "free" status of Berlin regardless of consequences? Yes, 5,946; no, 645.

5. Do you believe in a massive reevaluation of our cold war effort, support the payment of necessary taxes, for the following programs?

(A) Reorganize the Defense Department to produce more armament and more adequate defense. (B) Find means to more effectively combat the Soviet ideological and propaganda campaign for the support of the uncommitted peoples of the world. (C) Shift our foreign policies and our diplomacy from a defensive to a more offensive emphasis. Yes, 5,414; no, 765.

6. Do you favor acceptance of about $500 million as full payment of Russia's lend-lease debt of $2.6 billion? Yes, 1,116; no, 5,657.

7. Do you favor a U.S. trade loan to the Soviet of about $5 billion? Yes, 359; No, 6,143.

8. Do you favor a cutoff of our lend-lease negotiations with an announcement that the United States will select an anniversary date for the lend-lease debt and announce each year to the world the Soviet debt with interest, its failure to pay and a request for full payment? Yes, 5,398; no, 959.

DEFENSE, MISSILES, SPACE

1. Do you believe the present annual expenditures of $45 billion for our military gram is about right? Yes, 3,492; no, 1,924.

2. Shall the Joint Chief of Staff arrangement and the three service Secretaries (Army, Navy, and Air Force) be abolished in favor of a single Defense Chief of Staff to make military decisions? Yes, 3,913; no, 2,422.

3. Do you believe that the United States is especially vulnerable to nuclear weapons fired from Soviet submarines? Yes, 4,220; no, 1,821.

4. Do you favor a "crash program" of about $10 to $15 billion per year to develop an anti-missile missile to speed up our missile program and otherwise regain military superiority for the purpose of increasing our capability to deter war and would you support the necessary taxes therefor? Yes, 4,119; no, 2,001.

Tributes to Frieda B. Hennock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorially has paid a well deserved tribute to the late Frieda Hennock Simons, who, the editorial states:

As the first and only woman member of the Federal Communications Commission * * * was among the most vigorous champions of educational television.

I concur wholeheartedly with the statement of the Post's editorial writer that she—

Leaves a monument more substantial than marble, though it exists only in thin air.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which appeared in the Post of June 22, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an article from the New York Times of June 21, dealing with the life and accomplishments of Mrs. Simons.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1960]

FRIEDA B. HENNOCK

Frieda B. Hennock leaves a monument more substantial than marble though it exists only in thin air. As the first and only woman member of the Federal Communications Commission, Miss Hennock was among the most vigorous champions of educational television. Even after her FCC term ended in 1955, she continued her campaign for more "schoolhouses of the air" until her death on Monday at the untimely age of 55. Her efforts bore fruit. Some 257 channels—or 10 percent of the total—have been reserved for educational TV stations, and more than 50 educational stations are expected to be in operation by the end of this year. Miss Hennock was rightfully proud of her part in reserving a portion of the airwaves for purely educational purposes.

Miss Hennock was also a forthright dissenter of a kind that has been sorely missed on the regulatory agencies in the past few years. During her 7-year term on the FCC, her outspokenness sometimes vexed commercial broadcasters and grated the nerves of some potentates in Congress. If on occasion she erred through enthusiasm, her insistent demand for high standards of broadcasting seems more pertinent than ever in light of the low frequency scandals that have jarred the airwaves.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1960]

FRIEDA HENNOCK SIMONS DEAD; LAWYER, 55, HAD BEEN ON FCC—MEMBER OF AGENCY FROM 1948 TO 1955 WAS ADVOCATE OF EDUCATION TELEVISION

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Mrs. Frieda Hennock Simons, former member of the Federal Communications Commission and an early leader in the cause of educational television, died today at George Washington University Hospital. She was 55 years old. She underwent surgery for a brain tumor on Thursday.

A brown-eyed blonde and an outspoken woman of independent spirit, Mrs. Simons was for several years one of the most striking figures in the Capital's public life. She was the only woman to serve on the FCC.

She was married to William H. Simons, a real estate man here, shortly after leaving the FCC in 1955. At that time, she entered the private practice of law and shared offices with her husband.

CONSIDERED ACTING CAREER

Mrs. Simons was born in Kobel, Poland, the youngest of eight children. At 6, she was brought to New York. She attended the Brooklyn public schools and Morris High School in the Bronx.

In her late teens she began to think of a stage career, but at 18 she decided on law.

She started as a clerk in a Wall Street law office and attended the Brooklyn Law School at night. She received her bachelor of laws degree and was admitted to the New York bar in 1926.

In the court of general sessions, she appeared as defense counsel for two brothers in a first-degree murder case. She won an acquittal for her clients and won freedom for accused persons in a half dozen other murder cases.

In one instance she accepted legal work in a real estate concern, saved $3,000 from fees and then spent the sum to defend a man charged with murder in a payroll robbery.

"I'm glad I was a criminal lawyer when I was very young," she once recalled. "Knowing these people gave me an adult sense of values."

DEMOCRAT AMONG REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Simons was the first woman to become a partner in the New York law firm of Choate, Mitchell & Ely, and was the only Democrat among Republicans in the concern. She was active in city politics and was assistant counsel to the New York State Mortgage Commission when she was named to the FCC in 1948.

At a hearing on her nomination, a Republican Senator asked her what she knew about radio.

"Only that I've raised a lot of money for radio programs for [Franklin D.] Roosevelt," Mrs. Simons replied with typical candor.

She is credited largely with the fact that 257 TV channels have been set aside exclusively for noncommercial, educational use. She also had sharply criticized FCC grants that she thought tended to concentrate in one ownership too much control over mass communications.

Before leaving office Mrs. Simons proposed that, in major political campaigns, candidates of the major parties be given equal air time free to present their cases.

NOMINATED FOR FEDERAL BENCH

In 1951 President Harry S. Truman nominated her for a Federal district judgeship. The Bar Association of New York opposed her, and she was never confirmed by the Senate.

President Eisenhower did not offer her reappointment to the FCC in 1955.

"My voting record speaks for itself," Mrs. Simons commented later. "Having fought the interests, I was not the least bit surprised that I was not reappointed. Monopolistic forces control the entire field of TV."

Richard A. Mack, of Florida, was appointed in her place. He resigned in March 1958 as a result of disclosures of the activities of Commission members by the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee.

Just Imagine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Indiana Catholic which, I believe, merits the thoughtful consideration of every Member.

This editorial constitutes an honest and straightforward examination of the religious issue by a newspaper with a long record of dedicated service to my community. It is my opinion that this statement brings into focus an issue that should never be a derisive influence in our Nation.

I should like especially to call the Members' attention to a wonderful teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas to the effect that the principal purpose of human law is to bring about the friendship of man to man.

The editorial follows:

JUST IMAGINE

If the Vatican is anxious to have a Catholic in the White House, its semiofficial paper, L'Osservatore Romano, has not yet got the word.

Last week the Vatican daily published a front page editorial that had the effect of a broadside aimed right at Senator JOHN KENNEDY's personal crusade to convince American voters that a Catholic does not take political orders from the hierarchy.

The editorial was not aimed at the United States but at a threat to the church in Italy. It did, however, dig into the heart of the problem of the Catholic in politics that currently keeps American Protestants in a dither. And it did it in a language open to misunderstanding by people who imagine that a Catholic mayor, for instance, must confer with his Father confessor before deciding which direction to order for a one-way street.

Imagine what thoughts stirred in the head of an Ohio River Baptist as he read the headlines in his Louisville Courier Journal: "Catholic Paper Says Church Must Guide Flock Politically." By the time he reached the last paragraph of the story and learned that a Catholic, according to the Vatican's own paper, "may never disregard the teachings and directions of the church but must inspire his private and public conduct in every sphere of his activity by the laws, instructions and teachings of the hierarchy," he most certainly must have concluded: "The preacher was right, dagnabit; we can't afford to elect a President who must take orders from the Pope."

There was nothing wrong with the Osservatore editorial from the standpoint of the Italians for whom it was written. They needed it—every word of it. The authority of the church has always rested lightly upon their shoulders—rather more lightly than elsewhere in the world, Catholic tourists from other nations are sometimes surprised to discover.

It was not necessary to spell out for the Italians that the church recognizes the autonomy of the state and was not claiming authority over politics as such nor the right to dictate how citizens should vote. But these things are not clear to non-Catholics. And our quarrel with the Osservatore editorial is that it did not sufficiently take into account the effect of its wording outside Italy.

The political-religious problem in Italy today is unique; it is also extremely serious. There is danger that the Communists and leftwing Socialists (whose philosophy is all but indistinguishable from that of the Communists) may take over the Italian Government if the Catholics in the Christian Democratic Party do not remain united. Once in a position of power, the Reds would undoubtedly attempt to eliminate religion from the schools, pass marriage laws Catholics consider immoral, muzzle the Catholic press, and in every way possible eliminate religious influence from education and public life.

The church is particularly worried at this moment because there is a rift within the Christian Democratic Party. One faction wants to join with the leftwing Socialists in the hope of forming a government that would obtain social legislation they feel is needed in Italy. The Italian bishops and the bulk of Italy's Catholics have decided this is too great a risk. The bishops have, therefore, been urging Catholics to close ranks and present a strong front against the Red enemy. Catholics who are of the other persuasion are opposing the bishops, telling them to stay in the sanctuary and leave politics to the politicians.

This should be a familiar complaint to American Protestant clergymen, who of late have been taking quite a lot of backtalk from the laity for their attempts to apply Gospel teachings to social and civic problems. We live in an age of secularism, when even practicing Christians think that religion should remain inside the churches and that the clergy have no business mixing religion into the affairs of the world.

For an American Protestant to understand the problem faced by the church in Italy it should be sufficient to imagine a situation like the following: Supposing that in Indiana a fascist political party suddenly appeared as a serious threat, that it was known to desire the abolition of all gambling and liquor control laws and advocated public support of parochial schools, that it was, moreover, particularly opposed to the Methodist Church and dedicated to eliminating

all influence of methodism from education (including DePauw University) and civic life. What, then, would the Methodists have to say to their own members who denounced Methodist leaders for their unwillingness to collaborate with the fascist party?

This is no exaggeration. This is a fair example in terms we can appreciate of the political-religious problem Catholics face in Italy. The Italian bishops may be misjudging the situation; they claim no guidance from on high in these matters. But this is the way they see it, and they know their anticlerical Socialists; they have lived and struggled with them for more than 100 years. Rightly, therefore, does the Osservatore editorial observe that it is then up to the ecclesiastical authorities, and not to the arbitrary decisions of individual Catholics, to judge the moral licitness of such collaboration.

Such is the unusual case of the church finding it necessary to give a political directive—a rare and exceptional directive for a rare and exceptional case.

This is not to say, however, that it is unusual for the church to teach the principles men need to know for social and civic life. This is a prime duty of the church. But, seemingly, some Italian Catholics—like some of their counterparts here—are questioning the right of the church to speak out on social and political matters.

The Osservatore editorial warns against "an absurd distinction" being "made between a man's conscience as a Catholic and his conscience as a citizen."

"The church has the right and the duty," the editorial says, "to enlighten and aid consciences to make the best choice according to moral principles and those of Christian sociology."

This is the essence of the Osservatore editorial. It applies to Catholics anywhere in the world: to De Gaulle in France, Adenauer in Germany, or a Catholic President or dogcatcher in the United States.

Nothing frightening to a Protestant here. A Catholic in public life applies the principles of his religion, as a Protestant applies his.

It is not sufficiently appreciated that ecclesiastical direction does not depend upon the caprice of Pope or bishops. Shortly after the Vatican Council defined the infallibility of the Pope, the Catholic bishops of Switzerland issued a joint pastoral letter to calm the fears of Protestants who got the idea that the Pope would be issuing new and subversive orders at whim to Swiss Catholic citizens. They had this to say about the power of the Pope (and Pius IX approved it):

"He is tied up and limited to the divine revelation, and to the truths which that revelation contains. He is tied up and limited by the creeds already in existence and by the preceding definitions of the Church. He is tied up and limited by the divine law and by the constitution of the church. Lastly, he is tied up and limited by that doctrine, divinely revealed, which affirms that alongside religious society there is civil society, that alongside the ecclesiastical hierarchy there is the power of temporal magistrates, invested in their own domain with a full sovereignty, and to whom we owe in conscience obedience and respect in all things morally permitted, and belonging to the domain of civil society."

But what if Protestants don't like what a Catholic officeseeker must believe, about contraceptives or divorce, for instance? There's the rub. But only because Protestants have not been properly told about something else Catholics believe.

Catholic theology holds that not all that is sinful ought to be forbidden by law. St. Thomas Aquinas clearly taught in his treatise on law that: "Human law regards the mass of men, the greater part of whom are imperfect in virtue. And therefore human law does not forbid all evil acts from which men of virtue abstain, but only the more serious vices from which the greater part of men are able to abstain. Other wise imperfect men, being unable to obey such precepts, would fall into worse evils."

And Aquinas further taught that: "The principal purpose of human law is to bring about the friendship of man to man." If a Catholic politician hasn't enough sense to know what friction and civil discord he would stir up by trying to outlaw contraceptives and divorce in the United States, he hasn't any business running for Marion County commissioner, let alone for the Presidency.

So the Catholic lawmaker or executive of the law, though he accepts for the direction of his own life all that the church teaches in faith and morals, must decide for himself whether or not those teachings are to be embodied in civil law. Here he is the expert, not the bishop or Pope, and his decision will depend partly at least upon what the people will support or not support; it will be different in a country like Italy than in a country like the United States.

If this doesn't convince you, then by golly don't vote for a Catholic. This is still a free country.

The Challenge of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the more able Members of the House is my colleague from Texas, Congressman JIM WRIGHT. Congressman WRIGHT delivered a very thought-provoking and inspiring message before the Texas Motor Transport Association in Dallas on June 10. The address follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE SIXTIES

(By Congressman JIM WRIGHT, Texas Motor Transport Association, Dallas, Tex., June 10, 1960)

Once to each civilization comes an opportunity for enduring greatness, and we in America are upon the threshold of that opportunity.

Today most of the world looks hopefully to us—not only for bread but for inspiration—not only for material assistance but for spiritual leadership and moral example.

It is our chance profoundly to influence the future. It is our opportunity to be big and not petty, to demonstrate not only what we are against but what we are for, to justify the American dream, not as a flower that has begun to fade in the autumn of its existence, but as a young and virile plant capable of producing buds of an ever brighter color for each succeeding springtime.

Can we rise to this challenge? Can we demonstrate that for once the mantle of world leadership has fallen to a nation which wishes not to dictate, or dominate, or exploit but patiently to help create the atmosphere of freedom and human dignity and of nonviolent local self-determination in which all men may live in peace?

A GOOD BEGINNING

We have made a good beginning. For a hundred years we have started no wars and entered them only in defense of principle. We willingly forsook colonialism to grant the Philippines their independence when they asked for it. We have displayed the humility to extend the hand of helpfulness to our fallen foes in a manner unprecedented in human history.

In the past 2 years, we have redeemed our solemn promises to Alaska and Hawaii. We have shown that this form we call democracy is workable not only for Caucasians but for Orientals and Polynesians as well. We have by example demonstrated that a nation may grow, not through military aggression, but by others coming to us and voluntarily asking to share our perils and our responsibilities.

OTHER CIVILIZATIONS

Yet other civilizations, also blessed with a spark of greatness, strutted across the stage of world ascendency only to fade and wane, their brief bright promise unfulfilled.

The Egypt of the Pharoahs developed learning but not understanding, and was buried in the sands beside the Nile.

Jerusalem the golden, after flourishing under David and Solomon, disintegrated, quarreled internally, split into two kingdoms, and was never again the same.

The Greeks wrestled mightily with philosophic problems and bequeathed us an intellectual inheritance rarely matched in history. Yet even the splendid aristocracy of Athens became corrupt, abandoned its idealism, sought forcefully to impose its will upon others, and never recovered from the Peloponnesian War.

Rome, gifted with lawmakers and warmakers but cursed with a degenerate patrician class, surfeited in the excesses of its own prosperity and became cruel and lustful until it rotted from within.

WILL WE BE DIFFERENT?

Are we different? Will we be equal to the time? Or weary of the crusade for world idealism and flounder on the shoals of selfish preoccupation?

Will we be in truth "one nation, under God, indivisible" or will be disintegrate before the onslaught of selfish pressures which divide us into cliques and factions?

Will we have the vision to grasp the immense challenge of education, and thus claim the vast promise of the future? Or will we be charmed by the surface trappings of education and quibble in petty puerility over who goes to what schools while the future rushes on and leaves us?

In the cauldron of economic competition, will we establish the American economy as one capable of meeting the expanding needs of an exploding population? Or will we prove our worst critics right who decry the American economy as a crumbling relic, now stripped of its strength by our individual indulgence?

In the decade that lies immediately ahead, will America be on the rise on on the wane? This is the challenge of the sixties.

A LOOK IN THE MIRROR

Let's take a long, hard look at ourselves as we enter the 1960's. Let's be honest. Let's measure both the good and the bad. We are rich.

On the credit side, the average American family has more real income today than it has ever had before. I'm talking about spendable dollars, after taxes * * * and I'm talking about what those dollars will buy in spite of inflated prices.

According to official Commerce Department statistics released just this month, the average American has more real buying power than he has ever had in his life.

The typical family income, after taxes have been paid, and adjusted to compensate for increases in the consumer price index, is still $1,100 better than it was in 1947 and almost $1,900 better than it was in the boom year of 1929.

Perhaps even more important, this prosperity is more generally shared among all of America's families. What we have seen in the past 15 years since the end of World War II has been the most phenomenal expansion of a middle income group in history.

Today, more than 65 percent of the Nation's families enjoy incomes in excess of $4,000 annually as compared with 37 percent at the close of the war. This is the widest dispersion of buying power that any society has ever achieved.

Since 1947, the number of families in the $10,000 and above income group has increased from 5 percent to 14 percent; while the number earning less than $2,000 a year has shrunk from 25 percent to 14 percent. This is undoubtedly the most spectacular social and economic revolution of all time, and it would seem to bode well indeed for the future of the American economy. But we're in debt.

This does not tell the whole story, of course. The truth seems to be that, while Americans have more money than ever to spend on the good things of life, we are rapidly reaching a point at which they cannot spend it because they have already spent it.

Installment payments are taking an ever bigger bite out of the typical family's paycheck at the first of every month.

While our total buying power after taxes has increased by about 22 percent, our total mortgage and installment indebtedness has skyrocketed to more than nine times what it was in 1947.

And in just the past 6 years, the amount of this liquid buying power which is annually siphoned away from the typical American family in interest charges has more than doubled until today it stands at $24 billion a year.

A standard joke of the past few years has been that you can sell the average American anything at all just so long as the down payment is low enough. This is no longer quite true. Since he is already loaded down with payments, he will buy anything today only if the down payment is low enough and the amortization period long enough.

It is only one more step until the typical American will be the man who is spending a third of his income paying for things he has already worn out * * * and this man, whatever his income, is no longer a choice customer.

But for the time being at least, on balance, we are pretty well off financially * * * better off than any people have ever been in the history of mankind.

OUR CHANGING MORAL CODE

And now what about the moral fibre of the Nation as we face the challenges ahead with spending money in our pockets? Americans are going to church in unprecedented numbers; yet we are beginning to sense a gnawing self-doubt about the Nation's moral code.

The recent highly publicized payola investigations and the resignations of several administrative officials of Government who were exposed as the financial beneficiaries of those whom their agencies were supposed to "regulate" have been the latest, but by no means the first, in a sordid series.

Repeated disclosures have revealed too-prevalent a pattern of relaxed ethical standards in high places where the public has a right to expect absolute integrity. The Hoffa-Beck scandals pointed up the shameful picture of men misappropriating funds with which they were solemnly entrusted. Even certain Members of Congress itself have been found guilty of abusing the public payroll. "If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?"

We need in all of this to keep our perspective. It is necessary to remember that most successful businessmen are not Goldfines. Most labor leaders are neither Becks nor Hoffas. Most Congressmen neither employ realtives nor rent their front porches to the Government. Most appointees in the executive branch are not financial beneficiaries of selfish interests * * * just as most teen-agers are not delinquents and most television performers are not palpable frauds.

But there has been enough of it to make us all a little sick at our stomachs. For the past several months, as a member of the Federal Highway Investigating Committee, I have been delving more and more deeply into the highway program and have seen increasing evidences of both grand and petty graft.

Some highway contractors have knowingly, deliberately, willfully, cheated the public by using inferior materials and building the roads to substandard specifications. And in this they have been abetted by some highway officials.

Some so-called public servants have used their positions to purchase condemned property from the State they are supposed to be serving and then to sell it at enormous profits. Some have tipped off friends to the location of the routes, permitting the friends to buy lands in the highway's path at low prices and then approving purchase of the same lands with public funds at greatly increased prices.

In the past 4 years, we have spent $11.5 billion, much of it money paid in taxes by members of your industry, on the Federal highway program, and during this time the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System has risen from $27 billion to $41 billion.

Through all of this, I've had to keep reminding myself that most highway contractors, most suppliers of materials, most State and Federal highway officials are honest.

Most are like our highway heads in Texas where the only known incident of corrupt practices was discovered quickly by the State highway department itself and those responsible were immediately dismissed from the job and brought to justice.

Yet one who remembers when public-spirited citizens willingly gave their land for a highway between Weatherford and Ranger cannot help wondering what has happened now when a substantial number of people apparently can convince themselves that they are not cheating anyone so long as they are just cheating the Government. The trouble is that they are cheating everybody.

AGE OF THE "GOOF-OFF"

What, indeed, has happened? A national magazine recently said we are falling into what it termed a "group morality" which makes everything all right as long as it is being done by everybody.

Social critics have given us various labels. We have been called an "organization State," an "acquisitive culture," an "affluent society."

But the most stinging criticism is that which has labeled us as the age of the "goof-off"—the era of the job half done. From coast to coast our country unfortunately seems to have become populated with laundrymen who won't iron shirts, waiters who won't serve, manufacturers who deliberately build things to wear out and workers who engage in featherbedding, executives whose mind is on the golf course, students who take cinch courses, professors who teach cinch courses, institutions which offer cinch courses, organizations that sell academic degrees, people who buy academic degrees, public officials whose primary concern is not to lead, not to think, not to express opinion, but simply to stay in public office.

Further, we have moved into the new era of the 2-hour lunch, the all-day coffee break, the misleading advertiser, the paid-off disk jockey, the company credit card and the extravagant tax free expense account, the rigged television show, the dishonest butcher. Those who engage in one form or another of moral depravity range from the high-school flunky who wants to become a beatnik to the Congressman who puts his bar bill on the public voucher.

The Nation suffers from a national neglect that has institutionalized payola, imperfection, and complacency. Since it is easier to deceive than to perfect, we have mistakenly equated deception with the American way of life an one disc jockey stated it. And those of us who have mutely sat back and observed recent exposés as so much entertainment, have contributed our share to the national guilt. We give deception the complacency upon which it can thrive.

Am I unreasonably harsh in this appraisal? Maybe so. I hope so. There are magnificent examples of decency to inspire us. There is still much good mingled with the bad. If I overemphasize our failures, it is only because I am convinced that ours is a nation with a purpose and that we stand in danger of forgetting our mission as a people as we face the opportunities and challenges of the future.

OBSTACLES IN THE PATH

Briefly, let's scan the horizon and see some of the specific obstacles which loom like mountains and foothills in the path of the next 10 years.

The 1960's are certain to see a sharpening of the titanic competition between two opposing national philosophies. The unwritten pages of history are waiting to see whether this decade will tip the scales in behalf of the Soviet Union or the United States.

The Russians at least are quite specific about their goals.

They expect by the mid-1960's to achieve military superiority.

They expect by the end of the next 10 years to pull even with our economy in major productive capacity not in gross national product or the total volume of consumer goods, but in heavy industry, in machine tools, in water and electric power production.

They expect by the end of the decade to have captured the leadership in Asia and Africa and to have reduced the newly created republics of these vast areas of the world to economic dependence upon Soviet trade.

Let's not underestimate them.

Although the Soviet gross national product is only half ours, it is presently growing at a rate twice our own. Their industrial output, not more than one-third of America's in 1955, is closing the gap at an amazing 8 percent annual rate.

Briefly it amounts to this:

A nation with less than half our own GNP, living at about a third of our national standard of individual consumption, is spending as much on military strength as we are; ruthlessly and purposefully exploiting the ferment and the turmoil in the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world * * * wooing, threatening, boasting, sacrificing for its vicious cause of domination and deliberate destruction of democratic nations.

A nation that only recently rode in oxcarts now sends rockets to the moon. A nation once grossly inferior in industry now outproduces us in machine tools. A nation that was once almost completely illiterate now has an educational establishment that turns out twice as many scientists and engineers as ours. A society of peasants is now a great industrial complex. And this is one of the challenges of the '60's.

The key to this challenge was clearly given by a former high Government official who said in Washington last week that the basic difference between Russia's expectations for the 1960's and our own is this * * * Russia bases its hopes upon specific goals and upon a faith in its own ability to fulfill them; while we have no definite goals for the '60's and base our expectations upon the vague hope of Russian failures and a general faith in external circumstances, wholly independent of any clear-cut plan for our own.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR GREATNESS

We would be hasty, of course to say that we must improve our own performance only to compete with the Russians. Competition with another nation should not itself become the foolish fetish of our generation. Rather for the sake of ourselves and our children as well as the welfare and lot of humanity we should undertake the tasks with which the sixties so dogmatically challenge us.

Every challenge is an opportunity for greatness.

Stored in the warehouses of this land is enough grain and foodstuffs, surplus to our needs, to feed the hungry mouths of children and turn what has become a costly burden into a providential blessing and an instrument of peace. It takes only a little imagination.

Our cities are growing at an accelerated pace, and it takes only a little vision and a lot of intelligent application to help them grow in an orderly and well organized way so that they become examples of a proud society and not unplanned suburban sprawls which will create only shinier slums for the future.

Our land has been blessed with enough good soil and water and mineral resources to serve our needs well into the future if we conserve them and use them with the intelligence of an inspired society with a vision of the future.

The growing demands of a growing population will require a more efficient use of our rivers, our forests, and our mines. Conservation will be an ever-growing challenge of the sixties.

The challenge of education alone is enough to command our most earnest minds. By 1970 we shall need 1,500,000 new teachers—more than the total number now in service—if we are to maintain the present classroom number. Let it never be the epitaph of our civilization that we were so materialistic that we built buildings and forgot teachers or erected stadiums and forgot libraries.

You know something of the challenge of transportation. During the first decade after the war, automobile registration doubled. By 1955 there was a motor vehicle for every 700 feet of lane in both directions on all the roads and streets of the Nation. By 1970 there will be more than 80 million vehicles on the roads. To design and build a highway system capable of serving as the main arteries of the Nation's commerce is a challenge that dwarfs the little plans of little minds.

Air traffic is increasing at a pace which demands a bold and visionary approach if we are to prevent a traffic jam in the skyways.

We must demonstrate the self-discipline to begin a systematic plan of retiring the national debt which today consumes 11 percent of the national budget in interest alone, instead of simply letting it grow and inure to our children while we drift without fiscal plan or purpose.

And these are some of the challenges that face us in the sixties.

Walter Lippmann has raised the question as to whether a free society, depending as it does upon public support for its policies, can show the resiliency and the sustained will to endure the stresses and strains of a world in ferment.

The answer is we can * * * if we want to.

The capacity of America is unlimited. It is adequate to meet the challenge of the sixties * * * but not if we continue to spend more on sports than on science * * * more on scotch than on schools * * * more on entertainment than on education * * * more on carnivals than on culture * * * more on clothes than on conservation and more on cocktail parties than on cancer research.

It is not enough to know the price of things. More importantly, we shall have to learn the value of things.

What we need is a strong sense of national purpose, steeped in the realization of our historic opportunity. Long ago Emerson wrote that what America needed was "someone to inspire us to do what we can."

"The great menace to freedom," wrote Justice Brandeis, "is an inert people."

TWO WAYS

We are all familiar with the legend of Rip Van Winkle. * * * He fell asleep in 1769 and slept for 20 years. When he began his historic snooze, George III was his King and his country was a subservient colony. When he awakened some 20 years later, George Washington was President and his country was an independent Republic.

Old Rip slept through a revolution * * * an unprecedented revolution that witnessed to those who were awake the birth of a dramatic social and political movement * * * the democracy of America which has changed the face of the world.

We can meet the challenge of the new age in two ways * * * Rip Van Winkle's way of complacent comfort, superific contentment * * * or the way of survival, an alert and purposeful assault upon the challenges that lie ahead.

If we take the first way, we need only sleep. If we choose the second, we may need at times to sacrifice * * * but in sacrifice and striving is the fulfillment of the soul.

United States Faltering in Caribbean Invites Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have observed from various angles the worsening situation to the south of us in the Caribbean. Fortunately for the United States, the people of our country and the Congress have been alerted to its nature in substantial degree by the efforts of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

In and out of the Congress, he has spoken with rare courage and insight. His collected addresses aimed at clarifying the status of U.S. sovereign control of the Canal Zone are a major contribution unique in Isthmian history, and merit publication as a Government document.

Thus, it was with genuine gratification that I have read his June 12, 1960, address on the Caribbean and Panama Canal over the Manion Forum Network, which follows:

U.S. FALTERING IN CARIBBEAN INVITES DISASTER

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress for Pennsylvania)

DEAN MANION. Blame for the blowup of the summit conference will be gladly assumed by millions of American patriots who have vigorously protested against such meetings for years. Since we had everything to lose and nothing to gain in this evil encounter, it is indeed fortunate that it did not take place.

But our troubles with Khrushchev's international visitations are not over—not by any means. He will visit Cuba and Castro next and the United States is in no position to protest after having opened its doors to him at Camp David, last September.

Khrushchev's Latin American lieutenants have completed the conquest of Cuba. The big Kremlin mouthpiece is coming to that country now to organize the next step in the Communist drive for Panama. It is far more important for Congress to frustrate this impending Communist campaign for the Caribbean than it is for its committees to cry about the spilt milk of appeasement in Paris.

For what Congress and the country knows about the dangers now surrounding out vital interests in Panama, we are principally indebted to the research, eloquence and patriotic dedication of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. The entire country must be made to hear this important story and I am ever so grateful to this distinguished man for what he is doing in this cause and for his presence at this microphone to tell you about it. Congressman FLOOD, welcome to the Manion Forum.

Mr. FLOOD. Thank you, Dean Manion. It is indeed an honor and privilege to address this vast audience of the Manion Forum network. I do appreciate your generous comments about my contributions in alerting the Congress and the Nation to the communistic forces in the Caribbean that are now converging on the Panama Canal as the key target in what has become a fourth front.

During the present session of the Congress the questions of the sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal have been extensively debated. There is little new of basic nature that could be added to what has already been presented.

Yet, because of the failure of our Government, in both the Legislative and Executive branches, to take a firm, forthright position with respect to our just rights at Panama, the Isthmian canal policies of the United States have degenerated into dangerous uncertainty. It is imperative that these policies, now under challenge, be made definite.

Many will recall the attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone on November 3 and 28, 1959, requiring the use of force by Canal Zone police and the U.S. Army to repel the invaders. Under radical leadership, some of it communistic, the prime purpose of these mobs was to plant the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone as the symbol of Panamanian sovereignty over that vital strip of land.

These two attempts of the invaders failed, but their real objectives are still uppermost in their minds, and these are sovereignty over the Canal Zone and eventually nationalization of the Panama Canal.

It is significant that, subsequent to these two abortive efforts of Panamanian mobs, the Foreign Minister of Panama, Miguel J. Moreno, Jr., made extensive foreign travels, including a visit in Egypt to present Panamanian viewpoints and to be briefed on Egyptian experience in regard to the Suez Canal.

While there, Foreign Minister Moreno had ample opportunity to discuss the problems of the Panama Canal with Egyptian officials who had succeeded in bringing about nationalization of the Suez Canal. It is significant, too, that Panama and the United Arab Republic recently established diplomatic relations with each other.

Meanwhile, what had happened at Panama? Following the attempted November 3, 1959, invasion, the Government of the United States, instead of a stern warning against such future attempts, sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble.

This emissary, with the approval of his superiors in the State Department, issued a public statement recognizing Panama as "titular" sovereign over the Canal Zone and, according to Panamanian sources, agreed that the flag of Panama might be displayed in the Canal Zone to show such sovereignty.

In addition, the President of the United States himself, shortly afterward, publicly expressed the belief that Panama should be allowed to fly her flag in the Canal Zone to show Panamanian "titular sovereignty."

These declarations, made without the consent of either the Congress or the treaty-making power, reflect a credulity and naivete on the part of high U.S. officials that are simply unbelievable. The hoisting of the Panama flag would be the symbol of complete surrender and would be so hailed by Panama and universally interpreted.

Moreover, these irresponsible statements startled the people of our Nation, and they have deluged the Congress with letters expressing strong opposition to what they consider a pending surrender of our treaty rights at Panama.

In this connection, I have yet to find one U.S. citizen well informed on Isthmian problems who favors such surrender. I have never seen an experienced Panama Canal official, present or former, or any member of the Armed Forces who has served on the Isthmus, who does not vigorously oppose such an ignominious retreat from our solemn treaty responsibilities.

WHO ARE THE TRAITORS?

In fact, many are demanding to know what are the influences in our Government that have permitted United States-Panama relations to degenerate to the degree they have.

To them, I would add the question: What more could be accomplished by open, bold, and shameless treason than has been done at Panama through the processes of vacillation and appeasement?

The responsible officials of our Government who have talked in such loose terms about permitting the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone have never had any assurance from the Panamanian Government that such display would mean no more than a recognition of its "titular sovereignty," or, more accurately, its mere reversionary interest in the sole event of the United States ceasing to operate the Panama Canal.

Moreover, it is certain that the Panamanian Government would never make such an agreement but would hold such display as our recognition of the complete sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone.

In view of the wide knowledge of the Isthmian question in the Congress, it is not strange that the House of Representatives, after a notable debate on February 2, 1960, passed, by overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, House Concurrent Resolution 459.

This resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation in the 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties between the United States and Panama involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty.

This action by the House was not merely a routine vote of our membership, but a reflection of strong views of the American people on a matter in which they are vitally interested. As such, it served as a rebuke to those, in and out of Government service, who, by naive intentions or devious methods, would undermine our position of exclusive sovereign control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, at the solicitation of the Secretary of State, House Concurrent Resolution 459 has not yet been passed by the Senate, his opposition being on the basis that such action might "offend" Panama. This, in effect, is the same as saying that its approval by the Senate would anger Panamanian mobs and the radical politicians who take their cues from them.

Returning now to the question of displaying the Panama flag over the Canal Zone to indicate what is loosely called "titular sovereignty," this is not a meaningless gesture of good will as some of our naive leaders would have us believe. The flag has but one meaning and that is sovereignty.

For this reason, its display would be but the first step in the Panamanian program for eventual nationalization. The second step would be to secure its international recognition as evidence of full sovereignty. Then the way would be clear, in a legal sense, for the rest of their program through the most expedient means with the example of Suez before them.

The attitude of our Department of State touching these questions has undoubtedly given to our Latin American neighbors and the world at large the impression of weakness, timidity, and an excessive zeal for appeasement.

When considering this gravely important Isthmian question, we should never lose sight of the fact that the Panama Canal is a part of the coastline of the United States.

The flag of our country there is the symbol of our status as a sovereign people over the constitutionally acquired domain of the Canal Zone. The day another flag is raised over the Canal Zone will, indeed, be tragic and bode ill for the future of the United States.

As previously indicated, our problem is not restricted to the Panama Canal but it covers the vast area of the Caribbean recognized long ago by Admiral Mahan as the Mediterranean of the Americas.

CUBA AN OUTPOST OF KREMLIN

The great island of Cuba, close to the United States and located on the northern approach to the Panama Canal, has become a Soviet captive and its government an articulate instrument for Communist subversion in other Latin countries.

On the southern approach to this strategic waterway, we have Venezuela, which has been a center for planning the agitation, infiltration subversion, and armed attacks that are designed to transform Latin American countries into Soviet provinces, just as has been done in Cuba.

The seriousness of this situation was emphasized on February 26, 1960, by the President of the United States in his address to the Congress of Brazil. Describing the great issue of our time as "freedom or slavery," he stated that the people of our Nation would consider it intervention in the internal affairs of an American state if any power, "whether by invasion, coercion, or subversion, succeeded in denying freedom of choice to the people of any of our sister republics."

These strong words clearly uphold the Monroe Doctrine and its application to new dangers now arising; and the Congress, by positive declaration, can and should lend its full support to this end.

For resolving these problems there is a practical and definite program, which is not based on a blind devotion to the past but on a realistic appraisal of the present and the future:

First, reaffirmation of our historic policy of exclusive control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Second, announcement by our Government that no hostile, other provocative demonstrations or invasions will be tolerated in the Canal Zone or within the strategic vicinity of the Panama Canal.

Third, reactivation, under the direct control of the Chief of Naval Operations, of the Special Service Squadron for continuous display of the U.S. flag in the Caribbean area and other missions of diplomatic character.

Fourth, proclamation by our Government that the Canal Zone is a constitutionally acquired territory of the United States.

Fifth, extension of the Monroe Doctrine to include penetration and subversion.

The time for proper action by our Government has long since passed. The situation in the Caribbean becomes more critical every day. It thus becomes imperative that the Congress, which, under the Constitution, must assume and discharge such grave duties in questions of foreign policy, should consider and pass measures along the lines of those now pending in both House and Senate.

These measures make unequivocal declarations for the previously indicated extension of the Monroe Doctrine and the reaffirmation of our treaty-based and long-established Isthmian Canal policies.

May I ask this great audience: "Why should we wait for new blows to fall? To falter in our duty is to invite disaster."

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD. My friends, somewhere in this cowardly search for an accommodation with communism our leaders have lost the courage to defend America's vital interests.

Send this startling speech to your Senators. Tell them not to wait until new blows fall upon the American flag. The time to act is now.

Americans are sadly lacking in information about our sickening attitude toward the issues of Panama, Cuba and the entire Caribbean area.

This great speech by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the first to place these burning questions before the American people on a nationwide network.

We urge all corporations and individuals to order printed copies of this address for distribution.

Consultants Report, Migrant Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the discussions regarding farm labor problems and the efforts to maintain a steady and continuing supply of food and fiber to the American consuming public, much reference has been made to a so-called consultants report.

The Secretary of Labor, sometime ago, named a panel of four to make an appraisal of the situation. Named were the Reverend Monsignor George C. Higgins, Mr. Glenn E. Garrett, executive director of the Good Neighbor Commission; Dr. Rufus B. vonKleinsmidt, chancellor of the University of Southern California; and former Senator Edward J. Thye of Minnesota.

During the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, the question was asked of the Assistant Secretary of Labor, "Who in this group represented the growers, the employer?" Secretary Brown replied that the so-called consultants were picked on the basis that no one represented either of the principal parties at interest.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that actions should be based on the recommendations of four men who were picked because they knew so little about the problem. It is my privilege to represent a great alluvial area in the State of Mississippi whose citizens farm for their livelihood and whose fields produce much of the crops which sustain our Nation. These people know the problem firsthand. An organization they have formed to represent them, the Delta Council, has made a study of this so-called consultants report. From a background of firsthand knowledge and experience, Mr. Miller P. Holmes, president of the Delta Council, has written me a letter that will be of benefit to all Members in seeking properly to appraise the value of this so-called consultants report. Please remember that Mr. Holmes is not a director of any social action group, he is not an executive director of any international organization, he is not the chancellor of any school, and he is not a former public officeholder—he is just a good farmer and a substantial citizen of his community who has been honored by his neighbors as president of their agricultural association.

His letter and analysis of this situation will be of interest and value in a study of the problem facing us today:

DELTA COUNCIL,
Stoneville, Miss., March 23, 1960.

To: Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, House Committee on Agriculture, Hon. E. C. Gathings, chairman.

Hon. FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Delta Council, an organization representing the 18 delta and part-delta counties of Mississippi, wishes to respectfully submit the following recommendations and conclusions concerning Public Law 78 and the consultants report on the Mexican farm labor program.

We recommend the extension of Public Law 78 as proposed in the bill introduced by the chairman. We further strongly endorse the provision as proposed by Representatives DIXON, MCINTIRE, FISHER, and MCMILLAN that would prohibit the Secretary of Labor from issuing regulations pertaining to wages, hours, and working conditions of domestic labor under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Failure to extend Public Law 78 will mean that many farmers will not be able to secure labor necessary for crop production and harvesting. This would result in a great loss to farmers individually and to the agricultural economy. In some cases involving perishable food crops, it could mean that certain commodities would not be available to the consuming public or that across-the-counter prices for such commodities would be considerably increased due to the limited supply.

Public Law 78 has been effective in carrying out the basic objective intended by Congress, i.e., making it possible for farmers to obtain needed agricultural workers from Mexico to fill seasonal labor shortages. Public Law 78 has accomplished this objective in an orderly manner without adversely affecting the domestic work force. In addition, the existence of a legal system of obtaining needed foreign workers has almost eliminated the wetback problem.

In any program in which a large number of people are concerned, it is almost inconceivable that some dissatisfaction would not be encountered on the part of individuals. Employers have had to adjust their operations to meet program requirements that in some cases have appeared to be impractical. In other cases, individual workers have not proven satisfactory. Others have broken their contracts and have either returned home or sought employment elsewhere. We feel sure that in certain cases both employers and employees have had justifiable grievances. On the whole, however, the program has been very successful and has been in the national interest.

CONSULTANTS' REPORT

The consultants appointed by the Secretary of Labor have pointed out that the Secretary has found it extremely difficult to administer section 503 of the act which prohibits the authorization of Mexican employment unless the Secretary determines that: (a) domestic workers are not available, (b) use of Mexicans will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic farmworkers, and (c) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to Mexican workers.

With regard to these so-called problem areas, we wish to comment as follows:

The fact that domestic workers are not available in sufficient numbers in a given area is the prime criteria used in determining eligibility for certification. Such determinations are made based on studies and recommendations of Employment Service representatives within areas of demand. These recommendations are as accurate and reliable as is possible to obtain. The development of such information by the office of the Secretary would result in a duplication of effort that would require many additional employees.

The consultants have recommended that the objective of the Secretary should be to reduce reliance on Mexican labor. They recommended that this be accomplished by (a) limiting the ratio of Mexicans to domestic workers on individual farms and (b) limiting the number of Mexicans in any particular crop area to a specific proportion based upon the previous year's experience.

Both of these recommendations, in our opinion, are entirely impractical. First of all, some areas of production have a very limited supply of domestic farm labor. A rigid rule that would gear the number of Mexican workers to what would amount to a nonexistent supply of domestic workers would mean that such farmers would be denied the use of any farm labor.

The limiting of Mexican farmworkers within crop areas to a specific proportion based on previous years' experience entirely overlooks the fact that acreages of certain crops and weather conditions vary from year to year. Farming is a hazardous and high-risk undertaking at best. Weather conditions during planting, growing, and harvesting seasons have a decided influence on the volume of production and quality of agricultural commodities. Rather than impose needless restrictions, it would appear that the Department of Labor's objective should be to render a more effective service by helping to supply workers to farmers who need additional labor and jobs to workers who desire agricultural employment.

Recommendations of the consultants appear to be based on the conclusion that farmers will automatically use Mexican workers in preference to domestic workers and that the Secretary of Labor is therefore obligated to set up a complicated police system to prevent employers from discriminating against domestic farm labor. This is not the case and such a conclusion is erroneous. Considering the cost of transportation, housing, insurance, and other guarantees, Mexican workers are more costly than domestics. What appears to be a preference for Mexican workers in some areas is due to the fact that domestic workers are not available for farm employment and employers know that Mexicans, who are willing and able to work in agriculture, are readily available.

EXPERIENCE IN THE MISSISSIPPI DELTA

To illustrate the fact that preference is not given to Mexican nationals, we wish to briefly review the experience in the Mississippi Delta since World War II. This area is recognized as one of the most highly specialized cotton production areas in the world. Cotton production in the 18 delta and part-delta counties in Mississippi averages about 1 million bales per year and accounts for the major share of farm income. The loss of farm labor during World War II resulted in an acute shortage of workers needed for crop production. Faced with this shortage, farmers turned to Mexican nationals as the most logical and conveniently available supply of agricultural labor, and large number of braceros were used in the area for several years. During this period, Delta Council worked closely with the Mississippi Employment Service and with the regional USES in developing the farm labor program. After several years' experience with foreign workers, delta farmers, working through Delta Council and with the cooperatiton of the Mississippi Employment Service, decided that the best interests of all could be served by concentrating on the utilization of domestics and discontinuing the use of Mexican nationals. Such a program was undertaken, however, with the firm understanding that Mexican nationals would be made available if shortages developed and crops were threatened by domestic farm labor scarcities.

During the next 2-year period, representatives of Delta Council, along with representatives of the employment service, extension service, and production and marketing administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, participated in 47 out-of-area county forums with the objective of obtaining cooperation of farmers and business leaders that would lead to the release of farmworkers in those counties for seasonal use in the delta area. Assurances were given that local labor supplies would not be disturbed when needed at home and that an all-out effort would be made to assure their return. At the same time, the Employment Service initiated a stepped-up effort to help obtain more effective utilization of local labor pools through day-haul operations from larger towns within the area and those located immediately adjacent to the area. As a result of these intense efforts, farmers were able to obtain needed supplies of labor from domestic sources. They were aided in this effort by very favorable weather conditions. Also, following 1955, cotton acreage was drastically reduced because of acreage controls and marketing quotas. This resulted in some less demand for farmworkers plus a slightly larger supply from town labor pools because of migration from farms to nearby towns.

During this same period, Delta Council, working with the employment service and in cooperation with growers in Florida, developed a system through which off-season farm employment opportunities are made available to Mississippi farmworkers. Several thousand workers now participate in this program. In addition, crews are sent from

Mississippi to a number of other States for off-season employment in agriculture.

Although these sustained and intense efforts have been pursued for a number of years and Mexican nationals have not been utilized within the area since the initiation of the effort, the State has continued to lose farm labor. Also, the composition of the labor force has changed to a marked degree. It now consists of a higher proportion of older and younger people. Workers in these age groups are not as productive, and production rates, especially in weed and grass control, have dropped off sharply. Workers in the younger age group also offer problems to farmers who are doing their best to comply with child labor laws. Farmers, especially who have large operations, find it difficult if not impossible to accurately screen day-haul crews to eliminate workers under 16 years of age. The fact that many younger workers are accompanied by their parents further complicates the problem.

The expansion of cotton acreage within the delta in 1959 under the "choice program" posed many problems to delta farmers. Preseason planning meetings were held with the Employment Service in an effort to obtain effective utilization of all available farmworkers. Full use was made of the newly initiated Delta Weather Forecasting Service to pinpoint areas of possible rainfall and unfavorable weather so that workers could be routed to other parts of the area. Shortages did occur at several points; however, generally favorable weather conditions and the all-out effort of the Employment Service to channel needed workers into spots of acute demand prevented losses from taking place.

We cite these experiences in the Mississippi Delta to illustrate the fact that farmers desire to utilize domestic workers when the supply is available. The delta was fortunate in that it had a potential supply of farm labor conveniently located. Other areas are not so fortunate and, in spite of the efforts of individuals and organizations, such farmers must depend upon Mexican nationals.

While not now utilizing Mexican nationals, delta farmers are strongly in favor of the continuation of the program and the extension of Public Law 78 which they helped to develop. If the loss of farm labor continues in the State, however, delta farmers will once again find it necessary to utilize Mexican nationals.

COSTS UP—PRICES DOWN

It appears to us also that the consultants approached their study more from the standpoint of sociology than from economics. They gave no evidence of any consideration being given to the position of agriculture in comparison to other segments of our economy or to the fact that farm income has been dropping while production costs have been increasing at a rapid rate.

The report of the consultants makes mention of the fact that agriculture has been historically a low-wage industry. They state, "During the past decade, the wage differential between agriculture and industry has been widening steadily, and it may be inferred that the use of foreign workers in agriculture is partly responsible." Cotton was cited as a crop in which wage rates were unchanged or lowered between 1953 and 1958. No mention was made of the increases in production costs during this period or the decreases in prices that farmers received for their cotton. The fact is that the average price received by U.S. cotton farmers declined 6 cents per pound between the beginning of 1951 and the end of 1957. This amounts to $30 per bale. Prices declined even further in 1958 and 1959. At the same time, production costs continued to climb.

Cotton, along with other segments of agriculture, faces the perplexing difficulties common to a transition economy. Southern agriculture in particular has been going through the throes of a technological revolution. While great gains have been made, serious gaps still exist in the mechanization of cotton production. While it is true that man-hours per acre have been reduced sharply from the 160 required under the man and mule method of cotton production, hand labor requirements are still high, with weed and grass control representing the biggest bottleneck. Because of these gaps, cotton farmers now have the high expense of full mechanization without the economies that have accrued to certain other segments of agriculture from mechanized practices.

In an effort to increase yields and reduce unit costs, farm operators are using more fertilizer, farm machinery, insecticides, herbicides, and all kinds of agricultural chemicals. They have also adopted new practices such as deep tillage and supplemental irrigation. Since 1945, the use of nitrogen on farms has increased 175 percent. Tractor numbers on farms in the United States have tripled since 1940, and the total volume of all machinery and equipment on farms has almost tripled during the same period. A recent study by Dr. Grady B. Crowe, economist, USDA, and Dr. Rupert Johnston, economist, Mississippi Extension Service, showed that the investment per worker on a 600-acre mechanized delta cotton plantation increased from $2,220 in 1940 to $24,000 in 1956.

In addition, the study revealed that prices paid for production items have undergone a sharp increase. Between 1940 and 1955, wage rates for hired farm labor rose 200 percent, farm real estate values increased 150 percent, farm machinery prices went up 115 percent, farm real estate taxes rose 115 percent, and fertilizer prices increased about 60 percent. Since 1955, costs of these items have continued to rise.

Another significant fact is that cash costs of nonfarm goods and services included in crop production expenses accounted for more than 60 percent of total production costs in 1957. Farmers now spend almost four times as much for nonfarm goods and services as they did in 1940. The cost of these items has little or no relation to the prices that farmers receive for their commodities. When farm prices drop, they are likely to remain more or less constant or may even go up as a result of increases in industrial wages. This accounts, to a large extent, for the cost-price squeeze that cotton farmers are finding so acute.

On a typical delta cotton plantation of roughly 600 acres of cropland, production costs since 1940 have risen 165 percent. Most of this increase took place in hired labor, power and machinery costs, insecticides, fertilizer, and ginning. At the same time, cash or out-of-pocket expenses rose 145 percent.[1]

In conclusion, it appears that the report of the consultants was predicated to a large degree on the fact that farm wages are below nonfarm wages. This is an indisputable fact. They seek, however, to solve this problem by imposing restrictions and regulations that would tend to raise farm wages without dealing with the basic causes of the disparity. Such action would increase the cost-price squeeze and would adversely affect large segments of the agricultural economy.

Also, we certainly do not agree that the Secretary should be given unlimited authority to promulgate rules and regulations as he deems necessary. Neither do we believe that the Secretary should have authority to develop so-called sufficient controls and checks, as has been recommended. We are not cognizant of any occasion in which local and State employment services have been charged with dereliction of duty in carrying out the intent of the Mexican national program. The granting of either of these recommendations would result in more centralized control, more bureaus, and more Government employees.

The present system of advisory committees is an effective medium for advising the Secretary on farm labor programs and problems. We therefore oppose the establishment of a tripartite advisory committee as recommended by the consultants.

Respectfully submitted.

MILLER P. HOLMES,
President.

[1] "Certain Changes in Agriculture Which Affect Credit Needs and Capital Requirements," Dr. Grady B. Crowe, economist, USDA, and Dr. Rupert Johnston, economist, Mississippi Extension Service.

Pony Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been busily engaged in examining the activities of the Post Office Department in the field of transporting 4-cent letter mail by air.

The Post Office Department has maintained that it is able to transport this mail by air without paying any more in overall costs than is currently being paid for surface transportation. The Post Office Department is also making claims of drastic service improvements.

In its philately section on Sunday, June 19, the New York Times included an item on the pony express. The Times article explained how the Post Office Department has announced that it will not use jet airplanes to carry first day "pony express" covers westward from St. Joseph, Mo.

The Post Office Department said it has had to discard its plans because the flight schedule could not be worked out, and therefor first day covers from the respective points will be dispatched through ordinary mail channels. Many postal patrons feel that the schedules on transporting 4-cent letter mail by air have not been very well worked out and as a sponsor of a bill to eliminate the so-called airlift I feel that the Post Office Department has not worked out the necessary congressional authority to enable the operation to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the way in which the Post Office Department has continued to expand its unauthorized transportation of 4-cent letter mail by air, even though the House Subcommittee on Appropriations has specifically asked that there be no extention and even thought the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has approved a bill directing that the operation be discontinued. The reported bill, H.R. 12595, should be approved swiftly on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Post Office Department should immediately take note of official expressed congressional displeasure and desist from any further experimentation with this type of mail transportation.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed numerous sundry bills.

House rejected farm bill and passed bills on social security and supplemental appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 12938–12948

Bills Introduced: 12 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3723–3734; and S. Res. 344–345. Page 12940

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 9541, to amend the Federal Property and Administration Services Act with regard to material tests and fees (S. Rept. 1664);

S. 2561, authorizing construction in the Nation's Capital of a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt (S. Rept. 1665);

S.J. Res. 152, to create a commission to formulate plans for construction in the D.C. of a memorial to Woodrow Wilson (S. Rept. 1666);

S. Res. 334, providing for the retention of staffs of appointed Senators for not to exceed 30 days from termination of such appointment (S. Rept. 1667);

S. 3557, to expand and extend the saline water conversion program, with amendments (S. Rept. 1668);

S. 2587, requiring congressional approval for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres for facilities of any Government department (S. Rept. 1669);

H.R. 12263, authorizing conclusion of an agreement for construction by the U.S. and Mexico of the Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande, with amendments (S. Rept. 1670);

H.R. 9702, authorizing certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by the GAO (S. Rept. 1671);

H.R. 5040, to clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, with amendment (S. Rept. 1672);

H.R. 11787, authorizing continuation of flight instruction for members of the ROTC until August 1, 1964 (S. Rept. 1673);

S. 3558, authorizing the transfer of certain Federal property to the government of American Samoa (S. Sept. 1674);

H.R. 8212, relating to the procedure for ordering certain members of the Reserve components to active duty (S. Rept. 1675);

H.J. Res. 627, authorizing U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property (S. Rept. 1676);

S. 3733, to place Naval ROTC graduates in a status comparable with Naval Academy graduates (S. Rept. 1677);

S. 3734, relating to the definition of total commissioned service of certain naval officers (S. Rept. 1678); and

H.R. 12705, to delay for 60 days in certain cases the applicability of law relating to humane slaughter of livestock (no written report). Page 12939

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 12938

Humane Slaughter: H.R. 12705, to delay for 60 days in certain cases the applicability of law relating to humane slaughter of livestock, was received, referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported by that committee without amendment, and passed without amendment. This action cleared the bill for the President. Page 12945

Public Lands—Florida: Senate passed with committee amendments H.R. 8226, to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Fla. Pages 12948–12950

Public Lands—Massachusetts: Conference report on H.R. 5888, authorizing transfer of certain land in the Boston Naval Shipyard to the Massachusetts Port Authority, was adopted. Page 12950

Helen Keller: S. Res. 336, extending greetings to Miss Helen Keller on her 80th birthday, was adopted. Pages 12953–12954

Exchange of War Vessels: Senate concurred in House amendment to and cleared for White House S. 2618, authorizing the exchange of certain war-built vessels for

Appendix

Problems of Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, Mr. Ernest S. Marsh, president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., made some pertinent remarks the 14th of June before the members of the Association of American Railroads.

We have had considerable legislation this year pertaining to the railroad industry, and I recommend this article to the Members of this body, as it throws light on a good deal of legislation as it has developed in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and then in the Senate proper.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that printing the address of Mr. Marsh will require approximately 2½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $202.50. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD, notwithstanding the additional cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ERNEST S. MARSH, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO., BEFORE 1960 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ACCOUNTING DIVISION, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS, JUNE 14, 1960, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

As president of one of the many railroads serving the great transportation center of Chicago, I would like to join in Mayor Daley's hearty welcome extended to all of you here today so graciously by Mr. John Duba.

It is a pleasure indeed to have this opportunity to appear before the annual meeting of the Accounting Division of the Association of American Railroads and I want to express my sincere appreciation to your chairman and program committee for the honor in having this place on your program. There are several reasons why I am particularly happy over the distinction to be invited to speak to you on this occasion.

It was back in 1941 as auditor of disbursements that I attended an annual meeting of the Accounting Division out in Denver, Colo. I take great pride in being not only a former active member but now an honorary member of your fine organization.

So you see, I have at least some firsthand knowledge of your worthy objectives and your procedures in accomplishing those purposes through cooperative efforts of standing committees and special committees, and through these annual meetings.

I have thought these meetings have a special value for the railroad industry, not only as the clearinghouse for results of important committee activities during the year, but also as the means of establishing and maintaining personal contacts, which are especially important in interroad relations. Few other industries have so many men who must work cooperatively with their counterparts in other companies on a day-to-day and month-to-month basis as in the railroad accounting departments.

It is only through the railroads with their almost unlimited capacity to move things from where they are to where they are needed that our vast marketing and distribution system has built the high standards we Americans enjoy today. It is only through the railroads and that system that we can continue to enjoy those standards. Believe me, it is a complex business in which a maximum of teamwork and cooperation is required for successful performance.

I have at times made the understatement that our function in the economy is rather simple—that we are in the business of moving something or someone from one place to another. Our every thought in daily operations and in long-range planning must necessarily be directed to performing that function in a most efficient and economical way.

One aspect of our business is far from simple and provides a convenience to the public that is unique but almost taken for granted. I refer to that technique which makes it possible to do two things at the same time, (a) to compete, and (b) to work in cooperation.

We are not merely moving goods from one place to another on our own railroad, not just conducting a business of our own with our own plant to serve our own customers. It is much more than that.

Actually we constantly serve the public in a great national transportation organization in which two or three or a half dozen, or if need be, 12 or 15 separate railroad companies, each an independent enterprise, all join together to move a single consignment of goods between the most distant of points. They cooperate with each other and with the shipper—a shipper may go to any railroad agent at any station in the United States and arrange in one transaction for the shipment of his goods to any other place in the United States regardless of the number of roads that might be involved in hauling it from one place to another. This could never have come about, nor could it be continued, without the great contributions from railroad accounting officers.

The accounting officers were probably the first of railroad management teams to recognize the value and necessity for cooperation within the framework of an official association. The record shows that the first meeting for formation of the original Association of American Railway Accounting Officers was held here in Chicago on December 7, 1887, and your organization has had continuous existence ever since, becoming the Railway Accounting Officers' Association in 1918, and since the mid-thirties as the Accounting Division of the Association of American Railroads.

In my 42 years of service on the Santa Fe, I think I have never had a greater respect and admiration for the work of accounting officers than during the past 3 years that I have served as president of the company. Your group plays a most important part in this business.

The accounting department comes in contact with every phrase of railroad activity from the executive department to the section gang. Obviously, the protection of revenues and maintaining the integrity of receipts and disbursements are indispensable functions. Beyond that, your importance extends not only to record keeping and preparation of reports and statistics, but of still further significance is your responsibility for interpreting the results to insure that unfavorable comparisons, undesirable trends, abnormal ratios, and all of that are brought to the attention of the chief executive and officers of other departments for review, investigation and further attention. That relationship and cooperation in the management team is an essential, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly in this period of high costs when even closer scrutiny is imposed by shrinking profit margins.

You and your committees have accomplished outstanding progress in producing improved performance through new methods and electronic machine applications. You deserve the applause and appreciation of the whole railroad industry. It is, I repeat, an honor to address this meeting and I appreciate the opportunity to make these remarks.

We are now in a brand new era of competitive transportation accompanied by a severe inflationary spiral and there are grave problems and great challenges before you. I have every confidence you will meet these with success in the same spirit and determination you and your predecessors have exhibited in the past.

In the railroad industry it seems that we always have had problems and it may be fair to say that we always will. Still, I believe I have never seen a time when we face so many uncertainties.

Probably most, if not all of you, are aware of these problems and some of you may feel much as I do that discussing them here is equivalent to talking to ourselves. Still, I have never seen the time when there is greater need for facts to produce a correct understanding of the current and prospective situation. We must not become bored or complacent. We need more friends with a sound appraisal of our problem and it is with the hope that you in turn may help in stimulating clear thinking among your friends and associates that I mention a few of these problems.

When I say we are in a brand new era, I mean that this is a time which demands good, clean, comfortable and pleasant passenger service. An era that puts emphasis on fast dependable freight service and intensified efforts to reduce cost of operation and maintenance.

An era where we must recognize the inaction of Congress to give us fully adequate remedies to provide competitive equality with other forms of transportation. A keenly competitive era in which we must do more things to help ourselves, both service-wise, ratewise and costwise.

A good service and competitive rates are necessary to attract more business and a sustained high volume is needed for efficient utilization of the plant and lower costs per ton mile. Costs for ratemaking purposes should be realistic and forward looking, based upon the increased volume that could be attracted rather than upon statistics of the past without inclusion of that volume. Only in this way can the railroads achieve

their full potential and the public receive the benefit of the most economical form of transportation.

Certain recommendations have been made to help in removing competitive inequality of the railroads. Among these are:

(1) The Nation's entire transportation system should be subject to regulation, but only as much as necessary for the protection of the public;

(2) Regulation should not usurp management's right to manage;

(3) No form of transport should be either handicapped or favored by Government;

(4) Government subsidy of any of the costs of competing transport as a defense against monopoly should cease, inasmuch as the threat of monopoly in the transportation field no longer existed;

(5) Inland waterways should pay all their own costs;

(6) Highway transport should bear "its fair burden" of the cost of highways, plus its share of the general tax load;

(7) Airlines should ultimately pay their own way.

How do those appeal to you? Aren't they all good, sound, and equitable recommendations as of today? It might surprise you to know that they were made by a National Transportation Committee created in 1932, including former President Calvin Coolidge as chairman, Bernard Baruch, former New York Governor Al Smith, and other prominent Americans.

Usually the recognition that a specific problem exists is about half of the solution for it but actually the difficulties of the railroads have been recognized and have been a subject of studies and reports by boards, commissions, and committees for a quarter of a century. Still few fundamental remedies have been adopted and most of the basic causes of our difficulties are with us today.

Today we see on every hand that the failure of our Government to adopt the plainly needed reforms recommended years ago is causing deterioration of earnings in the railroad industry and harming our efforts to take full advantage of modernization and technological improvements designed to give better service and keep costs to the public at the lowest possible level.

Their continuation will jeopardize more hundreds of thousands of railroad jobs and the investments of other hundreds of thousands of American citizens—men, women, children, and institutional investors who have put money in railroad securities with the rightful expectation of receiving a fair return.

I mentioned the recommendations of the National Transportation Committee in the early thirties, then later President Roosevelt appointed the Joint Committee of 1938, comprising three railroad executives and three labor leaders. The committee recommended fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation. It recommended the establishment of tolls for inland waterways and relief for the railroads from grade-crossing elimination costs.

Back in 1947, President Truman told Congress that he believed it unwise to place the entire burden of expanding, improving, and maintaining the airways upon the general taxpayer. In 1950, he reiterated his demand that the airlines become "increasingly self-supporting in the near future."

In 1957, President Eisenhower, in his budget message to Congress, said, "The time has come when consideration should be given to requiring the users of the airways' facilities to share the cost of providing this service." Yet little has been done to remedy the recognized injustice.

In fact, the situation is reversed to such an extent that the Government right now is looking for new ways to help the airlines because their fares in competition with surface transportation are being maintained at levels which will not support costs and the requirements for new equipment.

Then, there was the Senate committee study of the national transportation system, which, after lengthy hearings, resulted in an extensive progress report in 1951, citing the need for impartial transport regulation, the unfairness to railroads of lavish subsidies to their competitors, the financial problems faced by the railroads and the need to allow railroads to make competitive rates.

Then, of course, the Cabinet Committee Report of 1955 which, among other things, recommended greater freedom for the railroads in competitive ratemaking.

Two years ago the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the Smathers' committee—conducted extensive hearings and investigations into the deteriorating railroad situation out of which came the Transportation Act of 1958 generally conceded to represent desirable and worthwhile legislation but only a partial step in the right direction.

Now in 1960 we have the report of the Department of Commerce entitled "Federal Transportation Policy and Program" submitted after a long study at the request of the President in his budget message last year for a reappraisal of Government policies.

Generally, this report advocates a gradual lessening of Government regulation with the transportation system being regulated by the same forces as the rest of the American free enterprise system. I find myself in wholehearted agreement with the majority of the recommendations contained in the report, particularly those which afford the railroads a more nearly equal opportunity to compete for traffic.

The recommendations of the 1960 report bear much similarity to those I mentioned earlier as coming from the National Transportation Committee in the early thirties. I should very much dislike the present report to fall by the wayside as have so many of its predecessors—that should not be permitted to happen. Measures should be adopted to insure that the recommendations will be actively progressed either through legislative or administrative action whichever is appropriate.

All of the distinguished bodies who have studied the railroad situation over more than a quarter of a century have come up with the conclusion that something needs to be done to strengthen the railroad position in the interests of the public and the Nation during peacetime and wartime. Just why Congress has never really come to grips with this problem is not too clear although my analysis suggests that they have a feeling that nothing could happen other than the effect upon the railroad industry itself, and Congress has not seemed to worry too much about that.

The real point and the point I want to emphasize is that great harm cannot be done to the railroads without doing great harm to the whole economy and the American people. It is a slow deterioration but if allowed to follow its present course, it could have an end result that Congress and the whole country might wish to prevent—the eventual end of private ownership of the railroads, then of other agencies of transportation, and perhaps other businesses.

As I said, we must recognize this inaction and do everything we can to help ourselves. Still, it is for this reason that I say here today you can be of assistance in producing a clearer understanding of the true situation among your friends and associates.

The disadvantage of inequality in a keenly competitive field is further aggravated by the problem of survival in this era of inflation. It seems to me that the inflationary trend is going to be with us for a long time. The constant pressure for higher costs for labor and material and more and more spending by governments is taking us down a road that is certain to bring severe results to the Nation's economy and its people, just as it has done in other countries where inflation has run its course.

The cost basis today is pricing much business out of the market and pricing our people out of jobs. There are hundreds of examples of the growing sale of foreign goods in this country. The import of foreign steel is growing terrifically. Another spectacular example is the steady rise in the number of small foreign cars to be seen on the streets and highways.

It is no secret that many purchasers of merchandise and other articles are going to the foreign markets. Many large companies are sending more and more buyers overseas to replenish their inventories. Many do not like it, but are under the necessity of meeting their competition.

Is there any wonder we have unemployment? Through the cooperation of business, Government, and labor it should be stopped somewhere along the line before it is too late.

The inflationary spiral that is so common to all industry is making it increasingly difficult for the railroads to have available funds for all desirable and needed improvements. It is probably appropriate to say that the increases on the railroads have just about followed the national pattern in other basic industries. However, it is fair to say also that this inflationary spiral hits an industry like railroads harder where prices are not so easily nor readily adjustable and where labor costs take up such a large proportion of operating revenues.

These pressures bear more heavily on the railroads too because of the high ratio of investment in physical plant and equipment and the necessity for carrying on a substantial capital expenditure program on a regular basis. To illustrate the long-term cumulative effect of competitive conditions and constantly rising costs of doing business, I would like to give you a comparison that seems particularly revealing.

Back in 1929, our best peacetime year prior to World War II, the Santa Fe had 16.6 billion revenue freight ton miles. In 1959 this increased to 36 billion. Total revenues amounted to $267 million in 1929 with a net railway operating income of $68.7 million.

By 1959 the total revenues were $634 million, more than 2½ times as large as 1929, yet the net railway operating income was actually less at $59.6 million, even after including $6.5 million of a temporary nature by reason of tax amortization of certain facilities for which necessity certificates were granted.

We have had no increase in our take-home pay in 30 years despite the fact that the physical volume of business more than doubled when measured in revenue ton-miles handled, and despite the further fact that the total money investment in road and equipment went from $1,094 million to $1,879 million, an increase of 72 percent.

Now, when it is considered that we need to provide modern equipment and facilities at several times the costs of the late twenties to handle an increased physical volume, the squeeze that is taking place becomes abundantly clear.

Probably the most interesting feature of the comparisons between 1929 and 1959 is that, even with the increased volume, we were able to come as close as we did to the net railway operating income of 1929, in view of the terrific increases in the costs of wages, materials and taxes. How we were able to show even this inadequate result is somewhat of a long story. In a few words, the comparison was aided by doing things to help ourselves—largely by a concerted program of modernization and improvement of the

physical plant with the adoption of new technologies and techniques, in which every department of the railroad participated. The accounting department centralized its activities and modernized its procedures, including among other things a timely installation of an electronic data processing center in our Topeka general office.

Of course, productivity has increased but wage increases have far outdistanced that improvement. The April 1960 monthly comment by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission shows that during the 1947–59 period, average compensation per hour paid for increased from $1.20 to $2.59, a rise of 115 percent, and that productivity measured in gross-ton-miles per employee hour paid for increased 58.6 percent—a splendid improvement in efficiency averaging almost 5 percent per year.

For the real index, however, the one that affects the results—gross-ton-miles per dollar of compensation—they showed a decline of 26½ percent during this period.

The inflationary pressures are felt keenly in our financial ability to make capital expenditures. We are providing many expensive frieght cars especially designed to take care of the particular needs of shippers, including of course, the popular DF or damage free cars, mechanical refrigerator cars, covered hopper cars, covered gondolas, air-slide cars, and we shock control cars utilizing a sliding underframe principle. The cost of new freight cars today is simply amazing in relation to prior periods.

As we march ahead with modernization and try to keep step with new equipment and methods, we can never consider the job fully completed, because what was modern yesterday may be obsolete tomorrow. The past has seen great changes in the railroads, but it takes a terrific amount of money to keep going ahead with the improvements needed to maintain the type of up-to-date service that will attract revenue and translate a part of those revenues into earnings.

Earnings are grossly inadequate and depreciation accruals are quite unrealistic. They completely disregard what should be the first essential of any business concern; that is, it should cover its full cost of merely perpetuating the business before it can be considered to have made a profit or to have a taxable income. To the extent that depreciation accruals fail to provide money for replacements to stay in business, the profits are overstated and largely taxed away.

We did have hopes of getting some help from Congress in 1958 that would have gone a long way toward remedying this undesirable situation. As a matter of fact, the Smathers bill, as it came out of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, contained a provision for a "construction reserve" which would have permitted us to set aside funds for capital improvements and deduct them from taxable income of the year, with the requirement that they be used for such improvement purposes within a 5-year period. If not so used in 5 years, the funds would then become taxable with certain penalties.

Because of opinion that the construction reserve fund constituted a tax measure and should have originated in another committee of Congress, the provision was lost by an amendment on the Senate floor, which eliminated it from the bill without prejudice.

Such a construction reserve would enable management to plan ahead and undertake desirable improvements necessary to meet transportation demands adequately. With such a reserve I am confident the industry would do much more modernization and replacement and would do it faster.

Congress provided treatment somewhat similar to the construction reserve in the Merchant Marine Act and, of course, everyone is familiar with the substantial public expenditure being devoted to waterways, highways and airways. They represent advance appropriations of tax money for improvements relating solely to transportation. All the railroads ask is some advance treatment of their own money, also for improvements relating to transportation.

In my opinion, there is no subsidy or Government gift at all attached to the constructioin reserve proposal. No more than the cost of the property—less salvage—can ever be deducted through depreciation charges. The actual cost is simply deducted sooner.

Certainly there would be no long-term loss of tax revenue to the Government. Quite likely, there would be no immediate decline. There might even by an immediate increase in tax receipts, as conceivably the adoption of the construction reserve could so stimulate capital expenditures as to put taxable income in the hands of builders and suppliers and their employees right down to the source of raw materials to such an extent that the Federal Treasury would realize greater net tax receipts.

The 1960 report of the Department of Commerce recognizes that in contrast to other transport equipment, depreciation rates for railway equipment fail adequately to reflect the obsolescence of motive power and rolling stock. It states that "such rates require a continuation of present review, and adjustment in detail to insure parallel principles for tax purposes with other forms of transport. * * *" The industry needs a better treatment of depreciation for tax purposes and everyone seems to agree it would be nothing more than fair treatment for Congress to take care of this inequality.

Another grave problem lies in the labor field. You are all familiar with the efforts the railroad industry has been making to remedy certain obsolete rules that require payments for work not done or not needed, commonly called featherbedding. I am sure I do not need to detail this problem to you.

I will merely remark that probably the two most important and costly issues involved have to do with:

(1) Firemen on freight and yard diesel locomotives, and

(2) The dual basis of pay which provides for minimum day payments predicated upon speeds of 12½ miles per hour in freight service, and 20 miles per hour in passenger service.

Personally, I have not looked upon these applicable working rules as having been forced upon the railroads by labor, nor have I looked upon them as resulting from any unwise concessions or lack of appropriate handling on the part of railroad management. They are carryovers from another era that have become outmoded with the passage of time and the development of new technologies, the adoption of which at huge capital expenditures has enabled us to perform the same operation with a far greater degree of speed and efficiency with modern power and facilities.

We are not blaming anyone for the evolution that has taken place nor is it our purpose to carry on an attack upon anyone or any group—certainly not upon our faithful and efficient Sante Fe employees who we are proud to say are doing what we think is an excellent job under the rules of the game.

Our attitude has been that any rules, laws or practices that have become so outmoded by progress should be reviewed to determine what revisions are needed to make them conform with the current situation.

The wage increases awarded this month by an arbitration board and recommended by an emergency factfinding board further emphasize the necessity for early review of outdated work rules to afford appropriate relief from burdensome provisions that no longer conform to modern operations.

I have talked a lot about problems because we seem to have an unusual number of them today, but I want to say that I do not lack confidence in the future of American railroading. I believe that with an equal opportunity and fair treatment to which we are entitled, we will be healthy and strong and continue to be the backbone of the American economy. I believe it is the obligation of all of you and of every American citizen to do what he can to bring about fair treatment and I earnestly solicit your support.

Thank you very much and wishing that you have a highly successful and enjoyable annual meeting here in Chicago.

High School of Commerce, Springfield, Mass., Graduation Exercises, June 13, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the High School of Commerce in Springfield, Mass., is one of the finest commercial secondary institutions in this country. It has contributed much to the well-being of its own locality and to the thousands of students that have passed through its doors. Founded and built in 1915, its function was to give special business training, development of punctuality, industry, self-reliance, and trustworthiness. Today, Commerce High prepares students for college, nursing, or business. Throughout its existence it has had a long list of dedicated teachers. The principals who have supervised the curriculum from its birth to the present day have been outstanding educators. Its record of accomplishment has added immeasurably to the excellent reputation that Springfield's school system enjoys throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to be invited by Principal Philip A. Sweeney to deliver the address to the graduating class of 1960 of the High School of Commerce on June 13. Under unanimous consent, I include the address, program, and list of graduates as part of my remarks:

Your honor, Mayor O'Connor; chairman of the school committee, Mrs. Lynch; superintendent of schools, McCook; Principal Sweeney; members of the faculty; President Dolan and members of the class of 1960; their parents, family, and friends, first let me express my gratitude for the invitation which makes possible my presence here this evening and the honor you pay me by the invitation to speak to you on this happy occasion.

When your principal and my friend, Mr. Sweeney, asked me, sometime ago, to be your guest speaker, I felt then and I know now that my talents would not be equal to the task. For this is no ordinary, run-of-the-mill affair. Indeed, it is a movingly deep, significant event in the lives of all who are presented tonight to receive their diplomas. For the High School of Commerce class of 1960, it is the first time and the only time that it will experience this event.

For an occasion so important and for an event that so swells the emotions, it is not an easy task to put words together that will spell out momentous or lasting impressions. Perhaps this is not too important. It seems to me in a high school or any graduation, it is the awarding of the diplomats that pales everything else into insignificance.

But guest speakers are thrown in for good measure and they have become part and parcel of the graduation ritual.

When Eleanor Larson interviewed me for your fine high school paper, Commerce, I quizzed her on what I should talk about. A good newspapwoman, she suggested that I talk about 5 minutes.

With a few minutes leeway, I have taken her advice. Too many years back to remember, in the very place you now sit, I sat, with starched collar, tight shoes, and rented jacket. As with you, we had things to do and places to go before the day was ended. With us, and some of your parents will recall, it was Sam's diner. Of course, that was before the days of house parties, Howard Johnson and Friendly with their three deckers and awful-awfuls.

Well, what counsel to give you or what wish to hold? As I look into your clean, fresh, beautiful faces, I can tell you what I wish. I wish I were 17 again.

For these, indeed, were and are the wonderful years. Teenage and high school. Rose-hued, fragrantly fresh, excitingly pleasant days. Always on the move but always moving forward in development and ability. I am sure that as you now pause and reflect, you are shocked by the raipdity with which your high schol days have raced by. As a matter of fact, it seems only yesterday that you were taken by hand of devoted parents to start in kindergarten or first grade. Surely, you can recall the untutored, self-taught answers of those days.

From those very first days, the educational process set in, and slowly, but steadily, you advanced in wisdom and learning.

And tonight you step across another threshold of life—you enter a new era and a new phase. Some of you will go on to business schools and colleges, others will find their place in the great field of nursing and public health, most of you will seek and find employment. But, for all of you, the scenery will change, the values of life will increase, responsibility will begin to grow heavier.

The rather carefree high school days will become a lovely memory. It will not now be so important to you that Frankie Avalon, Rickey Nelson, or Conway Twitty were replaced in the record race or hit tunes by Bobby Rydell, Bobby Darren, or the Everly brothers.

Within a few years, you will be moving into legal maturity and adulthood. What the future has in store for each of you, it is impossible to foretell.

None of us doubt, for all of us know, that we are living in a marvelous, magnificent, ever-changing period. The fusion and fission of the atom—the incredible exploration of space—the miracles of aviation and electronics—the fantastic progress in medical research that portends the ultimate conquering of the diseases that afflict mankind—all of these you are now witnessing, and they have played or will play an important part in your future. For you, life itself will be longer and healthier than for any of the grown adults you now know. Life expectancy has jumped remarkably over the past 25 years. It will expand even more in the next 25. So, you have very, very many years ahead of you.

I am sure you are also aware that you are living in a dangerous, difficult period. That is why you have to continue to develop your character, your ability—whether through further college study or the practical education that comes through experience or self-study. It might very well be that, in your time, just as have your parents, you will be called upon to make sacrifices to keep freedom alive, the Nation strong and democracy safe.

There is something to an editorial I read the other day which said "Our age is likely the blackest and brightest in human history; the most destructive and the most creative; the most humanitarian and the most barbarous; the most pagan and the most religious. What direction the world takes tomorrow depends on the rising generation of today."

You are the rising generation. The future belongs to you. To meet its challenge, there is a need that you make a success of yourself—of your own personal life. I do not mean success which is measured by the material considerations of fame and personal gain—or the attainment of high place and prestige. But rather, that true success which is the crown of all those who honestly, earnestly, do their best and live the every day, simple life with all that it involves in the practice of the commonplace duties of every day—that consists in the unselfishness of motive, the integrity of purpose, the passion for fairness.

No one else can purchase these attributes for you. The way can be pointed by training and loving parents. But the sort of a person you will make of yourself—how you will be regarded—whether people will admire and respect or despise you—all this is in your hands.

No matter where your lot may be cast, no power on earth can keep you from making a real person of yourself. Only you can choose the direction in which you will go. Every day you can say to yourself: Without capital, without influence—even in spite of the opposition of others, I can be true to myself. I can be a real woman or a real man and make my life a masterpiece. I am the only enemy I shall ever have. The only one who can wreck my personal career, keep me from being a success is the man or woman living inside my own skin. There is no destiny, no fate, that can ruin me. Under God, I am my own maker, my own destiny. "I am the master of my fate * * * the captain of my soul."

You have had a magnificent start to cope with the problems of the future. You have looked forward for years to this day—one of the crowning achievements of your young life. Your parents—self-sacrificing, devoted, loving—have toiled and lived for this day. For the part they have played in the success that is yours tonight, you can never repay. Teachers who have inspired and taught you and brought you to this moment are entitled to your gratitude.

This thanks and gratitude can best be expressed by doing the very best you can in whatever task is yours. By so doing, you will be a credit to Springfield's outstanding educational system, the High School of Commerce you love so much, to your devoted teachers, to your wonderful parents.

Yes, the future belongs to you. May God grant you the ability, the courage and the wisdom to face it with confidence and to meet it with unbounded success.

GRADUATION EXERCISES, HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, SPRINGFIELD, MASS., MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1960, AT 8 O'CLOCK, MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM

PROGRAM

Organ Prelude: Prelude in F Minor, Bach; Folk Tune, Whitlock.

Processional: Pomp and Circumstance, Mr. LeRoy Hanson, organist, Elgar.

"Star-Spangled Banner," class, choir, chorus, and audience, Smith.

Invocation: The Lord's Prayer, High School of Commerce girls' choir, Walter D. Nickerson, director, Malotte.

Hymn of Praise, Mozart.

Three Wishes, Roff.

One World, O'Hara.

Greetings from the school committee, Mrs. Mary M. Lynch, chairman.

Address: "The High School Graduate's Responsibility for the Future," Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, U.S. Representative, Second District, Massachusetts.

Presentation of class for graduation, Philip A. Sweeney, principal.

Declaration of graduation, Dr. T. Joseph McCook, superintendent.

Awarding of diplomas, Hon. Thomas J. O'Connor, Jr., mayor.

In appreciation, Bert Dolan, president, class of 1960.

Benediction: The Lord Bless You and Keep You, choir, Lutkin.

Recessional: "Pomp and Circumstance," Elgar.

MEMBERS OF THE GRADUATING CLASS

Ann Marie Abair, Judith Carole Abbe, Carolyn A. Agen, Brenda Dawn Agnoli,[1] Sandra Ann Aiken, Marianne Ames, Dorothy R. Arabik, Grace Catherine Arillotta.

Amos Lee Bailey, Barrie R. Baker, Laura Mae Barry, Beverly Ann Barufaldi, Ruth D. Beaulieu,[1] Joan Becker, Marvin E. Becker, Lucille Ann Bedard, Carol Ann Begley, Richard Belden, Elizabeth Frances Bell, Joan-Ann Bell, Charles H. Bentley, Ida Marie Bernardes,[1] Rosemary Katherine Beturne, Roy Edward Beusee, Carole Ann Bianconi, Annalouise Almeda Bieard, Sandra Lee Bielecki, Dianne Marie Bisi,[1] Carol Ann Black, Rita Blais, Gail Patricia Blanchard, Sandra Joy Blanchard, Patricia Ann Bordeaux, Ann Ellen Borecki, Rosemarie May Borowik, Hazel Borrette, Elizabeth Borst, Rita Marie Bourcier, Maureen Rita Bourque Cherie Carmen Bousquet,[1] Judith Thurston Bradway, Karen Irene Brauns, Karen Ann Bressette, Robert H. Brosnon, Carole Ann Brown, James Edward Brown, Sandra Harriet Brown, Joanne Olive Brunt, Sandra Vicki Bryant, Margaret Ann Buchanan, Catherine Marie Buldrini, Geraldine Ann Burke, Carol Ann Burrell, Judith Ann Burt, Pamela Joan Butler.

Cecelia Ann Calabrese, Louis A. Calabrese, Mary Ellen Cameron, Rose Marie Theresa Casali, Jane Marie Caserio, Rosemary J. Cavanaugh, Frances June Champagne, Patricia Lee Chapin, Elaine Alice Choiniere, Nancy May Clark, Joanne Consolini, Eleanor Rose Ann Cote, John W. Coughlin, Jr. Annette Marie Cox, Barbara Joan Coyle, Geraldine Giles Cullen.

Joanne Marie D'Amato, Linda Daniele, Helen Anne Daubmann, Judith Ann Davignon, Dorothy Mary Delarm, Annette R. Demers, Gloria Ann DePalo, Theodore Paul Dernago, Jr., Irene B. Desmarais, Anna Isabelle DiNoia, Bert Dolan, Dennis Robert Donahue, Catherine Marie Donnellan, Joyce Beatrice Dorman, Rena Helen Douglas, Linda Ann Dressel, Barbara Ann Dunn, Irene Jeanne Duquette,[1] Carolyn Margaret Durkee, Martha Angela Dziura.[1]

M. Judith Edgerton, Pamela Mae Edwards,[1] Richard A. Elsoid, Sondra Anne Elim, Judith Ann Elms, Regina Mary Emirzian.

Anne Marie Falcone, Marilyn Ann Farina, Gloria Jeanne Yay, Carol Marini Fazio, Donna Lee Fett,[1] Marilyn Ruth Figarsky, Marie Louise Florentino, Frances E. Fisk, Edna Mae Fitzgerald, Esther Ida Flemister, Joyce Mary Flynn, Elaine Alice Forsyth,[1] Joyce Ann Fortini, Portia Mae Freeman, Gale Lnida Freyenhagen, Judith Barbara Friedman, Martha Miriam Froebel, Barbara Jean Fronzi.

Dennis R. Gagnon, Suzanne Theresa Gallagher, Gay Carol Gallerani, William Anthony Galletti, Bettyanne Doris Gardner, Catherine Theresa Garvey, Beverly Faith Geiger, Joyce Ann Gelineau, Rosalie Diane Gentile,[1] Peter Eugene George, Geraldine

---

Footnote at end of speech.

Frances Giancola, Adelaide Giupponi, Joan P. Goodnough, Carol Ann Gordon, Agnes Pauline Gore, Arlene F. Gouvan, Joan Marie Gouvan, Joyce Amelia Grant,[1] Carl Arthur Greene, Regina Grilli, Lorraine Eva Groulx, Jean Alma Grover, Carolyn Lois Grundstrom, Lois Evelyn Gurney.

Frank Halloran, Evelyn Ann Hanson,[1] Priscilla Mildred Hartmann, Juliette Ann Hebert,[1] Vivian Madeleine Hebert, Rachel Virginia Hewitt, Carol Irene Holman, Judith Elizabeth Holman, Barbara Ann Hooper, Sandra Mary Hovagimian, Joseph H. Hrycay, Paula Hurley.

Shirley Elizabeth Jackson, Marjorie Ann Jameson, Petronela Helen Jaszewski, Irene Anne Jodlowski, Carol Ann Jodoin, Donna Lee Jones,[1] Lisa F. Jones, Vernia Mae Jones.

Camille Ann Kaczowka, Barbara A. Kamuda, Anne Marie Kane, Dinah Kay Kaplinger,[1] Joanne Beverly Keane, Sandra Mary Keeley, Dennis F. Kimball, Gwendolyn Viola King, Emmanuel P. Klenakis, Portia Klenakis,[1] Beverly Ann Knaus, Robert G. Knox, Marie Elaine Koob, Victoria Jane Kucharski, Cathryn Ann Kudrikoff [1].

Gail Margaret LaBrode, Joyce E. LaCroix, Shirley Ann LaPine, Marie Ellen Larro, Eleanor Louise Larson, Carol Lauer, Linda Ruth Law, Janet Leddy, Kathleen Marie LeDuc,[1] Annette Celia Lemire, Elaine Ann LeMoine, Constance Ann Letourneau, William Spiros Leventis, Elizabeth Ann Lewis, Joyce Marilyn Lewis, Priscilla Elsa Lindquist, Maryann Frances Lipczak, Margaret Ann Lohan, Patricia Ann Loizzo, Angelina Marie Lombardi, Sandra Diane Marie Longhi, Sandra Anne Lopata, Angela R. Lore, Barbara Ann Los, Ann Lotito,[1] Richard Allen Luchini, Joan Luppi, Lucille Barbara Lussier, Elizabeth Anne Lyle, Joanne Lilla Lyman,[1] Charlotte Louise Lynch.

Linda Jane Macaulay, Carolyn Mamuska, Virginia Manitoni, Ann Shirley Marie Marino, Elaine Virginia Markham, Susan Mary Marren, Daniel Martin,[1] Donald G. Martin, Ruth H. Martin, Joyce A. Marucun,[1] Alberta Mason,[1] Diana Mastrangelo, Roger Mayhew, Judith Ann Mazza, Patricia J. Mazzie, Maxine Alma McCants, Dorothy Louise McCaskill, Cecelia May McCormick, Lenard G. McCoy, Patricia A. Mederian, Dorothy Ann Meissner, Patricia Gail Mellen, Janet Theresa Merola, Muriel Elizabeth Millette,[1] Elizabeth Ann Moline, Wendy Ann Moran, Judith Ann Moriarty, Kevin John Moriarty, Joanne Marcia Morin, Dorothy Morini, Theresa Muia.

Susan Eunice Nadelman, Jean Ann Nelson, Robert J. Newman, Gail Nicholson, Marilyn Claire Noel, Art W. Noren, Marilyn Ann Norris, Patricia Lee Norris.

Joanne Margaret Ober, Patricia .Mary O'Connor, Christine Shirley O'Donnell, Elizabeth A. O'Donnell, Lynn O'Leary, Judith Ann Oliver, Carol Eivor Ottoson.

Patricia Ann Palozie, Soola G. Passidakis, Ann Marie Paul, Yvonne Mary Pelletier, Paul Penna, Madeline Rita Perrotta, Joyce Elaine Pierce, Thomas Adams Pietras, Joanne Pietras, Mary Pietroniro, Marlene Elena Planzo, Elizabeth Jane Plourde, Arnold Podgorski, Mary Rita Poulos, Carol Ann Pratt, Donald Maurice Prifti, Edith Annie Prindle, Cherrie Lea Putnam, Patricia Merle Putnam, Theresa Carolyn Pyzik.

Frances Rae Quaggin.

Dorothy Joyce Richards, Marcia Claire Richards, Virginia May Richards,[1] Violet Eden Richardson, Marcia Faye Richmond, Judith Rose Rickson,[1] Louise Ellen Robbins, Judith M. Roberts, Emily E. Robinson, Bonnie Sue Roode, Teresa Donna Rourke, Frances Rozkuszka, Kathleen Mary Ruel.

Betty Ann Safarik, Carole M. Samble, Barbara Jean Sarage, Alice Ann Sares, Nancy Eleanor Savage, Joanne Carroll Savoy, Robert Louis Scott, Crystalou Sergides, Gloria Marie Serra, Norma Jean Sharpe, Ronald Edwin Shaw, Kathleen Mary Shea,[1] Patricia Gail Shea, Margaret Ruth Sheldon, Patricia A. Sherman, Patricia A. Siano, Charles F. Simard, Gary Lee Small, Carolyn Janet Smith, Elizabeth Ann Marie Smith, Gloria Mary Smith, Mary Ann Smith, Sandra Faye Smith, Barbara Elaine Snyder, Beverly Ann Snyder, Eleanor H. Soja, Nancy Ann Spagnoli, Gene Spencer, N. Lesly Spry, Joan V. Stabile, Ann Marie Steiger, Carol-Ann Filomina Stella, Ruth E. Sterner, Margaret M. Stewart, Sarah L. Stovall, Barbara Joyce Streeter,[1] Elizabeth Louise Stuart, Barbara Lee Sturtevant, Barbara Jean Sullivan, Joan Margaret Sullivan, Lillian Sullivan, Rosalie Sutton, Carol Jean Swiattouski.

Diane Marie Talbot, Carol Marie Tamkovich, Judy Ann Taverner, Elizabeth Jeanne Taylor, Patricia Ann Teel, Katherine Mary Theocles, Cynthia Sue Theroux, Ruth E. Therrien, Edward B. Thomas, Grace Margaret A. Thomas, Paige Ann Thompson, Marilyn Anne Till, Ann Marie Tranghese,[1] Doris Charlotte Treat, Barbara Ann Trela, Janet Marian Tremblay, Arline May Trombley, Judith Mary Tunstall, Joyce Jeanne Turcotte.

Beverly Jean Vaz, Shirley Rose Veratti,[1] Yvonne Marie Vermette, Richard Verville, Judith Ann Vignone, Shirley Rosalie Villeneuve, Louis Anthony ViVenzio, Jr., James Charles Voltz, Patricia Bertha Vyskocil.[1]

James Curtis Wadleigh, Judith Alden Wadsworth,[1] Lynn Irene Watson,[1] Joan Ann Wdowiak, Beverly Jean Webster, Mary Anne Whatley, Barbara Jean White, Lillian White, Pauline White, Linda Anne Wiley, Barbara J. Williams, Frances M. Williams, Bonnie Leah Wills,[1] Elizabeth Mary Wilson, Eugenie Wisiolek,[1] Sandra Anna Wojcik, Patricia B. Wondolowski, Edward Francis Woods, Alan Cleaves Wright, Thomas E. Wright, Patricia Ann Wyman.[1]

Gloria Jean Yando, Carol Mae York.

Carolyn Zawrotny, Virginia Zucco.

---

[1] Honor students.

Address by Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Adlai E. Stevenson to the Illinois State Bar Association on June 23, 1960. I commend the address to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON TO THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, WAUKEGAN, JUNE 23, 1960

As leaders of the bar you are leaders of thought in your communities. My purpose here is to plead with you as thoughtful citizens to encourage sensible, rational discussion of the situation of our country in the world.

A few weeks hence, we Americans will be engaged in a political campaign in which the principal issue must be America's ability to meet successfully the challenge of the Soviet Union. There have been several previous opportunities for us to face up to this great challenge realistically. One opportunity was after the Suez debacle in 1956. Another was when the first sputnik was launched in 1957. A third was last year when Khrushchev told us face to face that we would lose our world leadership.

We did not take advantage of those opportunities. But today we Americans are finally beginning to realize that in Russia and China we face a giant political, economic, and ideological force in the world, and that force is making headway, especially in the poor and underdeveloped areas of the world.

Two recent events have shocked Americans into facing this fact. Last month our handling of the U–2 incident not only undermined our reputation for wisdom and competence but jeopardized our whole system of bases encircling the Soviet Union. And a few days ago in Japan we suffered another reverse in our efforts to meet the Communist challenge. As James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "At best the United States has lost 'face' in the Near East; at worst, it has lost Japan."

The intemperance of Khrushchev's attacks on the President created a natural sympathy for the President which left us with too little awareness of the disaster the summit fiasco was to the United States. So we were not prepared for the later shock of realization that the President's visit to a friendly nation like Japan would be dangerous not only to him but to that nation's government.

But the extent of the disaster in Japan and the ultimate fate of the new security treaty is not yet clear. What is clear is that the proposed visit by the President to Japan has accomplished just what it was intended to prevent—the Kishi government's authority has been destroyed and the new treaty imperiled. Already, powerful Japanese newspapers are proposing a renegotiation. We can only hope that the majority in Japan know that with the mainland in Communist hands Japan's security depends on the United States.

These setbacks, coming as fast as they do after mounting evidence that the power and influence of the United States has been slipping in the scales of world balance for several years, have underscored the need for a full and frank discussion of our international situation during the coming campaign.

It will do us no good to blame the Japanese riots solely on the manipulations of a few Communist agitators. Instead of looking for excuses, we should be asking questions:

Why didn't we foresee the consequences of the U–2 incident in Japan?

If Communist agitators are wholly to blame—how were they able to mobilize such passion and numbers in a friendly, allied country?

Why is there so much opposition to a security treaty with the United States?

When other governments on which we lavished praise and money are overthrown by crowds of students shouting for freedom—as in Turkey and Korea—is it a sign that we are out of touch with the changing current of opinion?

Is it possible that students, professors, and ideas carry more weight in Asia than guns, soldiers, and military pacts?

How can things get so mixed up that the natural antiwar feeling of so many people expresses itself in anti-Americanism?

These are just a few of the questions that must be discussed in the coming campaign. And on the need for such discussion there should be no disagreement between our two parties. But if we are to talk usefully about our foreign policies—on which survival literally depends—then we must do so in a political atmosphere free of accusations, of innuendo and of irresponsibility. Without an honest search for truth, democratic debate quickly degenerates into a demagogic slugging match.

I realize—better than most—that it is not easy to keep such discussion rational in an election year, when political passions and ambitions are aroused. No Democrat can ever forget the campaigns of 1952 and 1954

when we were called "the Commicrit Party," when "20 years of treason" was the not uncommon title of attacks on the Democratic record, and when we Democrats were reviled for being soft on communism and for fighting the Communists in Korea—all at once.

Today we are in danger of the same kind of deceitful and self-defeating politics. I say self-defeating because this sort of partisan nonsense not only debases democracy, but also actually weakens our capacity to meet the growing and changing challenge of our century.

Let me give you an example. In 1958, Vice President NIXON warned us that the Soviet economy was growing at a faster rate than ours and that "economic competition between the free world and the Communist world may well decide the world conflict."

And yet, when I called attention to the pace of Soviet economic growth 4 years earlier, Mr. NIXON accused me of "spreading pro-Communist propaganda" and doing "the cause of the free world great damage."

But the real damage, of course, has been done by those who preferred to score partisan points rather than face up to the fact of Soviet growth, power, and thrust. As a result, we have lost valuable time.

Today we cannot afford to lose any more time. And that is why I am concerned lest our political bloodstream is not yet completely purged of the virus of McCarthyism.

Surely the question of whether the Nation is wisely, shrewdly, and competently led is our main subject of discussion. Yet for criticizing the administration's handling of the U-2 incident, Senator KENNEDY has been warned on the floor of the Senate "to relieve himself of the suspicion of appeasement."

Surely, Governor Brown of California cannot be suspected of Communist sympathies. Yet Mr. NIXON'S Los Angeles campaign manager announced this month that a big Democratic vote in the primary would give aid and comfort to Khrushchev and Chou En-Lai.

Surely it should be clear by now that there is no party of appeasement in America. Yet in Texas, a State Republican convention cheered a speaker who said that the Russians would welcome a Democratic victory because "their record shows they are easy to deal with."

A Republican leader in Congress recently hailed Mr. Khrushchev's harsh words for NIXON as the best endorsement he could have. This kind of talk only invites the equally craven counter-charge that the Russians—knowing American reaction to their insults—are deliberately trying to elect a Republican administration.

Discussion of our foreign policy in this year of crisis must not be confined to such charges and countercharges. The decisions we have to make are too important.

We must decide how to restore the American power position and at the same time advance the cause of peace.

We must keep in mind that our chief problem is still how to deal with the Russians and the Chinese. It is not a matter of who is soft and who is hard, but of who is wise and who is stupid.

We know that no leader of either party is a Communist sympathizer. We know that all are concerned with the challenge of the Soviet system to our way of life and with the danger of war to life itself. We know that all are committed to the common goal which President Eisenhower has defined as a lasting peace with justice.

Therefore any debate on foreign policy should be concerned not with the goal but with the means by which we propose to achieve it. And any useful debate must deal with the hard facts, not irrelevancies. For only a serious discussion of our predicament will ever produce the new ideas and policies that we need so urgently.

Perhaps a President could be elected by a campaign of branding as disloyal every attempt to consider alternatives to the administration's handling of our foreign affairs. But if he were, his hands would be so tied that he would be unable to negotiate with the Russians.

This was the case of the first Eisenhower administration, which was so committed to a rigid policy of military pacts and massive retaliation that its policymakers could not take advantage of the change in Soviet tactics after Stalin's death.

Back in 1953 I described the change in these words: "Stalin's methods have not paid off. I think we can expect more subtle, more challenging, more divisive tactics. We can expect Communists to encourage and exploit every sign of weakness, distrust, misunderstanding or jealousy between us and our allies; they will probe the soft spot in the free nations and tempt the underdeveloped areas with both economic and emotional lures. And they will try to invade the trade."

This is what has happened. But I doubt if Mr. Dulles was able, until it was too late, to consider this revolutionary change and the opportunities it presented, in a calm and rational way. For he remained a prisoner of the soft-on-communism bombast of the bygone campaigns.

I can only repeat—if we have another such campaign, then we may wind up unable to deal with Russia at all. And in today's world that inability could spell the end of the human race.

So I want to make clear as briefly as I can what seems to me the dangers and opportunities of our relations with the Soviet Union.

The dilemma is obvious. On one hand, the Communists want world revolution. They want to dominate a satellite world of friendly states. We don't know where or when they may use force to that end. We do know that the Chinese high command and many Russian leaders regard even temporary deviation from the aim of world domination as appeasement.

But on the other hand, it is also clear that Khrushchev fully appreciates that nuclear war can destroy us all, and that pursuit of world control by war or even by an unchecked arms race can lead, in Marx's words, "to the common ruin of both contending parties."

Thus the Soviet leaders are both tough and apprehensive. They want to win but they don't want to die.

Our task, therefore, is to match toughness with toughness and apprehension with apprehension. On the side of toughness, we must maintain military power sufficient to discourage large or small aggression, and we must be united enough with our allies to prevent any nibbling away at the edges. And to do either demands a dynamic movement toward greater unity, because static alliances invariably break up. So we should be grounding our real strength in the creation of a permanent economic and social union in the Atlantic world. I believe that this union could also undertake jointly with the United Nations a revolution of economic modernization in the decisive underdeveloped areas of the world where the Communists are working so hard.

But on this fundamental basis of strength, we must seek by every means to remove the awful risks of pitting our strength against each other. The major task here is, of course, to achieve general and complete disarmament under international control. This is—this must be—the first aim of our dialogue with the Russians.

One of the reasons for the decline of American prestige and influence has been our Government's hesitation about pursuing this aim of worldwide enforced disarmament. In the single most important issue of our time, our Government has left the initiative to the Soviet Union.

The greatest danger of a nuclear war is not that the Russians will launch an attack. The greatest danger arises out of the likelihood of an accident. And if measures are not taken soon to prevent nuclear weapons from coming into the possession of additional nations, the risks of accidents will multiply in geometric proportion. Not only will it lie within the power of an unpredictable number of political or military leaders to trigger a holocaust; but a single rebellious military commander will be able to set the world in flames.

There can be no deterrent to war by accident. So a top priority in the formulation of new foreign policies must be a determined approach to prevent the further dissemination of nuclear weapons. The tragedy—the almost inexplicable tragedy of our time—is that the United States, with no expansionist aims and with everything to lose through a continuation of a state of international anarchy, did not take the leadership in the world's quest for arms control and peace under law.

Instead the impression is spreading that the United States does not really wish to disarm. Our hedging over the atomic testing agreement, the abrupt announcement of a unilateral end to the test ban, our frequent aggressive pronouncements—all these have raised doubts as to our sincerity. Today, negotiations at Geneva are at a standstill, and Russia is again threatening to seize the initiative and transfer the proceedings to the whole United Nations in August—much to the embarrassment of our allies, who don't want to be forced into the position of voting against the Afro-Asian bloc, or of being on our side and apparently against progress in disarmament.

Therefore, on the side of conciliation and understanding, we are going to have to summon more imagination, vision, trust, and sustained action than we have in the past. These are policies that deeply concern the world, and about which there has not been enough discussion and understanding at home.

But if there is to be constructive discussion in the months ahead, then the level of our campaign debate must rise above cheap charges of appeasement. I don't know whether Khrushchev wants to help elect NIXON or not—nor do I care. I don't know whether he wanted to help the Democrats when he was praising Eisenhower a few weeks ago—nor do I care.

What I do know is that Khrushchev's aim is American weakness and disunity. So I suggest that both presidential candidates this year pledge themselves in advance of the campaign to keep Mr. Khrushchev out of our national debate. Our elections have always been our own business. Let us keep them that way.

And let us conduct this campaign as Americans who respect each other's rights to disagree and who trust each other's good faith and patriotism. For not only our survival but all people's survival turns on our fortitude, our vision, our patience, and good sense.

We have much lost ground to recover. Self delusion has betrayed us too often of late. If we do not seek the truth—and speak the truth—about our predicament, we shall never recover the world's confidence and respect; instead we shall become a country of the mute and blind.

So I pray that in the coming campaign both parties will discuss the issues with a sense of the solemnity of our responsibility, and with some understanding that the whole human family is involved in the sanity and decency of our debate.

Dealing with the Russians is in all conscience the most difficult problem a nation

has ever faced. Neither party is likely to get it all right or all wrong. So let us attack each other's mistakes. But let us never attack each other's motives. Let the argument be conducted in a manner worthy of freemen.

Panamanian Tribute to Governor Potter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave accorded, I am delighted to include as part of these remarks the very fine editorial tribute to Gov. William E. Potter, now retiring as Governor of the Canal Zone, which appeared in the Star and Herald, Panama, R.P., in its May 12, 1960, issue.

In the latter part of Governor Potter's 4-year term, his duties and responsibilities required him to deal with firmness with two attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone by radical extremists of Panama, aided by Communist influences. Under the most difficult circumstances, he met these situations effectively. He could not in justice have pursued any other course than that which he followed.

It is gratifying, therefore, to note this commendatory tribute by such a conservative and highly respected newspaper as the Star and Herald. Coming from a loyal Panamanian source it means much and indicates what must be the mature judgment of thoughtful Panamanians.

The editorial follows:

HONORS FOR GOVERNOR POTTER

When representatives of virtually all Canal Zone labor organizations band together in honoring outgoing Gov. William E. Potter it would appear that the Governor's term of office has endeared him to many residents of the Republic as well as to his own fellow countrymen in the Canal Zone.

Among those who have perhaps learned to appreciate him best are the members of the Panama Rotary Club who have regarded him as a real buddy. This may be ascribed partially to the fact that the Governor has an unusually good command of Spanish, an attribute which is by no means common to the average North American residing in this young Republic.

One can point to many nephews—and perhaps more nieces—of Uncle Sam who call this isthmus home, yet who have made little or no effort to learn this rich Latin language which is so varied in its vocabulary of diminutives and superlatives.

This fact alone has greatly increased the popularity of Governor Potter among his Latin neighbors. Another language makes another man, it is said. It undoubtedly makes for better understanding of the joint problems between Panama and the Canal Zone. And that friendly fact has been sorely needed in not too recent problems arising between the two jurisdictions.

It has even been suggested—unofficially we admit—that a year or more of Latin should be added to the courses of all U.S. schools. It would be valuable for all who live on this isthumus and would be additionally helpful for those who cross the Atlantic and mingle with the nationals in the countries they visit. It would aid all those who travel abroad or through the Americas.

This venerable newspaper has enjoyed very friendly relations with Governor Potter and takes this opportunity to wish him well. We submit that his relations with the local press have ever been fair and honest and wish him the best of everything wherever he may go.

"The Day After Tomorrow"—Graduation Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, each year it is inspirational to be a part of graduation time and attend commencement exercises. Whether we be parents, or friends, or just interested spectators, it is an edifying experience to witness our young folks receive that first recognition in the academic world, a high school diploma. Permit me to remind the Senate that, while our children's lot is the happiest and most pleasant of any nation in the world, there is still a depth of understanding and an admirable intellectual attainment within them. A prime example of this attainment is the address delivered at Central High School, Omaha, Nebr., on June 11, 1960, by Dave Weddle, a graduating senior. His remarks, entitled, "The Day After Tomorrow" fully deserve the interest of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW

The student of modern history will always be amazed by America's progress. We have come from the covered wagon to the automatic transmission; from candles and cowpaths to cyclotrons and turnpikes; from an upstart, revolutionary government to a world power—staggering achievements in less than 200 years. Whether America's future will be as successful as her past depends on us, members of the most critical generation in history. Most historians, statesmen, and men-on-the-street predict that in our age the world will find either peace or death. Tonight we're taking the first step into that age. We have just completed 4 years of training for our future. Our education has tempered our maturity with sensitivity, and we are now aware that the world is not as peaceful as our own backyards on Sunday afternoon. The interest our teachers have taken in our preparation has made us realize that there is a crisis coming for which we must prepare.

In the coming years we will be called upon to use all our education, all our maturity, and all our sensitivity to strengthen this Nation. This strength must come from unifying tolerance, competent leaders, and alert citizens. America's most popular poet, Longfellow, once said: "All your strength is in your union. All your danger is in discord, therefore, be at peace henceforward, and as brothers live together." The basis of America is its people, working together, held together by understanding. Understanding we have learned from social studies and history, at basketball games and club meetings. High school has taught us to forget that people are white, black, yellow, and red, and to see everyone in striking shades of red, white, and blue. Twenty-five hundred years ago an ancient writer tersely commented: "Union gives strength." Today his remark gains force as we realize that the greatest contribution our generation can make to our country is to bury the Civil War—prevent prejudice and hatred, such as once caused our Nation to erupt in blood and smoke, from sapping the strength of our democracy. We should raise our children without bigotry; we should accept our fellows on the basis of what they can do for America, not on what color or culture they spring from; we should let old blindnesses die with past generations.

But just living quietly together with one another will not make America strong enough in our age. We must create leaders from among the members of our own generation, those loyal to America's traditions, yet with enough imagination and courage to launch us in new waters, if the need arises. Attempting to develop America's strength without such leaders to direct our actions as a country would be like trying to use an IBM machine without first plugging it in. These leaders will have the privilege to take our property, limit our freedom, and sacrifice our lives. Where will we get such people to govern our cities, our States, and our country? Whom shall we choose to shape the policies of freedom? We shall choose ourselves. In the final analysis, we must become our own leaders. Perhaps the President of 1988 isn't here tonight, but some of 1988's lawyers, doctors, scientists, and housewives are. We will lead in different fields and in different capacities, but we must all lead. We must have the initiative to shake off stupefying regimentation, for which our fad-crazy generation is noted, and to develop our creative abilities. We need less Presleys and more Van Cliburns, less beatniks and more leaders.

As citizens we must pursue the educational principles we have learned, keeping well-informed on foreign affairs and voting intelligently—not only for President, but also for mayor, councilmen, and county officials—and to back our ballots with action. We must not allow ourselves to become happily comfortable with a television set, suburban home, and savings account, while our foundation of democratic processes rots beneath us, neglected.

When we have fully developed tolerance and personal leadership in our country, we will be strong enough to tackle our international problem. A problem that is most startling, whose solution will require all our knowledge and training. A force defies us on every front. We don't know quite what to name it. History has never seen anything like it before. It centers in Moscow, Russia, and has clamped its strangling control over half the world's population. Our American leaders have withstood it, but still our enemies flourish, for America is not yet strong enough to conquer them. Therefore, we must gird ourselves to face the problem because in a few years we will be fighting the cold war—with businesses and taxes; as lawyers, as engineers, as ministers, as voters. We must understand the challenge facing us and realize that if we are to relax from international strain, we must either establish peace with Russia or destroy her. The third alternative—Russian conquest of America—we shall optimistically ignore. But we will remember it and its probability will prod us in our efforts.

It is time we recognized the harshness and intensity of our enemies that we may realize the seriousness of their challenge. I wonder if the Hungarian and South Korean teenagers thought that they would ever

really meet Russian tanks and guns? Do we comprehend that such suffering could engulf Americans? Do we realize that the Russian leaders have held only one goal—world domination? They cannot allow us to exist and remain consistent with that goal. Do we understand that the Communists have so reduced our international prestige through propoganda that the President's Press Secretary was mobbed by angry leftists just yesterday morning? Have the last 4 years opened our eyes to the reality that world tension is not a game? Consecration, dedication, sacrifices, victory—these are not words reserved for the American vocabulary alone; our enemies are also well acquainted with these words of life and death. They have yielded their whole beings to their State for the promise that America will be crushed. They attack us with religious zeal.

How have we answered such fervor, such sacrifice?—with a bloodless stockpile of armaments. We have developed our military resources to that ironic place where we dare not unleash our own power for fear of destroying ourselves. However, I am not attempting to diminish the importance of technicians, physicists, and chemists, for many of us will assume these positions, which are our great line of material defense. But I'm speaking of the spiritual battlefront where every American may serve. This country's great philosopher, Ralph W. Emerson, said: "Great men are they who see that spiritual is stronger than any material force." Yet at a time when billions of dollars are being spent for arms, the missionary efforts of all faiths are in need. We have looked for peace down the sights of rifles and have found none. May we realize the victories are won with spiritual light as well as military thunder. America can answer this challenge only if we recharge our sagging spiritual vitality. We stamp on our coins: "In God We Trust"; and then place our faith and hope in our businesses, paychecks, and new cars. While our increasing church enrollment feeds our "Sunday righteousness", our crime rate, juvenile delinquency, and immorality shock the world. Our people prefer comic books and the sports page to the Bible; recently three Brazilians began training to be foreign missionaries to the United States. A few years ago, Mussolini said that Western capitalism was decaying; while World War II raged, we had to admit that El Duce was right. Do we need a Mussolini today to show us that our spirituality is decaying? Must we bleed through another war before we see our need to restore the mental and spiritual discipline to our people? Let us realize that there is a relation between our faith, our values, and America's survival.

We will soon replace our elders in the life-and-death struggle with atheism. The outcome will depend on how well we use our education to strengthen America and how skillfully we use that strength in the world. Today we leave high school; tomorrow we will complete our higher education; and the day after tomorrow we will hold the reins of America in our hands. The destiny of the free world will then lie in our strength and its hope in the promise of our victory.

ABC Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the June issue of the Texas Parade, a very excellent magazine published in Texas and devoted to the story of good roads, appears a splendid article by the editor and publisher of the magazine, Mr. William B. Alderman, entitled "The Real Scandal of Interstate Highways."

After reading the article, I know that the Members of Congress will also find this fine article by Mr. Alderman to be of special interest. Therefore, I ask consent that it be included in my remarks. The article is as follows:

THE REAL SCANDAL OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS—DECISIVE MEASURES FOLLOW EVIDENCE OF WRONGDOING IN ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM WHILE NATIONAL POLICY CONTINUES TO DIVERT ROAD USE TAXES TO NONROAD PURPOSES

(By William B. Alderman)

Several Congressmen including one from Texas have recently sent to people in their districts questionnaires which included the question, "Do you favor a pay-as-you-go basis for Interstate Highway construction even if it requires a raise in the Federal gasoline tax?"

Representatives O. C. FISHER from the San Angelo district reported 58 percent answered yes, 34 percent no, and 8 percent had no opinion. Oddly enough, these answers came from Texans who lived largely in communities not on any interstate route.

The inference from all the surveys is that there is still a substantial grassroots support on behalf of the interstate program. It remains to be seen if this sentiment will be strong enough next January to influence Congress to continue building interstate highways at the present rate, financing them as previously arranged or setting up still more taxes.

The 1959 law increased the Federal gasoline tax from 3 to 4 cents per gallon until June 30, 1961. After that time an estimated $750 million of about $1.5 billion Federal road use taxes now going into the general fund would be earmarked for highways. This is the approximate amount brought in by the temporary 1-cent increase in gasoline tax. The administration has indicated the temporary gasoline tax should not only be continued, but increased and that the diversion of the $1.5 billion road use taxes to the general fund be continued as in the past.

There are forces now at work that could have a very adverse influence on the future of the interstate program and the fair treatment of those who pay more than $3.8 billion annually in road use taxes.

Over the years motorists have not objected strenuously to more taxes for building highways and this has been worked around both statewide and nationally to result in road use taxes going for many things other than roads.

Such an objective will be achieved if the Congress next January fails to follow up on the 1959 law which proposes to reduce the amount of the Federal road use tax diversion.

For various reasons and motives there has been criticism of the entire highway program which stemmed from a few isolated exposures of wrongdoing and some instances of outright misunderstanding.

For example, in recent weeks there have been investigations of dishonesty in connection with the Skelly bypass near Tulsa, Okla. Inspectors, on the Oklahoma State payroll, confessed that they doctored laboratory samples, falsified reports, and failed to take effective action to correct alleged irregularities in construction. A shocked and disgusted Bureau of Public Roads took the following immediate and forthright action on this instance:

1. Ordered more tests and reports on all Federal projects than have been required in the past.

2. Notified the State of Oklahoma that the inspectors who testified that they made false reports are no longer acceptable to the Bureau for work on any Federal aid project.

3. Required the State of Oklahoma to make full restitution of any Federal funds which may be proved to have been paid for unacceptable work.

4. Ordered placards setting forth the Federal criminal penalties for fraud to be posted on every Federal aid project.

(NOTE.—The Federal Government does not pay directly for highway work, but reimburses the various States who do and who are held responsible for its performance under plans and specifications.)

So in this celebrated exposure of dishonesty, the Federal Government has not been cheated. Effective steps have been taken to discourage a repetition in any State. And the full facts of the incident leave no justification to imperil the whole nationwide highway program because one pocket of dishonesty has been uncovered.

In the area of misunderstanding, it is quite common to hear talk of extravagance. Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of Public Roads, touched on this facet eloquently at a recent address in Dallas before the chamber of commerce central highway committee. He noted that the Interstate System was ordered built to carry the kinds and volumes of traffic expected for 1975; that it is good economy and good sense to build for the days ahead.

"Real waste and extravagance," he said, "would be to build something that became obsolete the day the opening ribbon was cut."

Most knowledgeable observers will agree that in Texas and in the Nation there has been more of this kind of waste and extravagance than of the kind relating to building too far ahead for a dynamic, growing America.

Armstrong went on to say that a dirt road would be cheaper than a 4-lane surfaced highway, but in an area of high traffic volume it would be a waste of anybody's taxes. "What may seem extravagant from one point of view is true economy from another," he pointed out.

He said, "The real cost of highways is measured by the cost of highways per vehicle-mile of travel. On our urban interstate routes, which cost the most per mile of construction, the returns are the greatest. Here actual travel is the most economical as the vehicle-mile cost of the highway will be about a half cent. This compares with about three-fourths of a cent on the Federal aid ABC system and a cost of 1.5 cents per vehicle-mile on farm-to-market roads."

Presently there are about five inveatigations of the highway program being conducted from the national level. Up to this time none of them has uncovered wrongdoing that has failed to meet immediate and decisive corrective measures. As for charges of extravagance and waste, Commissioner Armstrong said none of those which were specific have stood up under examination.

The multibillion-dollar Federal highway program is about the most heavily policed activity of the Government. The policing is a notable public service when it points up the need for corrections that are immediately made in procedures. It is a great disservice to the public when it is made a springboard for wild charges which tend to undermine public confidence in what is one of our Government's best administered and most useful programs.

One of the most eagerly awaited products of any of the investigations is the report from the Secretary of Commerce, due next January 3, dealing with cost allocation. It is to help guide the next Congress among other things to evaluate the benefits highways bring to groups other than those who use them for transportation. The report may give some valid basis for further argu-

ments on behalf of using a larger portion of road-use taxes for roads.

This is indeed the capstone for any sound highway finance policy, whether State or National. Over the years there has been no dispute of the theory that those who use the roads should pay for them. It should properly follow that taxes levied for roads should be used for that purpose. But herein lies the seed sprouting most of the controversies that have plagued modern highway programs since their inception.

EXTENT OF FEDERAL ROAD USE TAX DIVERSION

The following is a breakdown of the $3.8 billion of Federal road use taxes collected during the year ending September 30, 1959, which was just before the 1 cent per gallon "temporary" increase in Federal gasoline tax went into effect.

For highways:	
Gasoline tax	$1,716,345,000
Diesel fuel tax	56,849,000
Tires, tubes, etc	296,317,000
Vehicle use	34,984,000
50 percent of truck and bus tax	123,331,000
Total to highway trust fund for highways	2,227,826,000
To general fund:	
Automobile excise tax	1,204,639,000
Parts and accessories tax	174,830,000
Lubricating oil tax	76,565,000
50 percent of truck and bus tax	123,331,000
Total to general fund for nonhighway purposes	1,579,365,000
Total Federal motor vehicle excise tax collections	3,807,191,000

Clairvoyance or Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past few months make it quite clear that the Communist conspiracy is still an effective instrument and that the cold war is being prosecuted relentlessly by those who have nothing but contempt for the liberties which we cherish.

A publication has recently come to my attention entitled "The Minority of One." It is published by the Minority of One, Inc., Post Office Box 6594, Richmond, Va., and its publisher states that—

Regrettably, this publication is printed in a not unionized plant due to the local unavailability of a unionized printing plant.

It is rather amazing that an elaborately printed magazine in several colors could be sold on the newsstands without any advertising. The publisher states on the masthead, "No commercial advertising accepted."

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may wonder why I am bringing this publication to their attention. In an article published before President Eisenhower left for Paris, on the front page of this publication it predicts the failure of the summit conference in these words: "Toward the Summit, a Predetermined Failure?"

I am inserting at this point in my remarks, the entire statement in which this virtually unkown publication accurately predicts that an accomodation with the Russians was impossible:

TOWARD THE SUMMIT: A PREDETERMINED FAILURE?

As the summit conference approaches, there are many indications that more effort goes into preventing than into promoting a settlement of major international issues. President Eisenhower's and Secretary of State Herter's damping of undue optimism respecting the conference is of great importance, not because they are speculating on Soviet intentions but because they have an unmistakable knowledge of their own intentions—and success at the summit is impossible without their willingness and cooperation.

The American reception of Soviet concessions with regard to a nuclear test ban raises grave doubts as to our Government's willingness to stop the arms race. Such doubts are raised not only by critics of the administration; influential groups within its ranks admittedly oppose a nuclear ban. And without a nuclear ban, a reduction of conventional weapons is unachieveable.

It seems that something has gone very wrong in Washington: proposals that we submitted to the Soviets, in the now revealed hope they would be rejected, were essentially accepted and coincide to the last iota with past British overtures seeking a nuclear ban. Somebody goofed in estimating Soviet readiness to compromise. When the Soviets accepted our demand of divorcing underground tests from all other atomic tests, instead of celebrating, we were caught by surprise, and urgent consultations were held to verify, possibly for the first time, whether we meant what we had been contending throughout.

The protagonists of continued cold war within the administration and the industry found staunch support from Konrad Adenauer who, alarmed by a prospect of a new international reality in which Germany would no longer "need" to be armed, came to Washington to whisper into the President's ear advice he was eager to listen to. Prime Minister Macmillan's efforts obviously did not suffice to turn the tide: stripped of the phraseology of psychological warfare, the Eisenhower-Macmillan "accord" in substance rejected the Soviet proposals. The reaction of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, the cold-warring, ban-opposing Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, testifies to the predoomed character of the plan: "I haven't objected to what the President is trying to do, because I think that's quite a way from the Russian proposal". And right he is.

The President's unwillingness to act on a moratorium on underground A-tests beyond the term of his office is a new attempt to maneuver the Soviets into a position of rejection and opposition. In fact, the President put himself in the untenable and precarious position of claiming that this country cannot make commitments beyond his term of office. If he lacks authority to do so, certainly the Congress of the United States does not.

Our counter-proposals also betray an obvious contradiction. While we have been opposing the application of a test ban to underground explosions claiming such explosions to be undetectable, now we demand the "impossible"—that international inspection also apply to underground tests, which would be prohibited by a brief moratorium.

There are still more basic indications to bear out President Eisenhower's lack of optimism with regard to the summit conference. While it is true that the American economy, if properly inspired and guided, does not necessarily depend on a war industry, it is also true that a cessation of the cold war would necessitate far-reaching adjustments. Should our war industry be brought to a sudden halt, there would be no escape from a large-scale depression that would take many years to overcome. This is obvious, and were the prospect of an international accommodation real, the administration would be deeply involved in planning the necessary overhaul of our economy. As long as the administration shirks this primary responsibility, there is no reason to believe that it truly wants any arms reduction. In fact, in the absence of such planning one must assume that the administration does not even accept disarmament as a realistic possibility. Such far-reaching pessimism cannot be based on an evaluation of the antagonist's true wishes; one can only be that positive about his own intentions.

It seems that our Government subscribes minutely to the economic theory of our arms producers: Any amount of society's organized spending is "creeping socialism" but $40 billion of organized spending on weapons epitomizes a "free economy." As long as this is the economic doctrine of our Government, it will keep preventing a relaxation of international tensions and "peaceful intentions" will be no more than the slogen of its psychological warfare advisors.

World public opinion succeeded in inducing our leaders to meet at the summit but it has not inspired the sincerity needed at that meeting.

Our administration has learned the importance of pretending to melt the cold war but its basic objectives have not changed. If this pessimism should be borne out by events to come, the meeting at the summit, coming as it does in response to man's prayers and hopes, will hardly justify even the inconsequential amount of money and effort it will consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a further indication that this particular publication should be carefully reviewed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as well as by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it is noteworthy that it attempts to defend the entire Castro regime in Cuba in an article which appears immediately after predictions concerning the summit. I request leave to insert this article at this point in my remarks:

THE COST OF TRUTH

In this issue the leader will find a statement, by a number of prominent authors and other personalities, challenging the truthfulness of the American press in its depiction of the current situation in Cuba. This statement originally appeared as a paid advertisement in the New York Times.

This publication's assessment of the Cuban situation (see among others "Something Has Got To Give in Cuba," February issue) coincides with that of the Times advertisement.

The importance of the statement is not confined to the issues at hand. In addition to putting our Cuban image straight, it is one of the unfortunately infrequent protests of men of conscience against setting our national goals and policies on false assumptions and propagandistic distortions. It is a principled and an implied rebuff of a typical chauvinistic pragmatism that makes us read justice into every passing expediency. It proves that the American intellectual has an alternative to compliance with the corruption of our power elite. It is a challenge to that portion of McCarthyism which outlived its infamous personification. It is an act of self-assertion on the part of our intellectual greats who have so often

forfeited their social leadership to the militarist and plutocrat. Finally, it is a fulfillment of a long-neglected obligation of our intellectual aristocracy to awaken the conscience of the Nation.

If the drive of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee succeeds in reversing the thoroughly hypocritical policy our State Department has been pursuing, it will not only help Cuba but first and foremost the American people themselves. We will be saved from our own capacity for the big lie, and, though specifically pertaining to Cuba, the awakening might arouse our moral sensitivity to many other challenges.

The men who sponsored the Times announcement did not need a ghostwriter to express their thoughts. Why then did they need to purchase advertising space in the Nation's largest newspaper to denounce propagandistic lies? Certainly, the columnists and editorialists quoted and rebuked in the statement did not need to pay for the privilege of spreading lies; on the contrary, they were handsomely paid for it. How come so eminent a group of individuals had no way of correcting our knowledge of Cuban affairs except through personal monetary sacrifice? Why didn't our newspapers seek their views and information as a matter of editorial policy and news value? Why did they have to be paid to open their columns to the truth and then only in the dissociated, neutral manner of an advertisement? Have we fallen so far into the abyss of hypocrisy that truth has no chance unless commercially peddled a la "liver" pills?

The effort of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee could not be more praiseworthy, and one wishes to encourage its prominent participants to exert a more embracing influence on our national thinking and policies. Perhaps it is time they provided their leadership and prestige to consolidate fragmentized liberal efforts in this country to establish a prominent national organ that could potentially reach every American adult and that could bring to him the truth and the voice of conscience in a more assertive manner than a paid advertisement in a paper that must be bribed into accommodating the truth.

WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN CUBA?

From Havana come charges of sabotage, economic aggression, counterrevolutionary intrigue, air raids on Cuban canefields sugar mills, homes. Against this background, the great news agencies and a powerful section of the U.S. press raise a barrage of equally grave accusations. What can we believe in the welter of conflicting reports?

"We only report the facts," U.S. newsmen are accustomed to say. Is this true? Compare the following "facts."

Communism: "A pro-Communist state has been established in Cuba with the clear objective of bargaining with Soviet Russia for the munitions of war * * *"—Sokolsky in the New York Journal-American. True or false?

False. Not a shred of evidence has been produced to support such allegations as the one above, charges consistently used to create a smoke screen behind which the social objectives of the Cuban revolution can be attacked and sabotaged. Cuba's recent trade pact with the Soviet Union represents an effort to find new markets for Cuban sugar, and to obtain, not arms, but agricultural implements and industrial machinery for which credit has been denied in the United States. Many other American republics trade with the Soviets—as does the United States itself. Cuba's Communist Party is a tiny minority, with about 16,000 members. In the 1959 labor election, Communist candidates won in only 8 of the 243 locals of the 500,000-member Sugar Workers Federation, and none was elected to the executive council of the national labor organization, the C.T.C. In international affairs, Cuba finds its natural affinity with the other small, underdeveloped nations of the world. It is true that a profound social and economic revolution is in progress in Cuba, and that the sweeping reforms that are being inaugurated undoubtedly must affect the $1 billion U.S. investment in the island. But only those who equate communism with all forces that threaten the staus quo of property interests will find the Cuban revolution "communistic." Efforts to drive a wedge between the Roman Catholic Church and the revolutionary government, on the issue of communism, have been forcefully repulsed by the church itself. To quote the latest of several recent declarations on the subject, Msgr. Manuel Rodriguez Rozas, bishop of Pinar del Rio, says: "There is perfect harmony between the church and the state." "Our revolution," says Fidel Castro, is not communistic but humanistic."

Confiscation: "In Cuba, Castro is stealing American property with impunity."—U.S. News & World Report.

False. Although the word "confiscation" has often been used by the press in a context which would suggest illegal seizure, nothing has been stolen from any American—or any Cuban. The Agrarian Reform Law, designed to diversify Cuban agriculture and to give 100,000 landless peasants a stake in their own rich agricultural country, conforms in all respects with international law and the practice of all civilized countries. In some cases, it has been necessary to put property under the supervision of Government representatives (a process known as intervention), pending a decision as to formal, legal expropriation. Owners whose property is to be expropriated (much as it would be acquired by condemnation in the United States, to meet any legitimate public need) have been promised compensation in 20-year Government bonds, bearing interest at the rate of 4½ percent. This compares favorably with, for example, the U.S. land reform program imposed on Japan by General MacArthur after World War II, providing for compensation in 24-year bonds, at 3½ percent. The Cuban bonds have been printed and await only the proper signatures.

Chaos: "All that now remains is for Castro to give the word, and the terror, the ruthless hunting down and shooting of Fidel's opponents, will begin."—Newsweek.

False. Despite the above prediction, November 3, 1959, and the incessant references to "terror," "chaos," and "dictatorship" in the U.S. press, the great work of revolutionary reform and reconstruction now in progress in Cuba is going forward in an atmosphere of extraordinary optimism and energy, as any tourist can testify. The island is being governed by a provisional government under the Constitution of 1940, which is notable in the Hemisphere for its liberality. Cubans—and visitors to the island—remain freer in many respects than do U.S. citizens. For example, no police permit is required for a public meeting or demonstration, as in New York City. There is no censorship, not even a libel law. A foreign newsman needs no special visa, as he would in the United States (a tourist card will do), and no restriction is placed on his movements. Even the air raids on Havana—the occasions of real terror, and in one instance of the death of two Cubans and the wounding of 45—have failed to force the Government to take any but the most obviously urgent security measures. Despite an attempted invasion from Santo Domingo, a widespread counterrevolutionary conspiracy, and numerous small acts of sabotage and terrorism on the part of former Batista henchmen, the Government has refrained from invoking the death sentence against convicted counterrevolutionaries. Newsweek notwithstanding, not one of these has been shot.

"What have we done * * * ?" asks a new and hopeful generation of Cubans, viewed with hostility in Washington and Wall Street, accused of "impudence" for seeking their independence, threatened with economic and diplomatic "isolation" in the hemisphere.

Perhaps their crime is their youth. (The average age of the Cuban revolutionary leaders is 29.) Perhaps they have aspired toward too much, too soon. (Three thousand low-cost housing units built in the first year of revolution, more than 7,000 classrooms, hundreds of miles of new roads, 500 flourishing agricultural cooperatives, thousands of jobs created in new industries established through the voluntary contributions of a million Cuban workers.) Perhaps the explanation is simply that there are, in the United States, powerful interests bent on frustrating the primary purpose of the revolution: to give Cuba back to the Cubans.

It is true that the young leaders of the Cuban revolution have little patience with considerations of profit and loss, in the face of poverty and human need. Nor have they any saving experience with the amenities of public relations, or the intrigues of dollar diplomacy, or the sophistry of journalistic "facts" which distort truth. But if so, they are in the American tradition. Certainly they deserve a hearing. This much the American tradition owes them. This much we, as Americans, owe them.

Would you like to know more of the truth about revolutionary Cuba as it is today?

This public appeal for fair play for Cuba has the support of a group of thinking individuals, holding a variety of political persuasions, representing no one but themselves, linked here by a single common concern—for the overriding principle of justice which is always at issue, wherever partisan interest clashes with simple truth. Among the sponsors of this advertisement are the following:

James Baldwin, Simone de Beauvoir, Frank London Brown, Truman Capote, John Henrik Clarke, Prof. Robert G. Colodny, Richard Gibson, Dr. Maurice Green, Edmonde Haddad, Rev. Donald Harrington, John Killens, Sidney Lens, Norman Mailer, Julian Mayfield, Elva dePue Matthews, Prof. Eugene Noble, Rev. John Papandrew, James Purdy, Joseph Quintana, Alan Sagner, Jean Paul Sartre, John Singleton, Robert Taber, G. A. Thurston, Kenneth Tynan, Dan Wakefield, Sidney Weinstein, Robert F. Williams.

Waldo Frank, chairman; Carleton Belas, cochairman; Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Address your inquiries to: The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Box T249 New York Times, 229 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in America have the right to form our own personal views on national policies, but I have never seen a publication which so blatantly attacks most of the ideals and beliefs of the American people in a special column entitled, "Of What I Am Ashamed." So that this obvious new effort to infiltrate the American intellectual community may be revealed, I request leave to insert the publisher's comments in this article at this point in my remarks:

OF WHAT I AM ASHAMED

Of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for urging that this country's propoganda machinery be given full Cabinet status.

Of the administration's hospitality extended to Generalissimo Franco's Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella.

Of the Axacan Memorial Award bestowed on Fernando Maria Castiella, Spanish Foreign Minister, by the Georgetown University.

Of President Eisenhower's tongue in cheek response to recent press queries on his opinion of lunchcounter segregation.

Of former President Harry S. Truman's defense of segregationist store practices in the South.

Of the State Department's refusal to permit Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, a critic of the administration's nonrecognition policy, to travel to the Chinese mainland.

Of the furor raised by CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, against the Reverend Henry Gooch for delivering a sermon at West Point advocating racial intermarriage.

Of the fines imposed by Judge Eugene Loe of Montgomery, Ala., on 13 white and 7 Negro defendants for their "crime" of having lunch together.

Of the racist hooligans in various communities in Florida and Georgia involved in what seems to be an organized compaign of physical assaults on Negroes demonstrating for equal rights.

Of the appointment of a former FBI investigator of James R. Hoffa to the three-man board of monitors of the Teamsters Union.

Of the Federal Power Commission's Chairman Jerome Kuykendall for secret contacts with a representative of a gas company, resulting in changes in decisions regarding the company's (Midwestern Gas Transmission Co.) permission to pipe gas from Canada.

Of the soap-opera-family-situation comedy provided by two families, including wives, children, etc., etc., in the Wisconsin primary: the Kennedys and the Humphreys.

Of Florida-based airplanes raiding Cuban territory as positively proved by one such plane being shot down by Castro's forces.

Of the University of Illinois for suspending Dr. Leo F. Koch, assistant professor of biological sciences, for advocating an unacceptable theory on sexual behavior.

Of Frank Sinatra's yielding to pressure in firing Albert Maltz as the screen playwright for the film "The Execution of Pvt. Slovik," because the latter went to jail in 1947 when he refused to answer questions before a congressional committee on alleged Communist leanings.

Of the House Ways and Means Committee, the American Medical Association, and President Eisenhower for defeating Representative AIME J. FORAND'S bill to provide medical and hospital care for persons over 65 drawing social security benefits.

Of the New Hampshire Supreme Court's rejection of an appeal by Dr. Willard Uphaus, 69, former Methodist minister and Christian pacifist, jailed since December 14 for refusing to turn over the guest list of a Pacifist meeting of the World Fellowship in 1954 to the State's attorney general.

A Critical Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been reading of the walkout by airline pilots protesting a regulation ordered by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The dispute has highlighted a longstanding feud between the pilots and the Administrator over procedures of insuring airline safety. Aside from the question of who is right, we see in this dispute that there is a question of airline efficiency and more important one of public safety. Under permission previously granted, I include an article from this morning's New York Times which clearly presents the issues and furnishes a sharp picture of exactly how serious the situation has become. In closing I would like to quote the closing paragraph:

As long as the feuds continue the campaign for maximum airline safety will be sadly handicapped.

The article:

PILOTS-QUESADA FUED—THOUGH STRIKE IS APPARENTLY ENDED, UNDERLYING ISSUES ARE UNRESOLVED

(By Richard Witkin)

The wildcat strike that has disrupted operations of Eastern Air Lines and Pan American World Airways apparently is over.

If so, the Federal Aviation Agency will have won at least a temporary victory in its quarrel with the pilots over cockpit seating for FAA inspectors checking jet crews' performance.

In the industry there is general relief that the walkout has ended and, with it the immediate threat of its spread to other airlines.

But the industry is not very happy about anything else.

The issues underlying the strike—which go far beyond the problem of who sits where—remain.

And as long as they do, qualified observers feel, they will eat away at crew morale, and—what is more important—the efficiency and safety of operations will not be all they could be.

THE PROFESSED REASON

The professed reason for the walkout was an FAA ruling that the third pilot on four-man jet crews give up his front seat to FAA inspectors riding along to check crew proficiency, and move to the rear of the cockpit.

This switch from normal procedures, the pilots contend, is a safety hazard. (On some lines, by union-management contract, the flight engineer doubles as the third pilot, so the inspector can sit where he wants without altering procedures.)

But this squabble is but a small part of the story. Ever since Elwood R. Quesada became the first head of the FAA 18 months ago, he and the pilots have been engaged in a running feud.

Mr. Quesada tightened rules on crew performance and passed out stiff penalties for violations. Pilots complained of gestapo-like harassment.

Then, this spring, Mr. Quesada put through a rule making it mandatory for pilots to retire at age 60. The pilots, furious, are still fighting the ruling in the courts. Finally came the rule on cockpit seating for FAA inspectors.

There is little doubt that many pilots genuinely believe safety to be at stake in the cockpit issue.

A majority of neutral observers apparently do not agree. Nor do they agree with Quesada that the inspector can discharge his duties properly only from the disputed seat.

In any case, many doubt whether the pilots would have taken the extreme step of walking out—in defiance of court injunctions and the public stand of the union leadership—had the difference with Mr. Quesada been an isolated case rather than an added irritation in a long-standing feud.

This hit pilots in a particularly sensitive area because it seemed to some that Mr. Quesada was trying to show that the extra pilot was an unnecessary appendage. It took the pilots a long time to win their battle for the principle of having three qualified pilots in jet crews.

Nevertheless, few impartial observers feel the pilots chose a particularly good issue to walk out on, whether safety or the larger feud was the main motivating factor.

Pilot spokesmen point to the long tradition whereby the captain has the ultimate say on whether flight conditions are safe.

Others argue that the tradition should not extend to a mass refusal to fly, especially in the face of court injunctions.

On the overall feud, highly placed observers believe there has been too much chinjutting on both sides, and too little willingness to compromise.

They applaud Mr. Quesada, for the most part, for bringing a much-needed tightening up to aviation. But they think he could have been more diplomatic on some issues, particularly on the age-60 retirement.

In addition to feuding with Mr. Quesada, the pilots are engaged in a jurisdictional dispute with the flight engineers. This too has marred cockpit efficiency and is deplored throughout the industry.

As long as the feuds continue the campaign for maximum airline safety will be sadly handicapped.

Pilots Have Different Viewpoint: Disagree With FAA Regulation on Seating of Extra Man in Cockpit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from my constituent, Mr. Curtis M. Olsen of Port Chester, N.Y., a qualified pilot and a capable public relations man, portrays a side of the story that should be widely told.

I have profound respect for Mr. E. R. Quesada who took over the direction of the newly formed Federal Aviation Agency less than 2 years ago and whose administrative ability has injected vitality and force into that Agency.

My purpose in inserting this letter in the RECORD is simply to present the pilots' viewpoint regarding the question of adequate observation from the cockpit by an FAA inspector. I think the viewpoint of the pilots, who are themselves responsible for safety in flight, merits consideration in the total scheme of things.

Mr. Olsen's letter follows:

JUNE 17, 1960.

The Honorable EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOOLEY: It is regrettable that the controversy of the recent ruling (unilateral) by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency has precipitated the situation between Eastern Airlines and its pilots, with a situation of growing seriousness coming into the other three airlines, PAA, TWA, and American. The ruling in reference is that of the seating arrangement on the flight deck of jet aircraft; wherein Mr. Quesada insists that an adequate observation cannot be achieved from a position 3 or 4 feet further back in the cockpit. His insistence that the FAA inspector (who may not even be a pilot) be in a position where he can question the captain during the

course of the flight, despite the obvious conclusion that it is inadvisable to distract any pilot in the course of an approach to landing, or during flights in heavily trafficked areas.

This situation is merely one of a series that have arisen since Mr. Quesada took over the direction of the newly formed FAA less than 2 years ago; the effort presupposed to be one of the continuance of the excellent cooperation that had existed between the airline pilots of this country and the predecessor organization, the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Certainly the intention of the Congress of the United States was obvious, that of an administrative agency that would best accomplish the most orderly growth and proper supervision of the airline industry.

To describe briefly, this present situation represents the denial by one agency of the Federal Government of the United States, what another has provided. Contracts committing both the airlines and the Airline Pilot Association members to certain stated limitations and procedures, are part of the broad area under the National Railway Labor Act and stipulate a minimum crew of three licensed pilots on the flight deck of any jet aircraft flown in air carrier service of this country. This minimum crew concept resulted from hearings held before a Presidential Board and like any contract were assumed a certain inviolability. But, the FAA Administrator avers and promulgates rulings under section 600 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 that set aside this minimum safe crew. The result of this ruling is to observe and evaluate the performance and proficiency of the captain as a member of a pilot team, while denying him the services of one member of the team. And the inspector of this team is responsible to no one aboard the aircraft, merely to the FAA. So we are faced with the problem of disregard of the safe crew team in evaluation of the team in the name of safety.

Certainly there is room for reasonable doubt of the efficacy of this ruling, yet an appeal to modify or suspend the rule must be made to the agency originally promulgating it.

That this situation represents the state of cooperation existent currently through the Administrator's rule by fiat under what he claims is an emergency does nothing to increase public confidence in the airline industry, and the use of press conferences by the Administrator instead of industry conferences to achieve the proper implementation of civil air rules bespeaks a certain lack of administrative ability by the Administrator. Despite the pleas for conferences between those persons affected mostly by air safety, the pilots of the air carriers; the Administrator inserted his rule into the civil air regulations part 40:22 and part 41:5, making it mandatory for the pilots of jet aircraft to violate their contract. And this in the name of safety.

Further comment of safety might be indicated by the lack of action by the Administrator of the FAA in the matter of disparities in parts 40 and 41 of the Civil Air Regulations; for the flight time limitations of a crew operating in international aviation exceed those of pilots in domestic operation when a crew of two pilots, plus a third licensed crew member is aboard. The limit for domestic is 8 hours of flight in a 24-hour period, while it is 12 in 24 for the like crew in international service. That this represents a safety item has not brought comment or action from the FAA. And further, when the pilots of PAA, through joint resolution advised the company that they considered this unsafe and not in accord with reality, they were enjoined by court order to live up to their contract. Now through another court order they are enjoined from living up to another portion of the same, legal, binding, and current contract.

Senator ENGLE, through bills S. 3563 and S. 3564 and Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, through House bills H.R. 12440 and H.R. 12441; both attempt the correction of the oversights of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain powers of review over the actions of the FAA. Isn't this part of our governmental philosophy, to design sufficient checks and balances to prevent unwarranted arrogation of authority to any one arm or agency? We, the pilots of Pan Am, as well as all pilots currently flying air service in this country need a return to the spirit of cooperation between them and the supervisory agency of the Government; but they can only get it from a change in attitude at the top of the FAA.

Please use your influence in this Mr. DOOLEY, before irreparable harm is done the air carrier industry in the name of safety, for the consensus of jet pilots flying is that there is demonstrable and vital need for the crew complement as is. The airline captain must certify that he has examined all factors bearing on the flight at hand and certifies them as safe. How can he do this with one vital crew member displaced by an inspector who should observe for proficiency, not harass the crew.

Sincerely,

CURTIS M. OLSEN, *Pan Am Pilot.*

James Megellas Discusses the Forand Bill and Other Welfare Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, James Megellas of Fond du Lac, on May 2, 1960, addressed the House of Delegates of the Medical Society of Wisconsin at the Hotel Schroeder in Milwaukee. Mr. Megellas, former acting postmaster of Fond du Lac, is presently serving in his second term as councilman of the city of Fond du Lac, Wis. He was recently elected president of the Fond du Lac Common Council.

As a paratrooper with the 82d Airborne Division in World War II, he is one of Wisconsin's and the Nation's most highly decorated soldiers. He bears the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, the French Croix de Guerre, the Belgium Fouragere and the Presidential Citation with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Mr. Megellas is active in the civic life of Fond du Lac. He is the treasurer of the Fond du Lac Class D Baseball Club, and has been active in Red Cross, Community Chest, and YMCA drives.

I commend Mr. Megellas' remarks to Members on both sides of the aisle:

REMARKS OF MR. MEGELLAS

Members of the House of Delegates of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin and guests, I am very grateful for this opportunity to be here this evening to present the Democrat's Party's viewpoint on health and welfare. The invitation was extended to the chairman of the State Democratic Party, Mr. Lucey, and I have the very happy opportunity this evening to represent the Democratic Party.

Of course you might well realize that the position I express to this group here this evening might not be the most popular one, at least from what I have been able to read in recent accounts. Therefore, I feel somewhat like the fellow who was about to be tarred and feathered and run out of town on a rail.

They asked him if he had anything to say, and he replied, "If it wasn't for the honor of all this, I'd just as soon walk." [Laughter.]

I must confess, however, that that story does not apply to me. I am, indeed, most happy to have this opportunity to discuss the Democratic viewpoint, because today particularly controversy is raging around the type of health insurance we should have for our aged.

I think the Democratic Party is as devoted to the interest of people as are other people, and other medical societies, and, therefore, I am happy to present their viewpoint.

The subject I was supposed to speak on expressly tonight was the Democratic Party's position on health and welfare as adopted in the 1956 platform. Of course much of that is outmoded and outdated, but in due respect to the title of the assignment I am going to cover that briefly this evening, so we might have a little better understanding of what the Democratic Party's feeling is on this for all of our citizens.

Under the general welfare, the Democratic Party in its 1956 platform adopted in August 1956 states that the Democratic Party believes "that America can and must adopt measures to assure every citizen an opportunity for a full, healthy, and happy life. To this end we pledge ourselves to the expansion and improvement of the great social welfare program inaugurated under Democratic administration."

Under social security, as you know, the Democratic Party has been the champion of social security, inaugurated 25 years ago, and we will be observing the 25th anniversary of social security in this Nation this year.

We believe that social security coverage should be broadened to take in more people. The benefits should be greater. We believe that the benefits now enjoyed by our elder citizens are not sufficient to provide for a full life in the twilight years of their life.

Specifically, we say, "We shall continue our efforts to broaden and strengthen this program by increasing benefits to keep pace with improving standards of living; by raising the wage base upon which benefits depend, and by increasing benefits for each year of covered employment."

We feel the same way about unemployment insurance: "We shall continue to work for a stronger unemployment insurance system, with broader coverage and increased benefits consistent with rising earnings."

We take the same position about public assistance. We state: "The Democrats shall pledge themselves to increased aid for the aged, the blind, dependent children, the disabled, and other needy persons who are not adequately protected by our contributory insurance programs."

Under the provision for health and medical care we state in our platform only that "We pledge ourselves to initiate programs of Federal financial aid without Federal control for medical education. We pledge continuing and increased support for hospital construction programs as well as increased Federal aid to public health services, particularly in rural areas."

In the field of housing, "We feel that every American is entitled to a decent home and a suitable living environment."

These are not only words on the part of the Democratic Party, but we have translated these words into action. Last April you may have read in your local newspaper that the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives passed a housing bill which

proposes to spend $1 billion to finance FHA and GI loans for homes under $13,800. This bill passed the House and has now gone to the Senate.

The Wisconsin congressional delegation was split evenly, five Democrats favoring the bill and five Republicans opposing the bill. Of course, I need not tell you that the position of the Democratic Party on matters of housing and Federal aid for housing has not met with favor from the administration, and it is anticipated that if this does pass the Senate the administration will veto it. However, this is the position of the Democratic Party in the field of housing:

"We pledge that housing insurance and the mortgage guarantee programs will be redirected in the interests of the homeowner, and that the availability of low-interest housing credit will be kept consistent with the expanding housing needs of the Nation."

In the field of education, our party has a five-point program. I might say from my own personal viewpoint on education that this is perhaps next to medical care for our aged, the most important bit of legislation before the Congress. I think this is one of the most urgent needs that the Nation is faced with today, particularly in light of the recent scientific and technological advancements made by the Russians and the very threat to our security that they impose.

We need to offer more educational opportunities for children in this Nation. The greatest natural resource we have in this Nation is the imagination and mentality of our youth; and, unlike other resources that may lie dormant until used, not so with the brainpower of this Nation, because if we do not use this imagination and mentality and brainpower of our youth when it is available it will be lost for all time. This is a loss that this Nation cannot afford.

It doesn't make any difference to me, frankly, whether the boy or girl who finds a cure for cancer is colored or white, whether he lives in Arkansas or California or New York or Wisconsin, or whether the boy or girl who is going to advance our scientific program that will keep up abreast of the Russians lives anywhere else in this Nation.

It is our responsibility here in Milwaukee and in Wisconsin and in the Nation to provide adequate educational opportunities. This is an area in which the Government must act. I don't think we can sit back much longer. The need is there, and we must recognize it. If we don't, I believe history will prove us to be a second-rate power in time.

Our five-point program on education says this: "Providing Federal financing to assist States and local communities to build schools and to provide essential health and safety services for all schoolchildren. Better educational, health, and welfare opportunities for children of migratory workers. Assistance to programs for training teachers of exceptional children. Programs for providing for the training of teachers to meet the critical shortage in technical and scientific fields. Expansion of the program of student-teacher and cultural exchange with other nations."

These are some of the clauses in the Democratic Party's platform adopted in 1956, and I suppose it might be said by some that these are socialistic measures. Well, on that point I would very much disagree. I think every one of these proposals in the Democratic Party platform is an instrument of democracy.

Thomas Jefferson once said that government must do for people what they cannot do for themselves. This is the basis of government—to provide for opportunities and to take care of the needy, to heal the sick, and to eliminate illiteracy and all the other things that play on our masses. This is very essential.

Today there is a controversy raging in Congress over whether or not the Government should enter the field of health insurance for the aged. There is no reference made to this in the Democratic Party's platform because it was not an issue in 1956.

What will happen in the conventions of the two political parties, one in Los Angeles and the other in Chicago, I cannot speculate on at this time. There are many thoughts in this field. I was looking today for a program that was supposed to be delivered by the administration, providing care for the aged. Apparently that was not brought forth, but some program will be forthcoming.

As I view this situation, there are three schools of thought today in this Nation—three political schools of thought, but only two political parties. We have the conservatives, who generally follow a status quo proposition and don't advocate any change, and who like things as they are. There are the liberals, who advocate change and who will support new measures. There are the moderates, who come in between somewhere. You know, as a matter of fact, the moderates have been in control of the stage for some time now; while the liberals have advocated many proposals, they have not been successful.

While the conservatives oppose them in trying to keep the status quo, they have not been successful, and this is what we see today in this field of health legislation for the aged. We see the liberals advancing a program calling for compulsory health insurance financed through the social security system; the conservatives opposed to any change, to any Government participation in the program; and many moderates in both political parties advocating something in between.

When I was invited to speak here, I pondered what approach I might take. As I said, our party platform has not been drawn up, and I thought that for the sake of presenting the extreme position I would take the liberal viewpoint. I know it might not be the most popular here this evening, but I think if you are going to arrive at any understanding of the problem you must understand, first of all, the position of the liberals and why they have this intense feeling of sponsoring compulsory health insurance under the social security plan.

If I were to speak on either side of this question tonight, I feel I could speak with the same intensity and fervor because there is much to be said on both sides. The three D's of democracy are deliberation, discussion or debate, and decision. And unless you have an intelligent discussion and debate you can't arrive at a proper decision.

In this field particularly, wherever one recognizes the need for medical care for the aged that faces the Nation there is a great need for discussion and deliberation and debate. For that purpose, therefore, I am going to express the liberal viewpoint.

Only recently the official publication of the Democratic Party, the Democratic Digest, in its January edition made a statement that I want to quote in part since I am expressing the viewpoint of the Democratic Party:

"As a start in distributing medical care more widely, hospital and surgical care should be added to the benefits provided social security beneficiaries financed by an increase in payroll tax collections. Loans to local comprehensive health insurance cooperatives should also be authorized."

More recently, at the last meeting of the Administrative Committee of the Democrtic Party of the State of Wisconsin, which is the policymaking body, that body unanimously approved a resolution in favor of the Forand bill; so I think it is safe to say that the Democratic Party of the State of Wisconsin, at least on that basis, is supporting the Forand bill, and I will make my arguments on their behalf.

I don't think any discussion this year and this month about health and welfare would be to the point unless it were related in some part to the controversial Forand bill, which is today kicking up so much fuss in the Halls of Congress, in the various branches of your organization, and among the American people in all walks of life.

Almost all of our liberals are supporting it. I accompanied Senator KENNEDY and Senator HUMPHREY when they were campaigning in our State, and I heard Senator SYMINGTON speak, and they came out for a Forand-type bill. I am not going to elaborate on the provisions of the Forand bill. I am sure if any group is acquainted with the provisions of that bill it is the State Medical Society of Wisconsin.

Senator KENNEDY has introduced a measure of his own in the Senate. As you know, the Forand bill in the House was defeated in committee, although there is a movement now to bring it out of committee. Senator KENNEDY at the same time has introduced practically the same type of bill in the Senate. I think our position on this can be summed up in one word. We recognize there is a problem here, and we are concerned in solving it.

Modern medical science has brought about a miracle in extending the life expectancy of the individual. I want to congratulate each and every one of you here this evening because you have contributed materially to this accomplishment.

Today we can expect to live an average of 71 years. Sixty years ago the life expectancy was 48 years. Between 1850 and 1900 it had increased only 10 years. In 1850 a man could expect to live only 38 years. In 1960 the even larger miracle is that, having attained 65 years of age, the individual has a life expectancy of 14 additional years. As a result it has been estimated that there are 35 million more Americans alive today than there would be if no medical progress had been made since 1900.

Approximately 16 million Americans are 60 years of age or older, and the statistics that are available make it amply clear that their numbers will increase rapidly in the next decade.

I don't believe I have to point out the need, because I think it is generally accepted. The administration recognizes the need as do both political parties, but I do want to touch on it briefly to bring it more into focus.

Many older Americans are in real need today. They average $75 a month which they draw from social security. This hardly provides for food and shelter, much less for medical expenses which increase with age. Few are in a position to meet the cost of chronic illness, from which many suffer, yet even to get charity care itself, inadequate in quantity and often inferior in quality, they must suffer the indignity of a pauper's oath.

The April 16 edition of Business Week, on the subject of health insurance for the aged, points out that the average older couple spends $140 a month on health costs unrelated to hospitalization. One out of every six persons 65 years and older, said Senator JAVITS, pays over $500 in medical bills annually. Sixty percent of the old people have annual incomes under $1,000 and cannot afford home or office care that might cut down the length of hospitalization or eliminate it completely.

This is the shocking revelation, that over 9 million people have an annual income from all sources of less than $966 a year in the twilight of their career when the need for medical care is the greatest.

It is plain to see that among these people even a modest doctor bill, hospital bill or surgical bill amounts to a major financial catastrophe. This, then, is the problem.

The question is, How can it best be solved?

Insurance companies have taken steps to cover a larger portion of our older citizens in their health care plans. These efforts are indeed praiseworthy, but it is clear that the greater health care and the lower income of aged people does not make them good insurable risks for private carriers. Either the private insurance companies must raise their premiums to a prohibitive level or impose such restrictions on benefits that the value of the coverage and the benefit is too small in comparison to the needs of the aged.

A working man in his productive years can take advantage of group plans, but when he retires his income is down so low and generally his right to group coverage is often lost, so this does not generally apply to the aged. Only two out of five over 65 years of age have any protection at all, and in most cases it is very inadequate. The policy can often be canceled, and is very expensive.

It is said that the Forand bill would hurt the insurance companies and would hurt welfare agencies and others; but that is not true. As a matter of fact, the Forand bill would strengthen the welfare agencies because it would relieve them of the high cost load of the aged. Many hospitals, as you know from your own experience, have large and growing deficits.

Medical care can best be provided for under social security. During a man's productive years, when he can pay in small amounts the cost the Forand bill proposes, under social security, one-quarter of 1 perment matched by the employer, three-eights of 1 percent by the self-employed not to exceed $25 a year, isn't very much in amount; but when a man pays it during his productive years he is insured for his old age. If this bill went into force it would cover all people over 65 now under social security.

Dr. Basil C. McLean, who recently retired as president of the National Blue Cross Association, had this to say recently about the proposals for something like the Forand bill:

"A lifetime of experience has led me at last to conclude that the cost of care of the aged cannot be met by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these because of the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged."

I know that the doctors in this Nation are concerned about this type of legislation because they have said that this would be socialistic—that the patient would not have the opportunity of choice. Well, the Forand bill provides freedom of choice for hospitalization, and freedom of choice for surgical care. There is no denial of choice. It is there. It is a real choice. It is a choice that can be made and you know it will be paid for.

There is no use having freedom of choice of an automobile if you can't afford to buy one. There is no freedom of choice in having an opportunity to buy a house if you can't afford a tent. There is no freedom of choice of a hospital or doctor if you can't afford to pay for it except by swallowing your pride and going on the public relief rolls. This seems to me to be the denial of the real choice of freedom.

The well-known and conservative Washington Post supports the Forand bill approach in an editorial of February 20, 1960, which says in part:

"That the American Medical Association would offer its usual doctrinaire opposition to this proposal was as much to be expected as a bill from the doctor after a visit to his office. Senator MCNAMARA has observed that the AMA has nothing to offer but tired abuse. This is not by the wildest flight and the most neurotic fancy socialized medicine or political medicine. It is simply a system.

"If the AMA could but calm its nerves enough to realize it, this, like Blue Cross or group hospitalization or any other insurance program, would enable a patient to go to the doctor and the hospital of his choice and pay the bill, resulting from the care he needs in old age. It would enable American men and women to retire in their old age with more security and self-respect."

I know that this evening I am addressing a group of dedicated and devoted public servants. I know in my own community of Fond du Lac our doctors are very highly regarded, and we have a wonderful group of doctors. I don't think in any profession you can find a more dedicated and a higher level of person than you find in the medical profession. Over the ages the family doctor and the country doctor have been looked upon as the bulwark of the community, as a pillar of all that is good, and people have rallied around them in the community. This is true today.

However, I don't have the same feeling about the AMA. For years the ruling clique of the AMA and its powerful lobby in Washington have been using the time-worn tag of state socialism or socialized medicine in all legislation which they oppose. A generation ago the AMA opposed reporting tuberculosis cases to a public authority, which as you know has since become the basis of all tuberculosis control.

The AMA also opposed the National Tuberculosis Act, which Congress passed unanimously. Since then this organization has fought against compulsory vaccination for smallpox; immunization against diphtheria and other preventive measures by public health agencies; Federal aid to reduce infant and maternal deaths. It stubbornly resisted the Social Security Act. To this date it continues to oppose inclusion of physicians and surgeons under its coverage, and I quote from an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that says, "Poll after poll has indicated that the members of the American Medical Association would prefer to come under social security." But yet this apparent will, as I understand it, has been opposed by the AMA.

The list of progressive legislation which was unsuccessfully resisted by the AMA seems endless. It includes public venereal disease clinics; free diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer; the Red Cross blood banks; Federal aid to medical education; voluntary health insurance; Blue Cross; school health services, and Federal aid to public health.

The small clique controlling the AMA has opposed all the forward steps that the American people have taken through the Congress. As a layman it appears to me that this is quite an impressive array of bills that have been passed by the Congress in the public interest, and that all today are accepted by laymen, again, as I say, as instruments of democracy. They have proven themselves to be beneficial to the general welfare and the health particularly, of the people of this Nation.

I ask you doctors here this evening not to hang the scalp of compulsory health insurance, financed through social security payments, on your belt with these other proposals.

Some of you may dismiss all that I say here tonight as so much campaign oratory. You may feel that the Democrats are just out trying to bargain for votes. But I ask you to think of the older people you know. Look at this as a human problem. Look at it from the standpoint of thousands of individuals each trying somehow to get along. As doctors this is the way you look at your patients. As doctors interested in an explosive political problem you should look at the problem in the same way, through the eyes of individuals.

Would a State subsidy to private insurance companies help the people who need help the most? Should older people be forced to take a pauper's oath before they can receive medical care? Would the Forand bill be any different from Blue Shield where the Government pays the bill you send, just as Blue Shield does now?

If we answer these questions honestly, I am convinced that the only conclusion we can reach here this evening is that something like the Forand bill is the answer to this enormous problem.

Private insurance just can't handle this problem, and it is unfair to the rest of us to assume the cost of exceptionally high risk cases.

Likewise, there is something degrading about forcing people who have worked hard in their lifetime to take a means test in the twilight of their years just so they can qualify for medical care.

Finally, as doctors who are interested in having your bills paid, what better way than to expand the system used under Blue Shield, where you set the fees, where the patient picks his own doctor, and where the American system of free choice is preserved, as is true under the Forand bill?

There is a passage from the Holy Scriptures which has been used in the Forand bill campaign, which I think is wholly fitting and proper to conclude my remarks this evening.

"Cast me not off in the time of old age. Forsake me not when my strength faileth."

Thank you again for inviting me to participate in this discussion this evening. I hope that as a result of this gathering we will come up with a solution to the problem of medical care, which we are all so earnestly and deeply interested in and concerned about, which will prove beneficial for our older citizens and which will fulfill the solemnest hope of the American dream.

Commissioner John F. Floberg of the Atomic Energy Commission Has Proved To Be an Excellent Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with considerable regret, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the House to the resignation of AEC Commissioner John F. Floberg, which becomes effective today.

Jack Floberg has done an outstanding job as an AEC Commissioner for the past 3 years. He has demonstrated enthusiasm, competence, hard work, and good judgment, and has discharged his heavy responsibilities very capably.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to say that we regret to see Jack Floberg leave the Commission, and I am sure that I am joined in this sentiment by all my colleagues on the Joint Committee. He has served his country well, both as an AEC Commissioner and during an early period as an Assistant Secretary of the

Navy for Air, and he now plans to accept an important position with private industry. I am sure that my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and in the Congress, join me in saying "well done" to Jack Floberg, and in wishing him good luck in his new endeavors.

Fair Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial appearing in the Washington Post on June 22 concerning the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the investigative authority of the Civil Rights Commission is timely and important. I ask unanimous consent to include that editorial in the RECORD:

FAIR INQUIRY

The Civil Rights Commission was created in order to obtain for Congress some information vital to its legislative duties—whether "certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin." To help it in its task, the Commission was empowered to receive sworn allegations and to summon witnesses before it and question them under oath. Congress could have chosen to obtain this information through a committee of its own Members; it chose instead to obtain it through a Commission made up of distinguished citizens operating under the executive branch of the Government.

The Commission was not intended in any sense to be a court. It was not empowered to adjudicate controversies or try individuals. It pronounces no one guilty of any crime and imposes no penalties. It simply functions in lieu of a congressional committee. As Chief Justice Warren observed, "The only purpose of its existence is to find facts which may subsequently be used as the basis for legislative or Executive action." This being so, the Supreme Court was thoroughly justified, we think, in its conclusion that fairness does not require the Commission to adhere to the strict procedures of a court.

It is true that the Commission summons and questions voting registrars who allegedly have denied voting rights conferred by the U.S. Constitution. It questions them, therefore, about conduct which is criminal—and for which, it may be, they will subsequently be prosecuted. But the Commission itself is not interested in prosecuting them. If prosecution should be instituted against them, it will take place in a court where they will be accorded the full protections of due process—including the right of confrontation and cross-examination. The Chief Justice made the distinction clear:

Due process is an elusive concept. Its exact boundaries are undefinable, and its content varies according to specific factual contexts. Thus, when governmental agencies adjudicate or make binding determinations which directly affect the legal rights of individuals, it is imperative that those agencies use the procedures which have traditionally been associated with the judicial process. On the other hand, when governmental action does not partake of an adjudication, as for example, when a general fact-finding investigation is being conducted, it is not necessary that the full panoply of judicial procedures be used.

The Commission's function is decisively different from that of a security board as well as from that of a court. A security board passes judgment on a Federal employee's character and fitness for public trust; and its judgment may cruelly stigmatize the employee and cost him his job. In its decision of Monday regarding the Civil Rights Commission, the Supreme Court gave fresh indication that it considers confrontation indispensable to fair procedure in a security hearing.

But the Civil Rights Commission makes no such judgment and inflicts no such punishment. Its quest for the facts desired by Congress would be completely thwarted if it tried to conduct a trial or were required to pursue trial procedure. The Court's decision of Monday fortunately frees the Commission to carry forward its immensely important investigative function.

Walter S. Hallanan of West Virginia Nominated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks:

REMARKS OF ROBERT H. C. KAY, FORMER STATE CHAIRMAN, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JUNE 4, 1960, PLACING IN NOMINATION WALTER S. HALLANAN AS REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, there are some, Mr. Chairman, who look upon politics as something evil, but politics is nothing more or less than the science of governing ourselves. Politics is conducted through political parties. It is through political parties that this republic is maintained and sustained. As Elihu Root once said:

"Politics is the practical exercise of the art of self-government, and somebody must attend to it if we are to have self-government; somebody must study it, and learn the art, and exercise patience and sympathy and skill to bring the multitude of opinions and wishes of self-governing people into such order that some prevailing opinion may be expressed and peaceably accepted. Otherwise, confusion will result either in dictatorship or anarchy. The principal ground of reproach against any American citizen should be that he is not a politician. Everyone ought to be, as Lincoln was."

We are met on the eve of an important political campaign. A political party is something more than a static paper organization. It is something more than a constitution or officers or committee. It is something more than a tradition which one generation passes to the next for the sake of precedents. A political party is a body of men and women who have a common conviction and who strive to translate that conviction into the common life of our times. Its vitality is determined by the vitality of the men and women who work in party organization. It takes three elements to make a political party, indeed to justify its existence. The first is the ideal of government. The second is the candidate or candidates who espouse that ideal and who can be trusted to apply it. The third is made up of that great army of men and women whose business it is to get the candidates elected. Neither the issue nor the candidates can prevail without that army of workers. They form the rock upon which a political party must build its house. If that foundation rock is strong, the winds of adversity may blow against it, the frost of failure may attempt to weaken it, but it will survive and stand according to the strength and stability of that foundation.

It is from the heart of that army of political workers that I present for your consideration the man I wish to nominate as Republican national committeeman for West Virginia. High though his titles, proud his name, he is still one of us. He understands our problems. By the testament of his example we receive inspiration, hope, confidence and determination. In sunshine and storm he can be counted upon to be steadfast and stable. Neither adversity, discouragement nor criticism ever swayed him from his determined course. It is true that the snipers always shoot the man who carries the flag in battle; this is no less true in political campaigns. One who inspires others to action will always receive criticism from his adversaries. His adversaries in their confusion have neither the strength of the arm nor point to the arrow to pierce his faith, his courage or his ability. These qualities he possesses in measure of abundance found in but few men.

It is indeed fortunate that we in West Virginia, and in the Republican Party, have had a person so gifted, so inspired, so tested and so tried to assume again the continuation of the brilliance of his leadership. We who are the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," have always found him faithful to the trust, ever eager to be of help and assistance. He has kept and defended the faith in dark hours when others of faint heart could see no hope. He is the kind of national committeeman that every precinct worker, every party organization person, and every plain rank and file party member wants in this position of trust and leadership. His peers are few. Renowned above all others of the party's faithful, he is, indeed, its champion.

His years of experience on the Republican National Committee give West Virginia prestige a small state would not otherwise have. His recognition as an outstanding national leader likewise reflects credit upon this State. Small though may be her size and few her numbers compared with other States of the Union, her position on the National Committee ranks second to none. He made it thus. His sound advice and wise counsel on national matters are eagerly sought and diligently followed by national leaders. They know that in his knowledge and wisdom there is strength.

He has brought great credit to West Virginia. No other political party in the history of this State has ever honored a West Virginian as Chairman of its National Convention. Through him this honor came to West Virginia in 1952. While his selection as Chairman of the Convention brought distinction to his State, his impartial discharge of responsibility in the stress of those hectic days, made integrity and West Virginia synonymous. The people of the Nation said with one voice that West Virginia produced, in Walter Hallanan, a man. The name of the State and his name were inseparably linked, and the credit and glory of one reflected upon the other.

Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio, when he was then Governor, made the remark about a great American when he said, "As long as Ohio has men of Bob Taft's stature, she will send them to the U.S. Senate where they will be not only of benefit to the Nation, but also a credit to the State." So long as the Republican Party in West Virginia

has a man of Walter Hallanan's stature, ability, courage and faith in the Party's principles, he should be our National Committeeman. He has given generously of his time and his talents, his head and his heart, his energies and his pocketbook. He is known throughout the State by everybody as "Mr. Republican."

I, therefore, move that the Republican State Executive Committee now select and nominate to the Republican National Convention to be held in Chicago, Walter S. Hallanan of Charleston, W. Va., as Republican National committeeman for West Virginia.

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the late 1930's it was recognized that the nonuniformity of traffic control devices throughout the country posed dangers to life and property for the country's increasingly mobile population. By December 20, 1944, Federal legislation was passed implementing uniformity as recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads and a joint committee composed of representatives of the American Association of State Highway Officials, the Institute of Traffic Engineers, and the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws. The joint committee now also includes representatives of the American Municipal Association and the National Association of County Officials.

A manual on "Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways" was issued for nationwide guidance by the Bureau of Public Roads. The last edition was published in 1948 and amended in 1954.

A general revision of the basic manual, approved by the organization represented on the joint committee and by the Bureau of Public Roads, the American Standards Association, and other national organizations, will soon be issued. It will be an up-to-date guide covering modern standards for signs, signals, and pavement marking for all classes of roads and streets. Included for the first time will be standards for modern expressways, including the Interstate System. Also included for the first time will be standard signs for safe traffic control during construction and maintenance operations.

It has been generally accepted that these uniform standards have been a big factor in traffic safety in this Nation. This is one of the important findings of the Bureau of Public Roads recent report to Congress on "The Federal Role in Highway Safety."

The longstanding and meticulous attention which has been paid to this matter of uniform standards is undoubtedly responsible for the avoidance of many thousands of fatal and nonfatal highway and road accidents.

In fact, today the principal cause of automobile accidents is recklessness, which includes violation of traffic laws and inattentiveness. In this connection, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, has pointed out the way in which effective Federal action should again be employed to eliminate today's major cause of highway and street accidents. His article on the subject, recommending a national clearinghouse for major traffic offenses, the equivalent of the FBI's criminal files, appeared in the RECORD on June 6 at page 11009.

Senator CASE has embodied his ideas in the bill S. 3635, now pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It deserves the support of all.

Problems Don't Change—Just the Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a speech which I recently gave before a combined meeting of the Kiwanis and Lions Clubs in San Jose, Calif.:

PROBLEMS DON'T CHANGE—JUST THE ANSWERS

When a modern-day politician looks backward it is considered almost sinful. Today I shall sin.

But by looking backward into American history and American heritage—even to the first inauguration of President Washington, we find meanings and answers which illuminate present-day times and problems.

Between 1789 and 1960 there are vast differences. We have come from the simplest of colonial societies to a complex civilization which leads the entire world.

But for all the differences that set 1789 apart from 1960 we can find many similarities in problems which confront us in either the colonial or atomic age.

For President Washington it was a time of beginning and despite all that has transpired, we too are concerned with beginnings in the nuclear and space age.

One of the first issues which faced Washington and his Congress was to etablish the public credit of the United States. Another was to liquidate the Nation's debt. The third was to provide for defense. A fourth was to establish a fair system of taxation. And a fifth was to work out a place for America in the family of nations.

In 1960 the setting is much different and so is the magnitude of problems but basically they are the same: How to preserve our credit, how to handle our public debt, how much of our resources to allocate to our national defense, what kind of tax structure will serve the needs of Government and our private enterprise system, and how best to win and hold the confidence of a troubled world in our own ideals and values. Listen for a moment to a portion of Washington's farewell address:

"As a very important source of strength and security, cherish the public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible * * * avoiding the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

This advice, after nearly two centuries of change is still as sound as the day it was spoken. Even today we know that if our society ignores economic realities we will fall like all nations and empires whose political and moral decay pushed them into economic bankruptcy.

A sound economy will not guarantee a great nation, but there can be no hope for greatness without it.

In this day of titanic government I raise the question, "Have we rejected the advice which Washington so profoundly gave us and come up with different answers to the same problems?"

No one would suggest that we return to the first Federal budget which Alexander Hamilton presented to the Congress in 1791 calling for appropriations of $740,232.14⅔. But there is something striking in the fact that the total expenses of the Federal Government in its first 150 years amounted to $157 billion—and we now spend more than that in two years of operation.

As a nation we followed Washington's advice for nearly 150 years through war and peace, boom and recession, and over the generations we gained in national vigor and stature. But in the space of the last 30 years our budgets have increased by 25 times and the consequences are reflected in the public debt and our future commitments.

This brings me to my theme. Problems haven't changed—just the answers.

Instead of following the advice of Washington to use the public credit sparingly and avoid accumulation of debt by shunning occasions of expense, we have blindly pushed forth laboring under two of the most unkind delusions which have ever captured the mind of man.

First, we have become fascinated with the "crash" technique for solving our national problems. We have been persuaded that money will buy anything, that tremendous expenditures will guarantee prompt and definitive results. And, of course, the more we spend the faster we will solve anything. We have deluded ourselves into believing that for just a few more quick billions we can buy a faultless national defense, that for additional fast billions we can mass produce an ideal educational system, that billions of dollars are the whole answer to being first in outer space, that a few hurried billions are all that stand between us in victory over sickness, disease, and all the worries of living. Put all of these together and you see a state of mind that regards compulsive spending as the answer to 20th century problems.

Another great delusion is caused by a local and mistaken idea of the limitless resources of the Federal Government.

The story is told of a mid-western city which needed a bridge to cross the river separating this city from the countryside. The city refused to spend its funds on the ground that it gave the country people access to the city. The county refused to pay the bill on the ground that it gave city people access to the country. Finally the problem was solved in joint session of county and city officials—they would ask the Federal Government to foot the bill—This idea has become prevalent because people in a local community refuse to solve local problems locally and rely instead on the Government in Washington to do it for them—with some other fellow's money.

This thinking is undoubtedly a throwback to the depression of the thirties and the emergency pump priming of the WPA. But it is now engrained indelibly in mental attitudes. We seem to overlook completely the fact that when the Federal Government takes on the problems of local government it isn't "somebody else" who pays, but each one of us. It's our mortgage, our debt, our taxes,

and we will pay them each and every one of us.

We have forgotten that Government can't give us a cent that it doesn't first take away from us in taxes.

Laboring under these two great delusions, we have adopted a national state of mind which has led to our present Federal fiscal policy. We have justified the tremendous increase in public spending on ground of one emergency or another—fighting a depression, fighting a war, or reacting to changes in the temperature of the cold war. Now the slogan is "Keeping up with the Khrushchevs". Tomorrow it may be a different slogan, but they all rationalize the continued rise in government spending.

I wish that each of you could sit at my desk in Washington, D.C., and read the mail which comes to me from my constituency. By a count of 10 to 1 the letters asking for the Federal Government to spend more outnumber those asking that it spend less. The pressure is tremendous and it is only natural that men who are responsive to public opinion and elected by the public should sense this spirit—this changed national attitude—and vote accordingly. As a result, when we experience an economic down-spin we accelerate Government spending and borrowing to pull ourselves out. But when equilibrium is restored Congress seems, up to now at least, to lack the fortitude to cut back spending in order to pay off what has been borrowed to tide us through the emergency. If we continue along this line our national debt is bound to go in one direction—steadily upward. As it goes up inflation will always stalk us as it has 29 out of 67 free countries who have had price increases of 50 percent or more in the last 10 years.

Nikita Khrushchev has served notice that he will bury us economically. One thing is clear—to meet Mr. Khruahchev head on, we need to marshall our full strength and resources and employ them wisely and well. And so we must look to the fiscal problems of the future and decide once and for all if the advice of George Washington is out of date or is still good in the atomic age.

Where is the Federal budget headed in the next 10 years?

This is a statistical fact and not a prediction: If we continue the trend of the past 30 years for just 10 more years, we will be spending $160 billion per year by 1970. It seems fantastic, doesn't it? Yet it is not a bit more fantastic than the increases we have already experienced from $3 billion in 1930 to $9 billion in 1940, to $40 billion in 1950, to almost $80 billion in 1960.

In looking to our fiscal future there are three shocking facts that every American should be aware of—and ashamed of.

Fact No. 1: Future generations, your children and your grandchildren, now owe $750 billion in debt which you have bequeathed them.

We owe $290 billion, which is only the interest bearing national debt.

In addition we have promised veterans and their dependents some $300 billion in the years ahead. In fact, we have just finished paying veterans benefits for the Revolutionary War, are still paying them for the War of 1812 and have not yet hit the peak in our payments for World War I. On top of all this the unfunded Government liabilities for military and civil service retirement already amount to $60 billion if not another single man is retired from the military or civil service. This bring our total to $650 billion.

Add this to our c.o.d.'s—our commitments for highway improvements, for public housing, for public works, and for subsidies, add the unspent balances of appropriations in the defense program and you have a total of $98 billion in c.o.d.'s.

Add the public debt, $350 billion of future obligations, $98 billion in c.o.d.'s and you have the unbelievable total of obligations which future generations must pay of nearly $750 billion. This is the mortgage on America's future. I wonder what George Washington would be thinking in this year of 1960.

Fact No. 2: If this session of Congress doesn't add a single new program, the level of Federal spending is going to go up. This is due to "built-in increases" in existing programs which continue to push future expenditures upward. The catalog of built-in increases covers outer space, civil aviation, public works, merchant shipping, urban renewal, science education, medical research, public assistance, and veterans pensions. The farm program will become more costly unless we have the courage and the foresight to do away with the farm price support program.

For 1961 alone these built-in increases amount to over $2 billion and looking ahead to 1962 there are built-in increases of more than a billion. And unfortunately built-in increases are never accompanied by built-in decreases since Government programs, once started, develop their own immunity to curtailment. A year ago the President in his budget message specified 18 programs which should be revised in order to reduce expenditures. Only three of them were considered by Congress and the net result of that consideration was an increase of future expenditures by about $9 billion.

Fact No. 3: Pressures for new spending programs are increasing in intensity and represent by far the most dominant influence exerted against Congress. Each year there are new programs which, if considered without reference to the overall problems of the entire Nation, are worthwhile. To say no to these proposals places one in somewhat the same position as the father who denies the new dress that "sister just has to have." Certainly any normal father wants to buy that dress and wants his daughter to have it, but he realizes that the family budget just will not stand it.

Each of these things becomes a project of new and high priority. But as we are confronted with these priorities we have to face the fact that the budget is so saddled with yesterday's priorities that it has lost most of the flexibility needed to put aside the old and take up the new.

In response to pressures for new spending programs billions of dollars in new spending authorizations are introduced at each session of Congress and are backed by floods of mail from constituents who might benefit from the passage of such bills. In fact if the new programs currently pending in the House and Senate were to be enacted into law they would add between $50 and $60 billion a year to our present spending. And at the same time enough bills have been introduced which, if enacted, would reduce taxes by between $5 and $10 billion a year. This is what is called slippery arithmetic—vote against going into debt but spend more and tax less. The odd part of it is that the men who espouse such a philosophy are continuosly reelected.

Because of these proposals we hear that our budget is austere and reactionary; that we don't look forward and we don't have the confidence in the capacity of America to grow and support increased expenditures. Those of us who insist upon adopting a responsible fiscal policy are criticized and maligned as not caring; as having no human understanding and no heart.

Let me put some questions to you.

Is it wrong to believe in a balanced budget?

Is it wrong to think that the Federal government should live within its income, especially in times of prosperity?

Is it wrong to resist the infinite demands of special groups for special favors from the Federal Government?

Is it wrong to plan on applying surplus in each good year to the reduction of our staggering public debt?

Is it wrong to ask that a new look be taken at some of the subsidies that have grown untouchable with the passing years?

Is it wrong to believe that private enterprise can do a better job of fostering economic growth and government spending?

It must be wrong—because with each passing year the ranks of Congressmen who think it is wrong are thinner and thinner.

This is the result of a changed national attitude, an attitude which adopts the philosophy that any crisis can be solved on a crash basis with the spending of more money, provided you spend what you think is somebody else's money.

But I refuse to believe that it is wrong.

I believe it is possible for America to look ahead—to recognize that with a changing world which is now on the frontiers of space we can solve new and different problems with the aid of our Government. But I also believe that we can solve these problems by keeping faith with future generations and turning our backs on the principle of spending what we do not have.

At the present time Federal spending and tax receipts represent about 16 percent of our gross national product of $500 billion. If our economy continues to grow normally and we keep it fiscally sound, the gross national product could reach $750 billion by 1970. If we continue to tax at the rate of 16 percent of the gross national product, this would mean that the Federal Government can meet the needs of an expanding population in the nuclear space age with an expenditure of $120 billion and impose a tax burden no greater than what you pay today.

But how should we spend this $40 billion increase? Must we apply Parkinson's second law that Government spending automatically keeps up with Government income? Certainly we should not, but I have grave doubts that we won't.

Shouldn't we exercise the restraint which Washington recommended and use some of that $40 billion increase for debt reduction? Shouldn't we give some of it back to the taxpayers in the form of a tax reduction?

If we do not adopt this as a firm philosophy and a firm goal, if we do not resist the tendency of our people to ask for more and more, then we will find in 1970 that we will be spending more than our $120 billion of income and we will still be piling up debt and encouraging inflation and ruining incentive.

We must not fail to face these issues and answer them decisively.

But to do so we must take stock of our own moral qualities and decide that answers to old problems haven't changed and that the sound business sense recommended by George Washington is as good today as it was in colonial times. To do so our people must be indoctrinated with the spirit of turning their back on big and paternalistic government. Looking to government to solve each and every one of our problems can only result in one thing—big business, big government, and big labor. There will be no room for the small businessman and the independent soul who likes to solve his own problems.

Just a few weeks back I received a letter from a small businessman in Los Altos. He is in the business of supplying aquarium materials to schools and colleges. He same here as an immigrant and with his wife built up a successful small business.

Near the end of February 1959 the reemployment office of the Santa Clara County Welfare Department contacted this gentle-

man with the request that he give employment to a 16-year-old boy of Mexican descent and who had quit high school, was married to an even younger bride, and expected a child. He was on relief and so were his parents. He had been repeatedly refused employment and his best offer was $1 per hour working in a nursery. This small businessman agreed to hire the young father-to-be and employed him at $1.50 per hour. Subsequently, because he was satisfied with his work, he raised the boy to $1.85 per hour. One day the boy came to his employer and said, "I cannot make enough money after taxes to support my family on 40 hours per week. May I please work longer hours?" The request was granted and subsequently another member of the family, the boy's illiterate father, was taken off the relief rolls and given employment at $1.50 per hour. One more family had become self-supporting. A third man was hired from the Santa Clara County welfare rolls and made independent.

Then an official representative of the U.S. Department of Labor descended on this small business scattering Federal bulletins like a swarm of locusts and causing equal devastation. He learned that the small business shipped a few small orders across the State line into Oregon and assumed jurisdiction because this firm was in interstate commerce. For 3 solid days he plowed through all of the company's books, orders, and checks, interviewed all employees, telephoned ex-employees, and finally came up with the judgment that this small businessman owed $1,388 in back wages because he had failed to pay overtime in excess of 40 hours.

If this small businessman refused to pay this $1,388 in accordance with installments directed by the Department of Labor he would then be forced to deposit twice the amount and the Labor Department would notify each of his former and present employees that they would be furnished free legal services in order to prosecute a suit against their employer.

The ironic fact about this whole matter is that if the small businessman had paid the young fellow on relief $1 per hour and $1.50 per hour for all in excess of 40 hours per week, he would have complied with the law. But because he had paid him straight time at $1.85 per hour he found that he was to suffer because he had taken three families off relief.

Laws are supposed to be made for all people. Instead they seem to be made solely for the benefit of bureaucrats who enforce them in the name of what is good for employees. Employers are ignored. Isn't this to coin an overused phrase, "killing the goose which laid the golden egg"?

This is the result of big government where all morals and decent motivations are cast to one side, simply because the letter of the law and the book has not been adhered to.

I have no idea what effect this $1,388 will have on this small business. But to many small businesses it would mean bankruptcy. And what would take their place—large corporations.

This is not an isolated event; it happens many times daily. The result is big government, big business, and big labor.

In frequent conversations with the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and the district attorney, I have been appalled at the manner in which aid to needy children payments are made. On record in Santa Clara County are numerous cases of mothers who have borne several illegitimate children, often by different fathers. The fathers come home on weekends but make certain they stay away during the rest of the week to allow the mothers to qualify for aid to needy children payments. The mother then receives more than she could ever possibly earn. Here is a case where beneficient government offers encouragement to those who ignore the moral obligation of any decent father to properly care for his children.

What has become of the day when each of us in our communities personally felt the obligation to assist the needy family in the next block? Instead of feeling a personal obligation today we shift the responsibility to big government.

This is the striking evidence of how our whole society has changed.

In our new society free and articulate citizens are discouraged about even raising their voices against the current trend. I know full well that I will be criticized today for saying that each of us should recognize our obligations as human beings instead of passing it along to a government 3,000 miles away. Individual citizens in a free democracy have become so hemmed in by organized bigness that they feel they must march in step, with the end result that they no longer have a personality and a political dignity of their own.

The real challenge of today's society is not the "missile gap." The real security gap is that with the passage of each day we undermine the economic framework which is the true balance of power in the contest between international communism and democracy. Inflation, excessive taxes, exorbitant public debt, irresponsible spending, habitual deficits, long labor-management disputes, and "pressure group" government are illustrations of how we wear down the energies of our economy instead of enhancing its capacity to prove Mr. Khrushchev is mistaken in his estimates of our endurance.

This is the real challenge of our time. Problems of today are no different than they ever were. They only differ in degree. Answers which have been sound through the ages have been discarded. We labor under delusions; delusions that money spent in a crash program will solve any problem and that money which comes from Washington isn't ours but somebody else's.

I repeat Government can't give us a cent that it doesn't first take away from us in taxes.

The real challenge of our time is to stop deluding ourselves, to reawaken each American to his moral responsibility, as a member of a free society to help his fellow man, to work for the progress of a nation and humanity, and to ask of Government only that which he has tried to do for himself and has not been able to do.

Without such a change in national attitude, I fear the boast of Khrushchev, "we will bury you," is something more than just an idle comment.

We must see to it that it is the mind of America that shapes our Government, rather than Government shaping the mind of America.

The Late Douglas Elliott

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened at the untimely death of our colleague from Pennsylvania, DOUGLAS ELLIOTT. I originally had the pleasure of meeting him at the time of his nomination to succeed the distinguished late Richard Simpson through the courtesy of our former colleague, Franklin H. Lichtenwalter. After he became a Member of this body, I had occasion to become better acquainted with him. Short as that period was, I was convinced that DOUG ELLIOTT had great prospects for distinguished service in this body. Tragedies such as these are indeed hard to understand, and we will sorely miss him.

I extend sympathy to his loved ones.

Lynwood (Calif.) Elementary School Student Body Observes Special Day for Distinguished Graduate Student—An Exchange Student to Europe—As Tony Krulic Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your information and that of all others who read it a most interesting and inspiring experience which I enjoyed on June 3, 1960, at Lindbergh Elementary School in the great 23d Congressional District. The following texts explain the reason for Tony Krulic Day by these California elementary school students. Manifestly, it indicates very much that these several hundred elementary school students at this early age in their lives begin to realize the importance and significance of the fact that one of their former student body presidents had been selected from nationwide competition to be an exchange student to Italy.

The program follows:

TONY KRULIC DAY PROGRAM, LINDBERGH SCHOOL, LYNWOOD, CALIF., JUNE 3, 1960

Presiding, President Dayna Bancroft.
Recording secretary, Bobbie Swisshelm.
Ushers and programs, Paul Page and Jan Stephens.
Call to order, Dayna Bancroft.
Flag Salute.
Silent prayer.
"America," "Lindbergh School Song."
Welcome, Dayna Bancroft.
Music, Steve Niethamer, Frank Wahl.
Presentation of honored guests, Dayna Bancroft.
Presentation of distinguished guests, Miss Sparlin, principal.
Introduction of past presidents, Mrs. Hartz.
Presentation of gifts: Student body, Rickey Oelschlager; Brownies, Susan Staudt and Bobbie Gray; Lindbergh school personnel, Mrs. Gust; Lynwood Unified School District office employees, Mrs. Rollins; principal's, Miss Sparlin; Lynwood Unified School District Educational center and principals, Dr. McCaughin; past presidents, Fred Holder.
Response, Tony Krulic.
Remarks, Trudy Schwarz, exchange student from Germany.
Music, Bruce Bradberry.
Adjournment, Dayna Bancroft.

Past presidents: Bob Austin, Washington State; Jerry Henderson, Lynwood High; Tony Krulic, Lynwood High; Dana Hoopingarner, Lynwood High; Shirley Hamilton,

Lynwood High; Fred Holder, Lynwood High; Gail Perry, Lynwood High; Jackie Finch, Lynwood High; Roy Hansink, Hosler Junior High; Dennis Wilson, Hosler Junior High; Dan McCullough, Hosler Junior High; Rod Bancroft, Hosler Junior High; Ricky Oelschlager, Lindbergh School.

Lynwood teachers: Fourth grade, Mrs. Ella Gust; fifth grade, Mr. John Roseberry; sixth grade, Mrs. Wilda Hartz.

Messages: Mr. Clyde Doyle, Congressman, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Melvin Barnes, Oklahoma City Schools; Bob Austin, Ferndale, Wash.

Student council faculty sponsors, Mrs. Wilda Hartz, Miss Donna Mamula.

Distinguished guests: Congressman Clyde Doyle, Dr. Donald D. Reber, Mayor Arnold Finch, Mr. Norman Wasserman, Mrs. Robert Cohee, Mr. Walter E. Read, Mr. Kenneth M. Phelps, Mr. Lester K. Bright, Mr. E. L. Morris, Mr. J. Jack Willard, Dr. Robert C. McCaughin, Miss Laura A. Bechtel, Mr. Louis A. Thompson, Mr. Heustis B. Snow, Mr. Robert F. Kelley, Mrs. William Ruth, Miss Margaret Heidenreich, Mrs. Beatrice Escofie, Mr. Ralph Cosman, Mr. John Caples, Mrs. Charles Holder, Mrs. Tom Bancroft.

DAYNA BANCROFT, PRESIDENT OF STUDENT BODY, SPEAKS ON TONY KRULIC DAY

Welcome to Lindbergh School, and a big, warm welcome to all our visitors, especially our guest of honor, Tony Krulic.

We are proud to honor you, Tony, for many reasons, but most of all because you are one of the exchange students to go to Europe this summer. What a grand opportunity, and I know many surprises are in store for you.

We salute you, Tony, because you are one of Lindbergh's favorite sons. We will offer this tribute to you by guests of honor, music, and gifts.

Tony, I want to present you to our audience.

I understand Lindbergh was the first California school you attended. You entered here in the fourth grade, and Mrs. Gust was your teacher.

When you were in the fifth grade in Mr. Roseberry's room you were known as a good ballplayer and a good student.

As you entered sixth grade, when Mrs. Hartz was your teacher, you began to show your leadership ability. You had been at Lindbergh 3 years and you had made many friends. When you ran for student body president you were elected and on your way. During your term of office our Lindbergh School library was started, and you presented the key to the library to Miss Sparlin. This was the same year we won our Freedoms Foundation Award and your picture went to Valley Forge in our school's entry.

Tony, we have kept up with your records as you have gone through junior high and into high school. Every year you have added new honors to your list of achievements.

Now you have two of the highest honors any student can receive: A summer exchange program of travel and learning—and—president of the high school student body for 1960–61.

It's no wonder, Tony, we are proud of you, and that we salute you on this day.

May we stand and give Tony a big hand.

PRESENTATION SPEECH FOR THE STUDENT BODY—BY RICKY OELSCHLAGER

Tony, our student body was overwhelmed with happiness and pride when we found out that you were chosen one of 50 high school students to be an exchange student in Europe. We all know how hard you must have worked and how fine a citizen you must be to represent our country in a foreign land.

We are especially proud of you because you used to go to our school and were a fine student body president.

For about one week, everybody was trying to think of something that we could do to raise money for you. Finally someone came up with the idea of having ice cream and candy sales. Our student council approved this. Everyone worked extremely hard on the sales, and we have done a wonderful job, we think. I think I'd like to introduce two students who put forth a great deal of effort during the sales—Candy Dement and Bobbie Ann Swisshelm. We have had such fine cooperation, that I have this sum of $120.65 to present to you to use as you please in Europe.

Again, I want you to know how proud we are that you were chosen to be an exchange student. Have a nice trip, Tony, and a safe return.

MAY 31, 1960.

A favorite son will be honored tomorrow when Lindbergh Elementary School celebrates Tony Krulic Day in a Lynwood youth version of hometown-boy-makes-good.

The young man of the hour will be Tony Krulic, former Lindbergh student leader, now student body president-elect at Lynwood High School and the first Lynwood representative chosen for the American abroad student exchange program.

The salute to Tony beginning at 10 a.m. in the school auditorium will be highlighted by comments from distinguished guests and the presentation of gifts. Dayna Bancroft, present president at Lindbergh, will offer the first tribute to the school's student body president of 1954–55.

Dr. Robert McCaughin, superintendent of schools; Dr. Donald D. Reber, former Lynwood superintendent; Congressman CLYDE DOYLE, and Trudy Schwarz, the high school's first foreign exchange student will extend congratulations.

Four gifts will be presented to help with Tony's summer trip overseas under the American Field Service student exchange program. A student body contribution will be presented by Ricky Oelschlager, and Susan Staudt will offer the gift of a Brownie group.

Mrs. Ella Gust, Tony's first California teacher when he enrolled at Lindbergh in the fourth grade, will make the presentation from the Lindbergh faculty, and Mrs. Phyllis Rollins will give a gift from the office employees association of the school district.

All of Lindbergh's former student body presidents have been invited according to Principal Bess Sparlin, and they will share in the recognition day, as will Tony's mother Mrs. Beatrice Escofie. Introductions will be made by Mrs. Wilda Hartz, student council adviser. Lindbergh's tribute to Tony Krulic will also be hailed as a tribute to the strong citizenship program of the Lynwood Unified School District, Miss Sparlin says.

Musical numbers for the assembly program will be played by Steve Niethamer, Frank Wahl, and Bruce Bradberry.

"LINDBERGH SCHOOL SONG

I

"Our Dear Old Lindbergh School

"Lindbergh School, Lindbergh School
We're here to cheer for you,
Lindbergh School, Lindbergh School
Show them what you can do.
Blue and white, blue and white,
Colors that ne'er will die,
We love you, we do
We'll always be true
To our dear old Lindbergh School.

II

"Lindbergh School, Lindbergh School
We all have a common goal,
To learn to read, to learn to write
And be good citizens day and night—
White and blue, colors true
Will fly for evermore,
For you we will stand
You're the best in the land
Our dear old Lindbergh School."

Khrushchev Is "Soviet Man" Bred To Rule All by Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "Khrushchev Is 'Soviet Man' Bred To Rule All by Tension," which appeared in the May 22, 1960, Los Angeles Times. The article was written by Mr. Robert Hartmann, chief of the Times Washington bureau.

In my view, this extremely well-written portrait of Premier Khrushchev merits the attention of all Members of Congress and the public.

Mr. Hartmann presents a very penetrating insight into Mr. Khrushchev's character and as to what type of individual he is. But of greater importance, and this is the point of the article, he describes the type of individual Khrushchev represents.

I believe that everyone interested in world events will find the article interesting and informative in helping them better to understand the threat to freedom represented by the Soviet man.

The article follows:

KHRUSHCHEV IS "SOVIET MAN" BRED TO RULE ALL BY TENSION

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—"I'm a human being. I have feelings."

This was Nikita Sergeivich Khrushchev, his portly frame precariously upheld by a wooden chair, telling Moscow newsmen of his disillusionment with President Eisenhower 5 days before he told off the American Chief Executive in Paris.

Khrushchev's self-pity in Gorky Park, where he went to unveil the remnants of the U–2 spy plane (and to be cornered by newsmen) was a tipoff to the blast that blew his own summit conference skyhigh. It was also a tipoff of the man himself.

Why was anyone surprised?

Millions of persons around the world were surprised and are still mystified—as President Eisenhower said on his return yesterday—because they persist in regarding Nikita Khrushchev precisely the way he wants to be regarded, as a human being who has feelings.

BIGGEST LIE OF ALL

This is the biggest lie of all.

Khrushchev is not a human being, in the sense understood by our part of humanity, and if he has any personal feelings left, they are as absolutely under control as those of a Hindu fakir on a bed of nails.

He is, rather, what the French Communist newspaper L'Humanite proclaimed him in a special color supplement: Un Homme Sovietique—A Soviet Man and the archtype for all true Soviet men and women, as long as he lasts.

It is only in this frame of reference that Khrushchev or any other dedicated Communist within a working Commuhist society becomes remotely understandable. They are not just Russians, mere megalomaniacs, Marxist idealists, slightly veneered orientals, or anything else the like of which the world has never before known. They are a new species, a deliberate mutation, and fiercely proud of it.

KHRUSHCHEV SPUTNIK

I speak earnestly but not as a Soviet expert, a field in which we have too many amateurs already running for office. I am merely one of Khrushchev's sputniks—a term of feigned affection he himself applied to the foreign reporters who orbited ceaselessly around him when Vice President NIXON visited Moscow last July and revived again in September as the Soviet boss barnstormed his way around the United States.

On these exciting if exhausting assignments I watched Khrushchev pull many a trick from his bag both at home and abroad. He uses the same bag and often the same tricks. I have been fascinated by his brutal determination and frightened by the way in which he seemed to succeed in making otherwise hardheaded Americans accessories to his act.

The word "act" is used advisedly. Khrushchev is the consummate actor of this age. He does not "go into his act" as we are used to suspecting Western politicians of doing when the spotlight turns their way. Like all masters of deception he deceives himself in playing his part.

He not only lives his role; his role is how he stays alive.

It is with just such histrionic performances as he put on in Paris that Khrushchev climbed to the pinnacle of a new kind of society which had discarded all the old rules and was making up its own as it went along, but in which the only changeless coin was power. What we seem too sophisticated to grasp is that in such evolving and tightly controlled societies words, gestures, and postures are themselves instruments of power, weapons of a strange new warfare.

There is a story told in whispers behind the Iron Curtain, to the effect that Stalin used to amuse himself and the high party circles by commanding the rotund Khrushchev to dance the gozotski until he fell exhausted on the floor. But he always came up laughing with the others despite the hate in his heart.

MIGHT BE MYTH

Maybe this is a myth—nobody really knows anything of the Kremlin's mysteries except such rumors—but it is revealing nonetheless. Certainly the goatherd and coalminer suffered thousands of equally humiliating experiences both from czarist and Communist overlords along his road to the chairmanship of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

He must have had feelings once, but by now they are superbly suppressed as befits "a Soviet man." Instead of feelings he assumes attitudes for every circumstance, as Shirley Temple once expertly cried or laughed at the director's call.

Americans who watched Khrushchev on his road show tour of the United States last summer must have sensed the quick-change character of his many moods. Though he moved so fast this was more obvious to those of us sputniks who stayed with him the whole route.

MELLOW AND RUDE

He was mellow in Washington and angry in New York; as rude to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt (whose late husband he extravagantly praised last week) as he was to President Eisenhower in Paris. He watched the Hollywood can-can with the leering relish of a baldheaded row regular, then denounced it like a Puritan elder on the train leaving Los Angeles.

He blew his top and rattled his rockets at Mayor Poulson, demanded (and that time got from a fidgety White House) an apology for his imagined affront. But 24 hours later he forgave all and dallied in a passing affair with San Francisco. He instructed Iowans in corn growing and butchering, ate hot dogs, patted President Eisenhower's grandchildren on the head (all the time knowing, he admitted in Paris, that the United States was spying regularly over Russia) and lashed back in gutter Russian at reporters' questions at the National Press Club.

GAMUT OF EMOTIONS

No normal human being runs such a regular gamut of emotions or snaps back so instantaneously from livid rage to benevolent mercy. I saw him make the switch twice in the length of a single Pullman car as he walked through the press section of his special Daylight Limited train to San Francisco. This was neither temper nor temperament, but cold, calculated cunning; the epitome of the "soviet man" shaping events to his liking rather than submitting to nonexistent fate.

What is true of Khrushchev's amazing self-discipline is also true, to greater or less degree, of all Soviet citizens who have made places for themselves in the ruling elite of Soviet society. We can see it in the dour Gromyko, but Khrushchev's own physical appearance enhances his dramatic monolog.

He looks like a jolly old roguish peasant, and everyone knows the bottomless store of Russian proverbs he recalls or invents to adorn this unterrifying image of uncommon commonness. It is all but impossible for products of the Christian ethic the West has held for two millennia to doubt, upon first encountering Khrushchev, that he is not after all a human being fundamentally like most of us.

WHAT HE WANTS

He is not. He is not merely an astute and successful politician—a foreigner who talks and dresses and runs his country a little differently than we do. That is what he wants us to think he is.

Nikita Khrushchev is a Soviet man. And if he ceases to behave as the prime public example of a Soviet man is expected (by other Soviet men) to behave we will no longer have to worry about him; but we will have to deal with another almost exactly like him in everything but looks. The Soviet Union is deliberately creating a wholly new kind of subspecies of the human animal and it is this animal, Khrushchev is constantly tell us, who will inherit the earth.

This Soviet man cannot accurately be described by the kind of imagery we have heard this week from Paris; he is not "badmannered," "furious," or "indignant" except in our eyes; he does not "lose his temper" or "reach the boiling point" or "shout hysterically" unless it is for very definite purposes of his own.

BULLDOZES WAY TO GOAL

He "blunders" but once, nor does he need "blunders" by his opponents or any such pretext to shape his strategy, though he makes use of every enemy move—deliberate or accidental—to bulldoze his way to his goal.

The failure of Americans—in high and low places—to understand the phenomenon of a Khrushchev—a Soviet man—is not due to lack of scholarship on the subject. Harvard has a whole Russian research center devoted to the most meticulous study of this unique development which has challenged western civilization to mortal combat. In a splendid small volume, "How the Soviet System Works," three renowned American scholars make the picture clearer for anyone not too lazy to read it.

PERSECUTORY ANXIETY

"The (Soviet Communist) Party attempts—and has to some extent been able with small groups—to create the 'new' Soviet man; disciplined, working steadily and consistently, puritanical in conduct and motivation," the authors report. Prestige attaches to those who can master impulses and mood swings. The stress is on unlimited achievement, on restless organizing activity, and on tempo. The elite attaches great importance to technology, machines, and other assurances of mastery over nature and internal threats.

"There is also a persecutory anxiety which has two aspects. On the one hand, there is the compulsion to project tormenting fears onto foreign agressors; on the other, the constant scenting of ill will, revolt, and opposition in everyone's motivations."

The basic idea of the "Soviet man" is as simple as it is terrifying. Religion is outlawed and science is perverted to achieve it; man is an animal with a brain which can be trained to any kind of behavior the trainer desires. Mass Pavlovian therapy will suffice to condition the clods, but the better brains get more attention. The key to their control is the manipulation of tension.

ALL IN INTEREST OF STATE

Eminently documented by both Soviet and Western psychologists and psychiatrists is the fact that the science of the mind, in the U.S.S.R., aims not to free the individual from fears and frustrations but to respond to tensions correctly, that is in the interests of the state.

Thus the supreme error the United States made, looking back on the wreckage of the summit, was not the U-2 incident at all. The big blunder eclipsing all others was to suppose that relaxation of tensions could ever be the real desire of a Soviet man.

Tensions are the absolutely indispensable element of the Soviet system of making men (or nations) behave as desired. Any real relaxation of tensions in the world would inevitably lead to relaxation of tensions at home; this would bring the whole pyramid which Khrushchev now stands atop down in disaster.

WHAT TENSION MEANS

Tension in the Communist sense is something short of nuclear war externally and less than martial law internally, but it is just as much the opposite of peace in the Christian sense.

The most common and economical way to create tensions, as any husband and wife, employer and employee, or Democrat and Republican can tell you, is with words. And this, in the peculiar mind of the Soviet man—Khrushchev—is what words are primarily for.

Khrushchev's words are not supposed to convey simple meanings, and his apparent contradictions are deliberate, not irrational. He uses words and gestures with such practiced skill that he vaults over the language barrier at times—but solely to bend his hearers to his will, to force a preconceived pattern of behavior from them.

PLAYING MONSTROUS GAME

How can we continue to be surprised when Khrushchev does this? How can we expect a man of the elemental decency of Dwight D. Eisenhower to match him at such a monstrous game?

He destroyed Stalin with violent words, though Stalin was already dead. He destroyed Bulganin, Malenkov, Molotov, Zhukov, and a host of others so effectively with words it was unnecessary to kill them. Words have eliminated the most powerful men Khrushchev ever knew.

Why should we be shocked—or sympathize—when the "Soviet Man" determines to destroy President Eisenhower as he must destroy every symbol of decency and honor that stands in the way of the wave of the future he calls communism?

Foreign Policy Setbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by George E. Sokolsky as it appeared in the Washington Post of June 23, 1960:

FOREIGN POLICY SETBACKS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

Recently our country has encountered three major international setbacks:

1. Cuba.
2. The Paris summit conference.
3. President Eisenhower's visit to Japan.

The State Department is the agency of our Government responsible for formulating foreign policy, for evaluating data which come to it from many sources; for knowing in advance what events are likely to transpire. The most important men in this mechanism are the deskmen, usually junior officials who are specialists in particular areas or matters and whose reports and memorandums eventually reach those who finalize policy. The State Department is, therefore, the responsible body that must answer to Congress and to the American people for whatever errors, misinterpretations, incompetences led to the disasters associated with the events. If the men at the top are badly informed, it is the deskmen who passed on incorrect data. The alibi usually is that a man used his best judgment. If his judgment is no good, he should not hold that job.

First, the Cuban disaster. Our Ambassador to Cuba at the time that Fidel Castro seized power by revolutionary means was Earl E. T. Smith. When he was appointed to this office, he was briefed as to State Department policy by officials of the Department and Herbert L. Matthews of the New York Times who has had the reputation of favoring revolutionary groups in Spain and in Latin America. Smith, who is a knowledgeable person, reported back to the State Department on the Communistic characteristics of the Castro movement. His reports were ignored. Smith was retired because he was opposed to the extensive support given to Castro by the State Department which was principally responsible for putting Castro in power.

Second, prior to the holding of the Paris summit conference, I and others wrote that it would come to nothing. Therefore, it is not hindsight to say that there was ample information available to indicate that Khrushchev would have to find a way out of that meeting. In fact various broadcasts from Moscow foretold failure. Nobody could have foretold that Khrushchev would have attacked Mr. Eisenhower with such brutality of language and manner but there was ample evidence in Russian, Red Chinese and other satellite literature to indicate the course of Russian action. In charge of the desks in the State Department dealing with the summit conference and the President's trip to Russia were Hugh S. Cumming Jr., Director of Intelligence and Research; T. Achilles Polyzoides, Director of Current Intelligence Indications; Charles E. Bohlen was Adviser on Russian Affairs; Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs.

Third, the Eisenhower visit to Japan. I do not know enough about the current handling of the data from Red China and Japan in the State Department. Years ago, the Far Eastern Division in the State Department was one of the most competently organized and staffed.

It is impossible to believe that so great a storm could have been brewed in the Far East without some advance knowledge on the part of the State Department. What was done about it? What countermeasures were taken?

These questions need to be answered because faith in the efficiency and knowledge of the State Department is again disappearing in this country.

Farmers Not To Blame for High Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, published in Red Wing, Minn., an excellent editorial based on statistics presented in an article by the Land O' Lakes Creameries News.

By reading the News and the Republican-Eagle articles the facts surrounding food prices are put into perspective, and I thought it would be valuable for the Republican-Eagle editorial to be reprinted here:

YOU CAN'T BLAME FARMERS FOR HIGH FOOD PRICES

Land O' Lakes (Creameries) News calls attention to some figures which deserve a bit of reflection by all of us nonfarmers. The facts are from U.S. Department of Agriculture studies, and we assume them to be correct. Here they are:

In 1951, a U.S. population of 153 million people paid $42.8 billion for the food it ate that came from American farms. Of this $42.8 billion, $20 billion went to farmers. The balance, of course, went to processors, transport concerns, wholesalers, and retailers who provide the important service of taking the food from the farm to you and transforming it into the attractive supermarket items to which we've become accustomed.

In 1959, after 8 years of gradually rising prices, a U.S. population of 176 million paid $51 billion for the food it ate from American farms. But farmers received only $19.8 billion of this $51 billion total, with the marketing charges from farm through retail store rising from $22.8 to $31.2 billion.

Land O' Lakes' purpose was not to quarrel with the wages or profits being earned by the various middlemen or to object to the idea that we consumers are paying for more and more services—precooking, brown 'n serve, cake mixes, etc.—when we push the selfservice cart up to the food store checkout. But Land O' Lakes did want to make the point that, in 1959 as compared with 1951, U.S. farmers were feeding 23 million more Americans and were actually receiving less money—$19.8 compared with $20 billion—for doing so.

If food prices seem high to you, it's not because farmers are getting a lot of money or farm price supports have pushed up retail prices. As Land O' Lakes News puts it—

Farmers as a group have a proud record. Hunger in the United States has been greatly reduced. Important inroads have been made on hunger outside the United States. And all of this at prices which reflect the opposite of inflation in years when inflation has become a national problem.

Social Security Amendments of 1960 (H.R. 12580)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it is quite evident there is much fear and distressing doubt, in the minds of a goodly number of Members here that this proposal, H.R. 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960, is as reasonable and realistically responsive as it could and should be, to the needs and the desires of the great majority of American citizens. Under such circumstances we are, unhappily, because of the closed rule under which we are operating, permitted to vote only for or against the whole bill, without modifications.

Being restricted, then, to these two choices, I intend to support the bill because it does provide an extension and expansion of a limited number of benefits to those people whose needs are most urgent.

For instance, the bill removes the age 50 eligibility requirement for disability benefits; it liberalizes the eligibility requirements of old age, survivors and disability benefits; it makes certain improvements in the social security benefit protection for children and extends benefit eligibility to more widows; it effectuates certain improvements in the administrative financing and solvency provisions of the unemployment compensation system, as well as extending its coverage; it extends coverage to groups that were not before included. All these improvements are good and they have already been carefully and thoroughly explained by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unfortunately, the committee has not seen fit to recommend other advances and improvements which a great many of us have been advocating with the earnest hope that they would be included in this measure. Chief among these would be provisions to reduce the retirement age, especially for women, and particularly for widows; to increase the minimum benefits in accord with rising living costs; and realistically raise the outmoded and outdated basic income limitations.

Of course, the major fears and doubts about the substantial worth of this

measure are concentrated on the most controversial new title XVI, which would initiate a new Federal-State grants-in-aid program to help the States assist low-income aged individuals who need help to meet their medical expenses. In my own opinion this title, and its provision, and its provisions, fall far short of adequately and equitably assisting our older citizens in the desperate financial distress they tragically encounter from the ills and the sicknesses so common in the later stages of life.

It is my earnest hope, that after this measure is considered, and probably changed, in the Senate, we may yet have the opportunity to repair and strengthen this title so that a far more equitable and effective program of medical service and hospitalization treatment assistance may be granted to the millions of aged Americans so desperately and dispairingly in need of it.

Congressman Farbstein Protests Insults to Tourists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to my attention a situation which has existed for the last several weeks in the national parks of this area which I deplore very much and which I think all decent-minded citizens, upon being made aware of it, would similarly deplore. Feeling very strongly about the foregoing, I communicated with the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, requesting that some affirmative action be taken to see that this condition be cleared up.

Following is the letter which I wrote to Secretary Seaton:

JUNE 23, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For many weeks my constituents, including schoolchildren who have come to see their Nation's Capital, have been insulted on a basis of religion and race by the so-called commander of the American Nazi Party as they made their way to the galleries and museums in the area known as the Mall. For over 2 months this man Rockwell has held these meetings regularly, their only purpose being to incite to riot and be offensive to others.

The use of the Nazi symbol, the taunting language, the threats of his henchmen in the audience, the caricatures portrayed, plus the insulting epithets employed are all designed to incite the populace to hatred and violence.

This un-American incitement to riot, these libelous, flagrant, and abusing statements are beyond the limits of free speech. The incitement is such that police have already been forced to make several arrests on various disorderly conduct charges.

The Supreme Court has ruled that such criminal libel does not come under the legitimate interpretation of free speech. Is it necessary that mayhem occur before the authorities stop this disgraceful spectacle? Not only does Rockwell exploit and abuse so-called free speech privileges so generously accorded him, but he deliberately and obviously incites to violence in a manner incompatible with the safety of my constituents who come to visit the national shrines as tourists.

While unnoticed, and as part of a lunatic fringe, his use of the National Parks for the purposes of spewing his poison was sufficiently evil. Now that public attention has been directed to this malefactor by the near riot in New York City when he made application for a permit to speak in that city, I believe it to be the duty of the Department of Interior and its law-enforcement agents to protect the rights of the schoolchildren and other tourists from my district when they visit their Nation's Capital.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am particularly shocked to know that the atrocious spectacle that has been permitted has been exploited by world Communist propaganda to discredit the United States. Agents of Communist embassies in Washington have photographed this thoroughly atypical and un-American display, including the seeming coddling of the neo-Nazis by the U.S. Park Police.

I think the time has come for you to take action to abate this nuisance. Will you be good enough to acknowledge receipt of this communication and advise me whether it is your intention to take any action in the circumstances.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

Home Misrule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of June 23, 1960:

BALKY CITY COUNCIL

The House of Representatives, having lately turned back the District's drive for home rule and having thus reaffirmed its wish to act as city council for the Capital, has again shown how little suited it is to act in that capacity. Its legislative committee on District affairs for several months has refused to act upon the Commissioners' request for an increase in a variety of District taxes, needed to finance urgent public works improvements. Instead, at the 11th hour, it has decided to hold hearings on a proposal of its chairman to increase the sales tax alone. Whatever the merits of such a move, the Committee members must know that it would almost certainly be blocked in the Senate, where under adjournment pressures the objections of a single member would suffice to prevent any action.

With adjournment nearing, the Commissioners went back to the House District Appropriations Subcommittee to request the appropriation of the withheld portion of the Federal payment toward local expenses, which the subcommittee had previously refused to grant. Now the revenue, too, has been denied, even though the subcommittee in effect conceded the urgency of the public works projects by suggesting that the Commisioners build them if they can find the money.

As if this sort of performance were not perverse enough, Congress is also considering pay increases for various groups of city employees which would cost around $8 million—or nearly as much as the unfinanced public works projects. The pay raises would be mandatory, and if higher taxes or a higher Federal payment should fail to win approval, presumably urgent construction projects would have to be deferred.

The Commisioners have control only over the city's realty tax rate, and the way things are going, they may be forced to order a large increase in property taxes to keep the budget in the black and maintain essential services and programs. We think this would be the worst possible way to meet the emergency, for it would load upon one class of taxpayers a wholly disproportionate burden. But it will be inescapable if Congress persists in ignoring its responsibilities. At the very least, the Commisioners ought to be given control over other local tax rates if Congress is unwilling to face these problems intelligently.

An International Effort To Break Down the Language Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, recently a young Japanese by the name of Soichi Kato came to see me at my office. He told me about the International Language Institute and left me a memorandum which is set forth in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

He told me of the work that was being done by the International Language Institute to eliminate language barriers among nations. This is indeed a worthy purpose and one which should find support in the United States and elsewhere.

The memorandum follows:

International Language Institute was established in 1958 in Tokyo to eliminate the language barriers among nations.

As a result of our survey by questionnaires asking what should be the common language, the answers were divided into: (1) Esperanto, (2) English, (3) simplified English, (4) English and French concurrently, (5) English and Esperanto concurrently, (6) simultaneous interpretation, (7) impossible to chose any language, (8) should not chose any language, (9) encouraging teaching any foreign language in compulsory education.

We shall not support any particular language as the international language and we are going to set up an international organization to deal with this problem in a democratic and scientific way.

During our 2-year research, we found there were many things to improve the present situation, before we chose any common language. As an example, musicians and mathematicians already use international signs to communicate their ideas.

We have several research programs which are as follows:

A. International language policy in international conference.

Our data, collected at international conferences held in Tokyo shows that the delegates did not understand each others views by linguistic reasons. So, we shall study the nature of the handicap that exists between English-speaking people and non-English-speaking people.

We shall also study misunderstandings which happen frequently even among English-speaking people because of dialect, difference of usage, etc.

The correctness of interpretations, too, should be examined.

After scientific research, we may be able to recommend the delegates to speak at a certain speed, slower than usual, with a smaller vocabulary, and a standard pronunciation.

B. International language policy in tourism.

Today, New York is no more a city of Americans, but a city of those come from all over the world. The same could be said for Tokyo, Bombay, Cairo, or Moscow. So, we should be more kind to foreign tourists in order to avoid linguistic troubles.

For instance, employing common pictorial signs for traffic signs in every country may be a great advantage for drivers and pedestrians.

INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH

English is the language today most widely used in every airport, immigration office, etc., however, we find many difficult words in the documents even English-speaking people sometimes cannot understand.

If we have a certain limited vocabulary easy to learn and we make documents with it, every one who has learned this vocabulary of "international English" will be able to understand.

C. There are still many things in many fields, such as science, education, engineering, commerce, etc., which should be overcome by international cooperation.

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

Office: Heibonsha Building, Yonbancho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

President: Yasaburo Shimonaka, president of Heibonsha Publishing Co.

Standing director: Dr. Iwao Ayusawa, professor of International Christian University, international relations; Dr. Shiro Hattori, professor of Tokyo University, linguistics.

Secretary general: Soichi Kato.

Address in the United States: Soichi Kato, in care of Mrs. Solomon, 417 West 121 Street, New York 27, N.Y., United States of America. Telephone MO-2-2030.

Brainpower for the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

BRAINPOWER FOR THE SPACE AGE

(Address by Bernard Haldane, career development specialist, Fairleigh Dickinson University (N.J.), February 16, 1960, at the National Missile/Space Conference, Washington, D.C., as part of the panel presentation, Space Challenge—Philosophy)

(Panel chairman: Dr. Fred S. Singer, University of Maryland; panel members: Richard B. Canright, Douglas Aircraft Co.; Rear Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, Pacific Missile Range and Astronautics; Hon. James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania, House of Representatives; Mr. Haldane; Andrew G. Haley, Esq., International Astronautical Federation; Ernest K. Lindley, Newsweek magazine, Dr. Donald Michael, Brookings Institution; Dr. Leo Steg, General Electric Co.)

Where and how can space-missile organizations obtain the brainpower needed for operations and progress? This is the question to which my remarks are addressed. I expect to convey procedures and attitudes which can lead to overcoming the apparent shortage of brainpower, and lead to a 33-percent rise in desired brainpower availability within 2 years.

Plenty is being said about the slowest method of increasing brainpower—education along formal lines. There is general agreement that this method, and other generally accepted procedures, are not good enough to meet our needs.

Three other possibilities exist. First, stronger motivation of known scientists and engineers. Second, methods that will identify available and willing talent which is not now recognized. Third, better utilization of the time of scientists and engineers.

Take the first of these—stronger motivation. Management cannot dictate motivation; to be sustained, it must come from within, be self-inspired. But management can establish the climate for self-motivation. The difficulty here lies in long-held attitudes, hardening of the attitudes, as well as social custom.

I have created a dialogue to illustrate the problem. For obvious reasons, the characters are Alice in Wonderland, and the Mad Hatter.

"ALICE. Where I come from, people study what they are not good at, in order to be able to do what they are good at.

"MAD HATTER. We only go around in circles, but we always end up where we started. Would you mind explaining yourself?

"ALICE. Well, grownups tell us to find out what we did wrong, and never do it again.

"MAD HATTER. That's odd. It seems to me that in order to find out about something, you have to study it. And when you study it, you should become better at it. Why should you want to become better at something, and then never do it again? But please continue.

"ALICE. Nobody ever tells us to study the right things we do. We're only supposed to study the wrong things, and learn from them. We may study the right things other people do; and sometimes we're told to copy them.

"MAD HATTER. That's cheating.

"ALICE. That's true, Mr. Hatter. But I live in a topsy-turvy world. It seems like I have to do something wrong first, in order to learn from it what not to do. And then, by not doing what I'm not supposed to do, perhaps I'll be right. But I'd rather be right the first time, wouldn't you?"

We say we want to encourage excellence, but we give first attention to mistakes. We look for the weaknesses in people when we select them; we give them lots of attention when something goes wrong, and little attention when things are running smoothly. The accepted doctrine of management by exception has converted managers into troubleshooters rather than encouragers of excellence.

Nationally, we aim to lift averages through elimination of lows, rather than through stimulation of highs.

Yet the democratic ideal calls for giving attention at all levels, not just the bottom ones. It is well known that geniuses rarely take care of themselves; they need attention and encouragement, too. So do the steady builders in the middle, and old reliables.

What can be done to establish the climate for self-motivation, for stimulation of excellence?

Men and women are happiest when they are doing their best at the kind of work which fits their talents. At other times, according to doctors and psychologists, they are virtually asking for the illnesses that arise from tensions. The climate for stimulating men's excellence, then, is one in which each man finds encouragement to do his best.

So, if you want to get the best out of a man, look for the best that is in him. This is obviously different from looking for or giving greatest attention to his mistakes. Much evidence is available to show that men do not learn from their mistakes. Evidence is also available to show that they do learn from their achievements and successes—but usually are discouraged from doing so.

I believe it is evident that if a manager knows a man's best, and the man knows the manager does, then the man will be self-motivated to be his best more often—so long as he likes his work. Managers, then should encourage their employees to speak about their achievements—to discuss them without boasting or bragging. This kind of discussion helps a man to appreciate his best, and strive to do better—voluntarily.

We all know that the standard procedure of constructive criticism, combined with "letting well enough alone," doesn't work satisfactorily. It is possible, if not probable, that a climate where achievements are discussed as facts which could point the way to greater achievements, could stimulate the growth of excellence.

There really is plenty of room for improvement. Social scientists have pointed out that only 1 person in 20 uses as much as 50 percent of his brainpower, and that the great majority of us operate at the 25 percent level. A climate that encourages excellence could easily lead to a 20 percent rise in the application of our brainpower.

My second point is identification of available and willing talent which is not now recognized. This requires what I call success factor analysis, a procedure I teach at Farleigh Dickinson University, and have used with professional and management men for almost 20 years.

A largely untapped talent pool exists, awaiting identification and utilization. Personnel department policies will need to be modernized before much can be accomplished. It is a fact, for instance, that at every level of intelligence there are more non-college graduates than there are college graduates. Yet the possession of a degree has become necessary to consideration for a scientific or engineering position. Edison and Ford wouldn't have a chance with companies that bear their names. Personnel departments are self-protective—overly so—in their standards of selection; in general, these tend to establish mediocrity, high-level mediocrity perhaps. The exceptional man with great talent does not conform to such standards.

How can the men and women in this vast untapped pool be recognized? A 1-hour questionnaire, which can be completed at home, identified people with a pattern of high talent. This questionnaire explores the best in a man, finds out what he is self-motivated to do effectively, and also enjoy. An average of fifteen minutes with the answers exposes unrecognized talents.

The theory behind this questionnaire, "Individual Report On Achievement Experiences," will take just a minute to explain. Selected experiences reported on the questionnaire are analyzed, separated into factors. Since each of these experiences is a small or large achievement, not necessarily associated with a man's or woman's employment, each set of factors must include many of a man's best qualities. A group of these factors is repeated in almost all the achievement-experiences. These factors repeated in the different experiences disclose the man's best qualities; the experiences themselves show how he uses his best qualities most effectively.

Standard employment application forms, aptitude tests and structured job-interview procedures do not even seek this information.

Some training in success factor analysis is required in order to develop the desired facts; but a good manager or supervisor can acquire this knowledge readily. However, since the facts developed are taken from experience, and are not statistical, they are dependable. So we now have a way to identify scientific and engineering talent among those who lack degrees. Theoretically, this procedure could increase our space-age brainpower by more than 100 percent; but I think that a 15-to-25 percent increase would certainly result—providing we do not permit a college-degree "aristocracy" to bar such a program in personnel departments.

My third point, which I do not have time to discuss, calls for taking nonscientific and nonengineering tasks from scientists and engineers, so as to give them more time to apply their most-needed talents. Budget Bureaucracy militates against this, but the change must come if security and progress are to have higher priority than temporary balancing of the books. We won't have books to balance, if we don't have the brainpower and progress required by these times.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ABOUT BERNARD HALDANE

Educator, author, speaker, personnel consultant, pioneer—developed self-analysis and self-motivating techniques that bring out the best in professional men and women; widely quoted by business, government, educational, and religious leaders—in speeches, books, and articles.

Career success and executive development specialist—seminar leader at the American Management Association; formerly, adjunct professor of career development and personnel management, Wagner College; consultant on placement counseling to Harvard Business School; presently, career development specialist, Fairleigh Dickinson University School of Business Administration. Guest lecturer, George Washington University, Tampa University, Cornell University, etc. Most leading companies now use some of the procedures he developed.

Professional-business activities—discovered the success pattern, a new principle which shatters the limitations man has placed on his own potentialities; developed procedures (success factor analysis) which reveal a man's strengths and weaknesses—and help him to be his best more often. In 1947, founded Executive Job Counselors, Inc., a placement counseling service; 1960, founded the Haldane Workshop Seminars—to help professional management men plan for progress in their companies. Member, American College Personnel Association, American Management Association, American Personnel & Guidance Association, Society for Advancement of Management.

Placement consultant for the S.A.M., developed placement procedures recommended in over 70 colleges. Served government agencies in liquidation on outplacement of released personnel. Consultant on placement for classes of the U.S. Naval Academy. Founded and directed the first counseling and placement service for veterans with professional and management abilities (1945, for the S.A.M.). The White House commended this volunteer work.

Public service: Testified before Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the shortages of engineers and scientists; directed personnel development study for the Air Research and Development Command, U.S.A.F. (with Stanford Research Institute); counseled with ARDC on appraisal, identification and development techniques for engineering and scientific personnel; extensively quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (reprint available).

Author: More than 40 books and articles on new techniques that stimulate and assure success: How To Find the Best in Every Man—Personnel; A New Pattern for Executive Placement—Harvard Business Review; Help Guide Your Child To Success—Supervisor's and Foremen's Digest; New System for Career Success—Journal of Machine Accounting; The Best That's in You—Career Development Council (C.D.C.); Make Your Success More Certain—C.D.C.; Manual for Career Development—C.D.C.; Seed for Success; etc.

Speaker: Scores of addresses to business, professional, and educational groups, in addition to radio programs and TV appearances. Representative organizations include: American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Management Association, Personnel Clubs, National Association of Accountants, American Institute of Industrial Engineers, Society for the Advancement of Management, International Management Congress, Paris (U.S. delegate, 1957), Rotary, and other men's service clubs, Altrusa and women's service clubs, national conventions, university and college conferences—Cornell, Harvard Business School, Syracuse, Rutgers, University of Pennsylvania, George Washington University, Tampa University, etc.

Education and personal data—b. 1911, Brentwood, England; U.S. citizen, 1937; married 1951; granted first certificate by Royal College of Surgeons of England; attended Merton Institute, Columbia, and New York universities.

Social Security Amendments of 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to State for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, as we have taken up H.R. 12580, Social Security Admendments of 1960, it is apparent that the need for a liberal medical care for the aged bill is clearly and strongly supported by factual statistics that highlight the plight of so many of the country's senior citizens.

I vote for this bill despite the fact that I do not feel the provisions of the bill go far enough in attempting to give relief and a feeling of security to elderly citizens. Defeat of this proposal would kill off any chance of a medical care bill being enacted this year. I am hopeful that the Senate will amend and liberalize the provisions.

The following statistics highlight and emphasize the seriousness of the problem and the need for a more adequate program:

Persons over 65 have two to three times as much chronic illnesses as the remainder of the population.

The average hospital patient over 65 stays 15 days, twice the national average for all age groups.

The cost of medical care has increased 49 percent, since 1947. Hospital costs are up 300 percent since before World War II.

Four out of every five persons over 65 are not employed.

Half of those over 65 have incomes of less than $1,000 per year.

Only 40 percent of persons over 65 carry some form of commercial health insurance as compared to the national average of 70 percent.

We have come to a critical juncture in this tremendously important matter, either this Congress is going to provide necessary assistance to our senior citizens, who certainly have earned the right to such aid, or we are going to ignore the plight of the elderly.

I introduced a bill early in the year to amend the social security laws to make health benefits part of the social security system.

Agricultural Abundance an Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues and of others who read the RECORD to an editorial which appeared recently in the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian. It highlights an aspect of our farm program that is rendering a real service to America and the world.

The editorial follows:

[From the East Oregonian, Pendleton, Oreg., June 16, 1960]

AGRICULTURAL ABUNDANCE AN ASSET

(Members of the Pendleton Chapter of the American Association of University Women make intensive studies of many subjects of public interest. This is the first of two reports they have compiled from a study of Federal farm programs.)

The Federal farm program has been frequently displayed to the American public as a dastardly expense to the taxpayer. Any public program that accounts for some $6 billion per year is admittedly expensive.

Obviously, the problem is too complex to delineate in one article.

This article deals with that part of the Federal farm program that enables the United States to move substantial quantities of its farm surpluses in export sales to underdeveloped countries. Public Law 480 currently authorizes $1.5 billion per year to finance such sales to these countries. This represents 25 percent of the total farm program costs. It may be of interest to some to learn what all is included.

The significance of the export market to the Pacific Northwest wheat market is paramount. Freight rates have priced the region's soft white wheat and flour out of Eastern markets where it once enjoyed premium prices. Thus we must look to exports for 80 percent of our market. The influence of this market has some bearing right here at home. Umatilla County produces 25 percent of Oregon's wheat with an annual value of $12.5 million.

Public Law 480, now in its 6th year of operation, provides a means by which the

United States can sell, as well as donate, wheat and other commodities to underdeveloped countries. It is the basis of all "Food for Peace" programs.

During the first 5 years of its operation, Public Law 480 acounted for 45 percent of Pacific Northwest wheat exports. Nationally, it has accounted for $3.7 billion in sales to foreign countries; $547 million in famine relief; $1.2 billion in donations; and $1.1 billion in barter for strategic materials.

Let us examine a bit more closely some of these categories. This program provides a means by which the United States can donate food to meet famine conditions, brought on by flood, drought, hurricanes, and earthquakes, etc. Of the $547 million worth of food donated under this program, $247 million was represented by wheat.

Organizations such as CARE, U.N. Relief, United Catholic Relief, and others, have received food surpluses worth $1.2 billion, which they have distributed to needy persons in many countries. Food packages all bear the label "Donated by the people of the United States." These donations include food for school lunch feeding programs for 21 million school children in 68 countries.

In addition to donations to foreign peoples, Public Law 480 includes provisions for needy persons in the United States. From 1954 to 1959, donations totalling $413 million has been made here at home to 1.4 million persons in charitable institutions, 5 million needy families, and 14 million school children.

In 5 years the United States has traded farm surpluses to acquire $1.1 billion in strategic materials for defense.

Let us turn now to sales made to underdeveloped countries. Between 1954 and 1959, the United States received the equivalent of $3.7 billion in the currencies of a wide variety of countries. For the most part, the currency of underdeveloped countries has limited use in international trade. It can be used, however, to finance economic development projects within the country of origin. About 1.4 billion of this has been from the sale of U.S. wheat. It might be interesting to examine the uses to which the United States has put this $3.7 billion.

The law provides 16 major uses for this money: eight Federal agencies are involved in the programing of this money.

The largest portion of this money, 1.8 billion—or roughly 48 percent, has been loaned back to the purchasing countries for purposes of economic development. Long term, interest bearing (4 percent) loans have been made to 27 countries. In India $234 million has been loaned for the construction of the Sharavathi Power and River Development project. Pakistan received loans for construction of the Karachi Water Supply and Sewage Disposal System, for rehabilitation of Pakistan railroads, and for financing of small industries. Many other underdeveloped countries have received loans for construction of roads and bridges, irrigation and reclamation projects, construction of cement plants, hospitals, and many other projects needed in countries that are striving for improved conditions and economic development.

The second largest use of these funds has been by the United States itself. Fifteen percent of the total foreign currency ($567 million) has been paid for embassy expenses, military housing projects, and other U.S. costs abroad.

A category known as "common defense" accounts for $308 million, or 8.3 percent of the total. This is for the procurement of military equipment, and supplies in friendly countries. In Korea, funds accruing to the United States for sale of farm commodities under Public Law 480, provide 45 percent of the Korean army budget. About $80 million has been allocated for support of the Pakistan army. Similar uses are to be found in 14 countries, including Turkey and Formosa.

A category known as "grants for economic development" provides a means by which money can be granted to foreign countries for the construction and improvement of facilities for health, welfare, and education. This has amounted to $234 million, or 6.3 percent of the total.

Public Law 480 also provides for loans to private enterprise. In 5 years $224 million, or 6 percent of the total foreign currency, has been loaned to 70 firms. Sixty-five of these have been made to U.S. firms for a wide variety of projects. These include such familiar names as the Otis Elevator Co. (India); United Saran Plastic (Israel); Kaiser Frazer (Israel); Warner Lambert Pharmaceutical Co. (Pakistan); Pfizer Pharmaceuticals (Pakistan, Turkey, and Colombia); Abbot Laboratories (Pakistan, France, and Colombia); Bendix Corp. (France); Socony Mobil Oil (Greece); Singer Sewing Machine Co. (Pakistan); Sears Roebuck (Mexico and Peru); General Electric (Mexico); Philco (Mexico); Procter & Gamble (Mexico); Ralston Purina (Mexico and Colombia); International Harvester (Mexico); John Deere (Mexico); and the Lovable Brassiere Co. (Mexico).

All other uses of these funds account for $605 million, or 16.4 percent.

Among these other uses are items such as $1.8 million for a program to teach Turkish Army inductees reading and writing. It includes an educational program that most readers are familiar with—the Fulbright scholarship program.

The first specified use of these funds is for the development of foreign markets for U.S. farm products. This is the source of funds used by organizations like the Oregon Wheat Growers League for the development of markets in foreign countries. This program has played a major role in achieving a 300-percent increase in wheat consumption in Japan during a period of time when bumper rice crops were harvested. It is interesting to note that the total foreign currencies accruing to the United States, sixtenths of 1 percent ($18 million) has been set aside for market development. In the past 5 years, $12 million of this amount has been allocated to producer groups, such as the Oregon Wheat League. Producers of wheat, cotton, tobacco, etc., matched Government funds by providing $5.6 million obtained from growers.

Time will tell us how much foreign aid there has been in Public Law 480. This will depend on the extent to which countries repay their loans. If the loans are repaid, then the United States has been extremely successful in its efforts to assist in the economic development of underdeveloped countries. If the loans are not repaid, this will suggest that these countries have not progressed in their economy ar.d the effect of this could be far greater than the cost represented by unpaid loans.

This article has dealt only with 25 percent of the farm program. However, other portions of the farm program would reveal that the moneys are spent in a wide variety of projects, many of which the American people accept as worthwhile. Before people become overly critical of U.S. foreign aid and food disposal programs, it is well to examine carefully some questions regarding the U.S. responsibility to underdeveloped countries. Whether we like it or not we are involved in the cold war. We have accepted the fact that there is a conflict of ideologies in the world and a battle for men's minds and men's souls. The abundance produced on American farms is playing a very important role in the foreign policy of the United States.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most regrettable that the House failed to approve farm legislation today. Because this session is fast drawing to a close, it probably means that nothing will be done this year to correct the programs that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle admit are damaging, not only to farmers, but to all of our people. The failure to act today apparently means that the Government will continue on in the same insane business of spending more and more in piling up greater and greater surpluses that we do not need—all to the detriment of those who till the soil and to the consumers who are paying more and more for food and more and more in taxes to meet the added needs for defense.

Mr. Speaker, with all the imperfections which it contained, the legislation which was voted down was at least a step in the right direction, because, among other things, it would have attacked headon the scandalous situation involving the cost of the farm program, particularly as it involves the acquisition of surplus commodities by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a report dated June 18, 1960, from the National Grange, one of the Nation's oldest and most conservative farm organizations, for the consideration of my colleagues who may have some doubts about the need of adopting a sensible farm program in the interests of the entire Nation:

WASHINGTON, *June 18, 1960.*

The Grange placed a 4-point recommendation this week before the farm policy committee of the Democratic Advisory Council which will prepare a proposed farm plank for the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles next month.

The recommendations prepared and presented by Roy Battles, assistant to National Master Herschel D. Newsom, represent the kind of balanced and sensible approach to farm problems which has earned for the Grange leadership in farm program development and the unsurpassed confidence of Members of Congress.

The Grange rejected the argument that all present programs should be continued, and at the same time emphasized that it would be sheer folly to discard those programs without first having developed alternatives that would enable farmers to earn reasonable incomes from their labor, investment, and and management of our agricultural production and marketing facilities.

Here, in summary, are the four points of the Grange recommendations made at the Chicago meeting of the farm policy committee:

1. Farm income is dangerously inadequate in terms of national interest.

"Agriculture is the victim of a vicious cost-price squeeze which is not only unfair to

farmers, but dangerous to the Nation as a whole.

"Our capacity to produce in the case of practically all commodities continues to exceed by a significant margin our capacity to sell that production at anywhere near adequate prices. The surplus often sets the price for the total output. Farmers lack machinery for the most part with which to cope with this problem.

"Added processing and marketing costs usually are pushed back in the form of lower prices to farmers rather than resulting in higher prices to consumers, or narrower margins for those in between.

"Low farm income acts as a tremendous drag on the Nation's potential level of economic activity and well-being—because farmers represent an enormous pool of buying power for production, marketing, and consumer goods and services."

2. The efficient family owned and operated farm has an array of values that contribute to the general welfare to such a degree that we feel national policy should be pointed toward whatever steps are necessary to preserve it.

"The family farmer—with capital, labor, and management pooled under his control—has fed and clothed American consumers better and for a smaller proportion of their spendable income than is true in any other nation in the world.

"We believe the family farm represents the Nation's best insurance of a continuation of the policy of food abundance so vital to America in time of peace and in time of a national emergency.

3. In order to solve their income problem farmers must—with the aid of Government in most cases—develop commodity programs designed to stabilize and upgrade income.

"Many of these programs involve the implementation of effective bargaining positions. Farmers sell in a vastly different climate from that enjoyed by those who influence their production, marketing, and living costs, and for the most part lack the machinery with which to adjust their inventories, market on an orderly basis, and bargain effectively.

"Lacking the practical capacity to attain these fundamental goals without the help of Government, we feel that wise national policy calls for enabling legislation on a commodity-by-commodity basis to help them attain these ends.

"Agriculture is faced with a multiplicity of separate problems, more often diverse than similar, arising out of the relationship of agricultural production, processing, and distribution to the total American economy.

"There are two basic approaches to the farm income problem now being debated. (a) The so-called laissez faire, full, free market, get the Government out of agricultural price matters, let the law of supply and demand solve the problem. This is the squeeze-out route. Contention is this would result first in lower prices, then in fewer farmers, and that, eventually, because of fewer farmers, more income per farmer. This would be sheer folly—tantamount to inviting economic catastrophe; and (b) development of programs specifically tailored to meet the individual needs of commodities concerned.

"We favor enabling legislation which would (1) enable farmers to achieve a reasonable degree of effective control over their own marketings, (2) permit programs which place the responsibility for surpluses in the hands of producers themselves, (3) call for programs which would enable price to perform its function and protect farm income while using the facilities of private trade, (4) enable farmers to cope with ever-rising production and marketing costs, (5) enable farmers to secure income from consumers, not taxpayers, (6) authorize machinery that would enable farmers to continue to produce and market better products more efficiently, and (7) authorize programs that would give us the same sort of economic powers used in the public interest that are enjoyed by organized labor and most industries."

4. Plan now for meeting the expanded requirements of a growing population by developing a long-range land-utilization program designed to encourage each acre being put to its best use.

"We should be preparing for the day when our expanding markets finally catch up with our capacity to produce. This means land utilization so as to preserve its productivity.

"We do not envision this as a production adjustment effort, although it would undoubtedly help to balance excess supplies with demand, but rather as a program whereby farmers would be helped—educationally and sometimes with incentives—to utilize their land in accordance with wise land use.

"The best land, from a food production standpoint, should not be gobbled up by industries, defense installations, and other developments, when such developments could take place equally well on less desirable land."

Educator Praises Stand on School Construction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, with some people bemoaning the fact that the Federal aid for school construction bill has been held within the confines of the House Rules Committee, I believe it is of interest to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received recently from one of Minnesota's outstanding educators, Dr. George Budd. Dr. Budd is the president of Saint Cloud State College and is an informed spokesman for education progress in the State of Minnesota and the Nation.

I believe his letter clearly underscores the position of many members of the National Education Association who have seriously and constructively opposed further extension of Federal aid to education for elementary and secondary schools.

To give Dr. Budd's views on H.R. 10128, I am submitting the text of his letter to me at this time:

SAINT CLOUD STATE COLLEGE,
Saint Cloud, Minn., June 10,1960.

Representative ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: I am pleased to note that you voted against the Federal aid school construction bill. It is my hope that even though this bill has gone to the conference committee you will continue to fight against its passage.

I am a life member of the National Education Association and I am well aware that the NEA staff in Washington support the broadest kind of Federal aid to public education. I would point out to you that there are many strong, active, and important members of the NEA who, even though we are a minority, are unequivocally opposed to any expansion of the Federal aid to education program until such time as the individual States have proved that they have exhausted every possibility to meet their responsibilities to the children of the schools of their respective States.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE F. BUDD,
President.

Farm Surplus Reduction Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the House has just killed the only farm bill that has come to the floor this year. It appears that so far as wheat is concerned there will be no legislation this session. This should be sufficient notice to Members from the agricultural areas that the time has now come when they must stop playing politics with agriculture and attack the problem at its source.

The fact is, agriculture is simply the first of the various segments of our country to fall victim to our international, one-world policy. No one in Congress or no one in the Nation who has the ability to add a column of figures can lack the understanding of the problem facing American agriculture, but few have the political courage to do anything about it.

Everyone knows there is actually no such thing as a domestic farm problem. Everyone knows that the problem is simply a foreign policy problem. Everyone knows that what is actually happening is that America is importing the food that goes onto our tables and the fiber which goes onto our backs, and the production of the acreage supplanted by these imports is being purchased by the Federal Government and termed as "surplus."

There is no question but what we have in this country a large surplus, but that surplus is not created by overproduction. It is simply created by an oversupply.

Those who refuse to admit that the agricultural problem is simply the result of our foreign policy contend that overproduction and oversupply are synonymous. I call your attention to the fact, however, that oversupply can be created by three things: first, excessive imports, second, lag in exports, and third, excessive domestic production. The oversupply that we have in the United States today is caused primarily by the first two, excessive imports and a lag in exports. We do not have an excessive domestic production, only in the sense that our desire to maintain these foreign imports has led to a program of supports on certain commodities which have kept these commodities in high production and have thrown agricultural production out of balance.

The serious thing is that this program is not only throwing agricultural production out of balance in America, but it is throwing agricultural production out of balance throughout the free world.

DOMESTIC PROBLEM

Let us take a look first at the import problem as it applies to our domestic situation:

First, with regard to wool, American agriculture is permitted to produce less than one-third of the wool that is actually processed and used in this country, and yet because wood is a commodity that is readily susceptible to international trade, the Federal Government has been required to provide a wool support and subsidy program in order to prevent the complete abandonment of wool production in the Nation. It is impossible to determine the acreage required to produce the wool actually used in this country, but it is estimated it would require at least 75 million acres. If American agriculture were producing only the wool used domestically, there would be no surplus acres, there would be no need for soil bank and all of the other acreage reduction programs.

Another example: In 1958 we permitted the import of 2,061,456 head of beef into this country. This was serious, and some of us who protested were given the assurance that beef imports would be reduced. In 1959, instead of a reduction, beef imports jumped to 2,337,438 head.

The Department of Agriculture is unable to give me relative figures on the acres required to produce a beef for market, but it is estimated that nationwide it requires the production of approximately 20 acres to produce, feed, fatten, and place a beef on the American market. In other words, beef imports alone supplanted the production of more than 45 million acres in the United States during 1959. The total national wheat allotment is only 55 million acres, and there are probably few wheat producers who would not prefer being in the cattle business if they had a market for their beef.

Lamb and mutton: During the past 3 years imports of dressed lamb have increased more than 90 percent, reaching more than 9,500,000 pounds of dressed lamb in 1959, with mutton imports in 3 years jumping almost 7,400 percent to 47,300,000 pounds. Live sheep and lamb imports in 1959 totaled 75,073 head with facilities now available for mass importation of live sheep from Australia and New Zealand. The production of many thousand domestic acres is supplanted by these imports, and yet the Tariff Commission refuses to invoke the escape clause on any agricultural imports.

Hogs and pork have followed the same pattern on imports with thousands of head of hogs or the carcass equivalent in pork pouring across our borders supplementing the production of thousands of acres of corn and feed grain.

Other countries with an eye to protecting their farmers and consumers have taken steps to protect their people. Beef imports would probably have been a half million head higher in 1959 had not Canada and Mexico invoked quotas against exporting beef into the United States because the U.S. market was draining the beef from our two neighboring countries creating shortages and excessive prices in both of those countries.

DISRUPTION

The American international policy has not only ruined agriculture by forcing a freeze in acreage production, but is creating the same situation in friendly foreign countries who are exporting into the United States because their farmers are producing for export to America rather than producing for consumption in their own countries. Our policy has not only disrupted agriculture in America, it is disrupting agriculture throughout the free world.

WHEAT

The high support price resorted to by Congress rather than protecting the American farmer against foreign imports has resulted in a freeze in crop acres. The commodity that has suffered the greatest from this freeze is wheat with a 55 million-acre domestic quota and then an unlimited bypass program for farmers in noncommercial wheat areas. More than half of the so-called wheat surplus is annually produced by 1,200,000 15-acre exemption farmers. Wheat is no longer raised in the Great Plains wheat producing area. The present farm program has diverted wheat to the rice paddies of the South, to the sugarcane fields of the South—fields that should be producing rice and sugar but are prohibited because of the so-called Sugar Act which permits countries like Cuba to import over 3,200,000 short tons of sugar per year for American consumption while sugar beet and sugarcane acres are diverted to some other crop that instead of going onto the American market goes into some Government warehouse.

If Congress were to protect American agriculture from a majority of these imports, there would be no wheat problem. Acres now producing wheat would return to the production of beef, lamb, pork, wool, sugar, and the other food and fiber crops supplanted now by imports.

FEED GRAINS

This bill provides a special program for feed grains. This provision is supposed to be necessary in order to support the price of the crop. Were it not for importation of beef, pork, and mutton, we do not have enough acres to produce this food without the need for such a program. We are supposed to have a surplus of some 200 million bushels of barley and 275 million bushels of oats which costs the American taxpayers approximately $26 million per year in storage and which, because of its existence, is depressing the domestic price of these two commodities. By checking the records, however, we find that in the past 10 years this Nation has imported, primarily from Canada, 224 million bushels of barley and over 344 million bushels of oats. One wonders whose surplus feed grains the American taxpayer is contributing $26 million per year to store.

Rye is another example. In the past 10 years, the actual disappearance of rye has been in excess of the domestic production, and yet there are several million bushels in storage today at the expense of the American taxpayer.

THE ILLNESS

As I indicated before, there is in America today no farm problem. We do not have sufficient acres to produce the food and fiber eaten and worn by American citizens. Our problem is rather an international or import problem manipulated by the State Department under laws passed by Congress authorizing the further reduction of tariffs.

Of course, we have not seen the end of this yet. Meeting next September in Geneva under the aegis of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are delegates under the authorization of this Congress passed in August 1958, directing the President to further reduce by 20 percent import tariffs. Our delegates will be further reducing import quotas and tariffs on agricultural commodities. It can only have one effect on agriculture, and that is to increase imports and to further supplement the production of more acres, creating further and greater havoc for the American farmer and further compounding the problems of this Congress.

EXPORTS

Throughout our national history, America has been an agricultural exporting Nation. This is no longer true. Last year our agricultural exports, even though a bulk of them were highly subsidized, amounted to only $3.719 billion while our agricultural imports exceeded $4 billion. What Congress and the Nation have been doing under the program that has been in operation for a number of years is to import the food and fiber going onto our tables and onto our backs and then purchasing the production from the acres thus supplanted and trying to give away or sell for foreign currencies which are in turn given away, or to sell under a highly subsidized program for dollars the production from these acres that would otherwise be producing for American consumption.

These giveaway programs include relief and school lunch programs domestically and a vast Public Law 480 program internationally. Under Public Law 480, our products from the acres supplanted by foreign imports are sold for foreign currencies which currencies must then be used in that country and in many instances are used for the construction of highways, dams, public power facilities, and other programs that the American taxpayer cannot afford at home but is sponsoring elsewhere under the disguise of disposing of surplus farm products.

We brag about our foreign agricultural exports. The truth is we have very little foreign agricultural exports. What actually happens is that much of it, for which the Department of Agriculture is taking credit, is outright gifts, grants, and donations.

Of the $3.719 billion of agricultural exports last year, $1.050 billion was disposed of through Public Law 480. Other exports totaled $2.669 billion. On these exports the American taxpayers paid a subsidy in the form of ocean transportation of more than $90 million. Of the $2.669 billion exports it is estimated that $1.2 billion received governmental sale subsidies in the form of short-term

credit, sales from Government-owned stocks at less than market price, and export payments in cash or in kind at the rate of about 60 cents per bushel on wheat and 8 cents per pound on cotton, et cetera. In order to move these products at all, these export subsidies paid by the American taxpayer was in excess of 10 percent of the value thereof, this in addition to the cost of ocean transportation.

Actually, our so-called agricultural exports which are not gifts or the equivalent of gifts or are not highly subsidized in one form or another are small indeed. It is difficult to determine the exact figure, but it is probably not in excess of a half billion dollars.

It should be borne in mind that every dollar's worth of imports entering this country comes in at regular price and goes onto the American market at regular price, whereas, of the exports we actually have, not more than a half billion dollars is sold free of subsidy and a large percentage of it is given away.

DOLLAR VALUE

I am not proposing that we stop all agricultural imports. To do so would probably not only disrupt our domestic economy but would likewise disrupt the economies of friendly foreign countries. I am suggesting that it is absolutely essential that we stop a majority of these imports. Otherwise, the agricultural industry in America faces complete ruination.

It should be remembered that the American farmer is producing his product and selling it on the domestic market, receiving therefore a dollar bill worth 47.8 cents. This has been brought about because of inflation. The foreign farm producer sells his product on the American market and receives therefore a dollar bill which he in turn can deposit in any international bank and demand and receive 100 cents in gold from the depository at Fort Knox.

The American farmer operates on a dollar worth 48 cents in paying his rent, his machinery, his tools, his equipment, his labor, while his foreign competitor operates on a dollar worth 100 cents in gold.

SOLUTION

As I have indicated so many times before, the illness that faces American agriculture is the malignant import cancer. As an untrained physician, Uncle Sam is attempting to cure the illness by placing support price bandages over the sores where the cancer is draining instead of performing a major operation for the removal of the cancer. Major surgery can be accomplished in four principal steps:

First. Repeal of the Trade Agreements Act renewed in August 1958, which authorizes the President to further reduce tariffs as much as 20 percent.

Second. Return the handlings of tariffs to the Tariff Commission, an arm of Congress, as the Constitution requires, and force the Tariff Commission either to invoke the escape clause liberally or provide import tariffs equal to the competitive value of the inflated dollar on a domestic basis of 47.8 cents as compared with the foreign basis of 100 cents.

Third. Freeze all existing agricultural stocks in the hands of the CCC, permitting none of it to be placed on the domestic competitive market.

Fourth. Repeal all price supports, acreage controls, and regulatory programs, and return agriculture to the free enterprise system under the law of supply and demand.

In the case of presently supported crops, it will require a few years to adjust from the present acreages to acreages producing crops and foods that are salable on the American market, and during that interim period an adjustment program will probably be needed. For instance, wheat will need a domestic parity program while some of those acres are going into production of beef, mutton, pork, and other crops, but the time has come when Congress must stop this political and international hokum and face up to the realities of American needs.

PRESENT BILL

Today we are considering the extension of a wheat support bill, a program which provides a high support payment for wheat with a provision for limited production.

It is necessary that Congress pass this kind of a bill until the Congress garners sufficient intestinal fortitude to tackle this problem at its roots.

Much has been said about reducing support prices on the basic crops in order to discourage production of these crops. Much has been said about the value of the soil bank program and other programs to take cropland out of production. These probably are necessary, but let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that unless we materially reduce these imports, Congress cannot take land out of production fast enough to meet the added import problem.

American agriculture is sick, not because of American agricultural overproduction, but because of oversupply, and that oversupply has resulted and will continue to result from excessive imports.

Social Security Amendments of 1960

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the Social Security Act is of importance to millions of Americans today. It is for this reason that I am highly gratified that the Committee on Ways and Means has spent these past several months giving close study to many proposed amendments aimed at improving and strengthening this act. While this bill may not incorporate some of the features many of us might have liked to have seen presented to the House, it does recognize the fact that laws dealing with social security need almost constant attention in order to determine whether or not in these changing times the law meets the basic needs for which it was originally designed. I believe that there are some good proposals in this bill.

However, I am frank to admit, Mr. Chairman, that I was disappointed to have the committee fail to report favorably the Forand bill which would have placed the problem of medical assistance for the aged under our social security system. I wish to put myself on record as still favoring such an approach to this most pressing problem.

One significant amendment to the present law is the removing of the requirement that disabled workers must be at least 50 years old to receive benefits. This would be removed and although the present strict definition of eligibility would remain it does liberalize the law with respect to disability eligibility.

I for one am tired of having the threadbare cliche of "socialized medicine" thrown into the picture everytime the problem of America's senior citizens and their medical problems are discussed. I seem to recall that something of the same bogeyman was thrown up as a diversion way back in the days when the first social security law was enacted. The Washington Post in an editorial of February 20, 1960, rather effectively demolished this alarm cry of socialized medicine when it says in part:

> That the American Medical Association would offer its usual doctrinaire opposition to this proposal was as much to be expected as a bill from a doctor after a visit to his office. Senator MCNAMARA has observed that the American Medical Association had nothing to offer but tired abuse. This is not, by the wildest flight of the most neurotic fancy, socialized medicine or political medicine. It is simply a system, if the AMA could but calm its nerves long enough to realize it, which like Blue Cross or Group Hospitalization or any other insurance program, would enable a patient to go to the doctor and the hospital of his choice and pay the bills resulting from the care he needs in old age. It would help doctors, hospitals and medicine in general. And it would enable American men and women to retire in their old age with more security and self-respect.

There are other reasons why I favor the placing of this program within the framework of the Social Security Act. By placing this program under social security most older persons would benefit and could be assured of hospital care, additional skilled nursing care, and surgical benefits. Around 13 million men and women would get lifetime protection—all of those eligible for old-age benefits under social security. By placing this program under social security it

would mean that old people not entitled to old-age benefits would be helped indirectly if they turn to public assistance for, since smaller numbers would be forced to seek such aid, each one could be given more adequate assistance from the limited funds available to existing welfare agencies.

By placing this program under social security young workers would gain, since their aging parents would be protected at once and they and their families would have similar protection on retirement or if the wage earner dies leaving young children. The most any employed person would have to pay in the early years would be a dollar a month or 23 cents a week—one-fourth percent of earnings up to $4,800. For farmers and other self-employed people, the maximum contribution would be 35 cents a week.

Mr. Chairman, few persons over 65 have now nor can they afford good health insurance protection through any other means than within the framework of the social security setup. According to Government published figures only about two out of five have any such protection now and much of that is inadequate, can be cancelled, has lifetime ceilings and is very costly. The best-known policies cost from $6.50 to $8.50 a month per person and pay only part, perhaps not even half, of hospital costs for up to only 31 days.

It is my firm contention that by approaching this problem of medical aid for the aged from the angle of our social security setup, we would actually strengthen our welfare agencies, hospitals and Blue Cross. Such an approach would relieve these agencies of the high-cost load of the aged. Many hospitals today have large and growing deficits. Blue Cross keeps raising rates partly because it includes retired people without charging them more than the community rate. As a result, Blue Cross is increasingly threatened by competition from commercial companies selling such insurance. Public welfare agencies now spend $300 million a year for health care for the aged. In many communities a large part of the old-age assistance costs are for medical care, which is an ever-growing burden. A dependable system of financing health costs for the aged, such as would be provided through the social security system, would help these community agencies to improve and extend their services. High quality, skilled nursing homes would be assured of revenues. A speedy return to independence and home care could be stressed.

Now the costs of all this would be very moderate. According to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the cost would be only about $1 billion the first year and these new benefits can be financed on a sound basis through the social security payroll tax and without endangering present cash benefits. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the long-range cost of such a program under social security would be only about four-fifths of 1 percent of taxable payrolls. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that insurance through the social security system is the best insurance buy available.

When over 10 million Americans—and the estimate runs as high as 16 million oldsters—stand in need of big medicine, it is no time to come up with an aspirin tablet. To use the standing joke of the veteran of the past war, an APC—all purpose capsule—is not the solution to specific and pressing medical needs for these elderly citizens and we of the Congress should not hold this out to these people.

While I shall vote to enact the provision in H.R. 12580 concerning medical care for the aged, I must state that I am not at all satisfied with it. This dissatisfaction points up sharp differences now existing in the approach to the health problems our senior citizens are facing. This proposal in H.R. 12580 would leave the elderly liable to heavy outlays. Also, instead of being operated by one agency as would be the case under social security, this plan would be either operated by those of the 50 States which adopted it, or by commercial insurance companies which the States paid to do the job. Not only would such an administrative program be expensive and relatively inefficient, but the plan would require adoption by the individual State legislatures, and many feel that there would be heavy pressure from various quarters against such adoption. It is further recognized that many States are already in critical financial condition and would be extremely hard put to pay their share of the program. In addition, this program under consideration by us here today is designed to cover only about one-half to one million persons—leaving ignored the millions who need such insurance and who would be eligible under social security arrangements. Let us hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate will see fit to incorporate into its consideration of this bill the social security approach to this matter.

I support the other amendments to the Social Security Act and believe these changes are in the direction of liberalization and that in spite of the limitations I have discussed the bill deserves support.

The Blind: A Case of Mistaken Identity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to hear a most remarkable address by Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, president of the National Federation of the Blind, at a 40th anniversary banquet given by Minnesota Organization of Blind, Inc., in Minneapolis. Dr. tenBroek, who is an educator, author, legal scholar and social welfare administrator, prepared the address in braille. I asked him to have it transcribed into English that it might have the widest possible circulation—both because of the sensitive insights which only a man himself blind could have, and because of the penetration and precision of his thought, the beauty and eloquence of his expression, and the delicate humor and warm humanness of his persuasive presentation. It is easy to understand how he has risen to his position as chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of California and chairman of the State Board of Social Welfare in California. The address follows:

THE BLIND: A CASE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY

(Address by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek, president, National Federation of the Blind, spring 1960)

From time immemorial, blind people have been the victims of mistaken identity. Not that their lack of sight has gone unrecognized or unnoticed—far from it. But at one time or another they have been falsely identified also as a class of pariahs, as divinely accursed, as mentally defective, physically incompetent, or socially unstable. It is only in very recent years that society has begun to give recognition to the novel doctrine that blindness means only the loss of sight, neither more nor less; and that any further loss to the blind person is the consequence not of his blindness but of the social and psychological conditions in which it occurs. In short, the disability of blindness is physical; but the handicap of blindness has always been predominantly social.

This is still today a revolutionary doctrine—not only among the public but among the professionally informed and expert as well. In the social diagnosis of blindness, mistaken identification is still generally the rule rather than the exception.

There are, in particular, two forms of mistaken identity by which the blind are victimized in modern society. The first is the mistake of overidentification, which assumes that if blind people are alike in one respect they must be alike in all—and in all respects different from the rest of society. The second is the mistake of underidentification, which presumes that those who are blind have no characteristics at all in common and cannot for any purposes be grouped or classified together.

We are all familiar with the fallacy of overidentification, which in its classic form identifies all who are blind as members of a class of abnormal if not wholly incompetent human beings. What we may not know is how widespread this fallacy has become in professional and academic, as well as public, circles. While there are many social scientists and workers with the blind who recognize and resist this form of mistaken identity, there are others actively at work to reinforce and perpetuate it. The most dangerous form which this fallacy assumes today is that of categorizing the blind as a "deviant group." The concept of the "deviant" is a recent and dubious device of social science to identify any person or group which departs in some significant way from the "norm"—that is, from the average and conventional. In other words, "deviant" is a sophisticated synonym for the old-fashioned term "abnormal." The social scientist may protest that his use of "deviant" has only a technical and statistical meaning; that those who are superior and unusually gifted are no less "deviants" than those who fall below the social norm. But the fact is that "deviation" is seldom used to describe such differences as these. As one authority has noted, "Everyone is deviant in some respects. A man known to the author is abnormally short, abnormally good in singing hillbilly, * * * is undernourished, and is allergic to camel hair. In all of these respects he is markedly deviant, but he is a successful, in fact prominent, businessman with an enviable reputation." In short, this man's

"deviations" from the norm are no handicap because they pass unnoticed. He may be, as the author says, "markedly deviant"; but he is not marked as a deviant.

On the other hand everyone knows, or supposes that he knows, who and what a "real" deviant is. Sex fiends are deviants. Criminals are deviants. So are morons, fanatics, prostitutes, juvenile delinquents, and all who inhabit skid rows and lunatic fringes of society. In short, the term "deviant" refers in its most common usage to immoral or antisocial behavior patterns, and to the characteristics of abnormality which call for suppression or isolation. When the blind are so marked and classified, however innocent the intention of the classifier, they are effectually thrown back into the communal pit of outcasts and misfits which was known to earlier centuries under the simple and accurate title of Bedlam.

Lest I seem to exaggerate, let me cite an example from the current literature of social science. It is from a textbook significantly entitled "Social Pathology," written by Prof. Edwin M. Lemert of the University of California at Los Angeles, first published in 1951. Pathology, as the dictionary tells us, is the scientific study of diseases and the diseased. What are the social diseases with which this author is concerned? They are the diseases listed in several chapters under the heading, "Part Two: Deviation and Deviants"—and they include the following: "Blindness and the Blind," "Radicalism and Radicals," "Prostitution and the Prostitute," "Crime and the Criminal," "Drunkenness and the Chronic Alcoholic," and—finally and inevitably—"Mental Disorders."

These then are the deviations and deviants—the forms of social disease and the disease carriers—which are taken to be the proper subject matter of a study in "social pathology." This is the company which the blind find themselves keeping in a modern textbook of social science.

It is, of course, exactly the company which the blind formerly kept in the asylum and the almshouse. We need only recall the American almshouse of half a century ago, whose inmates comprised (according to a classic description) "the crippled and the sick; the insane; the blind; deaf mutes, feeble-minded and epileptic; people with all kinds of chronic diseases; * * * short term prisoners; thieves, no longer physically capable of crime; worn out prostitutes, etc." In short, the almshouse was the place of last resort for all those marked indelibly by society as "deviants." Over the years the blind have gradually made their escape from this bedlam and its psychological stigma, Or so we had thought and hoped. Are we now to be recommitted to the category of the asylum through a new device of mistaken identity: that of "deviation and the deviant"?

This form of mistaken identification of the blind is not a superstition conjured up by ignorant folk unacquainted with the nature of social groups. It is not the shrewd device of tax-conscious citizens who fear the excessive cost of adequate social provisions. It is not the rationalization of lighthouse custodians with a vested interest in the preservation of the myth of incompetence and abnormality. It is not the excuse of sentimental and overprotective souls who enjoy ministering to the helpless, so long as they remain perfectly helpless. It is the sophisticated theory of a professor of social science—an expert in social diseases—whose interest is in the classification and treatment of pathological deviations from the norm of social health.

It is especially significant—and in keeping with the proper moral attitude toward "deviants"—that the author of this textbook on pathological behavior regards the blind, and particularly the organized blind, with undisguised suspicion. In fact, he finds them a crafty if not a sinister group. His chapter on blindness and the blind opens with these words: "Blindness is at once a dramatic and engaging handicap." Near the end he cites a newspaper story to illustrate "the relative ease with which the public may be manipulated by the blind." He concludes his chapter with this evaluation: "As long as the societal reaction toward the blind remains as it is, there will continue to be a sizable number of the blind who make a profession of dependency."

No less revealing is this pathologist's attitude toward voluntary organization by the blind. After a summary account of two so-called militant groups of the blind in Minnesota—"militant," apparently, because they are all blind in membership and have had disagreements with local welfare agencies—the author concludes: "All these facts create interesting speculation. While the actions of the two groups may be regarded as the group equivalent of tantrum behavior, they also raise a question as to what happens when the blind in a collective capacity desert their traditional roles of humility and agitate in an independent way like any other pressure group." Finally, the author's judgment of the general capabilities of blind people (and incidentally of which ones among them are especially gifted) may be gleaned from this observation: "While most of the blind are immobilized because of illnesses or because of extreme dependency, some blind mendicants are able to move fairly well through their environments."

This then is the modern form of mistaken identity imposed upon the blind at the hands of some social scientists—the high-sounding categorization of "deviation and the deviant" which not only tars all who are blind with the same brush of abnormality but shuffles them in with all those others branded by society as "undesirables": that is, with radicals, prostitutes, criminals, drunks, and the mentally defective.

But it is wrong to think of this stereotype of the deviant as a new form of mistaken identity. It is rather, as we have seen, an ancient superstition in modern dress; it is the age-old conception of the blind as an abnormal, inferior, and suspect group—a group to be segregated and confined apart from normal society in institutions of charity and correction.

Nor is this conception of the deviant the only form of "overidentification" indulged in by social scientists. There is also the equally frivolous abuse of the vocabulary of psychoanalysis by social workers and psychologists—an abuse exemplified by the loose currency given such terms as "compulsive," "aggression," "compensation," and the like, which has led in some circles to the appallingly unscientific supposition that all blind persons are neurotic by definition—if not downright mentally ill. Even so relatively sophisticated a volume as Allen Gorman's recent study of "The War Blind" shows signs of succumbing to this easy imputation of ill-defined complexes and subconscious conflicts on the part of all who are blind: an attitude which leads inescapably to the inference that the primary responsibility for the condition of the sightless—for dependency and discrimination, for poor laws and prejudice, for exclusion and overprotection—lies not with society and its institutions but with the "unsocial" or unhealthy attitudes of the blind person himself. The consequences of such "pseudo-analysis" are as destructive as they are defeatist: destructive in their sweeping denial of normality and equality to all who are without sight, and defeatist in their suggestion that the only feasible solution to the social and economic problems that press upon the average blind individual lies in a change of heart or of metabolism on his part alone. They are still another variant of that form of mistaken identity of the blind which we have labeled "overidentification"—the assumption that blindness means, not just the lack of sight, but the lack of normality, the lack of ability, and very probably the lack of sanity as well.

This fallacy of overidentification occurs not only among those who are in opposition or indifferent to the blind; but even among many who are their friends and wish them well. Thus the State of Pennsylvania just last year passed a law permitting physically disabled persons such as the blind to teach in the public schools. Nothing could be more commendable or progressive. But the legislature could see no better way of accomplishing this than by amendment to a section dealing with mental disorders, communicable diseases, narcotics addicts, and immoral character. The law, as duly amended, now reads:

"Section 1209. Disqualifications. No teacher's certificate shall be granted to any person who has not submitted * * * a certificate from a physician * * * setting forth that said applicant is neither mentally nor physically disqualified, by reason of tuberculosis or any other chronic or acute defect, communicable disease or by reason of mental disorder from successful performance of the duties of a teacher; nor to any person who has not a good moral character, or who is in the habit of using opium or other narcotic drugs in any form, or any intoxicating drink as a beverage, or to any applicant who has a major physical disability or defect unless such a person submits a certificate signed by an official of the college or university from which he was graduated or of an appropriate rehabilitation agency, certifying that in the opinion of such official the applicant, by his work and activities, demonstrated that he is sufficiently adjusted, trained, and motivated to perform the duties of a teacher, notwithstanding his impediment."

Note with what unusual weight the burden of proof falls upon the blind or physically disabled applicant. All who apply to teach require a medical clearance; but he alone requires a testimonial from his college or his rehabilitation counselor to the effect that he is sufficiently adjusted, trained, and motivated—and that he has proved all this by his work and activities—whatever that may mean. Not only is the burden of proof upon the handicapped; the full spotlight of suspicion is on him; the underlying assumption that he is ill-adjusted and unmotivated. The traditional associations of mistaken identity, in the classic form of overidentification, are thus vividly revealed even in this up-to-date and constructive legislation partially removing the absolute bar against blind teachers.

So much for the form of mistaken identity known as overidentification. There is an equal and opposite form of mistaken identity which is no less vicious and destructive in its consequences—that of underidentification. It consists of the refusal to regard the blind as possessing any characteristics common to themselves which are also unique to themselves. It is the denial that blind persons can or should be classified together for any purposes whatsoever. This fallacy of underidentification is the device for example of those who reject the right of the blind to organize by themselves as an independent group—on the ostensible theory that blind people really have nothing in common which justifies their mutual association, and indeed that it is somehow a denial of individuality for the blind person to seek common cause with others who are blind. Thus the American Association of Workers for the Blind have argued against the right-to-organize bill that "the great majority of blind persons prefer to be considered as normal members of society"—that is to say, as individuals with no common

characteristics which organization might further. At the same time, the executive director of the Nation's largest private agency for the blind opposed the bill on the grounds that "it would tend to further the segregation of blind persons" and to coerce them into into an identification which he obviously considered artificial and unreal. In short, it is often argued that the blind have no right to organize because they have no need to organize—that there are no needs and purposes common to the blind which should draw them together in voluntary association.

This form of mistaken identity—the refusal to identify or classify the blind on any grounds at all—is also the device of those who, like some agency reviewers of Hope Deferred, resist any and all generalizations about "the blind" as suggesting a unity and solidarity which they choose to disbelieve in. Thus Philip S. Platt of the New York Lighthouse has said of the volume: "It is regrettable that the authors throughout the book generalize about 'the blind,' who have little if anything in common except varying degrees of loss of vision." Thus also Burnham Carter, the national director of Recordings for the Blind, maintained in his book review that blind people differ widely among themselves in their personal characteristics, and therefore cannot be classified together as a group. One wonders how Mr. Carter's agency justifies its restrictive title and even its existence. Since there is no group of "the blind," how is there a special and common need among them for recordings and talking books? The wonderment grows when we consider Mr. Platt's Lighthouse for the Blind. Here is a specialized agency providing a battery of services for a group which does not exist—or which, at best, has "little if anything in common except varying degrees of loss of vision."

This fallacy of underidentification is also exemplified by those who contend that the blind ought not to have separate sheltered workshops — for purposes of training, therapy, or employment—but should simply be thrown in with all others of the handicapped and unfortunate under a single blanket of shelter. It is the fallacy, further, of those who would take away the preference of blind persons in the Federal vending-stand program and extend it to all who are in any way physically disabled. It is the fallacy, still more significantly, of all who resist the provision of specialized counseling, training and placement facilities for the blind within programs of vocational rehabilitation—on the grounds that blindness is after all just another disability, no more or less complex or severe in its nature and consequences than any other.

This form of mistaken identification is, most popularly of all, the fallacy of those who would dissolve the established categories of aid under the social security programs of public assistance; namely, the categories of the blind, the aged, dependent children, and the permanently and totally disabled. The argument which they advance is one of the bureaucratic convenience and economy; but the assumption which lies behind it is that none of these categories or recipient groups is sufficiently distinct from the others to be treated independently, in terms of its peculiar needs and specific problems.

How valid is this argument? For an answer we must look at the purposes which public assistance is or should be designed to serve with respect to these various clients. Are they the same purposes for needy children and for the permanently and totally disabled, for the needy aged and the blind?

It is true that there is one overriding purpose applicable to all four categories: to relieve the distress of poverty through a program of income maintenance. It is true also that there is some intermingling and sharing of other purposes, such as self-care, medical attention and rehabilitation. Finally, it is true that some of the categories are more closely related to each other than others. Many of the blind, for example, are also aged. Where blindness is the consequence of the infirmities and diseases of old age, a choice of categories may be necessary. In other respects, the problems of the blind are more similar to those of the permanently and totally disabled than they are to those of the aged or dependent children. The compartments are not watertight. There is some seepage and interchange. Especially at the edges and in individual cases, there is a tendency to overlap. Differences are often to be marked out in terms of focus, emphasis and degree rather than in terms of absolutes and of kind. It was ever thus in dealing with humans, who, whatever their diversities, do at least have this in common, that they are humans.

Within these broad qualifications, however, the purposes of the four categories are distinct.

For aid to dependent children the purposes are to protect children from the consequences of poverty and family disorganization, to maintain and strengthen family life so that the children may avail themselves of educational opportunities and may grow up to be responsible, self-supporting, and self-sufficient citizens; to encourage parents to attain maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection. Needy children may vary in a thousand other ways among themselves; but as children they share these needs in common, and they share them with no adult group. For the restricted legal and social purposes of public aid, they are rightly to be regarded as a separate group and distinct category.

What about the senior citizens who are the recipients of old-age assistance? Are their needs no different from those of needy children? Are their problems those of babies and adolescents? Do they require educational opportunities? This group of aid recipients is by state of life past the years of preparation and training for occupation or profession. This group is by the chronology of life no longer concerned about relations with its parents. Their parents need no longer be encouraged to "attain maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection." The aged group is by the biology of life, if nothing more, freed from those features which have plagued the public relations of ADC; the availability of child-care facilities; truancy from school; juvenile delinquency; illegitimate children; sexual promiscuity; and common law relations. One does not, of course, maintain that those who are in the advanced years of life are identical in their interests, talents, backgrounds, or personalities. But however much they vary among themselves, in these and a thousand other ways, they share the characteristics and the needs which it is the purpose of old-age assistance to meet; self-care; housekeeping, nursing home, hospital and medical care facilities; the creative use of leisure in the sunset of life; the search for a role by and for those whom the economy and the social organization have left unloved, unhonored, unwanted, and unutilized.

No less distinctive and distinguishable is the set of special needs peculiar to those of our citizens who are permanently and totally disabled. The legal and social purposes of public aid are not concerned with the myriad personal differences—say, of race, color, or creed—among the members of this category; nor should they be. However much these members differ among themselves, they are alike in the needs which are imposed by permanent total disability—the need for restorative and independent living services—and they share these needs with no others in quite the same way or to the same degree.

How is it, finally, with the blind? Are their needs in public assistance the same as those of other categories of recipients? Are they to be treated in the same way as the permanently and totally disabled with whom they share many common problems and above all a common need for rehabilitation? If so, their hopes for escape from dependency, for the achievement of self-support and competitive acceptance, are surely doomed, for their rehabilitation problems are quite distinct, as I shall show in a moment. Are the needs of blind people still in the productive years of life the needs of older citizens who have progressed beyond those years? If so, the objectives of rehabilitation, of retraining and of economic contribution are pointless. Are the problems of blind adults then the problems of needy children? Only those who still regard the blind as helpless wards to be sheltered and overprotected are likely to answer that question in the affirmative.

To argue for the preservation of the principle of separate aid categories under public assistance is not at all to defend the present boundary lines or requirements of eligibility for any one of them. It is entirely unreasonable and senseless, for example, to provide aid to needy children (as the law now provides it) only on the death, incapacity or continued absence of a parent from the home. Children become needy on many more grounds than these. Again, with reference to old-age assistance, it is unreasonable to draw distinctions between those who have lived in one place for an arbitrary length of time and those equally old and equally needy who have not—or between those who are citizens and those who are not. But such objections as these are not to the principle of distinctive categories but only to artificial restrictions within them. Indeed, the opposition to separate categories—where it does not stem from the philosophy of mistaken identity—is otherwise misdirected and misconceived: it should be aimed, not at the principle, but at its maladministration.

In the field of vocational rehabilitation the common and unique needs of the blind as a group are no less distinguishable than in public assistance. For the average person with other disabilities, rehabilitation typically involves some form of medical provision or physical therapy: learning to walk or to use prosthetic devices, learning to use one's muscles after polio, learning to live with limitations after a heart attack, correcting a speech defect, or adjusting to a hearing aid. In short, vocational rehabilitation for the average disabled person who is not blind generally means physical restoration. But rehabilitation of the blind is altogether different. The average blind person in need of rehabilitation has no health problem. He is not sick. He does not need physical restoration. Lenses will not help him. He cannot be taught new ways of using his eyes. In short, his rehabilitation needs are not those of the patient. What he does need is help in adjusting to his blindness. He needs to understand that it should not keep him from doing the things he has always done. More specifically, he must have training in skills and techniques, and training also in a profession or vocation. The techniques of training must be geared to his disability and still more to his ability. Above all, he must have help in finding a job. The challenges which he confronts in the job market, the problems he faces, the attitudes of the wider community—such obstacles are the common hurdles of all who are blind.

Why must those who have distinct problems and peculiar needs be grouped together for aid and rehabilitation purposes? The answer is as simple as the proposition that all who are alike should be treated alike and all who are different should be treated differ-

ently. It is only by grouping those who are alike together that public assistance provisions can be particularly adapted to meeting their peculiar needs. It is only by grouping them together that a specialized staff with specific qualifications can be assembled and utilized in assisting them to resolve their problems. It is only in this way that it is possible to secure for the blind the solid advantages of special divisions of the blind in welfare departments, special workers for the blind in segregated caseloads, special administrative units and counselors and placement officers for the blind in vocational rehabilitation.

The underidentification of the blind, in short, is no less dangerous and destructive of their cause than the alternative fallacy of overidentification. Mistaken identity is no less evident where the blind are left wholly unidentified—where they are deemed to have no needs or attributes in common, for any purposes whatsoever. Rarely, of course, are the advocates of underidentification entirely consistent. If it is legitimate for there to be an American Foundation for the Blind, on the assumption that a distinctive group exists for whom particular services are desirable, then it is no less legitimate for there to be a National Federation of the Blind, on the assumption that the same distinctive group deserves the right to associate and to speak for itself.

Between the two forms of mistaken identity—those of overidentification and of underidentification—lies a broad field of true identification in which the blind may properly be classified together. The test, in every case, is plain and simple: it lies in the purpose for which the classification is made. If the purpose is that of public assistance, then, as we have seen, separate classification of the blind is proper. If the purpose is that of vocational rehabilitation, such independent treatment is again legitimate. It is legitimate because these purposes are clearly consistent both with the peculiar needs and problems arising from blindness, and with the social objectives of integration and self-support. In other words, where the purpose meets actual needs and forwards the ultimate goals of blind people, then separate classification is thereby justified—and there is no peril of mistaken identity.

On the other hand, if the purpose is that of segregating the blind from normal opportunity and participation, on the ground that they are all alike in their incapacity, then separate classification is illegitimate—and becomes a virulent form of mistaken identity. If the purpose is that of maintaining blind persons in dependency and custodialism, on the assumption of the universal helplessness; if it is that of regarding them as social "deviates" on a par with thieves and prostitutes; if it is that of dispatching them all to the psychiatrist, on the assumption that they are neurotic by definition; if it is that of refusing them the ordinary rights of citizenship such as those of dignity, privacy, and free expression—then the purpose is destructive, and any classification in its terms is illegitimate.

Finally, if the purpose of classification is that of the collective voluntary organization of the blind; and if this organization is carried out not to raid the treasury of funds which properly should go to others in greater need; if it is carried out not in order to gain personal political power or economic wealth or popular prestige; but if instead it is carired out in the cause of collective self-expression and self-improvement, toward the objectives of equality and integration, of opportunity and independence—who will then declare this purpose to be improper and this classification unlawful?

Those of us who are blind are—need we say it once again—citizens as well. We wish to be treated as other citizens are treated, for all ordinary and general purposes. But when we step off the sidewalk into traffic, we hope also to be recognized as blind, lest we soon be recognized as dead. Most of all we wish to participate freely and to compete normally for our places in the economic community—but we hope that in preparing for that competition our chances may be equalized through the special services necessary to counteract our handicap. We who are blind hope that our interests will be recognized as only normal and reasonable by those who govern our affairs—but we also believe that we are the ones best qualified to interpret and express those interests to the Government and public. We seek neither to be overidentified nor underidentified, but only to be identified, accurately recognized as we really are—in a way which will erase forever the ancient and double curse of our mistaken identity.

Foreign Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Mr. Conrad Kohler of Wisconsin appeared before a Senate committee this week and made a very interesting and informative address on the subject of foreign economic aid. Because this touches upon so much of our own economy as it relates to the development of the other countries, and because it comes from a young man whom I recognize as an expert in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Conrad Kohler and my home is Kohler, Wis. I am vice president of the Kohler-Joa Corp. We are manufacturers of heavy machinery and specialized equipment for the wood and wood products industries, which includes the furniture, sash and door, and plywood producers.

I am primarily concerned here in revealing to the committee the adverse economic position of one American industry—among many—which position can be directly attributed to the foreign-aid program of the U.S. Government. This industry is hardwood plywood.

It is particularly appropriate, however, to precede this testimony with the words of Joseph Stalin, who, in his book, "Marxism and the National Colonial Question," on pages 115–116, wrote, "That is why it is essential that the triumphant proletariat of the advanced countries should render aid, real and prolonged aid, to the toiling masses of the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development. Unless such aid is forthcoming it will be impossible to bring about the peaceful coexistence and fraternal collaboration of the toilers of the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism." It is this statement, gentlemen, which effectively establishes the origin of impersonal, tax-extracted, maladministered, and ineffective assistance from America to the countries abroad.

Within the past several years, five hardwood plywood manufacturers in my home State of Wisconsin have closed their doors and gone out of business. Each of these closures caused considerable hardship in the respective community, especially in those smaller towns where these plants employed a majority of the earning population. This, by itself, may seem to have been quite local in its harmful economic and social effects, but the apparent simplicity of the picture is deceiving.

My company, or our competitors, are now unable to sell them new machinery, nor will we order the required motors, castings, controls, and other equipment from still different manufacturers which would have built those machines. Consequently, the effective course of the economic harm done to the Nation by the elimination of these plants from American industry is traced to include a value far in excess of that originally perceived. All this can hardly be realistically reconciled by the grand opening of a modern, new plywood manufacturing factory in Manila or Tokyo or Helsinki.

The inexcusable irony of this situation lies in the fact that in all too many cases, these companies and the individuals involved are actually being forced to dig their own graves—through taxation, a large portion of which is to be sent abroad to finance competition.

Prior to World War II, for example, the plywood production of Japan was about 200 million square feet per annum of which 25 percent was exported.

Following the defeat of our dedicated and ruthless enemy in the Pacific, our Government extended foreign-aid grants and credits to Japan totaling $3,200 million as of March 31, 1960.

The Japan Trade Monthly, report for September 1958, established the hardwood plywood production of that nation during 1957 at 2½ billion square feet of which 630 million square feet were exported to the United States. There is little comment necessary to speculate on the amount of our aid to Japan that has been used to capitalize one of her most representative modern industries. There are now over 218 manufacturers of hardwood plywood in Japan with some 70 engaged solely in supplying overseas markets.

In 1951, plywood imports from Japan totaled 13 million square feet. In 1959, this figure reached 811 million square feet or an increase of well over 6,000 percent.

A similar accounting is true of the Philippine Islands, which has received foreign aid to the extent of $907 million as of June 30, 1959.

Dr. Zafra of the Philippine Embassy recently testified that foreign aid funds in excess of $5 million had been insistently advanced by the ICA to his country to finance development of a hardwood plywood industry there. Some 21 plants are now in production. He further stated that as a consequence of this obtrusion into their domestic affairs, the United tSates must be prepared to accept all the available plywood production of the Philippines and indicated that they will soon be in a position to ship some 300 million square feet per annum into our markets. In 1958 the Philippine Islands became the second largest exporter of hardwood plywood to the United States after Japan, and in 1959 supplied over 213 million square feet.

Shipments of hardwood plywood from Finland nearly doubled between 1958 and 1959. Imports from Formosa, during the period from 1956 to 1959, increased almost 9,000 percent, while Belgium's export of this commodity to our domestic market expanded 700 percent and that of France nearly 600 percent during the same period.

All of these foreign nations have been and still are the recipients of lavish grants and credits by our Government from the Treasury of the United States.

In 1951, hardwood plywood imports accounted for approximately 7.7 percent of our totaled domestic sales. In 1958, these sales amounted to 1.7 billion square feet of which over 911 million square feet, or 53.4 percent, were imported. During 1959, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce figures, over 1,330 million square feet of hardwood plywood was imported. If we estimate the U.S. market sales for 1959 at 1.81 billion square feet, based on the average annual increase in consumption of 110 million square feet since 1951, we have now lost a startling 73½ percent of our own domestic markets.

Gentlemen—it has long been generally recognized that perhaps the most influential stabilizer of our position in world trade has been our ability, under free enterprise, to reduce the costs of production relative to the rising cost of labor. It is a rather unamusing spectacle that American industry was able to accomplish this balance as long as they have, what with being continually squeezed between a massive and insatiable Government on one side and an overly powerful, spoiled and misled labor on the other. The invention and development of new machinery and production techniques had, in the past, offset the ascending charge for labor, making it possible to remain competitive in the world markets. Foreign labor costs, however, have not materially increased during the last 20 years or more, and where they have, it has been only a fraction of that which we have been forced to absorb in the price of our products.

But our Government's foreign aid program has placed the means of modern, low-cost, high-speed mass production overseas—as would a doting parent to a pampered child—into areas where the labor costs are one-fifth to one-tenth of our own.

As a result, the now completely unstable situation in which many American industries find themselves—indicated nationally by a previous and continuing adverse balance of trade—is that we are forced to compete pricewise, not on a healthy basis of production or quality, but on a cost of labor basis—to the extent that we are being priced out of world markets, while many are losing our own domestic market.

It is additionally true that nationalized or government favored industries abroad are able to create and expand with funds made available through foreign aid.

In more and more cases, American industry is being forced to transfer all or part of its manufacturing facilities abroad in self-defense to be able to retain its world markets. Furthermore, many producers are purchasing parts and subassemblies overseas for final assembly and sale in this country in an attempt to retain a portion of their domestic market. The hardwood plywood industry is an example where imported veneers are being used to face doors and panels in increasing quantities while the particle boards or laid-up cores are still manufactured here.

It is, unfortunately, axiomatic that capital can be sent abroad. But jobs cannot.

In support of this, I would like to quote from a letter written by Mr. Robert Strenger, president of the Wisconsin State Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL–CIO, to Congressman WILLIAM VAN PELT, of Wisconsin, Sixth District, dated January 11, 1960.

It reads:

"At the recent convention of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters, considerable discussion and concern was shown by delegates and members on the importation of goods directly in competition with our American employers who are employing members of the Brotherhood of Carpenters in various branches of industry.

"For quite some time, there has been a deep concern by our members on the importation of plywood. We are of the opinion that statistics will show that many of the smaller plants in Wisconsin have been shut down, throwing people out of jobs, mostly because of this cheap plywood imported from Japan and elsewhere.

"For many years, the lumber industry, from the raw material to the finished products, was ranked high in Wisconsin and has provided thousands of jobs for Wisconsin residents; but in Wisconsin this industry is on the decline, and if something is not done we will lose out on one of the greatest potential industrial opportunities afforded to the State. This industry, if it progresses, will have a terrific impact on the whole economy of the State, and the Nation also.

"We can appreciate assisting the foreign countries in raising their economic standards, but when it effects the wage earners of our own Nation who are paying a good share of the assistance through taxes, we believe some study and action should be given the domestic side of the issue. We don't think anyone in America would care to see our standard of living lowered, as it affects us all, and with the ever-increasing population we should take steps toward creating job opportunities instead of decreasing them."

I completely agree with Mr. Strenger.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to pacify the American public toward a continuing annual trade deficit—which reached $3.7 billion in 1959—when the Bank of Japan announces an international surplus of payments of $43 million for the month of March, and West Germany discloses a first quarter surplus of over $337 million, especially since our deficit is due in its entirety to the foreign aid program.

It is also difficult to explain the transplanting of American industry overseas to the American jobholder.

Gentlemen, it is interesting to speculate on even a partial reestablishment of industry abroad. Do we have any guarantee which we can trust that our so-called allies will not be forced into neutrality should the U.S.S.R. and the United States become involved in a hot war? Would it not then be reasonably simple for the Soviets to capture the oversea industrial complexes intact with their superior ground forces? Might she next estimate that what was taken would be sufficient to supply a Communist worldwide economy at an acceptable standard? What reason then would Soviet Russia have to "spare" the diluted industrial facilities of our country, since it would no longer be necessary to secure them for economic existence? Would they then willingly and without any warning attempt to destroy all of America—for possible recolonization at some future date?

It is realistically undeniable that the foreign aid program—a program which, including lend-lease has cost the American people over $124 billion since 1940—is primarily responsible for the international economic and political dilemma in which we find ourselves today.

I am a young man. There are many like me in this country. We are trying to start our own businesses and make our own futures. It is not easy under the taxes and the controls—but young men like us made this country great, and we want to see it remain great for our children. We will work hard to that end.

To help insure this, it is of extreme importance that this mad worldwide redistribution of wealth be soberly and realistically reappraised to conform to the best interests of the United States.

Through our present foreign aid program, America is following Joseph Stalin's spending prescription for the establishment of "a single economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."

I thank you.

An American Catholic for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1960, I was privileged to have been invited as a guest of the New York Post Office Holy Name Society, which held its 39th annual communion breakfast at the Hotel Astor in New York City. Many distinguished public officials and guests, including one of my distinguished constituents, His Excellency, the Most Reverend John A. Fearns, auxiliary bishop of New York, representing His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, who celebrated the mass prior to the breakfast, and the former Postmaster General, the Honorable James A. Farley, attended. The approximately 2,000 members of the Holy Name Society and the guests who were present were both moved and delighted by the splendid address delivered by the principal speaker, Dr. Edward D. Re, on the subject of "Catholic's Obligations of American Citizenship." Stressing the obvious compatibility of the teachings of the Catholic Church with the American Constitution, Dr. Re, a professor of law at St. John's University School of Law, as well as a member of the New York City Board of Higher Education, stated that it would be well-nigh impossible for any Catholic public official, including a U.S. President of the Catholic faith, to act in dissonance with the laws of the land without also subverting his moral and religious precepts.

Dr. Re, incidentally a graduate of both public and private schools in New York City, is an acknowledged authority on international and public law and the author of several leading treatises which are used in the leading law schools of our country. He is a special hearing officer for the U.S. Department of Justice and a vice chairman of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. A veteran of World War II, he is presently a major in the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Air Force Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask leave to insert into the RECORD the patriotic address delivered by Dr. Re on May 1, 1960, at the Hotel Astor in New York City:

Your Excellency, members of the clergy, distinguished public officials, members of the New York Post Office Holy Name Society, and guests, your kind invitation to address you on the occasion of your 39th annual communion breakfast does me great honor. This is an honor, however, which gives pause—both in view of the fact that so many laymen of distinction have addressed you in the past, and because of the serious duty it implies to bring you a message both significant and timely. Fortunately, the time is ripe—never in the memory of this great Nation was the duty upon the individual so clear and affirmative to exercise full citizenship with all its attendant rights, privileges, and duties. We might add too that never was the duty upon the Catholic citizen more clear or more insistent. Hence it is that

when asked by your moderator the title of my remarks, I responded that an appropriate title might very well be "The American Catholic's Obligations of Citizenship."

If I were to seek an appropriate theme to commence my remarks, I could not find a more suitable one than the beautiful exhortation taken from the Sermon on the Mount: "Even so, let your light shine before man in order that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in Heaven." Christianity is not a secret religion, or an esoteric practice, which removes the citizen from the world. Rather it is a positive, militant doctrine which bids him adore the Father in secret yet sends him to preach from the housetops. He is indeed meant to be the leaven of society, working in it and through it and with it, so that the mass is catalyzed, and rendered sweet, savory, and Godlike. The figures of the Gospels abound—the true Christian is not only a light before men, a leaven in the mass, but the salt of the earth which preserves, conserves, sweetens, and saves from corruption. The point is clear—he who buries his talents is censured and condemned; he who utilizes them and multiplies them is praised and is placed over greater things. Therefore, we as Catholics, in connection with citizenship, have special responsibilities and obligations which, as to their purpose, may be said to be "pro Deo et patria"—for God and country. Hence the proper fulfillment of the Catholic's obligations will not only inure to the glory of God but to the glory of our great country.

Now the obligations of the Catholic citizen are many. Of course, I can enumerate only a few. I start with the hypothesis that our obligations of citizenship, although they may begin at the polls, do not end there. Among the paramount duties of the American Catholic, indeed high on the list, is the duty to speak up, to enunciate clearly, to all Americans what he stands for. This is especially so when misunderstanding and confusion have become a divisive force in our land. We, therefore, have a duty to speak not as a pressure group, not as Americans who feel that we have been injured and maligned, but simply as Americans who owe it to our fellow Americans to enlighten them as to the guiding principles of morality, both spiritual and political, that motivate our behavior. It is not enough to state what we do not stand for. We must affirmatively declare what we do stand for.

A second pressing obligation upon us as Catholic citizens is to aline ourselves with our fellow Americans. At times there has been a tendency, on the part of Catholics, to separate themselves from community affairs and community activities. This tendency may have stemmed from differences of opinion and viewpoint, perhaps moral, or from sheer inertia. Often the Catholic tends to sit back complacently in the security of his faith. But bear in mind, that we who stand for love of God, love of country, love of parents, love of family and respect for duly ordained authority have given much and have much to give to America. To the extent that we separate ourselves from our fellow Americans, we are derelict in our duty, both to God and to country.

Although our obligations as citizens are constant, certain great issues that face our Nation highlight our responsibilities. Today the question that is perhaps foremost in the minds of so many Americans is, Is America ready for a Catholic President? It is, of course, oversimplification to say that we have been ready since 1789. The question is indeed a serious one and however un-American it may be regarded by so many of us, it must nevertheless be considered. The question may properly be deemed to be un-American and objectionable for two reasons. First, it violates article 6 of the Constitution of the United States which provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust in the United States." Secondly, it does violence to the first of the 10 amendments to the Constitution which all Americans proudly call their Bill of Rights. That amendment provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and it is not farfetched to say that to deny to any American any public office because of his religion is a violation of this constitutionally guaranteed right of freedom of religion. And I repeat the phrase, freedom of religion, because such are the words and the guiding spirit of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers who formulated that language were endeavoring to promote freedom of worship and religion and not a freedom from worship or religion. Clearly, this amendment prevents the establishment of a national religion or a favored church in America. It was designed to attain unity by guaranteeing an equality of treatment to all religions, permitting neither favored treatment to one nor discrimination against another. The question, however, Is American ready for a Catholic President? is not disposed of simply by saying that it is un-American. The question is not a simple legal question. It is rather a question which concerns the attitudes of our fellow Americans. It is a question that stems perhaps more from the heart than from the mind. And it is at this point that our mission of enlightenment must begin. Whether motivated by ignorance or bigotry, there is afforded by the question a golden opportunity for the Catholic to tell his fellow Americans precisely what the American Catholic stands for.

In this connection, both Christian charity and fundamental fairness require that we not do an injustice to our fellow Americans by believing that the overwhelming majority are opposed to a Catholic for President. Likewise, the views of a particular clergyman are not to be taken to represent the views of all Americans of that particular denomination. I have absolutely no doubt that our fellow Americans are fair. Note, for example, the statement of Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, Minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City who, in a sermon entitled "Religion and the Presidency," had this to say:

"It is unthinkable that the highest office in the gift of the American people should be permanently denied to any qualified representative of some 38 million Americans of the Roman Catholic faith." He added that selection of a candidate "should be on the basis of his experience and personal equipment for important public office and not because he belongs to the Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant faith."

With this, of course, all of us most heartily agree. And note also the statement made by Mr. George Sokolsky in a syndicated column appearing in the Journal American on March 7, 1960. In a column entitled "Religious Conflict Damages America," a column that I hope all Americans will read and take seriously, Mr. Sokolsky wrote:

"We already have too many racial and religious conflicts in the United States. * * * It it not a question of bigotry or smear. It is a question as to whether any American citizen, of whatever faith, who fulfillls the qualifications set forth in the Constitution, may be nominated and elected to the Presidency of the United States. Do we have secondary citizens?"

Surely to pose the question, "Do we have secondary citizens?" is to answer it. Yet I give these two quotations from non-Catholics to indicate my strong conviction in the basic fairness of our fellow Americans, and that our task of enlightenment is to proceed on the basis that those who have doubts about this matter of a Catholic President are genuinely interested in learning and are, at worst, laboring under a lack of knowledge of the fundamental tenets and beliefs of Catholicism.

It is, of course, improper and prejudicial to compare the civil status of the church in America with that of the church in countries like Italy, Spain, and Portugal. The civil status of the church, of course, depends upon the legal and constitutional framework of the particular country. And the American national policy of complete equality for all religious denominations is not only acceptable to Catholics but is regarded by them as the most practical and most beneficial in a pluralistic society that is America. As for the particular candidate who is of the Roman Catholic faith, the question would simply be whether he understands and appreciates the constitutional framework within which the church exists in America and the permissible degree of cooperation between church and state under the Constitution and the decisions of our Supreme Court.

From a purely positive standpoint, it is interesting to see what the church teaches American youths who attend its schools. "A citizen must love his country, be sincerely interested in its welfare, and respect and obey its lawful authority." These, my friends, are the words contained in the catechism of Christian doctrine which is the basis for the religious instruction of Catholic children in the United States.

We who, as Catholics, adhere to the principle that love of country is a virtue, have a duty to bring to the attention of all Americans the words of Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, who declared:

"My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church. * * * My civil and political faith is that of the Republic of the United States of America. * * * Between my religious faith and my civil and political faith, between my creed and my country, it has been said there is discord and contradiction, so that I must smother something of the one when I bid the other burst forth into ardent burning, that I must subtract something from my allegiance to the one when I bend my full energy to the service of the other. Those who speak so, misunderstand either my creed or my country; they belie either the one or the other. * * * The partition of jurisdiction into the spiritual and the temporal is a principle of Catholicism; no less is it a principle of Americanism. Catholicism and Americanism are in complete agreement. * * * They know us little who accuse us of coveting civil and political power that we may dim the fairest flower in the garden of Americanism. Our combats, if combats there be, are never against the liberties of America, but in defense of them; never against Americanism, but against such of its sons whose souls never yet have thrilled in full response to its teachings and inspirations."

A most eloquent testimonial, if one were needed, comes from the executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal, Alexander F. Jones. After citing the views of highly placed Catholic clergy on the separation of church and state from Bishop John Carroll of Maryland down to the recent utterings of Cardinal Cushing of Boston, and Archbishop John T. McNicholas, speaking on behalf of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the most authoritative body in the Catholic Church in America, he concludes: "This then is the record of 170 years of Roman Catholic opposition to joining church and state. * * * As a Protestant, I ask this question: How long must the idea of a Roman Catholic President of the United States be blocked by a contention the record does not justify."

In conclusion, may I respectfully remind myself as well as yourselves that ours is a noble mission—the love and service of God and country. The Lord grant that we may live up to both of them. May I urge one further thought. A well-known and well-worn maximum of the law is: the law favors

the vigilant. The Lord said: "The kingdom of heaven suffers violence and the violent bear it away." Yes, the violent in that scriptural sense, i.e., those with enthusiasm, those with love for a cause, those with a passion for justice—these are the victors in the struggle. What cause is so glorious, what purpose is so lofty, what life is so well spent as that which is consumed in the love of God, the love of his neighbor, and the love of his country?

St. Paul Welcomes Roy Wilkins Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to salute the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the occasion of their 51st annual convention being held in St. Paul, Minn.

I can think of no more appropriate salute to this fine organization than the welcome extended by the Minneapolis Spokesman and its editor, Cecil E. Newman, to Roy Wilkins, the top executive of NAACP, who, although not born in Minnesota, attended both high school in our State and the University of Minnesota School of Journalism. Even in the student community, Roy Wilkins exhibited the great qualities of mind and character which were to make him such an effective community and national leader.

Recently he was honored by the University of Minnesota, by being given its outstanding leadership citation.

Mr. President, I am happy to join my good friend, Cecil Newman, the editor of the Spokesman, in a salute and welcome home to Roy Wilkins; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Brought Roy Home," from the Minneapolis Spokesman of June 17, 1960, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROUGHT ROY HOME

When the brash young delegation from the St. Paul branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appeared at the Cleveland convention of the association in 1958, it was "armed to the teeth" with invitations for the organization to hold its 1960 convention in Minnesota's capital city.

There were the usual chamber of commerce bids, letters of invitation from Orville Freeman, Governor of the State, letters from prominent citizens and the saintly city's mayor.

More than this the St. Paulites felt they also carried a "secret weapon," or "hole card" not held by any other city seeking the 51st annual convention.

They did not unveil the not-so-secret weapon until the contest for the 1960 meeting got hot, and then they took full and legitimate advantage of the fact that St. Paul and Minnesota is the place where Roy Wilkins, the association's chief executive officer was reared and received his training and education.

Then the theme of the successful St. Paul convention selling job became "Bring Roy Home." Roy Wilkins himself maintained a studied, proper neutrality in the contest between the cities seeking the 1960 meet but what human being would not be excused if within his breast there was not a thrill in seeing that the homefolks were anxious to have him come back home as head of a powerful organization for good, in the Nation.

Although St. Louis, and Missouri may have some slight claim to being the birthplace of the dynamic, youthful Roy Wilkins, St. Paul and Minnesota claims him, as its own son, and rightly so, for it was here in St. Paul that he spent his formative years, attended high school, and graduated from the great University of Minnesota.

It was here in Minnesota that his ability for leadership was early discerned at Mechanic Arts and St. James A.M.E. Church, where as a young man he exhibited such fine qualities that he became a leader in youth religious groups in the city.

Mechanic Arts High School remembered the slightly built, articulate youngster who became one of the Nation's outstanding leaders, when in May this year the school presented him with the annual award which goes to a distinguished graduate.

This month his college alma mater the University of Minnesota will present Roy Wilkins the school's "Outstanding Achievement Award," at the closing session of the 1960 NAACP convention, Sunday afternoon, June 26, to be held in Northrup Auditorium, on the University campus. This award annually is presented to a graduate of the school who has reached the pinnacle of success in their chosen field.

Many Minnesotans believe the prominence which Roy Wilkins was to achieve, was early foreseen by his activity as a young man in his early high school years until the period after his graduation from the University of Minnesota School of Journalism. On and off the campus Wilkins showed a real interest in the issues of the day.

He was one of the editors of the Minnesota Daily, which was at that time and is at present, the largest college daily newspaper in the United States. This in itself was a distinction which up until that time had not been accorded any U.S. Negro student on a major college campus.

Not only was Roy a good student but evidence of his community activity outside the scholastic areas is shown by the records which list him as the first secretary of the board of directors of the newly formed St. Paul Urban League in 1922.

Roy Wilkins utilized his spare time to serve on the staff of a St. Paul Negro weekly, bringing to it the journalistic training he was receiving to improve the style, writing, and format of the publication.

When Roy left the Twin Cities of Minnesota in 1923 to become the managing editor of the Kansas City Call, where he remained until 1931 he became one of the first college trained journalists to be employed by a U.S. Negro weekly. The Call which had the field and incentive to become a great newspaper, grew into a well-developed publication with a good sound news and editorial policy which made it one of the important influences in the Missouri Valley. Wilkins as managing editor set a pace for news coverage unequalled in contemporary Negro journalism.

An excellent, effective, though not flamboyant speaker, Wilkins' articulateness and desire to advance the legitimate aspirations of the American Negro attracted the attention of the national office of the NAACP, notably the late Walter White. In 1931 Wilkins was invited to join the NAACP as assistant secretary and also as editor of the Crisis magazine, the association's monthly organ. He accepted the post reluctantly because he had grown to love the Call and his own Midwest.

Readers of this editorial know the extent of Mr. Wilkins' services to the NAACP, which resulted in his being named to fill the top executive position upon the untimely death of Walter White in 1955.

In the campaign for equality for the American Negro so well lead by the NAACP, Mr. Wilkins, as directing head of the organization, has shown real leadership in guiding the organization, which is the target of every influence in this Nation which rejects the idea of full democracy for persons of Negro ancestry.

As such he has been constantly on the firing line directing with consummate skill the public opinion skirmishes which are a part of American life. In this area of activity his training as a newsman holds him in good stead. Not a single one of the U.S. segregationists of stature is anxious or willing to meet Wilkins in debate on public platform, TV screen or on radio.

Minnesota Negroes and the white people too, are extremely proud that Wilkins, the chief architect today, for the extension of freedom, equality and true justice—indeed real democracy in this land, is a product of the great freedom-loving State of Minnesota.

That Wilkins today is one of 20 most influential and effective American leaders is a source of great pride to the people of this State and the Midwest.

Those who remember him as a vigorous, intellectually alert, vocal lad have watched Roy Wilkins as he assumed increasing stature in the United States and indeed by reflection and interest the international scene—as the emerging African nations, on the world's last frontier, identify themselves with the aims and aspirations of the 19 millions of U.S. Negroes with considerable and understanding pride.

The holding of the 51st annual NAACP convention which "Brings Roy Home," is more than just another convention to the people of Minnesota.

It has added significance and impact in that the great prestige of the organization, and the great progress our Negro citizens have made in the past two decades in the area of human rights, is embodied in the career and success of one of its sons, who has played such a tremendous role in the advancement of people, and country to increasingly sounder values in democratic living.

So, one can be sure as the NAACP convenes in St. Paul it will receive a hearty welcome, for in its welcome there is mixed the story of Roy Wilkins "a local boy who made good," a time-honored and laudable excuse for people, as well as entire communities, to feel proud of their products, and the things which those products have produced for the sum total of human good and progress.—C.E.N.

Back Door Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent granted me, I submit for printing in the RECORD a letter from the Director of the Budget showing that the new and unnecessary appropriations pending for back door expenditures would if passed exceed the budget by over $10 billion.

The letter follows:

JUNE 21, 1960.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In response to your query this morning as to the probable consequences to the Government's fiscal position of major spending and tax proposals already passed by Congress or now being seriously considered in its two Houses, I do not hesitate to advise you as to the gravity of the situation. The dimensions of the problem are set forth below, and I hope you will find it possible to bring this information before the Members of the Congress at the earliest possible time.

The prospective surplus of $4.2 billion which was reflected in the President's budget for fiscal year 1961 stands in acute jeopardy at this writing, because of the actions and inactions of the Congress with respect to the President's budget recommendations.

On the spending side, affecting 1961 and subsequent years, the Congress has taken steps toward authorizing amounts far in excess of the President's budget. It has:

(a) Approved an average increase of about 22 cents an hour, or about 8 percent, in pay of Government employees, costing $746 million a year, despite administration opposition on the ground that it is wholly unsupported and follows a 10 percent increase just 2 years ago and a liberal health insurance program effective this year. The 5-year cost would be $3,730 million.

(b) Voted in the Senate to increase Defense appropriations by $1 billion 180 million above the budget and appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by $474 million above the budget, a total of $1,654 million.

(c) Voted in the Senate to adopt a Housing bill with authority to spend, in a lesser period of time, $800 million more than the President's proposals. Total increased cost at least $820 million.

(d) Voted in the House an unrequested program of $1 billion 75 million to buy housing mortgages at a total cost of $1,075 million.

(e) Voted in the Senate for school assistance which would cost over $1.7 billion beyond the President's proposals in a 2-year period, $1,742 million.

(f) Voted in the Senate for an omnibus public works bill adding projects, over the administration's recommendations, totaling $400 million.

Beyond these, the Congress has under consideration in its committees a number of other unbudgeted proposals which could authorize further large amounts of expenditures. It is not possible to evaluate the probabilities of action on these at this session.

On the revenue side, despite all this action to increase spending, the Congres has thus far:

(g) Voted in the House to grant special tax deductions to the self-employed for pension payments, the cost of which would be $365 million a year, or over 5 years, $1,825 million.

(h) Failed to consider administration proposals to increase revenues through higher postal rates (to provide a self-sustaining postal service in accord with stated congressional policy), aviation fuel taxes, and highway fuel taxes (to obviate diversion of general fund revenues to the highway fund), with a consequent serious loss to the Treasury. The total or 5-year effect of the failure of these proposals would be $6,237 million.

These contemplated reductions from needed revenues, in the face of greatly increased spending, defy all fiscal logic. The commendable action of the Senate on Monday in rejecting committee-proposed excise tax reductions clearly evidences recognition of the necessity of relating revenue actions to expenditure actions.

The total added charge on the Treasury as a result of these unnecessary extra burdens is about $17.5 billions over 5 years. And even this figure does not reflect the possible continuance over the full 5-year period of such measures as those indicated for school assistance, housing, and highways.

It is true that most of these have not as yet been enacted, and there may be decreases, or even increases, before final action into law; also it is true that the impact will not be as large in fiscal 1961 as the authorization amounts. However, it is equally clear that if all or most of these measures are enacted in substantially their present form, they will shatter the hopes of millions of taxpayers that in due time there might be tax reduction and reform, while meeting our solemn obligation to reduce the staggering $290 billion public debt.

In assessing the significance of the figures which I have set forth in the preceding paragraphs, one more point needs to be stressed. The forecast of any budget surplus for fiscal year 1961 is only an estimate, based on reasonable assumptions regarding general economic conditions. If the Congress enacts greatly increased spending and if economic activity should not advance to the extent we have assumed, we could have a substantial deficit. In short, the estimated budget surplus for 1961 cannot be regarded as a liberal insurance policy which justifies taking unreasonable risks with our fiscal situation in the rush of the Congress toward an early adjournment.

As you are well aware, the President formulates and presents the budget for the Federal Government, but the final result is in the hands of the Congress. However, I would not be doing my duty as Budget Director if I failed to give you this frank expression of my concern regarding the budgetary situation for 1961 and future years.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

Labor Readies Big Vote Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the so-called clean elections bill was before this body, I discussed at great length with the author of the measure the necessity for placing some provision in the bill which would control the outlandish expenditures by labor unions in the field of politics. I tried by amendment to accomplish the same thing, but I was unsuccessful.

Mr. President, the Corrupt Practices Act prohibits such expenditures, and the Taft-Hartley Act prohibits expenditures by unions or by corporations in any election touching upon a Federal candidate.

I noted in a newspaper recently a column written by Victor Riesel, entitled "Labor Readies Big Vote Drive."

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I desire to have all the "doubting Thomases" in this body realize what labor will spend in the 1960 elections.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR—LABOR READIES BIG VOTE DRIVE

(By Victor Riesel)

While the Democratic Party has been preparing to nominate a candidate, labor's political leaders have been training thousands of activists in a series of 2-day mobile training schools to elect that candidate—and to attempt to defeat at least 14 "unfriendly" Senators. Some would call this a purge list, some would.

The roving labor institute for political action was the most modern since the ballot was contrived. The briefings were built around more professional motion pictures than the film festival at Cannes.

Through these political sprucing courses which covered the continental United States—and such points west as Hawaii and Alaska—went 6,500 regional labor officials. They were getting their primary training while the Nation was watching the big primary shows—and they will be the avant garde of the campaign later this year to smash the Republican Party.

All but one of the political action films were produced by Guy Nunn, media and communications expert of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers. The lone film came from the National Association of Manufacturers. It happened one afternoon not too long ago. One of labor's top political leaders telephoned the NAM. He wanted to know how much the businessmen's association wanted for its do-it-yourself political action kit.

The NAM spokesman said $300, but take it with our compliments. The labor man said he wanted nothing from the NAM—especially their compliments. So the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE)—which will make the national headlines many a day during the presidential campaign—sent along a check for $300.

In the kit was a movie called "Labor Conflict." In it are some picket line melees and some mighty grim pictures of Walter Reuther and colleagues. The COPE instructors showed it to their regional people as a hint of what might be thrown at them during the fall election drive.

This is a neutral study of precinct politics. As for labor's own movies, they were more detailed. These are six 15-minute films—which can be broadcast as well as shown in union halls. They deal with such topics as the Forand aid-to-the-aged bill, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, taxes, and social security. The use of the films and the bricfing sessions in COPE's 15 2-day area conferences are the most unusual campaigning activity yet developed.

These parleys began February 13 in Savannah, Ga. They wound up during mid-May in Portland, Oreg. Labor leaders believe their most successful conference was held in Philadelphia. It was run during the week—and drew 1,231, according to COPE's records.

COPE's practice was to put its two top political directors, Jim McDevitt and Al Barkin, in a city. First they would run a general session on the opening morning. That afternoon and the following morning the delegates were shifted into four discussion groups. Each group, in turn, was lectured on four topics. These groups were run in 75-minute classes.

After these detailed sessions, the conference ended with another mass general review parley. Thus every important politically active labor official from Coney Island to Waikiki Beach knows just what is expected of him and how he should attempt to fulfill his political mission.

Self-Determination for the Oppressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a most impressive resolution adopted by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians at a recent Baltic freedom meeting at Boston, Mass.

It is most appropriate that Congress should give attention at this time to the sorry plight of the peoples in whose behalf this splendid resolution was unanimously approved by a significant gathering of freedom-loving people.

The domination of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet was spawned in illegality, conducted in illegality and continues in illegality.

The aggression against these fine people who are committed irrevocably to the principles of human freedom was an unconscionable act and the ruthless deprivation of their personal liberties and right to govern themselves constitutes a crime against the law of nations and is a violation of basic human rights, as they are recognized by free governments and Western civilization.

As the resolution indicates, the suppression of these nations follows the usual Soviet pattern of brutality, tyranny, and flagrant disregard of the elementary God-given rights of human beings.

It would be unthinkable for this Nation—born as it was in better sacrifice and bloodshed for liberty, and conducted as it is to preserve the essential freedoms of the individual—not to rally to the support of peoples and nations seeking the free way of life and struggling to reestablish democratic institutions.

It is a sacred obligation of the American Nation to stand in a forthright, fearless manner for the perpetuation of the principles of freedom, democracy and justice, and if we are to be true to our own great heritage, we must not only sympathize with the aspirations for liberation of presently oppressed peoples but we must indicate to the entire world our purpose to do everything in our power to assist them in realizing their objectives to return into the orbit of free, independent nations.

It should be clear to all of us that the road to peace and international order does not lie in further appeasement or intoleration of tyranny and oppression. To the contrary, the road to peace and freedom must be assured, if it is to be assured at all, by strong resolution to defend human freedom and practicable determined efforts to build the necessary strength, military, economic and spiritual, to deter Communist aggression in the world and to compel respect for the aspirations of those who are seeking to throw off the shackles of slavery.

We must make it plain to the world that we will never compromise our principles and we will never yield to the threats of radical dictators, of the right or of the left. The task of American citizenry is to protect and preserve our great political and economic systems, not only as a cherished possession of Americans, but as a beacon light of hope and inspiration for millions of oppressed peoples throughout the world striving to be free.

With courage, determination, faith, and hard work, we can and will protect our liberties, and in our time find some way by which the rule of law and morality will replace force in the relations of nations and men. In that way, lies our opportunity, and it is a great opportunity and challenge, to establish a peace based upon justice and equity that will bring order out of chaos, and security, prosperity, and happiness to the human race.

I heartily congratulate Chairman Valdemars Lambergs, of the Baltic Freedom Meeting, and his associates for their significant contributions to the cause of liberation, liberty, and peace.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS ASSEMBLED AT BALTIC FREEDOM MEETING, LITTLE OPERA HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS.

Whereas 20 years ago, June 15–17, 1940, the Soviet Union violently invaded and occupied the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and thereafter illegally incorporated them into the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas by this unprovoked aggression the Government of the Soviet Union committed an international crime; and

Whereas 19 years ago, June 14, 1941, the Government of the Soviet Union started mass deportations of the Baltic people of all walks to slave labor camps in Siberia and other remote parts of the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas by this inhuman deed the Government of the Soviet Union committed a crime of genocide against the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nations; and

Whereas, by signing the Charter of the United Nations and later by adhering to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Government of the Soviet Union has assumed explicit obligations in regards to individual's right to life, freedom, personal security, and human dignity; and

Whereas, in violation of all these explicit obligations, expropriation, exploitation, slave labor, suppression of human rights, and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, overt and covert deportations are being continued in the Baltic States by ruthless Soviet occupation forces; and

Whereas we, free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are concious of our responsibility toward our subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain, we feel dutybound to speak out for those in captivity in protest against genocide and inhumanity in the Baltic States under Communist tyranny; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned about the weakness of the U.S. foreign policy in the face of ever-marching Soviet aggression that allows Soviet Union's Premier Nikita Khrushchev even to offend the President of the United States without any fear of retaliation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians assembled here, That—

(1) We accuse the Government of the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(2) We demand that the Government of the Soviet Union withdraw its military and political occupational forces from the Baltic States;

(3) We appeal to the Government of the United States to strengthen its foreign policy as to the Soviet Union and world communism as well;

(4) We request the Government of the United States to undertake all necessary and appropriate ways and means to speed up the long delayed liberation of the Baltic States as well as the other captive nations.

God save Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

VALDEMARS LAMBERGS, Esq.,
Chairman of the Baltic Freedom Meeting in Boston.

H. M. Baggarly, Tulia, Tex., Famed Country Editor, Given New Recognition as Editor of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on many occasions, I have had the privilege of discussing on the Senate floor and having had printed in the RECORD editorial columns by H. M. Baggarly, editor of the Tulia (Tex.) Herald.

From all the papers I see and read, both major dailies and country weeklies, and including the news magazines, I believe there are very few journalists today who are the equal of Mr. Baggarly. Week after week he does a masterful job producing a brilliant newspaper. When I say he produces the paper, I mean just that. He covers every editorial feature of his paper unassisted. He is not only writer of a brilliant column—he is reporter, photographer, sports editor, society editor, makeup editor. In addition, he writes and delivers two 15-minute newscasts each day on the local radio station and has a special news program on Sundays called, "The Country Editor Speaks."

He is truly a William Allen White of our times and a shining example of what newsmen with talent, energy, intelligence and particularly, courage, can achieve when they really make freedom of the press meaningful to the people they serve.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Publishers Auxiliary, a newspaper trade publication, in which Mr. Baggarly was honored as Editor of the Week. The article was written by Mr. Bill Dorr, associate editor of Publishers Auxiliary, and published under the heading "A Country Editor With a Taste for Controversy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COUNTRY EDITOR WITH A TASTE FOR CONTROVERSY

(By Bill Dorr)

As the cyclonic whirlwinds that whip across the sands of his native Texas Panhandle, Editor H. M. Baggarly is always in a whirl.

Being editor of the 3,200 circulation Tulia Herald is a time-consuming job, but Baggarly is also reporter, photographer, society editor, sports editor, and columnist. In fact, he covers every editorial feature of his paper—unassisted—and the paper runs 16 to 24 pages a week. In addition, he writes and delivers two 15-minute newscasts on a local radio station each day, and has a program called "The Country Editor Speaks" on Sundays.

Then in times of political campaigns he steps up his schedule to include as many as seven political columns and several radio and TV talks a week in addition to his regular duties at the Herald.

Does all this mean that Editor Baggarly writes short in his weekly column or skips editorials some weeks? You can bet your Ludlow he doesn't. He always writes editorials and his columns are long and deep rooted, generous of thought and intellect.

In 1957, for instance, the National Editorial Association selected "The Country Editor" as best column in the country. He has won first place awards in 1951 and 1958 from the Panhandle Press Association; and from the Texas Press Association in 1955 and 1957; from Theta Sigma Phi each year from 1953 to 1957 when the award was discontinued; editorial awards each year, 1953 through 1957.

Somehow, Baggarly makes the whole thing look—and sound—easy. He writes with a simple graceful style that seeps into the reader's system unannounced. He is at times witty, biting and, more rarely, eloquent.

"I have found that success of a newspaper, particularly a weekly, is related to the honesty and sincerity of the editor—even though much of the public may disagree with him—than to his efforts to be noncontroversial, to please everyone, to offend no one."

To offend, Baggarly has not been reluctant. Particularly when it falls in his line of duty as a country editor to keep his readers informed.

"Towns like Tulia," he wrote in a recent column, "and counties like Swisher have just about sinned away their day of grace when it comes to voting for friends of agriculture. We've just about had our last chance—and even now it may be too late."

One of the country editor's pet peeves is the Benson farm policies, and he has hammered with a satiric punch that has an abundance of lemon. He has opposed every major daily in the State in some of his political sanctions, as in the case of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, who won. In that event, his columns were run in State dailies as political ads and he took to TV and radio on behalf of his black horse candidate.

In 1952, despite overwhelming odds, he went all out for Adlai Stevenson in his campaign for President—so much so, that in the heat of the campaign a brick was tossed through his front window. AP carried the story and pictures through the Nation.

Undeterred by his county's overwhelming support of Eisenhower in that election, Baggarly was back again—all Stevenson—in 1956. "The county went 5 to 1 for Stevenson," he says proudly.

"I would say that my political writing has been the most rewarding experience I have had in the (newspaper) business."

Like southerners Ashmore and Golden and McGill, he has trained penetraing eyes on the civil rights controversy despite his southern background and setting:

"There are those who will subscribe by word to the principle that all citizens should be allowed to vote, regardless of color—yet in practice they submit black voters to a literacy test that many college professors couldn't pass. Then when the big bad Federal Government attempts to step in and to guarantee that the Negroes and the whites be treated alike when it comes to voting, they shout Federal encroachment and violation of States rights."

Editor Baggarly's political life has carried him far from his typewriter and into some exciting—and embarrassing—situations. Like this pearl from an oyster incident confided in a column to his readers:

It was too embarrassing to admit in print at the time it happened. In fact, it had been forgotten until we saw a similar incident happen in a restaurant the other night.

"Several years ago we were having dinner with Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor throughout the Roosevelt administrations and, for a while, under Truman. While eating an oyster cocktail, one of the oysters slipped off our fork and fell to the floor. Frances didn't see the accident which eased the embarrassment somewhat.

"Two hours later we prepared to leave. The preparations included slipping on our slip-on shoes which, for reasons of comfort, had been slipped off in the semidarkness.

"The forgotten oyster was quickly remembered when we felt it in the heel of the shoe where it had fallen.

"It was nearly a half day later that we found longed-for privacy and a chance to get rid of that slippery oyster."

Because of the depression years, Baggarly went against his mother's journalistic ambitions for him and became a schoolteacher at Tulia High School. Simply because his studies included sponsorship of the school paper, he became interested in newspapers and makeup:

"Being somewhat of a perfectionist, I spent each Saturday in the newspaper shop making sure that the page was made up as I wanted it. I even learned to make up the page myself. Soon the school paper began to win prizes in the various contests. I continued to teach a class in journalism and sponsored the paper until I enlisted in the Navy in 1943. Returning in the spring of 1946, I planned to resume teaching. In August, the editor of the paper wanted to take a vacation and asked me to pinch hit for him for two issues. I enjoyed it very much and when he returned the school agreed to let me serve as news editor of the paper by working after school and on Saturdays. At the end of a year, I bought third interest in the paper and resigned at school. After another year, friction developed between the three partners. I sold my interest and returned to teaching."

It didn't last. In 1950, Baggarly was approached by a group of Tulia citizens who wanted to buy the paper if he would return as editor. At first, he bought a small interest but a 1955 purchase of 50 percent of the stock, made him the principal stockholder.

Despite late entry, Baggarly is doubtlessly a born newsman. He has at once become a controversial editor and a popular one. He has opposed a majority of advertisers in political issues and had a steady increase in advertising, circulation and prestige. He has gained some of his strongest support from many who seldom agree with him.

"The fence straddler and the noncontroversial wind up with few if any supporters," he believes.

"To be deplored is the editor who measures every decision in terms of its effects on the advertisers, who is fearful, who is in intellectual bondage to those he feels are better qualified to speak than he. I know some editors who never take a side until they first see which side the big dailies take. Frankly, I dislike controversy and argument, yet I could not publish a noncontroversial paper.

"Often I feel that I would like to retire to an obscure job where I didn't have to become identified with every public issue—yet this thing is like having a lion by the tail. I can't turn it loose. Although there is more competition than ever in the newspaper field, I feel that nothing will ever take the place of the hometown weekly."

Editor Baggarly works with freedom in a field that has been toiled before by editors like William Allen White and Joseph Pulitzer. In this endeavor there is no immediate reward; it comes later with green shoots that promise fruit.

Such rewards have come. Like a letter from a blind man in Indiana after an appearance on an NBC panel from Chicago during the Little Rock crisis. The 74-year old listener wrote:

"Often a pleasant, sincere voice, clear, concise English, catches my interest as yours did last night. Tulia, I learn from the explorations of my family into the information almanacs, maps and atlases I cannot scan, is about 3,500. A town which I visualize as law abiding, religious in great degree and its people cultured and intelligent."

"It was rewarding to know that this blind man acquired a favorable impression of my town from what I had to say," Baggarly writes. "It is my desire that I will reflect a similar impression in the minds of our readers who live in more than 40 States and several foreign countries."

This seems likely.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the second part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part consists of the questions and replies for the section entitled "1961 Budget and Taxes—National Debt—Interest—Gold—Inflation."

The tabulated results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE—1961 BUDGET AND TAXES—NATIONAL DEBT—INTEREST—GOLD—INFLATION

1. Do you believe that the proposed budget expenditures of $79.8 billion are (a) about right, 2,886; (b) too low, 432; (c) too high, 1,650.

2. Anticipating a rising economy to produce more revenue, the President has recommended the following revenue measures to produce $84 billion in receipts. Which measures do you favor?

(a) Continuing the 10-percent telephone and transportation taxes. Yes, 3,228; no, 2,289.

(b) Terminate the 10-percent Federal telephone tax on June 30 to allow this tax to be imposed by New York State. Yes, 1,500; no, 3,930.

(c) Increase taxes on business cooperative. Yes, 3,786; no, 1,419.

(d) Reduce depletion allowances for oil companies, etc. Yes, 3,312; no, 1,827.

(e) Increase aviation gas tax from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon, impose same tax on jet fuel. Yes, 3,702; no, 1,593.

(f) A one-half cent increase to 4½ cents per gallon on motoring gasoline. Yes, 1,770; no, 3,672.

(g) Increase first-class postage from 4 to 5 cents. Yes, 3,126; no, 2,055.

(h) Increase airmail postage from 7 to 8 cents. Yes, 4,185; no, 1,338.

(i) Adjust all classes of postal rates to meet costs. Yes, 4,584; no, 735.

3. Do you believe in increasing or decreasing spending in the following areas?

(a) Defense. Decrease, 981; increase, 3,792.

(b) Farm subsidies. Decrease, 4,833; increase, 534.

(c) Foreign economic aid. Decrease, 3,879; increase, 1,254.

(d) Foreign military assistance. Decrease, 3,573; increase, 1,545.

(e) Public works, harbors, flood control, etc. Decrease, 1,752; increase, 3,384.

(f) Public housing, urban renewal, etc. Decrease, 3,012; increase, 2,052.

(g) Education construction, etc. Decrease, 1,656; increase, 3,219.

(h) Pay for Federal civilian and military personnel. Decrease, 1,845; increase, 2,739.

(i) Federal aid to States for highways, sewage, etc. Decrease, 2,463; increase, 2,307.

4. If you favor increased spending, which tax would you favor increasing?

(a) Personal income tax. Yes, 684; no, 3,480.

(b) Corporation and business taxes. Yes, 2,640; no, 1,620.

(c) Some new Federal sales or manufacturers tax. Yes, 2,940; no, 1,371.

5. Do you favor an increase in national debt and spending more than the tax revenues and inflating our economy at a rate of about 2 percent per year? Yes, 249; no, 4,956.

6. Do you favor a regular and systematic payment on the debt between $1 to $4 billion per year until national credit is improved? Yes, 5,313; no, 201.

7. Do you favor the grant of limited authority to increase the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Federal bonds? Yes, 3,666; no, 2,283; or do you favor an open competitive market for investor's moneys and permit the Treasury to sell bonds without governmental restriction and without governmental buying of its own bonds to produce an artificial low interest rate? Yes, 2,100; no, 2,823.

8. In order to strengthen our unfavorable international balance of payments, do you favor?

(a) Reducing our military and civilian personnel abroad. Yes, 3,498; no, 2,883.

(b) Restricting imports. Yes, 3,861; no, 2,361.

(c) Reducing foreign aid. Yes, 4,719; no, 1,767.

(d) Restricting U.S. tourist spending. Yes, 2,769; no, 3,615.

(e) Restricting the investment of U.S. capital abroad by increased taxation. Yes, 4,317; no, 1,998.

9. Do you believe that domination of markets and pricing practices by big business has substantially contributed to higher inflationary costs? Yes, 4,911; no, 1,872.

10. Do you believe that our antitrust laws should be strengthened and more vigorously enforced? Yes, 5,718; no, 1,005.

11. Do you believe that dominations of the labor market by big unions and its practices has substantially contributed to higher inflationary costs? Yes, 5,979; no, 1,035.

12. Do you believe that antitrust laws should apply to unions also? Yes, 6,243; no, 609.

13. Do you favor a minimum wage law of $1.25 per hour to include small business? Yes, 4,518; no, 2,385.

Medicine and the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I commend highly to my colleagues in the Senate the forthright speech of Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered at the conference of presidents and officers of State Medical Associations, Miami, Fla., June 12, 1960. Mr. Butler specifically endorses "the Forand and McNamara bills which would finance health insurance for the aged through the social security system," and he reminded his audience "that the social security program itself, founded under President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935, was branded 'socialistic' and worse by the same organizations which today apply similar labels to measures for caring for the health of our aged."

The "worst aspect" of the administration proposal for health insurance for the elderly is, Mr. Butler pointed out, "that it would require the individual beneficiary himself to pay the first $250 of his annual medical bill, and 20 percent of the costs above that. Now where does that leave the 60 percent of our aged citizens who have incomes of less than $1,000 a year?"

The Democratic national chairman also discussed related problems of medical care for the aged—the high cost of drugs, the need for increased medical research funds, and the shortage of doctors. Mr. Butler's statement shows a deep appreciation of all aspects of the present inadequacies of medical care in the United States. I am certain that all Members of Congress and all Americans will be interested in this thoughtful statement. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICINE AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(An address by Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at the Conference of Presidents and Officers of State Medical Associations, Miami, Fla., Sunday, June 12, 1960)

For the title of my address here today I have chosen, "Medicine and the Democratic Party." I am grateful to you for this opportunity to speak to you in this session of your conference. I am quite sure that you expect me to speak frankly to you and that I intend to do. There is need for the record to be made clear here and now that the charge that the Democratic Party favors socialized medicine is utter nonsense. There is equal need to make clear also that, if socialized medicine should come to our country, it may well be that the medical profession itself may have brought it about.

My oldest son has forsaken the professions of his father, law and politics, to become a doctor, a goal which I hope he will achieve, a noble profession which I hope he will honor and serve faithfully with unselfish and devoted work for the common good. So I start out by telling you that, despite the fact that I may be critical at times in this speech, I am friendly to your profession and as much concerned about its freedom from governmental control and regimentation as I am about my own profession of the law.

To me the general attitude of the medical profession to the Democratic Party is a curious situation in view of the preeminent record of the Democratic Party in having sponsored virtually every move in recent years to provide better medicine for all our people. Thus it would seem to me that the party of the people—for that's what the Democratic Party is—should be a natural political haven for you who are entrusted with safeguarding that precious asset of a people, their health. Why, all too often, should the American Medical Association and the Democratic Party find themselves taking opposite stands on vital health issues? My fondest hope for my words here today is that in some small way they may contribute to a better understanding of the problems that sometimes divide our respective organizations.

At the outset, may I define, broadly, the Democratic feeling which underlies and governs our attitude toward health measures? It is, simply, that a basic duty of government is to provide for the people those essentials of life which they are unable to provide for themselves. Under the meaning of "essentials" certainly would come large-scale medical research with the centralization and coordination such as is provided by the National Institutes of Health, in Bethesda, Md., largest such research center in the world. It was conceived and strated by a Democratic administration. Another example of necessary Government action was the handling of the Salk vaccine to insure that it was administered to a maximum number of people at a price they could afford.

This matter of price is important to our people. We know that millions of Americans go into debt to purchase medical care each year. We know that the average health insurance policy covers only about 25 percent of the total cost of the average illness. Particularly is this cost of medical treatment a problem among our Nation's 16 million people who are 65 and over. Sixty percent of our aged citizens have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Only about 40 percent of this aged group has health insurance. Much of it is inadequate in its coverage and the rates are high. In fact, an official of Los Angeles' suicide prevention center told a Senate subcommittee recently that the high cost of medical care is the most important reason for suicide among the aged.

This is a problem of national importance. It calls for Government action of the kind I mentioned a moment ago to provide an essential of life which people are unable to provide for themselves. It calls for Government action because no other form of action has been forthcoming to meet the problem. Neither the American Medical Association nor private insurance companies have come up with a workable substitute plan, although they have condemned two Democratic measures in Congress which would go a long way toward meeting the problem. I refer to the Forand and McNamara bills which would finance health insurance for the aged through the social security system. May I remind you that the social security program itself, founded under President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935, was branded "socialistic" and worse by the same organizations which today apply similar labels to measures for caring for the health of our aged.

When I said that neither the AMA nor private insurance companies have offered a workable substitute for the Forand or McNamara bills, I want you to know that is not

only my opinion. In April 1959, President Eisenhower's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had this to say:

"The difficulties of providing hospitalization and health insurance coverage for the aged stem primarily from the fact that the aged require above-average amounts of care and in general have below-avearge incomes. Any large expansion of protection for the aged thus seems unlikely without some way of covering the costs by spreading them over other segments of the population and throughout the lifetime of the individual.

"Voluntary insurance has succeeded in doing this to a limited extent through community-rated premiums and the inclusion of the retired aged in employed groups.

"There is a question, however, of how far voluntary effort and private industry can go in developing the kind of distribution of costs that would be needed to assure adequate protection to all or the great majority of the aged."

It is true that the administration, after much pulling and hauling, and after much pressure from its own party to come up with something to match the two Democratic measures, produced a health insurance bill of sorts for the aged. But it is a feeble thing, indeed. It has been called an "unworkable, actuarial monstrosity" among other things. I believe the worst aspect of the Republican measure is that it would require the individual beneficiary himself to pay the first $250 of his annual medical bill, and 20 percent of the costs above that. Now where does that leave the 60 percent of our aged citizens who have incomes of less than $1,000 a year?

Even Republican Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, has blasted the Republican plan. Only this week he described it as "basically unsound—costly and cumbersome." Earlier he had said the heavy payments required by the States under the plan could mean "a very serious fiscal situation" for them. Not only that but he endorsed the social security approach of the Forand and McNamara bills.

There is a second health situation making headlines today in which the Democrats have taken the lead, and in which again we look over our shoulders in vain for support from the AMA. I speak of the scandal uncovered by the Kefauver committee in the drug industry. And I do mean scandal. For here is a situation in which the motive for high profits has actually deprived some Americans of drugs they needed. The Kefauver committee heard testimony, for instance, that thousands of mental patients had to return to mental institutions because they could not afford the high cost of tranquilizer drugs on the outside.

It was testified that Ciba, one of the larger drug firms, sold to druggists for $39.50 the same number of tranquilizer tablets it sold to the U.S. Government for 60 cents.

It was brought out that the profit rate of the drug industry is the highest in the entire manufacturing field.

It was brought out that the Director of the Antibiotics Division of the Food and Drug Administration—Dr. Henry Welch—received $267,000 in the last 8 years, much of it from drug firms he was supposed to regulate, from his private publishing business. This business profited largely by selling reprints of its articles to drug firms, and it was brought out that Welch solicited the firms to buy these reprints. Welch has been allowed to resign from the FDA without official censure or reprimand.

It was also brought out that officials of the 20 largest drug companies gave $149,700 to the Republicans in 1956 and only $4,000 to the Democrats. This latter is an interesting point when you consider that the Kefauver committee undertook its investigation of the drug industry only when the Justice Department failed to act. It is interesting also when one watches day after day the efforts of powerful Republican members of the Kefauver committee to hamstring its operations, to keep the committee from holding hearings at all, or to force it to hold secret sessions where the public couldn't see what was going on. Why, I wonder?

We Democrats would have welcomed the backing of organized medicine in seeking to bring this ugly situation in the drug industry out into the open. Instead we found—as quoted by John Lear in the Saturday Review of Literature—that officers of four State medical societies (in Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) had telegraphed Republican Senator DIRKSEN, a member of the Kefauver committee, that the doctor-patient relationship might be damaged if witnesses were allowed to criticize the drug industry in public. If that be so, why didn't the doctors themselves take the lead in cleaning up the situation in the drug industry?

We found also Dr. Austin Smith, former editor of the AMA Journal, heading the powerful Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. Dr. Smith testified before the Kefauver committee in defense of the drug industry.

I would like to speak clearly here. I believe that the moral tone of the drug industry and of a Republican administration which allowed this situation to exist is not one with which the organized medical profession of this country can afford to ally itself. I believe the position of the drug industry is indefensible in the public mind. Medical associations it would seem to me, can only demean the whole medical profession by taking any position which can be interpreted by the public as one of defending the drug industry.

Now it might appear to some, with the rising life expectancy among our people and the new techniques available to our doctors, that the medical problems facing us have been reduced comfortably. But I believe the facts will not bear that out. For instance, the life expectancy in this country is fifth from the top among the nations of the world. Our maternal mortality rate is only third best among the nations. Our infant mortality rate is only 10th best. There are fewer physicians per 100,000 people in this county today than there were in 1921. We do not have enough hospitals or enough nursing homes, and the quality of the latter leaves much to be desired. We do not have enough schools to train more doctors. Millions of Americans are in debt for medical care and millions more put off treatment because of the fear of debt. Heart disease kills 900,000 Americans each year. The cancer death rate is 260,000 lives a year now.

We need more and better medical research. But consistently, ever since President Eisenhower took office in 1953, his administration and Republicans in Congress have opposed necessary increases in medical research funds. It would be nice to be healthy, say the Republicans, if it didn't cost so much. We Democrats believe that it costs too much not to be healthy. Disease costs this country about $35 billion a year—$20 billion for medical care and $15 billion in lost wages and lost taxes.

Over the last 8 years, the Democratic Party has significantly expanded our Nation's medical research. The first budget submitted by the Republican administration severly cut the medical research expenditures proposed in the last of the Truman budgets. Each year since, the Democratic Party has rejected inadequate administration proposals and considerably increased funds for medical research.

While the $400 million administration budget for medical research during fiscal 1960 is a vast improvement over the $50 million recommended by the Eisenhower administration early in 1953, it still is a relatively small expenditure when related either to Federal research expenditures generally or to the specific annual cost of disease.

With the great increase in Federal research and development expenditures since World War II, medical research has barely held its own at about 5 percent of our total research expenditure. The Federal medical research expenditure is only about 2 percent of the accepted cost-of-disease figure.

A year ago, the Senate Appropriations Committee appointed a committee of medical and lay leaders to conduct a comprehensive study of the exact capability of this Nation in the field of medical research. This group reporting last month said: "The proportion of the national income now devoted to health research is small in relation to the need and to the great economic return which has come from medical research in the past. The committee is confident that the Nation will support any level of research for which the men and ideas are available."

The committee recommended $664 million for the medical research programs of the National Institutes of Health during fiscal 1961, an increase of $264 million over the sum recommended by the Republican administration.

The committee went on to predict that by 1970 the total support of medical research in this country may well require annual expenditures of $3 billion, of which more than $2 billion in all likelihood will be provided by the Federal Government.

The Republican administration has constantly neglected the development of a major medical research program in the Veterans' Administration, with its 122,000 beds located in 170 hospitals all over the country. In the early years of the present administration, the VA medical research program struggled along with an annual allocation of about $5 million, compared with an annual VA hospital budget of $800 million. Over the last 5 years, Democratic leadership in both Houses of Congress has concentrated on lifting the level of the VA medical research program. By 1958 it had reached $15 million, but the administration cut it back to $11 million last year.

You well know that there is a critical shortage of doctors in America today. Most recent estimates are that we need a minimum of 25,000 more doctors to provide adequate medical care for our growing population.

Ever since 1949, the Democratic leadership in Congress has been trying to pass legislation to expand the capacity of our medical schools to train more doctors. Such legislation passed the Senate on two occasions during the Truman administration but was bottled up in the House, I am sorry to say, by the combined opposition of the Republican leadership and the American Medical Association. In 1951, Senator Robert Taft joined forces with the AMA to defeat an aid to medical education bill which he had originally sponsored. Again I ask, why does the AMA take this position?

In 1958 Dr. Leroy Burney, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, rang the alarm bell on the doctor shortage when he told the American College of Surgeons that the balance between doctors and patients in this country was "at the peril point." But the alarm did nothing to bring a legislative proposal from the administration. Instead, that famous Republican delaying tactic—the study group—was brought onto the scene and valuable time was lost while they studied instead of acting.

Another serious problem now is attracting students into the field of medicine. With the rising cost of tuition at medical schools, a medical education is being increasingly restricted to the sons and daughters of high-income families. Since 1950, the number of applicants for medical schools has dropped by one-third, a startling indication that the cost of medical education is an increasing

obstacle to the recruitment of able students. A recent study showed that one-third of all medical school graduates are at least $2,000 in debt upon completion of their education, and 17 percent of these have debts of $5,000 or more.

As I said at the beginning of this talk I hope my words contribute in some part to a better understanding between your professional organization and the Democratic Party. I assure you that there is action in the Democratic Party to back up my words. Within the last month the advisory council of the Democratic National Committee has established an advisory committee on health under the chairmanship of the eminent Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, head of the Department of Surgery at Baylor University, and recipient of the Distinguished Service Medal of the American Medical Association for a brilliant 6-year project which demonstrated conclusively that many kinds of strokes can be treated surgically.

I am proud to say also that this committee includes many other distinguished members of the medical profession. Among them are three Nobel Prize winners—Dr. Selman A. Waksman, who won the award for his discovery of streptomycin; Dr. Philip S. Hench, honored for his discovery of cortisone, and Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, for a new method of diagnosing heart disease by inserting a tube into the heart.

The purpose of our health committee will be to provide searching inquiry into the health needs of this country. I am sure the work of the committee will be of value to your profession as well as to the American people as a whole.

In closing may I say that I am immensely proud of the accomplishments of the Democratic Party in the field of medicine. I believe our record shows clearly that we have searched for the real problems confronting our Nation in the medical field and that we have sought intelligent solutions to those problems.

I believe further that Democratic programs in providing medical care for those unable to provide it for themselves, in providing for medical research, in providing for more medical training, deserve the support of doctors and related professions, indeed of all those interested in seeing that there is enough good medical care for all our people. There is every reason why all of us should work together in this most important field for the common good.

The Modern American Farmer as Seen Through the Eyes of a 17-Year-Old Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the important subject of the American farmer is widely discussed. A significant organization dedicated to principles of sound and advanced farming is the Future Farmers of America. Recently, I had the pleasure of hearing an outstanding speech by a member of this fine group. He is Mr. Wayne Moore, a 17-year-old 11th grader, of the Chocowinity High School, Beaufort County in North Carolina. I feel Mr. Moore's statements about the modern farmer are important to all Americans and I submit the speech in its entirety for the RECORD:

Honorable judges, worthy opponents, fellow F.F.A. members, ladies and gentlemen, and guests, the topic which I have chosen to discuss with you today is "Should You Be a Farmer?"

Farmers, it seems to me, are literally the most important people in the Nation. Our very life depends upon them, for they—a mere 13 precent of the population—produce the food that keeps all the rest of us alive.

Most of us are blinded by the cartoonist's stereotype of a farmer as a slouchy, unshaven laborer with a straw in his mouth and little else in his head. Today's farmer, however, is more scientist than laborer; if he's to hold his own against the competition he'd better have not only a healthy dose of commonsense but also a fair acquaintance with economics, marketing, chemistry, entomology, meteorology, plant and animal pathology, and cost accounting.

Few men today have as much freedom of thought and action as the farmer; few have as much financial independence. Except for about 3 months a year—during seeding and harvesting time—his hours are not long, and he chooses them himself. He is no longer a manual laborer; most of the drudgery, both around the house and in the fields, is done for him by power equipment. Perhaps the best way to get an idea of what his life is like is to take a look at an avearge—not wealthy—farm today.

TODAY'S AVERAGE FARM

The House has automatic heating, electricity, three or four bedrooms, one or two baths, living room, dining room, kitchen, office, and possibly a recreation room in the basement—for the kids, mostly. It has a radio and television. The kitchen has quite a bit of automatic equipment—washer, dryer, ironer, probably a dishwasher, and certainly a huge deepfreezer.

In his office area, the farmer has a desk, file cabinets for his records, and probably a big table around which all members of the family sit when they are planning the farm's operations. This planning conference is one of the reasons why, I think, a farm is the best place in the world to create a successful marriage and bring up children.

A farm family is an economic unit: husband, wife, and children are all working together for a common goal—the family's livelihood. This creates bonds which make marriages more lasting. Children are more self-sufficient, for they play an important role in earning the family's living, and they know it. I've seen boys of 8 or 10 driving a tractor and operating $5,000 worth of equipment; they're proud of their responsibility, and having it gives them stability and self-confidence as nothing in city life can.

Outside his home, this average farmer has a shop for maintaining his power equipment, at least one tractor with its accessories, a truck, one or two cars, barn, silo, equipment sheds, and a team or two of horses and livestock, depending upon the type of farm he operates. He has a garden which provides most of the family's vegetables, plus a cow or two and a few chickens and hogs to supply other foods. If not on a stream, he probably has one or more ponds which not only water his stock, but provide family sport in fishing and swimming.

INCOME

What about income?

This depends, of course, on the size, value, and productivity of the farm, and will vary widely. However, the average net annual income for a group of about a thousand farmers recently surveyed was about $6,200 after taxes. This would have been their take-home pay if they weren't already home—and they didn't have to buy much of their food out of this.

Apart from their annual pay as such, farmers are forever investing part of their income in land, buildings, equipment, livestock, and so on. Over the years, they are often far more valuable than those of men in other occupations or professions.

According to the latest estimates, the average value of farms—including land and buildings—ranged from about $7,000 in some States to over $70,000 in others. And the Nation's farms range in size from 10 or so acres to several thousand acres. There is no set starting point for a man going into farming—nor is there any limit to his opportunities. I know men who with fairly modest starts, have grown really wealthy—even by today's standards—from farming.

A farmer has three great adversaries—climate, insects, and disease—but they are worthy enemies and a life, to be full, must have struggle. The conditions of the struggle require patience and courage, and also bind farmers together in a deep neighborliness. Almost every week in rural papers, you read that friends filled a farmer's silo when he broke his leg, or neighbors harvested a widow's crops for her. The money that can buy this sort of consideration has not been coined.

EDUCATION

How much education should you have to be a successful farmer? The more the better. As with everything else, a boy can be a successful farmer with a high school education, but his chances are much better if he's been to college. He must know enough chemistry to handle soil and fertilizers properly, entomology to combat insect pests, plant and animal physiology and pathology to produce and husband good stock and crops, economics to market his produce profitably. All this he can learn at a good agricultural college.

Generally, agricultural colleges cost less than other professional schools. A resident can go through a year at State for $900 to $950 and as with other schools, he can cut this down through scholarships and part-time jobs. (Incidentally, since World War II there has been a steady increasing percentage of city boys who are planning agricultural careers, and many who have graduated are now successful farmers.)

APTITUDE

How can you tell whether you should become a farmer? If you love the feel and fragrance of good, rich soil trickling through your fingers, you will probably learn to love the land, and this is essential to a good farmer. If you get pleasure from growing things, both plant and animal, you have another of the requirements, just as you do if you like people and are inclined to help them. Finally, you should enjoy living and working outdoors.

If you do not have these interests, you should be counseled to try another career. But if you do have them, you have a chance at a life that calls upon a man for intelligence, sweat, and compassion, and rewards him with security, satisfaction, and spiritual peace.

The Right To Quit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a very strange decision was recently handed down by the National Labor Relations Board. Although we have become

used to decisions which are rather queer coming from that Board in the past, we had thought for the past several years that the Board had regained some sense.

This decision, Mr. President, is probably the wildest of all. It is called the Bonnie Lass case. It involves a fabricating company engaged in the manufacture of sweaters.

In June of 1958 the International Ladies Garment Workers Union sought recognition among the employees, and management told them if the firm were organized it would be necessary to close.

Mr. President, later on the firm did close the business. Still later the employers decided to go into an altogether different business, the buying and marketing of products of various mills.

The NLRB has ruled that the shutdown was illegal. The NLRB has gone further and has stated that the new company has to pay to each of the employees "a sum of money equal to the amount he or she would normally have earned as wages from December 15, 1958."

Mr. President, the very interesting recital of the case is the subject of an editorial in the Arizona Republic, of Monday, June 20, 1960, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO QUIT

There was a time, before Government granted labor unions their present monopoly position, when the right to go out of business was taken more or less for granted. This, however, is no longer the case: In a startling decision recently handed down by the National Labor Relations Board, that right was virtually denied to a New Jersey company.

The Bonnie Lass case, as it has come to be known, involved a fabricating company engaged in the manufacture of sweaters. In June 1958, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union sought recognition among the plant's approximately 100 employees. The following month, 50 workers went out on strike. In December of that year, the employers decided to go out of business, and they subsequently ceased their manufacturing operation and sold their equipment and machinery. (Later, the employers decided to go into an altogether different business, buying and marketing the products of various mills, a business which required only three full-time employees.)

The NLRB ruled the shutdown was illegal, because—it said—it was done to avoid dealing with the union. Therefore, Bonnie Lass had to reimburse the employees "by paying to each of them a sum of money equal to the amount he or she would normally have earned as wages from December 15, 1958, until such time as each secure or did secure substantially equivalent employment with other employers."

What this means is that the defunct company would be liable to pay its former employes' wages for the rest of their lives in the event they were unable to obtain new employment. And if they did obtain new jobs at lower pay than that which they earned with Bonnie Lass, the company presumably would be required to make up the difference indefinitely. Nor is that all. If an employee were later laid off, after having obtained employed with another employer, he would apparently—according to the language of the Board—be entitled to back pay from Bonnie Lass for the duration of the unemployment.

The Board's decision not only is unprecedented, but it directly contradicts previous NLRB rulings. In other cases, the Board ruled only that former workers be placed on a preferential hiring list, in the event the company ever resumed operation. And in once case, where the Board found that a company discriminately shut down to avoid bargaining with a union, the Board rejected a recommendation that the employer pay back wages until equivalent employment was obtained, and instead awarded back pay only to the time when the plant closed. Earlier, a Federal court of appeals had upheld a similar Board decision, and further observed: "But none of this can be taken to mean that an employer does not have the absolute right—to permanently close and go out of business—for whatever reason he may choose, whether union animosity or anything else. No more can the (Taft-Hartley) act be said to contain any basis to assess remedial back pay beyond the date of his permanent closing."

If the NLRB ruling is upheld, it not only will mark an extreme departure from previous decisions, but it will also signal a departure from commonsense. For if the Board can prohibit an employer from quitting business, it is just a matter of time before it can prohibit a worker from quitting his job, or from going out on strike. If the United States is to face successfully the enormous economic challenges of the future, it must be as free as possible from bureaucratic restriction. And this Board ruling is nothing more than an unjust restriction which seriously infringes upon not only the rights of the Bonnie Lass employers, but upon the rights of all individuals.

Miss Frances Knight of the Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, June 22, carried two most complimentary articles on the good works of Frances Knight, Chief of the Passport Office, and I call them to the attention of my colleagues of the House, so many of whom have already paid tribute to this distinguished lady.

LIE NOMINATES FRANCES KNIGHT AS REDTAPE CUTTER

(By John F. McLeod)

Frances Knight has done such a good job at the Passport Office that she should be considered for another important job—slashing away the redtape that stands in the way of tourists from other lands wishing to visit the United States.

That was the suggestion yesterday of Trygve Lie, former Secretary General of the United Nations at a testimonial luncheon given by the travel industry for Miss Knight at the National Press Club.

Representatives of some 75 international travel firms were present to pay her tribute for, as Mr. Lie said, turning State Department's Passport Office into "a service unit for the benefit of the public at large."

U.S. VISA LAG

Mr. Lie said, however, that the United States has lagged behind European countries who have abolished visa requirements for Americans.

"It sometimes puzzles the governments of these countries," he said, "that this cannot be reciprocated here. It seems odd that the country from whence most tourists originate should be one of the hardest countries in the world to visit."

Then Mr. Lie added:

"I cannot suggest a better solution than that your Government put Miss Knight in charge of this operation. I am sure she could find a way to dispose of the redtape that now very often blocks the tourist routes to this country."

Miss Knight was presented a world globe as a tribute from industry representatives present; then she indicated she had given a lot of thought to Government redtape cutting and perhaps to the job for which Mr. Lie nominated her.

Ears perked up when she said:

IF THERE'S A WILL

"What has been done in the Passport Office could be done in virtually every public service activity, if there is the will to do it. But too frequently the will is weak, the know-how is lacking and in the final analysis it is much easier to do nothing than to become controversial by stepping on sensitive toes. * * * It is a travesty of our times that so often it is easier to get a promotion at a cocktail party than it is to earn it at one's desk."

Transatlantic air travel was up 19.5 percent for the first quarter of this year over the same period last year, International Air Transport Association reports.

WHY THEY LIKE FRANCES KNIGHT

Why is the travel industry so fond of Frances Knight?

Michael J. T. de Tarnowski, district sales manager here for Sabena Belgian World Airlines, told the News this illustrative story:

A tour conductor arrived at New York's Idlewild Airport last Sunday morning from the Middle West without his passport. His plane was to leave that night, and several dozens of tourists were depending on him to be aboard to manage their tour.

This was Sunday morning.

Sabena's passenger representative at Idlewild frantically called Mr. de Tarnowski at his Washington home. Mr. de Tarnowski called Miss Knight at her home. Miss Knight called an aid who rushed right to the office and processed the passport within an hour. The passport was safe handed by an American Airlines stewardess to Idlewild just before the Sabena plane was to leave.

Added Mr. de Tarnowski: "Every international airline man in Washington can tell you similar stories of how Frances Knight has come to their rescue. She is simply wonderful."

Unemployment in United States Too High; We Must Meet the Challenge as Forthrightly and Successfully as Have Britain and Some Western Europe Industrial Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Department of Labor recently announced that employment in the United States reached an all-time high in May of this year with a figure of 67,208,000—an increase of 1,049,000 over April. While we are gratified by this develop-

ment, it must not obscure the somber facts of continued severe unemployment in many parts of the country and a national average of 4.9 percent last month.

An equally disturbing fact is that the rate of joblessness has held near 5 percent or higher for 31 consecutive months, and after each postwar recession has leveled off at a progressively higher figure.

Thus, we find persistent and too high unemployment among conditions of general prosperity and substantial industrial production. Much of this we know to be due to technological changes. But we must meet the challenge in the United States as forthrightly and as successfully as have several of the countries of Western Europe and Great Britain. In spite of the similarly of conditions of change in Europe and Britain and our country, few of the Western Europe industrial countries or the British Isles have permitted unemployment to go much higher than 2 percent. We must work diligently toward an equivalent record of accomplishment.

These are the conditions which led to the appointment of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems under the chairmanship of the diligent and effective junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. I am privileged to report that appropriate phases of the sound work of that committee, of which I was a member, are receiving the attention of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of which I am the chairman. I shall have more to say on the subject of the long-range problems of manpower and employment when the report of our initial hearings is completed.

Meanwhile, I commend for the attention of my colleagues two recent newspaper articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times, both of June 19, 1960. These stories offer excellent summaries of certain salient facts of the too-high rate of unemployment which exists even after generalized recession has been overcome. But there has not been anything approaching a satisfactory solution to the problem of chronic labor surplus and depressed areas, even though both the 85th and 86th Congresses passed comprehensive measure which would have enabled such areas to engage in rehabilitation and self-development programs. The President vetoed both the 1958 and 1960 enactments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the "Business Outlook" column from the Washington Post by J. A. Livingston and the New York Times story, "Unemployment: In a Rising Economy," by Richard E. Mooney.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1960]

BUSINESS OUTLOOK—FIVE PERCENT OF U.S. WORKERS GO WITHOUT JOBS

(By J. A. Livingston)

Stubborn. That describes present-day unemployment. It persists in particular industries in particular places and for particular persons and reasons. That's not good. And, yet, it's a mark of progress.

This is a period of industrial and economic change. Inevitably, some industries expand, others contract. As householders and industries switch from coal to oil and natural gas, coal miners in Pennsylvania and West Virginia lose their jobs. As freight moves by truck and passengers by airplane and autos railroad employment falls. And progress proceeds heartlessly.

Displaced workers often are not readily reemployable. Business men aren't anxious to take on older men. Older people hate to move. They have their homes, their friends, their habits. So we get pernicious pools of unemployment. The saving grace is that this change has occurred during general expansion. Disemployment has been cushioned by increased employment elsewhere.

Consequently, May cannot be called merry, even though employment reached the all-time high for the month of 67,208,000, an increase of 1,049,000 over April. The previous high was last year—66,016,000.

THAT PERSISTENT 5 PERCENT

And unemployment declined 201,000 to 3,459,000. Yet, 49 out of every 1,000 persons in the labor force were jobless. And the rate of joblessness has held near 5 percent or higher for 31 consecutive months, or since October 1957, when the 1957–58 recession began gathering momentum. The high was 7.5 percent in August 1958; the low 4.8 percent in February of this year.

In the 1953–54 recession, the high was 6.2 percent, and in the subsequent recovery the low fell to 3.8 percent. The peaks and valleys get higher, a primary indication of the stubbornness of the problem.

A second indication is the unusually high number of persons who have been out of work for 15 weeks or more—920,000, or a quarter of the unemployed. Almost half of these have been out of work more than half a year.

A third indication is the Department of Labor's list of "Areas of Substantial and Persistent Labor Surplus." These are located in 24 States and Puerto Rico and include such localities as Evansville and Terre Haute, Ind.; Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford, Mass.; Detroit, Mich., notwithstanding the high level of automobile production this year; Atlantic City, N.J.; numerous coal sectors in Pennsylvania and West Virginia; Providence, R.I.

WHITE COLLARITIS

The Nation is suffering from white collaritis. Once manual workers far exceeded white-collar workers. Now, white-collar workers exceed blue-collar workers. In 1940, blue-collar workers constituted 55.3 percent of the work force; in 1957, the proportion had declined to 47.6 percent; and today, it's just under 45 percent.

Manufacturing, long the hard core of American industrial activity, continues to expand, but with fewer workers. Five years ago, manufacturing accounted for 33 percent of the nonagricultural workers; today, far less than 31 percent. Such industries as steel, rubber, automobile are not employing as many persons in this prosperity as in the prosperous era of 1956–57. Railroad employment is down much more—25 percent from 1956—and bituminous employment, 27 percent.

These are high-pay industries. Not readily will workers leave them for lower paying jobs as clerks in five-and-dime stores or supermarkets, assuming the coal miner, or steelworker, or metalworker could adjust to such tasks.

LESS DEPRESSION PRONE?

As already noted, habit also causes viscosity. The older coal miner, the railroader, the steelman, the cotton spinner, whose job has progressed elsewhere, stagnates in America's pool of disutility. He's disfranchised economically by change.

A surge of the economy to new highs—a taking up of the slack—will reduce the unemployment that results from temporary layoffs. It will cut down the amount of fractional unemployment—waiting between jobs.

But it won't, unfortunately, eliminate the idleness of progress. This is, in large part, an industrial-welfare problem, which John L. Lewis, in his vast wisdom, foresaw when he set up the United Mine Workers' Health and Welfare Fund.

There's also a touch of solace.

If a high level of employment is less dependent on manufacturing, if the white-collar workers, who, heretofore, have had more stable jobs, predominate, then we'll be less depression prone. May this not be an explanation of the shallow brevity of our postwar declines?

UNEMPLOYMENT: IN A RISING ECONOMY—WHILE PRODUCTION IS AT A PEAK, AUTOMATION AND CHANGED LABOR MARKET KEEP JOBLESSNESS UP

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—The short, sharp recession of 1957–58 hit bottom 2 years and 2 months ago. Production, employment, and personal income have long since recovered the ground they lost in the slump and moved on to new records—but unemployment is another story.

In the prosperous years of 1955 and 1956, and in 1957 until the recession set in, the rate of unemployment averaged 4¼ percent. It rose to 7 percent and more in 1958. The first 12 months of recovery brought it down to 5 percent, and there it has remained. Five-percent unemployment is disturbing for two reasons:

(1) It is high. Three to four percent is probably the irreducible minimum; certainly the general objective for prosperous times.

(2) It has risen. In the late 1940's the rate changed between 3½ and 4½ percent. Two years after the 1949 recession it was down to 3½ again and went lower, with help from the Korean war. Two years after the 1954 recession it was 4 percent and did not go lower. Two years after 1958 it is 5 percent.

JOBLESS ANALYZED

What is this 5-percent unemployment?

In numbers, the Labor Department estimated this week that it was 3,459,000 workers in mid-May. They were a shade short of 5 percent of the labor force, which is the total of workers with jobs and those without but looking.

A number of characteristics stand out about those who are unemployed:

Youth: There are 5,500,000 teenagers in the labor force—only one-thirteenth of the total force. But 750,000 of them are unemployed—one-eighth of their number and one-fifth of the total unemployment. Young workers typically change jobs more often than those who have had time to become established. In the youngest bracket, 14 through 19 years of age, some of the unemployed are students who work part time or want to. Some in the May total were early summer-job seekers and high school seniors setting out for a career. And some were dropouts—boys and girls who have quit school and can't stay put.

Lack of skills: The rate of unemployment among unskilled laborers is almost 10 percent and the rate among the semiskilled is 7½ percent. By contrast, unemployment among managerial and professional workers is less than 1½ percent, and among white collar and skilled factory hands it is 3½ and 4 percent.

Color: Negroes suffer from discrimination plus lack of skills, and each of those factors probably contributes to the other. The rate

of unemployment among nonwhites is 9 percent. Among whites it is just half as much.

So much for description. How does it help to explain why, in the midst of the greatest prosperity this Nation has ever known, 5 percent of its workers are not working?

IRREDUCIBLE MINIMUM

First, let it be noted that no one is saying that in prosperous times there should be zero percent unemployed. On the contrary, it is assumed that there will be 2,500,000 to 3 million jobless in normal prosperity, largely because of constant job changing. Granting that, what accounts for the 3,500,000 unemployed today?

It may not appear that the aforementioned dominant characteristics of the unemployed are new. Basically they are not, but they reflect some significantly changed conditions:

(1) The 14-percent rate of unemployment among teenagers reflects the population boom, with the heaviest impact yet to come as more and more youths reach working age. At the other end of the age scale, with people living longer, unemployment is more frequent than the overall average, and lasts much longer.

(2) Higher-than-average unemployment among the semiskilled and unskilled reflects the fantastic technological advances of the postwar era, inspired in part by rising labor costs. The productivity of the individual workers is up. The replacement of men by machines creates more jobs for Ph. D.'s, and it may contribute to a greater prosperity that will create more jobs for everyone, but it doesn't do a thing for the men immediately displaced.

Another effect of advancing technology is the displacement of old products by new. As the military shifts from bombers to missiles, the market, for aircraft workers falls off.

(3) High unemployment among Negroes reflects no postwar phenomenon, but the current joblessness can be traced back to the labor needs of World War II when the demand brought workers into jobs from which they were previously barred. With the coming of peace many of these workers were reluctant to return to more menial jobs. And, because of automation, some of these lower jobs no longer existed.

The pressures caused by unemployment raise a big question. Is the national economy growing fast enough to provide jobs for all? At this moment, the answer has to be "No." Here in mid-1960 there is record prosperity but slow growth. On last year's record, the answer would be "Yes," The gross national product grew by a handsome 7 percent despite widespread effects of the steel strike.

VARYING GROWTH RATE

Today's "no" and last year's "yes" only illustrate that the growth rate is anything but constant. For further confusion, ask two economists what the long-term average is. It appears to be 3 to 4 percent, but that's a $5 billion difference in a $500 billion economy.

Looking backward, a fast growing labor force has been rather fully employed in most of the postwar years. Looking ahead, the force will most assuredly grow faster.

Since 1950 the national economy has grown by 43 percent, the population by 18 percent, and the labor force by 14 percent. The numerical growth was 28 million population and 9 million labor force.

In the coming 10 years it is estimated that the economy will grow by another 50 percent, the population by 15 percent, and the labor force by 18 percent. This assumes the same 28 million addition to the population, but an increased addition to the labor force—14 million.

Obviously, in an economy where productivity is rising, a 1 percent growth in production does not mean a 1 percent growth in jobs. The economy grows faster than the labor force.

PROBLEM OF MESHING

Must it grow three times as fast as the labor force, as in the 1950's? Not necessarily. It depends on what parts of the labor force and what parts of the economy are growing at what speeds.

Will the speeds mesh? They have never meshed perfectly and probably never will. The authorities agree and disagree on what to do about it.

They agree that there is room for improvement in the economic machine. Featherbedding in labor, monopoly in business and surpluses on the farm are generally deplored, if not eliminated. They agree that certain chronic disorders need relief. The very young and the unskilled need more training. Some of the skilled need retraining. Some communities are so depressed that they need outside help. Discrimination against Negroes and older workers does not vanish by itself.

They disagree on measures which each side advances in the name of faster growth. The "conservative" favors tax cuts to stimulate business and investment, and thus jobs. The "liberal" favors tax cuts to stimulate consumer spending, and thus jobs. Another "conservative" favors tariff protection so domestic industry may prosper, but his opposite "liberal" argues that higher tariffs here breed higher tariffs abroad and fewer jobs in industries which export.

Finally, and quite clearly, they disagree on the basics—whether generally higher Government spending will make the economy grow or break it, whether the exercise of restraints against inflation retards growth or assures economic vitality, and whether growth should or can be stimulated.

Sequoyah's 200th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 200th anniversary of the birth of a great American, the Cherokee leader and scholar, Sequoyah, whose statue stands in our Nation's Hall of Fame here in the Capitol.

Recently this anniversary was called to my attention by Mrs. Sidney H. Ruskin, 2663 Fair Oaks Road, Decatur, Ga. Mrs. Ruskin has eloquently summarized the contribution of Sequoyah in these words:

The year 1960 marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of the greatest of all Cherokee Indian leaders, Sequoyah, inventor of the famous Cherokee alphabet.

This Cherokee alphabet was the greatest contribution to the culture of the Cherokee Indian. Easily understood, it altered the status of the Cherokee from an illiterate to a literate people in an unbelievably short length of time. It led to the birth of the Indian newspaper, the Cherokee Phoenix, first published in 1828.

Sequoyah was granted an annual literary pension from the Cherokee government. He was the recipient of a medal from the Cherokee Council for his invention of the Cherokee alphabet. He was official emissary from the Western Cherokee to Washington. In this capacity and because of his famous alphabet, the famous oil painting was made of him by a Washington artist. He was a veteran of the War of 1812. He was an artisan who developed silvercraft to the highest level attained by North American Indians. He was the inspiration for the naming of the giant California redwoods, the Sequoias. He is commemorated in Statuary Hall in our Nation's Capitol. The noted historian, James Mooney, speaks of Sequoyah's alphabet thusly, "In the various schemes of symbolic thought representation, from the simple pictograph of primitive man to the finished alphabet of civilized nations—our own system, though not yet perfect, stands at the head of the list—the result of 3,000 years of development by Egyptians, Phoenician, and Greek. Sequoyah's syllabary, the unaided work of an uneducated Indian, reared amid semisavage surroundings, stands second."

Death of Charles W. Anderson, Jr., of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a beautiful editorial tribute to the late Charles W. Anderson, Jr., of Kentucky, written by Frank L. Stanley, Sr., and published in the Louisville Defender of June 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES W. ANDERSON, JR., LEAVES A RICH LEGACY

"Cut is the branch which
Might have grown full straight,
And burned is Apollo's Laurel Bough
That sometime grew within
This Learned Man."

—*Marlowe, Faustus.*

There is much to lament in the sudden, tragic death of Charles W. Anderson, Jr., one of Kentucky's most talented and highly successful individuals. Death came in the flower of a steadily advancing and brilliant career which saw him rise above the handicap of color and race to a pinnacle of national fame.

Born of formally educated parents and endowed by Almighty God with unusual talents and gifts, C. W. Anderson, Jr., learned early to use them well.

He had exceptional ability at leadership and organization. His was a vivid and productive imagination and dauntless courage. He was interested not in merely narrow and selfish things but seemed always to be looking toward the wider horizons which would benefit others as well as himself. He had the uncommon faculty to gather to himself loyal friends in every walk of life from Presidents and Senators on down.

There are many roads in life which one may follow. Some lead to quicksands of tyranny and some to statesmanship. Some roads lead to individual despair and others to happiness. Many roads lead to destinations unknown. Attorney Anderson was always ready to use his legal and legislative influence to erect helpful signposts for his fellow citizens traveling along life's highways and byways. He attained the stature of true statesmanship.

He sought as a legislator to use the rightness of law to prevent the privileged and

strongest travelers from impeding the progress and rights of the weak.

He used his voice and vote to open doors of opportunity for discriminated and segregated people. He was a true liberal and sacrificed much in the cause of freedom.

From an early age Charles Anderson seemed destined for leadership. Son of a doctor and a schoolteacher, he has adorned a great family name.

A truly fine lawyer, his leadership zenith was attained in political life. Notable first: Member of a southern legislature in 1935, assistant Commonwealth attorney in 1946 and delegate to the United Nations Assembly in 1959, all attest to his rare ability and prestige.

Among many things Charles Anderson was a gifted orator. But his eloquence did not consist, as many fine specimens of eloquence do, of types and figures, elegant arrangements of words and sentences but rather of that deeply earnest and impassioned tone and manner which can proceed only in a speaker with great sincerity and thorough conviction in the justice of his cause. He seemed touched with a quality which came from beyond the greed, the pettiness, and the passing passions of the hour. Charles Anderson would not compromise with wrong nor waver on a principle. He stanchly kept the faith that was his because he knew that finally the principle of human liberty must prevail.

In the course of his dedicated professional life, Charles Anderson championed unpopular causes. He insisted on full rights for all.

The many contributions Charles Anderson made to his community, State, and Nation are too numerous for review here. But because of them, new leaders will arise in Charles Anderson's memory, inspired by his devotion, to carry the torch of true liberalism toward the final goal. Examples of his achievements and unflinching courage will be cited endlessly.

He had great faith in democracy. His life was dedicated to making it truly functional for all citizens. His compass was the law of the land, and his ultimate goal, a better life for his fellow man. Democracy to him was not for the few, not for the strong, but for the individual—every individual under its banner.

One of the imperishable yearnings of the soul of man is to live beyond the day of death. During life our departed leader created to himself an everlasting memorial. His services to his Government, and through Government to his fellow man, will go on and on. Many hereafter, because of his enobling example, will gain new inspiration to serve in the cause to which he gave his full devotion. Those who seek to emulate his deeds will constitute the most lasting memorial that can possibly be erected in his honor.

Needed: More NATO Consultation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times:

NEEDED: MORE NATO CONSULTATION

The Canadian desire for greater consultation among the NATO powers seems justified, even if the United States apparently has not always seen it that way.

This renewal of Canadian enthusiasm for a more united voice in important military decisions of the NATO countries was prompted, in part, by the U–2 incident. While it is true that many key officials of our own Government were ignorant of the U–2 flights, the fact that this surveillance of Russia involved, for better or worse, the NATO nations is grounds for concern by any one of them.

As the Toronto Globe and Mail puts it, "Canada and the other smaller members of NATO have to demand consultation not only in decisions of moment made by the Big Three, but in decisions of moment made by any single one of the NATO powers—meaning, particularly, the United States."

It has long been known that NATO suffers not only from the absence of clearly defined purpose, but also from proper communication among the 15 member nations. Generally its purpose, of course, is to protect the free world against any military onslaught from Russia. But in recent years its functions have gone into the political and economic arena as Moscow stretched its trade attack throughout the world.

Too, not all countries have met their military obligations to NATO. Yet those which have, including Canada, do not always know precisely what actions the Big Three—United States, France, and Britain—contemplate unilaterally in pursuit of NATO aims. More open lines of communication would appear a small step toward improving the North Atlantic alliance.—R.W.

The Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a short time ago I received a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Brooklyn Tablet. Because it concerns a matter of current interest, the Connally amendment, and because I feel that the points made by the writer merit serious reflection, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brooklyn Tablet, May 21, 1960]

UNITED STATES ALREADY GONE FAR ON WORLD COURT MOVE

DEAR SIR: Recently I was prompted to do a little research in regard to one of the statements made by opponents of the Connally reservation (which reserves to the United States the right to determine what matters are essentially within our domestic jurisdiction and therefore not within the terms of our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court). I came up with a surprising result.

The particular statement is that there are 38 nations now having in effect declarations of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. This is quoted with understandable good faith by many advocates of repeal of the reservation and is in the U.N. publications. (See "Everyone's United Nation," 1959, p. 380.)

These declarations are set out in the 1953–59 Yearbook of the International Court of Justice. On examining these declarations I found that 21 of them are terminable on notice. The declarations for all the nations of the British Commonwealth which have accepted jurisdiction are terminable on notice, by their expressed language. These are for Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Pakistan, the South African Republic, and the United Kingdom. So are those for Columbia, Israel, Liberia, Philippines, Portugal, and the Sudan. Certain other acceptances of jurisdiction have no express provision for notice (and no unexpired term to run) and so they would appear to be terminable at will. These are for the Arabic Republic, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Turkey, and Uruguay. That makes 21 nations out of the 38 which apparently can terminate their acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction upon notice; leaving only 17 nations whose adherence has an unexpired term to run or else requires some advance notice for termination (such as, for example, in our case, 6 months or in some cases 6 months before the expiration of a term of years). Two of the 17 are not members of the United Nations, so it would be correct to say that only 15 of the United Nations countries are really bound to compulsory jurisdiction.

The U.S. declaration requires 6 months' notice to terminate, and following the notice we would be vulnerable to proceedings by unfriendly nations any of which could accept jurisdiction for the purpose of bringing cases against us. The United Kingdom was too smart to get caught that way for their declaration of acceptance of jurisdiction (in addition to being terminable on notice) excluded disputes with any nation which has not filed a declaration of acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction at least 12 months before bringing the case to Court.

We are told that the United Kingdom withdrew its equivalent of the Connally reservation, as if that should move us to do likewise. However, the United Kingdom's action has little significance since they could terminate their entire adherence upon notice anyway.

So it is fair to say that even with the self-preserving Connally reservation, we have already gone farther than 67 of the 82 nations in the U.N. in acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court.

JOHN B. GEST.

PHILADELPHIA.

Extending Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of this body and the Members of the Senate to an editorial from the Sentinel of Carlisle, Pa., in the June 16, 1960, edition. As the Members of the House will recall we passed a resolution earlier in this session to uphold the rights of this Nation in the Panama Canal and in the Canal Zone. The Senate, however, has not as yet taken any action on the House-passed resolution and the Sentinel, in the following editorial, calls upon it to take appropriate action on that highly important resolution.

The editorial follows:

EXTENDING MONROE DOCTRINE

U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, proposes that the United States extend the Monroe Doctrine to include subversion and that immediate steps be taken to prevent the Panama Canal from becoming nationalized, as was the Suez.

The House in Washington has passed and dispatched to the Senate a resolution upholding the United States rights to the Canal and the Canal Zone. But the Senate has withheld action on the resolution at the request of Secretary of State Herter. In the bargain, the executive branch granted permission some time ago to Panama to fly the Panamanian flag alongside that of the United States within the zone.

Few citizens, probably, realize that Representative FLOOD is making a valid request and one that would halt, as he put it, "the impression of weakness, timidity, and an excessive zeal for appeasement" by the administration of the nations to the south of us. With Cuba now practically a captive of the Soviet Union and lying so close to our shores, and very close to the northern approach to the canal, we can ill afford to be too kindly and too friendly with our southern brothers even though we need good relations with those of them which are Western allies.

It is all the further necessary that we exercise a stronger hand and hold our frontiers if the situation in Venezuela be studiously viewed. Venezuela, on the southern approach to the vital waterway, is a hotbed of agitation, infiltrated by Communists and others who hope to sever our relations with the free Latin countries.

With Representative FLOOD's proposal there can be little disagreement. The Senate should approve the resolution in quick order so that we can fully hold and protect the Panama Canal and the zone. They are strategic and immensely important to us. The zone was made inhabitable and the canal constructed at high cost, both in money and lives. It is unthinkable that we should share it, or allow any other nation to have even a small part in its operation.

New Recognition for Congressman Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Washington (D.C.) Post this morning handed a well-deserved editorial bouquet to our colleague, the Honorable STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, for his work on behalf of home rule for the District of Columbia. Motivated by the principle that in a democracy such as ours no group of people should be denied a voice in their local government, STEWART UDALL worked untold hours to try to make local self-government possible for the residents of our Nation's Capital. On top of the heavy load he has carried in the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, this near-miss he achieved has been indeed remarkable.

I am particularly pleased that the Washington (D.C.) Post has recognized his unusual leadership qualities—something of which his colleagues and I have long been aware. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, June 24, 1960]

SALUTE TO STEWART UDALL

As District residents view the wreckage of their hopes for home rule during the present session of Congress, there is a continued afterglow amid the gloom. This represents the admiration, respect, and appreciation that many voteless Washingtonians have acquired for Representative STEWART L. UDALL, Democrat of Arizona, who led the fight to discharge the House District Committee from further consideration of the bottled-up home-rule bill. The hard-fighting legislator from Tucson might well be designated public servant of the year in the District.

Few persons who watched the struggle to move the home-rule bill onto the floor of the House realize the volume of work that was entailed in getting 215 congressional signatures on a discharge petition. Mr. UDALL took charge of this task, not because his constituents have any special interest in it, but because he believes in the principle of local self-government. Month after month he continued the toilsome process of adding signatures, sometimes under the most disheartening circumstances. He stimulated many Congressmen into activity on the issue; he encouraged local home-rule groups; with some expert help he surveyed the entire membership of the House and brought the discharge petition within a few names of the required 219 when the time limitation ran out last week.

Mr. UDALL's performance was the more remarkable because of its unselfishness. It was not his home district for which he was fighting but voteless Washingtonians who have no political rewards to offer. Let no one assume, however, that his efforts in behalf of this worthy cause have been waste motion. His sature in legislative affairs has undoubtedly grown; his colleagues have come to recognize him as a stout protagonist, a man of principle and an effective leader. These are valuable assets to any man in public life.

Of course, many others contributed to the almost successful home-rule drive in the House. To all of them the District owes a hearty vote of thanks. It was STEWART UDALL, however, who led the fight and exerted the strongest pull for the restoration of local suffrage. The gratitude of the community is nonetheless real because it has no official voice with which to speak.

Frieda B. Hennock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn has given many distinguished public servants to her city, State and Nation. One such beautiful personality was the late Frieda B. Hennock. She was able, conscientious, and radiant with charm. Her passing is mourned by all who knew her.

I am pleased to direct our colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of June 22, 1960, and the column by Bernie Harrison which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 23, 1960.

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1960]

FRIEDA B. HENNOCK

Frieda B. Hennock leaves a monument more substantial than marble though it exists only in thin air. As the first and only woman member of the Federal Communications Commission, Miss Hennock was among the most vigorous champions of educational television. Even after her FCC term ended in 1955, she continued her campaign for more "schoolhouses of the air" until her death on Monday at the untimely age of 55. Her efforts bore fruit. Some 257 channels—or 10 percent of the total—have been reserved for educational TV stations, and more than 50 educational stations are expected to be in operation by the end of this year. Miss Hennock was rightfully proud of her part in reserving a portion of the airwaves for purely educational purposes.

Miss Hennock was also a forthright dissenter of a kind that has been sorely missed on the regulatory agencies in the past few years. During her 7-year term on the FCC, her outspokenness sometimes vexed commercial broadcasters and grated the nerves of some potentates in Congress. If on occasion she erred through enthusiasm, her insistent demand for high standards of broadcasting seems more pertinent than ever in light of the low-frequency scandals that have jarred the airwaves.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1960]

A LOSING FIGHT—OR WAS IT?

(By Bernie Harrison)

If there's one line which instantly evokes the frantic flavor of TV's relation to Government from the late forties to the middle fifties, it would have to be the one so often delivered by industry spokesmen (with understanding shrugs):

"It's only Frieda again."

Frieda Hennock, alas, won too few of her battles to make TV lift its sights and live up to its immense potential—but she never stopped fighting.

Her untimely passing this week only underscores the obvious; the causes for which the only woman to serve on the Federal Communications Commission fought (1948–55) can ill afford to lose a champion.

Unlike so many of the experts on TV's current woes, Miss Hennock (who served a full term on the FCC from 1948 to 1955) was right by foresight, not hindsight.

For example:

She was always for an FCC, with enough power to exercise directional control of the industry. As late as April 1955 she was telling a Senate subcommittee:

"The FCC should pursue a rigorous policy or refusing renewal of licenses of offending stations which disregard their public service responsibilities by continuing to victimize immature audiences with a concentrated and profuse deluge of crime, brutality, sadism and outright murder."

(The new FCC Chairman, you may have noted, recently asked Congress for the funds to hire monitors to help the Commission check the performance of stations.)

She was concerned with dangerous possibilities of a powerful medium improperly used as long ago as 1951, when no body was paying attention. And she distributed the blame equally. For instance:

"The overwhelming majority of educators • • • do nothing about TV."

And in distributing the blame for TV's woes, she did not overlook Congress. In May 1954, she wept as she gave the Senate a scolding:

"I will have to take my hair down and blame the Senate as much as the Commission for problems which have arisen in the television industry. • • • Senators call up and say, 'Hurry up and give us television service to our communitics and give it to us by tomorrow.' "

In April 1955, Miss Hennock was urging a Senate subcommittee to find a way of making radio and television time available without cost to the major candidates of the major political parties. Does that sound familiar?

The failure of UHF stations OK'd to function in VHF markets was no surprise to her. UHF prospects, she warned in the

early fifties, were nil if they were forced to compete with VHF's. They were nil.

And going back to the big color debate in 1950 and 1951, remember when the FCC OK'd CBS's incompatible system? Guess who dissented vigorously from the FCC majority and said the decision should be delayed until a compatible method had been perfected?

It was only Frieda again. Her proudest accomplishment, she felt, was in the fight to save TV channels for educational purposes. She said, in 1951, that 500 to 600 stations in the remaining TV frequencies should be set aside for noncommercial educational use, and she settled for 257 such reservations in the FCC's sixth report in 1952. Ours is still to be activated.

Overemotional? Extreme? Maybe. But looking back—with hindsight—one can only marvel at her restraint. I've a hunch that a number of awards for educational programing, etc., will be established in her honor—and they should be—but I think I'd settle for something more immediate. Like another Frieda Hennock on the Commission.

Our deepest sympathy to her husband, William H. Simons.

Editorial Support for Vice President Nixon's Food-for-Peace Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, editorials appearing in newspapers all over the country have praised the proposal of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to establish a United Nations food pool in the cause of peace. It has been properly noted that funneling this project through the United Nations would contribute to enhancing the world standing of that vital institution, and would also help insure worldwide distribution of food, which is one of the best antidotes to the poison of communism.

It is my hope that most serious consideration will be given to this imaginative proposal, which can contribute not only to building peace with justice, but to diminishing America's tremendous food surpluses.

Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of Members of the Senate an outstanding editorial on this subject which recently appeared in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle, June 22, 1960]

TO FIGHT REDS, FILL TUMMIES

The world food pool proposal supported by Vice President NIXON may become the most powerful weapon for peace that could ever be wielded in these trouble times. Implemented by the United Nations, it could change the whole complexion of the cold war on the principle that troublemaking doesn't thrive on a full stomach.

Mr. NIXON urges that creation of the pool of surplus food to feed the world's hungry be a U.N. function. The World Health Organization is eminently fitted to administer the program. Under such auspices the program could not be ascribed to unilateral action for selfish advantage of this Nation.

The food pool is a part of Mr. NIXON'S program for a new attack on the U.S. farm surplus problem. It is not a panacea, but its humane outlook should make it a factor in any ultimate solution.

The food pool potential should not be underestimated. Communism breeds on hunger, unrest, poverty, disease. Victims fall easy prey to the blandishments of the Soviets. But communism can produce no weapon—propaganda blasts, rockets, satellites, subversive tactics—to match a full stomach. A food distribution program under the U.N. may well be more important and more rewarding than any summit conference.

Food is practical, tangible, visible, edible, healthful—it is the best friend peace could ever have.

Prosperity by Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "'Prosperity by Edict' Could Hurt Economy" which appeared in the Tuesday, June 21, 1960, edition of the Chicago Daily News:

PROSPERITY BY EDICT COULD HURT ECONOMY—WAGE LAWS WORK TWO WAYS

As Congress gathers momentum for the final push, the House Labor Committee has approved an increase in the present $1-an-hour minimum legal wage. The compromise version would give pay hikes to some 3.3 million workers by raising the minimum to $1.25 in three stages by November, 1963.

This method of making people more prosperous by edict has gained in political popularity since the original 40-cent minimum was raised to 75 cents in 1950, and to $1 in 1956. Many workers heretofore excluded would be brought under the law. Of these, retail clerks are the largest group.

The 1956 hike in the minimum wage gave an opportunity to gage the effect on the economy. Some price rises were immediately noted, in such industries as lumber, cotton, turpentine, and peanuts.

What could not be accurately measured was the unemployment which resulted from the fact that some workers in some industries simply weren't worth a wage of $40 for a 40-hour week. Labor leaders, stanchly confident of the humaneness of their position, advocate that any industry which cannot afford a $1.25 hourly wage be allowed to vanish.

A rub comes, however, when and if this happens. The displaced workers may compete with those in another industry, exerting a downward pressure on wages. Or they may go on relief, since society has taken the position that if they aren't worth $1.25 an hour they can't work at all, but will be supported by the community.

Those who may thus go on relief have less than when they were working at below the new legal wage, and they are robbed of their independence.

For the most part, however, the higher costs incident to the raised minimum wage are passed along to the consumer and paid without much complaint. Industries requiring a high proportion of unskilled labor per dollar for income are placed under additional pressure to mechanize.

Some economists, disliking the principle of government dictation of wages, are persuaded that the net results would be better if the Government were simply to subsidize wages in the lowest paid industries. They contend that the dislocations and the cost to consumers would be less than by fixing a floor under wages.

In theory they could be right, but in practice that method offers administrative difficulties enough to give shudders to the most determined bureaucrat. The lawmakers, in proposing 3 yearly jumps of 10 cents, 10 cents, and 5 cents, have taken note of the possibility of industrial dislocations, and allowed leeway for adjustment.

A further concession to reality is the proposed exclusion of employes whose pay comes mainly from tips.

It is ironic, in a way, that the measure is sponsored by Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, who are among the wealthiest Members of Congress. A great many employers will contend that these two have too little knowledge of the practicalities of life, but nobody can argue that they arent alert to political realities.

Moving With the Brakes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 86th Congress is drawing to a close. One most important piece of legislation has not been enacted by the Congress that could have rewarding consequences for the economy.

Some time ago the administration requested that the present ceiling of 4¼ percent be lifted on Government long-term bonds. There has been ample evidence to show that by forcing the Government into short-term financing, a demand has been built up within the money markets that has caused an overall inflation in interest rates. The following editorial from the New York Times of June 18, 1960, is one that merits the attention of the House:

MOVING WITH THE BRAKES ON

The Treasury has made public the preliminary figures on the results of its first venture in the technique of advance refunding—which is to say, offering a new security in exchange for an outstanding issue that issue that isn't due for redemption until well into the future. The issue that had been chosen for the experiment by the Treasury's debt managers consisted of $11.2 billion in 2½-percent bonds issued in 1954 and due in November 1961.

In terms of reducing the refinancing task that would otherwise have had to be faced in November of next year, the operation was highly satisfactory. But if anyone had entertained serious hopes that the operation would produce any visible improvement in the maturity pattern of the Government debt (and fortunately few had any illusions on that point) these were emphatically disappointed.

It is possible to make these sweeping generalizations because the holder of the out-

standing 2½s was given a choice of surrendering them for one of two new issues. One of these was a 4-year note carrying a 3¾-percent coupon rate; the other was an 8-year bond with a 3⅞-percent rate. Holders of nearly $4.6 billion of the old bonds announced their readiness to accept the new notes; in the case of the new 8-year bond acceptances totaled a mere $321 million. Under the allotment plan announced a week ago $3.9 billion of the $4.6 billion in notes will be accepted. Naturally, the $321 million subscription to the new bonds will be recognized in full. This means that the problem posed by the November 1961, maturity of the old bonds has been reduced by $4.2 billion, or from $11.2 billion to $7 billion.

We not only know that the Treasury was unsuccessful in its effort to make a dent in its second problem—increasing the average life of the debt—but we know what and who are responsible for that failure. The "what" is the present legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates that the Treasury may attach to security issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. The "who" are those Members of Congress who have prevented the removal of this absurd and costly provision.

True, the 3¾-coupon rate carried by the new bond is well below that ceiling, but legally the ceiling is also regarded as covering the true cost of refunding a maturity issue in advance, a cost that, in the case of the new bond issues, is calculated at 4.22 percent. In short, the otherwise highly successful Treasury operation suffered from only one drawback. It carried a fresh and painful remainder that in this country the market, and not legislative fiat, decides what constitutes a fair price.

Aid to Certain Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Men's Class Forum of the Riverside Church, New York, N.Y., favoring the enactment of certain pending legislation, relating to aid to certain migrant workers and their children.

There being no objection the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the migrant workers of America, their wives and their children, who harvest so much of our fruit, vegetable, and cotton crops, are now largely unprotected in their rights and liberties either by the Federal Government or by the State where they work from sunrise to sunset but for such short periods of time that they cannot establish residence or State citizenship; and

Whereas the crew leaders now transport these defenseless, stateless migrants from State to State and from job to job at exorbitant rates and without contracts, and have arbitrary power to exploit them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express ourselves strongly in favor of Senator JAVITS' bill S. 1778 and Representative KEARN's bill H.R. 5930 for the registration of crew leaders and the curbing of malpractices, and we hereby urge our Senators and Representatives to bend all their efforts to secure the passage of these bills, and also of Senator WILLIAMS' bill S. 2864 and Representative BAILEY's bill H.R. 10378 to help provide education for migrant children.

Unanimously approved April 26, 1960.

MASON OLCOTT,
Chairman, Men's Class Forum.

Providing Economic Independence for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, a group of civic-minded individuals in my home district met and developed the idea that our largest city, Eau Claire, needed a place where handicapped persons could be employed. After many months and a great deal of work, a building was obtained, and six handicapped people were employed. At the present time, the Shelter for Handicapped, Inc., is engaged in many phases of light manufacturing and employs 14 people who, for all practical purposes, were previously considered unemployable.

I feel that the Shelter has not only become an asset to its community as a growing business but is doing a job that cannot be totaled in dollars and cents. This organization has taken the handicapped out of their homes and given them a chance for economic independence.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a story about the Shelter in the RECORD:

THE SHELTER FOR HANDICAPPED, INC.

The Abadan Grotto of Eau Claire surveyed the possibility of a cerebral palsey workshop in this community. The outcome of the survey showed a need for a multiple-handicap workshop, which led to a pilot project. The facilities of the McDonough School were offered, and the Abadan Grotto furnished transportation during the 3-month period.

Mrs. Ernest Affett, together with Mrs. Theodore Maxymof and the grotto auxiliary, evaluated the work possibilities of the handicapped adult. As this evaluation progressed, members of other civic groups and social organizations became interested, and the need of a sheltered workshop type of industry was realized. This realization brought about the official organization now known as the Shelter for Handicapped, Inc. The board of directors was formed of people of the community in many walks of life interested in aiding the handicapped.

The Shelter for Handicapped, Inc., is a nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonaffiliated organization whose main purpose is to provide sheltered workshop type of employment, giving the handicapped adult a sense of security, dignity, and usefulness.

A fundraising campaign was held in September of 1959 to provide the necessary funds to purchase housing for the Shelter. The lack of sufficient funds could not stop the desire of volunter workers in their aim. The Shelter was started on a "wing and a prayer," with more of the latter than the former in evidence.

The building at 115 Ninth Avenue was obtained and work began with four handicapped employees on November 23. In a few days the number increased to eight. A very happy Christmas rush began, and hands that had never been employed before were now producing items such as litterbags, ceramic items, stationery imprinting, and machine sewing.

Donations have been made by various individuals and groups in the forms of cash, labor, and equipment. Volunteers have spent many hours of their time in aiding the handicapped at the shelter, with only the handicapped receiving a wage.

The ultimate aim of the Shelter is to evaluate and provide experience to those who can be employed in outside industry, to provide a sense of security to those who are afraid to return to their job due to untimely setbacks, and to provide a job to those who cannot be employed in any other competitive industry.

The Shelter for Handicapped, Inc., is a community project worthy of the support of the entire community. It is the only sheltered workshop of its kind in the entire State and one of which Eau Claire can be very proud.

Social Security Amendments of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

COMMENDATION OF CHAIRMAN MILLS, HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the purpose in my remarks this afternoon on the subject of the 1960 social security bill is not to reiterate the words that were uttered by many Members during the discussion of the legislation, but I feel that it is proper to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, whose dedication to the soundness of the social security system protects the citizens of this country from the irresponsible measures advocated each election year, which if enacted would bring actuarial ruin to the social security fund.

Mr. Speaker, I especially wish to commend the chairman and the members of his committee on the soundness of the provision which eliminated the disability benefit provision to disabled insured workers 50 and over, since statistics show us that wage earners under 50 who are disabled very often have families in need, and actually are more in need of this legislation than only those who had been previously covered.

And surely, the provision for medical care for older folks in need is a practi-

cal approach to a problem designed to assist those needing this protection without impairing, as I indicated earlier, the basic strength of the social security fund. All of us recognize the responsibility of our society to provide for people truly in need, but we must resist the attempts of the socialistically inclined Members who would force compulsory Government regimentation upon our medical profession and our citizens, to the detriment of all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, may I repeat that Chairman MILLS is entitled to our respect and admiration for his constant interest in maintaining the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government.

Also, I would be remiss at this point if I did not remind one and all of our obligation to point out to the citizens we represent that you never get something for nothing from Government.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I wish to present for the consideration of the Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 45 of the Louisiana Legislature by Mr. Gibbs. This matter is of vital importance to the State of Louisiana and I am sure the Members from all States are interested in fair and equitable treatment. The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States denying rights of this State to its lawful wealth from the production of oil from submerged offshore lands has resulted in the application of one rule to other States and a different rule to the State of Louisiana, which is clearly discriminatory and based in law upon the justification of ancient treaties which never contemplated the production of minerals from such areas; and

Whereas the result of the drawing of one set of seaward boundaries for the States on the coast of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and of another set of boundaries for those on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico with each of the States upon the Gulf of Mexico having different boundaries, has been the allowance to all of the petroleum producing States except Louisiana of all or at least the major portion of the coastal production areas; and

Whereas this discrimination against one of the States is unwarranted in a Nation comprised of States of equal rights and dignity; and

Whereas this particular discrimination against the State of Louisiana causes a discriminatory reduction of revenue to the one State out of all of the petroleum producing States which has the greatest expense to afford roads, schools, law enforcement, judicial process, and the other benefits of State and local government to the petroleum industry and the citizens engaged in making their livelihood therein because of the swamp and marsh coastline of the State which extends across virtually the entire coastline for an inland depth in many areas of as much as 100 miles; and

Whereas the economic burden upon the State of Louisiana of providing the normal and necessary State and local governmental facilities for the petroleum industry and its employees and equipment, such as roads, schools, and law enforcement, is greatly in excess of the burden of other coastal States having a more accessible coastline; and

Whereas the loss of revenue from petroleum production from the area which other States are allowed to receive, will necessitate the State of Louisiana being unable to provide the necessary facilities for assisting the petroleum industry to expand and develop the petroleum resources of our tidelands, with the resultant loss to the entire Nation of the benefits to be derived therefrom: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Louisiana Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby urged and requested to take all measures within their lawful powers to obtain the restoration to the State of Louisiana of the revenue derived from offshore mineral development and operations which other coastal States are allowed. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Louisiana Senator and Representative in Congress.

———,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

———,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

Centennial of Theodor Herzl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, May 2 Marked the centennial birthday of Theodor Herzl, founder of the Zionist movement, prophet and martyr of modern Jewish nationhood.

The cause to which he gave his life was the achievement of a national home for the Jewish people who suffered persecution and oppression in lands less fortunate than ours. He inspired millions with the vision of a Jewish State restored to the family of nations. Through the Zionist organization which he created, Herzl's vision came to realization in the establishment of the Republic of Israel, whose 12th anniversary was also celebrated on May 2. In the wake of the terrible holocaust which decimated European Jewry in the Hitler era, there has arisen a vital center of Hebrew civilization in which the ancient Judaic concepts of justice and brotherhood are fused with Western ideals of equality and democratic freedom.

The name of Theodor Herzl will be enshrined in the hearts not only of his own people but of all men who rejoice in the doing of justice and the redressing of wrong.

In taking note of the centennial it is fitting to record our tribute to the memory of Theodor Herzl and to convey our felicitations to the Zionist Organization of America, which in the United States has carried aloft the banner of Herzl ever since the founding of the World Zionist Organization over six decades ago.

Defense Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of Friday, June 24, 1960, entitled "Far From Satisfactory" which discusses the pending action of the Congress on the defense appropriation bill.

The Congress over a period of years and through two different administrations has endeavored to bring about integration of the procurement and supply activities of the Department of Defense. The 3-percent cut of the procurement appropriation made by the House has a meaning beyond that of the cut itself. The meaning should be clear to the military departments that feet dragging and delay in making necessary reforms in this area will not prevail.

The editorial follows:

FAR FROM SATISFACTORY

In approving recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the defense budget, the Senate also has given the Pentagon a well-merited rebuke for its lethargy in consolidating supply and procurement services. As the Senate committee has pointed out, the progress of the Defense Department in reducing costly waste of dollars intended for weapons and other equipment is "far from satisfactory."

The overlapping and duplication of services in the fields of material buying and distribution have been strongly criticized in the past by the Hoover Commission, the Controller General and several congressional committees. Now the Senate appropriations group has added to the chorus of condemnation with this comment: "The committee notes with grave concern the numerous and admitted examples of waste and duplication in defense procurement which have been reported to this and other congressional committees. The audit reports of the General Accounting Office show that these are not isolated examples; rather they underscore the urgency of integrating the supply systems and service activities of the military departments—repeatedly expressed as the intent of Congress. * * * The committee calls on the Department of Defense to take immediate and vigorous steps to integrate its procurement and supply service activities in order to provide maximum utilization of the defense dollar."

The House, as a spur to such consolidation, cut the procurement appropriation by 3 percent—pointing out that much more than this amount could be saved by an efficient and effective merger of buying services. The Senate restored this cut—but, in effect, has backed its committee's demand for a prompt end to waste. Whatever the final action by the conferees, both Houses of Congress now have served notice that they expect drastic supply reforms—reforms which it has been estimated could save the Department more than a billion dollars every year. The savings could buy a lot of additional security for America.

Summits and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every American citizen regardless of party is relieved that our President is back on American soil. And by the same tokens we have only regret that Mr. Eisenhower was pressured beyond his better judgment into embarking upon a global tour, even though his visits to foreign shores were for the purpose of persuading a troubled world of our peaceful intentions. What does amaze us, however, is the critical clamor now coming from certain Democrats whereas a few short months ago they were insisting that a summit meeting was imperative and implied that if Ike failed to cooperate the issue would be raised in the upcoming election.

In that connection my favorite columnist, David Lawrence, in a recent statement brought into focus the fact that a certain influential Senate Democrat, on January 30, 1959, criticized the administration for appearing unwilling to negotiate the issues dividing East and West. This same Democrat, according to Mr. Lawrence, also declared that the United States should be willing to explore the possibilities of arriving at some understanding with Red China that might lead to its recognition. And then Mr. Lawrence further reports that this same Democrat Senator became so enthusiastic about summit conferences that in March 1959 he declared that they should be held at least twice a year and on June 7, 1959, remarked that he could not see any great reason to fear a summit and talk things over. In the light of these Olympian observations from such an exalted Democrat authority the present criticism coming from that camp seems to smack of insincerity and carries with it the political tinge which I suppose we must tolerate in an election year.

But as Mr. Lawrence observes in that same article—

> The real concern, therefore, in international relations today—a disease that is eating away at the vitals of the democracies of the West—is interparty politics.

And while we are on politics we may as well dispose of a recent statement by Columnist Ralph McGill to this effect—

> The GOP farm policy is a liability. It's foreign policy is a shambles. The major asset of the Republican Party was that of one which would keep the world at peace.

Taking these observations one at a time, what farm policy is he talking about? Does he refer to the 90 percent support program sponsored by the Democrats under which the farmer took his greatest losses except during the periods of war when a lot of Americans were getting killed? Or does he mean the farm policy of lower supports and reduced controls advocated by the President which the overwhelming Democrat majority in both Houses have steadfastly refused to enact into law? Sure, our present farm policy is a liability, but it is a liability handed down from previous Democrat administrations.

And as for our foreign policy—here again we have an inheritance that was bequeathed to Ike by his Democrat predecessors. The greatest misfortune to befall the GOP was that it had to pick up the pieces left by the debacle at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, while at the same time undertaking to contain a police action let loose by an inept Democrat Secretary of State who declared to the world that we had no intention of defending the Republic of Korea.

Finally, as for keeping the peace—in this era of the cold war an administration that can keep Americans from being fired upon in anger by other nations cannot properly be said to have failed to maintain the peace—albeit an uneasy one. And when we remember 1917–18, 1941–45, and 1950–52, we can only conclude that our Democrat critics are not talking from a position of strength and that from their previous record they are not the people that can be depended upon to lead us to that longed-for day when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

A Veteran Judge Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court handed down its now infamous edict seeking to bring about the mixing of the races in public schools. In essence that decision was nothing more than an arrogant, naked grab for power, a brazen attempt to usurp legislative authority, and an effort to unsettle accepted law which has been in force for decades.

In a recent issue of Southern Advertising & Publishing, Mr. Garland B. Porter, editor and general manager of that magazine published an editorial entitled "A Veteran Judge Speaks." Mr. Porter's remarks are pertinent, direct, timely, and clear as are the remarks of Judge Jule W. Felton whose statement serves as a basis for this editorial. This speech and the editorial indicate that informed and thinking people have not been deceived by the Court's attempt to rewrite the law in clear violation of its constitutional authority. Pursuant to unanimous consent I insert this editorial herewith:

A VETERAN JUDGE SPEAKS

(By Garland B. Porter)

The racial strife and political debates that were triggered by the "outrageous" (quotes are from the late Senator Walter George of Georgia) edict of the Warren Court on May 17, 1954, took a most interesting turn June 7 when Chief Judge Jule W. Felton of Georgia Court of Appeals stated that the Warren court on that day exceeded its constitutional authority when it ordered mixing of the races in public schools.

Speaking before the Georgia Lions Club convention, Judge Felton, a veteran of 41 years at the bar, said: "Separate and equal facilities is the law of the land, and those opposing the 1954 decisions are not misguided, ignorant, intolerant radicals." A very potent statement and fully justified by the Constitution itself and all precedents dated prior to the 1954 edict. The veteran judge stated further:

"The decisions of the Court acting beyond the scope of its power are wholly and completely void and are entitled to no respect and obedience anytime or anywhere."

The function of the Supreme Court is to interpret the law. That it can willy-nilly and by whim upset a whole line of decisions and interpretations without any intervening change of statutes or constitutional amendments is a gross abuse of power. This is true because once a constitutional decision is made, all statutory process must fall into line; the Supreme Court was designed to be and has fulfilled the function of checking after legislation, not creating it. Otherwise its only true function is nullified. The appearance of Warren on the Court did not alter this fact. To allow him to initiate and pursue a different process is to weaken the national system.

Judge Felton speaks in the true tradition of a judge, not a lawmaker. No judge can change the law of any case before him; and if any ruling he makes is contrary to law, it is thrown out. There must be a top rung to every ladder, and our Supreme Court is that rung. But this does not mean it is free of restraints of the law itself. The Warren Court did not simply rule on the case of Brown et al., it rewrote the accepted law and violated all precedents. To force mixing of the races is something wholly outside the meaning, purpose, and justice of the law of our land, and no Supreme Court can force it without invasion of the rights of the individuals.

Growthmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is true that we are living in critical and perilous times, when through the impatient act or insane will of a dictator, a spark can ignite the world and destroy civilization as we know it. Because this is general knowledge, it has been fashionable to criticize our Nation's growth as compared with that of Russia.

It is my belief that an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of June 24, 1960, places such views in the right perspective. The editorial follows:

GROWTHMANSHIP

The cult of growthmanship, as most of our readers are aware, is embraced by edgy people who see in every new Russian economic statistic that surpasses our rate of growth a sign that Mr. Khrushchev's threat to bury us economically is almost upon us. Missionaries of the cult hold that unless our Government forces growth so that we match or surpass the Russian rate we'll soon be overwhelmed.

Well, the basic fallacy in this sort of reasoning was shown the other day when two gentlemen we know were discussing the sim-

ultaneous launching of two U.S. satellites with one U.S. missile.

Said one: "I see where we now have 11 satellites orbiting the Earth and 2 orbiting the Sun, while the Russians have only 2 orbiting the Earth and 1 orbiting the Sun."

"Ah, yes," said the other. "But just think how much greater the Russian rate of growth will be when Moscow puts up just one more satellite."

Pharmaceutical Group Opposes H.R. 10597 as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I am keenly interested in the regulations and the operations of the District Commissioners. The Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York has been interested in raising the standards of the practice of pharmacy and protecting their economic interests. The pharmaceutical profession is one of the hardest working professions in our country and has demonstrated its responsibility and trustworthiness.

Recently I received a letter from the secretary of the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York, my old friend, Nicholas S. Gesoalde, who has complained bitterly of the rewriting of the proposed Pharmacy Act, H.R. 10597, without consultation and advice by the pharmacists. Consequently, the Pharmaceutical Society has withdrawn its support of H.R. 10597 and opposes the amended version because of the harmful consequences to the pharmaceutical trade and the bad effects it will have upon the public.

I am setting forth a copy of the letter which the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York has forwarded me in connection with this legislation, H.R. 10597:

JUNE 21, 1960.

Hon. ALFRED SANTANGELO,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York has been informed that the proposed Pharmacy Act, H.R. 10597, has been completely rewritten by the House of Representatives subcommittee with the consent of the District of Columbia Commissioners. The revision of said bill was drafted without the advice of the District of Columbia Pharmaceutical Association, or other pharmaceutical representatives. This change from the original bill would destroy pharmacy as a profession. Professional practice is reduced to a mere trade which has routine licensing.

The rewritten bill will allow complete elimination of the pharmacy board; provides loop holes for prescription dispensing by nonpharmacists; facilitates a store representing itself falsely as a pharmacy; and makes pharmacists criminally responsible for acts which others may perform with impunity. As a matter of fact, conditions under this bill would be worse than the districts laws of 1906.

The Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York, representing more than 6,500 retail pharmacists condemn the substance, or lack of substance, of the rewritten bill and deplores the procedure of ignoring pharmaceutical council in drafting a bill concerned with responsibility on pharmacists in public health. For this reason, the Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York must withdraw all previous support of this bill.

Yours very truly,

NICHOLAS S. GESOALDE,
Secretary, Pharmaceutical Society of the State of New York.

Africa on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 22, March 23, and March 24, Mrs. May Craig published three columns in various Maine newspapers.

In the first, she described to us Victoria Falls, and the changing mores of Africa.

In the second, Mrs. Craig describes the display of mercy for wild animals in the construction of the Kariba Dam on the Zambezi River.

In the third, she tells of the vast wave of nationalism now being felt throughout Kenya.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these three articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—DUCKTAIL JUVENILES COME FROM COCKTAIL PARENTS

(By May Craig)

VICTORIA FALLS.—The Victoria Falls were found by David Livingstone, Britisher, in November, 1855. They are the greatest, most stupendous, beautiful falls in the world. At the falls, the Zambezi River is 1,860 yards wide. It falls into deep rocky, winding gorges with terrific rapids. The natives call the falls "The smoke that thunders," because the spray and mist from the incredible crash of waters down steep rocks to the bottom of the gorge, rises 2,000 feet into the air, thick with rainbows. The thunder of the water can be heard from my hotel room and I can see the mist rising into the sky. It is like the pounding of heavy surf, but steady. Lying in bed, in this comfortable old (1905) British hotel, under a white mosquito net, one hears it and thinks awesomely that this has gone on since, as Kipling says: "The world was so new and all." There is an extraordinary engineering feat in the bridge that is built across the second gorge, so one can look to the roaring rapids, and then into the rainbow mist to the water falling over the cliffs of black rock.

Some of the southerners in our group had an argument with Mr. Sugg against the restrictions on voting here, a complex graduated system basted on literacy, income and property, which keeps most blacks from voting. "We get blamed for voting restriction in the South," said one editor from South Carolina, who didn't take any stock in this "partnership concept."

Today we visited a model native village, just as they have been for centuries, with huts, dancing grounds, prepared by the Government as an exhibit, with natives in the huts making pots, with bellows of skin over a wood fire, making spears and bows and arrows and ornaments. This is like a living museum.

Since we have passed our half-way mark, the group is falling apart. Everybody has lost or left behind their belongings; suitcases have broken hinges and are strapped or tied with rope, clothes are bedraggled, nobody has been really ill. Friendships and feuds have developed, we never remember the kind of money we use because we move every few days. Getting airmail stamps for post cards to home is a major project. One editor is sending post cards from every place we stop to everybody on his papers. Others have lists addressed at home and brought along on typed stick-on tabs, to all his relatives and friends. Mail for a post card from most of these countries is 25 cents, plus the cost of the cards, more than at home.

While some problems differ, between United States and Africa, there are some that are common—including juvenile delinquency. In Johannesburg, Union of South Africa, they were having a parent-teacher meeting about the "ducktail" juveniles, so-called because they wear their hair in a ducktail long behind on the neck. Psychiatrists talked to the parents. "Ducktail children come from cocktail parents," they said. They said parents must learn to live with their children. Don't try to force religion on your children unless you live the religion yourself. "It's like measles—you can't give it unless you have it." "If your child is stubborn, with a perpetual scream, let him carry on. He may be more patient than you—but you are bigger and if you can't stand the noise, walk out of the room."

Papers in Africa are full of tidbits about Princess Margaret getting married, especially since his father was twice divorced and he has three stepmothers, in view of all the fuss about Margaret marrying Peter Townsend—forbidden her because he was divorced, though the innocent party. Elvis Presley is in the papers, pictures and stories. Comment here because new budget in Union for social aids and pensions gives no increase to low income people and Africans. The whites get increase of 10 shillings a month; 2 shillings for colored; nothing extra for Africans. Provincial Commissioner Sugg defended the voting regulations here by saying they apply to white and black the same, only most black cannot make the literacy, income or property conditions.

In our country it is so well populated, standards of public health are high, we are rich, we do not have hordes of people in the almost savage stage, so we do not have some of the problems they have in this vast continent. Malaria is licked around the cities; even here in this comfortable hotel the screens are tight, set in small metal panels and we sleep under mosquito nets. There is a horrible thing called bilharsis, an infinitesimal parasite that lives in the rivers. Get wet, even sometimes by a few drops on the skin, and there is a slight red spot, the beast burrows in, roosts in the liver, kidneys and other vital parts and literally eats your insides out at his pleasure. Doctors and scientists are working on this, but have not licked it yet.

Maine housewives will be interested in the way they serve fresh, small, sun-ripened pineapples. They cut the top off for a lid; slice around the inside with a sharp knife, take it out whole, slice it, and put it back in the order of slices, so they fit, put the lid on, chill it and bring it to you at the table whole.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—AN EXTRAORDINARY DISPLAY OF MERCY FOR WILD ANIMALS

(By May Craig)

VICTORIA FALLS.—There is a kinship born of unselfish kindness, mercy, justice. In

building the first section of the great Kariba Dam on the Zambezi River, upstream from the Victoria Falls, they created the largest manmade lake in the world—not yet filled. The rise of the waters in the flooded areas left innumerable islands with wildlife on them, gradually starving as the islands grew smaller and smaller. The wild game rangers set out to rescue them. Blacks and whites worked together from dawn to dark, sleeping in mosquito net tents in the bush and jungle at night, roaming in waters in launches, large and small, with a small plane overhead to help spot the animals, which ran about in terror.

Catching them was in incredible task, they showed us a colored movie of part of it. Some of the animals, such as the sable buck, weigh 500 pounds; there was the mean wart hog with his sharp, curved tusks, poisonous snakes, little things like turtles and the babies.

Almost naked, with boots on, they roamed, swam, and watched. Some of the animals were caught as we catch young steer for branding in the West, with ropes. They set up great strong rope nets across an island, beaters ran the animals pell-mell into the nets, with drums and gongs and stones, and other men were behind the nets to run out and tie them up while they were caught in the nets.

This tying-up was dangerous, some were so frightened they had to be given injections of tranquilizers so they could be carried in the boats to the mainland. Some died of fright, they had no way of knowing this was an act of mercy to save them. There was one rhinoceros—the picture showed it—which was even more dangerous because frightened. It could have swam to the mainland, but every effort to make it go into the water failed. It kept charging its would-be rescuers, and so they left it: "Victorious—but to die."

Many of the various deer could swim to the mainland from the less-distant islands, but had to be guided. The males would herd the females and the babies and sometimes the launches were able to get on each side of the line of deer and guide them, helping those who were exhausted. If you think getting snakes and warthogs and biting, kicking animals into bags and boxes to load on the launches was child's play, you should have seen that movie. With the water rising every day, each day was worse. It is the most extraordinary act of mercy to dumb animals I ever heard of. It will be a bond of kinship forever for the black and white men who worked on it—still are. It may help the "partnership concept" which the British hope for here. They hope for industry from the dam—it was washed out twice by floods while building—OK now.

Climbing around the various edges of the falls is awesome and somewhat dangerous because the clouds of spray fall on the ground and make mud. They do not have any railings of any kind. Paths of many feet show the best spots to view the Devil's Cataract, the Boiling Pot, the terrible smooth rush of the river towards the falls, the white water as it hits rocks and islands, then the fall, twice as high as Niagara. Often the smash on the rocks at the bottom of the first gorge cannot be seen for the mist and rainbows. This fall into a gorge is a fearsome thing. There are several gorges in sharp curves like several letter S's. One has to wear galoshes and raincoats and bonnets to follow along most of the cliff edges because the spray falls like rain. Then into the Rain Forest, with great ancient trees, jungle ferns as tall as trees. It is all left as it has been since time began; if a tree falls, they let it lie; this is nature as it always was.

In the afternoon we went upstream by bus to take a boat to the calm Zambezi, far from the falls, with a pull only at floodtime. We went in two motorboats because we are so many, and a half dozen officials, and our consul and rangers went with us. I was in the lead boat; we saw crocodiles sunning on sand banks, innumerable birds, including the cormorant which stands on the shore, wings spread, ready to take off if it sees a fish, its long neck and sharp beak stretched out. Wild tropical trees and flowers and fruits along the way. We went to a small island where a clearing had been made for visitors. The guide and a native had brought a kettle and clean water, built a small fire over a grate, with twigs and bits of paper and made tea. Monkeys came down from the trees to watch, snatched a pack of cigarettes right out of one lady's handbag. They had brought plastic cups and a can of sweetened evaporated milk. It was too fantastic for words. We worried about the other boat not coming. Then at a small landing across the river we saw a man waving. Our guide and boat went over and did not come back. We felt marooned.

An hour later he came back with the rest of the group. Their boat had sprung a leak; they had managed to get to shore, stop a man in an auto on a nearby road, and he had brought the message to the small landing on his side and waved to us. Everybody was all right—but it was lucky the man in the auto came by—although our guide was going back anyway, when they did not come. This is life as a reporter visiting Africa. We are burned black by the African sun. There is the strangest combination of civilization and savagery, jungle and boulevard, movies and fighting tribes, with spears and faces daubed with colored muds, blacks unprepared for freedom but wanting it, whites hanging on by different methods.

Africa on the Move—Intent To Be Free Is Almost Savage in Kenya

(By May Craig)

Nairobi.—It is hard to remember that this is the land of the Mau Mau terror of 1957–58, when fanatic members of the Kiwuyu tribe swore brutal, sadistic, obscene oaths in jungle nights, facing sacred Mount Kenya, the death oath against the white men. Nairobi is a handsome city. We are staying in the new modern Stanley Hotel. At Government House this morning we met British Gov. Gen. Sir Patrick Renison and his Cabinet, sitting around a long, polished oak table, in red leather chairs with E II R gilt emblazoned on the backs—Elizabeth II, Regina. We walked on polished parquetry floors. Outside were the beautiful English gardens that the British carry with them round the world.

This year Kenya will get its independence, decide whether to stay in the Commonwealth with Elizabeth Regina as their head. Most of the black Kenyans (nearly a hundred to one white man) prefer to be a republic within the Commonwealth, as India is. This independence comes sooner than expected by anyone—in London, a few weeks ago they were talking of 3 to 4 years. But the passion for freedom now has taken hold of Africans as they see other African people getting freedom now—the Belgian Congo, nearby, to be free in June—perhaps in the Commonwealth as is Ghana, for the present.

Sir Patrick had most of his Cabinet sitting with him to answer questions in their field—it was sign of the times that his Minister of Housing is Musa Amalemba, only African minister in the government; and C. B. Madan, Asian minister without portfolio, one of two Asian ministers in the government. There are many Asians, Indians, Arabs in Kenya and they side with the African cry for freedom, but these ministers are more moderate than, for instance Tom Mboya, head of the Peoples' Convention Party and the Kenya Federation of Labor and one of the leaders of the Kenya independence movement. He is a friend of Jomo Kenyatta, who led the Kikuyu Mau Mau, was jailed for 7 years and is still in detention. Mboya is of a different tribe, the Luo, and was not in the Mau Mau horror, but he believes in Kenyatta as the great Kenya leader, that he should be allowed to come back into Kenya public leadership.

There is no doubt that when Kenyan blacks get control of the government, Kenyatta will be prominent, if he does not drink himself to death first. It would be better for his people if he did, because Mau Mau would destroy all foreign confidence in Kenya black government—and blacks cannot make a go of it, unless they have foreign capital and knowhow.

Amalemba belongs to the New Kenya Party, to which Madan the Indian minister belongs and also a Britisher, Michael Blundell, who believes that it is inevitable that blacks shall govern here, hopes they are sincere, and that whites can live peacefully and honorably here under black rule. There is another rightwing European party which is reactionary and separatist and has no chance of living.

The schools here are segregated, between European and non-European, though not the colleges. Segregation must go, said Tom Mboya, who had a press conference with us. Amalemba and Madan said: "Not yet." Said Musa Amalemba: "It would be difficult and unfair to put the great majority of black children in the white schools now. There is the language barrier, they do not have the preparation to keep up with the white children, their parents are mainly illiterate and could not help them." Mr. Madan agreed.

At the U.S. Information Service downtown office we had an off-the-record talk with our consul, Charles Withers, then Mr. Mboya and then Blundell. When Blundell came back recently from the London Conference on a constitution for Kenya when it is free, he was greeted by a shower of silver coins and cries of "Judas" from the whites who said he had betrayed them. Sir Patrick said: "Nobody got everything they wanted." But the blacks of Kenya are going to get freedom probably this year, and Mboya was frank to say this constitution, even if accepted as basis for an election, is only an instrument of progress and will be rewritten, without the guarantee against expropriation.

As the Dutch in the Union of South Africa and the Belgians of the Congo foresee what would happen to them under African control, so did the Governor General and his Cabinet—so did Prime Minister Macmillan who on a recent visit to the Union warned that "the wind of changing times" is blowing across Africa. It will be a hurricane unless the colonial powers agree to independence for Africans much sooner than they thought—and sooner than the Africans are really capable of running their own affairs.

"They know they cannot do with us," said Blundell optimistically. "They can't run the country without us. I believe they will create a climate in which we will stay and work." He admitted whites may become "second class citizens," when the blacks are in complete control. That standards of living will go down for the whites. "But we never did live as well as you Americans. And I find educated black Kenyans who want to live as well as we do."

In this beautiful modern city, it is hard to remember the vast expanses of this country, much of it empty, the seething, almost savage, intent to be free, especially among soldiers of the last war who saw the white world.

Worldwide Conference Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Oregonian for June 19, 1960:

OREGON'S CONGRESSMAN PORTER SEEKS $300,000 FOR WORLDWIDE CONFERENCE FUND

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Fourth District Oregon Congressman, is looking for an angel—any peace-loving philanthropic organization with $300,000 to spare will do—to finance an international conference of parliamentarians.

The Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie Foundations have all declined with regrets. Others have yet to be heard from.

Cyrus S. Eaton, the Ohio industrialist, has donated $1,000 to help arouse interest in the idea of a meeting of parliamentarians from most of the world's countries who would meet here in Washington. PORTER has used Eaton's donation to hire a man, Tom Blake to prepare for the conference by sending letters about it to prominent political figures throughout the world.

As PORTER envisions it, this conference would break down into small groups and deal with such knotty international problems as improving international courts, revising the U.N. Charter, plans for disarmament, prevention of war by miscalculation. It would be under the auspices of the World Parliament Association, American Bar Association, United World Federalists and the Members of Congress for World Law. The State Department has endorsed the general idea.

Purpose of the conference would be to focus attention on these problems, to muster public opinion in favor of negotiations, to spread the concept of governments settling disputes according to international law.

PORTER would like it to be held next spring, if some means of underwriting it can be secured. The estimated cost of transportation, lodging and other arrangements, he notes would be far less than the cost of one missile.

The Oregon Congressman, who has attended numerous international conferences in his 4 years in office, concedes that he strongly favors this method of seeking rapprochements between East and West. Said PORTER:

"I don't know any other way. If man's reasoning power is going to save him, we have to do as the old preacher said. 'Let's come reason together.' "

He noted that President Eisenhower, in telling the American people about the breakup of the Paris summit meeting, said, "We must continue businesslike dealings with the Soviet leaders on outstanding issues, and improve the contacts between our own and the Soviet peoples."

PORTER said among those who favor his idea for a world rule of law conference are Arthur Larson, ex-adviser to Eisenhower, and now a college president; Charles S. Rhyne, ex-president of the American Bar Association.

PORTER GOES ABROAD

While trying to foster interest and financial support for his venture, PORTER has been participating in meetings in Europe of an unofficial group known as the East-West Parliamentary Disarmament Conference. He became involved after a radio commentator, Tris Coffin, asked if he would be interested in attending such a meeting in London last winter. Coffin's broadcasts have been sponsored by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, of which Cyrus Eaton is board chairman. Eaton offered to pay expenses of any "forceful" Congressman whom Coffin selected. PORTER accepted and went to London in February.

There he became the American member on an executive committee assigned to plan for a future disarmament conference to be held late this year. It was for such a planning session that he went to Stockholm 2 weeks ago.

For the trip to London, PORTER received $1,075.20 in estimated expense money, but upon his return sent back $23 to Eaton. For the Stockholm meeting, he received $1,316, and upon his return he gave back $37 to Eaton. PORTER'S staff had slightly overestimated his expenses, and so the Congressman returned what was left to the man who is reputed to be worth $100 million.

EATON UNDERWRITER

Counting the $1,000 for planning the Washington conference, PORTER has received $3,331.20 from Eaton to underwrite his activities in these various meetings concerned with world tensions. He has another planning session scheduled for September in Brussels, with the big disarmament meeting probably in Rome after the elections. PORTER hopes to go, Eaton's generosity being what it is.

Despite some editorial criticism from Oregon, PORTER said he sees no reason for rejecting Eaton's funds that made his attendance at these meetings possible. He noted that he has made no secret of these benefactions.

"I can't think of a better way for Cyrus Eaton to spend his money," observed PORTER. "I think there is a concensus against war in the world. Conferences such as these help apply pressure of public opinion on the governments to find peaceful avenues."

As for Eaton himself, PORTER has never met him. He has read some of his speeches, he explained, and agrees with his general theme that peaceful coexistence must be sought through multiple contacts across and through the Iron Curtain. PORTER does not agree with all of Eaton's expressed views, as quoted in various articles.

RED COUNTRIES PRAISED

Recently Eaton returned from a visit to Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia with glowing accounts of conditions and the happy prosperity of the people. Eaton recently was awarded the Lenin Peace Prize.

"In some ways he goes too far in accepting and trusting the Communists," said PORTER. "Even though we deal with Communist states, we should always make clear that we believe in freedom."

PORTER is inclined to think Eaton is "naive" in his appraisal of Communist satellites, but he admires his effort to persuade Premier Khrushchev that American capitalists would much prefer peace and a decline in taxes that are now required for defense spending, to the profits to be gained from war munitions.

CRUSADES FOR PEACE

Eaton, at 76, is devoting himself with missionary zeal to his crusade for understanding between East and West. A Republican who favored Franklin Roosevelt, he is reported to control a $2 billion empire in iron and steel, coal, paint, rails and shipping.

He has invested considerable sums in recent years in his peace mission. Mainly Eaton has sponsored meetings of world scientists and scholars at his boyhood home, Pugwash, Nova Scotia, and subsequently in Europe.

PORTER said he is convinced these conferences have helped make people more aware of the dangers of atomic weapons.

Several weeks ago Eaton was criticized in the Senate by Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, for visiting Khrushchev after the blowup of the summit meeting. DODD suggested the Attorney General take action against Eaton under the Logan Act, which provides penalties for any private citizer who, without authority, deals directly with the head or representative of a foreign government in an effort to influence that government in relation to its policies toward the United States.

PORTER DEFENDS EATON

PORTER took the House floor subsequently to defend Eaton by discrediting DODD'S attempt at "restricting the efforts of citizens like Cyrus Eaton who believe that peace is too important to be left to the President, the State Department, the generals, or anybody else." PORTER said the Logan Act would apply only when a citizen tried to negotiate with a foreign government about a specific dispute or controversy.

"Communication among nations must increase, not decrease. If we are to attain peace and avoid war. We can disagree profitably. We should not seek a legal pretext for denying others the right to speak and act. In our crusade for peace, we need all the help we can get. We have too few thoughtful and concerned citizens like Cyrus Eaton spending their talents, time, and money for world peace," PORTER concluded.

Life Article Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the derogatory article by Walter Pincus and Don Oberdorfer in a recent issue of Life magazine was a great disservice to the Congress.

Congressmen who have risked their lives on so-called junkets carrying them at times to such places as the antarctic polar regions, often necessitating their flying through fog and storm over barren wastelands where the chance of survival if grounded would be remote, were pilloried for expenditures of a few dollars. Under careful analysis even the expenses in question could be properly accounted for save in one or two instances of fiscal abuse.

Since my name was mentioned in the Life magazine article I wish to point out that the dinner at the Orienta Beach Club, which was criticized by inuendo, was for some 20 people. The club insisted that the check be paid by a member, so consequently I paid the check and was reimbursed for it later on by the House Public Works Committee. This was a simple and honest business procedure and it reflected ill on no one. The Congressmen and the Congresswoman present paid to the committee their share for their spouses' expense on the cost of the meal. I was entitled to reimbursement as it was a legitimate committee expense.

When I spoke with Mr. Oberdorfer about the injustice of the article and the damage it had done to me by making me guilty by association, he explained

that the only reason he mentioned my name was because he wanted to show that the committee dined at a club, this attitude being in keeping with his theme of expensive traveling and high living.

The Orienta Beach Club is one of the finest clubs in New York's Westchester County. It is strictly a family club where conservative living and entertaining is emphasized.

In order that those who are concerned about this affair should know the facts, I dispatched a letter to some of my friends in my constituency delineating various aspects of the trip and indicting why the expense was necessary. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1960.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: Recently Life magazine carried a story on congressional spending.

I was mentioned and placed in a situation where, because of being included with other Congressmen who were pilloried by the printed word, I was regarded by some as guilty by association.

Let me clarify the issues as succinctly as I can.

First, I permitted the House Public Works Committee to hold a dinner meeting at the Orienta Beach Club on the occasion of one of its inspection trips because the club had the proper facilities and was close to the harbors and roads which were scheduled for inspection.

At the time I had two pieces of legislation pending in the House before the Public Works Committee. One had to do with the deepening of the East Basin at Mamaroneck Harbor and the other provided for a study of Port Chester Harbor.

Since it is a rule of the Orienta Beach Club that a member sponsor each party held there and pay for the same, I sent a check for the dinner costs. I was later reimbursed by the Public Works Committee, at the direction of the chairman of the committee, a perfectly honorable and normal transaction. However, Life magazine seems to attach some evil innuendo to this honorable piece of business.

I might mention that I did not bill the committee for the party which my wife gave for the wives of the Congressmen at the Stork Club earlier that day. She paid for that herself. We did not want or expect reimbursement. We felt it was our duty to be as hospitable and courteous to our friends as we could.

As for the payment of my wife's expenses. I have canceled checks for any and every expense she incurred as my companion on congressional study trips. I always paid my bills for transportation, lodging and sustenance as soon as the committee billed me. My checks were drawn to the order of the hotels at which we stayed, and to the railroads, ships or airlines on which we traveled. These checks are available to any responsible person wishing to see them.

Let me add, by way of explanation, that if Congressmen do not travel in behalf of their committees they are liable to approve expenditures of vast sums of money needlessly because they cannot know the facts at first hand.

I have learned more about roadbuilding and public works by visiting the Ottawa Road Experimental Installation in Illinois, the harbors for which Federal funds are being sought, and the sites where public buildings are to be erected, costing millions of dollars, than by intensive reading of literature pertaining to the same.

In the complex world it is necessary for a Congressman to inspect certain sites and facilities in order to know his subject and to ascertain what is taking place in certain areas. Only a provincially minded person would try to decide on the wisdom of an expenditure without studying the facts thoroughly and seeing and knowing the project intimately.

I have no apology for the trips I made in behalf of my committee.

I have traveled by train, bus, plane, and car, often at great inconvenience and under trying circumstances. I feel it is part of my duty as a Congressman.

Travel is not new to me. I have seen much of the world, having taken a long trip to Africa, Europe, Scandinavia, South America and the Antilles in 1938.

I feel that in serving my Public Works Committee I am serving my constituency and my country in accordance with my oath of office.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN B. DOOLEY.

Discrimination Against Reserves Charged in Retiring Officers With World War I Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the March 7, 1959, issue of the Army Navy Air Force Journal, there appeared an article dealing with the reasons that it is necessary for Congress to enact legislation to equalize the retirement benefits accorded Reserve officers of the military service with those of Regular officers. For some time I have been attempting to remedy one inequity in this area. My bill, H.R. 1136, is mentioned in the Army Navy Air Force Journal article, and I commend this article to the careful study of the Members of the House:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RESERVES CHARGED IN RETIRING OFFICERS WITH WORLD WAR I SERVICE

Many Members of Congress, as well as many other well-informed persons, have expressed the feeling that there should be no discrimination between officers of the Regular establishments and officers of the Reserve components. In the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 this was specifically established as basic policy: "There shall be no discrimination between and among members of the Regular and Reserve components in the administration of laws applicable to both Regulars and Reserves."

In spite of the general feeling that culminated in this statement of policy, there appear to be a few who feel that a retired Reserve should not have the same right to an increase in retired pay, because of World War I service that is now given to retired Regular officers.

Regular Army officers who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, whether or not in combat areas, retired under such circumstances that their retired pay would be less than 75 percent of their active-duty pay, are entitled to an increase in the retired pay up to the maximum of 75 percent because of such wartime service. Reserve officers, retired at considerably less than the maximum retired pay, do not get a similar increase for wartime service.

The provision for special recognition of service in the World War I period had its origin in the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507). At that time, due to the large increase in Regular officer personnel following World War I, there was a stagnation in promotion. In order to alleviate this bad morale factor, provision was made for voluntary retirement of Regular officers after 15 years of service. The retirement pay was at a reduced percentage rather than the conventional 75 percent, being based on years of service. The retired pay was such percentage of active-duty pay as was derived from multiplying the number of years of service by 2½ percent. A special award, however, was given to those who had served as commissioned officers during the war period by raising to the grade of major for retired pay purposes any officer below that grade who voluntarily retired under the act.

In June 1940, in furtherance of the same plan, the 1935 act was amended to provide that any officer on the active list of the Regular Army who had served in any capacity in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918, could, upon his own application, be retired with 75 percent of his active-duty pay, with an added provision for increasing the pay and rank of majors and lieutenant colonels, to lieutenant colonel and colonel.

The 1940 amendment made the retired pay provision so broad and liberal, to use the words of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, in Senate Report No. 1543, June 8, 1948, "as to make it theoretically possible to retire certain officers after only 1 day's service under a Regular Army appointment," if they had served in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918.

Shortly thereafter during the preparedness program, on July 29, 1941, Congress passed a joint resolution to provide a speedy method of elimination of unsuitable officers from the active list of the Regular Army. This law provided that any officer so eliminated who had served in any capacity in the military or naval service prior to November 12, 1918, should be retired with 75 percent of his active duty pay, with service of only 7 years. This law suspended for the emergency an earlier law passed in 1920 under which unsuitable officers were classed as class B officers and eliminated from the active list. Under that law, which was cumbersome to operate, officers eliminated from the active list who had had 10 years of service were retired with the reduced retired pay based on 2½ percent for each year of service, without a special award for World War I service.

When the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 was under consideration by Congress, the fact was brought out that Army officers who served in World War I were granted retired pay of 75 percent whereas officers in the Navy and Marine Corps who had served in World War I were not so entitled. In the House an amendment was adopted to provide a similar right for the Navy and Marine Corps officers. The bill was rewritten in committee and apparently to make this provision uniformly applicable, it said that the retired pay of any officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of the act, i.e., Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, thereafter retired under any provision of law, shall be paid 75 percent of his active-duty pay.

However, before the bill was passed by Congress, another paragraph was added giving to the class B officers eliminated under the 1920 act, 75 percent retirement pay if they had served in the World War I period. The War Department had opposed this latter paragraph but after a fight in Congress, the paragraph was adopted.

Having given this special right to officers eliminated from the active list as unsuitable,

under the 1920 act and under the joint resolution of 1941, Congress on October 18, 1943, amended the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 by adding another paragraph granting the same right to those officers who had been eliminated in 1922 as the result of an economy wave then existing. These officers had been retired if they had at least 10 years of service. The retired pay for the 10 year retired officers, under the act under which they were eliminated, amounted to only 25 percent of active-duty pay.

Thus, most, if not all, Regular Army officers retired on a reduced pay basis have had their retired pay raised to the maximum of 75 percent if they had World War I service. Even the officers eliminated as unsuitable whose retirement pay would otherwise be 17½ percent (the 7-year officers retired under the 1941 joint resolution), or 25 percent (the 10-year officers under the 1920 act), have now been raised to 75 percent merely because a part of their unsuitable service was during the period of World War I.

It is against this background that the equity of retired Reserves to a similar treatment is to be appraised.

Reserve officers in order to be retired must be 60-years old and must have had over 20 years of satisfactory service. When this age factor is considered, it will be seen that most of these officers not only were in service in the period of World War I but served as well in the period of World War II.

It certainly is equitable to consider that over 20 years of satisfactory service by a Reserve officer is equal to the 7 or 10 years of service by Regular Army officers, which service was so unsatisfactory that they were eliminated from the active list. The average retired pay for Reserve officers is not over 30 percent, with no increase at all for World War I service, yet the eliminated Regular officers have been granted 75 percent retired pay because a part of their service was during World War I.

There are bills pending in the 86th Congress to correct this manifest inequity, notably bills sponsored by Senators SPARKMAN and JACKSON, and by Representative HUDDLESTON. It is to be hoped that early remedial legislation will result, if only to assure justice to a dwindling but distinguished group of veteran officers whose service dates back to World War I.

Great Distinction for the Lenker Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention of the House to the fact that the South Dakota American Legion at their convention last week made history when they selected Bill Lenker, of Sioux Falls, as the American Legion department commander for South Dakota.

This is only the second time in the Legion history of the State that a father and son have held the position of State Commander. Commander Bill's father, Dr. Carle B. Lenker of Winner, held the position of department commander for South Dakota in 1926.

The other instance of both father and later the son serving as State Commander was in Indiana when former Gov. Robert E. Gates who was elected in 1932 saw his son elected in 1958.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is a great distinction for the Lenker family.

War or Surrender—An Alternative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a letter to the editor of the Santa Barbara News Press Saturday evening, June 11, presents rather a startling picture:

WAR OR SURRENDER—AN ALTERNATIVE

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

Never before in history (in time of peace) has the leader of any great nation been subjected to the vile indignities, slander and invective heaped upon our Chief Executive by that mass-murderer Khrushchev. Although this scurrilous attack has tended to unify the free nations, to millions in other parts of the world, our abject acceptance of this tirade suggests that we are weak and afraid—a "paper tiger."

To those who have been brainwashed into believing that surrender to the Communist conspiracy is better than a nuclear war, this indignity may be bearable. They do not realize that surrender (which includes complete disarmament and control by an international police force perhaps under the United Nations, eventually dominated by Russia) means subjugation by Communist forces and eventual liquidation (murder or death in concentration camps) of at least 40 million Americans. Those who have been misled by propaganda see no alternative—but there is one and it is completely logical.

Americans must accept the fact that we are not in a cold war—but a hot one. Communism and democracy cannot coexist. All Russian leaders have said so, and their plans are based on this premise. We are at war. Let us realize this and act accordingly.

Nuclear war is unthinkable—to us and to the Russians. The U–2 flights over Russia in the past 4 years have proven to Khrushchev that our atomic bombers cannot be shot down and that Russian defenses against them are therefore nonexistent. This may account, in part, for his hysterical reaction.

Our prime weapon is to encourage and support revolution behind the Iron Curtain and this is our ace in the hole that frightens the men in the Kremlin. The slaves in Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc., are our allies. They are our secret weapon. Why not use them?

Now is the time to resign from the United Nations, composed, according to the original documents, of "peace-loving nations" unless Russia and her satellites are thrown out. Now is the time to sever diplomatic relations with Russia and her puppets and thus cut off the major source of espionage in the United States. They cannot stand isolation. They cannot and will not wage atomic war knowing that it would mean devastation of their own countries.

Why not cut them off from civilized nations and let them wither on the vine until internal revolution overthrows their murderous dictators? And thus free the world from the threat of atomic war. Only then can we dream of world peace and work toward a world community of cooperative nations. In the meantime, let us look to our own defenses and expose the subversives who would take us over from within, since the plan for world conquest is based on these tactics. We need new laws to rectify recent decisions of our Supreme Court which now make it almost impossible to effectively prosecute Communists and subversives in Government agencies. (Write your Congressmen and Senators to this effect.)

Knowledge is power. Our citizens must understand not only what the Kremlin plans for us, but the strategy and tactics being used to confuse us and undermine our will to resist. If we will remember, believe in, and if necessary die for, the moral principles which have made our country great, the Communist threat can be overcome. Let us not be bluffed into surrender, liquidation, and slavery. In self-defense let us take the offensive—the Politburo is vulnerable and we are still invincible.

GRANVILLE F. KNIGHT,
Chairman, Santa Barbara Committee Against Summit Entanglements.

Where Mr. Nixon Stands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Wednesday, June 22, 1960:

WHERE MR. NIXON STANDS

Critics of Vice President NIXON, in his party and out, have raked him over the coals for not saying where he stands on the critical issues that face this Nation. They could profitably read his Minot, N. Dak., talk on how to make the huge farm glut shrink and his St. Louis speech on how to make the economy grow.

The Vice President made no attempt to spell out details of a farm program which he will elaborate later. But his talk in St. Louis was a clear and specific outline of what he thinks Washington should—and should not—do to keep business humming and our economy expanding.

He brushed aside the claims of some economists who argue that the Federal Government's only proper role is that of the impartial, innocent bystander—keeping hands off the economy, come hell or high water.

Mr. NIXON said Washington has four economic responsibilities at home. They are:

One, to "pursue sound fiscal policies" that check inflation.

Two, to combat abuses by industry or labor which curb competition or deprive us of the benefit of newer, better ways of making things.

Three, provide a tax setup that stimulates new and creative enterprise, instead of strangling it.

Finally, Government has a responsibility to prevent and correct wide swings between boom and bust by sensible fiscal policies, and by preventing the national misfortune of widespread unemployment.

Mr. NIXON said the United States free economy is so far ahead of the Soviet Union planned economy that the U.S.S.R. will never reach us within the foreseeable future, not even in the year A.D. 2000.

He warned that we must not imitate the Marxist system to match fancied gains often claimed for it. Some of Moscow's alleged great gains of the postwar years are due to an all-out effort to repair the ravages of war.

Both Japan and West Germany, it might be pointed out, outstripped the Soviet Union in economic growth in the same period under the same stimulus.

The Soviet Union is still a very primitive economy, as the Vice President said. It is still much occupied with the basic job of building a sizable steel industry and a trans-

portation system—goals which this country achieved a half century ago, or more.

As Moscow's planners get past the stage of building steel mills and attempt to satisfy the Russian people's pent-up demand for consumer goods, their "state planning" breaks down.

Thus, China factories turn out large expensive pieces, because their quota is expressed in rubles and this is the easy way to "fulfill" it. But Russian workers, who make an average salary of about $80 a month, can't afford these luxury porcelains. So they pile up in government warehouses.

Russia's economy is wallowing in red tape, the one product that "planners" turn out easily and in unlimited quantities.

In his talks in North Dakota and in St. Louis, the Vice President showed courage and conviction.

North Dakota's wheat farmers bitterly resent the soil bank idea which takes land out of production. But Mr. NIXON said, without hesitation, that "we must recognize the necessity for taking acreage which produces crops in surplus out of production."

He indorsed a new administration program for UN distribution of the world's supply of surplus food to feed the world's hungry. President Eisenhower, he said, intended to present this plan at the summit meeting which Nikita Khrushchev sabotaged.

Mr. NIXON made crystal clear that he is not wedded to the bankruptcy farm policies of the past. He said:

"We should not dig in and fight the battle over farm policy in the entrenched positions which we have occupied over the last 5 years."

At the same time, we should not abandon or destroy a free economic system that has produced more goods, more efficiency than any other system in the world.

Mr. NIXON nailed that battle flag to his mast here in a talk that is required reading for all candidates—and all Americans.

Effect of Importation of Leather Footwear on the Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly point out the effects of imports of leather footwear on the economy of the United States, and the serious consequences for American shoe workers and their employers.

More than 5,500 people in my district are directly employed in the manufacture of leather footwear.

This is an industry which has felt the full effect of import competition. From about 3.6 million pairs in 1949 imports had jumped to 80.5 million in 1959. Practically all of this increase has come since 1954.

During this same decade our exports of all types of footwear have been dropping. In 1949 we exported 5.759 million pairs; in 1959 fewer than 3.75 million pairs. Statistically, in 1949 we exported six-tenths of a pair of footwear for each pair imported, while in 1959 we imported over 21 pairs for each pair exported. Truly this is a phenomenal increase. Imports of nonrubber footwear have grown from slightly more than 1 percent of our production in 1954 to 3.52 percent in 1959. The number of pairs of women's, misses', children's, and infants' leather shoes imported in 1959 was over 12 times as large as in 1954 and about 2½ times as large as in 1957 while for men's and boys' shoes the comparable figures were 8 times and 2 times.

In December 1959 the Department of Commerce reported that it saw no indication of any halt in the increase of shoe imports; in fact, it stated, "There is good reason to believe that shoe imports during 1960 will be 10 percent higher than in 1959."

This is cause for serious concern to the economy of the United States and to the 23d Congressional District of Illinois.

Imports are causing serious concern in our country. While exports increased only slightly less than the gross national product between 1950 and 1959, imports increased by 8 percentage points more than the increase in gross national product.

Dun's review has recently completed a survey of the effects of imports on our economy. Both the members of their presidents panel—representing 175 of the Nation's leading companies—and a random selection of 300 small manufacturers expect more serious competition from foreign imports in the next 5 years. Most of the panel members and the smaller companies polled believe that lower labor costs, less overhead, foreign government export subsidies and low ocean freight rates account for the difference in costs. Many trace it primarily to lower wage costs although there is diversity of opinion here. I am sorry to say that close to 40 percent of the presidents of large corporations on the panel reported that they plan to launch more foreign operations: Licensing arrangements, new plants and expanded facilities abroad, joint operations with oversea manufacturers, and purchase of foreign concerns. I do not know how many of these are located in Illinois or if any are in my district, but I do know that this means the export of jobs from our borders and import competition. The smaller businesses must rely on increased efficiency, new products, automation and greater production. The increase in imports of finished manufactures, which in 1950 constituted about 18 percent of total consumption imports, accounted for about 34 percent of import transactions in 1959. Together with semimanufactures they accounted for over half of U.S. imports by value. This is a grave portent for my congressional district and for the State of Illinois.

For all these reasons, I feel that concrete action should be taken immediately to alleviate such conditions.

The following is an example of many resolutions which I have received from my congressional district:

Whereas it has become known that the American shoe manufacturing business, generally, and that of the Moran Shoe Co. of Carlyle, Ill., particularly, is imperiled by reason of unrestrained importation of foreign manufactured shoes; and

Whereas said foreign-made shoes are produced upon such an extremely low cost basis that they can be sold in this country in harmful competition with American-made shoes; and

Whereas the healthy economy of our communities is dependent upon the Moran Shoe Co.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we protest against the importation of foreign-made shoes to be resold in the United States in competition with domestic-made shoes; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our two Senators and the Congressman of this district.

(Endorsed by: Ruf-Marcham Post 404, the American Legion, Carlyle, Ill.; city clerk of Carlyle, Ill.; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Carlyle, Ill.; Ladies Auxiliary to Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 3523, Carlyle, Ill.; village clerk of Bartelso, Ill.; village clerk of Germantown, Ill.; village clerk of Huey, Ill.)

Nation Needs Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of June 24 points out another instance where U.S. oversea bases are encountering opposition within the country within which they are located. This further stresses the importance of building mobile bases at sea such as attack aircraft carriers and Polaris submarines.

The article follows:

TOKYO RIOTS BOOST NAVY CARRIER HOPES—ATTENTION FOCUSED ON PERIL TO OVERSEA BASES

(By John G. Norris)

Tokyo disorders over ratification of the Japanese-American security treaty are giving the Navy's proposed new aircraft carrier a much needed boost on Capitol Hill. For they focus congressional attention on the precarious condition of much of the U.S. oversea base structure and the key role of the Navy and its "mobile bases" in the Nation's basic "forward strategy."

"Yankee go home" cries have increased in many parts of the world, partly Communist inspired and partly of purely nationalist origin. As a result, the United States has withdrawn some forces from France. There is trouble in such longtime stanch allies as Turkey, Korea, and the Philippines. The U–2 incident raised questions about American base rights in Pakistan and Norway.

But it took the Tokyo riots and cancellation of President Eisenhower's Japanese visit to cause many on Capitol Hill to face up to the deteriorating base situation.

Recognition of the problem does not mean, as Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., affirmed last week, that the United States should alter its strategy of collective security alliances and keeping our "frontline" across the oceans. The alternate "Fortress America" strategy must not even be considered, Gates declared.

NO PAT ANSWER

If driven out of Japan, Gates said, we must go "some other place." Where? It would be impossible to replace the Japanese bases with their industrial facilities and skilled work force. Strategically, Korea and Formosa are too exposed and the Philippines too far south. In Okinawa, as President Eisenhower found out on his visit there, there already are complaints about the extensive areas occupied by American bases.

Hawaii is too far back and Guam has limitations.

There is no pat answer to the base situation. Bolster the collective security alliances wherever possible, maintain foreign aid at current or higher levels and do the best we can to hold crucial bases, administration leaders urge.

Others are urging greater reliance on "base rights" rather than complete bases, and some a reappraisal of the whole forward concept.

In this connection, Navy supporters on Capitol Hill are pointing up the advantages of carrier task forces as "mobile bases under the American flag." They can ply the seven seas without anyone's permission. They can help cement alliances by putting into foreign ports long enough to hint at American power, and for the crews to spend their pay and go back to sea before they wear out their welcome.

NO COMPLETE SUBSTITUTE

Carrier forces are no complete substitute for land bases in allied territory and certainly not for collective security alliances. But they can fill in many gaps, and by controlling the seas, link together what has been called the "oceanic confederation."

These arguments helped win Senate approval of an administration request for $293 million to build a conventionally powered aircraft carrier to replace one of the aging *Essex* type flattops built in World War II. It was defeated in the House Appropriations Committee largely through the strong opposition of Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri.

The case for keeping the Navy's carrier force modern as a potent "small war" weapon was argued at length during the appropriations hearings last year and again this year. Both times Senators voted for building a new flattop. Both times a majority of the House Appropriations Committee disapproved and the House itself did not vote on the issue.

ISSUE BEFORE CONFERENCE

Last year, the Navy lost because Senate and House conferees agreed on a compromise that the administration refused to accept. The compromise was to vote funds for the reactors and other long leadtime components of a nuclear instead of a conventional carrier.

Now the issue is up before a new Senate-House conference committee. The complex pro and con arguments will be voiced again behind closed doors. A second defeat would gravely threaten the future of the ship that the Navy believes will be the backbone of the fleet for many years to come, and weaken U.S. control of the seas.

A compromise like that of last year doesn't seem to be in the cards. Renewal of the cold war and anxiety over the future of American oversea bases, however, may finally win approval of the controversial ship.

Lewis "Seaway" Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on June 9, titled, "Lewis 'Seaway' Castle":

LEWIS "SEAWAY" CASTLE

Lewis G. Castle, dead in Massena, N.Y., at 70, truthfully was called "Mr. Seaway."

He worked long and hard to put the idea of the St. Lawrence Seaway across in this country. And after President Eisenhower signed the seaway bill in 1954, Mr. Castle worked even harder, as administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. In that position he supervised the U.S. portion of the huge project's construction.

He was a banker and businessman in Duluth when he served on the executive commission of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. For years he was a spokesman for the need and the advantage of U.S. participation in the seaway.

When his appointment to the development corporation came, he gave the job all the benefit of his business training in seeking the best and the most economical construction possible. And he also gave the job all the benefit of his great enthusiasm.

It seems to us that it would be fitting to memorialize his contribution to the seaway by naming some portion of it, such as a lock, for him.

Peace Through Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, because of the present widespread interest in the repeal of the Connally reservation, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning it by Dr. L. A. Alesen, which appeared in the May 17, 1960, Freedom Club Bulletin of the First Congregational Church, Los Angeles, Calif. My constituent, Mrs. Geraldine Earlin, of West Englewood, N.J., who is a leader in a number of civic and patriotic organizations, has made this statement available to me:

PEACE THROUGH LAW

(By L. A. Alesen, M.D.)

To those whose memories are not too short the proclamation calling upon Los Angeles to observe May as "Law Day" strikes a familiar and sinister note. Just 2 years ago, President Eisenhower called upon the entire Nation for a similar observance, and thereby triggered a great propaganda onslaught against our national sovereignty, leading to the attempt to abolish the Connally reservation. Public officials, bar associations, leading legal lights, and all manner of lesser organizations and individuals joined in the claque and clamor designed to condition the apathetic American people to relinquish their right to determine at all times whether any given issue was a domestic issue or was in fact an international one which should be adjudicated by the World Court. That public was urged to accept meekly and without protest this proposed fatal surrender of its birthright of freedom on the quaint and fanciful theory that America must take the lead in giving carte blanche to this international juggernaut, and thereafter, of course, all other nations would blindly follow. "Peace through law" was the attractive Madison Avenue gimmick coined for the occasion, and the unspeakable horrors of devastation and destruction by the H-bomb were duly painted in lurid detail.

After due time and opportunity had been afforded for this lethal barrage to manifest its expected effect, Senator HUMPHREY introduced Senate Resolution 94, calling for the repeal of the Connally reservation. This was all done quietly and without fanfare, with the full expectation that after a short and rigged hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee the bill would be reported to the floor of the Senate with a do-pass recommendation.

But something went wrong, to the great surprise and consternation of those who had so carefully plotted to take from the American people by stealth and subterfuge that which they knew would be difficult to wrest from them by open and honest approach. Once word of those hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee was imparted to the public by a few alert and patriotic citizens, such an avalanche of telephone calls, telegrams and letters descended upon the committee members and upon all other Senators that all hope of an immediate passage of Senate Resolution 94 was lost, and it was pigeonholed for the time being.

Recognizing that the necessary two-thirds majority required for the passage of the Senate resolution would be impossible to secure, a change in strategy resulted in the introduction of the McDowell resolution (H.R. 558) in the House of Representatives, an identical conterpart of S. 94. The passage of this resolution by a simple majority in the House, and in the Senate would achieve the same goal and with much less risk of defeat. Both measures now rest in their respective committees awaiting the return of the American people to their customary state of somnolence.

The pattern of this attack against American sovereignty is crystal clear: Hold in abeyance for the moment agitation for passage of the dangerous legislation now pending, and return to the grassroots with a clever selling campaign based upon broad and general pious platitudes extolling the virtue of law and the benefits it confers upon the individual. Then, having effectively conditioned the mind of the citizen to appreciate and approve those benefits for himself and his fellows on the national level, the next step will be the well-known trick of the psychologist in the transference of that approval to the international field, and thus the enrollment of our once great and proud constitutional Republic as just another minor waystation in the international welfare police slave state.

The proclamation calling for the observance of May 1 as Law Day is deliberately and disarmingly disingenuous, citing as it does the well-known and commonly accepted facts concerning the value of law in a civilized society, and the protection it gives the individual. Strangely missing is any reference to the unconscionably callous disregard of individual rights as guaranteed by the fourth, fifth, and sixth amendments now commonly practiced by the Internal Revenue Service in its administration of the income tax law; or by our courts and law-enforcement officers in commitment of the allegedly mentally ill. Strange, also, is the lack of any mention of the constantly increasing major crime and juvenile delinquency and the obvious fact that the most important single reason for that great and constant increase is the flight from individual responsibility so carefully taught by our public school system and so widely disseminated by the Freudian psychiatrist.

Those who seek to undermine and eventually to destroy American sovereignty work unceasingly and overlook no single opportunity to achieve their diabolical ends. The Bricker amendment, designed to protect us from domestic law accomplished by the evil mechanism of treaty or executive agreement in areas where the good sense of Congress still prevails, lost by one vote. Now before Congress are H.R. 531 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 83, which if adopted will give the President the so-called "sense of the Congress" that will free him to make or sign any agreements with the Kremlin that suit his fancy. This legislation is designed

to bypass the provision of section 2, article II of the Constitution requiring that all treaties before becoming effective have concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate.

The internationalists have always been with us. Our Revolutionary forebears were plagued with the Tories, the appeasers and the compromisers who sought in every possible way to discourage and obstruct the formation of the Republic. The Cliveden set in Great Britain during World War II agitated for a negotiated peace with Hitler, totally unmindful of what that peace would eventually mean. For a time, they did cause some embarrassment to the British Government in the conduct of the war. And now in America we have those who seek peace at any price and would sacrifice the very principles responsible for the greatest land upon which God's sun has even shone in exchange for a worthless piece of paper signed by a nation that has never honored its obligations except in their breach.

"The brave man dies but once; the coward a thousand times." Our cynics would call this corny as they do the Bible, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, but those great men who gave to us a nation founded upon the unique concept of individual primacy and right based upon individual responsibility pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. It it not now high time that we the natural beneficiaries of their genius and devotion realized once and for all time that there is something far worse than death by the H-bomb? Can we not understand that the blackmailer is never satisfied short of the total destruction of his victim?

Shall we continue to act as craven cowards quaking dutifully when the dictator frowns and abjectly and fawningly offering him every compromise and token of appeasement he requires, or shall we just for once remember that we are Americans, inject just a trace of calcium into our flabby spines and face with a smile of courage and resolution the worst he has to offer?

FMC Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial from the San Jose Evening News relative to the charges made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], that a contract recently awarded Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. was rigged:

FMC CONTRACT

It is of course no accident that a U.S. Senator from Ohio has succeeded a Representative from Ohio in charging that a contract was rigged by the Defense Department in favor of the Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. of San Jose.

Apparently Senator STEPHEN YOUNG (Democrat, of Ohio), has taken up the ball from Representative CHARLES VANIK, (Democrat, of Ohio), and is making the rafters ring with highly fluid denunciations that establish absolutely nothing.

Anyone who has followed the stories with a Washington dateline is left baffled simply because there is not a shred of evidence that specifications were so drawn as to make the local company, which has a vast history of service in both war and peace, the sole possibility for a winning bid.

The chief argument seems to be that there is an empty Government arsenal in Cleveland where the M-113 armored personnel vehicle can be produced. What is not mentioned is that FMC is not only skilled in turning out equipment but has skilled engineers and labor. In addition, it has the machines, the equipment, the know-how and the setup.

It is no accident either that Cleveland is in Ohio and this is drumbeating on a local level that makes the whole a sham.

The Bracero Story—Growers Tell Their Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a general impression has been created that the Catholic Church is opposed to extension of Public Law 78.

It is noteworthy that in the June 17 issue of the Monitor, the official newspaper of the Catholic archdiocese of San Francisco, an honest effort is being made to look at the other side of the coin.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit herewith a story written by James Kelly for this newspaper:

THE BRACERO STORY—GROWERS TELL THEIR SIDE

(By James Kelly),

INTO THE FIELDS

This week James Kelly, ace Monitor reporter, came back from the aromatic fields of Santa Clara Valley with the first of a series of five articles exploring the farm front.

The "Bracero Story" involves an issue: Should Mexican labor be used to harvest U.S. crops? It is a many-sided question, with expert testimony from growers, union organizers, Spanish-speaking missionary priests—and the braceros themselves.

Mr. Kelly has gone after the evidence. All facets will be examined. All angles investigated. He has promised a report in depth.

When a teenage daughter comes home 1 day and says, "Dad, did you know you're committing a sin?" When a high prelate in the church says that you "are perpetuating a ghastly racket against the conscience of our people," it's a pretty good time for any Catholic man to take stock of the situation and ask: "Am I really doing wrong?"

Three Catholics in Santa Clara County have asked themselves the question.

Paul A. Mariani grows and packs fresh, frozen, and dried fruit. He is one of the biggest in the business. He is a member of St. Joseph's Parish, Cupertino.

Stephen A. D'Arrigo grows and packs fresh fruit and vegetables. He and his brother Andrew own and harvest 80,000 acres of choice farmland in California and Arizona. He is a member of St. Christopher's Parish, San Jose.

Gerald B. Hansen is an attorney and U.S. commissioner in San Jose. He is counsel for the Progressive Growers Association of which Mariani and D'Arrigo are members. He belongs to St. Martin's Parish, San Jose.

All three are on the "other side" of an issue that is making headlines in daily and Catholic newspapers across the Nation. They believe it is right and proper for American farmers to import Mexican field labor—"braceros"—to harvest American crops.

They defend Public Law 78, enacted by Congress in 1948 to permit braceros to be brought into this country, and the internation agreement between the United States and Mexico that sets forth the conditions under which braceros are hired, housed, and handled.

ACCUSED

Because they do so, and especially because they represent so-called big or corporation farming, they find themselves accused of "perpetuating a ghastly racket." The accuser is Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio, executive chairman, Bishop's committee for the Spanish-speaking, an organization that is fighting hard for the repeal of Public Law 78.

Mariani, D'Arrigo, and Hansen have weighed the charge carefully. They have given it hard, serious thought, in private and in consultation with priests in the San Jose area and elsewhere.

They avowed they "would get out of the business right now" if in their soul-searching it turned up they were guilty in any sense of moral wrongdoing.

They can't see where they have done evil by hiring or defending the use of braceros.

Last week the trio told the Monitor their side of the story. Here are the arguments the growers and the attorney presented:

The U.S. farm labor force, now less than 7 million, has decreased by 4 million workers since 1940. Meanwhile, acreage in production has increased, and so have crop yields through more scientific farming. Without imported labor, who is to pick the crops?

SHORTAGE

"They claim we are flooding the labor market with cheap Mexicans," D'Arrigo said. "All we're doing is trying to fill a labor shortage, so that our fruit doesn't rot on the trees or go to seed in the fields. Fewer than 450,000 braceros were brought into the country last year. Does that sound like a "flood" when the domestic labor supply is so low?

"There's another thing important besides quantity of labor. It's continuity. We get men from Oakland. They work 1 day, 2 days, then quit. This can be disastrous, because a ripening crop doesn't wait for anybody. It has to be picked right now.

"Some are winos. They quit when they have the price of a bottle. Others say frankly they can afford to earn just so much without endangering their unemployment pay. The bracero is available when you need him, he's dependable, and he works hard."

Mariani chimed in here with another point: "Thousands of high school kids would love to have summer jobs in the fields, but we can't hire anyone under 18 to pick crops involved in interstate commerce. They come to me all the time and I have to turn them down. We're rearing a whole generation of youth who don't know the meaning of hard, muscular work—and for many of them it's not their fault. There are evils in child labor, sure, but here's a case where it would do them—and us—some good."

MAN-DAYS

D'Arrigo offered figures from his books to bear out his claim that local labor is nonavailable. During a single growing and harvesting season—1957-58—in one instance they showed a total of 3,372 man-days' work open to domestic workers. The total actually worked 1,031 man-days.

Providing Mexican workers with employment in this country is not morally bad.

"Granted, it involves separating men from their families for periods up to a year, but generally for a much shorter time than that, around 9 months at the most," Mariani said.

"For a man to be away from his wife and children is not evil in itself. How about men in military service, salesmen, and the like? The point is the need.

"I've seen conditions in Mexico. I know the poverty there. When I hire a bracero, I feel I'm helping a man to feed his family when otherwise they might go hungry. That's not the reason I hire him, of course. But should I be condemned for doing something good?"

Puerto Rico and Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro, who was looked upon as a liberator of Cuba, has now demonstrated his unreliability as a leader of freedom, and has disappointed many people who looked forward to amicable relations with Cuba under a democratic regime. Some of the Puerto Ricans who reside in my congressional area are keenly disappointed by the carryings-on of Fidel Castro. They are heartsick at his antics and his diatribes against our Nation which has always sought to befriend the Cuban people.

One of the prominent Spanish-American papers of New York, El Diario de Nueva York, published an editorial of their sentiments on June 14, 1960, which was translated for me and which displays the concern of the Puerto Ricans about Mr. Castro's activities and fitful rages. I believe that the American people would be interested in learning how Spanish-speaking people from Puerto Rico who love the Cuban people feel about Fidel Castro. A translation of the Spanish editorial follows and portrays the relationship with Puerto Ricans and Cubans, their hopes and aspirations, and now their disappointment in Fidel Castro.

PUERTO RICO AND FIDEL CASTRO

Puerto Rico gave leaders to the Cuban revolution so that Cuba could achieve its independence. The history of the glorious epoch of Cuba could not be written without underlining the names of Juan Rius Rivera, the soldier of Mayaguez who wielded his sword shoulder to shoulder with Maximo Gomez to free Cuba, and Pachin Marin, a poet like Marti, who in addition to his verses blazing with rebellion contributed with his arm and his machete—and his life in the jungle—to achieve Cuban sovereignty.

Cuba, once a Republic, also had in men of Puerto Rico leaders who helped to raise its political and cultural level. Eugenio Maria de Hostos, the great philosopher and educator, and the great teacher Felix Aguayo, both Puerto Ricans, laid the basis for Cuban public education. And the Puerto Rican medical revolutionary, Manuel Fernandez Mascaro, returned from the jungle and became Minister of Public Health and then Minister of Education of the Republic of Cuba.

The years that followed also revealed the participation of many Puerto Ricans in the social development of the land of Carlos Manuel de Cespedes and José Martí. So close has become the union between the two peoples that the Puerto Rican poetess, Lola Rodriguez de Tio, also one of the inspirations for the Cuban revolution, felt impelled to write her unforgettable symbolic lines:

"Cuba and Puerto Rico are of a bird its two wings
They receive flowers and bullets in the same heart."

The suffering of Cuba has been, since then, the suffering of Puerto Rico. Between the two peoples there has developed such an affinity of sentiment and interest that the Puerto Rican in Cuba feels like a Cuban, and in Puerto Rico the Cuban feels Puerto Rican.

The dictator Machado was hated in Puerto Rico because Cuba came to hate him. When Batista overthrew him and Cuba rejoiced, Puerto Rico also was happy because it believed that Cuba had embarked on a new life through democracy.

Batista fell, after having permitted the degeneration of the regime, and Puerto Rico, like the rest of the hemisphere, cheered Fidel Castro whom it considered the revindicator of the rights of the Cuban people to live in happiness and prosperity, free and unfettered to renew its own political, economic and social reconstruction.

But Castro, who uttered postulates of justice from the Sierra Maestra, when he reached power betrayed his own principles and worse, fell into the tragic error of making an alliance with the Communists who are the worst enemies of Cuba, of America, and the free world.

Puerto Rico is everything contrary to what Fidel Castro represents today. Puerto Rico is an enemy of the dictatorships. Puerto Rico is enemy of the false politicians. Puerto Rico is enemy of everything which smacks of repressive force, tyranical authority, of a police state.

And since Fidel Castro is everything repulsive to Puerto Rico and to the Puerto Ricans, Fidel Castro some time ago lost the sympathy and admiration which at one time accompanied him among all the democratic peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

More Support for Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my proposals to grant the item veto authority to the President, I wish to call attention to two editorials which have appeared recently in Iowa papers. One, "Fighting for the Item Veto" is from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of Friday, June 17. The other, "Item Veto in States," appeared in the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye on Wednesday, June 22.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the two editorials in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Des Moines Register, June 17, 1960]

FIGHTING FOR THE ITEM VETO

U.S. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, has joined the century-long parade of advocates of the item veto power for the President.

The Iowa Congressman delivered a speech in the House of Representatives recently on the subject. He said it was the first of a series he has planned, using material put together by a team of research assistants at the State University of Iowa.

He reviewed the reluctance of the writers of the Federal Constitution to give any more legislative power than absolutely necessary to the Chief Executive. This reluctance was born out of widespread distrust with respect to kings and others possessing great ruling powers.

Practical necessities of Government mechanics, however, compelled the granting of limited veto powers to the President. Gradually the States followed suit with respect to their Governors.

Since the end of the Civil War, every new State admitted to the Union, with the exception of Nevada, has granted its Governor some form of item veto power. Usually it has been limited to appropriation bills.

Six Presidents have strongly advocated the granting of this power to the President of the United States.

The practice in Congress of logrolling and attaching unrelated riders to appropriation bills has stimulated support for granting the item veto power to the President.

If a President were empowered to veto specific items in a bill without killing the bill as a whole, expenditures benefiting only relatively small pressure groups or sections of the country might be held within more reasonable bounds.

Representative SCHWENGEL deserves applause for adding his bit in support of a worthy cause. His efforts, like the proverbial drop of water, may not shatter the granite determination of most of his congressional colleagues to permit no weakening of their political power and advantage, but they will add to the slow erosion of that resistance.

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye, June 23, 1960]

ITEM VETO IN STATES

In his efforts to persuade Congress to give item veto authority to the President, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL has checked into how the States handle the matter.

He reports that 42 of the 50 States have provision for the item veto in their State constitutions. The missing eight include Iowa.

The item veto is important because it would permit the President to strike out an individual appropriation which smacks of the pork barrel, without being forced to veto the entire measure.

It is equally important in State government. For example, SCHWENGEL turns to Illinois, where in 1 year the Governor vetoed individual items totaling nearly $22 million, without noticeably hampering the State. The item veto permits the Governor to represent the entire State, which ideally he should. It can be abused, as can any governmental power, but its normal effect is to eliminate purely political appropriations.

If such a veto is good for the Federal Government, and good for 42 of 50 States, why would it not be good for Iowa? The answer: It would.

How To Organize a People-to-People Community Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, to provide American citizens with an opportunity to participate individually in the development of better understanding be-

tween themselves and other peoples throughout the world, people-to-people councils are being established in communities throughout the United States. These councils are designed to encourage more people to take part in the President's people-to-people program, inaugurated in 1956.

People-to-people councils were first established in Hartford, Conn., and Fresno, Calif. Working closely with the U.S. Information Agency, Office of Private Cooperation, the Hallmark Foundation prepared the plan to organize a people-to-people council in Greater Kansas City. It proved successful and will be used to develop councils in other communities. It was instrumental in successfully stimulating the organization of a council in Cleveland, Ohio.

Since its organization in January of this year, the Greater Kansas City People-to-People Council has made a good start in bettering international relations and understanding. Among many other projects of the past few months the council has established contact between the Boys Club of Rangoon, India, and the Boys Club of Kansas City, and has helped the Kansas Council for World Affairs plan a world trade program, which will take place in Topeka later this summer.

The following is a copy of the plan being prepared by the Hallmark Foundation for distribution throughout the Nation by the U.S. Information Agency:

HOW TO ORGANIZE A PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE COMMUNITY COUNCIL

"If we are going to take advantage of the assumption that all people want peace, then the problem is for people to get together and to leap governments * * * if necessary to evade governments * * * to work out not one method, but thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more about each other"—(Dwight D. Eisenhower, at the White House Conference to organize the President's people-to-people program, Sept. 11, 1956).

PEACE BEGINS WITH YOU

Today the world faces a crucial point in history. Survival is the issue. Through a failure to understand one another, nations could fall into a final, horrible war. Without constant communication and mutual understanding between the peoples of the earth there can be no peace, no hope for the future.

Dr. Edward Teller, the famed atomic scientist, recently told an audience in Washington, "We must agree, we must argue, we must remain friends, and we must arrive at some solution" to the "very difficult and vexing problems" which face mankind. This is the long-range purpose of the people-to-people program.

The people-to-people program is one of the greatest forces for peace and mutual understanding in the world today. In it hundreds of thousands of persons everywhere are getting together to try to bring an end to fear, suspicion, hatred, and war. If people get together, so will governments. For all governments, even those not popularly elected, must bow to the will of the people. On this fact alone may depend the future of humanity.

Thousands of Americans have joined the nonpartisan, nongovernment people-to-people program to bring people together. They believe that the only way to achieve peace and understanding is to work for it.

You can help. You can write letters abroad. You can send books overseas. You can invite visitors from other countries into your home. When you visit other nations you can and should call on persons with whom you have similar interests. You can support athletic exchanges, community affiliations, good will tours, and technical, professional and cultural exchanges. You can help in that way. But there is even more important help you can give the people-to-people program. You can provide leadership to get others to take part in people-to-people activities.

Until every individual in every community joins you in this work, the fullest potential of the people-to-people program cannot be realized. The need to get everyone working together is urgent. Tomorrow may be too late. You can help fill this need by organizing a successful people-to-people program in your community. You can organize a people-to-people community council.

WHAT IS A COUNCIL?

In every community there are individuals, groups, clubs, and organizations interested in creating better understanding and cooperation between the peoples and nations of the world. The idea for a people-to-people community council is based on the premise that in unity there is strength. The purpose of the council is to provide a central agency through which all of these individuals, groups, and organizations can plan and work together. Through this combined effort more attention will be focused on the people-to-people program, and more people in the community can be encouraged to take part in it.

The council provides a clearinghouse for information. It makes it possible for each member to learn what the other is doing. It serves as an exchange for ideas. It makes it easier for members interested in similar projects to work together. It suggests and recommends programs. It undertakes communitywide activities approved by a majority vote of its members.

Each group, club, or organization that joins the council retains its own identity and autonomy. The council exercises no authority or control over the policies or activities of its members. Funds necessary for the operation of the council are obtained by means approved by the council members. It engages in no large-scale fund-raising activities.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

First, write People-to-People Councils, Post Office Box 1960, Washington, D.C., and tell them you want to organize a people-to-people community council. They will help you get your local group going and will send you all kinds of booklets, leaflets, and folders showing you how to start letter-writing programs, book collections, international community affiliations and scores of other people-to-people projects.

Next, contact friends, groups, clubs and organizations in your community and explain the people-to-people program to them. Explain the importance to them of getting everyone to work together. From this group, form a steering committee to organize a council.

Then, have the steering committee call on community leaders and get their support and endorsement of the council. Get them to agree to serve on the advisory committee.

A recent study of American attitudes by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has reaffirmed the fact that "within every community there is a relatively small number of citizens who set the tone and the attitude of the community in the whole field of public affairs."

The report continues: "Community leaders can be identified by their positions within the community structure and the influence they have on community attitudes and activities. Top leadership is drawn primarily from business and those professions closely related to business. When top community leaders are prevailed upon to take an active and sustained interest in world affairs, the effects on the community can be substantial."

Now, with everyone agreed to a community council, call a meeting for formal organization, election of officers and selection of working committees.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION

In order to be fully successful, people-to-people councils must be self-reliant. There are times, however, both in the organization stage and in carrying on activities, when information and guidance from other sources may be needed. The Office of Private Cooperation of the U.S. Information Agency, Washington 25, D.C., can be most helpful when such assistance is needed. It will make available specialists in people-to-people activities to consult with your council, to the extent that the time of these specialists will permit.

WHAT OTHERS ARE DOING

People-to-people councils are active in Hartford, Conn., Fresno, Calif., Cleveland, Ohio, and Kansas City, Mo.; others are being established throughout the country.

Using the four steps previously outlined above, the Greater Kansas City People-to-People Council was successfully organized. Here is the plan it adopted. It may be modified in any way to meet your community's requirement.

THE GREATER KANSAS CITY PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE COUNCIL

The council consists of individual members and delegates from organizations in the community who have joined together to develop and coordinate the people-to-people program at the local level. It serves as a clearing house for people-to-people activities, throwing a spotlight upon the many events and projects undertaken in the community to encourage international understanding and people-to-people contacts. The council is further organized as follows:

A. Advisory board.

The advisory board provides the leadership for this council and consists of a chairman and a minimum of six board members.

B. Honorary committee.

The honorary committee consists of the mayor, the foreign consular corps and other local dignataries.

C. Officers.

The officers of the council are the president, vice president and secretary-treasurer.

D. Coordinating committee.

The coordinating committee consists of the president, vice president, secretary-treasurer, chairman of the advisory board, and the chairman of the operating committees.

E. Operating committees.

1. Planning committee.

This committee is responsible for the planning and direction of special events to be conducted by the council.

It assists in the development of cooperative programs by those organizations within the council having the same interests.

It undertakes research programs to find ways and means of creating new activities for the council.

2. Public relations committee.

This committee is responsible for the organization and execution of a public relations program to focus greater attention on people-to-people activities in the community. It prepares and distributes information concerning the council and its activities. When requested, it assists individual council organizations in the development of their respective community public relations programs.

3. Visitors committee.

This committee helps receive visitors from abroad to the community and cooper-

ates in arranging their local activities when so requested.

THIS IS A DO-IT-YOURSELF PROJECT

You personally can help bring about better understanding between peoples. You personally can work for peace through people-to-people contacts. You personally can organize a people-to-people community council. Do it now. Write today. Send your letter to People-to-People Councils, Post Office Box 1960, Washington, D.C. Remember—peace begins with you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1928).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

5494

Appendix

Increasing Second-Class Rate: Time Magazine and the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the fixing of second-class rates is a complex matter. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, did not act on rates even though we had extensive hearings.

We did not act because we did not have the basic facts we needed in order to propose responsible legislation. The Postmaster General told us that he was not complying with the terms of the Postal Policy Act of 1958 which require that the public service costs be computed and subtracted prior to a determination of what the users of the mail should pay. The Postmaster General asserted that he could not compute the costs of the third- and fourth-class post offices, star routes, and other matters which are plainly public service and have been so determined by Congress.

If there were a criminal penalty for breaking the law, the Postmaster General could be indicted and convicted.

Many of us on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have asked the chairman to establish a committee to make an inquiry into both the Postal Policy Act of 1958 and into the cost-ascertainment system. It is our responsibility to get these facts so that we can legislate with confidence as to postal rates.

I often wished during the hearings on rate increases this year, and I said so several times, that we could have the adversaries sitting side by side at the witness table. This would enable them to comment on each other's arguments and would help us sharpen issues and establish necessary facts.

David W. Brumbaugh, executive vice president and treasurer of Time, Inc., appeared before our committee on June 2, 1960. He submitted at that time a series of questions and answers which, at my suggestion, the chairman referred to the Postmaster General for comment.

I inserted the questions and answers in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Postmaster General asked me to submit the Post Office Department's replies and, under unanimous consent, I am doing so following these remarks.

I am also including, after the Post Office Department's replies, a letter I received, dated June 20, from Mr. Brumbaugh commenting on the Post Office Department's responses.

This interchange is, in my opinion, an interesting and valuable discussion of an important problem. Anyone who reads it will agree that we have a complex problem and we need more information before we can do our duty in connection with the fixing of postal rates:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REPLIES TO "SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON POST OFFICE MATTERS" SUBMITTED AS EXHIBIT B IN STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF TIME, INC., BY DAVID W. BRUMBAUGH BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, JUNE 2, 1960

Time's question and answer: 1. Did Deputy Postmaster General Stans testify before this Committee in 1957 that there are costs aggregating millions of dollars (examples given alone totaling over $200 million) spread across first-, second-, and third-class mail which should only be charged to first-class mail? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: Mr. Stans' testimony has been taken out of context. Mr. Stans did not testify that the cost ascertainment figures as such were in any way in error in spreading the $200 million of certain costs over all classes of mail. He did state that the special items which those costs represented were factors which should properly be taken into account for ratemaking purposes in fixing rates above cost for first-class mail. Specifically he said:

"Unfortunately, the cost accounting that would be involved to measure this factor, if we could measure it at all in cost ascertainment, would be fantastic. So we do not take it into account in cost ascertainment. It is a factor that we ask the committee to take into account as a value factor for first-class mail" (p. 221 of 1957 House hearings on H.R. 5836).

In the hearings before the Senate he amplified this concept as follows:

"The important thing about cost ascertainment is that it does not, in itself, provide an automatic formula for fixing postal rates. It was not intended to do that. But cost figures can serve a useful purpose in the ratemaking process if they are used as a starting point for the addition or deduction of other factors which are pertinent under ratemaking principles. This is the procedure followed before many other regulatory ratemaking bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission. Allocated-cost figures are refined through evaluation of pertinent ratemaking factors which do not enter the original costing system itself. Such computations are of immeasurable value in determining the revenue requirements of a class of traffic or type of service and the level of rates necessary to attain the desired revenue objective" (p. 29 of 1957 Senate hearings on H.R. 5836).

Time's question and answer: Did Mr. Maurice Stans subsequently see to it that the proper accounting procedures be instituted to rectify the errors? No.

Post Office Department's reply: Since Mr. Stans did not testify that the accounting procedures were in error, there were obviously no changes required in the system.

Time's question and answer: Does the Post Office use the concept of out-of-pocket costs and less than fully allocated costs when it appears before other Government agencies? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The consideration of out-of-pocket costs in ratemaking processes may be appropriate under certain circumstances. There is no question, however, but what the Congress itself has specifically and unequivocally rejected the concept of out-of-pocket costs for postal rate purposes. At one stage in the legislative history leading up to the enactment of the Postal Policy Act of 1958, the bill as reported to the Senate contained a provision that the cost of all classes of mail other than first class and fourth class shall be "computed on an incremental or out-of-pocket cost basis." This provision was deleted from the bill by amendment on the floor of the Senate on the grounds that it was dangerous, confusing, ambiguous and vague.

The Conference Committee rejected vestigial remnants of the primary function theory by deleting the remaining language in the bill (essential to any out-of-pocket cost concept) that first-class mail is the "primary function" of the Postal Establishment and the language referring to what the "cost" of the various classes of mail should contain. In lieu of these rejected principles, the Conference Committee, and subsequently the Congress adopted the Department's preference provision—that first-class postage revenues should be based on allocated expenses plus an "additional amount" representing a judgment appraisal by Congress of the value of intangible factors.

Time's question and answer: Has the Postmaster General publicly recognized that the principle of out-of-pocket costs must be considered in connection with second-class mail? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: If the Postmaster General made the statement attributed to him in response to a question while on a television program, his use of the term "out-of-pocket costs" was a slip of the tongue as the concept is contrary to the Postmaster General's philosophy of postal ratemaking. He undoubtedly intended to use the term "allocated costs" since he was using it with reference to the starting point from which rate considerations up or down must be made.

Time's question and answer: When supplying you with figures on individual publications in second-class mail, did the Postmaster General take into consideration the out-of-pocket costs of such publications? No.

Post Office Department's reply: The Department has not taken into account out-of-pocket costs for either individual publications or classes of mail since this concept is not germane to postal ratemaking.

Time's questions and answers: Exhibit 1–B, page 21, of the 1959 cost-ascertainment report shows a breakdown of the various subclassifications of second-class mail in which expenses are termed "actual." Are they "actual"? No.

Does the cost-ascertainment system allocate costs only to the general classes of mail and therefore is the breakdown of the subclassifications of second-class mail based solely on statistical averages and not on solid cost accounting? Yes.

Does the statistical breakdown of the second-class subgroups give full credit to those groups where more complete advanced preparation of the mail is more feasible and is performed? No.

Does the use of statistical averages misallocate whole cost categories such as millions of dollars of city delivery carrier costs to free-in-county mail which by definition cannot receive such service? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply:

It should be noted that these questions are directed only toward the validity of the breakdown of cost to subclassifications of second-class mail. They do not in any way question the accuracy of the total cost allocated to second-class mail as a whole under the cost ascertainment system. Any inaccuracies therefore noted or claimed in the cost breakdown by subclasses would serve simply to increase or decrease correspondingly other subclassification costs within the second-class mail category as a whole.

The Department agrees that it has allocated costs to subclasses of mail within a class through the use of average cost factors. Cost elements for second-class mail have been reduced, as appropriate, to terms of cost per piece, per pound, per pound-mile, and per cubic-foot-mile, and then applied to these quantities for the various subclasses. This procedure which was used in parcel post cases before the ICC has been accepted by the ICC in approving rate increases requested by the Department.

Any economies resulting from premailing preparation of publications are reflected in total second-class costs. No attempt is made to separately assign any savings resulting from such practices to specific subclasses. Neither does the Department attempt to assign to specific subclasses additional expenses which may be incurred as a result of the expedited treatment given publications having time news value. There are no data to support the premise that any one group of publications performs premailing services resulting in economies for that group over other groups of publications. The premailing requirements of the Department affect small publications as well, and where the area of distribution is limited, often result in substantial distribution economies.

With respect to the subcategory of free-in-county mail, it could be that to the extent that average delivery cost assigned to this item differed from actual rural delivery costs, some inaccuracy would result. However, any variation in costs allocated to free-in-county mail would automatically result in compensating variations for other subclasses.

The Department discontinued in the fiscal 1957 report the practice of indicating by footnote that the breakdown of second-class mail costs by subclass was developed by processes of approximation but specified in the transmittal letter that no significant change from preceding years was made in the cost ascertainment basic procedures. The Department intends to provide a footnote in future publications of the report.

Time's question and answer: Does the Post Office Department have a cost system which provides for the costing of individual publications? No.

Post Office Department's reply: The Post Office Department can and has on occasion analyzed the handling and established the cost of individual publications, but this procedure is intricate and must be tailored to each individual publication. It is, therefore, expensive and time consuming. The expense of a cost system designed to provide regularly cost figures for any one publication would be prohibitive. Since rates are never established for individual publications, the cost of making such analyses would not be justified.

Time's question and answer: Did the Post Office use simple average cost statistics for all of second class when attempting to compute the individual costs of handling Life? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The Post Office Department used average cost factors in computing the costs of handling Life. Mr. Stans stated (House Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearings, 85th Congress, H.R. 5836 and H.R. 5839, page 745) "the Post Office believes—that the result is not significantly incorrect as a measure of the full cost of carrying this publication." Mr. Stans further explained that "a field study made by the Post Office Department produced costs 11 percent below results obtained by use of average cost factors of Time magazine. The Saturday Evening Post cost study resulted in costs 1 percent below results obtained by average cost factors."

Time's question and answer: Did the use of simple averages substantially overstate the cost of transporting Life in the mails? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: Average cost factors were used in computing the transportation cost for Life magazine. Mr. Stans adequately explained on page 745, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearings, 85th Congress, H.R. 5836 and H.R. 5839, Post Office Department measurements of density in transportation as compared to measurements made by Life magazine.

Time's question and answer: Did the use of simple averages substantially overstate the cost of delivering Life on rural routes? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The use of average cost factors may result in overstating the expense of transporting Life magazine on rural routes. However, this apparent overcharge might well be offset by higher proportionate costs of city delivery service, the possibly greater distribution expense in urban post offices, as well as additional costs inherent in giving expedited handling to the handling of time value publications.

Time's questions and answers: In spite of the obvious conclusion by any competent analyst that the handling and sortation of pieces is the primary cost element in mail costs, did the Postmaster General ever testify to this fact prior to this year? No.

Is this fact clearly highlighted in the recently released "Survey of Postal Rates," and did we not testify to this very fact in 1957? Yes.

Post Office Department's replies: The Post Office Department has recognized the importance of handling and sorting of pieces as a significant element in mail costs. In fact, the Department has on several occasions recommended to the Congress increases in the minimum per piece rate in order to bring revenues derived more nearly in line with costs incurred for such mail. This fact, as Mr. Brumbaugh observes, has been further highlighted in the Department's "Survey of Postal Rates," which was submitted to the Congress pursuant to Public Law 85-426, and forms the basis for the Postmaster General's current proposal for a ½-cent charge for each piece of second-class matter. In 1957, the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Stans, in replying to a statement by Mr. Brumbaugh on this very point, testified: "There is merit in Mr. Brumbaugh's belief that the minimum piece rate of one-eighth cent per copy on second-class matter is entirely too low. However, he is incorrect when he attributes the entire loss on second-class mail to this fact" (p. 743, 1957 House hearings on H.R. 5836 and H.R. 5839).

Time's question and answer: Is it a fact that the larger the circulation of a magazine the more complete the advanced preparation of mail before entering can be made? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: This question is academic. The Post Office Department has acknowledged the benefits of premailing preparations of a number of publications. However, many smaller publications are made up almost entirely to rural routes and nearby offices, eliminating the need for most clerical distribution and thereby effecting the same economies as the more extensive premailing practices followed by a limited number of large circulaton publications.

Time's question and answer: Is it a fact, therefore, that the average cost per piece of handling a larger circulation magazine with complete advanced preparation is less than the average cost per piece of handling a small circulation magazine which cannot effect substantial advanced preparation? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: Again the question is predicated on the theory that large circulation publications automatically make more extensive premailing preparations than smaller circulation publications. There is not information available that substantiates this as a general principle.

Time's question and answer: Was this important fact given effect to in the post office calculations of handling Life? No.

Post Office Department's reply: The answers to questions 16 and 17 apply equally to this question.

Time's questions and answers: Since the cost per piece is the most important element, is not the second class rate structure which is based almost entirely on weight discriminatory against heavier pieces? Yes.

Does the recently released "Survey of Postal Rates" point up this fact on page 57 by stating that a disproportionate share falls on the heavier weight publications? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The three major cost elements in second-class mail are pieces, weight, and distance. Each of these elements is to some extent reflected in the present second-class rate structure. However, the handling of pieces is the principal cost determinant, while postage revenues are determined primarily by weight and distance. As a result, postage revenues derived from lightweight publications do not cover as much of their costs as do the heavier weight publications. The Department—as does Mr. Brumbaugh—recognizes this imbalance in the rate structure. Accordingly, the Postmaster General has proposed a one-half-cent-per-piece charge on all second-class publications in order to give greater emphasis to handling in the rate structure and to correct somewhat the disproportionate share of total expenses which is currently borne by the heavier weight publications.

Time's question and answer: Does the "Survey of Postal Rates" state that the rates on 40 percent of second-class mail have not been changed since 1925 and the rates on 20 percent have not been changed since 1879-1885? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: Unfortunately, Mr. Brumbaugh's statement of fact is open to possible misleading conclusions. The current second-class rate structure has evolved in response to many factors and many considerations, political as well as economic. In some instances, this has resulted in an inflexibility of certain rates despite increases in costs. However, it would be wholly misleading to attribute the entire current financial deficiency in second-class mail to these inflexible rate categories. It would be equally fallacious to imply that this revenue deficiency in second-class mail could be corrected merely by changes in these rate categories. With a prospective $280 million revenue deficiency for second-class matter based on 1959 volume, an upward adjustment in the level of all second-class rates is unavoidable if second-class revenues are to be brought more nearly in line with costs.

Time's questions and answers: Did the Post Office advocate and testify in 1957 that second-class mail should pay 50 percent of the costs allocated to it under their present methods of cost ascertainment? Yes.

Did the Post Office advocate and testify in 1957 that third-class mail should pay 75 percent of the costs allocated under their present methods of cost ascertainment? Yes.

Has the Post Office followed up its advocacy by preparing a consistent set of cost figures and releasing them at all times to the proper committees of Congress and to the press? No.

Post Office Department's reply: In 1957 the Department prepared tables showing the extent to which revenues in fiscal 1956 failed to cover 50 percent of the cost of second-class mail and 75 percent of the cost of third-class mail. These percentages were those which a departmental staff committee recommended as immediate goals for revenue coverage by these classes of mail under conditions existing in 1954 taking into account intangible service factors. This committee had also expressed the opinion that in the long run second-class mail should cover 75 percent of its cost and third-class mail 90 percent of its cost. The Department's rate proposals in 1957, however, called only for a coverage of 29.2 percent for second class and 77.7 percent for third class.

The Department has not used the 1954 committee recommendations since 1957. Since that date the Congress has enacted the Postal Policy Act of 1958 and the Department has developed its rate proposals in conformity with the basic concepts of that act and economic and operating conditions as they exist today.

Question 24 confuses proposed standards of cost coverage with the costs themselves. There has been no change in the basic cost figures reported under the cost ascertainment system since these are in nowise affected by rate considerations.

Time's questions and answers: Do the Post Office figures show that free-in-county mail in 1959 furnished zero revenue and cost the Post Office $15,444,933 to handle? Yes.

Does the Post Office assert that the only public service cost for this category is $830,000? Yes.

Does the Post Office leave the balance of $14,600,000 as a deficit in second-class mail to be assessed in theory against the other users of second-class mail? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: These questions bring out the fact that the loss in fiscal 1959 on free-in-county mail amounted to $15.4 million of which only $830,000 was attributable to the rate concession to this category of mail user and therefore considered as a public service reimbursable by appropriation from the Treasury. Time's answer to question 27 that the $14.6 million balance of the deficit is assessed in theory against the other users of second-class mail, is wholly untrue.

The $14.6 million remaining deficit represents a deficiency in the basic rate. When, and to the extent that, the basic rate is raised, the amount reimbursable from the Treasury as a public service will be increased accordingly. In no way is it proposed that this deficiency be assessed against other users of second-class mail. This is obvious when it is recognized that the administration's rate proposals will recover from users of second-class mail only a portion of the aggregate costs incurred by each subclass. Therefore, until a subclass rate covers the costs allocated to the subclass (and none do) such subclass cannot be considered as paying for costs assigned to another subclass as alleged.

Time's question and answer: Does the Postal Policy Act state that the entire loss should be removed as a Public Service cost? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The Postal Policy Act of 1958 provides that the amount which shall be deemed to be attributable to the specified public services shall be the amount appropriated each year for that purpose by the Congress. In its initial request for this appropriation, the Department submitted estimates for loss resulting from free and reduced rate mailings on two bases: (1) the difference between revenues received, if any, and the expense attributable to the categories of mail involved, and (2) the amount of revenue foregone owing to the application of free or reduced rates as compared with the rates otherwise payable. The Congress chose the latter of these concepts in implementing the law. They have reaffirmed this position in the 1961 appropriation action.

Time's question and answer: Does the Postal Policy Act state that no user or group of users of the mails should be compelled to pay for an intended subsidy of this nature? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: An affirmative answer to this question is correct. No action or proposal of the Post Office Department would require payment by any user or group of users of any intended subsidy to other users.

Time's question and answer: Is the Post Office contradicting both the law and reasonable logic when it handles costs in this way? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: It is assumed that this question refers to the answer given to question 27. Since the proper answer to question 27 is "No," the answer to this question would also be "No."

Time's questions and answers: Do the Post Office figures for 1959 show an excess of expenses over revenues for exempt publications of $60,126,922 and does the Post Office assert that only $3,094,000 is a public service cost leaving the balance as a part of the second-class deficit to be paid for by other users? Yes.

Do the questions and answers numbered 28, 29 and 30 apply to this case as well? Yes.

Do the Post Office figures for 1959 show an excess of expenses over revenue for exempt classroom publications of $3,757,631 and does the Post Office assert that only $224,000 is a public service cost leaving the balance as part of the second-class deficit to be paid for by other users? Yes.

Do the questions and answers numbered 28, 29 and 30 apply to this case as well? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: These questions are of the same general nature as those covered by questions 25–30. The same answers apply to both sets of questions. As stated under question 27, any deficit in a subclass cannot conceivably be considered as paid by another subclass until the latter more than covers its own allocated costs, which none do.

Time's questions and answers: Have the McKinsey report conclusions that additional postal rate increases can be easily passed along or absorbed been confirmed by the mail users who have testified here? No.

Do the indexes quoted by McKinsey on paper and hourly wage increases take any account whatsoever of efficiencies put into effect by industry to help to offset such increases? No.

Post Office Department's reply: Despite attempts by some witnesses to discredit its conclusions, the McKinsey report is an independent, objective, and factual evaluation of the impact of the Department's postal rate proposals. The report's findings rest on extensive statistical analysis of published data supplemented by actual interviews with representative mail patrons and an examination of confidential financial data. The facts which were uncovered in connection with these confidential interviews confirm and substantiate the statistical findings of the report regarding the ability of mail patrons to adjust to the modest rate increases which have been proposed.

Although much invective has been hurled at these findings, no adequate financial data has been offered by witnesses before the committee to refute the two principal conclusions of the report: (a) That postage constitutes a relatively minor cost factor in magazine and metropolitan newspaper publishing, and (b) that the rate increases which have been proposed would have little impact on circulation volume or on the financial condition of such publishers.

Time's question and answer: Is the Consumer Price Index up less than 10 percent from 1953 to 1959 and is the Post Office cost for handling a first-class letter up over 33 percent in the same time? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The Consumers Price Index is not an accurate index of the increases in costs of the service which the Department pays for. Since 1952, postal wage rates and the cost to the Department of employee fringe benefits have gone up more than 26 percent. Railroad rates have increased an average of more than 25 percent. Also since 1953 the Department has started an intensive program of modernization of its postal facilities. While for the most part these improvements are expected to be self-liquidating, initial installation costs under the Department's accounting system are written off in the year of acquistion. Many of these improvements are directed toward first-class mail. In addition there has been some change in the mix of mail since 1953 resulting in an increase in average weight per piece of first-class mail, primarily because of a relative decrease in the number of postcards.

Mr. Brumbaugh did not direct his question to the cost per piece of second-class mail which since 1953 has increased only 17.4 percent contrasted with the increase in transportation and wage rates of 25 percent and 26 percent.

Time's questions and answers: Can it be said that the Post Office efficiencies compare at all favorably with the progress of the private economy? No.

Has the Post Office testified before you that its operation is still essentially manual and very few modern machines even exist today? Yes.

Since the handling of first-class mail is a granted monopoly should the mail users and the Congress demand greater cost efficiencies so that constant increases of postal rates is not the only method to balance the postal budget? Yes.

Post Office Department's reply: The Post Office Department estimates that operational savings achieved since 1952 are at the rate of approximately $300 million annually. Total costs have gone up in excess of this amount because of wage and other increases referred to in the reply to question 37.

While post office efficiency improvements may not be as great as in many private industries, it should be borne in mind that the service has not been given the funds with which to mechanize its operations to any significant degree, as Time's representatives themselves admit. Furthermore, the Department is not permitted to pay incentive wage rates or employ executive talent on the scale of private industry. Despite these handicaps, it is apparent that the progress of the last 8 years has been outstanding in the history of the postal service. The rate structure which was inherited in 1953 was so far out of line with current-day price levels that no amount of mechanization or improved efficiency alone could balance the budget. The 1958 rate increases were but a half-step in that direction; the other half should now be taken to relieve the taxpayers of this unfair burden.

TIME, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 20, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: In my testimony before your House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 2, 1960, I presented a list of 40 questions and answers on Post Office operation, ratemaking, and accounting matters. I note that you inserted a copy of this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You also requested that the Post Office Department reply to this list of questions. The reply is before me and, because of your interest in these matters, I am taking the liberty of commenting briefly on the status of the factfinding rec-

ord with respect to some of the broad principles involved.

First, it is my intent hereby to restate our request to appear before your committee with representatives of the Post Office Department in order to debate those points on which we are in disagreement. We desire the true facts to be established and clarified for future policy and ratemaking purposes. This request is not for the purpose of prolonged controversy but rather in the interest of proceeding toward a goal of sound decisions in a less controversial atmosphere.

Indeed, although it is not desirable or appropriate to comment in detail in this letter about those Post Office answers which are in demonstrable error, I think this exchange has already been very fruitful because there now seems to be essential agreement on the following important conclusions:

(a) Allocation of costs between various subclassifications of second-class mail has been made on a statistical basis which takes no account of special preparation of mail by some users and is, therefore, subject to error.

(b) The Post Office has no accounting system designed to provide cost figures on individual publications. The Post Office says that the problem of analyzing the handling and establishing the cost of individual publications is "intricate, expensive, and time consuming." The individual figures previously released on Life magazine by the Post Office were a statistical approximation based on average cost factors and the Post Office says it had not done the "intricate, expensive, and time consuming analysis." The Post Office says it may have overestimated the cost of carrying Life on rural routes, but says this may be offset by other errors it made.

Fortunately, the Post Office for good reason now appears to have adopted the policy of not releasing such figures in the future.

(c) The handling of pieces of mail is the principal cost determinant in second-class mail, yet postage rates are determined principally by weight, distance and proportion of advertising matter. As a result, postage revenues derived from lightweight publications and those not carrying large amounts of advertising do not cover as much of their costs as the heavier weight publications and those carrying substantial advertising volume. The Post Office Department desires "to correct somewhat the disproportionate share of total expenses which is currently borne by the heavier weight publications."

(d) The Post Office states that "the rates on 40 percent of second-class mail have not been changed since 1925 and the rates on 20 percent have not been changed since 1879–85." These are subclassifications of second-class mail, such as religious and nonprofit publications receiving special rate consideration.

(e) The Post Office says it would not require any user or group of users to pay any intended subsidy granted to other users.

The Post Office does not propose to assess the deficiency on free-in-county, exempt publications and exempt classroom publications, amounting to approximately $80 million, against other users of second-class mail. We are glad to see this statement. If we can also assume that this loss is not to be assessed against other classes of mail, then it seems impossible to find any characteristic differentiating this from admitted public service items.

(f) The Consumer Price Index is up less than 10 percent from 1953 to 1959 and the Post Office cost for handling a first-class letter is up over 33 percent in the same time. In explaining this the Post Office says, "While Post Office efficiency improvements may not be as great as in many private industries, it should be borne in mind that the service has not been given the funds with which to mechanize its operations to any significant degree."

The cost per piece for handling second-class mail is up 17.4 percent since 1953 but second-class rates are up 67 percent on editorial matter and 100 percent on advertising matter in the same period, and the Post Office is asking for another rate increase.

From the above there is substantial progress in clarifying some areas of broad agreement from the Post Office Department with testimony presented by me to your committee.

I am greatly interested in assisting in any possible way to accomplish the further highly proper and desirable objectives, which still are unattained:

(a) Establishment of sound public service cost figures for Post Office operations and their removal from the costs of each class of mail.

(b) Correction of deficiencies in Post Office accounting, including matters testified to by Mr. Stans before your committee in 1957.

(c) Use of out-of-pocket accounting for second- and third-class mail to produce a result more nearly in accord with revenue requirements of the various classes of mail as determined by the Congress.

(d) Presentation by the Post Office Department of one clear and consistent set of figures on all occasions to all people.

(e) Development of a theoretically sound rate structure for second-class mail and progress toward it rather than away from it as rates are changed from time to time.

(f) Study by your committee of Post Office efficiencies, including a study of reports by management experts rendered to the Post Office in the past, such new ones as you might desire and a study of Post Office recommendations for mechanization and other cost-saving devices.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. BRUMBAUGH,
Executive Vice President.

Statement of the American National Cattlemen's Association to the Platform Committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including a statement of the American National Cattlemen's Association to be submitted to the platform committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties in their July conventions:

The American National Cattlemen's Association is a nationwide organization of cattle producers and feeders now in its 63d year. Its membership includes thousands of individual cattlemen operating in 47 States. It also includes 30 affiliated State associations of cattle raisers and feeders, and 120 breed, county, or regional associations.

The cattlemen for whom American National speaks, and to whose interests it is devoted, represent the largest single segment of American agriculture. The value of cattle and calves sold from farms and ranches was $7.5 billion in each of the past 2 years, or about 20 percent of the total cash income of agriculture. Cattle and calves produce more cash farm income than all six "basic" crops combined, and more than the combined sales of hogs, sheep, wool, and poultry and eggs.

We appreciate this opportunity to submit for your consideration our views on national agricultural policies as they may affect the cattle industry.

The American National Cattlemen's Association has traditionally and vigorously opposed legislative proposals and policy statements which would bring cattle under any form of artificially maintained prices, or controlled marketings, or continued subsidies.

We wish to reemphasize this point of view and to set forth our reasons:

1. Cattlemen, like any other sellers in the market, would be happy to receive higher prices for what they have to sell. However, experience has taught that artificial prices and controls are inseparable. We do not believe that the complex cattle business can fully serve its market or realize its full potentials under a system of production and marketing controls.

Beef is the preferred meat of the American people. Demand for beef has been increasing, and the cattle industry has been expanding production to serve our increasing population.

During the past decade increased per capita consumption of beef has been even more important to the cattle business—that is, has contributed even more to the expansion of the market for beef—than has the sharp increase in the population of the country.

We believe the market for beef can be expanded much more in the years ahead if the cattle industry remains competitive and aggressively strives to further improve the quality of beef offered to the public.

We believe that to whatever degree beef production would be restricted under a system of controls, we would be handing over to other food products a part of the sales volume we otherwise can achieve for our own product. Over the years this would be a price too great to pay for any benefits to be derived from an artificial and subsidized cattle market.

Historically the cattle business has been through repeated experiences of boom and bust coinciding with the ups and downs of the cattle cycle. At times it might seem pleasant for the cattleman to unload these problems onto the taxpaying public. But cattlemen have a long and proud history of insisting upon carrying their own problems of natural and economic hazards.

The price we must pay to have a free and competitive market for cattle is at times an income position lower than is easily accepted. The offsetting advantage is that difficult times keep the cattle industry always in the process of adjusting to its markets. And we know, with a free market there is opportunity to recoup from the stress of low-income years at other times when markets improve.

2. Coupled with the concept of a free market is the need for affording cattlemen—and all business—reasonable incentives and protection against unforseeable and uncontrollable conditions. These incentives and protections should come from logical income tax treatment and from realistic policies concerning imports.

(a) It is a recognized fact that any business with widely fluctuating conditions of supply, weather, and so forth, cannot put away in good years enough to offset entirely the losses or lack of adequate income during poor years. We believe that our Nation's fiscal policy should include provisions for averaging of incomes, for tax purposes, over a span of years to provide for funds to carry out normal business operations.

(b) American stockmen have no intent, or desire, to "fence out" reasonable competition. But they do expect the Government to adopt a realistic policy of tariff or quota protection against excessive imports of foreign livestock and meats. American prices, reflecting a higher standard of living and a high wage scale, often attract unusually large shipments of meats from countries which find in our markets exceptionally profitable outlets for their products raised and processed under substandard conditions. Tariffs on livestock and meat products now in effect have been made almost ineffective as a deterrent against such dumping by inflation and shifting world monetary values.

3. The cattle industry long has avoided interference with farm programs and policy questions not generally considered to directly concern cattlemen. But in recent years, we have observed a disturbing tendency for many farm programs not touching directly upon the cattle industry to become, in fact, a threat and a burden to cattlemen. We deplore these tendencies, and insist that they be corrected.

Especially disturbing to us has been the tendency to shift problems of price-supported crops onto the feed grains, or in the direction of expanding the acreage of grazing lands on a subsidized basis. Such attempts to solve the problems of other farm enterprises create a threat to the stability of the livestock industry. The willingness of livestock producers to face up to problems of their own must not be burdened by dumping the problems of the rest of agriculture upon them.

We request prompt and effective adjustments in programs and policies for the price-support crops that will protect the livestock producers from these burdens.

4. Agriculture does not exist in an economic vacuum. It becomes ever more an inseparable part of the total national economy. The well-being of the cattle industry requires reasonably full employment and production throughout the Nation, stability of the general price level, and a continuing healthy growth of the total economy of the country. Within such an environment, there is opportunity to build an expanding demand for our product through improved quality, efficiency, and service to the consumer, and to operate our farms and ranches with stability of costs and income.

We look to our potential leadership for policies and actions conducive to these objectives.

What Is the American Legion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting brochure titled "What Is the American Legion?" issued by National Commander Martin B. McKneally. This, Mr. Speaker, is a concise statement of the aims and accomplishments of that fine national organization:

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN LEGION?

(Everyone has heard about the American Legion. But few know much about it. As a mattter of fact, there has never been a completely satisfactory answer to the simple question: "What is the American Legion?" However, a national commander of the American Legion comes to know the organization as no other person can. Here is the way National Commander Martin B. McKneally defines and describes the world's largest organization of war veterans.)

A PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATION

The American Legion is fundamentally a patriotic organization, dedicated and devoted to advancing the ideals of America—justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty—and to exalting, under the motto "For God and country," the sacredness of human personality and the inestimable gift of American citizenship.

COMRADESHIP

It is the voice of many men and women who fought in three wars[1] and have bound themselves together in comradeship and service.

VETERANS

The American Legion believes that those who have served their country in time of war have earned a special status in our society. It believes that "veteran" is and must continue to be an honorable word.

COMPASSIONATE PROGRAM

Numbering its members in the millions, the American Legion has become a great and influential organization. In just one of its many programs (child welfare) the Legion last year spent $8 million. It has marshaled its resources on behalf of retarded children. It has used its facilities and its influence to relieve the lonelines and the financial distress of the aged.

LOVE OF COUNTRY

Since its beginning, the American Legion has sought to raise the standard of patriotism, of respect for the flag, of reverence for men who fell in battle; and it has tried to enkindle in each man's heart a love for his country.

ANTICOMMUNIST

The American Legion has been vigilant on the issue of communism. In 1933, the Legion raised its voice in strong opposition to traffic with Communist tyranny. Today, it is a rallying point against the seating of Red China in the United Nations and the recognition of that country by the United States.

CITIZENSHIP TRAINING

More than 4 million boys and girls have deepened their knowledge of the Constitution through participation in the American Legion National High School Oratorical Contest. Each summer, 16,000 outstanding high school boys receive intensive training in the operation of democratic government through American Legion Boys States. The annual Boys Nation extends the same type of training at the Federal level to two leaders picked from each of 50 Boys States. Legion posts sponsor 4,333 Boy Scout units, with a membership of 182,000. Nearly a million boys play baseball under American Legion auspices.

GI BILL

The American Legion sponsored, wrote, and supported the original GI Bill of Rights for World War II veterans. It also supported the Korean GI bill. Under these two acts, more than 10,500,000 veterans have received education and training. Five and a half million have been helped in the purchase of homes through guaranteed loans. Another quarter of a million have received business loans. While the original GI bill was opposed by many (including other veterans organizations), it is today largely credited with the smooth readjustment from a total war economy to a peacetime economy of undreamed of prosperity.

ITS MEMBERS

The American Legion is an organization which welcomes honorably discharged veterans of wartime military service, without regard to race, creed, or color. Its members include the President and Vice President of the United States, 61 U.S. Senators, 241 Members of the House of Representatives, and 31 Governors of States.

DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION

It is a democratic organization which belongs to the rank and file member. Its officers are elected and its policies made by the delegates to its annual national convention.

WORLD ENCIRCLING

The American Legion's nearly 17,000 posts are located in all of the States, in four territories of the United States, and in 30 foreign nations.

YOUR PARTICIPATION

Because the American Legion must always speak with the strong voice of patriotism, of knowledge, and of creative thinking, it needs and wants the membership of all war veterans who believe in individual freedom in these days of dark peril. It also needs their active and thoughtful participation.

[1] World War I, World War II, Korean conflict.

Let's Place the Responsibility Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the House of Representatives to accept the Senate wheat bill fixes the responsibility on the shoulders of the Democratic Members of the House. The Senate bill still lies dormant in the House Committee on Agriculture. There is still time to report out this bill and have it enacted into law before Congress adjourns.

I include, as part of my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Post of Saturday, June 25, 1960, as follows:

FAILURE ON WHEAT

The apparent failure of wheat legislation in the present session of Congress may be laid at the door of the House Agriculture Committee. Last January, President Eisenhower offered to sign any reasonable bill to curb the mounting wheat surplus even if it did not fully accord with his views. The Senate finally passed a bill leaving the price support for wheat at 75 percent of parity ($1.77 a bushel) and reducing acreage allotments by 20 percent. There were indications that the President would have signed the measure, but the House Committee insisted on clinging to its outworn concept of high artificial prices and was roundly beaten on the floor.

This is not the first time that the House has revolted against the over-reaching of the Agriculture Committee. The combination of Republicans and urban Democrats against the bill should have been anticipated, even though the size of the opposition vote (236 to 170) came as a surprise. No doubt this could have been avoided if the committee had accepted the substance of the Senate bill, but it had helped to defeat that measure before its own bid for price supports at 85 percent of parity went down. So the committee—and incidentally the Democratic Congress—was left empty-handed on the supposedly vital wheat issue.

The one slender chance of changing this negative record seems to lie in belated ac-

ceptance of the Senate bill by the House Agriculture Committee. With such backing, it would doubtless be approved on the floor, since it previously failed by only a few votes. Does the House committee have the statesmanship to reverse itself for the sake of curtailing the mountainous wheat surplus? Or would its members rather go into their reelection campaigns bearing the onus of having killed the wheat bill?

Responsible Individualism—Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a high school senior from Flintridge, Calif., has written a rather remarkable essay on "Responsible Individualism—Our American Heritage."

It is, in my judgment, and I believe in the opinion of many Members, a shining example of some of the good thoughts of our youth:

RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUALISM—OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Penny McElroy)

We discovered America, you and I, sometime between 1942 and 1945. Though we were not interested in anything other than our personal comfort, by virtue of birthright, each of us inherited certain inalienable rights and responsibilities, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining happiness. In other words we inherited responsible individualism.

In a very short time, each of us knew what we wanted—we wanted to grow up; yes, that's all we wanted—just to grow up.

Well, you know we are just about as up as we're ever going to get and that's my subject—"Growing Up."

There are many who will never grow up, and I believe it is because they have never been delegated their fair share of individual responsibility.

Most of us know adults who suffer the inability to face unpleasant facts and who are reluctant to assume obligations. They may be 30, 40, or 50 years old, but they have never grown up.

True, their American heritage is the same as ours, but since we find many of these among our own loved ones, I'd like to say that these dear hearts and gentle people have simply abdicated their American heritage of responsible individualism.

Remember when we girls all wore the exact sloppy Joe sweater that every other little girl wore, and the boys all wore jeans or else they all wore cords? We were little kids in our little world where we found our little security through identification with our little classmates.

Now we feel we're pretty clever shoppers if we select apparel and find only a dozen or so duplicates on campus—and if there are no duplicates, we're a total success. We've come out into the big world.

No more of this "monkey see—monkey do" business; we really appreciate being different from one another. We now have the courage to be individuals. And courage, we know, is merely fear that has gone to school—for fear can be overcome by knowledge.

There is only one "you" in the entire world. There is no one else like you (unless, of course, you happen to be an identical twin) but even then the likeness is only physical, for no human being ever shares those mental and spiritual elements that are peculiar to an individual personality.

Today the biggest battle centers on the worth of the individual. That part of the world, that atheistic, socialistic section of the world which denies individuals the right of personal expression and initiative, has become a real menace to the liberties and the human impulses that combine to make our people great in character and achievement. This is a challenge we must meet not only for ourselves and posterity but as a debt we owe to those who fought and struggled that we, who are in school today, might have our present great opportunities.

What can we do about it?

Well, for one thing, while we are growing up and concentrating on our future means of living, we can make sure that we do not neglect the ultimate aims and objectives for which we intend to live.

And while we are growing up, we can prove that we, as young men and women, will not swallow every socialistic nostrum offered us in bottles handsomely designed and labeled with such intriguing names as "Peace," "Coexistence," and "Democracy."

I really don't wish to keep rubbing it into adults, but it was mostly they who gushed over his most nauseating highness from the Kremlin whom we recently dined and wined so royally. Let us hope that his presence with his words and attitude may have started some people to thinking.

Some of us did some thinking, and some growing up, too. We discovered we felt very deeply about our God-given rights and the traditions of our American heritage.

Who says our generation will accept socialism and live under the tyranny of dictatorship whether it be hammer and sickle or some other version of absolutism?

Do you know about the "Judas" goats?

They are goats trained for use in meatpacking plants to lead sheep to the slaughter. The sheep blindly follow the "Judas" goat. Only when it is too late do they sniff the blood of the slaughter pen and panic.

Let us be smart enough not to follow the "Judas" goats who would lead us away from our great traditions and down paths to conditions of slavery from which there is no return.

The great fear of the false leaders is that our generation will wake up and grow up to appreciate the inestimable importance of responsible individualism before their perfidy hypnotizes us.

What is a fear for these false leaders is a hope for everyone else—especially for us, the young people of today. The awakening of our generation is, in fact, the hope of the world.

Self-Government for the Unincorporated Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the achievement of statehood by Alaska and Hawaii, only a few small islands are left in a non-self-governing status. At the proper time these areas also must be advanced to full self-government, and it is none too soon for Congress to begin thinking about it. A few months ago there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a paper prepared by Mr. Harold Seidman of the Bureau of the Budget, entitled "Our Territorial Dilemma," which suggests a manner in which this might be done. I have here another paper on the same general problem, written by Mr. Kirkley Coulter, Legislative Adviser of the Office of Territories in the Interior Department, which supervises most of our territorial possessions. Mr. Coulter has been in charge of legislative work for that office, and in that connection has been engaged in developing the general approach toward giving more self-government to these areas. I believe his paper may be a useful contribution to our thinking on this subject, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORIES

(By Kirkley Coulter, Legislative Adviser, Office of Territories)

It is clear that the United States, and the world, are fast moving toward the day when self-government will be the minimum respectable formula for the administration of any former possession. If that concept is accepted as the goal, the key question for our most advanced territories, the Virgin Islands and Guam, becomes, should they be given the right to select their own chief executive? And if so, how soon? In both areas there is already a popularly elected legislature, which theoretically has the power to determine policy. The principal limitation on full self-government at present is the federally appointed Governor.

In constructing territorial governments, it has been the American habit to establish the familiar check-and-balance system of independent executive, legislative, and judicial branches. In the territories there are fundamental differences from the situation in the States, however. The territorial Governor, being federally appointed, may have little popular support within the territory in any conflict with the legislature. On the other hand, he is charged with protecting Federal interests, which may not be viewed sympathetically by local public opinion.

This pattern of territorial government is more likely to result in conflict than in cooperation between executive and legislative branches. A check-and-balance system is prone to cause deadlocks anyhow, but in the State and Federal Governments they may be resolved by the pressure of public opinion, or ultimately by the next election. These solutions are not available in the territories, and the deadlocks tend to persist.

In short, the system has not been particularly satisfactory. The only cure discovered to date for the recurring deadlocks has been this: to vest extraordinary powers in the appointed Governor, so that his views will generally prevail in any dispute. For example, when a Governor's veto is overridden by a two-thirds vote of the legislature, the bill is still subject to an absolute veto by the President, who commonly upholds his appointee. The system has tended to place arbitrary power in the hands of the Governor, and to breed frustration in the minds of the legislators, who find that their theoretical authority to determine policy has been largely stultified by the broad powers given the Governor. Too often this has tempted local popular leaders either into irresponsible demagogery or else into devising means to take control of the executive branch away from the Governor. Yet it is no use accusing them of being irresponsible;

they can hardly be expected to be anything else, having been given no area of authority in which to take responsibility for results.

SELF-GOVERNMENT BY EASY STAGES

Some have suggested that the powers of the elected legislature might be gradually broadened, at the expense of the Federal Governor, as a means of establishing full self-government by easy stages. For example, it has been suggested that the absolute veto of the President be abolished, permitting a two-thirds override majority of the legislature to prevail over the Governor.

This proposal begs the question, and might create an impossible situation. If a Governor is to take responsibility for carrying out the executive functions, he must have sufficient power to protect the executive prerogative. Lacking any political backing among the legislators, he might find his vetoes consistently overridden, and in effect he might lose control over the executive branch. A great proportion of the conflicts come on issues involving an encroachment of the Governor's authority, or placing some unworkable duty on one of the executive departments, or breaching a carefully balanced budget. In other words, giving the legislature more authority to override the Governor might make it impossible for the Governor to discharge his responsibilities.

Diminishing the Governor's authority while leaving him with all the responsibility is no solution. Nor is there any workable way to divide control over the executive branch between the Governor and the legislature. If self-government is to be expanded, there is no practical place to stop, short of giving elected officials full responsibility and control over the executive branch, i.e., either an elected governorship, or a parliamentary system under which a chief executive stands or falls with his legislative majority.

If the executive power were vested in a person representative of the local electorate, he would have as strong a base in public support as would the legislators. Frequently he would be of the same political grouping as the legislative majority. Being faced with the same practical administrative problems as are the present appointed Governors, he would be in a position to explain those problems fully to the legislature, and thus perhaps prevent irresponsible legislation by persuasion. There would not be the present ideological conflict, of the elected popular representatives versus an outsider owing allegiance to Washington. Conflicts between the executive and legislature would no doubt continue, but at least there would be a basis for compromising or otherwise resolving them.

This paper will not attempt to say how soon the step should be taken in the Virgin Islands or Guam, of giving control over the executive branch to the people. The ideas suggested hereinafter are intended only to serve as general guidelines for that day when it comes.

PECULIAR FINANCIAL SYSTEM

The problem of moving to self-government is compounded by the unusual system of financing that has been created for the Virgin Islands and Guam territorial governments. A major part of the revenues of our various territories comes either from special Federal grants, or from the diversion of revenues which are truly Federal in nature. The peculiarity of the system is this: that these moneys are not spent by any Federal agency, but are diverted into the territorial treasuries, commingled with local revenues, and are then subject to appropriation by the local legislatures, just as if they had raised the money by taxing their own people.

The impact of finance on the practical operation of government may not be immediately obvious to the casual student. But the fact is that our financial help to our territories, particularly the manner in which it is provided, has shaped the whole nature of their governments, and dominated the attitudes of territorial officials toward governmental responsibilities and policies. It has given local officials a false feeling of opulence, a habit of looking to Washington to meet any financial needs, and a reluctance to tax their own people as long as the golden flow from outside continues.

In short, territorial politicians have been trained how to spend, but not very well how to tax.

In the Ryukyu Islands, which is administered by the Army, the pattern is different. There, substantial Federal financial assistance is also given, but it is not diverted into the control of the local government (GRI). It is expended directly by the federally-appointed High Commissioner through the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyus (USCAR), a Federal agency which is in effect a second government of the islands.

A MODIFIED PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

As noted above, there is a tendency on the part of the elected legislatures in the territories to try to take over control of the executive branch. Historically, the parliamentary system in England and elsewhere grew from the success of the legislature in taking over control of the executive functions away from the crown. It is not in principle a bad system, but a pure parliamentary system applied in the territories would ignore at least three major considerations, to wit:

The necessity of protecting the Federal interest via a Federal appointee;

The need to safeguard the expenditure of the Federal subsidies granted or Federal revenues now diverted into the territorial treasuries; and

The lack, among local residents, of many persons having sufficient experience or understanding of the considerable administrative, budgetary, and policy problems involved in administering the executive agencies.

The general problem has been analyzed in an article by Harold Seidman of the Bureau of the Budget entitled "Our Territorial Dilemma," published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1960. Mr. Seidman suggests, not a "pure" parliamentary system, but a modified one, under which plenary power would be kept in the hands of a federally appointed High Commissioner for each territory. The High Commissioner would normally exercise his power, however, only on the "advice" of a chief executive, a Governor or First Secretary, who would be responsible to the legislative majority. The High Commissioner would reject such "advice" only when the "Federal interest" was involved. If necessary, however, he would have plenary power to veto bills (with no legislative right to override), appoint department heads, in fact establish general policy, and even to dissolve the legislature. As precedents, Mr. Seidman cites the informal parliamentary system developed in the Philippines under Governor-General Harrison, and the pattern established for the Ryukyu Islands by President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10713, June 5, 1957.

Mr. Seidman's analysis is extremely helpful in several respects. Particularly to the point are his emphasis on the lack of public support for appointed governors; on the need for giving elected officials effective control over the executive branch in any system of true self-government; and on the necessity of retaining some device for protecting the essential Federal authority. His key proposal seems to boil down to this: that the function of a chief executive be given to one (popularly chosen) official, and separated from the duty of protecting the Federal interest, which would be given to a different (federally appointed) official. This principle seems sound but has limitations.

OMISSIONS IN THE SEIDMAN OUTLINE

However, some basic factors are passed over lightly or omitted entirely in Mr. Seidman's analysis.

1. The use of the word "plenary" to describe the proposed High Commissioner's powers is deceptive, to say the least, if applied to the Virgin Islands or Guam. The residents of those areas have heretofore been granted far-reaching statutory rights, including the right, through their elected representatives: to confirm certain gubernatorial appointees; to levy taxes; to appropriate; to override vetoes by a two-thirds vote unless such vetoes are upheld by the President; and to have their elected representatives serve out their full terms, without fear of premature dissolution of the legislature by the High Commissioner.

Presumably Congress is unlikely to rescind most of these rights. Yet it is not clear whether the high commissioner plan could work at all in the manner intended by Mr. Seidman unless the high commissioner had the authority, for example, to dissolve the legislature and order new elections.

2. If a chief executive responsible to the legislature in the Virgin Islands or Guam took office, he would presumably inherit control over all present territorial revenues including the Federal diverted revenues and Federal grants. The Seidman article refers specifically to the Ryukyu Islands as a possible model, but makes no mention that the Federal diverted revenues there are carefully kept under the control of Federal officials. So long as a governor is a Federal official, it may be sound to divert Federal revenues into the territorial treasury. The device loses its logic when the chief executive becomes locally chosen.

3. Mr. Seidman suggests that the high commissioner should have wide discretion in deciding when to exercise his plenary power to overrule the locally chosen chief executive—in vetoing bills, making local appointments to office, determining policy, and the like. If such plenary power were used frequently, it could utterly destroy the concept of local responsibility for the executive branch. The high commissioner would become the real governor, and the titular governor or chief executive would become a mere figurehead. It seems essential to define more precisely the exact powers to be exercised by such a high commissioner.

4. The high commissioner would presumably have an absolute veto (not subject to override) over legislative bills, whenever they affected the "Federal interest," which he alone would have authority to define as broadly as he chose. Since this is a power greater than now held by the governor of either the Virgin Islands or Guam, the people of those areas would probably regard the whole proposal as a step backward, rather than a step toward more self-government. If such an absolute veto power is to be granted, it might be better to specify what constitutes the "Federal interest" to be protected by such a veto.

SUMMING UP THE PROBLEM

The problem may thus be summed up as follows:

1. Any major advance in self-government for the Virginia Islands or Guam must consist of giving control over the executive branch of government to an official chosen directly or indirectly by the people.

2. If control of the executive power is to be relinquished, some authority must be retained in the hands of a Federal official, to protect the Federal interest from injury.

3. It would not be desirable to invade the political rights heretofore granted to the Virgin Islands and Guam in their organic acts.

4. Power should be kept in the hands of some Federal official (such as the Secretary of the Interior) to negate absolutely certain types of legislation to protect the Fed-

eral interest, but the categories of legislation subject to that power should be carefully defined.

It remains to specify the categories of local laws which might properly be negated by Federal action. The following types are tentatively suggested:

Any law which interfered with the conduct of a Federal program;

Any law which interfered with national security;

Any territorial law which contravened a Federal law;

Any law which endangered the financial stability of the territory;

Any law which discriminated against any person or class of persons;

Any law which unreasonably burdened or interfered with the development of the economy of the territory or the growth of trade and tourism. (This item is particularly applicable to the Virgin Islands.)

The power thus to negate local laws, with no right of override, is such a great one, that it would have to be used most sparingly, if any semblance of real self-government were to be preserved. Any decision by the Secretary to veto a law would have to be tied directly to the language of one of the categories listed above. It is not expected that he would veto minor bills merely on the ground that he disagreed with them. Nor should he veto appropriations merely because he thought them foolish, only if they seemed likely to lead to territorial bankruptcy.

He would not have to worry about stopping bills which invaded the gubernatorial prerogative, since the normal gubernatorial veto would deal with them if necessary.

SUMMARY

As part of any such reorganization of territorial government, it might be desirable to place control over the spending of all Federal subsidy money and diverted Federal revenues in the hands of a separate Federal agency (as is done in the Ryukyus) rather than permitting these funds to flow into the territorial treasury. Such a separate agency, headed by a Federal official to be known perhaps as the Federal Coordinator, could see to the wise expenditure of the funds, and might also usefully serve as an adviser to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the exercise of the secretarial veto of legislative acts which infringed on the Federal interest.

This general scheme of government could be worked as either an elective governorship, or as a modified parliamentary system. Under the modified parliamentary system, the chief executive, instead of being elected, would be appointed by the High Commissioner from among the legislative majority. The system would be a close copy of that in the Ryukyus, except that the Ryukyuans do not have statutory guarantees of their political rights, as do the Virgin Islanders and Guamanians. In the Virgin Islands and Guam the powers of the High Commissioner would be more limited than they apparently are in the Ryukyus. In the two organized territories (Virgin Islands and Guam), he would not have much power except to negate laws adversely affecting the Federal interest (as defined above), and to administer the programs financed by Federal moneys.

This rough outline is not held out as any cure-all of territorial governmental problems. The problem is to create responsible self-government without imperiling the essential Federal authority. It is here proposed that at the appropriate time, this be done by relinquishing control over the territorial executive branch, but retaining a power to negate laws of certain specified categories. The Federal judiciary would remain as at present. In the Virgin Islands there is a Government Comptroller under Federal direction who would continue to audit the territorial accounts, and a similar position could be established in Guam. It is inherent in such a system that at times the chief executive may not be that person whom the High Commissioner would have preferred. Yet there is no other way for our territorial peoples ultimately to develop political maturity, except by sooner or later taking responsibility. The scheme here broadly outlined is intended to bridge the critical transition period that must be passed over.

To Be Great Is To Be Misunderstood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting address entitled "To Be Great Is To Be Misunderstood" relating to the importance of advertising in the life of America and its people. The address was delivered by a close friend of mine of many years standing, Lawrence Valenstein, chairman of the board of the Grey Advertising, Inc., at the Marketing Executives' Seminar, Hotel Lombardy on June 10, 1960:

"To be great is to be misunderstood." This is one of the memorable sayings of the great American poet and philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson. When he said this he was talking about people.

He may well have said the same about advertising.

For this great force which has played so vital a role in shaping our mode of living is misunderstood by far too many people. Nor is the misunderstanding confined to any particular group. It includes financiers, professionals, educators, government officials, and even decisionmakers in management.

If these people who influence opinion are not clear about what advertising means to America, what can we expect from the general public?

That's one of the reasons advertising has been an open target for potshots.

We say "one of the reasons" because we are fully aware that advertising excesses do arise from time to time as the result of the heat of competition. Most often, however, they are perpetrated by "irresponsibles" who help make advertising a tempting target.

History shows that no industry can succeed in completely eliminating its scalawags. But we can do much, very much, to dampen the zeal of those who malign advertising because they do not understand it.

So let's spread the truth about advertising. The truth will be a bulwark against the poisoned darts of the ignorant and the malicious.

Not so long ago I met a gentleman from Australia. He is an economist who has been in this country for over a year studying our way of living, our business methods, especially our advertising. Since he preferred anonymity, I shall not name him.

I should like to report to you a very interesting and stimulating conversation I had with this gentleman.

To those engaged in advertising, his observations are refreshing. To others they may be eye openers because, despite the fact that advertising affects everybody, not everybody really understands what it is and what it does.

I shall try to give you a summary of our conversation. Not word for word, but the gist of what was said.

I began by asking my guest to give his impressions of advertising in America. His approach startled me.

"Advertising?" He began with a question. "Let's look at it this way. I walk down any one of hundreds of Main Streets and I see shops full of beautiful clothes (and I mean beautiful clothes), also beautiful sofas, chairs and lamps, and curtains and drapes. And so many, many things that take the drudgery out of living, lighten labor, and make life more comfortable and enjoyable.

"I go into homes of people of modest incomes and I find all these things which, all over the world, are reserved only for the upper upper classes.

"I see huge supermarkets' shelves loaded with food that only the very rich can enjoy in other parts of the world.

"I pass factory after factory and see huge parking lots filled with cars belonging to the workers. And I see your highways overflowing with automobiles.

"I see an active, busy people. Busy not merely with earning a living, but with enjoying living. That's my impression of advertising."

"Come, come, sir, what you have described are the fruits of the American system of free competitive enterprise, of the American genius for organization and production and of our philosophy of not standing still. Advertising has played a mighty important part in all this, but we can hardly give it all the credit."

And this was his answer:

"I believe that you Americans are so close to advertising that you don't really see what it has done for you. You don't give advertising enough credit. I have talked to some very intelligent and well-educated people in this country. And I was really amazed how little they understand what advertising had to do with the development of your society. What's more, I have frequently been astonished at the distorted notions so many people have of advertising.

"Your creative genius and wonderful ability for organization have resulted in a tremendous flow of goods of all kinds. This created a crucial need for masses of people anxious, willing, and able to buy and consume these goods.

"Only a society with a constantly rising standard of living could provide the customers for your goods. These customers had to be sought, taught, and often persuaded to move higher on the scale of living."

"And you think advertising has done all this?" I asked.

"Indeed it has," he said with emphasis. "I've often heard it said that machines produce products. Advertising produces customers. As your machines began to produce more goods, advertising was needed to supply more customers.

"But people are inclined to take the familiar for granted. Advertising is so deeply imbedded in your life that you accept it as you accept a daily newspaper, or twisting a dial for a television program, or going to school.

"Being part of the gigantic organism, most people cannot see the whole. And it is reasonable that they fail to understand that this giant must have a powerplant or it couldn't move. In my opinion, this powerplant is your advertising."

"Well said, indeed," I commented. "But how do you see this engine or powerplant in operation? I am very much interested in your point of view."

His reply showed the amazing depth and extent of his knowledge of our system of economy.

"I read recently that about $12 billion were spent for advertising in the United

States last year. People outside the United States can't even imagine such a sum. From what I've observed, even here people think it's a fantastic amount to spend. Yet to me it isn't. Let's look at it this way.

"Your factories can turn out a lot of goods. Suppose all your warehouses and stores become filled with merchandise. What would happen if this merchandise remained on the shelves? There would be a glut. Everything would slow down. Sure, people would still have to buy the necessities of living: food, shelter, wearables, medicine. But this is hardly enough to keep a very small part of your factories, railroads, trucks, planes, and shops in operation. Millions and millions of people would have to be laid off."

"Advertising's job is to keep these products moving to people, isn't it?" he asked.

"Yes," I replied. "Advertising not only gives people news about the new products, but provides the urge for people to own and enjoy these products. The wider and deeper the penetration of our products into the life of America, the greater the need for more production. This means more jobs. More jobs mean more people able to enjoy what we make. More people buying means more, still more production. And so on and so on. The result is that here more people enjoy more of the fruits of our productive genius than the people in any country anywhere in the world."

"Spreading the news of new products and getting them into the hands and homes of the people used to take years in the days of the general store and the horse and buggy. Advertising helps accomplish this in weeks or months.

"The amount of money invested in advertising is really only about 1 percent of the total volume of all sales transactions. Considering the big job it has to do, is this too much?"

"Indeed not," he agreed. "But here's another fallacy I found in the thinking of many Americans:"

"A common belief is that advertising raises the cost of goods. It seems to me that by increasing the volume of sales, advertising reduces not only selling costs, but the cost of making each unit. This enables the manufacturer to lower the price of his products. The history of your country has demonstrated that in the long run advertising has usually helped lower prices not of everything, but of practically everything."

My visitor had touched a point so often misunderstood. Few people realize that the cost of reaching a prospect through advertising is often less, much less, than sending him a postcard.

On a well-rated TV show, an advertiser can talk to a prospect for a minute at a tiny fraction of a cent. In popular magazines we can reach a prospect in a full page, in full color also for a tiny fraction of a cent. Other media such as radio, newspapers, outdoor, offer similar low costs of delivering a message to a prospect.

The point is that advertising is the quickest and cheapest way of reaching large numbers of people. It enables the advertiser to reach his market (customers) inexpensively and thus increase his production, thereby reducing the cost of making and selling each unit.

This, my friends, is an outside-looking-in view of advertising. I have reported this conversation to demonstrate that intelligent and informed people outside our own country often see our economic, social, and even political society, more objectively, and hence more clearly than we see it ourselves.

I should now like to discuss with you additional aspects of the positive side of advertising which are too often, far too often, overlooked by our critics and by many of us. We are too prone to fall into the error of thinking of advertising as a force which is directed only toward improving our creature comfort, and that it does nothing toward elevating us intellectually, esthetically and spiritually.

The truth is that advertising has exerted and will continue to exert a powerful influence on our cultural advancement.

Why is this not generally understood?

Frankly (and this may raise some eyebrows), this contribution of advertising has not been sufficiently advertised.

Consider these facts not generally known or thought of:

It's because of advertising that our mass media of communication can afford to command the finest talent from all over the world and give to the American people information, stimulation, and education which in other countries are available only to very few people. Have you been noticing the constantly improving intellectual quality of our mass magazines?

The largest circulation general magazines in 1959 devoted more than 2,700 pages to books, education, music, religion, philosophy, history, science, sociology, and similar subjects which may be classed as cultural.

We can tell a similar story about radio and television, but it would take too long.

The point is that mass advertising, directly and indirectly, makes possible dissemination of high-quality entertainment and information to every corner of America at a minimum cost.

Advertising is in a large measure responsible for better living, less drudgery, more leisure for more people. This, together with the contribution of our mass media, creates opportunities for intellectual and spiritual activities equaled in few, if any, other countries.

Just think of this. While millions and millions of dollars are being spent by Americans for cars, boats, sports equipment, and the paraphernalia of leisure, there is a growing hunger for improvement of the mind and for esthetic enjoyment.

Thousands of people (mainly adults) are enrolled in break-of-day television classes.

There are today 42 major American symphony orchestras against 32 in 1956. If we count colleges and small communities, we have an astonishing total of more than 1,100. And 275 of these were organized in the past 6 years.

The sale of serious musical records is increasing as rapidly as the sale of all other records.

Despite the competition from television, radio, and other media, Americans are buying about a billion dollars' worth of books a year, including paperbacks. Sure, a percentage is junk, but there are enough millions of good books sold to signify a healthy hunger for serious reading. The fact is that in the past decade retail dollar sales of books have more than doubled.

Today, American writing, music, painting, sculpture, and architecture influence the rest of the world. To quote the venerable London Times: "The American imagination has become the most powerful stream of Western thought and culture."

Let's now look at another side of advertising's place in the life of America.

What will be the effect on people's attitudes toward advertising as a result of all the hubbub that started with the television quiz fuss?

Despite all this fussing and fuming, let's remember that out of thousands of products and services being advertised, the FTC has found only a handful of cases to prosecute. Even some of those charges are fuzzy.

Actually, you cannot separate advertising from business as a whole. And business is basically honest. We in advertising are in a continuing war against scoundrels. But as in life, the miscreants always get the headlines. However, in the long run it's the people who decide what kind of advertising they will believe and respond to.

Advertising has never been able to sell an inferior product for a prolonged time. We give the consumer too little credit for the ability to detect fraud, deception, and trickery. But the mass American soon gets wise to chicanery.

The manufacturer of good products, promoted by advertising in good taste, will dominate the advertising scene long after the opportunist has withdrawn his shadily advertised product or has closed up shop completely.

This does not mean that we in advertising must give up our vigilance. But it does mean that all advertising must not be tarred with the same brush as the malefactors.

You often hear critics of advertising indict it for creating dissatisfaction in people's minds with what they have, and persuading and cajoling them into buying what they neither need nor want.

Let's consider this a moment.

Let's admit that a large portion of the products we buy are not to fill actual needs. But what are needs? The needs of people in undeveloped countries are not the same as our needs. Our needs of 50 years ago are not the same as they are today. We don't actually need television sets, electric razors, electric refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, shampoos, beauty treatments, packaged goods, or even automobiles.

For millions of people in other lands the automobile is an unattainable dream. Here the automobile is a necessity for millions. Sure, women can get along without nice clothes or sheer hose. But if these nonessentials give them a lift, why shouldn't they enjoy them?

We recognize that some people may be stimulated by advertising to live beyond their means. But that's not a fault of advertising. There have always been people who lived beyond their means and we'd have such people even if there were no advertising.

Do advertising's critics want to lower our entire standard of living just to discourage the few who are improvident? Would they curb the freedom of millions of people to enjoy new things, new conveniences, new labor-savers, new morale builders, just because there are some who are stimulated to spend more than they can afford?

Would they have advertising stop encouraging people to want a better life? Would they have the millions of people who create, produce, and market the so-called nonessentials thrown out of jobs? Do they want us to go back to the more primitive living of other countries? Do the American people want this?

Attackers of advertising on this score are actually attacking our entire American system. Some do this because they can make a few dollars on "sensational" books or services full of half-truths and evasions. Others because they prefer another system which would regiment people's wants and reduce us to a level dictated by the Government. I'm sure, it's obvious that if advertising, the spark of American business, were eliminated, it would kick the underpinnings from the marvelous structure American genius has built.

Without a healthy discontent there can be no progress.

Before I conclude there are two points I should like to touch on.

First. American advertisers have in their possession a powerful force in advertising. How does it use this force for public service?

We have created a highly efficient and effective instrument for this purpose in the advertising council, a nonprofit organization

supported by American business and advertising media.

Formed in 1942 to put the power of advertising to work for the Government, it engineered many drives on the homefront during World War II. War bonds, victory gardens, salvage of fats, tin and paper, women for war plants, and many, many others. While in other nations, governments usually had to force the public to efforts needed for victory by law, in the United States the advertising council helped inform and persuade the public to act voluntarily.

Since the war, the advertising council has been working on peacetime problems at the request of the Government, private public service organizations, and on its own initiative.

Each campaign is in the hands of a team composed of a volunteer advertising agency, a volunteer coordinator from the staff of an advertiser, and an account executive from the council staff. A complete advertising, merchandising, and promotion program is prepared for national media, local media, retail stores and other outlets which can logically contribute to the success of the program. The agencies prepare these campaigns without charge.

The advertising space donated by media to advertising council campaigns in 1959 alone is valued at about $182 million, to say nothing of the contributions of time and talent made by agencies and advertisers.

Here's what President Eisenhower said to the advertising council in Washington a few months ago.

"For 18 years you have been stimulating the Nation's conscience in areas where the voluntary work of great numbers of people has been necessary in order to promote worthwhile causes. I know you have been in such fields as conservation, organized charities, safety, prevention of accidents, and more recently in giving your efforts to the job of pointing out to our people the need for self-discipline if we are to avoid debasement of our currency and prevent inflation.

* * * * *

"And I think no other body has done more in this regard in trying to inform America across the board of these things than has the advertising council."

The second point.

We don't discuss sufficiently the positive contribution of advertising to our civilization. We should never miss an opportunity to talk about advertising's constructive side. Heaven knows we hear enough of the destructive.

And now I want to leave with you one final thought.

"What would happen if advertising were suddenly stopped?"

It would be like an atomic explosion.

Stores would begin canceling orders and reducing their staffs. This would be followed by manufacturers closing down plants and laying off millions. Volume production would be virtually impossible. Hence, prices would rise fast. Within a week most radio and television stations would close up shop for lack of revenue.

The same story would go for newspapers and magazines. Many would expire immediately. Some would continue as thin, anemic sheets. The cost per copy would zoom for those which would try to keep running only from circulation revenues.

I hope that you have found in my remarks some food for thought about advertising—which powers our American system of free enterprise to ever higher levels of good living, and that when you hear the mouthings of the uninformed or the ill intentioned, you will point proudly and truthfully to the contribution advertising has made and will continue to make to our American good life.

In God We Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the presentation of a plaque bearing our national motto, "In God We Trust," to the Washington Post Office on February 3, 1960. Since that time, similar plaques have been placed in the post offices in Dallas and Fort Worth as part of a national drive to establish such plaques in every post office in the country.

The leader of this drive, Miss Ora O'Riley, is a resident of Durant, Okla., in the congressional district which I represent. In recognition of her tireless efforts in this project, I wish to insert in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, excerpts from the dedicatory addresses made on these two occasions and a newspaper article which appeared in the Fort Worth Press:

THE LIVING GOD AND AMERICAN DESTINY

(An address by Rev. John J. Mueller, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Durant, Okla.)

Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury in 1861 received in that year a letter from the Reverend Mr. W. R. Watkinson, pastor of a small church near Philadelphia. It read:

"You are about to submit your annual report to Congress respecting national finances. One fact has been overlooked. * * * I mean recognition of the Almighty God in some form upon our coins. * * * What if our Republic were now shattered * * * would not antiquaries centuries hence reason from our past that we were a heathen nation?"

Shortly after receiving this communication, Secretary Chase wrote as follows to James Pollock, Director of the Philadelphia Mint: "No nation can be strong except in the strength of God or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins." Pollock made two suggestions for a slogan: "Our Country, Our God," and "God, Our Trust." The latter was revised by Chase.

The great motto does not imply that we have an established religion or state church, which would be a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. It signifies our belief in the one true and living God, in whom we as a people put our trust and with whom we link our destiny as a nation.

We rejoice that another American, Miss Ora O'Riley of Durant, Okla., is leading a national movement for the installation of plaques bearing the noble words of our motto upon the walls of Government buildings.

* * * * *

It is necessary that we go beyond the mere words of our national motto and seek the reality to which they point. This motto, "In God We Trust," implies the existence of other and lesser loyalties upon which we, to our peril, might possibly place our supreme confidence. It strongly implies, also, that it has been our experience in times of peace and war, in times of prosperity and depression, in periods of halcyon calm and in periods of stress that the Lord of history has justified the trust we have placed in Him. It also implies our belief that if our country does have a special mission to the world, it is from God and that, as we move forward, we had better look to Him as the guide and inspiration of our journey.

To see the wisdom of trusting in God, all we have to do is to look at some of the nations of earth who trusted in lesser powers. Egypt put her confidence in her architectural achievements. Greece trusted in her art and in her intellectual prowess. Rome put her ultimate faith in law and the sword.

* * * * *

With this consciousness of her great mission, America saw anew the place of God in her glorious history and her need for divine wisdom. But let this Nation beware the temptation to become so engrossed in her task or so enamored of her own might as to forget the Rock whence she was hewn, or the guide of her youth, or the counsellor of her maturity. With her great sense of mission before her, let her say again, "In God we trust."

It is in that spirit we dedicate today this plaque as a reminder, as an inescapable challenge in this present fateful hour.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY VERY REV. MSGR. VINCENT J. WOLF, FORT WORTH, TEX.

In our early days, when the constitutional convocation was in session, Benjamin Franklin wrote the President and told him that he had lived a long time, and the longer he lived the more convincing proof he saw the truth that God governs in the affairs of men. "If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice," he said, "is it not proof that an empire cannot arise without His aid? We have been assured of our sacred rights that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it." These words give us an insight concerning the character of our Founding Fathers. They were ideal statesmen and they gave birth to an immortal document, initially consecrated to God, proclaiming the inherent sacredness of the individual.

In the very beginning of our Nation's history the world outside and around was edified and inspired when they looked upon the United States. In fact, in 1861 the following was spoken:

"It was impossible for De Tocqueville to touch the soil of America," Lacordaire said, "without being astonished by this New World, so different from that where he was born. Everywhere else in the Old World where he visited, whether in England, Russia, China, or Japan, he came face to face with a situation he knew already—that of peoples governed by rulers. For the first time he saw a flourishing nation, peaceful, industrious, rich, powerful, respected abroad, spreading day by day into vast solitudes the tranquil stream of its population, and nevertheless having no master but itself, submitting to no distinction of birth, electing its own magistrates of every degree of the civil and political hierarchy, free as the Indians who preceded them, as civilized as the best peoples of Europe, religious without giving to any sect exclusive or preponderating rights, and presenting to an admiring world the living drama of the most absolute liberty in an equality the most entire."

Yes, unless God guards the Nation, we shall perish. Unless we recognize the sovereignty of God, we shall be powerless. Unless we make our declaration of dependence upon God, our Declaration of Independence among men will fail. Unless we conform to the will of God, we will lose our purpose. Unless we follow God's truth, we shall wander the face of the earth in error. Unless we seek liberty in God, we shall become the slaves of men. Unless we live according to our God-given rights, we shall be as living sepulchers. Unless we seek justice in fulfilling our duties—as well as exercising our rights—we shall be prisoners on earth. Unless we pursue happiness according to the

dictates of our conscience, we shall be a remorseful people.

Civilization is an endless pact of the living with the dead. Our fathers of old have lived and died for the principles that each person is made to the image and likeness of God. They were noble, God-fearing, and worthy of the name of an "American." We, who are in the land of the living, in this Nation under God, pledge our allegiance and our honor and all things we hold precious that we will do everything that we might deserve the continued good pleasure of the God of our fathers.

[From the Fort Worth Press, June 15, 1960]

"IN GOD WE TRUST" PLAQUE IN POST OFFICE—AND BLIND MAN READS THE WORDS

(By Seth Kantor)

The men came all dressed up into the east end of the main post office. They said their prayers. They made stirring speeches.

Then they went away, after dedicating a bronze plaque yesterday, with the words "'In God We Trust" on it.

That's when E. A. Giddens went to read the words on the plaque. His fingers touched them lightly. It's his way of reading. Mr. Giddens, 54, is blind.

He will work closer to the shiny new plaque than anyone else in Fort Worth. Yet he's the ony man in the post office, where 1,200 names are on the payroll, who won't be able to see the words.

Mr. Giddens of 4105 Sandage operates the newsstand in the post office. He's been there 11 years. From his stand he will stare at the wall with the plaque on it perhaps for many years to come.

Although the blind man was ignored as the dedication ceremonies happened directly in front of his stand, it was a time for Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant leaders to gather, to unveil the words for all the rest to see.

A tireless Catholic church worker in Durant, Okla., Miss Ora O'Riley, thought of the idea to put "In God We Trust," the motto on every penny, on the walls of every post office in the Nation.

Members of the Knights of Columbus in Ohio are producing the plaques. Business and professional men in Durant, and leaders of every church there, are backing the idea.

Plaques so far have ben placed in Washington, D.C., Durant, Dallas, and Fort Worth central post offices. Oklahoma City and Tulsa plaques go up tomorrow.

Miss O'Riley previously led Durant businessmen in a nationwide move to install hundreds of copies of a painting of Christ's head in offices throughout the Nation.

The painting was made by a well-known Chicago artist, Warner Sallman, a Methodist, whose son, Richard Sallman of 856 N. Bailey, resident here since 1947, attended dedication ceremonies of the post office plaque.

The blind man in the corner bowed his head as he heard Rabbi Isadore Garsel's invocation:

"May this land under Thy providence • • • fulfill the vision of Thine inspired seers." And the blind man could see, even as the rest, with their heads bowed.

Saline Water Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present two recent valuable articles and ask consent to reprint them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They deal with the fundamental subject of water—and as they warn of the exhaustion of our national water resources they also point to the hope for a solution to this problem which mankind's troubled eyes have not yet seen.

I ask that they be included in the RECORD both as a challenge to present attention and as a convenient source for study when the increasing crisis makes it impossible to delay consideration.

These articles, one being the column entitled "Topics," from the editorial page of the New York Times, the other a signed syndicated column by George E. Sokolsky.

This is a tremendous problem. It is a national problem. The Office of Saline Water is doing an excellent job but its program must be expanded. We all must work together to aid our American industries in joining with the government for this all-important Government-industry program to convert sea water into fresh water. Here is a hope to which generations of men and women will turn, both through their public and elected servants, such as the Congress, and also through private enterprise. We cannot neglect it. I know that you will find these articles to be both essential information and a real inspiration.

[From the New York Times, June 9, 1960]

TOPICS

FRESH WATER FROM SEA WATER

The news that two companies jointly have developed a new process for producing fresh water out of sea water gives us the latest hope of fulfilling one of mankind's oldest dreams. For ever since man first became conscious, he has been a slave to water, and water too often has proved to be a perverse master, giving us too much water when we don't need it, too little when we do. Early in history man learned of the water paradox of his earth: a planet surrounded by water, yet offering man barely enough of the kind needed to sustain his life. The cry of Coleridge's Ancient Mariner—"Water, water, everywhere, nor any drop to drink"—echoes throughout the centuries. And man's growth can be written in terms of his efforts to come to terms with these waters of his earth.

MAN'S WATER PROBLEMS

As man has multiplied, he has found new sources of water and new ways to harness old sources, but never has he been able to develop a surplus. On the contrary, sometimes it seems as if his water problems with the passing years become increasingly acute. So low did the water level in our town's reservoirs dip only a few years ago, for example, that we had to cut down the number of our baths and the number of shaves of our adult males. Homeowners have been directed on occasion to defer the watering of their lawns by municipal fathers casting anxious glances at the rainless heavens. An adequate supply of clean water has long been a key factor in determining the location of industry. No one has been made more aware of the preciousness of water than the farmers, who in good times have known the necessity to haul it by truck from the cities, and in bad times they have known the calamity of erosion and the unbridled fury of the floods. Possibly worst of all, we have felt the heartbreak of finding clear water made impure by the intrusion of salt water.

TRIAL AND ERROR

But man has never given up the battle, and throughout his struggle for water nothing has intrigued him more than the effort to tame the destructive saline waters of the sea and to extract good, clean water from them. As long ago as the 14th century, when the Arabs laid the foundations of chemistry, the process of distillation was tried. And while this process always works, given a vessel that will contain the liquid and some means of condensing the steam that is driven off, the energy consumed has always been tantalizingly excessive. Other processes have been developed. Chemical action was used in Navy survival kits during the war. The kits contained silver salts that would react when shaken in sea water to take the salt out of it, leaving the silver in a form that would oxidize and then precipitate—again a process too costly to be useful commercially. More recently, with improved knowledge of the way solids in solution become ions of their components, it has become possible to create fresh water from salt by ionization, but this method has not yet been used commercially with sea water.

A NEW PROCESS

Ever since the ammonia refrigeration method of making artificial ice was patented in the 1840's, the possibility has arisen of freezing sea water and thus expelling all impurities, including the salts. Frozen sea water is a mixture of pure water crystals and tiny salt crystals, the salt crystals occluded on the surface of the ice crystals. Up to this point the practical defect has been that every method devised to get the salt crystals off the ice crystals served to melt the ice crystals. The claim of the new process, developed by engineers of Struthers Wells Co. and Scientific Design Co., is that they have succeeded in centrifuging the salt off the ice, leaving ice crystals after the separation. It is too soon, of course, to know if we have finally hit on the elixir that can give us fresh water from salt, to end our water shortage and create, in Adlai Stevenson's phrase, "a new patrimony for the human race," but the stakes are so high that it's certainly worth giving any new process a whirl.

[From the Journal American, May 28, 1960]

A WATER SHORTAGE POSSIBLE IN 15 YEARS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the most serious political and social problems of universal concern is water. In this country, we generally assume that two things remain free for all to use—air and water. It is not always true about water and never in cities where the people are taxed for it. In some parts of the world, water is so scarce that it has to be used sparingly and treaties are made concerning it.

Marco Polo (1254–1324) wrote a description of his travels from Italy to Peking and back. He describes many rich areas, with gardens and farmlands. Some of the areas are now deserts and they are deserts because the water upon which their richness depended has disappeared.

The question as to whether the water table of the United States is falling is not subject to opinion; it is a matter for study and the production of accurate statistical data. On August 12, 1958, the House Committee on Government Operations recommended:

"The Office of Saline Water must substantially increase its efforts in advancing both basic research and pilot plant work in the saline water conversion program. Such effort would be facilitated by amendment of the Saline Water Act to eliminate the financial authorization restrictions now present in that act and by appropriation of sufficient additional sums to enable such work

to proceed promptly and without deferment."

Nothing has been done about this recommendation but the need for such research is great. It is estimated that the available fresh water supply in the United States amounts to about 515 billion gallons a day and that we are now using about 312 billion gallons a day. The water supply is not evenly divided over the United States and in some areas there is a definite shortage. If the population and the industrial development of the United States continue to increase, there ought to be a very serious water shortage in the country in 1975 which is only 15 years away. The time to consider this is now.

In 1957, the United States suffered from a water shortage which struck 47 States. More than 1,000 cities and towns in 1957 had to restrict the use of water.

The simplest solution to this problem is the adaptation of salt water to current needs. The cost is still very high but the quantity is unlimited. Considerable research is required to bring the cost of desalted water down to a reasonable price. Several plants already exist to distill water and the results are very satisfactory.

The alternative to the conversion of salt water is to limit use, which would be unsatisfactory. The United States is surrounded by water—the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, the Gulf of Mexico—water everywhere. It ought to be possible to develop a salt water distillation for usable water, to be carried in pipelines across the country, so that there would be a shortage nowhere. This is a feasible plan only if it is developed slowly and correctly and does not have to become a crash program where an actual drought is in existence.

The Secretary of the Interior has been put in charge of this program by an act of Congress passed in 1952, with a considerable budget for research and experimental plant operation. All this work is to the good because when it is possible to convert salt water into usable water, the United States will have all the water that is required for individual use, farm and industrial use at a reasonable cost. This is the objective and it does not need to be justified by fulsome attention to what other nations that lack water will say about us. It will be sufficient that we sensed a crisis, met it by careful research and experimentation and averted calamity.

I have lived among people who have inadequate water supply. I have seen their soil blown away by cyclonic winds. I have seen women carrying water on their shoulders because water is one of the most precious ingredients of life.

We need not ever face such a condition if we devote ourselves to converting the apparently unlimited supply of salt water to sweet water, usable for all purposes. It can be done and thus far, the experiments have been bringing the cost down. It could be that the mineral products taken out of the water would, in the long run, return great wealth.

We have all heard the line in the old Indian treaties which bound men to agreements "as long as grass grows and water flows," but experience impresses upon us that this does not mean forever. Rivers have dried up and grass has withered. Furthermore, such calamities can be made to happen by the hand of man as well as by nature. As a single example today, let me remind you that the American naval base at Guantanamo is much less in danger from hostile missiles or other military attack from near or far than it is from the cutting off of its water supply. This Dr. Castro, in his hate campaign, could easily accomplish. But modern applied science can end this sort of menace, simply by enabling Guantanamo to take its own potable water from the sea. Modern science as announced in these articles which I again recommend to every member of the House now offers emancipation from this form of fear and want.

Setbacks in Foreign Relations Due Largely to Certain Erroneous Assumptions in American Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RECENT SETBACKS SHOW NEED FOR REFLECTION

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Nobody, I think, should deny that the United States has suffered two severe defeats: at the summit that didn't happen, and in Japan. During the election campaign, Americans being what we are, it seems inevitable that these defeats will be made a political issue.

Yet it would be a pity if the process of electing a new President should obscure the real problem revealed by these defeats. Yet so far, it seems to me, nobody in high position or of high influence seems ready to ask the basic question: were these defeats just "incidental" to the cold war with its inevitable ups and downs, or were they the natural result of certain mistaken assumptions common to assorted leaders of both parties?

The President, according to Henry Gimmell in the Wall Street Journal, has no present intention of changing the policy he has folowed over the past years. His "dominant objective" is to "buy time during which the Soviet empire is neither permitted to expand nor pressed to contract during which it will evolve into a less virulent, less aggressive society."

This policy finds many champions in both parties at home and has the support of some major allies, notably Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain. But is it working?

Certainly, a neutral Japan, following the emergence of Castro's Cuba as a virulently anti-American, pro-Communist state, would demonstrate conclusively that it is not.

Where does the fault lie? James Reston of the New York Times attributes it to faulty U.S. "diplomacy." The President, he quotes Harrison Salisbury as writing, regards the Japanese crisis as "caused by circumstances over which he has no control." Mr. Reston attributes this to a presidential habit of "self-deception." But in my opinion, Mr. Reston does not go deep enough.

The fault, I feel sure, lies in certain wrong assumptions concerning the nature and purpose of the Communist world and, in consequence, of the means necessary to frustrate that purpose.

Here is a partial list of what seem to me to be current errors.

1. Since the U.S.S.R. and Red China will not risk a major war so long as the United States has the necessary minimum of deterrent power, no more military power is needed by the free world.

A mistake. With major war ruled out, the next strongest weapon in the cold war is prestige. Prestige remains to an overwhelming degree a matter of military power—and the readiness to use it. By crushing the Hungarian revolt, the U.S.S.R. lost popularity but gained greatly in prestige. The free world cannot afford to remain inferior to the Communist bloc in any major weapon.

2. In the absence of a world authority, a major nation like the United States can properly renounce the use of armed force under all circumstances, except direct attack, even though the adversary remains ready to use force. (This obligation lies in the U.N. Charter and was personally repeated by Eisenhower to Khrushchev at the first summit meeting in Geneva.)

Second error. Such a position lays the free world open to continuing losses of peoples, territory and resources by subversion. It relieves the adversary of the fear of just reprisals for almost any outrage short of major armed attack. It promotes pacifism in a country like Japan whose armed—repeat, armed—assistance is necessary to the peaceful defense of Asia.

3. National tensions are caused by threats, aggressive speeches and military preparations, hence can be lessened by soft words, absence of saber rattling, summit and cultural contacts and constant negotiations on subjects chosen by the adversary.

Simply untrue. The cause of 90 percent of the existing "international tension" is the Communist purpose of establishing a Communist world state. It can be lessened (abolished) only when communism achieves its aim (our submission) or when it is compelled by opposing power or natural evolution to renounce this ambition.

Until then the free world must live with "international tension" and use it to its own advantage. The U.S.S.R. and Red China are vulnerable short of war on a dozen fronts—provided we attack them.

4. Given a little time, Communist Russia and Communist China will increase their national rivalry to the point of political opposition, when both will become vulnerable to Western diplomacy.

No real evidence for this view. Even if the two Communist giants are not acting in well-timed concert (as I believe), their common belief in the inevitability of a Communist world state will prevent their pushing any personal rivalry to the point of rift. The free world should accept the unpleasant fact of their continuing partnership and count not upon time or act of God, but upon its own strength, resolution, and wisdom.

5. Although the existence of a Communist bloc of a billion subjects, including half of all Asia, is an undoubted fact, the free countries can successfully oppose Communist ambitions by a loose system of alliances, shunning any radical steps toward greater unity. For sooner or later the Communist bloc will revert to the normal system of rival sovereign states acting through the United Nations to preserve peace and harmony.

Presumably the greatest of all our mistaken assumptions. Every day it becomes clearer that a hastily assembled and disunited "all-star" team cannot hope to beat a beautifully coordinated football machine from Notre Dame or Michigan State. To oppose the Communist bloc successfully, the free world will have to match it in strength, determination, unity, and common purpose.

At least as I see it. Here then, in my judgment, are a few of the basic reasons for the recent setbacks. Nor do I see an end to such defeats until our leaders rethink the situation and recast their policy to meet it.

Questionnaire Results, First District, Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the response to our questionnaire exceeded the amount I expected. While these figures are in direct answer to the questions, the written comments on many of the questionnaires proved to me that my constituents had been giving considerable thought to legislation and to international affairs. I believe that it is gratifying to know that there are many Americans interested in the very vital issues of the day. It is impossible to reproduce here, all the written suggestions and comments; however, the figures represent, I believe, a fairly accurate cross section of the opinions, currently in my district.

The results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, FIRST DISTRICT, MASSACHUSETTS

1. Do you favor using Federal funds for:
A. School construction? Yes, 1,376—61.9 percent; no, 724—32.6 percent; uncertain 121—5.5 percent.
B. Teachers' salaries? Yes, 474—21.3 percent; no, 1546—69.6 percent; uncertain, 201—9.1 percent.

2. Do you think the Federal Government should take action to control drug prices? Yes, 1364—61.4 percent; no, 700—31.5 percent; uncertain, 157—7.1 percent.

3. Do you favor a fair trade bill which would allow manufacturers to set minimum prices at which brand-name merchandise can be sold? Yes, 742—33.4 percent; no, 1275—57.4 percent; uncertain, 204—9.2 percent.

4. Do you favor raising the minimum wage from the present $1 to $1.25 and extending the coverage of present law? Yes, 1272—57.3 percent; no, 750—33.8 percent; uncertain 199—8.9 percent.

5. Do you favor continuing our mutual security (foreign aid) program as:
A. Economic aid to friendly nations? Yes, 1,638—73.8 percent; no, 356—16.1 percent; uncertain 225—10.1 percent.
B. Military aid to friendly nations? Yes, 1,376—61.9 percent; no, 497—22.4 percent; uncertain, 348—15.7 percent.

6. Would you favor increased aid to underdeveloped nations? Yes, 1,361—61.3 percent; no, 524—23.6 percent; uncertain, 336—15.1 percent.

7. Would you favor a proposal to assist, economically, former independent nations now behind the Iron Curtain, such as Poland and Hungary? Yes, 821—37 percent; no, 1,032—46.5 percent; uncertain, 368—16.5 percent.

8. Would you favor depressed-area legislation which would include Federal loans and direct grants to rural areas for industrial development? Yes, 843—38 percent; no, 1,107—49.8 percent; uncertain, 271—12.2 percent.

9. If not, would you favor a bill which calls for local participation and Federal loans for areas interested in industrial redevelopment, but not direct grants? Yes, 1,267—57.1 percent; no, 230—10.3 percent; uncertainty, 724—32.6 percent.

10. Do you favor free medical care after retirement through increased social security payments? Yes, 1,110—50 percent; no, 941—42.4 percent; uncertainty, 170—7.6 percent.

11. Do you favor a balanced budget even if it means holding down on some new or expanded social welfare program? Yes, 1,491—67.1 percent; no, 480—21.6 percent; uncertainty, 250—11.3 percent.

12. Do you favor the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee which investigates communism in this country and is sometimes charged with overriding individuals' constitutional rights? Yes, 1,543—69.5 percent; no, 441—19.8 percent; uncertainty, 237—10.7 percent.

13. Do you believe the Federal Government should have more authority to regulate radio and TV programs? Yes, 807—36.3 percent; no, 1,177—53 percent; uncertainty, 237—10.7 percent.

14. Do you consider our $45 billion defense budget adequate? Yes, 964—43.4 percent; no, 476—21.4 percent; uncertainty, 781—35.2 percent.

15. Do you believe sufficient emphasis is placed on our missile and space programs? Yes, 951—42.6 percent; no, 821—37 percent; uncertainly, 449—20.2 percent.

Total replies, 2,221.

Fifty Dollar Fare to Europe via Construction of Two Transatlantic Superliners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by H. B. Cantor, president of the Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines, Inc., to the Association of Water Transportation Accounting Officers at Delmonico's Restaurant, New York City, on June 22, 1960, on the subject of "$50 Fare to Europe via Construction of Two Transatlantic Superliners."

In my remarks I also include a news item that appeared in the New York Times issue of June 23, 1960:

SPEECH BY H. B. CANTOR TO ASSOCIATION OF WATER TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTING OFFICERS

Mr. Graziano, Mr. Heidicker, honored guests, and gentlemen, I was extremely gratified to receive your very kind invitation to take lunch with you and to discuss my project of building two superliners to provide transatlantic crossings for a $50 fare.

I think it particularly appropriate that I talk to you about my plans since we share a common interest: You are accountants concerned with the shipping industry. I am a businessman determined to build my two liners, thereby contributing to shipping and related interests.

There has long been a definite need for low-cost ocean travel. Airlines, railroads, and buslines have done their share in achieving inexpensive travel. Considering that water is recognized as the least expensive means of all transportation, why is it that no form of ocean travel exists to match the land and air rates? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that the steamship lines are so steeped in tradition that they have failed to keep abreast of modern times. For example, buslines offer a cross-country fare of $69; airlines charge as little as $80 for flights to the west coast. I find it appalling that the least expensive rate aboard any ship sailing to Europe is $185.

My project will soon become an accomplished fact. I have signed contracts with Dr. William Scholz, president of the Deutsche Werft Shipyards of Hamburg, West Germany. Final plans are nearing completion and after their OK we anticipate that the laying of the keels will begin in a few months. Our contracts call for delivery of the first ship in 36 months. The second ship is scheduled for completion 12 to 18 months later.

As for physical details of the vessels, each will be 90,000 tons, 1,152 feet long and will be capable of carrying 6,000 passengers plus a crew of 1,350. With 260,000 horsepower, each will have a cruising speed of 34 knots, enabling a 4-day crossing between New York and Zeebrugge, Belgium, the first of two north European ports. The ships will be constructed with 20 airtight compartments, a safety feature designed to make them unsinkable. Designer of the ships is Vladimir Yourkevitch, one of the world's foremost naval architects and the gentleman who designed the famed *Normandie*.

Each liner will have a beam of 132 feet and a draft of 34 feet. The top deck will be a flatop with a clear space of 450 by 80 feet, to the rear of the smokestack. This area will be used as a sports deck for outdoor activities and a swimming pool. Below this will be a double-decked, glass-enclosed area, to be utilized as a huge convention hall for business organizations, fraternal societies and religious and other groups interested in holding shipboard conventions. The convention hall will have a seating capacity of 4,000 persons. Rollaway doors will make it divisible into meeting rooms for smaller groups.

As for accommodations and facilities, there will be a one-class service, with a large kitchen servicing a 1,500-seat cafeteria and a 1,200-seat formal dining room. In addition there will be self-service canteens, bars and cocktail lounges, snack bars and automatic food dispensers. Passenger cabins will be laid out in two- and four-berth arrangements. All staterooms will have private bath, television and will be air conditioned. There will be skating rinks, theaters, concert halls, chapels for religious services, a Free Port shopping center where merchandise from both sides of the Atlantic may be purchased at low prices and duty free and other conveniences and all forms of resort hotel recreation.

You may well question the economic feasibility of operating the ships on such a low-fare basis. Permit me to quote some interesting statistics, which I learned after having made an exhaustive survey of the operations of luxury liners.

Present-day luxury passenger liners have a four-class service system: deluxe, first class, second class, and tourist. This arrangement necessitates four kitchens, four dining rooms, four public spaces of all kinds, four swimming pools, four sets of fire stairs, etc. This quadruplication extends to the ship's personnel, thus requiring four head pursers, four head stewards, four chefs, etc. The result is a tremendous waste of manpower and an enormous amount of nonproductive space.

The *Queen Elizabeth* carries 2,200 passengers and a crew of 1,535. The *Queen Mary* accommodates 1,800 and has a crew of 1,300. The *United States* has 1,700 passengers and a crew of 1,063. In comparison, my ships will have 6,000 passengers and a crew of 1,350. In other words, the present-day liners operate on the passenger-to-crew ratio of 1¼ to 1, whereas the ratio aboard my ships will be 4½ to 1.

I have spent most of my adult life in the hotel industry and I have always been very conscious of costs and operations. If I were

to apply the methods of the luxury liners to my hotels, I shudder to think of the results. For example, my Hotel Dixie in New York has accommodations for 1,400 guests. If I were to operate the hotel on a 4-class basis the first 12 floors would be occupied with public spaces and the bed capacity would be reduced to perhaps 400.

Let me emphasize that the superliners will be operated as floating commercial hotels, eliminating the frills and luxury items, yet providing every facility for oceangoing comfort. In the application of hotel operational procedures to the ships, bear in mind that a major source of incomes in the hotel industry stems from the booking of persons attending conventions of all types. In this connection, I envision a tremendous scheduling of conventions aboard my ships. Groups sailing on the liners can hold meetings during the mornings and afternoons, leaving the evening hours for relaxation and enjoyment of the many entertainment facilities.

I mentioned previously that the interest of everyone here lies in the future of the shipping industry. You may be aware of the desperate straits in which the industry finds itself today. A recent article in the New York Times sounded an ominous note in reporting the sad fact that the U.S. Government is disposing of its shipyards due to lack of business. Our Nation today ranks eighth in the volume of new ship construction. Furthermore, February marked the fifth consecutive month in which no new shipbuilding contracts were signed.

We are all vitally concerned with this situation. I'm sure you will agree that something must be done.

I have given considerable thought to this picture of one of our country's major industries nearing a state of collapse. I would like to offer a suggestion which might well be a solution to the problem.

I would propose that the Government treat the shipbuilding industry as it has treated housing. I refer to Title I: Apartment House and Building Construction. In other words, the Government should devise an arrangement whereby it would accept a 10 percent cash payment from a responsible operator and then permit a 90 percent guarantee of loan at a 2½ percent rate payable in 30 years. I would suggest this rather than a subsidy. Payment would be made on a constant, self-liquidating basis. Thus, the total carrying cost of the 2½ percent interest, plus the 2 percent constant payment amortization—a total of 4½ percent—would be the same as the Government's offer of a 50 percent subsidy with full interest and full amortization. In this manner the Government would lose nothing and the operator would be given the opportunity of amortizing from income. In line with this, I noted recently that the Italian Government now provides a similar favorable arrangement, that of 2½ percent interest, to encourage new ship construction.

Although I have contracted to build my liners in West Germany and plans call for their sailing under the German flag with German crew, I still regret that I was unable to make the project an American one. However, I am ready and more than anxious to build two additional superliners here in my own country if the U.S. Government will assure me of the cooperation I need and indicate a recognition of the intense need for low-cost ocean travel.

My office has been deluged with requests from all over the world from prospective tourists and convention groups seeking to book passage. This tremendous, universal interest assures us that passage reservations can be filled easily year round for 5 years in advance.

I would like you to know that I have had Harris, Kerr, Forster & Co., most renowned hotel accounting and engineering firm, prepare a pro forma study and report. On 83 percent occupancy, which figure they project, they show an enormous available profit under American-flag operation. Also, the Nathan Habib Associates, eminent traffic consultants of Washington, D.C., have made extensive study of the passenger market, corroborating the same occupancy forecast. We have had other engineering studies and reports, all pointing to the enormous profitability.

Here's another point to consider: These ships could be immediately converted into troopships in case of emergency—and what troopships they'd be—each capable of carrying a complete, fully equipped combat division—under a converted flight deck that could carry and launch up to 150 jet interceptor aircraft; in other words, a troopship with its own air support.

FHA and title I financing make it possible to construct new apartment houses and other real estate. Under these acts the Government permits a responsible operator a 90 percent guarantee of loan for 30 years at a reasonable interest rate, which is exactly the type of financing I will accept, and build two additional ships in America, besides the two I will build in Germany. Why isn't this same type of financing available for shipbuilding? What good is all this housing without having the weapons—such as these ships—to defend them? Under this proposal I will require no operating or construction subsidy and will build two additional ships in my country and keep the employment here where we might soon badly need it.

Our Commerce Department estimates U.S. residents spent $2.4 billion for 1959 foreign travel. The American merchant marine provides annually a payroll of over $1 billion. American foreign trade employs over 4½ million people, generating wages of over $13 billion annually. Many of you make your living from the sea. With ship construction in America in the doldrums, a lack of ships might eventually strike a mortal blow to our economy: In fact, we are beginning to feel the effects right now.

Fifty-dollar fare to Europe for the little people of the world is the goal to which I have dedicated myself and I will leave no stone unturned to get it accomplished both in Germany and in America. Why can't we get it done in our own country?

Here is the greatest defense facility. It is convertible and useful and extremely important either in peacetime or wartime. We will require no operating nor construction subsidy. Why can't we get it done in America?

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1960]

PROMOTER SUGGESTS SHIPBUILDING LOANS

H. B. Cantor, hotel owner and proponent of transatlantic travel at $50 a trip, urged yesterday that the Federal Government adapt its housing construction loan program to the passenger shipbuilding industry.

In an address before the Association of Water Transportation Accounting Officers, Mr. Cantor foresaw as practicable, construction of 6,000-passenger ships with a down payment of 10 percent in cash and a 90 percent loan guaranteed by the Federal Government. This is similar to the loan-guarantee program under the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. Cantor said that in the absence of assistance from the Government for his ship construction plan, he had signed contracts with the Deutsche Werft Shipyards, Hamburg, West Germany. Final plans are nearing completion, he said, and after they have been approved he anticipates that the keels will be laid for the two ships within a few months. The contracts call for delivery of the first ship in 3 years, a second in about 4.

Mr. Cantor made no mention in his speech of the cost of the vessels. However, in earlier references to them he mentioned a figure of $75 million for each ship.

Each ship would have a crew of 1,350 men, and would be of 90,000 tons. They would be 1,152 feet long with a cruising speed of 34 knots on a 4-day crossing between New York and Zeebrugge, Belgium. Facilities would include a cafeteria to accommodate 1,500 persons and a 1,200-seat formal dining room.

Future Uncertain at Fore River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Boston Globe on Friday, June 24, 1960, entitled "Future Uncertain at Fore River," by Wilfrid Rodgers. This article is thought provoking because it points out the rivalry that is developing between the shipyards on the east coast and those on the west coast. The 6-percent differential granted to west coast shipyards on all bids gives to the west coast yards a distinct advantage in gaining Government contracts. This differential should be eliminated and all private yards should be compelled to bid on equal terms.

The technical skills available at the Fore River yard—the know-how are unmatched anywhere in the world. However, Fore River is being discriminated against because of the existence of this 6-percent differential in bidding.

The article follows:

FUTURE UNCERTAIN AT FORE RIVER

(By Wilfrid C. Rodgers)

NEW YORK, June 23.—What is the future of shipbuilding at Bethlehem Steel's Quincy shipyard now that the strike is over?

Barring an international crisis—not good. That is the word of company spokesmen. The uncertain future is the major reason why the company held out during the 5-month labor dispute.

Only through a realistic approach to wage increases could the firm stay competitive in an industry that each year is becoming more and more competitive, the spokesmen insist.

To begin with, Lloyd's Registry of Shipping—the industry's Bible—reports shipbuilding all over the world entering a slump.

No longer are the world's large shipyards glutted. The overflow of ship work has disappeared.

To add to the industry's woes, there has been a sudden decline in tanker usage. Some 400 modern tankers are tied up for lack of work. Others have been converted to carrying grain.

Not for many years have the U.S. shipyards been able to compete on price terms with foreign shipyards.

Perhaps even more important to the Quincy yard is that no longer does the east coast have a monopoly on the Nation's top skills and equipment for building large ships.

West coast shipyards in the past 15 years have put forth a challenge—and the Government, to a degree, is on the west coast shipyard's side.

On Government contracts the west coast is granted a 6 percent differential on all bids.

For the Quincy yard successfully to underbid a west coast competitor, its bid must be more than 6 percent lower.

POLITICS ENTER PICTURE

Politics also enter the picture.

In the past, New England congressional leaders have banded together to try to get contracts for New England yards.

Now west coast congressional leaders, with Representative SHELLEY, Democrat of California, spearheading the bloc, are beginning to make their weight felt.

Aim of the western group is not to get ships for any one yard or any one State, but to insist that shipyards in California, Oregon, and Washington are well taken care of via Government contracts.

Introduction of new methods, new machinery, and new skills have whittled away at what once was considered the forte of the east coast shipyard—highly skilled labor.

The Suez crisis gave U.S. shipbuilding a shot in the arm a few years ago. But lacking such a crisis, shipbuilders in this country today are eyeing the Government plan to replace the merchant marine fleet.

This is a $3 billion program. Aim is to replace 14 ships a year.

EXTENDS DEPRECIATION PERIOD

However, a few jaws dropped among shipbuilding executives a few months ago when President Eisenhower signed a bill permitting such merchant marine fleets to depreciate their ships over a 25-year period rather than 20.

Most shipbuilders see this as another cut in potential business.

Despite this bleak picture, the Quincy shipyard has a valuable asset—unmatched in the Nation.

It consists primarily of brains. Its official name—the central technical department.

Why is the CTD so important?

To begin with a modern ship may require as much as 700 miles of builders' blueprints.

Add to this such complicated and delicate engineering as atomic-powered ships require and CTD takes over.

PLAN SHIPS OF FUTURE

Already CTD is tackling problems that must be solved to float the ships, not of tomorrow, but of 10 years from now.

Its accumulation of brains is credited with making atomic-powered naval ships practical.

How much lead shielding does an atomic reactor need in a large ship?

Today CTD can give you an answer to such a question.

But only a short time ago, even the Navy that was to order such a ship didn't quite know the answer. The Navy went to CTD.

Out came the electronic computers. The brains went to work.

The Navy got its answer. Bethlehem and the Quincy shipyard got the Navy contract.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the third part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part consists of the questions and replies for the sections entitled "Castro and Cuba" and "Agriculture."

The tabulated results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

CASTRO AND CUBA

1. Do you approve of the present U.S. policy toward Cuba of waiting to allow Castro to further alienate Latin American public opinion before taking severe economic or military action against his regime? Yes, 2,772, no 4,131.

2. Do you favor an appeal to the United Nations dramatizing the executions and atrocities of the Castro dictatorship in violation of the Human Rights agreements? Yes, 2,707, no 803.

3. Do you favor an immediate nonnuclear war (of a magnitude of the Korean war) to depose Castro's regime regardless of possible political repercussions, on the theory that Cuba is now an agency of a foreign power in violation of the Monroe Doctrine? Yes 1,842, no 4,699.

AGRICULTURE

1. Do you favor a gradual reduction in price supports (including wheat)? Yes 6,064, no 558.

2. Do you favor an immediate abolishment of all farm price supports? Yes 3,324, no 3,381.

3. Do you favor increasing the soil bank to reduce agricultural surpluses? Yes 2,695, no 3,807.

4. Do you favor governmental aid to encourage cooperatives and other devices for inducing farmers to strengthen and pool their bargaining power for the sale of their products? Yes 3,972, no 2,720.

Red Chinese Give the Treatment to Another Western General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who dealt with the Chinese Communists almost daily for many months. He knows more about them from firsthand contact, not from VIP treatment. It is too bad if any credence should be given to the comments of General Montgomery on a situation about which he knows so little and so superficially.

The letter follows:

A. C. WEDEMEYER,
FRIENDS ADVICE,
Boyds, Md., June 21, 1960.

To the EDITOR:

Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery deservedly won the acclaim and gratitude of the British people and of the Allied nations for his outstanding achievements in World War II. I have been privileged to know the field marshal—not intimately, but sufficiently well to admire his intellectual integrity, exemplary leadership, and sound judgment in military tactics. However, his recent comments concerning Red China convince me that this fine old soldier should relax on his laurels within the soldiers' domain and avoid the pitfalls within the international arena.

I find it difficult to rationalize the fact that the loquacious field marshal is oblivious to the problems created by Communist China and their relation to the future status of the entire Far East, including Hong Kong-Kowloon. I am reminded of Katherine Mayo, who, after a brief visit to India many years ago, became a self-styled expert concerning the diverse problems in "Mother India." Similarly, Lord Montgomery made a 4-day visit to a country extending over 4 million square miles, within whose borders live more than half a billion people, where he was exposed to the archconspirators Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai—both sly and shameless, both particularly adept at distorting facts. He expressed the following provocative views concerning his visit:

"China is commonly supposed to be a nation of unhappy and depressed people, downtrodden and exploited by ruthless leaders and starved into submission, with fear abroad throughout the land. This may be true of the old China, but this is not true of the new China. Such ignorant comment about China does immense harm to the affairs of the Western World; too many people exploit falsehoods as truth and imaginaries as realities."

The field marshal continued: "I saw in Communist China everywhere a happy, laughing people—cheerful, friendly, and seemingly contented with their lot."

Obviously he is unaware of ample evidence concerning the massive famines in China of recent date and the official police action required to crush ruthlessly the dissident elements rioting for food. Nor has he heard the testimony of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macao, where over 300 are slipping across the borders daily to leave the land that Lord Montgomery describes so glowingly.

He expressed admiration for the Communist leaders Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. During World War II, I had occasional contacts with these two men, as I had with others of both the Nationalist and Communist Parties. Of course the Red leaders were charming and disarming with the British field marshal. But there is irrefutable proof, which is available throughout the free world and therefore to Montgomery, that they are crafty, rapacious individuals who operate completely within the discipline of the Communist movement.

The American labor organization AFL–CIO conducted a thorough research and analysis of conditions on mainland China. This revealed that approximately 14 million people have been killed by the Communist regime in the last decade; a congressional committee estimated that 20 million had been killed in the same period; and the free Chinese Government on Taiwan estimated that upward of 40 million have been murdered by the "benevolent" regime which so favorably impressed the British field marshal.

Naively Lord Montgomery accepted Mao Tse-tung's statement that there is widespread hatred of the United States throughout China and that this had its genesis at the time of the Marshall mission in 1945. Mao Tse-tung expressed Chinese resentment of U.S. interference in the affairs of the nation. If the British field marshal were knowledgeable concerning the facts, he would have, as a respected representative of the Western world, pointed out that the Americans were in China by invitation of responsible officials of the recognized government. Then he might have properly asked if the Chinese Communists had been likewise invited into Tibet, Indochina, Malaya, India, and Korea—all recent victims of naked Chinese Communist aggression.

Suggesting that the free world has nothing whatever to fear from Red China, the British field marshal stated, "China has far too much on her own plate to want to expand outwardly, either physically or ideologically." Viewed realistically, China must expand in some direction, for her arable land is much too limited to provide for an ever-in-

creasing population, already denied sufficient shelter, food, and sources of employment. Furthermore, every avowed Communist is pledged to spread the Marxist doctrine, by fair means or foul, and the Red Chinese are no exception.

Finally, our British friend suggested that Taiwan (Formosa) should be handed over to Red China. I wonder what his reaction would be to a suggestion, which I do not, of course, make seriously, that Hong Kong be handed over to Red China or that North Ireland be handed over to the Republic of Ireland?

To be subjected to Communist Chinese propaganda emanating from Peking, Moscow, and other Communist centers is a daily experience throughout the free world, but to have it dished up and articulated by a distinguished military leader of the West is indeed difficult to swallow.

Faithfully,

A. C. WEDEMEYER,
General, U.S. Army, Retired.

Perhaps Congressmen Should Be Required To Make Trips Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Temple Daily Telegram:

PERHAPS CONGRESSMEN SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO MAKE TRIPS ABROAD

Regardless of what politicians of either party would tell you about their own capabilities, there is not a man in the world capable of calling all the shots today.

World unrest is too widespread—changes take place too fast. It takes constant study and observation to even be acquainted with the world's troubles—not to mention the points where other troubles may be building.

How, then, does a body such as our Congress ever arrive at an intelligent decision on matters of global significance?

There are many ways, but in the main they rely on the advice of those accepted as authorities in the particular field.

How much better it would be if we had more Congressmen directly acquainted with world needs. And there is only one way to become better acquainted—go and see in person.

This raises up the much kicked and condemned term "junket." But handled properly, the world could come to appreciate junkets as inroads to understanding.

For instance, if Congressmen were required to spend 3 weeks of every year out of the country on guided and arranged tours of other countries, other governments and our foreign military installations, who could cast a stone by saying that this was wasted.

Wouldn't it be better to have a man's vote on foreign aid after he had been to see it in action? Would it not be better to have the lawmaker vote on military manpower levels after he had looked across the barbed wire at a Communist sentry?

Certainly it would.

Cost would be the cry of some. But remember that in many countries piles of foreign currency are building up in repayment of prior U.S. loans. These funds cannot be converted into U.S. dollars—they can only be spent within the country where they are accumulating.

There is no use arguing about the plans that allowed this situation to arise—the deed is done. These funds are presently available to pay expenses of U.S. Congressmen on their oversea travels within the affected countries. But they don't make a dent in it.

It seems logical that it should be used extensively for congressional enlightment.

And what about at home? The armed services and various bureaus of the Government sponsor tours to military installations, defense plants and space research centers all over the Nation for businessmen.

Why tell the businessman and expect him to tell the Congressman? Take the Congressman in the first place.

It's a problem that rests in the laps of our lawmakers themselves. They owe it to their own interests and the interests of the country to consider it seriously.

Their trips should be well-planned to see and learn as much as possible in a short time. The trips should be all business. Our freedom is at stake in every session of Congress that convenes—and the people deserve the best informed Representative that can be had.

The press corps of the Nation has been quick to complain about trips with congressional wives along—trips where unnecessary expenses were incurred.

These complaints are justified. They will continue as long as such mismanagement of public funds continues.

It seems doubtful that this week the public would hear complaints from the press corps if a plane bearing 15 or 20 Representatives and Senators had taken a week-long study mission through Alaska, the Philippines, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, and Korea within the last 6 months.

Perhaps their presence, their knowledge, or some word they could have passed along would have made the President's trip to the Far East this week one of triumph—or even not necessary—instead of one which has ended again in outright embarrassment for both Japan and the United States. The cancellation of Mr. Eisenhower's trip to Japan has been another victory for the Communists.

We should seriously consider sending our Congressmen on truly informative trips.

Dr. J. Fred Rippy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I made reference to the 1960 William Volker Distinguished Service Award to Dr. J. Fred Rippy. I have just received the press release of the William Volker Fund announcing this award and by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include it, as follows:

Dr. J. Fred Rippy, professor emeritus of history, the University of Chicago, has received the 1960 William Volker Distinguished Service Award of $15,000, it was announced today (June 19) by the William Volker Fund.

Dr. Rippy, whose retirement from the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1958 followed 41 years of teaching, research, and writing, was chosen for "distinguished service as a scholar and teacher."

The award is a tax-free grant presented annually by the William Volker Fund of Burlingame, Calif., an organization established in 1932 in memory of the late manufacturer, civic leader, and philanthropist. Previous recipients of the Distinguished Service Award have included Dean Emeritus Roscoe Pound of Harvard University Law School, Professor Emeritus Frank Knight of the University of Chicago; Frank E. Holman, civic leader in Seattle; Ludwig von Mises of the Graduate School of Business of New York University, and Professor Emeritus Charles C. Tansill of Georgetown University.

After obtaining his B.A. from Southwestern of Texas and his M.A. from Vanderbilt, Dr. Rippy began his professional career as an instructor of history at the University of California, where he received his doctoral degree in 1920. He then served as an associate professor of history at the University of Chicago until 1926, when he was appointed to a professorship at Duke University. In 1936 he returned to the University of Chicago, where he remained until retirement in 1958.

In addition to his regular academic appointments, Dr. Rippy has lectured on history and foreign relations at many universities and colleges; among them are Johns Hopkins University, the National University of Mexico, and the universities of Louisiana, Washington, and South Carolina. He was a delegate from the United States to the 1935 Pan American Conference on History and Geography. He was a member of numerous scholarly societies, and served on the editorial boards, for many years, of the Hispanic American Historical Review and the American Historical Review. In addition, he served as editor of the Duke University Press from 1929 to 1936.

Of the 13 books authored by Dr. Rippy, the latest was published by the University of Minnesota Press and Oxford University Press in 1959. Its title was "British Investments in Latin America, 1922–1949: A Case Study in Operations of Private Enterprise in Retarded Nations." In 1958, Regnery published "Globe and Hemisphere," and the University of Michigan Press released "Latin America: A Modern History."

Dr. Rippy will be 68 years old on October 27. He resides at 814 East Forest Hills Boulevard, Durham, N.C.

Presentation for Subcommittee Hearing on Relations of Business With Government in Washington, D.C., June 16, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend for reading and study to my colleagues the statement of Betty Remer, president of the Hearever Co., Inc., pertaining to small business and the harassments and frustrations that plague it.

Mrs. Remer, who through sheer determination and the application of efficiency of operation has singlehandedly built a going solid business, not only points up the lack of sympathy on the part of Government, but she makes constructive suggestions to correct shortcomings.

We in Congress pay lipservice to small business. We rant about its im-

portance in our economy. De we do much more?

Here is her good statement:

PRESENTATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON RELATIONS OF BUSINESS WITH GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 16, 1960

(By Betty Remer, president, Hearever Co., Inc., Castro Valley, Calif.)

It is an accomplished fact that imports are adversely affecting the sales, profits, employment and other conditions of small business. My company, Hearever Co., Inc., Castro Valley, Calif., a toy manufacturer and importer, is a prime example of the struggle of the small businessman for survival which is too often lost by "too little, too late" in getting relief and the protective measures that are so sorely needed.

We developed and manufactured a toy crystal device which became an overnight success because of its tremendous customer appeal and, feeling fairly secure, entered the toy and novelty field. We relied on patent protection for our toys to justify the many thousands of dollars spent attempting to acquire patent pendings and subsequent numbers. Unfortunately, for us, we learned that the process was too slow—usually 2 to 3 years—for adequate protection, and we were outmaneuvered by foreign and domestic competition copying our little toys to the last detail without practical recourse, due to present patent laws. Three months after we opened our doors, we employed 80 people, of which at least 50 percent were socially or physically handicapped. At present, we are only able to maintain an average of 12 to 15 employees due to these conditions.

In the toy and novelty field, "time is of the essence" and most items have short-term longevity. With present, outmoded patent procedures, patents have little if any value to our particular trade.

One of the only few ways left for small business to compete with large business is to develop new devices with adequate patent protection which distinguish themselves from existing devices and then, and then only, can they compete with larger organizations. Remove this last hope and soon small business of this type must fade out of the picture. Small business has always been and always will be the backbone of our little communities. Why? Because it establishes roots which spread in every direction for the refinement of its community's interests. Small business spends its earned dollars generally in its own immediate area. Large business, chain stores, and others, frequently remove their funds from the community and, too frequently, out of the State into the "golden pot" located at their home offices.

Problems arise, even after numbers are granted, as courts are reluctant to hold them valid. They are too difficult to enforce and too costly to litigate, as it is well-known to all that small business is consistently underfinanced. The United States has an outstanding record for technical know-how which could be our bread and butter. We are not sufficiently protecting this valuable asset that may well be our guarantee of continued economic stability. Without some protection of patents, new business is strangled; competition is prevented; and we will again be contributing to the growing monopolistic trend. Our economic situation is already suffering because of too many imports and not enough exports. Inventors in the United States are losing their incentive. Why, then, has Japan, who formerly ignored patents, recently come out with a more effective patent procedure than the United States? In all fairness, we should have the same patent protection given to us that is afforded to comparable companies in some of the more economically alert, foreign countries. We are often too guilty of "closing the barn door after the horses have left."

My suggested solution is to reevaluate, streamline, and put some strong teeth into our existing patent laws for the sake of our generally troubled economy and insure small business and the country, as a whole, of its continued, wholesome existence, thereby depressing monopolistic tactics, and solving some of our import problems.

One of the Federal excise tax inequities, relating to imports which exist, in my opinion, is the laxity in policing of the excise tax assessment due on transistor radios and related items. Many of these instances occur innocently. Some importers have no knowledge that the assessment even exists. Some companies insist it is the obligation of the manufacturer in Japan and not theirs. We believe that, in many other cases, unethical open-door importers are ignoring the assessment which places them in an advantageous position for bargaining. The tax which they are avoiding generally represents the greater portion of what little profit there is in this most highly competitive field of imported products. The taxpaying small importer, or large for that matter, cannot go on this way. It is incredibly unjust, unfair, and most important of all, poor economics, as the revenue lost to the Government would far exceed the wages of additional agents. I have heard that the ratio relation of moneys recouped to wages paid was 10 to 1. I fail to understand why this has not as yet been taken into consideration. To me, it is good commonsense and, again, good business.

My suggested solution is to increase the staff of Internal Revenue agents wherever necessary to have maximum control of the excise tax assessment collections, particularly at ports of entry. At customs a notification of excise tax liability should be attached to other custom documents.

An existing loophole in Internal Revenue's excise tax law, results in unfair competition between importers and generally favors foreign trading companies who maintain branch offices in the United States. Specifically, I am referring to the importing of radios and related products where the assessment of excise tax is proper.

Please keep in mind that excise tax on these items is paid by the importer or manufacturer, whichever the case may be, and is assessed on the first sale made in the United States.

For example, Hearever Co. buys a 6-transistor radio from Tsurumi Trading Co., whose sole office is in Japan. The radio is delivered from the dock in San Francisco to Hearever Co. The first sale in the United States by Hearever Co. to its customer includes duty, freight, operating and selling expenses, a small profit and excise tax.

Hearever Co.'s selling price, $18.

Excise tax paid by Hearever Co., $1.64.

Now, Hearever Co.'s competitor buys one of the identical 6-transistor radios from Nichimen Trading Co., in Japan, who also has branch offices in San Francisco. The radio is delivered to Hearever Co.'s competitor from Nichimen Trading Co., in San Francisco, which constitutes the first sale in the United States.

Competitor's selling price, $17.50.

Because excise tax paid by Nichimen, $1.25.

Please remember that this is the identical radio produced by the identical manufacturer in Japan, and the difference in price is because Hearever Co. must pay excise tax on base price, duty, freight, selling, handling and operating expense plus a small profit, while the competitor pays excise tax only on base price, freight, and duty.

This difference in the amount of excise tax can wipe out a major portion of the purchaser's or importer's profit, providing he is not using the most advantageous buying system, which most importers are not even aware of. This variance in pricing is one of the contributing factors in the present chaos of the transistor business. It is forcing some small importers, not using this system of buying, to get caught with heavy inventories, which eventually they must dump on the market in panic and further adds to the confusion we are faced with today.

My recommended solution is that legislation is needed here to provide a method of using a constructive price schedule for all imports of this nature where excise tax assessments are proper, and collectible at manufacturers' or importers' level on the first sale in the United States. It might be more equitable to charge the tax on base factory price, plus necessary shipping and duty costs, or a flat rate could be determined; or as a means to increase volume of tax, the department may decide to have it charged at consumer level, using a lower percentage on the list price. The method chosen is relatively unimportant as long as a constructive price schedule is determined.

Legal procedure inequities to small business due to delays such as tax litigations should be remedied. The unfortunate news of a pending tax suit against any business, small or large, by governmental departments endanger its financial status and many times results in killing or impairing its banking relations. In addition to this, his credit is restricted, if allowed at all. He practically becomes in a state of suspension and must usually rely on a limited few, factoring companies or private lenders, whose interest rate is often triple that formerly paid to his more conventional lenders.

My small company has had this miserable experience during the past year and a half, at a cost to date of more than $20,000 in factoring commissions.

In these apathetic instances of delay on the part of governmental agencies to expedite their legal procedures, the small businessman is forced to play the waiting game. The delay, lack of credit, mounting costly legal fees, and lowering of employee morale can break his back, and he becomes another mortality statistic in the crowded graveyard of the young and inexperienced small businessmen.

My recommended solution is for small business to have a group of men comparable to the group within the Veterans' Administration (technically trained, qualified men, familiar with Government regulations) who are hired for the sole purpose of acting as the small businessman's advocate. Small business cannot continue to turn the other cheek. The average owner of a young, small business, obviously cannot afford top legal talent. He is fighting his own war for survival of the fittest. His purse is too thin. He has no one to turn to except the Small Business Administration, which he generally assumes is used principally for loans, or is frequently unknown to many new small businesses who are suffering from the lack of proper legal or technical counsel.

There seems to be a missing link somewhere between small business and governmental aid and advice. Small business needs encouragement and help—not hostile policing when they inadvertently slip into the many pitfalls ignorance provides. The Agriculture Department spends hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars to prepare and distribute bulletins to educate or advise our farmers. Why can't small businessmen have the benefit of similar pamphlets along these lines? This would, indeed, provide a healthier climate for success and future governmental business relations.

There is inadequacy in custom liquidation procedure because of the custom department's delay in processing papers to the stage of final liquidation which results in severe hardships to importers and purchasers of imported goods, especially in cases where the importer is a manufacturer and is importing his components. How can any manufacturer price his products when he cannot be

advised immediately of the final cost of duty, particularly in the toy, novelty, and radio industry, which is known to be one of the most highly competitive fields of business with an extremely small profit margin? Our small business is in great jeopardy at this very time due to a 2½-year delay in final liquidation of goods which arrived the latter part of 1957. Small manufacturers cannot wait this long to price market their end product, because they are generally underfinanced and rely on a fast turnover of their inventory to maintain their economic status.

There is also a lack of continuity of classification of goods; for instance, toy motors are being classified as toys—toy crystal detectors are being classified as radios. In the case of toy motors which are, in fact, purchased for use as vibrators and dutied as toys, the explanation given by the customs agent was that—with the word "toy" preceding the word "motor," it was automatically placed in the toy classification. A ruling is necessary to indicate where duty should be applied; to the end use of a component or to the component itself.

My suggested solution is to remove the causes of delay in liquidation which in all probability will result in the increasing of the existing staff of agents processing the necessary documents.

And, secondly, we need a more realistic classification of imported goods.

In conclusion, may I say that the United States has spent billions of taxpayers' dollars to aid the weak, the defenseless, and the oppressed of the world. Small business meets all these qualifications.

Thank you for allowing me to present this material.

Current Fears of Teachers in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at a moment when the whole question of Federal aid to education is very much in our minds it seems fitting that I call attention to "Current Fears of Teachers in American Education," written by Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, of the American Federation of Teachers:

CURRENT FEARS OF TEACHERS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Much concern has been expressed as to the status of teachers from the early days of America. George Washington said: "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened," and teachers are expected to achieve this. John Adams, the "blue blood" of his day, uttered these favorable words: "The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and must be willing to bear the expense of it." About the same time DeWitt Clinton went even further by suggesting: "The first duty of government, and the surest evidence of good government, is the encouragement of education."

These worthy expressions of statesmen made during the early years of our history reflect the concern for public education and teachers, but the teachers were frustrated because they were unable to achieve the goals that would give America the status expressed by Washington, Adams, Clinton, and so forth. Teachers, through war and peace, were able to make progress in public education that greatly benefited the children of the Nation. When progress could be seen by the teachers, after long and difficult struggles, these were times when fears were at a minimum.

Even after some progress was evident, however, there was the fear among teachers of retaining the goals and reaching greater ones. Woodrow Wilson noted this by saying: "Popular education is necessary for the preservation of those conditions of freedom, political and social, which are indispensable to free individual development. No instrumentality less universal in its power and authority than government can secure popular education. In order to secure popular education the action of society as a whole is necessary; and popular education is indispensable to that equalization of the conditions of personal development which are the proper objects of society. Without popular education, moreover, no government which rests upon popular action can long endure."

Teachers are very important in our age. In fact, many believe teachers must become even more important in our civilization. M. H. Trytten of the National Academy of Sciences recently made one such suggestion, when he noted: "Education and the environment it serves are diverging as the rate of flux in our society increases. And yet the importance of education in modern life is steadily increasing. The closing of the gap would seem to be one of the great challenges facing us as educators."

With the early expressed heritage for education and the current recognition among leaders for greater dependence on teachers, it should follow that the teachers possess peace of mind in order to render the greatest service to humanity, yet there are current fears that should be conquered. These fears may be classified as economic, social, legal, physical, and moral.

Economic fear exists at the present time. During the period of time when fortunes are being made in America, teachers find themselves making less than one-half the amount earned by continental truckdrivers. The teachers find themselves in a poorer status in regard to the cost of living than during the great depression. Taxes have increased faster than their annual increments.

While many teachers find current saving to be impossible, they are further frustrated that they are supposed to supply goals for economic security even though their recommendations for worthy national objectives are disregarded. Finally, they face the possibility of periods of recessions in the years ahead largely because the programs they recommended are not adequately considered by the various units of government. Adolf A. Berle, Jr. of Columbia University has expressed these conditions: "My belief is that the United States will have reverses, possibly serious ones, in the next few years. In part these will be ascribed to be failures of the Government. Secondarily, it will be charged that the universities of the country, and its intellectual general staff, failed to prepare the country to take the necessary preventive measures. But at the same time, universities will be expected to supply the ideas, the analysis, the measures and even the men to meet any current emergency in almost any field."

George Romney of American Motors and the AFL–CIO have provided two ideas that are closely related here. Mr. Romney said: "While our economic obsession has produced material success at the sacrifice of adequate interest in education, it has nevertheless provided the resources capable of financing not only the additional facilities and personnel for our lengthening educational program and increasing school population, but also the compensation levels needed to attract and hold capable teachers and administrators." It would thus follow that greater Federal aid from the National Government should come in order to achieve the Romney statement, yet the AFL–CIO indicates the major hurdle: "The real opposition to Federal aid to finance education is because of the taxation question. The Federal tax system is based essentially on graduated, corporate, and personal income levies—progressive and workable and equitable. The States tax systems are based essentially on regressive levy, such as sales taxes, which deny the principle of ability to pay and which taxes a higher percentage of the poor and middle income groups' income than that of the wealthy."

Social fear exists at the present time. Woodrow Wilson, M. H. Trytten, etc., have dreamed of a dynamic society that would include all Americans. Teachers and books are necessary to achieve these goals. Edward J. Gordon of Yale University has expressed a part of the situation: "The student begins to see that great books are great metaphors of human experience as a way of understanding who he is and where he is going. If this happens, he sees that the good life depends largely upon accepting all other's as one's equal in opportunity, that one has no right to sacrifice others to one's own convenience."

Mr. Berle adds the teacher to the great books, and this develops a positive value system. He noted: "All this means a value system. It means teachers who teach according to that system. It means a public life carried on in that system. It requires men who would rather not be in office than get office by false promises, or by promising to support measures they believe are unsound, or who, once in office, want merely to coast from election to election. It means judging statements with fearless honesty. It means social engineers at all levels, from the village council to Washington, who act with the integrity of trustees for their community. It means lawyers who use their technique to secure justice and honorable arrangements, instead of peddling influence."

Teachers should be fearless, free citizens dedicated to the idea of reducing social fears. The first step in this goal is the development of greater quality in teaching, as this will stimulate more profound educational thought. Paul L. Dressel of Michigan State University has expressed it as follows: "We are forced then into the conclusion that it is the quality of teaching, the nature of the objectives and the nature of educational experiences which determine the liberal education contribution of a course and ultimately of a curriculum."

The second consideration is that the teacher has a major part in the development of the curriculum that is to be the framework of the social reconstruction. Warner Moss of the College of William and Mary has reflected this point: "Only if the professor participates in the construction of the curriculum can we understand the relevance of his work to that of the educational program as a whole. Only if he has engaged in the critical discussion producing the curriculum can he accept responsibility for it and believe in its worth. Only if the curiculum reflects his motivation can he hope to influence the student's motivation."

The third consideration is to insure that long-range goals will be considered as well as short-range ones. Dale E. Hathaway of Michigan State University has summarized this point as follows: "The faculty has both a major responsibility and a contribution to make in the process of long-range planning for institutions of higher education. It should be recognized by both faculty and others that this is a contribution which perhaps can best be made by carefully defining the roles of various groups in the long-

range planning process and by limiting the decisions which are required of the different groups."

The fourth consideration will become the social philosophy. Gerard J. Mangone of Syracuse University, has expressed this as follows: "Education—for living in the United States or spending some years abroad—is not worth much if it does not contribute to a vibrant social philosophy. Perhaps education for living and working abroad has been best summed up by Dexter Perkins in his exhortation to teachers to fire their students 'with a generous view of life and a wider view of knowledge.'"

Legal fear exists at the present time. On March 11, 1960, the Chicago Daily News noted: "Sometimes one might think it was a rule of the universe that the average man may accomplish only so much in a lifetime. Most of us struggle along to our three score and ten without more than a small fraction of the achievements of U.S. Senator Richard Lewis Neuberger." Teachers are thus frustrated because of their lack of status in many States.

Teachers are often victims of legal conditions bestowed to them by society. A part of this is reflected by the fact that the various States respond three different ways as to the liability of teachers and school districts. The common law is relied on in several States to give immunity. The second group of States prescribe limited liability. The third group prescribe full liability to teachers and school districts.

The second type of legal fear comes to teachers who are in States without job security (tenure) laws, or who have not qualified in States with these laws.

Harold Benjamin has described the result of legal fears. He noted: "Free men cannot be taught properly by slaves; courageous citizens cannot be well educated by scared hired men." Robert M. Hutchins reflects the results of legal fears: "Hannah Arendt has suggested, we appear to be entering an era in which men will no longer act; they will simply behave."

Physical fear exists at the present time. C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times recently described such a condition: "Like Draja Mikhailovich, the unhappy Serbian guerrilla executed by Tito for treason, Eden might have said about himself: 'Destiny was merciless toward me when it threw me into the most difficult whirlwinds; I wanted much, I began much, but the whirlwind, the world whirlwind, carried me and my work away.'"

Fear to self is as deadly as other types of fear. The teacher who is afraid of a part of the public because of what he taught in school, the way he disciplined his students, the organizations he belongs to, the racial and religious background of himself, or because he desires to seek public office often develops into a case of actual physical fear. When this becomes the condition, the statement of Dr. J. E. Morgan loses its effectiveness. Dr. Morgan suggested: "It is not possible for society to guarantee to every child a devoted mother and a wise provident father, but society can guarantee to every child a competent, well-prepared, and adequately paid teacher."

Moral fear exists at the present time. Former U.S. Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst, of Arizona, and the historian, Toynbee, give the teacher hope in this important area. Senator Ashurst recently said: "Mankind is inexterminable and there is everywhere a conservation of moral and spiritual energy that preserves the core of every noble resolve and worthy action and molds them into a beneficent achievement aiding the human race in its arduous struggle to conquer all the arts and sciences." On the other hand Toynbee noted: "The 20th century will be remembered as the 1st age in history in which people thought it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

The dreams of Ashurst and Toynbee still have not reached reality in many areas. George Meany described such a moral fear by writing to Mrs. Povl Bang-Jensen: "The courage and honor of your husband in his refusal to compromise his high principles will everlastingly provide inspiration to men everywhere who defend the ideals of freedom against the forces of tyranny. Sincere condolences to you and your children." This might have been a letter to a widow of a teacher who died in order to escape moral fear.

Leonard A. Duce, of Baylor University, recently described two phases of the moral principle, as follows: "Honesty is a virtue much spoken of but not often realized in its deepest expression. All too frequently, it is restricted to the quality of verbal statements. Only an intellectually active person can be intellectually honest. In other words, he must think seriously and for himself. Genuine intellectual activity involves much more than acquiring, preserving, and transmitting knowledge."

The teacher under moral fear is unable to meet the descriptions of Dr. Duce and often he may regret the day of his birth. He feels that the natural law is so important and that he is a traitor to his heritage.

In conclusion, let us remember the words of Bishop Vincent S. Waters of Raleigh, N.C., that teachers can secure "the right to physical integrity, the right to moral integrity, the right to intellectual integrity, the right to social integrity, and the right to economic integrity."

Educational Needs for Alaska Natives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, a serious situation with respect to the educational opportunities for native boys and girls exists today in Alaska. The present facilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are bulging at the seams. Also, approximately 400 qualified Indian and Eskimo children of high school age are being denied the right to attend high school due to the lack of high schools in their villages, or lack of space at the Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school at Mount Edgecumbe near Sitka, Alaska.

A recent editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on June 21, 1960, makes a constructive contribution toward corrective action, both by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and by the Congress, with respect to providing funds for the additional facilities which are needed. Both Nome and Fairbanks would be good sites for establishing boarding school facilities to afford to native children from the remote villages the high school education which they want and need. The editorial follows:

AN EDUCATED ALASKA?

Recently, a member of the News-Miner staff wrote a series of three articles concerning educational opportunities available to the native people of Alaska.

It was pointed out that public high school facilities for natives are concentrated near Sitka. Children from villages who wish to attend high school must travel far from their homes, and spend the school year in southeastern Alaska. This has a tendency to discourage many of them from attending high school.

What is worse, there is not room for all of them. Several hundred young people in the villages are turned down each year, when they apply to go to high school. In past years, there was room for all of the young people who wished to attend high school. But, in recent years, native young people have taken a great interest in education as a means of bettering themselves. The resulting demand for a high school education has outstripped facilities that are available.

So, the tragic fact of the matter is that Alaskan native boys and girls living in the villages are not guaranteed a high school education, even though most of them want such an education. We aren't talking about college, or a higher education of any kind. We are referring to something that is the right of virtually every citizen of the United States—except the native people of Alaska.

It is imperative that native children be given better educations. Not only should additional boarding high school facilities be made available to them immediately, but they should also be given opportunities to attend college, and vocational schools. Until these opportunities are made available to them, they are doomed to live their lives in poverty and want.

At the present time, there are funds available to send some of them to vocational school, and there are jobs open for natives who have technical skills.

But, it does little good to send a man or woman to vocational school when they have not progressed beyond the eighth grade. Furthermore, there are not a handful of natives in Alaska who have the skill to accept the technical positions that are now open to them.

It would seem that our Nation has failed the native people of Alaska.

As a final indication that our facilities are totally inadequate, this year some Alaska native boys and girls, who have not completed the first eight grades of elementary school, are being sent to Oregon to attend an Indian Bureau school there. How many children of Fairbanks would have finished the eighth grade if they were forced to go to Oregon to do it?

This is a matter that needs immediate attention.

The answer is simple. Another boarding high school must be built immediately, to serve the native people of the Yukon River system and Arctic Alaska. Until this school is built, native boys and girls who wish to attend high school, and possibly go beyond, will be denied this right.

The logical location for this school is right here in Fairbanks. This city is the hub of interior and Arctic Alaska. All educators familiar with the problems of natives agree that this school is an absolute necessity if we are to give Alaska's native children a change to better their lives.

Leaders of our city should get behind this project; we should see to it that native children of Alaska are given every opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a good education. Without fair educational opportunities, they are doomed to live unproductive, tragic, wasted lives.

Southeast Washington Low-Rent Housing Should Be Rejected Unless Other Districts Share or Slums Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that this could happen in America. It is difficult to believe that taxpayers' dollars from all over the United States could be so used by the officials of the District of Columbia and by local housing officials. It would seem axiomatic that taxpayers' dollars collected to rid areas of slums should in fact be used to eliminate slums and should not be used to depress real estate values and produce new slums. It is cruel enough to condemn private property for a higher public use but when the end result is a lower public and private use how can it possibly be justified? Often the people who have their homes taken suffer a great financial loss in the way that the takings have been made in the District of Columbia. Some of them have even become public charges after losing their homes with inadequate recompense. Other citizens of the District may not actually lose their homes but have their investments stolen by the lower use to which the nearby land is put by the Government. Paradoxically these others are currently being asked to pay higher taxes as their property values are being depressed by the Government.

In all fairness to the people of Southeast Washington, an area in which I own a house and live during sessions of Congress, the Government should not add to the already disproportionate share of low-rent housing borne by this section, merely to empty the slums of other sections of the city, at least until the other sections have borne their own share of the burden. I would not object to this new low-rent housing if it in fact was to result in the destruction or rehabilitation of slum areas. What is actually being done is the moving to Southeast Washington occupants of slums in other districts of the city while those vacated slums then become available to new slum occupants from outside Washington, who later qualify for new low-rent housing to be built for them. This is an endless chain and can well result in a population in Washington comprised chiefly of persons who have recently come here for the purpose of going on public relief. No intelligent Government would wish to have its Capital City so permanently occupied. In an effort to at least slow down this horrible adventure in bad government, I have introduced the following bill—H.R. 12668—and I hope it can be speedily enacted separately or as an amendment to some other law:

H.R. 12668

To amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act by adding certain requirements with respect to low-rent housing projects in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act (chapter 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Code) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 206. No new dwelling units constituting a part of a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937 shall be constructed in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia after the date of the enactment of this section unless (at the time such construction is to be completed)—

"(1) there will have been demolished or rehabilitated in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia, pursuant to the slum clearance and urban renewal program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 or another governmental program for the clearance of slums and the redevelopment of blighted urban areas, an equal number of dwelling units which constitute slum or blighted dwellings within the meaning of such program; or

"(2) there will have been constructed heretofore or hereafter in each of the other three quadrants of the District of Columiba a total number of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects so assisted equal to the total number of units of such housing (including the new dwelling units referred to in this section) constructed in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia, or in each such quadrant as large a percentage of such units among all housing units (privately or publicly owned) as is presently the case in said southeast quadrant."

Sixtieth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, In my extension of remarks, I include a deserving editorial entitled "Sixtieth Birthday," appearing in the New York Times of June 23, 1960, relating to the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The editorial is one that this splendid union richly deserves. As the editorial well said, "All these endeavors have helped strengthen the democratic way of life at a time when the validity of our enterprise economy has been viewed with increasing skepticism by our critics abroad."

The concluding sentence of the editorial in expressing best wishes to David Dubinsky and his associates in the ILGWU for "many more years of constructive service to the ideals of clean, creative unionism" is highly indicative of the progressive and constructive leadership of the ILGWU. I join with the New York Times in not only this tribute but also in the expression of many more years of constructive service to the ideals of clean, creative unionism. The article follows:

SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

The Inernational Ladies Garment Workers Union, as distinctive a New York landmark as the Empire State Building, is celebrating its 60th birthday today. Born in the scabrous sweatshops of the old East Side, it has brought economic uplift to its members and stability to its industry, the largest and, in many ways, the most fiercely competitive in the city.

A pioneer in the development of employer-financed pension and welfare funds, the ILGWU has introduced civilized procedures into the adjustment of labor-management disputes, built cooperative housing projects in place of the "lung blocks" in which its early members worked, and contributed millions of dollars to the advancement of labor and liberal causes in all parts of the world.

All these endeavors have helped strengthen the democratic way of life at a time when the validity of our enterprise economy has been viewed with increasing skepticism by our critics abroad. Not the least remarkable aspect of this contribution to the vigor of the capitalist system is that it was made by an organization whose founders were steeped in the traditions of socialism. To David Dubinsky and his associates in the ILGWU we wish many more years of constructive service to the ideals of clean, creative unionism.

A Suggestion for the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to me from a resident of my congressional district. I think his suggestion is excellent and I commend it to the attention of the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Further I would like to say, if we do not have American Negroes in Africa who can speak the language of the various countries, we should certainly make every effort to get them there. The letter follows:

The Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: I think our international relations and policies are in a bit of a mess. This could be easily the greatest understatement of the day.

As a single individual, and in my obscure position, there is very little I can do to change it. But I'm willing to do it even if it's very little. This is my suggestion:

The next time you or some of your colleagues should need a bit of information or should want some kind of investigation done in the Orient, please try this experiment: Send two people, one an American, a Caucasian, and the other also an American but an oriental, on the same assignment. Compare their reports. You will be in for

some interesting revelations, I think, and so would the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am an oriental and even from Europe, where I lived all of 1959, I could have given you information that your own people could not—simply because I, being an oriental, was never taken to be an American, and people talked to me quite frankly about Americans.

Maybe one reason our foreign policies are not so strong is because some information we get is not so accurate. It seems to me this is like a doctor basing his diagnosis on reports from the laboratory, staffed by not so knowledgeable technicians.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Cattle Imports and Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the candidates for President and the candidates for Congress are going to hear from the American farmer this fall as never before. The American farmer is tired of seeing his acres and markets given to foreign farmers. The following is only the beginning:

STATEMENT BY FRED H. DRESSLER, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, TO THE PLATFORM COMMITTEES OF THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES, IN CONVENTION, JULY 1960

The American National Cattlemen's Association is a nationwide organization of cattle producers and feeders, now in its 63d year. Its membership includes thousands of individual cattlemen operating in 47 States. It also includes 30 affiliated State associations of cattle raisers and feeders, and 120 breed, county or regional associations.

The cattlemen for whom American National speaks, and to whose interests it is devoted, represent the largest single segment of American agriculture. The value of cattle and calves sold from farms and ranches was $7.5 billion in each of the past 2 years, or about 20 percent of the total cash income of agriculture. Cattle and calves produce more cash farm income than all six "basic" crops combined, and more than the combined sales of hogs, sheep, wool, and poultry and eggs.

We appreciate this opportunity to submit for your consideration our views on national agricultural policies as they may affect the cattle industry.

The American National Cattlemen's Association has traditionally and vigorously opposed legislative proposals and policy statements which would bring cattle under any form of artifically maintained prices, or controlled marketings, or continued subsidies.

We wish to reemphasize this point of view and to set forth our reasons:

1. Cattlemen, like any other sellers in the market, would be happy to receive higher prices for what they have to sell. However, experience has taught that artificial prices and controls are inseparable. We do not believe that the complex cattle business can fully serve its market or realize its full potentials under a system of production and marketing controls.

Beef is the preferred meat of the American people. Demand for beef has been increasing, and the cattle industry has been expanding production to serve our increasing population.

During the past decade increased per capita consumption of beef has been even more important to the cattle business—that is, has contributed even more to the expansion of the market for beef—than has the sharp increase in the population of the country.

We believe the market for beef can be expanded much more in the years ahead if the cattle industry remains competitive and aggressively strives to further improve the quality of beef offered to the public.

We believe that to whatever degree beef production would be restricted under a system of controls, we would be handing over to other food products a part of the sales volume we otherwise can achieve for our own product. Over the years this would be a price too great to pay for any benefits to be derived from an artificial and subsidized cattle market.

Historically the cattle business has been through repeated experiences of boom and bust coinciding with the ups and downs of the cattle cycle. At times it might seem pleasant for the cattleman to unload these problems onto the taxpaying public. But cattlemen have a long and proud history of insisting upon carrying their own problems of natural and economic hazards.

The price we must pay to have a free and competitive market for cattle is at times an income position lower than is easily accepted. The offsetting advantage is that difficult times keep the cattle industry always in the process of adjusting to its markets. And we know, with a free market there is opportunity to recoup from the stress of low-income years at other times when markets improve.

2. Coupled with the concept of a free market is the need for affording cattlemen—and all business—reasonable incentives and protection against unforeseeable and uncontrollable conditions. These incentives and protections should come from logical income tax treatment and from realistic policies concerning imports.

(a) It is a recognized fact that any business with widely fluctuating conditions of supply, weather, etc., cannot "put away" in good years enough to offset entirely the losses or lack of adequate income during poor years. We believe that our Nation's fiscal policy should include provisions for averaging of incomes, for tax purposes, over a span of years to provide for funds to carry out normal business operations.

(b) American stockmen have no intent, or desire, to "fence out" reasonable competition. But they do expect the Government to adopt a realistic policy of tariff or quota protection against excessive imports of foreign livestock and meats. American prices, reflecting a higher standard of living and a high wage scale, often attract unusually large shipments of meats from countries which find in our markets exceptionally profitable outlets for their products raised and processed under "substandard" conditions. Tariffs on livestock and meat products now in effect have been made almost ineffective as a deterrent against such "dumping" by inflation and shifting world monetary values.

3. The cattle industry long has avoided interference with farm programs and policy questions not generally considered to directly concern cattlemen. But in recent years, we have observed a disturbing tendency for many farm programs not touching directly upon the cattle industry to become, in fact, a threat and a burden to cattlemen. We deplore these tendencies, and insist that they be corrected.

Especially disturbing to us us been the tendency to shift problems of price-supported crops onto the feed grains, or in the direction of expanding the acreage of grazing lands on a subsidized basis. Such attempts to solve the problems of other farm enterprises create a threat to the stability of the livestock industry. The willingness of livestock producers to face up to problems of their own must not be burdened by dumping the problems of the rest of agriculture upon them.

We request prompt and effective adjustments in programs and policies for the price-support crops that will protect the livestock producers from these burdens.

4. Agriculture does not exist in an economic vacuum. It becomes ever more an inseparable part of the total national economy. The well-being of the cattle industry requires reasonbly full employment and production throughout the Nation, stability of the general price level, and a continuing healthy growth of the total economy of the country. Within such an environment, there is opportunity to build an expanding demand for our product through improved quality, efficiency, and service to the consumer, and to operate our farms and ranches with stability of costs and income.

We look to our political leadership for policies and actions conducive to these objectives.

Sp5c. Donald E. Weber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that one of my constituents, a young man now stationed in Germany, has received a citation and a certificate of achievement from the Brooks Army Medical Service School Center at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Sp5c. Donald E. Weber distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious services while serving as personnel administrative specialist, Headquarters, 37th Medical Battalion, Sep., Army Medical Service School, from November 16, 1955, to March 21, 1960.

The citation, presented at a recent ceremony in Munich, says in part:

Through his outstanding leadership, initiative, and sound judgment, Specialist Weber contributed immeasurably to the success of the personnel section of headquarters, 37th Medical Battalion (Sep.). Specialist Weber has exhibited unusual ability as an organizer, a leader, and as an instructor to the newly assigned personnel clerks assigned to his section. His outstanding resourcefulness and intelligence caused him to be assigned many tasks which were accepted willingly and enthusiastically and truly outstanding results were attained.

By his dedicated approach to the problems presented by turnover and personnel and personnel shortages within the section and by his willingness to devote many hours of overtime effort, Specialist Weber's contributions to the success of the mission must be considered outstanding.

The House Committee of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the noted columnist, Holmes Alexander, of McNaught Syndicate, which appeared recently in more than 100 newspapers throughout the country.

Mr. Alexander has selected the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I have the honor of being chairman, as "the House Committee of the Year." The distinction which has come to our committee is due entirely to the hard work and dedication of the members who compose it. It is an honor which they richly deserve. No finer group of men has ever served upon any committee and their interest in its deliberations was truly inspiring to behold.

The members of "the House Committee of the Year" are: OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, chairman; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York; B. F. SISK, of California; ERWIN MITCHELL, of Georgia; JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania; LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa; JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota; KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut; WALTER H. MOELLER, of Ohio; DAVID S. KING, of Utah; J. EDWARD ROUSH, of Indiana; THOMAS G. MORRIS, of New Mexico; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts; JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado; FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of New Jersey; WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Wisconsin; A. D. BAUMHART, JR., of Ohio; PERKINS BASS, of New Hampshire; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York.

Mr. Alexander's article follows:

WASHINGTON, June 17.—It can be argued that none of the 20 outstanding committees of the House deserve any honorable mention this year. Some scandalous things have been discovered and printed about the way House Members swindle the taxpayer on their expense accounts, and how they live high on the hog when traveling in the line of duty.

PERFORMED HEROICALLY

Quite aside from fiscal irregularities, it was not a good year for House committees. Presidential election years seldom are. House leaders try to get controversial work done in the odd years, and to postpone what can't be finished without a lot of headbreaking. In 1959, for example, the House performed heroically by rewriting the Kennedy bill which came over from the Senate. Two near-unknowns, named PHIL LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia, and ROBERT GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, became household names. But this year the big, standby committees, like Armed Services and Judiciary, busied themselves with inconsequentials, like restrictions on retired officers becoming salesmen to the Government and like the abolition of capital punishment. The Harris Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, after catching some petty offenders in the regulatory agencies, got itself caught with a pocketful of phonied-up expense accounts.

Another committee which got a bad press for its expense accounts was Un-American Activities, but the offenses were not excessive and the accusations are suspect. Un-American Activities has automatically drawn a bad press for 20 years, mainly from the left-wing. This is a year when Un-American Activities did a number of worthwhile things. It fingered world communism in a concentrated drive to shake the Americanism of American youth. It went a long way toward salvaging a bad situation in which the Air Force was wrongly made to appear as attacking the American churches. And recently, in hearings in San Francisco, Un-American Activities did these important things in the words of Subcommittee Chairman EDWIN WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana:

1. "We have seen confirmed here (in the 'student' riots against the hearings) patterns of Communist activity."

2. "We have observed here the technique of obscuring technical membership in the Communist Party by official (but false) resignation."

3. "Another pattern is the campaign of foreign Communist propaganda being sent to schools, colleges, libraries, and homes in every nook and corner of the Nation."

It is a bit too late in history to sniff in contempt at such reports. The Un-American Activities Committee is earning its keep better than several other groups which claim a higher social standing.

But the House committee-of-the-year has to be the one called Science and Astronautics. This group has been in session almost every day since New Years. It would be incorrect to describe its chairman, OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, as any more than conscientious and earnest, or its minority member, JAMES FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, as any more than a busybody and omnipresent. But these are not bad qualities for the only committee on Capitol Hill with general jurisdiction over the enormous subject called "Science."

On scope alone, this committee was remarkable. It covered 10 subjects. One set of hearings on the huge assignment called "Adequacy of the National Space Program" ran over 6 weeks. This astonishingly versatile committee dealt with moon-mapping by the Army, oceanic research by the Navy, mechanical translation of foreign languages, development of the hydrofoil, scientific scholarships and the principle of Federal secrecy of documents.

IRREVOCABLE LICENSE

Only last week, in amending the National Space Act, members of Science and Astronautics had a knock-down-drag-out fight which related to private versus public ownership. It successfully defended a proposition which allowed a private or corporate inventor, even though working on a Government contract, to keep the patent to his invention, and allowed the Government to maintain irrevocable license to use such a patent.

Thus, in the last scheduled month of the 1960 session, Un-American Activities was pointing the finger of scorn and warning at fools and knaves. Science and Astronautics was striking a blow for incentive capitalism.

A lot of persons will find fault with such work—but what else is the cold war all about, anyhow?

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bonner Fellers and the great committee he represents is doing an excellent job in pointing out to our people the truth about foreign aid. The following is another one of his great statements:

IMPACT OF FOREIGN AID ON OUR ECONOMY AND DEFENSES

(Statement of Bonner Fellers, Brigadier General, U.S. Army (retired), vice chairman and national director, Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, before the Democratic platform subcommittee, Hotel Biltmore, New York, N.Y., June 21, 1960)

ECONOMIC AID

Foreign aid began—and was to have ended—with the Marshall plan to rebuild war-devastated areas. More than a decade after restoration of the war-torn areas foreign aid continues. President Eisenhower has announced that the program is now permanent.

Many billions of dollars spent on foreign aid are not carried on the annual mutual security appropriations. For the fiscal year 1960, $8.1 billion was available for expenditure. Including the interest on the money which we have borrowed to give away, foreign aid now exceeds $10 billion annually. The total cost of this foreign policy program for 12 years beginning with 1948 and excluding interest on the money borrowed is $86.7 billion. Thus our past and present foreign aid programs are consuming the equivalent of 20 percent of our personal income tax collections.

With the funds and equipment which we have given away, foreign countries have established industries which compete with ours. Thus, foreign aid subsidized by taxes upon our industry is undermining the very American enterprise that generates its support. We have given the rest of the world our latest machinery, know-how, and frequently raw materials. Foreign industry, largely Government-owned, pays little or no taxes and enjoys low wage scales.

On the other hand American industry pays from 4 to 10 times the wages of its foreign competitors. American industry pays prohibitive income and profits taxes, high real estate taxes, and pays for the research and development which our Government frequently gives to foreign competitors.

Foreign aid is undermining American industry by flooding our markets with cheap foreign products. By the tens of thousands, foreign aid is throwing American workers out of their jobs. Here are a few examples of 1959 dumping: Radio sets by the million; 4.4 million tons of steel products; 625,000 foreign cars (with a loss of 172,000 jobs to Americans); 1,220,000 sewing machines; Jewelry, tile, pottery, plywood, textiles, optical instruments, gloves—all at prices far below American prices.

THE U.S. ECONOMY

Our taxes continue confiscatory. Yet, during the past 7 years only twice has our budget been balanced! Last year we had a deficit of $12 billion—the largest peacetime

deficit in our history. In 1952 our gold stock stood at $23 billion; foreign claims stood at $13.5 billion. Eight years later, our gold reserve stands at $19.3 billion; foreign dollar credits, with which foreigners can demand our gold, stand at $23 billion. If foreigners should call this gold, and they can if they so elect, the value of our dollar would become all but worthless.

The inflationary result of these enormous debt burdens, coupled with confiscatory income taxes and the mass dumping of cheap foreign products on our markets, is fast undermining our economy.

U.S. Government obligations held by foreigners are officially stated at $12.117 billion. Interest payments by the U.S. Government to foreigners on these obligations amount to more than $500 million annually. These interest payments themselves constitute a form of foreign aid.

Foreign dollar investments in the United States of more than $12 billion is conclusive proof that foreign aid—except for countries directly threatened with Red aggression—is wholly unnecessary.

CONCLUSION

So far as economic aid is concerned, our financial position is such that this aid should be terminated without delay. Technical assistance, as conceived by President Truman, should continue to be made available to friendly peoples who seek assistance.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

It is argued that aid to our allies materially strengthens our own defense. But the fact is our allies can neither defend us nor lend material support for our defense. The threat to the United States comes from the sky. Red bombers and missiles based in the Soviet Arctic and fired against us over the Polar Cap are the real threat to our survival. Our troops in Europe, and our allies there, are not even in the path of the attack against us. They have not the means to offer an effective defense against this ghastly Red threat which can be launched over the Polar Cap. Such a threat can be met principally by the retaliatory capability of our Strategic Air Command (SAC) and by our own defensive measures over the North American Continent. Only Americans can defend America.

Despite this self-evident fact, the administration has endeavored to rest our security on a system of alliances. This is a procedure wholly unjustified by history. It is well illustrated by our present loss of oversea bases.

There is no assurance—should war come—that the Soviets will attack Europe. Their real enemy is the United States. Suppose the Reds strike only the United States. Would our NATO allies and other allies attack the Soviet Union? With what and how could they extend material assistance?

Possibly the most compelling argument for foreign aid has been that through it we have a string of oversea bases encircling the Soviet Union. In his statement of March 13, 1959, endorsing mutual security to the Congress, President Eisenhower listed as a first priority collective achievement the 250 allied bases which "our friends among the free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces."

Premier Khrushchev has blackmailed Norway and Pakistan into denial of bases for American reconnaissance flights over the U.S.S.R. Turkey has announced that she has not granted permission for such use of her bases. The Afghans have protested to our Government because our U–2 violated their airspace.

On May 30, 1960, Soviet Defense Minister Rodion Malinovsky warned that he had ordered Soviet rocket forces "to strike at a base from which a plane would take off and violate the airspace of the U.S.S.R."

This was followed on June 2 by Premier Khrushchev's irrational outburst that "if the cold war becomes hot, the first blow will be struck against those countries which play host to U.S. bases."

Malinovsky may have been bluffing, but our allies believe that Khrushchev was not bluffing.

The Communist-exploited riots in Tokyo have their origin in our quest for oversea bases. Our mutual security treaty with Japan would make her bases available to us for the next 10 years. Although the Japanese have ratified their new treaty with us, grave apprehension over our use of their bases continues.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are accomplishing their purpose—to neutralize our oversea bases. Their threat to destroy bases made available to us will have the effect of neutralizing the bases whether or not the host country declares them neutral.

If and when the Soviet overflights are again resumed—and in due course they should be resumed—we ourselves will likely not risk using oversea bases even were they made available to us. Should these bases be used and attacked by Red missiles we face one of two alternatives—go to war against the Soviets or renege on our treaty obligations. To avoid either of the alternatives we most likely will decide not to use oversea bases even for reconnaissance flights over Russia.

Modern airspace nuclear weapons have given a new meaning to alliances. Were war imminent, the Kremlin could threaten European NATO countries with total destruction—unless they declared their neutrality. And since the Soviets have the capability to destroy Europe, a neutral Europe appears inevitable.

The population of NATO in Europe is half again greater than ours. The economy of Europe is flourishing. European NATO powers have the manpower and are financially able to provide such ground forces as they deem necessary. The truth is the military need for American troops in West Germany does not exist.

Since SAC, entirely supported by the United States, constitutes the principal defense of the free world, it is mandatory that our allies provide their own surface forces and relieve the United States from sharing this burden.

It would appear that the only foreign military assistance which we should extend would be that to countries or areas which are directly threatened with Red aggression. Korea, Formosa and Berlin are examples.

SUMMARY

One cannot avoid comment on the failure of our foreign policy. The New York Times of Sunday, May 29, a supporter of our foreign policy, reports violent explosions within various nations about the globe. It pictures alarming turbulence in Cuba, Honduras, Algeria, Belgian Congo, Kenya, Cambodia, Indonesia, South Korea, and Japan.

The President of the United States has been uninvited to Russia; he has attended the summit conference sabotage; his invitation to Japan has been canceled; his personal diplomacy has collapsed. Having failed to take the initiative against communism we have now lost enormous prestige throughout the world.

The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee has been erroneously accused of being isolationist. But today we find that our internationalist leadership has made enemies instead of friends; it has caused our President to be insulted and humiliated. Foreign aid is undermining our economy; it is robbing our own defense; it has bought few friends; it has engendered much resentment and jealousy and some hatred abroad. In many areas of the world Americans are not welcome. In time of war we cannot count on oversea bases. Consequently, we must strengthen our home base. The only remaining recourse is to prepare to defend ourselves and the free world from bases in the Western Hemisphere.

Who now are the isolationists?

CONCLUSION

It is essential for the United States to return to a sound economy. At the same time we must expand the striking element of our Armed Forces so as to achieve and maintain air, space, nuclear supremacy over the Communist forces. This necessity must be achieved on a balanced budget and will require a reapportionment of funds among the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

RECOMMENDATION

It is respectfully suggested that the Democratic Party Convention Platform Committee adopt, in substance, the following resolution:

1. To continue technical assistance in countries which seek our aid; otherwise, foreign economic aid will be terminated.

2. Allied industrialized countries are now prosperous and should provide their own Military Establishment; in countries or areas directly threatened by Red aggression we should continue limited military assistance.

Sugar Allotment Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to incorporate my news release on the sugar allotment quota, which is for the press on Monday, June 27:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, 21st District, of Pennsylvania, called upon the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to the three-point program in the sugar allotment quota as it affects Castro's Cuba.

DENT suggested a three-amendment approach:

(1) Cut out all sugar quota as of the end of this year, or sooner; if the House deems it advisable—will give to the President of the United States the right and the power to restore all or part of the quota as he finds it to be in the best interest of the people.

(2) Reduce the sugar quota by the amount of sugar sold to Russia or Communist satellites at any price less than the subsidized price paid by the United States on the sugar program.

(3) Put the difference between the U.S. price and the world market price into certain escrowed funds to be paid to any American enterprise injured by the Castro policies of expropriation or confiscation. DENT pointed out that there would not be a deficiency in sugar because every sugar producing area in the world practically has a surplus, notably our friends in Mexico with over

a million tons and our friendly Latin-American countries and the Philippines.

The Castro Cuban Government recently sold Russia sugar under a 5-year program at a price which is about one-half charged to the United States. This, said DENT, is an outright subsidy to Russia out of the kitchen money of American housewives.

This is a program based upon commonsense and sound logic without any feelings of reprisal or economic straitjacketing, but rather a measure to bring back some similarity of sanity and economic soundness.

Statement by the Honorable John Lesinski in the House of Representatives, June 25, 1960, Regarding the Centennial Anniversary in 1961 of the Death of the Ukrainian Patriot, Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I desire to extend sincerest gratitude to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], and the able members of his Subcommittee on Memorials for bringing House Joint Resolution 311 to its first step toward final enactment. I was privileged to participate at the hearings conducted in connection with this proposal, and I fully realize the vast amount of study and consideration which was applied by that subcommittee. I also wish to compliment the sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], for the wholehearted enthusiasm and followthrough he furnished in bringing this legislation thus far.

In 1961, Ukrainian people all over the world will observe the centennial anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko. An account of his heroic life and splendid literary creations are indeed inspirational to all freedom-loving men and women. Hence the desire to have a monument to his memory placed on public grounds in our Nation's Capital is strongly urged by hundreds of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent. May I add that these fine people will effect the construction of the Shevchenko memorial through their own efforts and contributions.

Such an idealistic undertaking should understandably be endorsed by the Congress as a very important factor during this cold war of ideologies between the United States and the Kremlin. Today, as 45 million Ukrainians enslaved by Communist Russia work unselfishly and unceasingly to rid themselves of the despotic rule of Moscow, they do so by holding up this shining exponent of true liberty, Taras Shevchenko, as their symbol of inspiration and incentive.

I am not going to impose on the time of the House by attempting to present an account of the life and deeds of this great Ukrainian hero and poet. This was done, I may add, quite capably and factually during the subcommittee's hearings. I am happy to announce, in that connection, that a biographical documentary of Taras Shevchenko is scheduled to be printed by authority of a simple resolution which I introduced. The material is presently being prepared by one of the principal proponents of this undertaking who made a brilliant statement at the hearing. The projected plan is that all interested persons, associations, and organizations will be informed of the usual privilege of obtaining, by purchase, as many additional copies of the publication as they desire. These copies may be ordered through the Superintendent of Documents, at nominal cost, in conjunction with the press run of my original authorization.

I will conclude these remarks with the firm hope that this resolution receives deservedly favorable consideration in its future course toward final approval. I am completely convinced that a tribute to this distinguished Ukrainian, constructed as a memorial statue here in Washington, is certain to have a beneficent influence on all of us so long as the desire for human liberty, a better life, and the brotherhood of man remains alive and strong in the hearts of free people throughout the world.

Japan and Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people of Japan will always love and honor Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The recent award to General MacArthur by Japan is without precedent in world history. The people of South Carolina join me in congratulations to General MacArthur. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the Washington Evening Star of June 23:

JAPAN'S REAL ATTITUDE

We believe that the unprecedented award to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of Japan's highest decoration for foreigners is more indicative of the real sentiments of the Japanese people toward the United States than the recent mob demenstrations in Tokyo. The conferring on General MacArthur of the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers was more than a tribute to the 80-year-old soldier who proved to be a benevolent conqueror of Japan. It signified the gratitude of the Japanese people for America's "great contributions to the postwar reconstruction of Japan and to the development of the immense reservoir of good will that exists between our two nations today."

The extraordinary award had been announced by the Emperor on May 17 in connection with the centennial of Japanese-American relations. Ironically, the presentation took place in the wake of the violent anti-American rioting by Communist-led mobs and the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Japan. General MacArthur, deeply moved, commented aptly that he could recall "no parallel in history where a great nation has so distinguished its former enemy commander." We doubt that any parallel exists. And we also doubt that such an award would have been made if the vast majority of the Japanese people shared the anti-American feeling of the Tokyo demonstrators.

Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I support the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan and oppose any further extension of the franking privileges for Members.

This motion, if it is adopted by the House, will uphold the Senate and reverse the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee which seeks to extend Members' franking privileges to include the use of mail addressed simply to "Occupant" and delivered to every household in every community to which it is sent.

This would be, in my view, a thoroughly unjustified privilege and would understandably call upon Congress the great displeasure of the people we represent. Congress has more important things to do, especially in an election year, than to find ways and means of perpetuating itself in office at the public's expense.

The use of the frank is an old, honorable and absolutely essential privilege. If the frank did not exist, something like it would have to be invented in order to facilitate communication between the people and their elected representatives. The volume of congressional mail has grown heavier in recent years largely because people are better informed and are taking a more active interest in the conduct of their Government. The responsibility of Members of Congress to answer this mail, to help keep their constituents informed, and to help make possible a freer and franker exchange of views between constituent and representative could not be fulfilled without the frank.

Like all other privileges and rights, however, the frank can be abused. While the law clearly limits the use of the frank to matters of official business,

the line between official and political is sometimes difficult to draw. In addition, the availability of the frank may tend at times to encourage excessive use of the mails.

For these and other reasons, I believe it would be unwise to extend the franking privilege to include so-called "junk mail." Mail addressed simply to "Occupant" is clearly "junk mail." It seems to me that if mail is sufficiently important to qualify for the frank as official business it should be individually addressed. The added time and expense of individual addresses would be a healthy deterrent to the overly generous use of the frank.

There are other good reasons, Mr. Speaker, for opposing the extension of the franking privilege. Unless it can clearly be shown to be necessary for the proper conduct of Congress, we should not be placed in the position of voting for special benefits for ourselves. It is a matter of poor taste, as well as of questionable ethics, for Congress to award itself special privileges unavailable to ordinary citizens—unless those privileges are essential for the performance of official, public responsibilities. This calls for restraint, good judgment, and a concern to protect the integrity of Congress as the cornerstone of free, responsible, and representative government.

Those who urge the extension of the franking privilege, Mr. Speaker, do so on grounds that representatives of urban areas should have the same privileges now available to representatives of rural areas. Speaking for myself, as a representative of a distinctly urban area, I cannot accept this argument, nor do I believe the people I represent would accept it.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to call a halt to unwarranted special privilege, and the House of Representatives is a good place to stop it.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Activities of Senior Citizens Study Committee in Dearborn, June 25, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following letter I have received from a community in my district which has been taking positive action to explore the needs of the older people and to help them meet those needs. I believe it is appropriate at this time, when action is being taken on the national level, to call attention to what is being done by an individual community to help its older citizens.

The letter follows:

UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES
OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT,
Dearborn, Mich., June 17, 1960.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your kind letter of June 6 requesting results of the activities of the senior citizens study committee in Dearborn.

This committee was appointed last November following a general meeting called Retirement Horizons in Dearborn, attended by 135 persons including representatives of 20 public and private agencies. At this meeting group discussions developed a number of questions regarding which some of the people attending desired consideration. Included in the questions were a medical clinic for older people, publicity of existing services, increased family-service staff, a volunteer homemaker program, recreation and housing for older people.

The committee has met regularly since last November to consider the above and allied matters. They found that in Dearborn housing and recreation for the senior citizens are being handled by the city agencies responsible. A request was made by the committee to the united foundation for an increase in the family-service staff. The committee discussed in considerable detail with representatives of the medical profession and the independent pharmacists of Dearborn the subject of health and the medical needs of older people and attendant costs.

The study committee prepared and distributed 5,000 copies of a pamphlet entitled "Information for Dearborn Senior Citizens," a copy of which is enclosed [not printed in the RECORD] to as many persons as could be reached.

Attached to the pamphlet was a tear-off slip asking each person to respond if he or she was in need of more medical care and if he or she would like to discuss this with someone. The response to this question was small. Each person who responded was individually interviewed as to his medical situation.

The committee is now recommending that some form of public counseling for older people in the community is needed. It has been found in a number of instances that older people often need counsel on where to find and obtain needed help. This it is believed can be obtained through a professionally staffed counseling center. Recommendations that such a counseling center be created in the city is being considered. From such an office confidential referrals may be made to medical doctors or agencies best situated to help. The local medical society and the independent pharmacists have assured the committee that they will cooperate fully with such a counseling center in giving preferential attention to persons referred by reducing the cost of medical care and drugs when assured that a financial need exists.

We wish to express our thanks to you for your interest in the senior citizens problems and hope you will feel free to request additional information if this is inadequate.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE T. BENTLEY,
Chairman.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, at Commencement Exercises at Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently I interviewed Congressman CHESTER BOWLES on a TV show for the people of Massachusetts. We talked of various issues of public policy, including some of the more imperative considerations of foreign policy.

Congressman BOWLES' background as a Governor, public servant in the Federal Government, writer and Ambassador qualifies him to discuss matters of public importance to all of us.

Recently Mr. BOWLES delivered the principal address at the commencement exercises at Smith College, Northampton, Mass. In this speech, he discussed the basic dimensions of the challenge before us in a historical perspective. This address is really another contribution to the free debate on the national purpose, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMITH COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, NORTHAMPTON, MASS., JUNE 5, 1960, BY HON. CHESTER BOWLES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

President Mendenhall, members of the board of trustees, honored guests, alumnae, parents, and, most especially, members of the graduating class of 1960, it is a very real pleasure to join you here in Northampton for this last official occasion of your college careers.

Since your first freshman assembly in the fall of 1956, I have come to know many of you and to feel personally involved with interest, affection, and pride in much that you have done.

Over the years I have also become well acquainted with the traditional requirements of commencement speakers.

These rules are very clear.

The current state of affairs should be viewed with proper concern.

The inheritance being handed down by the speaker's own generation (so powerfully represented on such occasions by trustees, parents, and alumnae) should be commented upon modestly.

It should be stressed that this particular class is at a crossroads in history, and that great decisions lie ahead.

The graduating seniors, whose thoughts are properly concerned with new jobs, new tours, and new husbands, should then be called upon to drop everything and save the world before it is too late.

This year speakers from the University of Maine to the University of Southern California can be expected to sound an additional note. From hundreds of platforms such as this they will be saying that our moral values are not what they should be, and if anything, that they are slightly worse than at this time last year.

I wish I could promise to say something dramatically different. However it is undeniably true that in most walks of our national life we have not been doing as well as we should. It is also true that our complex and explosive world is in urgent need of your fresh energy and vision.

Although pessimism on such questions has always been considered un-American, and I think properly so, every thoughtful person knows that we are facing profound changes and that the course of events has never been less clear.

Views, assumptions, hopes, and expectations which succeeding generations of Americans have taken for granted are being jolted abruptly.

This situation is not unique in American history. Indeed, my generation faced something similar in the early thirties when the sudden collapse of our economy shocked us out of our easy assumptions that money, at least for the fortunate few, grew on trees.

But the present challenge involves far more than jobs, pay increases, and material comforts.

Now for the first time in American history, our future is tied to that of hundreds of millions of other human beings whose objectives, hopes, and fears appear different from our own, but who, like ourselves, are contending with new forces of massive strength and uncertain direction.

What convinces me that we may learn to deal effectively with this new world is the persistence in the American character of precisely those qualities of creative inquiry and flexible, pragmatic action which have enabled previous generations of Americans to cope with lesser challenges in the past.

Throughout our Nation a reexamination of our policies and purposes is underway. You sense it not only in Washington, D.C., but on college campuses, at crossroads and byways, in buses and in supermarkets, in business offices, and in grange halls.

This reexamination is particularly impressive because this time thoughtful Americans are digging so much more deeply into the nature of the challenge which we face. Dangerously oversimplified views of the world struggle are rapidly giving way to a more realistic understanding of what we are up against.

Let us review briefly three stages of American thinking about world affairs which succeeded one another in the 1950's.

Ten years ago the North Korean Army, armed and directed by the Kremlin, struck without warning across the South Korean border. Suddenly we found ourselves face to face with the militaristic, aggressive nature of world communism.

Before the Korean invasion, we knew that Soviet military power was formidable. But we had comfortably assured ourselves that it would not be used either by the Soviet Union or its satellites. As a result, our military forces had been reduced below the danger point.

In our hurry to redress this error, we adopted a narrowly militaristic interpretation of the challenge which confronted us.

Constructive, creative programs such as the Marshall plan and point 4 were downgraded. The new emphasis was on military force, military alliance, and military thinking. And this in turn set our national mood.

Military problems, being highly specialized and shrouded in secret, logically belong to generals, admirals, and heads of government.

Once the challenge of world communism was accepted primarily as a military challenge, there was little that the ordinary citizen could do except pay his taxes cheerfully and hope that our military experts knew their jobs.

After Stalin's death in 1953, we moved toward a second and much broader interpretation of the world contest.

As Mr. Khrushchev threatened to bury us economically rather than militarily, we became less concerned with the previously assumed inevitability of a military struggle, and more and more alarmed over the Soviet rate of industrial growth.

Our newspapers outdid one another, graphically, in portraying the burgeoning Soviet economy, and, editorially, in worrying over how we could stay ahead.

Although this broader view of the challenge was a long step toward reality, it still left the American citizen in the role of an anxious, but not yet directly involved, bystander.

Worldwide and indeed domestic economic problems, like military problems, had always appeared infinitely complex, and to belong primarily to the great corporations, the great labor unions, and to the distant Federal Government. And so to most Americans in this second stage the world contest still remained remote and impersonal.

In recent months, unless I am seriously mistaken, we have begun to move into a third stage of interpretation, and for the first time to understand what we are really up against.

We are beginning to see that the future may not necessarily belong to those nations which can set off the most rockets or produce the most bathtubs, and that the contest, stripped to its essentials, is between two widely varying interpretations of the meaning of life—one which believes in the inherent dignity of the human individual—the other which believes that man was born to serve the state.

As this becomes more clear, our attention will shift beyond the question of how our society can survive to what we Americans have to offer.

This, I suggest, brings us to the central point—the urgent need for direct involvement by each of us as individuals.

A contest that is primarily military or economic could reasonably be considered beyond our personal powers to influence in any way. But if the primary challenge for the long haul is what I believe it to be—the quality of American society—then each of us has an important part to play that cannot be delegated to a distant government.

Now at this point it may be proper for me cautiously to suggest that history may be more tolerant toward your parents' generation than many of you have been.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 12829. A bill to designate the reservoir formed by Canyon Dam on the Guadalupe River, Comal County, Tex., as Ed Cape Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 12830. A bill to designate the reservoir formed by Canyon Dam on the Guadalupe River, Comal County, Tex., as Ed Cape Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12831. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that drug advertisements must contain certain information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12832. A bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12833. A Civil Defense Bill to provide for a program to establish food storage depots near major cities in the United States to prevent the population from suffering from lack of food as a result of war, flood, or other local or national catastrophe which destroys the usual channels of food supply; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12834. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey the Caven Point Army Terminal, Jersey City, N.J., to the New Jersey Public Market Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 12835. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to assist the States in providing training and retraining for the unemployed and underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 772. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that certain unsuccessful candidates for the office of President shall be Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 579. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the administration by the Secretary of Commerce of the Federal-aid highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 12836. A bill for the relief of Tadashi A. Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12837. A bill for the relief of Donna L. I. Carlisle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12838. A bill for the relief of Bahran Ansary and Paridokht Ansary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.F. 12839. A bill for the relief of Ralph (Yunsoo) Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12840. A bill for the relief of Helena Rams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 12841. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12842. A bill for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 12843. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie J. Beamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

509. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the New Jersey State Bar Association, at its annual meeting in Atlantic City on May 21, 1960, on matters of Federal legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Albert J. Herman, departmeent adjutant, Veterans of of World War I of the U.S.A., Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., commending the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its devotion to duty, and urging the Congress of the United States of America to continue this valuable committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

511. Also, petition of Phillip Acker, city clerk, San Diego, Calif., relative to a resolution adopted, which requests legislation which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

512. Also, petition of Joseph B. Greenfield, Board of Aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., relative to a resolution adopted, which asks for the adoption of the Forand bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

After all, we were totally untrained, your parents and I, for the kind of world we have had to live in and even help manage.

I can remember little that I or my fellow students learned in college that was relevant to the world in which we were to live our adult lives.

Nor was there anything in the roaring twenties, into which most of us graduated, to prepare us for the economic collapse and social dislocations of the thirties, or for world involvement again in the forties.

But in spite of our unreadiness in terms of what history required of us, I think our record will stand up well under scrutiny.

We broke with 160 years of tradition to put isolationism behind us in world affairs.

We took action, born of economic and social distress, to give new depth and meaning to our national unity.

We pioneered in the postwar world with the bold, creative concepts of the Marshall plan, NATO, point 4, and the mutual security program.

Indeed, some of our more economically timid members still view some of our technological achievements with considerable alarm. Our cows, they say, give too much milk, and our new machines produce too much steel.

Yet in the most crucial area of all our performance has been admittedly and dangerously weak. In our efforts to deal effectively with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we have neglected the cultivation of those very human values which are basic to the health and vigor of our American society, and which in the next decade may determine our capacity to survive as a great and influential nation.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator, we have glorified them. Indeed, in an upside down sort of way we have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipualtion to explain some of our most admirable actions.

It is as though we have felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not as decent as they seem.

Thus we argue that the time has come to grant our Negro citizens first-class citizenship, not because they have been patiently waiting for it since the Declaration of Independence asserted that all men are created equal, but because the colored majority of mankind is said to be breathing down our necks.

In order to win public support for urgently needed scholarships for our colleges and universities, we call the legislation the National Defense Education Act, and then for safety's safe surround it with disclaimers and loyalty oaths.

Instead of proudly presenting our foreign aid program for what it is—an honest effort to help new nations ease poverty, illiteracy, and disease so that they may create the conditions of freedom within their own cultures—we explain that our real purpose is to buy friends and supporters in the United Nations, or to fill empty bellies on the cynical assumption that well-fed Asians and Africans will not question the injustices and harassments of the feudal societies in which many of them live.

When our Government generously rushes large shipments of food and medicine to shattered Chile, some of us tell each other that this is smart propaganda to set back the Communists.

Even when we set out to do the wrong things in world affairs—like hiking the tariffs on British bicycles or foreign clothespins—we explain that we are taking these actions in the interests of national defense.

Through our fears and frustrations we have come to act as though our chief national purpose in world affairs is not to maintain and extend our basic American commitment to human dignity, but simply to thwart the Russians.

Nor is this twisted pattern of behavior limited to foreign affairs. Here at home businessmen contributing to boys' summer camp funds and hospital building drives rush to cover up their decent motivations by pointing out that it is good business to do what they are doing, and in any event the tax laws keeps their out-of-pocket costs low.

In the face of some of the highest crime rates in the world we tolerate sadistic exhibitions on radio, TV, in the movies and in comics on the ground that they help keep the children quiet and their minds occupied.

We nod our heads in understanding when Charles Van Doren tells us that he continued his fradulent TV presentation because the whole academic profession had such a stake in his performance, and he did not want to let his fellow teachers down.

We shrug our shoulders when 600 or Mr. Van Doren's students at Columbia announce that they admire him for his slick performance, and that they cannot for the life of them see how it affects his usefulness as a teacher of liberal arts.

Thus, at the very moment in history when the true nature of the world contest is coming into focus, we find ourselves caught up in a maze of payola and quiz scandals, of spying and lying, of tax evasion and false expense accounts—of the fake advertisement, the thumb on the scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our effort not to seem gullible, not to seem to be suckers, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, to prove that we are realists who do not go off half cocked, we have developed a moral gap between beliefs to which we subscribe and our day-to-day performance which in its own way may become as dangerous to our long-term future as any missile gap.

This is particularly true if the cold war continues indefinitely. Can an open society like ours remain an open society indefinitely under the pressure of the military, technological, and psychological requirements of 20th century nuclear terror?

No one can be sure.

Already there are some among us who prefer the simple terror of the cold war to the complex search for realistic means to ease it.

This kind of mind is unhappy about complexity, about shades of gray, about difficult choices, about the necessity to pursue various alternative policies at once, about the requirements in the modern world for principles, balance, dexterity, and nerve.

Such individuals are good people to keep out of the control room in the age of push-button war. In the days of bayonets and machineguns they were dangerous enough—in today's nuclear world they have the cataclysmic touch.

So much for the challenge that we face. How best can we cope with it?

As members of an open society it is our primary responsibility to maintain the right of future generations to live in similar societies.

An open society is not a vacant one. It is open for inventiveness in statecraft as well as in science, for controversy in public as well as in private, for competition in ideas as well as in goods, for incentive for leadership as well as for leisure.

Admittedly, an open society faces disadvantages in a world where it coexists with closed societies. This is particularly so when the opposing closed societies are doing everything possible to demolish it.

Yet an open society is the kind of society we want. If we are to keep it, we must see that our individual family, community, college, and professional lives are freer, more creative, and more affirmative than the lives people lead in closed societies.

If we were free to ask them, and they were free to tell us, what difference would there be?

Three meals a day, hard physical work, the bare essentials of life, uncritically believing what the newspapers say, avoiding controversy, sticking resolutely to safe thoughts and simple comments, concentrating on the trite and the unspectacular, never probing, never arguing—these we might agree are the common lot of most of the 800 million people who live under Communist rule.

Now how can we, as members of an open society, successfully compete with a closed society of this kind? Only in living by significantly different values and for significantly different goals.

We must learn to make use of the freedom that our open society provides to do the things others cannot do because of their closed one.

We must accentuate the use of that marginal element in our lives which really is different from theirs—that goes beyond the essentials of eating, sleeping, and keeping alive, to the individual, distinguishing element that enables us to be different.

We must concentrate as free individuals in making use of our margin for living free lives, the margin which in the closed society has been stifled by the threat of fear, eavesdropping, secret police, and regimentation.

What is the outlook? Much, of course, depends on the cold war which, as I have suggested, has dangerously strengthened the negative forces in our own society.

Yet I am heartened because I think that our temptations toward lethargy, apathy, and a cynical retreat into simple pleasures have once again nearly run their course.

For one thing, my informants here at Smith and elsewhere tell me that our campuses are wakening up again.

The first stirrings are said to have occurred in your freshman year with the bitter news that 25,000 young Hungarians had died in the streets of Budapest in an effort to achieve the kind of open society which we take for granted.

More recently many of you have demonstrated your sympathy and support for the sit-in movements in our own American South because of your convictions that what is right in respect to human dignity must win out in the end.

Although some of my generation may disagree, I suggest that such actions are what help keep an open society alive and free. Indeed right here is a major distinction between a closed society and an open one—the closed society makes no pretense of relating its private to its public morals. The open, democratic society must do so continually.

Most impressive of all, the call for a new dedication of American young people seems to be coming from the students themselves. An editorial by Genevieve Lauterbach in your own Smith newspaper, the Sophian, has been widely quoted. It even found its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Some of you may remember what it said—"so sometimes we write home to mummy and daddy about the world situation. And occasionally we mention it to dear ole Joe. Dear Joe smiles and asks us to dance.

"We think of the money America spends on beer and cigarettes and we worry about the economy, and democracy, and things, when we see another TV antenna go up across the street. We remember the News of the Week in Review as we reread Vogue.

"We frown about our culture and its values as we tip the Negro waiters, and we promise we'll talk about the image of America sometime to somebody when we tour Europe this summer. * * *

"We're the very picture of American youth. We gaze at the wide horizons of the world before us with a questioning mind, filled with faith, hope and charity. We forget that challenge, like charity, begins at home."

All of this strikes me as healthy evidence that we are waking up.

We are beginning to see that the conflict between the closed Communist societies and

our own open one is far more than a conflict between rival defense establishments, rival economies, rival espionage systems, and rival summit negotiators.

It is a conflict that touches directly the lives, the energy, the sense of purpose, and the faith of each one of us.

To leave it to admirals, generals and politicians is to abdicate our responsibilities as citizens in a free society.

We must, of course, face the real possibility that even if we Americans rise fully and effectively to the challenge the game may still be lost for reasons beyond our control.

Mankind's hope for a more rational and meaningful existence depends not only on what we do and what we are, but also what happens in the closed societies of Russia and China.

Although here the future is the cloudiest of all, is there not some reasonable basis for hope?

Is it not possible that behind the ruthless, totalitarian leadership of Communist China, humanistic sparks may be smouldering and that out of the ashes of the dead past may again arise the creative genius which made possible the long miracle of Chinese civilization?

Can the Kremlin open the laboratories and lecture halls of the Soviet Union to the inquiring young minds necessary for scientific achievement, while still denying the right to think about, and absorb, the great truths of human history?

But whatever we do, let us not become so preoccupied with the forces and counterforces within China and Russia that we neglect to do the great and good things we are able to in partnership with the majority of mankind for whom communism is still an unappealing foreign ideology.

Every enduring civilization since the beginning of time has been built on the proposition that man is more than a chemical accident.

We ourselves are deeply committed to the concept that man is surrounded by belief and lives for a purpose.

Forty years ago on three continents, Ghandi, Wilson, and Sun Yat-sen represented triumphant moving forces of wider freedom and more significant life.

Although these forces were blunted defensive by two world wars and the chaos that followed them, much of the world is now again on the march.

Africa, Asia, and Latin America are undergoing a revolution based on rising expectations. Hundreds of millions of men and women who were once doomed to endless poverty, misery, and disease, are reaching out not only for bread but for dignity and respect.

The proper position of the American people is at the head of this revolution, acting boldly in the faith of Jefferson and Lincoln and backing our efforts not only with the solid muscle of our material strength but with our historic dedication to the universal rights of man.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the fourth and final part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part covers "Education" and "Hospitalization, Surgical Insurance for the Aged—Forand Bill."

The tabulated results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

EDUCATION

1. Which plan of additional Federal payment to States for public education do you prefer? (a) Murray-Metcalf bill, 915; (b) Senate bill, 291; (c) administration bill, 2057; (d) none, 2471.

2. How would you propose to finance a substantial Federal education program? (a) Lower personal income tax exemptions, 444; (b) borrowing, 416; (c) increase income tax rates, 481; (d) sales tax, 3,439.

3. Do you believe that more emphasis should be placed upon science, mathematics, and vocational training? Yes, 5,807; no, 898.

4. Do you believe it is possible to increase the quantity and quality of our education by television, more instruction standardization, etc., that would produce both savings for taxpayers and provide increased teachers' salaries? Yes, 4,313; no, 2,215.

HOSPITALIZATION, SURGICAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED—FORAND BILL

1. Would you favor a federally administered voluntary hospital and surgical insurance program for the aged to be paid for by the aged instead of a compulsory program under the social security system? Yes, 2,821; no, 3,561.

2. Do you favor the Forand bill or some similar national compulsory social security hospitalization insurance for the aged? Yes, 3,790; no, 2,904.

Jackson for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Washington, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, has very properly stated that he is not a candidate for nomination as Vice President of the United States, that this is an office which assuredly must seek the man, not the man the office. Notwithstanding, many friends of Senator JACKSON, knowing his capacity and the measure of his accomplishment, are now suggesting to the Democratic Party that he should be nominated as Vice President. Personally, I believe no better choice could be made. Senator JACKSON has a long and brilliant record of public service and is a specialist in many fields.

Senator JACKSON is well known in Alaska. His association with my State has been close through the years and he was floor manager of the Alaska statehood bill when it was passed by the Senate just 3 days less than 2 years ago today. Senator JACKSON's qualifications for the Vice Presidency are well stated in the lead editorial which appeared in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times last Saturday, June 25. I ask unanimous consent to include that editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and take great pleasure in doing so.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JACKSON RATES PLACE ON TICKET

The Democrats should nominate Senator HENRY JACKSON as their candidate for Vice President. They couldn't do better.

JACKSON would be a real vote fetcher. He is a man of proven ability in the field of public service. He is a student of the responsibilities that come to him. He does his homework and knows his stuff.

Alaskans know JACKSON as a true friend and helper. He helped them many times during the territorial days. He was one of the key figures in the Senate on the side favoring statehood legislation.

The Nation knows JACKSON, too. He has gained prominence for his intelligent handling of public business. He has made himself an authority in the field of atomic energy as a result of his membership in the Joint Committe on Atomic Energy.

As a politician JACKSON has developed an uncanny habit of winning elections. He has won six elections for a seat in the House, and two for his Senate seat. His "batting average" at the polls stands at 1,000 percent.

There are Democrats who are well aware of the strength of Senator JACKSON for the national office.

Some quiet campaigning is going on to bring his name before the Los Angeles convention. It is obviously being done delicately because the winner of the presidential nomination will have much to say about his running mate. Too much aggressiveness could hurt the Jackson status.

His recognition goes beyond the politicians. The New York Times recently described him as an "effective doer in the field of national security." He has also been prominent on the front pages of New York and Washington newspapers for his efforts to improve the machinery of Government. He is chairman of a Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. Editorial comment on his objective approach to the task of the committee has been consistently laudatory.

It would be inspiring to have Senator JACKSON win a place on the Democratic ticket.

It would inspire the young people of the Nation because he has come up the hard way. Everything he has done he has done on his own.

One of the results is that he has qualities of dependability and trustworthiness that would stand any man in good stead for positions of great responsibilities. He is known for frankness and sincerity.

His selection as vice presidential candidate should balance the ticket no matter which of the many contenders for the top spot wins. Jackson is the only man from the West Coast who is a prominent contender.

The Alaskan delegation would do well to nominate Senator JACKSON at the appropriate time. They would be supporting a friend of long standing. They would be rendering a service to their party. They would also be strengthening their Nation by putting a qualified man in line for this important job.

Resolution by the Brooklyn Insurance Agents Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Brooklyn Insurance

Agents Association, Inc., at their meeting on June 8, 1960. This represents the thinking, energetic men who are in close touch with the business world and the community of Brooklyn. I believe it worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Whereas it is our considered opinion that the constantly decreasing value of the American dollar has been brought about mainly through the steady increase in Government spending, bringing the public debt of the country to an all-time high; and

Whereas the interest and refunding of the public debt together with the steadily rising costs of Government services requires a taxload on the American public which is fast approaching the confiscation stage; and

Whereas there is constant pressure by various groups for more and more so-called welfare legislation whereby the public debt would be further increased, or alternatively, taxes would be increased to meet the costs of such projects; and

Whereas this association representing the insurance agency business in Brooklyn believes the time has come to call a halt to Government spending for any but defense purposes and the most essential services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon our Representatives in Congress to actively oppose any legislation that would further increase the public debt, or increase the already heavy taxload on the people, and that they further oppose any legislation that will extend the present "creeping" inflation in our American economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator from New York, and to each Representative from Brooklyn in the Congress.

BROOKLYN INSURANCE AGENTS ASSOCIATION,
W. F. STANZ, *Secretary*.

Expanded Efforts To Preserve Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, to assure a necessary reservoir of natural resources for generations of the future, the Nation, I believe needs to expand its efforts to better utilize, conserve, and manage these resources.

Over the weekend, I was pleased to review the challenge in the field of conservation, as well as to make some recommendations, in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES GREATER EFFORT TO PRESERVE NATURAL RESOURCES; OUTLINES 11-POINT LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

(Excerpts of address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations)

Friends, in a fast-growing nation—existing in an increasingly complex world—we face a great many large and varying challenges.

At this time, I'd like to discuss with you the task of maintaining, preserving, conserving and best utilizing our natural resources—without which a nation would "dry up and wither away"; and without which a nation—and a people—would not be able to meet its challenges. The fundamentals of a good resources program include: Efficient use; adequate development to expand reservoirs to meet the requirements of national security and a growing economy; effective conservation to provide for future generations; and equitable distribution of benefits from resources and efforts to discourage wasteful exploitation.

With the fast-increasing population—as well as urban and industrial expansion, there is—as you and I recognize—a great need to assure that these resources are handled wisely.

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Question. What, then, are some of the national objectives of our conservation program, Senator WILEY?

Answer. (1) Increased understanding and assumption of responsibility for conservation leadership by local people, their local soil conservation districts, and their county and State governments;

(2) Acceleration of on-farm soil and water conservation practices, including land use, not only for local benefit, but in light of the effect on, entire watersheds and river basins;

(3) Greater planning, within river basins and watersheds, for multiple use of water, including efforts to promote improved and efficient water use and management.

(4) Expansion of basic, as well as applied, research in the fields of soil, water, and forest conservation;

(5) Further improving, management, and development of our public lands, recognizing the growing pressures for recreational use as well as for the production of crops of timber, livestock, and water;

(6) Strengthening educational efforts in the field of soil and water conservation through the medium of general education as well as through specific organized youth and adult groups, both rural and urban.

Question. Now, what are some of the long-range objectives?

Answer. More emphasis on long-life (as contrasted to annual and recurring) conservation practices in, for example, the cost-sharing phase of the soil conservation program; use of a basic soil and water conservation plan as a basis for technical assistance, credit and cost-sharing aid in conservation on farms or ranches; as possible, separate identification and administration of those programs, aimed primarily at stabilization of production, from those with primary soil and water conservation objectives; better correlation of Federal conservation programs with the programs of State conservation agencies; encourage new investment of private capital in the application of soil and water conservation work and watershed development.

Question. Now, turning to the preservation of our outdoor heritage, what progress is being made, for example, in expanding our national park system?

Answer. You will recall that the National Park Service undertook a program, initiated in 1956, called the Mission 66 program. This program is working to improve conservation and expansion of the national park system. The objectives include: Providing more adequate recreational facilities; assuring protection of natural and historic features of our park lands; and making these out-of-door areas more accessible to visitors.

Included in the national program are efforts for new and improved roads, trails and parkways, visitors' centers, museums, campsites, utility systems, and other services.

In addition, the National Park Service is attempting to appraise the Nation's outstanding scenic, scientific, and cultural resources and evaluate, and meet the future public demand for them.

Question. Along these lines, we recall that you cosponsored legislation for the establishment of a Moraine National Park in Wisconsin. What is the status of this project?

Answer. Initially, the Park Service conducted a preliminary survey. The study revealed that there was real geological, biological, historic significance to the glacially formed moraines. Unfortunately, the Department has been hampered by lack of funds for carrying out the necessary follow-up studies to determine the extent of moraines for inclusion in a possible park system.

Within the limitation of their capabilities, I have suggested that the Department go forward on this as early as possible.

We recognize that if this is too long delayed, there may well be serious deterioration of the valuable moraine features on our Wisconsin landscape.

EXPANSION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

Question. As the senior Senator of a conservation-minded State, what's the outlook for improvement of our fish and wildlife programs?

Answer. Currently, there are 18 million acres of national wildlife refuges, 100 fish hatcheries, laboratories, and other facilities for fish and wildlife research.

Nationally, under the supervision of the Department of Interior, programs of research, planning, management, and protection are being carried forward in close cooperation with States, like Wisconsin, to stem the decline of fish and wildlife resources. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, for example, administers two national wildlife refuges in Wisconsin, the Necedah National Wildlife Refuge of 40,000 acres, and the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge of 21,000 acres.

Question. What's being done in the fisheries management program?

Answer. Two fish hatcheries are operated in Wisconsin: The Lake Mills Hatchery and Genoa Hatchery which, together, produce about 4,300 pounds of warm water species such as bass, and bluegills, and small quantities of trout, for stocking local waters. The La Crosse Research Laboratory now conducts research on methods for selective control of fishes for better management and conservation of Wisconsin's lakes, streams, and ponds.

Question. What is the outlook on the eradication of lamprey in the lakes?

Answer. Sea lamphrey control operations conducted from a field station in Marquette, Mich., include electric barriers and chemical treatment of Wisconsin streams.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is conducting research on lake trout and white fishes from a field station in Ashland. This research is directed to rehabilitation after depredation by sea lampreys to the balance between planted and natural trout in Lake Superior.

CONSERVATION OF WATER

Question. What about conservation of water, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Fortunately, Wisconsin has been blessed with rich water resources. With a fast-expanding population, however, it is expected that we will need more effective methods of use and reuse of water for industrial and similar purposes; as well as a more effective conservation program.

National experts indicate that by 1980, the United States will have to turn to ocean water for industrial, agricultural, and human consumption. To help meet this need, I cosponsored legislation to set up a program for converting saline and brackish water suitable for industrial, agricultural, and human utilization purposes. Five demonstration

plants are being constructed for sea water conversion. Fortunately, the program is going forward encouragingly. As a matter of fact, reports already indicate that it has been possible to substantially cut the cost of converting sea water for human, industrial, and agricultural purposes.

Question. What are some of the highlights of the work in Wisconsin?

Answer. Under the Department of Interior, the following programs are underway.

In the face of a possible future water shortage, we are carrying on extensive water resources investigations in Wisconsin. Information on streamflow and lake stage is being obtained in about 90 locations. Groundwater investigations are in progress in nine areas. Most of this work is financed cooperatively with the University of Wisconsin, the Public Service Commission, and the Commission on Water Pollution.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Question. Now, turning to soil conservation, Senator, we recognize that the organization of soil conservation districts has become a practical means for carrying on effective measures to conserve our natural resources. What is the scope of this program?

Answer. Nationally, there are 2,865 soil conservation districts. These include about 90 percent of the land in farms and 95 percent of all the farms and ranches in the United States. In Wisconsin, for example, the agricultural land by November 1956 had all been organized into soil conservation districts. By June 1959, over 39,000 farmers—operating more than 6½ million acres of land—were cooperating with Wisconsin's 71 soil conservation districts. Some of the outstanding practices include: stripcropping, totaling more than 971,000 acres; crop rotations, more than 173 million acres; pasture planting, 247,000 acres; tree plantings, 66,000 acres; waterway development, 12,403 acres; terracing, nearly 4,000 miles, and contour farming, 173,195 acres. Under the agricultural conservation program, also, a remarkable amount of progress has been made toward putting into effect real, constructive conservation practices.

SCOPE OF AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND SERVICE

Question. Senator, what about research in agriculture?

Answer. We recognize that research is a key to progress in agriculture, as in other fields. Currently, the Agriculture Research Service is conducting a wide variety of programs in soil and water management and conservation designed to permit more efficient, sustained, and profitable use of these resources. The studies include plant and animal life, soil chemistry, methods of cultivation, irrigation and crop rotation, efforts to produce crops of high nutritive value and soil-water-plant relationships that may affect management of different soils.

Research is also underway in such fields as watershed hydrology, stream and reservoir sedimentation, runoff, engineering aspects of drainage and irrigation, and other programs.

Incidentally, a large portion of this research is carried out in cooperation with State agricultural experiment stations and State departments of agriculture. For example, the Upper Mississippi Valley Conservation Experiment Station at La Crosse, Wis., and Madison, Wis., are focal points of such research and does a splendid job.

FOREST RESOURCES

Question. Now, turning to our forestry program, Senator, in view of the increasing population demands for homebuilding as well as for industrial progress, are we making adequate progress in carrying on forest tree plantings, conservation, and management programs?

Answer. Fortunately, the Federal Forest Service—as well as constructive State programs—are making a fundamentally significant contribution to assuring an adequate volume of forests and forest products for generations of the future.

We recall, of course, that the Forest Products Utilization Laboratory, in Madison, Wis.—celebrating its 50th anniversary this month—is making a significant contribution in the field of research.

Overall, our 181 million acres of forest lands grouped into 151 national forests—including two in Wisconsin, the Nicolet and Chequamegon Forests—yield water, timber, forage, recreation, game and other wildlife, and minerals. All of the renewable resources are managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services.

In fiscal year 1959, 8.3 billion board feet of timber was harvested in the national forests. The cut in 1960 is expected to reach 9.6 billion board feet. In addition, 6 million livestock graze on national forest range; also watersheds are managed to regulate streamflow, prevent floods, and provide water for power, irrigation, navigation, and municipalities.

Recreation, too, ranks with water and timber as a major use of the national forests. Visits to these forests for recreation climbed from 68.5 million in 1958 to 81 million in 1959, and the trend is steadily upward.

Developing the recreation resources, improving the habitation for wildlife, and the prevention and controlling of fires and pests go hand in hand with the management of other resource values of the national forests.

By the year 2000 a nearly doubled timber growth will be needed by a population of nearly 300 million. Consequently, the Nation cannot just haphazardly expect that our natural soil, water, and forest resources will be able to make these ever-increasing demands of the future. Instead, these resources must be protected, developed, and managed to assure that we will have ample resources for the times ahead.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of conservation practices and programs for soil, water, and forest resources underway—and for the future.

As stewards of these important resources, you and I—and the Nation—have a responsibility for vigilantly improving and expanding these programs for assuring a reservoir of such invaluable resources for the future.

At this time, I greatly appreciate your being with us for this program.

Thank you very much.

Resolution on Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., on June 20, 1960:

Whereas there is now pending before Congress the Forand plan; and

Whereas this plan would extend the social security system to include moderate hospital, nursing homes, and other care for all persons eligible for social security benefits; and

Whereas many residents of our city would be helped by the adoption of this plan; and

Whereas the city itself and the State would save a substantial amount of money if this bill was adopted; and

Whereas this board of aldermen approves the adoption of the Forand plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution asking for the adoption of the Forand plan be sent to our Senators from Massachusetts, Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader and the minority leader of both branches of Congress, and the Secretary of Health of the United States.

Alderman JOSEPH B. GREENFIELD.

Adopted in board of aldermen June 20, 1960.

Approved June 22, 1960.

ALFRED R. VOKE,
Mayor.

Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL,
City Clerk.

The Cincinnati Office of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, the FBI is a highly efficient fact gathering agency which has an outstanding record of accomplishments in the intelligence field as well as in law enforcement. The high qualifications and accomplishments of the FBI are well known throughout the world. It is significant to me that the FBI has established a reputation for wholehearted and enthusiastic cooperation with local law enforcement agencies. In the Cincinnati area the FBI and all law enforcement agencies work hand in hand. The net result is unequaled harmony, unmatched efficiency, substantial economy, and most agreeable results.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the views of Mr. C. A. Harrell, city manager of Cincinnati, in which he expresses the views of the citizens of this area and the high regard of the community for Director J. Edgar Hoover and his representatives in the Cincinnati FBI office:

CITY OF CINCINNATI,
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 21, 1960.

Mr. E. D. MASON,
Special Agent in Charge,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Post Office and Court House Building,
Cincinnati, Ohio

DEAR MR. MASON: Your letter commending Chief Schrotel and his staff for their police efforts is greatly appreciated.

The Cincinnati Police Department is highly honored and proud to work with and cooperate with the FBI. The excellent caliber of performance and reputation of the FBI is well recognized in every land in the world. Therefore, we are most happy to join with you in combating those members of society who do not choose to follow prescribed rules of conduct.

We know of no greater organization with which we can work with than the FBI. Please extend to your eminent Director, J. Edgar Hoover, our most sincere thanks for the privilege of having the wonderful assistance of the FBI, and you may rest assured of our ever-continuing cooperation.

A copy of your letter has been sent to the city council for the official record.

Kindest personal regards and best wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

C. A. HARRELL,
City Manager.

Appendix

Roads to Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have here an excellent valedictory address delivered by Miss Linda A. Harrison at the graduation exercises of Melrose High School on June 8, 1960.

This is a most encouraging document, Mr. President, since it forcefully demonstrates the vigor and vision of our youth, in a time when we are experiencing new tensions in our relationships with the East and when the entire Nation is debating our national purpose.

Appropriately enough, Miss Harrison's remarks deal primarily with the challenge of foreign affairs, and the need for Americans of all walks of life to give their talent at a unique frontier—at the edge of the "largely unexplored territory of international relations." The address is titled "Roads to Agreement." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROADS TO AGREEMENT

(Valedictory address delivered at Melrose High School by Linda A. Harrison, June 8, 1960)

As the members of the class of 1960 leave Melrose High School and enter their various worlds, they will perhaps find a world in which the usual frontiers are gone. Man has conquered nearly every challenge on this earth. He has already climbed the highest mountains, penetrated to the floor of the deepest ocean, bulldozed trails through thick jungles, made desert lands arable, and turned frozen wastes into inhabitable regions. Are there, then, any frontiers left today? In my opinion one vast frontier does remain, challenging the most resourceful of men to explore it and solve its mysteries. This frontier is unique because it is not a physical area. It is the largely unexplored territory of international relations. Throughout history nations have had their differences, but at no time before this has the world been split so decisively into two opposing factions. Today we are keenly aware of the divisive forces pitting the East against the West—communism against freedom—in a cold war. The U–2 spy plane incident and the breakdown of the Paris summit conference emphasize our awareness of this frontier and point out the need for someone to convince the world that the basic demands of two peoples, far from running contrary to one another, are actually alike. President Eisenhower was thinking of this when in an address to the Nation he called America's efforts at negotiation a "careful search for common interests between the Western Allies and the Soviet Union." Someone must persuade nations that man's hope for survival and peaceful coexistence lies in his finding cooperative methods of meeting common needs.

Like every other developing area the field of foreign relations has had its first men and its first discoveries. Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, Cordell Hull's good neighbor policy, and General Marshall's Marshall plan—all are products of original thinking on international problems. In a nonpolitical field, the work of Albert Schweitzer and that of Frank Laubach have been significant. The examples that these men have set are inspiring others today. A few Americans are making successful efforts at creating goodwill between nations.

In 1954 a farm-raised Air Force master sergeant was stationed in Korea. As he walked through the fields near his base, Eugene Hoops noticed that the Koreans were not harvesting their cereal crops efficiently. Because they used a short blade attached to a long handle, they were able to gather only a fistful of grain at a time. Sergeant Hoops introduced the people to an American scythe, taught them to forge their own scythes, and enabled the Koreans to gather their crops five times faster than they had before. On another occasion Sergeant Hoops, realizing the terrible erosion of topsoil taking place on Korean farms demonstrated the effectiveness of cover crops; and then by distributing wild plum seeds to plant, Hoop practically put an end to this tragic waste of fertile soil.

Three thousand miles west of Korea, in India, another American is working toward cooperation in a different way. Mrs. Honsinger Fisher is striving to teach thousands of the illiterate in India to read and write. Laboriously, she and her staff have worked the numberless tongues of India into language primers. With the aid of the CARE organization they have produced "literacy kits" which contain slates, slate markers, and primers—enough supplies to teach 25 people to read and write. Mrs. Fisher estimates that for the price of one Sherman tank she could make 5,000 people literate—5,000 people who could learn to distinguish the truth for themselves.

Another American who has put foreign aid on a person-to-person basis is Dr. Thomas Dooley. At Dienbienphu in 1954 Dr. Dooley saw the link that exists between malnutrition, ill-health, and ignorance on one side and the false promises of communism on the other. He resigned his post in the Navy, organized a volunteer medical team, and returned to the Far East—this time to the Kingdom of Laos. There he has set up hospitals and trained the natives to treat their own people. By wiping out pain and suffering Dr. Dooley and his assistants are bringing the people of Laos closer to understanding of Americans.

These "not so ugly" Americans and many, many more like them who are steadily conquering the frontier of human relationships are representing America well overseas. Just as these men of good will are finding pathways to the goal of understanding, all men should search for enlightened solutions to the problem of coexistence. One of the mildest and most modest of men, Mahatma Ghandi, led his people and the British down one road to agreement. His plan of passive resistance solved peaceably a problem which often creates violence—that of a colony's separation from the mother country. The relative tranquillity in India contrasts sharply with events in Kenya where the brutality of the Mau-Maus was met with similar violence by the British. If, in our time, men use the brain power now channelled into rocket-making to seek new and original answers to the question of cooperation this frontier should soon be conquered.

Acceptance of war has become so standard in our civilization that we must remind ourselves always that war is completely contrary to basic human nature. When the roads to agreement are finally found, the aggressive side of man's nature will seek satisfaction, not in killing, but in waging war against its true enemies—poverty, disease, and ignorance. Then men will have found that William James, the American philosopher, referred to as a moral equivalent for war. It is intrinsic in the moral and religious heritage of all peoples to want to find the patterns of living which will satisfy man's basic urge to live at peace with his neighbor.

An Urgent Report on Domestic Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 86th Congress draws to a close, I believe it of utmost importance to discuss with my colleagues the situation existing in this Nation, including my State of Oklahoma, with respect to the oil-producing industry.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that a little over a year ago, President Eisenhower instituted mandatory controls over oil imports. This action was taken because conditions in the domestic petroleum industry had been growing steadily worse due to an ever-increasing flood of foreign oil imports. He acted pursuant to the national defense amendment which Congress had made a part of the Trade Agreements Act, and which required the President to take the necessary steps to curb the imports of any commodity which were threatening the national security.

In announcing this mandatory program, President Eisenhower stated:

The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemispheric reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.

Note his words, "the new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States." Surely all will agree this is a noteworthy goal.

Let us examine matters to see just how much of this goal has been accomplished.

Shortly after the program was announced, there seemed to be some renewed confidence instilled in the domestic petroleum producing industry. Drilling picked up. The price of crude oil, which had been steadily declining in the face of climbing drilling costs and and ever-increasing imports, began to level off.

Operators began to feel they could plan future drilling programs in the knowledge that they could sell the oil they found at a fair price which would not be chipped away by cheap foreign produced oil.

Thus, the search for and development of the vitally needed future oil reserves received encouragement as intended by the President's action under the defense amendment. For example, for the Nation as a whole, oil well completions rose in 1959 about 3½ percent over 1958. However, the record will show that this momentary bright outlook has faded away to a point that it can be said that the domestic petroleum industry is neither, to use the words of the President, "stable" or "healthy."

Just what do we find when we look at the facts?

For the Nation, we see this:

First. Geophysical and core drilling crews—the real barometer on oil exploratory activity—are down 13 percent from 1959.

Second. Active rotary rigs are down 19 percent from 1959.

Third. Crude oil production is down 131,000 barrels per day below 1959 averages.

Fourth. Crude oil price reductions have become the order of the day. These price cuts coming in the face of rising costs for everything the operator uses in looking for oil.

Employment in the industry has likewise decreased by many thousands over the last year.

In my own State of Oklahoma, conditions are even worse than for the United States as a whole.

Crude production during the first 5 months of this year is 20,000 barrels less daily than during same period last year and 60,000 barrels less daily than same months in 1956. Allowables have just been reduced to the lowest level in 5 years.

Price cuts have been widespread.

On June 15 last year, 248 rotary rigs were active—this year on June 13, the figure is 173—a decline of 75 rigs or 30 percent.

The number of wells drilled so far this year is 1,743, a decline of 868 wells or 33 percent from same months last year.

The number of Oklahomans employed in the oil- and gas-producing industry in March was 42,400 compared with 44,700 in March of 1959—a drop of 2,300 employees or more than 5 percent in just 1 year. Here again comparing this year with 1956, we see that there has been a drop of 7,000 employees—or 14 percent.

All of these factors have had a depressing effect on the entire economy of Oklahoma.

Does this sound like the oil-producing industry in my State or the Nation as a whole is stable and healthy, capable of meeting the goals laid down for it by President Eisenhower when he established the oil import program in March 1959?

The answer is an emphatic "No."

Mr. Speaker, I must say that had we not had this mandatory program, things would be much worse.

But we must not overlook this fact—that even with this program, total oil imports into this Nation—including residual oil, last year amounted to more than 650 million barrels. That is a lot of oil. In fact, today, total imports amount to more than 25 percent of our domestic oil production, the highest rate in the history of our industry.

Mr. Speaker, we hear many of the experts say that the domestic oil-producing industry is in dire straits because of other factors and not imports. This kind of an answer does not impress me. We must recognize that we are weakening our domestic oil industry because of excessive imports. Solve this problem first. It is this simple. Are we going to continue to allow foreign produced oil to continue to share U.S. markets in ever-increasing amounts while our own industry shrinks and becomes less and less able to meet the goals and challenge of our national security needs?

The answer is clear. I, therefore, call on the executive department to substantially reduce allowable oil imports now—reductions that will be sufficient to meet the executive department's own goal as laid down last year. If this cannot be done, then in the interest of national security Congress will have to reconsider this whole matter to the end that legislation will be enacted to preserve this vital industry in a strong and healthy condition—a position of strength, capable of meeting the challenge of any enemy in the world today.

Adjournment Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include copy of my newsletter released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Congress is caught in the grip of its annual adjournment rush.

At this time of the year I am always reminded of individuals who put off until the very last minute doing many things they know must be done. Apparently, it takes a rapidly approaching deadline to get down to hard work.

Congress is trying desperately to adjourn before the beginning of the Democratic convention on July 11. No one wants to have to come back after the conventions and finish up. That accounts for the feverish activity in recent days to dispose of many difficult and complex issues.

Remaining on the agenda are housing, minimum wage, social security, aid to education, and many other important issues. Unless Congress can dispose of these matters in an orderly fashion in the few days remaining before the conventions, then we have no other choice but to come back and finish up.

There is really no excuse for this annual last minute rush. One cause is the tendency of committees to delay getting down to serious business for several weeks after Congress convenes each year. Another reason, too, is that Congress must wait until committees have cleared bills for debate on the floor.

The prospects for the next week or so are for long sessions lasting from 10 o'clock in the morning until late each evening. This will continue until Congress clears its agenda and can adjourn, assured that it has not neglected any important public business.

CONGRESS MUST DECIDE WHAT TO DO ABOUT CASTRO

The Sugar Act expires this year. Ordinarily, it extension would be routine matter but the emergence of the Fidel Castro regime in Cuba has greatly complicated the picture.

How long can the United States continue to tolerate Castro's insults and threats? Should we continue to buy Cuban sugar at good prices when our domestic producers and friendly nations could supply all the sugar that is needed here?

Thus far the United States has hesitated to take such reprisals against Castro. The hope has been that he would curb the extremists in his government and get along with the United States. But to date Castro has shown every indication of becoming more and more violent toward us. He has invited Khrushchev to visit Cuba and apparently Russian technicians are due to visit Cuba on technical missions.

Can we delay acting any longer on the question of sugar? There is strong sentiment in Congress for acting now even at the threat of alienating some of our friends in Latin America. These Members feel we should start by cutting back or canceling the Cuban sugar quota. At least, they feel we should give the President authority to act if the situation worsens.

It is a ticklish problem. No one wants to make Castro a symbol or a martyr. But he must be dealt with. We cannot continue indefinitely to accept his insults and disgraceful charges. If we do, the rest of the world will lose faith in us.

Forging a Nation's Will Via the Ballot Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in 1960—a presidential election year—the American people fortunately are becoming increasingly aware of their duties as citizens—particularly of the need for participating in elections.

Unfortunately, the record of votership in this country has been far too low.

I am delighted, therefore, that, across the country a great many organizations, including management as well as employee groups, are endeavoring to stimulate greater recognition of people on the need to vote, as well as participate in other ways in our Nation's political life.

For example, I was privileged recently to contribute an article entitled "Forging a Nation's Will Via the Ballot Box" to a splendid publication, Wisconsin Telephone News, published by the Wisconsin Telephone Co., for its employees.

Reflecting on the need for greater participation in public affairs by citizens—as well as amplifying the splendid way in which management is encouraging such participation, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORGING A NATION'S WILL—VIA THE BALLOT BOX

The lifeblood of a republic is its people—well informed, creative, thinking, knowledgeable citizens.

In our country we have been endowed with a rich heritage of freedom, including a voice in our government. Tragically, however, too few eligible voters exercise this great privilege—for which our forefathers fought and many died, and for which millions of peoples around the world still yearn.

Currently, barely one-half of the people in this country are participating in its political life. What does this mean? Among other things, it threatens: Rule of a minority, loss of voice in government for millions of people, disproportionately "strong voice" in government for the special interests crusading for their own goals, and a general loss of creativeness and strength which patriotic, dutiful, forward-looking citizen support can bring to government.

The dismally poor record of U.S. voting ranges from 24 percent in 1904 to 63 percent in 1952. By contrast, voting in other countries has ranged as follows: Italy, 93 percent; West Germany, 89 percent; Turkey, 87 percent; Denmark, 80 percent; England, 89 percent.

We realize, of course, that voting is more than just marking and "X" on the ballot, or pulling a lever on a voting machine. Fundamentally, the exercise of this precious right includes educating ourselves on: The issues in a political campaign, the candidates and their qualifications, informing eligible voters of—and encouraging them to meet—registration requirements, educating potential voters on the processes of government—and the value of citizen support, participation in—and, if deemed advisable, constructive opposition, and finally, launching a counterattack against the apathy which, regrettably, is allowing to go unheard the voice of millions of people.

In the spirit of good citizenship, civic-minded management—including the Wisconsin Telephone Co., as well as employee organizations—are now, constructively and wisely, encouraging greater voter participation in elections. This opportunity of voting challenges us to creatively attempt to find ways and means in which our Government—now the greatest in the world's history—can still better serve the Nation.

In a republic, the governmental machinery is the adopted method of carrying out the community, State, or National "business of the people."

If we allow somebody else to "attend to our business," there can be a dangerous loss of freedom.

The ballot box is the means by which "We, the people, speak." If we speak en masse, then the ordinances and laws of the land will reflect our will.

The Local Government Officials' Stake in Air Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Commissioner Arthur J. Benline, of the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, has been in touch with me on a number of occasions regarding the overall need for expanded air pollution control and research programs. Commissioner Benline is well qualified to comment on this subject in his capacity as head of New York City's air pollution control program.

I want to call attention today to a speech which the commissioner made on June 20 at the conference of mayors and other municipal officers in Rochester, N.Y., entitled, "The Local Government Officials' Stake in Air Pollution Control." This speech is a hard-hitting and informative analysis of the growth of our Nation's air pollution problems and of the urgent need for an intensification of our efforts to deal with them. Above all, it contains much good advice for communities that are just beginning to come to grips with air pollution difficulties.

I commend Commissioner Benline for his excellent and very useful speech, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS' STAKE IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

(Address by Arthur J. Benline, commissioner, New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, at the conference of mayors and other municipal officials, and the New York State Building Officials Conference, Rochester, N.Y., June 20, 1960)

We hear more and more about air pollution and the need for its control. Hardly a day goes by that we do not see a Government official, a scientist, or an industrialist making a statement about air pollution. Perhaps in your hometown, some citizens are beginning to talk about air pollution and the need for control.

Fortunately, although every area of our country suffers from some form of air pollution—since air pollution, like television, is a byproduct of our civilization—at this time most of the country does not face a serious problem. But, as the U.S. Public Health Service has been saying for some time—the problem is becoming more serious and perhaps dangerous and, most importantly, air pollution will get worse in many places before it gets better.

It is useless to talk about air pollution control without pinning down a few basic facts at the outset. The most important question to be asked in any given case is: Do the people want to avoid air pollution and pay for cleaner air, or are they willing to let air pollution increase and try to control it when it has gotten out of hand? There is not the slightest doubt that the latter approach is foolish, expensive, and dangerous.

The need for air pollution control exists everywhere today, even if it is only a matter of controlling a local nuisance. In most cases, however, air pollution is or will be much more than a nuisance—it is a problem of economic concern and it is a public health matter.

How should local government operate in the field of air pollution control? A great deal will depend on local circumstances, because we must be flexible in our approach. But, there are a few distinctive guides we can use in answering the question:

First. Local government officials must realize and make the citizens realize that there is no such thing as clean air. Clean air is not an attainable goal, since any foreign matter in air is air pollution. But cleaner air is an attainable goal.

Second. Local government officials must understand and make the citizens understand that air pollution is a two-way street. Everyone suffers from air pollution, but everyone is capable of causing air pollution and everyone does cause air pollution on occasion.

Third. Local government officials must understand and make the public understand that all forms of air pollution must be controlled—the leaf fire as well as the smoking industrial chimney. Get enough leaf fires going in a small town on a hazy fall day and you can equal the pollution output of the local factory.

Fourth. Local government must stress two overriding facts: Air pollution costs everyone money, particularly because of wasted fuel and wasted materials, and, air pollution can be a factor—perhaps a highly important one—in our health.

Fifth. Local government officials must understand and make the citizens understand that there are no such things as standards of air pollution control. We are not dealing now with building codes or the various standards of the American Standards Association. We are dealing with a new field of governmental concern and we are still feeling our way along the path to cleaner air.

To accomplish these goals, local government must start with a good, solid, basic law, one which recognizes that in the field of air pollution control, technological progress is taking place all the time. That means that there are some sources of air pollution which we can control right now; others which we may be able to control within a year or two, and still others we may not be able to control for some time. That means the rules under which the control agency operates must be flexible enough to permit advanced technology to be utilized as quickly as possible.

Wherever manmade air pollution is attacked—and I shall leave the pollens to others—there are two facets of the problem: control of old equipment, which was installed without a thought as to what came out of the pipe, stack or exhaust; and control of new equipment, which should be installed only after it has been shown that it conforms to the best engineering techniques available. The key to control of air pollution in many cases is good equipment, well designed, well installed, well maintained and well operated.

Those last two points are important. You can have the best equipment in the world, but if it is not maintained properly, or it is not operated properly, you are going around in a great circle and getting nothing for your pains but a headache. It is clear, therefore, that the job of local government does not end when it approves a new installation of equipment or control devices. Quite the contrary. The job just begins.

Let me make this clear right now: Don't think of air pollution control as a short-term proposition. It is not. Given air pol-

lution—and we have it—we must have air pollution control. Given continued air pollution—and it is safe to predict we will have it—we must have continuing air pollution control.

All right. We have the law. We have good equipment. We have inspection to insure proper maintenance and operation. Well and good. But—we have people.

Few people cause air pollution by design. Some do not know any better. Some are just lazy. Some just do not know what's going on in the world, let alone what's coming out of their chimney.

That means that one of the major concerns of the local control agency must be education—constant, repetitive, simple education as to the basic facts of air-pollution control. And it means that coupled with the education must be the power to take stern legal action against offenders, when education fails. And, believe me, it will fail, on occasion. Yes; we must have the candy, offered at all times. But, the stick must not be far off, if the candy should fail.

Given the sound, basic law, given the desire of the local government to do a job, given the support of the public, and given sensible administration, the air of any community can be made cleaner by controlling or eliminating local sources of air pollution.

But, air pollution in any given community does not affect only the air of that community. Air pollution does not stand still. It has no respect for manmade boundaries. That is why we need a broader attack. But, in undertaking this broader attack, we cannot, we must not lose sight of the truth that the local source of air pollution must ultimately be controlled by the community in which that source originates.

We in the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control have long recognized that air-pollution control is a matter not only of statewide, but of nationwide concern. We favor superior Government support and prodding of local control agencies. We welcome cooperative programs within a given area where air pollution is spilling across political and geographic boundaries—we have such a cooperative setup now with New York State and New Jersey State authorities. All of this is to the good. Such wider vision should be encouraged everywhere.

But the people of the local community must not be lulled into a false sense of security by thinking that just because there is a New York State Board of Air Pollution Control, or just because there is a U.S. Public Health Service, that air pollution will go away. Nothing could be further from the truth. There are not and there will not be any magic wands in air-pollution control.

The hard truth is that air pollution anywhere will be controlled or eliminated where—and only where—the people of the community which is causing air pollution are concerned enough to do something about it.

If you want to control air pollution in your community—and you should want to, before you have to—start doing it now. Make use of the knowledge of others—none of us knows everything. Share your knowledge with others.

But do the job yourself. And start doing it quickly. It is later than many of you think. It does not take very long for any community to start having a serious air-pollution problem, but, once it exists, it will be a long, hard pull to get cleaner air. As Government officials, all of us have a responsibility and a duty to see that we get the job done properly. The Air Pollution Control Association's directory of "government air pollution control agencies" shows that in many States and cities where there is no separate air-pollution-control unit, the building department or building official is charged with this responsibility. In other jurisdictions those duties are delegated to the health officer, the city engineer, public works, or some type of cooperation or coordination between such related agencies. But almost without exception the staff assigned to this duty is inadequate in numbers.

That cloud—no bigger than a man's hand—which lies just above the horizon, is not a cloud at all. It is the signal that air pollution will come to any community which believes that it cannot happen here.

Trade Up in European Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of June 23 reporting on the great expansion of trade within the European Economic Community this year.

The article reports that trade among members of the Community has increased by 40 percent in the first quarter of 1960 over the first quarter of 1959, and that imports from outside of the Community have risen by nearly 20 percent. The latest data which I have received from the Department of Commerce shows that U.S. exports to the EEC have risen by 54 percent—considerably more than the internal trade gains of the EEC, and nearly three times more than the gains made by other nations in their exports to the EEC.

I believe that the great increase of the internal trade of the European Economic Community and the even greater rise in U.S. exports to these countries are indicative of the tremendous economic expansion within that area and of the vast potential which this market offers to the American producer. Now that all of these nations have substantially or completely eliminated their trade and payments restrictions against dollar goods is the time for U.S. producers and exporters to expand and develop their markets in Europe. A good start has been made. U.S. trade policy must now place this country in the flexible bargaining position necessary to keep expanding the markets in the European Economic Community which are so vital to our own and the free world's economic development and our balance of payments position.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE IS UP 40 PERCENT IN SIX-NATION BLOC—COMMERCE WITHIN EUROPEAN COMMUNITY SHOWS SHARP INCREASE OVER LAST YEAR

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, June 22.—The six-nation European Economic Community appears to be performing surprisingly like a common market long before it really is one.

Officials of the Community's executive commission reported today that internal trade, which grew almost twice as fast as trade with outsiders last year, continued on a similar path in the early months of this year.

Trade between the members was 40 percent higher in the first quarter of this year than in the same period of 1959, according to unofficial figures just compiled.

Imports from and exports to the outside world also grew during this period, but not nearly so fast as trade within the Community. The United States was among the beneficiaries of the growing imports of the Community, which this year are up nearly one-fifth over last year. But the main growth was internal.

The tremendous growth in exchanges of goods within the six—France, Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—can scarcely be attributable to changes in tariffs, or even to elimination or enlargement of the relatively few remaining import quotas.

The tariff reductions so far amount to a mere 10 percent, for example, and most of the quota liberalization has helped outsiders almost as much as members of the Common Market.

SOME SPECIAL FACTORS

Several special factors, mainly recovery from the 1958 recession and the devaluation of the French franc, account for much of the trade increase, but not all.

The conclusion of the experts is that businessmen in the six countries are already anticipating the day when free trade will be a fact.

This is far from the case now. Even with the recent decision of the six nations to accelerate the achievement of the Common Market, tariffs by next January 1 will have been reduced only 30 percent from their 1957 level, compared with 10 percent now.

This means they are making an effort to establish sales outlets in the markets of fellow members early in the game, even at some sacrifice of prices and profits at this stage.

One direct bit of evidence is that prices last year for intracommunity exports averaged 5 percent more than the year before, and this was one explanation for the general price stability for the consumers throughout the six countries.

It is apparent from statements of businessmen and their trade associations that they fully expect the Common Market to proceed to its goal of internal free trade, probably well before the treaty deadline of 1970–72. For example, the head of the French wholesalers' association said recently that "what we have always considered as exports we will soon have to consider as internal trade."

OTHER PROGRESS NEGLIGIBLE

Tariffs are not everything, however. Progress has been negligible on such matters as transport discrimination, where Italy refuses even the first step of requiring the transport rates to be published.

Besides, a shipper from New York to Colorado does not have to face the annoying problem of the turnover or value added tax, as does the shipper from France to the Netherlands. The Frenchman must apply for forgiveness of his tax and the Dutch customer must pay a special tax on the imported item equivalent to the Dutch turnover tax on the same item producted domestically.

Last year the Netherlands found it convenient to raise its equivalent tax on many products at about the same time tariffs were reduced.

A little progress on the turnover tax problem was made this week when the ruling Council of Ministers of the Common Market agreed upon a standstill from now on, with plenty of advance notice required for any changes. But these taxes are far from harmonized and, depending on how they are administered, can constitute a disguised import barrier.

Thus the six nations are far from a common market of the sort the United States

has internally. Still trade expands with surprising speed.

Evidently, the impending reduction of straightforward trade barriers alone—tariffs and quotas—is proving enough of an incentive for many businesses to seek markets in the fellow member, or to specialize in parts of finished products that require imports to complete them.

Africa on the Move—By May Craig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 25, 26, and 27, Mrs. May Craig published three columns which were printed in various Maine newspapers.

In the first, written in Nairobi, she cites the need of understanding by the West for African native customs.

In the second, she recounts a press conference held with Tom Mboya, KAU leader.

In the third, Mrs. Craig tells of the happy Ethiopia of today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these three articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—NATIVE CUSTOMS NEED UNDERSTANDING BY WEST

(By May Craig)

NAIROBI.—Living close to animals which we do not have in the more populated countries, the Africans, black, yellow, brown, white, all have a feeling of kinship for them, that we do not have. Over the gates into the Nairobi National Park, a game refuge, there is a sign which says:

"The wildlife of today is not ours to dispose of as we please. We have it in trust. We must account for it to those who come after us. Signed: His Majesty King George VI." The rangers are black Kenyans, except a few. They wear khaki uniforms, green caps, with a ruffle hanging down the back of the neck to protect them from the sun. They thus have a protective coloration. They ride bicycles and on paths to which tourists cannot go. We go in cars or small buses. Fine Mercedes, painted like a striped zebra. In these countries the number of "human bodies" that may be carried is printed prominently, how many sitting, how many standing.

We got up at 5 o'clock, had quick toast and coffee brought to the room, left at 6, black dark, great bright stars. By the time we got there, the dawn was coming on, with stars still showing. We rode along in that magic time between dawn and sunrise and gradually we could see the animals getting up, coming to the waterholes, grazing. It was a lovely thing.

The park officials take no nonsense. Signs say: Stay in your car. Do not disturb the animals. No dogs or firearms allowed. Do not discard litter.

We saw many deer of all kinds, cheetah, those sly beauties. Ostriches, many giraffes, tall and slender, looking at us, eating from the tops of the flat-topped trees. There are rhinos here, but they are shy and we saw none; lions passed the thatched rangers huts near the gate just after we had gone in, they told us as we came out, but we did not see them. There were the vultures, black, solemn, many in trees, others circling the sky. All sorts of birds, bright butterflies, elegant jackals, hyenas, the ugly things with humped shoulders. None were afraid and we kept very quiet. It is a pity we did not start saving our own natural wild life sooner—now some of it is gone forever.

This business of witch doctors, voodoo, medicine men, even Mau Mau, needs understanding by the Western whites. Africans have an old civilization; there are the Zimbabwe ruins in Rhodesia. The tribes had intricate systems of laws, justice, marriage, war. They had no written language and the witch doctors and medicine men were the keepers of religion, medicine and other lore. They passed it down from father to son, they had acolytes and disciples. They knew about herbs and diseases and mixed their cures with religions, gods and devils. Many, including the Mau Mau, believed in eating essential organs of enemies, sacrifices, gaining strength, making cures. Today we "civilized" people go to our doctors and get ground up thyroid glands, for instance. Many of our serums are cultured on animals.

The people believed they could be bewitched, a hex put on them, and they would die. Many of us get psychiatric treatment, take pills with nothing in them and get cured because we believe in the doctor. The Africans are emotional people; they have gained from white civilization, but they have suffered from it too. They have been belittled; now they are gaining pride, there is what they call the "African personality" that their leaders want to regain, develop.

The Mau Mau is part of the independence symbolism which absorbs them, inspires them. It was evil in its actions and results and had to be stamped out as such; its evils were holding back the Africans from coming into the light of freedom, into the family of nations of today. But evil needs to be understood, its reasons and roots, and its consequences.

"Education is one of our great needs," Mboya said. This takes time. Even educated people need experience in addition to the education in college. He thinks for now there need be no more than one party dedicated to independence. Later there may be more. "We must not try to impose our kind of democracy in Africa," said one knowledgeable white official. "They are attuned to authoritarian rule. They want to adjust democracy to their needs." Mboya said his people appreciate the exchange and scholarships of Africans to the United States. It is true some are going to Moscow and will bring back some of that creed. That is the competition we face. He smiled as he said that Africans believe in majority rule and how can the Western whites object to that since it is their principle?

The pace of development is based on climate of public opinion, not on some white man's opinion. He does not think pan-Africanism should be attempted now, however desirable it might be in the future, even if only like pan-Americanism, which is a friendship of free separate nations. He thinks like-minded African nations might federate regionally. But Africans are as different as white, yellow, or brown peoples, and need not be compressed into one group. "You should not think blacks necessarily think alike, are alike, just because they are black," he told us.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—MBOYA IS AGAINST PROPOSED VOTING RESTRICTIONS

(By May Craig)

NAIROBI.—Into the office of the U.S. Information Service here, where this group of 40 white U.S. reporters, editors, publishers, owners of papers, radio and TV stations were waiting, tall, velvet-black Tom Mboya came from the bright African sunshine outside where cheering crowd of black Kenyans gathered to see him. He came catlike, young, only 29, already the idol of his people. He was born of poor, illiterate parents on one of the fine highland farms owned by white men, on the dried cow-dung floor of a thatched mud hut. His father worked with other Africans for $7 a month. He remembers the white overseers with the sjamboks, the hippopotamus-hide whips.

Even that wage helped pay for Tom to go to a Catholic mission school, 25 miles away, at $14 a year tuition. There he learned to read and write, scrawling his lessons in sand under a tree because there were no blackboards. Later he went to a higher Catholic school where he got first lessons in English. He was known to hate violence, which is perhaps why he was never a leader of the Mau Mau. He learned of the American revolution, the lesson: No taxation without representation; about Abraham Lincoln who freed the American slaves and of Booker T. Washington, the great Negro who wrote the book "Up From Slavery" and led his people. Tom even thought of being a priest but was embittered because the priests at the schools did not encourage his budding political ideas.

Today he paid tribute to the missionaries, when we asked him at the press conference, but said that they did not live up to what they preached—they accepted the status quo of black subservience to whites. One of us asked if it were not obligatory that the missionaries do this, else they would not be allowed to stay. He said bitterly that Christians should expect to be persecuted sometimes for what they believed right. He said that Christianity would not decline because of Kenyan independence, but its role would be more religious, and would have less other influence.

When his father could no longer pay the fee, Tom's education stopped. He got to Nairobi, took a 3-year public health course, got a city job, and then heard Jomo Kenyatta's speeches calling for freedom, and Africa for the blacks. Then he was in politics. Kenyatta in 1929 had gone to London for 15 years, then to Moscow for 2. There he learned the cell system and other Communist doctrine. The cell system was well suited to the tribal system of the Kikuyu tribe. He set up a network of bush schools against the white men, revived ancient barbarous rituals out of which the Mau Mau horrors grew. By 1952 gangs of Mau Mau were raiding and killing, each sworn to secrecy. The government was forced into emergency measures. Men, women, and children were being killed, not only whites but the loyalists among the Africans who opposed the Mau Mau. There was slaughter on both sides, the Mau Mau were hunted down. As many as 50,000 in a day were rounded up. Kenyatta was sent to a distant province camp prison. Most of the Mau Mau were put through rehabilitation and are back in regular life. Some of the worst are still in detention, including Kenyatta.

Other Mau Mau leaders followed Kenyatta into prison and Mboya took over as leader of the Kenyatta Party, the KAU, raised money for Kenyatta's defense. Kenyatta does not think much of Mboya, thinks he is too young, too moderate. But Mboya is the leader today; when KAU was banned in 1953, the Kenya Federation of Labor became the focus of the independence movement. He was its leader at the age of 23. Labor leaders in United States and Britain helped him. The International Federation of Free Trade Unions paid his way to a seminar in Calcutta where he learned sympathy with India. He won a scholarship to Oxford, where his English came in handy. He came to the United States to lecture and talk with CIO's Walter Reuther who helped him get money to build

the handsome labor building here in Nairobi. Coming home he won a seat in the legislative council.

Today he talked with us carefully but boldly. He is one with Nkruma of Ghana in wanting a single voting roll, one vote for one man. He is against the proposed voting restrictions agreed on in the recent London compromise—that is what he means by saying the new constitution will be changed. The restrictions would require that everybody under 40 years of age must be able to read and write his own language, own property, or have some income, about 75 pounds a year. This would restrict the number of African voters, of course.

Mboya was asked today whether he would guarantee property of the whites, especially in the highlands, and he said not entirely—that some of the large holdings must be broken up and measured out to Africans. As to compensation—Blundell said: "Where is he going to get the money, if the Europeans do not stay?" Mboya has a fine mind; he knows his problems, but he has to hold his leadership. He denies any Communist inspiration in the Mau Mau, so do many white officials here. He said today he would hope for multilateral assistance in building up Kenya, so not to be involved in political ideologies of either East or West.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—HAPPY ETHIOPIANS WANT NO CHANGE

(By May Craig)

ADDIS ABABA.—This the oldest Christian nation in the world, this Ethiopia. According to the lore of the people—and the Bible—its monarch, Haile Selassie I, is the descendant of King Solomon, King of Jerusalem, and Mekeda, Queen of Sheba, who lived nearly 3,000 years ago. The present Emperor is the 225th ruler of the line. With Eritrea, this is a big country, more than all of New England plus all States through Virginia and Kentucky, and west through Ohio and Michigan. Its average altitude is over 8,000 feet and officials here besought us to consider this and take it easy.

The Blue Nile rises here in Lake Tana, joins the White Nile in the Sudan, flows into the Mediterranean as the Nile, in Egypt. For centuries they have quarreled over the waters, for years over division for dams, hydroelectric power, irrigation. Just last year they agreed and the work began.

Queen Mekeda was quite a girl and pretty. She heard about King Solomon and how wise he was so she decided to trek up and see him. Sheba was a rich kingdom then including both sides of the Red Sea. Solomon had built a navy for commerce on the Red Sea, including Ethiopia which was on both sides of the Red Sea too. So Mekeda got together "a very great train, with camels that bear spices, and very much gold and precious stones" according to the Old Testament, and betook herself to Jerusalem, thinking up some good questions to try on the wise King.

Solomon had a thousand wives and concubines but he looked on the Queen and found her "black but comely." Besides, one more didn't matter and Sheba was a good conversationalist, while most of the thousand while beautiful were mostly dumb. In those days king and queens and gods and goddesses did about as they pleased. So Sheba and Solomon had an affair and after she went back to Sheba she bore Solomon's son, Menelik, first ruler of the line of Solomonic Ethiopian Emperors—bearing the father's name to this day.

Many of the areas adopted the Jewish religion; Christianity gained a foothold in what is now Ethiopia about the first century of the Christian era, and Islam expanded into it in the eighth century. About one-third of the Ethiopians today are Coptic Christian, one-third Moslem, one-third pagan. Greek travelers knew Ethiopia favorably, Herodotus and Homer wrote of it, Marco Polo and Vasco de Gama visited it.

Menelik I, first of the Solomonic line, was born about 980 B.C. The present Emperor, the Conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Elect of God, Emperor of Ethiopia, was born in 1892.

This is one of the few absolute monarchies left in the world. The Emperor had six children of whom two sons and one daughter are still living. He is a great grandfather at 72. The Crown Prince and heir apparent is Merid Azmatch Asfa Wosen Haile Selassie, who also has a son. He is not regarded with too much confidence as a successor and although the present Emperor is absolute and is said to have the utmost devotion from his people, the succession may not be happy. So great is the respect shown the Emperor that when one of our group went downtown in a cab and the Emperor passed by, the cab driver not only drew to the side and stopped but insisted that she get out and stand at attention as the Emperor went by.

The Emperor and his sons were educated abroad as well as here. This regime welcomes foreigners to stay as long as they wish. More than 400 young Ethiopians are abroad at universities, including United States, Canada, England, Germany, India, France, Switzerland. Technicians and advisers from many countries are here on invitation, in the Government, and the teaching staff includes more than 200 foreigners of 17 different nationalities. Education is the main preoccupation and a deep desire for more rapid progress—which is inclining some of the ministers to pressure the Emperor into seeking aid from the Soviet Union, since he cannot get enough from us and the West or world financial organizations to go ahead as fast as they want do.

The Communists are making a great effort here to spread their doctrine though we are told by American officials and Ethiopians that the monarchy is safe, that the people do not want change, are not affected by the racial revolutions and forceful independencies of other African nations. Ethiopia is free, prosperous, will have a constitutional monarchy soon, regard themselves as white people (black to pale gold), and are friends with the West. The Italians, allies of Nazi Germany, drove the Emperor out temporarily, but he came back and there is no ill will with Italians; in fact, most of their trade is with Italy.

There are border troubles with the Somali countries which the Emperor says he will resist with force, to prevent his borders from being pushed back. It is hard to believe that the absolutism can remain in a world of change, or that the people, many of whom live in such poverty, are as politically unconscious as we are told. Little good American news gets in the controlled press—they get Russian Tass, Agence France Press, and British Reuters free service, while our AP and UPI are costly by Ethiopian standards, though UPI had just made new low rates.

Resolution Endorsing the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt Minimum Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following resolution adopted by the council and approved by the mayor of the city of Pittsburgh on June 22, 1960, endorsing the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt minimum wage bill:

Whereas the present Minimum Wage and Hour Act falls woefully short of its stated objective of achieving a minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and the general well-being of workers;

Whereas of some 45 million workers who could and should be protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act, over 20 million are totally excluded;

Whereas this lack of coverage means that these excluded employees are paid pitifully low wages or are worked excessive hours without pay;

Whereas extension of coverage and increase in minimum wage is needed for obvious humanitarian and social reasons, for the benefits the economy would gain from increased buying power for low-income families, and for providing protection to socially responsible employers against unscrupulous wage chiselers; and

Whereas the welfare of the citizens of the city of Pittsburgh requires greater income than is provided under the present minimum wage, and broader coverage of the law to include persons presently outside its scope: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the elected members of the City Council of Pittsburgh, respectfully request the Congress of the United States to approve the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill which is designed to raise the minimum wage rate to $1.25 an hour and extend coverage to about 7½ million of the unprotected workers; and urge all Americans to write to their Congressmen and Senators so they will support this measure; and be it further

Resolved, That at the request of this city council, the Honorable Joseph M. Barr, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, will declare the week of July 26–July 2, 1960, as "Pass the Minimum Wage Law and Extend the Fair Labir Standards Act Week" in order to call to the attention of the American public the extreme importance and necessity of this action.

Hazleton, Pa., Business Firm Observes 120th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., issue of Monday, June 13, 1960, which reports that the Reinhart furniture store in that city has completed 120 years in business. This is truly a remarkable record, Mr. Speaker, when it is considered that during that long period this Nation has gone through four major wars, six major financial panics, the long anthracite coal strike, and the great depression of the 1930's. As a personal note, my late grandfather, Attorney Daniel J. McCarthy, a very distinguished member of the bar, was a close friend and associate of the Reinhart family for many years. In recognition of this historic event, I include the above-mentioned news story as part of my remarks:

REINHART'S IS 120 YEARS OLD

Currently observing its 120th anniversary, the Reinhart furniture store at Broad and

Pine Streets is believed to have been the first store exclusively devoted to sale of retail furniture established in the eastern United States.

The firm is also the outgrowth of what is believed to have been Hazleton's first industry, a furniture shop established in 1840 by Martin Reinhart, a cabinet maker.

The factory flourished and when a new plant, using steam-powered machinery was built some time after 1871, Reinhart was making dressers, bureaus and other pieces in addition to the chairs which were the first item.

Furniture pieces made by hand at the old Reinhart shop over 100 years ago are now collectors items.

The retail business, which was eventually to overshadow the original enterprise, was established by Martin Reinhart's son, George. When he died at the age of 44 his widow continued the business under the present name, Mrs. E. Reinhart's Sons.

Today the business is operated by the fourth family generation, A. Oscar Reinhart and his three sons, William, James, and John.

Martin Van Buren was president when the firm was established. It was not easy to operate a business in those pre-Civil War days, particularly when the nearest bank was at Mauch Chunk (now Jim Thorpe).

Over the years the firm has gone through four wars, six major financial panics, the long anthracite coal strikes and the depression of the 30s.

Reinhart's built the city's first "skyscraper", the four story building which is still part of the establishment, since greatly expanded by the erection of a modern two story structure.

Alaska's Transportation in the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I take especial pleasure in presenting here the text of a paper on Alaska transportation delivered at the Transportation Institute, Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo, on June 18 by Hon. Laurence K. Walrath, member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the fine address he gave at Western Michigan University, Commissioner Walrath gave a historical account of Alaska's transportation system, described its operations today, and made some very interesting and informed comments about its future.

Mr. President, few people are more qualified to speak on this subject than Commissioner Walrath. He has made several trips to Alaska and we Alaskans consider him as one of us by adoption. I ask unanimous consent to include Commissioner Walrath's speech with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S TRANSPORTATION IN THE SIXTIES

Your chairman gave me a choice of topics. One was that I discuss what may be in store for the general shipping public in the next decade—the other, that I "enlighten" you, as he phrased it, regarding Alaska's transportation problems of the sixties. I believe he knew which I would select, since my enthusiasm for our 49th State is no secret—to see and study it is to be captivated by it. But since both topics would cast me in the role of a prophet he was, indeed, a courageous man; especially since he must know by now that not one of the several legislative recommendations of the ICC, made after my first visit to Alaska, has yet been enacted into law; and even those which seemed to me essential have, in fact, become highly controversial in detail, if not in substance.

But, assuming that you, too, will accept what I may say in the spirit in which it is offered—as a sincere, but personal, appraisal, and that you may find in the solution of Alaska's problems some measure of hope that shippers everywhere may eventually benefit, I am perfectly willing, even happy, to tackle the assignment.

Because I believe the legislative changes, essential to Alaska's transportation's full partnership in the Nation's economy, will soon be worked out, and that the Congress will find a way to resolve the controversies in the public interest, I will not take advantage of your hospitality by arguing temporary problems flowing from the law. Instead, I think it far more important to try to paint a word picture of Alaska's basic problems—those not curable by simple amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act—and to suggest reasons for them and possible solutions.

Contrary to the impressions of most of those who recall the romatic stories of Jack London, Stewart Edward White, and Rex Beach, who wrote of the dog sled, gold rush and salmon days there is nothing of the "primitive" about the movement of goods and people in Alaska today. The heroic bush pilots helped change all this, and today Alaska's air facilities are modern. Service and safety, despite weather and terrain, are the very finest to be found. Dog sledding is now mostly for sport.

The Alaska Railroad, Government-owned, and operated by the Department of Interior—some 500 miles of main line—is also well above average as a system, completely dieselized, and renders efficient service. The same is true of Alaska's primary highway system (traffic and terrain considered) which consists of more than 2,000 miles of all-weather, blacktop roads, and is now kept in year-round operation by capable engineering. It provides the "right-of-way" for some of the most up-to-date truck fleets of the country. Like the railroad, its chief drawback is that it serves such a relatively restricted area.

Water service from west coast ports, to the extent that it presently operates, is also modern, efficient, and reliable.

Why then are there transportation problems? They result from a complexity of reasons which seem to fall generally into three categories: Geographical, political (in the very broad sense), and economic. Together these factors account for the circumscribed nature of Alaska's system of transport and its extremely high cost—not attributable to distance alone. The combination of these also serves to retard the further expansion of the system of surface transportation into large portions of Alaska which desperately require it if a sound economy for the whole State is to develop.

A study of the map of Alaska and comparative census figures since 1940 reveals that only in the limited area where all modes of transportation are available has Alaska enjoyed its remarkable development. This particular area enjoys its transportation advantages largely as the result of the "broad politics" I mentioned earlier, together with defense and geographical reasons.

The Alaska Railroad had been located in the Anchorage-Fairbanks area prior to World War II—starting as early as 1914, with the public purposes of opening up the known deposits of coal and reaching the gold center of Fairbanks some 400 miles to the north. Following the outbreak of war with Japan in 1941, defense authorities realized the necessity of a military highway in the heart of Alaska and the Alcan (now called Alaska) Highway was built through Canada to Fairbanks, which was also already connected with the ports of Seward, Valdez, and Haines.

Also during World War II, in order to shorten the sea-land supply route to Anchorage and Fairbanks, the line of the railroad was extended about 12 miles southeast of Portage to Whittier, which remains principally a military port; this line traverses two mountain tunnels totaling some 18,000 feet and cuts about 50 miles off the rail route to Anchorage.

The so-called rail or rail-highway belt might also be called the population belt since in its relatively small area of influence is to be found more than 75 percent of Alaska's 1960 population.

Location of highways and rail lines since 1940 was not designed to reach Alaska's greatest productive potential but was intended to make possible the successful defense of America against arctic air or sea aggression. However, we can be thankful that, regardless of primary purpose, areas of great beauty, and vast natural resources were opened. For example, both railroad and highway traverse the incomparable Kenai Peninsula from Anchorage south to the port of Seward. Both also reach Palmer, some 50 miles north of Anchorage en route to Fairbanks, in the heart of the famous Matanuska Valley where, in the short summer months of long days are produced carrots 3 feet long and cabbages as big as bushel baskets. Both rail and highway reach Mount McKinley and Mount McKinley Park—one of nature's great panoramas of awesome beauty and protected wildlife.

Let's pause a moment to consider a side effect of the military phase of Alaska's economy. Since 1940 when Anchorage was still a frontier town of less than 4,000 people, and Fairbanks a small, brawling mining town of saloons and trading posts, a steady flow of defense money, supplies and people have passed through them, much of each category finding its way into civilian life with the result that Anchorage today is a sprawling city of neon lights, modern hotels and stores, and a population of nearly 83,000—more than 1,000 percent growth in two decades. Fairbanks boasts nearly 43,000 inhabitants. In spite of this ostensible prosperity both Anchorage and Fairbanks are beginning to realize their economy is far from balanced. During the 20 years in which most of this has transpired nearly everything of substance has been shipped in, very little going out, and costs, whether of materials, labor or development were only a secondary consideration, so long as military necessity and emergency were the driving forces.

In effect, these high costs of military necessity set the pattern for the costs of civilian projects at a level which now tends to defeat any effort to sustain industrial or commercial production. Labor alone is from 25 to 60 percent higher than in the "southern 48."

This, then, is the other side of the coin—almost a frustrating dilemma which bids fair to get worse before it can get better.

Volume transportation for Alaska's bypassed treasure troves becomes of even greater importance in the decade ahead, especially for those areas which lie so much closer to the other continental States and which have not had—and will not have—defense developments of lines of communication.

Southeastern Alaska is a clear example of such a bypassed area. Lying about halfway between Seattle and Anchorage, its Inside Passage provides beautiful, protected, deep water abounding with commercial fish. The snow-capped mountains of its islands and

mainland contain unlimited timber and pulpwood, as well as coal and strategic ores. However, the rugged terrain of the Canadian mountains which flank it on the east, ingrained as they are with huge glaciers of the ages, makes the construction of land communication virtually impossible except at a very few points, and then only at prohibitive expense. Add to this Canada's lack of enthusiasm to spend the large sums necessary to open up northern British Columbia and the Yukon Territory and it will be seen the southeastern Alaska is at the moment as isolated from commercial contact as if it were an island in the far Pacific.

Because of its isolation, southeastern Alaska enjoys only a modest amount of tourism, no industrial development to speak of, and remains a series of fishing villages and small towns, dependent as communities on air and water for contact with each other and the outside world. This area enjoys an almost temperate climate, very similar to, but even less severe than, that of northern Michigan. In it are found the old towns of Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka, and the capital city of Juneau. The total population of this large and potentially rich area is less than 35,000 inhabitants, with only Juneau and Ketchikan approaching 10,000 each. Contrast this with the Anchorage-Fairbanks rail-highway area some 600 to 900 miles farther north and west from Seattle but which now boasts of more than 160,000 permanent residents—75 percent of the State's total inhabitants.

I wish we had more time to go into some of the odd circumstances which result from this complex admixture of geography, politics and economy. For example, the disparities in freight rates between ostensibly intermediate and more distant points present some real anomalies. One of these was emphasized by the somewhat humorous but truthful testimony we heard last fall from the local undertaker in Cordova. He said to Senator BARTLETT on the committee record pretty much as follows:

"Bob, I'm not here to talk about the high cost of living; I want to complain about the high cost of dying—it costs so much more for me to get a coffin delivered here from Seattle than it does to ship it 150 miles further west to Seward and then by rail all the way north to Anchorage that I'm advising my clients they'd better move over there when they get ready to die."

The difference, of course, is that Anchorage, in the rail-highway belt enjoys joint water-rail rates. Cordova, although closer to Seattle and on the southern mainland, has no land transportation to the interior. When a ship calls at Cordova it's the end of the line for freight, and, therefore, its water rates from Seattle are local—and maximum.

Another phase of a similar local twist was illustrated by testimony heard at Valdez, where, you will recall, there is a highway connection to the interior (but no rail). One of the witnesses, a local Valdez merchant, testified that rates from Seattle were at a level as high as those to Cordova, but that freight destined to the interior on the highway route to Fairbanks, enjoyed a water-motor rate substantially less than that for delivery at Valdez. He said in substance: "Senator, when I first heard about this rate difference I began to order all my freight shipped to me at Glennallen, some 90 highway miles north of Valdez; then I drove my own truck up there and brought it back here. Now I still order it to Glennallen to get the lower rate, but try to intercept it here at the dock and save the trip."

You will agree, I am sure—from just these two examples, that they do have local problems which cause the cost of living (or dying) to vary from place to place. Preference and prejudice certainly exists—whether it is undue is another question.

Alaska also has assets which even the presence of all modes of transport is unable to unfreeze. At Seward, where the most favorable transportation circumstances exist, we heard testimony by an expert concerning Alaska's shrimp supply. As I recall it, more than half the known reserves of the world have been located in and around the Gulf of Alaska. The texture and flavor of Alaska shrimp is superior to any I've ever eaten. But here again, the high costs of labor in the defense area, both for fishing and processing, have kept Alaska shrimp from world markets.

These are a few of the problems of Alaska's economy, and there are others. When it is realized that the pegged price of gold, together with the high costs of Alaskan production, has actually resulted in the closing of productive mines, such as the famous one at Juneau; that wild fur production has substantially given way to the better pelts of controlled fur farms; and that Alaska's commercial salmon production has been declining steadily; it is apparent that Alaska's real future lies in a newer economy than that of the romantic gold rush and "silver horde" days. It must be built upon commercial and industrial production and upon tourism, which require mass transportation to approach fulfillment.

But there are advantages in adversity. The harsh reality of Alaska's geography and economy has already resulted in substantial contributions to transportation progress. While the rest of the country was engrossed with the controversial features of modern piggybacking plans, Alaska, without fanfare, enjoyed what may be the world's first and finest containerized freight operation on joint rates and through routing by motor, water, and rail. Both dry freight and refrigerated traffic, since before statehood, have been moving in motor carrier trailer containers from Seattle by Alaska Steamship Co. to Seward, then on flatcars of the Alaska Railroad to Anchorage and Fairbanks, thence back to the motor carriers for store door delivery at destination. (This, in large part, accounts for cheaper coffins at Anchorage.)

The success of this coordinated operation has proven that there are economies in single-factor joint rates and that it can work in the other States, provided the carriers are willing to undertake the cooperation necessary to success. The greatest lesson, I think, is that it would not have succeeded even in Alaska if only the carriers were the beneficiaries. The shipper, too, must benefit if any plan of multimode transport is to produce optimum results.

Alaskans have learned to be practical. For example, in recognition of the staggering cost of an orthodox highway system in the southeast, the present efforts, which bid fair to succeed, are to establish an extension of existing highways through an inside-passage ferry system. My guess is that within the next 3 or 4 years you will be able to drive your family (or dispatch your trucks) from Kalamazoo to Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and there, for a modest ferry charge, drive aboard for passage to the principal islands and towns of southeastern Alaska.

Such a system, apart from the shot in the arm it would give the economies of such towns as Ketchikan, Wrangell, Sitka, Petersburg, Juneau, Skagway, and Haines, would allow you to avoid hundreds of arduous highway miles, even if you intended going on to Fairbanks.

Many have asked whether we will ever have railroad connections through Canada and into Fairbanks where the Alaska Railroad now terminates. Until recently I would have thought that very unlikely, partly because of Canada's apparent lack of enthusiasm and partly because of the problems of the railroads generally, with emphasis seemingly on reduction of plant and services in the interest of survival as private enterprise systems, rather than upon expansion. However, some of you may have read the AP release of June 2 from Victoria which indicated that the building of a railroad into the northwest revolves about the extent of concessions which Canada may be willing to give to the Swedish financier, Axel Wenner-Gren, who wants to develop the tremendous hydroelectric potential and through that the industrial potential of the Yukon River area.

That article reported the incorporation of the Pacific Northern Railway Co. for the purpose of constructing a 700-mile railroad from rail connections in southwestern Canada, at a cost of a quarter-billion dollars to tap the potential of the great northwest and, according to the report, there is some indication that the actual building will depend upon the company's being given permission to extent into the Yukon and Alaska. Such a rail connection could brighten the economic outlook of interior Alaska overnight, and cheap hydroelectric power in the southeast would open its vast resources to the world.

Always, when I reach this point in my thinking, I reluctantly visualize what development of the southeast would mean to those of us who cherish its very isolation for its natural beauty and its fabulous hunting and fishing. Obviously, an expansion of commerce and industry will affect some of this, but perhaps we have learned the lessons of conservation and will avoid the thoughtless destruction which so often accompanies civilization.

It was there in the southeast last fall while waiting for evening flights of geese and ducks, and tramping mountain slopes following deer trails, that I recalled something I had read and from that I began to visualize a way for commercial transportation to reach this part of the world without blasting away mountains, clearing vast areas of timber, and changing the courses of rivers to build rail beds and highways. It may be that the very ruggedness of its terrain will cause southeastern Alaska to be the real proving ground for an entirely new and different form of transportation.

I have in mind the experiments being conducted with the air-cushion craft, which rides not on wheels but on compressed air. During the past year it has been demonstrated that such craft can move over land or water at impressive speeds. The major obstacle, so far as Alaska is concerned, is that present models require relatively smooth terrain and can climb grades no greater than 8 or 10 percent because of the thin cushions of air which support them. However, one of the last detailed articles I saw said workable plans actually exist for a craft which can rise to a height of 30 feet, there to hover motionless or accelerate to speeds approaching 100 miles per hour, while loaded with great quantities of freight.

Already proven as amphibious, and with concentration now on adapting their movement to rough terrain, success for use in Alaska would seem to be assured in the not-too-distant future. Instead of having to build highways or railroads, tunnels or bridges, it may be that the only requirement will be to have survey crews locate and mark feasible routes following the natural terrain. With the anticipated low cost of operation and high speeds predicted for such craft, circuity of routing would be less important than it is in rail or highway building.

I do not believe this picture is too far-fetched. If the engineers can do what they say, Alaska could use it today. If it is proven feasible under such adverse conditions, think what it can mean elsewhere. With highway construction and improvement of waterways calling for billions of tax dollars in the next decade and with railroad maintenance a

mounting burden, perhaps the air cushion, impervious to potholes in highways, deficient rail beds, and shallow rivers, will provide the economies we must have.

In any event, you will agree I am optimistic. If there is a way to do it, Alaska will find it.

U.S. Engineers Have Long Record of Service to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Lake County Banner of Tiptonville, Tenn., an outstanding weekly newspaper of the Nation, on Thursday, June 23, 1960, an excellent article relative to the U.S. Engineers.

We in our congressional district are very proud of the U.S. Engineers because of the wonderful work they have done in behalf of our people.

The article follows:

U.S. ENGINEERS HAVE LONG RECORD OF SERVICE TO NATION

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, known as the world's largest fighting-constructing organization, celebrated its 185th anniversary on June 16.

Originally constituted by a resolution of the Continental Congress on June 16, 1775, the corps has had a long record of responsibility for the defense of the Nation and development of its resources. The first Chief Engineer was Col. Richard Gridley, so designated by Gen. George Washington, and by congressional resolution, his pay was set at $60 per month.

Since that time there have been 40 Chiefs of Engineers, the present incumbent being Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, whose term has only recently been extended for 2 years by recommendation of President Eisenhower. Included in the list of Chiefs of Engineers are such men as Maj. Gen. Louis DuPortail; Col. Jonathan Williams, first superintendent of West Point; Brig. Gen. William Louis Marshall, who as a junior officer served in rivers and harbors work on the lower Mississippi River (1876–90); Lt. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, author of the comprehensive plan for flood control on the lower Mississippi River; and Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, who was district engineer, Memphis district, during the all-time high water of 1937.

Because a majority of the trained and experienced engineers in the Nation made up the Corps of Engineers, following the Revolutionary War, the first nonmilitary engineering projects were placed in their hands. Construction of harbors, canals, and early roadways was followed by development of the country's inland waterways systems. First congressional authorization for a study of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers came in 1820, and the ensuing planning became a pattern for development of these waterways for more than a century. Waterways planning was followed by railroad planning, and the first transcontinental route was surveyed by the corps.

Development of flood-control plans by the corps came about long after the program of inland waterways had been well advanced. Early appropriation for corps waterways development specifically limited construction of flood-control works except where they could be shown primarily as aids to navigation. Only following the lower Mississippi Valley disaster in 1927 did the Congress recognize flood control as a national problem, and even then the authorized improvements were limited to the lower Mississippi Valley. The outstanding record of that project was responsible for the act of 1936 which finally committed the Federal Government to a nationwide program of flood control.

The act of 1928 placed responsibility for flood control in the Mississippi Valley in the hands of the Mississippi River Commission which had been established in 1879. The Commission, composed of three Army engineer officers (one of whom serve as president), the Commandant of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, and three civilians, has been in continuous existence since its establishment. It supervises the work of district offices located at Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans. In addition, the same organization, functioning as the Lower Mississippi Valley Division, includes the St. Louis, Mo., District.

The U.S. Army Engineer District, Memphis, with Col. Marvin L. Jacobs as district engineer, comprises an area of nearly 27,000 square miles, including southeastern Missouri, southern Illinois, western Kentucky and Tennessee, northern Mississippi, and eastern Arkansas. Among its more important responsibilities are the maintenance of navigation facilities and channel stabilization from the vicinity of Cairo, Ill., to the mouth of White River, Ark.; construction, enlargement and flood emergency maintenance of more than 636 miles of main line Mississippi River levees, and more than 560 miles of tributary levees; operation of the Wappapello Dam and Reservoir on the upper St. Francis River, and construction of a giant flood-control and drainage project throughout the St. Francis River Valley. Local flood protection projects have been constructed at Dyersburg and Memphis, Tenn., and the Memphis Harbor project, now nearing completion, is an outstanding example of cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and local government.

The Angry American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Boston Pilot on June 25, 1960:

THE ANGRY AMERICAN

Americans, at the present time, are very seriously concerned about the logic of their international position and are troubled over the recent developments which were as unexpected as they were violent. The collapse of the summit, followed so promptly by the Far East demonstrations, has plainly shocked the public which had begun to hope for a lessening of tensions. It is normal enough for people to allow themselves to hope that things will be better, but it is the more disheartening when we find in reality that they are worse. This can, however, be a blessing in disguise.

The smiling, pleasant Khrushchev is in many ways more dangerous than the Paris denouncer, with all his crudeness and bad manners. Similarly, the incidents which upset the status quo are warning symptoms that indicate an illness of which we might otherwise be unaware. For Americans to be shocked, in short, may be the best thing for them and for the future of the free world. To be sure, no one expected any wonders from the summit conference, although it would have been hard to have foreseen the actual eventuality. Neither did anyone, including the State Department, know the size and effectiveness of the Japanese opposition, even though all were aware of dangers. Clearly, we have misjudged the situation, only believing what we would like to believe.

Nothing suggests, however, that we have to compound our errors at this point by altering essentially our international posture; if temporary disillusionment should encourage a new isolation from our allies, some sort of a withdrawal, we would be in serious trouble indeed. On the other hand, a vast amount of positive good can come from understanding the international picture in more realistic terms if we use our new knowledge wisely. To learn that the cold war is cool only when the Communists see that climate to their advantage, and to know that they can also push up the burners at a moment's notice, is a salutary reminder.

Americans are apt to be more realistic when they are a little bit angry and, if we judge it correctly, that is their present mood. Ruffled and humiliated in the person of their President, in both East and West, they are very likely to take action which they would otherwise just as soon postpone. Undoubtedly, we need a reappraisal. It need not be agonizing if it will only be prompt. What we surely need more than anything else is a true knowledge of the present international situation, not as we would like it to be but as it actually is. After our recent unpleasant adventures, we are in a mood to understand the unpleasant wherever it exists; we do not want a pretty picture, we want the true picture.

The Communists have shown again, along with their ugliness, their true purposes. Tibet is back in the news with a finding of genocide against Red China, and this should recall Hungary and its bloodbath at the hands of the Soviet. The Japanese riots show the Communist use of the so-called neutral countries and the extent of the conspiracy against the free world. After we take the true measure of this menacing enemy, let us take the true measure of ourselves. As soon as we find what is required of us, let us set to action. Americans in their present mood, as in the past, will be equal to the demands of history.

Garfield Saw Self Nominated When Nominator Became Nominee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I placed in the Appendix to the RECORD the excellently written article by the able Boyce House, of Dallas, Tex., describing how the Great Commoner, the brilliant William Jennings Bryan, with his matchless oratory, won the presidential nomination of the Democratic Party at the age of 36, the youngest presidential nominee in our history.

Mr. House has written another in his series of absorbing historical accounts of

presidential nominating conventions, this time, the dramatic account of the unique instance when a nominator became a nominee in the Republican National Convention of 1880. Not only that, but James A. Garfield was present in the Convention Hall and saw himself win the nomination for the presidency, the only presidential nominee in history to witness his own nomination. This interesting story was printed in the Houston Post for Sunday, June 19, 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today this account, from the Houston Post, where it is titled, "Garfield Brilliant: When a Nominator Became Nominee."

There being no objection, the article as ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARFIELD BRILLIANT—WHEN A NOMINATOR BECAME NOMINEE

(By Boyce House)

How an orator made a speech of such brilliance in nominating another that he himself became the nominee for President—this forms a story unique in the annals of national political conventions.

Not only that but was the first—and so far as research has disclosed—the only time that a man was present and saw himself win the most coveted of all political honors.

That man was James A. Garfield; the year, 1880; the scene, the Republican convention in Chicago.

The chief candidates were Gen. U. S. Grant (who, 4 years earlier, had concluded his second term as President) and James G. Blaine, that man of magnetism from Maine. Garfield was not a candidate. On the contrary, he was directing the campaign of his fellow Ohioan, John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury. Garfield was the Republican floor leader in Congress, where he had served nine terms, and was U.S. Senator-elect.

It was a case of Grant against the field. Leading his forces was Senator Roscoe Conkling of New York, one of the foremost orators of the Nation, a man of great ability but of an imperious nature, arrogant, almost contemptuous toward those who opposed his will.

And Conkling almost succeeded in winning the war before the names of the aspirants had even been presented. He sought to establish the unit rule, which would have meant that the vote of a State would be cast in its entirety for the candidate favored by the majority of a delegation. This would have given Grant 367 votes, only 9 short of a majority, and would undoubtedly have resulted in his nomination on the second ballot—if not, indeed, by the switching of votes, on the very first ballot.

Garfield, as the chieftain of the anti-Grant forces, was able to defeat this move.

Later, he and Conkling clashed again. To head off a possible bolt if his man was chosen, the New York Senator moved that every delegate be honor bound to support the nominee, whoever he might be. This carried with only three dissenting votes, the trio being delegates from West Virginia. Infuriated, Conkling moved to expel them.

Garfield replied in a most persuasive speech, appealing to the convention's sense of fair play and "to the deep-seated individualism of his audience," as a biographer expresses it. There was great applause and the motion was badly beaten.

Conkling, if no one else did, sensed the possibilities of the situation. While Garfield was speaking, the New Yorker wrote across the top of a newspaper, "I congratulate you on being the dark horse," tore the margin off and, at the close of the speech, had the note passed to Garfield.

Although both contests had resulted in victory for the anti-Grant elements, these were, after all, only skirmishes. The battle was about to begin in earnest with the nominating speeches and then the actual voting.

Conkling placed Grant in nomination. The speaker had of course a military leader of inspiring achievements as his subject. Grant, after leaving the Presidency had spent 2 years in touring the world, being everywhere received with such honors as had never been bestowed on a private citizen; then, returning to the United States, was welcomed everywhere as a national hero. The orator began with a bit of verse which was currently popular:

"If asked what State he hails from,
Our sole reply shall be:
He comes from Appomattox
And the famous apple tree."

These lines set off wild cheering and the speech was interrupted many times by applause. Chauncey M. Depew (who served in the U.S. Senate from New York) said of Conkling's speech, in his memoirs, that it "was perfectly prepared, delivered with great effect and received universal acclaim on the floor and in the gallery." Historians say that the conclusion aroused storms of applause and shouting which "surpassed anything ever known before in a convention."

It was Garfield's colossal task to follow an oration which unquestionably ranked—and still ranks—as one of the most magnificent speeches ever heard in a national convention. Furthermore, he had no popular hero to present. Sherman was colorless, completely lacking in the ability to inspire enthusiasm. Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts (who was both the temporary and permanent chairman of the convention) said in his autobiography, "There was nothing stimulant or romantic in the plain wisdom of John Sherman. It was like reading a passage from 'Poor Richard's Almanac' after one of the lofty chapters of the 'Psalms of David.'"

If these were not sufficient handicaps, Garfield was going to have to make largely an extemporaneous speech. That very day he had written his to his wife, "I have arisen this morning to tell you the peril I am in. I have not made the first step in preparation for my speech nominating Sherman, and I see no chance I can get to prepare it. It was a frightful mistake that I did not write it before I came. It now seems inevitable that I shall fall far below what I ought to do."

Garfield began in a quiet voice, "I have witnessed the extraordinary scenes of this convention with deep solicitude. Nothing touches my heart more quickly than a tribute of honor to a great and noble character; but as I sat in my seat and witnessed the demonstration, this assemblage seemed to be a human ocean in tempest. I have seen the sea lashed into fury and tossed into spray, and its grandeur moves the soul of the dullest man; but I remember that it is not the billows, but the calm level of the sea, from which all heights and depths are measured.

"When the storm has passed and the hour of calm settles on the ocean, when the sunlight bathes its peaceful surface, then the astronomer and surveyor take the level from which they measure all terrestrial heights and depths.

"Gentlemen of the convention, your present temper may not mark the healthful pulse of our people. When your enthusiasm has passed, when the emotions of this hour have subsided, we shall find below the storm and passion that calm level of public opinion from which the thoughts of a mighty people are to be measured, and by which final action will be determined.

"Not here, in this brilliant circle, where 15,000 men and women are gathered, is the destiny of the Republic to be decreed for the next 4 years. Not here, where I see the enthusiastic faces of 756 delegates, waiting to cast their lots into the urn and determine the choice of the Republic, but by 4 millions of Republican firesides, where the thoughtful voters, with wives and children about them, with the calm thoughts inspired by love of home and country, with the history of the past, the hopes of the future, and reverence for the great men who have adorned and blessed our Nation in days gone by, burning in their hearts—there, God prepares the verdict which will determine the wisdom our work tonight.

"Not in Chicago, in the heat of June, but at the ballot boxes of the Republic, in the quiet of November, after the silence of deliberate judgment, will this question be settled."

He then stirred his audience with an eloquent portrayal of the glorious history of the Republican Party and presented for their consideration a man who, in high office for 25 years, had played an important part in the great achievements of the party. Hoar described Garfield's speech as "one of the greatest oratorical triumphs I ever witnessed."

Grant, as expected, led on the first ballot with 304 votes; Blaine was next with 284, and Sherman was third with 93. Three others received a total of 74 votes. On the second ballot, one vote was cast for Garfield and thereafter, on almost every ballot, one—and sometimes two delegates from Pennsylvania—voted for him. Ballot after ballot showed almost no change.

Overtures were made to Garfield to permit his name to be a compromise choice but he said that he would rise in his place and denounce any such movement if his name became prominent in the balloting. Sherman had no chance; his highest vote was 120; and, sensing the possible trend, he sent a telegram authorizing the release of his delegates when their vote would be likely to nominate Garfield.

The 34th ballot was being taken and the lines were little changed as the rollcall proceeded. And then the break came. Wisconsin, last on the list, voted for Garfield.

Instantly, Garfield sprang to his feet and said, "I rise to a point of order. No man has a right, without the consent of the person voted for, to announce the person's name and vote for him in this convention. Such consent I have not given." Hoar, fearing that Garfield would say something which would make his nomination or acceptance impossible, interrupted, "The gentleman from Ohio will resume his seat."

On the next ballot, Indiana voted for Garfield. During the following ballot (the 36th and last), Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts said that "Garfield sat immovable with a pained expression on his face." All eyes were turned upon him. It was drama, tremendous, unprecedented. A biographer declares, "Some saw in his appearance the aspect of a man overwhelmed by a stunning surprise" and the New York Tribune correspondent noted "an appearance of extra resoluteness on his face, as that of a man who was repressing internal excitement."

Grant's "guard of 306" voted for their idol until the end, then Conkling moved to make the nomination unanimous. Victory in the November election went to Garfield, the man who had made a nominating speech of such impressiveness that he himself was chosen for the Presidency.

Congressman Carroll Reece Honored for 40 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday our colleague, the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE, was honored by his constituents and many friends throughout the State of Tennessee on the occasion of completing his 40th year of service as Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District. I am sure that my colleagues will want to join in congratulating CARROLL REECE on his remarkable achievement.

In this connection, the Nashville Banner, last week, described the ceremonies and reviewed the record of our distinguished colleague. I request unanimous consent that this article concerning the life and service of Congressman REECE be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

CONGRESSMAN REECE TO BE HONORED FOR 40 YEARS' SERVICE

ROAN MOUNTAIN, TENN.—Officials of several States will gather here Saturday to honor B. CARROLL REECE, who at 70 is approaching completion of 40 years' service as Representative of Tennessee's First Congressional District.

REECE, banker, statesman, and soldier who is a candidate for his 18th term in the House of Representatives, will be honored with a "This Is Your Life" program to be a feature of the 14th annual Rhododendron Festival here. It will be "Carroll Reece Day" at the widely heralded annual event.

Knoxville Attorney Ray Jenkins will be master of ceremonies for the program. Wayne Graybeal, Roan Mountain contractor, will present the honoree with awards and gifts following the program. A festival queen was to be selected today from 22 contestants.

The "This Is Your Life" program for REECE will be divided into five phases. Jenkins will moderate the phase depicting REECE's early life; George Dugger, Sr., Elizabethton attorney, will moderate the phase concerning REECE's educational and political life; James R. Greer, Roan Mountain banker, will conduct the phase concerning the Congressman's military career; Mrs. Grace Shell, postmistress of Elizabethton, will moderate the family phase; and Marvin Bryan, Nashville, will conduct the phase concerning REECE's business life.

Jenkins and Guy L. Smith, editor of the Knoxville Journal, and former State GOP chairman, were to leave Knoxville for Johnson City tonight. Jenkins said he would have breakfast with the Reece family Saturday morning and then come to Roan Mountain in a motorcade.

Jenkins labeled REECE "one of the few statesmen left in Washington * * *. He is my kind of statesman—a moderate conservative."

REECE and Representative HOWARD BAKER are the only Republican House Members from Tennessee. REECE also serves as State GOP chairman and is a former national GOP chairman. He attended the 1958 Rhododendron Festival here with Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

LONG SERVICE

The recognition of REECE, Graybeal said, is commemorated to his "long service in Congress, from the First District of Tennessee, and his contribution to humanity."

In the 40 years since he first was elected to the House of Representatives as a young man of 30, REECE was never defeated in the Republican primary.

There have been two interruptions in REECE's House tenure. An independent candidate, Greeneville attorney O. B. Lovette, unseated him in the early thirties for one term; and in 1946, he resigned his seat to become GOP national chairman.

He lost again in 1948 when he tried for the U.S. Senate against Democrat ESTES KEFAUVER. But in 1950, REECE returned to the House and has been there since. He has no GOP opponent for the party nomination in the August primary, but Arthur Bright, Kingsport Democrat, will oppose him in November.

REECE, of Johnson City, was born in Butler, Tenn., and reared on a farm. He attended Watauga Academy, Carson-Newman College, New York University, and the University of London. He has an LL.D. degree from Cumberland University.

He is a member of the board of regents of the Smithsonian Institution; member of the American Statistical Association and the American, Tennessee and Federal Bar Associations.

BANKER

REECE is president of the Carter County Bank and First National Bank of Jonesboro and is chairman of the board of Sullivan County Bank.

He enlisted in May 1917 and served in the American Expeditionary Forces from October 1917 to July 1919. During that time he commanded the 3d Battalion, 102d Infantry Regiment, 26th Division. He received the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, and Croix de Guerre with palm and was cited for bravery by Marshal Petain, and Generals Pershing, Edwards, and Hale.

He was married in 1923 to Louise Despard Goff and they have one daughter, Mrs. Louise Marthens, Washington.

The First Congressional District which he represents includes Carter, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Greene, Hamblen, Hancock, Hawkins, Jefferson, Johnson, Sevier, Sullivan, Unicoi, and Washington Counties.

"Welsh Heads Fine Democratic Ticket"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Welsh Heads Fine Democratic Ticket," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette of Thursday, June 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELSH HEADS FINE DEMOCRATIC TICKET

An excellent and well-balanced ticket headed by Senator Matthew E. Welsh of Vincennes as the nominee for Governor was chosen by the Indiana Democratic State Convention Tuesday in Indianapolis.

The Democrats were full of enthusiasm and confidence and are ready to launch a crusade to clean out the State House after 8 years of Republican rule under Govs. George Craig and Harold Handley.

They believe that a vast majority of the people of Indiana feel it is time for a change. They think the people are sick and tired of the scandals of the Craig administration, the high taxes of the Handley administration, and the do-nothing record of both.

Under the leadership of Senator Welsh, the Democrats can offer a real contrast to the past 8 years in the Governor's office.

Matt Welsh is one of Indiana's best-trained public servants. He knows the business of the State from his distinguished career in both houses of the general assembly.

His honesty, his capability, and his experience are beyond question.

At the age of 47 he is at the peak of his vigor and usefulness, and his devotion to the welfare of all the people is known from one end of the State to the other.

Senator Welsh comes from a fine Indiana family and has an attractive family of his own, including his wife and twin daughters.

He took his B.S. degree from Wharton School of Commerce and Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, studied law at the Indiana University School of Law and received his legal degree from the University of Chicago.

Twice elected to the house of the general assembly, he resigned from that position to serve in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

In 1950, Attorney Welsh accepted appointment as U.S. District Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, where he made a fine record.

He served in the State senate in the 1957 and 1959 sessions as Democratic floor leader.

To know Matt Welsh is to like him and respect him. And he deserves election in November, not for his own sake, but for the good of Indiana.

Allen County and the Fourth District are especially pleased by the nomination of one of their own outstanding lawyers and jurists, Clarence R. McNabb, of Fort Wayne, as a candidate for judge of the Indiana Supreme Court.

Judge McNabb's successful career as a practicing attorney and his 6 years on the Allen circuit bench are surety that he will add strength to the ticket and to the State's highest court.

The Democrats of Indiana have taken to the victory road. They will make a clean-cut campaign. They pledge good government and they will earn the right to win in 1960.

Poland Through a Thousand Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the Polish people's illustrious cultural contribution to Western civilization, the University of Minnesota through its center for continuation study is presenting on August 2–5 an institute on Poland through a thousand years.

Because of widespread interest in the subject I request that the program and details regarding the institute be print-

ed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROGRAM

TUESDAY, AUGUST 2

Registration: Center for continuation study desk.

Convocation: Orchestral concert, Leo Kucinski, conductor. Soloists: Stephan Hero, violinst; Bernhard Weiser, pianist, Northrop Auditorium, 8 p.m.

Reception following convocation: Lounge, center for continuation study, 10 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3

Introduction: Fred E. Berger, director, center for continuation study, University of Minnesota, 9:15–9:30 a.m.

Poland in Historical Perspective: M. K. Dziewanowski, associate professor of history, Boston College, department of history and government, Chestnut Hill, Mass., 9:30–12 a.m.

Luncheon, 12–1 p.m.

The Geography of Poland: John R. Borchert, professor and chairman, department of geography, University of Minnesota, 1–2 p.m.

Poland and the Sciences: S. Mrozowski, professor, department of physics, University of Buffalo, Buflalo, N.Y., 2:30–4:30 p.m.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 4

Poland the Humanities: Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz, professor and chairman, department of sociology and anthropology, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 9:30–12 a.m.

Luncheon: 12–1 p.m.

The Polish Language: Ludwik Krzyzanowski, editor, the Polish Review, Polski Instytut Naukowy w Ameryce, New York, 1–2 p.m.

Early Polish Literature: Waclaw Lednicki, department of Slavic languages and literatures, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 2:30–4:30 p.m.

Convocation: Earle Spicer, folk singer, Northrop Auditorium, 8 p.m.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 5

Polish Literature: Part II (contemporary)—Victor Weintraub, professor, Polish literature, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 9–10 a.m.

Poland in Music: Johannes Riedel, associate professor of music, University of Minnesota, 10–12 a.m.

Luncheon, 12–1 p.m.

Poland Today: Christine Hotchkiss, roving editor, This Week magazine, editorial department, New York, 1–2 p.m.

Poland in America: Open forum, 2:30–4:30 p.m.

Dinner: Center for continuation study dining room, 6 p.m.

The Importance of Preserving the History of Immigration: Rev. Ladislas J. Siekaniec, past president, the Polish-American Historical Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

ELIGIBILITY AND FEES

Anyone interested in what the program of the institute has to offer is eligible to attend. Because of the support of Polanie, the institute can be offered for a fee of $5. Registration is personal and nontransferable and must be made for the entire period of the course.

ACCOMMODATIONS

The dormitory and other facilities of the Center for Continuation Study are available, if desired, to those who register for the course. It will provide the most convenient housing available on the campus. Dormitory space in the Center as well as parking space in university parking areas, however, is limited; and those who want to live at the Center during the course are urged to apply without delay. The application blank which accompanies this announcement lists rates for rooms, meals, and parking facilities. Rooms and parking space will be assigned in the order in which applications are received, and each applicant will be notified as to what reservations have been made for him.

Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, an educational group has recently completed a study which indicates clearly that the procedure through which our institutions of higher learning select students is sorely wanting. A good friend and neighbor of mine, Dr. Donald S. Bridgman of the National Science Foundation, has put his finger on the key to one approach to the problem. He has noted that there are certain occupations for which there is no need for college training and that certain persons might be both happy and successful in those occupations without having to go to college. There is, of course, the problem of how to determine who is suited to such occupations and how to convince them of this fact. There is also the even larger problem of convincing the colleges that they and the entire country would be better off if they improved their method of selecting students. Pursuant to permission previously granted, I include an editorial from this morning's New York Times. The editorial:

WHO SHOULD BE EDUCATED?

Higher education in the United States, costing more and more each year, attracting larger and larger numbers of students, is still not reaching all the young men and women it ought to reach and is being wasted on some who are getting no real benefit from it. This is a conclusion one has to draw from a report made public Saturday under the auspices of the College Entrance Examination Board. Dr. Samuel A. Stouffer of Harvard University describes the situation as "a sad indictment of American democracy."

The contributing educators found that color, race, economic position and social background were factors in some admission policies; that colleges seek for athletic talent but not for academic talent; that too many students of superior ability drop out of college; that creative students are sometimes passed over because they are handicapped by an early, underprivileged environment, and that not enough is known about how to measure ability.

Not everybody needs to go to college. Dr. Donald S. Bridgman of the National Science Foundation thought the public should realize "that occupations for which less formal education is needed are more satisfying to the interests of many individuals."

Turning the facts and figures around in one's head, one may approach the conclusion that the question is not whom we can permit to go to college but whom we cannot afford to keep out of college. Higher education cannot be made available to literally every young person in any early future, but it must be made available to every young person who is able to use it for the good of the community.

In short, the processes of selection—one might even say of academic recruitment—must be vastly improved. Intellect, character, the ability to influence other people in constructive ways—all these are important. Other criteria, including family income, ancestry, or the prospective student's prowess in football, are, to put it mildly, of lesser importance.

Baring Calls for Immediate Resumption of Highway Probe Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the following letter by a citizen to Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, June 22, 1960, as a public service so that all people may better realize the seriousness of the highway program scandal, and may be apprised of the necessity of their giving expressions of their support to Congressman BLATNIK so that he may continue the highway probe at once.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 22, 1960.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK: I and some citizens of America are appalled to read in an Associated Press news item, New York Times, June 21, 1960, page 21, city edition only, that you have decided supinely to "hold no more hearings until after the November elections, partly to keep political considerations out of the inquiry."

The Congress of the United States acting in behalf of the people of America charged the subcommittee presently headed by you almost a year ago with the investigation of the national highway program.

Over a year ago I brought unrefuted documentary evidence to you revealing misplanning, misstatement of technical and economic fact, and general behavior against the best interests of the people of New York and of New Jersey, which involve a waste of more than $450 million in public road building fund.

These matters were ignored until individuals of good will sent me to courageous Congressman WALTER S. BARING of Nevada who examined the documents and made ground inspections of the locations involved.

More than 4 months ago you received documentary proof from Congressman BARING that the superintendent of public works of the State of New York, who handles over $180 million of Federal-aid highway funds this year, had falsified to Congressman BARING the state of demolition of homes in the Seventh Avenue, Brooklyn area.

You have taken no action on this outrageous violation of public trust.

You have received unrefuted documentary proof from Congressman BARING that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads issued false technical data to the House Subcommittee on the Reno Interstate Highway over which you presided as chairman, February 1959.

You have not reinvestigated this situation to cause resignation of those responsible for the issuance of false information, to vindi-

cate Congressman BARING's public-spirited testimony at that time, to protect the people of Reno, or to save the people of the United States from the wasteful expense proposed for a projected interstate route through downtown Reno.

All who are working to eliminate the falsifiers and evildoers from their positions of power and influence in the highway program know that you, Congressman BLATNIK, are scrupulously honest. You revealed your integrity on February 10, 1960, during your interstate highway low bridge clearance hearing. On that occasion you brought to the attention of the subcommittee (and of America) the fact revealed by earlier military testimony that if we continue construction of the Interstate Highway System as now geometrically designed, we can never again move oversized military or missile objects any considerable distance overland in the United States.

Over $2 billion of Federal-aid highway funds have been spent or obligated, much of it under the administration of revealed falsifiers or their protectors, since the time that your subcommittee was charged with examining the highway program for irregularities.

I am informed that a few days ago you pleaded a shortage of funds needed to continue a meaningful probe into the high places from which the highway program is mismanaged, and that you were informed that Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, knows and is favorably disposed toward your subcommittee's financial needs, and that you were advised to speak to Congressman CANNON on the subject.

I am informed that you have not done so.

The highway program scandal and the scandals of its associated relocation and urban renewal projects planned for the low-taxed capital gains of the favored few who ruthlessly use their political and financial power to influence public planning and communication media will either be cleaned up now, or the United States will be enslaved and destroyed by the enemies which are now assembling at our very doorstep.

You can hold day and night hearings now and throughout the summer without improperly influencing the elections if you will continue to be absolutely honest and objective in your procedure.

Even if individuals on either side of the political aisle might possibly be discomfited, it is still imperative that the truth be revealed before elections and not suppressed until after elections.

In light of these facts, and of your certain knowledge that "some of 120 cases involved 'incompetence, negligence, and even plain wrongdoing,'" a failure or even a delay by you or by the subcommittee to meet your joint responsibility at this crucial time can only be construed by citizens of objective outlook as an overt act to hasten the decay of the moral fiber and to aid in the downfall of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY SUCH SMITH.

Gen. Joseph Haller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, June 11, 1960, which comments upon the death in London, England, of the great Polish patriot and military leader, Gen. Joseph Haller, at the age of 87:

GENERAL JOSEPH HALLER

Like so many Polish patriots and soldiers down through the centuries, Gen. Joseph Haller ended his earthly sojourn in exile. It was because he loved Poland and freedom so much that he could not bear to submit to the tyranny of an alien regime that was the antithesis of all he stood for in life. So at 87, in a London hospital far from home, his dream of the liberation of his country not realized, he joined his comrades in the eternal bivouac.

This is an example of the tragedy of these troubled times, but there is also a nobility about the idealism of men who sacrifice so much in the name of liberty. It is hard for Americans to appreciate fully the decision of a Thaddeus Kosciuszko or a Joseph Haller because we have been fortunate not to be torn between two such extremes. Only men who have died for principle can begin to understand the cross General Haller had to bear.

This gallant soldier, who commanded Polish and American volunteers in France during the First World War and later was a participant in the "Miracle of the Vistula" when his forces turned back the Red hordes at the gates of Warsaw on that eventful August 15, 1920, visited Wilkes-Barre four times—in 1923, 1934 (twice) and 1940. In the Polish forces he commanded in France were scores of Americans of Polish extraction from this area.

Let us hope General Haller will rest; in the not too distant future, in the soil of Poland, his lonely exile over with the dawn of freedom in the land he loved so much he could not endure the sight of its enslavement. That will be a great day for General Haller, for Poland and for the free world.

Soviet Beachhead in Cuba Endangers All Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 26, I delivered the following speech over radio station WGAN in Portland, Maine:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, this is your Congressman JIM OLIVER reporting developments on the Washington scene.

Fifteen years ago, at the end of World War II, our country was the undisputed leader of the world. Not only had we proven, beyond the shadow of any doubt, our military strength by making the "world safe for democracy" for a second time in one generation; but our productive capacity, in making armaments and later consumer goods to meet the great hunger built up by wartime curtailment of consumption, was greater than all of the other nations of the world combined.

And today, a short 15 years later, recent incidents on the international front cause us to reflect whether we are still occupying the position of leadership which was earned by the blood of battle and the precepts of freedom which have historically served as our basic guide; or have we as a nation been relegated by recent events almost overnight to the status of being considered "a second-class power?"

There can be no question in the minds of thinking people but that our posture of leadership is relatively weaker, in spite of the billions of dollars we have given to nations in all quarters of the globe. Our President, it appears, cannot, without risk of his personal safety, visit friendly nations to say nothing of visiting our cold war enemies. In many areas we are the most hated nation on the face of the earth. The architects of our foreign policy continue to be blinded by the pre-engineered, Kremlin directed, prestige-destroying debacles such as we have witnessed in the Japan incident which, following the summit collapse, added to a decline of our national prestige through the personal embarassment and insults to our President.

Over these past few years we have learned a few things about Communist tactics in every part of the world. We know their techniques including provocative and, at first, peaceful mass meetings designed to whip the mob into a frenzy toward ultimate violence. But in order for communism to succeed, we must first be defeated from within. Belief in a supreme being and a respect for law and order are the antithesis of the immoral doctrine of this cult. Hence, God must be denied and the existing legal structure destroyed before freedom can be enslaved my Marxism. Two thousand five hunded years ago, San Tzu, a Chinese militarist wrote:

"To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."

This, my friends, is exactly what Khruschev and his henchmen are trying to do today; to get us to quit without fighting. By downgrading us culturally, scientifically, diplomatically, and economically, and in every other way to convince the world that the United States of America is a second-class power; that free enterprise does not and cannot work and hence they—the other free nations—should accept the extended invitation of the Communists to "join 'em" because they can't "lick 'em."

Our diplomatic failures abroad have tended to obscure the threat to our Latin American neighbors from the Communistic menace of penetration. It is unquestionably desperately vital to the security of our country each time a nation overseas embraces the Communistic philosophy; but it could be catastrophic if one of our hemispheric neighbors embraced and practiced this credo; for the nations of the American continent are interdependent.

For years since the good neighbor policy was introduced in the 1930's, the United States together with all of the countries of the American continent have been bonded together not only geographically, but, which is more important, by a spirit of friendship and cooperation.

The United States and the rest of the continent are vitally important to each other. Billions of United States dollars have flowed into these countries in the form of purchases of raw materials and investments. In turn, we have in most instances, been their prime supplier of finished products. This is democracy in action. This has been the greatest living example of peaceful coexistence. Our relation with these countries has, for the most part, been that of a partner rather than a competitor.

With improved transportation facilities, we are growing even more dependent on each other. The potential of mutual benefit for the nations of the American Hemisphere is tremendous; but this potential could be lost to our mutual destruction if we fail to be alert to the covetous eyes from overseas envying our material resources and if we make the traditional American mis-

take of taking our friends for granted and not applying in time the ounce of prevention needed now to preserve the integrity of the continent from the grasping designs of the Kremlin. For, it should be obvious to all that our Latin-American neighbors are a prize which the Kremlin will go all out to capture and plans to do just this may be further advanced than we commonly realize, or are willing to admit.

Is the island of Cuba, located only minutes by air from the mainland of the United States, becoming the beachhead of the Soviets to be utilized for the organizing and training of Communist legions to infiltrate and conquer the Latin American nations, preparatory to their main objective—the conquest and control of the United States?

To answer this, we must closely analyze and evaluate, in a cold, hard, realistic light, occurances currently taking place in that country with which we are all familiar. We must shake off the rosy-hued glasses of complacency which have clouded the administration's evaluation of the developments in Cuba. We can no longer afford the luxury of smugness and complacency, which have been ablinding us for these past eight years. We must call a spade and recognize these facts:

1. The constant, unrelenting vitriolic attacks on the U.S. by Castro on manufactured pretexts, certainly are not necessary to preserve or solidify his so-called "revolution." These attacks make sense only if Castro as a communistic agent is deliberately attempting to undermine the prestige of our Nation.

2. Soviet cargo ships are calling at as many Cuban ports as possible to load sugar but what is more important to unload undisclosed cargoes.

3. Confiscation without compensation of "foreign"—(American) property in Cuba.

4. Expulsion of American officials as spies.

5. The important economic discussions currently underway in Moscow with a Cuban trade mission. Reportedly, the Soviet Union is ready to offer maximum trade to Cuba and to send any material, specialists, and technicians, which Castro wants to order.

There is no question but Cuba is supplying the Communist bloc the beachhead in America which they have been trying for years to obtain.

Through excuses such as solidifying the revolution the Cuban leader and his lieutenants will continue to expand and integrate Cuba into a model commune of the Communist network.

From this springboard, the Communists will throw their full efforts into an all out drive to infiltrate and organize Latin America, with Cuba as the model the Communists envision that the other nations of the hemisphere will follow and supplant their independence with the status of becoming Soviet satellites. Through Castro, the voice of the Kremlin will then be heard and felt throughout the Western Hemisphere.

On June 10th, Cuba entered into a 5-year commercial agreement with Red Czechoslovakia, which in effect gives credit in the amount of $20 million to Cuba, repayable in 10 years, for purchases, not specified, in the pact, in Czechoslovakia.

The pact includes an agreement for technical and scientific cooperation which provides for sending Czech technical missions to Cuba. Cuba has signed other similar pacts with the Soviet Union and its bloc of satellites. It should be clear to us that Castro and his communistic advisers are well on the way towards being totally economically welded into the Communist bloc of nations and moving rapidly towards a military alliance as well. Castro, with no constitutional limitations to check his personal power has made Cuba a virtual party to the Warsaw Pact, which as we well know, was organized to enslave by infiltration, subversions and bloodletting if necessary, the rest of the free world.

Cuba's current informal recognition of Red China is expected to blossom into full diplomatic recognition preparatory to an increased effort on the part of the Communists to draw the Latin American nations into supporting Red China's bid for membership in the United Nations.

To us, a people dedicated to the cause of liberty and diametrically opposed to communism in any and all of its many forms, these acts of Castro should wave a flag—yes, my friends, a red flag for all of us to see. The past, it is said, is prologue to the future. We need only to open our eyes to see the arrogant militaristic bastions which have replaced freedom and democracy in other parts of the world, to recognize that, not only are the symptoms of infection present, but that the malignant cancer of communism is restlessly awaiting an opportunity to contaminate insidiously the bloodstream of this continent, with its venom.

The beautiful island of Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores will be, under current plans of the Kremlin, is to be a Russian naval and missile base poised at the very heart of our country.

This Communist beachhead is being clearly established. We must reappraise and reevaluate our foreign policy towards Cuba in this realistic light. We must find an approach upon which our people and Cuba's people can work together to salvage the longstanding friendship which burned brightly in the pre-Castro days.

This is essential. Unless we face up to the threat of this Soviet beachhead, our country in the near future may be jolted out of its complacency some morning by waking up to find a fully developed Soviet war machine aimed at our jugular. It is highly possible that before this year ends, communistic staged demonstrations will take place in such areas as Italy and West Germany, as a diversionary tactic, to allow a major communistic Cuban victory, such as the one I mentioned, to go unnoticed and unchallenged until too late.

The vigorous opposition of Americans to international communism is axiomatic. In our national interest, America's obligation to the world is clear. Our objective must be more than a containment of this vile menace. We must turn back this rising Red tide and restore the dignity of freedom to men. But first, we must concentrate on throwing them out of the American Continent. The Monroe Doctrine is even more applicable today than it was when first drafted in 1823. It extends not only to direct attack but to subversion and infiltration, as well. This we must reaffirm.

The administration should be given authorization for a flexible sugar policy. A reappraisal of our current 2-cent-per-pound "gift" over the world market price for Cuban sugar should be made, working toward a repeal of the same.

The formal omnibus indictment of Cuban anti-American action, which is currently being drafted for the consideration of the Organization of American States is a good move. The OAS is the proper body to deliberate and act in this critical period of emergency.

Furthermore, an inter-American army, operating within the framework of the OAS, could and should, it seems to me, provide a vehicle whereby desirable inter-American action and policies could be implemented.

And, finally, to meet this ever present, ever recurring Communistic threat we must realize that its success depends on decay of the soul, and hence the best defense to this menace rests with the nations of the free world to reevaluate, reaffirm, and strengthen our moral standards.

Earl J. McGrath, Executive Officer for Teachers College, Columbia University, Suggests Education Proposal for Party Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the remarks of Mr. Earl J. McGrath, executive officer of Teacher College, Columbia University, New York City, on June 21, 1960, when he addressed a convocation at the Ball State Teachers College in Muncie, Ind. Mr. McGrath is well qualified to speak on the subject of education. He will be remembered as a former Federal Commissioner of Education. Mr. McGrath's remarks follow:

In only a few days our two leading political parties will hold their quadrennial conventions to nominate a candidate for the presidency of the United States. The delegates to these meetings traditionally adopt a platform which expresses the current position of the party on important public issues and in the event of the election of the party's candidate, serves as a guideline for a legislative program. Until quite recent years these utterances gave only small and perfunctory attention to education. Even lately the discussion of education has either failed to deal explicitly with some of the most pressing problems, or the issues have been obscured by generalities. More importantly the relationship between education and the other features of American life has not been clearly established so that the voter could realize the full implications of our failure to sustain the educational enterprise at a high level of efficiency. Without presuming to speak for either party, or to introduce partisanship into matters where it should have no place, I would suggest the following content as suitable to be included in the section on education in the forthcoming platform statements.

Recognizing that education is a principal factor in our domestic well-being and position among the nations, that in this highly competitive world the race for survival goes to the swift in the educational development of their people, that many of the abilities of our people are now wasted for lack of educational opportunity, that social progress is to that extent retarded, that the Federal Government has at its command—while the States and communities do not have—the resources to support education as our national destiny requires, we declare it to be our firm and unequivocal purpose to strengthen the educational enterprise of the Nation:

(1) Establishing within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Permanent Advisory Council on American Education appointed by the President of the United States and composed of men and women of the highest competence and civic status to advise the Secretary, and through him the Chief Executive, on the condition and needs of the total educational enterprise of the Nation.

(2) Making available immediately to the States $2 billion annually of Federal tax money (about $50 per child of school age) to be used by the States in the same manner

in which they use their own funds for current expense or for the erection, enlargement, or improvement of buildings used for educational purposes.

(3) Giving increased support to the U.S. Office of Education in such ways as to make possible national planning cooperatively with the State educational authorities and by bringing the manifold educational activities of the Federal Government under the general supervision of the U.S. Commissioner of Education so that the national effort in education could be identified, coordinated, and supported.

(4) Providing $5 million a year at once and an addition of $5 million each fiscal year for 4 years for the support of educational research and for the rapid dissemination of the results.

(5) Providing $7,500,000 for 4 years for 10,000 scholarships of an average value of $750, the amount to vary with student needs as established by the institution attended.

(6) Providing grants totaling from $300 million to $800 million a year, graduated over a 10-year period, to institutions of higher education, both public and private, for the erection of buildings, the funds to be granted in accordance with their willingness and ability to accept additional students, and justified on the grounds of the institution's contribution to the national welfare in a time of emergency.

(7) Increasing Federal support of vocational education, education of exceptional and handicapped children, and the education of children of migratory workers to the end that the maximum and most effective use can be made of the abilities and skills of all potential workers in the increase of productive capacity to keep the Nation strong and prosperous.

These Federal objectives in the field of education will impress some as being too idealistic. To others they will appear to involve an expenditure of Federal funds beyond our resources. To still others they will seem to place the Federal Government in a dangerous position of educational control.

To the fainthearted or cynical I would reply that this period in our national life requires the highest type of imaginative idealism in our country's history. Without it we will suffer the fate of all societies which became satisfied with their lot and blindly sure of their place in the sun. To the parsimonious taxpayer I would say that if we make even the most modest sacrifices of our abundant luxuries, the necessary expenditures are well within our resources, and moreover that the income from these investments in education will more than offset the initial cost.

Even if this were not so, the expenditures would be essential to national survival and could, therefore, legitimately be charged off as unavoidable living expenses. To the alarmist I would point out that the history of Federal aid provides little ground for the assumption that Federal control of education is the inevitable consequence of such grants. If, however, a danger of Federal controls exists, this risk must be carefully balanced against the perilous consequences of our failure to act—the impairment of our national well-being at home and the nightfall of our primacy among the nations. Through the ages educators have been idealists. They must now buttress an elevated vision of their calling with a stern advocacy of the measures required to make the Nation physically, morally, and spiritually strong. In so doing they will gain the richest satisfactions of life and at the same time they will dignify the profession of teaching in the eyes of the world.

Unlimited Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, seldom does one have the privilege of knowing a hard-hitting, straight-shooting newspaperman who has the courage to rebuke those of his profession who abuse the freedom of the press.

On the editorial page Col. R. L. Thompson, editor and publisher of the Moran Sentinel, seldom fails to criticize the Democratic Party and its candidates, but he uses his other pages in a fair and reasonable manner as far as news items are concerned. And of some 36 newspapers in my congressional district, his is one of the very, very few that does not use extreme and unfair censorship where Democrats are concerned.

In his June 16 issue, one of Colonel Thompson's editorials took his fellow publishers to task for interfering with fair procedures in criminal jurisprudence and I include it as part of my remarks:

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

As I have said so many times, nearly every man accused of a crime in this country is subjected to double jeopardy, which is to say, he is tried twice—once in the newspapers and once in a court of law.

The fifth amendment to the Bill of Rights makes it plain that a man cannot be tried twice for the same offense, yet the newspapers are permitted to go on trying men just the same.

When a man is tried in the newspapers he is nearly always found guilty by enterprising crime reporters which makes it very difficult for him to prove his innocence when he gets to court.

Only a few years ago a newspaper reported that four men attempted to escape from jail. One of the four was charged with stealing a calf, and he was named as one who sought to escape. No innocent man in his right mind would compound his troubles by trying to escape from jail. This man actually never sought to escape and in order to get a fair trial for him, the newspaper had to go to court to answer charges of contempt.

This ought to be done more often. Just the other day a women was found dead in a lover's lane near one of our large cities. One woman has already been charged with murder but the police are still investigating for more evidence. Acres of comment on the case have already appeared in the newspapers and more is sure to follow. I have been reading the newspaper reports and have been able to deduce from them some evidence as to the woman's guilt or innocence.

If I should be called upon to sit in judgment in this case, I could not dismiss from my mind what I have read in the newspapers which may, or may not, be true.

In law an accused is presumed to be innocent until he is found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, yet we permit newspapers to go on piling up evidence that a man is guilty or innocent long before he gets a hearing in court.

The newspapers have a right and a duty to report that a crime has been committed, but they have no right to print evidence which, in many cases, is not admissible in a court of law.

Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David Lawrence received an honorary LL.D. degree from the second oldest Catholic College in America, Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Md., and made the commencement address to the graduating class of which his nephew was a member. I thought my colleagues would like to read the article appearing in the July issue of the Catholic Digest about our Governor who is making a fine record for the State of Pennsylvania.

The article follows:

GOVERNOR LAWRENCE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGREES WITH ELIHU ROOT THAT POLITICIANS PARTAKE IN THE HIGHEST FORM OF CITIZENSHIP

David Lawrence, Pennsylvania's 71-year-old Governor, works from 10 to 16 hours a day. He strides briskly through the halls of the Capitol at Harrisburg around 9 in the morning. He then paces himself so well through a day of conferences, talks with visitors, briefings with legislators, and press meetings that there is no stoop in his 5-foot-9-inch frame when he leaves the office at night.

Moderation at the table and a lifelong habit of exercise have kept his figure trim. He has a ready smile and is quick with a jest.

He needs a large supply of both stamina and good humor in the job to which he was elected in 1958. (Lawrence is the first Catholic and the oldest man ever to hold the office.) As Governor he faces the toughest task of his more than half century in politics. It still is too early to determine how successfully he will be.

When he took office in January, 1959, he faced massive problems. He inherited a $177 million deficit from the administration of fellow Democrat George M. Leader. Disastrous floods a week after he was sworn in caused millions of dollars in damages in the western section of the State. For 14 years Pennsylvania had been losing ground economically, with whole communities jobless. Ten percent of the State's working force was unemployed. The unemployment fund was dropping toward zero.

Sending the largest budget in history to the legislature (it topped $1.9 billion in the general fund alone), Lawrence bluntly stated, "I have no rabbits in my hat, no magician's trick which will make it possible to pay for increasing costs without increasing taxes." Among the tax increases was a 1 percent hike in the sales tax, making it a total of 4 percent, the highest in the Nation.

He got an advance of $112 million from the Federal Government to bolster the unployment fund, took immediate steps to spur employment, and won higher appropriations

and retention of a favorable tax climate for industrial development.

Some of his moves were merely stopgap measures. It may be a year before it is known how successful they were. Much will depend on future programs—and on his success in establishing a cooperative spirit in Harrisburg, where he has a split legislature.

It was his success in getting politicians, labor and industrial leaders, and financiers to work together for the good of the city that won him the reputation of being the best mayor in Pittsburgh history.

Lawrence came from a family of active Democrats. Following his graduation from high school, he went to work as an office boy and stenographer in the law office of William J. (Billy) Brennan, Allegheny County Democratic leader.

Brennan taught Dave to believe just as firmly in the future of the party as he himself did. At that time, the Democrats of the country could be packed into one of the 1st-ward boilers, still leaving plenty of room for steam.

He went to his first national convention, at Baltimore in 1912, as a page boy. He has attended every Democratic convention since, though he was not a delegate until 1924, when he replaced Brennan, who had died. Lawrence supported Al Smith that year.

Pickings were slim for western Pennsylvania Democrats until 1931. Lawrence was head of the emaciated party in his section, and a power in State councils. He finally ran for the office of county commissioner, and suffered his first and only defeat. But a lesser event gave him and his party the needed break.

It fell to Lawrence to make arrangements for a Franklin D. Roosevelt rally. He was advised to hire a small hall so that it would be packed.

Instead, Lawrence took a gamble and hired Forbes Field. The depression, a dissatisfied labor force, and Roosevelt's message of hope combined to fill the baseball stadium. In November, F.D.R. carried Allegheny County in a landslide. The new President named Lawrence collector of internal revenue for the district. He remained his friend even when the Pittsburgher personally told him he was against the Supreme Court packing plan.

Lawrence became State Democratic chairman in 1934, and engineered the election of George E. Earle as Pennsylvania's first Democratic Governor in 40 years. Earle named him secretary of the Commonwealth.

Things were going swimmingly for Lawrence when the roof feel in on him in 1938. A split in the party brought defeat in the State elections. Swiftly there followed a Dauphin County grand jury indictment of Lawrence and some of his associates. He later was acquitted by Republican juries after two long trials on charges of misusing the powers of his office.

Most people today dismiss the charges as politically inspired, but Lawrence has never forgotten them. Only one other event ever brought him more suffering.

One evening in 1941 the telephone interrupted a card game in the Lawrence home. A guest, Joseph Barr, now mayor of Pittsburgh, picked it up.

A voice informed him that the two Lawrance boys, Brennan, 16 (named after Billy Brennan), and David, Jr., 13, had been hurt in a car crash. Lawrence, who had thought the two boys were upstairs playing pingpong, glanced outside and found that his car was gone.

It was an hour before he located the right hospital and learned that there were two dead and five survivors.

"Give me the names of the survivors," he said.

He copied down the names. Neither of the Lawrence boys was among the five still living.

Lawrence turned to his wife, and said, "Alice, our boys are gone."

Mrs. Lawrence still makes a practice of writing to strangers who suffer a similar tragedy.

The Lawrences have been married 38 years, and have made their home in Pittsburgh in a modest house in a plain neighborhood for 20 years. They have been made financially independent by an insurance business Lawrence shares with a Republican partner. They have two daughters, both married, and a son, Gerry, a student at Philadelphia's La Salle College.

For a time after the death of his sons, the grief-stricken father lost his interest in politics and almost in life. On his doctor's orders he got back into harness. Today, when a friend suffers a death in his family, Lawrence will point to a picture of Brennan and David on his desk, and advise, "Work hard and it will heal."

Until 1945 he was satisfied with his role of organizer, while other men ran for office. This attitude has earned him the title of kingmaker. The title has some foundation, but Lawrence is more than a kingmaker.

He is a party man. He has guided his career on the dictum that what is good for the party is the course to be followed. He always has believed that Lawrence is good for the party, but if his only value had been as an organizer he never would have run for office. Many times he has pointed to a man whose useful career has ended needlessly, and said, "His ambition killed him." He believes that "political arrogance is political suicide."

Cynics claim that he set the stage in 1945 for his nomination for the first of his four terms as mayor of Pittsburgh, and that he pulled the strings which made him a candidate for Governor in 1958. They have no proof to support their charge.

Lawrence backed a candidate for the mayoralty nomination in 1945, but his man declined to run. Fearing a split over other possible candidates, the caucus asked Lawrence to run. He called Alice, and with her approval accepted. A deadlocked caucus in 1958 catapulted him into the governorship. Again he accepted after telephoning his wife.

Despite all this, the kingmaker legend will haunt him as he leads the Pennsylvania delegation at the Los Angeles convention this summer. As a national committeeman and keeper of his State's 81 votes, he will be a power there, just as he has been for many years.

Two of his top political successes occurred at national conventions. He helped talk Adlai Stevenson into accepting the nomination in 1952. And 8 years earlier, fearful that Henry Wallace was gaining strength over Harry Truman for the vice-presidential nomination, the Pennsylvania delegate moved for a recess until the next day. The move eventually put Truman in the White House.

As a negotiator Lawrence has had the trust of labor, management, and the public. He is a consummate politician, but his credo in office has been that "good government is good politics."

Khrushchev learned that when Lawrence informed him on his visit to Pittsburgh that "in America, politics stop at the water's edge."

David Lawrence was the youngest child of Charles and Catherine Lawrence, and like his two brothers, Isaac and Charles, and his sister Mary, he was born at Pittsburgh's historic Point section at the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers.

The Point at the time was a rundown collection of frame houses and blackened boiler yards. The Lawrence home had four rooms, no running water, and no heat except the kitchen stove.

By ordinary standards the Point was a slum, and the people who lived there were poor. Lawrence does not accept the appraisal. "We were not poor, and the neighborhood was a good one." It is people that make slums, and he remembers the people of the first ward with pride. His neighborhood gave the city five mayors.

The family attended St. Mary of Mercy Church, where his father was a trustee and his mother a member of the altar society until their deaths. The children were educated in the parish school. Lawrence still attends the same church when in Pittsburgh, and continues to take up the collection there.

St. Mary's pastor, Msgr. D. A. Lawless, is one of Lawrence's stanchest friends. The priest, who sat in the courtroom through Lawrence's two trials, says, "Dave has never forgotten his humble origins. None of his old friends dies that he doesn't remember to have a Mass said for him."

Lawrence's mother, the monsignor says, "was a one-woman Catholic social-service center," and so revered that a church (St. Catherine's in Allison Park) was given her name. Lawrence went to his mother for advice even after he became mayor.

Most of Dave's friends went to work right after grade school, but his father sent him to St. Mary's High for a 2-year commercial course.

One of his teachers there, Sister Casimir, R.S.M. now 87, remembers that David's father told her he wanted his boy to work hard. She still keeps an eye on her former charge.

"I had to warn him about misuse of a word on television recently," she said. "I wrote him and told him to watch his vocabulary."

Dave played the outfield for the S.J. Toole Baseball Club—a political organization, naturally. His manager, Robert A. Foley, remembers that he was a good fielder, but only an average batter. His idol was the Pirate's Honus Wagner. "I used to wait at the old Expo park, and he always took me in to see the games."

He probably is the only boxing manager who ever became a governor. He managed three fighters in his early days. "The biggest purse any of my boys ever won was $350."

Lawrence cannot succeed himself as governor, but 1962 will not bring retirement. He has loved political life too long to give it up. He is proud of his profession and is fond of quoting Elihu Root: "Politicians are citizens who partake in the highest form of citizenship. To be properly labeled a politician is one of the great tributes given in a democracy."

Federal Employees Health Benefits Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Mr. O. C. Leckman, business agent of the United Postal Workers Local Union No. 245, Pittsburgh, Pa., to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their feelings about the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act. The editorial appeared in the June issue of the local's newsletter. Mr. Leckman has brought out some points which he feels some of the other Members of Congress

might like to compare with opinions from their sections of the country.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

It has been stated that the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act which offers hospitalization benefits effective July 1960 is a monument to the late Senator Neuberger.

Senator Neuberger was a most respected Member of the U.S. Senate, a man of character and convictions, and a champion for the rights of our people.

It would have been proper for the Members of Congress to make certain that a suitable monument was built for the Senator they so highly respected. However, the many complaints registered by Federal employees, and the dissatisfaction expressed, indicate the monument is a shaky and unstable one, and disrespectful to the wishes of the late Senator.

It appears this act of Congress was bombed from the start when it allowed the Civil Service Commission to approve many individual union and organization plans. A very satisfactory plan could have materialized had all employes been banded together and allowed to deal with individual insurance companies, under a free enterprise system of competition. However, when unions were allowed to deal for themselves, and when it was possible for each to come up with an offer a little more attractive than the Government Blue Cross and Aetna plans, all advantages and possibilities for a country-wide employee deal were dead.

Federal employee unions and organizations are now using their hospitalzation plans to attract new members from the ranks of other unions and from those who must otherwise accept the Blue Cross and Aetna plans. These actions will widen the split between the Government unions.

A five-member advisory committee from the ranks of organized and unorganized labor was appointed last year by the CSC to advise them concerning employee opinions. The committee was composed of James Campbell, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO; Jerome Keating, vice president, National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO; Vaux Owens, president, National Federation of Federal Employees, independent organization; William Ryan, president, District 44, Federal Employee Branch International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO; and Leon Wheeless, Director of Civilian Personnel Policy of the Defense Department.

It appears to our employees that these people have ignored the possibilities of gaining great advantages for all employees under a great combined and single program, and have concentrated on a program which may sell their individual unions. It is our belief that Government unions would progress faster if they would conceiftrate more on honest and sincere representation for employees than by merely attempting to sell their individual unions in competition with other unions and organizations.

Employees had hoped for a good hospitalization plan from this important act of Congress. They know now that what has been granted is little more than another Government subsidy—to the insuring companies. It is true that in some respects the new policy has more coverage than our old Blue Cross-Blue Shield agreements, but the additional coverage is of a nature seldom needed. In some respects, such as maternity benefits, employees have lost the advantages offered by their old policy. Some of our employees are immediately concerned with this, for their impending maternity cases which were fully covered under our old agreement will cause them great expense under the new Government-approved plans. Employees are greatly disturbed over the Civil Service Commission's approval of such a program.

Forty Years as Veterans' Aid Without Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is agreed, I am sure, that loyal and patriotic citizens make up the backbone of this great Nation of ours and are, of course, its future salvation. In one of the cities in my congressional district there resides such a man—Mr. Michael Cassic, Sr., of Hazleton, who for the past 40 years and without any remuneration, has placed thousands of flags and markers on the graves of veterans in some 18 cemeteries in the Hazleton city area on or about each Memorial Day. Mr. Cassic is to be warmly congratulated for the high degree of patriotism which he has displayed over four decades and the residents of Hazleton and its surrounding area are indeed most fortunate to have such a gentleman in their midst. In line with this outstanding performance, I include an article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of Tuesday, June 14, 1960:

MIKE CASSIC: 40 YEARS AS VETERANS' AID WITHOUT PAY

If you were to ask a man to handle a job for 40 or more years without pay, you'd probably get the quickest "no" you ever heard in your life.

But, in the city of Hazleton, there is such a man; a World War I veteran, a family man and a leader in veterans' affairs.

PLACED THOUSANDS OF FLAGS

It is through him that thousands of flags and markers have been carefully placed on the graves of veterans in the 18 cemeteries in the city area on or about Memorial Day.

He has seen to it that the job has been done since he returned home from the war in 1920 with the rank of sergeant in the Regular Army of the United States.

This man is Michael Cassic, Sr., 975 East Chestnut Street, who for many years was a Luzerne County detective.

In addition to placing flags and markers on the graves of the veterans of all wars, Cassic has also found time to transfer "misplaced stones" to the proper cemeteries and to, as he said, "lend a hand in straightening out some of the stones that were leaning to one side or another."

The cemeteries that Cassic has cared for during these past 40 years include St. Gabriel's, St. Joseph's, Mother of Grace, St. John's Greek Catholic, St. Stanilaus, Most Precious Blood, Holy Trinity Slovak, Holy Trinity German Caholic, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Beth Israel, Agudas Israel, St. Peter and St. Paul Lutheran, St. Mary's Greek Catholic, St. John the Baptist Polish National, SS. Peter and Paul Lithuanian, St. Michael's Ukrainian, Mount Laurel, and St. Patrick's at Beaver Brook.

Today, Flag Day, Cassic made a brief visit to one of the cemeteries in the area to see that at least one American flag is flying over the grave of a man or woman who served that this Nation might live.

Cassic looks back on his 40 years of service to his fellow veterans with a pride that is unequalled.

He feels that he has carried out to the best of his ability a program that certainly means more to veterans and their families than to others, and perhaps, down deep in his heart, Mike Cassic knows that his initials are symbolic of what his services through the years have meant to those who served their Nation, "Mike's Contribution."

Federal Bureau of Investigation—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the first of a series appearing in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch relative to the wonderful record of the world's greatest law enforcement agency. I wish to join with the many friends of the Bureau in expressing continued confidence in, and respect for the Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

The article follows:

THE FBI—FIDELITY, BRAVERY, INTEGRITY—THESE WORDS ARE EMBLAZONED ON THE FBI SEAL. WHO ARE THE MEN AND WHAT ARE THE DEEDS WHICH HAVE GIVEN THEM MEANING?

WASHINGTON.—One of the most chilling sounds in the world is the unexpected scream of a squalling cat at night.

Ask J. Edgar Hoover, a man of indomitable courage and who has personally led extremely dangerous assignments against vicious criminals on many occasions during his more than 36 years as Director of the FBI. He knows it firsthand.

On a dark night in 1942, Mr. Hoover led a squad of agents on a raid in Chicago. The FBI had learned that the Touhy Gang was hiding out in a Chicago apartment. The net was drawn around the building.

J. Edgar Hoover and another agent climbed in a window and made their way up the stairs in pitch blackness. Suddenly, Mr. Hoover stepped on something soft and a horrible, echoing scream split the air. The Director had stepped on a black cat.

Now, 18 years later, Mr. Hoover maintains he has no doubts that the scream of an anguished cat can make anyone's hair stand on end.

But it takes more than a noisy cat to deter Mr. Hoover. He is the same J. Edgar Hoover who was challenged by Alvin Karpis many years ago in New Orleans. Again leading a squad of agents, he personally arrested Alvin Karpis on May 1, 1936, and rang down the curtain on the Barker-Karpis Gang, one of the most vicious gangs of the "Terrible Thirties."

The Director, who at 65 has the physical vigor of a man many years younger, has set the example for personally leading dangerous and hazardous undertakings whenever time would permit.

Although he missed the famous Dillinger apprehension by hours because of conditions beyond his control, there have been few major undertakings when he was not personally supervising "the situation."

Years ago, FBI agents took into custody a notorious kidnaper who refused to tell where he had hidden the body of his murdered victim. Ultimately he said he would tell only J. Edgar Hoover. Hoover walked into the room, elicited a full confession and flew with the kidnaper to a remote spot in Minnesota where the victim's body was found.

During this trek across the snow in bitter cold, Mr. Hoover and agents stopped in

a country store to purchase warm clothing. Later, the storekeeper wrote to Mr. Hooover that one of the old-timers around the cracker barrel had remarked: "Hoover wasn't much as a President, but we got to admit he is a great investigator."

Investigator Hoover would not completely agree with that statement. He is a close personal friend and admirer of former President Herbert Hoover. There is mutual admiration.

The former President once remarked to the special agent in charge of the FBI's Cincinnati office that he felt one of the high spots in his service as President was the administration of the FBI by Director J. Edgar Hoover. The two Hoovers are not related.

The late Julius Lully owned Harvey's Resturant in Washington, D.C. Mr. Hoover enjoyed particularly dining at Harvey's and was quite partial to the steaks, the Florida stone crabs, green turtle soup, popovers, charcoal-crisp hamburgers, and angel food cake.

Over a period of years, Lully and Mr. Hoover became the closest of friends. Each enjoyed a joke at the other's expense. On one occasion, the crisp-spoken J. Edgar Hoover, at the conclusion of his meal, asked the waiter to bring a cherry heering (a noted Danish cordial). Imagine his consternation when, in a short time, the waiter reappeared with a large platter and one herring with a cherry perched on top.

The waiter remarked to Mr. Hoover that orders of the house were to comply with any request of the guest. In short order, Lully, lurking in the background appeared and advised Mr. Hoover that if he would speak more clearly such difficulties could be avoided. The director enjoyed the joke.

On another occasion, Hoover sent a letter to Lully purporting to be from a renowned New York chief, accusing Lully of stealing a certain recipe. Lully brooded over the letter for several days. Then he showed it to Mr. Hoover who frowned his disapproval. Lully exploded: "Why I would not steal a recipe from that bum."

Mr. Hoover: "Where did you steal it?"
Lully: "I got it from * * *"

A most heart warming experience for every man and woman in the FBI was a recent May 10 when Director Hoover celebrated his anniversary as director. He has had 36. In reflecting upon his years of service, Mr. Hoover said:

"I would not exchange my life and experiences these past years for those of any other person in the world."

"Vast problems have confronted the FBI and law-abiding citizens during this period * * * gangsterism in the 1930's; espionage and sabotage threats of World War II; Communist subversion and treachery; the rise of crime to record heights during the 1950's.

"A career of law enforcement presents a never-ending opportunity to combat the enemies of our society. Each day has seemed more interesting and often more challenging than the previous one. And to top it off, a finer group of associates cannot be found than the men and women with whom I have been honored to serve. What more can a man ask of life than blessings such as these?"

The men and women of the FBI feel the same way toward the director. In him they see a leader inspirational in approach, dedicated in objective, firm in supervision, fair at all times, sympathetic as occasion warrants, but always a patriot and a man of selfless sacrifice.

Mr. Hoover has served as director of the FBI under 5 Presidents and 12 Attorneys General. Since that day on May 10, 1924, when the new Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone appointed him, Mr. Hoover has enjoyed the respect and esteem of his superiors, coworkers, and subordinates.

Prior to his appointment, the Teapot Dome Oil scandal had become a national disgrace, resulting in the imprisonment of a cabinet officer and the removal of the Attorney General.

President Harding had become ill on a trip to Alaska and died. Vice President Calvin Coolidge became President. He brought the dean of the Columbia Law School, Harlan Fiske Stone, to Washington as Attorney General.

Stone realized a housecleaning in the Department of Justice was necessary. He looked around for an individual with the ability, courage, and drive to take charge of the Bureau of Investigation and commence the housecleaning there.

He chose J. Edgar Hoover. Mr. Hoover lost no time. He cleaned out the political hacks, the incompetents, the unstable personalities; severed the dollar-a-year men and those with honorary appointments, and instituted the foundation on which the FBI has been built. It has grown and prospered through the years. Merit is the foundation.

Daily during the course of activities of every FBI agent there is the unanticipated, the unexpected. No agent knows when he leaves home in the morning when he will return, or whether he will ever return.

He is a man sworn to the service of the public of the United States. He is a dedicated, devoted individual operating in the public behalf. Loyalty and dedication are key notes in FBI activities, but these alone are not sufficient. Mr. Hoover expresses his belief that the accomplishments of the FBI may be traced to three fundamentals: (1) Careful selection of personnel; (2) Thorough training and supervision of personnel; (3) Frequent and unexpected inspections by impartial officials reporting to the director concerning all phases of FBI performance.

Special agents through the years have undertaken hazardous assignments with great personal suffering and with unusual inconveniences to their families. In every instance, they have demonstrated dedication and unequaled spirit.

Perhaps the calling of FBI work is similar to that which inspires highly trained teachers to devote their years to serving young people and molding future citizens even though the teachers could probably make more money in another line of work. Many special agents of the FBI have received attractive offers from industry, but have refused to leave their FBI employment.

In tracing why there is such spirit in the FBI and such a willingness to volunteer for FBI missions many considerations can be offered. Among them would be the careful selection of personnel, the requirements that applicants be graduate attorneys.

The stringent physical requirements similar to those demanded of a cadet enrolling at West Point also might have a bearing. The withering and intensive background investigation given each FBI applicant helps to screen out the undesirables and make it possible to select only the best.

This "cream of the crop" technique undoubtedly has much to do with providing the type of personnel who can fit into the FBI scheme of operations. The careful and intensive training schools, the constant refresher courses, the frequent unannounced examinations, all tend to keep an FBI employee on his toes. Tight supervision also helps.

It is quite possible, however, that the real reasons boil down into very simple terms—leadership at the top and the example set by that leadership provide the inspiration and the code for guidance of the FBI.

The philosophy of FBI employees has been to look after the FBI duties to the best of their ability.

It is the citizens, who profit most from such philosophy. "Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity" is the FBI motto. "Service above self" describes the FBI best.

A Demonstration of Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Fort Scott Tribune, there appeared an editorial which clearly shows that good citizenship and the recognition of responsibility can keep filthy, pornographic literature from the hands of the children of the city.

The effort of the Postmaster General to obtain additional legislation, and his many speeches on the subject, should both be directed toward the solution as evolved by the citizenry of Fort Scott, Kans. He and the Attorney General should more effectively enforce the laws now in effect and stop attempting to divert the attention of the American people from the shortcomings of the administration.

Censorship, and to what extent, would be the issue if more legislation is considered. As pointed out in the editorial, it would be dangerous to give unlimited censorship powers to any public official or Government agency. If an effective measure could be written, which protects against censorship and against the invasion of private rights, to cleanse the mails of filth, it would be passed by the Congress without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, because publisher G. Watson Marble, in the editorial of June 15, spells out the sensible approach to a serious problem, I ask that it be considered as part of my remarks:

EFFECTIVE LOCAL CENSORSHIP

To a very considerable extent the task of keeping news and magazine stands free of filth literature is a local concern. It would be wonderful if any legislative body could pass a law outlawing obscenity and making it enforcible. No such law can ever be found, let alone be enacted, and for obvious reasons.

The very apparent problem is in defining what is good or bad, decent or indecent, wholesome or obscene. Many people will agree as to the extremes, but can never agree on the borderline cases. There can be no precise definition which can be written into law, acceptable to all, and enforcible too.

Even if such laws were enacted, they would be dangerous because they could be misused as unjustified censorship. Who is going to tell who what they can read and not read, or tell any publisher what he can print or not print? That can never be done in this country by law.

But in every community there is a reliable, sensible, and effective means of policing literature offered for sale. Parents, ministers, teachers, even operators of newsstands themselves, know what is good and what is bad for young people in their community to read. They can, if they want, be the arbiters, the voluntary censors, for their own community.

The plan has worked in Fort Scott. Groups of adults have expressed concern at various times over material that some distributors would make available at newsstands. Retail men have felt the same concern. The result has been that our town has been kept relatively free of filth literature that is so obvious in some other places. A town can be kept just as clean as its people want it to be.

Putting a stop to obscene material that is sent through the mails is more difficult.

That material can come to juveniles without knowledge of postal authorities and in violation of postal rules. Here again, is a parental responsibility to apprehend and control. Parents can stop that flow of fifth through the mails, too, if they want to. They can keep it out of their own homes, and they can help others by notifying postal authorities whenever they do find it.

Report on Wildlife and Recreation in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the report of the committee on wildlife and recreation to the 47th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which met in Washington May 24 to 27, 1960.

This was a newly created committee, the principal purpose of which was stated to be to give attention to the problems involved in use of our many reservoir projects throughout the country. The importance of adequate recreation facilities becomes more evident each year with our burgeoning population, and the ever-increasing tempo of modern living.

It was a pleasure and honor for me to be asked to serve as chairman of this committee and I trust that our deliberations will, in some measure, contribute to a solution of some of the problems that confront us in this field.

The committee, which was meeting for the first time since its creation, held two sessions on May 24 and its report was presented to the convention on May 26 by Mr. Hayden W. Olds, Chief of the Division of Wildlife of the State of Ohio, who represents the Ohio River division on the committee, and was unanimously adopted.

It is to be hoped and expected that as the committee gains experience in dealing with the matters over which it has jurisdiction, it will make a sound and useful contribution in the conservation and use of our water resources in these fields of recreation and wildlife.

The committee's report is as follows:

The committee on wildlife and recreation was called to order by Chairman ED EDMONDSON at 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 24, 1960, in the Concord Room of the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

The following members of the committee were present: Chairman, Representative Ed Edmondson; Ronald W. Green, Augusta, Maine; Hayden W. Olds, Columbus, Ohio, and W. D. H. Rodiguez, Monroe, La. Arthur S. Tidwell, Jr., Monroe La., was appointed to the committee by the chairman and thereafter elected secretary by the committee. Committeeman John A. Biggs, Washington State, entered the committee meeting after noon, along with Senator Leon Field and W. T. Gooldy, Oklahoma, representing Committeeman George Knapp, Oklahoma.

The meeting adjourned at noon and convened again at 2.30 p.m. and adopted the following resolutions:

1. To commend the president and executive officers of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for creating the committee on wildlife and recreation thereby recognizing the importance thereof to the public welfare of the Nation and permitting greater consideration of these subjects in the deliberations of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

2. To support and endorse Federal legislation designed to recognize recreation as an integral part of any new flood control legislation, water supply, hydroelectric or reclamation project and that recreational benefits be evaluated and considered as a partial justification for such projects.

3. To request consideration of a change in the present land acquisition policy of the Federal Government to promote the acquisition of an adequate acreage in fee simple to guarantee public access and use for recreational purposes and that the cost of these lands be included as a part of the project cost.

4. To request consideration of the development of recreational and access facilities as part of the cost of approved projects.

5. To endorse, approve and urge the continuance of the present policy under which the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation make available recreational areas under lease or license to State and political subdivisions, civic and service nonprofit organizations.

6. To preserve and protect the recreational and wildlife facilities we urge the continuation of the Federal antipollution control program and the provision of matching funds to finance this program.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

The committee unanimously recommends the acceptance of these resolutions by the Congress of Rivers and Harbors.

What Can You Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of listening to the following sermon by Rev. W. Paul Ludwig at the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church recently and it was so apropos of our problem today that it occurred to me it worth worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?

Of all the pathetic cries that are squeezed out of the heart of man, the most desperate is the ultimate sob: "There's nothing we can do about ." Staggered by the recent shocks which have well-nigh seemed to swerve our planet out of orbit, too many of our compatriots have shouted into the darkness: "We're trapped. The cell door is bolted shut. It was a nice party while it lasted, but now——?"

As if God's lifeless shape were heaped in a corner under a pile of rags. Man cannot be original even with his tears. We sputter as if there had never been a broken heart but ours; as if no other nation had ever been rocked to her foundations; as if by some divine reluctance we would be spared the moral judgment of God; as if in His grievous disappointment God in a cosmic pout would turn His back upon us. There's nothing to be done—not even with an assist from Heaven.

Even with our vaunted adaptability, it sometimes appears that we Americans are as prone as any race on earth to put life into a quick freeze—to finalize our hope, or our lack of hope, in an irrevocable interoffice memo. Perhaps it is a matter of semantics.

Mencken's "The American Language" lists many of the differences in vocabularly, pronunciation and syntax between our American speech and the English which is spoken in England. These variations appeared quite early as the American colonists faced objects and experiences quite remote from the traditional routine of the old country. An Englishman who visited Savannah in that city's infancy protested the adulteration of the pure mother tongue:

"The village," he wrote, "stands upon the flat of a hill; the bank of the river (which the Americans in barbarous English call a bluff) is steep and about 45 feet perpendicular." So came an early protest against the word "bluff."

The point to be noted is that popular language is a barometer of a people's peculiar temper. It suggests whether a race is basically refined or vulgar; instinctively poetic and picturesque, or stolid and prosaic; it reflects the warmth of a nation's heart, the generosity of her spirit, the depth of her religious conviction. We can weigh a nation's prejudices or analyze the general texture of her political fabric, if we know her vernacular, her common language, her idiomatic speech.

Above all others there is one characteristic of our American language that staggers me with its deadliness. Our speech is riddled with compartments and categories, with words and phrases that classify humanity—that thrust people into groups and types. It is an exceedingly acute reflection of our mood. Classifications once were comparatively simple. A man was either good or bad; either a churchgoer or a person of feeble standing in the community. He was marked according to his craft or business or politics. But these things are inconsequential in our day. We have increased the number of categories but decreased their moral relevance.

Agnes Newton Keith writes this whimsical paragraph in her book, "Land Below the Wind":

"Everything in the world about me shares in a great vigor. I recognize now as never before the tremendous aliveness of the people of this American continent, a germinating aliveness which makes it impossible to catalog them. People and positions flutter out of their pigeonholes and refuse to be documented. Wives wash their husbands' woolens in order to ride in handsome motorcars; plumbers talk philosophy and philosophers do the plumbing; the man who paints the pantry borrows the anthology of English poetry and the man who compiles the anthology paints his own pantry." If only this trend attested to our spiritual health. No such claim can be made. Most of us go on branding and being branded.

We stamp people as they stream by: "She's a typical schoolmarm." "Isn't that just like a preacher?" "He talks like a bond salesman." "Politicians are all alike." "You can tell what he does for a living." "She's just the type." And so the phrases pour from our lips like a potent acid that dissolves individuality. We hook our insulting tags into a man's heart, and if he is ultrasensitive he may never recover.

But there's an antidote for this contemporary poison. I know a story—the story of a Man and an ancient city called Jericho. I know the story of a Man on His way into the city. And of the crowds clinging to the rooftops and the staircases, or standing ankle deep in dust along His road of entry. I know the story of a Man and another man—and of how they met. The other man had climbed into a tree, for he was too small to see—as all men are small before they meet

Jesus. But this man was branded. His legal name was Zacchaeus; to the people he was "a chief publican, a tax gatherer, and rich." Many inventions had been circulated about his dishonesty. He had discovered the unfortunate predicament of belonging to the aristocracy of wealth.

I know a great story: when the Big Man and the little man met. And the One called to the other, "Come down, my friend, we have some things to talk about. Today I must abide at thy house."

And try as they would, the people couldn't get his tag back on. It wouldn't stick. Zacchaeus, the publican—the tax gatherer. Not any more. Zacchaeus, the friend of Jesus. The Master had only one category for men. They are all the children of God; they are all sinners, nevertheless; and He loves them all.

Inevitably we cringe at the sounds and sights of world revolution. The susceptible student mind is being pressed into the mold fashioned by unscrupulous leaders. With personality ignored, culture frowned upon and the soul granted only the deference of a smile, we shudder at the blight which withers the individuality of so much of the earth's population.

The vanity and power mania of a few agitators cannot be held solely responsible. There is something in us all that deserves censure. Mob hysteria is only made possible by those who are willing to be regimented. Those who thrive on group identity rather than self-identity provide the raw material for the madness of our time.

Are we talking about Japan? About any of the festering spots remote from our shores? Or is it America that needs our first scrutiny and our unending prayers? Swept by the tide of our pleasurebound society, men who once knew their own name can react now only to the label which describes the particular pressure group in which they are enmeshed. We are being constantly pushed and shoved and jostled into the car that is nonstop until it reaches the basement.

And in the midst of it all, the pathetic sob: "But what can we do about it?"

I know another story: of a woman at a well. Of a woman who wore a blemish—which was her tag. And of a Man who wore no blemish whatsoever—whose only label was that He was the Son of God. But He saw no type in her save the universality of sin and an opportunity to be once more the Redeemer.

And the beggar. Remember?—the blind beggar whom Jesus healed with spittle and clay—and faith. The townspeople saw his label fluttering away. They rushed to tie it back on. "Is not this he that sat and begged?"

An American visitor to London wrote home to his friends: "You must visit the Victoria Embankment and see the people sleeping on the benches. They are the most interesting types." God help us. Is our whole society a vast sociological laboratory where men have no more distinctiveness than a row of test tubes?

I know a Nazarene who utterly defied description. The unique thing about Christ is that He was unique. You could always single Him out. No standard model, He. No assembly line Christ. No member of the mob.

W. R. Maltby tried to convince us that "we have bleached all the color out of Jesus." Maybe this is what has happened to His followers. But not to Him. Never.

Why did the scribes and the Pharisees hate Him so? Hear them reviling the blind beggar after Jesus had healed him. "Thou art His disciple," they cried, "but we are disciples of Moses. We know that God hath spoken unto Moses, but as for this man, we do not know whence He is. We do not know where this fellow comes from. We haven't the slightest idea where He belongs." That's what fanned their fury. The Pharisees—the men of precise definitions—of standardized classifications—no wonder they parted company with Jesus. He slipped right out of their fingers.

Praise God there is no cell big enough to imprison our Christ. He refuses to be dressed up in a uniform. Even the Christ in denominational regalia is slipping behind the scenes. Christ in a business suit, or in a picket line must be forgotten. The mysterious Son of Love must be seen through our imperfect eyes as the crucified Saviour of the world. He stands triumphantly, majestically alone.

Then where do we stand who profess to follow Him? What can we do about this battered world? We can plead the forgiveness of God for our easy complacency. We can confess the sins that have perverted our discipleship. We can get back into the family of the Father by acknowledging the lordship of Christ and accepting His redeeming love. The task of the individual before he can do one iota for the society in which he lives, is to get himself right with God. This is what we can do about it. Only then can we work with God for the redemption of this frightened and frightening world.

For a Secretary of Science and Technology With Cabinet Rank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is an article from Burnell & Co., Inc., in Pelham Manor, N.Y., urging the appointment of a Secretary of Science and Technology, with Cabinet rank.

I think this viewpoint is well taken and worthy of consideration by Members of the Congress.

The article follows:

FOR A SECRETARY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WITH CABINET RANK

Twentieth century scientific endeavor has been so productive that we no longer tend to think of achievement in terms of a decade or a generation. Each significant scientific accomplishment marks the beginning of an age in itself. Thus, we have the atom age, the nuclear age, the age of automation, the space age, electronics, and so forth. Since scientific progress is inextricably linked to survival, it follows that it is an important concern of Government. The vast expenditures for defense—more than $40 billion—the large sums for research—$500 million annually—are indicative of our concern with maintaining technological leadership.

NO VOICE IN CABINET

Yet, while the executive department of Government is advised on matters of public policy by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, State, Interior, Treasury, Defense, the Attorney General, and the Postmaster General, there is no policy formulating voice speaking in behalf of science. Since Cabinet members have traditionally been the President's closest advisers—the policy was established by George Washington during his second term and officially recognized in 1907—there appears to be an urgent need for a Secretary of Science and Technology with Cabinet rank.

THE SECRETARY'S RESPONSIBILITIES

A Secretary of Science and Technology with Cabinet rank would do much to clarify our scientific goals and objectives. He would: (a) Help coordinate military and civilian elements of scientific programs to achieve a common goal; (b) recommend top level decisions on the inauguration and development of specific projects; (c) establish our objectives in space, nuclear energy, and so forth; (d) have the responsibility for funds and priorities vital to each program; (e) back up members of his team with authority; (f) oppose arbitrary fund limitations.

In an era when science is of transcendental importance to peace and progress, its voice should speak from a position that carries with it no less than the prestige and the influence of the executive department of Government.

Here We Stand—A Declaration of Principles Which Guides the Staff of American Agriculturist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent declaration of principles, written by Hugh Cosline, appeared in the July 2 number of American Agriculturist.

This farm paper founded in 1842 represents the thinking of the farmers of the Northeast, in which my district is situated.

Mr. Speaker, these northeastern farmers get very little representation in the Congress of the United States, yet they represent one of the most important farm areas in the Nation. They also represent, more than any other section, the family farm to which so much lipservice is paid.

It seems to me that this short declaration presents not only the thinking of the farmers of the Northeast, but the commonsense approach to the problems of agriculture as a whole.

The article follows:

HERE WE STAND—A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES WHICH GUIDES THE STAFF OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURIST

(By Hugh Cosline)

Many years ago, our Founding Fathers wrote a Declaration of Independence that lives today as a charter for national purpose. We think it's a good idea to restate basic principles now and then. What better time than near our celebration of Independence Day?

The policies of the editorial staff of American Agriculturist on current farm problems are reached only after thoughtful analysis. Before final approval, two questions must have an affirmative answer: In the long run, will our position improve the financial returns from farming and add to the contentment and happiness of all our readers? Does it meet the following fundamental principles?

FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Farmers cannot go it alone in today's complicated organized economy. Through or-

ganization, they must seek solutions to the troubles that harass them.

We have good organizations, but they must be strengthened. This can be done by increased membership, by grassroots policies established by farmers, by electing and hiring good administrators, and by greater participation on the part of members to see that policies once established are carried out.

American Agriculturist pledges its support to the job of increasing the influence of all sound farm organizations.

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE

The future is bright for young people who wish to farm, who understand and are willing to give what it takes, and who have or are prepared to get the necessary training.

The predominant type of farm in the Northeast will continue to be the family farm, although it will average somewhat larger than at present. Most of these farms will be fundamentally one- or two-men farms, and will be big enough so that, using modern methods and equipment, the man or men will be fully employed. This will permit modern conveniences and luxuries to develop a satisfying homelife.

Your editors will continue to be optimistic about the opportunities in agriculture.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

Farmers who expect to maintain incomes sufficient to give their families modern comforts and conveniences must continue to reach out for and adopt practjes which enable one man to produce more with less work. It is the responsibility of American Agriculturist to supply the information needed to do this.

GOVERNMENT

Government is too big, and is doing too many things. In particular Government has no logical reason for owning or operating any type of business establishment in direct competition with its citizen taxpayers.

Government cannot guarantee prosperity to any group. It has nothing to give anyone which it doesn't first take away from someone.

As affecting agriculture, no Government program now in operation, or to be tried later, will solve the price problems of farmers. Certain activities, for example, marketing agreements and orders, will help in getting prices warranted by supply and demand. But, in fact, the effect of price supports past and present has in total been harmful rather than helpful. In particular, Government attempts to control food production have been largely nullified by the actions of other Government agencies which have encouraged production. For example, reclamation of land not presently needed, the granting of easy credit, and the maintenance of unrealistically high price supports.

But, regardless of these facts, there seems little hope that Congress will give up in its attempts to cure the price problems of food producers. Therefore, farmers must continue for some time to live with the present disgraceful situation.

The editors of American Agriculturist will continue to present the facts about Government farm programs as we see them.

EDUCATION

A democracy cannot endure without an informed electorate. This makes education a No. 1 requirement. It is expensive, and will continue to be so, but it should have first priority.

Our schools are not perfect; they never will be. But the strongest force to make them better will continue to be keen interest and activity on the part of all parents and taxpayers.

American Agriculturist favors adequate schools; is opposed to Federal aid and control.

FREE ENTERPRISE

The prime reason why America has prospered above other countries has been the freedom of the individual to set his sights high, to work at whatever job he wishes, to keep the products of his labor, to worship according to the dictates of his conscience.

Therefore, it is our belief that any effort to hamper this freedom, whether it be voluntary groups such as farm organizations, labor unions or political parties, or any course of action by any branch of government, will inevitably curtail freedom and the well-being of all. Your editors will continue to resist the trend toward a regimented economy.

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH

Mechanical power, made effective through the ingenuity of man in a free society, is mainly responsible for better living standards. Yet this mechanical power is puny compared to the spiritual power which is available to all. This spiritual power breeds courage to resist oppression, it develops integrity to oppose dishonesty, it gives high strength and purpose to the lives of all.

Opinions From the Eighth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the year I receive ballots from members of the National Federation of Independent Business in the congressional district I represent. These persons are small businessmen and since small business constitutes an important part of our economy, I am always interested in the views expressed on these ballots. I have tallied the results of the balloting and believe it reflects the thinking of this group on some of the important issues we are considering in Congress.

Here is the way the average small businessman in the Eighth District of Ohio feels about some of these subjects:

He is overwhelmingly opposed to any further raising or extension of the Federal minimum wage law.

He believes imports should be curbed.

He believes tariffs should be tied into foreign wage rates.

He strongly favors the taxation of co-ops.

He suports a program to retire the national debt.

He is in favor of reducing subsidies and a cut in spending.

The distressing thing about the small businessman's position becomes apparent when it is realized that he is opposed by powerful pressure groups. On every one of the issues noted above, he represents a small voice against the labor union, the free traders, the spenders, and a variety of organizations whose ultimate effect is to oppress him.

It is not possible to marshal any arguments here for or against these issues, but I do believe it is necessary that Members of Congress are made aware of the position of the small businessman and appreciate the fact that he is entitled to some consideration in the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I felt it necessary to speak up for the small businessman in almost these same words. Unfortunately, the plight of the small businessman has not improved in that time and, in fact, his difficulties continue to increase. It is significant to note the 86th Congress has done little to help him. Once again, then, I can only hope that the Congress which convenes next January will give more attention to the independent businessman than has been evident in the past.

The Agriculture Situation With the Politics Left Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, now that hope of passing any major revision to existing farm legislation is apparently laid away for this session of Congress, it would seem desirable that Members of Congress take a new look at this problem that always seems to be with us. Being a farmer, myself, I believe I have a first-hand knowledge of the problems that exist that adversely affect the farmer's income. I believe I also have an understanding of the limitations we are faced with when we attempt to fix prices with Federal legislation. The vast difference in crops, people, climate, and markets, to say nothing of size of farms creates a dissimilarity of interest that makes almost impossible regulatory and price fixing legislation that is satisfactory to all concerned. A price that may be necessary for the small farmer to make ends meet can be overly attractive to the real large farmer.

Prof. O. B. Jesness, longtime dean of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota, has written an article which is published in the July issue of Successful Farming magazine. This article, in my opinion, sets forth in clear, brief language the agricultural problem of the Nation without any attempt to blame or justify anyone for what has happened in the past. Congress in its next session must deal with the build-up of surplus farm products. I feel the points clarified by Professor Jesness as fact or fancy provide valuable information for all Members of Congress. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

THE FARM PROBLEM: FACT AND FANCY

(The political conventions this month signal the start of the final dash to the election finish line. Political speeches will get more partisan, promises will get bigger, liberties with the truth may become more evident. This report will help you better judge your candidates.)

(By O. B. Jesness, professor emeritus, University of Minnesota)

The heat and oratorical license of the political campaign—now getting a full head of

steam—make it more difficult than usual to separate fact from fancy in trying to think straight about the farm problem. Nor is the job made easier when fancy sometimes has more appeal than fact.

Another difficulty is that neither fact nor fancy on farm issues is pure white nor ebony black. Fact does not always come crystal clear with no tinge of fancy. Nor is fancy always purely a child of imagination.

But in the coming months of emphasis on politics, it behooves us all to try to separate the wheat from the chaff, and to set our thinking straight on at least a few points. Otherwise, we may be even more hopelessly confused by the avalanche of words which soon will cascade around us.

Fact or fancy? Low prices are the cause of farm problems. No one in his right mind would deny that the prices you receive are important in determining your farm income. So, can there be any question about price being the cause of all present-day farm difficulties?

Well, farm programs of the past three decades appear to have accepted as fact that price is the problem. But if the problem was that simple—if price is the real cause of the farm problems—why haven't three decades of effort cured the problem?

Answer. It appears that the prices with which we are concerned are the consequence of something else. So the attack on farm problems should be centered on that something else.

Fact or fancy? Unsatisfactory prices for some farm products are a consequence of surpluses. Now we're getting warmer. Persistent surpluses provide us with clear evidence of an excess capacity to produce the commodities involved.

In short, the basic farm problem arises out of the fact that too many resources—especially land and manpower—are being used in lines in persistent surplus.

Fact or fancy? Food is such a necessity that there cannot be too much. Now there's an appealing statement. But contrary evidence in the form of about $9 billion of the taxpayers' money tied up in loans and inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not easily overlooked.

Political minds may find it convenient to blame the administration—particularly the Secretary of Agriculture—for inefficient handling. However, this surplus problem is no respecter of party lines. Other Secretaries and administrations have faced the problem. For instance, the ever-normal granary of the 1930's was fast becoming ever-abnormal until it was bailed out by World War II.

Then demands of war, the rebuilding of Europe, and the Korean conflict provided a ready market for all we could produce—until the early 1950's. But farmers don't want war-oriented prosperity.

Fact or fancy? We have recognized the fact of surpluses. The acreage allotments and marketing quotas legislated for basic commodities are an indication. The more recent soil bank is another.

But mounting stocks suggest that we have only given lip service to the existing of the problem. We have not faced the facts squarely. For example: In providing acre allotments for wheat and cotton, Congress softened the curb by limiting the total below which allotments were not to fall.

The 55-million acre minimum for wheat still leaves too much land in wheat to bring that crop into balance. Further, the limit was shifted from seeded to harvested acres, which eased the controls. Softening curbs still more was eliminating from restrictions those below a certain acreage—15 acres in the case of wheat.

We haven't controlled surplus production. We haven't really tried to do so.

Fact or fancy? But farmers stand ready to accept and abide by effective controls on their production and sales in return for assured supports.

Some politicians and others who advocate a continuation of present support levels or raising them, recognize that we cannot go on piling up stocks—burdening the public with mounting costs of carrying and disposing of surpluses.

They make the statement that farmers would accept stiff controls in exchange for "high" supports. Past experience suggests that this is not true. A politician who hopes to stay in office has to be a good judge of public opinion. The unwillingness of Congress to authorize stronger controls suggests resistance to, rather than demand for, such measures from farmers.

The minimums and softening of curbs cited above is one proof of this. Another is the present administration's short-lived proclamation of cross-compliance and total acreage allotments—which brought such an avalanche of criticism that they were abandoned.

The consequence of these failures of politicians and/or farmers to accept really effective controls has been that a significant share of the land held out of wheat and cotton has gone into feed grains. Feed grain and livestock producers have felt the effect of these failures.

In short, the half-hearted attempts to control surpluses in some lines has resulted in a spread of, rather than a cure for, the surplus problem.

Fact or fancy? The best answer is to drop the whole business of farm programs and let Nature take its course. This suggested by some who are sick and tired of the present mess and are tired of looking for panaceas.

Although there probably are not very many who seriously think we can continue traveling the road of the present farm program very much longer, the "let nature take its course" view falls short of facing facts frankly.

Such withdrawal in the light of stocks which public policy has encouraged and permitted would lead to chaos in markets and spell disaster for some farmers. This route is unacceptable.

Fact or fancy? Rights to produce should be assigned to the farmer and made transferable—rather than being attached to his land. Let's see how it would work: If you wanted to expand a controlled enterprise, you could buy rights from others without having to buy land in order to get them. This would establish values for rights. The benefit would go to the seller—and you would incur a cost which you would expect to recover from production.

It would hamper your progress, make it more difficult for your son to start farming. He'd have to buy a farm, then buy the right to produce on it. It would give those leaving agriculture something besides their land to sell—but place an additional burden on the man who stays and tries to make a go of farming. Is this what we want farm programs to do?

Fact or fancy? The rallying call of politicians that they "want to preserve the family farm." What they want to preserve it against is not too clear—and may not be too clear in their own minds.

You get the picture of corporations swallowing up family farms right and left. Is there any indication that any general move of this kind is on foot? If it were, results would soon show up in an increase in numbers of hired farmworkers. But the trend has been in the other direction.

Farms have been increasing in size through consolidation in order to make more effective use of modern machines and technology. This has been an adaptation of family farms to modern methods—a strengthening, not replacement.

Fact or fancy? We can get rid of our surplus stocks through Food for Peace and similar endeavors. Again there is need for tempering fancy with reality.

On the one hand we find those who talk glibly about giving away food as though there were no limits.

On the other extreme are those who would restrict such activities, if any, to the domestic scene.

We need to continue to build markets for our products, and to use our food for humanitarian purposes whenever possible. But we cannot realistically expect to get the solution for agriculture's ills in this realm.

Fact or fancy? Farmers should be given "bargaining power." This proposition can be dressed up to carry a lot of appeal. Fancy would have you believe that everyone except the farmer is a monopolist. The fact is that many are not.

The controls which others are supposed to have over production, markets, and prices are easily exaggerated. A look at the rate of business failures makes that obvious.

But even if everyone else were a monopolist, just how would your political "friend" give the farmer bargaining power? Controls over production and sales would be essential—but not enough. If the individual farmer is to get the benefits of such power, the numbers participating must be restricted. Are we ready to require a Government permit for everyone wanting to farm?

Fact or fancy? We should help farmers in lines which are in serious surplus make adjustments. Aim of such a program would be not to hold parts of farms in idleness, but to acheieve adjustments through programs on selected farms with voluntary participation of the farmers involved.

But, isn't this the purpose of the present conservation reserve? The purpose may be the same but the method would be significantly different.

As it has been applied up to now, the conservation reserve has been a shotgun approach. It is not selective in any marked degree in concentrating on the crops or areas where adjustment should take place. Its aim is to take out crop acres—rather than specifically acres of hard winter wheat, cotton, and other crops in need of adjustment.

Much of the conservation reserve involves temporarily withholding land from crop use. The more difficult parts of the adjustment program involve a longer time land removal For example, instead of holding land out for 3 or 5 years with the intent of increasing its productivity and then returning it to its former use, some more permanent shifts are needed.

For instance: In the case of hard winter wheat in the Great Plains it may be a shift out of wheat back to grazing. In other cases it will be a shift out of agricultural use entirely.

Where necessary, it should include help to farmers to transfer to other occupations that provide the prospects of better income to them. It should be a voluntary response to inducements provided by public funds.

These may involve payments for several years ahead, or the use of leases in some instances, and perhaps land purchase in exceptional cases. Firm commitments to keep the land out of specified uses will be essential.

Gradual lowering of price supports will be a part of the program to avoid the impossible situation in which the conservation reserve finds itself—the Government bids to take land out of production through the conservation reserve program, and at the same time provides incentives to farmers to continue production through price supports.

The conservation reserve has encountered opposition from local suppliers and others dependent on the farm community. The same may be expected of any program which

leads to major adjustments in some localities. While these effects cannot be ignored, it may be in order to remind some of the leaders and firms injured by adjustment that they cannot expect the public to support unneeded agricultural production just to keep them in business.

SUMMARY

The real question is whether we will fare better over the years by using and improving the market or by turning the job over to the Government.

The choice is not between Government domination and no Government participation. It is one of what sort of Government participation we want.

The time for sober thinking about this is before we assign the job of control to the Government.

Afterward may be too late.

The High Cost of Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial entitled "The High Cost of Federal School Aid," which appeared in the Western Hills Press of Cheviot, Cincinnati, Ohio, on Thursday, June 23, 1960. This fine editorial should be read by every Member of Congress for it furnishes pertinent information on a most important subject. The article follows:

THE HIGH COST OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Advocates of Federal aid to education have a bill pending in Congress proposing appropriation of $975 million at the rate of $325 million for the next 3 years to finance new school building. This is based on the House Education and Labor Committee report indicating an annual requirement of 52,700 more classrooms for the period from 1960 through 1964.

Federal aid is justified in any area only on the premise that an essential need cannot be supplied by the local community. What is the record in this regard insofar as school building is concerned? We are told that in the past decade—without any Federal aid—the classroom additions have averaged 59,400 per year and that, since 1955, this average has been 66,900 classrooms per year.

Obviously the overall aggregate need has been met in recent years. But has the need been met in the States where it is most acute? This is a moot question which would be difficult to answer. However, it would appear that if the distribution has not been equitable, then the pending legislation is not the answer, for, under the proposed bill, 42 percent of the Federal tax money appropriated would go to only seven States. In addition to Ohio, these favored seven include New York, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and Michigan. Hardly the neediest States, we would say.

But to bring the problem closer to home. Western Hills school districts have not escaped the demand for additional school facilities nor have the taxpayers of these communities shirked their obligation in meeting the demand. Colerain Township may be cited as a typical example. The people of that community have generously approved eight separate bond issues aggregating over $4 million for school building, not to mention numerous tax levies for school operating purposes, since 1947.

Nor has this been an oppressive burden against which local taxpayers have rebelled. With few exceptions, they have approved each new request as it has been presented by their respective boards of education. Moreover, the soundness of the askings have been vindicated when the resulting tax rate has been substantially less than the estimated amount, indicative of conservative, knowledgable financing based on a first-hand understanding of local needs and ability to pay. Indeed, because of increasing tax duplicate, in some cases there has been no net increase or the new tax rate has actually been less than that of previous years.

Thus on November 21, 1958, the Press headlined "Tax Rates Down in 8 of 11 Districts." The following story stated, "The tax rates announced Wednesday by the Hamilton County Budget Commission prove the exception to the rule that 'taxes never come down.' In 8 of 11 unincorporated political subdivisions in the 7 western Hamilton County townships, the rates on which taxes will be collected in 1959 have declined."

Or again, as recently as December 10, 1959, the Press reported, "The largest single jump in tax duplicate in any western county political subdivision is that in the Oak Hills School District, where the duplicate is now estimated at $81,700,000. This represents an increase of almost $6 million over the $75,897,850 current valuation and is a principal factor in reducing the Oak Hills District tax rate by 46 cents from $18.44 this year to $17.98 next year (1960)."

Thus, it may be seen, that in many cases the circumstances creating the school problem also provide their own built-in answer—given competent administration and understanding support at the grassroots level. Yes, we know there are exceptions, but these too can be met through State-aid in those States where the people are determined not to surrender another responsibility and privilege of local self-government to centralized Federal bureaucracy.

Under the Federal aid system, the people will not only lose direct control of limiting the cost of financing their schools, but may ultimately lose the right to administer them through their locally elected boards of education. The people have abdicated many of their rights and responsibilities to the feudal benevolence of a faceless Washington. When they abdicate the right and responsibility of educating their children, they will have traveled beyond the point of return on the road to Federal bureaucratic dictatorship.

A Tribute to a Great Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, recently the high school principal of Moran, Kans., announced his retirement. Mr. I. T. Dirks, who could have earned much more had he abandoned the field of education, is loved and admired by all who really know him. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that he intends to continue as a resident of the Second Congressional District of Kansas.

Because Col. R. L. Thompson recognized the contribution Mr. Dirks made to his community and because it is a well-deserved tribute, I ask leave to include the editorial which appeared in the Moran Sentinel of June 16 in the extension of my remarks:

THE ORDEAL OF PEDAGOGS—AND A TRIBUTE

During the years that I have given over to fomenting trouble, stirring up animosities, arousing fears, encouraging heresy, fostering recusance, denouncing Democrats and endorsing Republican nonsense, very few pedagogues have got their names listed in my book of Sir Galahads and Joan of Arcs.

The reason is easy to explain and it does not cast an invidious reflection upon their professional competence. Through the years my contacts with them were scanty and I thus got to know only a few of them intimately.

I have been told by professional grumblers and other such cranks that the generality of pedagogs are protean creatures easily frightened, jolly backslappers lacking in backbone and hence men and women of dubious usefulness in the world.

This estimate, which I incline to accept with misgivings, probably stems from the fact that birchmen are often forced to succumb to expediency in order to hold their jobs. The lines they follow are hard ones indeed. They are public servants without a political machine to keep them safely in office, and many of them find themselves constantly under the unsparing thumbs of irrational one-kid parents or a maiden aunt struggling heroically, but in vain, to make a man of a delinquent nephew.

If pedagogues do submit occasionally to upbraidings without a fight and take to the tall and uncut on weekends to escape the horror of tar and feathers, they cannot be blamed. I'd do the same thing myself just as I do it every week in getting out this organ of doubtful enlightenment. Like the pedagogue, every editor is at the mercy of the public and he soon discovers that he must not tread on sensitive toes if he hopes to survive.

But if some birchmen are timorous fellows, it is not true of them all. I. T. Dirks, who was the high school principal here for many years and who recently announced his retirement, was a notable exception.

During his years here I got to know him rather more than casually, and the more I got to know him the more I respected his independence and his talents as a teacher. He was as far removed from a milksop as a man can get and he could not be pushed around. Knuckling to the demands of an infuriated paterfamilias and running from a fight were as abhorrent to him as underwear is to a nudist.

Throughout his long career he refused to tolerate outside interference in the management of his schools, and he was able to defend this policy on solid ground. His objectives were always clearly defined, his rules simple and just and his requirements high but reasonable. As the principal it was his business to recommend the appointment of qualified teachers, to weed out incompetents, to maintain discipline and to steer students into fields of learning for which they had some talent. He succeeded magnificently on all counts save perhaps the last one. He always surrounded himself with a staff of ability, and many of his students went on to distinguish themselves in other institutions.

Mr. Dirks was always on cordial terms with his staff and the reason is not far to seek. He knew a capable teacher when he saw one and there were never any misfits on his staff to flub-the-dub and lower the scholastic standards. Proof of this may be found in the fact that his teachers always went to better jobs, not worse ones. The cases of Reese Pollard and Seth McClintock are recent examples. When they left here both men moved up, not down.

Like all realistic men, Mr. Dirks never sought to surmount the insurmountable or to remedy the irremediable. He entertained a few convictions concerning the academic life which ran counter to popular concepts but he kept them discreetly to himself. He once confided to me that he believed all schools were carrying athletics to an insane extreme, and that the time and money wasted on them should be put to a more profitable use. But he never committed the fatuity of trying to expunge what is now intrinsic in our educational system. Winning football and basketball teams are very dear to the hearts of all Americans, and he never attempted the futility of altering the unalterable.

He once told me that too many of his high school graduates were entering college who ought to be attending trade schools and he often deplored his inability to guide them into channels of learning that were not beyond their capabilities. "But some parents," he said, "believe their progeny are potential Shakespeares and Edisons, and there is nothing I can do about it."

Like all uncompromising men who follow what they conceive to be a sound and honest course, it was only natural that Mr. Dirks should leave some enemies along his academic trail. I have heard him excoriated by some very respectable people but these denunciations never altered my conviction that he was an extremely competent workman in a profession that is heavy laden with pitfalls, frustrations, and abominations. Like Grover Cleveland, he distinguished himself by the enemies he made rather than by the friends he kept.

With more than 40 years of teaching behind him, Mr. Dirks now enters upon a less strenuous and more peaceful life. With his septuagesima just around the corner, I am hoping that many more years of usefulness are spared to him.

Former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Critical of Policymaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article by Mr. Jack Raymond which appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, June 15, 1960:

TAYLOR CRITICAL OF POLICYMAKING—TELLS SENATORS LACK OF CLEAR GUIDANCE TO MILITARY IS A PERIL TO CIVIL CONTROL

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff, warned today that civilian control of the military was imperiled by the lack of clear national policies.

General Taylor, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, repeated the criticisms of the organization of the Defense Department that he has been making since retiring from the Army last year in self-described frustration.

He charged that the Nation's military chiefs received no clear guidance, that top-level planning was incomplete and that rigid budgetary considerations play an overriding part in developing military forces.

"As a result of the foregoing conditions, we have the strange phenomenon of the partial loss of control of the military in Government, where all parties, including the military, are dedicated to the principle of civilian control," General Taylor said.

SEES CONFUSION ON CONTROLS

Too often, General Taylor went on, the principle of civilian control has been "confused with the need for layers of civilians between the responsible military chiefs and the seats of decisionmaking authority."

True civilian control would assure military forces that could provide a flexible tool for defense and maneuver for the President and the Secretary of State.

But lack of clearly defined national strategy, vagueness of guidance, and obsolete methods of budgetmaking combine to make difficult, if not impossible, this meaningful kind of civilian control, General Taylor said.

The general testified that although he had not been a member of the National Security Council, he had "seen the end product" during his 4 years as Army member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

NO CLEAR GUIDANCE

During that time, General Taylor continued, the chiefs did not receive "clear guidance" on the role of the military forces in carrying out the objectives of national strategic policy.

In response to questions by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York, General Taylor agreed that the military leaders had been forced to "make assumptions" where concrete statements of military objectives should have been available. Thus, he indicated, military men took responsibilities that should remain in civilian hands.

General Taylor testified that in his experience the joint strategic objectives plan, developed by the Joint Chiefs, had "never been an effective document."

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, is chairman of the subcommittee, a unit of the Government Operations Committee.

It has been holding hearings on the adequacy of the Government's organization to deal with the "cold war."

General Taylor said that he had been told that conditions at the Pentagon had improved since Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., had taken over. The general served under Secretaries Neil H. McElroy and Charles E. Wilson.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to comment on a very significant anniversary—the 15th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter which took place in San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

On that memorable day, the representatives of 50 nations affixed their signatures to the basic document of a new international organization, open to all peace-loving nations of the world on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality, and dedicated to the achievement and maintenance of international peace.

Four months later, on October 25, 1945, the Charter of the United Nations came into force, having been ratified by more than two-thirds of its signatories, including the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The purposes and principles of the United Nations Organization were outlined clearly in article 1 of the Charter. In brief, they were and continue to be as follows:

First. To maintain international peace and security.

Second. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

Third. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and to promote respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all.

Fourth. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Much has transpired in the world since that memorable day 15 years ago. We have seen the United Nations Organization grow in membership, in prestige, and in the scope of the functions which it performs. Today, the United Nations is engaged in activities throughout the globe. Its programs serve and affect the lives of countless millions of people. Through its social, economic, educational, legal, and political activities, the United Nations is endeavoring to enlarge the area of freedom and order in the world, to assist the peoples of the various continents in realizing their aspirations for a better life, and to promote the maintenance of peace.

There is a difference of opinion in some quarters about the United Nations, about its endeavors and about its achievements. The facts, however, speak for themselves. In an uncertain and strife-torn world, divided by communism, the United Nations has tried to transcend political boundaries and to promote peace, order, and social welfare of the peoples of its member states. While the organization is far from perfect, it has done a better job with the tools at its disposal than most critics will admit. Its record on this score is clear and open for all to see.

In my opinion, the United Nations has proved itself to be an important instrument for promoting, on the international scene, the attainment of goals which are vital to all of us. The hopes of millions of peoples, aspiring to a better and a peaceful future, are centered upon it. I am hopeful that, in the troubled years that lie ahead, the United Nations will continue to exercise its constructive influence and enjoy success in its worthy undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD the text of an address by President Harry S. Truman, delivered yesterday in San Francisco at an observance of the 15th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

It is a very thought-provoking and forceful statement of some of the basic international problems of our day—and of the way in which the United Nations has and can continue to help in solving those problems.

There is one particular passage in President Truman's address which I would like to quote at this point. It reads:

In this nuclear age, no nation can live unto itself alone. There is no hope for any nation in isolationism or in imperialism. The United Nations is the best hope of mankind for deliverance from mutual destruction.

I commend this statement, and the entire text of President Truman's address, to the attention of the membership of this body:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH ON THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A most important development in within the last year has been the presentation before the United Nations General Assembly of a disarmament plan by the head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Khrushchev.

I thought it was the most important event of Khrushchev's visit because he considered the United Nations the proper place to deal with so vital an issue as disarmament. This is a forward step in Russian thinking about the United Nations. I regard this as a sign of the growth of the United Nations as a force in working out the problems of peace.

I would like to believe that the fact that he used the United Nations forum for the only concrete and public proposal of his visit is evidence of his esteem today for this international organization.

I hope that Khrushchev was not making just a grandstand play. But whether or not events reveal that Khrushchev made his proposal in good faith, the fact is that the United States is the one place where disarmament should be dealt with.

Disarmament, to succeed, should be a steady process of creating conditions which make it more and more difficult for any nation to break the peace. Effective disarmament should remove from the world not only the terror of nuclear weapons and guided missiles, but also the threat of mass armies.

INSPECTION CALLED KEY POINT

Effective disarmament means an open world with no secret armies, no secret war plans. If we are to achieve effective international control of armaments, we have to have every nation open to inspection.

This is what I said 5 years ago on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. And in all the years since the founding of this international organization I have seen evidence of the continued need for service of the United Nations in the cause of peace.

New and ancient jealousies over sovereignty have made some of the work of the organization difficult and, at times, frustrating. As we have seen in Korea and in the Middle East, and as I hope we shall see in the Far East, the role of the United Nations has been more than theoretical and academic. It has been practical and effective. In my opinion, it has helped keep some explosive areas from plunging us all into a third World War.

I have felt from the very beginning, and my convictions have been confirmed by the experience of the United Nations to date, that we must have an international police force at the disposal of the United Nations.

The international police force must be strong enough to undertake such police action as the United Nations deems necessary to maintain the peace.

CHARTER'S SPIRIT PRESERVED

It is my belief that the sovereignty of no nation will be impaired. In reality, sovereignty of nations will be made more secure. The establishment of the international police force would require only the delegation of certain limited authority.

Time and experience will teach us just how much authority it will be necessary to delegate to the United Nations to make this international police force a more and more effective arm for helping keep the peace.

The United Nations today is a living institution. Like all living things, it follows a development of its own. Some of the things we put down on paper in the charter have not come to pass—some of the procedures originally planned have proved unworkable; but they have been replaced by new activities, new procedures, all within the spirit of the charter, that we did not foresee 10 years ago. This is the course of all written constitutions if they are to endure and meet the changing needs of the years.

Fifteen years ago in San Francisco all the nations represented agreed on the goal of world peace. They also agreed that to achieve peace would require determination and effort. On that occasion I said:

"If we had had this charter a few years ago—and above all the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

"It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our thinking and all our actions be based on the realization that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning, and, with our eye always on the final objective, let us march forward."

The question of armaments has clouded the international horizon for many years. It grows more and more serious. Every year science places new and more terrible weapons in our hands. Every year the financial burdens of defense grow heavier and heavier. Every year the consequences of sudden attack and the perils of inadequate defense become more deadly. Today, the battles of World War II are almost as far behind us technologically as the battles of Napoleon or the techniques of Genghis Kahn. The use of force in international affairs today raises the threat, the almost incomprehensible threat, of total destruction, not only of cities and nations, but of all human life.

I earnestly hope that the time has come when we may break the deadlock on international disarmament.

A communique issued by President Eisenhower and Chairman Khrushchev at the conclusion of their private meetings at Camp David stated, among other things, that no disputes would be settled by force.

There was nothing new in this declaration that the Soviet Union was not already obligated to observe as a member of the United Nations.

The Charter of the United Nations embodies the obligation of the members not to use force except in defense of the charter. This is both a legal and moral obligation. It binds all the nations that signed and ratified the charter, even those that may be strong enough to violate it. It is a powerful, if intangible restraint on all the member nations. It is sustained by the mighty force of the moral judgment of mankind.

FREEDOM IS EMPHASIZED

Second only to peace in the United Nations Charter is the emphasis it lays on improving the standards of living of mankind and safeguarding the fundamental freedoms and the dignity of men. This work must be carried on at the same time that we strive to eliminate war. Indeed, this humanitarian program strikes at one of the main causes of war. It is a tribute to the framers of the United Nations Charter that they gave this objective such great importance, and set up machinery for pursuing it effectively even before the framework of international peace was completed.

One of the arguments that has gone on since the very beginning is that between the liberal constructionists and the strict constructionists. To the Soviet bloc, much that the United Nations has done is illegal, because it was accomplished in circumvention of the big-power veto. For this liberal interpretation, the United States is more responsible than any other nation, because the Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1960 made it possible to switch the center of gravity from the Security Council to the General Assembly. The General Assembly then took over the direction of affairs in Korea, because it was clear that when the Russians returned to the Security Council they would block the Korean program in the Council.

A few weeks ago, another step taken for a liberal interpretation from the chair laid the ghost of the double veto. Ten members of the Security Council were to set up an investigating committee for Laos and they wanted to determine that the setting up of such a committee was a procedural matter, because the Charter grants the Security Council the right to create subsidiary bodies to help the performance of its functions. The Russians insisted that they could have a veto in the vote to determine whether or not the matter was procedural. The Security Council by a vote of 10 to 1 swept such nonsense aside and thus laid the ghost of the double veto.

The United Nations has grown profoundly: First, through the liberal interpretation of the Charter. The second way in which the United Nations has grown is by the addition of new bodies and the expansion of existing functions.

One of the greatest inspirations given the United Nations was the point 4 program, which led to the expanded technical assistance program; the Paul Hoffman program for the Special Fund, and the agreement last fall to establish an international development authority as part of the International Bank (as recently suggested by Senator MIKE MONRONEY). Thus a last effort is now going on to help underdeveloped areas.

The agency for the peacetime use of atomic energy is another addition to the United Nations family of agencies.

Another argument that has gone on in the United Nations has been over the question of the freedom of dependent areas. It is not too much of an oversimplification to say that the argument is between the colonial-minded and the others. The Colonies in 1776 struck the first blow against the colonial system. Within the last 15 years, over one-fourth the population of the world has thrown off the yoke of colonialism. And some of these nations were helped to independence by the United Nations, such as in the case of Israel, Libya, and Korea. In most of the cases, the new nations have been welcomed into the United Nations, where they have found an opportunity for self-expression. Indeed, I think if this great revolt against the colonial system had occurred in a world of anarchy, the dislocations might have been quite serious.

CONSERVATIVE FEARS DISCOUNTED

There are those conservative people who are afraid of what the new states will do. But just as we had a right to make our own mistakes in 1776, and it looked as though in what John Fiske has called the critical period our mistakes would destroy us, so the other new states have a right to make their mistakes. It is true that with the admission of so many new states into the United Nations the United States does not have the automatic domination of the General Assembly, we will have no trouble in having a two-thirds majority with us. I think this has been demonstrated in the last few years. But I stress that we must be on the side of human freedom and our position must be right and, I might add, clearly expressed. So it is up to us to do right by the rest of

the world—free and slave or dominated by totalitarians.

As I think back over the past years, I am encouraged by what has been done in the economic and social field. But all our accomplishments to date are only a good beginning. There is much that remains to be done. Here is a challenge to the understanding, the generosity and the ingenuity of man.

We now take it as a matter of course that one nation should offer scientific instruction and technical advances to another, free, without expecting a return of any kind except the consciousness of being part of the brotherhood of man. What a tremendous step forward this is in the realization of our common international responsibilities. Fifty years ago, a program of technical assistance would have been considered completely visionary. Nowadays, the only real question is—how big should such a program be? This revolutionary change in public opinion is the result, at least in part, of the economic and social portions of the United Nations Charter, and the general acceptance of their underlying philosophy.

I am glad to see that technical assistance and economic development are a growing part of the work of the United Nations. While all international good works need not be confined to the United Nations, there are many situations in which this organization is the best channel for such international activities. I hope all the member governments will support these activities of the United Nations wholeheartedly and generously.

In this nuclear age, no nation can live unto itself alone. There is no hope for any nation in isolationism or in imperialism. The United Nations is the best hope of mankind for deliverance from mutual destruction.

FOUNDING SPEECH RECALLED

Will you please be patient with me while I repeat a statement or two from the speech I made here in San Francisco just 15 years ago? While I am no prophet nor the son of one, my viewpoint 15 years ago has not changed with regard to the United Nations, its effect on the peace of the world and the necessity for its existence to maintain that peace.

"The charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into any fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustment—but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war.

"There were many who doubted that agreement could ever be reached by these 50 countries differing so much in race and religion, in language and culture. But these differences were all forgotten in one unshakeable unity of determination—to find a way to end war.

"Out of this conflict (World War II) have come powerful military nations, now fully trained and equipped for war. But they have no right to dominate the world. It is rather the duty of these powerful nations to assume the responsibility for leadership toward peace.

"It [the United Nations] has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct economic and social causes of conflict.

"This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable.

"Under this document, we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can attain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security."

Now here is what happened. The United Nations establishd a Commission on Human Rights, of which Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom I appointed to the Human Rights Commission, was the first chairman. It has produced a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This universal delaration was adopted in Paris on December 10, 1948, without a no vote. While the declaration was not ratified by the U.N. it has been incorporated into the Constitution of New States cited in U.N. resolutions and in court decisions. It has become a source of law, according to the U.N. Secretary General.

"If we fail to use it [the U.N.] we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it."

"If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation, or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal."

"The successful use of this instrument will require the united will and firm determination of the free peoples who have created it. The job will tax the moral strength and fiber of us all."

The U.N. is the permanent "summit." That's where conferences should be held.

U.S. Militarily Ready To Deal With Any Conflict, Gates Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people a fine report of the statements of Secretary of Defense Thomas A. Gates, Jr., regarding the military capabilities of the United States, and particularly his excellent defense of the request by the Navy Department for additional aircraft carriers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this article from the Washington Post of Monday, June 27, 1960. The article follows:

U.S. MILITARILY READY TO DEAL WITH ANY CONFLICT, GATES SAYS

(By Jerry T. Baulch)

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates said yesterday that "We're militarily ready and sound" to deal with either a small war or a major war.

"Our readiness is intact and sensible, and we can quickly deploy forces and augment forces if we need to do so," he said.

Then Gates said America's defense is based on its mutual-security program and he made an indirect plea for restoration of the $200 million the House cut out of the military aid outlay.

The Secretary also urged that Congress approve a controversial new aircraft carrier for the Navy and authorize more money for Bomarc antiaircraft missiles. Senate-House conferees, trying to reconcile different versions of the $40.5 billion annual defense budget, are still debating these two expenditures.

Gates expressed his views in reply to questions by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, in an interview taped for radio-TV stations in the Senator's State.

NO MAJOR WAR EXPECTED

The Secretary summed up the military outlook for East-West relations in the light of the collapse of the summit conference and the U-2 spy plane incident, President Eisenhower's just-completed Far East journey and the anti-American rioting in Tokyo.

Gates said he does not believe the Russians are going to "start anything in the form of a major military crisis."

"They will continue to harass us," he said, "they will continue to talk, they will continue to step up their cold war activities, and perhaps, in some modest way, put pressure on us that might involve minor military actions."

Gates said America's defense program is planned on the basis that there would be "no substantive concessions" made to Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

CORNERSTONE OF DEFENSE

Then describing the mutual security program as a cornerstone of this Nation's defenses, Gates said:

"Our whole strategy is based on our collective security arrangements and the free world joining together with free world strength and determination.

"If we do not get the support of the mutual security program, we will have to prorate the cuts and do a less effective job, which would be harmful to these treaty obligations that are so essential to us."

In urging that Congress give the Navy another attack carrier, Gates said carriers provide the best means for the United States "to project its power, particularly in case of trouble." This is especially so, he said, in parts of the world, "where it is difficult to overfly countries, and where existing airfields are inadequate."

"And with these carriers already deployed—there on the spot," he said, "this is probably one of our great limited war weapons systems."

Gates said the carrier is a "much more flexible and multimissioned weapons system" than the Polaris-firing nuclear submarines will be.

Senator J. William Fulbright: "A Great National Asset"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article concerning the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

The article, by the fine columnist of Newsweek magazine, Ernest K. Lindley, was published in the April 1960 issue of the American Oxonian. As Mr. Lindley concludes—

It is no exaggeration to say that FULBRIGHT is a great national asset. Under the seniority rule he can be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as long as he sits in the Senate and the Democrats have a majority. The voters of Arkansas permitting, his influence will continue to grow.

The article follows:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT, CHAIRMAN OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

(By Ernest K. Lindley (Idaho and Pembroke, 1920), director, Washington bureau, Newsweek)

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (Arkansas and Pembroke, 1925), the only Rhodes Scholar so far to sit in the U.S. Senate, became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on February 6, 1959. This advancement came just over 14 years after he entered the Senate, following one term in the House of Representatives, and just over 10 years after his initial appointment to this committee. The seniority rule, combined with Democratic casualties from death, defeat, and voluntary retirement, moved him from the bottom of the ladder to one rung below the top in 8 years. When the only Democrat who outranked him on the committee, the nonagenarian THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN of Rhode Island, decided that he could no longer carry the heavy burden of the chairmanship, FULBRIGHT succeeded to it.

FULBRIGHT has one of the best minds in the Senate. His speeches are well-organized, thoughtful, thought-provoking, and highly literate. He has long been an earnest student of world affairs. He is an orderly and efficient presiding officer and a penetrating inquisitor. His skill both as a chairman and as an examiner were first impressively demonstrated a decade ago when, as head of a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee, he conducted a thorough investigation of political and personal favoritism in the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Committee—much to the distress of the Truman administration.

As chairman, FULBRIGHT fixes the agenda of the Foreign Relations Committee. The schedule is heavy—perhaps two or three meetings a week in slack times and as many as two daily almost every day when mutual security or other large and complex matters are under consideration. FULBRIGHT'S deliberate, urbane manner, his intelligence, and his knowledge of the subject matter help to maintain a good working atmosphere around the large mahogany table in the committee room on the street floor of the Capitol. After closed meetings, he usually briefs the press, and the correspondents have found him accurate, fair, and generally helpful. The professional staff of the committee—numbering six—respect him and like working with him. He reads and absorbs their analyses and much else about world affairs.

At least potentially, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can exert enormous influence on American foreign policy. What sort of foreign policy does FULBRIGHT favor? Before exploring that question, and to put the answer to it in perspective, we should first take note of at least four other points: (1) FULBRIGHT'S position in the Senate as a whole; (2) the present composition of his committee; (3) FULBRIGHT'S character; and (4) his concept of the role of the Senate and its Foreign Relations Committee in formulating and conducting foreign policy. I shall take these in order.

Although FULBRIGHT'S Senate colleagues like and highly respect him, he is not quite a member of the ruling "inner club." He has been a little too independent, is a little too intellectual, not enough of a manipulator or glad-hander, to be included in this group. In recent years he has been fascinated by LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S skill as a majority leader and, himself, has begun to essay some of the arts of intra-Senate politics and management. However, 13 other Democrats, as well as 5 Republicans, have seniority equal to or longer than his. By contrast, Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan was the senior Republican Senator when he became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Walter F. George, Democrat of Georgia, was the patriarch of the Senate when he returned to the chairmanship in 1955. (He was already very senior during his early service as chairman in the Roosevelt administration before he stepped down to take charge of the Finance Committee.) Tom Connally, Democrat of Texas, although not quite so eminent, was an elder when he took the chairmanship and a tough, practical politician.

The Foreign Relations Committee normally includes headstrong men. At present it contains an unusually high percentage with their own fish to fry. Consider the Democratic side alone. Two, JOHN F. KENNEDY and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, are aggressive candidates for the presidential nomination. ALBERT GORE of Tennessee is a potential candidate for the vice-presidential nomination—he made a late bid for it in 1956. MIKE MANSFIELD is majority whip. As LYNDON JOHNSON'S deputy and because he is thoroughly articulate, MANSFIELD appears frequently on radio and television and, when the Senate is in session, is interviewed almost daily by the press. JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama was Adlai Stevenson's running mate in 1952. FRANK J. LAUSCHE of Ohio always has been a hardy independent. WAYNE MORSE of Oregon is the most unpredictable maverick in the Senate. This leaves, on the Democratic side, only the aged GREEN plus RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana and FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, both of whom have outspoken minds of their own. Moreover, as subcommittee chairmen, several of these men have made themselves authorities in various fields. Without even consideration of the Republican minority, this is obviously not an easy committee to lead or even to harmonize. Even the august George, under whom many of these same men served, seldom could unite it, although he usually could mobilize a majority. Certainly, with such a membership, Vandenberg could not have won the unanimous agreement which he invariably did on important matters.

It was MORSE who engineered the first specific defeat suffered by FULBRIGHT as committee chairman. MORSE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, was bitterly opposed to the confirmation of Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador to Brazil. FULBRIGHT, opposed as a rule to amateur or politically selected diplomats, did not feel that he could object to her, since she had acquired experience, indeed had been very successful, as Ambassador to Italy. A majority of the Committee stood with FULBRIGHT and the Senate confirmed her nomination. However, MORSE'S onslaught had injured her usefulness and she withdrew, pointing out that he was the subcommittee chairman with whom as Ambassador to Brazil she would have had to work. Then President Eisenhower nominated Ogden R. Reid, former publisher of the New York Herald Tribune, as Ambassador to Israel. Reid was totally lacking in diplomatic experience. FULBRIGHT therefore opposed him. MORSE swung around and supported Reid, and, in the end, he was confirmed. Although the issue was not major and although FULBRIGHT, believing as he did, probably would have acted as he did, even had he expected to stand alone, the experience was a reminder that the chairmanship of a committee such as this does not automatically carry with it the power to control.

FULBRIGHT is not, I think, fiercely ambitious or power-hungry. His Arkansas backstool stands as a bar to presidential hopes, even if he might otherwise harbor them. But, quite aside from that, he does not, I think, have the inward urge to dominate. It may be appropriate to recall here his pre-congressional career. Born in Missouri in 1905, he moved to Arkansas with his parents. He went to Oxford with an A.B., Phi Beta Kappa key, and football letter from the University of Arkansas. He took a second in modern history and won his half-blue in lacrosse. On coming down in 1928, he spent 3 years at his hometown, Fayetteville, seat of the University of Arkansas. In 1931, he entered George Washington University Law School in the National Capital. On receiving his LL.B. with distinction in 1934, he became an instructor in law at George Washington and an attorney in the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. In 1936, he returned to the University of Arkansas as a lecturer in law. Three years later he became president of the university. He was also for a time president of the family lumber company and investment firm. For several years, his biography in the Congressional Directory noted also: "lives on a farm near Springdale, Ark., and has been engaged in farming most of his life."

As a politician, FULBRIGHT has won four consecutive electoral victories: to the House in 1942, the Senate in 1944, 1950, and 1956. In Washington, he and his attractive and intelligent wife, Betty (Elizabeth Williams), have engaged in a very active social life. They live on Belmont Road, one of the finer residential streets. They have two daughters: Elizabeth, 24, a Bryn Mawr graduate, who is getting married in April of this year, and Roberta, 21, who attends the University of California.

Despite his varied nonacademic experience and interests, FULBRIGHT remains, in no small part, a reflective intellectual. He has long held that the Foreign Relations Committee is not equipped to formulate foreign policy, much less to take responsibility for its day-to-day conduct. With this must be coupled his profound distrust of a Government in which the President is of one party and Congress—or even one of its Houses—is controlled by the other party. After the Republican landslide of 1946, he felt so strongly about this that he publicly suggested that President Truman appoint a Republican Secretary of State and then resign, permitting the Republican to become President. (I don't think Mr. Truman has ever forgiven him for this.) FULBRIGHT agrees that a divided Government in 1947 and 1948 did, in fact, produce fine achievements in the foreign policy field—among other things, aid to Greece and Turkey, and the Marshall plan, and the Vandenberg resolution paving the way for NATO. He agrees that a divided Government has worked fairly well under Eisenhower and that, indeed, the voters may be said deliberately to have chosen such an arrangement when, in 1956, they simultaneously reelected Eisenhower and a Democratic Congress. Still, he considers a divided Government basically unsound and unlikely as a rule to work well, especially under a President lacking the background and qualities which have given Eisenhower an aura of nonpartisanship.

Add to these beliefs FULBRIGHT'S experience on the Foreign Relations Committee under such a powerful chairman as Senator George. Several times George committed himself to support an Eisenhower or John Foster Dulles policy without consulting his committee colleagues. On occasion, one telephone call from a man he trusted, such as Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, would be enough to line up George. Although George's commitments did not automatically prohibit debate and dissent, they were inhibiting. FULBRIGHT, among others, often felt frustrated—he probably especially so because of his distrust of Dulles. (He considered Dulles rigid, sanctimonious, and, at times, casuistic.)

FULBRIGHT'S approach to bipartisanship or nonbipartisanship, consequently, is somewhat different from that of several of his recent predecessors. Like them, he believes in a nonpartisan treatment of foreign policy. He prefers "nonpartisan" or Vandenberg's

word, "unpartisan" to "bipartisan." In his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 18, 1959, he said:

"'Bipartisanship' has been used too frequently to cloak the absence of a fundamental national agreement and to serve as a sort of synthetic substitute for such agreement. When misused in this fashion it can have several pernicious results. Too many people are given a practical veto over policy. There is an inhibition on the kind of free debate out of which a fundamental national agreement emerges. And finally, policy comes to represent the lowest common denominator.

"'Nonpartisanship' does not mean the absence of debate on foreign policy. It does not mean the absence of criticism of those who are making—or not making—foreign policy. What it means is the absence of debate precipitated and carried on with a view to gaining a partisan advantage. It means the absence of criticism motivated by partisan considerations, the kind of reflex criticism in which a Democrat automatically denounces what a Republican has done, and vice versa. Under nonpartisanship, the opposition party supports or opposes the President on the merits of the policies, or lack of them, which he espouses. It does not oppose simply for the sake of opposition."

These sentiments could have been expressed by Vandenberg, George, and Green—the other Foreign Relations chairmen of recent times who have worked with an Executive of the opposing party. But they—especially the first two—were readier than FULBRIGHT seems to be to accept joint responsibility for specific policies and programs. Vandenberg insisted only that there be full consultation from the beginning and at every important stage. Gradually, while he was chairman, nearly all important policies except those pertaining to China and Palestine were brought under the bipartisan umbrella. (As much of his party, including Robert A. Taft, was still isolationist, Vandenberg could line up no more than one-third of it and seldom more than two-thirds. But he always produced enough votes to make a comfortable bipartisan majority.) And all the major programs of those years—and some when he was only the ranking minority member—bore his definite imprint. He did not hesitate to propose specific modifications and additions, some the fruit of his own thinking, others the adjustments he deemed necessary to obtain substantial Republican support.

How far FULBRIGHT could be persuaded to go toward accepting the sort of joint responsibility that Vandenberg—and, in a somewhat different way, George—shouldered has not, at this writing, been tested. No new move comparable to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, NATO, SEATO, or the Formosa Resolution, has been presented since he became chairman. He, of course, fully recognizes his committee's responsibility for treaties as well as in connection with the confirmation of sundry Presidential appointees. When the President calls him to the White House he, of course, responds. He likes to be kept well-informed by the Secretary of State and others responsible for our foreign policy. But he is not, I think, eager to take more responsibility than he must for specific policies.

Rather, FULBRIGHT stresses what he regards as a more fundamental function of his committee: to promote examination and discussion of basic problems. He has repeatedly expressed worry about the tendency of our policies to become stratified. He has raised many challenging questions himself, both in speeches and in examining Secretaries of State and other important witnesses. He has often said that the State Department could profit from the fresh thinking of others, especially in the universities. In July 1958, he took the lead in persuading the Foreign Relations Committee to authorize a review of our foreign policy by outside groups. The Senate appropriated the required funds. From this enterprise, under FULBRIGHT's direction, have come 21 studies by private organizations and educational institutions with specialized knowledge. The Council on Foreign Relations of New York prepared basic aims of U.S. foreign policy. Other groups reviewed separate geographical areas and special aspects, ranging from such mundane but important problems as administration, through the impact of military technology, to the relation of worldwide and domestic economic problems to foreign policy.

While spurring the thinking of the State Department and other policymaking and conducting agencies, FULBRIGHT has defended the professional career services. He saw their morale damaged during the McCarthy period. He saw honest reporting from the field and independent thought discouraged. His objective is to release the full abilities of the pros. It is to FULBRIGHT'S great credit that he vigorously assailed McCarthy and McCarthyism when nearly all his Senate colleagues of both parties were still afraid to do so. In the same spirit one of his major addresses near the close of the 1959 session was a devastating reply to "The Ugly American."

FULBRIGHT'S broadest usefulness until now has been as a good tutor, challenging assumptions as well as conclusions, spurring all concerned to think and think again. But he has been concretely creative also. As is well known, he conceived the plan to use sales of war surplus to finance international exchanges of scholars and teachers. (As he has often said, the idea was inspired by his experience as a Rhodes Scholar.) Since their inception in 1947, the Fulbright scholarships have enabled 23,000 persons from other lands to come to the United States, and 14,300 Americans to go overseas. If the interlocked Smith-Mundt scholarships and fellowships, which FULBRIGHT has diligently sought to expand, are included, the totals are even higher. The original sources of funds for the Fulbright system have been augmented by proceeds from the oversea sale of farm surpluses and by congressional appropriations. FULBRIGHT has made the protection and enlargement of these exchanges his No. 1 responsibility. At nearly every session, he has had to fight for funds. He monitors the enterprise down to small details. Last year he wrote in the Federalist (the George Washington University house organ): "My part in the establishment of the exchange program has been the most gratifying experience of my career in public service."

FULBRIGHT has long favored Western European political unification. At one time he wanted to make Marshall plan aid conditional on progress toward political union. On that he had some sharp exchanges with Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson. Again, in one of his major speeches in 1950, FULBRIGHT said: "The choice facing European democracies was and is just this: Federate or perish. And the task facing America is so to conduct itself that it will help nurture those tentative roots toward federation like Euratom and the Common Market that have managed to take hold—to nurture them with the object of creating a real European union."

In recent years, FULBRIGHT, like so many others, has paid increasing attention to Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. At the 1959 session he took the lead in framing legislation to give the Development Loan Fund a 5-year authorization. To the astonishment of him and his colleagues, the President, in a quick turnabout under pressure from the budget balancers, registered effective objection to that very constructive proposal.

On the central question of Soviet relations and negotiations, FULBRIGHT has urged greater flexibility without prescribing definite alternatives to the courses actually followed. His prodding, if it did not stimulate, certainly did not discourage the new trends in American tactics which set in after Dulles' death. He likes Secretary Christian A. Herter. He is closer personally, however, to Douglas Dillon, the able Under Secretary and former Ambassador to France, who is concerned primarily with economic policy. Dillon lives just across the street from FULBRIGHT, and they often get together informally.

In the domestic field, FULBRIGHT has generally the record of a moderate liberal, with due allowance for the special interests and prevailing attitudes of the people of Arkansas—which it would be politically fatal for him to oppose. Even now a threat hangs over him—the possibility that Governor Faubus will enter the senatorial primary against him in 1962.

FULBRIGHT is deeply worried about the total Soviet challenge and what he regards as our failure to muster our resources to cope with it. In his final speech of the 1959 session, he listed some of the things he believes we must do: Spend more on education—"not just a little more, but a great deal more." Arm ourselves better with both conventional and advanced weapons. Make the Strategic Air Command bases less vulnerable to attack. Put our foreign development loan program on a long-term basis and give it adequate financial resources. Build civil defense shelters.

"I don't know how much all these things would cost," he said. "I know we can afford them if we decide we want them badly enough."

The strength of his feeling came out in another passage in the same speech: "It is about time, I think, that we Americans recovered our traditional capacity to be outraged about ourselves. For if any people in human history had the means to win out over a willful adversary, yet failed to use its natural strength, we are that people. This country has the natural, the industrial, and the human resources to do almost anything it wants to do—provided it passionately wants to. It is nonsense to say we cannot afford it."

It is no exaggeration to say that FULBRIGHT is a great national asset. Under the seniority rule he can be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as long as he sits in the Senate and the Democrats have a majority. The voters of Arkansas permitting, his influence will continue to grow.

The Moscow-Peiping Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor, Correspondent Joseph C. Harsch suggests that our "somewhat egotistical" assumption that Mr. Khrushchev's recent actions are intended to influence U.S. politics may be in complete error and that an internal argument may, in fact, be the true cause. His outline of the possible nature of that internal argument is well worth our at-

tention and, under permission to extend remarks, I submit it for the RECORD.

STATE OF THE NATIONS—THE MOSCOW-PEIPING ARGUMENT

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Dialectical arguments among Communists may have no more applied political meaning than the theological arguments of the Middle Ages which raged for centuries before John Huss and Martin Luther did something about the situation.

The fact remains there is a whacking great argument going on among Communist theologians, and it could provide a more important explanation of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's recent behavior than the somewhat egotistical assumption that he is meddling in U.S. politics.

The latest episode in this argument is the three-column article in Pravda June 12 which denounced "leftwing sectarian moods and tendencies" in general, and in particular those "who because they have power in their hands think they can introduce communism and avoid historic phases in its development."

The Pravda article taken by itself would be meaningless to any westerner. But it clearly belongs in sequence to an argument which was initiated in Peiping in April before the summit conference debacle and has been going on ever since.

The 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth fell in April. The Chinese Communist Party press used the anniversary as the excuse for a long series of articles which were out of line with Mr. Khrushchev's current policy. The opening article argued, for example, that a third world war would result in "several hundred million more people turning to socialism" and that "then there will not be much room left in the world for the imperialists while it is quite likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse."

It seems relatively unlikely that Peiping would be thus openly supporting a third world war at a time when Mr. Khrushchev still was preaching coexistence unless there existed at least a dialectical difference of some importance between the two great Communist capitals. The issue was apparently the old one of whether a third world war would be good or bad for communism. Moscow has long contended that such a war is undesirable and unnecessary.

In April there was only the mildest rebuttal from Moscow in the form of a veiled rebuke, to dogmatists. May was, of course, the month of the summit. As June opened it was assumed that Moscow might swing into line with Peiping ideology and, of course, it did so to the extent of agreeing with Peiping that President Eisenhower was allegedly untrustworthy.

In early June Moscow ideologists took a hard swipe at deviationism in Yugoslavia which seemed to make the Yugoslavs the mutual whipping boy for both ends of the Communist axis.

But on June 8, just after Moscow had relaunched its revised disarmament proposals at Geneva, Peiping took another step to the ideological left which must have come as something of a jolt in Moscow. Liu Chang-sheng, member of the Chinese Central Committee and world roving mouthpiece of the Chinese governing clique, made a speech which virtually condemned the disarmament proposal as a publicity stunt and was viewed by Western experts as the sharpest attack ever made on Mr. Khrushchev in any Communist country.

One of Mr. Liu's contentions was that "only when the socialist revolution is victorious throughout the world can there be a world free from war." It sounded very much as though Peiping thought Mr. Khrushchev was on the run and that criticism of him was enjoying an open season.

Four days later Pravda hit back and hard. Incidentally, the argument on both sides has been based throughout on Lenin texts.

Conceivably all of this is comparable to the medieval arguments about the number of angels which can dance on the point of a pin. But it seems far more plausible to recognize that Mr. Khrushchev's whole foreign policy has been under serious attack within his own camp.

Mr. Khrushchev committed Communist heresy when he asserted that Mr. Eisenhower is a man of peace. He has been attacked repeatedly for that heresy. His defense became ideologically impossible when Mr. Eisenhower defended the U–2 flights. Pravda, June 12, was denying that "negotiations between the leader of socialist and capitalist countries is a deviation from the tradition of Marxism and Leninism."

The implication is that Mr. Khrushchev is far more concerned about his reputation for orthodoxy in the Communist world than about the identity of the next President of the United States. The charge of heresy is serious enough for any ordinary communicant of any ideological movement. It is intolerable to the head of the movement.

Where Now With Wheat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with both political parties seeking to build planks into their 1960 platforms pointing the way to "a prosperous American agriculture," the only road toward that goal that has any real chance of success is still the road with the least political appeal. The experiences of the past 25 years have unfortunately suggested that farm programs that are economically sound are usually politically unacceptable. That was the apparent result again, here in this body, on Thursday, June 23, but it is still hard to explain the "politics" of the situation. Twice in the past 2 years Farm Journal, a leading farm magazine, has circulated printed ballots asking farmers across the Nation to choose among five possible courses of governmental action, all the way from complete governmental control of farming to getting the Government completely "out." The vote each time was within 1 percentage point of the other time—apparently no fluke, then. Some 55 percent of the farmers who responded both times voted in favor of getting the Government "clear out."

From the letters I receive from my farm constituents, and from the meetings I have had with their representatives, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the great majority of them also favor getting the Federal Government "out" of American agriculture. I have, as I have pointed out before, accordingly introduced a bill (H.R. 9781), which would accomplish just that, even though I have little hope of success. When my farm people ask me, "Why doesn't the Congress listen to us when we say we want again to stand on our two feet?", I can only answer that either the Congress doesn't believe the farmers mean what they seem to say, or it doubts the farmers' wisdom in taking such a stand as well as their ability to survive the rigors of a return to a relatively free market—one under which price supports would be used not to fix farm prices, but to realistically promote orderly marketing.

But still the Congress, or at least the majority party in control thereof, clings to unrealistic, unworkable, and economically disastrous production controls that are not controls, even though the compelling factors of depression and war are no longer present, and with a resulting destruction of markets, the piling up of unconscionable surpluses and the imposition of heavy burdens upon consumer and taxpayer. This would be bad enough in so-called "normal" times, but the fact that this course has coincided with the irreversible technological revolution that American agriculture has been experiencing has made it little short of sheer madness.

About four-fifths of American agriculture is still thankfully free of governmental controls, and it is no accident that this is the only area of the farming industry—and it is a major industry, today—that has been doing fairly well. It has been, rather, in the areas where government has been oversolicitous and has interfered the most that there are real difficulties. The No. 1 problem is, of course, the problem of wheat. Our surplus wheat stocks of over 1.3 billion bushels represent about 2½ times the annual U.S. consumption of wheat as a food. Our investment of around $3.2 billion therein is presently costing you and me and all the rest of us over a million dollars a day, every day of the year including the extra day of this leap year, just to store and pay interest and transportation charges on. Wheat has been effectively priced out of world markets, and when we have tried to even give it away we have run into substantial difficulties.

This intolerable situation comes close to being the major domestic legislative problem of the year. Prompt congressional action this year was necessary, and the urgency of the situation was such that all members should have been ready to make major concessions in their previous positions of policy in order to arrive at a compromise wheat solution that could become law. Such was not the case, however, and now we are right back where we started. Such a result might have been intended to create a hand-made "political issue" in some people's minds, but, as a Republican, all I can say is that if the Poage bill, even in its watered-down form as H.R. 12261, is the best farm program the Democratic Party can come up with, I, for one, will have no fears with respect to the "farm vote" next November.

Why can we not agree on what would seem to be the obvious fact that wheat production can never be balanced with effective market demand so long as increased production is encouraged by guaranteed high prices? Increasing price supports, as would have resulted under the loaded referendum for subtitle A of title I of H.R. 12261, based on

the clear lessons of the past, would only once again have stimulated a most natural incentive to increase the total yield even on reduced acreage, and add to rather than detract from our splitting surplus headache. As my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McSWEEN], said in his well-reasoned separate views to the committee report on H.R. 12261, "the more productive farms will be driven to further efficiency as a means of survival, and the less productive farms will continue to close down at the present rate." Surely, this is not our aim, or, if it is, the highflung phrases we have heard from 1938 to date about helping the family farmer have been just so much eyewash.

We should seek, instead, to discourage excessive wheat production and, while I would have much preferred to terminate political tinkering with the natural laws of supply and demand once and for all, I was willing to concede that subtitle B of title I of H.R. 12261 might have helped to do just that, and was infinitely preferable to the program under which we now must operate. Subtitle B was practically word for word the wheat proposal formulated by the American Farm Bureau Federation, representing over a million and a half paidup member farm families in every State in the Union, and thus the largest general farm organization in the United States. The Farm Bureau is a voluntary nongovernmental organization wholly controlled by its members, representing nothing but farmers from every part of the country, producers of every kind of a commodity. Presumably, it was not easy for it to have arrived, by majority vote, at a plan acceptable to its members; having done so, however, I believe the Bureau merited the opportunity of seeing if it would work.

Now, at first glance, it would seem that they might have had that chance through the referendum proposal set forth in H.R. 12261 by voting their plan, subtitle B, into effect. But let us take a look at how that referendum would have worked. Only wheat producers working over 15 acres this year were privileged to participate in choosing between the so-called alternative proposals represented by subtitle A and subtitle B. That meant that over half of our Nation's wheat farmers could not vote. In New York State, for instance, since that is the area I was primarily interested in, there are 38,463 farms on which wheat is presently produced. Of that number, only 5,664 work more than 15 acres. This meant that if H.R. 12261 passed in its original form, 32,799 New York State small wheat farmers would be completely disenfranchised. I could not support something as un-American and undemocratic as that, particularly in view of the apparent fact that the large producers who would have controlled the vote would no doubt be the ones who would prefer, for obvious reasons, a continuing high, rigid price-support program.

Therefore, when the movement to cut out all but subtitle B of title I of H.R. 12261 failed, and the move to substitute the Senate wheat bill—S. 2759—which I would have supported though not with enthusiasm, likewise failed, there was no alternative but to vote down the monstrosity that H.R. 12261 then represented. There is yet time to act in a responsible fashion. I hope we will have that opportunity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include the following editorials from the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press and the Christian Science Monitor, both from the issues of June 25, 1960:

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, June 25, 1960]

WHEAT BILL RIGHTLY BEATEN

Defeat of the wheat bill in the House, 236 to 170, is something for which consumers, taxpayers, and New York farmers can be grateful.

The bill would have increased wheat price supports from the present 75 percent of parity to 85 percent and reduced wheat acreage by 20 percent. The acreage reduction would have been of little or no effect against the incentive created by the higher price support.

According to estimates, the bill would have meant some $80 million a year in higher feed and production costs for New York's dairy farmers. It would have meant higher prices for milk for consumers. For taxpayers it would have meant higher taxes to support, store, and give away huge new wheat surpluses. A $3,500 million wheat surplus already exists.

The cost of storing agricultural surpluses valued at around $9 billion runs to $1,500,000 a day, which is money that could be better used for education, highways, defense or any number of more desirable purposes. Chief beneficiaries of the price-support program are not family-type farms but corporate and big acreage operations.

Despite huge Government expenditures to prop agriculture, farm prices, affected by huge surpluses, tend to drop. The agricultural appropriation for fiscal 1961 totals $4,005,222,683, or more than the cost of the whole Federal Government in the 1930's.

The farm price-support program creates a burden on the Nation that is as intolerable as it is fantastic. The only answer possibly lies in gradually reducing price supports to the point where they are no longer an incentive to huge overproduction. The wheat bill moved in the opposite direction.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 25, 1960]

FARM STALEMATE STANDS

Apparently Congress prefers a prolonged wheat surplus to a sudden shortage of votes in November. The House of Representatives has now rejected three different plans for curbing the surpluses which legislation now on the books encourages.

The Senate had passed a bill cutting wheat acreage by 20 percent. The Poage bill just defeated in the House will have made the same cut but "sweetened" it with an increase of nearly 15 percent in the price support level. Since acreage cuts have proved ineffectual in the face of rapid increases in per-acre yield, the Poage bill could even have induced more production. It was also faulty in other respects.

Estimates on this year's wheat crop indicate that about 200 million bushels will be added to the tremendous stores piled up in the last decade. The Senate bill might have cut this somewhat next year. Yet even bolder measures are required to reduce not merely the rate of increase but also stocks on hand.

The Eisenhower-Benson effort to check surpluses by lowering price supports has probably helped hold down excess production. But neither party appears ready to take the drastic steps needed. Mr. NIXON'S plan for a food stockpile would give the surpluses another name but not lessen their burden. Mr. KENNEDY, after backing lower supports, has switched to the high-support position and we have heard little from any other Democratic hopeful that is hopeful on surpluses.

But the House's unexpected rejection of the Poage bill indicates awareness that the wheat situation has become fantastic. Next year (not an election year) this should be even plainer.

A Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 86th Congress comes a final responsibility of each individual Member to render to his constituents an accounting of his stewardship. I think it is recognized that we cannot please all the people all the time. However, we have the right and indeed the obligation to support and justify to the people how and why we voted the way we did and to explain our actions during each session.

In reporting to my friends and those who reside in the First Congressional District of my State of Washington, I am frank in saying I may not always have taken a popular position, but at least I did in good conscience vote the way I thought was proper. It is on this basis that I will return home and report personally on my record of public service this year.

Recently there has been widespread public criticism of Members of Congress over expenses charged to the Federal Government in connection with travel. Also, there is indignation over waste and extravagance in the way Congress spends the taxpayers' money for its own use.

Without pointing the finger at any colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I have supported itemized accounting and publication of all legislative committee spending. That a clear code of ethics for officials in all branches of the Federal Government has never been enacted, I deeply regret. I have sponsored such a plan so that conflicts of interest would be clearly defined. Public confidence for institutions of Government must be maintained. I am glad to say some progress in that direction has been made recently.

This is no holier-than-thou statement. Let the conduct of each Member stand on his own record in connection with improper practices. As for our legislative budget, I have always voted on the theory and firmly stated that the Congress could not expect to demand economy in the military and other agencies and departments of Government unless we ourselves set a good example in this respect. I regret to say that Congress has not always seen fit to practice what it has preached with regard to holding down expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, this is a presidential election year and even more than usual partisanship has colored and distorted views and political news and generated more preconvention political heat than light. However, I am glad to say that there has been a minimum of partisanship and politics in our traditional bipartisan foreign policy.

Your patriotism, Mr. Speaker, and that of certain other Democratic leaders has stood the difficult test of obvious opportunity. As always, in America in a crisis, the welfare of the country has taken precedence. I feel the Nation owes a debt, however, to you, Mr. Speaker, who never failed to respond when President Eisenhower and the Republican Administration needed your support in foreign affairs.

I think we underestimate the success and effectiveness of that foreign policy. There is more peace and prosperity in the free world today than at any time and more moral and military deterrent strength than at any time since the Marshall Plan was adopted. Meanwhile, Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviets have been smoked out for what they are, vicious conspirators whose sinister hope is to enslave all the peoples of this earth.

In domestic affairs, such as with farm legislation, in contrast to foreign affairs, political advantage and party politics have seemed to have been the overriding issues.

Speaking of our agricultural situation, I must deplore, as I have during the past session of Congress, that no legislation has been passed to reduce the inexcusable costs of farm subsidies or to end Federal controls. Our obsolete war emergency agricultural program must cease. It is a disgrace.

One of the major issues of the 86th Congress, of course, was the medical aid program for the aged.

The high cost of hospitalization and sickness cannot be ignored. Certainly the aged who are more subject to illness, especially catastrophic illness, and whose incomes are lower, must obtain health protection. With dignity, medical assistance must be available to the needy and I am confident the basic principles of socialized medicine need not be embraced to accomplish such assistance for retired people of modest or meager incomes.

Federal control of education continues to be a threat. A temporary school construction bill to help the States in the present emergency—if based on helping only school districts which have exhausted their own resources—is only dangerous in that it could lead to the States reducing their efforts and depending permanently on the Federal Government.

Certainly if the Federal Government attempts to finance and set standards for maintaining the schools, including salaries and curriculum, it could result in nationalization of our schools and give us the Russian system of regimentation and conditioning of youth for socialism. It could be as it was in Japan, Italy, and Germany under despotic dictators like Hitler.

Where school legislation, including a construction bill, did not meet my ideas of built-in safeguards against diminishing local responsibility, I have opposed and voted against it. Rather, I have consistently urged a return of tax funds to the individual States to spend as locally desired.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention inflation and the national financial picture. I have introduced a bill which would do much to solve a weakness in our system. There are two strong pressures on Members of Congress. One consists of groups favoring programs that entail Government spending and the other groups seek reduced taxes. If Congress favors and supports spending, it should pass a comparable increase in taxes. By the same token, if Members of Congress support less taxes, then we should vote against increased expenditures.

My bill would enforce this policy by requiring that Federal income and expenses be balanced. It would require a reduction of the huge national debt each year. In an emergency, by a record vote, Congress could waive this constitutional provision. Otherwise, we could not adjourn without a balanced budget, including a debt reduction.

Congressional committees this year favored programs requiring spending far in excess of the President's budget. When we establish new costly programs in excess of revenue, it is fiscal irresponsibility not to vote new taxes to increase revenue. I have been against that kind of spending—against so-called budget-busting.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should point up one national problem which remains unsolved and which especially affects the Pacific Northwest. This problem has to do with fishing and the proposed extension of the historic 3-mile limit. The Geneva Convention on the Law of the Sea sought to extend and widen the coastal sovereignty for fishing rights and would have taken away the historic right of Americans to fish outside the 3-mile limit off of Vancouver Island. Our Puget Sound fishing industry must retain that right. A settlement with Canada, therefore, must be arrived at before any international agreement is signed.

Another problem has to do with our west coast shipbuilding industry. A differential of 6 percent has long been the Federal policy in recognition of our higher costs. This only applies to the ships which are built for operation in the Pacific. Elimination of this differential could have an extremely adverse result on employment in Pacific coast shipyards.

In both the foregoing matters I take some satisfaction in that I was able to play a leading role in defending my industries and temporarily we have succeeded in holding the line. Meanwhile, I hope the fairness of our cause has been convincingly read into the record. I serve notice, Mr. Speaker, that we of the Pacific Northwest and west coast are convinced of the justice of our cause and therefore we will continue to resist efforts to harm west coast industries.

Our Washington State delegation, including our Senators, as always, have closed ranks regardless of political party and cooperated closely in all such matters that vitally concern the welfare of the State.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me assure my friends in the Congress that during the past session I have appreciated their cooperation. It is a great honor of course to serve in this House of Representatives and a double privilege to be associated with so many fine and able colleagues. In the four terms I have served here I have learned one does not gain in effectiveness as a Member of Congress by experience alone, but by a combination of know-how and friends. Again, I express warm thanks to those who have worked closely with me.

I feel constrained also to publicly express thanks to my constituents at home for the honor and extreme pleasure of representing them in the Congress of the United States. Shortly I hope to carry this message to them in person when I am back home.

So, Mr. Speaker, this concludes my remarks. I only hope my service has justified the confidence of those who voted to send me to Congress and justifies likewise the kind way in which my efforts in most every instance has been received.

Facilities for Capitol Pages Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, an event of the past weekend points up the urgent need for proper facilities for our pages in the House of Representatives, and for the other pages on Capitol Hill. One of the pages who were attacked last Saturday was Michael Madigan, a young man serving here because of my appointing him. Ever since 1951 I have had a bill pending in Congress to establish proper housing, recreational, and other needed facilities for our pages. I have testified, along with other Congressmen, in a number of hearings in favor of such facilities. Polls have been taken among Members of Congress showing that, in the opinion of the vast majority, the establishing of such facilities is one of the most urgent needs of this community. Actually it is the most urgent need.

We have the responsibility for these young men whether we do anything constructive about it or not. Our responsibility does not diminish one iota because of our failure to act.

The current proposal before the committee is House Resolution 23 and reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration is authorized and directed to rent or otherwise acquire a suitable residence, within a reasonable distance from the Capitol, to be maintained as a home for pages employed by the House, and to appoint an individual or individuals of mature years to act as supervisor of the home and to be responsible for its operation under rules and regulations made by the committee.

SEC. 2. Each page employed by the House shall be required to reside in such home unless he is authorized to live elsewhere by the committee. Pages employed by the Senate, with the approval of the committee, may reside in such home.

SEC. 3. The expenses of renting and operating such home shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the committee and signed by the chairman thereof. The committee shall establish such rates for room and board as it may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to make the maintenance of such home, including the supervisor's salary, a self-sustaining proposition. The obligations for room and board incurred by each page shall be deducted by the House Disbursing Office from the compensation which such page is entitled to receive from the United States and shall be transferred to the contingent fund.

This is a modest proposal. Actually, if the Congress would approve it I believe that the funds for an adequate building could be secured from private donations. However, with the tremendous expenditures we are making on new developments on Capitol Hill, all probably well justified, there certainly should be no niggardly approach to question of erecting or renting adequate quarters for this purpose. Such structure would not have to be an expensive type of building but it should not be delayed any further. A newspaper account of the event of last Saturday is as follows from Sunday's Washington Post:

TWO HELD IN ATTACK ON FOUR HOUSE PAGES

Two 18-year-old youths were charged with robbery yesterday in connection with an attack on four 16-year-old House of Representatives pages.

Arrested were Willie L. Yelverton, of 1313 C Street NE., and Ronald M. Moore, listed at 211 Sixth Street NE. The pages identified them as members of a band of about 10 youths, armed with knives, who attacked them at Fifth and East Capitol Streets early yesterday, police said.

Yelverton denied being involved. Moore told of being with the group, but denied participating in the attack, police said. Other members of the group are being sought.

The pages, all of whom suffered minor cuts and injuries, were George Dozier, of Anniston, Ala.; Jack Thompson, of Fayetteville, W. Va.; Michael Madigan, of Jacksonville, Fla., and Arthur Kaspar, of Milwaukee. Dozier and Thompson live at 207 Constitution Avenue NE., and Madigan and Kaspar at 101 Fifth Street NE.

Dozier told police the gang took his watch and wallet containing $4.

What Is an American, Anyway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the editorial, entitled "What Is an American, Anyway?" comes from the Maysville, Mo., Record-Herald, but has been reproduced with favor by the Bossier Press, Bossier City, La., edited by Mr. Ned Touchstone. It is very unusual and therefore I present it in this extension of remarks:

[From the Bossier City (La.) Press, June 24, 1960]

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN, ANYWAY?

(This editorial is from the Maysville (Mo.) Record-Herald. It is so appropriate and describes us Americans so well that it is reprinted here. We believe our readers will enjoy it as much as we have.)

He yells for the Government to balance the budget and then takes the last dime he has to make the downpayment on his car.

He whips the enemy nations and then gives 'em the shirt off his back.

He yells for speed laws that will stop fast driving, and then won't buy a car if it won't make 100 miles an hour.

An American gets scared to death if we vote a billion dollars for education—but he's cool as a cucumber when he finds out we're spending $3 billion a year for smoking tobacco.

He gripes about the high prices of the things he has to buy but gripes still more about the low prices of things he has to sell.

He knows the lineup of every baseball team in the American and National Leagues—and doesn't know half the words in "The Star-Spangled Banner."

An American will get mad at his wife for not running their home with the efficiency of a hotel, and then he'll get mad at the hotel for not operating like a home.

He'll spend half a day looking for vitamin pills to make him live longer—then drive 90 miles an hour on slick pavement to make up for the time he lost.

An American is a man who will fall out with his wife over her cooking then go on a fishing trip and swallow half-fried potatoes, burnt fish, and gritty creek water coffee made in a rusty gallon bucket—and think it is good.

An American will work hard on a farm so he can move into town where he can make more money so he can move back to the farm.

When an American is in his office he talks about baseball, football, or fishing; when he is out at the games or on the creek bank, he talks about business.

He is the only fellow in the world who will pay 50 cents to park his car while he eats a 25-cent sandwich.

An American likes to cuss his government but gets fighting mad if a foreigner does it.

We're the country that has more food to eat than any other country in the world and more diets to keep us from eating it.

A New Czech Exile Newspaper Understands and Fights Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of Members of Congress to a new Czech exile monthly newspaper edited in Munich, Germany, by Mr. Milos Svoboda, a Czech anti-Communist refugee. The newspaper's name is Ceske Listy—Czech News—and its first issue appeared on June 1, 1960.

In an analysis of the abortive Paris Conference, the paper says that the aim of the Communist moves wrecking the Conference were to harm the United States in the eyes of the world and to influence the American elections against Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. NIXON. That this analysis was right was clearly evident in the happenings in Japan, which are merely a continuation of the purposeful Communist attacks against our President. The Czech News describes the Communist bosses as cool and calculating men and declares that the Reds did not make any mistake in Paris. They predict a summit conference will come 8 months later at which time the Reds expect to have new partners striving for coexistence, they want to force the participation of Red China in international conferences and want more trade and more coexistence. The Czech News regrets the way in which the big press write in the West using Khrushchev's moves against Mr. Eisenhower instead of calling for stronger anti-communism in the West. Had Khrushchev not known the way in which this press was going to write, he would not have dared to wreck the Paris Conference, says the Czech News.

It is gratifying to see one exile newspaper grasping the situation so soberly and rejecting the unrealistic optimism of other exile publications and organizations which have believed that the Reds have made mistakes while in reality they have again scored one of their big propaganda successes. We certainly need people who see the global danger of the sly Communist in a clear way.

In his introductory article, the former Czechoslovak Minister and General of the Army, Lev Prchala, chairman of the Czech National Committee in London, propounds the idea of Christianity and tolerance between the Czechs and the Germans. This outstanding exile, General Prchala, spent World War II in London fighting Hitler, but refused to return to the Czechoslovakia of the national front in 1945 condemning the communization measures taken in that land and opposing communism as strongly as nazism. Had the Czech people heeded the advice of this just and wise man, they would probably still be free.

The first issue contains an article written for the Czech News by the distinguished American writer, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, former Chief of U.S. Intelligence in the Far East under General MacArthur. In a brilliant analysis of the dangers of coexistence, General Willoughby warns of summit conferences. The general quotes the words of Dmitri Manuilski about the "stupid and decadent capitalists" who would leap at another chance to be friends of the Communists and also Lenin's words that "promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken." General Willoughby, however, finds an encouraging sign in the fact that the victims of the Iron Curtain, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Germans and others are finding a way together and that a broader principle emerges, the principle of freedom, friendly neighborliness, and self-determination for all.

In a message to the new newspaper, Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, of the U.S. Marine Corps, retired, declares:

The governments of the free world do not undertake sufficient steps against communism. The road to the preservation of our freedom and to the liberation of the enslaved peoples does not lead through summit conferences, negotiations, trade and friendship with the Communists. What the free world needs is an active warless policy of liberation using the means of an economic, political, journalistic, cultural and diplomatic offensive against world communism. Before communism can be removed without war in your country, its helpers in the free world must be removed.

Ample quotations are given in the newspaper from speeches of distinguished Members of Congress. The words of Senator THOMAS J. DODD are quoted demanding that the question of the captive nations be exploited as an offset against the Communist offensive. On this question, the West is on sure ground—legally, morally and politically. There is no issue on which the Kremlin is more sensitive or more vulnerable.

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA is quoted as demanding a firm policy on Germany. Berlin must never fall into Communist hands. Senator HRUSKA mentioned in his speech, quoted the Czech News, a letter by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein demanding a firm policy so that it be heard by Nikita Khrushchev who seems to have reached the false and dangerous conclusion that the free world is intimidated by his claims to power and supremacy.

Furthermore, the newspaper quotes words of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER. Czech News reports the words of Communist leaders such as Lenin who said:

"Up to now we have won our victories over the world bourgeoisie because of its inability to unite," and words of Georgi Dmitrov: "The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

The Czech News contains many reports about Czech and exile life. One interesting article reports a meeting held as a common manifestation against Communist tactics at the summit meetings which was staged by the Ukrainian exiles in Munich, under the leadership of former Prime Minister of free Ukraine, the Honorable Jaroslaw Stezko, by the Hungarian refugees, the Anti-Bolshevic Bloc of Nations, the German Union of Expellees, and the Victims of Stalinism. A member of the Bavarian Landtag, Mr. Herbert Prochazka demanded that the German Federal Government support materially the political exile of the enslaved peoples. The resolution of the Anti-Bolshevic Bloc of Nations whose president is Mr. Statzko, demanded the expulsion of Red regimes from the UN and that the question of the liberation of the captive nations be put on the daily agenda of world politics.

Also the scientific part of the new paper, in which, for example, Dr. Rudolf Wierer, former university professor of Brno, analyzes the new Czechoslovak Communist constitution, and the cultural parts are interesting. The editor, Mr. Svoboda, stresses the importance of the Czech exile orchestra director Rafael Kubelik, formerly in Chicago and London, who is going to Munich in 1961 to direct the Munich Symphony Orchestra.

This new newspaper hopes to reach not only the Czech exiles, but also the old Czech settlers in the countries of the free world. It is a refreshing sight to see this new publication advocating concrete proposals of action against communism. The Czech News proposes to persuade the governments of the countries of the free world to forbid the transactions of Western currencies as donations to the Communist countries through the Red monopoly foreign trade organization Tuzek. The paper says that the Communists prefer Western currencies to simple gift parcels, but that they would admit simple gift parcels if the Tuzek operations are prohibited because they prefer gift parcels for their needy population to nothing. This is sound logic for fighting anti-Communist exiles and the organizations such as the Assembly of Captive European Nations and the Free Europe Committee with its radio free Europe could derive useful information in the field of anticommunism.

This new newspaper, the Czech News, which brings so many quotations of American statesmen and Members of Congress and which clearly sees the dangers of communism, and seeks to effectively fight the Communist danger, and which preaches freedom, justice and friendship between nations, including the Czechs, Germans, Slovaks, Hungarians, and others, really deserves the attention of Members of Congress and the moral support of all Americans.

Congressman Joseph Barr, of Indiana, Proposes Traffic Safety Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARR], for having introduced legislation designed to increase traffic safety on American highways.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, H.R. 12684, would prohibit the use in commerce of automobiles not equipped with certain automatic warning signal and running light devices.

The original suggestion that every car should have a light on the top at the rear which flashes orange or some other warning color the moment the driver takes his foot off the accelerator, thus giving the motorist behind a chance to slow down, was made by Lowell Nussbaum of the Indianapolis Star.

At this point in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial dated May 21, 1960, from the Indianapolis Star concerning Mr. Nussbaum's thoughtful suggestion which Congressman BARR has in turn proposed for the consideration of Congress. The editorial follows:

THE NUSSBAUM EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

Lowell Nussbaum, columnist for the Indianapolis Star, has come up with an idea that we believe is one of the most constructive and workable suggestions for increased traffic safety that has been conceived in some time.

Nussbaum argues that one of the main reasons why we have so many of these "chain reaction" accidents, where one car slows or stops suddenly and another bumps into it and then the ones behind bump each other, is that there is no warning light, like a brake warning light, when the driver takes his foot off the accelerator. Many times the driver ahead will simply take his foot off the gas and slow down when he sees trouble ahead without putting on his brakes. Thus the man behind him has no warning that a sudden stop is in the offing. So Nussbaum suggests that car manufacturers install a warning light on the rear roof of all cars that light up, in orange or red or some other warning color, whenever the driver takes his foot off the accelerator. This would give warning to the drivers behind that the car ahead may be getting ready to stop. Nussbaum believes that if such an "early warning system" for cars were standard equipment, it would eliminate a lot of bumper to bumper accidents in cities throughout the United States.

Lowell's additional safety suggestion is to use the front half of this roof light as a white running light that would be turned on, and stay on as long as the ignition is on. It would warn cars coming in the opposite direction, or passing cars from the opposite direction, of the presence of an oncoming car. It would also warn drivers coming out of side roads who might not notice a light-colored oncoming car as well as they would notice a strong white light. This too, might make possible the avoidance of many highway accidents.

We think Lowell Nussbaum has a worthwhile idea here, one that would reduce traffic accidents and increase traffic safety. It is simple, inexpensive and could easily become standard equipment on all automobiles. We recommend it to the car manufacturers of the United States.

Local Reception Fetes Azores Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 17, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, southern Alameda County was fortunate in having a large number of people of Portugese descent come there in the period when the sod was first being broken. These people made a great contribution to our country and many of the outstanding citizens of our communities sprang from them.

Southern Alameda County was also fortunate in having Dr. Antonio de Freitas Pimentel, Governor of the District of Horta, Azores Islands, and his distinguished wife, recently pay a visit. The Hayward, Calif., Daily Review cov-

ered a reception given for them on June 15, that I make part of these remarks:

LOCAL RECEPTION FETES AZORES OFFICIAL

Dr. Antonio de Freitas Pimentel, Governor of the District of Horta, Azores Islands, and his wife were honored at a reception Monday evening at the Hayward home of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Massa, 20382 Mission Boulevard.

Some 25 leaders of the State's Portuguese colony gathered in the Massa gardens to welcome the Pimentels to southern Alameda County.

Both the Government official and his wife are distinguished physicians in the Azores where they maintain their own hospital on the island of Fayal.

THANK YOU TOUR

Their visit to the United States is an expression of appreciation on the part of the island people for aid given by this country 2 years ago when a volcanic eruption devastated vast areas of the Azores.

The Pimentel's host Monday evening was one of four delegates assigned by the Portuguese colony of California to deliver relief money raised by the group to the Azores.

Portuguese consul in San Francisco, who chaired the California delegation to the Azores, Dr. Vasco Futecher Pereira and his wife headed the list of leaders present at the reception to honor the Pimentels.

DIGNATARIES ATTEND

Among others in attendance were Antonio S. Bettencourt, Portuguese vice consul; Alberto S. Lemos, editor and publisher of the Portuguese Journal; Mr. and Mrs. F. F. Pimentel, Santa Maria, the Governor's brother and sister-in-law; Mr. and Mrs. Marcy deCosta of San Leandro, and Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Moitozos of San Joaquin Valley.

De Costa, who has been decorated by the Portuguese Government, is chairman of the Portuguese section of the International Hospitality Committee.

The Moitozos sponsored more than 100 of the Azores islanders who were among 1,500 families permitted by special act of Congress to enter the United States on a nonquota emergency basis following the Azores disaster.

Joining the Edward Massas in welcoming the Pimentels were other members of the family, including their 12-year-old daughter, Valerie, and Massa's sisters, Aurea Massa, former Hayward High teacher, and Mrs. Frank Lenz and her husband, all of Hayward.

DINNER BEFORE

Michael E. Massa and his wife, Joan, joined his parents in honoring the Azores officials at dinner on the peninsula prior to the reception.

In California until July 2, when they will journey to the east coast, Governor and Mrs. Pimentel have been honorees at many civic and social events, including a reception given by Oakland's Mayor Clifford Rishell.

Guests at the Oakland reception included Col. N. M. Armstrong of San Leandro, who had been entertained by the Pimentels in 1955 in their home in Fayal.

The Crossroads of Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Roy M. Harrop, of Omaha Nebr., is the author of this article on William Jennings Bryan which I commend to the attention of the Congress:

THE CROSSROADS OF DESTINY

If William Jennings Bryan were here now. Why Congress has failed to balance the scale at abundance.

On March 19, 1960, many Americans will celebrate the 100th birth anniversary of Col. William Jennings Bryan, of the 3d Nebraska Regiment in the Spanish-American War, whose birthplace was Salem, Ill.; died in 1925 at Chattanooga, Tenn., and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery; he was one of our greatest statesmen, soldier, author, onetime editor of the Omaha World-Herald, and his own paper, the Commoner, lecturer, constitutional lawyer, Congressman from Lincoln, Nebr.'s First District in 1890, and Secretary of State during the first Woodrow Wilson administration.

Colonel Bryan was better known as the Great Commoner and silver tongued orator, and was three times the nominee of the Democrat Party for President of the United States. For over 30 years Bryan's voice was the Nation's conscience—a voice that was neither small or still on matters concerning Federal solvency, money, banks, economic security, the free coinage of silver, and other matters of national importance.

Commoner Bryan, peerless leader of the Democrat Party will always remain foremost in the hearts and minds of the advocates of States rights, did more than any other political leader when he proposed to restore the solvency of the United States of America, remove the mortgage shackles, placed on the people by the international moneychangers and international bankers, from the farmers and put the farming and livestock industry on a prosperous basis, remove the debt-wage slavery system from labor of the Nation, and provide the consumers with sufficient annual wages to buy the surplus products of the farming and other industry, restore peace and prosperity to the people of the United States and abolish financial panics and ruinous bankruptcy which follow these cycles of Federal deficit spending sprees and inflation and deflation of bank credit by the bankers of this country.

In 1896 he ran for President for the first time on the bimetallism issue—free coinage or silver (ratio of 16 silver to 1 gold dollar) at which time he delivered his famous convention speech, at Chicago, condemning the monopolistic gold standard of the Republican Party, when Bryan said to his opponents: "You shall not press down on the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind on the cross of gold." The convention went wild with applause. At last the Democrats had found their champion, the Great Commoner. He also said: "We denounce the dollar, under the gold standard, as a robber; we denounce the issuance of notes intended to circulate as money by national banks as in derogation of the Constitution; we demand that all paper money be made legal tender for public and private debts, or which is receivable for dues of the United States, shall be issued by the Government of the United States." This would have made the Federal Government free from debt, interest, and taxation on our own medium of exchange, and restored Federal solvency.

In 1900 Bryan ran again for President on the issue of anti-imperialism and States' rights. This time he said: "We are opposed to this private corporation paper, circulated as money but without legal tender qualities and demand the retirement of all national bank notes as far as the Government paper or silver certificates can be substituted.

In the 1908 platform, Bryan advocated Government ownership of railroads, telegraph, and telephone and Postal Savings Banks as branches of the U.S. Treasury with every post office a bank. (Postal savings banks were later enacted into law without full banking privileges, serving only as a depository.) Bryan advocated that all postal savings banks should have full banking powers of deposit and withdrawal by check, operated solely by the Federal Government. He said: "We believe that insofar as the needs of commerce require an emergency currency, such currency should be issued and controlled by the Federal Government. (Today the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank System issues all the currency for the various national banks and receives all the profits from loans made by National Banks of the United States of America; they are exempted by law from payment of Federal income tax on these profits, and are responsible for our National Federal debt, now $295 billion, which is the present debt limit placed by the Federal Government.

Bryan, the Great Commoner, began his fight for popular election of U.S. Senators in 1890, signed the proclamation as Secretary of State in 1913. He championed the income tax law in 1892, the social security law; as Secretary of State, he put the official seal on the income tax law in 1913. He opposed Government by injunction, obtained a law guaranteeing a trial by jury in contempt cases; was author of the law compelling publicity of campaign expenses, demanded public ownership of railroads and proposed postal savings banks 10 years before Roosevelt took up the cause of the forgotten man; drew 30 peace treaties under which the United States took a step forward for world peace.

Bryan's contribution to his age was primarily his belief in the inherent dignity of man and his economy security as well as the solvency of the United States of America as brought out in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. This peerless leader opposed the trespassing on individual freedom by the Federal Government or corporate agrandizement. He said: "Monopoly is intolerable and indefensible." In millions of homes throughout the Nation his picture hung on the wall and he represented their hopes for the future, a defender, a personal godfather of the common people of the United States of America.

Colonel Bryan said the passage of the Federal Reserve Bank Act in 1913 was the work of Congressman Carter Glass, of Virginia, and Colonel House, of Texas, who was President Wilson's personal adviser; also assisted by Henry Clay Frick, Otto Kahn, Frank Vanderlip (of the National City Bank in New York), J. P. Morgan, Jr., A. Barton Hepburn, Barney Baruch, Paul and Felix Warburg (international Rothschild bankers), and Secretary of the Treasury, McAdoo. All of these men had their hands in to influence President Woodrow Wilson to put his stamp of approval on the bill which had been rewritten by Congressman Carter Glass and Colonel House of Austin, Tex. Bryan refused to sanction this bill as rewritten, and threatened to resign (which he later did) because this new bill authorized the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank, administered by private bankers, to issue private bank notes and make loans to the Government rather than to issue U.S. currency, as authorized under the Constitution, free from interest and taxfree. If Bryan's advice had been followed there would today be no Federal debt or regimentation of industry in America, we would not be a nation controlled by bankers, the people of this country would have economic security, peace and prosperity and we would have avoided World War I, World War II, the Korean war, which were mainly to bolster up topheavy financial structure and keep industry in operation.

Commoner Bryan, like Honest Abe Lincoln, believed in the solvency of the United States of America and said it was the duty of Congress to keep it that way regardless of political parties or international bankers. Byran once said: "Congress has the constitutional, sovereign right to coin money, regu-

late the value thereof and of foreign coin, fix the standards of weights and measures." At no place in the Constitution is it provided that Congress shall delegate its rights to private bankers (Federal Reserve Banks) to issue their bank credit currency and charge the Government of the United States interest thereon for the use of its own credit, or create a Federal debt to private bankers to be paid by taxation levied on the people. This is a crime against the people and future generations, to burden them with a debt which is not of their own creation and is intolerable and indefensible.

Colonel Bryan further told why Congress has failed when he said: "For generations Congress has been trying to balance our economic scale by destroying commodities to correspond with an insufficient money supply, thereby to raise the price level, in place of increasing our money supply to balance the scale with abundance—full production, full consumption, and full employment."

We are again at the crossroads of destiny with a debt burden in the colossal volume of approximately a thousand billion dollars, which includes the Federal debt, State, municipal, and private debts. Our Federal debt, caused by a cancerous growth of deficit spending—inflation and deflation monetary policies—has now reached the staggering sum of $295 billions, all of which is borrowed bank credit (not cash money), and foisted upon us by international bankers under the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank System, which must be paid through taxation by the people of the United States. The only alternative would be repudiation of all debts, unless the lawmakers in Congress take over the Federal Reserve Bank System as provided in the original Federal Reserve Bank Act, passed in 1913.

Col. William J. Bryan was a soldier and he would not forget the millions of draftees of all nations who laid down their lives in World Wars I, II, and the Korean war, who, not realizing they were the pawns of the scheme of international bankers to gain control of the world through their control of money and credit monopoly which has produced a debt-credit slavery system, under the one-world government scheme (the United Nations) did not realize they might spend the remainder of their lives in a foreign prison, and some are still serving sentences in Chinese Communist prisons.

If Commoner Bryan were here today, his conception of United Nations a world court would be far removed from an alien supergovernment composed of 15 members with only 1 U.S. member. He would not recognize an international flag, nor consent to reduction of the U.S. Government as a mendicant to peaceful coexistence with Dictator Khrushchev or international communism. He would never submit to a program of surrendered rights and policies. He would not agree to summit agreements which would transfer the right to declare war from Congress to the United Nations. He would never permit the submission of the Monroe Doctrine. He would stop foreign immigration until our labor is fully employed; he would discontinue foreign giveaways; he would hold fast to our control of the Panama Canal and our foreign possession; he would never submit to an alien court's jurisdiction over our domestic affairs in contravention of the Constitution of the United States of America or in violation of the Connally amendment, and any other question vital to our rights, liberties, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our problems today are equally grave and perplexing. Having reached the forks of the road, which way shall we Americans go? Standing between civilization and chaos, destiny is hidden here. There is no half-way ground. We must choose between the Communist scheme of peaceful coexistence under the United Nations one-world government, which would make slaves of the U.S. citizens, or adhere to our United States Constitution, that we may survive and live as freemen, and as Abraham Lincoln said that "Government of the people, for the people and by the people may not perish from the earth."

If Bryan were here today, he would adopt the same financial plan used by Abraham Lincoln in the War Between the States crisis when at his request, the Congress issued full legal tender currency (and there remains in circulation today $345 million of this full legal tender currency, good for all debts, public and private), and we believe Bryan would command Congress to exercise its legal option to purchase the Federal Reserve Bank System's actual capital of $304 million (as authorized in the Federal Reserve Act of 1913) and pay for this bank's actual capital with the issue of full legal tender currency (U.S. notes). Then it would be, as was originally planned by Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma and William Jennings Bryan and other leading Democrats and Republicans in Congress at that time, a Government-owned reserve banking system, the capital owned by the U.S. Government (not by private national banks) and we would thereby pay off our burdensome national debt without taxing the people one copper cent, and we would be a free and independent nation, as our forefathers, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson, planned.

In colonial days, George Washington warned the American people "to beware of foreign entanglements." All of our wars have been financed by the Rothschild International Bankers as far back as the American Revolution, and today this Nation is hopelessly enslaved to this alien bank-credit system, which does not deal in real money, but in bank credit, a false substitute for money, and today our Government is paying over $11 billion annually to the money-changers for the use of its own credit, which we, the taxpayers, must pay for a medium of exchange to finance the economy of the United States of America in order that the free-enterprise system may survive under bankers monopoly.

Only the spirit of William J. Bryan, his love of the truth, his sympathy with humanity, his devotion to liberty and justice, based on the Constitution of the United States, his faith in God, in the eternal salvation of mankind, will bring the new "birth of American freedom" for which he pled * * * return to Congress its constitutional right to issue full legal tender currency, good for all debts public and private, pay off the national debt, build the Interstate and Defense Highway System through every State in the Union, and a transcontinental highway from Fairbanks, Alaska through Canada, the United States, Mexico and the Central American Republics to the Canal Zone of Panama, and repeal all Federal manufacturer's and retailer's excise tax on oil, gas, diesel fuel, passenger autos, trucks, buses, tractors, parts and accessories, tires, use of highway vehicles, transportation of persons and property and other related purposes, restore peace and prosperity.

This would provide jobs for our 5 million unemployed and an increased purchasing power so that the excess farm commodities may be consumed instead of becoming a surplus, warehoused (unsolved farm and labor problem) of goods and services which consumers cannot buy with becomes a penalty on taxpayers in the sum of $11 billions annually—reinstate democracy as the invisible bodyguard of liberty and justice, protect freedom of the press and freedom of speech, states rights, and preserve our representative form of government from the wrecking forces of ignorance, international world courts, inroads of international communism, and bank-credit-debt slavery system under the rule of the international bankers.

What America most needs today is a President endowed with the vision, courage, foresight and intelligence of William Jennings Bryan, who at this crucial point in our history would command Congress to exercise its sovereign powers as above stated. In conclusion, I would affirm two points: (1) Both men and women must be aroused to the necessity of restoring this country to solvency immediately (and the American people are not so aroused now) and (2) Congress must be made to realize that this effort is necessary on their part to save this Republic our economic security. Able leadership will appear when enough people care, demand and spend some of their money and time to protect their lives, property and families from cunning international Communists who would destroy this Republic—the last stronghold of freemen in the world today which William J. Bryan fought so valiantly for 30 years to preserve.

The author herein says he was a personal friend of William Jennings Bryan, and the statements made herein are from personal knowledge and from talks with Secretary of State Bryan while he was in Washington, D.C., during the Woodrow Wilson administration and of other periods during his lifetime at Lincoln, Nebr.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of June 25, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JUNE 25, 1960.

The social security amendments of 1960 passed by a vote of 381 to 23. I opposed the amendments strenuously in view of the acturial unsoundness of the present system, which continues to impose ever greater tax burdens on future taxpayers as we liberalize the program for today's beneficiaries. The system is not pay-as-we-go. The political gesture every 2 years before elections of "sweetening the pot" is a form of political bribery for votes, as I see it. The bill this year removed the 50-year age limit on disability benefits, changed from 18 quarters to 9 quarters (1 quarter equals 3 months) the work period necessary to qualify for coverage, raised benefits for dependents and survivors, extended coverage to physicians, ministers, domestic workers, State employees (by choice), and others. No provision to meet the added cost (tax increase) was suggested.

The major new section would provide medical service for the needy aged. This was a watered down version of earlier proposals such as the Forand bill and the administration's medicare program. This new medical aid is extended within the framework of the social security system, along the lines of the present public assistance program, and is optional to the State. The Federal Government will provide grants out of general revenues, to be matched by the States, the

Federal portion being 50 to 65 percent of the total.

Five of us Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee objected to any Federal program extending medical aid to the aged, largely because the area of need, and the level of such services already being extended at the local and State level are unknown to us. Three of us joined in a separate minority view, stating our objection to the actuarial unsoundness of the social security system as presently constituted. A lot of the arguments and misunderstandings about social security, I think, stem from the widely held belief that those drawing benefits paid for them during their working years, or that present workers are today contributing enough to finance their own benefits when they retire. This simply is not so, and never has been so.

Some examples (case No. 1:) An employee who, together with his employer, had paid in the maximum amount possible in social security taxes from the time the program began in 1937 until the first of this year has paid a total of $2,292. If he retires this year when he and his wife both reach 65, he'll start drawing on an annuity worth $31,200. Compare that with the $2,292 figure, the most anyone can have paid into the program to date (case No. 2:) An individual qualifying for a minimum benefit on January 1, 1960, could have paid in, with his employer, as little as $36 and could draw benefits expected to amount to $8,600. Who pays? Future generations, not the beneficiaries. How? By a gross tax starting with the first dollar earned, hardest on the lowest incomes—no deductions allowed. The social security tax for most will exceed income tax. (Case No. 3:) A farmer with net income in 1975, from self-employment, of $4,200 with a wife and two children and standard deductions would pay $276 income tax and $283.50 social security tax—with three children, income tax $156, social security tax $283.50. Still the program will be in the hole. Today, present beneficiaries will draw $65 billion more than they have paid in. The cost of present contributors as future beneficiaries, is unfunded to the amount of $300 billion to $600 billion. How high should taxes be raised to make the program sound? No one knows—but surely it is a study worthy of our attention. Otherwise, the program may collapse or be voted out by hard pressed taxpayers of the future. Instead, we continue to add unfinanced new benefits every election year. Twenty-three Members voted against the bill.

The House wrestled around in another effort to formulate an acceptable farm program, but got nowhere. The real point at issue is to whom a new farm bill must be acceptable. The Democratic leadership in Congress would like to woo the farm vote but must satisfy the administration's demand for a bill aimed at lowering surpluses born of subsidies. In wheat alone we now have stored 1.3 billion bushels, a 2½-year supply, costing $3.2 billion. Storage and transportation costs alone exceed $1 million a day. The leadership in Congress has thus far proposed only more control, regulation, and support schemes, when it's pretty apparent that Government controls, regulations, and support schemes helped to push the farmer into his present fix.

Billy Graham, in Washington for his crusade, spoke at a breakfast meeting to Members of Congress. Perhaps his message and his presence were best described by Reverend Elson when he called Billy Graham "the right man with the right message at the right time." Billy forcefully reminds us of the truth, and need for, the great lessons of the past, of our spiritual beliefs that stress individual initiative and responsibility. I was most happy when Billy told me he will be coming to Dallas in the fall for a crusade.

Distinguished Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., Adopt Resolution Commending Committee on Un-American Activities for Its Devotion to Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a resolution just received and a letter accompanying same dated June 25, 1960, from the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Department of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and almost each other of the Members of this great legislative body are also grateful, as I am, that this distinguished group of veterans of the wars of the United States have seen fit to commend the House Un-American Activities Committee and send forward this resolution:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I
OF THE U.S.A.,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1960.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Committee on Un-American Activities.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the 4th annual convention of the Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., on June 18, 1960.

This resolution was prompted by circumstances that demand strict vigilance. We hope it will assist in averting further attacks on the committee.

Respectfully,

ALBERT J. HERMAN,
Department Adjutant.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, DEPARTMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 18, 1960

Whereas recent developments indicate an increased spread of Communist influence aimed primarily at the United States of America, threatening our democratic form of government and endangering our existence as a free nation; and

Whereas the freedoms we enjoy were secured and preserved at a great sacrifice of human lives and property, and deprivation; and

Whereas there is an apparent increase in un-American activities within our own borders which menaces our love of liberty; and

Whereas an effort was made to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, and which committee is vigorously pursuing its duties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., in convention assembled on this 18th day of June, 1960, go on record as commending said House Committee on Un-American Activities for its devotion to duty and to urge the Congress of the United States of America to continue this valuable committee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and to each member of the committee.

Deterrence and Arms Control: They Go Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most intelligent statements of why it is essential for the United States to have both a powerful military defense and a sound policy of arms control at the same time is the following editorial, "Deterrence and Arms Control: They Go Together," published in the June 1960 issue of the National Amvet, published by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea.

Under unanimous consent I include this article in the RECORD:

DETERRENCE AND ARMS CONTROL: THEY GO TOGETHER

There is, understandably, considerable confusion in the public mind today about the simultaneous emphases on (1) second-to-none deterrent power and (2) arms control. Attainment of these two highly desirable goals may seem paradoxical to many. Yet it is distinctly possible, and extremely desirable, to achieve both. They, in fact, go hand in hand.

How?

It is indisputable that the United States must maintain impenetrable deterrent power. Such power, first of all, gives us security against the threat of enemy attack, because an enemy will be reluctant to commit aggression if we are known to have the capabilities to beat down the aggressor. Second and even more important, we must have the military and civil defense power to fend off attack, should an enemy strike.

We must leave to the experts the analyses of the quantities and types of weapons necessary for second-to-none deterrent strength. Closing the "deterrent gap," if such a gap exists, is extremely intricate because in this era weapons can become obsolete long before they have been produced, due to continuing scientific advances.

We must extend lead time between the drawing board and operational stages in order to hedge against obsolescence. Ultimately our fate must rest in the hands of the Nation's top scientific and military leaders acting under wise and judicious political direction.

Disarmament, on the other hand, means an end to the current, dangerous missile game, in which the great powers of the world continually and competitively build their stockpiles of bigger and more destructive aggressive weapons and stand poised for attack. With aggressive weaponry developed to its present capabilities, victory by thermonuclear warfare would mean rule over a graveyard. And it is reasonable to assume that if present trends continue, the weapons of the future would be even more devastating. The bleak end of the world pictured by Nevil Shute in "On the Beach" is by no means beyond the realm of possibility, if the missile competition progresses. And what value is victory, if there is no nation left to rule?

And yet the powerful nations of the world will not engage in effective discussion on disarmament and nuclear bomb test bans unless these nations are convinced that they have reached a military stalemate (mutual deterrence). At this point they can see that there is nothing ahead but mass destruction. Reduction of weaponry and peaceful competition on the world scene become the only viable alternatives.

While maintaining our strength we must pursue all efforts to halt competition in aggressive weaponry. We must try to divert our vast creative abilities to purposes that, instead of wiping out mankind, will enhance the health and happiness of mankind. We can concentrate on space exploration for peaceful purposes; we can harness the great forces of nature with atomic energy; we can find the causes and the cures which will eliminate disease; we can provide food, clothing, and shelter for the underprivileged peoples of the world; we can help the newly emerging nations find the avenues to national fulfillment through self-government; we can seek greater education for all to broaden appreciation and enjoyment of our years on earth.

We can do all this under the banner of competition. This can be valuable and healthy—perhaps particularly so—when the competitors are the mightiest nations on earth. We in America especially know the power of competition; we have grown strong and wealthy chiefly as a result of our internal economic and political competition. On a world basis competition can achieve even greater values if it is directed into peaceful and humanitarian channels.

And so it is that survival requirements command military defense and deterrence second to none in the world; and that mutually high military defense and deterrence, when achieved by the powerful nations, command a determined search for arms reduction and control. Thus, defense and disarmament go hand in hand as prerequisites to a world of peace with freedom.

Voluntary Weather Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many people who contribute every day to essential activities of the Government without receiving any pay and, in many instances without receiving much in the way of recognition for their services. One such group of largely unsung contributors to public service is the voluntary weather observers of the Nation.

Private citizens, as a matter of fact, have been serving our Government as voluntary weather observers since before the U.S. Weather Bureau was established. There are currently about 12,000 men and women in the United States who, without any compensation, take and record weather observations every day, making their records available to the Weather Bureau. Dr. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Bureau, has understandably called the observations an invaluable treasure to the Nation.

I am pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that the Weather Bureau has instituted an award system to furnish public recognition of the service of such people. It has created the Thomas Jefferson Award for "outstanding accomplishment in the field of meteorological observations." The naming of this award after our third President is highly appropriate since he himself maintained an almost continuous record of the weather from 1776 to 1816.

Seven persons have been selected to receive the Thomas Jefferson Award this year, Mr. Speaker, and I am extremely pleased to say that one of these is Mr. Phil Brogan, of Bend, Oreg. Mr. Brogan has served long and faithfully as a voluntary weather observer. He has taken daily observations at Bend since 1923—37 years, without missing a single day. His outstanding fidelity in this service and his consistent accuracy and promptness in recording and reporting his observations is something he has every right to be very proud of.

I am gratified that the Weather Bureau is giving Mr. Brogan this signal recognition. It gives me pleasure to extend my own personal congratulations to him, and I wanted to give him this added recognition by calling the attention of my colleagues to his receipt of the award. It goes without saying that in so doing, I am joining the Weather Bureau in its expression of gratitude for Mr. Brogan's outstanding service to the community over the years.

The President's Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the following report by Columnist James Reston in the June 19 issue of the New York Times expresses in this writer's usual pungent manner the reaction of many to the official administration attitude following the breakdown of the summit conference and the more recent incidents in Japan. As Mr. Reston says, while we must maintain a constant, careful watch over Communist nations, "it is really too innocent to suppose that they will react to all this like Christian gentlemen" and, furthermore, "it is clearly not true that there was no other course that the United States could have followed." Under permission to extend remarks, I submit Mr. Reston's article for the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT'S INTERVIEW ON THE "ST. PAUL"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—If anybody is interested in analyzing what is wrong with our diplomacy these days, he might get a clue from reading the dispatches of the reporters who saw President Eisenhower yesterday aboard the cruiser *St. Paul*.

"The President," reported Harrison Salisbury to the New York Times, "appears to be in robust health * * *. He sports a fine suntan * * *. Today he shows no sign of despondency over the Japanese development. One reason for this is that he regards the events as caused by circumstances over which he had no control.

"There is no sign that the President feels any responsibility over the course of events either at the summit meeting or regarding the Japan trip. He seems to believe that in both cases there was no other course that the United States could have followed * * *.

"Aboard the *St. Paul*, the President appears somewhat isolated from world news sources despite the most modern electronic media of communications available to him. By last evening, he had not had any report on world reaction to the Tokyo cancellation."

AN ODD ASSUMPTION

This is in some ways the most disquieting item of the week. For it indicates that the attitude of injured innocence and the habit of official self-deception persist despite two of the most humiliating diplomatic reverses in recent American history.

It is true, of course, that the President is not responsible for Mr. Khrushchev's savage bad manners in Paris, or for the weakness of the Kishi government, or for the barbarians in the streets of Tokyo, but it is clearly not true that there was no other course that the United States could have followed.

In fact, the President himself insisted for years on a totally different course of avoiding these high-level meetings unless they were most carefully prepared and a propitious atmosphere was assured. This was his policy from the 1955 summit meeting until it was suddenly reversed late in 1959 to provide for new meetings and new summits which on the President's own assurance gave very little hope of progress.

This, however, is not the point. The past is gone; but the habit of Presidential detachment from personal responsibility, and even from information about the opinion of the world, apparently remains, and that is a point of some importance.

We are engaged in a very rough business. We are establishing military bases on the fringe of the Communist empire and establishing bombers and rockets on those bases. We are justified by the aggressive policy of the Communists in doing so, but we should not be surprised if the Communists use every possible device to frustrate our efforts, particularly if we reflect on what we would do if they established rocket bases in Cuba.

COPS AND ROBBERS

No doubt we are convinced of our own good intentions toward the Japanese and even toward the Russians, but no nation is ever as virtuous in the eyes of other nations as it is in its own eyes, especially if the nation concerned has once invaded Russia and dropped atomic bombs on Japan.

We are getting into trouble because we are not seeing ouselves as others see us, and not seeing others as they actually are. We see ourselves, quite accurately, as the policemen of the world, trying sincerely at great cost to maintain order, decency and freedom in the world.

But robbers don't like cops and Communists don't like Western freedom or Western manners, and Communist students are not satisfied with chasing girls: they feed on Prime Ministers.

Accordingly, while it is essential to watch them very carefully, even if we have to fly over their hideouts to do so, and to establish bases to keep them from destroying the alliances, it is really too innocent to suppose that they will react to all this like Christian gentlemen.

In this kind of war there are bound to be reverses and there are bound to be mistakes. No doubt this is an unmitgated nuisance, but the facts have to be faced and anticipated.

During the last war, when Hitler complained that his armies were being hampered by the severe winter weather in the Soviet Union, Winston Churchill remarked: "No

doubt this is true, but after all Mr. Hitler should have known that it snowed in Russia."

Bill Cunningham—Man Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when the famous newspaper columnist and radio commentator, Bill Cunningham, passed to his eternal reward the Nation lost one of its most patriotic and devoted sons; the newspaper profession one of its most brilliant luminaries and a multitude of Americans a beloved and loyal friend.

It was my high privilege and honor to know Bill Cunningham for many years. I first met him when he was All-American center on one of Dartmouth's greatest football teams. Later I watched his great career in the newspaper field unfold, until he became one of the most widely read columnists in the country.

Any words of mine would be entirely too inadequate and feeble to recount the greatness of Bill Cunningham and to recite his tremendous contributions to the American people and our Nation. His magnificent career stands out like a shining star. It encompassed broad fields of endeavor; it was as wide as humanity itself.

There was stark tragedy in Bill Cunningham's last days because he was stricken by a dread disease that sorely afflicted him and in a short space of time ended his mortal life. He was a strong, rugged, powerful man who seemed virtually indestructible, and his final sickness and untimely demise were almost incredible to those of us who knew him well.

Bill Cunningham was big and powerful in every way—physically, mentally, and spiritually. Strength was the very essence of the body, mind, and spirit. Though he had a will of iron, his heart and his sympathies were as light and tender as the gentle breeze of a summer day, and he loved his friends and his fellow man with an intensity that knew no bounds.

He was beloved by everyone who knew him and his vigorous personality came through with a friendliness, geniality, loyalty, and warmth that made him beloved as well as respected and admired by those who were close to him and by those who knew him.

Bill Cunningham was a great man and his love of country and his patriotism were a true inspiration.

He dearly loved his wonderful family which always played such a real part in his life. His devoted wife and his children were invariably uppermost in his mind.

He was a man of deep and unyielding convictions. He fought militantly for things he believed in, and he never hesitated to speak his mind, even though at times it meant bitter controversy.

He would never compromise his principles and always stood stanchly by what he thought was right and just. If, in the heat of battle bitterness developed, as it often did, he was the first to hold out the hand of reconciliation.

I had the honor to be a member of a small group of which Bill Cunningham was the central part that met just once a year in the beautiful home of my esteemed and able friend, the distinguished business and civic leader, Mr. George Wallace of Fitchburg, Mass. This club was comprised literally of only a handful of members drawn together by common interests in the problems of the country, by close personal ties, and by the delights of popular music in which members of the group were especially interested.

Bill Cunningham, among numerous accomplishments, was an accomplished pianist and organist, and on these occasions of delightful relaxation he would play for hours with zest and enthusiasm some of the old and new songs that he liked and our small group invariably joined with him to make these cherished days of gathering unforgettable experiences in our lives.

Now that Bill is gone our little group has decided as a mark of respect and affection to have no more meetings. We will miss him; the Nation will miss him; the newspaper business will miss him; the radio audiences will miss him. Most of all his loving family and his devoted friends will miss him. He was a man among men.

Bill Cunningham has left us all a great legacy—not alone of personality and genius and devotion to great causes and patriotism and love of country and love of his God, although all these things were sacred to him. But he leaves us perhaps, most of all, a legacy of supreme courage, a courage that never faltered, a courage that was unsurpassable, a courage that gave him strength, power, and resolution to fight for the things he believed in and to face every situation confronting him with intense fortitude and to stand alone unflinchingly and fearlessly, if necessary, as he did at the end when he battled with such admirable spirit and tenacity against the overwhelming odds of his last illness.

Another quality of Bill Cunningham's that stood out throughout his lifetime was his loyalty.

Loyalty to family and friends, to his beloved college, and to all the things he held dear was the trademark of this great, gallant, and devoted man who lived for something more than himself, who lived for his country, his family, his friends and who strove mightily and unselfishly in his journey through life to make the world a better place for his having been here.

Bill Cunningham's memory will be perpetuated in many places and in many ways, and it is especially fitting that his friends, supported most generously by the incomparable George Wallace, are establishing scholarships at his famed alma mater to keep his precious memory green, and to give help and inspiration to other boys who come along the pathway he once came to set their sights high, and to work and strive to advance themselves in life, not for themselves alone, but to help to shape a nation and a world in which all peoples may live together in freedom, peace and friendship.

Myriad indeed are the high tributes that have been paid to Bill Cunningham and profound the sorrow and the grief occasioned by his untimely passing. To his devoted family his lovely wife and loyal helpmate and his dear, loving children whom he cherished, I again tender my most heartfelt sympathy. Their bereavement is a most sorrowful one. But I am sure that the good Lord, in whom Bill and his family ever have reposed in their trust, will help, guide, solace and sustain them to bear their truly irreparable loss with that spirit of reconciliation, courage and fortitude that marked the life of their dear, departed one.

May Bill Cunningham find eternal rest and peace in his eternal reward. May the lesson and example of his courageous, devoted, constructive life serve for long to inspire our people and guide young Americans of the future.

Bill Cunningham wrote many peerless articles and delivered some tremendously impressive addresses of which more will be heard as years roll by. Because the headline of the article of his tribute to the famous "Iron Major," the outstanding football coach, his friend Frank Cavanaugh, was captioned, "He was a Man Among Men," I thought it would be appropriate to insert this writing as part of my remarks, because it so completely exemplifies and summarizes the role which Bill Cunningham himself played in his life and will continue to occupy in our memories—"He was indeed a man among men."

The article follows:

THE BEST OF BILL CUNNINGHAM—CAVANAUGH WAS A MAN AMONG MEN

(By Bill Cunningham)

They're about to launch the Frank Cavanaugh picture and some of us who knew and played for the celebrated Iron Major held a sort of memorial service for him last night over a big radio hookup synchronized with the official release of the film. I haven't seen the picture, but the publicity releases on it say that Pat O'Brien has done a memorable characterization.

Photographs of O'Brien as Cav look like photographs of O'Brien as O'Brien, but that won't make so much difference to millions. A beauteous young lady billed as Ruth Warrick plays the part of Mrs. Cavanaugh, and they say that the Cavanaugh boys, six of them in the Army, had a hard job getting oriented when they visited the studio while the picture was being made. They couldn't quite straighten out the sight of a pretty girl younger than they are playing the part of their mother.

CAV KNEW HOW TO BREAK THAT TENSION

The printed synopsis of the picture seems to say that the script holds pretty faithfully to the old coach's life story with the football emphasis upon his postwar career. A man who never knew him, and who never even saw him, wrote the scenario but he did a faithful job of researching and it could be possible that he did a better job because he never had come in personal contact with the subject he was handling.

Because of this, he could at least see the whole history objectively. Those who knew Cav mostly have the memory of some experience or experiences so deeply burned into them that the rest wouldn't get an honest chance. Cav wasn't a person you met and forgot.

The memories may be funny or serious. Sometimes they are of no particular importance, even, perhaps, in a story of his life. and yet it suddenly strikes the rememberer that they add up to something, that they do belong, and belong hard to any record of the man.

Psychology, for example—morale, they call it in wartimes. I don't know what he called it, or whether he called it anything. But there was almost nobody who more skillfully knew how to play on the emotions of young men faced with a hard physical chore. The following incidents, for example, add up:

I was a member of the last squad Cavanaugh coached at Dartmouth, and he was keying us for the Princeton game. We were to take the train next morning, and he had assembled us after supper for a last blackboard talk, a final mental rehearsal of plays and plans. We were in what I suppose you'd call the lobby of the big gymnasium. I remember the air outside was clear and frosty cold.

Cav went through the technical part of the talk, and then he digressed into how much this game meant to the prestige of the college, what we owed the college, and what we owed to ourselves. Cav always spoke in a deep organ tone.

As he developed this theme, you could have heard a pin drop in the place. Finally he was telling us what the game meant to the alumni, and in proof of this, he drew a big sheaf of telegrams from a briefcase and began to read them. Whether on the level or not, we never knew, but nobody thought to question their authenticity then. They came, or so he read, from all over America, from this alumni association and that from this famous alumnus and that historical athlete.

We were as tense as kids could be as he came to the end. Knuckles were white, faces were strained. It wouldn't have taken much to have broken us into tears. In fact there were tears on some cheeks.

"And now," our coach concluded, "this final message is from that great football enthusiast, Mrs. Frank W. Cavanaugh. It reads, 'You forgot to pay the rent. Please send $25.' That's all, boys. See you tomorrow."

In other words, he took us right up to the line drew us tight as fiddlestrings, and then skillfully snapped the tension with a laugh.

I never thought much about that passing incident until years later when a man told me what seems to me to be one of the great stories of the last war. It was of Cav's coming up to take command of a hard-driven outfit that had been holding a bleak and bloody sector for many days without relief. Long overdue for a rest, they were ordered, instead, to dig in for some more. Life was all mud and misery and clock-round danger. Cav suddenly arrived as their new commanding officer.

He evidently looked the situation over and it didn't take him long.

"Listen," he growled at his new command, "you so-and-so came over here to die. I'm going to make sure that you get the chance. I don't want to hear any more bellyaching. What do you think you rate—the Waldorf-Astoria? You're going to dig up those guns and you're going to move 'em to the top of that hill. And you're going to hold that hill come hell or high water. And if it's a little too muddy or a little too rough for some of you sissies up there step over into my dugout and maybe I can fix you up a cup of tea."

The man telling the story was a member of this dogged outfit. They had really been fighting like tigers. He said Cavanaugh promptly became the most hated man in France. Some of them even said they'd shoot him if they got an honest chance. All of them expressed the hope that he'd get it first.

But they moved, he said, and hate or no hate, they noted that Cav took for himself the most dangerous dugout. He also took for himself the most dangerous jobs. At regular intervals up with the supplies came generous rations of cognac. Nobody knew who ordered it, or who was paying for it. A long time afterward, they found out that Cav did. A long time afterward they remembered that for all the hard words, he was gentle with the wounded, certain of their food, that he worked relentlessly for their relief and finally got them out of there.

It was after the war at a reunion that they saw Cav next. He'd been wounded, decorated and had almost died, in the interim, but here he stood upon a platform before those same men again.

"The hardest thing I ever had to do," he said, "was to try to play the bully to great soldiers, and great Americans such as you were in France. The words burned my throat. I didn't dare look you in the eyes for fear you'd see that I was lying. But when I joined you, your nerves were raw, your fighting spirit had lost direction. You'd been left in there too long. You'd taken more than any human beings should be asked to take. You hated the job. You hated the war. You were hating everything in general and nothing in particular. I gambled on the chance that if I could concentrate your hatred upon me, could give you something definite and personal and present to hate, that you'd hate the job less and proceed to do it better.

"CAV CRIED AS THEY WRUNG HIS HAND

"It almost killed me, and I've been waiting all these years to tell you that I didn't mean it, that you were really great soldiers and that it was an honor to serve with you, even if I couldn't tell you so at the time. If apologies, gentlemen, aren't too long overdue * * *".

The man said the ovation almost tore the building apart, that Cav cried as they swarmed up to wring his hand, that they finally got him on their shoulders and I don't know what all.

But, shucks, don't get me started upon the subject of Cav. Whatever the movies did, it would be impossible to get it all. There was a man.

Nuclear Powered Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the feasibility of nuclear powered aircraft has long since been proven. Our concern now is with performance. Here the answers will come faster after we put the first atomic airplane in the air. Already there has been too much delay. I sincerely hope the Congress itself will not become an ally of an administration which has been distinguished by its lack of vision in regard to the atomic powered airplane.

If ever a program has been studied to death it has been the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. It seems that the only thing that will discourage the appointment of more committees to study the project will be the first flight of an atomic plane by the Soviet. We have had enough of committee studies—what we should do now is to give adequate support to the engineers and scientists actually working in the program and give them the go-ahead signal to put a plane in the air as quickly as possible.

I have been impressed with the work of Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff, Development, for Nuclear Systems, and with his efforts to get the atomic plane off the ground. His predecessor, Maj. Gen. Donald Keirn, USAF vigorously supported an early flight program. General Keirn was an Air Force officer experienced in technical matters as an aeronautical engineer.

As a matter of fact those who know the project best agree unanimously that as an existing technology it is now technically feasible to test flight an A-plane—the Pentagon and the Bureau of the Budget notwithstanding.

I believe my colleagues in the House will be interested in the following article written by General Branch which appeared in the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of June 25, 1960:

AEROSPACE NUCLEAR POWER

(The Journal is privileged to publish the following authoritative report on the nuclear aircraft propulsion program. "We are turning the corner in the effort to develop nuclear power for aerospace appliactions," the author declares.)

(By Brig. Gen. Irving L. Branch, USAF, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, for Nuclear Systems)

By and large the most candid statement that can be made concerning the present status of our nuclear aircraft program is that we are concerned not with feasibilty, but with performance. We have long since proven the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for aircraft; we are now concerned with providing the highest possible quality in our initial performance. This does not mean to imply that we have conquered all of our technical problems, but it does mean that our technical problems are primarily those which limit the level of advanced performance that can be achieved with nuclear flight. Short of such advanced performance, we had earlier deferred our decision to demonstrate early nuclear flight.

Although the nuclear aircraft program has been plagued in the past with a series of reorientations and redirections, the hard work in the years of research and development has produced much valuable data. The program is now going forward based on a firm background of significant and important component and powerplant milestones and with an established directive for its initial goal for first flight. Based on this valuable background, successful attainment of our objective is assured. We are now embarked on a sound technical program, on a predictable time schedule to culminate in nuclear flight in the mid-1960's.

Roughly 14 years ago, the nuclear aircraft program began with little more than a few theoretical estimates, a basic understanding of what had to be accomplished, and a great deal of conviction.

Today, although the scope of its work continues to increase, the nuclear aircraft

program is but one of four distinct nuclear power programs under the technical management of the joint AF–AEC Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Office.

In the past 5 years we have added the Rover nuclear rocket project, which is destined to ultimately provide NASA with a high power density, multiton payload rocket booster; the Pluto nuclear ramjet program which offers the Air Force a globe girdling, low level supersonic missile, and the SNAP (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) project, which will provide lightweight, compact, long-lived power supplies for advanced space missions.

SNAP will ultimately provide the electrical power to make interspace ionic propulsion systems practical. Rover has passed its first milestone, Kiwi A, a successful high temperature reactor experiment which was the first of several feasibility demonstration devices.

This program is confidently on schedule toward a flight device.

PLUTO is scheduled for its first demonstration reactor in the near future.

We have already achieved the succesaful operation of radioisotope-fueled SNAP power devices. The first SNAP reactor power device, SNAP 2, has already operated for several hundred hours at designed power. Concurrently the SNAP 2 system turbo-alternator, driven by mercury vapor, has operated successfully for over 1,000 hours. It only remains to mate these two components in order to demonstrate that a 3-kilowatt electrical power system, capable of unattended operation in space for 1 year is at hand.

Appraising the status of these programs we can confidently say today that we are turning the corner in the effort to develop nuclear power for aerospace applications. Although these programs continue to be a tremendous research effort, we are dealing more and more in terms of actual component development and fabrication. The expenditure in terms of time, money, material, and manpower has been tremendous. In the manned aircraft program alone, almost a billion dollars has been expended.

At times this expenditure has caused severe criticism of these programs; yet, when the programs are viewed in the larger context of the revolutionary technology that is being unraveled, the proportion between cost versus payoff becomes acceptable.

In the aerospace age that we are currently entering, nuclear propulsion technology offers a beginning where chemical propulsion technology appears to be severely pushing its limits. The nuclear component development and testing that we are successfully doing today is being performed within intrinsic material temperature environments of at least 1,000° to 2,000° beyond temperatures imposed on materials in chemical propulsion work. A single advanced Rover test device about the size of an office desk, will generate power equal to the power output of Hoover Dam.

The first nuclear aircraft, whether it be a development or a prototype aircraft, will be capable of sustained endurance in the air, up to 5 days or more. Nuclear systems are going to be large systems but they are going to provide large payoff for our efforts. In rocket applications the payloads will not be measured in pounds but in tons. Nuclear propulsion will be, in every sense, a heavyweight capability of enormous potential, in which these stated applications are only the initial concepts; yet, in themselves, they are startling enough to underscore the point that the payoff is, in truth, realistically proportional to the tremendous investment in their development.

We are, in fact, standing on the threshold of the nuclear propulsion era. When the first Wright aeroplanes were purchased by the Army Signal Corps, the most visionary of the planners could not guess at the full impact of what was to come. Similarly, it is difficult for us, today, to foresee the full impact of nuclear propulsion from the vantage point we occupy. To be sure, we have initial applications that are well defined.

We are planning for a first flight nuclear aircraft that has the potential for sustained air alert missions in the strategic force; we are planning for single stage nuclear rockets that can lift multiton payloads that can be matched only in part by enormous multistage chemical rockets. There are also definable SNAP applications. Satellite, as well as moon based and planet based stations, manned or unmanned, can be supported far better by the use of SNAP high capacity, long-lived, auxiliary power packages that can be transported in compact form through space.

The sheer potential of successful nuclear propulsion has transcended specific applications. Although the initiation of each of our programs were nurtured by the Air Force, in conjunction with the AEC, it became apparent that nuclear propulsion technology, be it for rockets, ramjets, aircraft, or space power, is of national importance. For this reason our programs are being guided from the agency level with Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration interests included. Only in this context can our efforts be fully responsive to national requirements.

We as a Nation are firmly embarked on the penetration, exploration, and assimilation of space. The rate at which this effort will progress is debatable but the inevitability of the effort is unquestioned because the fundamental drive to seek out the unknown is deeply rooted in the nature of man. Whether military or nonmilitary agencies will mount the major portion of the effort is open to question. It is axiomatic that aerospace nuclear power will provide the ultimate means of doing the job.

Even Lincoln and Roosevelt Had Many Critics in the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, many of my friends are disturbed by the contsant attacks made on me in the editorial pages of various newspapers in my district. They are disturbed by the concentrated efforts of some newsheets to do me great harm personally and politically. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I offer the following remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the great Civil War President, Abraham Lincoln, answered his critics this way:

"If I were trying to read,
Much less answer, all the attacks made on me,
This shop might well be closed for any business.
I do the best I know how, the very best I can
And I mean to keep doing so until the end
If the end brings me out all right
What is said against me won't amount to anything
If the end brings me out all wrong
Ten angels swearing I was right would make no difference"—Abe Lincoln.

Our great leader through the depression years and through the Second World War was Franklin D. Roosevelt. A researcher recently discovered that during his almost four terms as President, 97 percent of the editorials written about him were negative in nature. Yet not one single law enacted during his administration for the benefit of people has ever been repealed.

Being the object of criticism by some unfriendly members of the press may be the only similarity I have with these two great humanitarians, but even for this I am proud.

Regardless of the criticism which may be directed against me, I intend to continue working just as hard and just as honestly as I can for the benefit of my country and my district.

In Favor of Increased Communication With China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Editor Felsheim of the Bandon (Oreg.) Western World, in my district, quotes Editor Canham of the Christian Science Monitor with regard to recognition of Red China.

In my opinion the problem is increased communication for which many people use the word "recognition." I believe that recognition is by no means the first step and indeed is only an incident in establishing the kind of communciations which will help avert world war III and help prepare a way for reciprocal disarmament agreements ultimately.

Under unanimous consent I am including the text of Editor Felsheim's editorial from the April 14, 1960, issue of the Bandon Western World:

URGES RECOGNITION OF CHINA

Editor Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, has urged that the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Communist China. Canham has put his finger on a controversial subject in the United States. Many citizens of this country feel that diplomatic recognition of a country is tantamount to approval of that country's government.

The British hold the opposite view. They believe they should recognize a force in being, or a fact that is accomplished, and that their diplomatic recognition of a country or a government of which they do not approve does not indicate approval of the form of government involved by any means.

Canham says that "since we cannot destroy the Peiping Government we must learn how to live with it."

He says that it is difficult for us to learn the true dimensions of the problem without carrying on diplomatic relations and maintaining whatever contacts are possible.

It is doubtful that anything will be done in the near future along the lines suggested by Canham. On the other hand, eventually the United States might come to the establishment of some sort of diplomatic contact with Red China.

Many Americans do not believe that the United States should recognize the Chinese Communists at this time. It must be admitted, however, that chances seem slim indeed that Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa can ever recapture the mainland. And it seems that the Reds there are in firm control.

In other words, it appears that the Reds will be in control for a long time, like the Reds in Russia have been, and that sooner or later if the United States wishes to carry on any contacts with China, even though disapproving of its form of government, it may be necessary to deal, officially, with the regime now in power.

Private Power Company Propaganda Advertising: False and Deliberately Misleading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, for some time, a private electric power group, America's electric light and power companies, has been flooding the American press with full-page advertisements designed as blatant propaganda against legal public power systems in the United States. One of these recently appeared in U.S. News & World Report, for June 6, 1960, with the caption, "Would You Invest $10,000 To Lose $350 a Year?"

Now I would like to analyze this advertisement paragraph by paragraph to refute the false and deliberately misleading statements, recklessly dangled before the eyes of the American people. Such propagandizing, it is claimed by the private electric light and power companies, is an attempt to educate the citizenry in the proper point of view regarding public power. These advertisements are in fact nothing more than vicious misrepresentation and slander.

The advertisement following the caption starts out:

Doesn't make business sense, does it? Yet that is exactly what is being urged on the United States by the lobbyists for more Government-in-the-electric business.

Here's how it works. The advocates of Federal electric power systems want Government to spent $10 billion more on top of about $5,500 million of taxpayers' money already spent.

How the private power interests derived the figures $10 billion and $5.5 billion is not readily understandable. As far as can be determined, the total investment in Federal power programs is actually estimated at closer to $3 billion.

FANCIFUL FIGURES

Next the question of taxation is introduced into the picture as follows:

These so-called public power systems are exempt from all Federal taxation, and largely from any State or local taxing. On the other hand, $10 billion spent by independent electric companies would produce about $350 million yearly in Federal, local, and State taxes, at today's rates.

So the public power proposal boils down to hitting most taxpayers twice: Use their taxes to build Government power systems, and tap them for the share of taxes that Government systems escape.

These statements are gross exaggerations and misrepresentations.

Again, where did the figures of $10 billion and $350 million come from? No source or method of computation is revealed in the advertisement. Apparently, the method of deriving these statistics is that of the "big lie."

As to escaping taxation, the following quotation from an exhaustive study of Government and business by Vernon A. Mund stands in refutation:

The facts are that often public power pays its full share of State and local taxes in other ways.

Municipal utilities and public utility districts typically pay State taxes on gross revenues from retail sales, State sales taxes, regular State business taxes, State gasoline taxes, State generating license fees, industrial insurance, and unemployment taxes, in line with those paid by privately owned utilities. They also usually pay local business and occupation taxes and local franchise taxes. It is common for publicly owned enterprises to furnish services, such as street lighting, at little or no cost. On some occasions, moreover, they pay special gross-revenue taxes or make cash contributions to State and local agencies in lieu of property taxes. The value of such payments and services may fully offset the property tax burden which privately owned utilities must pay.[1]

PUBLIC POWER PAYS PUBLIC DIVIDENDS

There are numerous instances of the construction of local public buildings with moneys from the earnings of locally own utility systems:

One such example, is the municipal building of the city of Ilion, N.Y., which was erected by funds contributed by the municipal electric system. Although such a contribution would not appear in the income statement as a tax item, there is no question that, if this contribution had not been made by the municipal utility, it would have been necessary to utilize tax revenues in order to construct this civic improvement.[2]

Regarding the question of Federal taxation, it is true, of course, that publicly owned utilities are exempt from Federal taxation. But this is not the whole story, by any means. Take as an example the Tennessee Valley Authority, perhaps the most common target of private power interests. Rates for its electricity provide not only for all costs of rendering the service and State and local tax equivalents, but also yield net earnings for the Federal Treasury of more than 4 percent.

These net earnings give the Federal Government an interest return on the money appropriated for construction, as well as a return which is equivalent to Federal income tax payments. To quote from Mr. Gordon Clapp, a former director of TVA:

TVA is not required to pay Federal income taxes. This is logical, since TVA is owned by the Federal Government. All of TVA's income belongs to the Government. But if a share of TVA's power earnings, after setting aside the equivalent of interest, were earmarked for income taxes in the same proportion as for private utility companies, there would still be something left for a dividend to the taxpayers.

IMPORTANCE OF LOW-COST POWER

No fair-minded discusion of private and publicly owned powerplants should omit mention of the great expansion in industry and employment resulting from the availability of low-cost public power. Such industrial benefits inevitably broaden the tax base. Economic expansion in the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia Basin, for example, bears out this statement. It is difficult, of course, to measure exactly the increase in tax returns due to these Federal public power systems. However, Brooks Hays, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, estimates that since 1933 when TVA was inaugurated, $12 billion more have been collected in Federal taxes from residents of the TVA area than would have accrued to the Federal Government had pre-TVA conditions prevailed.

Furthermore, an attack on public power on the score of tax evasion is particularly uncalled for and malicious, since private utility companies in actual fact receive a huge subsidy in the form of tax reductions.

PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN GLASS HOUSES

For private power interests to sponsor an advertisement accusing public power systems of avoiding their share of taxes is an irony of ironies.

Through provisions for accelerated amortization and liberalized depreciation in the tax laws, private power firms are subsidized to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. During World War II, Congress enacted legislation to provide accelerated amortization of defense plants. Extraordinary expansion was needed in plant capacity to manufacture arms and munitions for the national defense. Quite understandably, the Federal Government stood ready to aid in financing such expansion.

The rapid amortization program provided that the cost of a defense plant could be amortized over a 5-year period instead of over its longtime useful life. The sum set aside for depreciation was deductible from income as a business expense. Thus the Federal Government largely paid the cost of the new defense plants by reduced taxes. Certificates of necessity were issued to industrial companies in authorization of rapid amortization. Some utilities were issued these certificates during World War II and the Korean conflict. However, the Office of Defense Mobilization began in 1953 to issue certificates of necessity for the ordinary expansion of powerplants. The 85th Congress put a stop to these manipulations. However, according to the Federal Power Commission and the American Public Power Association, because of rapid amortization, tax benefits of $1.5 billion have been amassed in the coffers of private utilities concerns.

WRITEOFFS FOR PRIVATE COMPANIES

But this is only part of the story left untold by those who complain of tax

[1] Mund, Vernon A. Government and Business. New York. Harper & Bros. 1955, p. 572.

[2] "More Power at Lower Cost," American Power Public Power Assoc. APPA Document No. 53-S-01 p. 17.

evasion. Liberalized depreciation allowances were written into the Revenue Code in 1954. Section 167 increased the amount of the cost of a plant that may be written off in the early years of its life for tax purposes. Therefore the tax bill of the company is reduced.

This is not all. Utility companies have approached State utility commissions to urge higher utility rates, and have based their estimates for such increases on a normal tax bill, not a tax bill which allows for liberalized deductions for depreciation.

And let us make no mistake about it, liberalized depreciation is a tax reduction, not a tax deferral, since the utilities have been experiencing unprecedented expansion in recent years. The stockholders in the utility companies, not the consumers of power, are reaping tremendous gains from these tax provisions.

The truth of the matter is this: the utilities are deriving huge profits from one of the most extensive subsidies ever handed out by any government. Reliable estimates place the Federal tax subsidy granted to private utilities through accelerated amortization certificates and liberalized depreciation practices available since 1954 at more than $10 billion.[3]

Next, the old, familiar, and false refrain appears in the advertisement:

> The tragic fact is that more spending for such Federal power programs would be unnecessary. The hundreds of independent electric companies are able and ready to provide for the Nation's electric needs. They've already proved they can supply plenty of low-priced power without using tax money to do it.

DEFAULT OF PRIVATE COMPANIES

The truth is this: Public power systems such as the Tennessee Valley Authority were constructed because private companies either would not or could not provide electricity at moderate cost. Referring again to the TVA, private interests believed that a wide market for the electricity generated by a system of dams on the Tennessee River could not possibly be developed. Today, TVA is having difficulty in meeting all demands for electricity.

The rates of publicly owned utilities are typically below the rates of private utilities. To quote again from Mund:

> Some 60 publicly owned utilities in the United States and Canada, in particular, sell electricity for residential use at rates under 1 cent a kilowatt-hour. This rate is fully 60 percent below the average residential rate in the United States.[4]

Rural electrification is another case in point. Modern methods of agriculture demand extensive application of electricity. The use of individual plants generating electricity on a single farm is prohibitively expensive. Should American agriculture then be penalized because private companies believe a program of rural electrification would be unprofitable? And in this connection it should be emphasized that rural electric cooperatives pay back every cent they borrow from the Federal Government for construction and operation of generating plants, transmission lines, and distribution systems, with interest.

MULTIPURPOSE DAMS

Then too, private companies rarely think in terms of multipurpose dams for flood control, irrigation, and national defense, as well as electric power for home, office, and industry.

The experience of waging World War II and subsequent inauguration of the new atomic and space age have proved the need for vast quantities of cheap electric power. For precisely this reason, atomic energy installations are located at Oak Ridge in the Tennessee Valley.

The advertisement winds up its propaganda by urging the reader to send for a booklet entitled "How Federal Government Electricity Affects the Businessman." This pamphlet contains, of course, further doses of the same type of half-truths and untruths as appear in the advertisement.

No such statements as those which are used to smear public power in a large, authoritative-looking advertisement in U.S. News & World Report and other publications should remain unrefuted.

Both public and private power have a place in the American economic system. And public power, legalized by the laws of the land, has a right to exist without continual harassment from private power interests using their ratepayers' money in a scurrilous campaign.

[3] Clyde T. Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

[4] Mund. op. cit, p. 553.

Toll TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial on the subject of "Toll TV," by S. H. Fabian, president of the American Congress of Exhibitors, which appeared in the Film Daily, New York City, June 21, 1960. The editorial follows:

I pick up an out-of-town editorial today and it tells of the toll TV promise to supply the public with better entertainment. This, of course, is merely a semantic screen—to smother the issue, to befuddle public opposition against a nationwide scheme to force families to pay for something they now receive free.

Chet Bahn having offered me the hospitality of this space for comment pertinent to our business, I'll presume to do some public reflection about this better entertainment.

So I ask myself what is "better"? To guide my way, I look for roadmarkers. I like to latch onto specifics. To some folks "better" means "pay or die"—to others, the best is "wild strawberries." So I analyze the mechanics, or if you prefer, the electronics of better shows.

"Pay or die" opens in the larger seating capacities—"wild strawberries" in the midget houses, the toll TV pledge implies that the TV medium will cater to the lovers of the subtle, the ironic, the esoteric; i.e., to the minorities. Is this an honest commitment? Can you serve minorities through a mass electronic medium?

In theaters we can scale down from 4,000 seats to a 400 seater. An art theater with low overhead, and benefiting from word-of-mouth, can play to a profit with such minimum audiences week after week after week, satisfying creators, distributors, exhibitors, and customers with offbeat tastes.

How do you do this with a TV channel, when you need mass patronage for adequate payoff each time you project the feature?

Another angle: Who will make these better shows? Are there creative minds the studios cannot reach? Silly idea, isn't it, when Hollywood combs the world for talent?

Is it implied that free TV will not spend the necessary money, or make the effort? You couldn't defend that argument. Free TV has really been trying hard.

So toll TV has nowhere to go for a supply of better entertainment, except to artists and craftsmen who are doing their best now for theaters and free TV.

So much for the specious guarantee of better entertainment. Now let's look at the other side of the argument. It the toll TV programs won't be better, can they be worse? Look hard at the facts and the logic. And you must be suspicious of every claim of superior programs. You must suspect the bland assurance that toll TV justifies paid admissions in the Nation's living rooms for the type of diversion the set buyer now receives for free.

First. TV—free or paid—is a motion picture; a shadow show on a screen. It is a dwarfed, denigrated offshoot of the motion picture theater film; but a worse motion picture.

Second. If Hollywood starts selling new features to slot-machine TV it will be utilizing a highly developed cinemascope, Todd AO, 70mm, Panavision technique for a porthole size picture.

How long will it take the producers and directors to throw technical progress into reverse, reducing the scale and scope, the magnitude and genuine spectacular size of their productions to the diminished frame of the little coin box in the home pygmy proscenium arch? Another example of worsening; of the degradation of the motion picture art.

At this point the industry we have known, blooming with constantly improved skills, will be swiftly shrinking into a vestigial remnant.

My space is running out and I must choke off the urge to lift the curtain on the other fantasies and fables in the promised programing for entertainment fields other than feature film. Another time. Another expose.

Address of John J. Corcoran to South Dakota Department, American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in my home State of South Dakota, the American Legion recently held its annual convention. In my conversations with Legionnaires, and in correspondence with South Dakotans, I have heard many expressions that this was one of the most

outstanding State conventions held by the South Dakota department.

Among the many speakers addressing the convention was Mr. John J. Corcoran, director of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. President, to ask that the remarks made by Mr. Corcoran to the South Dakota American Legion convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, distinguished guests, delegates to the 42d annual convention of the department of South Dakota, and fellow Legionnaires, may I begin by saying how happy I am to be here in South Dakota. It is a particular privilege to participate in this convention because of your department's prestige and stature in the national organization. The department of South Dakota is recognized as one of the great leaders of the American Legion. In membership, in rehabilitation, in all your endeavors, you lead and you set an inspiring example for others to emulate.

It is a pleasure to attend this convention for a reason that is of great importance to me and yet may not be readily apparent. I refer to the fact that this meeting as well as the very existence of the American Legion is a demonstration of patriotism. Let me explain.

It has always seemed to me that a characteristic if not an essential of greatness in a nation is the love of the people for the Nation. That love of course is called patriotism. Without it, the Nation declines. Patriotism is manifested in many and varied ways: respect for the flag, obedience to authority, willingness to offer one's life in defense.

There is another way in which the people demonstrate love of country, and this one has particular application here. It is the fact that they attribute a special status to those who defend the country in time of war. It is of course true that to defend one's country is a duty of citizenship. But since the beginning, nations have distinguished between those who did and those who did not perform that duty. And it must always be so. For as long as we suffer certain men to endure special hardships, special deprivations and special disciplines, we have established for them a special place in society which sets them apart from the rest.

This special treatment of war veterans is the Federal veterans program. I am convinced that patriotism and love of country justifies, yes, demands a sound and reasonable Federal program of benefits for those who served the Nation in time of war.

Legionnaires have undertaken to assure that there will be a sound and reasonable program. This is a heavy responsibility. We must always be fair to the veterans and to the country. We must consider both the need of the beneficiary and the ability to pay of the benefactor. We must establish and honor fundamental principles to circumscribe our requests lest we permit abuses and excesses which will jeopardize the entire program and constitute a disservice not only to the Nation but to the veterans themselves.

And this responsibility rests most heavily upon the shoulders of the American Legion because the American Legion is the largest and most influential veterans organization. And of course this burden is for you delegates to carry because you establish in your convention what will be the ultimate position of the organization.

If the past is any criterion, the American Legion will continue to be a responsible, conservative, effective force. The Legion's impact on the veterans program will continue to be constructive and forward-looking—as were its efforts that led to the GI bill of rights, a superior medical program, and so forth.

My visit to this great department reassures me that the leadership is in capable hands and that the challenge of the future will be met.

Helen Keller's 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the prayer offered by our beloved Chaplain of the House at the opening of yesterday's session was particularly appropriate. Yesterday was the birthday of Miss Helen Keller. On this day, she reached the glorious age of 80.

Chaplain Braskamp's words of prayer applied magnificently to this fine woman—one of the greatest woman of this or any other time. "Almighty and everblessed God, may we accept this new day as a beautiful gift from Thy hand and a glorious opportunity for heroic endeavor to serve Thee and our generation faithfully. Grant that we may be wiser today because of the failures of yesterday and more trustful when we are assailed by fears which darken our way and dwarf our capacities."

Mr. Speaker, Helen Keller's whole life, it seems to me, has been tailored to fit these inspiring words of prayer.

Only rarely have there been people who have risen above geographic and cultural boundaries to become symbols of faith and goodness to all the world. Helen Keller, blind and deaf since infancy, has become such a symbol.

Through her courage, intelligence, and beauty of mind and spirit she has enriched the lives of many thousands of people, proving that physical handicaps need be no barrier to a full and rewarding life.

During World War II Miss Keller toured our military hospitals, bringing new hope to wounded, frightened men. She has reached beyond America, speaking for the blind in Australia, Canada, Egypt, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia—in all parts of the world. Unable to see or to hear, she has yet been one of the most effective representatives of America to peoples abroad.

Many foreign governments have honored her. She was awarded the Medal of Merit by Lebanon, the Chevalier Legion of Honor by France, and the Southern Cross by Brazil. Civic, educational, and welfare organizations in the United States have also paid her homage.

Miss Keller has reached out to the suffering through her writings, including "Out of the Dark," "Let Us Have Faith," and "The Open Door." She expressed the foundation of her philosophy in the book "This I Believe," writing: "Belief in God as infinite good will and all-seeing wisdom whose everlasting arms sustain me walking on the sea of life. Trust in my fellow men, wonder at their fundamental goodness and confidence that after this night of sorrow and oppression they will rise up strong and beautiful in the glory of morning. Reverence for the beauty and preciousness of earth, and a sense of responsibility to do what I can to make it a habitation of health and plenty for all men."

These words speak eloquently of her innate nobility and generosity, qualities which have brought light into the dimmed eyes of others who share her blindness.

As she celebrates her 80th birthday, it is a privilege for me to join with many fellow Americans in expressing the gratitude and affection due Miss Keller as a great American, and a great human being.

Mr. Speaker, Helen Keller's 80th birthday was commemorated throughout the Nation and the world. Great editorial and news stories paying tribute to her appeared in newspapers in this country. Local communities joined in the acclaim of this marvelous woman. I am proud to cite my own city of Springfield, Mass., that proclaimed "Helen Keller Day" under the leadership of Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, Mrs. Sidney Levy of the National Council of Jewish Women; Miss Anita M. O'Shea, chairman of "Helen Keller Day"; Dr. Honore E. Gaudreau, George Trelease, Rehabilitation Counselor for the Massachusetts State Division of the Blind; Mrs. Anthony Caputo, Paul Caputo, Miss Irene Duquette, home teacher for the Massachusetts State Division of the Blind; Mrs. Herman Carlisle, Robert F. Tuveson, and Miss Hazel M. French.

Commencement Address by Ambassador Herve Alphand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to draw attention to a significant address delivered on June 16, at the commencement exercises of City College, New York, by Ambassador Alphand of France. As we are all aware, the bridge of friendship that links our nation to our traditional friend and ally, France, has been both preserved and strengthened by the exemplary diplomatic skill and the admirable dedication of the distinguished Ambassador of France.

The spirit and content of this address made before the 1960 graduating class of City College only serve to confirm the high esteem Ambassador Alphand has won in the minds and hearts of those privileged to know him and his work. In view of the quality of this commence-

ment address, and of its significance for the times in which we live, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HIS EXCELLENCY MR. HERVE ALPHAND, AMBASSADOR OF FRANCE TO THE UNITED STATES, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT CITY COLLEGE, NEW YORK, ON JUNE 16, 1960

First of all I want to tell you how much I appreciate the honor done to me today by City College. I know the important place your university occupies in the life of New York, this gate of America open on France and on Europe. As my friend Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of your most famous alumni, once said: "It is the peculiar glory of this college that, if Townsend Harris was its pioneer, rightly cherished as such, it is the people of the city of New York who were the real founders, who built it for the children of the city."

The kindness of your welcome and the warmth of President Gallagher's words of greeting bear witness to the affection that through me the College of the City of New York feels for France. By this I am deeply touched but not entirely surprised. I know that since its beginning in 1847 your college has remained faithful to the spirit of its founder in giving the French language a choice place in its curriculum. Each semester 2,000 students take French courses. Your college has invited French lecturers of the highest standing from Bergson to Jasinski, while it has associated its commencements with three of my predecessors: MM. Jusserand, de Laboulaye, and Henri Bonnet.

When I accepted Dr. Gallagher's kind offer, as Paul Valéry once did in an identical situation, I asked myself this question: "What shall I say to these young people? They know more than I do because they go to school, because they have prepared examinations—which afford men the only opportunity to know, for some days, something * * *." And then I tried to find out what in France could correspond in the life of a young man to the very moving ceremony of the commencement; although this word is French, it does not correspond to any similar manifestation marking the end of university studies in France. I thought then of the time in 1930 when I started on my career. I attempted to establish a comparison between the world situation of 30 years ago and the situation of today, between the opportunities offered to me then and those available to your young experience.

I thought that today, as of old, the world is raked with fears, is dreading a possible but unpredictable incident, is anxious as to what tomorrow might be. Is it really quite new? History teaches us that at all times the world has been in a state of crisis. And so it is that the United States has been in a state of crisis for 200 years and France for about 2,000 years.

We must admit however that the risks involved in these eternal crises have spread considerably. For if cruelty and violence nowadays are unfortunately as common as of old, the means of extermination placed at the disposal of man have become considerably more powerful. In 1930 the modern weapons were indeed terrible and murderous. As we say 10 years later, they made it possible for great morsels of Europe to fall under a totalitarian domination. Today the prospects are infinitely more terrifying as it would be possible for one of the two opposite camps to make a decision that would eliminate the greatest part of humanity in a few hours.

Besides the monstrous dangers with which the existence of scientific and atomic armaments is facing us, we must also admit that the threat of psychological disintegration of our civilization is today greater than it was 30 years ago. To be sure, nations have kept their same fundamental qualities; on this earth there are still Slavs, Chinese, Anglo-Saxons, Germans and Latins and it is, for instance, the national interests of Russia which are primarily responsible for the actions of the Soviet Union. But international communism, the cold war weapon used by Moscow, Peiping and their satellites, is infinitely more dangerous today than it was 30 years ago.

Its propaganda floods the whole world with delusions. One can see its effects in Cuba as in Guinea, in the incidents of Tokyo as well as in the heart of Europe.

The youth of 1930 could hope that a great portion of Africa and Asia would remain immune to war and to ideological strife. This is now out of question. Out of an obsolete colonialism, new nations are born nearly every month on each one of these two continents. This evolution corresponds fully to the expressed wishes of France and of the United States, traditional champions of the right of self determination for all peoples. But it is quite evident that in order to build in those nations a true democracy, a regime of individual freedom not to be mistaken for independence, to improve their economic status and raise their standard of living, these young nations must associate themselves freely with older nations which offer them brotherly and disinterested cooperation. Such are the objectives of the French "Communauté." Otherwise, we will see these African and Asiatic nations soon fall into chaos, opening the door to totalitarian regimes infinitely more oppressive than those they have known through the ages.

Thus, my friends, in a way, the prospects facing a young man entering life in 1930 could appear less hard and complex than the ones awaiting you today. And yet to what catastrophes the world was heading for, just a few years later. What sufferings and trials it had to go through. Ought we to believe then that you will have to dread even worse prospects from the life now opening before you?

I would not like, on this day of joy, to draw for you too dark a picture nor would I like to deprive you of hope. In the present situation, there are some comforting elements and I am convinced, as far as I am concerned, that if we know how to understand and use them, we shall be able to thrust aside the horrible threats imperiling the very existence of mankind.

First of all, one of the causes of world conflict which existed in 1930 has disappeared: I mean the danger of German imperialism. Twice since the turn of the century, the unbounded ambitions of Germany have thrown our peoples into tragic wars. We believe that such a threat does not exist now. This is a new fact and it is of major importance for peace that the two old enemies, France and Germany, have renounced the idea of destroying each other and have decided to cooperate together within the framework of European institutions, bringing together also Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. Forever, these nations have banished hatred from their relations. They constitute a human, political, and economic unit organized for their mutual prosperity and defense. One hundred and seventy-five million men, heirs to a great civilization, have, within the Common Market, decided to associate their resources and create an economic entity comparable in strength to the two greatest, I mean the United States and the Soviet Union. Within the limits of this new union, goods, men, and capital will circulate freely. We expect that this association which, on the next 31st of December, will accelerate its pace, will bring to all nations involved an improvement in their living standards similar to what has benefited the American people.

This new formation will not in any sense constitute an autarchy. It will be liberally open to international trade; by its origin and its political principles, it belongs to the West. Consequently, it will try to avoid all frictions which might bring it into opposition against its European neighbors and notably England, and it will work in close cooperation with the United States of America. The methods of negotiation which have been set in Paris between the Six, the Seven, the United States and Canada give us the assurance that the aim will be achieved through an unprecedented expansion of international trade. The increased purchasing power of the Common Market countries will be an element of progress and equilibrium in the whole world especially as regards the countries of Africa, of Asia, of Latin America where they will be able to buy more raw materials and more foodstuffs. To my way of thinking, there is no factor more important for peace in the world today.

In the second place, I believe that the free nations are today better prepared than they were 30 years ago for the eventuality of a general war. First of all, because, militarily speaking, the profusion of pacts signed between the two wars were mostly legal instruments unimplemented by a coordinated organization as set up today by the Atlantic Treaty. The warnings given by Colonel de Gaulle who, with extraordinary vision, foresaw the exact nature of the 1940 war, were ignored by the successive French Governments. England did not begin to build planes and tanks until the day after Munich. Finally, the United States was isolating itself from its European brothers as if its vital interests were forever to escape this peril. We do not entertain such illusions now. Each one of our countries knows that it must individually and collectively prepare its defense, and that, in the absence of any general and controlled disarmament plan, there is unfortuantely no other way to avoid war than to maintain a balance between the forces confronting each other.

Psychologically also our peoples are not falling into the errors committed between the two wars. After the brutal breakdown achieved by M. Khrushchev at the Paris Conference, I am struck to see to what extent the Western World has been able to maintain its sang-froid. In the United States, I notice that, irrespective of parties, everyone agrees that one must avoid any show of weakness, any concession which, unless paid in return, would give our opponents the feeling that we are trying through appeasement to obtain peace at any price.

In other words, this spirit of submission to the totalitarian will which, from the remilitarization of the Rhineland of 1936 to the Munich Agreement of 1938, brought us directly to the Second World War seems to me to be absent today in the Western World. Everytime our rights, in any part of the world, are threatened by subversion or aggression, either at Berlin, in the Middle East, in Asia or in Africa, the Governments of the United States and of France have been the first ones to react with vigor. They believe that appeasement does not lead to peace with justice.

Such are, my friends, the shadows and the lights of the picture offered to our observation on this day of your commencement. It is a hard life, full of risks, but also a fascinating life that is open to you. Whichever career you will choose, you will have to use, so as to preserve the freedom which is so dear to all of us, not only the knowledge that you have acquired in this College, but also courage and character. As General de Gaulle said recently: "Competitive efforts are a necessity of life". It will take

much of wisdom on the part of men to avoid that these needed competitive endeavors turn into murderous conflict.

To conclude, I would like to attempt formulating the wishes which I am making so that the life which begins for you today be peaceful and so that the essential values of which our two countries have been the permanent defenders through many difficult trials, be preserved.

Above all, I believe that we must not permit totalitarian regimes to take any lead over us either in the field of modern weapons or in that of scientific achievement. This requires without doubt great financial sacrifices, a discipline which is in no way contrary to the rules of democracy and, finally, a better cooperation between all the countries sharing the same ideal. From this point of view it is right to note that, after the failure of the summit conference, the links which unite us and especially the relations between France, the United States, and Great Britain, far from being loosened, appear closer than ever. These relations must be harmonized in such a way as to avoid duplications and, as far as possible, any conflict of interests.

But if we reinforce ourselves so as to maintain a fragile balance between the two worlds, this does not mean that at the same time our policy should prove inflexible. In spite of failures, in spite of insults, in spite of temporary reverse we must constantly strive to bring the two camps closer together whatever their fundamental ideological differences. For France, this implies, as the President of the Republic stated a few days ago, three conditions:

The first one, the détente, that is to say, the practice of better international relations * * * without which catastrophic dizziness would conquer the mind."

The second condition is the search for a general and controlled disarmament preferably dealing, we feel, with the vehicles of death capable of transporting nuclear bombs and causing general destruction.

The third condition is the implementation of a common program for all the industrialized and well-endowed nations, aiming at saving underdeveloped countries from famine and misery.

My final wish is that, in all these great problems, France and the United States, friends and allies since the very birth of your great Republic, pool together their initiatives and resources—which are important—to save, whilst it is still time, the only form of civilization which makes it possible for men to live in liberty.

Song Entitled "Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, very recently in a ceremony here in the Capitol Building, Mr. Harry Shalin, a District of Columbia author and composer, received a Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge medal for his very beautiful song entitled, "Freedom." The presentation was made by Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation, and Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, the words of this excellent composition have a most meaningful and profound message for all Americans. The song serves as a very timely reminder that we must never take for granted the freedoms we enjoy in this country.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the words of Mr. Shalin's song, "Freedom," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SONG WINNING FREEDOMS FOUNDATION MEDAL—1960

(By Harry Shalin)

We sing of love and fortune
And of so many scenes,
But do we sing of Freedom
And what this great word means?
Without this thing called Freedom
Enslaved our souls would be,
We'd find ourselves unhappy
And drag on bitterly.
Ever be mindful of this:
Your soul can only know bliss
When it is righteous and free,
When it can woo liberty.
So sing the songs of Freedom
Forever in our land,
And know that joy and Freedom
Go always hand in hand.

The High Cost of Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the concern of many Ohio citizens over the proposed Federal aid to education bill has been expressed in a recent editorial appearing in the Western Hills Press, a prize-winning suburban weekly, which reaches thousands of readers in Cincinnati.

Mr. A. Huneke, the editor, points out in this editorial that in many cases the circumstances creating the school problem also provide their own built-in answer—given competent administration and understanding support at the grassroots level. The editorial affirms that in Ohio local school districts are meeting the challenge of growing school populations without recourse to Federal handouts.

I ask unanimous consent that this informative editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Advocates of Federal aid to education have a bill pending in Congress proposing appropriation of $975 million at the rate of $325 million for the next 3 years to finance new school building. This is based on the House Education and Labor Committee report indicating an annual requirement of 52,700 more classrooms for the period from 1960 through 1964.

Federal aid is justified in any area only on the premise that an essential need cannot be supplied by the local community. What is the record in this regard insofar as school building is concerned? We are told that in the past decade—without any Federal aid—the classroom additions have averaged 59,400 per year and that, since 1955, this average has been 66,900 classrooms per year.

Obviously the overall aggregate need has been met in recent years. But has the need been met in the States where it is most acute? This is a moot question which would be difficult to answer. However, it would appear that if the distribution has not been equitable, then the pending legislation is not the answer, for, under the proposed bill, 42 percent of the Federal tax money appropriated would go to only seven States. In addition to Ohio, these favored seven include New York, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and Michigan. Hardly the "neediest" States, we would say.

But to bring the problem closer to home. Western Hills school districts have not escaped the demand for additional school facilities nor have the taxpayers of these communities shirked their obligation in meeting the demand. Colerain Township may be cited as a typical example. The people of that community have generously approved eight separate bond issues aggregating over $4 million for school building, not to mention numerous tax levies for school operating purposes, since 1947.

Nor has this been an oppressive burden against which local taxpayers have rebelled. With few exceptions, they have approved each new request as it has been presented by their respective boards of education. Moreover, the soundness of the askings have been vindicated when the resulting tax rate has been substantially less than the estimated amount, indicative of conservative, knowledgeable financing based on a firsthand understanding of local needs and ability to pay. Indeed, because of increasing tax duplicate, in some cases there has been no net increase or the new tax rate has actually been less than that of previous years.

Thus on November 21, 1958, the Press headlined "Tax Rates Down in 8 of 11 Districts." The following story stated: "The tax rates announced Wednesday by the Hamilton County Budget Commission prove the exception to the rule that 'taxes never come down.' In 8 of 11 unincorporated political subdivisions in the seven western Hamilton County townships, the rates on which taxes will be collected in 1959 have declined."

Or again, as recently as December 10, 1959, the Press reported: "The largest single jump in tax duplicate in any western county political subdivision is that in the Oak Hills School District, where the duplicate is now estimated at $81,700,000. This represents an increase of almost $6 million over the $75,897,850 current valuation and is a principal factor in reducing the Oak Hills district tax rate by 46 cents from $18.44 this year to $17.98 next year (1960)."

Thus it may be seen that in many cases the circumstances creating the school problem also provide their own built-in answer—given competent administration and understanding support at the grassroots level. Yes, we know there are exceptions, but these too can be met through State aid in those States where the people are determined not to surrender another responsibility and privilege of local self-government to centralized Federal bureaucracy.

Under the Federal aid system, the people will not only lose direct control of limiting the cost of financing their schools, but may ultimately lose the right to administer them through their locally elected boards of education. The people have abdicated many of their rights and responsibilities to the feudal benevolence of a faceless Washington. When they abdicate the right and responsibility of educating their children, they will have traveled beyond the point of return on the road to Federal bureaucratic dictatorship.

The True Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Communist drive to conquer the world—by ideological as well as military, economic, and other means—creates a need for countering such a many-pronged offensive. More positively, we need to take the offensive, for example, on the ideological front. The day of passivity is gone. Unless we get out and sell the story of freedom to the undecided people, we may find that communism—holding out a carrot of material advancement while hiding the chains of spiritual and mental enslavement behind its back—will have succeeded, by such a ruse, in gaining control of many more peoples of the world.

For this reason, we need to continually reevaluate and further clarify not only our own goals and purposes but the effectiveness with which we are getting free ideas across in the to-and-fro battle of freedom versus communism.

From time to time, therefore, I always welcome the observations of individuals who see through the haze and the fog to remind us once again of our fundamental purposes.

In the June 27 issue of U.S. News & World Report, for example, David Lawrence has a most thought-provoking article entitled "The True Summit." Reminding us of fundamental—not superficial—issues, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUE SUMMIT
(By David Lawrence)

The mobs take over. Just as in Korea a few weeks ago, now in Japan their wishes prevail. Law and order vanish as passions rise and governments crumble.

Is this mob spirit spontaneous that sometimes sweeps free countries and renders them helpless?

We know that Communist agents, financed by Communist gold and trained in the art of "demonstrations," have infiltrated many Western countries, including our own.

We hear in America the voices of the partisan and the defeatist. They tell us American "planning" is at fault because the mobs forced the Japanese Government to cancel President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo. They tell us that American "prestige" is damaged because a Communist-led mob compels a weak government in Tokyo to withdraw its invitation to our President.

But can American prestige really be damaged by Communist-inspired demonstrations?

Is our prestige dependent upon Communist caprice? Is this what "peaceful coexistence" is supposed to be? Is this what the advocates of "summit" conferences—in Britain, in France and in America—have been pressing the administration to accept as the basis of our policy?

We must brush aside the campaign oratory and the phrases of the partisan critics who see American policy at fault whenever the Communists perpetrate evil. We have doubtless made some mistakes. We have tried to be friendly to Khrushchev even as he was sabotaging us in other parts of the world and stimulating a movement to endanger our relations with Cuba.

We have tried to defend ourselves militarily by sending U–2 planes to detect Soviet preparations for surprise attack. Was it wrong for us to try to deter an attack by missiles that would carry nuclear weapons?

Clearly, we shall drift from crisis to crisis unless we make up our minds that the key to it all is in the hearts and minds of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the other countries now under the domination of Communist imperialism.

We would not be worrying today over another world war if free governments were in control at Moscow and Peiping. Autocratic governments are nothing new in the world. They have disturbed the peace of mankind again and again.

President Woodrow Wilson taught us that it is not the people of a country but their autocratic government which becomes our enemy and makes the world unsafe for democratic institutions.

How do we get rid of autocratic governments? Only by military force, which, of course, means war? Surely the world can find a better answer. Humanity is certainly more resourceful now than ever before, especially since ways of communicating from people to people have been improved through scientific inventions and technological advances.

There is, of course, a valid approach through counterpropaganda—telling the story of freedom's cause by radio and otherwise. But there is an even more powerful influence which has never been fully exerted. It is the influence of the spirit of man himself. Jesus said: "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Many of our clergymen and national church organizations, unfortunately, are so preoccupied with political and economic controversy on the domestic front that they have missed their opportunity to mobilize throughout the world the spiritual power of our Nation and of other nations. Must laymen head up the new crusade?

It matters little from which source comes the inspiration of men and women everywhere to seek God's guidance in these hours of crisis.

How shall we convey to the people behind the Iron Curtain that we have for them the love that Jesus proclaimed as the true basis for human relationships?

It is not that we should strive to persuade others to adopt our system of Government or our forms of worship. But we must try to meet the peoples of the Soviet Union at the altar of spiritual brotherhood.

We cannot undertake such a mission by proclaiming superior virtue—or by any "holier than thou" attitude. On the contrary, confession is good for the soul. As we concede our errors, we must try to extend the hand of sincere fellowship to those peoples who may wish to reveal their feelings to us. For it is under freedom rather than tyranny that the spirit of God can emancipate hundreds of millions of human beings who are the victims of totalitarianism.

We have worldly goods to share with our brethren. We can make unlimited sacrifices to gain world peace. For there is no crime like that of war in its massacre of the innocent.

We must reach out for God's guidance and seek the fellowship of the peoples of all countries as we turn to Him who presides over the destinies of all of us at the true summit.

Growth of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today we hear a great deal about "growthmanship," in regard to the growth of our economy.

The Wall Street Journal has pointed out in a very cogent way the dangers which will exist to our economy if the views of those who believe that the Federal Government has a direct and overbearing responsibility for this growth prevail.

On Monday, the Wall Street Journal published an article entitled "The Deadly Growth"; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE DEADLY GROWTH

We have lately been in the garden putting fertilizer on our shrubs and poison on our weeds. The fertilizer feeds a growth that's slow and sturdy. And, curiously, our weed spray kills by also stimulating growth. It makes the plants grow so fast they burn themselves out—and die.

So when the politicians start talking about the Nation's economy and how they are going to make it grow we are prone to ask: What kind of growth? The drugged and overstimulated kind? Or a growth that puts down roots deep and solid?

For a good many political candidates these days, ranging from Adlai Stevenson to Governor Rockefeller, tell us our economy isn't growing fast enough. They lament the fact that our growth rate is "only" about 3 percent a year while the Russian economy, depending on what statistics are used, is expanding at the rate of some 7 percent or 8 percent. And then they declare that we "must" expand faster or woe betide us in the race with the Communists.

Now there are a number of phony things about this argument. For one, percentage figures are meaningless without taking into account the base from which each is figured; and the base of the U.S. economy is many times that of Soviet Russia. For another, the argument suggests that Russia is already "closing the gap" with the United States. Yet as Vice President NIXON pointed out recently, 20 years ago Soviet production was about 45 percent of U.S. production—and today it is still only about 45 percent of ours.

But quite aside from the fallacies in measuring the relative growth of the United States and Russia, there is another disturbing thing about this argument. It assumes that growth, any kind of growth, is an absolute good, and then goes on to conclude that therefore anything that stimulates growth is good.

Mr. Stevenson has mentioned 5 percent as the necessary growth rate; Mr. Rockefeller talks of 6 percent; others have their own figures, mysteriously arrived at. But all those of this persuasion are united in insisting that the Government must do something to force the rate higher. And common to the prescription of each is more spending in the Government sector, more direction by the Government of spending in

the private sector. All to the feeding of the great god Growth.

Of course, stimulating growth temporarily is no great trick. The Government can multiply farm production by simply lifting its price supports. It can enlarge our oil production by squeezing tighter the controls against oil imports. It can stimulate the housing industry by easier money for mortgages. It can make many an industry boom by just pouring out enough paper money for roads, hospitals, schools, dams, power projects, or whatever captures the planners' fancy. In short, with sufficient doses of inflation it can give the whole American economy the exhiliration of frenetic activity.

But so far among the political candidates, Vice President NIXON alone seems to have given any thought to "what kind" of growth this would be. He too wants more growth and he does not reject Government activity to encourage it. But he spurns the idea of growth for growth's sake only.

"The growthmanship school," he observed, "argues that the Government should plan and manipulate the economy to arrive at an arbitrary, fixed percentage rate of growth. * * * They believe that Government spending regardless of its purpose spells growth and, therefore, is good in and of itself."

But the lesson of nature is that growth is not automatically good, in and of itself. And the lesson of history is that inflationary spending will, in Mr. NIXON's phrase, "wreck the economy, not expand it, because true growth is based on sound money, not phony money."

America will grow, we need have no fear of that. But we had best remember that growth is good only when its roots are deep and lasting. And never forget that a drugged growth can be deadly.

Cotton Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the U.S. Tariff Commission yesterday in holding that imports of cotton goods were not rendering or tending to render ineffective or materially interfering with the Department of Agriculture's programs is incredible. It establishes that the Commission refuses to recognize the clear intent of Congress as stated under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and that Congress must act if we are to protect our economy against this rising tide of imports.

In 1956 I proposed legislation which had for its purpose limiting the quantity of manufactured cotton products within any tariff schedule which may be imported annually into the United States to a figure not to exceed 150 percent of the average annual quantity of such manufactured cotton products imported during the 2-year period then established as 1953 and 1954. Action was not taken on this legislation, although hearings were held, because it was argued by some that other actions—in some cases voluntary on the part of importers—would solve this problem.

It is evident that voluntary actions will not remedy this situation and that we cannot count on the Tariff Commission to protect our cotton growers and our cotton industry. Legislative correction is needed.

To further illustrate the scope of this danger to our cotton economy, I wish to include with this statement data compiled by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute:

On June 29, 1959, the National Cotton Council filed a petition with the Secretary of Agriculture for relief from cotton textile imports under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Two days less than 1 full year later, the cotton industry received the Tariff Commission's reply to the request for relief.

Here is what happened meanwhile:

Imports of—	Units of quantity	Annual rates	
		A year ago	Now
		Million	*Million*
Cotton cloth	Square yards.	164	497
Cotton yarn	Pounds	1	15
All textile manufactures.	Dollars	800	1,000

UPSURGE IN TEXTILE IMPORTS CONTINUES

A large volume of foreign-made cotton textile products is continuing to move into U.S. markets. These low-wage textile products include cotton yarns, unfinished cloth, and many varieties or types of garments.

Sharp increases in U.S. imports of cotton textiles have occurred since drastic reductions in U.S. textile import duties were made in 1955 during negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

In 1959 these imports reached new highs. Now we find these low-wage textile products are being shipped in from many countries which heretofore were not important factors in world textile markets. In addition to the traditional Japanese and European competition, U.S. textile mills now face an everwidening circle of low-wage competitors based in Hong Kong, India, Korea, Pakistan, and Formosa, as well as other countries which are developing textile manufacturing capacity.

The basic facts which portray the sharply increasing trends in cotton textile imports are reported in world trade statistics by the U.S. Department of Commerce. These historical trends of cotton yarn, cotton cloth, wearing apparel, and other miscellaneous textile manufactures are depicted in the attached tables and charts.

COTTON YARN

Cotton yarn imports have shown a precipitous increase since 1957. In 1958 U.S. imports of cotton yarn reached 835,000 pounds, the highest level since the Korean war years of 1950–51. However, in 1959 cotton yarn imports again increased sharply to a total of 1.4 million pounds, an increase of 65 percent. The latest Government reports covering the January–April period in 1960 indicate a 5.5-million-pound import level, or an annual rate for 1960 of about 15 million pounds of foreign-made cotton yarns.

These foreign-made yarns are coming from Brazil, the Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Egypt, and Israel. The latest trade reports indicate that shipments of these yarns are currently continuing at high levels.

COTTON CLOTH

U.S. mills are confronted with a sharply increased import level of low-wage cotton cloth from foreign countries. The rising trend in cotton cloth imports is much like that in cotton yarn. From a level of about 73 million square yards in 1954, cotton cloth imports rose to 133 million in 1955, and to 168 million in 1956. They eased to 122 million square yards in 1957 with the imposition of the Japanese voluntary quota arrangement, but increased to more than 141 million square yards in 1958 as other countries began to capitalize on the U.S. market. An explosive jump to 241 million square yards in 1959 represented a 70 percent increase over the 1958 import level. If the first quarter of 1960 import rates are continued throughout the year, U.S. mills stand to lose almost one-half billion yards of production of unfinished cotton cloth alone to low-wage foreign countries. There appears to be no lessening in the buildup of textile manufacturing capacity around the world. Neither is there any cessation of the steady erosion of traditional U.S. domestic and export markets by textile manufactures produced under conditions below wage standards required by law in the United States.

APPAREL

Textile end products, such as apparel, are now being shipped into the United States in ever-increasing quantities from the low-wage countries.

This is a logical development in view of the low-cost advantages growing out of the differential in wage and working condition standards between the United States and foreign countries. The advantage gained from the production of yarn and cloth in low-wage countries is multiplied when it is finished and manufactured into end products. Additionally, their competitive edge is sharpened further by the raw material cost factor. Foreign manufacturers buy cotton, including U.S. growths, at prices about 25 percent below those U.S. mills must pay.

From a level of $47 million in 1954, U.S. apparel imports more than doubled in 1956 to $107 million. They continued to rise to $124 million in 1958, and increased sharply to $190 million in 1959.

The same incessant upward trend is indicated for 1960, and a careful appraisal of factors involved points toward the continuation of this trend in the years ahead.

For example, cotton shirt imports of 511,000 dozen in the first 4 months of 1959 compared to imports of 565,000 dozen through April of 1960. In 1953 these shirt imports were only 11,000 dozen. In 1954 they had risen to 211,000 dozen; and by 1956 they had increased to 1.2 million dozen. Cotton shirt imports in 1959 totaled 2.2 million dozen, which represented a rapid rate of increase.

Other examples of these trends are seen in the rise of cotton sport shirts from 1.3 million dozen in 1953 to 1.9 million dozen in 1959. Cotton trousers imports jumped from 1.8 million dozen in 1958 to 3.3 million dozen in 1959. Imports of cotton blouses and shorts sets doubled in the same period to reach nearly 1 million dozen sets.

TEXTILE MANUFACTURES

A significant change has occurred in the overall textile trade between the United States and the rest of the world. In 1947 U.S. textile exporters found a world market for $1.4 billion worth of textile manufactures while imports amounted to only about one-fourth of this volume. This net textile export balance diminished until by 1955 U.S. imports of textile manufactures of $585 million had grown to 95 percent of our $615 million export trade. By 1958 a net textile import balance was firmly established. U.S. imports of textile manufactures totaled $837 million in 1959 in contrast to exports of only $634 million. And the latest available statistical measurements of world trade in textile manufactures in 1960 indicate that these trends are continuing. Imports of textile manufactures are currently running at more than 140 percent of our export trade.

MANMADE FIBER FABRICS

Following the Korean war, U.S. imports of manmade fiber fabrics ran at more than 1 million pounds in 1953 and 1954. A steady rise in imports to more than 3 million pounds in 1957 was followed by a further increase to nearly 5 million pounds in 1958. In 1959, U.S. imports of manmade fiber fabrics shot upward at a heretofore unprecedented rate. Imports of these fabrics totaled 11 million pounds in 1959. This was more than double the 1958 level.

GATT

Currently the Government has included a number of textile items on its list of products to be considered for possible U.S. concessions in the next negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Notably the list includes such cotton items as yarns, knit goods, hosiery, underwear, quilts and bedspreads and such synthetic or manmade fiber items as yarns, knit fabrics, and all kinds of apparel.

Naturally, the industry is planning to appear before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information in an effort to have textile items removed from the GATT list. Our position is that present tariff rates have failed to stem the flow of imports and there is no need to reduce them further for the purpose of stimulating world trade in textiles.

U.S. exports and imports of textile manufactures

The United States has changed from a net exporter to a net importer of textile manufactures since 1958. The excess of imports over exports has steadily increased from 6 percent in 1958 to an estimated 43 percent in 1960.

[Millions of dollars]

Year	Exports	Imports	Imports as a percentage of exports
1947	1,389	366	26
1948	848	497	59
1949	657	335	51
1950	517	451	87
1951	819	539	66
1952	660	513	78
1953	640	464	72
1954	621	440	71
1955	615	585	95
1956	629	648	103
1957	667	635	95
1958	663	637	106
1959	634	837	132
1960	[1] 700	[1] 1,000	[1] 143

[1] Estimated annual rate based on 1st quarter totals.

Source: Compiled by ACMI Economic Information Division from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

U.S. imports of selected textile products

Imports of cotton cloth in the first quarter indicate an annual rate for 1960 that is almost double the record high of 1959. Cotton yarn imports in 1960 are at an annual rate of 11 times the 1959 total.

Year	Cotton yarn (thousands of pounds)	Cotton cloth (thousands of square yards)
1947	783	15,969
1948	916	31,764
1949	262	19,743
1950	1,211	47,799
1951	1,457	45,779
1952	259	36,337
1953	198	64,300
1954	236	74,456
1955	142	133,252
1956	184	188,248
1957	161	122,496
1958	835	141,540
1959	1,381	240,765
1960	[1] 15,188	[1] 479,496

[1] Estimated annual rate based on first quarter totals.

Source: Compiled by ACMI Economic Information Division from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

Apparel imports

Apparel imports have risen sharply since 1954, doubling by 1956.

They increased more than 70 percent from 1957 to 1959.

	Amount (in millions)
1948	$24.1
1949	21.1
1950	28.5
1951	38.5
1952	39.0
1953	45.3
1954	47.0
1955	76.4
1956	106.8
1957	109.0
1958	123.7
1959	190.0
1960	[1]186.0

[1] Estimated annual rate based on 1st quarter totals.

Source: Compiled by ACMI Economic Information Division from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

Opportunities for Women in the Legal and Judicial Field—Address by Hon. Florence E. Allen, Senior U.S. Circuit Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, at the recent national awards banquet of the General Federation of Women's Clubs on June 13, 1960, Judge Florence E. Allen, senior U.S. circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, delivered an outstanding address which I feel is worthy of the study and attention of every Member of Congress.

Because of the importance of this address by one of the greatest women in the history of our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN THE LEGAL AND JUDICIAL FIELD

The subject assigned to me presents a wealth of possibilities. When I began to practice law in 1914 few women lawyers in the country went into court; now the entire field of professional activity has opened to the woman lawyer. Also the grant of suffrage to women opened the door to public office as in no other profession. Immediately after the vote was secured women who had been doing not only the leg work but the brain work of many and important public office, particularly in the counties, could and did become the head of the office, the clerk, the recorder.

Women today fill countless positions in the executive branches of Government, State and National. A woman has been a member of the Cabinet of the United States. Women have served with credit to themselves and to all women on municipal councils, State legislatures, and in the Congress of the United States, including our distinguished Senator SMITH of the U.S. Senate sitting here tonight. Women have won their spurs in representing the United States as ministers and ambassadors. Not all of these women were lawyers, but many of them were, and the nonlawyers possessed high governmental qualifications. Women judges have sat, not only in juvenile courts, but in courts of extensive municipal and county jurisdiction, in a State court of last resort, in various Federal courts, the Tax Court, the Customs Court, the district court, and the U.S. Court of Appeals.

It is important and proper that women who have legal training and are otherwise qualified should have opportunities for careers which put to the best use their education and experience. But I shall speak tonight of the broader opportunity which faces women lawyers and judges today. This is a time when we have to raise our sights and reappraise opportunities all along the line. In the present world crisis it is hardly fitting to satisfy ourselves with the fact that women today may enter lucrative employments in one of the time-honored professions. As we consider national and international situations we realize that the woman lawyer is needed by America and by the world as never before.

She is needed by the country for her training enables her to join with men in teaching citizens and particularly the youth coming on, the meaning of the Constitution of the United States. When our forefathers declared in the Preamble (the first written statement in history as to the purpose of erecting a government), that the United States was being founded "to establish justice" and "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," they were not using idle words. They were using words that Americans must understand. Justice is not, as certain people believe, a system under which they get what they want. Justice is a system under which they get the thing that they are entitled to have and others are entitled to receive the same. Liberty does not mean the license to commit cruel murder "for kicks"; liberty means that you and I live unregimented, unrepressed, unbrainwashed, with freedom to choose our calling or profession, to choose our place of living, to choose our friends, with the right to develop ourselves just as plants grow in the sun. Some Americans have forgotten these simple but basic truths. The lawyer is needed to help call Americans back to the fundamentals, both through his own integrity and idealism and by his teaching. And what does this situation open up for the woman lawyer? It opens up a mighty privilege and opportunity. We should accept this challenge with eagerness and courage because of the widespread movement in the world to attack the ethical basis of law. The extent of this challenge is not realized.

Those of us in the free countries who have devoted ourselves to the profession of law inherit glorious traditions upheld by principles which lie at the very base of civilization. Nothing so marks off the man from the beast; nothing so demonstrates the divine element in humanity as the desire for justice found in ancient peoples, in remote tribes and in civilized countries of the world. It has been voiced by prophets, legislators, and judges for many centuries. "What doth the Lord require of thee?" said Micah. "He hath shown thee, Oh man, what is good and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." This desire for justice demonstrates the ethical basis of law. Why did the Ten Commandants declare: "Thou shalt not kill." Because it is wrong to violate the rights of others. As Andrew Jackson, one of our Presidents who was also a judge, used to charge his juries, "Do right between these parties. This is what the law always means."

I shall not attempt to recapitulate the basic ways in which the law has aided in es-

tablishing justice and freedom. It is not too much to say that, while freedom from invasion could be established by repelling invaders, freedom and justice for the individual could not possibly be secured without the enactment of law defining individual rights and obligations. Since the time of Hammurabi and since the bringing of the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai, civilization has realized that there must be law in order to protect the rights of individuals, the family, and the community. Certain basic principles have developed. One of them is that we shall secure justice more completely under a rule of law than under a rule of men. Another is that individuals shall be equal before the law. Most important of all, the law in its gradual development has always expressed an ethical purpose.

All of this has been a slow growth through the centuries but, as historians counted the gain, they rightly felt that tremendous advances had been made. And then, all at once, freedom and justice were destroyed before our eyes, first by Hitler and the Nazis and then by communism. We saw the horrors not only of war, but also of the gas chambers, of slaughter of groups like the Polish officers at Katyn. Not only has life been ruthlessly destroyed but human rights have been utterly disregarded through the concentration camp and the hideous system of forced labor. Countless millions throughout the world live in terror because of "thought control" imposed by despotic governments. The little Chinese tailor who casually remarked that "the cloth was not so good as formerly" is subject to a charge of wrong thinking, of being deviationist and antirevolutionary. And this is a charge carrying a sentence of forced labor or even death. We know now the cruelties of the denunciation process in which men and women supplied with printed forms for the purpose are urged, under heavy penalty of refusal, to accuse their friends, their neighbors, their fathers, their mothers, their wives, their husbands, their children. Through vast areas of the world freedom and justice have been destroyed, and why? Because Stalin spoke, the Politboro spoke, and Mao Tse-tung speaks, and that is the law. Today in vast and powerful countries we have the rule of men, not of law, and so in these countries freedom and justice are abolished.

In Soviet Russia, Vyshinsky and Undrevich, in their book on Soviet law attack the idea of penologists who "hold the view that the purpose of a court is to apply the law and to apply it uniformly to all classes of society." They thus ring the death knell for equality before the law. To hold such a view, according to Vyshinsky, is to "ignore the task of stamping out our class enemies" and "to emasculate the class content of judicial practice." As Vyshinsky states: "The law of the Soviet regime is a political directive and a judge's work is not to apply the law according to the requirements of burgeois legal logic, but to execute the law unwaveringly as an expression of the policy of the party and the government." In a later passage it is explained that "the Soviet State openly repudiates the political independence of judges * * *. We openly require our judges to carry out the policy of the proletarian dictatorship * * *." Thus openly is abandoned the principle of justice applicable to all persons, even against the state itself. Written constitutions purport to establish freedom of speech, of public meeting, of the press, of association, etc.: but the laws as interpreted set aside these constitutional declarations. This is in accord with Soviet law, for, as declared by the Law Institute of the Academy of Science in Moscow, a party directive has the force of law. This explains why in Russia, the government is so willing to ratify treaties. It is bound only by the directive of the party. If the directive conflicts with the constitution, or with the treaty, or with any express law, the directive of the party controls.

I am aware that in certain directions Russia has relaxed the rule of terror and the abuses of the secret police. But eminent political scientists recognize that this rule as to judges still is in force.

In these days then, when we see the ethical basis of law attacked, when we see government of men, not of laws, government which openly repudiates the equality of men before the law, their right to personal freedom, their right to work at whatever calling they choose, when, in a word, the principles of justice are discarded in powerful countries, we as lawyers, face a specific challenge. It is not enough for us to enjoy employment in a luctrative, learned, and honorable profession. It is not enough to practice law ethically. We have to help teach the coming race the ethical basis of law. We have to fight as lawyers against the movement to abolish the conception of right and justice which lie at the basis of civilization.

The Constitution of the United States, a landmark in organized law, was not only written by lawyers but its purpose and meaning were explained by lawyers. Never before in history had such a pamphlet been issued to the world as the Federalist. Never before has such a legal classic been written at the founding of a government. The very reason it was written was that lawyers recognized their obligation in this crisis to teach and lead the people. Hamilton, Madison, and John Jay in eloquence as simple as it was profound, explained the various proposals of the Constitution and their significance in the building of that Union so essential to the maintenance of peace and freedom. In these distinguished essays they won the support, not only of Washington and Jefferson but of the man in the street. It is not too much to say that, if the Federalist had not been written, if Hamilton had not explained the Constitution to New York, and if Madison had not performed a similar service in Virginia, the Constitution would not have been adopted.

Exactly the same public service is demanded of lawyers and of laymen today. Unless we inspire the coming race with a conception of the ethical basis of law, the precious freedom built up through the centuries will inevitably be destroyed. The ethical basis of law implemented in the free countries is the real defense against communism. And to the protection of this ethical system of law every member of the bar, and every true American, is called. This is today at once our challenge and our mighty opportunity.

The Great White Fleet—A Step Forward Toward World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recent tragic disasters in Chile and other manifestations of nature's wrath around the world have served to focus attention once more on the proposal to establish a Great White Fleet. A vehicle for the creation of this great humanitarian armada is Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, which I am proud to be one of the cosponsors.

In my view, this mercy fleet could carry to the corners of the world a message of America as it really is today—dedicated to helping people everywhere to build healthier, happier lives. It is my hope that the recent tragedies in Chile and elsewhere, regrettable as they are, will help speed progress on this proposal which can mean so much in the cause of world peace and understanding.

The man who first suggested the Great White Fleet, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, recently delivered an interesting address on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE FLEET

(By Comdr. Frank A. Manson, U.S. Navy, before the London International Chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association, London, England, May 17, 1960)

I am fully conscious of the honor it is to address this distinguished group of Anglo-American executives and their guests. It is with pleasure and humility that I discuss the White Fleet, a topic close to my conscience, and the one which you chose for me.

This being my first public statement on the White Fleet since Life published the original proposal last July, I feel particularly rewarded to exchange views with a group of transportation authorities. Economic transportation is one of the keys to the success of the White Fleet, the economic transportation of one nation's strength to another nation's weakness.

Undoubtedly many of you have not heard of the White Fleet until this moment. Therefore, I think I should begin by briefly describing what it is. Since this is an Anglo-American audience I should also say at the outset that the White Fleet idea was first presented to the people of the United States. Some people have asked why I did not take the original proposition to something like NATO, SEATO, or to the United Nations and call for the creation of a worldwide White Fleet. I did not have sufficient data from countries, other than my own, to conclude that this would be a feasible proposition. I had no inkling how such a thing would be received and furthermore, I felt it was prudent to see what my fellow citizens thought of it before I presented it elsewhere. Although I felt in my heart that American reaction would be favorable I had no way of knowing for sure. Nor did I know what the reaction would be in newly developing countries. So much currently is facing humanity. Essentially the White Fleet is a new instrument for harnessing America's strength potential into her mothball fleets to help make the benefit of civilization available to the newly developing countries.

In view of such programs as the Marshall plan and point 4, which to my mind symbolize the real care of U.S. thinking, I did not consider that the White Fleet represented a radical departure from past U.S. efforts.

A White Fleet of mercy ships is something tangible. It is something that people, regardless of their education or station in life, can see and comprehend. Its only motives are humanitarian and these motives are easy to understand. They are difficult to distort, and this, I feel, will be of increasing importance as we move into the sixties.

The exact composition of the White Fleet will vary depending on the mission. Its overall capability will include ships designed to render assistance in such fields as elementary education, agriculture, nutrition, medicine, various types of engineering specialties, electrical power and research and these are by

no means all. The ships will be combat loaded to fight the many human problems which beset newly developing countries. The long-range missions is to help people who want to help themselves and become self-supporting.

The real purpose of the White Fleet is to render technical assistance in areas of continuing need. Additionally the White Fleet should prove helpful in times of disaster and crisis such as those brought about by floods, earthquakes, and storms. While dramatic, I do not envision that the disaster capability of the While Fleet will provide its most important function. In the first place, the U.S. Navy, which is now deployed worldwide, has demonstrated time and again that it can render emergency assistance within a matter of hours to virtually any spot in the world. This type of emergency service is already in being and would hardly provide the best utilization of the White Fleet. In some instances, such as Agadir, the Navy might call for the assistance of the White Fleet after it has handled the most urgent part of the situation.

Many people have asked me whether a White Fleet would have been useful at Agadir in view of the tremendous emergency support rendered by the military and civilian personnel of many Western countries. I went to Agadir in connection with my official Navy duties and frankly I don't see how the rescue operations during those first few hours or first few days could have been greatly improved. The French Navy, with a base at Agadir, began rescue operations within a matter of hours as did the U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force. Soon the military and civilian forces of other nations were sending various types of assistance. We sent out a call for clothing and food from our Naval headquarters in London and the response was so overwhelming and the tonnage so great that a ship had to be sent from Norfolk to make the final delivery.

But the military forces could only stay in Agadir during the most agonizing part of the emergency. They all had their jobs to do and they had to return to their assigned military duties. A French doctor at Agadir who knew of the concept said the White Fleet would have proved most useful after the military forces had completed the dramatic rescue operations.

The situation today in Agadir appears most appropriate for a White Fleet operation. The city is in shambles, about 90 percent destroyed; it is without electric power or a water system. Most of the survivors are living in tents—24 canvas cots to a tent. Many of the people still walk half dazed about the countryside. There are no schools. The medical clinics and maternity wards are nothing more than canvas cots on the bare earth. The people are in need of a continuing supply of the basic necessities until they can get themselves organized once again. The city of Agadir is in need of technical assistance—and this will be so for some time to come. In fact there is virtually no White Fleet capability envisaged which could not be utilized in Agadir because virtually everything was lost. But Agadir is only one part of Morocco where the White Fleet could serve a worthwhile purpose.

I use Agadir as an example because public attention has been recently directed there. There are literally hundreds of situations in Africa, Asia, and South America that lend themselves to a White Fleet solution.

Now a few words about the future of the White Fleet. The idea continues to grow in the United States and throughout the Western World. Only recently I received a letter from a friend in Africa enclosing a clipping of a ship recently acquired by the Indonesian Government to fight against yaws. It is a floating dispensary and its only mission is to examine the population for yaws and treat all the cases which it finds. This is very heartening to know that such a ship is now in existence. A few weeks ago a poultry processing group in the United Kingdom contacted me regarding the feasibility of installing some sort of a poultry processing unit in the White Fleet. They said they thought it would be possible and effective. Then only a few days ago I received a letter from a manufacturer here in London and I quote from his letter. "I have reread the Life article on the White Fleet and am more than ever assured of the importance of this concept of aid to stricken areas. I can say on behalf of my company that we pledge what support we can give to you and the American organizers of this effort. * * * While the material support we can give will necessarily be small compared to the vastness of the enterprise—it could be important. Our Dexion material is a fundamental basis for building almost anything." I had never heard of Dexion material until I received this letter. I have subsequently investigated the material and discovered they can build anything from a school desk to a medical clinic. Actually it is what I call a man-sized erector set and it is such a marvelous idea that I am surprised it was not thought of years ago. In any event, I am delighted with this generous offer and am forwarding it to the White Fleet sponsors in the United States.

The first ship to sail from the United States will be the SS *Hope*, as the sponsors of the White Fleet and those responsible for Project Hope have joined forces. I am confident that this ship, whose first call is Indonesia, will emphasize the urgency of the White Fleet. I personally hope that the next White Fleet ship will be an LST, a landing ship tank. It is inexpensive to activate and operate and can gain access to most any coastal area. It can be multipurpose, carrying an assortment of capabilities and be most useful in numerous situations. Other types of amphibious ships and merchant hulls should be considered for the White Fleet. Some people have suggested that the nuclear-powered merchant ship *Savannah* would make an excellent White Fleet flagship. I do not know of the plans for *Savannah* but feel that this suggestion is worth consideration.

A few people have thought that I advocated Defense Department sponsorship of the White Fleet and budgetary support from the U.S. Navy. I have never entertained this thought nor would I recommend it. In fact I feel that such a policy might prove self-defeating. To organize and operate a White Fleet at the expense of military and naval preparedness would be foolhardy. Our defense funds are needed to meet the very real military challenge confronting the Western World. Financial support should come from civilian sources.

As to the long-range implications of the White Fleet, I am reminded of the recent talk with one of England's most gracious and talented people. As we walked about his estate looking at the beautiful gardens and trees he said that the White Fleet had brought to mind three people he knew who had planted gardens. One man had planted his garden studiously, with the careful planning of an industrious banker. He walked the grounds many times before he spotted the first plant. When he had finished his planting his garden was beautiful, it was professional, but it had required a rather long period to complete the project. The second man had planted his garden with a reckless abandon of a Johnny Appleseed. While there was no particular design or discernible pattern to his work he had utterly blanketed his estate in beautiful flowers. The third man that he knew lived near the Scottish border. He had planted no flowers at all. Instead he had torn down the old buildings and replaced them with beautiful stone structures. My friend told this man that these structures should last for a generation and the man replied, "I intend for them to last for at least three generations." "But where are your flowers?" my friend asked. The man replied that he had no flowers and he pointed to a group of small trees and stated "I planted trees instead. There is something about trees which reflect a man's faith in future generations. There is something about trees that is indestructible."

Gentlemen, I would like to close with the suggestion that what my friend said about trees also applies to the White Fleet. There is something about this plan that suggests faith in future generations and the indestructibility of ships. I have said many times that I have no illusions that the White Fleet will bring peace in one sweeping movement. Peace can only come a bit at a time, but one step forward is worthwhile and I am confident that the White Fleet is a step forward.

Africa on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 28, 29, and 30, Mrs. May Craig published three columns which were printed in various Maine newspapers.

In the first, Mrs. Craig tells of Ethiopia's rich products and customs.

In the second, she recounts an unprecedented conference with his Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia.

In the third, she describes the Republic of Sudan as a "benevolent dictatorship."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these three articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—COFFEE WAS ONE OF ETHIOPIA'S FAMOUS SPICES

(By May Craig)

ADDIS ABABA.—If you drink the best mixtures of U.S. coffee, you get Ethiopian coffee blended into it because this is the home of coffee, originating in the province of Kaffa, and was one of the famous "spices" for which ancient Ethiopia was famous. The country is rich in rivers, forests, minerals. There is power in the Blue Nile as it drops 5,500 feet through gorges sometimes 4,000 feet deep before it gets to the plain of Sudan where it meets the White Nile at Khartoum. She has fertile soil, abundant seasonal rainfall, year-round growing season. It is no wonder Mussolini tried to take Ethiopia to feed the Italians as he set up collective farms in the green hills that rim the Northern Mediterranean opposite Italy. Since history began, there have been struggles for land, food, cattle—now for minerals and oil.

The language here resembles Hebrew, Arabic, and other semitic languages, since the origin of the people is Hamitic and Semitic. The language is called Amharic, and English is the second language. When we asked our Ambassador, Don C. Bliss (Vermont, Dartmouth), whether any of his staff spoke the language, he said his wife did.

and two are learning. There is great criticism in foreign countries because we send people who do not speak the language. Mr. Bliss said this is very difficult and it was not necessary for us to speak it. But the Soviet Embassy has people who speak it. They turn out reams of literature, give away food, are busy as bees. They have one of the largest staffs. Congress is careful of our money and economizes on Africa. We have given probably $100 million in credits to Ethiopia, in all, but we must have "projects" approved in advance and account to Congress for it. The Communists can say: "What do you want? We'll give it to you on easy terms." The Soviets do not always produce as promised, their work is often shoddy, and the recipients usually find strings attached when it is too late. But this takes time, and time is running out.

The Ethiopian calendar is not like ours, but like the Jewish. It starts the year in September and is about 7 years and 8 months behind our calendar. It is divided into 12 months of 30 days each and 1 month of 5 days. The country is near the Equator so day and night are the same length and sunrise is the same time the year round. The 24-hour day is divided into sunrise and sunset instead of midnight and midday as we do.

Going back to our too-little assistance here—the U.S. Information Service is so skimped that they could not keep the American-trained librarian and now have an Ethiopian who is well-educated. But it would be better to have an American to greet and help the crowds of Ethiopians who come.

We are back to brushing our teeth with bottled mineral water and there is nothing more loathesome than toothpaste and mineral water—it foams in your mouth. "Don't take a drop of the tap water in your mouth," our resident American friends warned. "Don't eat anything raw." Bananas you peel yourself—holding it in the skin stripped to the bottom as you eat. Peel oranges or apples, open your own eggs. I am wrapped in the magic protection of my immunization shots and the array of antimalaria, antidysentery pills that I brought with me. No mosquitoes here but I spray the bedroom with repellant just to discourage anything else that might come around, including the small black ants that have eaten a hole through the wooden frame of the window. This is a romantic-looking hotel, suitable to the country, set in lovely gardens, with huge roses in bloom, but it is not what Americans call comfortable. They never put enough lights in the halls anywhere in the world as we do in America, and it is an engineering feat to find the keyhole.

But everybody is so kind and obliging, they do everything to make us happy. There are Ethiopian helpers on every floor, only the bells often do not ring. The lights often fail, so we all have candles and matches in the room. In Nairobi when I went to dinner with one of the consulate people whom I have known round the world, not only the lights went out but the electric stove, too, so dinner was 3 hours late. But from my window I can see the distant mountains, the air is cool, the flowers are gorgeous, and I am steeped in thinking of the great ancient history of this country and these people. Americans are so young. Minor annoyances—my navy blue shoes are now polished black; toast is cold and hard.

Jouncing along good, then dusty roads a hundred miles to enormous sugarcane plantation and mill, run by efficient Dutch who built up in Indonesia and were thrown out with nothing, starting again here. If the monarchy should fail, despite the solid power of the present Emperor, or the Communists get it eventually, these Dutch will be out again, as are so many in Cuba, Congo, Guineau, and other African nations.

Africa on the Move—A Truly Royal Man Holds an Unprecedented Conference

(By May Craig)

Addis Ababa.—This day I have seen a truly royal man—His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia, the oldest continuing kingdom in the world. Not only does he have great dignity, there are lines of care in his face, of the responsibility of an absolute monarch, a country torn by shifting tides of change in the world, especially in Africa on the move. The Italians took Ethiopia in World War II, part of the Italian and German war to win the world, and he was in exile. His people are devoted to him now, especially because they are deeply religious and he is the religious head of faith too. Billy Graham was here a few days and was well received and made some converts. There are all religions, though the major religion is Coptic Christianity. There is a new Seventh-day Adventist Church building; the American YMCA and YWCA are active—though the women, not veiled, are beasts of burden in rural areas and unconscious of the freedom they might have.

We have a stake here, and all the free world. Pushed out of Northern Africa, British, French, Americans would like bases here in this friendly country, but it treasures its independence and stands with "the movement for the liberation of all African peoples," His Majesty told us at an unprecedented press conference. Never before, has he given so long an audience, nor answered questions from journalists. The questions were restricted to six, the general tenor of which was given to his officials a few hours before the press conference, but we selected what we wanted to ask, and ranged over recognition of Red China, her membership in the U.N., whether she should have the China seat in U.N.; possible acceptance of Soviet assistance; possible war with Somali over borders; economic situation here, along with education, etc.

His answers, given through an interpreter, though he speaks English somewhat (French fluently) were not definitive. To the Communist China question, for instance, asked by your correspondent, he said he hoped the great powers at the coming summit meeting would reach some agreement on membership of Communist China in U.N. and recognition of the plain fact that it is a great, populous nation. He did not say whether or not he intends immediate recognition but implied it by saying it is not a question at the moment. A long talk with his foreign minister, who has been Ambassador to the United States, brought out hopes that the two Chinas might reach some conciliation, perhaps there might be two Chinas in the U.N. as members, but with neither necessarily occupying a permanent seat in the Security Council.

Our reception by the Emperor was formal and magnificent. Before we went in we went to see 30 royal lions in cages, with many cubs of various ages. They were truly wonderful, some grizzled with age. On the steps of the royal palace on a chain, with two keepers, was a lion, and we had our pictures taken with him; some of us, not me, even touched him, despite warnings of the keepers. We waited two by two in a great hall, thick with rugs, illuminated by glittering cutglass chandeliers reflected in mirrors, with beautiful window draperies, and two large throne chairs, topped by red velvet draperies, with golden crown overall. Then we went upstairs to another great hall, where there were rows of chairs for us before another less-formal throne chair. The Emperor came, straight and dignified in uniform, with rows of medals, hardly any gray in the abundant black hair and beard. He is of a pale gold color with fine high features, very thin.

One by one, we were introduced by name to the Emperor by Marcel Durlaux, our tour director, for whom this press conference was really a triumph. Then we were seated, the Emperor read a statement in his own language, which was translated and we were given copies. Then the six of us chosen to ask the allowed six questions rose one by one, addressed him and spoke. I was fourth with my triple China question. He answered quite at length to each, pausing for the interpretation.

Then he rose and, with some of his ministers led us into another magnificent hall, where a collation was spread on a white linen covered table. Waiters passed trays of champagne, and the Emperor chatted informally with some of us, introduced by his Minister of Protocol. He gave me some extra time because I saw him when he visited Washington and because I am a Washington correspondent. Also he spoke of "General" and President Eisenhower who helped drive Mussolini and Hitler out of Africa.

During the day we visited the handsome university endowed by the Emperor, one of the most modern I have seen. Yeshi I. Taffesse, sister of one of the staff at the university spent 2 years studying in the United States, 1 year at Fryeburg Academy in Maine. We saw the magnificent Jubilee Palace, celebrating 25 years of the Emperor's reign; our Vice President Nixon was the first foreign honor guest to stay there. It is the official guest house. Opposite the grounds is rising African House, which will house the U.N. economic mission, African conferences—one coming in June—and U.N. or other international meetings. Incidentally, while we have no missile base here we do have a small Army base, mostly radio, for communications—very valuable.

While the African nations are friendly with Israel and receive much technical know-how from her in industry and agriculture, and wish the Nasser hostility to Israel about the Suez could be settled, they do not foresee it now. Yesterday we visited their prized Koka hydroelectric plant on the Hawash River, rising in Ethiopia and flowing into the Blue Nile, which will give needed power and irrigation water to make this arid but deep topsoil bloom like a rose. One generator is operating; the rest ready in a year and a half. The contractor is Italian. After the war, the Emperor said there should be no revenge from a Christian nation. The Italians are building the dam as reparations, with some money from the Ethiopian Government. The King owns many enterprises here. He has a monopoly on production and sale of liquor, which helps his budget. He promised a constitutional monarchy and it is now underway, but he is and will be the absolute monarch. What comes after? Who knows?

Africa on the Move—Republic of Sudan Is a "Benevolent Dictatorship"

(By May Craig)

Khartoum.—The Republic of Sudan is the largest country in Africa—a million square miles. Its first known settlements date back to 5,000 B.C. It has conquered and been conquered; it has been beaten in war, overrun, occupied. Turks, British, Egyptians had it in recent times. It is Moslem and Arab predominantly. In February 1953 an Anglo-Egyptian agreement was signed beginning a 3-year period of self-government under international supervision. In January 1954, the Sudanese Parliament held its first meeting. In 1955 all foreign troops left. In 1956 the two governments recognized the Sudanese as a fully independent sovereign state. The flags of Britain and Egypt were hauled down and the Sudanese flag went up. It is one of the few peaceful revolutions of our times.

It is now a "benevolent" military dictatorship. Its President is Ferik Ibrahim Abboud, who is also President of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces of the Republic, Prime Minister, and Minister of Defense. The people, who range from coal black to light brown are deeply patriotic.

They gave us copies of the music and words of their national anthem:

"We are the soldiers of God, soldiers of this our land; ready for any challenge; we shall never betray our call; in the face of death itself our souls are in God's hand; we count our country's glory the greatest prize of all. This is our land, so dear, whose flag flies brave and clear; oh, sons of this Sudan, this is a sign for you, to shoulder hard your tasks and do your duty true."

In a little booklet they gave us about the Sudan, it begins: "This is the story of a people, a desert and a river. Today the people are independent, the desert is fertile, and the river utilized. In Sudan the Middle East ends and Africa begins." It is this linkage of Arab-Moslem Middle East and north Africa with middle, southern, and western Africa that makes the Sudan so important to the peace of the world. They belong to the Arab League, but they want to remain a separate nation, friends with all. They are Mediterranean and they are African.

The White Nile and the Blue Nile come together here in a great confluence to form "The Nile." I sit now on the balcony of a hotel in Khartoum overlooking the Blue Nile. Our group has just come from an unprecedented press conference with the President in his long, low, large, white palace, built by the British Lord Kitchener. It fronts on the Nile Road under a double row of great trees which meet in an arch, along the Blue Nile, near the confluence. We had to submit our questions in writing the day before, and he spoke to us through an interpreter, a tall, dark, intellectual man, with the scars of tribal gashes, gained in his young manhood, on both cheeks. Several of the officials had these—as we have seen all over Africa—sign of how recently they have come into the modern world. The President did not have the scars.

We asked when there would be free elections. He replied—when current survey shows the people are ready and capable. Their long close relations with Egypt and Britain have given them many capable and educated leaders. The President is one of the few African leaders who spoke freely and cordially of their gratitude to the United States for its help in development of their country. "They are frankly neutral, they wish to be friends with East and West—they will not accept any help that is not clean and good." There are Communists here, but they are under control of this Government. We passed the Soviet, Communist China, and Yugoslav Embassies—one of the few times I have seen the Red China flag flying—red ground, one large white star with four small stars in a semicircle around it. They have not "officially" accepted aid from the Soviet. A Soviet delegation was here last year but did not offer "cash loan," the President said, and so no application has been made to the Soviet by the Sudan.

The President said that the recognition of Communist China was by a previous Parliament before he took over. However, he said, it was the manifest desire of both countries to recognize Red China and "we saw no reason to reject it." Asked if he was satisfied with American aid, he smiled and said that they are grateful, do not want to "talk figures;" need more, of course, for rapid progress but realize that "we are at the end of the camel train" in comparison to American aid to other countries.

He hopes the cold war will soon be over—"It benefits nobody." The Sudan, as most—not all—African countries, is angry about the French atomic bomb tests in the Sahara. The Sudan is near the desert, and has protested to the French Government and the United Nations, which, he said, "ignored us." They are for freedom for Algeria, completely—and the French atomic tests solidify feeling against the French.

Statement Released by the Organization, Soul of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a new departure in efforts to further understanding between citizens of this Nation and the people of the world has recently been undertaken.

The project is sponsored by a private, nonprofit educational organization—Soul of America. It utilizes tape-recorded "living letters" which it exchanges between the students of high schools in 100 American cities and similar schools abroad.

The goal of this commendable program is explained in a statement recently released by Soul of America, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORGANIZATION ANNOUNCES "LIVING LETTERS" TAPE EXCHANGE BETWEEN SCHOOLS IN 100 AMERICAN CITIES AND SCHOOLS IN OTHER NATIONS

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 3, 1960.—The Soil of America, a private nonprofit, educational organization concerned about the image of America which is projected to the rest of the world today announced sopnsorship of a plan for the exchange of tape-recorded "living letters" between high schools in 100 American cities and similar schools in other parts of the world.

Under the plan high school students in this country would "talk" their letters to their counterparts in other nations. In return students in other parts of the world would send taped replies to high schools in the United States.

Initially it is planned to established such an exchange between this country and the USSR and Latin America. The first living letter will be tape recorded this summer and will be offered to a school in Moscow under cultural exchange terms which will provide seciprocity if accepted.

The announcement was made at a meeting of the Soul of America in Washington, D.C., by Harry H. Semmes, president of the new organization. Mr. Semmes pointed out that "this is in accordance with the President's recent statement after the summit collapse when he stated that we must "* * * improve the contacts between our own and the Soviet peoples, making clear that the path of reason and commonsense is still open if the Soviets will but use it."

Mr. Semmes described the purpose of the Soul of American as being "* * * to remind Americans, particularly the youth of America, of the basic concepts on which this country was founded and belief in which stimulated the growth and character of the Nation, and to inform our countrymen of the necessity of making known to the people of this world the true beliefs upon which our freedoms are founded.

"We believe that this should be done with humbleness and modesty, but without apology, and that it should be made known that the important thing, about America is not what we have in terms of material wealth, but what we are in terms of human liberties."

In announcing the formation of the Soul of America organization, Mr. Semmes made public an exchange of letters between the organization and President Eisenhower and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

President Eisenhower in his letter to the organization stated in part:

"I am highly gratified by the concern and conviction which bring Americans together to stimulate increased awareness of America's idealism and spiritual heritage and to seek ways of imparting throughout the world a greater knowledge of America's character. This purpose is close to my heart. It underlies much of the work of the present administration, an example being the programs carried out by the various people-to-people committees. Each effort to the same end can contribute significantly to presenting the true picture of America to the world."

Senator JOHNSON in his letter stated:

"I would like to congratulate you on the concept and formation of the Soul of America. I believe that you are setting forth on a most worthwhile venture, and I think you have an opportunity to make a truly significant contribution to your country.

"In these troubled times, I am afraid that continuous talk of arms and defense tends to make us overlook what is truly important. It is this: that all of our planes, guns, and men under arms, important though they may be, are only the shield to guard what is really the heart of America—our sacred heritage of liberty."

The Filipinos Demonstrated Warm Affection for America in Their Welcome to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all followed with interest President Eisenhower's recent visit to certain Asian countries and we read with pride the warm and affectionate welcome extended to him by the people of the Philippines. According to the press it was an unprecedented reception, unprecedented in numbers—about 3 million Filipinos cheered and shouted their welcome in a tumultuous parade; unprecedented in spontaneity—Filipinos came from all over the islands by every means of transportation and at their own personal expense; unprecedented in sincerity—the crowds all but swamped the presidential car and all security arrangements were brushed aside.

It fills the American heart with pride that the Filipino people should have thus shown their loyal friendship for us. In a sector of the world where neutralism has found adherents and where recent developments have not been of an encouraging outlook for us, it is refreshing to have this Philippine token of good will and gratitude. It is good for the American people to realize that true friendship is a thing of the heart, that it cannot be imposed or bought. The Filipinos showed this in Bataan and Corregidor. This was in war. In peace,

whatever disappointments they may have had, whatever grievances they may have, whatever suspicions they may harbor, justified or not, that their friendship is being taken for granted by us, the fact is that when they had the opportunity to show to the world their esteem and affection for the American people, they showed it as nobly as they did in our darkest days during the Pacific War.

President Carlos P. Garcia, as their able and worthy spokesman, expressed it so beautifully in the following two eloquent addresses which, in the words of a distinguished American editor were "the words of a statesman and couched in flawless English that would have done honor to the prose of Woodrow Wilson."

The first one was delivered at the state dinner which the President of the Philippines and Mrs. Garcia gave in honor of President Eisenhower at Malacañang Palace:

Mr. President, in a powerful story by Ambrose Bierce, I recently read the thrilling account of a regimental line of battle awaiting the order to advance. As only Bierce's pen can describe it, the reader sees the long line, quiet, perfect in its precision, each officer and soldier at his post, each superbly disciplined, alert and ready. Then in beautiful flashbacks, the author sketches in the background, behind the lines, tumult among the supply trains, orders and counterorders, medical corpsmen and others running in all directions, in short a kind of disorderly order. The storyteller ends his story with one felicitous sentence: "The men who do not fight are never ready."

I recall this story tonight not only because our distinguished guest of honor was once a military leader but because there is a moral that I would like to draw from it.

Under this roof, Mr. President, many a great foreign dignitary had been entertained but never one with your record of service to the world. You have been the supreme commander of the most powerful army ever mustered together under one command in recorded history and you have led them as the legions of freedom to victory and to immortality. This was in war. In peace, you have been twice elected to the highest post in the gift of the American people and under your leadership, America has shown she can rise to great heights because your vision and statesmanship have summoned her to dare and to achieve.

We are engaged today in a life and death global struggle against communism. Your recent efforts to relieve world tensions and reach an agreement that can lead to peace have been unfortunately frustrated—I hope only temporarily. But deep as the impress your war record has left in history and high as your place is on the roll of your country's statesmen, posterity, Sir, will honor you more for the unrelenting struggle that you are waging for peace. Your serenity and unruffled poise in the face of abuse, your dignity and restraint, your stubborn determination to continue to reach your goal despite obstacles in your way—your life indeed has been a life of constant fight—ready to lead the world once again to victory and to peace.

If we are to win in the struggle in which we are now engaged, we must avoid in our free world disunity and disorder as depicted in Ambrose Bierce's flashbacks. The time for unity is now and the Philippines is ready to join its efforts, modest though they be, with that of like-minded nations, in concord and harmony, to fight for peace, that it may not be said of them: "The men who do not fight are never ready."

Cardinal Newman once aptly said: "Men are guided by type, not by argument; that some winning instance must be set before them or the sermon will be in vain and the doctrine will not spread."

Mr. President, you are the type and the winning instance to inspire the free world to follow and emulate.

Ladies and gentlemen: I ask you to rise and drink a toast with me to this century's indomitable fighter for peace, the President of the United States.

The second one was delivered at the dinner given by President Eisenhower at the American Embassy in Manila in honor of President and Mrs. Garcia:

Mr. President, I am grateful to you for your kind and generous words. If your visit to the Philippines, these 3 days that you have been with us, the acclaim that you have received from the vast and unprecedented multitudes wherever you have been seen, the spontaneous demonstrations from our people of their esteem and admiration for you, have given you a spiritual lift, Mr. President, you have made us very happy indeed.

The hundreds of thousands of smiling Filipino faces that were turned toward you had only one message. They saw in you the image of the American people. The nuances of international politics they care very little about. But they know that the United States is engaged in a struggle against a danger that threatens their country, too. They know America is their friend. Many of them are still alive who fought for American ideals of freedom and democracy which are also ours, in Bataan and Corregidor as did their forbears in Tirad Pass and Balintawak. In your person they saw embodied the prestige and principle of the United States. In a mass plebiscite of unprecedented popular demonstration they once more cast their vote of confidence in the United States.

You have seen a people that have risen out of the debris of war and have established a democratic government and have maintained it despite the difficulties and handicaps of postwar reconstruction. You saw Manila soon after the Second World War and you compared the devastation as second only to Warsaw. The grit and determination of our people you have seen as evidenced by the material progress of our country. Much remains to be done but we are happy that you came and saw what has been accomplished and you will return to the United States better acquainted with our needs and our problems.

Your bold venture in personal diplomacy we admire. It is in your character to dare where others would hesitate. But our harassed world needs venturesome spirits with the vision and the courage to blaze new trails to achieve the peace humanity must have if we are to survive. Our people are behind you in your purposeful undertaking and we wish you, Mr. President, godspeed.

In a few moments you will be departing from our shores. You are going forward in your adventure because in the words of President Theodore Roosevelt you are among those who do not "shrink from the hard contest, where men must win at the hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear." That is the courage and the statesmanship that is the need of today and you go, Mr. President with the hopes and the best wishes and the prayers of the Filipino people.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us drink to the health of the traveling symbol of the highest values that freemen treasure: freedom, the dignity of the human individual, and peace—the President of the United States.

In President Garcia's welcome speech to President Eisenhower, there is expressed such loyalty to American ideals of freedom and democracy that it is difficult to understand how some American newspapers in the past could have doubted even in the slightest this Filipino leader's strong and abiding friendship for the United States. Here is a true friend of our country speaking:

The Philippines and the Filipino people bid you and your distinguished party warmest welcome.

As the humble spokesman of this nation so graciously honored by your visit, I would like to give voice in the greatest measure possible to the immeasurable feeling of affection and esteem that beats so spontaneously in our hearts for you and the great American people.

I recall with a deep sense of gratitude the visit that it was my privilege to make in the United States as your guest 2 years ago. I am happy that you have honored us with this return visit and I express the hope that we can make your stay with us a treasured memory that you will always cherish in the same manner that you made my sojourn in Washington an unforgettable experience.

Here, Mr. President, is a nation that stands for all that America stands for in the way of the greatest human values—freedom, democracy, and the brotherhood of men. These are the ideals that bind your country and ours together, and with them the other nations of the world striving sincerely to win world peace with justice and honor for all.

You had been in our midst before. Indeed, at one time you lived with us, worked with us, and dreamed with us the life to which we aspire—a national aspiration that was our inspiration and article of faith during the long dark moment of the last World War. When we welcome you, therefore, at this time, we feel and we wish you to feel that it is a welcome home.

BATTLE OF BATAAN RECALLED

Welcome home, Mr. President; welcome, America, whom the Filipino people hold closest to the heart. This is an affinity forged in common principles, common ideals, and common experience in war and in peace. I need not recount again the history of this affinity, for it is already well known. The story has been told in the course of half a century, culminating in the apocalypse of Bataan and Corregidor and the apotheosis of Philippine independence following victory for the free world.

But the victory remains to be made complete. And you, Mr. President, come to our midst in the course of a continued quest for the just peace that will endure. We assure you and the great American people that you lead, as well as the free nations that have identified themselves with the great cause, that the Philippines is and will ever be a staunch friend and ally over the vicissitudes of time.

You will be long remembered by our people and other free peoples in Asia for your patient, passionate, and unrelenting quest for a permanent and just world peace in whose environment man may finally subdue such age-old adversaries as ignorance, disease, poverty, and vice and fulfill his highest dignity. We realize that sinister forces keep trying to undermine this grand effort for world peace, but we believe that in the end a gleaming white tower of world peace and brotherhood will rise sturdy and strong upon the firm foundations that America has laid under your leadership.

We in the Philippines know that there are dark clouds hovering over the world, including over our own land, because of the Communist offensive. The collapse of the summit conference in Paris has of late intensified the cold war. That you have not been disheartened or dismayed is a summons for the free world to rise to greater heights than heretofore reached. We are with you, Mr. President, as your friend and ally in the great

cause that as freemen we are pledged to defend with all our might and main in complete identification with the rest of freedom-loving and peace-loving humanity.

Around you here today, Mr. President, are the Filipino people, of whose ovation my voice is but a part. See the sincere friendship reflected in their faces. Hear them thunder welcome. And with them and us are also the representatives of the foreign community in Manila, friends too who are with us in the cause of true peace and true amity among nations.

Welcome home, Mr. President. We remember you as the Army officer who came to us way back in 1935 to help us organize our national defense. You are not a stranger to these multitudes who today are acclaiming you. You have made lasting friendships among them. We have watched with increasing pride your rise in your people's esteem as though you belonged to us also.

We look at you as the champion of everything that we cherish nearest and closest to our hearts. By this popular manifestation we hope to impart to you the message that in the Philippines, America has a peerless friend and among the Filipinos she will always find a people who are one with her in ideals.

You are at home, Mr. President, as if you were among your own. And in this spirit, let me open our doors and to you with a full heart in our national language—"Tuloy po kayo sa amin [Welcome, sir, to our home]."

Mabuhay. [Long life.]

Appropriately, President Eisenhower responded with these words:

Mr. President and my friends of the Philippine Islands:

This is indeed for me a homecoming. As I circled over your city I saw the old familiar sights of the Laguna de Bay, the Baguio mountains and the Pasig River, and finally this lovely coastline along which your city lies. Indeed, these sights aroused in me sentiments and emotions that no eloquence of mine could ever adequately express.

I worked among you for more than 4 years. I came here as an assistant to General Douglas MacArthur and only yesterday morning, of possibly—my days are getting mixed up—2 days ago, I called General MacArthur and had a conversation with him about these islands, and this section of the world that he knew so well, and he asked me to convey to you his sincere conviction—strengthened with the years—that always there will be unity between the Philippines and the United States of America. And he asked me to convey to you—Mr. President, and to your people—his warmest greetings and his best wishes for your continued welfare.

The last time that I was enabled to come to see your country was just after the conclusion of World War II. I then saw a city wrecked and living in destruction—everything torn to pieces. As I flew over the city today I saw what Philippine courage, Philippine energy, Philippine endurance, and stamina could accomplish.

Manila is as beautiful as ever it was before—and more so. All over your country the ravages of war have been repaired, by your refusal to surrender to despair or to lose faith in your own destiny.

As I looked at these familiar sights, there was one thing, of course, that was missing: So many of my old friends of the years just preceding World War II, they are gone. So many of them paid the price that freemen have been called upon to pay again and again for the defense of freedom, for the right of living as human people of dignity, to stand straight under their God, and bow the knee to no one else.

I pay tribute to those great heroes, and to all who fought with them and beside them—both American and Filipino. I hope in a symbolic way to pay my respects when I go to some of the cemeteries where they are buried.

But to you, the living, and among you are many of my old friends, I affirm again the determination of the United States to live with you as a true partner in defense of those ideals of liberty and human dignity in which we alike believe.

Between us, just as always it has been the case between members of a family, are some problems to be discussed and to be talked about and to negotiate. But the negotiation and those conferences take place in a spirit of common dedication to ideals that make us true partners. Therefore, no petty differences of any kind can ever tear apart these two great countries, which are certain together to march down the lane of the future—free, proud, prospering, and always friends.

Thank you very much.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "Triumphant Start," speaks fittingly of the Philippine reception as spectacularly successful and called it "the true voice of Asia." The editorial follows:

TRIUMPHANT START

President Eisenhower's tour of the Far East has had a spectacularly successful beginning in the Philippines. Many more than a million Filipinos lined up between the airport and the center of Manila to bid him a welcome that surpassed anything seen in the Philippines before.

This was again the familiar Eisenhower, beaming, buoyant, the personification of friendliness and sincerity. The thunderous cheers and waving banners that greeted him and hailed him as "champion of democracy" were, of course, first of all, the acclaim of a friend, an ally and a member of our own family now grown to independence. But they were more than this. They represented the true voice of Asia which, for all its longing for peace and, in some quarters, neutrality in the great conflict of our days, instinctively sees in the United States the defender of freedom and human dignity.

In this respect the Philippine welcome represented a rebuff to the propaganda campaign unleashed against the United States and President Eisenhower personally by Premier Khrushchev and Chairman Mao. It also conveyed a rebuke to the exponents of that campaign in Japan who would separate that country from other free Asian nations.

This aspect of the reception lifted the speeches exchanged between the Philippine and the American Presidents above the diplomatic courtesies usual on such occasions. It gave depth and emotional impact to President Garcia's declaration that the Philippines are and will continue to be stanch friends and allies of the United States in defending freedom and democracy. It gave importance to President Eisenhower's reciprocal pledge that no "petty differences," such as often arise between members of a family, can divide us. That the President conveyed like sentiments from General MacArthur, liberator of the Philippines, added a special touch of grace to the event.

Mr. Speaker, who is this man, the President of the Philippines, who at times has been misrepresented by a sector of our press? An Associated Press dispatch, published by the New York Herald Tribune of June 14, 1960, says:

MANILA, Tuesday, June 14.—Carlos P. Garcia, 63, President Eisenhower's host today, is a blend of tough politician and dreamy poet.

The Philippine President has never lost an election in the jungle of Philippine politics, along a path that took him from the House of Representatives to Senator, Governor, Vice President, and President.

Mr. Garcia was the Vice President of the Philippines under President Magsaysay. His favorite activity is chess. He took over after Mr. Magsaysay was killed in an airplane crash in 1957.

The President himself has never been accused of dishonesty in office. Recently, Mr. Garcia has been taking a tough line toward wrongdoing.

Mr. Garcia indorses Mr. Magsaysay's feeling of pro-Americanism, although his "Filipino first" policy has been misconstrued in some quarters as anti-American.

An incident at a private dinner for Filipinos who once studied at American universities gave a good illustration of this.

Several speakers told of the early days of American rule in the Philippines, when they were bright young men inbued with the ideal of Philippine independence. They intimated that the United States had been slow in granting it.

Mr. Garcia was annoyed at the tone of some of the speakers. He threw away his prepared speech and told his audience, which included only one American, that he had stood and watched the Filipino flag go up and the American flag come down over Manila July 4, 1946.

He said he looked around at the war-devastated city and thought the the Americans could have delayed the promised grant of independence on the ground that the country had been wrecked by the war.

"But they kept their promise, and gave us our independence when they said they would." Mr. Garcia said. Then he banged his fist on the rostrum and fairly shouted:

"That is the America I know, and love."

President Eisenhower's visit to the Philippines was really a show of confidence in the leadership of this pro-American Filipino who refused to surrender to the Japanese during the war but preferred to risk his life with the resistance movement. The joint communique of the two Presidents shows the support that President Eisenhower has pledged to give the efforts of the Garcia administration to industrialize the Philippine economy, the steps taken to foster closer friendship with the Philippines' Asian neighbors, to modernize the Philippine Army, and to defend the Philippines "automatically" in case of enemy attack.

The communique follows:

President Eisenhower, at the invitation of President Garcia, paid a state visit to the Philippines on June 14 to 16, 1960, returning the visit of President Garcia to the United States 2 years ago.

President Eisenhower recalled his personal association with the Philippines extending over a period of many years. As the first President of the United States to visit the Philippines while in office, he expressed his deep sense of satisfaction that he had been afforded this opportunity to attest to the admiration and affection which the Government and people of the United States feel toward their Philippine allies.

President Garcia, on his part, viewed the affection shown to President Eisenhower by the Filipino people as a grateful remembrance of the latter's tour of duty in the Philippines some 25 years ago and their admiration for his military leadership in the Second World War and his dedicated labors for a just and lasting world peace.

The visit afforded President Garcia and President Eisenhower, together with other officials of both governments, an opportunity for a frank and cordial exchange of views on matters of mutual interest. In a review of the international situation and of the bi-

lateral relations of the two countries, the two Presidents—

1. Reaffirmed the bonds of friendship and mutual understanding which have historically joined the Filipino and American Governments and peoples.

2. Noted the problems facing the free world at the beginning of the new decade and discussed the possibility of increased tensions in view of recent statements by Communist leaders in Moscow and Peiping. They renewed their determination to support the work of the United Nations and the objectives of the United Nations Charter in the interest of true international peace and progress based on justice and the dignity of the individual.

3. Assessed the continuing threat to peace in the Far East posed by Communist China. They reaffirmed the importance of regional co-operation in insuring the independence of the nations of Southeast Asia. They emphasized the important role of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in furthering such cooperation and in developing a sense of regional solidarity; and they noted with satisfaction the contribution being made by the Philipines toward strengthening its ties with its Asian neighbors.

STRESS CLOSE PLANNING

4. Noted that President Eisenhower's visit and the warm response thereto by the Filipino people provided renewed evidence of the strength and vitality of the alliance between the Philippines and the United States and of its essential contribution to the security of southeast Asia. To promote the continuing strength of the alliance and to enable the Philippines to discharge its obligation thereunder, they emphasized the importance of close military collaboration and planning between the appropriate authorities of their countries. They further expressed the view that this close military collaboration and planning should be aimed at the maximum effectiveness in formulating and executing United States military assistance programs and in furthering Philippine defense capability in the light of modern requirements.

5. Noted the recent meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the SEATO held in Washington and expressed satisfaction with the continuing effectiveness of the SEATO as a deterrent to Communist agreement in southeast Asia. They were also gratified that the Washington conference had given attention to the economic objectives of the SEATO, recognizing the importance of economic cooperation between and among the members.

ASSURANCE RENEWED

6. Recalled the provisions of the Mutual Defense Treaty. President Eisenhower, on his part, renewed the assurance he had made to President Garcia in Washington that under the provisions of this treaty and other defensive agreements between the Philippines and the United States and in accordance with the deployments and dispositions thereunder, any armed attack against the Philippines would involve an attack against the United States forces stationed there and against the United States and would instantly be repelled. It was noted that this understanding was included in the agreement reached between the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines and the Ambassador of the United States on October 12, 1959.

7. Noted with satisfaction the considerable progress that had been made in talks between the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines and the Ambassador of the United States toward settlement of problems arising from the presence of U.S. bases in the Philippines. They expressed confidence that the few remaining problems will be similarly resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the two governments.

8. Reemphasized the importance of strong, stable economies in furthering the objectives of peaceful development in the free world. President Eisenhower expressed his gratification at the evident progress which has been made in the Philippine economy, including notable advances in industrialization. The contribution which the U.S. aid programs have made and will continue to make to Philippine economic development was emphasized. In recognition of the economic interdependence of all nations in the modern world, they discussed opportunities for increased private investment and expanded trade between the two countries in a climate favorable to free enterprise and to the free movement of capital.

President Garcia and President Eisenhower concluded that the exchange of views and the renewal of personal associations made possible by President Eisenhower's visit will further strengthen the traditional ties between the two countries and will contribute significantly to the advancement of their cooperative efforts on behalf of peace and progress in this vital part of the world.

Expressive of the feelings of the American people whose reaction to the Philippine reception is one of heartfelt gratitude to the Filipino people and to the leadership of President Garcia under whose direction the arrangements for the welcome were made, is the following editorial of the Arizona Republic printed on June 19, 1960, entitled "Our Real Allies":

OUR REAL ALLIES

President Eisenhower said the size of his reception in the Philippines last week had not been equaled "at any time, anywhere" in his travels around the world. In contrast with the rioting Japanese mobs in Tokyo, some 2 to 3 million friendly Filipinos in Manila cheered themselves hoarse for the President and demonstrated their friendship for the United States.

You would have to go back 60 years in history to find the genesis of President Eisenhower's amazing reception in the Philippines. After an accident of war had dropped the islands into our laps, President McKinley declared the United States had no intention of remaining permanently sovereign in the Philippines. Instead, he said, the United States would train the Filipinos in the art of self-government and would give them their national independence when they were ready. That promise was kept on July 4, 1946, and nothing since has seriously affected the unity of American-Philippine relations.

One reason why the Filipinos like us so much is that we never showered them with foreign aid. Roughly a thousand American school teachers went to the Philippines on the U.S.S. *Thomas* and other Army transports in 1901 and 1902, but their salaries were paid by the Philippines. Americans served as governors general, as supreme court judges, and as secretaries of public instruction until the Philippines achieved commonwealth status in 1935, but they, too, were paid for by the Filipino—not the American—taxpayer. It is true that the United States has been generous in war damage payments and trade arrangements with the Philippines since World War II, but that is because the Japanese destroyed the Philippine economy in their efforts to hurt the United States. The Filipinos stood by us in the war, and we obviously owed them a boost in rebuilding their economy.

It would be a mistake, nonetheless, for Americans to take the Filipinos for granted. We must respect the pride of the Filipinos, and we must never forget they are citizens of a sovereign nation. We should not demand more favorable conditions for American military personnel in the Philippines than in Japan, for instance. We should pay off the rest of the war damage claims which we originally accepted. We should continue to make Export-Import Bank loans available.

For it is quite possible that the Philippines will soon become our only reliable ally in the Far East. The Kishi government in Japan could fall at any time. The successors to the Rhee government in Korea have not made clear where they stand. Chiang Kai-shek is a true friend, but no one can say what will happen to Formosa after he dies. India, Burma, and Indonesia are neutralist at best, pro-Communist at worst. Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia have more propaganda than strategic value. Malaya's position is always dependent on Chinese-controlled Singapore.

We need the Philippines, and the Philippines needs us. We should continue to build on the firm foundations laid during six decades of united effort. President Eisenhower's visit to the Philippines is the brightest spot in what so far has been a grim journey.

Mr. Speaker, as a fitting conclusion may I include in my remarks the following address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, which he delivered several days ago at the annual dinner of the 4th Marine Division held at the Shoreham Hotel and printed in the Sunday Washington Star, in which he eloquently and substantively analyzes the significance of President Eisenhower's tumultuous welcome that the Filipinos accorded him, in the light of recent events in Paris, in Moscow, and in Japan:

As you know I have just returned from the Philippines where I witnessed the unprecedented welcome, unprecedented in number and in warmth, given by the Filipino people to your President. It was a moving spectacle to see 3 million of my fellow countrymen anxious to show, in a tumultuous demonstration of esteem and affection, their faith in the United States. It brought to my mind other unforgettable scenes—the foxholes of Bataan where our starving, malaria-ridden, poorly equipped Filipino soldiers fought and fell for the American flag.

Many years have elapsed since the war. An uncertain peace had followed. A new danger had arisen to threaten freedom. Because of this new menace and because of America's growing responsibilities as the leader of the free world, it was felt in many quarters in the Philippines that in America's effort to make new friends, old friendships at times seemed to be taken for granted and even former enemies appeared to be given preferential consideration over former allies.

I have repeatedly given voice to this feeling of my people in my public utterances here in the United States. At the same time I always underscored the fact that despite this, I was certain that the Filipino people's friendship for the United States is steadfast and unswerving, that because we share your faith in the ideals of freedom and democracy, we can always be depended upon to show that faith in any supreme test.

The summit conference was brazenly scuttled by Stalin's successor. An invitation previously extended to President Eisenhower was abruptly withdrawn. Another invitation to visit another country was causing tension, riots, and bloodshed, and a government was about to fall. America's prestige was at stake. Here then was another challenge for the Filipinos to show their faith in your people. They accepted the challenge—and from the moment President Eisenhower landed on Philippine soil until he left 3 days later, because to them your leader is your

Nation's image, the Filipino masses from the barrios and hamlets and towns spontaneously gathered in Manila and the reception they accorded the President of the United States has made history. It was the Filipino way of telling the world that its faith in America is whole and unimpaired. This, may I emphasize, is the essence of loyal friendship.

What is the moral to be drawn from this? Your press can overplay the riots and the snake dances and the subversive and hate slogans to the neglect of other newsworthy events in friendly countries; you can magnify the importance of security treaties and get lost in discussions as to whether ventures in personal diplomacy and goodwill visits are useful or not; you may mistakenly favor countries which you believe are potentially useful industrially and militarily to you in the future; but in the long run, what really counts because it is abiding and is not subject to political expediencies of the moment or to Communist blandishments, is for you to have friends, friends tested and true, who whenever the showdown comes can be trusted to stand up and be counted on the side of freedom and human dignity.

Let America ponder these recent events, and if I have any message for you tonight it is to invite you to indulge in a searching national introspection that you may be able to distinguish hereafter between fair-weather friends and those who believe in you, as we in the Phillipines do, because of the identity of our democratic and libertarian ideals."

Department of Justice Undercutting Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 27, 1960, the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., began carrying for its readers editorial correspondence by one of the South's and the Nation's most talented newspapermen, Col. W. D. (Bill) Workman, Jr., author of the bestselling book, "The Case for the South." In keeping with his usual eloquent editorial writings, Colonel Workman penned for the Times and Democrat an outstanding column which merits the attention of the Nation. It is entitled "Department of Justice Undercutting Principles." I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE UNDERCUTTING PRINCIPLES
(By W. D. Workman)

Like the Supreme Court, the Department of Justice should stand above all as a pillar of the law. But it, too, is joining the Court's effort to undercut vital principles of American jurisprudence.

The Supreme Court did its most damaging work in 1954 when it virtually junked the doctrine of stare decisis in arriving at its school desegregation decision. Now comes the Justice Department with an onslaught against the equality well-established legal concept that civil rights are individual rights—to be asserted by the individuals concerned.

Attorney General William P. Rogers, armed with the authority of the 1960 Civil Rights Act and motivated by the 1960 presidential contest, is dispatching his minions throughout the South in what tacitly are admitted to be fishing expeditions for voting law violations. Registration records in county after county are being examined by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—not on complaints by aggrieved citizens, but on grounds of questionable data compiled and publicized by integrationist organizations.

Undoubtedly there have been in the South, as elsewhere, instances of denial of the right to register and to vote. Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that Negroes in some times and places—not all— have been discriminated against in their efforts to participate in elections. Such instances provide the basis for proper legal action to correct abuses and safeguard the right of qualified persons to vote irrespective of race.

But at the same time, a great deal of the lack of Negro voting strength stems from a vast indifference to things political. Negro students of the problem have themselves admitted that. Witness, for example, this statement by James T. McCain, who reported on "The Negro Voter in South Carolina" in a 1957 Howard University study:

"Even though discriminatory tactics are still being used against the Negro to keep him from taking part in politics in South Carolina, this plays only a minor role in keeping those who can qualify from getting registration certificates and voting. * * * Apathy and the lack of political consciousness restrict the use of the ballot by the Negro more than any other factor."

A year later, Florida State University Prof. Elston E. Rhoady observed: "We may well have reached that plateau in the development of greater Negro participation in politics which demands greater efforts by Negroes themselves."

And from the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Roy Wilkins, has come this comment:

"The examinations of the present scene (1957), buttressed by historical data running back to Reconstruction days, indicate that the Negro voter's fate is in his own hand. Every contributor (to the study or "The Negro Voter in the South") and commentator mentions apathy as a factor in the low rate of registration. * * * The point is that Negro citizens must prepare to present themselves in numbers to be qualified, and that that preparation is their responsibility."

Yet in the face of what often is a monumental apathy, the Attorney General's Office seems determined to develop data which somehow can be made to make the white southerner liable for his Negro neighbor's indifference. The absence of legal complaint of wrongdoing seems beside the point, for the Justice Department stands ready and eager, although unasked, to intervene in behalf of the uncomplaining citizens.

The long-range implications of this attitude are sinister. If the Justice Department can enter the local scene to search out and persuade local citizens that their rights are being abridged with respect to elections, where will it end with respect to other matters? The courts heretofore have stood as temples of justice to which the aggrieved individual might turn in his need. Will they now become tools of the Federal Government for implementation of whatever political philosophy might hold sway in Washington at a given time?

The trend is away from the English law and toward the Roman. The common law concepts which have given Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, and American people a pattern of law based upon the will of the people seems to be withering. In its stead is growing the philosophy of Roman law, which is handed down from above and which reflects the dictatorial outlook of the authoritarians who rule: "The law is what we say it is."

The Department of Justice sails more readily into this swirl of legal change by virtue of the turbulence stirred up in 1954 by the Supreme Court. Until then, it was held that matters once settled by judicial decisions provided precedents upon which laymen and lawyers alike could rely in meeting similar situations. In gutting that doctrine, the Supreme Court acknowledged that it was departing from legal precedents and was leaning upon sociological advices.

Thus, from actions both by the Supreme Court and now by the Justice Department, the Federal Government enlarges its growing role as "big brother" to countless Americans who neither seek nor need this fraternal despotism. A new pattern of jurisprudence is emerging—one which admonishes the citizen to depend, not upon established law, but upon all-powerful Government, for the protection of his rights, whether these be real or fancied.

American Deciduous Fruit Industries Feel Effects of European Import Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at a time when many government officials and economists are seriously concerned with the problem of the balance of U.S. payments, it behooves us to examine the import restrictions imposed by some European countries upon American commodities.

This refers especially to the continued severe restrictions against the importation of American deciduous fruits, a condition which imposes serious hardships upon the apple and pear orchardists in West Virginia and other States.

Many of these restrictions operate in violation of the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which calls for the removal of such barriers with the improvement of the balance of payments position of the countries in question.

This problem is considered in more detail in statements presented earlier this year by the U.S. National Fruit Export Council and the apple and pear industry to the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE APPLE AND PEAR INDUSTRY, FEBRUARY 10, 1960

Europe has historically imported substantial quantities of fresh apples and pears. U.S. exports of apples to Europe for the 5 years prior to World War II averaged 8,563,000 bushels, or about 15 percent of the fresh crop; pear exports averaged 2,008,000 bushels, or about 45 percent of the winter pear crop.

The European market was an integral part of our normal market and merchandising plans. It was not merely a surplus disposal program. Orchards were planted and practices followed to fill the demands of this market.

To aid in developing this export market, the industry sponsored legislation which was enacted as the Apple and Pear Export Act in 1933. This act fixed minimum standards for the export of U.S. apples and pears to assure that only good quality fruit is exported. This is essential because our costs are much higher and we can compete in the export market only on the basis of high quality.

The trade barriers that have been erected have seriously disrupted our normal market pattern.

In Western Germany the apple and pear industry must wait from year to year to find out whether imports of apples and pears will be permitted. Frequently the action has been taken at such a late date in the season that little benefit is derived. In order to effectively merchandise our crops, we must be able to make necessary plans and take certain steps well in advance of harvest. While our own industry operates under uncertainty, other European countries have access to the West German market.

In France, imports of U.S. apples and pears have been at a bare minimum and only under extremely difficult situations. Generally, we have been denied access to the French market. This season France has programs for importing apples and pears from the dollar area. However, this is only for this season and is not liberalization. At the same time, France established a 30,000-ton quota for apples from Common Market countries to be imported prior to the general opening date of February 15, 1960. The U.S. apple industry was not offered the opportunity to compete with the Common Market countries. Furthermore, it was a well-known fact that supplies were very short in these Common Market countries and they were importing from the dollar area.

The United Kingdom has established a northern hemisphere quota for apples without too much apparent consideration of the domestic crop. Only 20 percent of this quota is permitted to be imported prior to January 1. This is strictly protectionism. This restriction in 1959 resulted in inadequate supplies prior to January 1, which resulted in extremely high prices to the United Kingdom consumers. We could have exported a great many more bushels to the United Kingdom if this restriction was not in effect. Furthermore, their system of licensing has resulted in not all of the licenses being used and we believe representation should be made in this particular.

In closing, we wish to emphasize that every continental European country continues to prohibit imports of fresh apples and pears from the dollar area until local supplies are practically sold out.

STATEMENT OF THE U.S. NATIONAL FRUIT EXPORT COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 10, 1960

We are the representatives of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, an organization comprising all of the fruit export interests of the United States—including producers, packers, processors, and export shippers.

We are here today to remind you that most European countries are still imposing quantitative restrictions against the exports from important segments of the U.S. industry, and to advise you that we think these remaining trade barriers to U.S. fruit exports should be terminated now.

For the past 12 years representation of our industry have continually sought access to our traditional markets abroad. We have stressed the discriminative nature of these restrictions, which have encouraged foreign competitors, while barring U.S. products.

You and other departments of the U.S. Government have recognized the hardships which these barriers created, and which were supposedly due to the shortage of dollar exchange. You have repeatedly reminded us that under the rules of the GATT these foreign countries were obligated to remove these barriers as soon as their balance-of-payments position warranted.

As foreign economies have improved there has been some relaxation of trade barriers against U.S. fruits by European countries. However, these relaxations have usually been applied to fruits not produced by these countries or their dependencies, such as dried fruits, tree nuts or, in some instances, citrus fruits.

At the present time most European countries continue to impose quantitative restrictions against the exports of important segments of the fruit industry. In practically every instance these remaining restrictions are designed to protect local growers, or producers, in affiliated countries, and there has been no discernible tendency for such barriers to be reduced.

In the fresh deciduous fruit field every continental European country continues to prohibit imports of fresh apples and pears from the United States until European supplies have been sold out. In the canned deciduous fruit field, the United Kingdom, France, and Italy sharply limit or completely prohibit imports. Individual examples of barriers to protect arrangements with other territories or countries are provided by the United Kingdom's restrictions on fresh and processed grapefruit (and Japan's restrictions on raisins). Further details will be submitted by the industries most directly affected. Each of these remaining restrictions prevents U.S. fruit exporters from sharing in a market which has demonstrated a desire for U.S. fruits.

Within recent months the International Monetary Fund has found that the industrialized countries of the world, particularly in Western Europe, can no longer be considered to have balance-of-payment problems. These foreign countries are obligated to terminate now each of these restrictions under the rules of the GATT.

Our industry is not seeking price support or even assurance of exports. It is only seeking an opportunity to compete on the basis of price and quality in important foreign markets. This market was built and can be sustained only on the basis of quality. Conditions now warrant that this opportunity should be provided and the U.S. Government should insist that the unjustified and arbitrary barriers to trade in U.S. fruit and fruit products should be removed and should take the necessary steps and procedures to accomplish this objective.

SUMMARY

I think you will agree that the need is most pressing and the time most opportune.

1. All departments of Government appear to be in agreement as to the necessity for improving our adverse balance of trade.

2. We must have action now before the countries representing the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association solidify and incorporate present restrictions into their respective trade policies. We must not let that happen.

Water—Key to Our Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the South Dakota Wildlife Federation conducts an annual essay contest for schoolchildren in my State. Essays are written in conjunction with National Wildlife Week.

The recent issue of the South Dakota Wildlife News, an informative monthly publication edited by Don McDowell for the federation of which Ellsworth Brown is president contains the 1960 winning essay.

In calling attention to this excellent discussion of our most precious resource, water, I wish to point out that the author, and winner of the wildlife federation essay contest is an eighth grade student in Yankton, S. Dak., Miss Ann Sattler.

I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as it was printed in the South Dakota Wildlife News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From South Dakota Wildlife News, June 1960]

ANN SATTLER WINS SOUTH DAKOTA WILDLIFE FEDERATION ESSAY CONTEST

(Ann Sattler, eighth grade student at Yankton Junior High, has been named winner of the South Dakota Wildlife Federation essay contest for 1960. The annual contest is sponsored by the South Dakota Wildlife Federation in connection with National Wildlife Week, observed this year on March 20–26, with Howard Ahrendt as State chairman. Ann also won first place in the Lady Ikes of Sioux Falls essay contest.)

WATER—KEY TO OUR SURVIVAL

"And the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters * * * And God said let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures."

So the Bible relates how water was the key to the door of life for all living creatures, from the smallest animals to man. And since that first day animals and human beings have become increasingly dependent on water.

Let us see what is behind the doors opened by the key of water. From the earliest ventures of travel attempted by man, to modern present-day transportation, water has always been one of the most important methods of transportating people and cargo. Water has been used for irrigation of crops and plants since times of ancient Egypt when waters of the Nile were used to transform that arid land to fresh greenness. Irrigation has become increasingly important over the years. In the United States it has brought the dry, bleak deserts into bloom and produced many useful crops. Modern homes and cities gulp fantastic amounts of water—far more than ever before in history. Industries, increasing in number, size and impotrance, are also very thirsty for water. Indeed, industry consumes 60 billion gallons of fresh water each day. Finally there is the healthful enjoyable recreation provided by water, which most of us take for granted.

"Fine," someone says, "so there's no problem. We have many uses for water on which all life depends and we seem to have a good supply of it. So we have no problem."

But if this person would stop to look around, and reason, he would realize that the key called water is slowly rusting or wearing out. In other words, with all this pure water being used, but not conserved by purification after use, our living waters are slowly dying, being polluted. That is, much water is being lost to use by contamination of two kinds; silt from soil erosion and unwanted wastes (sewage and industrial wastes).

Silt, one enemy in the water pollution army, must be battled chiefly in rural agricultural areas and localities where soil is exposed or where clearing is taking place without thought of leaving land cover or wilderness and wildlife areas. When bare soil is eroded, it frequently washes into the streams and rivers.

The thirsty factories that drink up gallons and gallons of pure clean water return nearly the same amount of now highly polluted water to the source. Millions of homes add to the water contamination with body wastes, dishwater, bathwater, etc.

"Oh, well," the optimist brushes off our problem of pollution, "I have heard that water has the ability to purify itself by means of the natural water cycle.

Yes, water has the ability to purify itself—up to a certain point. This self-purification of water is a part of the delicate balance of nature, but of necessity is limited and cannot possibly care for the tremendous quantity of silt and wastes pouring into our water today. So unless artificial purification is employed our water will rapidly become unfit for drinking, irrigating growing foods, recreation such as swimming and fishing and for wildlife use. People, animals and plants would all be without the essentials of life.

Fortunately, some thoughtful citizens have taken it upon themselves to become well-informed on the pollution problem. More important, many are doing something about it. All cities have treatment plants to purify water going into the people's use but not all have facilities for purifying the polluted water leaving their cities. Many States are working on the problem. Some States are banding together to meet the problem where their pollution problems overlap. Some industries are diligently trying to meet the responsibilities by treating their own waste products. The control of erosion is widely and intelligently practiced in many places. These are all steps in the right direction, but there is still much to be done to meet our responsibility to preserve the life of water, which first gave life to us.

We are in a race against time. We must wisely save waters before pollution destroys them. Perhaps, knowing the facts, people will soon unite to have laws passed to adopt a water purification plant for decontaminating water before it is sent back to the sources of water supply. This is a responsibility for each of us—every person in his home, each farmer, businessman and profesisonal man, and every industry. This is a problem for each community. We, the people, must promote united effort against the water pollution army.

Our economic keyring is provided with this important key to survival—let's work together to keep it bright and useful by fighting the effects of erosion and pollution. Let us heed the warning in Lord Byron's poem.

"Til taught by pain, men really know not what good water's worth."

Water is truly the key to our survival.

South Carolina: A Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the May 1960 issue of South Carolina magazine there appeared an article which I feel very accurately describes why we South Carolinians are so proud to be South Carolinians. The article, entitled, "South Carolina: A Portrait," was written by the able and talented associate editor of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., Mr. Anthony Harrigan. So that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might get a better understanding of why we South Carolinians are as we are and are so proud of being as we are, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA: A PORTRAIT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

How is it being a South Carolinian? It really isn't necessary to ask that question. Lowcountrymen and upcountrymen are always saying how it is. In the columns of country weeklies, at political speakings, on the long piazzas at Charleston, and under the tall pines that brighten the red clay hills above Edgefield, South Carolinians are busy telling their story. They are like lawyers in a courtroom where the air is alive with tension. South Carolina is a cause.

If you are thinking about the way a living is earned, a South Carolinian is being a tobacco farmer on a flat strip of land in the Pee Dee, a lawyer on Broad Street in Charleston, settling a business deal over a cup of coffee in a cafe; a millworker in a modern windowless plant on the outskirts of Anderson, a banker in Greenville who raises cattle as a sideline. South Carolinians earn their bread and rice, cowpeas, and sivvy beans, barbecue and country ham, in a hundred different ways.

South Carolinians aren't as rich as Floridians or Virginians. On the other hand, they aren't frightfully poor these days; they aren't talking poor mouth. If the golden weed isn't as golden as it was a few years back, if the wages paid in Japanese cotton mills are causing mill doors to close in some Palmetto State communities, if the pink tide of shrimp is running richer in the Gulf of Mexico than off Folly Beach and Beaufort, still things look pretty bright.

The sea of pines that drowns entire landscapes, once burned over and white with dust, represent healthy bank balances in many county seats. The grey, weathered shacks, once part of the South Carolina image, are coming down or are obscured by green oats in fields once white with cotton. Thousands of new businesses—motels under hoary oaks or at the edge of creeks named after Indian tribes, fabricating plants in the pineland, brick plants, and papermills—all represent a sizable stake in the present and firm hopes for the future, widening horizons in cities, farms, and suburbs.

Many an eloquent son or daughter of the Palmetto State has told in print how it is being a South Carolinian. Ambrose Gonzales, DuBose Heyward, W. W. Ball, Josephine Pinckney, Herbert Ravenel Sass, Ben Robertson, and scores of others have set down their respective definitions.

In their definitions is a common image of the Palmetto State as a State of fierce loyalties. This is South Carolina, they say: incredible courage and independence, struggle against fantastic odds, resistance to alien ideas. South Carolina has bred heroes, masters of statecraft, philosophers. It has channeled good blood into the life of the Republic, and spilled much of its own blood in defense of the American heritage. South Carolina has also bred demagogues, lived under scalawag rule. It has enjoyed government by aristocracy, and suffered kakistocracy, rule by the worst class. Bold men, fighters, hellraisers—they have been the chief breed in the Palmetto State.

That is how it is—being a South Carolinian. And what is it that characterizes their outlook in life? The common denominator can be seen in the State's fiery politics, for the hallmark of South Carolina politics from Calhoun to the present day is adventurous realism. The faith of their forefathers is more meaningful to them than the shibboleths of modernism, the slogans of herded people in big cities. There is a boldness about South Carolina's political thought, a willingness to travel lonely roads of history and a determination to follow their own cussed bent, not the route of expediency—all of which is peculiarly South Carolinian.

William Watts Ball once spoke eloquently of this Carolinian breed: "There are gentlemen and scholars, there are elders and deacons, there have been crooks and skinflints, roughnecks and drunkards, cardplayers and dancers, repentant sinners and brethren strong in prayer. * * * They have been good soldiers and some of them heroes: others, loafers. * * * They have never taken a beating lying down, and they get up most unexpectedly. * * * There is good blood in the worst of them and bad blood it were better not to stir. * * * They are strong and not altogether lovely. Damn them, they are my people. I am one of them, thank God."

Success Story of Keith Kahle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I know of no attribute more universally admired in America than that of success. I speak of the success that stems from tenacity, an honest will-to-win; success that crowns the efforts of men willing to get out of bed earlier and work later than other men; success made possible by America's system of free enterprise.

The success story of Keith Kahle, a native Oklahoman and now a proud Texan, exemplifies the potential of growth and progress that is all America's.

Sparked by unswerving determination, Keith Kahle has nurtured an idea into one of the Nation's great feeder airlines. It is now an integral part of America's air transport system.

The story of Keith Kahle's notable achievements in his chosen profession was recently detailed in the North Star, an Oklahoma City, Okla., newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEITH KAHLE PERFORMS AN AIRLINE MIRACLE IN 10 SHORT YEARS

(By J. Landis Fleming)

If Central Airlines, conceived in Oklahoma City and born in Fort Worth, only a short decade ago, doesn't eventually become one of the largest feeder airlines in the country, it won't be the fault of Keith Kahle, founder-president, who is about as well

known in Oklahoma City aviation circles as he is in the Texas city.

As a Central fan from way back, we journeyed to Fort Worth last week (via Central, naturally) to track down this Kahle and observe firsthand the man who has guided this successful outfit from the beginning. We met him shortly after 9 a.m. in his office in Central's magnificant new operations building at fabulous Amon Carter Field.

Approximately 5 hours later, we knew the secret of Central's success. It is Keith Kahle, one of the most fascinating persons we have ever met. Back from a trip (via Central), he bounced into the office, picked up a phone to see how many passengers were flying that day, then checked on the weather. When it appeared that Central would set a passenger record, he sent a memo to each station, "Chance to set record today. Good luck. Let's don't lose 'm."

Flying down Friday morning we became, without knowing it, a part of a red letter day for Central. For on that day Central established an alltime record since the firm started operating in September 1949. Friday a total of 777 persons flew in Central airplanes. And if you don't think that is remarkable, listen to Kahle, as he puffs on his inevitable cigar and talks about the early days, not so long ago, when he had nothing but a dream.

It all began, actually, 7 years before that September of 1949, when Central flew 54 passengers. "Most of them were my relatives and close friends," Kahle chuckles. He finished high school at Norman, and in 1932 received a degree in mechanical engineering at Iowa, majoring in aeronautics and journalism. In 1932, he learned to fly at Oklahoma City's Will Rogers Field. Actually, he made three efforts to start an airline before he finally succeeded, and it was sheer determination and persistence that finally made Central a reality.

The first attempt, which involved Kahle, Jerry Sass, W. C. Lewis and three others, now deceased—F. C. Hall, Billy Hightower, and Leslie Fain, ended in failure. Then, in 1942, when Kahle was doing public relations at Tinker Field, he started work on his first exhibit for the Civil Aeronautics Board. This took 2 full years, and Friday he dragged it out to show to us. It has hundreds of pages, and weighs 28 pounds. The exhibit contains complete factual information about every city proposed for the route.

It took 2 more years to get the certificate. Oklahoma City's Guy Marchant put up the money, and Luther Bohanon came in as legal counsel. The name "Central" was coined one night in Denver's Brown Palace hotel, during a snow storm, where the three had met. Bohanon was in the service, stationed near Denver. The list of those who encouraged and helped Kahle contains many familiar names—Robert S. Kerr, then Governor; aviators Bennie Turner and Wiley Post; Moss Patterson, and Stanley Draper.

Kahle's office was in the Commerce Exchange Building, which also housed the city chamber of commerce. It was then 1946, and all appeared rosy. Then Marchant sold out, and Kahle was back where he started, except that he had a certificate to start an airline, but no money. He started a trek all over Oklahoma, looking for a million dollars to go with his certificate. Many he talked with are minor stockholders today. Others wished they had listened.

At that time every airline in the country was operating in red ink. "I was ready to fly," he recalls, "and even a kite would have looked good." No one but Kahle and Draper thought that Central would ever get off the ground. Finally Kahle ran across Fort Worth's F. Kirk Johnson, president of the Ambassador Oil Co. and today Central's board chairman. And he sold him. Financing allowed for single motor planes only, so back to Washington went Kahle, where he managed to get the regulations changed.

Senator Elmer Thomas and many others helped him there, and he got permission to use the single-motor planes and fly only in daylight hours and in good weather. The firm bought Beechcraft Bonanzas, which would carry the pilot and three passengers. So, in September 1949, 7 years after he had started making his exhibit for the CAB, the first Central plane took off from Fort Worth with Kahle and his friend Stanley Draper aboard. It was bound for Oklahoma City but ran into bad weather and got only as far as Dallas.

Today, a little more than 10 years later, Central carries 16,000 passengers a month, using the old reliable DC–3's connecting 36 cities in 6 States. Late this year the line will carry its millionth passenger, and to date Central planes have flown more than 27 million miles, with 159 million passenger miles on the record. There has never been a fatality.

Kahle recalls that Tom Wren, with CAB, told him, "Why get into the airline business? Then your troubles will just begin." "At the time," he says, "I thought, how stupid can a man be?" Many times he remembered what Wren told him. Kahle became well acquainted with the late Tom Braniff, whom he says helped him a great deal with advice. In 1950 the small Beechcraft planes became inadequate for the growing business, and the DC–3's were purchased. Today the line owns 15 of these "workhorses of the air," considered by many to be the safest craft flying.

Last August Central moved into its fine new operations building and a big modern hangar and maintenance building, at Amon Carter, built by the city of Fort Worth at a cost of $1,800,000. Central is paying this out on a long-term basis. In front of the operations building flies Old Glory and the flags of the six States where Central operates, presented by the Governors.

We toured the maintenance building, where Central has its own upholstery department, sheet metal and welding shops, printing shop, etc. Here is carried a huge inventory—thousands of spare parts, nuts, bolts, screws, and the myriad items needed to keep the planes in the air and on time. Motors and planes are completely overhauled at regular intervals. Every employee knows Keith and loves him. Espirit de corps is high, because the employees seem to sense that Kahle lives and breathes Central.

Here is the nerve center of the line, where, by radio and teletype, dispatchers keep track of operations, and know every minute where every plane is, where it is going, and its fuel needs.

Kahle's hobby is his work. In his office and outside in the reception room walls are lined with hundreds of pictures, and they tell the story of this remarkable man and his baby, "Central." He is a man who makes friends, keeps them, and appreciates them. He laughs at his speech impediment, which causes him to stutter when he gets excited. This actually adds to his charm.

He keeps in touch with all departments, and keeps one eye on the weather. His employees know exactly where they stand. He minces no words and says what he thinks. He is bursting with pride for Central, and his pride is justified.

"What is the future of Central?" we asked him. "How high is the sky?" was his quick answer. Right now Central is asking to double its mileage, and, following 2 years of hearings in Washington a decision will be made in the fall. Arrival of the jet age has proved to be a boom for feeder lines. The big airlines want to pull out of the smaller cities. For instance, American is asking to leave Joplin and Springfield, Mo., and Central is asking to pick them up.

Following the Kansas-Oklahoma decision in the fall, another series of hearings will begin, in which Central is asking for service to Austin, Houston, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Alamagordo, El Paso, Midland, and intermediate points. If this expansion is granted Central will be ready with new equipment. Going to bat for Central at the hearings have been Senators MIKE MONRONEY and BOB KERR and friends of Central from all six States.

Central works closely with the communities it serves, and new service is the signal for a celebration. Kahle tells of the time a girl in one of his offices in a small town told a visiting Congressman, "Our airline is on time." "That made us feel proud," he says, "when she said 'our airline.'"

If Keith Kahle had found a local backer, back in the early days, chances are that Central's $250,000 a month payroll would be in Oklahoma City today, instead of Fort Worth.

Talking about the firm, Kahle emphasizes that "90 percent of Central's success is due to our board chairman, F. Kirk Johnson." We didn't get to meet the chairman, but we have a feeling that he would make the same remark about his president.

We did ask a number of employees about their president. "Keith Kahle? He's a wonderful man. He works harder than any of us. He is Central." This was the gist of the answers. He works as hard as any of the 495 employees, and he expects the same of each of them. He has been able to instill in each of them a pride in their line and its future, and that's what builds great institutions.

Keith Kahle is living proof that determination pays off. He wanted an airline, and he got an airline. And Central Airlines today personifies the man who heads the firm. His attention to detail, his boundless enthusiasm and energy, his pride in the firm, and his determination to make Central the best feeder line in the country, are evident in the immaculate appearance of the equipment, the efficiency and courtesy of the personnel, the on-time schedules, and in the steady growth and progress of Central.

The story of Keith Kahle and Central Airlines is a modern success story. But it didn't just happen. It was made to happen, because this man knew what he wanted, and he never became discouraged enough to quit. Central Airlines today is a monument to an amazing man, Keith Kahle.

Lippmann of Growthmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's papers Walter Lippmann discusses with his usual high skill the central issue of America's economic growth and the responsibility of Government officials, including Members of the U.S. Senate for it.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTHMANSHIP

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last week at St. Louis the Vice President announced that "we are now engaged in

what will become, before this year is out, a major national debate over the subject of economic growth." Who will be debating with whom and about what? According to Mr. NIXON, while we are all in favor of growth, the critics of the administration, namely Governor Rockefeller and the leading Democrats, are not to be taken seriously. For they are playing "the most fashionable parlor game of our time—a game that might well be called 'growthmanship.'"

Just why do these playboys spend so much time and energy on a mere parlor game? It is because they realize the great importance of our slowed-down rate of growth. At our rate of growth in recent years we are unable to meet our public needs, to add to our defenses, and at the same time to keep on increasing private investment and to keep on raising the civilian standard of life. We have been producing less than we need and less than our economy is capable of producing.

From 1953, which marked the end of the Korea war boom, through 1959, the average rate of increase of output has been only 2.4 percent. The average is low because in those 7 years there were two recessions. The net result was that the average rate of increase was less than the average, 3 percent, from 1870 to 1930. Yet in these 7 years of sluggish growth, the country has had the capacity—it has had the labor, the capital equipment, and the technical know-how—to grow at the rate of at least 4 percent.

It may not seem like a big difference, to grow at an average rate of less than 3 percent or to grow at an average of 4 percent. But in an economy of $500 billion, it makes an enormous difference. Each percentage point of increase is about $5 billion, and so the difference between our recent average rate of 2.4 percent and the 4 percent which we are quite capable of is the difference between adding $12 billions a year and adding $20 billions a year to our wealth.

We have a rapidly growing population. At only $12 billions increase, we cannot spend more on defense and on our public needs—such as education and urban redevelopment and scientific research—without reducing the improvement in, perhaps without cutting back, the civilian standard of life. But a 4 percent with $20 billions, we can afford to do the things that reasonable men, including as we shall see the Vice President himself, think should be done.

That is why concern with our growth is not a parlor game.

Judging by his St. Louis speech, Mr. NIXON does not understand the problem. For after scoffing at the popular interest in growth, he concludes his own speech with a broad general endorsement of a large spending program. That, at least, is what he calls it when Governor Rockefeller and the Democrats propose the same kind of program. Under his auspices it ceases to be a spending program and it becomes "investment in the public sector."

He would invest in "our public education establishments, in our national transportation system, in the renewal of our rundown urban areas, in the development of our natural and human resources, in providing imaginative new leadership for the exciting scientific and technological revolution which will dramatically change the whole character of life in America and the world in our lifetime."

He goes on to say, as if he thought he were Nelson Rockefeller, John F. Kennedy, and Hubert Humphrey rolled into one that "timidity in these areas would be as detrimental to the national interest as timidity in private investment."

In this extraordinary passage Mr. NIXON has adopted the domestic program of his opponents. But there is still a difference between him and the Democrats and Governor Rockefeller. He does not say, and assuredly he does not know, how to pay for the expensive program which he now advocates for it cannot be paid for unless there is a substantial rise in the average rate of growth except by cutting down on private investment and on private consumption. So if Mr. NIXON wants his promises to the voters to be taken seriously, he will have to learn to play the parlor game of growthmanship.

There is one other feature of the speech which calls for a few words. In a long passage Mr. NIXON talks about the Soviet rate of growth, which he puts at 8 percent and our own which he puts at 3 percent. He then says that the opposition critics are proposing to raise the American rate to that of the Soviet. If the critics do that, they are exaggerating. A sustained average rate of 4 percent would be ample for us. Mr. NIXON says, too, that the critics think, as Mr. K. apparently believes, that the Soviet economy will by 1970 catch up with and surpass the American.

No serious American student of this subject agrees with Mr. K. What the serious critics say is that the Soviet economy is about half as big as the American and that its rate of growth has recently been at least twice that of the American. This means that the annual increment of new wealth—which is available for military and civilian purposes and for private consumption—is about as large in the Soviet Union as in the United States.

(Thus, call the U.S. economy 100 and the U.S.S.R.'s 50. If ours grows at about 3 percent, there is an average increase of 3. If theirs grows at 6 percent, there is also an increase of 3.)

Now, with equal annual increments, the Soviet Union directs a larger portion than we do to national purposes. To understand the significance of this Mr. NIXON need go no further than to the studies of the CIA and the testimony of Mr. Allen W. Dulles:

"The major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized industrial, military, and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of the consumer-type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our gross national product nor of our respective industrial production is a true yardstick of our relative national power position. The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

Review of Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we recognize, the problems in agriculture continue to seriously challenge us. In the face of such a complex situation, I always welcome the ideas of individuals attempting to find a valid explanation for the current conditions and thus provide a framework within which to seek more realistic solutions.

Recently, I was privileged to have forwarded to me a letter by Marvin A. Schaars, chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Wisconsin. Over the years, this great university has been a fountainhead of original thinking and new ideas.

In reviewing the agricultural situation, Chairman Schaars points out, among other things, the difficulties of farmers making "a go of it" in a so-called free market when he "has to buy many production goods in a largely protected market; that is, protected by patents, trademarks, tariffs, fair trade laws, minimum wage laws, organized bargaining associations, subsidies of different kinds, and so forth."

As a thoughtful analysis of one aspect of the complex problems confronting us in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I share your view that the family operated farm has certain economies, especially if unpaid or lowly paid family labor is considered as part of this economy, and that large scale, incorporated, commercial farms faced with fixed operating costs such as those for feed and labor also have certain diseconomies. Unfortunately, however, we still have too many family operated farms that are just too small in crop acres, that don't have the 120A, 200A, or even 250A of tillable land on their farms, as you mentioned in your letter, to provide the basis for a decent family income.

There is no question that many more farmers would have been forced out of agriculture before now if it had not been for the price support program. One can hardly expect one sector of our economy, namely agriculture, to sell in a free market and make a go of it when the same sector has to buy many production goods in a largely protected market; i.e., protected by patents, trademarks, tariffs, apprentice rules, unemployment insurance, fair trade laws, minimum wage laws, organized bargaining associations, subsidies of different kinds, etc. I do not criticize American labor, American industry, or American commerce for having taken steps to protect their own interests—regrettably, farmers as a group have not been able to do this sufficiently well by themselves in their cooperative marketing, purchasing, and service organizations and have been virtually forced to seek governmental intervention, as some other sectors of our economy have done, in their behalf. The idea that we still have a freely competitive market, a so-called laissez faire economy, is, of course, a myth—for many it is neither free nor is it fully competitive. Instead, it is a combination of monopoly, considerable regulation, and some free competition in production and distribution.

Agriculture is in an especially difficult position under these circumstances. Senate Document No. 77 has this to say:

This report shows that farm prices would fall substantially and production would continue to increase by about 2 percent per year if all acreage controls (except tobacco) were removed and price supports were at levels which would permit an orderly reduction of currently excessive stocks of storable agricultural commodities over a 7- to 10-year period.

Increased marketings would result in average farm prices of about 90 cents per bushel for wheat; 80 cents a bushel for corn, with other feed grain prices in proportion; $3 per hundredweight for rice; 25 cents a pound for cotton; $15 per 100 pounds for beef cattle; $11.20 per 100 pounds for hogs; $3.60 per 100 pounds for milk at wholesale; $2.60 per 100 pounds for milk for manufacture; 29 cents a dozen for eggs; and 15 cents a pound for broilers. Production and prices are shown in tables 6 and 7 of the Department's report.

As estimated by the advisory committee realized net farm income would drop to $7

billion by 1965, about 46 percent below the 1958 level.

• • • • •

You will note that a committee from the college also favors a program of restricting expansion in production of milk as one step toward better prices for milk net at the farm.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN A. SCHAARS,
Chairman, Department of Agricultural Economics.

"Back-Country" Tour by Publisher Reveals Lush Sylvan Beauties of Southern Region of West Virginia; Charles Hodel Reports on Interesting and Unique Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, much has been written about the economic difficulties of coal-producing areas of West Virginia—especially southern counties. Too little has been said or placed in writing about the scenic grandeur and the natural potential of what Publisher Charles Hodel of the Beckley (W. Va.) Post Herald and Raleigh Register so vividly described as "the lush sylvan beauties of this southern region of West Virginia—on June's first Sunday."

Mr. President, it is a privilege to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the story, "Southern Region Offers Superb Scenic Route," by Mr. Hodel and published in the Sunday morning, June 19, 1960, editions of the Post Herald and Raleigh Register.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN REGION OFFERS SUPERB SCENIC ROUTE

(By Charles Hodel)

More definitely than ever before in my 50 years in Beckley, there were revealed to me on June's first Sunday the lush sylvan beauties of this southern region of West Virginia—at its superb best, of course, at this season of the year.

The revelation came in the company of three friends, former Judge Winton A. Riffe, of Beckley; Deputy Sheriff Wesley Thompson, of Coal City; and Emerson Mills, one time county jailor, who lives at Odd.

Judge Riffe and Deputy Thompson, (by prearrangement) picked me up at home at 9 a.m. They brought me back at 4:30 in the afternoon, having cruised all the back-country between Odd and Bramwell during the elapsed 7½ hours.

All the way, mostly over dirt roads, it was one of the most wonderful experiences I have ever had.

Leaving Beckley, we stopped at Odd (by way of Ghent) for Mr. Mills. Thence through Egeria and a view of the beautiful and fertile countryside of that area; which could be rich agriculturally, but for lack of all-year access roads.

Moving on south over twisting rural roads (not shown on maps, but all familiar to Judge Riffe acting as navigator), we entered an enchanted land of hills and dales that for pristine beauty cannot be exceeded anywhere.

For all its ruggedness, that area (and much more of this southern lobe of West Virginia) is simply incomparable in its early June lushness and splendor. And that marks it also as land of great agricultural potential.

As we rode along in the brilliant sunshine of the ideal June day, Judge Riffe and Mr. Mills named perhaps a half dozen old-timers who had in the past extracted great fortunes from large farms.

We passed through one of the flat tops from which the whole range of mountains takes its name. It is known as Bluff Mountain (3,536 feet). With very little dirt moving, a plane landing field could be developed there. But perhaps, in the interest of tourist enjoyment, no part of this unsullied region should be disturbed—except for the laying down of better access roads.

Burtons Gap and Clarks Gap were also traversed, affording prospects of steep verdure-clad slopes, frequently topped by bald peaks locally referred to as "tater hills."

Through devious windings over hill and down dale, lush and beautiful at every turn, we drove all the way to the original Flat Top and traversed it—another site for an easy airport of several crisscross runways, should it ever be deemed necessary or desirable.

Riding on, we passed through McComas, a sight of a different sort. McComas was one of the biggest and most impressive coal mining operations ever developed in West Virginia. A double tipple served mines in the mountains on both sides of a deep hollow. Now a veritable ghost town, there are still evidences that its onetime population of 3,000-plus was well housed. Some of the nice houses are still standing and occupied. Places where others stood are marked merely by tall brick chimneys.

From McComas we moved on over more back country roads in the direction of Bramwell. Fifty years ago what with the fabulous Isaac T. Mann living there in a splendid house and heading one of the Nation's three strongest banks, also located there, Bramwell was a magic village. It still boasts more beautiful homes than equal population.

From Bramwell we turned back, again over secondary or even lesser roads, but still with magnificent spectacles of nature at every turn.

Pinnacle Rock Park was encountered. And we passed through Bluewell. Thence we ascended Old Flat Top, with its altitude of 3,400 feet, up from Windmill Gap, and marking the junction of boundary lines of the three counties of Mercer, McDowell, and Wyoming. Here lies a great expanse of fertile and therefore productive soil, more or less neglected. It is from that area that the whole range of heights—including Bald Knob (3,250 feet), Huffs Knob (3,566 feet), and White Oak (3,000 feet), and Freezeland (3,360 feet) mountains, in Raleigh County—derives its name.

The purpose of the trip was to acquaint the writer with the possibility of putting down a superbly scenic two-lane hard surface on the route we took and on across the peaks of White Oak and Freezeland mountains, to Meadow Creek on New River.

Judge Riffe had often talked of taking such a trip—firm in the conviction that such a road would at once attain fame as one of the finest tourist drives in the United States. He's right.

At the end of the drive with an old friend and two new ones, I was, and am, in full concurrence.

Jobs for Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Department of Labor, under the vigorous and farsighted leadership of Secretary Mitchell has for a long time been endeavoring to dispel some of the doubts and misconceptions which are prevalent as to the abilities and competence of older workers. The Department has released a number of detailed and thoughtful statements indicating the high performance records of older workers who have considerable work experience and job know-how at their command.

This is indeed a worthwhile undertaking. Older workers have contributed greatly and will, I know, continue to contribute greatly to our Nation's economy. It is a tragedy when, on the basis of certain unwarranted preconceptions, workers in this group are prevented from getting the type of jobs for which they are fully qualified. I know that the Department of Labor will continue in the excellent work which is being done to disprove the frequent and harmful allegations which make it difficult for older workers to obtain top jobs.

I want to call attention today to an editorial entitled, "Oldsters' Dilemma," which recently appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and which strongly and enthusiastically supports the efforts of the Department of Labor to dispel many of the myths and prejudices which have grown up as to the abilities of older workers. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, June 22, 1960]

OLDSTERS' DILEMMA

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell believes that the true older worker story—that of ability and competence—has not been adequately told. Unfortunately, the myths about the older worker obscure the real story.

Mitchell's recent statesmanlike analysis of the older worker's plight should be enlightening to Rochester with its high ratio of older residents and its industries' deep involvement and interest in the subject.

The Department of Labor took into account most of the usual objections to hiring older persons and countered with results of pertinent studies.

Is the older employee really less productive? Studies in 26 plants showed very little difference and when there was a difference it often was in the senior worker's favor.

Is the older worker less flexible? Psychologists found that in the working world a mature person learns differently from, but as well as, a younger one. In addition, from experience, he can select, value, and conserve and can grasp principles faster than the younger worker.

Won't the older worker be out of date in the missile age? This implies a misconception. Skills were found to be interrelated; a man who can do one job well easily adapts his skill to a new challenge.

Mitchell says group generalizations applied to older workers usually are hokum. The Labor Department is pushing a nationwide program to help dispel the myths and prejudices that frustrate older workers. But this is a local as well as a national problem. It is Rochester's concern because, as Mitchell puts it, "ability is ageless."

Text of President Eisenhower's Report on His Far East Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in his speech last night, President Eisenhower, as illustrated on his Far Eastern trip, again demonstrated the will, courage, dedication, and devotion to duty for his country, regardless of personal danger, that has been reflected in his life in peace and war.

Even the events in Japan, disturbing as they were, had positive effects for the free world. These include:

Highlighting the Communist failure despite frantic efforts to cause rejection of the United States-Japanese Treaty;

Demonstrated that personal diplomacy far from being dead, was so successful that the Communists of Moscow and Peiping spared no expense and effort in whipping up, and paying for, the demonstrations in Japan;

Reflected the fact that Khrushchev withdrew the invitation for President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union provides further evidence of the success of the personal diplomacy of the President—in Asia, Europe, Middle East, South America, and the Far East; and despite the fact that the Communists stirred up trouble in Japan and other nations in the Far East, as they have done elswhere in the world—warmth and friendship literally poured out to greet President Eisenhower as the leader of our great country.

Having done an outstanding job of again serving the best interest of the people in the free world, President Eisenhower deserves the deep gratitude and respect of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the President's remarks as printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1960]

TEXT OF EISENHOWER'S REPORT ON HIS TRIP

My friends, I have just returned to Washington from a trip to the Far East. It has been a trip so marked by events of significance that I shall try this evening to give you a simple background of fact, against which these recent events can be viewed in perspective.

To begin, a few personal observations on the trip I have just concluded:

First, American relations with the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea and Okinawa have been strengthened.

Second, the people of these Far Eastern lands took advantage of the opportunity given by this visit to demonstrate anew their long and ardent friendship with and for the people of America. The American people are gratified, I am sure, as am I, by these heartwarming demonstrations.

Third, the ratification of the Mutual Treaty between the United States and Japan represents an important victory for the free world—a defeat for international communism.

BACKGROUND OF TRIP

And now, let's look at the background of this trip—and the others I have taken in the interest of world peace.

This trip was planned as one of a series which have, in total, taken me nearly around the world, to 27 nations of Europe, the Middle East, south Asia, north Africa, the Americas, and the Far East. Those nations I have visited during the last 10 months have populations reaching an aggregate of over a billion people.

To understand where these visits fit into the overall foreign relations of this Government we must go back to 1953, to the time when I was assessing the world situation with the late Secretary of State Dulles, preparatory to my assumption of the office of the Presidency.

At that time, we recognized that the Communists had, for some years following the conclusion of World War II, taken advantage of the chaotic aftermath of conflict—and of our own self-imposed military disarmament—to indulge in a continuous campaign of aggression and subversion in Asia and eastern Europe.

They had disrupted the lives of millions of free people, causing lowered living standards and exhausted economies. China and its half-billion people had been lost to the free world. The war in Korea, then in condition of stalemate, still dragged on.

ONE ESSENTIAL FACT

We began our studies with one essential fact before us. It had become clear, by 1953, that the accumulation of atomic weapon stockpiles, whose use could destroy civilization, made resort to force an intolerable means for settling international disputes. Only in the rule of law, which meant the attainment of an enduring peace with justice, could mankind hope for guarantee against extinction.

With these facts in mind we concluded, and have since been guided by the conviction, that there were several things which we should do simultaneously, all of them in conformity with the ideals expressed in the charter of the United Nations.

It was, and is, mandatory to present before the world, constantly and vigorously, America's great desire for peace and her readiness to sit at the conference table to discuss specific problems with anyone who would show an equal readiness to negotiate honestly and in good faith.

This we continue to do in spite of difficulties such as the regrettable action of the Soviet delegation in walking out of the 10-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva this morning. But, from the very beginning we have made it clear that until real progress toward mutual disarmanent could be achieved, our first concern would be to keep our own defenses strong, modern, and alert.

We tried to identify all those areas in the world where serious trouble could erupt suddenly, and developed suggestions for correcting the causes of unrest and of enhancing stability in such localities. Through cooperation with our friends, we have succeeded in removing causes of friction in many of these areas.

PERSONAL CONTACT SOUGHT

In support of these purposes, we have sought, from the beginning, frequent personal contact with responsible governmental officials of friendly nations. Indeed, we have felt it wise, also, to seek to improve communications between ourselves and the Soviet Government. Akin to this effort was one which has come to be called the people-to-people program—a completely new type of venture in international relations which has been amazingly successful.

Along with these objectives, we have constantly striven to devise better methods of cooperation with our friends, working out with them programs by which together we could improve our common security and raise living standards. Our mutual security program has been and is a vital means of making such cooperation effective.

To carry out the purpose of proclaiming and demonstrating to the world America's peaceful intentions, we first made a number of policy statements and a series of concrete proposals that might lead to fruitful discussions with the Soviets.

As early as April of 1953, I suggested disarmament talks with the Soviets and pledged that I would urge the United States to apply a substantial portion of any savings realized through mutually acceptable disarmament to the improvement of living standards in the less developed nations.

Later that year I proposed, before the United Nations General Assembly, that we devote all discoveries in atomic science to peaceful uses. Nineteen months later at Geneva I suggested the open-skies method of mutual inspection.

INVITATIONS ISSUED

In the meantime, the Secretary of State set out tirelessly to make calls on friendly governments and to strengthen collective security. In return, we issued invitations to heads of state to visit America and her people. Other good-will visits were concurrently made by the Vice President and other personal representatives.

Many heads of government or state responded promptly to our invitations to visit this country. In the past 7½ years, more than 70 heads of state and Prime Ministers have come to the United States (some of them several times) in visits extending from a few days to some weeks. In this respect the period has been without precedent.

Other visitors are to come in the near future. Indeed, tomorrow we shall be honored by the arrival in Washington on such a visit of the King and Queen of Thailand, and later in the year the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan, and the King and Queen of Denmark.

I early began to receive urgent invitation to make return visits to the countries whose heads had paid us the courtesy of coming to see America and our way of life.

Many months ago we concluded that I should personally accept some of these invitations, as opportunity should present itself. Secretary Herter, first as Under Secretary of State and later as Secretary of State, enthusiastically concurred. Oversea visits by me, all of us felt, would be a strong support of other successful programs.

VALUE OBVIOUS, HE SAYS

The great value resulting from these journeys to 27 nations has been obvious here and abroad. Throughout the world there has been opportunity to emphasize and reemphasize America's devotion to peace with justice; her determination to sustain freedom and to strengthen free-world security through our cooperative programs; her readiness to sacrifice in helping to build the kind of world we want.

These visits involved, of course, valuable conversations between heads of state and government, as well as the promotion of understanding among peoples.

However, except for so-called summit and the NATO heads-of-government meeting, none of my visits has been planned or carried out solely as a diplomatic mission seeking specific agreements, even though discussions have invariably involved important issues.

Incidentally, I believe that heads of state and government can, occasionally, and preferably on an informal basis, profitably meet for conversations on broad problems and principles. They can, of course, also convene to give solemn approval to agreements previously prepared by normal diplomatic methods.

But heads-of-government meetings are not effective mechanisms for developing detailed provisions of international compacts, and have never been so considered by this Government.

GOOD WILL ASPECTS

On the other hand, the good will aspects of a visit by a head of government can frequently bring about favorable results far transcending those of normal diplomatic conferences. They have resulted in the creation of a more friendly atmosphere and mutual confidence between peoples. They have proved effective in bringing closer together nations that respect human dignity and are dedicated to freedom.

Indeed, it seems apparent that the Communists, some time ago, reached the conclusion that these visits were of such positive value to the free world as to obstruct Communist imperialism. Thus they have sought every possible method to stop them. Through their propaganda they bitterly opposed my entry into the Philippines, in Taiwan, in Okinawa, in Korea, and, of course, Japan.

In Paris last month they advanced false and elaborate excuses for canceling my invitation to visit the Soviet Union, when all that was necessary to say was that they found it inconvenient to receive me.

With their associates in Peiping, they went to great lengths and expense to create disorders in Tokyo that compelled the Japanese Government to decide, under conditions then existing, that it should revoke its long-standing invitation for me to visit that sister democracy.

These disorders were not occasioned by America. We in the United States must not fall into the error of blaming ourselves for what the Communists do; after all, Communists will act like Communists.

CLEAR PROOF OF VALUE

One clear proof of the value, to us, of these visits is the intensity of the opposition the Communists have developed against them.

Respecting Japan, in spite of the outrageous conduct of a violent and disorderly minority, I have been assured that the people there were, in overwhelming majority, anxious to welcome me as a representative of a nation with which they wished to cooperate and to have friendly relations.

Of course, the basic objective of the Communist-inspired disorders in Tokyo was to bring about the rejection by the Japanese Government of the treaty. That the Communists were defeated in their frantic efforts to prevent ratification of that treaty speaks well for the future of Japanese-American relations. Obviously that signal defeat for international communism far outweighs, in importance, the blocking of my scheduled visit.

Another purpose of the Communist-inspired riots in Tokyo was to weaken confidence between our people and to persuade the United States to change its basic policies toward Japan. It would be a tremendous victory for international communism if we were to permit the unhappy events of the past several weeks in Japan to disrupt our economic relationships with that nation; or to weaken the feeling of friendship and understanding which unites the vast majority of the Japanese and American people.

Japan has once again become a great nation. Over the postwar years she has painstakingly created a new image of herself, the image of a responsible, peaceful, and cooperative free-world nation, mindful of her obligations and of the rights of others. Japan has made a fine record in the United Nations as well as elsewhere on the international stage.

SEEK TO BUILD LINKS

Since the loss of mainland China to the Communists in 1949, the need to link the other nations of the Far East with the United States more strongly, in their mutual interests, should be apparent to all. We seek, and continue to build and strengthen these links, with Japan as well as with the other countries, by actions of many kinds—of which my recent trip was but a single example. In the present circumstances, a Far Eastern policy of "waiting for the dust to settle" will not meet the free world's need.

The other free countries of the Far East, small in relation to the massive area and immense population of Red China, can survive in freedom and flourish only in cooperative association with the United States and a free Japan.

Through our aid programs, through our bilateral and collective defensive arrangements such as SEATO, through our very presence in the area, we help them greatly. And a free and friendly Japan can reinforce this American effort, as indeed she is already doing through aid programs of her own.

Because of the Prime Minister's necessary withdrawal of his urgent invitation of last winter for me to visit Japan on June 19, I was of course unable to meet with the Japanese Government and people or to bring to them assurances of American good will.

This was disappointing, but we should not forget the favorable effects of visits elsewhere in the Far East, as well as the final approval of the Japanese-American Treaty by both Governments. Moreover, the general improvement that has come about through exchanges of visits by friendly heads of government is recognized and appreciated throughout the free world.

I wish that every one of you could have accompanied me to Manila, Taipei, and Korea and thus witnessed for yourselves the outpouring of friendship, gratitude, and respect for America. The throngs of people there, like the many millions who, during earlier journeys, lined the streets of great cities in the Mideast, Europe, north Africa, South America—as well as in Canada and Mexico—had one overwhelming message for our Nation.

MESSAGE TO NATION

That message, expressed in glowing faces, friendly shouts, songs, gaily painted placards, and homemade signs, was that they wanted to be partners with the United States. They share our ideals of dignity of man and the equality of all before the law—they believe in their God; they believe that the American people are their friends. They believe that Americans are sincerely devoted to their progress which means so much to them, and which is so evident on every side.

These demonstrations have been inspiring to all who have not closed their eyes and minds to their meaning. Moreover, the leaders of the free peoples I have met here or abroad have assured me, privately and publicly, that they approve of America's purposes and policies, even though details of implementation are frequently subjects for discussion or negotiation.

They have expressed the hope that visits to their countries by the senior officials of our Government might be of greater frequency. They have shown me evidence of their marked material progress through American cooperation. They have testified to the reborn hope and restored confidence of their peoples.

Let me stress, however, that all the profit gained by past and any possible future trips will be quickly dissipated should we Americans abandon our present course in foreign relations or slacken our efforts in cooperative programs with our friends.

This is what the Communists want. It is imperative that we act with mature judgment.

We must recognize their tactics as a deliberate attempt to split the free world, causing friction between allies and friends. We must not fall into this trap; all of us must remain firm and steadfast in our united dedication to freedom, and, to peace with justice.

Above all, we must bear in mind that successful implementation of any policy against Communist imperialism requires that we never be bluffed, cajoled, blinded or frightened. We cannot win out against the Communist purpose to dominate the world by being timid, passive, or apologetic when we are acting in our own and the free world's interests.

We must accept the risks of bold action with coolness and courage. We must always be strong, but we must never forget that peace can never be won by arms alone; we will be firm but never truculent; we will be fair but never fearful; and will always extend friendship wherever friendship is offered honestly to us.

FINAL, PERSONAL WORD

Now a final, personal word—

So far as any future visits of my own are involved, I have no plans, no other particular trip in mind. Considering the shortness of the time before next January, and the unavoidable preoccupations of the few months remaining, it would be difficult to accept any invitation for me, again, to go abroad.

But so long as the threat of Communist domination may hang over the free world, I believe that any future President will conclude that reciprocal visits by heads of friendly governments have great value in promoting free-world solidarity.

And this I assure you. If any unforeseen situation or circumstances arising in the near future should convince me that another journey of mine would still further strengthen the bonds of friendship between us and others, I would not hesitate a second in deciding to make still an additional effort of this kind.

No consideration of personal fatigue or inconvenience, no threat or argument would deter me from once again setting out on a course that has meant much for our country, for her friends, and for the cause of freedom—and peace with justice in the world.

Thank you and—good night.

The Lebanon Enterprise Honored by the the Kentucky Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in 3 years, the Lebanon Enterprise, in my hometown of Leba-

non, Ky., has been named by the Kentucky Press Association as the best of the State's large weekly newspapers. The award, a repetition of the honor which came to this paper in 1958, was announced at the Kentucky Press Association's annual midsummer meeting at Cumberland Falls State Park in Kentucky and a plaque which goes to each year's winner was accepted for the Lebanon Enterprise by George Trotter, coeditor with Paul Crowdus of the paper.

This year's award marked the third time the Enterprise has been judged Kentucky's best. The first such award was in 1925, when the paper was owned and edited by the late Oliver Kelly, Sr. The Enterprise finished second in 1956, won in 1958, and repeated this year.

I take great pride in commending this newspaper for this outstanding and unique record. Since it is my hometown newspaper, I know its editors, publishers, owners, employees, news policies, and editions extraordinarily well. These well-deserved honors provide eloquent testimony of the magnificent contribution it is making not only to our county seat town of Lebanon and our county of Marion, but also to our State of Kentucky and the Nation. The unusual recognition of being named the best large weekly newspaper in the State, for the third time, is further proof of the uniformly high esteem in which it is held by its local readers and the general public on a more far-reaching scale.

Each editor and each person connected with this splendid organization deserves and has earned rich praise for an important part in the achievements of this courageous, progressive, and remarkably fine newspaper. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Lebanon Enterprise.

Equalization of Pay of Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently Congress passed legislation to equalize the retirement pay of its own Members. I find no particular fault with that; but I do find fault when we do not take equal interest in equalizing the pay of retired military personnel.

Almost 3 years ago I attempted to amend the bill based on the Cordiner report, so as to include retired officers' pay; but I was talked out of that, here on the floor, by the promise that hearings would be held on a similar bill which would be introduced in this Congress.

Mr. President, both the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I have introduced such measures to make adjustments in the pay of our retired military personnel; but I am sorry to have to state that up to the closing days of this session, no consideration has been given to those measures.

Mr. President, in connection with this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "By Way of Contrast," which was published on June 27, in the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY WAY OF CONTRAST

The alacrity with which Congress has passed legislation to equalize retirement pay of its own members is in sharp contrast with the foot-dragging which has marked its consideration of a bill similarly to equalize the pay of retired military personnel. The Associated Press reports that the congressional pension measure "swished through the House under circumstances indicating that Members didn't desire a detailed explanation." The bill previously had been approved by the Senate in a slightly different form. It now awaits the President's signature.

The legislation, in addition to sweetening certain pension benefits, would eliminate an inequity which has prevented Members who left Congress before October 1956, from taking a deferred annuity at age of 60 instead of the present 62 after 10 years of congressional service. The deferred annuity plan heretofore has been available only to Members who retired from the legislative body after the 1956 date.

We are all for such equalization as well as for adequate retirement benefits in general for Senators and Representatives—as we have stated on many occasions in the past. We are also strongly in favor of equal treatment for retired officers and enlisted men of the armed services. Under an ill-advised economy provision of the 1958 Military Pay Act, however, all servicemen—most of them combat veterans—who retired before the act became effective are receiving substantially less retirement pay than those who have retired since that date. The discrimination here is just as unfair as the discrimination which has existed with respect to congressional veterans who left before October 1, 1956.

Yet, although the House, to its credit, has approved the equalization of military retirement pay, the Senate so far has failed to act. In fact, the bill still is stalled before a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee. Is equity for retired public servants to be limited to those have served in the Congress?

Friendship of Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago a series of tragic natural disasters brought death to a large number of our neighbors in the Republic of Chile. The United States moved promptly to bring to the assistance of survivors food, medicine, and whatever else was required to assist the Government of Chile during and immediately following the earthquakes and tidal waves. It was another example of putting the theory of the good neighbor into practice, and the actions of North American personnel in Chile were such as to win for them the gratitude of all who witnessed our people in action. Furthermore, the bonds of friendship which have long existed between the people of the United States and Chile were strengthened beyond measure.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to quote briefly from a broadcast on May 29, 1960, by Radio Emisoras Nuevo Mundo, Santiago, Chile, in Spanish to Chilean audiences:

The gratitude of the Chilean people manifests itself in eloquent spontaneous affection for the crews of the U.S. planes.

Soldiers, nurses, aviators, and others who tour the city have witnessed innumerable demonstrations of affection and gratitude. They are usually surrounded by Chileans you want to talk to them. Last night, as the Americans did the rounds of the restaurants and public places in the capital, they were given ovations. A few entered a restaurant, and those present immediately stood up and greeted the Americans with a standing ovation. At another restaurant on the same street, the public, by way of expressing their gratitude, burst into spontaneous singing of the national anthem.

The Yankee boys, among whom were several colored officers and soldiers, entered night clubs and were immediately bombarded with offers of treats. Some accepted courteously, others would decline with a very moving explanation: "Excuse us, please, but we must get up early tomorrow to work." Several persons, upon hearing their explanations, were so moved that they shouted loudly: "Viva Uncle Sam." "Viva the United States." For a fact, they were all up bright and early, working actively at the loftiest mission of peace.

Mr. Speaker, Chilean Minister of Interior Sotero del Río reported to the Chilean Chamber of Deputies on June 3, 1960, on the earthquakes and the help given by foreign countries. The aid given by the United States was singled out as a gigantic effort of cooperation.

On June 8, 1960, the U.S. Ambassador to Chile received the following message from the Chilean Chamber of Deputies—official text should be obtained from the Department of State:

The Chamber of Deputies, in a session occurring on June 1, officially recognized the fraternal and generous cooperation that your Government has so kindly lent to Chile in connection with the painful catastrophe which has occurred in the country. The Chamber resolved on this same occasion to transmit to your Government by means of Your Excellency the statement of unanimous recognition and gratitude for the spontaneous, selfless and opportune collaboration which has been appreciated by the Chilean people in all its noble significance in moments of such grave affliction facing this nation.

The High Cost of Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Western Hills Press from the Cincinnati area is one of the outstanding community newspapers in the country. Its fine and capable editor, Albert H.

Huneke, has written an excellent and most thought-provoking article on the subject of Federal aid to education in the June 23 issue.

In view of the fact that this is one of the so-called must pieces of legislation before the Congress, it is my feeling that every Member of both the House and Senate should have the opportunity to read what the Western Hills Press has to say on the subject.

The article follows:

THE HIGH COST OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Advocates of Federal aid to education have a bill pending in Congress proposing appropriation of $975 million at the rate of $325 million for the next 3 years to finance new school building. This is based on the House Education and Labor Committee report indicating an annual requirement of 52,700 more classrooms for the period from 1960 through 1964.

Federal aid is justified in any area only on the premise that an essential need cannot be supplied by the local community. What is the record in this regard insofar as school building is concerned? We are told that in the past decade—without any Federal aid—the classroom additions have averaged 59,400 per year and that, since 1955, this average has been 66,900 classrooms per year.

Obviously the overall aggregate need has been met in recent years. But has the need been met in the States where it is most acute? This is a moot question which would be difficult to answer. However, it would appear that if the distribution has not been equitable, then the pending legislation is not the answer, for, under the proposed bill, 42 percent of the Federal tax money appropriated would go to only seven States. In addition to Ohio, these favored seven include New York, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and Michigan. Hardly the neediest States, we would say.

But to bring the problem closer to home. Western Hills school districts have not escaped the demand for additional school facilities nor have the taxpayers of these communities shirked their obligation in meeting the demand. Colerain Township may be cited as a typical example. The people of that community have generously approved eight separate bond issues aggregating over $4 million for schoolbuilding, not to mention numerous tax levies for school operating purposes, since 1947.

Nor has this been an oppressive burden against which local taxpayers have rebelled. With few exceptions, they have approved each new request as it has been presented by their respective boards of education. Moreover, the soundness of the askings have been vindicated when the resulting tax rate has been substantially less than the estimated amount, indicative of conservative, knowledgable financing based on a first-hand understanding of local needs and ability to pay. Indeed, because of increasing tax duplicate, in some cases there has been no net increase or the new tax rate has actually been less than that of previous years.

Thus on November 21, 1958, the Press headlined "Tax Rates Down in 8 of 11 Districts." The following story stated, "The tax rates announced Wednesday by the Hamilton County budget commission prove the exception to the rule that 'taxes never come down.' In 8 of 11 unincorporated political subdivisions in the 7 western Hamilton-County townships, the rates on which taxes will be collected in 1959 have declined."

Or again, as recently as December 10, 1959, the Press reported, "The largest single jump in tax duplicate in any western county political subdivision is that in the Oak Hills school district, where the duplicate is now estimated at $81,700,000. This represents an increase of almost $6 million over the $75,697,850 current valuation and is a principal factor in reducing the Oak Hills district tax rate by 46 cents from $18.44 this year to $17.98 next year (1960)."

Thus, it may be seen, that in many cases the circumstances creating the school problem also provide their own built-in answer—given competent administration and understanding support at the grassroots level. Yes, we know there are exceptions, but these too can be met through state-aid in those States where the people are determined not to surrender another responsibility and privilege of local self-government to centralized Federal bureaucracy.

Under the Federal aid system, the people will not only lose direct control of limiting the cost of financing their schools, but may ultimately lose the right to administer them through their locally elected boards of education. The people have abdicated many of their rights and responsibilities to the feudal benevolence of a faceless Washington. When they abdicate the right and responsibility of educating their children, they will have traveled beyond the point of return on the road to Federal bureaucratic dictatorship.

Foreign Policy and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Worse Than No Policy at All." The editorial was published in the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette of June 23, and deals with the propriety of the U–2 flights and the necessity for them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORSE THAN NO POLICY AT ALL

While this Nation's espionage activities are primarily a matter of defense policy, they have recently been linked closely with foreign policy as well. In fact, the most spectacular and profitable espionage activity of all, the U–2 spy flights over the U.S.S.R., terminated as a result of pressures during the summit blowup. These pressures came not only from Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, they came also from our own allies who were under threat of Soviet retaliation if bases in their countries were used again for the U–2.

It is the termination of the U–2 flights, and their very important defense significance, that must be reconsidered now as a major tactical detail in the long overdue reappraisal of foreign policy. If U.S. foreign policy continues so sensitive to fear that we cannot employ a superior means of detecting a sneak attack, then our defense itself is potentially crippled.

Ever since the first Soviet sputnik went aloft in 1957, this Nation has struggled with doubts about its future defense position. These doubts led first to a national psychology bordering on defeatism, and then to waves of defense spending mania in Congress. Fortunately the budget-boosting attempts were held in check. But there was little checkrein on political criticism of the administration's defense policy. The charge of "lagging defense" was revived with every fresh international crisis.

It took the U–2 spy flight incident of May 1 to reveal that the Soviet Union itself has a serious weakness in defense. Diplomatically and politically, a great deal was made of the incident. Not enough was made of the tremendous contribution to U.S. security from nearly 4 years of such flights prior to the May 1 failure.

One of the most complete reconnaissance files any nation ever had on the war potential of an adversary was amassed during those years. All that has been stopped now, and resumption by the Midas and Samos space spy vehicles is perhaps 2 years away.

The U–2 flights kept us safeguarded against possible Soviet preparations for attack. They were an invaluable forewarning system in our concept of deterrent defense. With U–2's reconnaissance information, our Strategic Air Command bombers ran much less risk of being caught on the ground. Since the U–2 flights were stopped, SAC has had to go on partial airborne alert.

Eventually Midas and Samos will provide the forewarning even more effectively. But they are not yet dependable. Still, the launching of a test Midas last month had significance even beyond its military promise. It provided proof of the defense development that had been going on during much of the time that the critics had been agitating for a revision of the defense program.

Defense gains like the U.S. breakthrough in reconnaissance are useless if foreign policy puts a ban on them. If the U–2 was important during the past 4 years, as it certainly was, it is even more important now. Yet, through what must be recognized as our own and our allies' default, Khrushchev has succeeded in eliminating one of our best advantages.

If our allies cannot face the risks that Western security presents, then the United States must find other ways, such as U–2 takeoffs from carriers, to resume reconnaissance that may mean vital protection. A foreign policy that puts chains on defense is worse than none at all.

Spend Where Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be hearing once again about the Federal employees' pay raise recently passed by the House of Representatives.

The following letter from a civil service employee is of great interest at this time. The letter appeared in this morning's Washington Post and points up a well-known fact, that we will soon have to face in this country, namely, that we cannot go on forever having guns and butter.

The letter follows:

SPEND WHERE NEEDED

I write this letter as a Government civil servant. My chief source of income is my Federal salary.

Congress has recently voted at 7½-percent pay increase for classified civil servants. This increase was approved at a time when the Government is being forced to make such decisions as: (1) Should funds be devoted to better missiles for space exploration, or to oceanographic research? (2) Should the Air Force spend funds for supersonic bombers, or

hardened missile sites? (3) Should the Navy spend money for missile submarines, or hunter-killer submarines?

Yet all these things are needed if we are to regain our military supremacy, the loss of which we have just begun to feel in recent weeks. Nonetheless, Congress has decided that the civil service is worth 7½ percent more than it was 2 years ago, when a 10-percent increase was granted. Since the cost of living has not risen that much, the increase cannot be justified on grounds of inflation.

I do not understand wherein the civil service has become so valuable to the Nation, but in this period when money is ammunition and survival, I suggest that as a matter of patriotism (if I may use this chauvinistic and obsolescent term), we forego the increase at this time, and spend the money where it is needed.

FREDERICK W. NAGLE.

PRINCESS ANNE, VA.

"Tiger" Teague: Hard-Hitting, Honest, and Able Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, is a hard-hitting, honest, and able leader. He is liked and respected by his colleagues. They heed his words when he speaks on the floor of the House or when he writes them letters like the one I am including hereafter.

A veteran who was wounded in action during World War II, "TIGER" TEAGUE is a sympathetic and conscientious Member of Congress. He is also a responsible and informed legislator. He knows that this House is not going to give a hundred-dollar-a-month across-the-board pension to all veterans of World War I, regardless of need, at a cost of almost $2 billion.

His letter of June 20 to me and other Members of the House speaks for itself. I commend the letter and the enclosure to the attention of all persons who are willing to consider the facts about the proposal embodied in H.R. 9575:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am receiving inquiries concerning the discharge petition on the bill H.R. 9575.

This is the measure which seeks to provide a $100 a month pension to all veterans of World War I, regardless of need, who served for 90 days or more. The first year's cost is estimated at $1,040,384,000. An identical bill to H.R. 9575 and more than 100 other pension proposals were before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs when it reported the bill last year which became Public Law 86-211. This law will become effective July 1, 1960. It will give increases to more than 1 million veterans, widows, and children. The Veterans' Administration is placing the new program in operation now. A change as proposed by H.R. 9575 would completely disrupt the pension program. Public Law 86-211 passed the House with only 34 votes against it. There were six votes against it in the Senate and the bill was supported by the American Legion, VFW, DAV, and AMVETS.

I am enclosing a copy of an editorial which appeared recently in the National News, the official paper of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. Please note that the editorial expresses the opinion that an unlimited pension, with no needs provision, such as is proposed by H.R. 9575, is not justified. (I do not have additional copies of the editorial.) Of course, there is no doubt there are some who support an unlimited pension, regardless of need, but this is not the viewpoint expressed in the editorial and such a program has not been supported by the American Legion, VFW, DAV, or AMVETS.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

[From National News, April 1960]

AN UNTENABLE POSITION

The editor of the National News in this issue of the paper proposes to set forth in type his views on the pension program of the veterans of World War I. It should be carefully noted that the sentiments expressed represent only his thinking and he does not in any manner want to infer or imply that his views are shared by any of the national officers of the organization.

The Louisville mandate on pension legislation is unrealistic, unworkable and threatens the prestige of the veterans of World War I which has taken years to build.

The mandate completely ignores the advice of experienced congressional leaders who have the best interests of the veterans at heart. It proposes a pension of $100 per month for all veterans of World War I regardless of length of service or present income.

Every pension law on the statute books was initiated with small monthly awards and then the amounts were increased over the years. The first Civil War pension law provided for payments of $6 to $12 per month if the veteran served 90 days or more. These rates were gradually increased so that by 1947, the amount payable was $90 per month.

The first provision of pensions for those men who served in the war with Spain was adopted June 5, 1920, and the amounts were set at $12 to $20 per month depending upon disability. Increases over the years brought the amount payable to the present rate of $101.59.

This was the formula recommended to the delegates to the Louisville convention but unfortunately they were confused and ill-informed when the resolution was brought up for a vote and the present mandate was adopted to the extreme regret of many delegates who had serious doubts as to the logic of endeavoring to push such a proposal through the Congress.

Now it is apparent that their misgivings were well founded. It is rare indeed that a Member of Congress can be found who will make a forthright statement that he will vote and work for a pension of $100 per month for every veteran of World War I, regardless of length of service or income. Chairman TEAGUE at the hearings on March 15, warned that a measure of this description faced a long and rocky road in the Congress. Other Congressmen have not hesitated to express their opposition to this type of legislation. They resent being asked to sponsor such legislation and have been honest and frank in advising the leaders of the veterans of World War I that a measure of this description can be enacted into law.

Your national commander faces a momentous decision. Should he adhere strictly to the Louisville mandate which he has been informed has absolutely no change of passage or should he endeavor to secure some benefits for our aging buddies and later seek liberalizing amendments that would ultimately bring us in sight of our goal. The writer prefers the latter course.

There Were No Ghostwriters at the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

THERE WERE NO GHOSTWRITERS AT THE ALAMO

(By Russell Birdwell)

Very soon the two great political parties of the United States will nominate their candidates for President. One of these men, by a vote of the people, will be assigned the awesome duties of the White House: civilian leader of the Nation, Commander in Chief of all its Armed Forces and keeper and director of its nuclear weaponry.

Who are these men who seek the most formidable job, the most responsible job on earth? But more important: who is the one man who, after the political merry-go-round has stopped, will hold in his hand the gold ring of victory?

Do we know him? Have we ever known him? Will we ever know him?

Who has written his speeches? Who—or what board of ghostwriting strategists—has fashioned the phrases, molded the thoughts, designed the delivery, authored the image, staged the presentation, put the political show on the road to win the larger number of votes?

Who is the actor reading the script?

Or, in this moment when eternity could be closer than ever before, is there a statesman who for the sake of a vote is not all things to all men; a man who will put America back on the high road of security and accomplishment, without fear or favor or compromise; a man who wants to do the job that must be done and to hell with friend or foe who would have it otherwise; a man who knows that the American softness must be hardened; a man who knows that when our house is in order no man will ever dare to trespass.

In short, a man.

There is a growing anxiety among the people to have straight answers. They don't want the handiwork of the opinion molder. They have had a bellyful of payola, influence peddling, quiz show rigging, the ghostwriting of political speeches—symptoms of a pallid public morality.

They are finished with the great deceptions.

They wait impatiently, as the free world becomes smaller and smaller, for a return to the honest, courageous, clear-cut standards of frontier days—the days of America's birth and greatness; the days when the noblest utterances of man came unrehearsed.

There were no ghostwriters at the Alamo. Only men. Among them Col. David Crockett, who was 50 years old; Col. James Bowie, 40; Col. William Barret Travis, 26.

These men left a legacy for all who prize freedom above tyranny, individualism above conformity. They had gone to Texas to carve out new lives. Their ranks included men from 18 States and 6 foreign nations.

Their foe was a Mexican dictator, Gen. Santa Anna, at the head of an army of 7,000 well-equipped, well-trained troops, who in 1836 sought to crush the growing State of that faraway land now known as Texas. Santa Anna crossed the Rio Grande River, invaded San Antonio. His first target was the Alamo, a mission built in 1718 by Franciscan Friars and manned in the year 1836 by 185 volunteer citizen-soldiers. Presumably an easy target: 185 against 7,000.

The dictator did not realize that his enemy were not a common breed. He faced hard-living, hard-loving, hard-fighting believers in freedom.

Let us look now at the words of a few of them. Their own words.

Defeated for his fourth term in the U.S. Congress, Crockett announced: "You all can go to hell—I'm going to Texas."

And then he rode 1,500 miles on horseback to Texas, not yet a part of the United States, and in his diary he wrote:

"I promised to give the Texans a helping hand in their high road to freedom. If there is anything in the world worth living for it is freedom. Early this morning the enemy came in sight, marching in regular order and displaying strength to the greatest advantage in order to strike us with terror. That was no go. They'll find they have to do with men who will never lay down their arms as long as they can stand on their legs."

In 1834, 2 years before Colonel Crockett rode into the Alamo with his followers "to hit a lick against what's wrong and to say a word for what's right," he toured the New England States as a U.S. Congressman and while visiting in Boston he wrote:

"We then went up to the old battleground on Bunker's Hill, where they were erecting a monument to those who fell in that day-break battle of our rising glory. I felt as if I wanted to call them up, and ask them to tell me how to help protect the liberty they bought for us with their blood; but as I could not do so, I resolved on that holy ground, as I had done elsewhere, to go for my country, always and everywhere."

After entering the Alamo Colonel Crockett wrote to his children in Tennessee: "I hope you will do the best you can and I will do the same. Do not be uneasy about me—I am with my friends * * *. Your affectionate father, Farewell, David Crockett."

As the Santa Anna hordes pounded against the mission that had become a fortress, Colonel Crockett wrote in his diary: "We are all in high spirits though rather short of provisions for men who have appetites that could digest anything—but oppression."

Land was cheap in Texas in those days—it was selling for 12½ cents an acre. But the price of freedom and liberty came high. Before the Alamo fell Crockett wrote: "We will go ahead and sell our lives at a high price."

Col. James Bowie, in words remembered by Mrs. Susanna Dickinson (she and her 3-year-old daughter with a little Negro boy were the only survivors of the glorious disaster), said: "I prefer to die in its ditches rather than give up an inch of Texas soil to a dictator."

When word of Jim Bowie's death reached his mother she said: "So Jim is dead. I bet they found no bullets in his back."

Col. William Barret Travis, the young South Carolina lawyer entrusted with command of the Alamo by Gen. Sam Houston, in a letter to Texas' Gov. Henry Smith:

"We are ill prepared for attack, yet we are determined to sustain it as long as there is a man left. Death is preferable to disgrace. Should Bexar (San Antonio) fall, your friend will be buried beneath its ruins. I shall not surrender or retreat."

The situation hopeless, Colonel Travis gave his men a way out just before the final onslaught: "Any of you who wish may leave with honor. Here on these ramparts you have bought a priceless 10 days of time for General Houston. You are brave and noble soldiers. God bless you."

No man gave up his post. All gave their lives, after killing 1,700 and holding the enemy for 13 days. The precious time bought enabled General Houston 46 days later at San Jacinto to win Texas' liberation.

There were no ghostwriters at the Alamo. Only men.

Depletion Allowance Senate Amendment to Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as opposed to the minerals depletion allowance Senate amendment to the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960. This amendment will adversely affect the clay products industry in my district, as well as other areas in the great State of Ohio, which is the largest clay products producing State in the United States. This industry is already operating at a reduced rate and will be curtailed even more as the result of this amendment. Most of the clay products producers in Ohio are small businessmen—the largest clay pipe producer in Ohio has sales of only $12 million per year.

As we all know, our Ways and Means Committee held extended hearings on this proposal and it was concluded that no legislation involving depletion matters would be considered this session of the Congress. Every Member of this House knows that under our Constitution, tax legislation is initiated in the House of Representatives after appropriate hearings and study by the Ways and Means Committee. For the Senate to inaugurate tax legislation is an improper seizure of the prerogative of the House of Representatives and unconstitutional.

Reports of the amount of tax loss to the Treasury, if this amendment were not enacted, are grossly exaggerated. To begin with, a clay producer is limited in the amount of depletion he can take under the law. Also no depletion allowance can be taken unless the clay producer shows a profit and then it is only 50 percent of the net income. If the Congress feels that the depletion rate has been excessive, the House Ways and Means Committee had ample opportunity to reduce it during the hearings held prior to this session of the Congress. To undertake a remedy by this means is without due process and a complete disregard of our legislative process.

I realize we are in the last days of this Congress and the adjournment rush is on. However, this is no license to vote on legislation without proper deliberation. The damage to this industry has been done and our only recourse is to consider remedial legislation during the 87th Congress. I plan to join with my colleague, FRANK T. BOW, in sponsoring a bill to remedy the injustice that has been done.

Onion Trading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, 1958, a bill to abolish futures trading in onions was signed by President Eisenhower.

In November 1959, after court tests of the measure, futures trading in onions ceased on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and on all other commodity exchanges.

The passage of the onion bill marked the first time in history that the Congress had enacted a measure to prohibit futures trading on an organized commodity exchange, although between 1880 and 1930 more than 200 bills were introduced.

When this matter was considered in the House on March 13, 1958, I stated that this measure helps no one, neither the farmer nor the consumer, and that it would be mistake to pass it.

Many of the Members of Congress will remember the campaign against futures trading in onions. It was well organized and, at times, was so intensive in character that it became hysterical.

The principal complaint against futures trading in onions was that this trading depressed prices. It did little good to argue that onion prices always had been highly volatile in nature.

Nor did it curb the opponents of futures trading to point out that the per capita consumption of onions has not increased in the past 20 to 30 years. But since 1949 the production of onions has increased 35 percent more than the rise in population.

Nor did it avail to have oniongrowers tell the committees of Congress that they used futures trading to protect themselves from the unpredictable and drastic changes which frequently took place in onions.

One of the most articulate of these, Chester W. Kempley, onion producer of Montello, Wis., told the House Agriculture Committee:

> If the Congress approves a measure to end futures trading in this commodity, I will lose the privilege of insuring my crop against a possible decline in prices. I will have to assume the entire risk of those unforeseeable changes in price which affect most commodities. Since there is no Government floor for onion prices, I will be thrown to the wolves.
>
> With today's high fixed costs of production, hedging has become a most valuable privilege, the continuance of which could mean life or death to the grower. Without it, many of us could be wiped out by a couple of consecutive bad years.

The pleas of growers who used the exchanges to protect themselves made little impression. The chorus that low prices and price declines were the fault of futures trading rose higher and higher.

One argument against futures trading in onions was that the commodity was

perishable and, therefore, not adaptable to trading. I never quite grasped this argument, but it was made.

During the hearings on the onion bill it developed that the only study conducted by the Department of Agriculture indicated that futures trading lessened price fluctuations and contributed to price stability in the commodity.

The survey was made by the Division of Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA. The gist of it was contained in this statement:

Price variability is best measured in short-time periods, such as month to month, or, if feasible, on a week-to-week basis. Of price variability data herein measured, the month-to-month changes in the cash price of onions in the 1930–40 period and 1947–55 period are probably the most valuable. This analysis showed that a significantly greater average month-to-month variation occurred in the 1930–40 period than in the 1947–55 period.

Once again, we went right ahead to outlaw futures trading—and do away with low prices in the onion industry.

What has happened since futures trading in onions ceased?

The aftermath has been some of the lowest prices in recent years.

It is evident that the solution for the troubles of the oniongrowers is not the abolition of futures trading.

Let me quote some of the prices since November by comparison with prices in other years:

Average monthly prices per hundredweight

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Season average price
1957	2.20	2.55	2.55	4.35	4.55	4.90	2.85	1.75	1.65	2.00	2.10	2.20	2.85
1958	2.45	3.10	5.00	5.50	2.65	2.50	2.45	2.20	2.30	2.50	2.70	3.25	3.39
1959	4.50	5.00	7.70	7.90	3.85	2.40	2.70	2.80	1.90	1.90	1.80	1.60	2.41
1960	1.50	1.30	1.60	2.50	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

May prices are not yet available, but all indications are that they will be well below average prices for the month for the past 3 years.

In February, 1960, the Food Research Institute at Stanford University published a comprehensive study of futures trading in onions. The study is contained in the February bulletin of the Institute.

For those interested, I would advise that they get the February bulletin and study the article, "Price Effects of Futures Trading" by Holbrook Working.

Like the study by the Department of Agriculture, the Stanford study concludes that futures trading promotes price stability in onion prices, the inference being that such trading is in the interests of the producers.

We have then this aftermath of the action in banning futures trading in onions:

First. Extremely low onion prices, contradicting the primary argument relied upon in the campaign against trading.

Second. The power of the Congress has been employed to outlaw a legitimate business and one which, on the basis of the record, served a most useful purpose.

Third. The attention of the onion industry, and of those interested in its welfare, has been diverted from the real problems of the industry which must be dealt with on a practical basis if the situation of the onion producers is to be improved.

Fourth. The abolition of futures trading in onions has injured all commodity exchanges through a precedent which indicates that they are conducting their operations on sufferance.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a most dangerous period, a period when propaganda and agitation are weapons employed systematically and effectively against democracy and free enterprise. This is all the more reason for us to keep our heads, to proceed on the basis of logic and reason rather than emotion and prejudice.

From one standpoint, abolition of futures trading was a minor matter, one with comparatively little effect. From another, it is disturbing and raises questions as to our own ability to conduct our affairs in an orderly, calm, and logical manner. We were, in my opinion, stampeded into an unwise act. This entire episode has some most disturbing implications.

I have heard it said that if the commodity exchanges had done away with abuses and had cooperated with the Congress and the onion growers, the abolition of futures trading in onions never would have taken place.

I do not defend abuses on the commodity exchanges any more than I defend abuses and excesses in any industry. But the remedy is not to kill the business concerned; granted, of course, that the abuses can be eliminated.

I think we made a mistake when we killed futures trading in onions. I said so at the time. I think the developments since then prove I was right.

There is no equity in singling out futures trading in onions for death, while leaving futures trading in potatoes and in many other commodities untouched. All the arguments made against futures trading in onions can, for example, be made against trading in potatoes.

Yet today we deny the onion farmer the means of protecting himself through futures trading. We grant that protection to the potato farmer and other farmers whose products are traded in on the commodity exchanges.

Not that I advocate further action toward the abolition of futures trading. Quite the contrary. I think we should take steps to restore futures trading in onions. This is the way to correct a mistake and to undo a wrong.

Observes 50th Year as Pharmacist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., on Monday, June 27, 1960, there appeared an extremely interesting feature on Mr. C. Roy Johnson, of Hazleton, who is currently observing the completion of 50 years of pharmacy. In reading this story, I was particularly impressed with the estimation that Mr. Johnson made regarding the number of prescriptions which he has filled during the past half century—500,000. I am wondering if this figure establishes a national record for one pharmacist. At any rate, it is interesting to contemplate and Mr. Johnson is to be warmly congratulated for the extremely fine record which he has established in both business and in the community life of the city of Hazleton. As a further extension of my remarks, I include the above-mentioned feature article from the Plain Speaker:

C. ROY JOHNSON OBSERVES 50TH YEAR IN PHARMACY

Remember the time when the accepted cure-all for black eyes was leeches?

Or the street corner medicine peddlers who attracted wide-eyed crowds by tossing handfuls of half dollars?

C. Roy Johnson, celebrating his 50th year in pharmacy, has these and many other remembrances of an age in which pharmacy consisted of a pill board, mortar and pestle, some 50 concoctions, and a strong leaning to old wives tales.

Sitting recently among the 5,000-odd preparations necessary for his pharmaceutical trade today on West Broad Street, Johnson reminisced over the golden anniversary of his profession and recalled a pertinent point:

"The Hungarian leeches were best for black eyes. Not the American leeches, because they were less efficient."

Despite the fantastic advancements made in drugs, some of the oldtime remedies still are available, Johnson points out.

Annually, the Johnson Pharmacy sells about a dozen 2-ounce bottles of skunk oil at 50 cents a bottle, dog fat, and goose oil. What use do his customers make of the skunk oil? Mr. Johnson, proffering a capless bottle to prove there's no odor, shrugs his shoulders.

One of the veteran pharmacist's prized possessions is a frame containing eight prescriptions written by now deceased doctors of the area. The costs of the prescriptions, dutifully recorded on the faded papers, range from 25 cents to under a dollar.

Such prices do not exist today, Mr. Johnson admits, because of the high prices of new drugs. Some capsules in the Johnson Pharmacy, as in other drugstores, range as high as 75 cents each. "Research costs money," he explains.

Johnson estimates he has filled some half million prescriptions in his 50 years, and—in answer to those of us who often try to decipher them—admits a telephone call sometimes is necessary to a doctor to explain his prescription writing.

The mortar and pestle still are a part of the modern drugstore, but most compound-

ing now is done by pharmaceutical supply houses, assuring the utmost degree of accuracy, Johnson explains.

The intriguing operation of the hand-operated pill board—which, strangely, produced uniformly rounded pills, is adeptly told by him.

After leaving Hazleton High School, he was graduated from Hazleton Business College. Favoring his strong inclination to pharmacy, he acquired work as an apprentice in 1906 to Nathan N. Lewis, who had a pharmacy on the southeast corner of Broad and Wyoming Streets. Under Lewis' tutelage, he became a qualified assistant pharmacist and entered the Medico Chi College Department of Pharmacy, where he graduated with honors in 1910.

Not being certain of employment in Hazleton, he took—and passed—the New Jersey and Pennsylvania State board examination. After graduating, he returned to Hazleton and was given employment by Frank Furman, then manager of the Frank & Barber drugstore.

After a short time, Nathan Lewis offered him a 50-percent interest in his pharmacy. Johnson accepted.

The store was then moved from Broad and Wyoming Streets to 35 East Broad Street and operated under the name, Sunnyside Drug Store. During the following year, Mr. Lewis built a building at 437-439 West Broad Street and then a branch store was opened at that address.

In 1914, Lewis & Johnson disolved partnership, with Mr. Lewis continuing at the Broad and Pine Street store and Mr. Johnson taking over the West Broad Street location. In 1915, Mr. Johnson purchased the vacant lot at 347 West Broad Street and constructed his own storeroom and apartment which he occupied in April 1917. It was at this new store that the first electric neon sign in the city of Hazleton and first all electrically cooled soda fountain in the city were installed.

As the Johnson Pharmacy grew, he acquired the store of Harry Andes at 571 Alter Street which was later moved to its present location at 580 Alter Street in the building purchased from the Slovak Greek Catholic Union.

In 1934, Mr. Johnson opened a store in Weatherly managed by Henry Miller. He operated this store for several years and then sold it to one of his former employees, LeRoy Lamont, who still operates it.

The Johnson family of pharmacists consists of C. Roy Johnson and his two sons, Roy E. Johnson, who manages the Alter Street pharmacy, and Don F. Johnson, who with his father, manages the Broad Street store.

In another step forward in 1955, Johnson purchased the old Holman building which adjoined the Broad Street store. The building was razed and the area paved to provide parking space for patrons.

Looking back over the many thousands of prescriptions on file, Mr. Johnson notes the many physicians who were practicing medicine in town a half century ago who have died. Among them were Doctors Alexis, Brosius, Bittner, Buckley, Bendick, Casselberry, Corrigan, Carter, Cook, Doolittle, Dyson, Dietz, Dessen, Danzer, Fagan, Grala, Gayley, Gaughan, Harrington, Hoffman, Hanlon, Hutchison, Hunsicker, Jones, Kaufman, Keller, Kochczynski, Lonshore, Lathrop, Leckie Jr., McGeehan, MacKellar, Owens, Pierson, Pierson Jr., Smith, Scott and Struthers.

Among the pharmacists who served during this period were H. J. Andes, Donald Brown, Frank Eble, Frank Furman, Peter Gabrio, Cal Hughes, Charles Haines, Earl Henwood, Bruce Hicks, Willian Krell, Jacob Krause, Nathan Lewis, B. C. McNeil, Guy Mumaw, Fred Schimpf, Ben Traux, Richard Thomas, Elwood Walk and the late George Waschko, who was a classmate and close friend of Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Reece: American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, having unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call attention to the great tribute paid our colleague, the Honorable CARROLL REECE, the Representative from the First Congressional District of Tennessee.

Thousands of east Tennesseans converged on Roan Mountain last Saturday to honor their first son, veteran Representative CARROLL REECE. The occasion was "CARROLL REECE Day," in commemoration of the Johnson City Republican leader's career of public service, which has covered four decades, and for his contribution toward the growth and development of the First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, this memorable occasion was arranged as part of the annual Rhododendron Festival, and on this occasion Congressman REECE was saluted by more than 600 letters and telegrams from Members of the Congress and governmental leaders across the Nation, including the President and Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate, I believe, to call attention to CARROLL REECE'S outstanding record as a member of the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I. He was a battalion commander and is the holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, and French Croix de Guerre. In addition to this, he was cited for bravery by both General Pershing and Marshal Petain of France.

One of the South's great newspapers, the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, in its editorial columns paid a great tribute to Mr. REECE and I am happy to bring this recognition to the attention of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. The editorial follows:

MR. REECE: AMERICAN

A vast majority of Tennesseans are able to put aside political partisanship and pay honor to a deserving native son, regardless of his political affiliations.

This refusal of Tennesseans to put party above the man has manifested itself twice in recent years. Though predominantly Democratic, the State gave President Eisenhower a majority in both 1952 and 1956.

And this independence is being exhibited today at Roan Mountain where B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee's Mr. Republican, will be the guest of honor as thousands gather for the colorful Rhododendron Festival.

The tribute will follow the format of the TV show, "This Is Your Life," and will trace the highlights of Mr. REECE'S long and successful career which is marked by success not only in the political arena, but as a businessman and soldier.

Mr. REECE is a politician, in the finest sense of the word. He is being recognized today upon completion of 40 years' service as U.S. Representative from Tennessee's First Congression District.

Congressman REECE is a party man and proud of it. Today he is serving as chairman of the Republican State Committee and he speaks with a strong voice in national party councils. During one of the few breaks in his long congressional career, the East Tennessee legislator was national GOP committee chairman.

Today he serves as president of two banking institutions and as chairman of the board of a third. Mr. REECE also is a lawyer, having graduated from nearby Cumberland University.

And Tennessee has had few sons who have served in the Nation's Armed Forces with such distinction.

A battalion commander with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I, he is a holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, and French Croix de Guerre. He was cited for bravery by both General Pershing and Marshal Petain of France.

He is now 70 years old. His political career began at 30. The Congressman is a candidate for an 18th term in the House of Representatives. He has never lost a Republican primary election and only once lost a congressional race, but at that Mr. REECE was only sidelined for one term. He won the next election.

During his lifetime the veteran Congressman has received many honors, but this recognition today by his fellow Tennesseans must rank with the best.

The Banner joins in the salute to Congressman REECE who is able to put aside political partisanship in favor of Americanism.

Tenth Annual Observance of National Catholic Youth Week, October 30 to November 6, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following article calling attention to the 10th annual observance of National Catholic Youth Week from October 30, 1960, through November 6, 1960. The theme for the week is:

RESPONSIBLE YOUTH—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

The National Council of Catholic Youth, sponsor of the week, is to be congratulated for so correctly assessing the value of our young people, and for calling so strongly on them during this trying epoch.

The United States of America rightly concerns itself with the marshaling of its moral and material resources. The importance of youth in this process is awesome. Their impact not only upon the realization of our national dreams but also upon the extension of freedom and justice in all the nations is critical.

The use of our tremendous national wealth, our moral presence in the world, our whole society and its institutions; soon these will be the everyday businesses of our present-day youth.

Two chief considerations suggest themselves. The first is that we as a Nation are blessed with young people the vast majority of whom reflect already the very responsibility on which we must rely. To these young people we owe commendation and generous encouragement of their efforts.

The second consideration is that at the risk of repetition we must impress more and more forcefully on our youth a deep understanding of their present and their future responsibilities as an integral part of our

Nation. Further, we as adults must not only expect but also exemplify the integrity, the energy, the idealism asked of our young people.

National Catholic Youth Week specifically involves the 7 million young people—teenagers, university students, young adults—represented in the National Council of Catholic Youth. They, and their counterparts in all American society, deserve our congratulations, as do the competent and unselfish adults working with them. I ask the attention of the entire public to this great week, and the support of the public for all those private programs devoted to the development of an able, spiritually strong and resourceful youth.

In Praise of HUAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James J. Matthews, of Arlington, Va., wrote an excellent letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which was published in its June 22 issue, with reference to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I feel that both the Members of the House and Senate should have the benefit of Mr. Matthew's objective and well-reasoned analysis of the work of the committee.

The letter follows:

IN PRAISE OF HUAC

I am writing in connection with several articles that have appeared in your newspaper concerning the operation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Your constant attack on the committee combined with those emanating from Eleanor Roosevelt, son James, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam and others have created in my mind a sincere curiosity about the committee, its procedures and its methods.

To see for myself what really was going on, I attended the committee hearings concerning Communist activities among seamen groups on June 7.

I notice an obvious inadequacy of coverage of these hearings in your paper, although you voice your criticism with first-page emphasis. Perhaps in an air of "academic freedom," you would like to know something of the operation of this committee which you have so freely lambasted in the past.

The events which I witnessed on June 7 would sicken the heart of any American citizen, regardless of political philosophy. The identified Communist witnesses called to testify behaved more like violent animals than human beings. One such witness, who identified himself as a student, acted in complete contempt. He yelled in defiance of the request that he lower his voice. In a smart-aleck attitude, he moved his witness chair back into the audience and on one occasion called a Congressman on the Committee, "fellow" and attempted to turn the committee hearing into a mockery of congressional procedure.

During his testimony, a group of young people in the room, delegates from the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, insisted upon loudly applauding the witnesses and jeered and carried on a harassment of Staff Director Richard Arens. Apparently the young students had arrived as a result of a meeting held in New York City at the Woodstock Hotel 4 days prior to the hearing at which they had decided to outdo the noisy protest the committee had experienced in San Francisco.

Through the efforts of the Capitol Police, the students did not achieve their goal, although at one point during the testimony, two of the group had to be forcibly ejected from the hearing room.

I am greatly disappointed in what I had assumed was a correct and fair appraisal of this committee by your paper. You have attacked it repeatedly, stating that it served "no legislative purpose," then you bury in your back pages an extremely sketchy account of a typical committee hearing which, by the way, was receiving testimony concerning H.R. 11580 a legislative bill introduced by Committee Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, to protect the security of this country's merchant ships.

The shocking, and I am not one who is easily shocked, behavior of witnesses at the hearing I attended should be seen by every conscientious American. The violent defiance of the committee was more obnoxious and contemptuous than, but quite reminiscent of, the behavior of Khrushchev and Castro in their frequent attacks on President Eisenhower and our country itself.

It is indeed unfortunate that if you have a deadly axe to grind, you have chosen the Committee on Un-American Activities as your prime target. Your newspaper, so free to state alleged abuse of "academic freedom," is guilty of abuse—that of neglecting its public duty of covering news for news' sake, and not for personal and political reasons.

May I suggest that in the future, you give more coverage to the productive work of the committee. Perhaps in this way you can prove to the public that if the committee is bad, it is so on its own merits, after a careful and fair weighing of the facts involved. I believe you are fearful of the public's decision, should they be totally informed.

JAMES J. MATTHEWS.

ARLINGTON.

Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 26, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Ohio, presented to Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, 22d District of Ohio, its outstanding citizen award at its department convention in the Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo, Ohio.

This award was presented to Congresswoman BOLTON for her legislative activities in behalf of servicemen in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. The immediate cause for nomination of Congresswoman BOLTON for this award, among her many legislative accomplishments, was her untiring efforts in the Congress and with officials of the Veterans' Administration and the many interested veterans' groups in the construction of the new VA General Medical and Surgical Hospital in Wade Park, Cleveland, Ohio. Her activities in behalf of the construction of the Veterans' Administration Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Brecksville, Ohio, was also cited by the V.F.W. committee which selected her as the recipient of this award.

The citation, presented by John F. Choffey, past Cuyahoga County council commander, V.F.W., in behalf of John Fyre, Department of Ohio commander, reads:

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Department of Ohio, awards this citation for outstanding citizenship to FRANCES P. BOLTON, who has served her community, State, and Nation for many years as a loyal citizen. Faithfully devoted to her country's needs, she stands a worthy example to young and old for sacrifices beyond the call of duty.

Mrs. BOLTON's friends, both in and out Congress, look with pleasure and pride upon this recognition of her efforts and devotion to the veterans of her district and the Nation. We note that the award specifically commends here outstanding citizenship, which I am sure her colleagues will regard as a true measure of her distinguished service in Congress.

Communications Act Amendments, 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things that has been lost sight of is what the Committee has been trying to do as the result of 78 days of investigation last year and this year. There are essentially three things the Committee has been trying to do.

First, we have been trying to come up with this bill today, which commonly has been known as the payola bill. That is one part of what the Committee has been trying to do. Second, we have had under consideration the matter of what ought to be done, if anything, with reference to networks. And, the third thing has been ex parte hearings. All of this is covered under three bills now under consideration by the Committee of which the principal one seems to be H.R. 4800, on which we have held weeks and weeks of hearings plus executive committee meetings.

Today we are talking about just the payola bill. If anything is going to be done with networks, it seems to me that ought to come up under a separate matter; it ought to be considered separately; it ought to be gone into separately, just as we have gone into the question of payola and just as we are now going into the question of what ought to be done about ex parte contact hearings. So, we ought not to get sidetracked from

the principal thing we are trying to undertake here today, and that is to dispose of the one thing that we have under consideration, and that is payola.

If anything is going to be done constructively as the result of these extended hearings, which I repeatedly mentioned on the floor, we will have to do it in some kind of orderly fashion. In my opinion, this whole question of networks and what ought to be done about them ought to be taken up separately and considered separately, and we ought to hold hearings on them separately.

I know how deeply the ranking minority Member has felt about this problem, and I certainly respect him for it, but if we are going to take these matters up and accomplish anything we will have to consider each matter on its own merits and concentrate on each issue in some orderly way.

I would like to read how the gentleman from Michigan has defined "network" in his amendment, and I quote:

"'Network' means a person or organization which, as a part of its regular business, by contract or agreement, express or implied, with two or more affiliated broadcast stations, offers or supplies program service to such stations under prescribed conditions for the purpose of effecting a coordinated broadcast of identical programs by such stations."

Now, as you turn to section 343, of the gentleman's amendment, titled "Authority To Regulate Networks," I quote as follows:

The Commission shall, from time to time, as in its judgment, the public interest, convenience, or necessity may require, (1) classify television and radio networks, and (2) issue such rules and regulations with respect to each such class of networks, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assure that the policies, practices, and activities of such networks shall not adversely affect the ability of broadcast licensees to operate their stations in the public interest.

From this I assume that the gentleman intends to have classes of networks, all of which will be regulated by the Commission. In my opinion, this part of the amendment is so complicated that I do not know how it will work. And certainly it is not definite enough for me to get an understanding from this quick reading as to what the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be upon an affiliate of two or more stations.

This brings me back to my original point, that in a matter so involved as what should be done about networks, we ought to have hearings on this in detail. Nothing could be more disastrous to America than to have the networks become involved in regulations which would not be definitely in the public interest. I certainly will do my part insofar as any regulation is necessary, but it does appear to me that there ought to be further hearings, in order that we may be certain that what we are doing is in the public interest. Today, on the spur of the moment is not the time to undertake all of the involvement set out in the amendment from the gentleman from Michigan.

Ohio's Fair Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, during this, my first term in Congress, I have sat in these Chambers and listened to hours of debate concerning voting rights of certain classes of our society. I am pleased that the 86th Congress has taken constructive action in protecting the voting rights of all of our citizens, and enacted legislation which will extend presidential voting rights to residents of the District of Columbia. There is, however, still another class of citizens who annually are denied the right of casting their ballots for the men and party of their choice. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to those who must change their legal residence, thus resulting in disenfranchisement. I am proud that my own State of Ohio has considered this problem, and taken the necessary steps to assure her citizens the right to vote. I would like to bring to your attention the following editorial from one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, the Ironton (Ohio) Tribune, which describes the procedure practiced in Ohio assuring all citizens a voice in the presidential election:

ANOTHER OHIO ADVANTAGE

Two publications which arrived in our morning mail recently carried crusade-type articles on the temporary loss of franchise in presidential elections by the millions of Americans who move from State to State.

Both decried the failure of States to correct the situation, charging them with being behind the times. One admonished moving families to look over election laws carefully, seeking loopholes through which they can evade legal restrictions and cast their national ballots next November. The other proposed a complicated electronic brain system that would dispense voting licenses to citizens.

Strangely, both articles indicated their authors are behind the times because neither mentioned Ohio, which this year inaugurates the procedure by which new residents who are otherwise qualified to vote may cast their ballots for President and Vice President.

Ohio is the first State in the Union to adopt such a provision. It was approved as a constitutional amendment in the 1958 general election and the enabling legislation to put it into effect this year was passed by the last general assembly.

According to Secretary of State Ted W. Brown, the State's chief election officer, officials of many other States sent quick congratulations to Ohio when the word got out about what had been done. They are reported to be studying the system for incorporation into their own election laws.

While we're on the subject, we should point out that the Alliance League of Women Voters claims credit for originating the idea. It is a fact that a Stark County legislator, State Senator Ed Witmer, sponsored the necessary legislation in the general assembly.

The new move is typical of Ohio's position on elections. Our laws are considered to be model ones in many respects. Officials and interested citizens alike are constantly on the alert for ways to make them better.

So to those elsewhere contemplating moves this summer, we offer this bit of advice: Don't try to evade outmoded election laws and don't fall for a plan that requires expensive machinery. Just move to Ohio.

The Future of Our Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years I have had the pleasure of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs. During this period we have witnessed the enactment of many items of legislation; the most important being the granting of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Recently we have had opportunity to give more consideration to our offshore flag areas, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Members of the subcommittee visited each of these areas during the past year preparatory to studying their legislative needs. We fully expect to present legislation for floor consideration early in the 87th Congress. In fact we have a bill pending in the Rules Committee which would provide for territorial deputies to the House of Representatives from Guam and the Virgin Islands. I am hopeful for early action on a similar bill in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I asked the Secretary of the Interior, who has administrative responsibility for our offshore areas, except Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone, for his views on the long-range needs for our territories. Secretary Seaton's answer dated June 14, 1960, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1960.

Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: You recently requested that we send to you our views on a long-range approach to the problems of various offshore possessions. I hope the following discussion will be of some assistance to you.

Our foremost objective is the attainment of self-government for each of our remaining territories. Because of varying circumstances inherent in each area involved, the method, the time element, and the degree of self-government that may be achieved, will differ somewhat.

With respect to the Virgin Islands and Guam, our two remaining organized, unincorporated territories, it is our fervent hope that the Congress will approve legislation granting them nonvoting representation in Congress as recommended by the President in his budget message of last January. This Department has urged favorable action on the legislation now pending. However, although such legislation has recently been acted upon favorably by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to date

it has not yet been passed by either Senate or House.

Despite the shortness of time remaining in the present session, I still hope it may be possible for Congress to enact legislation of this type this year.

Following the enactment of legislation for representation in the Congress, it is our view that careful study should be given to permitting the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands to elect their own Governor.

How soon such a step may be taken will depend upon developments during the next few years, particularly upon the growth of political maturity of the people in each area. In addition, we believe that such a grant of authority would have to be coupled with special provisions to take account of the following problems:

1. The financing of the local governments under a regime of full local self-government. At present, the governments of the territories are financed to a major degree by the diversion into their treasuries of what are truly Federal revenues. Whether such diversion of Federal revenues could appropriately be continued, in whole or in part, on the present basis would have to be determined, and if so, in what manner.

2. The protection of the Federal interest after there is no longer a federally appointed Governor. The Federal interest in our remaining territories is large and continuing, and we believe it must be protected through some appropriate mechanism, even though full self-government on the local level may be granted. In that connection we believe the "Federal interest" should be more precisely defined than it has been in the past.

3. The maintenance of a close liaison between such local governments and an executive agency of the Federal Government.

With respect to American Samoa, it was possible a few weeks ago to take the greatest step forward politically in more than 60 years of American administration. I refer to the promulgation on April 27 of the Constitution of American Samoa, a basic framework of government developed primarily by the Samoan people themselves. It was gratifying to me to be able to be present personally in American Samoa on that occasion to participate in the ceremonies on behalf of the U.S. Government. It is our hope that after functioning for a period of about 5 years under the Constitution it will be apparent whether or not American Samoa, as a next step to self-government, is ready for organic legislation and a change in its political status to that of an organized, unincorporated territory.

Some experience with the new structure of government for American Samoa, and with the provision of nonvoting representation to the Virgin Islands and Guam, should place us in a better position to judge what further steps forward should be taken, and how soon. We hesitate to be too specific at this time, particularly since any additional actions should depend in some degree upon consultation with the peoples of the areas affected.

The above statements represent our views at this time with respect to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. The development of such long-range programs for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is far more complicated because of the wide diversity of cultural, social, and economic interests present in this geographically scattered area. Nonetheless, in the past few years substantial progress has been made in self-government through the chartering of municipalities, the establishment of district congresses, and the creation of an Inter-District Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner. This progress we intend to encourage at every step. It is our view, however, that it would be premature at this time to hazard specific conclusions as to the future governmental organization that should be established for the trust territory on a long-range basis.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

New Jersey Lynch Attempt of Negro: Another Case of Yellow Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last month a 17year-old Negro was almost lynched by a mob of white people in Irvington, N.J., following the boy's attack attempt on two white girls.

Characteristically, the Newark newspapers did not reveal the racial identity of the persons involved. If this incident had occurred in a certain section of the United States, race would have played an important part in the news account; but most of the northern newspapers suppress news of racial conflicts in their own communities. Such is a disgraceful fact.

It is understandable that the residents of Irvington would be outraged over a Newark Negro's rape attempt against local white girls but it is inexcusable for newspapers to suppress facts while sanctimoniously editorializing on similar events elsewhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include misleading articles from the Newark-Star Ledger, Newark Evening News, and Irvington Herald. They follow:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, May 27, 1960]

BOY'S "ATTENTIONS" END IN ARREST

A 17-year-old Newark youth was arrested at gunpoint in Irvington last night after he was chased several blocks by 15 men for being aggressive toward 2 teenage girls, police reported. The boy was in Essex County Youth House today pending charges.

Police said the youth admitted following the girls, 16 and 17 years old, for several blocks about 10:30 p.m. and then putting his arm around the younger one. Their screams attracted a group of men who began chasing the boy in 17th Avenue. Sgt. Ira Tompkins and Detective Eugene Osieja, patroling the area, entered the chase and stopped the boy near the Newark line.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, May 28, 1960]

ATTACK SUSPECT RESCUED FROM IRVINGTON MOB

(By Sylvan Davis)

An angry mob of more than 100 persons, yelling "kill him" and "let's get him," surrounded a 17-year-old youth as 2 Irvington detectives escorted him into a police car yesterday after he tried to attack 2 high school girls.

The detectives warned the irate crowd to keep its distance as they pushed their way toward the police car with their prisoner. Then they locked themselves in and drove off to police headquarters.

The girls, 16 and 17, said the youth followed them for several blocks, then suddenly grabbed one of them around the waist at Grove Street and 22d Street. The second girl tumbled to the curb as she tried to fight off the assailant.

Their screams frightened him off, and also attracted a group of boys standing nearby. Some 15 teenagers chased after the fleeing attacker.

Detective Sergeant Ira Tompkins and Detective Eugene Osieja, cruising the area, spotted the chase. They caught up with the youth at 17th Street and arrested him at gunpoint.

Then they drove him back to the scene of the attack, where the girls identified him. By this time, the crowd had swelled to more than 100.

They surrounded the suspect and the detectives, yelling threats as they closed in.

The detectives hustled the youth back into the car.

After he was questioned at headquarters, the suspect was transferred to the youth house to await action of juvenile authorities.

[From the Irvington (N.J.) Herald, June 2, 1960]

ACCUSED YOUTH AWAITS HEARING

IRVINGTON.—A 17-year-old Newark youth, accused of accosting an Irvington girl as she walked with a girl friend at Grove Street and 22d Street at 10:30 last Thursday night, has been sent to the youth house in Newark to await appearance in juvenile court.

Detectives Sergeant Ira Thompkins and Eugene Osieja, cruising in the area, said they heard girls screaming and spotted the lad as he was being chased by a group of boys who were also attracted by the screams. They arrested the youth at 17th Avenue and 21st Street.

The boy told them he had been walking and had followed the girls, 16 and 17, for a block when he grabbed the younger one by the waist. She told police she fell trying to push him away. He was frightened away by their screams, police said.

A small crowd gathered as the detectives escorted the youth to the patrol car.

Dedication of Paterson, N.J., Heliport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Paterson, N.J., marches on. I know that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will be glad to read the following editorial which appeared in the Paterson Evening News on Thursday, June 23, 1960:

THIS IS A GREAT AND HISTORIC DAY FOR PATERSON

This is a historic day for Paterson and all of us should feel a sense of exhilaration as the events unfold.

Paterson Heliport is being dedicated, military and civilian helicopters float in Greater Paterson skies and land on the first Government-city port of its kind in America.

So there is profound reason for the pleasure Mayor William H. Dillistin reflects as he presides over the dedication of what will

some day in the not so distant future be Paterson's important link with the world travel.

Even as he proclaimed the formal adoption by the city of its heliport hard by the Passaic Falls where Alexander Hamilton envisioned America's first industrial city, the mayor recalled with feeling the late Mayor Edward J. O'Byrne's role in joining with the dedicated civic leaders who pressed for this port. It has been a long fight to achieve the result but today was payoff day in sweet satisfaction.

The significance of the heliport dedication is heightened by its alliance with the fourth anniversary of Forward Paterson, composed of community leaders who are dedicating their very lives to the purpose of rebuilding Paterson.

While this is Forward Paterson today, all of us share in the gratification of the community wide planning which will make for a greater tomorrow. That goes as well not only for the faithful city planners who have joined in the enterprise, but to organizations like the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, whose energetic secretary, Ed MacEwan, exemplifies the working spirit of the chamber.

And, too, interlocked into the get-up-and-go spirit of this great day, is the commercial development fund, an offspring of the chamber and representing the progressive merchants of downtown Paterson. With energy, industry, and ingenuity, they have tied Heliport Day into Transportation Week, and buses and other vehicles traversing this north Jersey area herald the mercantile advantages of downtown with bright-hued signs calling all to come to Paterson to shop.

Similarly, with the city jumping in all this activity, today comes reassuring word to the Paterson Housing Authority that shortly, Federal officials in Washington will soon be giving formal approval to the plans to remake the greater part of our downtown city. This is wonderful news, and when the formal ratification comes through, we will be on our way to the new and greater Paterson.

This city, as Mayor Dillistin so appropriately points out in his heliport address printed elsewhere in the News tonight, has a record for vital and historical firsts. Today is another in a long series.

Paterson is on the move. If you have not yet caught the spirit, get it neighbor, big things lie ahead. Make yourself a part of the team.

Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, at the Annual Communion Breakfast, Pocono Catholic Missions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I present the speech of my distinguished colleague and my friend and neighbor from Pennsylvania the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER to the Pocono Catholic Missions.

A great American, he speaks as our outstanding authority on the evils of communism and it is good to know that this excellent address was delivered before a Catholic church society, a bulwark against the encroachment of atheistic communism:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL COMMUNION BREAKFAST, POCONO CATHOLIC MISSIONS, BARTONSVILLE HOTEL, BARTONSVILLE, PA., JUNE 26, 1960

In the invitation which Reverend Galligan extended to me to speak this morning, he suggested as a subject "The Imminent Danger of Communism." The subject is based on a premise which, I regret to say, has not even at this late hour been accepted in certain quarters; namely, that there is an imminent danger of communism.

If communism is only an economic system set up for the production and ownership of things, how could it be inherently evil and an imminent danger? If it is only an economic system, the evil of communism must, at most, be that it doesn't work as well as some other system of production and ownership. If this is the case, surely those who live under it will sooner or later recognize this and change the system and those who do not have a Communist system will reject it.

Over the centuries there have been many instances of communal ownership of property. In America the Indian tribes practiced a form of communal ownership which might loosely be characterized as communism, spelled with a small "c."

J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, titled his recent book about Communists in the United States "Masters of Deceit." He might well have pointed out that the term "communism" is itself a deceit when applied to the international conspiracy which began with Karl Marx, which has since been headed by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev, and which has caused more human suffering than any force in all history.

No, communism, spelled with a capital "C," when applied to the force which has its tentacles in every part of the world today, does not characterize just another economic system.

What is it then? It is a conspiracy of a relatively few fanatics who deny the existence of God and of all moral values and who are bent on the enslavement of every man, woman, and child in the world. The objective of these fanatical few, who regard themselves as the vanguard, is not conversion of the world to the ideology of communism in the way that the Christian missionaries converted the heathens to Christianity. Their objective is conquest by force, stealth, intrigue, and subversion

The most appalling fact of this generation is the failure of the free world to grasp the fundamental nature of communism. Communism is not just a political organism within the generally accepted meaning of that term. It is not just military aggression of a particular nation or group of people.

Communism involves an ideology, but it is more than an ideology. It is a dynamic system aimed at the destruction of all moral and spiritual values and of any society built on them. It is a scheme for total regimentation and control of every body and mind in a universe conceived to be exclusively governed by materialistic forces.

One of the basic fallacies of some of the leaders of the free world in attempting to cope with communism is to regard it as just another form of government which can be voted in or out at the will of the citizenry. This is precisely what the Communists would have the free world believe, but the facts are otherwise.

There has never been a single country taken over by the Communists with the knowing approval of its subjects, and once in power, Communists have never relinquished control except where they were ousted by force. Communism generally follows the same basic pattern which in essence consists of, first, softening up its prey by deceitful propaganda; second, subversion; and third, force.

The success of the Communist conspiracy in any of its operations is in direct ratio to the intensity of the efforts by trained, disciplined Communist agents who, compared to the number of free people, are always relatively few, though they now number a worldwide fifth column of some 33 million. It is no more possible for free people to coexist peacefully with these dedicated revolutionists than it is for the body to coexist peacefully with cancer.

Now, let us consider the specifics of my theme—the imminent danger of communism. In pursuing this theme, I could generalize by quoting the testimony of FBI undercover agents who have appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities and who have stated that the Communist operation on American soil now is more deadly and dangerous than ever before in the history of this Nation. I could likewise quote the testimony of those experts on international communism who have consulted with our committee and who portray the frightening picture of Communits encroachments over the world. The Communist series of military successes, diplomatic triumphs, riots and propaganda victories in the total warfare which they are waging are sobering to all men dedicated to freedom.

If I should attempt to describe each of the many areas of Communist activity, both over the world and in the United States, which in the aggregate constitute the imminent danger with which we are faced from communism, it would necessitate literally weeks of time. I should then be obliged to discuss Communist activity in virtually every segment of our society in which Communist agents are now operating. I would have to recount the facts respecting the increasing flood of Communist propaganda, to detail the startling truth regarding Communist political subversion, to trace the activities of Communist lawyers in an operation which we call legal subversion, to describe the activities of Communist agents who are now in our defense facilities, as well as many other areas of Communist activity, each one of which is a part of the Kremlin's total warfare against its only formidable enemy—the United States of America.

Permit me then to dwell exclusively on just one phase of the Communist operation, namely, espionage. The simple fact is that the international Communist conspiracy has built and now maintains and operates the largest, most extensive espionage machinery in the history of the world. In just this one phase of Communist activity, its range, techniques and acomplishments are so extensive that I can only give samplings in an attempt to portray its imminent danger.

On the very day last September when Khrushchev addressed the United Nations with an appeal for total disarmament, two Soviet United Nations officials were arrested by the FBI in Springfield, Mass., while attempting to get classified information on U.S. defense from an American citizen.

At the time Khrushchev was blustering about the U-2 incident, I was in Europe and ordered the release of testimony taken by the Committee on Un-American Activities sometime earlier from Lt. Col. Frantisek Tisler, former military and air attaché of the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington who defected last July.

In this testimony, Tisler revealed that he had been given military intelligence training before coming to the United States in August 1955; that, in the final instructions given him before he came to this country, he was told over and over again that his title as attaché was merely a cover for his role as an espionage agent; that while he served ostensibly as attaché in the Embassy, he was actually chief of the Czechoslovak Military

Intelligence Directorate Residentura, with its headquarters in the Czech Embassy, and that five officers worked under him in gathering military intelligence in the United States—four in the Embassy and one at U.N. headquarters in New York City.

His job, Colonel Tisler testified, was, and I am now quoting his exact words, "to personally recruit American citizens to act as agents and, in their agent capacities, to furnish me with intelligence on classified materials related to the U.S. military developments."

He also said that his office facilities in the Embassy were "used to house my records and equipment, which I used for clandestine intelligence purposes."

He revealed that the Czech Ambassadors to the United States were aware of his espionage activities and those of his staff as well, and that his staff people were not the only espionage agents operating out of the Embassy. He stated that the Czech Ministry of the Interior also had a residentura in the Embassy and a suboffice in New York, and that, during the years 1955 to 1959, while he was attaché, 45 percent of the Czech Embassy staff and the U.N. delegation in New York were engaged in intelligence activities.

At the time this testimony was released, I emphasized that the U-2 incident "must not distract the attention of the world from the wholesale espionage, sabotage and propaganda operations conducted by the Communists in every country of the free world."

In March of last year, our committee released the testimony of Petr S. Deriabin, a former officer of the Soviet secret police. Deriabin informed our committee in this testimony that the K.G.B., formerly known as the M.V.D.—which is responsible both for foreign espionage and the internal security of the Soviet Union—has 3,000 officers in the Moscow headquarters of its espionage operations and 15,000 of them scattered around the world. He testified that the Soviet Union uses embassies, consulates, trade missions, cultural and scientific exchange groups, the news agency Tass, refugees and alleged defectors from communism to infiltrate its agents into foreign countries.

He identified a Major Zagorsky, who had recently visited the United States a a member of a construction delegation, as a man who had worked with him at the Moscow headquarters of the M.V.D. The same was true, he said, of Lt. Col. Aleksandr Kudriavtsev, who came to this country with the Moiseyev Dancers and took curtain calls with them at the end of their performances. He also identified Metropolitan Nikolai of the Russian Orthodox Church, who visited this country in 1956 as part of a religious delegation, as an agent of the M.V.D.

Deriabin testified that the G.R.U., the military intelligence branch of the Soviet Union, had many more agents scattered around the world than the M.V.D. and that 60 to 70 percent of the representatives of Tass, the Soviet news agency, are M.V.D. agents.

Still earlier last year, our committee released a report called "Patterns of Communist Espionage." In it was revealed a dozen recent cases of Soviet espionage activity and recruiting attempts that had not been previously disclosed. Most of them were cases in which Soviet secret police agents had attempted to blackmail into espionage persons in this country who had relatives behind the Iron Curtain or who had recently visited Iron Curtain countries to see the members of their family and relatives.

This report named seven so-called diplomats attached to the Soviet Embassy in Washington who have been expelled from the United States for espionage. It named five more who had been identified as having engaged in espionage, even though they were not declared persona non grata by our Government. It named five members of the Soviet U.N. delegation who had been expelled from the United States for spy activity, six persons attached to satellite embassies who had been asked to leave this country for the same reason, and four others as persons who had been identified as M.V.D. agents, although they had not been caught in any espionage activity while serving in this country.

The same report also quoted excerpts from the testimony of nine former high-ranking officials and agents of the Soviet secret police, all of whom have defected from the Soviet service and have testified, in effect, that every Soviet embassy, consulate, and official delegation is a nest of spies. On May 24, U.S. Ambassador Lodge submitted a memorandum to the United Nations which gave details on the espionage activity of 11 Soviet diplomatic personnel who, in the last 7 years alone, have been expelled from this country for spying.

It is apparent from these facts that no nation has ever abused diplomatic privilege the way the Soviet Union has in its efforts to steal the secrets of every free nation on the face of the earth.

Many people think that our security agencies need worry only about Communist espionage in this country. Our committee report revealed, however, that the Soviet Union and its satellites also conduct intense espionage activity against American embassies, consulates, and diplomatic officials in all Iron Curtain countries. To penetrate our security safeguards in these establishments, they use blackmail, bribery, sex, narcotics, and every device which devilish minds can contrive. All servants employed by the U.S. Embassies in Iron Curtain countries are cleared for such service by the M.V.D. and are forced to report everything they can learn in the course of their duties. Listening devices are concealed in every imaginable hiding place. American diplomats behind the Iron Curtain can never be sure when it is safe for them to talk without their conversation being recorded even when they are out in the open and can see that there is no one near them. In one case we know of, Communist agents concealed a transmitting device in the heel of a U.S. military officer's shoe.

On May 13, the West German Ministery of the Interior made its annual report on spy activity. This report revealed that in the year 1959, 3,051 persons in West Germany admitted that they had spied for Iron Curtain countries. It is estimated that there are now 16,000 professional Communist spies in West Germany, plus many more "part-time" agents. Since the end of World War II, over 15,000 Red agents have been arrested in that country. In the first 4 months of this year, 820 more were arrested.

Yet Khrushchev had the blasphemous gall to say in reference to Communist espionage at the time of the U-2 incident: "As God is my witness, my hands are clean and my soul is pure."

Does the man who runs a spy apparatus of such magnitude—and is such a hypocrite—have any right to put the United States on the defensive in the court of world opinion on the subject of espionage?

Khrushchev, to use Shakespeare's phrase, "doth protest too much."

Just a few months ago, on February 8, 1960, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified as follows before a House appropriations subcommittee:

"Our investigative coverage has clearly disclosed the continuing threat to the security of the Nation from the espionage efforts of the Soviets and their satellites."

Mr. Hoover then requested that he be permitted to go off the record while he discussed with the House Members, in some detail, the facts about current Soviet espionage in the United States.

In his testimony before the same subcommittee last year he said that the Soviet Union's "peaceful coexistence" campaign "has opened the door for foreign-directed espionage on an accelerated scale"—and then added:

"Our investigations have clearly disclosed an overall expansion of Soviet bloc intelligence activities against the United States. There has been a predominantely widespread use of 'legal' agents operating under the guise of diplomatic status. There are indications, further, of a general tightening-up of the organizational structure of the Soviet intelligence apparatus. There can be little doubt that this increasing pressure of foreign-directed espionage activity will continue with added emphasis for an indefinite future period."

What about the other side of the coin? Khrushchev charged that the United States violated international law and Soviet sovereignty by flying in the air space above Soviet territory without its permission.

In the past, there was general agreement that each nation was completely sovereign over all air space above its territory. There was no height limitation. This was in the days when planes could fly only at what we now consider very limited altitudes.

An element generally recognized in international law influenced the acceptance of this principle. This was the ability of nations to enforce their claimed sovereignty. Antiaircraft guns in those days had sufficient range to reach any aircraft. No planes could fly so high that they could not be hit. Nations could therefore control all air space above their territories. There was no question about their ability to enforce the sovereignty they claimed.

This concept in international law—of sovereignty being determined largely by the ability of the sovereign to control and enforce its rights in specific areas—is a concept of long standing. It was this principle which, many years ago, led to the recognition in international law of the extension of a nation's territorial rights 3 miles into the high seas. This, at the time, was the range of a cannon ball—and thus the general limit of a nation's ability to enforce its sovereignty with coastal guns located within its boundaries.

What is the rule of international law today on the subject of air space sovereignty? Actually, there is no clear-cut law at all on this subject. What we do know with certainty, however, is that the old concept of unlimited air space sovereignty is no longer accepted. This can be readily proved by the number of manmade satellites now circling the earth at varying altitudes and regularly passing over many nations in their orbit. Since these satellites were launched, no authorities on international law and no leaders of nations have claimed that this country's or the Soviet Union's placing them in orbit was a violation of any nation's air space.

Today, in the latest development of this kind, our country has the Tiros and Midas satellites circling the earth. These are taking pictures continuously. No one has ever seriously charged that this is a violation of international law or national sovereignty.

We know that before long this country, the Soviet Union, and probably other nations as well, will have manned space vehicles in orbit. No one has as yet suggested that these will violate any nation's air space.

What does this mean? It means simply that the old rule of unlimited sovereignty in air space is, as I said before, no longer accepted—and that what is accepted is that a nation's sovereignty ends at some altitude above the earth's surface.

What is this altitude? Is it 100 miles? Apparently not, because satellites orbit at that height without protest. It must be lower.

Is it 50 miles, 25 or 10? On this point, there is no international agreement or law. Therefore, until some agreement is reached, we must rely on general principles of international law to find a reasonable answer to this question.

The principle that obviously applies here is the old one of sovereignty being limited by a nation's ability to enforce it. So far as we know today, no nation has the ability to enforce air space sovereignty at a height of 12 miles or more above the earth—the altitude at which the unarmed American U–2 reconnaissance plane flies.

It would therefore appear that, according to accepted principles of international law, the U–2 flights over the Soviet Union were neither a violation of international law nor of Soviet sovereignty.

I think it is about time that America stood up for its rights in this case and hurled Khrushchev's charges back in his teeth. Principles of international law are on our side—and not his. It's about time we stopped feeling guilty and apologetic about legitimate steps we must take to protect ourselves from destruction at Khrushchev's bloody hands.

We have been retreating too long before the tyrants in the Kremlin on issue after issue. It is time we called a halt before we find ourselves where retreat will no longer be possible.

Yes, Reverend Galligan, and friends, there is an imminent danger from communism. There is also an imminent danger which comes from our own indifference, our failure to grasp the fact that there is an imminent danger from communism.

Red Dust Settles in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article about the Marxist-Leninist infiltration of Fidel Castro's tyranny in Cuba. The article is the work of an experienced career diplomat, Dr. Emilio Núñez-Portuondo, who served as President of the Security Council of the United Nations. His judgment has been confirmed by events.

Certainly, both the Monroe Doctrine as well as the Declaration of Caracas—1954—preclude the conquest of any American Republic by an Asiatic or European power. Soviet China and the Kremlin, defying the Monroe Doctrine and the Inter-American Doctrine of nonintervention, are establishing a most dangerous domination of the Fidel Castro dictatorship. The entire Western Hemisphere, including Canada, has a right and duty to defend itself.

KHRUSHCHEV AND CHOU EN-LAI IN HAVANA

In our issue of last November 30, on returning from our trip to South and Central America where we gathered opinions of U.S. friends, we reported:

"We are afraid, our friend continues, that the officials concerned with Latin American affairs in the State Department are not prepared to effectively combat the maneuvers of international communism, because up until now they have never had to meet a situation such as the one now existing in Cuba. It is a mistake to consider that what is happening in Latin America is a political movement of the old Latin American school. It is time to request the services of specialized experts in combating communism that must be available, not only in the State Department, but in the CIA and the FBI, as well."

When we wrote this, it was not our purpose to offend the officials of the Latin American Section of the State Department. After so many years of fighting international communism, we are convinced that it is not an easy task to correctly estimate the magnitude of their power to maneuver and simulate. It is our thought that without a great deal of experience acquired from the study of the problems created for the world by international communism, it is certainly imprudent to gain this needed experience at the expense of Latin American problems.

If the behavior and reactions of the Communists, mainly Russian and Chinese, are analyzed as if these were normal persons who think in accordance with the Christian ethics of western civilization then a very serious error is committed. Our sense of duty, sharpened by a lifetime devotion to the cause of the free world, compels us to repeat that we have become alarmed ever since observing that U.S. officials in charge of studying the civil war of Cuba have failed to realize that the Fidel Castro movement is nothing more than a new maneuver, the greatest effort to date of Moscow and Peking to subject Latin America to its sphere of influence.

Our alarm increased when doubt was expressed as to Castro's militant communism and it was argued that members of the Rebel Army were not Reds because they wore religious medals—which was, of course, a deliberate effort to deceive the foolhardy. Clearly, we have a completely Communist regime in Cuba today at the command of Moscow and Peking.

We shall not let up on our warning that Cuba is a more clearly defined Communist regime than Poland, and it is more subjected, unconditionally so, to Russia and China than Yugoslavia.

On November 30 we also wrote, "What do the Soviet Union and Communist China want? Patience, to be sure. Every day that passes is useful for the achievement of the goals of international communism. Communization will proceed in Cuba. The government will continue to take over private property and perfect its technique of repression. The efficiency of the armed forces, until now, practically nil, will be increased. And what interests Soviet Russia and Communist China even more, other Latin American countries will attempt an imitation of what has transpired in Cuba.

"On the other hand, Fidel Castro is taking full advantage of the infinite patience of the Government in Washington. He has become the hemispheric leader of international communism and of the anti-United States campaign in this part of the world. His name, it must be confessed, has become the symbol of rebellion against a great nation, the champion of modern imperialism, according to the propaganda of Moscow and Peiping. The passage of time brings him many advantages."

Well-informed persons tell us that the ideas expressed by some Washington officials on meeting the dangerous Cuban situation have passed through three stages. The first, as the Communist Government was getting started, consisted in doing, convinced as these officials were that with the passing of time the many mistakes and blunders committed by Castro would wreck Cuba, and this would serve as a very painful experience to the other Latin American states which would now receive the favors previously bestowed on Cuba.

This method could never work for Cuba. It has never worked anywhere. The United States tried it already, first in Soviet Russia 40 years ago, and then Red China, just 10 years ago, without favorable results in either case.

Rumors are circulating (we haven't been able to confirm them sufficiently to report them as fact) that the second stage consists of inter-American action within the framework of the OAS, but the formation of an inter-American army will not contain one single American soldier or marine. The authors of this plan also advise that the U.S. Government will in no case take the initiative for joint action in Cuba. A Latin American government will have to take the first step.

Naturally, this plan is doomed to failure. How will an inter-American army be formed without containing a single citizen of the only great military power in the Hemisphere? Even so, one would expect that the United States would at least take the initiative, inasmuch as it is the leader nation of the Americas and the one most directly affected by the existence of a Moscow-Peking-dominated Communist regime, only 90 miles from its shores.

The third stage is immediate and total economic blockade to prevent Cuba from receiving one single article of commerce from an American nation. As a result of the consequent bloodletting, it is argued, the Castro government will be quickly overthrown and the country will then recover rapidly.

The technique of economic blockades did not even function in Napoleon's time when he established a continental blockade against England. It was equally ineffectual in the case of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and Nationalist Spain. On the contrary, a blockade would facilitate the rapid communization of the island and its foreign trade would pass to the Communist countries on a barter basis. We have already seen that great quantities of Russian oil have reached Cuba; the same with articles that one never imagined would be sold there, such as Russian cigarettes and matches.

It was also argued by Communists and fellow-travelers that concerted action in Cuba would obstruct the Summit Conference. Well, the Summit failed, not because of Cuba, but because one of the Russian objectives is to afford time to Cuban Communists to firmly establish themselves in power.

Action against Fidel Castro and his comrades could create problems in Berlin, Korea, and Formosa, it was also said. This is a favorite argument of American Reds and sympathizers designed to give more time to their Cuban cohorts. Cuba will not present any problem regarding Berlin, Korea, or Formosa as long as the Russians and Chinese are convinced that the Western powers are determined to maintain their rights at any cost. And Khrushchev has declared that he will not bring up the Berlin problem for another 9 months.

Acceptance by Khrushchev and Chou En-lai of Fidel Castro's invitation to visit Cuba, and Castro's statement over TV last week to the effect that the Cuban economy is tied only to the Communist states are far more important happenings than could ever transpire in connection with Berlin, Korea, or Formosa.

The significance of these events cannot be lessened by statements, attributed by U.S. dailies to the State Department officials, indicating doubts that Khrushchev will visit Cuba and asserting that the Russian and Chinese bosses will be coldly received by the Cuban people because they are Catholics. What will become of these doubts if Mr. K. and Chou do in fact go to Cuba? Are they completely unaware of the machinery used by the Reds to fabricate triumphant receptions? Poland is more Catholic than Cuba

and both of these gentlemen received a hero's welcome there.

We are not trying to impose a criterion. Perhaps we write only for history, the supreme judge of the acts of public men, the judge of us all. But we are obliged to warn, once again, that if urgent action is not taken immediately to apply the Declaration of Caracas and the Monroe Doctrine, all of Latin America, absolutely all, will shortly fall into the jaws of international communism and become converted into slaves, not only of Moscow, but of Peiping.

To consider the tragic Cuban problem as a local phenomenon is the greatest of all errors. History will judge accordingly.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH STANDS UP TO FIDEL CASTRO

After the pastoral letter of Monsignor Enrique Pérez Serantes, Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, reported on in our last issue, was released, it was obvious that the other bishops of Cuba would declare their position in connection with Fidel Castro's Communist regime.

On June 2, Monsignor Eduardo Boza Masvidal, Auxiliary Archbishop of Havana, delivered the strongest Church criticism yet directed against the Fidel Castro Government and its domestic and foreign policies.

He warned in effect that "The state has no right to control the means of expression, to impose thought control, foment class warfare or usurp private properties."

The prelate described the arbitrary confiscation or expropriation of private property as "nothing less than robbery." He emphasized that neither a police state nor a welfare state "is acceptable to Christian theology." "Also unacceptable," he added, "is the state based on the extremist point of view of absolute liberalism, socialism, or communism."

Monsignor Boza Masvidal censured the attitude of the Revolutionary Government respecting the United States, saying "nationalism should not be based on hatred for any other people in the world."

The Archbishop echoed the warning against communism made 2 weeks back by Santiago's Archbishop, Msgr. Pérez Serantes, warning the Cubans that "Christian doctrine is against all imperialism."

The prelate spoke at closing ceremonies of the spring semester of the Pope Pius XII Institute of Social Studies at Villanova University, of which he is the rector.

His speech covered 14 points which are now being debated, defining the Church's position on such subjects as wealth, education, nationalism, the confiscation of property and "functions of the Christain state."

We were sure that the Catholic Church would confront the Communist regime of Fidel Castro, as we predicted. The church cannot give in to Communist regimes, not only because they are atheistic, but because in denying man's free will they convert him into a machine in the service of the state. Surely the other bishops will follow the example set by Perez Serantes and Boza Masvidal.

For those unfamiliar with the practices of international communism, we must warn that the actions of Cuban Catholic officials will not suffice to bring about the termination of the Fidel Castro regime. It is true that in Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela, church action was decisive, but we must not ignore two circumstances that do not pertain to the Cuban situation.

The first, that Peron, Rojas Pinillas, and Perez Jimenez were Catholics and Fidel Castro is not; and even more important, in Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela, existed dictatorships, but they were not Communist regimes. In these countries you had regular armies composed of Catholics, and in Cuba you have popular militias and an army composed of Communists.

The case of Cuba is the same as Poland, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, which have predominantly Catholic populations but which have not been able to free themselves from the Communist regimes, in spite of hundreds of pastoral letters and sermons in defense of democratic principles.

The Catholic Church will become the church of silence if material help is not given the Cuban people to put into practice the aspirations of the church, to put an end to the slavery to Moscow and Peking. We hope that the experts who announce exultantly that the Cuban Catholics alone will take care of Castro and his comrades will reflect that since this has never happened in any other country, it does not seem likely that it will happen in Cuba.

Independent Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence have been the ultimate goals of all individuals as well as nations, irrespective of race and religion. In a very general sense, man's long and uneven progress through the ages may be reckoned by the degree of freedom in which he has lived and enjoyed life. For that reason freedom and independence may be regarded as man's noblest aspirations.

After the First World War many new states were set up in Europe, and the free peoples in these states did well until they became casualties in the last war. Since the end of that war the spirit of freedom has fared rather badly in Europe and in many other lands, and Communist totalitarian dictatorships set up there have shown utter contempt for it. Fortunately, however, in the case of many African peoples it is different. It is encouraging to find that within the last dozen years about a dozen African peoples who have not known full freedom for a long time, have already attained independent status, and many more will join them in the near future. Somalia is one of the latest of these which became independent on June 27.

The new state Somalia, with a population of about 700,000 people in an area of about 70,000 square miles, in East Africa, south of the Red Sea, has been a British protectorate since 1887. In general they have fared better than other Somalis under other governments, but still they wanted to be independent and masters of their own destiny. And the British Empire, in the process of evolutionary dissolution, agreed to their independence. This agreement was honored yesterday, on June 27, when Somalia proclaimed its independence as a sovereign member of the family of nations. Within the next few days the Italian Somaliland will also become independent. It is hoped that then the two former British and Italian Somalilands will unite and form the larger Somalia, as it is envisaged and planned by the present leader of today's Somalia, Mohammed Haji Ibrahim Egal. Upon the union of the two Somalilands, the new state Somalia will have about 2 million inhabitants with a territory as large as Texas, 265,000 square miles. But regardless of its size in area and the number of inhabitants, today we salute the new state Somalia, the independent and sovereign Somalia in East Africa.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which the great statesman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, is the dynamic head, I, with the other members of the subcommittee, chairmaned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] and including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] extend heartiest greetings and best wishes to the new sovereign nation.

Resolution Adopted by the Louisiana Legislature Relative to Offshore Oil Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States denying rights of this State to its lawful wealth from the production of oil from submerged offshore lands has resulted in the application of one rule to other States and a different rule to the State of Louisiana, which is clearly discriminatory and based in law upon the justification of ancient treaties which never contemplated the production of minerals from such areas; and

Whereas the result of the drawing of one set of seaward boundaries for the States on the coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and of another set of boundaries for those on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico with each of the States upon the Gulf of Mexico having different boundaries, has been the allowance to all of the petroleum producing States except Louisiana of all or at least the major portion of the coastal production area; and

Whereas this discrimination against one of the States is unwarranted in a nation comprised of States of equal rights and dignity; and

Whereas this particular discrimination against the State of Louisiana causes a discriminatory reduction of revenue to the one State out of all of the petroleum-producing States which has the greatest expense to afford roads, schools, law enforcement, judicial process, and the other benefits of State and local government to the petroleum industry and the citizens engaged in making their livelihood therein because of the swamp and marsh coastline of the State which extends across virtually the entire coastline for an inland depth in many areas of as much as 100 miles; and

Whereas the economic burden upon the State of Louisiana of providing the normal

and necessary State and local governmental facilities for the petroleum industry and its employees and equipment, such as roads, schools, and law enforcement, is greatly in excess of the burden of other coastal States having a more accessible coastline; and

Whereas the loss of revenue from petroleum production from the area which other States are allowed to receive, will necessitate the State of Louisiana being unable to provide the necessary facilities for assisting the petroleum industry to expand and develop the petroleum resources of our tidelands, with the resultant loss to the entire Nation of the benefits to be derived therefrom: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate thereof concurring), That the Louisiana Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby urged and requested to take all measures within their lawful powers to obtain the restoration to the State of Louisiana of the revenue derived from offshore mineral development and operations which other coastal States are allowed; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Louisiana Senator and Representative in Congress.

Godless System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under previous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Bulletin, a weekly survey of German affairs issued by the Press and Information Office of the German Federal Government entitled "Guide to Atheism."

This article discusses the shocking antireligious and irreligious teachings of communism in the Soviet zone of Germany where, as elsewhere in the Communist world, the state arbitrarily interferes in church matters.

Distributing any antireligious books to young boys and girls is a customary Communist technique practiced wherever communism continues its propaganda and that is throughout the world. The design is to poison these young people against religion, against the most precious beliefs of their home, family, and nation.

One of the foundations of Marxism is antireligion and bitter opposition to belief in God. If the Communists had their way, they would establish Godless atheistic Communist forces in every nation where they are able to gain a foothold.

Meanwhile under doctrines of free speech and free press, religious-minded people are forced to tolerate a virtual barrage of propaganda derogatory to religious faith, religious philosophy, religious belief, and religious activities.

The article, by citing specific instances of antireligious propaganda, forcibly brings to our attention the extent to which the Communist world goes in order to discredit those who believe in God and embrace fundamental values of religion and morality and to indoctrinate the young and the people.

This practice must be strongly denounced. Our political system is based on freedom and gives to every person the right to his or her own religious beliefs. This does not mean, however, that we give to Communists or other persons the right to assail, attack, disparage and derogate the sacred beliefs of other people.

I hope that the American people will continue to recognize the hatred of communism for religion, personal liberty, human freedom and the moral standards and ethical values and religious beliefs of Western civilization. So long as this kind of spirit and activity exists in the world, our great Nation must be prepared to protect its security, its institutions and its way of life.

And by all means, we must let the courageous West German people know of our admiration and support for their stanch, fearless fight against antireligionists and allied Communist enemies of freedom, justice and decency.

A government based on hatred of God is evil and it cannot survive in the long run. And a government that teaches atheism to the young is certain to wallow in the fleshpots of materialism and wither in degeneration and decay.

The article follows:

GUIDE TO ATHEISM

Everywhere in the Christian world, young people will shortly be taking their first communion. In the Soviet zone of Germany, the inhabitants are Christians no less than elsewhere. But there, the state interferes in church matters. It has forced 95 percent of all young people to take part in a "youth dedication ceremony" instead of the religious ceremonies.

On the occasion of the "youth dedication ceremony," each boy and girl is presented with a book. Its title is "From the Other World to This—A Guide to Atheism" (Vom Jenseits zum Diesseits—Wegweiser zum Atheismus). It assures its young readers that the church serves "the ruling classes" by "subjugating the workers".

In the book's very first chapter, under the heading "Superstition," the following sentences are found:

"The word superstition is generally taken to mean belief in supernatural forces, such as soothsaying, card-reading, star-gazing, etc. Such forms of belief differ from religion in that they are not organized into religious communities. They are, however, no less widespread.

"To this day, the bourgeoisie scientists have not been able to distinguish properly between religion and superstition. Instead, by evasion and prevarication, they have tried to prove that religious concepts are not a part of superstition but differ from it fundamentally.

"Both superstition and religion came into being because of man's apparent inability to explain natural and social phenomena. Both mirror reality erroneously, in fact fanatically, and proceed on the assumption that there are supernatural beings and forces.

"Both result from the circumstance that the suppressed and exploited classes seem to be powerless against the ruling classes in an order of society based on exploitation; by utilizing religious and superstitious notions, the ruling classes can make religion and superstition serve in suppressing and subjugating the workers.

"The rulers and exploiters have an interest in keeping the workers superstitious; they want them to remain confused in their concepts of reality, so that they will not discover ways of solving their problems but will continue to rely on God, the stars, or a talisman."

The attack contained in these statements is, of course, directed specifically against the Christian religion. The implication, however, is that an atheistic crusade against every religion in the world is taking shape in the minds of the Soviet zone's propagandists.

Commemoration of Baltic Genocide Day by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians assembled at the Baltic Freedom Meeting in Boston, Mass., in protest against the violent occupation and annexation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union 20 years ago:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS ASSEMBLED AT BALTIC FREEDOM MEETING, LITTLE OPERA HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS.

Whereas 20 years ago, June 15–17, 1940, the Soviet Union violently invaded and occupied the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and thereafter illegally incorporated them into the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas by this unprovoked aggression the Government of the Soviet Union committed an international crime; and

Whereas 19 years ago, June 14, 1941, the Government of the Soviet Union started mass deportations of the Baltic people of all walks to slave labor camps in Siberia and other remote parts of the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas by this inhuman deed the Government of the Soviet Union committed a crime of genocide against the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nations; and

Whereas by signing the Charter of the United Nations and later by adhering to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Government of the Soviet Union has assumed explicit obligations as regards individual's right to life, freedom, personal security, and human dignity; and

Whereas in violation of all these explicit obligations, expropriation, exploitation, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, overt and covert deportations are being continued in the Baltic States by ruthless Soviet occupation forces; and

Whereas we free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are conscious of our responsibility toward our subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain, we feel dutybound to speak out for those in captivity in protest against genocide and inhumanity in the Baltic States under Communist tyranny; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned about the weakness of the U.S. foreign policy in the face of ever marching Soviet aggression that allows Soviet Union's Premier Nikita Khrushchev even to offend the President of the United States without any fear of retaliation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians assembled there, That—

(1) We accuse the Government of the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(2) We demand that the Government of the Soviet Union withdraw its military and political occupational forces from the Baltic States;

(3) We appeal to the Government of the United States to strengthen its foreign policy as to the Soviet Union and world communism as well;

(4) We request the Government of the United States to undertake all necessary and appropriate ways and means to speed up the long delayed liberation of the Baltic States as well as the other captive nations.

God save Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

I Pledge Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act requires students who receive loans under the statute to sign an affidavit disclaiming subversive intentions. I firmly believe that the national distrust implicit in this singling out of the academic community has no rational basis and remains as an unwarranted reflection upon the parents and teachers of the students who apply for such benefits.

The utter futility of such affidavits has been widely recognized and, indeed, was recognized by Congress last year when it repealed a similar requirement in the Labor-Management Relations Act.

I wish to call the attention of this House to an editorial that appeared in the Meriden Record, of Meriden, Conn., on June 25, 1960. It is simple, direct, straight from the shoulder and worthy of consideration by this body. Therefore, I ask that this editorial be inserted into the RECORD at this point:

I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE

The controversial "loyalty oath" requirement for students who benefit from the scholarship provisions of the National Defense Act is moving toward repeal, at least in its more objectionable part. The requirement that had students in many of the Nation's leading colleges and universities protesting and threatening boycott of the program has been deleted by the Senate and is now awaiting action by the House. If the Representatives agree with their colleagues in the upper House, an end will be written to one of the sillier attempts of Congress to enforce paper loyalty.

The act as it still stands requires students who qualify through need for the scholarships to take what has been labeled the "loyalty oath." This consists of two parts, one an oath of allegiance to the United States and the other an affidavit disclaiming subversive intentions. Nobody objected overly much to the pledge of allegiance; after all, that goes on in most every schoolroom across the Nation every morning, or should. But the disclaimer of subversive intentions was, it was claimed, a direct insult, and one which could not be tolerated by the scholastic community.

Repealed by the Senate is this subversive intentions bit, while the pledge of allegiance remains intact. This makes good sense; the pledge is a reminder, routine but by no means unhealthy, that any student, or any other member of the community for that matter, should be glad to renew. The disclaimer of subversive intentions, on the other hand, is worse than useless. Certainly it wouldn't stop any real subversive from his designs; such protestations are ineffective for such a purpose. But it would serve—and has served—to irritate out of all proportion those loyal but touchy intellectuals and students who feel that they and the educational system have been singled out for unfair question.

The whole fracas is one of those pieces of congressional stupidity that never should have happened. The House should concur quickly with the Senate action so that the whole unhappy business can be finished and forgotten.

Integration in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address by Paul G. Blazer, Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Ky., May 29, 1960, chairman, executive and finance committees, Ashland Oil & Refining Co., Ashland, Ky.:

INTEGRATION IN KENTUCKY

There are very few places in this country where there is so little display, as in Kentucky, of those unfortunate attitudes which account for the existence of so-called minority groups. This is true as regards matters pertaining to religion as well as races. In Kentucky, bigotry and racial prejudice are confined largely to people of limited education. Kentucky leaders in education, religion, industry including labor, commerce, agriculture, and communications appear to be unusually free from such prejudices. In this favorable climate of understanding and mutual consideration, Kentucky, while quietly making such gratifying progress in integration, has been able to avoid the racial tensions which have marred both southern and northern communities. In view of the accomplishments to date, there would appear to be little likelihood here of the disturbances and accompanying bitterness which have wrought such disaster in other States.

Much of the credit for the progress in Kentucky must be given to those Negroes who have provided outstanding leadership for their people. This is especially true of their educational and religious leaders. I get the impression that, despite opposition, their views continue to have general acceptance among the rank and file of Kentucky Negroes. All of us must recognize the importance of these leaders retaining their positions of leadership in the face of radical influences imported principally from outside our commonwealth. We can help them most by enabling them to prove that their reasonable attitudes are meeting with success.

College students have figured extensively in both the international and national news pertaining to political and racial differences. Young people, under the influence of skilled propagandists and agitators, lend themselves easily to disorders which often are little more than the normal expression of the rebellion of youth against authority. Any agitation which can capitalize emotionally on that characteristic of young people has little difficulty in making the headlines, as we have witnessed in many foreign countries.

Prejudices involving various races exist in many areas of the United States but, looking ahead over the years, I believe all of us must concern ourselves principally with problems relating to the economic, political, and sociological adjustments of the American Negro. We can assume that the Negro population will continue to increase and that their fields of occupation will expand, accompanied by financial ability to live in better residential areas. Due to existing prejudices, these legitimate accomplishments and aspirations will cause continuing racial tensions.

There is no easy solution. The problem is a challenge to all of us. We can't just sweep the whole affair under the rug. We must avoid extremes, but we must make progress. There will be those who are too impatient for action; others will resist all efforts toward progress. Both kinds of extremists tend to defeat their own purposes.

I feel very strongly that all of us must work toward the attainment of racial equality in education and economic opportunity. To the extent that is accomplished, many of the other problems can be solved more easily. Within all races there exists class consciousness, which has its roots in disparities in educational and living standards. These disparities aggravate all other prejudices.

When various European nationalities were immigrating to this country in large numbers, they found it necessary to take lower paid jobs with resulting lower living standards. Many of us can recall when they were referred to disparagingly and accorded scant recognition. With their attainment of economic equality and educational development, those national origins have ceased to be significant. In much the same manner, the bitter prejudices against Orientals existing a generation or two ago on our west coast are largely disappearing.

Prior to the turn of the century, when the Jews were being persecuted in eastern Europe and coming to this country in such great numbers, there was extreme discrimination against them in this country. This has been almost obliterated as the grandchildren of those immigrants, who often were almost penniless and poorly educated, have now gained positions of leadership in education, finance, entertainment, and other fields of endeavor.

It is interesting to note that, down through the centuries, Hebrews, through their own choice, have avoided intermarriage and thus have retained their racial and religious identity. In spite of a mixture of racial and religious discrimination against them, they have maintained their racial pride and are solving their problems in a manner which well could be emulated by all minority groups. For example, I am told that certain country clubs, to which only Hebrews are eligible, probably are the most expensive and, from the standpoint of difficulty of admission, are the most exclusive in the country. These clubs, of themselves, are of little importance; I mention them only to illustrate that our Hebrew friends, through the establishment of their own social, cultural, and philanthropic organizations, are not content with endeavoring to emulate any other group. They have adopted their own high standards of accomplishment in order to give full expression to their remarkable talents. They are not limiting their goals by thinking only in terms of equality.

If, through the development of similar racial pride and a determination to maintain racial identity, the American Negroes can establish challenging goals of attainment which will permit full expression of their unusual talents in many fields, their

problems will be lessened and the fears of many people, as to certain Negro objectives, will prove to have had no substance. A positive program of that character would alleviate the frustrations which doubtless exist today on the part of many young Negroes.

I presume responsible Negro leaders recognize that the elimination of every social barrier would be tragic for all concerned. There is a widespread fear that complete social integration between the Negro and other races would mean, for all practical purposes, the assimilation and absorption of the other races into what is today referred to as the Negro race. Any marked development in that direction would result in violence and a disastrous conflict.

The often used words "racial equality" should be taken to mean equal human rights and particularly an equality of opportunity for educational, economic, and social advancement, using the word "social" in its broadest sociological meaning and not in a narrow sense. Unfortunately, certain commonly used phrases, and especially those pertaining to racial matters, are confusing because they are not clearly defined and have different shades of meanings to different people.

Viewed as a whole, and acknowledging instances to the contrary, the American Negroes are continuing to make tremendous strides. Only a 100 years ago they were regarded in the eyes of the law, and in practice, not as persons but as property to be disposed of at the will of the owners. Their competition as slave labor is reported to have depressed the standard of living of non-slave-owning white people in the South. Even after emancipation, much the same situation existed and, doubtless, some of the bitter feeling today in certain sections of the South reflects those early economic factors. Regardless of wishful thinking, old prejudices cannot be eradicated quickly; radical, coercive action only intensifies them and makes more difficult the attainment of legitimate objectives—objectives in which the substance must be regarded as more significant than the form.

In my opinion, the most urgent goal of the American Negroes should be to gain better and more widespread education for their young people. The availability and the quality of their education is far more important than whether it is obtained in schools that are segregated or integrated. I strongly support integrated education. If practiced beginning with the lower grades, it should be accomplished more easily. Long-range, such integration, in the absence of violence, should greatly lessen racial prejudice. In much of Kentucky the issue of integration in schools no longer exists.

Integration in the schools of Ashland, where I live, has been practiced progressively over a period of years without, so far as I know, a single unfortunate incident. Integration started from the first grade and is to be completed through all grades in 1962 when the Booker T. Washington Grade and High School will be abandoned. All Negro senior high school students now receive a part of their instruction at Ashland's central high school. Some of them are attaining outstanding scholastic records. One of the most highly regarded Negro teachers in Ashland is instructing white students principally. Much credit is due C. B. Nuckolls, principal of the Booker T. Washington school, who has contributed to the intelligent local leadership in which members of his race take pride. In fact, the entire community is highly pleased and proud of the success of the Ashland integration program which has been made possible by many years of friendly racial relations under good leadership.

Integration in education in Kentucky has been aided by the leading Kentucky newspapers. The most prominent Negro educators have supported the conservative program of progressive introduction. It is my impression that most Kentucky colleges have accepted integration in principle. It is being practiced extensively in the larger colleges. I believe this quiet, continuing accomplishment in our Kentucky schools will be duplicated in other fields of racial relations, provided the extremists do not gain more influence. Each race has its share of extremists, and it is in these extremists that the danger lies. Fortunately, unlike other States, integration has not become a partisan political issue in Kentucky.

Certain important labor organizations made a genuine contribution toward economic equality for Negroes when they voted approval of admission to their affiliated organizations on terms of equality. The implementation of that policy is making headway. Industry in Kentucky is moving cautiously in the same direction. Progress is determined by local sentiment of rank and file employees which is not the same in all geographical areas. I am confident that gradually Kentucky Negroes will be given positions of increasing responsibility. Education and outstanding individual achievement play an important part. It is less difficult to integrate a Negro scientist into a group of research workers than a young Negro woman into an office clerical position. School integration should improve the personal attitudes which influence employment discrimination. The personal attitudes to which I refer are usually inherent and largely beyond the control of the individual. People, when questioned regarding their prejudices, often say they do not know why they feel that way. Since it is principally an involuntary, subconscious prejudice, it can be altered only gradually. While usually the prejudice is dormant and scarcely evident, a minor incident caused by too rapid change can lead to widespread bitterness and thus destroy years of progress.

It has been said that, in the South, Negroes, as individuals, may be regarded with affection and esteem, even though they are not similarly regarded as a group, whereas, in the North, the situation is the reverse in both respects. I am uncertain as to the complete accuracy of that statement, but it probably has sufficient validity to support my personal opinion that racial problems and their solution vary widely in different areas; courses of action appropriate for one community may be inappropriate and highly damaging to racial relationships in other communities. Organizations working for racial equality often defeat their purpose by failure to recognize that fact. Generalizations in such a delicate, psychological field are dangerous. Personally, I believe the lessening of racial inequities can best be facilitated by a frank exchange of ideas at the local level in connection with a careful appraisal and recognition of the attitudes in the individual communities.

Pursuing that thought, I am confident that present community and individual attitudes in Kentucky, on the average, reflect greater understanding and are far more conciliatory than in the Deep South or in those areas in the North where are substantial Negro populations. We must make certain that we do not lose any of the ground we have gained. If we can avoid the introduction into Kentucky, from either the North or the South, of extreme attitudes which certainly have no place here, there will continue to be a lessening of individual prejudices. Just as the young people of our generation are much more tolerant than their parents, the next generation should have better mutual understanding. There will continue, however, to be many problems which must not be neglected and toward the solution of which all of us must proceed cautiously but constantly.

You young people who are now graduating from Kentucky State College are the chosen few. You will be faced with great responsibilities because of your greater opportunities. You should keep foremost in your minds the importance of personal achievement.

I urge each of you to develop your abilities to the utmost. If you should be one of those from your group who can emerge as an inspired Kentucky leader, comparable to Dr. Whitney Young, Dr. Rufus Atwood, Publisher Frank Stanley, Attorney Charles Anderson, Dr. Atwood Wilson, Mrs. Murray Walls, Dean Kathaline Carroll, or State Representative William Childress, you will contribute more to the advancement of your people in Kentucky than a dozen extremists who believe progress can be attained by arousing emotions and stirring up trouble.

I am aware of the unhappy events that your college has experienced recently which resulted in the destruction of your gymnasium. This points up what can happen when youth becomes misguided and I emphasize that, given the same ingredients, it could happen anywhere. The job of all of you now, administration, faculty, alumni, and friends, is to rid your minds of the sorrows of the past, and get along with stronger preparation for the future. For 74 years this college has served the youth of this State and it will continue to render even greater service in the future.

Our State is justified in replacing destroyed facilities and proceeding in orderly manner with other planned improvements. I have no doubt but that the college can arise out of the recent unfortunate situation even stronger and more serviceable than it ever was before, for it is out of hardship and adversity that man develops and grows strong.

You will be faced with the necessity of making many important decisions. In order to avoid mistakes, you will have to separate the important considerations from the unimportant. You must be guided only by the fundamentals which have substance and permanency. Your education, supported by good character, hard work, and confidence in yourself, should assure success.

I am sure you are aware that in order to gain equal recognition, you may have to do better than others. Often that is an additional challenge and not a disadvantage. More people fail because of lack of incentive to give their best than because of obstacles. Circumstances are sure to provide obstacles, but you must develop your own incentives and self-confidence. Remember strength and courage often come unexpectedly when they are most needed.

The necessity for building an independent social structure to accompany the anticipated rapid progress of Negroes in all fields of endeavor should provide an attractive challenge for you young graduates to whom we in Kentucky will look for the future leadership of your race.

Results of a Poll in Fifth Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a survey of my district on several issues before the Nation. In order to apprise the House of the thinking of the people of the Fifth Congres-

sional District of Ohio on these important matters, I am inserting the results of this poll in the RECORD.

The questions and the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers to each question given by the people of the district in the questionnaire are set forth below:

1. Should such an anticipated $4 billion surplus develop, do you favor a reduction in our national debt ($290 billion) before a tax reduction? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

2. Do you favor legislation to permit the Federal Government to intervene in a labor dispute affecting the Nation's economy after the 80-day cooling-off period has expired? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

3. Should labor unions be subject to the antitrust laws? Yes, 84 percent; no, 16 percent.

4. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to put the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis? Yes, 57 percent; no, 43 percent.

5. Do you favor an additional increase in your social security tax to cover hospitalization and surgical benefits for the aged? Yes, 36 percent; no, 64 percent.

6. Should the income limitations be removed from our social security laws? Yes, 44 percent; no, 56 percent.

7. Do you favor repeal of the constitutional amendment limiting the Presidency to two terms? Yes, 29 percent; no, 71 percent.

8. Should the benefits of the GI bill be made available to our peacetimes servicemen and women? Yes, 39 percent; no, 61 percent.

9. Should the income limitations be removed from our veterans' pension laws? Yes, 38 percent; no, 62 percent.

10. Do you favor the Senate-passed bill to provide Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries? Yes, 36 percent; no, 64 percent.

11. Do you favor President Eisenhower's use of "personal diplomacy" in an attempt to settle world problems? Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.

Communications Act Amendments, 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell the gentleman that, in my opinion, this is a worthwhile measure and I believe that it deserves the unanimous support of the House. It is like voting against sin or against crime.

All of us well remember the hearings conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], last year and also this year, when the abuses involving payoffs or payola were uncovered. I want to commend the committee for bringing these abuses out into the light and for suggesting the necessary corrections.

It seems to me that the broadcasting industry, and television in particular, is still not fully aware how much harm it has done to itself by these abuses. It will take years before its prestige and honor is reestablished in the public eye. People have lost confidence in television, regard it with cynicism, and in numerous instances have learned to ignore it. The American public does not like when it is so taken for granted and its trust abused.

I regret this state of affairs. The broadcasting media should and could be a great source of public enlightment, entertainment, and education. It is still not too late to make them so. Abuses such as payola should be eliminated and outlawed for the benefit of the industry and the American people, and the sooner that is done the better it will be for all concerned. To permit this type of racketeering to exist only makes a laughing stock of our broadcasting industry in the eyes of our own people and visitors from abroad.

I may not be present for the final vote since I am leaving soon to keep a speaking engagement, but I should like to utilize this opportunity to state my views and to urge my colleagues for affirmative action on the bill.

Health Care of the Aged—Who Pays the Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Harvard Business Review for January-February 1960. Written by Gaston V. Rimlinger, it presents an impartial discussion of the facts about health care of the aged:

HEALTH CARE OF THE AGED—WHO PAYS THE BILL?

(By Gaston V. Rimlinger)

(Business, already shouldering the costs of social security, sees another burden to be lifted, and needs to figure what its part should be.)

Are incomes from the best commercial health insurance policies adequate in view of the rising health costs of the aged?

Should health benefits for retired employees be kept on a voluntary basis, or made compulsory as part of the social security system?

Is it inevitable that industry will be called on to increase greatly its contributions either to private or governmental programs of health insurance for retired employees?

How can the employee best be encouraged to pay during his years of greatest productivity for the higher medical benefits he will need in his declining years?

While pensions plans and social security for aged citizens have become an accepted part of the American scene, payments under both private and Federal plans are insufficient to support retired persons when sickness strikes them. Coupled with the astronomical rise in ordinary living costs has been a skyrocketing of medical and hospital charges—expenses which retired citizens naturally incur more than any other group, simply because they are older.

The question of what can be done to provide adequate medical care for retired employees is a nagging problem to businessmen. The problems relative to caring for the aged extend far beyond what used to be considered the employment relationship; today employers know that they must find a satisfactory solution quickly. These questions no longer are the concern only of businessmen with a strong sense of social responsibility. They arise at the management-labor bargaining table and often form a considerable part of union contract demands. Speculations regularly take place in Congress relative to placing compulsory health insurance for the aged under the social security system, necessitating, of course, sizable regular contributions from all businesses. In one way or another, today's businessman will have to help provide for the health and well-being of his employees long after they have ended their active employment with his company.

Some of the most recalcitrant problems raised by the steadily mounting pressure to provide more adequate health protection for elderly citizens lie in the areas of underwriting and financing the costs of such protection. In examining the nature of these problems and in surveying proposed alternative solutions, this article seeks to offer a brief from which executives can decide for themselves the most efficient way to support health care for employees.

MULTIPLE PROBLEMS

Here are some of the major reasons why the search for a solution has assumed increased urgency:

1. The aged population, commonly understood to comprise those who are 65 years old or over, is increasing and will continue to increase both absolutely and relatively to the total population. The number of aged rose from just over 3 million in 1900 to over 15 million in 1959; the figure is expected to surpass 21 million by 1975. Of the total population, only 4 percent in 1900 were over 65 years old, but it is estimated that the figure will be around 10 percent by 1975.[1]

2. Accounting in part for this increase in population has been a scientific revolution in medicine in the last 50 years which has considerably lengthened the span of life and virtually eliminated some dreaded diseases. Although the most dramatic impact of these advances has been felt in the younger years (23 years, for example, have been added to life expectation at birth since 1900), recent developments in surgery and antibiotics are highly significant in the field of geriatrics.

3. The increased number of aged and the medical revolution, combined with a rising standard of living, have produced a wide spread concern with the problems of the aged. These forces engender, moreover, a significant transformation in our social attitudes toward the economic and medical welfare of our senior citizens. Never before have there been so many publications, conferences, research projects, and organizational experiments that deal with these problems.

4. The most immediate pressure intensifying the feeling that "something must be done quickly to meet the health cost of the aged" is the threat—or promise—of Federal compulsory health insurance within the framework of the social security program. The sections providing for such an insurance system were stricken from a bill (H.R. 9467) introduced by Congressman AIME FORAND in 1957. However, he introduced a new bill

Footnotes at end of speech.

(H.R. 4700) containing essentially the same health provision in the 86th Congress. Hearings held on this bill in July 1959 brought no further action, but it is expected that this election year will provide an excellent opportunity for the enactment of its major provisions.

5. Many aged persons are unable to finance their health expenses because their health costs are considerably higher than average while their incomes are considerably lower. Underneath this simple explanation lies a host of interrelated issues and implications relevant for a longrun solution of the financial problem.

UNABLE TO PAY

As a group, aged persons have low incomes which can be directly related to two general causes: (a) the growing gap between total-life and working-life spans, and (b) the inadequacy of existing pension arrangements. Retirement, forced or voluntary, and lack of employment (or employability) account for the fact that in 1958 only one in every five persons aged 65 or over had any income from employment compared to one in every four in 1948. Aged persons drawing benefits from social security and related public programs increased from 20.2 percent to 68.2 percent between 1948 and 1958. Despite a vast increase in public benefits, and notwithstanding similar improvements in private pensions, there were still 8.8 million aged persons in 1957 with cash incomes of less than $1,000.[2]

In addition to incurring higher average health costs than the population as a whole does, the aged must pay rising physician, hospital, and pharmaceutical charges out of incomes that are frequently fixed or nearly so.

The U.S. National Health Survey for 1957 to 1958 confirms earlier findings on the higher incidence of illness and disability among the aged. Bed-disability days and restricted-activity days per person were found to be over two times higher than for the entire population and about three times higher than for the 25- to 44-year age group. The number of days per 1,000 persons spent in short-stay hospitals (excluding such institutions as psychiatric and tuberculosis hospitals) was nearly twice as high for the aged as for the average of the population. The same group saw physicians 6.8 times per year per person against an average of 4.8 for all ages.[3]

The causal relation between illness and low income must be remembered too. Those aged persons who are in the work force lose over twice as many workdays per worker per year as the average of all workers—causing a significant drain on their incomes. Also, a low income status often implies inadequate housing and nutrition, as well as a lack of preventive care, all of which aggravate medical conditions and increase health expenses.

Employment opportunities, pensions, savings, and price stability are significant factors bearing on the aged's ability to pay for health protection and are, to a greater or lesser degree, subject to the joint or separate actions of management and labor. To assess the significance of these factors, however, we must have some idea of health costs and of available methods of meeting them. In this latter area management can and has made direct contributions to the solution of the aged's health cost problem, but current efforts are not commensurate with the scale of the task.

FOOTING THE BILL

In considering how health costs are financed, we shall disregard the significant amount of free care given elderly patients by their physicians and focus on actual charges. Disregarded, also, are unmet health needs, which can be quite substantial. A national survey conducted in 1953 under the auspices of the Health Information Foundation indicates that aged persons who incurred health expenses paid, on the average: $233, hospital bill; $74, physician; $42, medicine; and $61, other medical items (e.g., appliances, nurses).[4] A sample study of aged recipients of social security in 1957 shows that 6.6 percent of the beneficiary couple had medical expenses of $1,000 or more.[5]

How are these charges met? And what is the role of various agencies and organizations in meeting them? Comprehensive information on how payment is made for the health expenses of the aged is not readily available. moreover, the picture is continually changing. The safest generalizations that can be made are these: (1) health insurance so far plays only a minor role in defraying such medical charges, and (2) the vast majority of aged persons bear the financial burden of their health charges without assistance from either relations or welfare agencies.

According to the 1957 survey of social security beneficiaries, only 14.4 percent of married couples and 9.2 percent of unmarried beneficiaries had some of their medical costs met by insurance. Of the couples without insurance coverage, 85.5 percent were also without assistance for the payment of their medical bills from welfare agencies or relatives. Of the couples with insurance, 89.6 percent were without outside financial help; some of their health bills simply remained unpaid. Medical debts increased for 3.8 percent of the couples without insurance benefits and for 15.1 percent of the couples with insurance benefits.[6] (The latter group most likely had mainly hospital and surgical expenses which are relatively high, but for which insurance is more common.)

These data generally confirm the findings of a 1952 survey of aged persons in Rhode Island. Only about 10 percent of the Rhode Island aged incurring medical bills had insurance benefits; 11 percent had help from relatives and 8 percent from public assistance.[7]

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

A cursory examination of how the health bills of the aged have been met in the recent past can easily lead to unduly pessimistic conclusions. The situation is more promising, at least for the future, especially if one focuses on efforts to deal with the issue.

But as far as management and organized labor are concerned, they have only begun to recognize the burden of health expenses on old and retired workers. The inclusion of benefits for retired workers and dependents in collectively bargained health plans is a recent development, and its extent is not fully documented.

A study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of 300 health and welfare plans, covering 40 percent of all workers under such plans in late 1955, shows that 67 of them (covering 1,784,000 workers) extended hospital benefits to retired employees; and 58 (covering 1,745,000 workers) extended surgical benefits; and 35 plans (covering 1,491,000 workers) extended medical care benefits. Similar benefits were available to the dependents of the retired workers in about 80 percent of the cases.[8] This development is vastly important, but the great majority of the active workers under health and welfare plans still lose their protection on retirement. And among those who keep their benefits, slightly less than 25 percent suffer reductions in benefits on retirement.

From the financial viewpoint, the arrangement under these plans was less favorable for retired than for active workers. In less than one-half of the plans the employer covered the entire premium cost for the retired worker, and in only about one-third of the plans did he cover the entire premium cost for the retiree's dependents. In about one-fifth of the plans the employer shared the premium costs with workers.

It is important to note, however, that "although a substantial proportion of the plans required the retired worker to pay the entire cost of hospital, surgical, and medical benefits if he wished to continue coverage for himself and his dependents, the retired worker gained the advantage of group-rate participation which otherwise would not have been available to him."[9] In this manner, by allowing the retired employee to continue as a member of the group, the employer and active employees can make a significant contribution toward increasing the availability of insurance protection to their retired colleagues. The cost of insurance for each active member, of course, will have to reflect the shared higher expenses of the aged subscribers.

A word of caution must be entered against an increasingly widespread tendency to use statistics on the percentage of persons covered to mean the percentage of persons with adequate health protection.

Coverage usually does not mean that all expenses are covered. There remains great room for experimentation in this area, but progress is being made as far as can be concluded from the most recent information which seems to indicate that plans are gradually being liberalized as experience is accumulated. A 1958 digest by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of 100 collectively bargained health and insurance plans—admittedly not necessarily a representative sample—shows that 45 of the plans extend hospitalization, 40 extend surgical benefits, and 26 extend physician's benefits to retired workers.[10]

Employee health plans fall into the general category of voluntary insurance. The important question of what the role of such plans will be in the future depends on three factors: (1) the general effectiveness of voluntary insurance in providing health protection for aged people; (2) the accessibility of such insurance to individuals not covered by employee plans ("accessibility" includes not only the availability of appropriate policies but, as well, the ability of the retiree to pay for them); and (3) the availability of protection through governmental measures. The character of industry's future responsibility for the health care costs of the aged is determined to a large extent by the development of workable private versus public methods of insurance.

VOLUNTARY INSURANCE

According to recent estimates, about 40 percent of the group 65 years old and older throughout the country possess some form of medical, surgical, or hospitalization insurance. Taking hospitalization insurance alone, the New York Department of Insurance estimated that 65 percent of the State's senior citizens were without coverage in 1956. This does not mean, of course, that the remaining 35 percent were fully covered. although most people with hospitalization insurance also have surgical insurance.

Insurance against doctor bills not related to surgery is much less prevalent, however. These bills are of lesser importance on the average but by no means unimportant on a restricted budget. And, in this connection, it is worth noting that the more restricted the budget, the less likely is the possession of health insurance. The 1957 survey of aged social security beneficiaries shows that of the couples with incomes of $5,000 or over, 66.5 percent of the husbands and 70.1 percent of the wives possessed hospitalization insurance. For husbands and wives with a family income of less than $1,200, only about 20 percent had hospitalization insurance.[11]

In spite of the fact that the aged still represent the largest group not covered by health insurance, considerable progress has

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

been made in recent years. A comparison of the 1951 and 1957 surveys of aged social security beneficiaries shows that those with some health insurance rose from 23 percent to 43 percent in the 6-year interval. A large share of the credit for this remarkable progress is due the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. Of the estimated 6 million persons 65 years old or over with hospitalization insurance in late 1958, about 3½ million were covered by Blue Cross.[12]

Progress in voluntary insurance coverage depends not merely on ability to pay for it but also on the availability of insurance. Both factors are affected to some extent by company policies. An indication of the significance of the availability aspect is brought out by the fact that most of the aged members of both Blue Cross and Blue Shield enrolled originally at their place of work and continued their coverage after retirement.

The majority of the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans offer continuation of benefits to members regardless of age, but most of them place an upper age limit on nongroup enrollment, which makes it impossible for an aged person independently to acquire insurance. Older people who are able to convert their previous group contract to an individual policy and those who are still able to acquire nongroup coverage often find, even under the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, that their rates are about 15 to 20 percent higher than those for group coverage. Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans have been liberalized in recent years, but some of them still restrict benefits for aged nongroup enrollees, especially for preexisting, chronic medical conditions.

Restrictions can be eliminated completely with group enrollment, a fact demonstrated by the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York which insures against the full cost of comprehensive care, without loss of benefits for those who convert to individual contracts on retirement. Commenting on the New York plan in a recent HBR article, Edwin J. Grace cited the advantages of such comprehensive care, that is, care for the insured both in and out of the hospital. Such a plan of preventive medicine, Grace feels, will facilitate early diagnosis, effective medical treatment, and reduce unnecessary surgery and ensuing hospitalization.[13]

TOWARD FLEXIBILITY

In addition to these advances by nonprofit organizations, insurance companies have made efforts in recent years to provide more effective health insurance for the aged population. Since 1952 an increasing number of group policies with individual conversion features have been made available to employers. Younger persons are offered policies permitting coverage to more advanced or unlimited ages. Companies have begun to issue, as well, both group and individual insurance to older people.

Another new development, still in the experimental stage, but introduced by three major companies, is the issuance of individual policies which become paid up at age 65. Unfortunately, there are no figures available on the number of persons covered by these different commercial policies or on the actual amounts of benefits they provide. It should be remembered, however, that these are indemnity plans which pay fixed sums of money for specific illnesses, usually calculated to be somewhat less than expected cost.

Although the availability of commercial insurance for aged persons is definitely improving, restrictive practices should not be overlooked, since such practices can make insurance deceptive. The New York State Department of Insurance has reported that within the State in 1956 only about 22 percent of those covered by group health insurance contracts had the right of conversion to individual contracts at retirement or other termination of employment. Such conversions, furthermore, usually entailed substantially higher rates as well as a reduction of benefits. Its findings on individual policies are even more startling, for here only a "little more than 1 percent * * * are noncancelable or guaranteed renewable for life."[14] New York has been more concerned than most States with legislation prohibiting cancellations because of age or high health costs of the beneficiary. Information concerning the frequency of such cancellations and nonrenewals in the country at large is not available.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Government at all levels is already paying a substantial share of the medical bills of the aged population. No attempt will be made to enumerate the governmental agencies concerned with providing or financing helath care. Similarly, contributions by philanthropic organizations cannot be examined. Note, however, that most of this care is available only to indigent and medically indigent groups (those who are self-supporting except for medical expenses), or to specific categories of individuals like aged war veterans, retired military personnel and their dependents, aged beneficiaries of workmen's compensation, and aged inmates of penal and certain long-stay health institutions.

Without minimizing the value of the services provided for these sepcial categories, the most important governmental medical assistance to the aged is for patients on relief, individuals who meet a needs test. Here progress also has been made in recent years, but lack of central information on local, county, and State activities makes it impossible to obtain a clear, up-to-date account of the situation.

Until 1950, Federal funds granted the States for old age assistance could not be used to make direct payments to suppliers of medical services, although the cost of such services could be included in computing the amount of the public assistance granted the recipient. An amendment to the Social Security Act in 1950 permitted States, under certain circumstances, to use Federal funds to make direct payments to suppliers of medical services, instead of giving the money to the needy person and letting him decide whether or not to pay his medical bills. This amendment gave more flexibility to the States, but its general significance was greatly limited because no additional Federal funds were provided and because medical assistance to the indigent in many States is mainly a local, not a State responsibility. More Federal money and more convenient methods of matching Federal and State funds were made available to the States by amendments to the Social Security Act in 1956 and 1958.

In spite of improvements, and belying the popular notion that in America the very poor as well as the very rich get the best medical care much remains to be done to furnish the needy with care comparable to that available to those who can afford to pay. This is one of the main conclusions reached by a comprehensive study of medical care for the needy, made in 1956 under the auspicies of the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California. It notes that "except for 12 States, public medical care programs are limited, and the public welfare recipient who is ill must rely on the good will and free services of physicians and voluntary hospitals."[15]

THE ROAD AHEAD

This is a particularly appropriate time, in view of the still unsettled status of proposed financial measures, to look ahead, evaluate various alternatives, and try to anticipate the future role industry will play in this area.

There is little doubt that in the years to come employers will assume a greater share of the financial burden. During the last 10 years, developments in pension and benefit plans have laid the groundwork for this extension of fringe benefits. Many of the arguments advanced in support of pension plans can be applied to health plans for retired employees. Moreover, whether he does it alone or with his employer's assistance, it is most sensible for the individual to pay for the high health expenses in his later years of life when his income is highest, preferably during his most productive years.

There will always be some disagreement, as in the case of other benefit plans, over how much expense should be borne by the employee and how much by the employer. But this is not the crucial issue. The main controversy in recent years is whether health benefits for retired employees should be kept on a voluntary basis or made compulsory as a part of the social security system. In the latter case all employers would contribute to the aged's health expenses; under the voluntary system, management and labor retain a choice of how they will allocate the wage bill.

No attempt can be made here to deal with all aspects and implications of the complex question of voluntary versus compulsory insurance. But any answer must take into account the potentialities for success and the problems connected with either approach. It will be useful, therefore, to examine briefly the case for and against compulsory insurance under social security and the potentialities and problems inherent in the extension of voluntary insurance.

COMPULSORY INSURANCE

The 1959 version of the Forand bill, like its 1957 predecessor, provides aged old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries with up to 60 days of free hospitalization a year, up to 120 days a year of combined free hospitalization and nursing home services, and full payment for the cost of surgical services. To finance these services the social security tax on both employers and workers would be raised one-fourth of 1 percent of taxable wages starting in 1960. The patient would retain free choice of physicians, hospital, or nursing home, and these would receive payments according to rates stipulated in agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The program outlined by this bill is not just another amendment to the Social Security Act; it represents a development of major significance—evident from the strong reactions it has evoked. The American Medical Association has called it a revolutionary proposal and has declared its strong opposition to it. The American Hospital Association has been inclined to compromise: It feels that some Federal measure is necessary to relieve hospitals of serious financial strain, but finds the compulsory aspects of the Forand bill unsuitable. Others reported to be in opposition to it are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Retailers Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the life and health insurance industries, and the National Association of Manufacturers. The AFL–CIO, on the other hand, is strongly in favor of the bill as an initial step toward more thorough coverage.

Aside from strong objections raised as a matter of principle by interested parties against any kind of compulsory health insurance, a number of cogent arguments have been advanced. The most weighty, in my opinion, is the danger that the lack of any provision for care outside of hospitals and nursing homes will further increase the bias, inherent in many of our present voluntary insurance arrangements, toward use of these facilities for illnesses that could be treated

Footnotes at end of speech.

more cheaply at home or in the doctor's office.

Another argument is that, viewing progress in voluntary coverage, the bill is a hasty and irrevocable measure which will undercut the possibility of a solution through voluntary efforts. Others are concerned about the longrun impossibility of limiting the amount and kind of protection provided—they see socialized medicine wedging in and fear that it will not be feasible to restrict the program to the aged once it is enacted. Some fear it will be impossible to predict and keep costs under control. Finally, there are many administrative problems that have unfavorable implications for good medical practice.

None of these arguments is entirely without foundation, and if the goal is a perfect system, the enactment of the bill will vindicate its critics. Whether its potential shortcomings are greater than the potential weaknesses of voluntary insurance is not mainly a matter of facts but of the values we attach to facts.

Assuming that we are willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to assure that adequate care is accessible to our seniors without undue financial hardship to them, then it is a matter of determining the suitability of voluntary measures to achieve this end. Those who argue most strongly in favor of the Forand bill center their case on the inability of voluntary methods to provide what we desire. A recent AFL–CIO press release argues that the best commercial policies now available are not nearly good enough. Nelson Cruikshank, the director of the AFL–CIO department of social security, gives essentially these arguments:

1. Commercial policies are expensive and their cost has to be borne by the older persons alone.

2. Aged couples have to face these costs at a time of rapidly declining ability to pay.

3. The vast bulk of health expenditures are not covered by the available indemnity policies, despite their cost.

4. The policies lapse if the holder forgets to submit his premium within a stated period.

5. There is no protection against Statewide premium increases in fees or against cancellation of a plan.[16]

POTENTIAL OF VOLUNTARY PLANS

Some of the foregoing weaknesses apply mainly to commercial indemnity health insurance purchased by aged persons. What are the promises of company health plans for retired workers, paid-up-at-65 commercial or nonprofit plans, or special nonprofit plan policies to be purchased after retirement?

Company health plans cannot hope to cover more than a fraction of the aged population. Moreover, the great majority of these plans provide only limited protection against health care expenses. Most of these plans have ceilings on covered expenses, not only to reduce the cost, but because costs of comprehensive care are difficult to predict. In fact, the more comprehensive the coverage provided, the more unpredictable are costs. Companies and insurance underwriters are understandably reluctant to guarantee the cost of an unknown quantity of services far into the future—a future subject to changing price levels and advancing medical technology. They are on much safer ground if they limit their future commitments to specified maximum figures. Even then, companies have an additional interest either in not hiring a worker past his fifties or in not including him under the plan.

Considerable extension of coverage might be possible by allowing more retired workers continued participation in the group plan of the active workers at their own expense. So far, experience with this approach has not been promising. For instance, only a small percentage of those with conversion privileges under the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York choose to continue their coverage, even though individual premium rates are only slightly higher than group rates. Many more, undoubtedly, could afford it. There is a serious need for educating older workers to be fully aware of their insurance needs.

ALTERNATE SOLUTION

The outlook for voluntary, reasonably comprehensive coverage other than company health plans is not too encouraging. The insurance industry suggested a paid-up-at-65 indemnity insurance, but it presents difficult underwriting problems. Actuarial experience will have to accumulate before the extent of feasible coverage can be determined. Even more than company health plans, this kind of policy has to limit the range of benefits in favor of cost predictability, at least for the time being. And, unless a person purchases this kind of policy early in life, it necessarily would be expensive. This is not an argument against the policy, but against its immediate significance even as a limited solution to the problem of the aged.

From the medical profession have come several interesting suggestions regarding the adaptation of Blue Cross-Blue Shield to the requirements of the aged population. One of these, the paid-up-at-65 Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan, has not received much encouragement from those responsible for its management. The major objections again center on the problem of longrun cost predictability, on the additional problem of financial management created by the necessity of accumulating large reserves, and on the problem of adverse selectivity.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield are service plans and are based not on individual experience rating but on community rates. This means that the high costs of care for the aged members would raise rates somewhat for all members of a given group, and very heavy aged membership could make participation unattractive for healthy young people, who might be able to find cheaper coverage elsewhere. Blue Cross-Blue Shield would risk having an excessively high number of expensive members.

Distributing the costs over the productive years is not the only method of lessening the financial burden in the later years of life. An alternative approach, reported in "Medical Economics," [17] involves a special Blue Shield contract for aged persons at substantially reduced rates. To make such contracts feasible, participating physicians agree to provide care for the aged at fees that are said to average about 40 percent of ordinary charges. Already in effect in Iowa and under discussion in a number of other States, this plan is not without serious problems and objections. Opponents point to the danger of setting a pattern of very low rates for special groups and to the difficult position for doctors having a predominately aged clientele. It is pointed out, also, that hospitalization, the major expense, could not be adapted to this plan.

CONCLUSION

The debate on the health care problem of our senior citizens has reached the point where important, far-reaching decisions are inevitable. On all sides the access to adequate medical care for the aged, as for the rest of our society, has come to be recognized as some kind of basic right akin to the right to elementary education. Financing the aged's care is only one of a number of difficult problems in this issue, but one which is of particular importance to industry and labor. Its importance is seen most clearly when the problem is considered in terms of the two basic ways of allocating the health costs: either when they arise in the later years of life, or over the productive life cycle. Experience amply demonstrates the undesirable consequences of attempting to meet the costs when they arise. Frequent consequences are financial hardship, unmet health needs, and/or the need to rely on public or private charity.

In spite of the great difficulties of predicting the costs of health care at some date far into the future, measures must be taken to distribute these costs over the productive life cycle of the individual. It seems inevitable that industry will be called on to increase greatly its share of this financial burden facing the individual. Most likely, the increased contribution will take the forms of both expansion of company health plans and extension to retirees, and of increased payroll taxes to provide for health benefits under social security. Notwithstanding the considerable technical problems of providing hospitalization and surgical benefits under social security, the very difficulty of cost prediction itself, as well as the essentiality of these benefits, would seem to recommend the social insurance method.

But this does not eliminate the role of employee plans and individual policies. Even if hospitalization and surgical services are provided under social security, there will still remain a need—to provide protection for nonsurgical doctor bills. In this field company health plans and individual policies would be likely to continue as an essential supplement to the social security provisions, in a manner similar to the supplementation furnished by company pensions and individual annuities to the income from the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits programs.[18]

With conscious effort on the part of industry, labor, and an enlightened public, the task of providing for every citizen's health needs in his old age can be accomplished. We have the foundations for a comprehensive private-public insurance system; now we must build on that for completely adequate health care at a reasonable cost to all.

---

[1] John J. Corson and John W. McConnell, "Economic Needs of Older People" (New York, Twentieth Century Fund, 1956), pp. 7–8; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Illustrative Projections of the Population of the United States, by Age and Sex 1960 to 1980," "Current Population Reports," series P–25, No. 187 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 17.

[2] Lenore A. Epstein, "Money Income of Aged Persons: A 10-Year Review, 1958–1958," Social Security Bulletin, June 1959, p. 3.

[3] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "U.S. National Health Survey," July–September 1957, Series B–10, pp. 4, 16; Series B–7, p. 7; and Series B–1, p. 3 (Washington, Government Printing Office).

[4] Odin W. Anderson and Jacob J. Feldman, "Family Medical Costs and Voluntary Health Insurance" (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 127–130.

[5] "Medical Care Costs of Aged OASI Beneficiaries: Highlights From Preliminary Data, 1957 Survey," Social Security Bulletin, April 1959, p. 3.

[6] Ibid., p. 7.

[7] Agnes W. Brewster and Dorothy McCamman, "Health Costs of the Aged," Social Security Administration Rept. No. 20 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1956), p. 109.

[8] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1221, "Analysis of Health and Insurance Plans Under Collective Bargaining, Late 1955" (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1957), p. 8.

[9] Ibid, p. 18.

[10] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, computed from Bulletin No. 1236, "Digest of 100

Selected Health and Insurance Plans Under Collective Bargaining, Early 1958" (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 4.

[11] "Medical Care Cost of Aged OASI Beneficiaries: Highlights From Preliminary Data, 1957 Survey," Social Security Bulletin, April 1959, p. 5.

[12] Agnes W. Brewster and Ruth Bloodgood, "Blue Cross Provisions for Aged Persons, Late 1958," Social Security Bulletin, May 1959, p. 20.

[13] See Edwin J. Grace, "Keep Your Employees Out of the Hospital," HBR September-October 1959, p. 119.

[14] New York State Insurance Department, "Voluntary Health Insurance and the Senior Citizen," 1958, p. 117.

[15] Margaret Greenfield, "Medical Care for Welfare Recipients—Basic Problems," 1957 Legislative Problems, No. 3, Bureau of Public Administration (Berkeley, University of California, 1957), p. 3.

[16] Press release, Feb. 4, 1957, reproduced in Public Health Economics, March 1959, p. 132.

[17] Lois R. Chevalier, "They're Taking a 60-Percent Cut in Fees," Apr. 27, 1959, p. 167.

[18] See Daniel M. Holland, "What Can We Expect From Pensions?" HBR July-August 1959, p. 125.

Mrs. Beatrice Majors Van Vleet Burns, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, one of the things we are most proud of in American history and in present American life is the pioneer spirit. Every one of us likes to feel that he has this spirit in one form or another.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I have come across a most fascinating book concerned with this spirit. It is called "Hoofbeats of Destiny: The Story of the Pony Express." Its author is Robert West Howard, and it appears in paperback. This is at once a scholarly and vivid story of the pony express and of the men who founded it. The hero of this book is not Russell or Waddell—two of the men who ran the line—or even Wild Bill Cody. The hero of this book is the third man who really ran this line, and whose dream it really was that this line should exist. His name was Alexander Majors. By the men who rode the horses, who drove or rode with the wagons, who ran the relay stations and the telegraphs—by these men and by all who knew him he was called, in a spirit of love and respect, "Ol Gospel." Today still the name of Majors is a proud one in several parts of the country, especially in the State of Nebraska.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is another Majors whom this book brings to my mind and to whom it gives me an opportunity to pay tribute. This is a Majors who lives in Hawaii and who is known and loved by very many Members of this Congress. I speak of course of the wife of Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress, Mrs. John A. Burns, the former Beatrice Majors Van Vleet, who is a close descendant not simply in blood but in real spirit of the great man who founded the pony express.

Upon reading this book I kept thinking how much Mrs. Burns would enjoy reading it and how proud she would be. But even more than this I kept thinking how proud and how delighted old Colonel Majors would have been had he been alive today and had the pleasure of knowing Mrs. Burns. For the same qualities he displayed—his integrity, his wonderful human warmth and sense of humor, and his ability, in the face of adversity, to grow in these qualities rather than lose them—these are some of the same qualities that endear Mrs. Burns so deeply to everyone she meets and that make her regarded as the first lady of Hawaii in the hearts of so many Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of Congress will enjoy reading this book and that, upon reading it, they will think as I did of the woman for whom we have such warm affection and respect, Mrs. John A. Burns, Mrs. Beatrice Majors Burns, of Hawaii.

Opposition to H.R. 12419 by New Jersey Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, recently on the Consent Calendar there appeared H.R. 12419, which was passed over without prejudice on June 24. This legislation provided that before a State could use pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls, they would have to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies. Such legislation is opposed by the Department of Agriculture of the State of New Jersey. In order to explain the State's position in this matter, I am pleased to include in my remarks a letter, dated June 27, I received from the Honorable Phillip Alampi, Secretary of Agriculture of the State of New Jersey, which reads as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Trenton, N.J., June 27, 1960.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I am sorry I have not had the opportunity to consult with you at length in regard to H.R. 12419.

The objection of this Department can be summarized in that the proposed legislation places primary emphasis upon the protection of fish and wildlife, thus subordinating other values vital to our national welfare, such as the production and marketing of food and fiber, the management of our forest resources, and the public health.

Whenever it has been necessary for this Department to engage in a large scale pest control program, with or without the cooperation of the Agricultural Research Service, we have never failed to consult with our Department of Conservation; specifically the Fish and Game Division.

You will, no doubt, find that the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare have also consulted with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior before initiating such programs.

In November 1954 an insect, known as the white-fringed beetle, capable of as much damage in this State as the Japanese beetle, was found in Vineland on 350 acres of agricultural land, involving 15 property owners. It was necessary for this Department, with the assistance of the Agricultural Research Service to treat that land in the spring of 1955 with a very heavy concentration of an insecticide. Our division of fish and game was consulted. A few birds were killed, but this damage was certainly not significant and if it had been necessary to treat that land with concentrated sulphuric acid in order to eradicate the beetle from this State, even that measure would have received serious consideration. The potential damage by the pest was such that almost any measure would have been justified for the welfare of the people of this State. The insect was eradicated and all of our people have benefited from that effort.

Surely, we are all aware of the current threat of eastern encephalitis in New Jersey. Some extraordinary measures might be necessary to protect the lives of our people. In spite of this priority based on human health, the fish and game interests of this State are represented on an interdepartmental committee which is planning and carrying out the 1960 program. The mosquito is the vector of this disease, and there is every indication at the present time that song birds provide an important reservoir of disease. We all hope that it might never be necessary to deliberately reduce the song bird population. But, if at some future date, such a measure would have to be taken, how could the Fish and Wildlife Service possibly give its blessing?

As I read report No. 1786 to accompany H.R. 12419, I am not convinced that the Fish and Wildlife Service favors the measure. The objections of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Agriculture are well outlined. We see no benefits to be gained by this legislation and are of the opinion that it could do much harm in the orderly development and execution of programs for the benefit of all the people.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP ALAMPI,
Secretary of Agriculture, State of New Jersey.

Spirit of Paderewski: Challenge to Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 25, in solemn ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, delivered a memorial address commemorating the great achievements of Ignacy Jan Paderewski.

In these troublesome international periods it is well for us to dwell upon the accomplishments of a man such as Paderewski, who combined in his lifetime musical genius, deep devotion to

his native land and dedication to true world peace.

The great respect in which Paderewski is held is shown by the fact that he is one of the first to be honored in the champion of liberty commemorative stamps. Great credit is due the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, through whose guidance and appreciation of the contributions Paderewski made to the world, that this stamp was included in the series, and is to be issued October 8.

The Postmaster General's address follows:

THE SPIRIT OF PADEREWSKI: CHALLENGE TO OUR TIMES

This is a solemn moment for me, as I know it is for you.

I am deeply honored to join with you in paying tribute to Paderewski on this centennial commemoration of his birth.

I want to congratulate Mr. Witkowski, the Paderewski Foundation, and the Polish American Congress on organizing this moving tribute to a great statesman and a great musician.

My assignment today is not an easy one. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reflect, in words, the towering stature of this man who walked among us during my youth and early manhood.

It is, I believe, fitting that we commemorate this man in the Valhalla of American heroes. Here, with us, are his bodily remains. But today we note and rededicate ourselves to his spirit.

Only a handful of those whose home and citizenship were in other countries lie here. Yet, if there were only one from a foreign country, it would be appropriate that he be Paderewski.

Around him sleep scores of thousands of Americans who have given their lives to build, preserve, and strengthen our country.

They would understand the passion that ruled Paderewski throughout his life in his devotion to his native Poland.

He would understand those buried here, who gave their final measure of devotion to the principles of freedom and independence.

They rest together in good and honored company.

All Americans who feel a profound love for Poland, and recognize the great contributions of the Polish people to American freedom, understand her pride in claiming Paderewski as a son. But the Polish people would be the first to recognize that he belongs to more than Poland. Through his genius, he belongs also to America and to all mankind.

For Paderewski was a genius in the truest sense of the word, and he dedicated his genius to the highest ideals in the worlds of both art and statesmanship. Beyond that, Paderewski displayed a genuine nobility of person, and a truly Christian strength of character.

No one who has seen him can ever forget the majestic head and inspired face. Nor can we forget his dignity of carriage, which often seemed to make him grow twice as tall. It was his spirit, however, that shone through, and is remembered by all of us here today.

A longtime friend of Paderewski's once said of him: "He had boundless vitality. When he came into a room, the lights seemed to go up."

It was this inner light—this inner fire—that sustained him through his 81 years of life, and won him the admiration and reverence of all who prize the ideals for which he stood.

Few now living can remember the blaze of glory with which he burst on the American musical scene, that night in Carnegie Hall 69 years ago.

But no free peoples will ever forget the courage and devotion to country which he displayed so remarkably at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and as the first Prime Minister of a reborn, independent Poland.

Paderewski knew war, revolution, and tyranny even as an infant. As the merest child of 3, he saw his father cruelly thrust into prison by the Russian oppressors in revenge for his courage in aiding the Polish patriots who fought to throw off the yoke of their eastern conqueror.

One must believe that this horror-stricken little boy had burned in his heart a sight which laid the basis for his determination in the protection of his native land.

In this faith in his beloved Poland, he perservered to the last hours of his life—never faltering—just as he perservered in seeking perfection in his musical skills, his poetry, and his role as a composer.

But his guide throughout his life was love for man. If freedom and independence demanded war and revolution, he did not waver. But his genius was in building and creating, rather than in violence and destruction.

It was the mark of this great man that when he composed the war hymn for the Polish soldiers in World War I, the battle song carried the phrase, "My errand is not of hatred, but of love."

Similarly, in the period after World War I it might have been the easy path to distract the Polish people from their problems at home by turning to war against the Russians.

Paderewski's hatred for the Bolsheviks was no less than that of his countrymen, but he nevertheless chose the harder path of recreating a new Poland—of rebuilding its economy and its society.

Always he was guided by what he knew was in the best interests of the cause of freedom and independence of Poland.

Once Paderewski was asked who was the greater—the statesman or the artist. Without hesitation, he replied "the statesman," and then gave a definition of the term which applies so accurately to himself:

"I speak of that man of state whose courage, morality and wisdom open for humanity a greater path of destiny; of those rare spirits which, voicing the innermost hopes and visions of the race, mold the future and hold up the torch for life."

Truly, he was a statesman.

I have talked of Paderewski, the man; of some of his achievements and his principles.

But what were the motivating forces that made this man's life an object of admiration and respect for his own people, and for free people throughout the world? Wherein lay the inner spiritual strength that sustained him?

Like so many men of genius who contribute so much to mankind, Paderewski was possessed of a wide range of noble qualities of character. Yet, in reviewing his life, I am impressed by certain ones that stand out as an index to his success.

And I am struck also by the fact that these are characteristics that have marked the men of leadership throughout the ages.

Paderewski, early in life, developed to its fullest extent the stout moral pillar of self-discipline. Throughout his life this was reflected in a strength of character that was like a beacon light to others.

It supported him in the days of the Paris Peace Conference, when he sat in the councils of the victorious allies, and worked without ceasing to secure justice and freedom for the Polish people.

Paderewski had unwavering determination in the face of adversity. He dedicated himself unhesitatingly to a cause, no matter how hopeless it might seem at the time, or what hardships it may have inflicted on him.

Paderewski was not concerned with superficial prestige, with bluster or flamboyance. He was a gentleman to the core, in appearance, in manner, and in deed. It is clear from his life that he did not believe that erratic appearance marked the great musician, any more than he believed erratic behavior was the mark of the statesman.

Paderewski had an abiding and vital religious faith. It was a real, living presence in all the actions of his life.

When he returned to the concert stage at the unprecedented age of 62, he was fearful of what the passage of time had done to his skills. Told by his sister that he had never played better, Paderewski replied, simply, "Yes, God was with me all the time."

His sincere, lifelong religious belief won him the friendship of many distinguished churchmen of his own Catholic faith. It also won him the admiration and respect of millions from other faiths, who saw in Paderewski the living example of the Christian statesman, the Christian artist, and the Christian human being.

From the depths of his religious faith, no doubt, sprang Paderewski's quality of selflessness. He served his people always—himself never.

No one can forget the example he set for leaders of free countries when, in the fall of 1919, he voluntarily stepped out as Prime Minister of Poland.

Paderewski could easily have assumed control of his wartorn nation as director, but he felt that he had done his duty. He had served as the unifying force, as no other man could have done, to draw together the Polish people in their first, faltering steps toward existence as an independent nation.

When this was done, he turned the reins of power over to others. He sought not power, but a free native land.

Paderewski was possessed of an innate generosity. Less than 5 years after first visiting the United States he established an award to encourage American composers.

Throughout his life, he was a continuing benefactor of the young of his native Poland and of our own country. He encouraged them to develop their resources, in the study of music, language, and philosophy.

It was Paderewski's generosity with his own personal fortune, during and after World War I, in fact, which required his return to the concert stage in 1922.

But when I speak of his generosity, I do not mean only of his worldly goods. Far more important, Paderewski was generous with himself. Early in life, Paderewski coined a motto which he adopted as his own: "The Fatherland first, art afterward."

This was his real generosity. He gave of all his talents to the cause he felt most right and important.

We must remember that Paderewski made fortunes many times over through his skill as a musician. I would hazard the guess that he was the highest paid concert artist of his age.

Yet he hesitated not an instant before turning to the service of his country when he was needed. Without regret or fear, he turned his back on the piano and all the material riches it had earned for him.

He saw his duty as a man of genius, and directed his efforts toward helping his Polish people toward independence, and in guiding them into being a free, self-sustaining nation.

Again, when the conquerors from both East and West devastated Poland in 1939, Paderewski gave fully of himself. Almost 80 years old, he journeyed to France to accept the Presidency of the Polish Parliament in Exile, and once again fulfill his destiny to unify and lead the Polish people in their fight for freedom.

He was a sick man, and could well sense that shouldering this tremendous burden of political leadership could constitute his death warrant.

He nevertheless answered this call to duty, giving his physical powers, his heart and soul,

and his genius without sparing, in answer to the summons of country and conscience.

It is because of this lifelong service to his country and to the principles of freedom that I have directed the Post Office Department to issue special stamps in the "Champions of Liberty" series, honoring Paderewski.

The special stamps will be placed on sale for the first time on October 8, here in Washington, D.C.

This event will coincide with our remembrance of the great contributions made by the Revolutionary War hero, General Pulaski, to our American cause of independence.

Living in today's troubled world, we have an obligation to ourselves and our fellowman to study the qualities that made Paderewski great, and to emulate them in our own lives.

The free world cries out today for leaders and for citizens who will put moral principle first, and accept their responsibility to ward off the forces that threaten our way of life, whether external or internal.

We need today men of Paderewski's self-discipline and courage, who will not retreat before threats, who will not be bullied, who will be confident that a just cause is worthy of any sacrifice.

Too many national leaders, both then and today, would seek the easy way out, of compromise and appeasement.

Often we forget, what Paderewski knew so well, that justice is its own strength. It requires only men of character and courage to take a stand and emerge victorious.

Paderewski's dedication to a cause, surpassing any thought of himself or his own personal glory, is a trait of character so essential in these times of tension.

We have seen a recent example of this in the dignified and unselfish manner in which President Eisenhower has carried himself.

But too often we see the opposite—a man retreating and maneuvering, determined to protect not the cause for which he stands, but only himself.

As we remember this great man, today, we should rededicate ourselves to the abiding Christian faith that sustained him.

Finally, if there is but one lesson we can draw from Paderewski's life, and one element of character to which we pay tribute, it is the generosity of spirit which he displayed.

We live today in times that test the intellect, the moral courage and the dedication of every man.

Abroad, we face the blackest tyrannies—more ruthless and deadly than civilization has ever known.

In our own ranks, too often, we face self-interest, moral cowardice, and retreat.

If we are to survive—and survive we will—we must study well the example left to us by such giants as Paderewski.

We must learn and believe, as he did, that the phrase, "Right makes might," is not an old-fashioned, out-of-date slogan.

We must feel, as he felt, that devotion and dedication to a just cause cannot but succeed in time, if we carry ourselves with determination and confidence.

We must believe, as he did, that the freedom of mankind is the highest value, and pledge ourselves to do our utmost to achieve it.

Above all, we must draw the lesson from this great patriot that the first, and all-compelling duty of genius, is to his fellow man.

Let no one who has ever heard or seen Paderewski, has read about him, or has heard of his role in history, say: "My business is too important to take time for public affairs," or, "I am devoted to the world of arts and cannot be bothered with political life," or "I am too busy taking care of the home," or any of the other thousands of excuses we in public life hear every day from those who will not contribute their talents to the all-important mission of making this country, and every country in the world, a place in which man can live in freedom and dignity.

Late in life, Paderewski said: "The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is the great aim of my life."

Paderewski's vow was to his native land. We know from this heroic man's career that he would have taken the same vow to protect his fellow man, wherever oppressed and persecuted.

In respect for the immortal soul of the man who lies here with us, I urge that we take—each of us—this same solemn pledge—that we dedicate ourselves to pit all our talents, abilities, and energies, as he did, to achieving strength, freedom and independence for our fellow man, in whatever country he may live, or in what state of bondage he may now be.

With courage, with determination, and with the strength borne of confidence in the justness of our cause, we shall accomplish our mission.

With God's help, we shall go forward to the final victory, when every man can say with pride, "I am free."

The United States' Presence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often, particularly in recent days, that an emotional expression of warmth and gratitude comes our way. It is one of the ironies of history that from our implacable intent to do good springs the most puzzling paradox of our society. People benefiting most from our generosity are sometimes those criticizing us most severely.

For this reason it was like a breath of clean, fresh air to read the moving remarks of Rev. P. Prudencio de Salvatierra, Chilean priest. Not since the people of a war-recovered Austria proclaimed their thanks and eternal indebtedness to the American taxpayer has our own sacrifice on behalf of others been so warmly received.

I urge us all to read the stirring remarks of the Chilean priest:

(Translated from El Diario Ilustrado, Santiago, Chile, June 7, 1960)

THE UNITED STATES PRESENCE

(By Rt. Rev. Prudencio de Salvatierra Capuchin)

(Translation by A. M. Swenson)

The world is aware of the power and the vast physical resources of the United States. In Chile, however, we now have tangible proof of the generous spirit of the United States. We have felt the heart beat of that nation, her compassion, her abnegation and her efficiency.

For us the hour of thanksgiving has come; the time has arrived to sing praises to that great people. Our voices, though broken by emotion, echo the gratitude of countless thousands of victims for the great nation to the north. Our dictionaries are inadequate in the light of U.S. generosity. Though we do not wish to ignore or minimize the important contributions of other sister nations, we do wish to express our thanks to the United States at this time.

From the moment that disaster struck, even while tremors subsisted, we could see the huge Globemasters approaching to render aid. These ships became intimate friends with our clouds and our mountains. Landing heavily on our uneven strips, they were unburdened of their cargo of hospitals, ambulances, tents, clothing in extraordinary quantities, foods and medicines, doctors and nuses. Those giants of the air seemed to carry inexhaustible supplies. From them, mountains of help were literally unloaded as they flew in and out of the disaster area.

Smiling young men, perhaps a bit disconcerted, thronged our streets in friendly groups. The simplicity which characterized them was that of people who seemingly have accomplished nothing extraordinary. Yet the applause, admiration, and gratitude followed these men wherever they went. They were uniformed young men. Some were officers who knew what they were about and yet breathed cordiality. Others were pilots, nurses. Among them could be seen weather-beaten faces, eyes fatigued by lack of sleep, the evidences of sore feet tired out by well-doing.

In the extensive area covered by the earthquakes, these American young men were angels of kindness, the friends of the suffering ones, of the desperate, the capable engineers of the urgent piece of work at hand.

They did not know our language. But they did not need to know it. There is a universal tongue, an Esperanto of love, which loosens grammatical bindings and does away with vocabulary limitations, a language which speaks directly to the eyes, to the blood, to the needy and the hundry. How well we all understood these young men. How well we translated their every move.

To be near one of these young Americans was a comfort. It imparted a sense of security. It was as a gift of Providence. They had brought everything and were ready to undertake anything, not excluding the most heroic of sacrifices. Where has the United States gotten that human potential, those fresh and manly souls, that eagerness and rapidity to be of service in a time of need? Have we not been told repeatedly that Yanqui imperialism lacked feeling? That Yanqui imperialism was only interested in enslaving and oppressing the nations of the world?

American friends, don't carry back to your homeland the bitter remembrance of some politicians nor the unjust and ironic headlines which appeared in some of our newspers. Forget them. Forgive them. You are above this vileness which has barked as you went by. The anguish of our people has touched your heart and you have come to this distant Chile to lend us your strong arm and open your bountiful hand.

What better song could we sing to your nation than to acknowledge and give thanks for her presence which stood for hope in these dark days and for her noble unselfishness?

Chile will not forget. Chile will never be able to forget these days and the part played by the United States amid the ruins and tears of people so crushed. In each Chilean heart there is a monument of appreciation erected to all of our friends.

Reservation-Style Operation Bootstrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three articles with relation to Operation Bootstrap, written by Helene C. Monberg and carried in the Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo. These articles are most factual and present the problems encountered in attempting to offer an inducement for industry to locate on Indian reservations.

After many years of living on an Indian reservation, working with Indians and with Indian problems, I am convinced that this is the only solution to the problem and I hope a program can be developed which will meet all objections and yet present a sufficient inducement that some industries may provide employment for the Indian people on their own reservation areas.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel, June 16, 1960]

RESERVATION-STYLE OPERATION BOOTSTRAP GETS WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FROM INDIANS

WASHINGTON.—Operation Bootstrap, reservation style, legislation to bring industry to Indian Reservations, received enthusiastic support from dozens of Indian tribes at hearings held by the House Indian Affairs Subcommittee here this past week.

About 30 tribes as far east as Wisconsin, as far South as Mississippi and as far West as Arizona enthusiastically endorsed bills by Representatives E. Y. BERRY, Republican of South Dakota; DON SHORT, Republican of North Dakota, and ODIN LANGEN, Republican of Minnesota, designed to offer some opportunity for reservation Indians other than farming.

The Quechan Tribal Council of the Yuma, Ariz., Indian Reservation, put their support for the legislation in a tribal resolution as follows: "It has been demonstrated that industry has not been inclined to look to Indian Reservation areas for plant expansion even though there are large pools of employment on almost every reservation. It has been demonstrated in Puerto Rico and in many foreign countries that tax incentives have proved to be the inducement necessary to get industry interested in locating in these areas. Therefore, we firmly believe that Operation Bootstrap, reservation style is the answer to our problem by providing tax inducements to bring industry to Indian Reservations and to provide jobs for reservation Indians who otherwise would have no chance for employment."

BERRY, who lives on the Standing Rock Sioux territory in South Dakota, introduced his Operation Bootstrap, Indian style bill in 1959 after a visit to Puerto Rico in 1958, where he saw the Puerto Rican Operation Bootstrap program in operation. Congress in 1950 passed a bill giving Puerto Rico a Commonwealth status and exempting the island, once known as the poorhouse of the Caribbean, from U.S. individual and corporate income taxes, excises, estate and gift taxes and permitted it to retain proceeds from its customs duties. Then, with the inspired leadership of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Puerto Rico inaugurated its Bootstrap program under which 600 industries have located in Puerto Rico in the past decade. They are exempt from municipal, corporate, partnership and personal income taxes for 10 years; from taxes on dividends and profits for 7 years, and from taxes on property from 5 to 10 years.

The benefits under Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap has been far more than economic. Literacy rates have shot up. Life expectancy has been lengthened by 22 years. Death rates and infant mortality rates have been more than halved. Per capita income has increased from $121 to $480 annually, and now stands second only to oil-rich Venezuela in Latin America.

Using the Puerto Rican Bootstrap as his prototype, BERRY drafted a bill which contains the following features:

1. Indian tribes would be authorized to set up corporations which would build plants to sell or lease to industrial firms on a long-term basis, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Interior. Plant construction funds would come from tribal funds, or from Federal or commercial loans to the tribal corporations.

2. Firms which took over these plants on the reservation would be completely exempt from Federal, State and local taxes for 10 years.

3. They would be able to amortize their property eligible for depreciation on a 5-year schedule.

4. They would receive a deduction from any Federal tax for 5 years in an amount equal to three times the annual welfare payments paid to an Indian prior to his industrial employment.

5. They would receive Government aid in conducting on-the-job training for Indian employees.

Three days of hearings on the Berry-Short-Langen bills brought out the following advantages in such legislation:

1. It would give Indians an opportunity to make a living on their reservations by some means other than farming. BERRY testified that only about 13 percent of our entire population, Indian and non-Indian alike, is successful in farming and ranching.

2. It would enable Indians to stay on their reservations and still improve their standard of living. The Bulova Watch Co., which employs about 80 Chippewa Indians from the nearby Turtle Mountain Reservation in Rolla, N. Dak., and the Simpson Electric Co., which employs 100 Indians at a plant located on the Chippewa Indian Reservation at Lac du Flambeau, Wis., have found this to be so. At the Rolla plant most of the workers have replaced their shacks with modern homes, they have kept their homes up, and have generally bettered their home and living conditions, according to Father Hildebrand Elliott, whose parish is the Turtle Mountain Reservation.

3. It would permit reservation Indians to swap a relief check for a weekly pay check, as Berry puts it. Indian and non-Indian witnesses alike agreed that most reservation Indians who are on relief are sick and tired of a handout existence, and are willing and eager to work.

4. It would improve the morale of reservation Indians and cut down the crime rate. Without any chance for other than a mere subsistence existence, many Indians on reservations lapse into an outlook of utter hopelessness, the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare stated. Father Elliott said that if reservation Indians "were given work * * * they will have a higher degree of self-respect. They will not feel like beggars, and they will not act like beggars * * * receiving handouts." North Dakota officials credited a drop of almost 60 percent in juvenile delinquency on the Chippewa Reservation to the fact that most Indians are employed. Crime rates are also down there.

5. Indian workers make excellent workers when given the opportunity to work. Rolla reported that its Indian workers had shown high intelligence, finger dexterity, good eyesight, excellent muscular coordination and patience. Furthermore, their absentee and turnover rates are completely satisfactory and lower than the national average," reported Robert Schwebel, general manager of the Rolla plant.

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel, June 17, 1960]

OPERATION BOOTSTRAP FINDS ROAD ROUGH IN BRINGING INDUSTRY TO RESERVATIONS

WASHINGTON.—House hearings on Operation Bootstrap, reservation style, legislation designed to bring industry to Indian reservations, brought out some serious roadblocks in accomplishing such a desirable objective.

Three days of hearings before the House Indian Affairs Subcommittee here this past week indicated that neither the administration nor many members of the committee believe it is a totally practical program.

The legislation is sponsored by Representatives E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, DON SHORT, Republican, of North Dakota, and ODIN LANGEN, Republican, of Minnesota. It would permit Indian tribes to set up corporations which would be able to use tribal funds and government loan programs to build industrial plants on their reservations, with the approval of the Secretary of Interior. Firms which took over the plants would receive substantial tax concessions for 10 years. The Government would provide on-the-job training for the Indian employees.

On the surface, the legislation appears to be so desirable that it would seem strange that the Government had not already put such a plan into effect. But it raises some major policy considerations. Among the most important are the following:

1. Would Operation Bootstrap become a means by which industries would take flight from areas where they are now operating to avoid taxes and high wages by setting up shop on Indian reservations where they would not have to pay taxes and could pay low non-union wages to Indian employees?

The Berry bill is patterned on the industrial Bootstrap Operation in Puerto Rico under which that Commonwealth has lured 600 industries to the island under tax concessions. New industry was not created in Puerto Rico. Industry merely shifted from the United States to Puerto Rico under the lure of cheaper labor, cheaper rent and land cost, plus the advantages of no Federal income tax.

2. Would Operation Bootstrap become just another long-range Indian subsidy? Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democratic, of Colorado, pointed out that any industry which moved to Indian reservations was likely to be motivated by the idea of making profits rather than by the idea of helping the Indian. He feared that once such a program got in operation, it could last 300 years, because Indians would try to keep open uneconomic plants that would not otherwise locate on Indian reservations.

3. Would Operation Bootstrap victimize Indian tribes by bringing in fly-by-night operations which would leave the reservation as soon as the tax incentives were lifted? There is no past experience to guide Congress in this regard, because so few industries are located on reservations. But testimony by Marvin J. Sonosky, an attorney representing several Dakota Indian tribes and the Shoshones of Wyoming, indicated that a South Dakota tribe had an unfortunate experience in this regard several years ago. A fly-by-night outfit put in a toy factory on the reservation, he said. The tribe put up a small sum of money in a subsidy. The Bureau of Indian Affairs paid for vocational training for the Indians to be employed and gave the factory a substantial subsidy. When the training was over, it just disappeared, Sonosky testified.

4. Would Operation Bootstrap result in discrimination? Representative JACK WESTLAND, Republican, of Washington, pointed out a problem it would raise in his district. He said, "I have an Indian reservation where Union Oil Co. is going to establish a refinery.

Just a mile or so away on non-Indian land Standard Oil Co. of California is going to build a refinery. Would you grant a tax exemption to Union, and not to Standard of California because one is on a reservation and the other is not?"

5. Would it overcome the general impression that Indians are not good workers? Robert W. Miller, of Public Relations Research Associates, Inc., who has made quite a study of the problem of industrial employment of Indians, told the committee that he had found the majority of industry is very leery of employing an Indian even when Indians are available for employment. Potential employers tend to regard an Indian as a drunkard, dishonest, worthless, and not to be trusted, Miller said. Indians who have been actually employed by industry generally have proved to be good workers, he pointed out.

6. Where would the leadership come from to make such a program a success? ASPINALL pointed out that, to the extent Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap has been successful, it has been due almost solely to the inspired leadership of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, who made it possible and who has been able to carry it on in spite of handicaps. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been unsuccessful in its efforts to move industry to border Indian areas, and no outstanding leader has emerged among the Indians themselves to spur on such a program.

7. Would it upset the socal pattern of Indian life? Both in the Rolla, N. Dak., plant which employs Indians and in the Puerto Rican Operation Bootstrap program many of the employees are not men but women. Father Hildebrand Elliott, whose parish is the Turtle Mountain Reservation on which the Rolla plant is located, said of this situation: "Nearly all women are working, but the men in the house, not having work, have to look after the family, if they are looked after.

"This has been the occasion sometimes of family disagreements. Although the natural order of things means that the man of the house should be the breadwinner, it is not totally bad because the women tend to save their money to improve the lot of their family."

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel, June 23, 1960]

REWRITTEN BOOTSTRAP BILL WILL BE GIVEN IN NEXT CONGRESS

WASHINGTON.—Operation Bootstrap, reservation style, will return to Congress next year in a new legislative garb.

That's the word of Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, author of the bill, following hearings on his controversial measure earlier this month before the House Interior Committee.

The bill is designed to bring industry to Indian reservations, and it has the enthusiastic support of about 30 tribes across the country. The bill as drafted by BERRY is obviously in need of redrafting and he knows it.

He said in an interview with the Sentinel: "The hearings were very useful because they pointed out some of the drawbacks in the bill. They laid the groundwork for action on such a program in the next Congress. I intend to rewrite the bill to make it as simple as possible, and to introduce the new bill draft the first day of next session.

"There is no question as to the need for a program to try to bring industry to Indian reservations and border areas. Relocation alone cannot do the job. With proper safeguarding, and under carefully controlled conditions, I believe that some industries would be ready, willing and able to locate on or near Indian reservations to take advantage of Indian skills," BERRY stated.

BERRY faces three major hurdles in redrafting his bill. He must redraft it so that it does not materially cut into tax revenues, thereby incurring the opposition of the Budget Bureau and the U.S. Treasury. He must not make it a bait for industry to take flight from other parts of the country; otherwise he will incur the opposition of New England and Middle Atlantic congressional delegations. And he must not make it a bait for industry to seek low-cost nonunion labor, thereby incurring the opposition of the labor unions. He must walk in a very thin line.

Meanwhile BERRY has continued to receive and to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from all over the country in support of his bill. He put into the RECORD on June 1 an editorial from the Grand Junction Sentinel which stated that Operation Bootstrap was one of the few large-scale Indian legislative proposals presented to Congress in recent years that makes sense.

The Hustling Hustler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of asking the printing in the RECORD of an article which appears in the magazine Combat Crew, which is the official publication of the Strategic Air Command.

In the June 1960 issue of this publication appears an article by the commander of the 43d Bomber Wing concerning our first supersonic bomber, the B–58 Hustler.

Having had the privilege of flying in the Hustler at twice the speed of sound, I can personally attest that there is no more vibration or sense of stress on this piece of equipment at 1,400 miles an hour than one would expect in a fine automobile on a well-engineered highway at 60 miles an hour.

Colonel Johnson, the author of the article, is an ace pilot who distinguished himself in World War II and Korea and his observations should be encouraging to all of us concerning this most modern and most sophisticated weapons system in our SAC arsenal.

The article follows:

THE HUSTLING HUSTLER

(By Col. James K. Johnson, commander, 43d BW, Carswell AFB)

"Canopies closed; second station seal the canopies."

"Roger, canopies sealed."

"Pilot to ground, stand by to start engines."

"Roger, sir, ground crew standing by; clear to start No. 2."

Not long ago I went through such a procedure on my first B–58 ride. I was naturally enthused about the prospect, although when I received my assignment to command the first B–58 tactical and training unit in SAC, I had viewed it with mixed emotions. As a pilot I was anxious for the opportunity to fly SAC's first supersonic bomber at twice the speed of sound, as my fighter background had given me a taste for speed and maneuverability. On the other hand, some tales were floating around about the revolutionary B–58 which, if true, would give any individual food for thought and consideration. Now that I'm in the B–58 program and checked out in the aircraft, I find that such tales are untrue and that the aircraft is everything a crew member desires. It is for that reason that I decided to write this article; and when Maj. "Skip" Young, editor of Combat Crew, offered me this space in the magazine, I jumped at the chance.

It is my firm conviction that the B–58 is an excellent aircraft and has a definite place in our combat inventory. Some of you reading this article will have the opportunity before long to join the B–58 program as formal aircrew instruction began in the middle of May 1960 at Carswell Air Force Base. Therefore, I shall attempt to give you a general overall view of the aircraft and its systems, cite the qualifications required for aircrews, and describe the training program.

The B–58 is a small aircraft as we have come to think of bombers. It is only 97 feet long, with a wing span of 57 feet. Its empty weight, without pod, of approximately 52,500 pounds rises sharply to gross better than 80 tons. It has the familiar delta wing and wasp waist fuselage of the F–102 and F–106. This, in turn, introduces several flight characteristics which are relatively new to most bomber pilots although now SOP for supersonic aircraft.

Like the B–47, the B–58 has a flight crew of three, but a defensive systems operator is used in lieu of a copilot. In addition to his ECM activities, the DSO operates the remote controlled tail turret and acts as a performance engineer. Crew members sit in tandem in separate compartments, entrance to which is gained by overhead canopies.

Four General Electric J–79–5 engines, each providing 10,000 pounds thrust at military, furnish the go power. This thrust rating per engine is increased to 15,600 pounds, with maximum afterburner under standard sea level static conditions.

In addition to the sleek design and the 60° sweptback delta wing, the most noticeable feature of the aircraft is the externally attached pod. This free-fall bomb pod is carried on pneumatically actuated hooks beneath the fuselage of the aircraft. The pod is designed to carry a warhead and has the added capability of containing fuel to supplement the aircraft's normal fuel supply. When released over the target, the 57-foot pod follows a natural ballistic trajectory. One of the prime purposes of the external pod is to avoid the necessity of providing internal fuel and weapons storage facilities which must be carried home as empty volume to the detriment of supersonic performance.

The first thing that will strike you old bomber pros when you inspect the cockpit is the absence of a control wheel. In its place you will find a stick. Remember those days? The four throttles fit comfortably in the left hand and the rest of the instruments and controls have been logically placed and are easily accessible. All instrument and control panels have been angled to face the pilot. Another feature borrowed from the fighters is the caution and warning panel. In case of specific malfunctions, a yellow or red master lamp will glow on the pilot's front instrument panel. A separate panel at the pilot's right side will illuminate, highlighting the specific malfunction such as battery discharging or aft pump 10. The red or yellow color of the lamp indicates the seriousness of the malfunction.

The flight characteristics are excellent, and response to controls is positive and instantaneous. An excellent feature associated with the flight-control system is the autopilot. The majority of us are familiar with autopilots but usually think of them as an aid to the pilot on long hauls to assist him in

maintaining constant headings and altitudes. Attitude, however, is the basic mode of this autopilot system and is in effect at any time the system is engaged. Therefore, the autopilot may be engaged with the airplane in any desired pitch or roll attitude within the limits of the reference table gyros, and that attitude will then be maintained. A variety of other modes of operation are available, including speed, altitude, heading, and approach.

A unique feature of the Hustler is known as control stick steering. A trigger switch on the control stick grip deactivities the aileron and elevator autopilot servos, allowing the pilot to manually reposition the aircraft without removing his hand from the stick. Upon release of the trigger, the autopilot automatically resumes control, utilizing the new attitude selected as a basic reference.

Up to now I've been talking a great deal about the aircraft from a pilot's point of view. But the other crew members are just as enthusiastic as the pilot about the aircraft and its subsystems.

The navigator, or second station operator, will find that his station is quite comfortable. And unlike many aircraft he has flown in, this one is warm for all crew members, eliminating the constant arguments over who's got the heat—or the cooling, for in a supersonic aircraft cooling is equally important. Displayed immediately in front of the navigator are all the controls and indicators for his integrated navigation-bombing system, the AN/ASQ-42. This system consists of a Doppler radar set, electronic altimeter, astrotracker, computation and stabilization system (inertial), search radar, automatic ballistics computer, and a malfunction detection and switching system. The complete system can guide the aircraft over a great circle course to any desired destination without visual reference and with a minimum of radio-radar transmissions. The navigation mode is used during the entire mission except while on the actual bomb run. Automatic radar photography can be accomplished whenever the system search radar is not being used for navigator checks.

The primary navigation set is basically a Doppler inertial system, using an astrotracker for a standard heading reference. The position of the aircraft, together with destination and intermediate fix points, is cranked into visual counters in terms of specific latitude and longitude.

While the aircraft is en route, the course and position are continuously computed by a precise dead reckoning operation. Periodic search radar sighting may be made over known fixes to check the accuracy of the dead reckoning computations, allowing for en route adjustments. The aircraft attitude is sensed by the inertial elements while the altitude is obtained by a radio altimeter. All radiating equipment may be operated intermittently, if desired, or kept off for as long as 5 hours without seriously degrading the system accuracy. Transverse coordinate operation is provided for accurate polar navigation, and a map comparator screen, located adjacent to the search radarscope, displays radar map pictures for inflight comparison.

Another unique system is provided the navigator in the form of an automatic data-handling system which records pertinent flight information for in-flight reference and postflight evaluation. Known as the inflight printer, this system receives data from various sources throughout the aircraft and records the information on a paper tape. Such informtaion as time, present latitude and longtitude, ground track and speed, and "D" values (difference between barometric and radar altitudes) are automatically recorded as often as once a minute or upon demand.

The third station operator, or defensive systems operator, is similarly well equipped. The controls to his countermeasures equipment are located conveniently in front of him, as is the radarscope for the tail turret. As I mentioned before, the DSO is also the gunner and thus controls both active and passive defense capabilities. In addition to these duties, the DSO has assumed many other responsibilities involving his close coordination with the other crew members. He and the pilot work as a team through all checklist procedures and record all pertinent data on appropriate records. He is the performance engineer for the crew.

On the B–58 this function has become particularly important due to the vital necessity of maintaining precise CG locations. Fuel is stored in the wings, pod, and fuselage between the crew compartment and the tail turret. CG is maintained by transferring fuel from one tank to another, the same, as in most aircraft, and is normally controlled by an automatic system which senses the fuel weight in each tank. Due to the wide speed spectrum of the B–58 from subsonic to mach 2, it is necessary to move the CG considerably to maintain proper balance for various airspeeds. The fact that hundreds of miles of flight range can be lost through improper CG management emphasizes the requirement for rapid and precise fuel transfer. Although actual fuel transfer is the responsibility of the pilot, it is the duty of the DSO to monitor and advise him as to how much fuel is to be transferred and into which tanks.

One problem that has always been with us and is becoming more acute in the B–58 is proper interphone voice procedures. Each crew member must remember to speak slowly and distinctly in order to insure that immediate and proper understanding is made. Too many times we find that individual crew members do not fully comprehend what the other man is trying to say in time to take positive action within the short period allotted for the many functions in today's high speed airplanes. This failing is just as true of old hands as it is of brand new crew members.

Annex I to SAC Reg 51–19 spells out the individual requirements necessary to join the B–58 program. They are relatively high at the present time, although a large number of the personnel within SAC meet them.

A pilot must possess a minimum of 1,000 hours total jet flying time, of which 500 hours must have been flown since he was upgraded to aircraft commander status in a SAC multiengine bomber/recon jet aircraft, and he must have been an aircraft commander for at least 1 year on a SAC senior or select crew.

The navigator is required to have 500 hours in a SAC multiengine bomber/recon jet aircraft and must also have served for 1 year on a SAC senior or select crew.

The DSO must possess 200 hours in a SAC multiengine jet aircraft or be a qualified phase V capsule EWO officer.

The B–58 checkout training program follows the general rules of most aircrew programs in that it consists of three phases of training—academic, simulator, and flying.

The aircraft commander course is 60 training days in length, or approximately 3 calendar months. The first 30 days are devoted to academics, followed by 30 days of flight instruction. Flight simulator instruction for the pilot begins early during his academic training, and at least one-half of the missions will be completed prior to his first B–58 flight. The flight simulator assumes an even greater role in the training program than ever before, since the majority, if not all, of the B–58 flights for students are in a solo status.

For the first time in Air Force history a flight simulator rather than a system trainer is available for instruction of crew members other than the pilot. These flight simulators have the added capability of being electrically tied together to provide a crew mission trainer.

The TF–102, trainer version of the Convair delta wing fighter, is presently used as an airborne training vehicle. The individual pilot-student and his instructor will have an opportunity to fly together and practice the exaggerated nose-high takeoffs and landing of a delta wing aircraft, together with afterburner operations and supersonic flight. TB–58's are now being manufactured and the first is due for delivery in June. As the TB's become available, such training will be given in them rather than in the TF–102's.

The navigator and DSO each receive extensive training in their specialties. The navigator attends a 6-week prerequisite course on the bomb/nav system at Mather AFB prior to coming to Carswell. The DSO likewise attends a 6-week training course on his equipment, but in this case it is conducted at Keesler AFB. A 1-week training period for live gunnery fireout on the OQ range at Schilling AFB is planned in the near future. Both the navigator and DSO will receive 20 days of academic training at Carswell. Flight training for these crew members consists solely of B–58 sorties and will vary from six to eight missions dependent upon the availability of TB–58's for pilot instruction.

In these paragraphs I have attempted to describe the B–58 Hustler and the road that lies ahead for her crews. For those of you who are to come to the B–58 program, I hope that it will be a very short time before you, too, hear the words—"Canopies closed. Stand by to start engines."

Winning Essay in Contest Sponsored by Propeller Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, and very warm friend, the Honorable THOR TOLLEFSON, recently addressed the Propeller Club of my hometown of Galveston, Tex.

There his attention was invited to an exceptionally fine essay which won a nationwide contest sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States.

The winner was Miss Mimi Bender, of Galveston. The essay which won the award is very significant and shows a study and a grasp of our Merchant Marine which I wish were shared by every Member of Congress.

I commend it to each one of you and to the American public as part of your required reading.

[From the Galveston Tribune, May 28, 1960]

WINNING ESSAY IN CONTEST SPONSORED BY PROPELLER CLUB

Below is the essay which won for Miss Mimi Bender, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Stacey Bender, a free cruise to the Mediterranean in a nationwide contest sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States. Announcement of her achievement was made

at the Martime Day dinner Friday night in the Galvez Hotel.

She will sail from New Orleans on a ship of the Central Gulf Lines at a date yet to be determined.

Miss Bender has been accorded other honors as a student at Ball High which she entered as a freshman in 1956 the year she came here with her parents from Baltimore when her father was named director of trade development for Galveston Wharves.

She is president of the Pan American Forum, manager of Ball High a capella choir, treasurer of the Pep Club, and this year was chosen as one of the 20 students comprising the "Good Fellow" group. She is also a member of the National Honor Society.

Mimi was the founder of St. Mary's infirmary Junior Auxiliary, consisting of 35 girls, and is currently the president.

She plans to enter Christian University in the fall, specializing in nursing and education.

The subject of her winning essay is "How the American Merchant Marine Contributes to the Prosperity of the United States."

ESSAY BY MIMI BENDER

"Representing the circulatory system of our life's blood, the American Merchant Marine plays a vital role in serving the vast industrial system that is the foundation of the prosperity of our Nation.

"With four major coastlines comprising the longest seacoast of any nation in the world, and with serious domestic and world responsibilities, we must have a sound, progressive and continuous shipping policy in order to protect and foster our Nation's foreign commerce. America's shipping contributions to a flow of commerce are for the most part unseen except by those who live in seaport cities; however, although we may never actually see an American merchant vessel, our way of life and even our very lives may depend on it.

"The U.S. Merchant Marine totals about 3,000 ships, of which about 1,000 are privately owned and 2,000 are Government owned. As of January first of this year, only 939 merchant ships were actively in use. Half of those ships, roughly 450, are the liners that carry cargo in the U.S. foreign trades. Close to another 100 dry cargo ships offer liner service in what is called the domestic trades. The remainder of the U.S. merchant fleet is composed of ships that engage in tramp-type operations, such as tankers and bulk carriers. The average expense of operating an American cargo ship varies between $2,200 and $2,500; whereas a foreign-flag cargo vessel can operate on as little as $1,200 per day. The cost of construction and operation of vessels under our flag is far greater than any foreign flag because of the vast difference in living standards.

"Our dependency

"With less than 10 percent of the world's population, we use more than half of the world's rubber, manganese ore, iron ore, zinc, copper, and lead. For all these commodities we are dependent on foreign sources of supply for about 25 percent to 86 percent of our consumption. The automotive manufacturer needs some 208 products from 56 foreign countries to fabricate a modern vehicle. Our airplanes, diesel locomotives, tractors, agricultural and industrial machinery all have components imported-ocean borne.

"Agriculture, food processors, wholesale and retail outlets, domestic transportation, rail, barges, trucks, and ships, our pantry shelves—all are concerned with the availability of that versatile metal—tin. Think of the part the can opener plays in the average American home. Consuming about 85,000 tons of primary tin annually, America produces only 0.1 percent of the world's supply. Canada and Mexico produce a fraction; however, the bulk of raw tin comes from the mines of Bolivia and Asia. All by ocean carrier.

"Imports to increase

"All U.S. imports will be increasing much faster than U.S. exports during the next decade. The volume of our raw material imports will increase in direct proportion to our increased industrial expansion. An increase in all our imports will provide dollars overseas to finance our exports. At present the United States exports about 10 percent of its entire production.

"A quarter of our cotton production is worn in every corner of the earth; a third of our wheat and half our rice help fill empty stomachs of the hungry overseas; a quarter of our tobacco is smoked in foreign lands. The merchant fleet guarantees to U.S. industry a continuing flow of essential imported raw materials avoiding paralysis in our mills and factories. Unless we have sound basic laws relating to our shipping, we can't maintain a fine fleet of American-flag ships, and we can't overcome the competitive economic problems which are inherent in our higher standards of living.

"Economic leader

"Our Nation is the economic leader of the free world. The American merchant marine is the vital link that binds our Nation with all the free farflung places where American ideals for world cooperation need to be known and need to be understood. Unless we keep American ships on the seas in sufficient quantities, those peoples will not know ideologically, commercially, or culturally. Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane has said, 'Our strength in world affairs is only as great as our maritime strength.'

"Historically, America has looked to its merchant marine in every military crisis. Government studies have emphasized the Nation's need for a strong merchant marine, capable of turning instantly to military service. In World War II if it had not been for the bridges of ships, our Government, our people, and our liberty would have gone down to ignominious defeat. Hot wars have been won by bridges of ships; cold wars can be prosecuted successfully in this same manner.

"Merchant marine goal

"Increased quantities of American merchandise moving in American ships is the goal sought by the merchant marine. A healthy flow of commerce, and a resultant strong economy are necessary to our Nation's welfare. American vessels on regular foreign trade routes are subsidized by the American taxpayer. But these same vessels pay their way, and in taxes returned to the Government, analyses, taking into account every phase of impact, have proven the operation to be virtually self-supporting.

"America needs to ply the trade lanes of the seven seas. Furthermore, America needs more and faster cargo ships. Our standard of living is operating against us when we build ships with higher priced labor and sail ships with high-priced seamen. But the need is great. We have assumed, willingly, the mantle of free world leadership, and it is our great responsibility to gird our loins with ships to provide economic independence, and a strong reservoir of trained manpower to build and run them should a greater need arise. Is our commercial economy directly paying part of the bill for maintenance of a strong merchant fleet? If our ships cost more to build than those of other nations, what is the cost of the built-in defense aspects to our foreign commerce? With the American merchant marine carrying only 15 percent of our Nation's foreign commerce, labor management and maritime technologists must collaborate in order that this essential phase of our national interest may prosper."

Effect of Importation of Shirts on the Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, the effects of imports of shirts on the economy of the United States is most serious, resulting in the millions of dollars' loss in local, State, and Federal taxes, an increase in unemployment and welfare costs, decrease in millions of yards of goods in the purchase of domestic textiles with much less raw cotton purchased from the growers. Southern Illinois is a wonderful place to live and industry has no small part in making this possible. Increased imports, particularly from Japan and other Asian countries, is of serious concern to our textile industry which should not be subjected to this unfair competition.

In the textile industry there is serious concern regarding increased imports, particularly from Japan and other Asian countries. It seems to me that there is adequate cause for alarm.

Approximately 5,775 persons in Illinois apparel and related products industry worked for firms engaged in the manufacture of men's and boys' furnishings in 1956. Imports into the United States of men's and boys' shirts and nightwear totaled $6.9 million in 1956. Last summer the Executive Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America reported that imports of shirts had increased eightfold since 1954 most of the increase coming from the Far East. This may sound like a small amount, but from March to September 1959 in the small sector of cotton shirts imports from Hong Kong increased sixfold. In February 1960 an estimate was made that such shirts were coming into the United States from Hong Kong alone at a rate of 30 million shirts a year. With Japan we have set a quota on imports of cotton shirts at a level about 1 million dozen a year. The segment of Hong Kong producers agreeable to a quota have demanded a figure higher than that of Japan. Present estimates indicate that the ratio of imports from Japan and Hong Kong equals 12 percent of U.S. production. Fears have been expressed that Japanese and Hong Kong quotas will be ineffective because other low-cost areas such as Formosa, Portugal, and Spain will immediately increase their exports to us. In 1958, 1.5 million dozen shirts were imported; the total for 1959 jumped to 2.41 million dozen.

Apparently we need a worldwide quota or some equalization of cost legislation to permit our shirt producers to compete with these low-cost foreign producers. The Clothing Workers' report I have cited above warned that "many thousands" of jobs in the textile industry are in jeopardy and I concur with their sentiment.

Imports are causing serious concern in our country. While exports increased only slightly less than the gross national product between 1950 and 1959, imports increased by 8 percentage points more than the increase in gross national product.

Dun's Review has recently completed a survey of the effects of imports on our economy. Both the members of their president's panel—representing 175 of the Nation's leading companies—and a random selection of 300 small manufacturers expect more serious competition from foreign imports in the next 5 years. Most of the panel members and the smaller companies polled believe that lower labor costs, less overhead, foreign government export subsidies and low ocean freight rates account for the difference in costs. Many trace it primarily to lower wage costs although there is diversity of opinion here. I am sorry to say that close to 40 percent of the presidents of large corporations on the panel reported that they plan to launch more foreign operations: licensing arrangements, new plants and expanded facilities abroad, joint operations with oversea manufacturers, and purchase of foreign concerns. I do not know how many of these are located in Illinois or if any are in my district, but I do know that this means the export of jobs from our borders and import competition. The smaller businesses must rely on increased efficiency, new products, automation, and greater production. The increase in imports of finished manufactures, which in 1950 constituted about 18 percent of total consumption imports, accounted for about 34 percent of import transactions in 1959. Together with semimanufactures they accounted for over half of U.S. imports by value. This is a grave portent for my congressional district and for the State of Illinois.

For all these reasons, I feel that concrete action should be taken immediately to alleviate such conditions.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Nebraska has passed cooperative legislation to implement the program to eliminate water pollution. They have carried on a very effective information service to many of the communities of the State who have in turn set up their own taxing schedules to raise the proportionate amount of local contribution for the improvement of sanitary facilities.

It is my pleasure to introduce a resolution that was adopted unanimously by the Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council at the June 10 meeting in Scottsbluff, Nebr.:

Whereas the Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council is gravely concerned that the development and use of the Nation's water resource be such as to serve the greatest good for the greatest number; and

Whereas there exists attitudes and policies in Federal agencies and in the Congress which discount important and essential values inherent in Federal water impoundment works because these values are of a nonreimbursable nature and/or classification; and

Whereas the development on these nonreimbursable values are the only direct benefits the great majority of American taxpayers can realize from Federal water impoundment works: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council urges its congressional representation, the National Congress, and the several Federal agencies concerned to sponsor and support policies and legislation which will give nonreimbursable public values equal consideration, in both weight and financing, with reimbursable values in all Federal water impoundment works; and be it further

Resolved, That the council urges greater coordination between governmental agencies concerned with nonreimbursable as well as reimbursable values throughout the planning and development of these public works to the end that multiple use of the Nation's water resource may be truly achieved and that all the citizens who support these public works through taxation and otherwise may realize all public values inherent therein.

More Support for the Point 4 Youth Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to establish a point 4 Youth Corps to enable young Americans to participate in public and private technical assistance programs abroad at a soldier's pay continues to draw favorable comment and support from all parts of the Nation.

As part of my remarks today, I should like to offer for the RECORD two of the most recent examples of public interest in the program. First, I offer an article by George W. Oakes titled "Point 4 Youth Corps for United States," which appeared in the editorial section of the Washington Sunday Star on June 26, 1960. Following this article, I offer the text of the resolution favoring the point 4 Youth Corps offered by Frank Wallick and adopted by the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention, Sunday, June 26, 1960. I commend both to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, June 26, 1960]

POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS FOR UNITED STATES

(By George W. Oakes)

Our foreign aid program may be rejuvenated by a novel proposal written into the new law—a Point 4 Youth Corps.

Sensing the relatively unexplored opportunity for enthusiastic Americans just out of college to participate in the economic aid program and the potential contribution they could make abroad, Representative REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, sponsored the innovation in the recently signed mutual security law. A corps of several thousand young Americans are envisioned to serve voluntarily at a soldier's pay in public and private technical aid missions in the underdeveloped countries. The President is to select a university or nongovernmental research group to make specific recommendations for the formation of the Youth Corps. Most of the funds for this study will come from private foundations, with $10,000 from the Government if Congress passes the appropriation later.

Many critics of the foreign aid program have pointed to its excessive emphasis on military aid—guns, tanks and superhighways—or the "militarism-encased-in-concrete approach." Others have publicized the impact of poorly selected personnel overseas on the people we are trying to help.

Encouraged by the successful experience of private organizations using young people in underdeveloped areas, Mr. REUSS believes that more trained young Americans actually out in the field, teaching modern farming methods, operating malaria control, maternity and child-care programs, setting up rural schools, and helping in village development projects like elementary sanitation and water supply, can prove to the peoples of Asia and Africa that the United States is genuinely interested primarily in their welfare and not merely in our defense.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM

For example, two men of International Voluntary Services, a church organization interested in technical aid programs abroad, operated a 33-acre experimental farm in Egypt under an International Cooperation Administration contract so well that, after the Suez crisis blew over, the Egyptian Government not only requested the men to return but asked for more.

Also, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, after criticizing many aspects of the aid program in Vietnam, highly praised the experimental station set up by young American graduates of agricultural colleges. Living in quonset huts in the hill country, these workers taught the natives new planting methods and the best use of 5 acres of land and a water buffalo they had been given. The committee report said "this kind of program is helping the little people to help themselves."

When in Cambodia, Mr. REUSS met a team of four young American schoolteachers—a young Negro man from Chicago, an Italian girl from Brooklyn, and two Southern Baptists. They were going from village to village organizing village schools and were given a most appreciative welcome by the illiterate natives.

The plan for the new Youth Corps is to attract college students—both men and women—particularly those specializing in agriculture, education, public health, and public administration, for a 2-year tour of duty. On graduation they would be given a 3- to 6-month course of specialized instruction, stressing languages and technical training. There is a possibility that these volunteers would be credited with the usual period of military service, as has been done for those participating in the International Voluntary Services program.

PAY LIKE MILITARY

Each volunteer would be paid on a modest scale of compensation, perhaps $60 a month in addition to expenses. Selection would be on the basis of enthusiasm for such grassroots jobs and way of living, plus the ability to work successfully with ordinary people in the underdeveloped areas. At first the aim would be to recruit about 1,000 in the

next 2 or 3 years, with a goal of perhaps 10 times that number. There are now 6,000 Americans abroad engaged in the foreign aid program under ICA. It is estimated that $50 million annually would send 10,000 Youth Corps members into the field.

The State Department has been skeptical about the practicality of the plan, largely because it may involve new administrative problems in addition to its present ones. However, foreign aid officials believe that a Youth Corps could be integrated into the existing operation possibly by placing it under semiprivate control. For example, contracts might be made with universities specializing in these fields to choose the candidates and even to operate the program with Government administrative support. The young people would be supervised by competent older administrators and technicians now serving in the economic aid program.

Nevertheless, there may well be a problem of fitting recent college graduates into the economic aid program. For one thing ICA policy has been to use nationals of the country for some of the tasks which the Youth Corps would perform. Also, many underdeveloped countries have urged the ICA to send high-ranking and experienced men from university faculties in the United States. In fact, some of the most successful university-directed programs in the underdeveloped areas have not included those below the rank of associate professor.

STUDENTS ENTHUSIASTIC

College students seem enthusiastic about participating in frontier living overseas. More than 400 students at Lehigh University have sent Mr. REUSS a petition stating their willingness to serve. The United States National Student Association, representing some 1,300,000 students in 375 colleges and universities, is mobilizing support for the Youth Corps idea. In Washington, Dean Ernest S. Griffith of American University's School of International Service believes he will have 10 to 20 candidates available for the Corps when the school reaches its full enrollment, especially in Africa, where youth is an advantage in dealing with the natives.

Quite a number of outstanding college graduates are now applying for jobs in underdeveloped areas. For example, Sam Bowles, son of Representative BOWLES, Democrat of Connecticut, who recently graduated magna cum laude from Yale, will leave shortly to take a 2-year job as a history teacher in one of northern Nigeria's secondary schools.

RESOLUTION FAVORING POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS OFFERED BY FRANK WALLICK AND ADOPTED BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF WISCONSIN

Whereas America's young people are basically talented and idealistic;

Whereas America's oversea economic development programs often lack close identification with people;

Whereas Congress HENRY REUSS has introduced a study proposal for a point 4 Youth Corps and this program has been adopted as part of the Mutual Security Act of 1960;

Whereas New York Times correspondent James Reston writing on America's national purpose has said: "If the main war is the battle in the underdeveloped areas, Why not offer talented young men of draft age the option of using their brains in the civilian service in Indonesia, rather than sentencing them to Army kitchen police in Hoboken?": Be it therefore

Resolved, That the 1960 Wisconsin Democratic Party Convention in Milwaukee wholeheartedly approve of the Reuss-Neuberger point 4 Youth Corps as a practical way to harness America's idealism in the only war we seek—the war against illiteracy, disease, hunger, and poverty—among the uncommitted, emerging nations of the world.

The Condition of Man in the Age of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would not relish the chance to read the thousands of commencement addresses which were delivered at our colleges and high schools this month. I have had the great pleasure of reading one such address, however, and its wisdom is so penetrating, yet simple, that it deserves a wider audience than it had at my alma mater, the University of Arizona, at Tucson on June 1.

The address was made by Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch, former professor of English and dramatic literature at Columbia University, and author of books on drama, literature, nature, and man. Two of Dr. Krutch's most recent books, "The Measure of Man" and "Human Nature and the Human Condition," indicates his continuing consideration of questions which have been the preoccupation of philosophers.

It was to such a question that Dr. Krutch addressed himself at the commencement in Tucson early this month—that in a world which can give money, fame, and power, the only security an individual can have is his own honor, and this he can only give himself. Dr. Krutch does not say that individual morality is lower today than in previous generations, but he is profoundly disturbed by our growing lack of shame in the usual moral indiscretions common to man. The burden of the Krutch address was that, without personal integrity and self-respect in the age of science, man—who may, or may not, survive the vast destructive power he has created—will almost certainly lose his humanity.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should ponder the words of this man of wisdom and goodwill, Dr. Joseph Wood Krutch, of Tucson, Ariz.:

When an old man has an opportunity to address a youthful group on so traditional an occasion as this it is certain that some platitudes will fall on impatient ears.

You will, then, not be surprised if I begin with some very familiar ones, my excuse being this: I would like, in the end to make one deduction from these platitudes which is not as commonly emphasized as I think it should be.

But the platitudes must come first. This, as you well know without being told as often as you are told, is an age of science. Also one in which science has come to mean more and more the techniques for acquiring power. We call it power to control the forces of nature, but we are becoming increasingly aware that it means also power over human life—including, unfortunately, power to destroy it on a large scale—on so large a scale that it may involve the destruction of ourselves as well as of our opponents.

In one way or another these platitudes will be the theme of a large proportion of the commencement addresses being delivered this week in hundreds, perhaps thousands, of schools and colleges. On the one hand, thousands of young men and women are being urged to devote themselves to science as the great need of our time and urged to do their part in making our Nation strong. At the same time, a probably lesser but still an immense number of young people are being warned of the dangers as well as the promises of technology and not a few are being urged to avoid an exclusive stress upon it. They are being told that philosophy, ethics, religion, and the arts are an essential part of the human being and that we neglect them at our peril.

Those who stress the dangers as well as the promises are not always querulous old men. Among those who sound a warning are some who have been most deeply involved in expanding science themselves. Here for instance, is a singularly brief, trenchant statement from a great atomic physicist, J. Robert Oppenheimer: "Nuclear weapons and all the machinery of war surrounding us now haunt our imaginations with an apocalyptic vision that could well become a terrible reality: the disappearance of man as a species from the surface of the earth. It is quite possible. But what is more probable, more immediate, and in my opinion equally terrifying, is the prospect that man will survive while losing his precious heritage, his civilization, and his very humanity."

Now what is this "humanity" which Mr. Oppenheimer is afraid we may lose? Is it simply poetry and music and art? Can we keep from losing it by insisting that all students, even in scientific institutions, take courses in the romantic poets and music appreciation? Well it is partly that and the proposed remedy is good as far as it goes—which isn't really very far.

In more general terms the issue is much larger. It has also, of course, something to do with our increasingly greater, our almost exclusive stress, upon wealth and power as the only things worth having, upon, for instance, our willingness to accept what we call a high standard of living as necessarily the equivalent of what philosophers used to call the good life; it is materialism as all this is somewhat platitudinously called. Insofar as we lose interest in things other than material goods we are at least becoming less like human beings of the past, and in that sense we are indeed losing our humanity.

But what I have in mind and want to talk about this evening is something which seems to me even more characteristically and exclusively human than arts, letters or an appreciation of nonmaterial goods. You may call this something by the dull platitudinous word "morals," though I should prefer to call it "the strong clear sense of good and evil as the most important realities of the human being when we contrast him with the animal or the machine."

If I say this I hear from you an almost audible protest. "You do not mean to imply," I can almost hear you exclaim, "that we are not today deeply concerned with morality." Surely ethical questions are among those of which our society is most deeply aware. Has any other age ever talked so much about "social justice"; ever professed so much concern for the submerged common man? Has any other ever appeared to take more seriously "human rights"—political and economic rights, the rights of racial minorities, the rights of colonial people, et cetera? Do we not acknowledge as no age before this ever did our responsibility for what we are calling for the first time "one world"? Isn't ours the great age of social conscience as obviously as it is the great age of science? And is not conscience at the very base of morality?

All this I readily grant. But I am also aware of a strange paradox. It is often said—and my observation leads me to believe it true—that this seemingly great growth in social morality has, oddly enough, taken place in a world where private morality, a sense of the supreme importance of purely personal honor, honesty, and integrity seems

to be disappearing. Beneficent and benevolent social institutions are administered by men who all too frequently turn out to be accepting "gifts" which are bribes more or less disguised. The world of popular entertainment is rocked by scandals; college students put on their honor cheat on examinations; and candidates for the Ph. D.—in social as well as in other studies—hire ghost writers to prepare their theses.

Again I seem to hear an objection. "But haven't all these things always been true? Is there really any evidence that personal dishonesty is more prevalent than it always was?" I do not know. Perhaps they are not actually more prevalent. What I do know is that there is an increasing tendency to accept and take for granted such personal dishonesty. The bureaucrat (and the disk-jockey) say, "Why, yes; I took presents but I assure you I made just decisions anyway." The college student caught cheating does not even blush. He shrugs his shoulders: "Everybody does it and besides I can't see that it really hurts anyone." Recently a reporter on a New York newspaper stopped six people on the street and asked them if they would consent to take part in a rigged television quiz for money. Five of the six said "Yes." Yet most of the five, like most of the college cheaters, would probably profess a strong "social consciousness." They may cheat but they vote for foreign aid and enlightened social measures.

Jonathon Swift once said: "I have never been surprised to find men wicked but I have often been surprised to find them not ashamed." And it is my conviction that though men may be no more wicked than they have always been they are less likely to be ashamed—which, by the way, they call being "realistic."

Why are they less ashamed? I think that the answer is to be found in the student's reply: "Everybody does it, and, besides, it doesn't really do any harm." Precisely the same thing was said in many newspapers about the TV scandals. And if you look at this so common pronouncement you will see what lies behind the breakdown of private morality as opposed to public; of personal honor as opposed to social consciousness. If everybody does it, it must be all right. Honest, moral, and decent mean only what is usual. This is not really a wicked world, because morality means mores and usual conduct is the only standard.

The second part of the defense, "It didn't really hurt anybody," is equally revealing. Didn't hurt anybody means didn't do that abstraction called society any harm. The harm it did the bribetaker and the cheater isn't important. It is purely personal. And personal as opposed to social decency doesn't count for much.

Sometimes I am inclined to blame sociology for this paradox. It has laid too exclusive a stress upon social morality and tended too often to define good and evil as merely the socially useful or its reverse.

I opened for instance, a widely used college textbook of psychology at the chapter headed "Morality." It is a very brief one, and in it I read: "We call a man moral when his actions are in accord with the laws and customs of his society." No qualification follows, no suggestion that a thing may be evil even though sanctioned by law and custom. Certainly no hint that under certain conditions a man should be called moral only when he refuses to do what a bad law permits or an evil custom of his society encourages.

If you accept this psychological concept of morality as no more than mores, then you are logically compelled to assume, for instance, that in Nazi Germany a man who persecuted the Jews was a moral man and one who refused to do so was immoral, since persecution was certainly both the law and the custom in the society of which he was a part.

I doubt that the author of this textbook would have followed his logic to that extreme. But he gives no reason why one should not do so. And he certainly implies that a student may cheat on examinations and a public official accept gifts without ceasing to be moral provided only that cheating and bribetaking are common practices of his group and his colleagues.

What social conscience and social morality leave out is the narrower but very significant concept of honor—as opposed to what the sociologists prefer to call socially desirable conduct. The man of honor is not content to ask merely, "Will this or that hurt society," or "Is it what most people would permit themselves to do." He asks, and asks first of all, if it would hurt him in his self-respect, would dishonor him personally; and he is not moved (as the cheating student is moved) by the argument that it would not hurt society or, even perhaps, that since it would help him get the job he wants, it would enable him to do good and is thus truly moral though the old fashioned might call it dishonorable.

Two generations ago the world was genuinely shocked when the Imperial German Government dismissed a solemn treaty as a mere scrap of paper. Today, we merely shrug when a government breaks a treaty. Statesmen are not expected to be men of honor. Only to do whatever seems advantageous to their government.

The cheating student has come to believe—by some sociologists he has even been taught—(1) that immoral means simply "socially undesirable" and (2) that whatever everybody does is permissible since, after all, "moral" means no more than "according to custom."

When some scandal breaks in government or journalism or business or broadcasting the usual reaction of even that part of the public which can still be shocked is to say that it could not have happened if there had been adequate laws supervising this or that activity. But is it not equally true that it could not have happened if a whole group of men, including the supposed guardians of public morality had not been devoid of any sense of the meaning and importance of individual integrity? May one not go further and ask whether any amount of "social consciousness" or any amount of government control can make a decent society composed of people with no conception of personal honor or dignity?

It was a favorite and no doubt sound contention of early twentieth century reformers that "playing the game" as the gentleman was supposed to play it is not enough to make a just society. But the time has come to add that it is, nevertheless, indispensable.

I hold that the so called "social conscience," unsupported by the concept of personal honor, will create a corrupt society. But suppose that this is not necessarily true. Suppose that no one except the individual suffers from the fact that he sees nothing wrong in doing "what everybody does." Even so, I still insist that for the individual himself nothing is more important than this personal, interior sense of right and wrong and his determination to follow that rather than to be guided by either "what everybody does" or merely the criterion of "social usefulness." It is impossible for me to imagine a good society composed of men without honor.

I shall not labor the point any further. But I will assume the privilege of a commencement speaker to give advice; and what the advice comes down to is this: Do not be so exclusively concerned with society, and "social conditions" as to forget your own condition. You are your own self and you cannot shift the responsibility for that self to "world conditions" or the mores of your civilization. This is your burden and it is also your ultimate resource.

The time may come when you lose hope for the world. But it need never come when you lose hope for yourself. Do not say "I will do what everybody else does." Be, if necessary, a lonely candle which can throw its beams far in a naughty world.

And I say this not only because I think that in the end it best for society. I say it first of all because it is the best and happiest course for you yourself. If you must be pessimistic about the world and believe society corrupt, then do not see in that any reason why you should be corrupt yourself. Be scornful if you must; but base your scorn on the difference between yourself and what you think deserves your scorn.

Some will say that if you do this you run the risk of spiritual pride. But I think the world could at the present, do with a little spiritual pride here and there because there seems to be so little of it about. You will be told that you run the risk of thinking yourself wiser and better than the common run of men. But I hold that preferable to being content not even to try to be better and wiser than they are.

You may think that personal integrity and self-respect are not what you want more than anything else. You may say to yourself that putting them first would make it too difficult to get along in the world; that you would rather have money, power, fame or even, you may smugly say, the chance which money, power, and fame will give you to "do good in the world." But if you do say any of those things you will be making an unwise choice; you will be surrendering something which cannot be taken away from you to gain something which can be taken away and which, as a matter of fact very often is.

We hear it often said that what present-day men most desire is security. If that is so then they have a wrong notion of what the real, the ultimate security is. No one who is dependent upon anything outside—money, power, frame, or what not—is or ever can be secure. Only he who possesses himself and is content with himself is actually secure.

No matter how bad the world may become; no matter how much the mass man of the future may lose such of the virtues as he still has the fact remains that if you alone refuse to go along with him, if you alone assert your individual and inner right to believe in and be loyal to what your fellows seem to have given up; then at least you will still have retained that humanity which Mr. Oppenheimer fears we may all lose.

A Perfect Administration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial by David Lawrence entitled "A Perfect Administration?" which appeared in the July 4, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

A PERFECT ADMINISTRATION?

(By David Lawrence)

Judging by some speeches, inside and outside Congress, that are getting headlines nowadays, there is a perfect way to run the foreign policy of the United States.

The critics have encouraged us to believe that the way to win the "cold war" is to

elect a President next time who will know in advance what the Communist regime in Moscow is planning and will promptly take just the right action to defeat its purposes.

This, to be sure, is a very large order. It assumes that the President will always be in perfect health, that he will never need any time off for recreation—especially, that he will never play golf—and that, with a telephone at his bedside, he will be able at any hour of the night to issue orders to his thousands of subordinates. Indeed, it is asserted that the President should know what military pilots are taking off for any destination throughout the world every minute of the day and night. He should, it is said, be able to suspend any airborne alert which our bombers occasionally fly in an attempt to get warning of the enemy's preparations for a surprise attack.

The President should also be tuned in—legitimately, of course, and not through any espionage device—on the deliberations at the Kremlin. He should be able to regulate his oversea trips so that he will not run into such a dilemma as he did in Paris or Tokyo. In fact, the President is to know in advance the temper of the mobs that are gathering in any foreign country to demonstrate against our prestige. Above all, he is to be an expert in diagnosing the psychopathic aberrations of a Khrushchev.

More than this, the President must never fail to spend enough money to keep us ahead of the Russians in everything—from missiles to professors of science and all other categories of education. One ingenious way to accomplish all this supposedly is to use Federal funds to increase the number of classrooms in the country and, of course, raise teachers' salaries.

If anyone so much as mentions the budget as a possible barrier to big spending programs, the President is to rise up to denounce budget considerations as old fashioned or as thwarting our national purpose.

Money, we will be told, grows on trees. Anyone who thinks that a perennially unbalanced budget will produce inflation and a 10-cent dollar is to be given a simple and pious lecture about the need for a 5-percent increase annually in our national growth. This presumably will at once dispel all fears of fiscal chaos.

Under the perfect administration, to be sure, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will conduct our foreign policy, and the Secretary of State will take his instructions from Capitol Hill, despite the fact that the Constitution says this is solely an executive responsibility.

As for domestic problems, by waving a magic wand, we will have just the right wages, the right prices, and adequate receipts from higher taxes. The Government would regulate all business.

The perfect administration will regard as outmoded any protest decrying all this as destructive of private initiative. Instead, the slogan is to be "more spending for more growth, and more government in more business." Anyone who objects will be called a misguided disciple of big business or an old fogey who is far behind the times. The demand is for bold and imaginative ideas no matter what they cost. Taxpayers are to be dubbed "illiberal" if they object to paying more taxes while their dollars shrink in purchasing power.

As for money spent abroad, the foreign countries receiving it are to be given constant aid and yet do nothing for the United States in return. Our military bases there are to be regarded as superfluous and as annoying to the Communists—hence they would be withdrawn, as recommended by Moscow. If this brings us to a posture of isolation, then it will be urged that we quickly get more missiles and intercontinental bombers, even if it costs many times what our allied bases cost us now. As for our allies, they are expected to enjoy these disengagement policies, comforted by the thought that all this is peaceful coexistence.

What candidate can assure the perfect administration? If any would-be nominee cannot do it, his campaign promises, whatever they are—even before the conventions take place—must be held up to scorn. Only someone with the ability to awe Communists into immediate acquiescence in, if not submission to, our demands should theoretically be given serious consideration by the delegates of the two national conventions.

Will the American people be misled into believing that Utopia is just around the corner and that, if only we will give up all our armament, including nuclear weapons, the lion and the lamb will lie down together? Fortunately, the average voter has plenty of commonsense, and he will recognize that the perfectionists are really partisans who are overplaying their hand.

Collapse of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting report which is contained in the following Dan Smoot report for June 27, 1960:

COLLAPSE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

In January 1957 (after the Eisenhower administration revealed that it had invited Tito of Yugoslavia to visit the United States), Congress formally registered stern disapproval: neither Congress nor the people considered Tito a proper guest for this country, because of his association with the crimes of Nikita Khrushchev.

In 1959—without letting Congress or the people know until it was too late for protests to be effective—Eisenhower invited the chief hangman himself to visit America.

Shortly after his triumphal tour of America, Khrushchev visited Communist China. In Peiping, Khrushchev told Chinese Communist leaders:

"If enough people follow Eisenhower, we will get what we want, over a great deal of opposition from some quarters. He is most discreet and does not bring up unpleasant subjects like some of the American warmongers."

Seven months later, May 1960, Khrushchev at Paris turned on his "discreet" friend, the President, saying he was not a proper guest for the Soviet Union, calling him names, humiliating him and America in the eyes of the world.

Khrushchev's henchmen in China and Japan immediately pressed the advantage which international communism had gained in its campaign to disgrace America. The Communist Party in China poured money into Japan to finance demonstrations against Eisenhower's proposed "good-will" trip to Japan.

As if hypnotized, or dazed by their stunning defeats, Eisenhower and his policymakers and all their internationalist supporters, both Democrat and Republican, in Congress and out, insisted that Eisenhower had to go to Japan: his trip was necessary to American prestige.

The Communist riots in Japan became increasingly bloody and sinister.

On Sunday, June 12, 1960, when President Eisenhower departed from Washington for the Far East, he was asked about the possibility of canceling his visit to Japan; rioting in Tokyo was, by then, dangerously out of control. The President said bluntly that he was going to Japan—that he would not be stopped by "hostile agents."

On June 17 (June 17 in the Far East; June 16 in the West) Communist leaders in Tokyo said 300,000 would be mobilized for demonstrations on Saturday, June 18, to protest Eisenhower's scheduled arrival the next day. The Prime Minister of Japan (Nobusuke Kishi) acceded to the Communists' demands: He canceled President Eisenhower's visit.

News of the cancellation was released to the world hours before the President himself knew about it. He received the news (with surprise and dismay) while reviewing a parade in Manila. James Hagerty (the President's press secretary) admitted that President Eisenhower had been given no forewarning of the cancellation and knew nothing about it until he heard about the newspaper account.

On June 17, 1960, the President left the Philippines, sailing under severe military alert intended to protect him from the Chinese Communists. He headed for Formosa, despite the heavy Communist bombardment of Quemoy (which his good will visit prompted), while the Western World expressed alarm and the Communist world gloated.

The New York Times news service, in a dispatch from Hong Kong, said:

"Although the United States' loss of face in the Far East as a result of the cancellation of Eisenhower's trip to Japan will be enormous, observers here believe that it will be relatively insignificant compared with the prestige Red China will gain, not only in the uncommitted countries of Asia, but also in Communist parties—legal and underground—throughout the world."

The Soviet newspaper, Izvestia, said:

"The events of these days should have proved to Eisenhower, even if he is blind and deaf, that the Japanese do not wish to see him on their soil, that he is not only an unwanted guest, but he is like a man who forcibly wants to break into another man's home."

A United Press International dispatch from London said:

"There was deep concern in Western diplomatic circles over the effect of the cancellation, on Eisenhower's personal prestige and that of the United States, and, consequently, the entire Western World."

An Associated Press story from Washington said:

"Official Washington Thursday viewed as a diplomatic catastrophe the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Japan.

"The event—and the forces which brought it about—threaten the future of the United States-Japanese alliance.

"The northern anchor of the allied security system in the Far East is thus endangered.

"At the moment, it's anybody's guess where Japan will stand in the cold war, once the current upheaval is over.

"Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and the chieftains of Red China won a stunning victory in their cold war campaign to cut down U.S. prestige and destroy the system of alliances and foreign bases which constitute the free world's forward defenses against Soviet-Chinese Communist power."

Thus, the crashing collapse of American foreign policy was evident to the world. Indeed, that collapse has been evident for several years. The events of May and June 1960 merely compelled everyone to admit it.

The Cleveland Report on Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

A FRESH APPRAISAL: THE CLEVELAND REPORT ON RED CHINA

(By Emil Brunner)

(Emil Brunner, one of the most influential of living Protestant theologians, was born in Winterthur, Switzerland, 1889. From 1922 to 1953 he taugh theology at University of Zurich, except for a year as visiting professor at Princeton Seminary (1938–39). After teaching for 2 years at International Christian University, Tokyo, he retired and is living in Zurich. His writings are in the recent tradition of continental neoorthodoxy.)

You have asked me to convey my opinion about the Cleveland message. This I wish to do, indeed, feel I must do at the behest of conscience, and is what I would have done even without your request. I wish to state the result of my painstaking examination before any further commend: I am utterly alarmed at this message. The ground for my reaction is explained in the following pages.

I shall begin with the most important postulate of the Cleveland message, and which is also discussed at greatest length therein, namely, the demand that Red China be received into the United Nations. The Cleveland message is right insofar as it affirms that the U.N.O., the nucleus of a future international order which is to replace the present international anarchy, must be given our complete support. That it is an anomaly for the most populous nation on earth not to be represented therein is something to which many are acutely sensitive even on our side, and the wish to correct this anomaly through the admission of Red China to the U.N.O. is therefore very understandable and quire debatable. But we must not overlook the fact that such a change in the U.N.O. probably would result in its losing what prestige still remains to it, as well as the complete loss of its capability to accomplish even a part of that for which it was founded. Yet I do not wish to address myself to this challenge in itself, but rather to place it in the context of the total complex from which perspective this and other questions must be considered.

The world today stands over against two terrifying dangers: that of total nuclear war and that of world bolshevism. The Cleveland message speaks of the first of these in well-chosen and persuasive words. Total nuclear war means nothing less than the total obliteration of the greater part of mankind. That which the Cleveland message has to say in this regard receives my committed agreement. We cannot even conceive any real idea of the horror of such a total war. It actually surpasses one's conceptual powers. No individual can imagine what conditions, what destruction of human life and material goods such a war would bring with it.

It is probable that the greatest part of the earth presently occupied would scarcely be habitable in the wake of nuclear war, and that the few still living would face a future burdened with a horrible mortgage of sickness and a heavily damaged progeny. Who would want to say a word vindicating such a war?

SILENT ON DANGER

However, the Cleveland message is virtually silent about the second danger, and this is ground for the sharpest counterargument. The Western World must also hear from the church concerning why such tremendous efforts are expended for military preparedness and why its governments so determinedly promote such preparedness. This can only be the case in a situation of alarming danger making such preparedness a necessity. The church must tell the world what she for the most part does not know, namely, what bolshevism in its aim for world domination is actually like.

Any judgment about this danger actually has nothing to do with separating "evil" peoples from the "good," as the Cleveland message expresses it. For bolshevism has not come to power anywhere in the world through a movement of the people, but since its beginning in Russia it has been imposed upon large masses of people against their will by a small minority.

It is undoubtedly necessary to evaluate the original motive of the Communist revolution in its positive signification. The power of this movement can only be explained if we understand it as a rebellion against the social injustice in the world, particularly as to the manifestation of the extreme wealth of the few on the one hand and the poverty (beyond the comprehension of Western man) of great masses of people on the other. Communism originally wished to create justice and a humanly significant existence for all. But a system has been made out of this praiseworthy motive which has exchanged its ideals for the most extreme antithesis. This system we call bolshevism. So-called communism is not a political or an economical system comparable to others but a system which wishes to conform the whole man. The totality of human life on earth is its ideology, and it is in a position to accomplish its aim through centralized, highly organized and fearful power. In the power realm of this totalitarian communism, there is no possibility of withdrawing from this process of systematically compelled molding or even to undertake anything against it. Wherever this power once is established, it becomes the definitive tribulation of the ensnared people. In earlier times there was a possibility to revolt against a tyrannical system. But under the totalitarian Communist dictatorship, subsequent to the establishment of the perfect power organization, with its all-knowing secret police service and the universarrly present coercive powers, no such possibility exists. This is the new element in the total state—and the Communistic is merely the most highly developed and thoroughly designed total state. Every other form of totalitarianism, for example, that of Hitler, is by comparison with the communistic, pure dilettantism.

THE NEW IMAGE OF MAN

Bolshevism is above all a refined mechanism designed to shape man in its own image. It alone possesses the schools, it has an absolute monopoly over the press, the theaters, the cinema, radio, and television. One of its most effective methods is the withholding of knowledge of what other people think and the kind of life they live from the peoples over whom they have control. This is achieved by means of the Iron Curtain, for example, through employment of the dictatorially controlled press to mislead the enslaved people. The Communist state rears very person from kindergarten to university according to its program, which is thought out to the minutest detail. Moreover, this educative process is distinguishable from ours in that through its instruction and training it so shapes the ensnared persons that they, subsequent to the completed process of this education, are really no longer able to think otherwise, nor do they wish to do anything other than that which this power wishes. Not only is all criticism of the system forbidden—and this prohibition is actualized through gruesome punishment—but the brainwashing is so psychologically determined that the individual actually thinks and wills to do that which the system thinks and wills. Any other thinking and willing is eliminated.

We have heard all kinds of things about the relaxation of the thought-control terror. But this is merely an illusion, for communism will only allow as much opposition as will not strike at its heart. When the latter become apparent, however, its suppression is fundamentally gruesome and without scruple. Inasmuch as there are in Russia today a few persons who internally oppose the system, this is but a sign of the fact that the process of dehumanization has seen considerable progress. This education process has not yet been so fruitful in the satellite States, first, because the internal opposition was stronger than in Russia (which never has known anything but a despotic order), and second, because the isolation from the rest of the world via the Iron Curtain was not so easily accomplished. But so much more brutal was the implementation of the power arm when the freedom movements became apparent, as in the case of the East German workers' class, and in Poland and Hungary.

The system of Communist totalitarianism is saturated with the idea that the whole world is to become Communist and with the will to assist this inevitable process through the power of the Kremlin. Communistic totalitarianism has had the fixed plan, since the time of Lenin, to subjagate completely the world under its system, without war if possible—through the excitation of internal unrest, and through the formation of Communist parties whereby it can intervene as the power which comes to the help of the "freedom fighters," as it did with great success in China; as it has attempted recently in Lebanon (though it did not prevail, thanks to the alertness of the American foreign policy); as it now is trying to do in Iraq; or, if there is no other way and no favorable prospect, through conquest, as it actually did in Hungary and Poland and even earlier in the Baltic States; as it attempted in Korea in 1950 and as it recently has done with success in Tibet. How systematic and cunning is their work could be elucidated by various statesmen (cf. M. de Gaulle in this regard, about the Indians mustered in Paris in order to be planted in Algeria as freedom fighters).

AMERICA IN 1978

Some years ago, a timetable of an influential Communist leader was disclosed in which we read: "1960, all Asia communistic; 1964 all Europe; 1978, all America and thereby the whole world." This is fundamentally not a new idea, but the old statement of Lenin: The road to Paris is through Asia. This plan does not necessarily imply war; but if the Western people (the capitalists and imperialists) are not wise and determined, the Kremlin in alliance with Peiping can achieve these goals, step by step, virtually unnoticed. Its tactic is not the stupid "all or nothing" but the shrewd "always a bit forward toward the inevitable goal of Communist world dominion." Pressure concentrated upon this objective is as constant as that of an expanding glacier, but the separate steps can be modified depending upon the solidity of the defensive measures which they may meet.

Bolshevism has achieved a great deal. In 1939, 17 percent of the total surface of the earth was under Communist control, which meant about 9 percent of the total world

population and 10 percent of the industrial potential. Today the same figures are: 20 percent of the total surface, 35 percent of the world population, 33 percent of the industrial potential. And this immense advance of the slave system took place in a period of 18 years. It would have been even more stupendous but for the alertness of American foreign policy and the preparedness of the Western World.

But what is meant by Bolshevist world domination? The picture drawn by most of even the well-informed is far too optimistic—for two reasons. First, the Communist system, after its victory, could drop all restraint, which it must still utilize as it still must consider world opinion. How unrestrained it can be has been impressed upon us by the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolt. Second, not until total communism is victorious will its true character be manifest: atheism is its basis, moral nihilism the result, the total robotization of mankind is the inevitable consequence. One hears it asserted again and again that the issue of godlessness is not so serious: witness the fact that Russia still has churches and even theological seminaries. But suppose we consider the lot of the churches under a victorious Bolshevist system. There would be no churches or Bibles any more except for those that a few of the courageously faithful, at risk of life, would have in hiding. To what end victorious bolshevism presses can be seen in the people's communes in Red China. The Chinese family, the greatest social force of world history, is in a very brief period being demolished and the individual is being made a workhorse in the ant kingdom.

Communism is the system of consequent inhumanity, which it must be as the system of programmatic atheism.

"GOOD" VERSUS SOUL DEATH

If one asserts to the contrary that communism has also accomplished much good, it must be conceded good in the sense of industrialization, in the raising of living standards, in the freely accessible and gratuitous (Communist) education, in technical performance—but all of this is nothing in comparison with the death of the soul of man. The free development of the soul, a free faith and hope, free action according to conscience—these can never be conceded, for they would attack the system at the roots and destroy it. If people are satisfied with being well-fed workhorses, they may then permit the Bolshevist danger to overtake them. But so long as they still have freedom of thought and faith, so long as they consider love and humanity more worthy than technically sophisticated apparatus, so long will they fear communism and detest it as the greatest delivery that has yet made its appearance on the scene of human history. It is, in a word, an antigodly, anti-Christian system.

It should therefore have been the first duty of a national council to explain the nature of this devil to all Christians and to strengthen the will of them to say: "To this system, I and above all my children and grandchildren will not be subjugated." Their divine destiny is at stake. We have here to do with all that which in actuality concerns our faith: that man finds God in His Word and that he loves his neighbor inasmuch as God has first loved us. Of all this there is not a word in the Cleveland message. But all sorts of wishful thinking is strengthened among the people, namely, that things are not really so bad with communism; surely the good in it will come to the fore; it is definitely not so belligerently oriented, and so forth. The Cleveland message has neglected the fact that communism is a devilish system which can allow no correction of itself without mortal danger to itself. It is therefore a system which cannot permit any constitutive improvement at any point of importance. To the contrary, the system has perfected itself, both in the sense of self-perpetuation and in that of the systematic seizure of all that will serve it, yet without harm to itself. Thus it has made no backward step in its plans for world dominion and the realization thereof.

A FATEFUL PROPHECY

Once these two terrible dangers have been set over against each other, the question must be put as to which of the two is the greater—the unleashing of a nuclear war by accident (for an intentional initiation is as good as excluded), or the danger of world bolshevism? Before the question is answered, we must first establish the fact that it was singularly the nuclear preparedness of the West that has hindered the advance of bolshevism since 1945. We are thankful for this preparedness, for that alone has kept us out of the bolshevist soul-murdering machinery.

The will for the extension of the Communist rule has always been before us and has been recognizable. But it pursuance of the rapid expansion of its rulership, as had been the case with its crushing of China and its conquest of East Europe, was hindered through the nuclear arming of America and by the founding of NATO. What would be the result of a weakening of the Western front through, say, a progressive atom death campaign? That this came out of Moscow, was planned by the Kremlin, was already announced by Manuilsky in 1931 at the Congress of the Comintern: "We will begin by stirring up the most theatrical peace movement that has as yet existed. Electrifying proposals and extraordinary concessions will be made on our side. The capitalistic lands, stupid and decadent as they are, will be so inspired as to assist in their own downfall. They will fall into the trap of the proferred opportunity of a new friendship. And as soon as they are deprived of their defensive protection, we will smash them with our clenched fist." Now it is the churches of America who are misleading the American people "to fall into the trap" inasmuch as they depict the terror of atom war but not that of the dominion of communism. German church leaders have acted similarly on earlier occasions under the slogan "Against Atom Death." But they do not know that they are thereby promoting the causes of the Kremlin.

POSSIBILITY VERSUS CERTAINTY

But is not the alternative the factual irruption of the most fearful catastrophe, total nuclear war? A distinction must be made at this point. The expansion of Bolshevist control consequent to the abrogation of the preparedness of the West is an absolute certainty, the irruption of nuclear war consequent to accident is pure possibility. Thus we say what we must next elect: to remain firm in our defensive posture. That we therewith hope for a less dangerous resolution than the pursuance of military preparedness is dear to every Christian. Perhaps personal visits to Russia and China may help a little. Perhaps a change of position by the Russian people will still come to pass. That the satellite peoples still shared in complete opposition to the Communist regime is a matter of record as we saw in East Germany in 1953, Hungary in 1956, and Poland of which we know through the inner events which occurred in the Hungarian struggle for freedom. The most important thing is the unqualified determination to stand firm in the military preparedness of the West while refusing to fall prey to the contemporary noises of peace from Moscow. This is the one thing that will impress the lords of the Kremlin. What Khrushchev and Mikoyan desire with their paraded bonhomie is nothing other than the anesthesia and paralysis of the alertness of the West and its most probable disunifications. Our only chance to surmount this terrible danger over mankind is through our clarity of vision, firmness of will, and unity. The Cleveland Message says nothing about all three points. That is why it is a calamity (Unglück) that can only be partially improved by prompt exposure of its weaknesses and through powerful counterpropaganda by the church.

Pacifism has already played an ominous role several times in recent history. While it sweetens the thoughts of the opponent so that military preparedness and the defensive will no longer exist, it makes the pacifist cooriginator of war against his will in that it inspires the attacker to unleash a war. I hold this to be eminently plausible in regard to bolshevism. The weakening of the defensive power of the West is therefore a direct support of the expansion of bolshevist rulership.

We have to do with a fearfully dangerous, powerful and shrewd antagonist. Every concession immediately benefits the power growth of world communism. That is why the Christian must hold fast with all those who have come to know the diabolical character of bolshevism, in order to guard mankind from this greatest of social evils: from this soul-destroying system of fundamental inhumanity. The slogan of the Christian must be: in love and faith, firm in opposition.

Resolution on "Metro" Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON "METRO" GOVERNMENT

Whereas during the 1930's a collection of organizations—financed by tax-free foundations, and devoted to the ideal of government by experts, gathered around the University of Chicago—which with foundation money built a home for them at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago. Today, virtually all the drive for "Metro" government, as well as the experts who do the governing, comes from "1313"; and

Whereas Metro government is the core of a movement to establish in the United States a Soviet-style arrangement—dividing the nation into metropolitan areas—each governed by an appointed expert; in direct violation of the constitutional provision that each State shall have a republican, or check and balance form of government; and

Whereas the California interlock to the Metro "complex" is through the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation, which since its establishment in 1939 has paid a yearly assessment to (as determined by) the Council of State Governments, housed at 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago. The League of California Cities is an organization member of "1313's" Committee for International Municipal Cooperation U.S.A.; and

Whereas a radical tax proposal to implement the urban renewal scheme was proposed by the League of California Cities; the tax geared to operate at State and local levels. The local funds are provided by tax-allocation bonds to be paid off by pledging all the anticipated increase in tax revenue expected by redevelopment. This LCC prepared scheme, which the "planners," and politicians promise "won't cost the taxpayers

a dime," has become nationally known as the "Sacramento Plan," and appears in identical language in both the California Community Redevelopment Law (Secs. 33950–54) and State Constitution (art. XIII, sec. 19). It legally empowers the redevelopment "authority" or agency to authorize bonds in any amount desired, yet it is not held liable, apparently, for the debt created. Additionally, the redeveloped or "renewed" area's tax contributions bypasses the municipal government (which provides the municipal, or city services) and is allocated direct to the redevelopment agency; and

Whereas the Metro-drafted "model" constitutions, charters and laws, which are sloganeered as "strengthening the government," are, in fact, disguised proposals for the abolishment of constitutional rights, and for the overthrow of our form of government by interstate compact: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pro America, California Chapter, Santa Monica Unit urge the California Legislature to sever existing governmental relations with "1313," its affiliated agencies or organizations, and that no further appropriations to these said agencies be authorized: Be it further

Resolved, That an investigation by appropriate committees of both the State and Federal Governments be instituted for the purpose of determining the degree of danger inherent in the "Metro" collectivist philosophy (which already has and continues to infiltrate our dual governments at all levels) as antagonistic to, and the antithesis of, our republican—or check and balance—form of government, erected as an institution of, by and for the people.

Resolution unanimously passed, March 2, 1960, by vote of membership.

Cape Cod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am strongly in support of a suitable bill to protect the magnificent natural resources and advantages of lovely, historic Cape Cod in my home State, I think it is most essential that any such measure should contain adequate safeguards for the State, various communities, and private owners.

Sometime ago when I introduced the very first of the measures for the proper protection and development of Cape Cod, I had in mind a thorough exploratory study and appraisal to delineate the problems and try to solve them. I was not committed then, and I am not committed now, to inflexible specific provisions in this legislation. In fact, I think that flexibility and agreement should be among the desirable aims of any law or laws enacted by the Congress for Cape Cod.

In a general sense, I believe it should be the objective of any legislation of this character to minimize rather than to maximize the amount of community and private land to be taken for the project.

Secondly, I would look with extreme disfavor upon technical provisions of any bill which would arbitrarily wash out certain community and private lands and real estate holdings, by immediate or suspended condemnation proceedings without first striving for common ground and agreement between the parties.

I see no reason why a policy of taking land and buildings in wholesale lots and over widespread areas against the will of the inhabitants, the communities, and possibly the State of Massachusetts is necessary to carry out the fine objective of the conservation of Cape Cod. Actually, it would appear that apart from the taking of limited areas of presently unimproved and unused land which can, I think, be agreed upon, relatively little other land and few homes and buildings need to be taken, or should be taken, by the Government in the furtherance of the project.

I think it is unquestionably true that careful study of the area by Government experts and by the committee would disclose the fact that it would be comparatively easy to secure substantially full agreement upon this legislation that would not involve extreme interference with community and private property on the cape.

As I see it, the objectives of the legislation are clear or should be clear: to conserve these great natural resources for the people, and to prevent deterioration of this beautiful area by cheap commercial exploitation that would besmirch, if not destroy, the natural beauties of the Cape.

As Congress moves to carry out sound and wise conservation policies, or in fact any policies that involve interference with community, State and private rights, we should, I think, exercise great care and discretion in order to implement commendable objectives in such a way that their accomplishment will work least interference with and detriment to the people who reside in affected areas. If this standard is applied in the case of the proposed Cape Cod program it will in the long run bring salutary results. It will conserve the Cape's natural beauties for the people.

I appreciate the deep interest and work on this project of our able and distinguished friend, Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, as well as the contributions of our able and distinguished Senators from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY and Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. At a recent meeting of the Massachusetts House delegation, Congressman KEITH gave a very fine exposition of the progress and status of present plans and possible agreements. After listening to his able talk and explanations, I got the distinct impression that a substantially satisfactory agreement could be worked out on the basis of zoning laws and selective use of the property involved that would permit a practical bill and a workable program.

I am sure that the committee is desirous of enacting a reasonable, helpful and constructive bill for the protection and improvement of Cape Cod. I hope and urge that any legislation reported to the House will be predicated on agreement and will avoid unreasonable confiscation of property and the encouragement of undesirable conditions on the Cape.

Let me compliment the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs upon the careful consideration it has given to this matter. I thank the learned chairman and all the members of the committee for the opportunity given me to present my views.

In conclusion, I may say that I have every confidence that the very able and distinguished chairman and members of this great committee of the House will give penetrating and equitable consideration to the problems posed by the pending bill.

In that way, I sincerely believe that satisfactory solutions can be found to conserve lovely Cape Cod so that its beauties, advantages and historic shrines can be secured for the people of this generation and for posterity.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President, Board of Education, Upon Receipt of Special Award at Dinner of Public School 20 Alumni Association, June 8, 1960, Hotel Commodore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to insert an address made by the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education of the city of New York at a dinner of New York Public School 20 Alumni Association. Many well-known people, including Senator Javits, Harry Golden, George and Ira Gershwin, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, and others were students of this old building in my congressional district. The board of education is planning to create a new Public School 20 in the same area but I am certain the old Public School 20 will be remembered with fondness and warm regard by its former students.

The address follows:

When I was appointed to the board of education, almost 9 years ago, my initial action was to visit several schools.

The very first one I inspected seemed to be inspecting me as I entered its doors. It was Public School 20. And for just a few trembling moments, a little boy had come to school late—more than 50 years late—and I stood there with a lump in my throat and my heart full—as it is now—of long and tender thoughts that almost defy expression.

Where had it gone—that crowded half century of busy days tumbling after each other through all those years? So much had changed. So many dear faces had vanished forever. Yet, right outside, the streets were very much the same, and I was still there among those wildly shouting, madly racing youngsters.

And Public School 20 was very much the same except that the seats had shrunk, the walls had closed in as the whole room dwindled to a miniature of what I remembered.

I stood in the center aisle where the sliding doors opened to join all the classrooms into a single large assembly; only it wasn't large any more. I heard the voices of my young classmates raised in the old songs, murmuring the early prayers and pledges of allegiance. And I knew that I was standing in a special place, a shrine not only of my own remembered youth, but of the young hopes and dreams of a brave new world.

For Public School 20, as a first step in the making of Americans, took in the newly arrived immigrant children and the children of immigrants, taught them the beginnings of wisdom, the joy of freedom, and the privilege beyond price of being American citizens.

I was one of those children. I sat on the hard benches, listening wide eyed to the story of those who founded this blessed land of opportunity. I joined the chorus of voices that sang, "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty," and learned the meaning of that magic word.

What a little boy learns he never forgets, and I will never forget Public School 20, which taught me the precious truth that the most important title in the world is "citizen"—"citizen of the United States."

So it was that I came back to our old school—and so it is that I come back to you tonight, with a humble heart and gratitude that wells up, together with tears of remembrance. For I am deeply mindful of the honor that you are doing me and through me to the many thousands of our school graduates who have added glory to its name. They constitute an honor roll of talent and achievement that few great universities could match.

Yet, ours was but a small elementary school, almost engulfed by the overwhelming masses, the sounds, sights, and unceasing ferment of the lower east side.

Others may wonder how it was that such a steaming cauldron of poverty and overpopulation could have cradled such great gifts—such men as George and Ira Gershwin, Jack and Ben Javits, Harry Golden, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Irving Caesar—and so many more that the list seems endless.

Others may wonder, but we know. We were there and we witnessed the odds in the struggle for survival. We know that the obstacles were so great that it took strength and courage, that extra spark of ambition, that extra strain of energy to rise above the squalor and temptations of the street, to keep your eyes and hopes and dreams on the things beyond, for which we or our parents had come to America.

Perhaps, the greatest spur of all was the inner conviction that we were carving out a new frontier, just as surely as the pioneers who won the West. There, on the east side, we were building a better world for our children. We studied, worked, and strove to rise above our environment, to make something of ourselves for their sakes.

But I sometimes wonder whether the generation which has inherited our efforts is not too busy enjoying the fruits to do any plowing and planting of its own. I wonder whether we are now coasting, instead of climbing. Are we allowing our triumphs to tarnish along with the ideals that gave our Nation vitality, integrity, and moral purpose?

We were crowded and uncomfortable in those early days on the east side. Yet, in spite of discomfort and need, so many individuals found the resolution and desperate energy, that had given our country its own special caliber and bred its greatness. We must never become too satisfied. We must not let down our guard.

Give us restless men and women. Give us young people eager to meet new challenges. Give us healthy discontent and a determination to wrestle with the world as it is and to bring it nearer to what it ough to be.

There may be some who lament that the spirit of Public School 20 has vanished, now that it no longer serves elementary school purposes. They are wrong. The Public School 20 we know, remains. It is here in this room and in the hearts of all of you.

Public School 20—and the things it represents—can never die. A school is great because of teachers and students and the riches of mind and soul they bring to its making. We alumni know best of all that Public School 20 was never just a cold and lifeless structure. It was you and I and the many thousands who carry its lessons with them, an eternal burning torch of love and allegiance such as few men bear for their alma mater on higher levels of learning.

Public School 20 lives. And I give you this pledge as president of your board of education, returning in spirit to those narrow halls and crowded benches where we first met—that I will make every effort to see that a notable new Public School 20 rises on the lower East Side.

This new building will inherit a great tradition. You want it—and you will have it.

This promise I give you, knowing that it will be made possible by the constant help and encouraging support of a man who, like his revered father before him, continues the tradition of such east side pioneers in the field of enlightened social legislation as Henrietta Szold and Meyer London. With his help, the new Public School 20, will rise, with its unique and remarkable history, to the expanding pattern of our city's school construction as part of the world's greatest system of public education.

I refer, of course, to that determined champion of learning, and the best friend our children ever had, our mayor, Robert F. Wagner.

You have given me these unforgettable moments to hold dear among the most gratifying memories of my life.

Here, tonight, I truly feel that I have come home. I am again near the sheltering arms of my sainted parents. Once more I am hurrying through the crowded lanes of noisy pushcarts to be with my schoolmates. And I am proud to be among you, proud that I am part of Public School 20, and that Public School 20 will always be part of me.

Our school has affected posterity. It has produced men of such knowledge and influence that their words and deeds guide the destiny of mankind.

Knowing the depth of my feeling from our school, a friend of mine given to poetic expression was inspired to write the following lines.

"You found your faith upon the noble tie
That joins all men in brother love secure;
In honor great, in aspiration high,
In worthy deed, in thought and purpose pure.
We, who have gone before, await the day
When Public School 20 stands a school again,
And in some great tomorrow we can say:
Send forth to make a better world—its finest men."

Let me close then, as I began—with a heart full of gratitude and a humble thank you.

Capitol Pages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Washington newspapers carried stories yesterday about the stabbing, robbing, and beating of four Capitol pages not very far from these Chambers.

We all hope for the speedy recovery of those who were attacked by a large gang, and that their personal property is recovered.

More graphically than any words uttered on this floor, this incident points out a shortcoming in our present method of housing, supervision, and possibly selection of our pages who perform such valuable service for us daily.

Earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 11741 to correct these shortcomings. This bill was referred to the House Administration Committee and to my knowledge no action has been taken by the committee to bring this matter to the floor of the House for our further consideration.

There is no denying that certain parts of Washington, despite its beauty, its culture, and its history, are rather rough places for boys to spend their formative years. It is even more evident that the chances of a boy staying out of trouble under these conditions are decreased considerably if he is without adequate supervision and he is permitted to roam the streets of this large city at any hour of the day and night.

Yet this is the situation in which Capitol pages find themselves.

They can live where they will, despite the fact that the Congressional Hotel is only a short distance from the Capitol and has ample facilities to provide adequate housing for these boys.

They are under no supervision, and in fact are not even required to attend school if they are here for a relatively short time.

They are free to live in private homes scattered throughout the city, to come and go as they please, to study or not study as they see fit.

They are selected not on the basis of merit, or competition between those who are most qualified, but on the basis of political patronage.

There are no enforced study periods, only limited counseling and guidance and plenty of opportunity to get in trouble.

I hope that my colleagues will take heed to the warning which has been given us by this latest incident, and that we will enact legislation which will make the housing, the supervision, and the selection of our pages more realistic and more fair to all concerned.

There is no reason why our pages could not be a nucleus for education and training in politics in the best sense of the word. Surely, the facilities are readily available in our Nation's Capital for such education in our history, our traditions, and our heritage of freedom.

The schedule we demand of our pages is almost overwhelming, our requests at times approach the impossible.

The least we can do is to see that our Capitol pages have every opportunity to make the most of this experience, that they are firmly grounded in the basics of government and that they are well-acquainted with our Nation's underlying strength of purpose and ideal.

Let us not wait for a truly tragic incident to force our hand in this matter.

Let us take steps to insure that adequate housing, adequate supervision, and selection of pages, is forthcoming for these young men who are of such value to us in the performance of our tasks.

"Civil Defense—An American Tradition" Prize-winning Essay by Anna Kaye Koontz, Hume, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, today it becomes my privilege to ask that there be made a part of the RECORD the full content of a prize-winning essay in the State of Missouri upon the subject, "Civil Defense—An American Tradition." This is part of the national essay contest sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in which the winners in each State competes in the national finals.

It makes me very happy and proud to announce the winner for the State of Missouri is Anna Kaye Koontz, who is a resident of Hume, Mo., in Bates County, which is a part of the Fourth Congressional District. Miss Koontz is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ted Koontz. Her father is in the drug business in Hume. This spring, Anna Kaye was graduated from the Hume High School. She had the honor of being salutorian of her class, and throughout her high school career engaged in many extra curricula activities. She plans to enter the University of Missouri this fall. Miss Koontz was sponsored by VFW Auxiliary No. 4110 of Rich Hill and Hume, Mo. In this auxiliary, Mrs. Mary Northrup of Rich Hill is the essay chairman and has been for the past 6 years. Mrs. Northrup is a department officer of the State of Missouri, Ladies Auxiliary of the VFW and is now in her 12th year as president of No. 4110.

I note from the essay that Miss Koontz points out that the concept of civil defense was first announced when our country was very young. She then proceeds to present the analysis that here in America government is really each of us, and then goes on to distinguish between the types of disaster—natural or peacetime, and manmade or wartime. The conclusion of her essay most appropriately observes that there must be a continuity in the program and that civil defense is everybody's business.

It is my considered opinion that Miss Koontz is deserving of the highest congratulations upon her effort and that Mrs. Mary Northrup equally deserves special commendation for her years of effort and devotion to this annual contest. The prize-winning essay follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE—AN AMERICAN TRADITION

Ever since the beginning of our country, Americans have found it necessary to guard carefully their freedoms, homes, and families against civil emergencies. It was while America was still young and perhaps to a certain extent still unsettled that "Civil Defense—An American Tradition" was born. The importance of being prepared against disaster of any nature was recognized by the early Americans and by a strong desire within their hearts they were impelled to action. They set forth to form a government which would provide for this common defense. Since the Constitution has come into effect, it has been a traditional responsibility of the Government to provide for this common defense.

Yes, it is a responsibility of the Government to provide a civil defense program for protection against disaster, but who is the Government? In America we have a democracy, a government by the people, for the people? So in answer to the question, Who is the Government? it is you. Every citizen of the United States is a part of the Government, and thus the civil defense responsibility is placed in the hands of the people. It is a privilege to be a part of a democracy-ruled country, so do not shirk the responsibilities. We, the Americans, must keep in mind the importance of being prepared against disaster just as our early forefathers did when they wrote the Preamble to the Constitution and stated that "We, the people of the United States, in order to * * * provide for the common defense. * * *" The American tradition, civil defense, must not be cast aside. We must realize that as long as there is a need for a strong military defense we also need a strong civil defense to protect us from disaster.

There are two basic types of disaster, the natural disaster and the manmade disaster. Let us take a closer look at manmade disaster. In this age of rapid weapon development we must recognize the fact that manmade disaster can happen here. The thoughtless attitude that manmade disaster cannot happen here is far too numerous among our citizens. At the present, Russia and the United States are challenging each other, testing which nation has the more highly scientific developments of weapons, homes, educational systems, and even governments. This great contest has been kept on reasonably friendly terms, but if it were not it could prove dangerous. It was proved during the 1954 tests in the Pacific that just one nuclear explosion could seriously threaten the lives of every unprepared person by radioactive fallout within an area of 220 miles in length to a varying width up to 40 miles. Fallout from one test explosion spread over 7,000 square miles of the Pacific Ocean.

What is this fallout that everyone should be concerned about? It is the radioactive particles produced by nuclear explosions, that fall to earth from the upper air. When the bomb explodes, large quantities of soil, stone, and debris are drawn up into the ascending cloud. After mixing with highly radioactive material released by the bomb, particles fall back to earth and produce radioactive contamination. This is very dangerous because it can cause serious illness or even death to humans. It can also cause damage to crops and livestock. An attack by manmade disaster is a distressing thought.

Now let us consider the natural or peacetime disaster. It can destroy our home and families just as a military battle can. The force of a great flood can quickly cut river channels where main streets stood, acting as a vandal, robbing us of our own possessions. Even the most local of disasters—the tornado—can strike many communities causing millions of dollars worth of destruction in a single night. And hurricanes can hurl their devastating winds and rain on coastal regions making an unpredictable course of destruction.

In the face of this destructive duet—natural and manmade disasters, we must be prepared to protect our homes, families, and freedoms. There are five steps to safety everyone should know in the event of disaster:

1. Warning signals and what they mean.
2. Your community plan for emergency action.
3. Protection from radioactive fallout.
4. First aid and home emergency preparedness.
5. Use of Conelrad (control of electromagnetic radiation 640 or 1240 kilocycles on standard AM radio).

In keeping with our Government's traditional responsibility set forth in the national plan for civil defense, mobilization is the continuity of government program. This is a plan which stipulates the course of action State and local governments must take to survive a nuclear attack, and continue to protect life and property. The continuity of government programs is well underway. The national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization states:

"Civil defense is the responsibility of each citizen and of all governments—Federal, State and local—with the Federal Government having the role of direction and coordination of the total national effort."

Civil defense, the American tradition takes on a new and different meaning in this nuclear age. It is the challenge of this time of every American citizen to build an essential civil defense system. What you, as an American citizen need most for fighting in this challenge to prepare for disaster, is knowledge of the nature of the threat—knowledge of self-protective measures to meet the threat, and confidence in your Nation's ability to overcome natural or manmade disasters. Do not forget, civil defense is everybody's business.

Summitry Is Dead; Good Riddance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., June 22, 1960:

SUMMITRY IS DEAD; GOOD RIDDANCE

The era of high-level personal diplomacy is dead at the hand of a President who seemingly had little use for it.

His Secretary of State spoke the last words over the institution of summitry, born in the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt and suffering its last fatal illness in the international events of the past few weeks.

Expiring with it is the theory, embraced by many persons, that chiefs of state can get together, talk things over, and iron out all the ills of this troubled world.

But nations are not like two neighbors involved in a dispute over a line fence who can compose their differences in a few words.

The processes of diplomacy have been built up through centuries of exeprience. Certain ways of doing things have been found best. In the rush to adapt the processes to the age of air travel the summit concept was born.

Presidents have used good will trips and consultations with friendly chiefs of state with excellent results. The type of personal diplomacy represented by Mr. Eisenhower's tour to the Philippines and Formosa and his almost casual conversations with President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan is

valuable and we are not certain it should be abandoned.

But where delicate and controversial negotiations with a real or potential enemy, such as the Soviet Union, are involved, face-to-face diplomacy, practiced by the heads of nations, is totally without value unless the spadework is done through normal processes.

Roosevelt first proved that at Yalta where the free world lost its shirt and Truman underscored it when he lost his pants at Potsdam. President Eisenhower did not do well at the Geneva conference.

He was reluctant to agree to go to Paris unless some progress on East-West negotiations was produced at the lower levels of diplomacy. He was pressured into it, perhaps, by Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain and by those in America who believe that it is possible to deal with the Russians.

Maybe the President erred in not standing his ground. But now that the collapse of the Paris meeting before it started and the Japanese incident, which marred his good will trip across the Pacific, have demonstrated the drawbacks of this type of diplomacy, he does not hesitate to call a halt.

It is likely that his successor in office, be he a Democrat or a Republican, also will shun summitry.

The argument as to its usefulness has been closed out. Any President who consents to its revival in the absence of a startling change in world conditions, will confess to a dangerous naivete.

Nixon on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, an informed commentary on the recent farm speech by Vice President NIXON appeared in a recent issue of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, Red Wing, Minn. To my view, this newspaper has correctly appraised the Vice President's position and I call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON ON AGRICULTURE

There were hints and echoes in presidential candidate NIXON'S North Dakota farm speech Monday that sounded pretty promising to us. Surely, "we should not dig in and fight the battle over farm policy in the entrenched positions we have occupied over the past 5 years." Certain it is that "beating Secretary Benson around the head on the one hand or damning the Democratic Congress on the other will not help the farmer." American farm families do indeed deserve much better.

One major encouraging note was NIXON'S explicit recognition that the line of approach toward getting supply of farm products back in line with demand in the marketplace is to take farm resources out of production. Thus NIXON—by implication, at least—took his stand for the much expanded soil bank which Governor Rockefeller, Farm Bureau, Congressman QUIE, and other have all been supporting. This—rather than more high price supports, more production controls, more regulation on acreage and planting—is definitely the right direction to move.

The second major note we found encouraging was NIXON'S call for a joint undertaking of all the surplus-producing nations to get food surpluses into the hands and mouths of the world's hungry. This must be generally along the lines of the "food for peace" ideas Senator HUMPHREY has been espousing for years, but the international approach is different. The difficulty of avoiding injury to normal commercial farm markets should not be underestimated, but all our Christian and ethical convictions require us not to sit by with spoiling food surpluses on our hands while other human beings suffer from malnutrition. And such handling of food that we Americans can't eat should be looked upon not as a dole to undeserving people but as a way to give them the strength, the energy, and the basic physical health to do the huge building jobs of schools, transportation, and industry that urgently need doing in all the backward countries.

NIXON will need to be much more detailed and explicit as the election campaign begins, and he apparently intends to be. But this North Dakota speech spells out the most clearly to date his general program for agriculture. He obviously will not go down the Farmers Union road of highly regulated, tightly controlled farming but neither will he keep Benson and Benson thinking around the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He believes that government must help farmers work their way out of their problems, and he is eagerly searching for new ideas and new approaches.

Let's Not Give Away Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the U.S. Senate for its ratification the Antarctic Treaty concluded between the United States and 11 other participating nations. This treaty, on the face of it, would prohibit the use of the Antarctic for military purposes and for nuclear testing. One of the signators to this treaty is Soviet Russia.

I consider it proper and necessary that the citizens of the United States be warned of the actual and real purposes and effects of this treaty:

First. There is no reason to believe that the Soviet will honor this treaty except and unless it serves her purposes to do so. The history of treaties signed by the Soviet proves conclusively that the Soviet will repudiate and avoid the obligations of this treaty whenever it suits her self-interest. The Yalta Treaty, the Potsdam Treaty and the hundreds of other treaties that the Soviet has failed to honor and deliberately violated are conclusive proof that any treaty with the Soviet becomes a dangerous delusion on the part of the United States.

Second. The United States, by reason of its own public opinion and its respect for world opinion, will attempt to honor this treaty while there is no reciprocal assurances that the Soviet will also do so. This treaty will result in the United States immobilizing herself in the Antarctic while the Soviet will be free to use the Antarctic for military and political purposes.

Third. The United States, by engaging in this treaty, is giving up its preeminent claims to the Antarctic and indefinitely postponing its claims to sovereignty and the perfection of its legal rights to the Antarctic.

Fourth. The Antarctic treaty will legitimatize Russia's presence in the Antarctic and give encouragement to her continuing trespass and the build-up of this area for its political-strategic-military purposes.

Fifth. A number of the 12 nations who are participating in this treaty are not the proper parties in interest and have no legitimate or direct claims to the Antarctic. This treaty, instead of leading to a settlement of the sovereignty to the Antarctic, will further compound and confuse the claims of the various nations to this vast area. The United States has nothing to gain by this treaty and everything to lose. The Soviet has nothing to lose and all of the Antarctic to gain.

I would like to insert a comprehensive and very fine article on this subject by Mr. George Fowler which is contained in the June 30 edition of Human Events:

LET'S NOT GIVE AWAY ANTARCTICA

(By George Fowler)

In discussing Alaska, Americans sigh with relief and thank Providence for "Seward's Folly"—our purchase from Russia in 1867 of the rich and strategic territory that became our 49th State.

We shudder at the thought of a 20th century Red Alaska, with its rich mineral resources being shuttled to Soviet ports and its airbases aimed against Washington and New York, rather than Moscow or Peiping.

Yet the Eisenhower and previous administrations have taken a long winter's nap regarding the highly strategic continent of Antarctica—a potential horn of plenty from the standpoint of natural resources. The President has supported a treaty to internationalize Antarctica and there is danger that it will be ratified by the Senate as the lawmakers rush toward the end of this session.

Last November, in Washington, representatives of 12 nations having Antarctic claims, the Soviet Union included, met and signed this treaty. It guarantees nonmilitarization of Antarctica and allows for freedom of scientific investigation by all nations. Fine words—but the Stars and Stripes were planted in Antarctica in 1821 by an expedition headed by Capt. Nathaniel Palmer of the U.S. Navy. In 1839 Lt. Charles Wilkes mapped 1,500 miles of Antarctic coastline during his exploration, establishing it as a continent.

On the basis of American expeditions—we have explored more of Antarctica and mapped greater portions of its mammoth expanse than all other nations combined—international law experts maintain the United States is entitled to claim four-fifths of the entire continent. Officially, we haven't claimed an inch.

The late Adm. Richard Byrd, famed South Pole explorer, testified before Congress in 1954 regarding this gargantuan oversight: "Ask any schoolboy 'Who owns the South Pole?' and he'll turn to an American geography book or the World Atlas, where the map of Antarctica is cut up into some half dozen pie slices that start from the pole. The name of the nation claiming each slice is clearly printed. Yet nowhere is the proud name of the United States."

But, are we really out much by passing off our rights to this great white land of frost, peopled mostly by amphibious seals and penguins, where the temperature drops to 120 degrees below zero at its barren surface?

Needless to say, you can't power jet-age projectiles on whale oil; but Antarctica sports more than the world's largest mam-

mals. Before his fifth and last South Pole expedition Admiral Byrd stated: "I have been connected with four expeditions to Antarctica for our country and each time we returned with new convictions that the so-called useless frozen real estate (just about what opponents of the Alaska purchase were murmuring a century ago) at the bottom of the world is actually a treasure house of fabulous riches.

"Its wealth is waiting to be used when our own resources—which we have been and still are expending so recklessly—are exhausted. Unlike the North Pole, Antarctica is no sea of floating ice, but a continent of 6 million square miles of land—almost as big as the United States and Europe combined. A sheet of glacial ice covers most of the rock, except where mountains that rise as high as 15,000 feet pierce the icy landscape.

"It was on the side of one of these mountains that I saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world. Other explorers and I have also brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and even uranium lie beneath the age-old ice just waiting to be tapped. This untapped reservoir of resources is vital to America's future. But perhaps as important is the strategic value of Antarctica."

We know that atomic energy can be used to melt Antarctic ice in order to uncover the continent's hidden treasures. Modern mining techniques can master the task of unearthing these minerals. From a military standpoint even the layman realizes that, in this era of atomic submarines and man's increasing ability to function in sub-zero weather, due to scientific strides, the determined efforts of an enemy nation to physically control strategic parts of the continent and employ it as a fortress capable of choking our maritime lifelines in time of war are an alarming possibility.

The establishment of Russian military bases in either frozen or ice-free portions of Antarctica could raise havoc. Red submarines operating out of Antarctic pens would be in easy reach of South America in one direction and Australia in another. Red missile launching pads in Antarctica would be in range of Argentina, Chile, and perhaps areas as far north as the Panama Canal.

Yet in spite of this danger we are in the midst of a Mexican standoff regarding Antarctica largely of our own making, due to the timidity of men in high places who desist from claiming their Nation's due in an age of high crises. At last year's 12-nation Antarctica conference we agreed to "freedom of scientific investigation" on the part of all nations. Does this mean that anyone, the Soviets included, can send in scientific and technical teams, come upon large quantities of mineral wealth, chop them out and ship them home, while the Nation with a right to the lion's share of Antarctica's riches sits on its haunches and watches?

The treaty guarantees nonmilitarization. Does this mean that the Russians, guilty of breaking a thousand international agreements, will refrain from constructing military installations in an unpopulated continent with a million hiding places?

There is little wonder that Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, called the language of the treaty "nebulous," and Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, said that "while the language of the treaty seems unduly vague, it is clear that no rights of the United States to Antarctica are recognized, nor could they be, once the treaty is ratified."

Certainly the activities of the United States in Antarctica have given this Nation a stellar claim. American sailors, scientists, and explorers have suffered and died establishing our rights. The Government has spent between $100 million and $300 million on Antarctic exploration. During Operation Highjump alone (commanded by Byrd in 1946–47), a naval task force of 4,000 men charted 1,700,000 square miles of the continent—900,000 of which had never been seen before.

In a letter to Secretary of State Herter shortly before last year's 12-nation agreement, Congressman JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York, scored our Antarctic policy. Wrote PILLION: "It is inconceivable that the United States allow its preeminent status in the Antarctic to be reduced to the same level as those nations with little or no valid interest in this continent.

"This self-destruction of our interests can only lead to chaos and obstruction to the orderly free development of our political and economic interests in the Antarctic. Our experiences with the Soviet in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements should serve as sufficient warning not to again commit political suicide."

Knowing the character of Communist Russia, what is to stop her from setting up Antarctic space stations under the "freedom of scientific investigation" clause of the agreement? South Pole experts maintain Antarctica is one of the most suitable sites on earth for such ventures. The South Pole is a firmly fixed point, in contrast to its Arctic opposite number. For space-tracking purposes any object in the southern half of the sky surrounding the earth would be continuously visible to Antarctic tracking antenna.

Could not the Russians at some future date turn their scientific efforts into big gains for their geopolitical, military, and strategic interests? Not that things aren't bad enough already. The United States, with paramount legitimate interests, occupies three permanent Antarctic stations. Russia, with little legal right on the continent save through the noodle-spine largesse of Uncle Sam, who seems to have lost his beard, maintains four permanent stations that we know of.

Consistent with their gigantic gall, the Russians are exploring parts of Antarctica claimed by such as Norway and Australia, mapping areas and renaming mountains and mountain ranges. The Russians boldly claimed the entire continent in 1950, although they had shown no real interest in it until after World War II. Even kindergarten children and Hyde Park matrons must realize by now that any "12 nation agreement" the Reds sign will have little bearing on the expansionist designs of the Kremlin.

Bills have been introduced and shelved in Congress calling for the United States to claim what is rightfully hers. Patriotic organizations, chambers of commerce and South Pole experts have vainly beseeched Presidents, the State Department, and Congress to take some interest in this problem before the Russian bear gobbles up the Antarctic.

But the timid souls of political prominence continue their America Last-ism regarding this frozen gem at the bottom of the world. It doesn't take a foreign affairs wizard to scan Russia's past performance chart and figure out what capers our groin-kicking opponents will pull in Antarctica if we don't get hopping down there. It now stands for the U.S. Senate to act in our enlightened self-interest by rejecting the treaty and for the next administration to take a fresh look at the need to assert our Antarctic rights.

CPA's for Public Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the June 1960 Journal of Accountancy.

In my view, the call this article makes for accountants to become more active in public service is very pertinent and timely:

CPA'S FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

In Spokane, Wash., a member of the institute who is a candidate for the city council made this statement in a televised campaign speech:

"As a certified public accountant, I represent a profession whose members ordinarily do not seek many public offices. Perhaps the highly confidential nature of our work and the exactitude with which it must be performed make us reluctant to become involved in political issues. However, in the fields of business, industry, U.S. Government service and education, a certified public accountant is a member of every good management team. Many fine CPA's are presidents of large publicly held corporations. The Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States are all certified public accountants."

CPA's do have exceptional qualifications for public office, and it is regrettable that so few of them seek it. The only CPA's holding elective offices of national prominance at present are the Governor of Rhode Island and the mayor of Los Angeles. A few CPA's have been Members of Congress, but there are none at present, although the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB of California is a registered public accountant.

A few, but still too few, have been running for and winning such offices as membership in State legislatures, city councils, and school boards, where their ability to understand finances and budgets gives them a special opportunity to render genuine public service.

While there are nearly four times as many lawyers in the United States as CPA's, and admitting that legal training has some special value for legislators and administrators of the law, the contrast between members of the legal and accounting professions in public office is still startling. In Congress, approximately two-fifths of all the Members are lawyers.

Many law firms encourage their younger men—and partners, too—to be active in politics. CPA firms might well do the same, whether or not many of them actually seek public office. Last year an editorial in the American Medical Association News said:

"Physicians, like other professional people, have a responsibility to take an active interest in politics, to urge competent men to run for office, to become well-informed voters, and to express their views to their elected representatives on pending legislation.

"If the professional men of America do not become more active in goverment and politics and do not join in concerted resistance to further inroads on local authority and initiative, they will be doing less than citizenship demands of them."

CPA's share this responsibility of citizenship, either to become candidates for office or to take an active interest in political affairs in their own communities.

Whether the subject under discussion is the Federal budget or the cost of a new school, CPA's will be listened to with respect by their friends and neighbors. If they are willing to make a little effort, they will find ample opportunity in either of the major political parties to make a constructive contribution to citizenship education and clarification of basic issues.

Candidates of both parties agree that the greatest internal threat to the United States of America is fiscal irresponsibility, although they disagree violently as to what is responsible and what is not. In this area particularly, members of the accounting profession can help to promote sound thinking.

Working through either party, according to their personal preference, certified public accountants have a unique opportunity to persuade other citizens why they should vote, and vote intelligently. In this year particularly, they will find in most communities a warm welcome if they volunteer for political activity. If they accept the opportunity and the obligation to contribute to public enlightenment in the political arena, they can exert a tremendous influence for better government.

Statement of the West Virginia Glass Workers' Protective League Before the Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the glass industry of the United States in the face of cheap imports from foreign countries is well known to the entire membership of the House. Unless immediate relief is given, the glassworkers of America will be in the same predicament as those workers in other industries such as pottery, chinaware, etc., who no longer have jobs because of the stiff competition these imports have occasioned.

The West Virginia Glass Workers' Protective League have been given an opportunity to file a statement with the Tariff Commission in which they plead the case of these many workers. They have stated their situation so well that I respectfully request permission to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I trust they will take an opportunity to review it and consider the bleakness of the future of these folks unless something is done quickly to reduce these imports and their devastating effects on America's industries:

STATEMENT OF THE WEST VIRGINIA GLASS WORKERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUE BEFORE THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, the West Virginia Glass Workers' Protective League, whose membership is composed of American flint workers and flat glass workers, deeply appreciate the opportunity to submit a statement to this distinguished committee.

In West Virginia, as well as throughout the United States, the people are wondering how much longer we can help support the rest of the free world.

In West Virginia, 38,000 workers have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits; 282,675 more are receiving surplus food. We firmly believe this is caused by automation and importations. While we can condone automation, we bitterly oppose importations. It is hard to reconcile ourselves to a situation whereby we are unemployed with no prospect of immediate employment, while foreign workers are busily engaged in producing goods that we formerly produced.

Unless relief is given soon, it is inevitable that many of our members will go the same way as the pottery workers, watchmakers, the workers in the bicycle, hardwood-plywood, chinaware, camera, textile, sewing machine, typewriter, clock, and the clothespin industries.

We are bitter against our present reciprocal trade agreements that allow hundreds of thousands of boxes of window glass to be imported to this country every month while our members are walking the streets waiting for a tank, that has been shut down because the warehouse is full of boxed glass, to start operating again.

Since the trade agreements program was enacted in 1934, tariffs have been reduced 75 percent. It would definitely aggravate the situation if imports were allowed to take an even larger share of the already declining market.

Seventeen countries are now exporting window glass to this country. We do not concur with the State Department's philosophy of appeasement of other countries in order to hold their friendship at the cost of the American worker. We can go all over the world saving is from communism, but we may come home to find it here. Many of the thousands now unemployed in the glass industry, lost their jobs as a direct result of importation, and they are unhappy about it.

Because foreign glass sells 25 percent less, almost all of the eastern and western seacoast has been lost to our domestic manufacturers of plain sheet glass. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, ships from all over the world will be emptying their cargoes in Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Toledo, and the Buffalo area. It is a matter of record that the very first ocean-going vessel to reach Chicago, the *Prins Johan Willem Frisco*, carried a cargo which included window glass. Having lost almost all of the eastern and western markets to imports because of the difference in prices (25 percent less) we now face the same situation in the Great Lakes area.

We cannot visualize how the the American workman and the American businessman may be helped by making it more attractive profitwise for an American manufacturer to close his plant here to make investments abroad. Our present unfair Reciprocal Trade Agreements are doing that very thing. We believe a reappraisal of the tariff situation certainly is called for, but not to the detriment of the American glassworkers. Many European and Asiatic countries have less unemployment than we do here in the United States.

The American glassworker is being outwaged by cheap foreign labor. The basic average hourly wage of the Japanese glassworker is about 26 cents an hour; the Italian, 36 cents; the French 47 cents; the German, 55 cents; the English, 70 cents. The American basic average hourly wage is $2.22 an hour. The combined average wage of the foreign glassworker is 47 cents an hour. Does the State Department expect the American glassworker to live on $3.76 a day?

Statistics on importation of window glass (S.S.E. boxes) to this country are as follows:

Year:	*Imports*
1948	15,953
1949	76,081
1950	546,671
1951	1,526,121
1952	611,545
1953	1,610,212
1954	1,390,366
1955	3,372,710
1956	5,527,110
1957	3,635,295
1958	5,170,333
1959	8,640,656

In 1955 imports captured 14.4 percent of our domestic markets. In 1956, imports captured 18.3 percent; 1957, 19.8 percent; 1958, 20.3 percent; and in 1959, imports increased to 34.1 percent of our domestic markets.

The beginning of 1960 found the flat glass industry operating at approximately 55 percent of its total capacity. Today, in the United States, two window glass factories are completely closed. The Fourco Glass Co., which operates three factories (two in Clarksburg, W. Va., and one in Fort Smith, Ark.) is now operating at 52 percent of its total capacity, with 41 percent of its employes laid off. An average of over 720,055 boxes of window glass enter this country each month. This 720,055 boxes equal the normal production of the Rolland Glass Co., its Adamston flat glass division, Clarksburg, W. Va.; the Harding Glass Co., Fort Smith, Ark.; the Blackford Window Glass Co., of Vincennes, Ind.; and the factories of the American-Saint Gobian Corp., in Arnold, Pa., and Okmulgee, Okla.

The American Flint Glass workers over a period of years have lost considerable ground. It was pointed out that automation was the reason for the lack of employment in the handmade division of the industry, but we find, today, that the automatic machine division of the industry is feeling the pressure of imports.

In the past few years there has been a definite decline in the number of employees in hand plants. Several plants have gone out of existence. Among them the Paden City Glass, Paden City, W. Va., the Cambridge Glass Co., of Cambridge, Ohio, and the A. H. Heisey Co., of Newark, Ohio.

In 1958 imports of glass in the category totaled $11,989,055. The leading source of imports was West Germany.

In 1958 exports of machine-made table and kitchen glassware totaled $4,321,412 (Canada, $1,861,700), and those of handmade table and kitchen glassware $396,150 (Canada, $293,000), these categories including most glass tableware and novelty ware. Exports of machine made tumblers, drinking glasses, and stemware were $3,665,150 (Canada, $1,728,600). Exports of heat resistant cooking glassware totaled $1,951,712 (Canada $1,595,600).

Exports were approximately $1,654,353 less than imports.

We, therefore, urge the Tariff Commission to consider the critical plight of the American glassworker. If we may reiterate, any further cuts in tariff on any glass could well be the end of one of America's oldest industries.

Appendix

Social Policies for the Aged in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks of my brilliant and forthright colleague from the State of Oregon, WAYNE MORSE, on the occasion of the 13th Annual Conference on Aging, held at the University of Michigan this week. In his speech on the first day of that conference, June 27, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has outlined, in his typical scholarly fashion, the background to the emergence of the aged in our country as a national matter, and not merely as a group with the same conditions and problems the relatively fewer numbers of senior citizens experienced in previous generations. He shows, too, that despite the cries of alarm by the "standpatters" among us, the Nation can afford much more than it is now contributing to the dignity and well-being of our growing numbers of retired men and women.

And finally, and much more to the immediate issue before us, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reminds us that all of us, young and old, have a stake in the decisions that must be made today—especially concerning the protection against medical care costs during retirement.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL POLICIES FOR THE AGED IN A DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, University of Michigan, 13th Annual Conference on Aging, Ann Arbor, Mich., June 27, 1960)

It was a great honor and pleasure for me to receive and accept your invitation to participate in this Conference on Aging at the University of Michigan.

When Clark Tibbitts, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare contacted me about this conference, I was particularly anxious to come. Clark Tibbitts' father-in-law was president of Reed College out in my State several years ago, and I have memories of many pleasant associations with his family.

But it is pretty hard for a Member of Congress to try to tell you anything about this subject matter that you do not already know.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, has established a Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, under the outstanding chairmanship of my good friend from Michigan, Senator PAT MCNAMARA.

The great work which Senator MCNAMARA has done as chairman of that subcommittee should come as no surprise to anyone in Michigan or for that matter to anyone in the country who knows PAT MCNAMARA. He is a great humanitarian with a tender but realistic understanding of human welfare problems. He meets my definition of a constitutional liberal, namely, one who seeks to translate into legislation the human rights guarantees and private property guarantees of the Constitution.

We have a long way to go in the United States before we can say truthfully that we have lived up to the constitutional liberalism of the great liberals who wrote the Constitution. We should never forget that our Constitutional forefathers made clear that the primary objective of our system of self-government is to promote the welfare of people. They taught the lesson that I fear many in our generation need to learn, namely, that the only true wealth we have is human wealth. The most precious values we have are human values. The wealth of America is to be found in our people, not in our Wall Street, smokestacks, factories, mercantile empires, and other material things. They are but instrumentalities with which to serve the general welfare of our people within the procedural checks and balances of our constitutional system.

PAT MCNAMARA understands this and as a great liberal legislator, seeks to put it into practice in the Senate of the United States. I shall always be proud of the fact that I campaigned for his election in 1954 in Michigan and I shall always stand ready and willing to be of any further assistance that I can to this great liberal from Michigan. He must not be lost to the Senate of the United States and I am confident that the people of Michigan will share that point of view in November 1960.

Likewise, I am pleased to be associated with the junior Senator from Michigan, Senator PHILIP HART. He is another forward-looking liberal of the Senate. It is my prediction in Ann Arbor tonight that as the years go by, he will make a great record for himself and Michigan in the Senate of the United States.

I have followed the hearings and reports of Senator MCNAMARA'S subcommittee very carefully, and I am impressed by the extent to which it has called upon you people here today for information.

Of course, some of us in the Congress have looked for years to Wilber Cohen for guidance on social security matters; we still do. He is one of the Nation's leading experts in the field and we hardly know how to act on a social security matter in Congress, without the services of Professor Cohen.

Professor Donohue is another major source of light and guidance to Congress on problems concerning the aged.

So if I were to report to you on the hearings and findings of this particular subcommittee, I would be in the position of quoting back to you many of your own words.

EMERGENCE OF THE AGED AS A MINORITY

But the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged has carefully canvassed the Nation in seeking both expert opinion and personal experiences concerning the pattern of life in America for those 45 and over.

It has produced the most comprehensive and valuable survey of this subject available to Congress.

The very establishment of this subcommittee in the Senate is part of what the subcommittee report of last January calls an evidence of growth in national interest in problems of the aged. The meeting you are having right now is an evidence of it, as is the proposed White House Conference on Aging scheduled for next year.

Unlike most of America's minorities, the aged are emerging as a distinct minority, rather than being absorbed. You are all familiar with the social and economic changes in this country which are steadily separating people 65 and over from the younger population. This development is found, as our subcommittee report notes, in housing, employment, income, health needs, and in a kind of social ostracizing of the aged, insofar as family life is concerned.

The three-generation family is rapidly disappearing in America. The reasons for that are an interesting and not altogether inspiring commentary upon our values. Among the reasons for it are economic and medical technologies which, of course, are not entirely subject to a moral judgment.

But the subject I am here to talk to you about concerns a social policy toward the aged. That implies more than just an objective study of what our mores are in modern America toward the aged; it calls for some thought about what they should be.

But in order to make any value judgments, we first have to know what the facts are. That is why the Congress and the Nation is so indebted to the University of Michigan and similar centers elsewhere in the country for the social and economic information they can bring to Congress on this subject.

A second factor in the increasing awareness of the problems of aging is the simple increase in the number of people 65 and over. From 4 percent of the population in 1900, the 65 and over group was almost 9 percent in 1958, and will be well over 10 percent of the population for the next several decades. The rise in their numbers has coincided with the isolation of the aged as a group.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

I would like to summarize for you some of the other factual situations which our subcommittee has found, and which must be the framework of any future policy toward the aged.

Although it has not rated first in the attention given it, I would mention, first, the changing employment status of the labor force, not only among those 45 and over, but for all Americans. This is the rising participation of Americans of working age in the labor force and the declining participation of those over 65. A higher percentage of people under 65 and especially under 45, are working today than ever before.

The entry of women into employment largely accounts for this increase. But among men and women over 65 fewer are working than ever before, and it seems likely that the trend will continue. In 1900, 37 percent of this group was working; by 1950, only 26 percent was working; and by 1975, it is estimated that 17.5 million men and women over 65 will be outside the labor force and only 4.5 million in it, or 20 percent employed.

Together with declining employment goes a sharp decline in income of those over 65. Already the lowest income group insofar as age is concerned, their income problem is likely to worsen unless some steps are taken to do something about it.

As our subcommittee pointed out, the fact that more people of working age are working should dispel alarmist views about the few having to support the many, since the ratio of working people to nonworking people remains favorable. It certainly shows that our economy can sustain measures to aid the aged, if it continues its present determination not to employ them in gainful occupations.

With the drop in their income goes the change in housing, in medical care, in social activities, and similar shifts in living patterns which have come to mark the over-65 as a minority group.

WHAT SHOULD OUR POLICY BE?

I think that our policy toward the over-65 minority group must be dictated by a consideration that there are some respects in which this group wishes to remain distinct from the rest of the population.

Many of them do not in fact want to work. To some extent, this desire is conditioned by illness or some disability.

To a great many others—if they have sufficient income—retirement is a time to put aside many life-long responsibilities and enjoy oneself. Some men and women among the over-65 group prefer to remain with others of their own age, and some experiments in housing for the elderly have been notably successful.

Because it is impossible to say that the elderly have a uniform desire to be reabsorbed into the three generation family and the economic patterns they knew in their own youth, we must have some alternative policies for the aged.

First, I think it is important to break down the barriers to their gainful employment, for those who wish to be employed. Discrimination due to age is just as unpleasant and unjust as racial or religious discrimination or any other kind which ignores capability.

Driving people out of the labor force is an ugly and undesirable thing. I am proud of the fact that my State of Oregon has one of the seven State laws aimed at curbing discrimination based upon age. We need more such State laws, and we need a firm Federal policy to knock down these barriers among employers who work under contract to the Federal Government.

In short, those who wish to continue working after reaching retirement age should have the opportunity to do so.

But we must also make it possible for them to retire. The social security structure of today is still tied too closely, in my opinion, to the concept in which it was originated. As a depression-born institution, it was intended to provide a minimum subsistence to the elderly, so they would be encouraged to retire and make room for younger workers in the scarce number of jobs available. Its benefit system was inadequate even by depression standards, and our standards of what is a desirable standard of living are much higher today.

In my opinion, social security should now be elevated into the kind of retirement system on which people 65 and over can live in reasonable comfort.

Certainly it should include health insurance. As the first Senator to introduce a companion to the Forand bill in the Senate, I have been amazed by the rapid ascendence of this proposal as a political issue.

In 1958, I offered my bill as a floor amendment to the modest boost in social security benefits which was passed at that time. Only two Senators even joined in the discussion of my amendment. We could not get a rollcall vote on it; it was rejected by a voice vote with only a handful present.

Two years later, it is at the head of everyone's list of domestic issues in the 1960 campaign.

POWER OF THE POLLS

This brings me to a final point: The most practical way for the aged to make known their views is through political action. It is fine to put all the figures together in committee reports, but the universal language most clearly understood by most politicians is not the language or facts or logic, but the language of votes.

Had not the enthusiasm and interest in the Forand bill been communicated to Members of Congress through letterwriting, poll taking, and similar means of expression, it would not now be the issue it is even though the need for it remained the same.

I have pledged on many platforms that I shall see to it that the voters have the benefit of a Senate rollcall on the Forand-Morse bill or on the NcNamara bill before the November election. I have already prepared my original bill as an amendment to the House-passed social security bill, substituting the insurance plan for the public assistance plan of medical care.

When we have had a vote on it in the Senate, the voters will be in a much better position to pass judgment in November. Because the House of Representatives was unable to adopt anything more than the public assistance health plan, I do not expect that our insurance proposal will make much headway in conference with the House, even if it is adopted by the Senate. But it will provide the foundation for another try next year.

There was a time when the "ham 'n egg" issue was big in California, and possibly Florida, but not elsewhere. That is no longer true. As the aged have emerged as a distinct minority, their power at the polls has also become greater.

What today's young and middle-aged citizens expect out of life in their own declining years is also a factor which must make itself felt. But they must become conscious of the political connection between how they vote on election day now and the kind of policy which they will live under in their old age.

Adoption of a progressive and enlightened social policy requires both education and political action. Education on the subject has been advanced considerably in recent years; I hope the day of political action is not far off.

A Doctor's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constitutent, Mr. Donald MacLean, of Berwyn, Pa., has asked me to bring to the attention of this House a letter written recently to the editor of the weekly publication of the Philadelphia County Medical Society. While some of us may not agree with Dr. Daly's statement in its entirety it certainly raises many provocative points which should be thought through. The letter, as follows, is comended to your careful consideration:

EDITOR, PHILADELPHIA MEDICINE:

How any physician can favor social security is beyond my comprehension. By favoring this socialistic monstrosity, he denies all the principles organized medicine has proclaimed for years. How silly to oppose State medicine, support the Jenkins-Keogh bill and then beg to be included in social security.

Apparently the propaganda of the physicians' committee for social security is being accepted as factual.

It is said that this plan is actuarially sound. This is untrue. It is not insurance, it is a Federal dole financed by taxes. The Supreme Court considered it a "relief" program when, on May 24, 1937, it declared the legality of the Social Security Act. The scheme is not actuarially sound—and particularly unsound for the new entrant. A new entrant can expect to pay a tax of $1.69 for every $1 promised in benefits. This is completely contrary to the claim that it is a sound investment for the young physician.

It is claimed that under social security physicians have the same rights and guarantees as in an insurance contract. This also is untrue. Social security has no guaranteed benefits. There is no contract with the Government for the relief payments. The social security law states (sec. 1104) "the right to alter, amend or repeal any provision of the act, is hereby reserved to Congress." Again you are at the mercy of irresponsible politicians facing election. Under an insurance plan, an individual has a contract with the insurance company and has certain guaranteed rights written into his policy.

It is claimed that social security for physicians is a better buy than legitimate insurance. This is also untrue. Computed on the first $4,800 on earned income, a self-employed person is taxed $216 a year. If a doctor invested $216 a year until the average retirement age of 69, after working 40 years, this fund would contain more than $35,000. If he used only the annual interest (6 percent—some mutual funds pay this and better) without touching the principal, he would have an income of approximately $170 a month. He would still collect this amount even if he continued to work; unless he were 72 years old, he couldn't collect a social security dime if he earned more than $100 a month (G.P., March 1960—p. 79) or if he decided on insurance, he could use the same amount as the annual cost of social security to purchase a life annuity averaging $216 a month after he reached 65.

It is only commonsense that physicians should reject and resist social security because they cannot ask for this socialistic measure and oppose socialistic medicine. If social security is right for physicians, then it follows that socialized medicine is right for their patients.

There are enough men of nobility in our ranks who still and will continue to strive to realize the ideals inculcated by their illustrious teachers. One must fear that the future belongs to the "gimme's" and the "something for nothing" characters who forget that there is no such thing. The politician takes your money and some of your liberty. The end is national catastrophe.

Those who will not read history are bound to repeat the mistakes of the past. Hard facts mean nothing to the liberal and the socialist. Germany cast off much of her socialim for free enterprise and is now the most prosperous nation in Europe. England is decaying rapidly in wealth and spiritual courage. Sweden, with the "womb to the tomb care," has the highest suicide rate. Hardship and freedom—yes, freedom to starve—made America great. It developed rugged characters, independent in mind, jealous of the encroachment of the omnipotent state and their symbol was the rattlesnake—"Don't tread on me." But the politicians have conditioned the people to a giveaway philosophy—they have sown the wind and we will reap the whirlwind.

JOSEPH A. DALY, M.D.

The Power of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, our colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK] has been with us only a short time, but he has impressed all of us most favorably with his fine knowledge of public affairs, his profound judgment, his deep knowledge of the law, and his wise decisions. Accordingly, he has influenced legislation as well as made friends and gained the utmost respect of all of his colleagues.

The Senator from Oregon delivered a most impressive and worthy talk to a group of Senators at a special meeting this morning. His remarks have been reduced to writing and should be shared with our colleagues and the people of the Nation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF PRAYER

I have taken for my subject this morning "The Power of Prayer," and for my text two passages from Mark. The first is:

"In the morning rising up a great while before day, He went out and departed to a solitary place, and there prayed." Mark I: 35.

And the second:

"He went a little further and fell on His face and prayed, saying: 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt.' And He cometh unto the disciples and findeth them asleep and saith unto Peter, 'What, could you not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.'" Mark 36, 39–44.

On these two occasions, as on others, our Lord taught us to pray by example. On another, He taught us how to pray, when, in answer to a question of a follower, He recited what is known as the Lord's Prayer—the perfect prayer, it may be said, because of its total acknowledgment of man's feelty to God: "Thy kingdom come; Thou will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

Someone has written that—

"Prayer is the peace of our spirit, the stillness of our thoughts, the evenness of recollection, the seat of meditation, the rest of our cares, and the calm of our tempest; prayer is the issue of a quiet mind, of untroubled thoughts; it is the daughter of charity and the sister of meekness."

The question arises—For what shall we pray? For material success, for victory in war, for our eternal salvation?

Surely, the last must be the supreme desire of all who profess belief in God and the immortality of the soul. And so little children are taught to lisp at their mothers' knees, "Now I lay me down to sleep. I pray the Lord my soul to keep."

The poet, Tennyson, has the dying King Arthur say:

"I have lived my life, and that which I have done
May He within himself make pure; but thou,
If thou shouldst never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.
Wherefore let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain
If knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those that call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is everywhere
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

We pray for good health, for success in a business venture, for a safe voyage. But some pray only that they may become better men and women. Of this sort is the sublime prayer of St. Francis of Assisi:

"Lord, make me an instrument of your peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light, and, where there is sadness, joy. O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be comforted as to comfort; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved as to love; for it is in giving that we receive; it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

The skeptic scoffs at prayer and sneers that prayers are never answered, that the loved one for whose restoration to health we pray, dies; that so many, notwithstanding their prayers, fail to reach the goal in life upon which their hearts are set, but instead are victims of poverty, disease, and the thousand and one ills that flesh is heir to.

But if one who is not a theologian may venture an answer to these men of little faith, it might be said that their objections are based upon a misunderstanding of the Christian's conception of God's relationship to man. We believe in the infinite goodness and wisdom and the omnipotence of God; that he is the creator and we the creatures and hence that his will, not ours, shall be done. Prayer is an act of faith. The inarticulate major premise of every good prayer is submission to the will of God; and the paradox of misery in the world on the one hand and a God of infinite goodness, who created the world, on the other, is resolved by the Christian's faith that obedience to the will of God is the greatest of all good. Indeed, the devout prayer of the Christian, the humble prayer, such as that of the publican who stood afar off and beat his breast and cried out, "Lord be merciful to me a sinner," such a prayer is itself a good, for "Who rises from prayer a better man, his prayer is answered."

The birth of Christ was heralded by the angelic choirs singing of peace to mankind. The word "peace" was frequently on the lips of the Saviour. But there is no peace in the world today and the prayer of the peoples of the world, whether uttered or not, are for peace, for the warding off of the threat of destruction of our civilization that hangs over our heads like a pall.

It was to secure this peace that the United Nations was organized in the fond hope that it would provide a forum in which disputes among the nations would be settled without resort to arms. It is yet to be demonstrated that through this or any other similar machinery peace can be preserved. In the meantime the world stands armed as never before in history, and the peoples of the world spend their substance on weapons of unbelievable destructive power.

The philosopher may say that all of this is the supreme example of the folly of mankind. So perhaps it is. But we are caught in the fell clutch of circumstance, and we must deal with it; and no more fearful responsibility ever rested upon the shoulders of men than the responsibility of statesmen and leaders of peoples to avert the threatened disaster and to set our feet upon the path that leads to peace.

We say that the enemy is Godless, and so indeed are the leaders of the enemy, but can this truthfully be said of their people? We boast that we are followers of Christ, the meek and humble Christ who died on a cross to save mankind, but should we not do a little soul searching to find if our lives match our professions, if our faith is a living thing, a thing of substance, and not mere words. The King in Hamlet knelt down to pray, but could only despairingly exclaim:

"My words fly up, my thoughts stay down below.
Words without thoughts never to heaven go."

And so it is with too many of us. If not sworn enemies of God, we are too often neutralists. We do not believe in our hearts in the providence of God.

Christ said, "Ask and you shall receive." May I suggest, Is not this an acceptable time to storm the gates of heaven with our prayers for peace, or, rather, should I say, for the means of achieving peace? There must be some better way to that goal than arming for war. Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane said to his disciples, "Watch and pray." We are not indeed called upon to bare our breasts to the sword of our enemy. It would be wrong not to prepare to defend ourselves against aggression. But while we watch we can also pray—pray for the turning back of the tide of immorality that tends to corrupt our society, for the increase of understanding and the spirit of charity among us, and, for our leaders, that God may open their hearts and enlighten their minds and strengthen their hands for the stern tasks that lie ahead. So we may hasten the coming of that "one far off divine event to which the whole creation moves."

Defense Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the June 24, 1960, Washington Evening Star.

The editorial is representative of the growing voice for improved procurement and supply procedures in the military departments to end waste of the taxpayers' money.

As indicated in the editorial, much of the current move against procurement waste was spearheaded by the action of the House Appropriations Committee which in the fiscal 1961 Defense appropriations bill, reported April 29, 1960, recommended a 3-percent, across-the-board reduction in procurement appropriations as a positive move toward taking immediate steps in this regard. The editorial follows:

[From the Evening Star, June 24, 1960]

FAR FROM SATISFACTORY

In approving recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the De-

fense budget, the Senate also has given the Pentagon a well merited rebuke for its lethargy in consolidating supply and procurement services. As the Senate committee has pointed out, the progress of the Defense Department in reducing costly waste of dollars intended for weapons and other equipment is "far from satisfactory."

The overlapping and duplication of services in the fields of material buying and distribution have been strongly criticized in the past by the Hoover Commission, the Comptroller General and several congressional committees. Now the Senate appropriations group has added to the chorus of condemnation with this comment: "The committee notes with grave concern the numerous and admitted examples of waste and duplication in defense procurement which have been reported to this and other congressional committees. The audit reports of the General Accounting Office show that these are not isolated examples; rather they underscore the urgency of integrating the supply systems and service activities of the military departments—repeatedly expressed as the intent of Congress. The committee calls on the Department of Defense to take immediate and vigorous steps to integrate its procurement and supply service activities in order to provide maximum utilization of the defense dollar."

The House, as a spur to such consolidation, cut the procurement appropriation by 3 percent—pointing out that much more than this amount could be saved by an efficient and effective merger of buying services. The Senate restored this cut—but, in effect, has backed its committee's demand for a prompt end to waste. Whatever the final action by the conferees, both Houses of Congress now have served notice that they expect drastic supply reforms—reforms which it has been estimated could save the Department more than a billion dollars every year. The savings could buy a lot of additional security for America.

Address Delivered by Father Patrick J. Nooney, National Chaplain, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have obtained an address by Father Patrick J. Nooney, of St. Joseph's Parish in Struble, Iowa, who is also national chaplain of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This speech, recently presented in Yankton, S.D., in observance of Loyalty Day, points out the disaster that lies ahead for this Nation if we continue to pursue materialistic self-seeking pursuits and do not reawaken ourselves to the true understanding of our values.

I ask unanimous consent to have Father Nooney's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY DAY SPEECH GIVEN BY FATHER PATRICK J. NOONEY, NATIONAL CHAPLAIN, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AT YANKTON, S. DAK., ON MAY 3, 1960

Last Sunday, May 1, thousands of Americans participated in Loyalty Day parades and ceremonies sponsored throughout the Nation by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We still find it necessary to talk about loyalty. And why?

Listen to this statement made by the Chinese Communist intelligence about the 7,000 American boys imprisoned in North Korea during the recent war: "The American soldier has weak loyalty to his family, his community, his country, his religion, and to his fellow soldier. His concepts of right and wrong are hazy and illformed. Opportunism is easy for him. By himself he feels frightened and insecure. He underestimates his own worth, his own strength, and his ability to survive. He is ignorant of social values, social tensions, and conflicts. * * * He is insular and provincial. He fails to appreciate the meaning of, and the necessity for, any form of organization or discipline."

If only 50 percent of this is true, it's still a sad analysis of those American boys who never grew up to be men. The record bears out the Communist report. One out of three was guilty of collaborating with the enemy, and 1 out of 7 was guilty of serious collaborating, and 21 soldiers remained voluntarily with the enemy. All of this, without the use of brain washing.

After thoroughly studying this situation, the U.S. Army found with our soldiers, an almost universal inability to adjust to a primitive situation—and a regrettable lack of the old Yankee ingenuity. It was also the result of some new failure in the childhood and adolescent training of our young men—a new softness. The whole physical routine of Army life seemed to collapse in the prison camps. Survival of the fittest became the law. Finally, in 1955, the President of the United States found it necessary to spellout for the U.S. Army the new code of conduct for captured prisoners of war.

There is a good deal of confused thinking prevalent today on what loyalty is, and to whom, or what, we owe loyalty. It is unfortunate that we must have a Loyalty Day. Every day should be Loyalty Day. This loyalty of which we speak should be directed first of all to God and His never-changing laws. It should include patriotism—love and respect for country, community, and neighbor.

Not too much is being done to offset this poor thinking on loyalty. The strength of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other groups like it, is needed to reawaken the American people to a true sense of values. We need to learn, once more, that some values do not change—not everything is relative.

LOYALTY DAY

Years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt said: "Americanism means the virtues of courage, honesty, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood—the virtues that made America." "The things that will destroy America," he prophesied, "are prosperity-at-any-price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life." It seems that today our major loyalty is to the dollar sign and payola is accepted in the business world as well as in radio and television.

Former President Herbert Hoover says: "We are in the midst of an increasing moral slump, as witness the increase in major crimes." Last year, one-half million young people were arrested and 250,000 of them are proven, hardened criminals. Our annual crime bill runs into the millions and for every dollar given to any church, we spend $12 on crime. While the young people involved in these figures are but a small minority of the Nation's youth, the problem is a large one.

We can hardly believe that integrity and moral strength are increasing, when we see, daily, the exposure of municipal corruption and the improper operation of some home loan, meat, and fuel-oil businesses. A recent article in Parade magazine states the following facts: "In Chicago, police conspire with a thief to loot the very same business establishments they are paid to protect. In Los Angeles, a high-school adviser is charged with urging his students to get ahead by stealing, and promises one of his pupils $500 to rob a jewelry store. In Brooklyn, N.Y., the district attorney reveals that inspectors from the bureau of weights and measures have accepted bribes, so that dishonest butchers and oil companies can cheat customers. Dozens of diskjockeys confess to taking payola to plug recording, frequently the worst music in the Nation, before a gullible public. In New York college students allegedly have cheated on exams and obtained degrees by hiring ghost writers to turn out their theses, term papers, and exams—paying from $50 to $3,000 in fees. A congressional hearing exposes rigged TV quiz shows. When confronted with the shocking evidence, network executives say, in effect: 'We didn't know what was going on.' There are a number of crooked labor leaders robbing their membership blind and hiding behind the fifth amendment every time a congressional committee seeks to expose them."

Are these isolated instances of greed, negligence, and dishonesty? Or do they indicate a definite trend toward cheatsville and amorality? Can it be that money, not love or service, has now become the dominant motive and yardstick of achievement in our society? Have we, since the end of World War II, lost our ideals, our sense of responsibility, our sense of discipline, and striving? Have we lowered our standards all along the line?

Hundreds of generations ago, Plato wrote: "What is honored in a country will be cultivated there." Is it possible that in our country, we have been honoring the dollar sign and the pleasure men, all out of proportion? We are all the victims of our environment and heritage. And for the past 75 years, we in this country have made lions of our millionaires and gangsters, to the disadvantage of our poets, scientists, politicians, and teachers. Witness the low salaries of educators and scientists. Perhaps we should rewrite Plato's statement applied to our culture: "Who is publicized in a country is frequently emulated by its younger generation."

What can we do about all this? Is this the era in which our basic goal is personal security, personal security in terms of money—regardless of how acquired? Or is this just a passing stage of moral laxity, brought on by a prosperity we cannot handle?

If we have overhonored and overglorified material wealth, then we must balance the scales. Children must be taught that success is a job well done, that a man feels rich when he writes a good poem, composes a good song, builds a sturdy bookcase, save a human life. A man is a success who serves well and honorably. Success in America must not be measured in dollars alone. According to the latest poll, most people now think it is. So, at this point of our history, we are long on dollars and short on idealism. When people were poorer, other real values were more appreciated, i.e.—religion, truth, freedom, and loyalty.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and their auxiliaries and other groups have done a fine job of sponsoring Boy Scout troops and other youth projects to interest and train our young people for right living. But there still is not enough basic training received from the home, school, and community to insure [the] fundamental loyalties and objectives. Our national leaders have repeatedly stated that American youth, compared to European youth, are soft, both physically and mentally.

Are we failing our youth in not setting higher standards? We are too inclined to

take the easy route of getting our entertainment over television, rather than reading on our own, or properly developing the mind and body. The problem of pornographic and indecent materials available on newsstands is largely ignored, in spite of repeated FBI reports that show increases in such materials, are paralleled by increases in crime. In trying to give our children all we did not have, we have gone too far. Many young people have too much, too soon—too little appreciated.

Patriotism is not something confined to ancient history. It should be instilled in young people in their homes and schools. We need to place more emphasis on owning and displaying the flag. All citizens must become more interested in their schools, including the curriculum and standards of conduct. Parents should clamp down on unrestricted use of the car, and the too-early, unsupervised recreation of their children. How will we react when the next torch is lighted, and we need to send soldiers to another part of the globe? We won't be loyal to God and country without training, and we cannot train our people after war is declared.

We must get back to sound fundamentals. We must instill in our youth a real sense of God; a sense of direction; a knowledge of right and wrong; a sense of responsibility to God, country, and neighbor; a sense of mission or vocation; and a sense of urgency. Now is the time to do what we are supposed to do, whether it be as a student in a school, or a worker on a job. Our duty is to ourselves and to the next generation. We must convince all citizens that the freedom we enjoy is worth fighting and dying for, or else we may not be able to keep it.

Dr. Tom Dooley, who rates seventh on the list of 10 most admired Americans, and who works in Laos, 5 miles from the Red China border, said this in an address to students: "It is a very special kind of world we live in. * * * And in this new kind of world, we need a new kind of man. We don't need men and women who are just physically tough and strong. What we need now are men and women who are morally and spiritually strong. We need men who have a terse and succinct understanding, a complete and total and simple understanding of their God * * * and not only must they possess this * * * but they must be able to articulate this. * * * All around the imprisoned world it is now a stark and proven fact that only if a man possesses the strength of belief and understanding of his God * * * only with that power, will he live and without that power, he will die."

Reminder and Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today in the industrial city of Poznan, Poland, the spontaneous peoples revolt took place against the Soviet-imposed Communist government. This revolt brought about significant internal changes in Poland. For a period, the government, aware of widespread resentment against rigid Communist doctrine, eased many of the socialistic programs in the country and for this period, at least, the spark of freedom was rekindled behind the Iron Curtain.

The last 4 years have seen, however, a slow but steady return to the normal tyrannical administration that is inherent in any Communist government.

It is well for us to make much today of the Poznan occurrence, since it demonstrates to the world the instability of the Soviet slave empire—especially the lack of popular support which is a basic Soviet weakness in the satellites.

The Polish people along with their unfortunate neighbors in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and, for that matter, in the Ukraine, are all passionately waiting for the day that freedom which they hold so dear will once again be theirs. I believe that we should take constant note of the internal disunity that exists behind the Iron Curtain where strongly nationalistic people are held under the bondage of communism—attempting to replace their traditional Christian heritage with the atheistic dogmas of international communism. Certainly, they shall not succeed, and it is well for us at this time to look forward to commemorating Captive Nations Week here in the United States to display, again, our constant sincere interest and respect for the oppressed peoples in Communist lands, and, as I have indicated, with our help, the spark of freedom will remain and will some day shine forth in all its splendor.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include with my remarks, a statement of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters, and urge the Members of both bodies to give it their careful attention:

REMINDER AND WARNING

Four years ago, on June 28, 1956, the world once again was horrified at the news that Poznan suffered death and torture from the hands of Soviets; namely, the worker, common man and even innocent children.

The news spread into the entire world that Poland, demanding bread and freedom, emerged into streets of Poznan, and as an answer received a salvo of communistic muskets and death.

Throughout the entire world messages were sent and hour after hour, the press, radio, radio and television brought news enumerating new facts. Many protests were issued, motions were made and resolutions formed thus giving honor to the heroes of Poznan. The historic uprising of Poznan was indeed heard around the world.

Everything in this world passes and is quickly forgotten, and so the Poznan bloody affairs slowly died out and was also forgotten. The world is very quick to forget an event that had just yesterday made an impression upon it.

Nevertheless, Poznan became a symbol of Poland demanding its freedom, and the name "Poznan" with its heroic act, demanding independence behind the Iron Curtain became an echo and a petition as well as a call for freedom and a protest against the tyrannical rule of communism.

No one was able to quiet the lips of the suffering people of Poland, and thus was heard the real voice of the enslaved nation of Poland rebelling against its enslavers.

The blood of the heroes of Poznan cannot have been shed in vain. It was able to arouse a strong reaction in the world 4 years ago; but today it is already forgotten. Therefore, it is necessary that on the anniversary of this brave act we once again recall it when the Communists continue to encroach upon the spirit of freedom. The world must again be reminded and made to realize the fact that the situation which faced Poland yesterday coexistencial politics become a reality for the Western countries and among them may be enumerated America.

In the bloody days of the revolution in Poznan, Poland admitted that she is an ally of America and not a satellite of Soviets. In the international arena, Poland appeared as the friend of many nations. Poland is aware of its historical mission, its part in awakening and directing the way to freedom by means of sacrifice and war. Poland cannot and must not be forgotten and disregarded.

Poznan reminds the world of the wound which had been inflicted by Communists to freedom, to morality and, in general to the natural rights of every human being, which were established by the civilization and culture of human and historical development. The Soviets took over the west-central countries of Europe and brought into them a government of terror and oppression.

Poznan again calls to us but this time with a voice of warning to the conscience of all Western civilization: the blood of the Heroes of Poznan urges us to increase our vigilance, to avoid any coexistence between America and communism. The blood of the Workers of Poznan is the voice of Poland crying out that there must come an end to all dictatorial rule of Kremlin. The blood shed upon the streets of Poland is eloquent testimony that peace and coexistence with the Communists is a false illusion. The Blood of Poznan is proof positive that Poland will never permit herself to become communistic. And although she had again been partitioned for the fourth time, thus finding herself she is enduring courageously the present enslavement and she believes firmly that justice shall triumph and that God's providence rules and watches over her. If the Communists go too far, she will undertake such tragic acts as the Poznan.

Speaking of the tragic revolutions and giving due honor to the heroes on the fourth anniversary of the Poznan uprising, it is necessary that we prove that with the bloody enslavers of the oppressed nations, the West, namely America, always searches for the truth for the sake of her own and happiness makes no tragic mistakes for which someday we must bear the consequence and maybe even have to pay in blood.

That is why the Anti-Communistic Confederation of Fighters for Freedom for Poland in the U.S.A. reminds America today that the Soviets together with Hitler's Germany were the only nation which was excluded from the League of Nations for their acts of aggression, terror, and revolution. During the 40 years of communistic oppression, thousands of communistic spies were caught at treacherous acts. Khrushchev shouted in the Chaillot Palace in Paris, that he caught a robber at his action. The entire world was overcome and bewildered with the language and actions of Khrushchev, the Soviet dictator, toward the President of the United States of America. It is unfortunate that the political leaders were unable to reply to Khrushchev to the effect that the robber and murderer at all times is no one else but Khrushchev, himself. His bloody hands are bathed in the blood of the millions of innocent victims butchered behind the Iron Curtain.

That is why the Parisian lesson finally opened the eyes of the West showing who Khrushchev is and what his aim is. But already we forget about this sad lesson and once again we yearn to shake the hand of the Budapest bloody butcher. The maniacal policies of Hitler became the ideal of Soviet politics. Khrushchev used Hitler's brow-beating strategy in 1955 in Geneva, and as a result once again there was bloodshed for thousands in Asia. These gangster tactics failed however in Paris, thank be to God. And the world was thus saved from another

Teheran and Yalta. That is why America must abandon all talks and agreements with the Communists.

Therefore, on the fourth anniversary of the revolution in Poznan, the members of the Anti-Communistic Confederation of Fighters for Freedom for Poland in U.S.A. appeal to the conscience of the leaders of America to breakoff all negotiations and talk of coexistence with the communistic murderers. We appeal in the name of the good of the West. Let us remember that: Freedom is something that cannot be divided. Either the entire world benefits from it or no one possess it at all. What a paradox that the colored people are obtaining their freedom and love of independence are imprisoned under Soviet imperialism. Either the world will realize this fact and see through the false communistic front and awaken at last to bring about freedom for all or else we shall be forced to die under communistic aggression.

We the members of the Anti-Communistic Confederation of Fighters for Freedom for Poland in U.S.A. believe that the West will awaken and change its policy toward the Soviets thus making our voice heard and respected.

In the crucial days of the beginning of World War II, spokesmen for the United States and Great Britain inspired us with declarations like these:

"We are fighting to save Poland's independence; we are fighting in defense of freedom; we are fighting for peace; we are meeting a challenge to our own security; we are defending the rights of all nations to live their own lives, and fighting against substitution of brute force for law as the arbiter between Nations; we are fighting today against violation of the sanctity of treaties and disregard of the pledged word; we are fighting today for the preservation of Christian principles; we are fighting as our fathers fought to uphold the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God; we are fighting for democracy and against the bloody communism."

In the light of such magnificent utterances, how could they have permitted gallant Poland, to taste "defeat to victory"?

The criminal injustice done to Poland must be undone.

On this fourth anniversary of the heroes in Poznan, may there exist within our thoughts, a place for those who calling for bread and freedom gave their lives upon the altar of freedom.

Long the strong American Nation live. May there exist a friendship between Poland and America.

Let there exist a true friendship among all nations and may world peace become a reality.

May the American Nation live, who for hundreds of years of its history has sacrificed in the service of peace and freedom.

"My True Security — The American Way"—Essay by Miss Crawford Meginniss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to direct the attention of my colleagues to a prize-winning essay written by Miss Crawford Meginniss, of Dothan, Ala. Her essay, entitled "My True Security—The American Way," was entered in the national contest which, as Senators know, is sponsored annually by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. The purpose of the contest is to promote initiative and self-reliance among American youth.

In the contest a winner is chosen from each State; and from the State winners three are chosen to receive scholarships to the colleges of their choice.

Miss Meginniss is the Alabama winner. Her essay is an excellent one, and I urge all my colleagues to read it.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning essay which Miss Meginniss has written be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY TRUE SECURITY—THE AMERICAN WAY

Security is symbolized by safes, vaults, and lockboxes, and can also be seen in the cold, gray stone and steel bars of a penitentiary. The security of the Nation is in the hands of the military—a bomber pilot of the Strategic Air Command, an alert radar operator on the DEW line, a naval officer with eyes fixed on the periscope of an atomic submarine, a sentry at a barricade between East and West Berlin. Government employees are classified as good security risks or poor security risks after a thorough investigation of their background, their associates, their living habits. Security is also the terms applied to secrets of state as well as the precautions taken to safeguard them.

It is not without significance that stocks and bonds are called securities. In making loans, bankers and financiers usually require collateral for security.

Individuals are constantly seeking security for themselves and their families. The usual means to achieve what they consider security is the acquisition of material wealth—personal and real property.

Others seek security through education and training in order to develop their capacities for attaining the greatest possible material success. There are also those who look for security by attaching themselves to an organization or a group which they believe to be strong enough to protect them from real or imaginary threats. Frequently, for the sake of security, they are willing to sacrifice freedom of choice, initiative, and individuality.

Thus security can mean many things to different people. Certainly the desire for security is universal, and, on the whole, a not unworthy desire. Since in this world we are set in the midst of so many and great dangers, the search for security is a natural part of life.

The question is: Where is real security to be found? Governments rise and fall; the passings of the great civilizations of Egypt, Greece, and Rome, all testify that there is no certain security in any state—even in our own United States. Armed might offers no lasting security, for no success of arms has ever produced lasting peace.

The accumulation of material possessions is a weak basis for security, since many fortunes, which were built up with great effort over many years, have been wiped out overnight. Even the best education and training cannot insure security, for injury, loss of health, or the lack of opportunities to use such training might interfere.

The "gang spirit" which strives for security by organization, societies, orders, parties, and the like, leads to the subjugation of personal freedom and the animalizing of the spirit. No human organization can offer real security, for they, too, are shortlived and doomed to destruction.

It should be obvious that lasting security is not to be found in anything temporal or mortal, but only in the abiding and the eternal. Therefore, the security of any nation, any people, any individual is of value only when it has its roots in those ideals, those values, those principles which never die.

My personal security then must be founded upon a strong faith—faith in God, the God of battles, the God of history, the God of creation, the God concerned not only with the limitless reaches of space, but also with me, my hopes, my fears, my potentialities, and my shortcomings.

Therefore in the presence of so much insecurity, I will attach myself to Him, and will strive to make His will—my will. And in the storms and stresses of this life, my prayer will be:

"Change and decay in all around I see.
O Thou Who changest not, abide with me."

An Objective Appraisal of Karl Detzer's Article on "Our Great Highway Bungle" in the July Reader's Digest by Gerald Bogan, Executive Secretary of the Iowa Good Roads Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, all Members, I am sure, received a reprint of the Reader's Digest article on "Our Great Highway Bungle," written by Karl Detzer and appearing in the July issue. If they read the article, they would be disturbed by some of Mr. Detzer's statements.

Mr. Gerald Bogan, executive secretary of the Iowa Good Roads Association, was disturbed and saw fit to take issue with Mr. Detzer's objectivity in this article. On June 20, he wrote the editors of the magazine and pointed out some of the shortcomings in Mr. Detzer's reporting. Since this letter will probably never be printed in the Reader's Digest, I am asking unanimous consent that it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the Members who are deeply concerned with this program, will have the benefit of Mr. Bogan's observations. The letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: As a regular and faithful reader of your magazine and one who always has admired the manner in which controversial subjects have been objectively handled, I was shocked and dismayed to read the many unobjective statements in "Our Great Big Highway Bungle" by Karl Detzer in the July 1960 issue. It is quite obvious in reading the article that Mr. Detzer either does not know the facts or chooses to ignore them. It also is evident that he set out to prove a point and proceeded to do so regardless of the facts. Let's examine some of the statements:

"The official figure was quietly raised to just under $40 billion." Can Mr. Detzer honestly believe that the figure could be "quietly" raised with the Congress of the

United States in session almost constantly since the passage of the act in 1956?

"Relocating railroads that lie in the path of the new roads." Is Mr. Detzer so ignorant of the facts that he does not know that where railroads lie in the path that they are bridged by some sort of separation?

"Shovels out money." What honest reporter would use such language when he should know that Congress makes the appropriations to the various States on the basis of a formula which has been approved by Members of the Congress?

"From there on the States take over and they (the States) decide how much money they need, how much right-of-way to buy, where and at what price. They decide the type of paving, how thick the surface should be." Any reporter who took the time to investigate would know that there are certain standards which must be met to qualify for any Federal aid and that the standards have been approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials in concert with the Bureau of Public Roads.

In his remarks about the "lonely Nevada interchanges," why didn't Mr. Detzer find out why the interchanges were approved by the State of Nevada, and supposedly its Governor? Perhaps there is a reason, which does not meet the eye, or perhaps the plans are for the future. The point is, Mr. Detzer should have tried to find out, if he is a good reporter, why the interchanges were designed and placed as they were.

The story said that new superhighways were being built "shoulder to shoulder with existing toll roads." Nowhere in the article did Mr. Detzer cite examples where there was actual construction of roads which parallel existing toll roads. Why did he not cite examples?

Why pick on Omaha? Why not any of the nearly 125 cities listed in the "General Location of National System of Interstate Highways, including all additional routes at urban areas designated in September 1955?" He could have purchased such a book for 55 cents from the U.S. Government Printing Office and would have found out that not only are routes being built into and through but also around urban areas. These were authorized by Congress and not by a bureau in Washington. Had Mr. Detzer taken the time to look into the record of public hearings on interstate construction in such States as Iowa he would have found testimony, which has not been refuted, that on the basis of vehicle-miles of travel the interstate routes in the urban areas are the cheapest to build. He also must be aware of the fact that Congress has been in session since 1956 and has had 4 years to correct a mistake if the language in the original act giving equal consideration to local traffic was not what the representatives of the people wanted.

If Mr. Detzer had been a thorough reporter he would have discovered that it was Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, who first suggested a watchdog committee. He also would have read Congressman SCHWENGEL's speech on the floor of the House, May 26, in which he pointed out that while most select committees have not more than a one-vote margin for the majority party that in the case of the Blatnik committee there is a 2 to 1 majority. Isn't it possible that there would be a cry of politics under these circumstances? Mr. Detzer, if he had taken the time, would have found that Congressman SCHWENGEL suggested that perhaps men trained, not as labor investigators, but as engineers, should be assigned to the committee for a thorough study of the engineering weaknesses of the interstate program.

A good reporter would have pointed up not only the failings of the program but its good features as well. While it is true that a dramatic divorce gets more attention than a 50-year marriage, a reporter has some responsibility in citing the good as well as the bad, unless he is fighting for "a cause" and is propagandizing instead of reporting. How about the 25,000 contracts on the Interstate program in which there has been no "skullduggery"? This is not to suggest that misuse of public funds should not be called to public attention; it is to suggest that we "shouldn't burn down the barn just to get rid of the rats." Why didn't Mr. Detzer point out the life saving features of the Interstate System? I'm sure there is dramatic evidence even on the short stretches of the new superroads that have been completed of how much safer they are than conventional highways. Here in Iowa, the rate on the conventional State primary system is 5.99 deaths per million vehicle miles, while on the short stretch of the Interstate open in the State it was only 3.42 deaths per million vehicle miles last year.

Mr. Detzer's charge that the Bureau of Public Roads "has been inept" doesn't stand up under close examination. While it may be true that there are some isolated cases in which there has been ineptness, in the great majority of the cases the record shows that there has been great skill in handling the biggest highway building job in mankind's history. "Perhaps it is time not to go ahead," says the article. Is Mr. Detzer really suggesting that the connected sections of the Interstate System should be abandoned? Certainly he can't be serious. If the Congress does take such drastic action there is no question that many States would be forced to continue the projects as State highways because of demand.

The larger question, however, is "why the article?" Does Reader's Digest, which has been a leader in honest, objective, and fair reporting, call the Detzer article "fair"? It sounds more like a campaign document for someone. If there is to be an assessment of blame it must be placed squarely at the feet of the Congress, and the Congress has been in session and is now in session and could make any corrections deemed necessary. Reader's Digest owes it to its fair-minded readers to present the good of the Interstate System * * * what it means in savings of life * * * in reduction of operating costs of cars * * * in transportation of goods. I hope Reader's Digest will print such an article and soon. As a former newspaperman and press association reporter I know that those on "the desk" have just as much responsibility as the reporter. And the Reader's Digest editors cannot escape the blame for the Detzer piece.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD BOGAN.

Columns Written by May Craig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 31 and April 1, Mrs. May Craig published two columns which were printed in our Maine newspapers.

In the first, Mrs. Craig cites the need for foreign capital in the country of Sudan.

In the second, she describes the ancient and the modern blend of Tunis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—SUDAN IS SENSITIVE TO NEED FOR FOREIGN CAPITAL

(By May Craig)

KHARTOUM.—Principal crop here in Sudan is cotton, which they export—the Soviet Union buys much of their export cotton. We do not need it. They grow an unusually fine long staple cotton and we buy some of that. They have recently floated a loan from the International Loan Fund to build a large textile plant but this will supply their own people—and not all of its own demand, so Maine and other American textile areas need not fear influx of textiles from here—though the Japanese will lose some of their textile market here.

"We are on the move economically," the Sudanese Minister of Information told us at a press conference. They need to stop being a one-crop cotton country, to diversify their agriculture and get more industrial development. They are sensitive to their need for foreign capital and will make the climate here favorable to it. One official said large Russian credits, underline credits, have been made available in the recent weeks. The Loan Fund is providing $10 million for the textile plant and private capital $14 million. It will begin operation in 1961, under American management to start—"so efficient the Americans are," they said, but they mean to learn. It is this moderation that makes this dictatorship suitable for the development of the country, for the time being, though there have been several small revolts against it. This is an important strategic area for the West and we like it better than the sudden unprepared freedoms of some of the other countries who say frankly they know they are taking a risk but they want to be free at any price. Here they are independent of any foreign domination. Their dictator is their own.

The construction of the high dam on the Nile by Egypt, now begun with Russian aid, will not benefit the Sudan, nor hurt, except that it will mean a large artificial lake above the dam. Egypt will help resettle the Sudanese ousted from the land to be flooded by the lake. This country is varied—it runs from desert to jungle, north to south; from Egypt and Ethiopia on the Mediterranean and the Red Sea to the center of Africa and this makes it akin to all of them. About 60 percent of the people are Moslem, speak Arabic; the southerners are Nilotic, Pagan, and Christian, few Moslem. There is freedom of religion, we saw Coptic and Catholic Churches. The press is controlled and though there may be free expression of political opinion, it may not be printed hostile to the government.

There are many beautiful mosques with graceful tall minarets: men in turbans, veiled women, though not all. American and English signs; Cocoa-Cola and Pepsi-Cola buildings on opposite sides of the same street; Shell oil; British Haig & Haig; Singer sewing machines with treadles. Men will sew you a garment up right there on the sidewalk. Camel beer is a frequent sign—local product. There is free medical aid for the poor; private for the rest. The population is 26 million, small for so large a country.

We are away from mineral water for the toothpaste—have thermos bottles of boiled water in our rooms, the tap water still taboo. We struggle with the boys as they still call them here, who clean the rooms, bring coffee when the desk wakes us by telephone. We are two to a room, but it is large and airy, with shuttered windows, big wooden-bladed

fan in the ceiling, worked from the wall switch. We struggle with the money for which we get brutally low exchange, as everywhere on this trip. We have to take whatever they choose to give us for our dollars. Though gratuities are included in the tripfee paid by our papers, radio-TV companies, you can't beat the tip system which is worldwide from Orient to Paris, from Middle East to Africa and if you want more than minimum service, there is the outstretched hand or the beseeching eye.

The price of post cards, to which Americans are addicted, is 13 to 14 cents each; if you expect them to get to the United States under 6 weeks, you have to put on airmail stamps at 25 cents each, which runs into money.

Ramadan, the sacred month when all Moslems over 19 years of age fast from 2 a.m. to sunset, is now going on. Our guide on the bus told us this afternoon that he had not eaten since the previous midnight. Ramadan upsets the economy, people sleep in the day when they can, eat and celebrate at night. American residents here said the Sudanese are conservative, calm; the government says it will make this into the usual democratic pattern eventually, does not say when.

The people are so absorbed in interior problems that they do not bother too much about exterior problems, are not as passionate and exigent as in the African countries trying still to get away from colonialism. The Yugoslavs do more business here than other of the Communist bloc—and they are not international Communists. They talk the Communist "philosophy" along with the trade, of course. We ought to send more Americans here in various capacities, so the Sudanese will know us personally, our coming caused great interest and we got the warmest welcome—and the press conference.

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—TUNIS BLENDS THE MODERN AND THE ANCIENT

(By May Craig)

TUNIS.—Our long journey west from Egypt to Algiers started with more weather trouble. We did not see President Nasser until 10 o'clock at night. It was getting on to midnight when we got to the airport. There we found weather bad in Tripoli, capital of Tripolitania, one of the three provinces of Libya. We waited and waited—then back to the hotel—minus our baggage which was already packed on the plane. Fortunately we got our hotel rooms back, and spent the night in bed, which was better than being cramped into a small plane. Next day we took off, but the delay meant we missed the program arranged for us in Tripoli, only saw our foreign service officers at the airport. However, we stopped in Bengasi in Cyrenaica, another Libyan province, and there one of our Tripoli officials met us with the literature they had prepared for us—in Tripoli they would not let the literature through customs, so our Embassy people had just come to Bengasi with it. This is evidence of the restrictions on freedoms in these countries which call themselves free. Newsweek magazine is banned in Egypt. President Nasser said that Newsweek had reported that U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold had spoken "hardly" (meaning harshly) to Nasser about transit restrictions through the Suez Canal. "One does not speak 'hardly' to the President of the United Arab Republic," he said proudly.

Flying for hours over the terrible desert, edged by the blue, blue Mediterranean, passed over ancient, historic ground, where the Phoenicians, Carthaginians, had their early civilizations, where cities are built on ruins of cities. The Romans had North Africa for centuries; Mussolini tried to regain the green hills back of Bengasi which was the breadbasket for imperial Rome and might have gained prosperity and living room for his people of Italy if he had not gone madly into war with Hitler.

Tunis is a mixture of modern and ancient, is trying to build up tourism for her treasuries of history. But until they can prove to tourists that they can be comfortable, drink pure water, eat safely, they will not have much luck. Here I have had my first touch of the prevalent dysentery, but had the drugs to get over it fast. We have had considerable minor illness and bruisings and nausea on planes. Several of the group have left to prolong their trip in Europe.

You really should see us as we straggled in late last night; several of the men have spears, swords, bows and arrows, wrapped up in brown paper; packages of all sorts, draped with cameras and flight bags, the lady with the fur coat is justified here because it is chilly. No heat in the rooms; when I asked the hallboy to turn on the heat in the radiator he shook his head. "It is summer."

Looking forward to the imbroglio in Algeria, backward to the dilemmas which face the former colonies struggling to be free, one is somewhat pessimistic about the near future. There is practically civil war in the Belgian Congo, where the three rival candidates for bossman when freedom comes June 30, are fighting tribal and political wars. Joseph Kasavubu, with whom I lunched, has moved his family across the Congo River to the Republic of Congo, which is still in the French community; he says his southern areas should stay out of federation with the rest of Congo. Belgians, forced out, are outraged lest British and French get more influence, especially down toward the coast, which is richer. In southern Congo are rich copper mines and there is movement to leave the Congo federation and join up with Rhodesia which would like the copper, diamonds, uranium this move would provide. Southern Rhodesia is thinking of leaving the federation. Nasser would like Tripoli and Libya to join the U.A.R., but they have just struck "oil so sweet you could almost use it for gasoline" and Tripoli wants all the money from its development. The King of Tripoli is old and ill; his heir apparent does not show evidence of being able to hold the country in an era when monarchies are on the way out. When one says "Africa is on the move," one must add that it has indeed got on its horse, but it is riding off in all directions.

President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia is forward looking, wants to industrialize his country to raise the standard of living. He is bucking Ramadan, the month-long Mohammedan fasting, which means eating all night, sleeping, or too weak to work in the day. It defeats efficient industrial competition. All the orthodox are against him and he may fail. A few miles out from the city of white stucco, with blue doors and ornate wrought-iron fancy window guards, are the ruins of ancient Carthage, which the Romans did indeed "delenda est." It makes one seem to temporary, so ephemeral, as one stands by the Sphinx in Cairo which looks with the calm detachment of 5,000 years on the strutting men of today; on the ruins of Carthage which once ruled the world. There is a World War II American cemetery here on a hill looking out of the lands they died for.

On the way to Carthage we passed handsome houses on the blue Mediterranean where French and Americans live. Arabs were tearing down a solid wall and some pillars—entrance to the gardens of the French consulate. This is for a road right through the vast private estate of the consulate. France has protested—but the men were working—it will be down and the defiant road built before anybody can do anything about it. Are French soldiers to die uselessly for this estate?

Federal Bureau of Investigation—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second of a series appearing in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch relative to the fine record of the world's greatest law-enforcement agency:

WASHINGTON.—J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, and his men must maintain constant vigilance. Lawlessness is never at rest and can only be combated by swift, decisive action.

Such was the case of an Arkansas fugitive who stood in an alley and carefully drew a bead on a pursuing FBI agent.

The agent dived behind a telephone pole, and the bullet splattered harmlessly into a garage door 12 inches from his head.

Shooting from behind the pole, the agent put a bullet into the left index finger of the fugitive and later remarked that the fugitive's hand was just about over the heart area when he was hit.

The shot temporarily stunned the fugitive; blood gushed. But one of the queer tricks of fate, the fingerbone had deflected the bullet from the heart area. He turned and ran up the alley at full tilt. Two agents continued the pursuit.

This story began at Arkansas State Prison where George Henderson was serving a term of 9 years for armed robbery. He had a long criminal record and had been arrested by the FBI in Baltimore several years earlier. With the help of his common-law wife, Henderson escaped.

Arkansas authorities requested FBI assistance under the fugitive felon statutes. A large-scale search covered most of the States in the East and Middle West.

FBI investigation led from Ashland, Ky., to Dayton, Ohio. Dayton agents were alerted that Henderson might soon appear there. Alert agents spotted Henderson and his wife. A dizzy pursuit followed through Dayton streets at speeds up to 70 miles an hour.

Henderson made a turn into a side street. It was a dead-end road. He abandoned his car and fled in one direction, his common-law wife in another.

During the chase, additional FBI help had been summoned by radio. The help arrived and reinforcing agents captured the common-law wife.

Some time later, a Dayton housewife sent a letter of praise to the special agent in charge of the FBI at Cincinnati.

She said she was aware the FBI was entrusted with protecting the civil rights of citizens. She had now seen an example.

She was in her dining room attending to her canary when she heard voices outside. Looking out she saw an individual across the street taking refuge behind a tree. He was bleeding and had a gun in one hand. On her side of the street, there were two individuals, later identified as special agents of the FBI.

She was certain that a gun flight was about to take place. She heard all of the conversation. In order to avoid a further fight and possible bloodshed, the agents persuaded Henderson to lay down his gun, walk across the street and surrender. He ultimately was convicted in Federal court in Dayton for his assault upon a special agent.

Special agents do not talk about their work. In this instance, however, the housewife related that she was well aware of the

earlier gunfight in the alley. After Henderson had been wounded, he had turned and fled up the alley, presenting a sizable target to agents who easily could have shot and killed him. The FBI did not wantonly take life, and agents, at risk to themselves, caused an armed fugitive felon to surrender voluntarily. In her opinion this was a great tribute to the FBI, characteristic of the services rendered daily to the community and country.

Frank Lawrence Sprenz on March 2, 1959, robbed a bank at Hamilton, Ohio.

Practically all bank robberies come under FBI jurisdiction. The Federal statutes cover banks established under the laws of the United States, members of the Federal Reserve System, those chartered by the United States, and those insured by the FDIC, institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and Federal Credit Unions. Sprenz had chosen a bank insured by the FDIC, which was located close to an airport.

At the time, Sprenz was a badly wanted individual, recently being added to the prominent "top 10" list of FBI fugitives.

Although the FBI has wanted notices in its files for approximately 91,000 fugitives, it is impossible to request the public to cooperate in seeking all of them. Consequently, the FBI has arranged to designate certain badly wanted individuals as members of the top 10 group. Sprenz was added to this elite group a short time before. From the Hamilton bank, Sprenz escaped with approximately $26,000 in currency.

He drove to the nearby airport and stole a plane owned by a flying club.

His problems began immediately. Only a few feet off the ground, Sprenz was disturbed and his vision obscured by dollar bills flying around inside the airplane. This was a most inappropriate time because as a part of the takeoff, it was necessary for Sprenz to give close attention to the pitch of the propeller, the retractable landing gear, and certain other aeronautic responsibilities.

In every walk of life, decisions are unavoidable. Sprenz was no exception. He had the alternative of taking care of aircraft duties or recouping the money blowing around the plane and through the open door. Sprenz visualized that chasing him could become a very popular sport if he failed to close the door. He made his decision, closed the door, scooped up the currency, stuffed it into a sack, and then looked after the aircraft itself.

In a little while, he was able to relax. Sprenz was now ready to cool and soothe his nerves. His first move was to turn on the radio to the standard broadcast band. Sprenz claimed he picked up a Columbus radio station. The first announcement which greeted his ears was "The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports the robbery of a bank in Hamilton, Ohio, and identifies the robber as Frank Lawrence Sprenz, one of the FBI's top 10 fugitives." Sprenz later said he was thoroughly disgusted and switched off the broadcast band and turned on the pilot's wavelength.

Sprenz settled back for a steady report of weather conditions and other matters of interest to pilots.

Within a few minutes, an alert was sounded and the Civil Aeronautics Authority by radio cautioned all pilots as follows:

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation urges all pilots to be on the alert for Frank Lawrence Sprenz, the fugitive identified as having robbed a bank at Hamilton a short time ago. Sprenz has also stolen an aircraft identified as follows: Red and white Beechcraft Bonanza, and the number of this aircraft is N–2829–V."

Sprenz glanced out the window and commented to himself, "By golly, that's the right number."

He switched off the radio and concluded his best move would be to quickly ditch the plane and not proceed to Pennsylvania as planned, where he had a car waiting. Sprenz abandoned the stolen airplane at West Lafayette, Ohio, and took a cab to Coshocton where he purchased a car.

But he underestimated the skill and tenacity of the FBI. A dizzy chase began with the FBI at times as close as 20 minutes behind him. During the next 33 days this chase continued throughout the Midwest, the Eastern States, to the Pacific coast, and to the Southwest.

Exactly 33 days after the Hamilton bank robbery, Sprenz was in custody and en route to Cincinnati, Ohio, to face a Federal court for the Federal crime of bank robbery.

In subsequent interviews with special agents, the full background of Sprenz was reconstructed. Sprenz said he always had abhorred publicity.

As a matter of fact, on three consecutive weekends while he was a resident of Seattle, Wash., he had spent his time trying to counteract unfavorable publicity. According to Sprenz, he went from post office to post office tearing down from walls "wanted flyers" issued by the FBI.

Then, said Sprenz, "the FBI did a dirty trick." It issued the large poster-size wanted flyers by the millions * * * too many for him to destroy. He left Seattle.

At an early age, Sprenz was affiliated with a youth organization. He said he had no interest in youth activities but this group had a link trainer in the meeting hall. He viewed the link trainer as his opportunity to learn to fly. Now he could encounter on the ground the basic problems that an aviator might experience.

Throughout his service with this youth organization, he spent his time at each meeting in the link trainer.

As a result, Sprenz, in the course of his criminal activities, stole an airplane at Toronto, Canada, and crashed it at Baltimore, Md. On another occasion, he stole an airplane at Scranton, Pa., and flew it to New Hampshire. Both of these thefts were in violation of Federal law prohibiting the interstate transportation of stolen aircraft. The theft of the airplane at Hamilton, Ohio, was not a Federal violation as he did not cross a State line.

All of his life he had wanted money. After the Hamilton bank robbery, he was sitting on the sands of Oregon watching the Pacific Ocean.

Nearby in a motel he had nearly $22,000 in good, hard cash.

"But of what use is money," thought Sprenz, "I cannot send it to my wife and children, I cannot use it on myself—it is useless."

Sprenz thought how much he would liked to have changed places with himself a few years ago.

He concluded he should go to Cuba and join the revolutionary forces. While en route to Cuba he crashed his plane in Mexico and brought about the chain of events resulting in his capture.

Special agents were also interested in the two dozen cars he had stolen or purchased with stolen funds. Sprenz confided he had always been taught the importance of living in a frugal fashion. Therefore, he said he never spent more than $200 or $300 for an automobile because all he desired was transportation.

He enrolled in an eastern university to learn public speaking. "After all," said Sprenz, "a man in my status, as a fugitive, needs to be able to influence people and to contact them in the most favorable way. Therefore, I felt that public speaking would be an asset to me."

While he was in the Hamilton County jail at Cincinnati, Sprenz appeared bronzed and in perfect health. He held up his pants and demonstrated how much weight he had lost. One agent commented to him. "Frank, it appears as though you are ready for the Olympics.".

Sprenz replied, "Yes, at Atlanta." Actually, Sprenz did not go to Atlanta, but was confined by the Federal Government at its maximum custody institution at Alcatraz, Calif.

The ability to meet, work with, and understand people at all levels is characteristic of the FBI.

It is a part of the intensive training inspired by Director J. Edgar Hoover. Versatility is one of the basics of FBI operations. Some fugitives have a sense of humor and an appreciation of human nature as did Sprenz. The FBI deals with them all impartially and fairly. The FBI realizes that temporary lighthearted humor may quickly change to deep-seated viciousness; any ruse which suits his purpose is the armor of the escape-minded criminal.

Natural and Industrial Resources of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the future of my State of West Virginia lies in its industrial growth. Although the State is small in geographic area and population, we have the natural and industrial resources to enable us to attain an industrial complex.

There are those who continually strive to examine and, subsequently, promote the State's promising aspects. Regarding these efforts, I would like to call attention to a series of editorials appearing in the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser from June 22 through 25, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that this series be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE NEEDS UNITED EFFORTS TO SPEED INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

(First of a series)

The group of Southern States that includes West Virginia is continuing to move forward among the most favored of the country for business and industrial development.

The 1960 edition of the Blue Book of Southern Progress reported that in the 1954–59 period business volume in the 15 States rose from $206.13 billion to $287.30 billion.

Manufacturing output value climbed from $53.13 billion to $79.58 billion. The number of active manufacturing enterprises reached 65,100 with a total employment of 3.770 million persons.

Payrolls jumped from a 1958 total of $43.294 billion to a 1959 level of $51.190 billion. The volume of wholesale trade increased from $59.831 billion to $65.886 billion.

The extent of expansion of the chemical industry during the year was indicated by the gain of 354 in the number of articles in the chemical research field originated in the South. The total reached 3,905.

The largest gain in the number of articles was made by Tennessee. Other States cov-

ered in the report were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Even the fast pace of development should quicken in future years, the publication predicted. The consensus of 75 business, professional, and educational leaders quoted was that the next decade would offer the greatest opportunity for industrial growth in the South's history.

But for those of us who live in West Virginia neither the story of past progress nor the prospect of future developments is so bright. During the last 10 years the State was one of only four in the country that declined in population.

The major cause was the shrinking employment in the coal mines. To meet growing competition from other fuels the mines reduced production costs by installing more and more efficient machinery that made fewer and fewer men necessary.

Naturally a great many who lost their jobs in the mines moved to other States where work was available.

Even the decline in population does not tell the entire discouraging aspect of the story. Despite the loss of a great many people, there are still about 70,000 in the State who are able and willing to work but can't find jobs.

Mine employment will also probably shrink still further. Production may rise with the expanding population and the discovery of new uses for coal through research but new machines may supply the demand even with smaller manpower.

To provide work for the thousands who will never again return to the mines it will be necessary to develop new local industries and to attract others from the outside.

Solving this problem is essential not only for progress but for providing funds to make possible an acceptable standard of education, construction, and maintenance of highways and the other governmental services that the State must have to avoid becoming a hopelessly backward area.

The picture is not entirely dark. There are garden spots such as this area even in the desert of despair reported in a series of magazine articles.

New industries are going into production, others are under process of construction, and still others are in prospects. There are numerous favorable factors for industrial expansion in West Virginia, as in the other Southern States.

But there are also handicaps. Overcoming them will require a united and continuous effort of officials, private citizens, and organizations on a local and State level.

Means of overcoming them and taking advantage of the promising opportunities of the decade ahead will be considered in later editorials of this series.

ZONING OF LAND IS NECESSARY TO SAVE SCARCE PLANT SITES

(Second of a series)

West Virginia's greatest obstacle to industrial development is its mountains. The rugged Allegheny chain that sprawls from the eastern border across a large part of the State does not offer enough level ground for many extensive industrial operations.

Even where a plateau provides a place for a plant, surrounding mountains make the development of essential transportation facilities almost impossible.

For the most part railroads have to follow the valleys, and to permit even a reasonably safe grade, highways have to twist and turn up and down the high peaks and ridges.

Building roads through such mountainous sections also lays an additional burden upon the State because of heavy engineering and grading costs.

For these handicaps there are, of course, some compensations. There is an abundance of timber on the mountains that affers material for woodworking operations.

Such industries have been recommended as especially suited for the State.

Research offers the possibility of discovering new byproducts of coal that will trigger the development of entirely new lines of industry. The blacktop material now under test in Kentucky and Pennsylvania for road surfacing may also be suitable for building purposes.

Plants for producing and fabricating the material for its numerous purposes could absorb much of the surplus labor now existing in the mining sections.

The greatest opportunities for expanding the economy of the eastern part of the State probably lie in the encouragement of tourist travel. The rugged mountains and picturesque gorges are strong attractions especially to those accustomed to level country.

Providing more conveniences and more recreational facilities, marking historic spots and building better roads will draw many more visitors to the State and greatly increase the amount of money they leave behind.

The benefits would extend to this section and all along the Ohio River. The valley's beauty has been celebrated in song. There are also numerous spots of historic interest, such as the site of the Battle of Point Pleasant, recognized by many historians as the real beginning of the Revolution.

The land along the Ohio and its tributaries also offers the strongest attractions for industrial development. It has an abundant supply of coal, natural gas, electric power, and water for transportation or plant operations, and it is close to the big markets of the East and the Middle West.

But the limited number of available sites calls for special efforts to save them from less profitable use through an extensive program of zoning by the State and the communities.

Such a program is now underway in Huntington and Cabell County with the cooperation of the West Virginia Economic Development Agency. Similar efforts are needed in Wayne County and others along the Ohio and its branches.

Federal aid for the work is available through the Economic Development Agency for counties having a population of less than 50,000.

Making land available for industrial development also requires extensive community efforts to keep prices down and even optioning or buying available sites.

Here suitable tracts have been purchased by the Huntington Industrial Corp. The Appalachian Power Co. owns a considerable acreage at Apple Grove. The railroads have also acquired locations along their lines, and this week the PCT Co. bought 350 acres east of the International Nickel Co. plant.

Encouraging the opening of smaller industries often involves the offer of a suitable building. This too takes extensive community efforts, such as those of the chamber of commerce and its affiliate, the Huntington Industrial Corp.

These activities of organizations and governmental agencies must also be accompanied by the cooperation of various segments of the population to build the kind of State and community that an industrial corporation wants.

The location not only must be suitable for profitable operations but pleasant as a home for those who run the plant.

How Huntington and West Virginia rate in this respect will be considered in the next editorial of the series.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE BIG FACTOR IN ATTRACTING NEW INDUSTRY

(Third of a series)

Those who complain most because the Huntington area and other favored sections of West Virginia do not attract more industries should really take a large part of the blame upon themselves.

They and their neighbors and all private citizens who make up public opinion have in the long run more influence in determining the kind of State and community they have than do the officials themselves.

For they choose the officials. And without public support officials cannot create the manmade attractions that will induce industrial survey teams to choose a particular location for a plant.

An instance of public failure to support an effort to make this area more attractive to industry occurred when Huntington voters rejected a proposed excess levy for capital improvements at the May primary election.

The refusal was attributed largely to dislike of the current city administration that submitted it rather than to opposition to the improvements themselves.

That may have been true, but if it was, the people only cut off their noses to spite their faces, for the proposed improvements were not for the benefit of the administration but for the public.

At any rate, this instance illustrates the need of reasonable cooperation between public and officials for improvements that in themselves constitute progress and will encourage further progress.

The city administration has an opportunity at this time to show its willingness to encourage industrial expansion by removing the present gross sales tax from factory products shipped out of the State.

Regardless of the merits of arguments for or against the tax, city council could at least show a friendly attitude toward industry by granting the pleas of the plant executives who have protested that the charge hurts business and cuts employment.

The loss of revenue would not be too serious, and it would be more than offset by council's contribution to what is called a good business climate.

The State also could make its climate more genial for business and industry by extensively overhauling its makeshift tax structure. The mere fact that it wanted to remove inequities would be a favorable sign.

To provide the kind of climate an industrial corporation needs all elements must cooperate in the spirit that flows from the realization that their interests are identical.

The public attitude is composed of the separate attitudes of various segments of the population. Especially important is the attitude of working people.

Temperamental, unreasonable or domineering labor leaders can do more to keep industry from a State or a community than perhaps any other single influence.

The officials of a desirable corporation do not want bootlickers for workmen nor favoritism from government. They want man-to-man friendliness and fair give-and-take relationships in personal and community activities.

They are more than willing to carry their share of the load of progress, and they want to live among people who are progressive.

It is not difficult to determine just how progressive a community is. The most obvious sign is perhaps the condition of the streets. But industrial teams go much further.

They investigate the churches, the school system, the cultural attractions, the recreational facilities, the response of the people to the annual charity appeal and all the factors

that determine whether the community is a desirable place to live.

They do not even overlook the intellectual level of the people who will be their neighbors.

Other factors influencing the location of industries in this area and in the State will be considered in tomorrow's editorial of this series.

BETTER HIGHWAYS GREAT NEED IN GETTING STATE INDUSTRIES

(Last of a series)

The scarcity of desirable sites for new industries in West Virginia should spur the public and officials to more intensive efforts to increase the attractiveness of those that do exist by improving the area surrounding them.

City, county and State zoning programs to save available sites from less desirable uses were discussed in an earlier editorial of this series. Programs are now underway in Huntington and Cabell County in cooperation with the West Virginia Economic Development Agency.

Similar efforts are especially needed in Wayne, Mason and Putnam Counties in this area and in other counties along the Ohio and its tributaries that offer the most favorable conditions for industrial development.

In addition there should be local, State, and even Federal programs in these areas for all possible improvements that will encourage industrial corporations to select the sites offered.

Among the most important improvements needed are modern highways. This applies particularly to the Ohio and Big Sandy Valleys in this area but also to numerous other sections suitable for industrial operations.

Even close to Huntington there are potential plant sites that can be shown only by asking an industrial survey team to walk part of the way. This has a doubly adverse effect.

It raises a psychological handicap because of the inconvenience it causes those making the inspection. This in turn tends to feed any suspicion that the community itself is not progressive.

More important still, a road is essential even for hauling construction materials while a plant is going up. One is also necessary for trucks and for employees' cars after operations begin.

Having to build a road to a site increases the cost of the plant to the company.

And even without that addition, Huntington has a higher than average level of construction costs. This in itself is no inconsiderable disadvantage.

It results partly from the gross sales tax that goes on the original contractor's price and then on that of each subcontractor and even sub-subcontractors.

This is another reason for removing or at least revising the State gross sales tax law.

High construction costs also apply to residences for executives and workmen that a new plant would bring to Huntington. Complaints about the high price of homes were heard from a great many of the employees transferred here from Richmond, Va., by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway a year or two ago. Quite a few of the newcomers moved to Ohio.

Cost of housing can be an important factor in rejecting a proposed site for a plant. It can also be an obstacle in the growth of any city. No doubt it was at least partly to blame for Huntington's loss of population during the last decade and its drop to second place among West Virginia cities.

Its tendency to encourage residential developments in Ohio has also increased the need of a loop from Interstate Highway 64 with two bridges across the river.

A loop connecting with U.S. Route 52 in Ohio would relieve the heavy traffic congestion on the bridge at Sixth Street and would encourage residential and industrial developments in both States.

If the Federal Government declines to include the loop in the interstate highway program, residents on the two sides of the river and their States must somehow devise means of building a greatly needed new bridge here.

These and similar improvements in all the State's sections suitable for industrial expansion would not fail to attract the attention of corporations looking for plant sites.

If accompanied by all the other essential improvements in the various factors included in an industrial survey, they would relieve local and State agencies of the need of "selling" locations.

Industries would come in on their own.

International Development Association

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11001) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11001.

The purpose of the International Development Association is to bring about a better means of financing our mutual security program through cooperation with our friendly allies who are ready to acknowledge their responsibility in financing this new international loan agency.

It is a modern truism that we live in a world of crisis and that the United States is called upon to accept greater responsibility than any other nation. Our wisdom, will, efforts, and actions quite literally may determine the future of mankind—at the extreme may determine whether mankind has a future.

I do not rise simply to repeat truisms. Rather I fear that this truism has become such an intimate part of our lives that we have managed to thrust it from the forefront of our consciousness. I fear that we cannot tell a truly pressing crisis in our foreign policy when we encounter one. We simply react with the feeling that all this has been said before; dismiss the crisis from our minds and go about our daily routines. But we are indeed in the midst of a most serious crisis in our foreign policy. It is essential that we look it full in the face.

Walter Lippmann, perhaps the most distinguished commentator of our times, summed up our situation when he wrote last week of the pressing need for an "unavoidable reappraisal, which must in many ways—to use the words of John Foster Dulles—be agonizing." Such a reappraisal is long overdue. The need for it cries out. But are we about to engage upon one? As I listened to the President in his address to the Nation on Monday night I had the impression that nothing could be further from his mind.

The problems pressing upon our Nation's foreign policy are so many and so difficult that I could not attempt to even touch upon them all. But some are more pressing than others and most deserving of our immediate attention.

One is our military posture. We have drifted from a position of decided superiority to a point where we are not only challenged, but where we may very well be becoming a second-class power. I do not wish to reopen the enormously complex arguments surrounding the missile gap. It is sufficient to note that such a gap does exist in favor of the Soviet Union and that the gap will reach a peak in the ensuing year or two. This is an immensely serious matter. It is not dissolved or washed away by citing what we may do or hope to do sometime in the future. Nor can we banish the specter by recalling America's moral strength. Nor is it removed by pointing to hopes for a balanced budget. This missile gap could prove so important to our country that in a few short years our concern with a balanced budget may seem a rather bad joke.

This decline of our military posture has already produced critical results in NATO, the keystone of our foreign policy. The full effect is hidden as the organizational facade of NATO continues unimpaired, but the heart and soul of NATO is rapidly being eroded away. I am reminded of C. Northcote Parkinson's rule of thumb by which one can identify decayed organizations by the very perfection and flamboyance of their facades and structures.

What has happened in NATO is that the key strategy upon which the treaty organization was founded has been outdated by time and changes in weapons systems. NATO's heart is the commitment of the United States to come to the aid of Europe, and to do so successfully. This was a feasible strategy when we had a monopoly of nuclear weapons and a decided military superiority. But these conditions no longer exist. Now Europeans, of the most responsible and pro-American sort, ask whether we would indeed come to their defense when this would be tantamount to our committing suicide. If the Soviet Union attacks Europe, they ask, would the United States retaliate on the Soviet Union, knowing as we now do, that that retaliation against Russia could bring down upon us Soviet missiles that might cause 40 million American dead. No amount of public talk about our commitment to NATO answers this question. It is a very good one. We can hardly blame Europeans for asking it, or for answering that the answer is in the negative. What is needed is a vigorous and immensely difficult, indeed agonizing, reappraisal of our whole military strategy toward Europe and NATO; a reappraisal inevitably linked with our total military posture.

In Asia we have had a policy of encircling the Communist bloc with a string of military alliances and military bases. So long as we had a monopoly of nuclear weapons, very strong arguments could be made for this policy. But it is now in need of radical reappraisal.

Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and other underdeveloped nations of the world

present a problem for the United States, completely different from that in Europe. In Asia the main currents are pressing for swift and sweeping change in the spheres of both politics and economics. Asians consider these changes first priorities, whatever we may think of them.

The United States has long been the symbol—worldwide—of the struggle for independence from colonial rule, of democracy, and of freedom linked with economic well-being. These things appeal enormously to Asians, Arabs, and Africans and it has been our policy to repeat them over and over. Our words have encouraged others to seek our goals with our support. But our actions have belied our words. Our emphasis upon military alliances, military bases, and military aid has inevitably placed us in a position of giving our strongest and fullest support to the maintenance of the status quo at all costs. Is it any wonder that American influence and American prestige has declined when we have persisted in urging these people to seek democracy and freedom while using our concrete influence and strength to prevent change in the oppressive status quo? Clearly this is a major facet of our foreign policy which most urgently needs reappraisal.

Events have caught up with us. The Government of Korea under President Rhee had the fullest and most complete support of the United States. It was overthrown by Korean young people because that Government was dictatorial and corrupt. Fortunately for us, those students still admire us. Students everywhere do not. In Turkey, the Army with wide popular support moved in to end an increasingly dictatorial government which we had long supported. In Iraq, 2 years ago, we had a much sadder experience with the overthrow of a government which we had hoped would provide a keystone to the Baghdad Pact. In Japan, there is great popular admiration and support for the United States, coupled with equally great and popular antagonism to our policy of drawing Japan into a military alliance involving military bases in Japan. Most Japanese dread the idea of being caught between nuclear powers in a conflict which they could only lose, and lose totally.

Our economic and technical assistance programs have produced some success. But they have moved falteringly and we have been quick to subordinate them to outdated military considerations. It is clear that one of our most pressing tasks is a complete reappraisal of our aid to Asia and other underdeveloped countries; a reappraisal running to the very roots of our policies.

In foreign policy timing is of exceptional importance. Small matters let slide tend to become crises, and crises let slide tend to become disasters. Walter Lippman has suggested that the President is uniquely qualified to undertake the badly needed reappraisal in the last months of his term in office. Surely it is true that the President is held personally in unparalleled esteem and could, if he would, launch such a reappraisal. But all the signs are that no reappraisal is to be forthcoming. We are instead offered the President's willingness to undertake still further personal "goodwill" journeys throughout the world. What is needed is the leadership right here in this city to begin the monumental and agonizing task of reappraisal, including reappraisal of "goodwill" tours by our Head of State.

In this quadrennial election year every pressure is against a serious reappraisal—every pressure but the most important and vital—the precipitous crisis in our foreign affairs. The Nation must find leadership with energy, drive, imagination and will to move forward. We have stood still and lulled ourselves far too long with fables that all the world loves us and all the troubles are just stirred up by nasty little minorities. The race in this world is to the strong and the swift. It is to those willing to make sacrifices and to those willing to combine wisdom with the energetic pursuit of successful and proper courses.

Let the Truth Come Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, reasons for keeping the American people adequately informed on foreign policy were outlined in a recent column in the Daily News written by Peter Edson.

I think it is worthy of the serious consideration of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE TRUTH COME OUT
(By Peter Edson)

President Eisenhower's report on his Far East goodwill tour tries to put the best possible face on what happened. He accentuates the positive accomplishments in Korea, the Philippines and Taiwan. The negative aspects of canceling his scheduled visit to Japan are conveniently blamed on the Communists.

This looking on the silver lining of every international cloud is apparently what most American people want to hear. They do not like disturbing news which infers that the United States is anything less than perfect.

Thus, when critics of the administration decry the fumbles over the U-2 spy plane incident, the breakup of the summit conference, the withdrawal of invitations for the President to visit Russia and Japan, there is some protest from people who don't like that kind of talk.

"We have the best communications system in the world," the protestors expound in effect. "Whatever we say about ourselves is broadcast to every country on the globe. Why should we advertise the fact that we have made mistakes?

"And why should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issue a report publicly criticizing the administration's handling of the U-2 plane incident and the summit breakup? The newspapers, radio, and TV ought to keep still about such things," they say.

When it is asked if censorship is wanted to prevent such self-criticism the answer is, "No, there shouldn't be censorship—except maybe in time of war. But this is cold war. And the newspapers should voluntarily lay off anything that makes America look bad."

And as if by afterthought, it is sometimes added that, "You never catch the Russians admitting they do anything wrong."

But the answer to this argument in favor of suppression of criticism of America is not necessarily found in what the Russians do or don't do. Better answers are found in Korea and Turkey, which have just gone through bloodless revolutions.

Both these countries exercised strict censorship under Korea's former President Syngman Rhee, Turkey's President Celal Bayar and Premier Adnan Menderes. Public criticism of their governments was strictly prohibited.

If there had been freedom to criticize in both Turkey and Korea, many of the mistakes of the past 15 years would not have been made. There would have been better government. It would not have been necessary for university students to riot and force the overthrow of corrupt administrations.

Trying to suppress unpleasant facts or gloss them over does not correct old mistakes or prevent new ones.

The democratic way is to let the truth come out, in the best traditions of George Washington and the cherry tree.

How You Can Vote for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week Americans for Constitutional Action gave wide circulation to an article by the chairman of its board of trustees, Adm. Ben Moreell, U.S. Navy, retired, entitled "How You Can Vote for Freedom." I wish to call the attention of the House to this article because it not only contains a frank statement of the basic purposes of the organization which Admiral Moreell heads, it is an appeal for a return to constitutional government and the concepts of the Founding Fathers of this country. It is also an appeal to the millions of voters who will go to the polls this year to help stem the drift toward statism and so-called welfare state programs.

Americans for Constitutional Action is a citizens group which established headquarters in Washington in early 1959. It is governed by a board of trustees of outstanding Americans, among them being Ben Moreell, chairman, Washington, D.C.; Charles Edison, treasurer, West Orange, N.J.; Bonner Fellers, vice chairman, Washington, D.C.; Felix Morley, secretary, Gibson Island, Md.; Howard Buffett, Omaha, Nebr.; Edgar N. Eisenhower, Tacoma, Wash.; Ralph W. Gwinn, Pawling, N.Y.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N.Y.; Robert W. Johnson, New Brunswick, N.J.; Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Ill.; Walter B. Martin, Norfolk, Va.; Philip M. McKenna, Latrobe, Pa.; Mrs. R. Templeton

Smith, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Loyd Wright, Los Angeles, Calif.

Admiral Moreell, as I am sure all Members of Congress know, was organizer of the war-famed Seabees. He has had a brilliant career as an engineer, an industrialist, and has served the country repeatedly as a member of some of the most important investigative groups.

HOW YOU CAN VOTE FOR FREEDOM

(By Adm. Ben Moreell (CEC), USN (Retired))

Americans for Constitutional Action was conceived, developed, and brought into being by a group of citizens who believe that these United States now face a crisis of such major proportions as to jeopardize their survival as a Federal Republic, and our future as a free people.

The basic and critical issue is freedom of the individual. We of ACA believe that free enterprise, freedom of speech, of worship, of assembly, and all other freedoms are but reflections of this basic freedom. Impair any freedom and you are sure to hurt some individuals.

The degree to which we have departed from the ideals of the Founding Fathers, which were derived from their belief in a Government of strictly limited powers, is indicated by the gigantic growth in size, scope and power of our national Government, with a corresponding shrinkage of State sovereignty and personal liberty.

The Second Hoover Commission revealed these pertinent statistics:

1. In 1910 the Central Government cost the average American family $38 per year; in 1955 it had grown to $1,600, or 42 times. (Today the cost per family is $1,748.)

2. During this same period the population increased only 81 percent; i.e., less than double, but the debt of the Central Government grew from $1 billion to $275 billion. (It is now $288.8 billion.)

3. Government employees, civilians only, increased from 324,000 to 2,362,000, or almost seven times. (There are now 2,353,000.)

4. The budget of the Central Government grew from $639 million to $65 billion, or 100 times. (For fiscal 1960 it is $78.4 billion.)

5. The Central Government now owns about one-fourth of the land acreage of the continental United States. (Government ownership is still growing.)

6. In 1955 it owned and operated some 3,000 different kinds of business and commercial enterprises in competition with its own citizens.

The history of human liberty, as Woodrow Wilson reminded us, is the history of the limitations placed on governmental power. As government expands, the liberty of every one of us contracts.

It is clearly evident that the American people and their once free institutions have been engulfed by the so-called welfare state and its protagonists.

How did this come about? It was accomplished legally, by majority vote of legislators, elected to the U.S. Congress, who conceived it their duty to promote omnipotent government by taxing and spending and making more and more of our citizens dependent upon government for their livelihoods and even many personal needs.

Those legislators are proponents of enhanced and centralized political power at the expense of individual rights. This is socialism, the natural forebear of communism.

The end products have been onerous taxation, politically engineered inflation resulting in a sharp decrease in the purchasing power of our money (some 55 percent since 1933), moral confusion and the decline of personal liberty.

We have devised the ACA-index to provide accurate data on the voting records of all Senators and Representatives during the past few years. By means of this index one can tell which of our legislators have consistently voted for individualism and personal freedom and against collectivism and coercion. Some of these distinguished statesmen are pictured in this folder; there are others, but the total number is alarmingly small.

The fundamental purpose of ACA is twofold. It is first, to reelect those legislators who, by their voting records, have shown their dedication to the principles of constitutional conservatism. They have advocated arresting and reversing the current movement toward "welfare statism," centralized government, regimentation of the economy, expropriation of private property, onerous taxation, and debauching our currency. Secondly, ACA proposes to elect other constitutional conservatives who will unite effectively with those now in office to achieve their common ends.

ACA is vigorously pursuing this purpose throughout the country. We must make a maximum effort now.

Congratulations to Green Bay Press Gazette on Its 45th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout the history of the United States, our newspapers, as well as other information media, have played a vital, indispensable role toward creating a better-informed citizenry in our Republic. We recognize, of course, that the lifeblood of a republic depends upon a well-informed citizenship.

Across the country, the people in communities large and small look to their local or regional newspaper for: News of local, State, national or international significance; special features of interest to the reading public; information on civic, educational, cultural, spiritual or other topics; entertainment; and a wide variety of other informational services.

For creative effort in providing this kind of citizenry for our country, our newspapers deserve the commendation and deep gratitude of the people of our country.

Today, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to one such outstanding newspaper in Wisconsin, the Green Bay Press Gazette, celebrating its 45th anniversary.

Over the years, the Gazette has established a constructive record of high standard reporting and editorializing, as well as in presenting a broad gamut of features and other information to its readers.

Through its excellent services, it has written a unique page in history of progress for Green Bay and surrounding communities. For its outstanding contribution to a better life for its readers and the citizens of these communities, the Gazette, I believe, deserves real commendation as well as congratulations upon its 45th anniversary.

Recently, the Gazette published a fine article by Jack Rudolph reviewing the history and progress of this outstanding publication. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS-GAZETTE BIRTHDAY SOON—45TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Jack Rudolph)

The Press-Gazette observes an important anniversary next Wednesday. Forty-five years ago, on June 29, 1915, the first issue of the paper was published, following the merger of the long-established Green Bay Gazette and the youthful but anemic Free Press.

The new enterprise was the outcome of a newspaper war between its predecessors that had driven both close to the wall. Their groggy condition had paved the way for a completely new deal under the direction of two young newcomers to town and a well-known local attorney.

The latter was Victor I. Minahan, member of one of the most influential and colorful families in Green Bay's history and brother of Drs. Robert E. and John R. Minahan. A highly successful lawyer, Minahan had founded the Free Press, although he took no part in its actual management, nor did he become active in the Press-Gazette for another 15 years.

The newcomers were John K. Kline and Andrew B. Turnbull, a pair of ambitious young newspapermen from Saginaw, Mich. Kline was the editor and Turnbull business manager of the fledgling Press-Gazette.

Minahan had launched the Free Press in May 1914, invading a field the Gazette had monopolized since the suspension of the venerable Green Bay Advocate in 1906. The only reason he gave for getting into the business was that he felt the city was big enough for two daily papers.

NOT BIG ENOUGH

He was wrong. The Gazette had become stuffy and self-satisfied and needed a jolt, but the plain truth was that Green Bay was not large enough to support competing dailies. The attempt nearly killed both.

The Free Press, which began publication on May 14, 1914, was a good paper, much more aggressive, modern, and newsworthy than its stodgy rival. However, after a promising start it failed to live up to Minahan's hopes. He once ruefully declared that the best month it ever had in its 14-month existence cost him $1,100.

Although it never came close to breaking even, the Free Press hurt the Gazette even more. By early 1915 both were virtually on the ropes, although neither realized how close to a knockout the other actually was.

Both Minahan and N. C. Pickard, publisher of the Gazette, were fighters and neither would give in. At this point Kline and Turnbull entered the picture, thanks partly to the persuasiveness of one of Green Bay's most enthusiastic drumbeaters—Capt. John A. Cusick.

SAGINAW NEWSMEN

Kline was then managing editor of the Saginaw News and Turnbull advertising manager of the U.S. Graphite Co., of Saginaw, but anxious to get back to the newspaper field where he had previously spent 15 years. They had worked together on the News and had dreamed of running their own paper. Both being young and not too opulent, however, their sights were set somewhat below anything the size of Green Bay.

Early in 1915 Cusick, a Green Bay real estate promotor and developer of Bay View Beach, called on them in Saginaw, apparently at the instigation of Minahan and others who were concerned about the situation here. Neither Kline nor Turnbull actually jumped for Cusick's bait, but they came

to Green Bay, looked the situation over and took an option on the Free Press.

Back in Saginaw—before they made the downpayment—they began to cool off. The Free Press, they felt, had possibilities, but they weren't sure of the wisdom of coming into a strange community while a long-established rival was still in the field. On another trip to Green Bay they informed Minahan the deal was off unless the Gazette could be picked up, too.

The latter wasn't convinced Pickard was ready to quit but Turnbull had a hunch he might. Turnbull had heard a rumor the Gazette had once been offered for sale for $125,000 and he suggested Minahan make Pickard the same offer—although neither had any idea where they would find that kind of money.

MADE THE DEAL

Minahan caught the Gazette publisher in his office one morning when Pickard was feeling low and the latter accepted the offer. Surprised but determined not to let his competitor off the hook, Minahan hurriedly drew up an informal option on a piece of scrap paper and bound the agreement with every cent he had in his pockets, about $25.

Raising the $125,000 as well as the initial payment on the Free Press plus enough to get the show on the road took considerable scrambling, but the new owners made it. The Press-Gazette made its bow at the end of June and hasn't missed an issue since.

Things were touch and go at first. Turnbull recalls with a grin how he would wait in his darkened office on Saturday nights for his subscriptions collectors to report in to see if he had enough to meet the next payroll. He didn't dare turn on the light.

The Gazette-Press fight had depressed advertising rates murderously, and the Press-Gazette had to raise them again to survive—a touchy business. The break came when John Baum, owner of Baum's Department Store, agreed to the increase and talked other merchants into going along, an action for which Turnbull is still vehemently grateful.

Because of inherited conditions, the Press-Gazette lost money in its first months. By the end of 1915, however, it had not only made up the lost ground but ended the year modestly in the black.

MOVED TO CHERRY STREET

The first issues were published from the old Gazette building at Adams and Pine Streets—now the Architects Building—but shortly after the merger it moved to the Free Press plant on Cherry, just west of the alley behind the recently razed Elks Club. The building is gone now but its site, currently a parking lot, is marked by a crumbling terrazzo tile entrance with the name "Free Press" still visible.

The Press-Gazette published from there until the present building was occupied in 1924. When opened, the new plant was one of the most modern small newspaper spreads in the country, a distinction it still enjoys, although it is no longer small.

To maintain the distinction through 36 years of expansion and mounting circulation, the building has undergone extensive alterations, culminating 5 years ago in the addition of a third story. From it today a force of over 200 people daily issue a paper that runs as high as 64 pages with a paid circulation nearing 44,000.

In 45 years the paper has had only three editors. Kline occupied the post until his sudden death in 1930, at which time Minahan emerged from the background to take over the desk. He continued as editor until he died in 1954. Leo V. Gannon, who joined the staff as a reporter in 1922, then stepped into the editorship.

Turnbull, only survivor of the original triumvirate, is president of the corporation, whose official title is the Green Bay Newspaper Co. He also held the position of publisher from Minahan's death until he relinquished it just a few weeks ago.

Next Fall as a Prelude to the 50th Anniversary of Naval Aviation To Be Observed During 1961 the Navy's "Blue Angels," a Precision Flying Demonstration Team, Will Be the Subject of "The Blue Angels" Television Program Consisting of 39 Half-Hour Dramatic Adventures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, news headlines and broadcasts have made crystal clear to the American public that this Nation cannot afford a moment's relaxation in the fullest development of its defensive powers. In many areas of the world, the U.S. Navy is the first bulwark for peace on behalf of the world's free peoples. And to the Nation, maintaining naval aviation superiority is a matter of absolute necessity.

Given the maximum material facilities possible, the American Navy nevertheless places its ultimate reliance on its manpower. This tradition of faith in its personnel is symbolized today by the U.S. Navy's Blue Angels, a precision flying demonstration team that has won the profound admiration and respect of millions.

These flyers and their teammates serve as an inspiration to the youth of our country in this age of airmindedness. The Blue Angels contribute substantially to the program of bringing the highest types of young men into the Navy's service.

I am privileged now to inform my colleagues in the Congress that, next fall, many additional millions of people will be made aware of the flying accomplishments of the Blue Angels through the mass medium of television.

I want to commend California National Productions, a subsidiary of the National Broadcasting Co., and its NBC Television Films Division for undertaking such an important work. Titled "The Blue Angels," CNP is now in production of 39 half-hour dramatic adventures with the cooperation of the U.S. Navy. Mr. Sam Gallu, former naval officer who saw active service in the Pacific throughout World War II and previously distinguished himself in television with the "Navy Log" series, is producer-director of the forthcoming "Blue Angels" program.

In particular, I wish to commend Mr. Earl Rettig, president of CNP, for dedicating his company to this important television series.

"The Blue Angels" television series will be seen throughout the United States at a most propitious time beginning this fall. It will debut shortly before the Navy begins to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the birth of naval aviation; the half-century mark will be officially observed all during 1961.

An End to Measles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we hear of the great amount of medical research being done to help conquer the dread diseases of the world, including cancer, polio, heart disease, and so forth. Sometimes we neglect to hear about other types of medical research.

The Pitman-Moore Co., of Indianapolis, Ind., through research has been trying to find a vaccine to conquer the measles. Progress has been made and research is continuing. While we usually think of measles being a child's disease, adults suffer from them also, and at times this can be very dangerous. The research of the Pitman-Moore Co. will continue and we all hope that it will result in success.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Indianapolis Times of Sunday, June 26, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN END TO MEASLES

When the oldtimer grouses about how soft today's youngsters have it, and how things were when he was a boy, he usually brings up the measles.

Everybody got them in those good old days, he says.

Well, many youngsters get measles today. It's no fun and never was. It's an uncomfortable, and sometimes a very dangerous, disease.

Nobody will complain if tomorrow's youngsters don't get measles.

It looks as if they won't, thanks to the scientists of the Pitman-Moore Co. here.

The vaccine developed by the Indianapolis drug firm—while it still needs more development—promises to make the future days much better than the good old ones for countless children.

Mothers all over the world will be grateful to Dr. Anton J. F. Schwarz, Dr. Philip A. Boyer, Lowell W. Zirbel, and Dr. Charles J. York.

They work in a field demanding unending patience, absolute discipline of thought, and an enthusiasm for truth.

Credit in huge doses must also go to Pitman-Moore.

Research of this kind takes a great investment in time, people, brains, and money.

To start such a venture means to take a great risk of failure, of loss on the investment. Not all research pays off.

When it does—and a company takes a bold step in medical science—it stands to make a healthy profit, and deserves it.

Pitman-Moore took the risk.

All indications are that the world's children will reap the real profits—freedom from measles.

A Friend Departs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a change of command occurs this week in the Nike antiaircraft defenses surrounding the Metropolitan Hartford area. Col. Vester M. Schultz is relinquishing command and it will be assumed by Col. John Lanterman.

I had the opportunity to meet Colonel Schultz during his stay at the Nike headquarters in New Britain and I also know of the esteem in which he is held by the people of New Britain. An expression of that esteem is contained in an editorial which appeared in the New Britain Herald and which I offer for the RECORD. It is entitled, "A Friend Departs."

Colonel Lanterman, who recently paid a courtesy call on me, appears to be a fine officer and I am sure the continued efficiency of the 63d AAA Group will reflect his able leadership. Both men strike me as the finest of dedicated career officers, and I am happy to pay tribute to them now. Commanding a combat organization in fixed installations near major metropolitan centers such as Hartford and New Britain in my district is a relatively new development in American history, and our officers have had to display outstanding qualities of leadership in adjusting to many problems. I want to pay a personal tribute to Colonel Schultz and to wish the best of luck to Colonel Lanterman.

The editorial follows:

A FRIEND DEPARTS

New Britain will be bidding adieu to a respected military friend next month when Col. Vester M. (Dutch) Shultz, head of the 63d Artillery (Nike) Group, is transferred to Washington, D.C.

The city's relationship with the local unit has always been an amicable one and the friendly, cooperative manner of Dutch Shultz has done much to cement that relationship. His handling of the sometimes ticklish problems which arise between the military and the civilian could well serve as a model for his successors.

A recent example was the speedy resolution of a situation that could have resulted in strained feelings, but didn't. Helicopters landing at the local base were a source of irritation to nearby residents. Mayor Kremski and the colonel quickly got together and arranged to have the copters land at the parking lot adjacent to Willow Brook Park—away from New Britain Homes.

The speed and good will in which these arrangements were made are typical of the way in which Colonel Shultz has conducted himself while in New Britain. There can be little complaint about his brand of public relations which are well worth emulating.

While we cannot help but feel a certain sense of loss at being deprived of a tried and true friend, at the same time we share in the feeling of pride which he must feel at being chosen a member of the Operations Research Office, a joint military-civilian organization that studies and evaluates modern warfare methods.

Knowing the spirit and outlook which he brings to his work, we know that he cannot help but be successful in his new endeavor. Nevertheless, we wish him a bountiful share of good luck.

Cancellation of the President's Contemplated Trip to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Herald appeared an article entitled "Augustans Think Upset Trip Heralds Dark Hour for United States." I ask unanimous consent that the article, including the various quotations in connection with it, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTANS THINK UPSET TRIP HERALDS DARK HOUR FOR UNITED STATES

Does the cancellation of President Eisenhower's planned visit to Japan mark the darkest hour in U.S. diplomacy since the Korean crisis?

Key Augustans, with reason to have special insight into the situation, were asked this morning. They seemed, generally, to say the affirmative.

Here are their comments:

Hugh G. Grant, who served in the U.S. State Department some 10 years under the late Secretary Cordell Hull just prior to outbreak of World War II, and who was U.S. Minister to Albania and Thailand, had this to say:

"The cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Japan points up the fact that U.S. foreign policy is bankrupt and has been since World War II.

"We have squandered billions of American dollars in remote places around the world to buy friends and allies including Japan, which we rehabilitated after the war; and we have fewer friends than ever before.

"Eisenhower's visit to Japan should never have been planned in the first place. It played right into the hands of the international Communists just as did Eisenhower's agreement to go to the summit in Paris with Khrushchev.

"President Eisenhower should return to Washington in a hurry and devote his attention to the Communist conspiracy right here at home, and our back door in Cuba, rather than in faraway places.

"A thorough housecleaning in our foreign and domestic policymaking is imperative, and now."

Student riots in Japan aimed against Eisenhower and the Kishi regime definitely do not represent the attitude of the Japanese people, in the opinion of the Reverend Charles B. Macmurphy, who just 2 years ago was teaching English in a Lutheran boys high school in Kumamoto, Japan.

"I hope none of my boys were in it—but that I couldn't be sure of," he said.

"To understand this student uprising," Macmurphy said, "you would have to get a picture of Japanese today.

"In the universities all kinds of ideologies run rampant. It is a part of their culture, Japanese children, subservient to their parents while growing up, are permitted to be absolutely free in their thinking in the universities.

"Any kind of group can come in to promulgate their own kind of thinking. The Communists have steadily been making hay through these susceptible, suddenly freethinking young Japanese.

"That is why more missionaries—preachers and schoolteachers—are needed to work with these Japanese students.

"The students, inflamed by Red doctrines which tend to make them think they are giving all for Japan, will fight for this ideology. They are very Japan minded."

Macmurphy pointed out that the mature Japanese, as a whole, has no "Hate America" attitude. Instead, America is highly admired and regarded.

The young Lutheran minister, who was ordained last Sunday at Resurrection Lutheran, plans to go back to Japan as a missionary next spring after attending the Lutheran School of Missions in Chicago this fall.

Brig. Gen. Howard M. Hobson, Fort Gordon commander, pinpointed the problem as a Communist tactic, and urged a resurgence of national strength:

"Recent activities in the Far East, particularly in Japan, indicate clearly that the stated aims of communism have not altered or changed, and that they will continue in the future to exploit every means at their disposal to further their cause of world domination.

"Thus, it behooves us, as American people in all walks of life, to call upon our strength, moral, economic, and military, to bolster our continued national defense to defend our Nation and our way of life. We realize that we couldn't defend this Nation without the Reserve, the National Guard, our STRAC units, and our other members of our Military Establishment.

"We have continuously fostered the one-Army concept, molding these elements into an effective fighting team. We must continue our unity of effort and purpose, cooperation between industry, the military, the private citizens and Government, to form a solid front."

The sentiments of Augusta's Chinese community was summed up by Prof. C. H. Lam, who was born in Canton, China:

"The cancellation of Ike's trip was a bad thing, because relations between the United States and Japan will break pretty soon as a result. The Premier is now scared by the Communist demonstrators. These Communists do not represent a majority of the Japanese people. Most Japanese people like the United States better than Russia, because the United States has helped them in business and industry, and other ways:

"They know what has happened in China. The Chinese people have nothing to eat. The Chinese mainland is in bad shape, and many people are suffering.

"I am glad Ike is going to Formosa," continued Lam. "His trip will make the people very happy. The people in Formosa are like the people in the United States—they stick together."

Spyros J. Dalis, professor of world economics and politics at Augusta College, expressed agreement at the minority power of the Communists in Japan.

"To my estimation, the cancellation was a catastrophe to our diplomatic efforts. Our prestige has suffered a tremendous loss because only a small minority (about 4 or 5 percent of the Japanese population) has upset the plans of a nation like Japan and

the efforts of Eisenhower to establish good will.

"What took place was a return to old aggressive Communist techniques to discredit the office of the President of the United States. The cancellation was a good thing for Ike's personal safety. However, if I were President of the United States, I would have made the trip even if my life was at stake. The loss of prestige is too great a price to pay, when Japan's 100 million people are being led by only 200,000 to 300,000 Communists."

A different view was held by retired Gen. R. O. Barton.

"Thank God Eisenhower is not going. I was concerned for his safety, and it is not impossible that some fanatic or Communist will try to get him in Formosa or South Korea—I'll be glad when he gets back to home ground.

"He was wise to plan these goodwill trips, because he has had such a tremendous reception wherever he's been. Nobody could see ahead to this near revolution when the trip was set up several months ago.

"I have never been too enthusiastic about foreign aid. The Marshall plan, which was instituted during Truman's regime, works under the theory that it is better to reconstitute countries rather than allowing the Communists to exploit them.

"As far as the effect on future diplomatic relations is concerned," General Barton commented, "I'm not too sure of the outcome. I'm inclined to hope that the world will realize two things—Ike's integrity and intense desire for peace and the reduction of armaments, and a discovery of Communist-inspired false propaganda."

Ghana Attains Republic Status, July 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, July 1 marks a significant date in the lives of the 6 million citizens of Ghana. On that date their young nation will become a Republic, with Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah assuming office as its first elected President. Under the new constitution, executive powers will be vested in the President as head of state, with the Ghana Republic retaining membership in the British Commonwealth.

Establishment of the Ghana Republic with its embodiment of the concept of African unity comes just over 3 years since independence was first attained. It was my great privilege to have attended the independence ceremonies as a member of the U.S. official delegation, headed by Vice President RICHARD NIXON. I am advised that the current delegation is composed of Deputy Under Secretary of State Raymond Hare, Ambassador Wilson Flake, and James H. Lemon of the District of Columbia. Included among the list of unofficial representatives from the United States will be Claude A. Barnett of Chicago, director of the Associated Negro Press, Inc.; Dr. Horace Mann Bond, dean of Atlanta University and Mrs. Bond; Dr. Leo Hansberry of Howard University, Washington, D.C., and Mrs. Hansberry; and Walter A. Phillips, president of the board of trustees of Lincoln University, the U.S. institution of which Prime Minister Nkrumah is one of its noted international alumni. The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral, will preach in Accra on July 3. All of this group have been long-time friends of Ghana and active in programs affecting that country and much of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Ghana's emergence as a Republic, I should like to extend my congratulations and good wishes to all her people.

The accompanying excerpts are from the June 24 oversea release of World News Service of Chicago:

GHANA BEGINS NEW ROLE AS REPUBLIC ON JULY 1

ACCRA, GHANA.—In the hurly-burly of Africa's current political climate, July 1 is a significant date. That is the day Ghana becomes a republic.

There will be no immediate change discernible in Ghanian life. Though the 6-million-plus citizens of Ghana will take time out to celebrate the holiday properly, they will not linger long over the celebration. Instead they will quickly return to the daily routine of building up the strength and substance of their young and dynamic nation.

But the changeover to a republican form of government will have far-reaching effects on Ghana, Africa, and the rest of the world. For this is the next step in the democratization of Ghana.

The major difference that will occur in Ghana during the 4-day celebration—from July 1 to 4—is that Kwame Nkrumah displaces Queen Elizabeth II of England as head of the Ghanian nation. In becoming a republic, Ghana follows the path blazed in the British Commonwealth family by India and Pakistan.

Thus, republicanism for Ghana and the establishment of an African as the chief of state is a natural evolutionary result of Ghanian nationalism and the basic African desire to depart from the tradition of European colonialism. And since Ghana will retain its membership in the British Commonwealth, its leaders will still recognize the Queen as head of the Commonwealth, but not of Ghana.

In essence, Ghana has achieved sovereignty in fact and theory with a bloodles revolution that has kept Great Britain friendly to Ghana in a turbulent time when bitterness could so easily have been generated.

Coincidentally, the July 1–4 celebration of the emergence of Ghana as a republic falls precisely on the 184th anniversary of America's Declaration of Independence from British sovereign rule. This Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, was part of a bloody war which gave birth to 13 loosely-coordinated States that later fused together and became the present United States of America.

While the future of the pan-African ideal of a United States of Africa cannot be predicted, conditions for the eventual realization of this dream are better in Africa today than they were in America in the latter years of the 18th century.

Certainly President-elect Nkrumah of the Ghana Republic has long been the builder of the Pan-African dream. As head of the sovereign state of Ghana, he will have the opportunity and occasion to speak out more forcefully than ever to promote a United States of Africa. This, to many, is the significance of the Ghana Republic.

Nkrumah undoubtedly will undertake to further his and Ghana's mission as a focal point for pan-Africanism, when he delivers his inaugural address from the balcony of State House. There will be many other events, including a giant fireworks display and nationwide radio broadcasts, as well as receptions and state ceremonies.

Attending the celebrations of the Ghana Republic will be representatives—both official and unofficial—from all nations of the world.

Food for Peace: Friend Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, historically, the United States has accomplished more—in terms of helping its neighbors to live better—than any nation in history.

In making such recognition, I emphasize that this is not entirely self-laudatory; and I recognize that we can still further improve our programs for cooperation with other nations of the globe.

At this time, however, I would like to refer to a specific program which has not only served to fulfill a great humanitarian purpose but also to make friends for the United States; that is, our food-for-peace program. During the last 5 years, the food-for-peace efforts have included shipments of over $9 billion worth of foodstuffs to countries around the world. In many instances, these actions were lifesavers for the recipient countries—often suffering from shortages of food from droughts, natural disasters or other adversities.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an informative article by Neal Stanford entitled "Food for Peace: Friend Winner." Reflecting the splendid way in which various programs have served to fulfill not only humanitarian needs but also to make friends for the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE: FRIEND WINNER

(By Neal Stanford)

Food for peace is a multi-billion-dollar operation, over $9 billion in 5 years, or nearly $2 billion a year.

Food for peace (if you have forgotten) is the Madison Avenue title for Public Law 480, passed in 1954. It began as a straight farm-surplus-disposal program. It has now become a major factor in U.S. foreign economic policy.

Food for peace allows sale of surplus farm products for foreign currencies. It provides disaster relief abroad. It contributes food packages for distribution the world over through such agencies as CARE. It permits exchange of surplus U.S. food items for strategic foreign supplies.

This column, however, is primarily concerned with its disaster relief operations, which in 5 years have reached the neighborhood of some $500 million in emergency help. This is a side of food for peace in which Americans can take especial satisfaction.

Food disaster programs undertaken in the last year include:

1. Shipment of some 26,500 tons of wheat and grain sorghums to Ethiopia, where crops had virtually been destroyed by drought and locusts.

2. Shipment of some 8,000 tons of wheat to Libya, principally in the Province of Tripolitania, which suffered drought conditions.

3. Further shipments of wheat and rice to Morocco and Tunisia to continue a refugee-feeding program.

4. Provision of some 2,000 bales of raw cotton to two American voluntary agencies which are having it manufactured into 80,000 comforters for free distribution to the needy on Formosa.

5. Provision of 6,000 tons of rice to typhoon victims in the Ryukyu Islands.

6. Shipment of nearly $4 million worth of flour, wheat, and nonfat dry milk to Japan, which was hit by a typhoon last September.

7. Shipment, for the fifth year, of some $5 million in wheat flour and nonfat dry milk to Italy for its child-feeding program.

8. Shipment of 1,600 tons of corn to Austria to complete a program of assistance to Hungarian refugees.

9. Shipment of 5,000 tons of barley to Jordan in connection with a drought relief program.

And the latest disaster relief programs undertaken by the United States, under Public Law 480 cover earthquake relief for Chile and Agadir.

Among the first programs of this kind undertaken was one in 1955, when Communist Yugoslavia, suffering a drought, was sent $43 million worth of bread grains.

Over 42 countries have been helped in this disaster relief program in the past 5 years. In Europe: Austria, Czechoslovakia, both West Germany and East Germany, Hungary, Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia.

In Africa: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Malagache Republic, Morocco, and Tunisia.

In the Near East and South Asia: Afghanistan, Ceylon, India, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen.

In the Far East and Pacific: Cambodia, Formosa, Japan, Korea, Laos, Ryukyu Islands, Vietnam.

In Latin America: Bolivia, British Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay.

The surplus commodities used have varied with the needs of emergencies: bread grains, coarse grains, fats and oils, dry beans, milk and milk stocks, rice, raw cotton.

It has already been explained how it happened that U.S. food relief under this disaster program got into Communist Yugoslavia. It reached Soviet-occupied Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary through a Danube flood relief program administered on a regional basis.

Congress has authorized over the years up to $800 million in surplus commodities for disaster relief, and recent amendments have authorized the spending of some $300 million more a year on this kind of program, plus carryover.

The ICA (International Cooperation Administration) is responsible for administering this program. But it of course falls under the overall supervision of the White House Food-for-Peace Coordinator, Don Paarlberg, a special assistant to President Eisenhower. His job is really that of expediter rather than operator—to break bottlenecks. In title II of Public Law 480, which centers on disaster and emergency relief, that is of prime importance.

Disaster relief, it is true, accounts for only about 5 percent of the whole food-for-peace program, but it is the best friend-winning operation in all of America's foreign economic policy.

Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 8, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I took occasion to comment on a booklet prepared by the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute showing how vital and essential the products of the industry that association represents have become to our modern American way of life—not only at home, in our offices, and in our factories, but in protecting the health of our people.

Because it is a relatively new industry, the air-conditioning segment of the so-called mechanical refrigeration industry—and air conditioning is, after all, the application of mechanical refrigeration to the spaces in which we live and work—had suffered for many years because of the lack of standardized rating systems, which sometimes resulted in unrealistic claims for the job that certain equipment would do for its purchasers.

The manufacturers of air-conditioning equipment realized that this caused confusion on the part of potential users of their products, and decided to do something about it. What did they do? They set up a certification program, under the aegis of the trade association of the industry, the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, and today the producers of more than 90 percent of all unitary air conditioning in the country have signed contracts to participate in this program.

Unitary equipment, as defined by the ARI under the program, does not cover room air conditioners (which are not a part of the certification program), but does include all types of central residential equipment, as well as many commercial and industrial units, ranging up to 135,000 B.t.u.h. capacity. B.t.u.h., incidentally, stands for British thermal units per hour. British thermal units have been established, under the program, as the only true measure of cooling capacity, although the term "tons" may be used equivalently—that is, when 1 ton is used to represent not more and not less than 12,000 B.t.u.h.

This program gives assurance to the purchaser of residential air conditioning that the unit he buys bearing the ARI seal of certification will perform according to the rated standards of the institute. It means that it is subject to grueling tests by an independent laboratory under contract to ARI to make certain that the rating is correct. The testing laboratory selects certified units at random from distributors' warehouses, and puts them through the tests for capacity and other performance characteristics.

I am happy to know that the air-conditioning industry has established this self-regulating program to assure purchasers of their products. It is another example of free enterprise at work under our American system. Here is an industry that recognized the need for regulation and certification but did not wait for some Government regulatory agency to step in.

I would like to salute the industry and the Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, which represents it, for this forward-looking step in behalf of the American public.

Dr. Milada Horakova

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 10 years ago Monday, June 27, 1950, Milada Horakova, one of the noblest women of our time, died on the gallows in Communist Czechoslovakia. It is fitting that we in this body should observe this tragic anniversary because, in death, Milada Horakova became a legend to her people and a symbol to freemen everywhere.

Both before and after the war Milada Horakova was internationally known as one of Czechoslovakia's foremost women. She was an uncompromising idealist. When the Nazis occupied Czechoslovakia, she joined the underground and risked her life to help people who were on the Gestapo's wanted list and to aid the families of Nazi victims. For this she paid with 5 long years in Nazi concentration camps. But solitary confinement and mental and physical tortures failed to break her spirit.

When Dr. Horakova was liberated by the American army in May 1945 she and her family returned to Prague. Immediately, she threw herself into the struggle again—this time against the Red fascists. She was elected president of the Women's National Council of Czechoslovakia, and she was also elected to membership in the Constitutional Assembly.

In February of 1948, the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia of course—under the protective bayonets of the Red army. Dr. Horakova resigned all her public offices in protest and went underground once again. She did her utmost to keep the opposition alive by maintaining contact with the various democratic political leaders.

On September 27, 1949, she was arrested. For 9 months she was completely shut off from the world. Finally, in June of 1950, she was brought before a so-called people's court together with 12 other victims accused of opposition to the Communist regime.

Milada Horakova's final words to the Communist court will live in the minds of freemen forever, together with the words of Nathan Hale and Patrick Henry.

Under the new concept of law we are called traitors—

She told the court—

but we still know that if we had freedom of action again we would act no differently than we have acted all our lives, truly serving the noble ideals of liberty, democracy, social progress, and humanity. That loyalty is now considered treason. We stand here unshaken, while expecting the severest penalty. In this most trying moment it takes strength and the realization that we were not alone in our action, that our cause will not die with our going. There are men abroad in the free world who will win our battle and prove that our cause was just. I shall gladly accept this punishment, this sacrifice, knowing that it will strengthen the nation in resisting communism.

Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the 10th anniversary of the execution of Dr. Milada Horakova was observed Tuesday evening in Washington at a meeting in Pierce Hall at 16th and Harvard Streets NW. This meeting being sponsored by the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the Czechoslovak Society of America, and other Czechoslovak organizations. The speakers were Dr. Peter Zenkl, former mayor of Prague, and Mrs. Jana Feierabend.

Mr. President, as a modest tribute to this noble woman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of an article entitled "Milada's Living Heroism," by Mila Lewis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILADA'S LIVING HEROISM

(By Mila Lewis)

It was soon after Milada Horáková took her law degree that I came to know her—an attractive, vivacious girl in her twenties. Her pleasant and dignified personality stood out in any gathering; she was well read, loved good plays and music, dressed tastefully, was happily married, and doted on her little daughter.

She was excellent in her work at the social welfare department of the city of Prague, and a fine organizer, who readily accepted responsibility. She also worked as a volunteer in the Women's National Council, the central body which represented most women's organizations working for equal rights and professional opportunity, for better housing and standards of living in the young Republic. There was nothing fanatic about Milada, though her devotion to the nation and her pride that she could work hard and effectively in the new democratic atmosphere after liberation showed in every act. There was nothing bombastic about her, no gloating after praise or successful drives and encounters in the arena of public affairs.

Democratic ideals and relations were so deeply rooted in her that she never betrayed them through 5 years of terrorism and humiliation in Nazi prison camps. On returning home at the end of the war, unbroken and full of determination, Milada had immediately to accept election as president of the Women's National Council, succeeding Senator Plaminkova who had been executed by the enemy in that same war for national freedom. Our first council president had trained Milada for that responsibility through years of labor, the tough school of legal and parliamentary work for equality, the finesse of international relations. For years she was chairman of the legal section of the National Council and in 1937 was elected vice chairman of the women in law section of International Business and Professional Women. All of us on the board recognized Milada's qualities of leadership; her election was unanimous.

Although most who returned from the horrors of Nazi imprisonment required months to recuperate, Milada threw herself into work at once. Although she bore the physical scars of manacles and torture the rest of her life, one remarkable phase of her personality was utter lack of self-pity. She never looked back or expressed regret at the price she had paid—her eyes were always forward. She realized very soon that Czechoslovakia had thrown off one conqueror only to face another equally determined, unscrupulous and brutal—but rather more subtle and deceitful. This led her into national politics as a member of Parliament for the largest democratic party—that most devoted to the policies of Presidents Masaryk and Benes. Here she met the Communists at every turn, knew their perfidy and intrigue at first hand—both at the City Hall and in Parliament.

She met them even in the Women's National Council, for two members of the board, her fellow students at law school, had turned fanatical Communists who harried Milada at every step and undermined her work. When in Prague in the fall of 1947 I telephoned her and arranged for a visit. The Reds were riding high that time, operating with all the power of the U.S.S.R. behind them. Her first words were "I must see you before you go to the council office, but where can we meet without being overheard? My home is out because you would be marked. We will meet on the street and go for a walk—that is the only safe place. To an observer from peaceful America that was a sign of what hopeless odds the democrats faced—when a member of Parliament had no place to sit down safely for a talk with a friend she had not seen for 8 years. But Milada and others who were actively involved in the struggle never lost hope, no matter how restricted their freedom or how wily their opponents.

Those 2 hours walking the streets with Milada were a vivid lesson in Communist methods and fanaticism. For instance, one of her women classmates, and colleague in the National Council, now a judge, had recently taken her to task in utter seriousness, "It is high time that you came over to us; drop those Western ideas and your friendship for imperialists, while there is still time. I warn you as a friend that if we win we must arrest you and if you are brought into my court, I must sentence you to death for all you have done to undermine the regime." In horror I stood stock still and stared at Milada. She knew the threat was made in earnest, and also knew what had happened to thousands of Czechs who resisted the Reds. She showed no sign of hesitation—much less, of fear.

My only plea was: "Milada, it is time you went abroad, where you can work just as effectively for the country." In spite of all arguments I had used with Plaminkova years before, her reply was the same. "No, my girl, I could never leave them now. There is a lot of work to do, and every one of us is needed to help win the election which come next May. That is just why the Reds are so furious—they already see they cannot win a majority."

I asked, "And what if the elections are never held? What if they pass some law or take some step to make elections impossible, or declare the results invalid?" Her reply was the same as that a great Prague editor gave my husband "Oh, that would be unconstitutional. The elections must be held and must be free because only a free state can live and be worth living for." As she left me finally, Milada said "Don't worry about us. We will fight right back at them."

And fight she did—in all sorts of ways. They all fought hard and openly on through the rough days in February 1948, when the Reds took over the government with armed brigades of factory workers, took command of the police to throw officials bodily out of ministries, when employee committees had their own employers arrested and seized their property, jaintors took over direction of hospitals and schools in the name of the party, and scores of thousands of ordinary citizens were herded into mines and concentration camps on unsubstantiated charges that they were anti-Communist, were hoarding food, or had served in Western armies during the war.

Milada was one of a group of 13 who were given a theatrical trial to demonstrate the power of the regime. All her friends followed with horror the progress of that trial on trumped-up charges, faced with no evidence except generalities by a virulent prosecutor, with no defense save courage. One can only imagine what excruciating days and nights she suffered when, as someone wrote after the Battle of Guadalcanal, even the bravest fear being murdered—only the crazed deny it.

Shortly before the court passed sentence she declared "Under the new concept of law we are called traitors, but we still know that if we had freedom of action again, we would act no differently than we have acted all our lives truly serving the noble ideals of liberty, democracy, social progress and humanity. That loyalty is now considered treason. We stand here unshaken while expecting the severest penalty. In this most trying moment we take strength from the realization that we were not alone in our actions, that our cause will not die with our going. There are men abroad in the free world who will win our battle and prove that our cause was just. I shall gladly accept this punishment, this sacrifice, knowing that it will strengthen the nation in resisting communism."

My True Security—The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently a nationwide essay contest among high school students was sponsored by the Jaycees, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, on the subject, "My True Security—The American Way."

Mr. President, at both the State level and the National level that contest, a considerable educational scholarship was offered. They were won by Stephen L. Beach III, of Murrah High School, Jackson, Miss., the son of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen L. Beach, Jr.

I invite this outstanding essay on this unusually timely subject to the special attention of my colleagues and to the attention of the American people. At a time when we need a sense of direction and a solid sense of security, as well as strict adherence to the true American way, it certainly is gratifying to have such a splendid essay as this come from a young man 17 years of age. It is refreshing as well as inspiring to us to read and to share his thoughts.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY TRUE SECURITY—THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Stephen L. Beach)

An ostrich with its head in the sand is seeking security. Whether it be the false security of the ostrich or the more rational security of man, the very concept of security is that of protection, of defense. It is a negative approach. It is the antithesis of action and accomplishment. Here are three examples:

The French built the maginot line. They thought to sit behind this great defense secure from military attack. But when attack came, it went around the ends of the maginot line and France fell—a victim of its own preoccupation with security.

Because of a similar attempt at security, Ole Miss lost its 1959 season football game to L.S.U. The Rebels, having scored a field goal early in the play, adopted a defensive style of play behind the shield of that 3-point lead and went on to defeat under the offense of the Tigers. However, on New Year's Day when these teams met again in the Sugar Bowl, security was not the watchword. There, an offense that never let up throughout the game, carried Ole Miss to overwhelming victory.

Our Lord, Jesus Christ, emphasized the do-nothing quality of security in the parable of the talents. A master, leaving on a journey, entrusted to his three servants certain talents to be cared for during his absence. Those who received 5 talents and two talents doubled their trust and, on the return of the master, were praised as "good and faithful servants." Not so the servant with whom only 1 talent had been left. He "digged in the ground and hid his lord's money." He adopted the safe, the secure way; and he returned the 1 talent to his master. But the master chided him as "thou wicked and slothful servant."

Life and literature are filled with such examples. Can we draw a lesson from them? It seems fair to conclude that when an individual, or a nation, becomes so preoccupied with security, of and for itself, he, of necessity, abandons the concept of opportunity; for security and opportunity are opposed. Those, so preoccupied with security, have crossed the crest of the hill and are on the way downward to mediocrity and oblivion.

This Nation was built by men and women seeking liberty and freedom of opportunity. There was no security in this then savage land for them. They faced only insecurity, privation, cold, hunger, want, and danger. But they did not wait for government or society to give them security from any of these—to safeguard them from attack or nature's harshness. They had the goal of freedom in their eyes and, as they sought and attained that goal, they created their own security—a security such as the world had never known before.

For myself, then, I reject the false security of paternalistic government. I refuse to forfeit the game of life for the craven security offered by some ism, foreign to the traditional and proven American way. Instead, I take my stand among the ranks of those dedicated to preservation of the liberty and freedom of opportunity won for us by our forefathers. In that atmosphere of freedom I, too, shall seek opportunity—opportunity to serve my country, my State, and mankind, as well as myself. I ask only the right of opportunity to rise as high and go as far as I can by my own efforts. I ask only the right of opportunity to shoot at the moon—perhaps to fail—but the right of opportunity to pick up the pieces and try again. And if, in that atmosphere of liberty and freedom of opportunity, I utilize my talents, however few they may be, with all the prudence and diligence of which I am capable, I will win the game of life. I will develop the self-reliance, that will be my true security—the American way.

Farmers Ride the Gravy Train, but Everybody Else Gets the Gravy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Goehner Grange held its regular meeting on June 27, Master Burdette Batcheller presiding. The guest speaker for the evening was Stanley Matzke, who addressed the assembled members on the subject, "Farmers Ride the Gravy Train—but Everybody Else Gets the Gravy."

Mr. Matzke now lives in Hastings, Nebr., where he served as public relations officer for the Central Nebraska Public Power & Irrigation District. However, he practiced law for many years, served in Nebraska's unicameral legislature for several terms, and was farm editor for the Lincoln Journal, in addition to owning and operating farmland of his own.

The thoughts he set out in his speech on Monday evening are worthy of note, since they are the product of many years of activity and thought devoted to the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS RIDE GRAVY TRAIN—BUT EVERYBODY ELSE GETS THE GRAVY

(Comments by Stan Matzke, Hastings, Nebr., before Goehner Farmers' Grange, Goehner, Nebr., June 27, 1960)

What the farmer needs most in this critical time of readjustment in farming is an understanding of the true situation of agriculture on the part of the consumers of his products and the businesses and industries with which he does business. But what nonfarmers are getting are untrue, unfair, and ofttimes vicious brainwashings from national publications, magazines, propaganda sheets, political handouts and too often from individuals, officials, and organizations who are supposed to represent the farmers of our Nation. Many elements of our economy which are to a great extent living off the farmer, in order to further exploit agriculture or, perhaps, to allay their sense of guilt, have become almost hysterical in publicizing and spreading untruths and mistaken notions about farming and our whole agricultural industry. But for the most part criticism of farmers is due to lack of understanding and misconceptions about agriculture.

Here are some of the mistaken notions about farming with which the public, and particularly the food consumers of our Nation, are being constantly bombarded:

The focal point of these tirades of misrepresentation for the past 5 years is that farmers are being subsidized, with the implication that the farmer is living the life of Riley while collecting his Government checks at the expense of the taxpayers and food consumers of our Nation none of whom would ever think of accepting a subsidy or a handout.

The fact is that the greatest subsidy that one segment of our economy has ever received from another is that which consumers have received from farmers over the past 50 years in the form of abundant, high-quality food at prices which are comparatively the lowest the world has ever known. This subsidy has been extremely costly to our farm population—in long hours of hard labor; in denying themselves of ordinary comforts, conveniences, and advantages; in denying their children cultural and educational opportunities and in their inability to become financially stable so that they can weather the hard times which always come.

This subsidy flowing from the farm to our nonfarm people is constantly getting heavier. In terms of working time required to purchase it, food in our Nation has become the cheapest the world has even seen. Compare what 1 hour of work would buy in 1929 and in 1957, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1929 the wages for 1 hour of work would buy 6.4 pounds of bread, in 1957 the same 1 hour of work would buy 11 pounds of bread. Here are some further examples of what the wages for 1 hour of work would buy in 1929 and 1957:

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine: 1.2 pounds of steak, 7.8 pints of milk, 1 pound of butter, 1.3 pounds of bacon, 1.1 dozen of eggs, 17.7 pounds of potatoes.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven: 2.2 pounds of steak, 16.6 pints of milk, 2.8 pounds of butter, 2.8 pounds of bacon, 3.7 dozen of eggs, 36.3 pounds of potatoes.

In 1946 the typical market basket of food cost $767 of which the farmer got $397. By 1957 the cost of this same market basket of food had gone up to $1,010, an increase of $243 of which increase the farmer got a mere $3. In other words the consumer paid $243 more for his market basket of food and the farmer got $3 more, while his operating expenses and costs of living were skyrocketing.

The reason that food prices remained fairly stable during the past 7 years is that while processing costs, marketing costs, and profits went up, prices of farm products to the farmer decreased 20 percent. Had farm prices gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items we would have had food and clothing prices about 25 percent higher than we have had. This would have resulted in consumers paying some $65 billion more for their food and clothing than they did during the 5 years from 1952 to 1957.

Another aspect of this situation is what many economists call the "hidden subsidy," moving from our farms to our city and urban population. For much of the past 100 years the rural areas of our Nation have furnished the human resources which have made our Nation industrially, politically, socially, and morally strong. In ever-increasing numbers our young men and women leave the farm before they are 25 years old. Today more than half are following this trek to the cities. This means that farm families and farm communities rear, feed, clothe, shelter, and educate these young people throughout their nonproductive years. Then they head for the cities and urban areas which get the beenfits of their talents and their earnings and taxes. One out of every three adults living in our cities, towns, and villages today was reared on the farm. Migration resulted in a net transfer from farms of 6 million persons in the 1920's; 3.5 million in the 1930's; nearly 9 million in

the 1940's; and during the 1950's, in spite of a high birth rate on farms, migration has reduced our farm population another 3 million. This constitutes a contribution, at the expense of our rural people, to the strength, vigor, and talent of our Nation so great it cannot be measured. This steady stream of human resources moving from our rural areas to the cities is a subsidy which added to the subsidy of abundant, low-cost food also moving from our farms to our urban areas, is a burden which in times past has put agriculture through the financial wringer and will again unless it is curtailed.

It has been the operator of the family sized farm who has borne the brunt of this subsidy to the urban and consuming public. Changing agricultural technologies, mechanization, large commercial and corporate farm units, and the administration of Government farm programs over the past 7 years have put the family farm under additional disadvantages. These farm programs from their beginnings in the early 1930's until a few years ago helped to some extent to equalize the disadvantage of the family sized farm operator instead of skimming the cream of the farm program money for the storage, processing, transportation, packaging, and allied industries which handle farm produce, with huge payments for the large "farm companies," individually and corporate owned, which are rapidly becoming more numerous and larger.

Which brings us to another mistaken notion. The generally accepted one, even among farmers and farm organizations, that Government farm programs are entirely outmoded. It has been during the last 25 years of farm programs that this Nation has built its agricultural productivity to a point unmatched by any nation in the history of the world. It is a terrific story of efficiency and economy which has produced ever mounting output from fewer and fewer farmers to meet the needs of an increasing population eating better and better. Never have so many been fed so good, by so few at so low a cost. Our farm programs, ineffective and misdirected at times as they have been, have played a part in bringing this about. Changes in our farm program are highly necessary. Especially changes which would make the farmer the beneficiary of at least a major part of the huge sums being spent which are now going to the corporations and companies which store, process, package, and distribute agricultural products. The welfare of our agricultural plant is as important to our Nation as is our industrial, military, and armaments program. A 24-hour shortage of food would do more than anything to convince the American people of this fact. And unless we, with proper farm programs, protect the bargaining power of the family-sized farm operator and keep him in the business of producing, the day will come when there will be no more family-sized farms.

The family-sized farmer doesn't close up shop when things get rough as the company farms do when profits fall below a net of 6 percent after taxes. When times get tough the farm family deprives itself of all comforts and conveniences in an attempt to get along—but it keeps on producing. The telephone is disconnected, the daily newspaper is stopped, trips to town are curtailed to once a week, farm youths are taken out of college, Dad and the older boys find a part-time job in town—but they keep on farming, and producing, and it is this production which results in abundant, low cost food. That's why allowing the price of farm products to drop way below parity hasn't curtailed production. Industry keeps up prices by shutting down an assembly line or a factory, labor withholds its services to force higher and higher wages, but the farmer is at the mercy of every other segment of our economy.

But while labor, with the help of Government, has been able to protect its share of our national income, we must remember that increases in wages are largely spent for things which the farmer produces, for meat and milk and eggs and bread, and are hence much less of a deterrent to the farmer's welfare than increases in profits, dividends, managerial salaries, and interest rates, which do not to any great extent increase the recipients food consumption.

Contrary to much of the antifarmer propaganda, farming is not like any other business. The fact is that production of agricultural products is much different from any other enterprise. The farmer, unlike the businessman, can control neither the supply of his product nor the price he gets for it. Nature, always unpredictable, to a large degree determines both the farmer's output and his income. The industrialist adjusts his product to a predetermined demand and produces it in a factory unaffected by rain or drought, ravages of plant and animal diseases, or bugs or pests. The farmer sells his product wholesale at a price set by the buyer and buys the things he needs at retail at a price set by the seller. Industry controls its prices by limiting production and labor protects its income by giving or withholding its service.

One favorite misrepresentation frequently heard is that "farmers are responsible whenever food prices go up at the grocery store." Hundreds of examples can be cited to show the falsity of this notion, as in the past number of years retail food prices have risen while the price the farmer received for the specific items declined. The farmer's share of the food dollar has been going down and down; currently it is about 39 cents of each food dollar spent by the consumer. The cost of food to the consumer has been reduced by the efficiency and economy of the farmer, but it does not show up at the corner market. If the farmer gave his wheat away the cost to the consumer of a loaf of bread would be reduced only about 2½ cents, but would not be as the saving would be absorbed in costs and profits of processing and marketing.

Yes, the farmer is accused of "riding the gray train," because of so-called Government subsidies, while other segments of our economy insist they are getting no Government assistance. This is perhaps the widest variation from the true facts of any of the mistaken notions about agriculture. In the past 50 years, for every $1,000 this country has spent for subsidies, the farmer has earmarked for him $5, only a fraction of which he has actually received. Government aids to business and industry over the past 20 years have added up to some $47 billion, while the cost of all farm programs and farm supports has amounted to just one-eighth of that amount. While metropolitan newspapers and national magazines publicize and editorialize on the $5 billion annual farm subsidy they never point out that a large portion of that budget never gets anywhere near a farmer, but for the most part is for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, for industry or the consuming public. Almost $1 billion carried on an export program for the purpose of winning good will abroad; $19 million is for Federal meat inspection for the benefit of meat consumers; $150 million carries on a school lunch program; $234 million for foods donated to foreign countries; $120 million for running the U.S. Forest and Park Service, including recreational facilities for 45 million touring citizens each year. And of the amounts used to purchase farm products each year very little gets down to the family-sized farmer. After the big individual landowners, farming companies, and corporations get their share, the processors, packaging and tin can manufacturers, middlemen, etc., all with income and profits at an alltime high, whittle the family farmer's share down to where the program is of little stabilizing value to the operator of the average family-sized farm. The farmer is riding a gravy train—but everyone else is getting the gravy.

And always there is the comfortable assumption held by so many that the farm problem is solely the farmer's affair—"Let him fry in his own fat." We had a terrible example of what can happen to our Nation if we allow our agricultural plant to crash on the rocks of bankruptcy as we did in the 1920's. The rest of our economy came tumbling down in short order. Today with almost 40 percent of our Nations' labor force working in agriculture or for agricultural-related industries and with farmers furnishing a multibillion dollar market for industry and business, the result of a collapse of our agricultural plant would be disastrous to our economy. The only solution which farm critics have to offer is to do away with farm price and production controls, get the Government out of agriculture and set the farmer free to produce, market, compete—and go broke. As a Nation we cannot afford to again ignore the effects of the consequences of this approach. Should the farmer operate in a free economy it would be free on one side only. Prices farmers would receive would drop to disastrous levels while nonfarm industries with effective methods to control their production and maintain prices would continue to flourish—until it would be too late. Farmers by the very nature of their operation must look to Government for economic bargaining power in their attempt to get a fair share of the Nation's income. Otherwise they are on their way through the financial wringer with resulting bankruptcies, mortgage foreclosures, tax delinquencies, and curtailed buying power which soon will affect the entire Nation. For farmers to operate successfully with no Government program it would be necessary to strip business and labor of the advantages they have through governmental protection and granted powers, monopolies, subsidies, fast tax writeoffs, depletion allowances, income tax advantages, tariff protection, patents, copyrights, Government grants, artificially fixed interest rates, and dozens of other aids they receive from Government.

The farmer is the victim of his own efficiency, which although it has contributed much to our Nation at large has left the farmer holding the sack. A century ago one person in farming provided food and fiber for himself and three others. Today one farmworker provides for himself and 20 others. If farmers farmed today as they did in 1940, the consumer's food bill would be at least $13 billion a year higher than it now is. In all fairness one might ask, "Which is better, to have a surplus costing everything around $3 billion a year in taxes, or to charge the consumer $13 billion more a year for his food?"

In 1950 there were 25,058,000 people living on farms. That's 16.6 percent of all of us. Now, 8 years later, though population has increased, there are some 5 million fewer farmers. Only 12 percent of the total population, and recently Dr. Sherwood O. Berg, of the University of Minnesota, told the conference on patterns in rural education, held at the University of Nebraska, that by 1975 only 7 percent of our population will be farmers. And remember that of these left on the farms many are nighttime farmers holding down offfarm jobs to make both ends meet. In 1957, for example, one-third of the net farm income came from off-the-farm jobs. The family sized farm operator is trying desperately to continue his tremendous contribution to our national economy—but the odds are against him.

In answer to a recent USDA announcement that 96 percent of our farmland is

still operated in family sized units, a friend of mine described a typical Nebraska family farm. The farm consists of 1,000 acres, all under irrigation, tremendous improvements, and equipment, owned by a man and his wife and 3 children—a family farm. Dad and mother live in Florida to where they retired from the contracting business, one son is a New York lawyer, another is a San Francisco doctor, and the daughter is the wife of a Chicago banker. The farm is operated by a professional manager and a few hired men and seasonal Mexican stoop labor.

And this example isn't too far fetched. Recently a central Nebraska farm went up for sale at an estate sale—1,237 acres. Five farmers were at the sale wanting to buy parts of it to set up sons and sons-in-law in farming. One California resident purchased the entire tract and it is operated out of a city office with a few seasonal hired men. The trend to large holdings and corporation farming, together with the continual drain on the small farmer, can mean the end of family sized farming—and what then?

I predict that the end of the family sized farm will mean either the end of low cost food—or this Nation will go hungry. Unless farm produce prices are raised far above their present levels hard times will come even to big farming, and when things get tough these farming companies will do like those who rushed into poultry, broiler, and egg production, a few years ago, they'll shut down regardless of who or how many go hungry. They'll not keep on producing, like the family sized farm operator, regardless of what it may cost them in reduced income. They'll let the lands lie idle and the buildings empty. You can't turn agricultural production on and off like an assembly line or a factory.

The basic question which must be answered before we can begin to solve our farm problems so as to best serve all our people is—"Is the family sized farm operation worth saving?"

And before we answer that question let us ponder long and well what will happen when our business communities and our industries are deprived of the business which is generated by a farm family living on every farm and ranch, buying the multitude of things which they need?

And let us seriously consider what will happen to our Nation when it is deprived of the economic, social, moral, political, and cultural influences which under our traditional pattern of family agriculture had their roots down on the farm.

Not a Blackmailer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Blackmailer," printed in the Washington Evening Star of June 29, 1960, dealing with references by Governor Williams of Michigan to certain alleged political blackmail on the part of Senator JOHNSON of Texas to win the Democratic nomination for President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A BLACKMAILER

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON blames the summer heat for Gov. "Soapy" Williams' suggestion that the majority leader had resorted to a form of political blackmail in an effort to win the Democratic nomination. This is too charitable an explanation.

Governor Williams, who is backing Senator KENNEDY for the nomination, made his accusation on Sunday in answer to a press conference question. The Governor said one of Walter Reuther's lieutenants told him Senator JOHNSON had threatened to block health benefits for the aged if the Michigan Governor were to announce his support of Senator KENNEDY. This is vicious stuff—especially so since Mr. Reuther, one of the Governor's stanch political allies, says the accusation "has no basis in fact."

Furthermore, Governor Williams cannot plead lack of opportunity to find out whether his charge was true. For he said on Sunday, June 26, that he told Senator KENNEDY about this alleged threat prior to June 2. Why didn't he ask Walter Reuther whether it was true before smearing Senator JOHNSON?

This Williams effort is cut from the same political cloth as the insinuation by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., during the West Virginia primary, that Senator HUMPHREY was a slacker in World War II. This is dirty politics, and it is a bit surprising that the "liberals" seem so undisturbed by it. If Mr. NIXON were the offender their roars of outrage would be heard from Maine to California.

Reds To Employ Rough Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of reading a series of three editorials on the subject of the recent collapse of the Paris summit meeting, and the resulting challenge facing us in the free world.

These editorials were written by the very able editor and publisher of the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Mr. Virgil Pinkley, and as a series, appeared in that newspaper on the dates of June 14, 15, and 16, 1960.

Mr. President, Mr. Pinkley is a scholarly writer on this subject, and writes from observation and knowledge acquired from 25 years of experience covering news around the world.

Mr. President, in order that the important views of Mr. Pinkley may be made available for reading by all Members of Congress and others, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLISHER REPORTS REDS TO EMPLOY ROUGH METHODS, MORE THREATS

(First of a series)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

The Soviets and their Red Chinese Communist allies have decided to intensify the cold war. Coexistence has become nothing more than a slogan. It was attempted, and seen from the Kremlin's viewpoint, it was a failure.

The new Communist line is to be rough and tough with the United States and Western Germany, to be critical of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Britain and President Charles de Gaulle, of France; and above everything else, to go for President Eisenhower in the most violent manner, morning, noon, and night.

There will be more threats, more bullying, more power politics attempted by Moscow and Peiping in a worldwide drive to whipsaw free and neutral nations.

MORE SUBVERSION

Propaganda and subversion will be greatly augmented.

A return is being made to the classic Red techniques and doctrines as practiced by Lenin and Stalin.

We never should have expected basic Communist principles and goals to change. Seen from the Kremlin's position, why should they? To alter the worldwide Communist program would change greatly the planning, teaching, and practices of years. This is something the Red leaders do not want, any more than they are willing to give up the Iron Curtain.

The decision to wreck the Paris summit meeting was taken some weeks in advance of the actual conference. The U-2 plane incident provided the Russians with exactly the excuse they desired. It was the perfect vehicle to use. The episode was the ideal platform from which to work. Had this development not occurred, some other pretext would have been employed.

Why?

There has been growing disbelief in the Kremlin that coexistence would produce the results Nikita Khrushchev believed he could obtain. He really did not want coexistence or the results such a policy could bring if honestly and fairly applied. His idea was to use the coexistence theme as a new facade behind which to work, a Communist smokescreen, a new and clever propaganda approach. It was to cloak real Red aims which continue to be, to cause strife, bring about discontent and eventually to lead to world power.

Khrushchev believed his program could weaken NATO, drive wedges between the United States and our allies, bring about divisions between the administration in Washington and the American people and that it might lead us to abandon or reduce the importance of overseas bases. It was designed to induce the West to drop its guard, to cut back on military strength and security—generally to lull us and the free world into more complacency. In short, to soften us up even more and make Communist advances more certain, and to accelerate the global Red drive for conquest and power.

We tend to forget the Soviets and their Communist followers think in terms of entire continents and centuries.

Two-and-a-half years ago Nikita Khrushchev got the go-ahead from the Kremlin and the Presidium to try and sell coexistence. Some powerful elements, especially the military, and more specifically the Red marshals doubted the program. But they had agreed to Khrushchev's authority as the No. 1 man in Russia.

He did not, and he has not, however, achieved the same individual power won over the years by Josef Stalin. Khrushchev has to consider more the desires and wishes of the party, the Red marshals, international communism—especially the branch which operates in Peiping—and the Russian people themselves. They want more consumer goods, and a higher standard of living—things Khrushchev promised as he threw Georgi Malenkov from power.

So Mr. K. went abroad and came to Amerika to sell sweetness and light called coexistence.

When he returned from the United States and the so-called Camp David spirit the Red marshals confronted him with the repeated flights of American observance planes over Russia. The Red defenses apparently were unable to prevent our high and fast flying jets from roaming back and forth across Soviet territory.

It was an open admission of Russian security weakness. This situation only underlined the importance and value of the U.S. strategic bombing forces now and for some years to come.

The Red marshals were angry. They are fatalists. And we should remember that they are more oriental than occidental. They demanded action.

In addition, Khrushchev had been trying to retire some 200,000 Red army officers. They resented being returned to civilian life. As officers they enjoyed special privileges and great prestige. They were a favored class. In most cases their civilian income did not match their salaries and special benefits as officers.

So Mr. K. faced opposition from within. This situation reflected itself in speeches he, Marshal Rodian Malinovsky and other top ranking Reds made in the weeks immediately before the summit conference. And then the U-2 incident burst upon the world.

(Editor's Note: Second of a series)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

Just before Nikita Khrushchev's airplane left Moscow for the ill-fated Paris summit meeting there was an ad hoc gathering of the Soviet Presidium held at the airfield.

The final script which Mr. K. was to read and enact in Paris was reviewed and agreed upon. Marshal Rodian Malinovsky, Red Defense Minister, was present. Throughout the entire Paris sojourn and the hours spent in East Berlin while en route back to Moscow, Marshal Malinovsky stayed leech-like right at the side of Premier Khrushchev.

The arrival of the Russian party in Paris on Saturday, May 14, 2 days before the conference was to open, gave the tipoff. Khrushchev was stern and cold. Malinovsky's attitude was the same.

Almost at once the Russian leader asked for an audience with President Charles de Gaulle, the host for the conference. In no uncertain terms Khrushchev denounced President Eisenhower and called him many vile names. He asked President de Gaulle to repeat his statements and to leave no doubts in Mr. Eisenhower's mind that the Kremlin did not want to do business with him—that he was not to be trusted.

The U-2 plane incident was belabored extensively. Then Marshall Malinovsky lectured De Gaulle and made all kinds of threats about the strength of Russian arms, the crushing power possessed by the new Soviet rocket army, and how his country would lay waste Paris, France and any parts of the world through rockets and missiles.

When Prime Minister Harold Macmillan arrived from London the next day the same act was repeated by Khrushchev and his shadow. This then, was the atmosphere which immediately preceded the summit gathering.

When the conference opened Monday morning, May 16, the Russian boss refused to shake hands with President Eisenhower. He sat during the tense and stormy meeting with his back turned against the President, or seated sideways.

ABUSES IKE

He repeatedly abused Mr. Eisenhower in violent terms. The President kept his temper but it was a mighty effort. And, as events have shown, that was only the beginning of the personal vehement attacks made by Khrushchev against our Chief Executive.

As for the U-2 plane episode, most of our Western European allies believed we needed to make such flights for our security and in the defense of the free world. They do question seriously, however, the timing of a flight on the eve of the conference and they are appalled by the clumsy way in which we handled the matter.

As you will recall, there were numerous conflicting reports. It seems evident that there was lack of proper liaison between the White House, State Department, Civilian Space Agency, Pentagon, Central Intelligence and possibly the National Security Council.

Our statements and reports made it appear that we were not telling the truth. This really hurt us. Today, whatever else may be said against the United States in most parts of the world, few charge us with dishonesty or lack of good faith. Our reputation for truth is a valuable one and we should always keep truth on our side and wheel it out when needed as a gigantic weapon in our arsenal.

No intelligence officers in Western Europe accept the stories and statements put out by the Kremlin about the alleged shooting down of the U-2. They believe that if the plane had been hit by a modern rocket at a height of 60,000 feet or more, that it simply would have disintegrated and that its pilot never would have bailed out and parachuted safely to earth. About all they accept is that the Soviets in some way forced down an American reconnaisance airplane and we admitted losing such a plane while in flight over Russia. The most common belief is that the aircraft encountered some trouble, was forced to a lower altitude of say 15,000 to 30,000 feet, and that Red fighter planes made it crash land.

Suspicion of foreigners has been traditional in Russia. In the days of Catherine and Peter the Great, there was great intrigue in the czarist courts.

The concentration camp, secret police and strict censorship are not new in Russia. Nicholas I, some 154 years ago, had a decree prepared on censorship. It said that no curbs would be put on writers, but that they must be accurate and comply with the truth. Of course, then as now, the censor ruled on what was honest or fair and accurate. The theme of Nicholas' decree has been repeated on several occasions by Nikita Khrushchev. The mighty men of Russian literature, such as Pushkin and Tolstoy, battled against the wielders of the censor's pen.

The present-day rulers of Russia, the meh in the Kremlin, have used the U-2 incident to stir up suspicion and hatred of America and to issue all kinds of nonsense about capitalistic plans to destroy Russia and end communism.

All along the Iron Curtain there already has been a tightening of security and more strict patrol measures are being adopted, along with additional censorship of various mediums of mass communications.

Khrushchev and his colleagues do not want an end to censorship, travel restrictions or the Iron Curtain.

The day is still far off in Russia when a Soviet citizen really is free. That day will have come when he may listen to a foreign radio broadcast without fear of arrest or having the broadcast jammed, when he can stroll down the streets of Stalingrad or Minsk and buy a foreign newspaper, or when he can enter a travel agency and purchase a ticket to Los Angeles.

Meanwhile, Red leaders are preparing new demands for the Russian citizens and their Communist allies or slave followers. New work and production goals will be announced shortly.

Indications are that the Soviets will accelerate their programs of rocket and missile production—and there will be no strikes permitted to halt or slow up the output either. New measures are being taken to try and correct a current weakness which enables foreign jet planes to come in and fly across Soviet territory at tremendous speeds and great heights.

More threats and pressures will be applied against members of NATO and nations permitting the United States to have military bases. Already this program has met with considerable success. We have called off, for at least the time being, any observation flights. Some of our allies have begged us not to use their bases for such flights, if they are resumed.

And we know all about the worldwide Red propaganda drive against the West and us.

Hourly news bulletins from Japan, from the Philippines, from Cuba, and many other parts of the world give the details. You may be certain that President Eisenhower is the butt of much of these efforts and he faces a rough time indeed on his Far Eastern trip.

(Third of a series)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

Russia is not ready, nor does the Kremlin desire an all-out shooting or nuclear war at this time.

This is the general opinion expressed today by top ranking officials in Western Europe.

Just back from a news gathering swing of 3 weeks following the collapse of the Paris summit meeting, I continued to be impressed by the calm of Western Europe and the widespread desire there to step up defensive efforts. There is more unity among NATO members today than at any time since the Soviets, under the personal orders of Nikita Khrushchev, put down with much bloodshed the efforts of the Hungarians to throw off their Communist slavery and regain their independence.

For months Europe has been afraid that Khrushchev might make a fatal blunder over West Berlin. But now that the Paris meeting he first proposed, then demanded and personally wrecked, has now passed without any action over Berlin, people are breathing easier.

BERLIN NOT SAFE

Also, the rather mild statement made about Berlin by Khrushchev when in East Berlin enroute back to Moscow 3 weeks ago, seems somewhat reassuring. This does not mean, however, that Berlin is safe, or that the Kremlin may not at any time reintroduce this time bomb which keeps ticking away.

Europe has learned to live with crises.

I would say that the calmest and most determined people to be found in the world today insofar as Soviet threats and actions are concerned are in West Berlin, and in Finland, Turkey, and Norway in the areas of those countries having common frontiers with Russia.

MORE WORRY HERE

Actually, there is more war scare and hysteria in America than most countries. We seem to be on the mountain peaks, or in the depths of the valleys—wildly optimistic or unrealistically pessimistic.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former Supreme Commander of NATO, once told me, "Americans tend to think all Russians are 7 feet tall, but the closer one gets to Russia, the more average the Soviets become."

European experts on Russia believe that during the next few months the Moscow-Peiping axis will appear stronger than ever. From these two capitals new drives will be made against neutral countries, small nations permitting NATO or U.S. military bases, and to present America as the warmongering international villain.

The world is being divided up by the Russians and Chinese Red leaders for new propa-

ganda campaigns. Moscow and Peiping will whipsaw nations and countries. Special attention will be given Africa, the Middle East and the Far East by Red China. The Kremlin will rain its biggest propaganda guns against members of NATO, the United States, Africa, the far Pacific, and Latin America.

In Russia itself the emphasis is to be placed on heavy industry, rocket and missile production, reducing the previously announced military personnel cutbacks, trying to devise ways to prevent foreign fast- and high-flying jets from cruising at will over Soviet territory as we have been able to do for the past 4 years, and to pushing agricultural projects, especially in Siberia.

In the latter region some of the pet plans of Khrushchev have met with failure due to drought and heavy and persistent winds and duststorms.

I find that Western Europe looks to America more than ever today for leadership of the free world. They want us to head up moral and spiritual drives as well as staying strong militarily, industrially and economically.

There is much interest in the election of our new President. They hope the man we select will be the most capable and best trained leader we can produce. They trust he will be vigorous, imaginative, young in outlook and actions and an outstanding executive and administrator.

Europeans do not believe another so-called summit meeting is possible for at least a year. They cannot see a new American President rushing off to a meeting with Khrushchev until some time has been spent in office.

Based on the evidence to date, Western Europeans do not expect Mr. Khrushchev to be replaced as the No. 1 man in the Kremlin, unless natural causes so dictate. He does not have the power of Stalin and he must rule through the Presidium and take into consideration the wishes of the Communist Party and the Red marshals. But at present he is still the boss.

I've come home convinced that the most important issue before the American people is to select the best qualified man for President and to surround him with our most capable and dedicated assistants so that maximum efforts can and will be made to maintain the peace. Any nuclear war would destroy much of the human race and most of civilization. No one really can imagine the suffering, misery, and utter devastation a modern war would bring.

Unless the peace is maintained, all other matters become secondary and really unimportant. If the world goes up in a nuclear explosion our hours and wages, more or less social security, higher or lower subsidies for farms, and shorter working hours have no meaning or importance.

I also am convinced that we in America have become soft and too complacent. Perhaps this might be all right, or not too dangerous, if we lived in a secure and peaceful world where all other governments and rulers had our common desires and an equal adherence to fairplay and justice.

Unfortunately this is not the case.

To the best of my knowledge and ability I am certain that we are living in an even colder war era which has become more dangerous.

Russia, Red China, and communism are on the march. Their basic goals of 40 years and more have not been changed. Objectives, regardless of time and effort required, are the same and remain constant.

And in Nikita Khrushchev we face one of the most powerful, capable, cunning, and ruthless men who has ever risen to world power.

He is shrewd and intelligent. He is a gambler. He is a believing and practicing Communist and he is fully capable of bold unorthodoxy.

We have no choice but to remain strong militarily for a long, long time if we wish to remain free. We need to push our rocket and missile programs, and to make our Strategic Air Force even more capable. This means accelerating our output of B–52 jet bombers and getting the B–70's into the air and operational in considerable numbers.

Today, as never before in my opinion, America needs unity, loyalty, and dedication. We need to protect and strengthen our institutions and ideals. We must, if we are to survive, be willing to sacrifice and work harder. And we greatly need leadership of the highest caliber.

Berlin Must Always Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Indianapolis Times of Sunday, June 26, 1960, had a very excellent editorial on Berlin. This editorial stressed the necessity for the United States to be as firm as we were 11 years ago during the Russian blockade of Berlin which we defeated through the now famous Berlin airlift.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I had the opportunity of visiting West Berlin last year. My definite impression from conversations I had then with officials of the West German and West Berlin governments is that they want the United States not to back down in the face of Soviet threats.

Upon my return to the United States I made some comments on this matter which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, June 26, 1960]

BERLIN MUST ALWAYS BE FREE

U.S. planes sped to Berlin with milk and medicine 12 years ago today.

The shipments were unplanned. It was a stopgap measure.

The Russian blockade of the western city threatened 2½ million Berliners with starvation—just 3 years after World War II had ended.

This was the start of the massive Berlin airlift, in which Allied pilots, mostly American and many Hoosiers, ferried the essentials of life to a courageous city.

Communist rulers still hunger for Berlin.

The city's magnet, drawing the lifeblood from the Russians' East German satellite surrounding it, is more powerful than ever.

Swarms of refugees still reach the free city, despite tightening travel restrictions within East Germany.

West Berlin by no means enjoys all the prosperity of West Germany, but it keeps getting healthier.

Unemployment has been whittled down from 300,000 10 years ago to about 30,000 today.

Buildings keep going up. Investments are increasing.

The city has heart, guts, and brains.

The people are closer to communism than perhaps any others in the West. They understand it better, respect its force, and live next door to it without panic.

Whenever a new crisis is threatened by the Kremlin, Berlin is calmer than Washington.

The airlift of 1948 was so effective that 11 months later the Russian blockade was given up as a failure. It was one of the West's greatest victories.

Some experts today believe it could not happen again. They believe the Eisenhower administration would cave in at a showdown. They believe the Berliners would not be as tough as before, after 11 years of material comfort.

This defeatism must not be accepted.

Military and diplomatic planners, somehow, can always face the past and plan for yesterday's crises.

Today there is a fleet of trucks in a U.S. military compound in Berlin. They are never used, but are ready for airlift duty.

Today the city officials of Berlin have enough coal, food, and medicine in dumps and warehouses to maintain life for a year.

Today the Russians have radar jamming stations surrounding the city, so the planes couldn't fly in every minute.

But if there is another Berlin crisis, it will not be the same. New planning, new moves will be needed, and the West will have to be just as tough, resourceful, flexible, and united as it was 10 years ago.

BERLIN AS I SEE IT—THE CHOICE IS NOT SURRENDER OR WAR

Berlin is the place on the world map where the Soviet Union has decided to test the firmness of the U.S. commitment to the defense of the free world.

As Berlin goes, so will the free (and the uncommitted) world go.

West Berlin is a small, isolated, indefensible, outpost of freedom. Its 2½ million inhabitants are free only because the West, and in particular the United States, has committed itself to stay there. The presence of U.S. troops in Berlin is the equivalent of a burglar alarm. Any military attack on Berlin now would precipitate a military reaction by NATO which might lead to all-out war. The Russians are well aware of this, and this is why West Berlin is still free today. This is why they have mobilized all their political, psychological, and diplomatic resources to try to get us to withdraw from Berlin.

It might be asked why it is so important to the security of the United States that 2½ million West Berliners should be kept from being absorbed by the East German Communist regime. After all, as former Secretary Dulles noted, Berlin is militarily indefensible.

It is true that we have a moral commitment to the West Berliners, but we have a prior moral commitment to our own people. Would any sane American advocate that we run the risk of events which might lead to Soviet nuclear bombardment of the United States and the death of countless millions of Americans, simply in order to try to preserve the freedom—not even the lives—of 2½ million foreigners?

Such questions, which are natural, can only be answered convincingly if the issue of Berlin is seen in a pioneer perspective.

It is my sincere belief that the reason we must be prepared, if necessary, to remain in Berlin at all costs rather than allow ourselves to be pushed out or be a party to disguised capitulation is clear, for if Khru-

shchev believes that we are not prepared to fight, he will bring increasing pressures, threats, and harassment to bear on the Western position and access routes in order to bring about our withdrawal from Berlin, through some form of diplomatic capitulation. This would be another Munich.

Should we ever give up our position in Berlin (except, of course, as part of an overall acceptable settlement to the problem of Germany), we will simultaneously and inevitably have given up our security positions all over the world. The cement of the defense of the free world, which consists of the power, the resolve, and the pledged work of the United States of America, will liquify overnight should we allow the Russians to force us out of a place which we ourselves have proudly built up and protected and committed ourselves to hold as a bastion of freedom.

Berlin is one of those issues which go to the heart of our worldwide security position.

There is a fateful link between the maintenance of the freedom of the West Berliners, and the survival of millions upon millions of our fellow citizens. Here is how the causal sequence might run.

1. The Soviets succeed in driving us out of West Berlin because they realize that we are, in the last resolve, prepared to abandon West Berlin rather than run the risk of all-out war.

2. The handwriting on the wall then at once becomes apparent to all our allies, to all the countries with whom we have mutual security pacts, and—just as important—to all the uncommitted peoples of the world.

3. The foundations of our present defense and security policy would then turn to sand under our feet. By permitting the Soviets to win the battle of Berlin, and showing to the world that the United States will back down rather than risk war with the Soviet Union even on an issue bloodless victory of absolute import on the worldwide front.

4. Then America progressively becomes isolated politically and strategically, as the free world realizes that the once mighty deterrent, backed by unshakeable resolve, no longer exists.

5. One of the last stages is reached when the American Government and people are faced with the decision whether to accept the extinction of our freedom, or to fight, because we believe that life by itself, separated from the values by which we live, is not worth living.

6. The last stage of all would bring home to us the bitter awareness of the relationship between the maintenance of the freedom of 2½ million West Berliners, and the survival of countless millions of Hoosiers and other Americans.

As an illustration of the significance of Berlin to other parts of the world, a Japanese Ambassador to a Western European country recently said to one of our officials that Japan's destiny depended on the outcome of the struggle for Berlin. He said that if the United States and its allies stood firm in Berlin, pending a reasonable final settlement of the German problem, the confidence of the free world in the United States would be strengthened. The other side of the picture, he said, was that if the United States abandoned Berlin, the people of Japan will know that their turn will surely come, and will be guided accordingly.

Thus, the issue before us is inescapable. In order to face the issue successfully, it must be seen in its proper light.

The choice before us is not between giving up Berlin and all-out war. If we stand firm in Berlin and convince Khrushchev of our determination to do so, we shall not have war. On the other hand, if we abandon Berlin, we will have started a chain of events which will ultimately bring our country face to face with the awful dilemma: whether to live as slaves under Communist domination, or die rather than submit to slavery.

VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator, Democrat, of Indiana.

Frank J. Pipal, of Omaha, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this week, a very distinguished and widely known Omahan passed on to his great reward. He was Frank J. Pipal, one-time Omaha city forester, author, and naturalist.

He came by his love for trees and forests honestly and almost inevitably because he was a native of Bohemia, now a part of Czechoslovakia. People of that nation historically have shown a love and respect for trees and forestry generally. Mr. Pipal came to this country at the age of 12, determined to devote his lifetime career to that of a forester.

He worked for many years with the University of Nebraska's internationally known naturalist and botanist, Dr. Charles E. Bessey. He was a teacher for many years and served as superintendent of schools. In addition to performing his duties as Omaha city forester notably, he organized Omaha's Junior Foresters among the ranks of grade school students.

As a result tens of thousands of Omahans now know trees and appreciate them much the better because of these unselfish and untiring efforts.

He was well beloved in the community in which he worked. So is the fine family which Mrs. Pipal and he raised, and all of whom came to Omaha to observe their parents' golden wedding anniversary only a week before he passed on.

The Omaha World Herald for Tuesday, June 28, paid tribute to this fine gentleman in its lead editorial under the title, "Frank J. Pipal."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK J. PIPAL

There are, doubtless, happy men who make their living, say, as accountants, and who spend most of their free time on a hobby such as building boats. But fortunate indeed is the man in whom vocation and avocation are perfectly combined.

Such a man was Frank J. Pipal, retired Omaha city forester, who died Sunday. Mr. Pipal never ceased marveling that people would pay him for doing what he would gladly do for nothing.

Mr. Pipal first fell in love with trees in his native Bohemia; he planted his first tree when he was 5 years old. Coming to this country at the age of 12, he was determined to be a forester. The difficulties were many, and so were the interruptions. But eventually he earned a degree, and later a master's degree, from the University of Nebraska.

Mr. Pipal worked in forestry for years, part of the time with the University of Nebraska's internationally known Dr. Charles E. Bessey. But the interruptions continued. Mr. Pipal was for a time superintendent of schools and, in depression days when foresters were not regarded as essential, he ran a hardware store outstate.

In 1941, when the city of Omaha decided to hire a forester, Mr. Pipal applied, and with his superb qualifications, got the job. From that time on he lived and breathed trees—and communicated his love for them to others.

Far beyond the call of duty, he organized Omaha's junior foresters. Tens of thousands of Omahans now know trees and cherish them because of lectures by Frank Pipal they heard long ago.

In 1951, Mr. Pipal, at the age of 70, was compelled to retire from his city position. But it was only a technical retirement. He wrote a column for this newspaper, and wrote booklets on trees and lawns. As a consulting forester, he was kept busy diagnosing and treating sick trees.

He advised people on what trees to plant. But he never forced his ideas. If one of his clients insisted on planting a fuzz-shedding cottonwood, the gentle Mr. Pipal merely told him the facts, and reflected privately that it was his client who would have to live with the tree.

When tornadoes struck in Nebraska and leveled trees, Mr. Pipal responded instantly. Going to the scenes of disaster, he cheerfully worked 12 to 16 hours a day advising on cleaning up the mess and on the planting of new trees. Such restored towns abound with living memorials to Frank Pipal.

Only a week or so ago the trim and wiry Mr. Pipal bounced into the World-Herald's editorial rooms with a box in his hands. In it he had a cutting from a tulip tree in bloom. With glowing enthusiasm he showed it to his colleagues.

Last Wednesday he and Mrs. Pipal observed their 50th wedding anniversary. Their two sons and their families came to Omaha for the event. On Sunday afternoon Mr. Pipal was playing with his grandchildren at a lakeside cottage near Fremont when he had a heart attack and died almost instantly.

He lived a good life, and he will be missed by thousands who knew him and loved him.

No Outcry for Allan Pope, Doomed To Die in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "No Outcry for Allan Pope, Doomed To Die in Indonesia," which I think is thought provoking. The article follows:

NO OUTCRY FOR ALLAN POPE, DOOMED TO DIE IN INDONESIA

A three-man military tribunal in Indonesia last April imposed the death sentence on

American flier Allan Lawrence Pope, of Homestead, Fla., on charges of aiding the 1958 rebellion against the leftist Sukarno regime. The 31-year-old American admitted bombing a military objective, but not civilians. He maintained that he was being tried because he was an American, since Indonesian rebels, who like himself were neither leaders nor planners of the revolt, were released without trial.

The death sentence on Pope raises the question: Why are those who oppose capital punishment indifferent to the fate of this young man who thought he was fighting in the free world's battle against communism? The execution of robber, kidnaper, and sex-pervert Chessman, who had every possible chance during 12 years to prove his innocence, rocked liberals and leftist idealists all over the world. But editors in Italy and France who protested Caryl Chessman's death, or those who stoned the U.S. Embassy in Lisbon, are silent.

Not so long ago there was a similar hue and cry over Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, who had betrayed their country. Before that it was Tom Mooney, convicted of bombing a preparedness parade in San Francisco. And, for those who remember 1927, there were Sacco and Vanzetti, convicted of murder and robbery. The Socialist of their day charged it was their radical affiliations that condemned them. Many citizens who cannot be classed as radicals shared this belief. The protests rocked the Nation. Bombs went off in New York and Philadelphia.

Where do the pseudoliberals and the anti-capital-punishment groups hole up when teenage Hungarian freedom fighters are executed 3 years after the revolt in which they heroically took part? Millions are liquidated in Red China because they hate communism, and "progressives" urge recognition of the Red tyrants. Why no hue and cry for Allan Pope?

Japanese Exchange Student Apologizes for His Countrymen's Misbehavior Toward Eisenhower Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Big Rapids, Mich., in the 10th Congressional District, which I represent, is probably the first city in the United States to receive an apology from a Japanese citizen for the manner in which a throng of leftist agitators conducted themselves with respect to the proposed visit to Tokyo by President Eisenhower.

The letter comes from a Japanese youth who came to the United States as an exchange student under the American Field Service international scholarship program and later returned to his native Japan.

The communication and the circumstances under which it was written are related in the Big Rapids Pioneer, a daily newspaper published in that city. The account of the letter and the letter itself follow:

FEELS ACTIONS OF JAPANESE DETESTABLE

Noby Matsumoto, Big Rapids' first American Field Service exchange student, in a letter to the people of Big Rapids, has extended his apologizes to the United States for the riots and misbehavior of leftist groups in Japan that caused the cancellation of Eisenhower's visit to that country.

Remembering, he said, the friendship extended to him here, he finds it hard to understand the "Pearl Harbor" attack on Hagerty and the rioting that led to the cancellation of the Eisenhower trip.

The letter of apology was enclosed in a personal letter to Lloyd Atkins, Director of the Field Services program here. In his letter to Atkins, Noby expressed his warm regard for the people of the United States and of Big Rapids, and said that he has just finished his year at college and was preparing to return to his home city of Takamatsu.

He says there are two AFS'ers in his city this summer, and stressed the need for making the program more complete, so that everyone will be aware of it and "when the general idea is understood, there will be no riots nor anything of that nature."

As school is over for Noby, he and a few of his friends were preparing for the long, 20-day, 1,000-mile walk to their homes in Takamatsu. Noby spoke of the trip, laughingly, as a break from the routine of school.

He expressed sincere thanks for the Future Farmers magazine which Atkins sends him each month, and sent his warm personal regards to all his acquaintances in Big Rapids.

NOBY'S LETTER

JUNE 22, 1960.

DEAR FOLKS IN BIG RAPIDS: It was on the afternoon of August 13, 1957, when I was merely a high school senior, that I came to Big Rapids as a first American Field Service (AFS) international scholarships exchange student to the city from among 90 million Japanese to work for a tiny part of people-to-people campaigns. Frankly I had carried from home nearly halfway around the globe a bit of anxiety concerning the Pearl Harbor "incident" of 1941; however, my stay in Big Rapids, U.S.A., soon proved it unnecessary, and in fact my best souvenir from the United States was the friendliness of the people.

True friendship is something that can be attained only gradually, and somehow it is so fragile while under construction that we always have to be extremely watchful against stumbling. Although I dare not say that I promoted our mutual understanding to the utmost extent, I should like to regard my job in Big Rapids as fair and not as a complete failure; that is, we were on the way, furthering relations.

Thus it is truly a shame that once again I have to face you with disgrace after the recent "Pearl Harbor attack" on America's press secretary to the President and also our withdrawal of the invitation of Mr. Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo, Japan. I personally detest almost with fury the discourtesies executed by violent rioters of our own country to the U.S. high officials and consequently to the whole nation of America. Here I will neither argue about the present Japanese political issues which I am sure you are informed of nor blame solely the general demonstrators, and I certainly have no intention whatsoever of making an excuse for all the chaos now taking place in and around Japanese capital. But whatever the cause, whatever the reason, our country owes you a deep apology which can hardly be paid off. I really doubt, therefore, how much this my letter will help temper your anger, but here is my personal regret and apology to you folks. I am afraid there is little I can be doing now, but I do promise you that I shall be doing my best to improve the situation, and I earnestly hope that there has been no too disgusting a change made in our good close relationship, though after a terrible storm, and that we are still on the right track.

Very sincerely yours,

NOBUSUKE NOBY MATSUMOTO.

Soviet Subjugation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter and splendid resolution which I have received from the American National Latvian League in Boston, Mass., in which attention is called again to the Soviet subjugation of the once free and independent countries of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia:

AMERICAN NATIONAL LATVIAN LEAGUE IN BOSTON, INC.,
Jamaica Plain, Mass., June 25, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader of the House of Representatives, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Hereby I convey a resolution adopted by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians assembled at the Little Opera House in Boston, Mass., June 18, 1960, in connection with the commemorations of the Baltic Genocide Day (June 14) and with protest against the violent occupation and annexation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union 20 years ago.

I request your attention and appropriate action in the House of Representatives on behalf of the subjugated Baltic States.

Sincerely yours,

VALDEMARS LAMBERGS, Esq.,
Chairman of the Baltic Freedom Meeting in Boston.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS ASSEMBLED AT BALTIC FREEDOM MEETING, LITTLE OPERA HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS., JUNE 19, 1960

Whereas, 20 years ago, June 15–17, 1940, the Soviet Union violently invaded and occupied the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and thereafter illegally incorporated them into the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas, by this unprovoked aggression the Government of the Soviet Union committed an international crime; and

Whereas, 19 years ago, June 14, 1941, the Government of the Soviet Union started mass deportations of the Baltic people of all walks to slave labor camps in Siberia and other remote parts of the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas, by this inhuman deed the Government of the Soviet Union committed a crime of genocide against the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian nations; and

Whereas, by signing the Charter of the United Nations and later by adhering to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Government of the Soviet Union has assumed explicit obligations in regards individual's right to life, freedom, personal security, and human dignity; and

Whereas, in violation of all these explicit obligations—expropriation, exploitation, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, overt and covert deportations are being continued in the Baltic States by ruthless Soviet occupation forces; and

Whereas, we, free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are conscious of our responsibility toward our subjugated nations behind the Iron Curtain, we feel dutybound to speak out for those in captivity in protest

against genocide and inhumanity in the Baltic States under Communist tyranny; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned about the weakness of the U.S. foreign policy in the face of ever marching Soviet aggression that allows Soviet Union's premier Nikita Khrushchev even to offend the President of the United States without any fear of retaliation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by American Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians assembled here, that—

(1) We accuse the Government of the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

(2) We demand that the Government of the Soviet Union withdraw its military and political occupational forces from the Baltic States;

(3) We appeal to the Government of the United States to strengthen its foreign policy as to the Soviet Union and world communism as well;

(4) We request the Government of the United States to undertake all necessary and appropriate ways and means to speed up the long delayed liberation of the Baltic States as well as the other captive nations.

God save Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

VALDEMARS LAMBERGS, Esq.,
Chairman of the Baltic Freedom Meeting in Boston.

Nothing Is Small, Begun With Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 396 years ago there were no European settlements in what is now the United States. Then on June 30, 1564, the permanent settlement of our country began when Rene Laudonniere and his French followers, seeking religious freedom in the new world, came to near where Jacksonville, Fla., stands today, and began the settlement of our land, which has never been interrupted since.

Significantly, they began their efforts with prayer. As Laudonniere recorded it in his acount of the events:

I commanded a trumpet to be sounded, that being assembled, we might give thanks to God for our favorable and happy arrival. Then we sang a psalm of thanksgiving to God, beseeching Him that it would please Him of His grace to continue His accustomed goodness toward us his poor servants, and aid us in our enterprise that all might turn to His glory.

Afterward having measured out a piece of ground in the form of a triangle, we all exerted ourselves, some to bring earth, some to cut fagots, and others to raise and make the rampart, for there was not a man that had not either a shovel, cutting hook, or hatchet, as well to clear the ground by cutting down the trees, as for building of the fort, which we did hasten in such cheerfulness that within a few days the effect of our diligence was apparent.

It is doubtful that in their days these people had any firm feeling of significance in history in what they did. They were few in number; and severe suffering and sacrifice were ahead for them. It was from the beginning a nip-and-tuck matter of whether or not they would abandon their adventure. They did persist and their deeds inspired England to settle to the north in Virginia and stimulated the Spanish to settle at St. Augustine in 1565. The Spanish coming eliminated the French flag from Florida, at least for that century. The French beginners of things at Fort Caroline in 1564 probably thought of themselves as failures; but their courageous acts in an unknown wilderness almost 400 years ago came at an opportune time in history, when civilized man sought a new freedom in a new land and their fragile beginning started our great America. We should all be thankful that they began their efforts in prayer. Surely nothing is small begun with prayer.

Tribute to Gen. Julius Klein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve as toastmaster at the testimonial dinner of the American Jewish Literary Foundation on Sunday evening, March 27, 1960, at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City.

Gen. Julius Klein was one of several honored guests at that dinner. Following are the remarks of my dear and longtime friend. Abraham Feinberg, who made the presentation to General Klein, and the remarks of General Klein in accepting the citation:

REMARKS OF ABRAHAM FEINBERG

Congressman MULTER, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I am very aware of the restrictions and conscription of time on all of us who are proponents of the various recipients, and, therefore, I will be not only brief, but brief within the limitations set by the chairman.

I think one of the tests of the friendship which a man lays claim to is the expression which people give to him upon an occasion such as this. I think it is not without significance that the friendship which I have for Maj. Gen. Julius Klein has induced me, as a Roosevelt-Truman Democrat, to appear here for a Taft-Eisenhower-Nixon Republican. Moreover, I think it is a sign of his claim to friendship that, as a general of the Army, there is a congratulatory letter handwritten by the fleet admiral of the Navy, Chester W. Nimitz, under whom General Klein served, and sitting on the same platform at a time like this is a general of the Marine Corps, who would have found it, except for his admiration for General Klein, a difficult thing to be with a general of the Army on the same platform. My knowledge of history of the rivalry between the services is balanced.

There are many telegrams here and I know that I would use up more than my few minutes in reading them, but I think it is interesting to see the variety of the names of the people who have sent messages in honor of General Klein. This one is from JACOB JAVITS; the next one is from RICHARD NIXON; the next one from STYLES BRIDGES; another one here from the Ambassador of Israel to the United States, Avraham Harman; from the Governor of Illinois, William G. Stratton; from the Minister of Israel to the United States, Jaacov Herzog, whose father was the Chief Rabbi of Israel; and here is one from a Democrat by the name of ESTES KEFAUVER; and another Democrat by the name of Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK; one from the Governor of this great State, the boss of Carolyn Simon who is sitting here as secretary of state, Nelson A. Rockefeller.

I could talk, I think, on each of the phases of the general's career, phases as journalist, author, politician, statesman, hero of his country, decorated not only by this country, but by the Government of France and the Philippines, and his career as a Jew. I think I could talk upon each one for not 2 minutes or 20 minutes, but for 2 hours. I think, in deference to the length of the program and to your own patience, that I should say only that I can think of no one for whom I would rather be present in the function which has been assigned to me tonight than Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, and I now have the honor to present the award to General Klein, which reads as follows:

"The American Jewish Literary Foundation recognizing the preeminence of Gen. Julius Klein herewith bestows this citation upon him in behalf of its division of literary art for a record of distinguished service to the welfare of our country, which the President of the United States declared merits the respect and honor of all Americans, for his championship of human rights and leadership in the struggle against bigotry, for his stature as former Commander of the Jewish War Veterans in which he labored to secure legislation for veterans welfare, for his contributions to the community as former combat soldier, newspaperman, civic leader, and student of international relations, for his efforts in behalf of the State of Israel.

REMARKS OF GEN. JULIUS KLEIN

My good friend Abe Feinberg, Congressman Multer, Rabonim, distinguished guests, I am deeply touched with this award. I don't believe I deserve it, being in the company of such distinguished scientists like Dr. Bela Schick and Dr. Savin and my old colleague and friend Harry Hershfield makes me indeed very, very proud. I am particularly pleased that Congressman MULTER presides tonight. He has severely criticized me in the past and I presume he will do so in the future. From his point of view, I am sure he always felt that he was right. I am delighted to see that my good friend Abe Feinberg, who is so very busy on behalf of my old colleague in the Pentagon, STU SYMINGTON, is gracious enough to make this presentation.

Being a descendant of an old rabbinical family by the name of Schick, maybe Dr. Bela Schick would like to do a little research into his own family. He will find that our ancestors came from Spain. His and my great grandfather was Mcram Schick, the man who wrote the Shale Shuves and so many commentaries to the Talmud.

I think being here tonight and being the recipient of this award makes me feel very, very proud. I hope I can live up to it and I hope your organization is going to call on me for further service. I think this is a typically American gathering tonight, a meeting presided over by a very distinguished legislator of great moral and political and personal courage. I am delighted to be here, and personally pleased that my old comrade in arms, the very distinguished heroic soldier, one of those great sons of New York, General Krulevitsch is here with me. It was my privilege, like his privilege, to be a senior officer in the Pacific, both serving under Admiral Nimitz—he as a marine officer, and I as an Army officer—and I know General Krulevitsch feels the same way as I do; and as we retire from the service, that we hope

we have given our country the best that is in us, and I would like to salute, not only a great citizen of your State, but also a great soldier and a fine Jew.

A week ago today I spent all night from Saturday to Sunday assisting in the arrangement of a most historical meeting, the meeting between Chancellor Adenauer and Ben-Gurion in New York. We got through about 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, and those who were ready to go to services like Minister Jaacov Herzog, put on the tfillen and tallis and did so. I went home to my room to sleep; but history has changed in 1 week. Adenauer and Ben-Gurion have met.

And so, here I am tonight, a Chicagoan, receiving an award that I hope I can live up to. Harry Hershfield, my old colleague, has spoken in the name of all of those of us who tried our best to interpret the American way of life. I want you to know that I am indeed very, very grateful that you asked me to come here from Chicago, and I shall cherish this award for the rest of my life. Thank you ever so much.

The Association of the Bar of the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has prepared an excellent report on the Senate approved Senate Joint Resolution 39. This report on the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to assure prompt filling of vacancies in the House when such vacancies exceed 50 percent of the membership is timely and vital. I call it to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
June 17, 1960.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judicary Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: The Senate has recently approved Senate Joint Resolution 39 which has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The resolution embodies three proposed constitutional amendments, one of which would assure the prompt filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives in the event that vacancies in the House should exceed 50 percent of its authorized membership. The Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has authorized the transmittal to you of this letter setting forth its views on that aspect of Senate Joint Resolution 39.

The proposed article of amendment provides for the appointment of Representatives by the executive authority of each State to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives whenever the total number of vacancies in the House exceeds half of the membership. If that state of affairs should arise, the executive authority during the succeeding 60 days would be empowered to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period. Such appointees would serve only until the people fill the vacancy pursuant to article I, section 2, clause 4 of the Constitution. That clause presently reads: "When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

The committee on Federal legislation supports this amendment and the joint resolution which proposes it. Several members of the committee believe also that the proposed amendment should permit temporary executive appointment to any vacancy in the House pending elections to fill any vacancy. The 17th amendment affords precedent for such provision. The amendment proposed by the joint resolution would fill a gap in our constitutional scheme.

It would not affect the existing method of filling vacancies in the House by popular election. It would merely permit, under stated conditions, the prompt, and temporary filling of vacancies pending such elections. In the event of a national catastrophe, as a result, for instance, of a hydrogen bomb attack, a substantial period of time would undoubtedly elapse before elections would or could be held. The report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate favoring the amendment indicates that a minimum period of 60 days would probably expire before such elections. (S. Rept. No. 561, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).)

The problem arises only out of the existing constitutional provision for filling vacancies in the House solely by election. Other vacancies in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government may be filled promptly, either for the balance of the term of the vacancy or temporarily pending elections to fill the vacancy. In the case of the Senate, there is provision in the 17th amendment for filling vacancies by temporary appointment pending elections. In the case of the Presidency, article II, section 1 of the Constitution provides for succession of the Vice President upon the removal, death, resignation, or inability of the President, and, pursuant to the power granted by the same article, Congress has provided by statute for succession if there should be neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of the Presidency (62 Stat. 672 (1948), 3 U.S.C. 19). In the case of the judiciary, vacancies are filled by nomination and appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (art. II, sec. 1). Thus, the only gap in our constitutional scheme for dealing with the possible consequences of a hydrogen bomb attack is in the provision for filling vacancies in the House.

From time to time since 1949, Congress has considered the subject matter of this proposed amendment. In that year, Senate Joint Resolution 145, a similar amendment, was proposed in the Senate. In the 82d Congress, public hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 59 embodying a similar proposal. In the 83d Congress, public hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 39, similar to present Senate Joint Resolution 39 now before the House Judiciary Committee, and the former also passed the Senate. In the 84th Congress, public hearings were held on a similar proposal embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 8, passed by the Senate in 1955. Another similar proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 157, was introduced in the 85th Congress but no action was taken upon it.

Our committee normally takes the position that there should be no idle tinkering with our Constitution and that, if a problem could be disposed of otherwise, there would be no need for an amendment. And it has been suggested that this problem can be dealt with by a change in the rules of the House of Representatives. The suggestion is based upon the assumption that the House interprets the constitutional requirement of a quorum as depriving it of the power to act if there are 50 percent or more vacancies in its membership. We do not understand this to be the case. We understand that, under the present interpretation of this rule by the House, the constitutional requirement of a quorum is construed as meaning a majority of the Members chosen, sworn and living, whose membership has not been terminated by resignation or action of the House. (Rules and Manual, U.S. House of Representatives, sec. 53. H. Doc. No. 458, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1959)).[1] Presumptively this interpretation would include a vacancy created by impeachment of a Representative by the Senate. Accordingly, no change in the existing House rule appears to be necessary to enable the House to function as a result of a serious depletion in its ranks, unless, of course, more than a majority of the remaining Members were so injured that they would be unable to attend. The proposed amendment would remedy the latter situation in all probability, if all vacancies were filled promptly by appointment. But the fact that the House could continue to function with its ranks seriously depleted does not solve the basic problem which the amendment is intended to solve. It is intended to provide for broad appointive representation in the House from the entire country, pending the filling of vacancies by elections.

In the final analysis, the proposed amendment would merely assure a larger and more geographically representative composition of the House if its membership were sufficiently depleted in a time of serious emergency. The theory is that it would be undesirable for the House to act on necessarily important legislation which would be considered during the interim period pending elections, without representation of the country as a whole. We accept that theory.

We believe that the real need for prompt appointments, pending elections, to fill the depleted ranks of the House is based not alone on the desire for a more geographically representative body but also upon the need for a larger number of Representatives to carry on during a time when, presumptively, the pressure of work upon each Representative will be extremely heavy.

The amendment would also serve to assure the choice of a President by the House, in the event that at least one-half of the seats in the House should be vacant and, at the same time, that no presidential candidate should have received a majority vote of the electors. The quorum for such purposes, under article II, section 1 of the Constitution, consists of representation from two-thirds of the States and a majority vote of all States is required to choose the President.

It is possible, of course, that atomic attack might deplete the ranks of membership in the House by less than 50 percent. This suggests an inquiry as to whether such a situation should also call for Executive appointment to fill such vacancies. There is, of course, no magic in numbers or lack of

[1] Senate rule III 2 provides that a quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn. The power granted by art. I, sec. 5 of the Constitution to each House to determine the rules of its proceedings would not seem to empower either House to vary the meaning of the constitutional requirements of a quorum. The validity of neither House nor Senate rule has been passed upon by a court. However, we believe that the House rule reflects a valid interpretation of the constitutional requirements for a quorum. See *United States* v. *Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1, 6 (1892) and *State* v. *Orr*, 61 Oh. St. 384, 56 N.E. 14; *State* v. *Farrar*, 89 W. Va. 232, 109 S.E. 240; *People* v. *Wright*, 30 Colo., 439, 71 Pac. 365; *Barry* v. *New Haven*, 162 Ky. 60, 171 S.W. 1012; *North Platte* v. *North Platte Waterworks Co.*, 56 Nebr. 403, 76 N.W. 906; *Mueller* v. *Egg Harbor City*, 55 N.J.L. 245, 26 A. 89.

numbers, but we believe that sufficiently broad representation would still exist in such a situation that there could be no serious objection to the continued functioning of the House under its existing interpretation of the constitutional requirement for a quorum pending elections to fill the vacancies.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard W. Hogue, Jr., Chairman; M. Bernard Aidinoff, Stuart K. Barnes, Alfred Berman, William G. F. Botzow, Victor Brudney, Edward Q. Carr, Marvin E. Frankel, Edwin L. Gasperini, Cecelia H. Goetz, Daniel H. Greenberg, Claude E. Hamilton, Jr., Peter L. Keane, Robert A. Kirtland, Herbert Prashker, William J. Rennert, William I. Riegelman, Leonard B. Sand, William J. Schrenk, Jr., Hayden N. Smith, L. Harrison Thayer II, Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

Government Needs Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reporter Dispatch, of White Plains, N.Y., June 4, 1960:

GOVERNMENT NEEDS UNDERSTANDING

Management in politics? There was a time when the leaders of the Democratic Party would have condemned such a practice as something bordering on subversion. But times have changed—and the new outlook has been described quite aptly by William F. Luddy, the Democratic county chairman.

In an address before a graduating class of the Action Course on Practical Politics, Luddy rapped what he called a drifting away from political life of a large segment of Americans. And, principally, he pointed out the drift of a so-called management class.

"For a great many years," he said, "there has been building up a management class which has taken itself out of politics. They are greatly missed, and I hope that they can be brought back. They must realize that if they want good government they have to take part in practical politics."

At that point, Mr. Luddy said, businessmen can't participate civicly merely by joining luncheon clubs. He suggested that they become active in politics—"politicians must work out problems in the best interest of all the people."

It is a stand that should be endorsed by management personnel of industry and commerce. We have watched the Nation's artists, writers, actors and actresses, the unions—almost every segment of American life—become actively engaged in politics. Yet at the same time, business and industry, vital to the economy and well-being of the Nation, have gone unrepresented.

Thus the initiative, intelligence, and imagination of industrial and commercial leadership is lost to the country. It constitutes an abstention from citizenship responsibility in a field that can advance the cause of our democratic society, the field of practical politics.

Hmm. Could it be that a lot of the bosses of Westchester industry are not enrolled for Tuesday's primary?

Project Hope Accepts South Bend Nurse for Voyage to Indonesia and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Project Hope, a Navy hospital ship soon to head for Asian ports on a mission of medical care and the teaching of health, has impressed many Americans as a symbol of a positive and imaginative approach to building world peace.

I am pleased indeed that on the initial voyage of the SS *Hope*, one of the nurses aboard will be Miss Ann Roden, of South Bend, Ind.

I should like to include in the RECORD a column by Edward P. Morgan from the June 4, 1960, issue of the AFL–CIO news describing Project Hope and an article from the South Bend Tribune of June 12, 1960, concerning Miss Roden's participation in this fine project:

[From the AFL–CIO News, June 4, 1960]

MORGAN SAYS: PROJECT HOPE TAKES HEARTS, TOO, OUT THE MOTHBALL FLEET

On a day of homage to the war dead it seems not untimely to pay respects to those occasional humanitarian ideas to keep people living—ideas which, if brought to full flower, could conceivably obviate the need of New Memorial Days in the future.

About Christmastime a year and a half ago in Washington, a doctor, a lawyer, and a businessman formally incorporated an idea. They called it the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., or, for short, Project Hope—health opportunity for people everywhere. The idea was simple: Take a Navy hospital ship out of mothballs, load it with medical supplies, a trained civilian staff of doctors, nurses and technicians and sail it off to Asian ports as a floating storehouse and schoolroom for health with a mission of mercy as an added assignment in case of disaster, like the recent quakes in Chile, the tidal waves in the far Pacific.

Attorney Eugent Zuckert, a former Atomic Energy Commissioner; industrialist Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., and Dr. William B. Walsh, medical officer on a destroyer during the war, were all three driven by this philosophy: Poor health and illiteracy are the two heavy horsemen riding down the hopes of the underdeveloped countries. The unwell cannot learn properly. Poor health leads to poverty, poverty to hunger and hunger to despair. This chain reaction, unchecked, makes the illusory paternalism of communism attractive. As an antidote, Walsh took the idea to President Eisenhower who was struck by its potential in real people-to-people diplomacy. He promised to put a hospital ship in operating condition if Project Hope could raise enough money to run it as a citizens' venture, not a Government project.

Redtape being what it is, even in good will, the U.S.S. *Consolation*—rechristened *Hope*—is still being readied in the Bremerton, Wash., Navy Yard, but by mid-September it will be off to Indonesia with a staff of 60 doctors, nurses and assistants aboard, all volunteers. Already Walsh is oozing optimism: School children's dimes, pledges from industry and labor have subscribed a third of the $3.5 million budget.

So impressed was AFL–CIO President George Meany with the idea that he sent a special letter to all unions urging contributions equivalent to 10 cents a member—this alone could net more than a million dollars. A Detroit milk container company will spend $250,000 to film a documentary of the project. The petroleum industry has pledged $300,000 worth of fuel, enough to run the hospital ship for a year and the American President Lines, in cooperation with maritime unions, will operate the vessel.

Indonesia was the first of half a dozen Asian countries to invite Hope in. And no wonder. The country has 1,500 trained doctors for a population of more than 85 million.

Admittedly this is a tiny drop in the great bucket of need. There are bigger plans. Minnesota's Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has been working for some 2 years with other Members of Congress of both parties on a grandiose project to demothball a number of excess naval ships and embark them as a permanent Great White Fleet of peaceful missions for public health training, other technical assistance programs and to supply food and first aid in catastrophes. A resolution calling on the President to establish such a disarmed and disarming armada is grounded somewhere in committee and with the last fortnight's headlines of disaster as added impetus, HUMPHREY is trying to refloat it.

Walsh is sympathetic toward such moves but with pardonable pride in his own project he hopes to get Hope afloat first. He has an old-fashioned idea that people will respond if they have a sense of participation—something that can easily get crushed in the wheels of bureaucracy.

The job, though, is plainly so vast that to have more than a feature-story meaning, however inspiring, it will need all the combined support of Government and public and all the imagination that the bureaucrats and the private citizens can give it.

At any rate the idea strikes me as more fitting to the occasion of Memorial Day than the prospect of nuclear carnage or the carnage of combat on the highways with which we currently celebrate it.

[From the South Bend Tribune, June 12, 1960]

SOUTH BEND NURSE ACCEPTED ABOARD U.S. MEDICAL SHIP

When the SS *Hope* leaves San Francisco to give medical aid to Indonesia and Vietnam, a 25-year-old nurse from South Bend will be aboard.

Ann Roden is one of the 22 nurses, 15 doctors, and 2 dentists selected out of thousands of applicants to make this first voyage for Project Hope—health opportunities for people everywhere—which promotes world peace by providing medical aid and training for needy countries.

Miss Roden, who was head nurse in pediatrics at Memorial Hospital from 1956–59, became interested in the privately sponsored Hope project through a magazine article. Now working in a children's hospital in San Francisco, she flew to Chicago for an interview with the project's chief nurse. She was accepted, and came to South Bend to tell her parents before returning to her job in San Francisco.

A 1956 graduate of the School of Nursing at the University of Michigan, Miss Roden has "lived and breathed" nursing since she was 7. She says she has always wanted to do foreign service in nursing, and has closely followed the deeds of Dr. Thomas Dooley, University of Notre Dame graduate and medical missionary in Laos.

The first 6 months of the year tour will be spent in Indonesia, and the last 6 months in

Vietnam, she says. These countries were picked out of a great number that asked to have the SS *Hope* and its crew visit their country. Project Hope is the prime function of the People-to-People Health Foundation, a corporate entity of the committee on medicine and the health professions.

Initiated at the suggestion of President Eisenhower, the people-to-people program strives to promote world peace through increased understanding between the American people and the people of other nations. Its basis is the recognition that health is essential to the attainment of national dignity.

Project Hope is essentially a teaching operation, rather than an attempt at widespread treatment. The SS *Hope* was formerly the naval hospital ship *Consolation*. The 1,500-ton vessel, donated to the project by the U.S. Government, is equipped with 800 hospital beds and a surgical section. The ship will serve as a training and treatment clinic; a base for wide-ranging medical, nursing, and sanitation teams; a medical school, and the logistic center for medical aid and health and exchange program.

SHIP CARRIES HELICOPTER

Miss Roden says that the ship will carry a helicopter, which will be used to transport the medical team inland. The team will live in the ship except when they take trips further inland. To better understand the people, during the crossing the team will be oriented toward the religious and historical backgrounds of these countries.

Miss Roden left South Bend Friday to return to her job in San Francisco. The SS *Hope* plans to set sail from San Francisco about September 15. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Roden, 51585 Myrtle Avenue, will be there to see her off.

Dr. Arthur M. Gates, Popular Keystone State Dentist and Civic Leader, Is Observing His 53d Year in the Practice of His Profession in Coalport, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are few men in public or professional life who, at the age of 78 years, can boast of more varied interests than the popular and genial Dr. Arthur M. Gates, who for the past 53 years has practiced his profession as a dentist in Coalport, Clearfield County, Pa., in my congressional district.

Dr. Gates throughout his entire life has maintained a deep interest in public education, having taught school for 2 years after his graduation from Millersville Normal School. For a period of 46 years Dr. Gates served as a member and treasurer of the Coalport School District and for the past 11 years he has been treasurer of the Beccaria-Coalport-Irvona Joint School's board of education. In addition, during the period 1903–12 Dr. Gates served a 4-year term as borough councilman.

It has been my great pleasure to value Dr. Gates as a personal friend for many years, and I join with the community of Coalport and his many friends throughout the Keystone State in congratulating him on the twin anniversary of his birth and completion of the 53d year of dental practice in Coalport.

The following tribute to Dr. Gates appeared in the June 23, 1960 issue of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress. It reveals his fine achievements and the pardonable pride Dr. and Mrs. Gates have in the success of their four children together with the upspeakable joy provided by the love and devotion of their grandchildren:

COALPORT DENTIST, 78 TODAY, STILL IS BUSY AT HIS WORK

COALPORT.—Marking his 78th birthday today, Dr. Arthur M. Gates of Coalport can look back at a combined career of dentistry and public service that few men can boast.

In his 53d year as a practicing dentist here, Dr. Gates has served for 46 of the last 48 years as a member and treasurer of the Coalport School District Board of Education. He also served a 4-year term as a borough councilman in 1908–12 and for the past 11 years has been treasurer of the Beccaria-Coalport-Irvona Joint Schools Board of Education.

Dr. Gates' interest in education, however, can be dated even before he became a school board member in 1912, for after his graduation from Millersville Normal School he taught school for 2 years. One year was at Beaver Valley, Cambria County, where he was an instructor in the upper four grades and the second was at Blain City, where he taught seventh and eighth grades and served as school principal.

In 1904, Dr. Gates began the study of dentistry at the University of Pennsylvania Dental College and on graduation in 1907 opened his office here. While studying dentistry, he longed to become a surgeon, but because of financial circumstances had to forego that career.

Because of his interest in education, this year has special significance for Dr. Gates. Three of his granddaughters were graduated from high school this year and he was able to attend the graduation exercises of all three.

The granddaughters are Nancy Lynn Fisher, who was graduated from B–C–I High School May 31; Mary Elizabeth Conners, of Wynnewood, near Philadelphia, who received her diploma June 4; and Karen Marie Gates, of Shamokin, who was graduated June 7. All three girls received special awards at their graduation and Mary Elizabeth was valedictorian of her class at Sacred Heart Convent.

All three girls are registered for college in the fall—Nancy Lynn Fisher, at Carnegie Institute of Technology where she will major in art; Mary Elizabeth Conners at Trinity College for Girls at Washington, D.C., where she will major in languages; and Karen Marie Gates at Misericordia College, Dallas, Pa.

Dr. Gates was born June 23, 1882, the son of the late P. C. and Sematha Jane Hoy Gates, longtime residents of Coalport. His father was one of the incorporators of Coalport Borough and secretary of the board of education and borough council for many years.

Mrs. Gates is the former Frances DeSales Buck, daughter of the late Frank J. and Lucinda Rose Weakland Buck. Mr. Buck operated a grocery and general merchandise store in Coalport for many years.

Dr. and Mrs. Gates are the parents of four children: Frances Gates Fisher, a teacher in the Coalport elementary school; Mary Gates Conners, a teacher in the Lower Merion Township Schools near Philadelphia; Dr. Lionel Perry Gates, chief surgeon of the Shamokin State Hospital; and Dr. Robert Paul Gates, a heart specialist on the staff of the East Pittsburgh plant of Westinghouse Electrical Manufacturing Co.

Dr. Gates still observes regular daily office hours from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m., although he and Mrs. Gates in recent years have taken a month to 6 weeks' vacation, generally in Florida.

Federal Bureau of Investigation—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the third of a series appearing in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch relative to the wonderful record of the world's greatest law enforcement agency:

ARTICLE 3

WASHINGTON.—The FBI freely makes available to local agencies information involving violations of criminal laws within their jurisdiction.

Hence, the FBI expects, in accordance with Presidential directives, that local agencies will immediately refer to the FBI any information relating to subservise activities or possible overthrow of the U.S. Government. And they do.

Attempts at espionage or sabotage have been brought to the FBI's attention by local agencies since a Presidential directive in 1939.

Unified law enforcement in the United States during World War II, coordinated by the FBI, made it possible to avoid a single successful act of foreign-directed sabotage. Enemy espionage was nullified at the outset.

During World War II, countries at war with the United States were driven to desperate lengths in an effort to reestablish espionage and sabotage networks * * * to no avail.

Soviet espionage operations in the United States continue to suffer tremendous setbacks at the hands of the FBI.

During 1951, for example, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted as atomic spies for the Soviet Union. In 1953, Otto Verber and Kurt Ponger, naturalized American citizens who performed Russian espionage in Austria, were sentenced to prison.

Another Soviet espionage apparatus was smashed early in 1957 with the arrest of Jack Soble, Myra Soble and Jacob Albam by FBI agents.

In the summer of 1957, Col. Rudolph Ivanovich Abal was arrested and the equipment he used to transmit information to Russia was seized.

Abel was a carefully concealed espionage agent living an innocuous life in the United States, but he was a dynamic and active arm of Soviet espionage here.

He made use of virtually all of the techniques of professional espionage agents, including secret drops, special codes, radio transmissions and the use of hollowed-out coins for the transmitting of espionage data.

These are only some of the highlights of FBI accomplishments in combating Soviet espionage operations.

In addition, a number of persons have been indicted as a result of Soviet intelligence activities directed against the United States.

Some of these persons have been convicted while other fled the country to avoid prosecution. Information gathered and disseminated by the FBI has resulted in a number of Soviet and satellite diplomats being declared persona non grata.

World War II was the first public occasion in which the FBI had a clear opportunity to demonstrate its abilities in preserving our internal security.

Within a matter of hours after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, FBI agents swung into action based upon a Presidential directive and armed with Presidential warrants. Carefully prepared plans of the FBI which had foreseen such an event were quickly executed.

Director Hoover had instructed that the most dangerous alien enemies be ferreted out and kept under constant observation. This was long before World War II. Plans were prepared to cope with an emergency. The FBI was ready when war started. The most dangerous enemy aliens were promptly taken into custody.

In all, 16,062 alien enemies were arrested during World War II. Each was promptly presented before a Presidential alien enemy hearing board comprised of citizens of his community.

In each instance these hearing boards arranged for internment for the duration of the war, parole, or outright release, depending upon the facts gathered by the FBI.

This program of planning in advance, with careful investigation, had much to do with the prevention of any effective espionage or sabotage here by foreign powers during World War II.

Today, during a period of cold war when it is obvious there are persons at large devoted to the primary interests of foreign powers and not to the welfare of the United States, the FBI is still responsible for the internal security of the United States.

Agencies of the Federal Government and law-enforcement agencies representing cities, counties, and States are cooperating fully with the FBI. The FBI is responsible for correlating all information essential to protecting the internal security of the United States and disseminating it to the interested Federal agencies.

Security operations are primarily preventive in nature. Intelligence and counterintelligence information gathered and disseminated by the FBI frequently results in protective action before a violation of the law has occurred.

Facts furnished may justify diplomatic protests, visa cancellations, denials of access to classified data, and other types of nonprosecutive precautionary action. Naturally such data is of particular interest to the State Department and the White House.

Accordingly, the FBI's effectiveness in combating espionage, sabotage, subversion, and related threats to this country cannot be measured in terms of arrests and convictions.

Based upon facts, witnesses, and evidence located by the FBI, 109 Communist Party leaders have been convicted under the Smith Act of 1940. The first 11 were convicted in New York in October 1949 at the trial of the party's top national leaders. Based upon Supreme Court rulings in 1956 and 1957, however, only 39 of these convictions remain; the others have been reversed by the courts.

During the 1959 fiscal year, six Communists were reconvicted in Denver, Colo., under the conspiracy provisions of the Smith Act. These six subversives originally had been convicted in 1955; however, 2 years later their cases were retried by the circuit court of appeals. On the other hand, during the fiscal year retrials were ordered for six party functionaries in New York who had been convicted in 1956. As the fiscal year ended, indictments remained outstanding against 13 party officials.

Other convictions were returned against persons who failed to admit membership in subversive organizations when executing official Government security questionnaires. In addition, security-type investigations also led to a number of perjury convictions.

With regard to the threat of internal communism today, Mr. Hoover has this to say:

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., remains an integral part of the international Marxist conspiracy against God and freedom. Never has the party's leadership been more strongly pro-Soviet than it is today. The Communists' immediate objectives: 'Establishment of youth group and infiltration of American labor organizations and basic industries * * * all with a view to destroying our economic system and our free government'."

"Public apathy is our greatest enemy." (J. Edgar Hoover.)

One constantly bumps into individuals who claim they were investigated, screened, and cleared by the FBI. Nothing can be further from the truth.

In all of its history, the FBI has never cleared any individual. As a matter of fact, it is quite foreign to FBI responsibilities to clear or not clear any individual.

Even in the most heinous kidnaping or bank robbery, the FBI is forbidden to express any opinion. If an individual is guilty of a crime, the FBI presents the facts to the U.S. attorney. He decides whether there is probable cause and sufficient justification for a Federal complaint and an arrest warrant. The U.S. attorney decides what legal action will be taken. No FBI opinion is offered.

If there is an indication of disloyalty or of a security risk, the FBI will conduct appropriate investigation and make its reports available to the interested Government agency. These reports are not accompanied by any recommendations for corrective action.

The FBI holds steadfastly to its basic premise of being a fact-gathering organization. It was in March 1947, that the Federal employees loyalty program was established. The FBI was given responsibility for conducting loyalty-type investigations of employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. Under this program, not a single person has been cleared by the FBI. Not only that, the FBI never expects to clear anyone.

The responsibility of the FBI in the intelligence field is clear. Quietly and thoroughly, the FBI handles its particular duties with regard to the preservation of the internal security of the United States. Its effectiveness may best be measured by the continuation of our American way of life—unmolested.

Tomorrow the marvels of modern scientific criminal analysis.

The Challenges We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a review of "The Challenges We Face," by Victor Laskey which appears in the Saturday Review for July 2.

Mr. Laskey points out, that in "The Challenges We Face," Vice President NIXON has commented on virtually every subject of vital interest to Americans.

The review follows:

(By Victor Lasky, a writer for NANA and various magazines, who has observed the rise of RICHARD NIXON at firsthand since 1948.)

Assuming he is not caught flagrante delicto between now and July 25, when the Republican convention opens in Chicago, RICHARD M. NIXON appears destined to be the Grand Old Party's nominee for President this year. This, despite the recent challenge hurled at the Vice President by Nelson Rockefeller. The Governor accused NIXON of fence-straddling and called on him to "tell the people where he stands" on assorted public questions.

Now Mr. NIXON has unintentionally obliged. He has produced a sharp, timely, and substantial reply in "The Challenges We Face" (McGraw-Hill, $3.95), a well-edited, solidly documented compilation of his public utterances over the past 4 years on such varied subjects as Red China, civil rights, education, Latin America, labor, economic growth, national defense, Africa, refugees, foreign aid, Khrushchev, taxes, the budget, and the forthcoming campaign.

In short, Mr. NIXON has commented on virtually every subject of vital interest to Americans. Though it does not possess the literary flavor of the political writings of Adlai Stevenson, his book does present clearly and in depth the views of a presidential aspirant who, in a remarkable political rise, has yet to lose an election.

These, therefore, are the views of the man to whom the American people may well entrust the leadership of the free world for years to come. They should be of particular interest to American liberals, many of whom—for reasons this reviewer finds difficult to comprehend—view with dread the possibility of Mr. NIXON's occupying the White House.

What will undoubtedly surprise some people is the reasonable manner in which the Vice President states his case. There is none of the earthy partisanship of, say, a Harry Truman in this book. And one rather suspects that this will not be to the liking of the NIXON-phobes, who would rather deal with the mythical NIXON they have created—a man of no honor, no principles, no convictions.

This reviewer has known the Vice President for 12 years. He has followed Mr. NIXON'S career on an almost day-to-day basis. And he can state flatly that most of the propaganda attacks unloosed against the Vice President bear little, if any, relation to reality.

Mr. NIXON pulls no punches in his book. He says what he thinks. For example, he is opposed to recognition of Red China. And he spells out the reasons. But he does not follow the example of other presidential hopefuls who also claim to oppose recognition yet, at the same time, call for a reappraisal of that policy.

Not that Mr. NIXON is forever committed to nonrecognition. But he believes the initiative should come from Peiping. Only when that regime adequately demonstrates its willingness to live in peace with its neighbors should we begin a reappraisal of a China policy which, incidentally, has the overwhelming support of Members of both parties in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. NIXON is convinced that Red China may well be an election issue this year. But, he adds, "the overwhelming issue at the present time is the security and survival of the United States of America." And he believes that in choosing their President in November the American people "will put as their first qualification whether or not the candidate is able to cope with this issue of survival in all of its aspects." This involves such related issues as foreign policy, national defene, and methods to meet the ceaseless Soviet challenge—on all fronts—to free institutions everywhere.

But, unlike most of his calamity-howling rivals, Mr. NIXON believes that the United States is in pretty good shape. And that the Soviet leaders whom he's met in recent years are well aware of our overwhelming superiority in most areas.

The Vice President is far from complacent, however.

It is not enough for us to be on the right side [he observes]. History is full of instances in which superior civilizations were overwhelmed by others with more will to win, more drive, more energy. Around the world, in every nation, the representatives of communism are true believers like Mr. Khrushchev—working overtime for the victory of communism. * * * The fact that we have no desire to conquer the world does not mean that our alternative to communism is simply to leave the world as it is—ignoring the misery, disease and inequity on which communism thrives. We, too, have a purpose and a mission in the world today—and that is what we must make clear as we meet the Communist challenge.

And, drawing on his years of intensive world travel, Mr. NIXON spells out the need for better administered foreign aid, increased private investments overseas, more liberal trade policies, and an upgrading of our official overseas representatives.

Like Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. NIXON also emphasizes the necessity of continuing advances in all sectors of American life. But, unlike the Governor, he places greater emphasis on the so-called private sector—not the Government sector—in stepping up our national growth rate to compete with the Soviets. He deplores hysterical reactions to occasional manifestations of Soviet progress. "It would be a mistake in reacting to the Soviet challenge to swing to such an extreme that we might lose our present advantages," he says.

For example, in discussing the need for increased scientific education, the Vice President warns: "We do not want to ape the Russians and eventually become simply a pale carbon copy of the scientific materialists who run the Soviet Union."

Mr. NIXON is far from being the extreme conservative some liberal critics believe him to be. In many areas, his views probably will not satisfy some right-wing Republicans. Generally speaking, the Vice President appears to prefer the middle of the road to the ditches at either side.

What kind of a presidential campaign does Mr. NIXON envisage? He believes it "should be a hard-hitting contest on the great issues before the American people. * * * As to whether this * * * will be a mud-slinging campaign, I can only say that it certainly will not be so far as I am concerned."

This book is an indication of the high-level approach that Mr. NIXON intends to take during the campaign. If his Democratic opponent—whoever he may be—follows suit, then the American people will at long last be able to decide on issues, not personalities.

Maximum Development of Our Cities—A Vast Challenge for a Genuine Public-Private Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, filling the proceedings of this 86th Congress have been many subject of vast importance to America's cities. We have debated mass transportation, housing and urban renewal. In some instances this debate resulted in sound legislative accomplishment and in many, all too many other instances, the debate produced only guideposts for work which must be done here in future years.

I am among those Members who favor various sound Federal programs for our rapidly increasing urban population. Therefore, it is only fitting that I should stress the overriding fact that development of our urban centers to their maximum must involve a comprehensive public-private partnership, embracing all levels of Government and all segments of a community's business life.

Mr. J. Stanley Purnell, one of the leaders in Pittsburgh's renaissance, stressed the importance of this partnership most effectively in a recent speech before the Urban Renewal Advisory Commission in Toledo, Ohio.

Under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Purnell's remarks because I believe them of truly national significance:

ADDRESS BY J. STANLEY PURNELL, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, T. MELLON & SONS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

The prophets of urban doom would have us city people mired down in a morass of obsolete physical plant, inadequate transportation, horse and buggy government, and deteriorated housing and neighborhoods.

Inadequate for today, America's cities seem to be completely unprepared for the onslaught of population growth of the next two decades. 85 million more Americans will be here by 1980, and most of them will seek to live in and around our major cities.

Simultaneous with these dire reports are reports of another kind. Cities all over the Nation are starting to face up to their problems. Private enterprise, civic leadership, and public authority have teamed up to meet the future head on, and fashion cities which fully measure up to the needs and desires of Americans of the soaring sixties.

We who live in the atomic age, the age of anxiety and the space age, also live in the new and exciting urban age. It offers the challenge of competition, the satisfactions of civic participation, and the fascination of engaging in the greatest of all arts—that of civic design.

American cities are engaged in an increasing competition, not only for employment opportunity and economic advantage, but also for physical excellence. Attention of an unprecedented nature is being paid to the character, esthetics, and design of urban development. The hodgepodge growth of the 19th and early 20th centuries is being superseded by enlightened planning and design promising significant changes in the character of our cities over the next two decades.

This is a friendly, though vigorous competition. We in Pittsburgh are happy to be in it. We are glad to contribute what we have learned to the growing stockpile of experience in the revitalization of American cities. We seek to learn from others, to borrow from their ideas and their experience.

Although we have been hard at work for 15 years in the conscious effort to improve our city of Pittsburgh and our region, in many ways the job has scarcely begun.

In San Francisco, the dramatic Golden Gateway project involves a design competition in which many of the Nation's leading architectural firms are teamed with large private developers. In San Francisco, too, under the leadership of J. D. Zellerbach and other prominent business and civic leaders, a new dynamic civic group was created to keep the urban renewal program moving and private enterprise involved.

My old home town of Baltimore is forging ahead with the wholly locally financed redevelopment of the heart of the city's center under the guidance of the Greater Baltimore Committee.

A complex of new ideas and devices is being used in the redevelopment of the University Circle in Cleveland under the leadership of Case Institute and Western Reserve University. In addition, 5 years ago, business leaders put together the Cleveland Development Foundation in order to get urban renewal started. Its initial accomplishment was the causing of the private construction of more than 5,000 dwelling units for moderate income families.

In Pittsburgh, business leaders have been pioneers in the redevelopment of the city. As a matter of fact, they started at the end of World War II in 1944, when the city was engaged in a fight for survival. The outlook was bleak; industry was at a standstill. The city was just plain dirty. Civic pride was at a low ebb. Pittsburgh was not a very good place in which to live or work. Many were ready to nail down the lid on Pittsburgh's coffin.

But Pittsburgh wasn't buried. The dire prophecies did not come true.

The reason they have not can largely be attributed to a group of young men of vision and courage who had assumed positions of leadership in our large corporations. They were unwilling to sit on the sidelines and watch their city decay.

Under the leadership of Richard K. Mellon and a number of his associates, these younger officials and executives founded the Allegheny Conference on Community Development. What we call the Pittsburgh Renaissance dates from 1944, the year the conference was organized.

From its inception, the conference has included the community's leaders in business, education, industry, labor, science and local government. Its program is formulated and carried out by an executive committee composed of some 25 of the conference's 100 sponsors. The executive committee meets monthly to debate and confer upon every phase of the organization's civic program. This close devotion has been an outstanding characteristic of the conference since it was first organized.

Several points should be mentioned:

1. The conference was determined and serious.

2. The leadership worked together. Business rivalries and personalities were forgotten in the interest of the community development program.

3. The conference leadership worked with political leadership on the State, county, and city level, disregarding the fact that they might be on opposite sides of the political fence.

4. The conference leaders did not delegate conference work, but gave their own time and prestige to the program.

5. The highest caliber professional staff was obtained for the conference and for other civic and public agencies.

6. Business leaders were not afraid to use available tools, and develop and use new methods when the old ones were inadequate.

The work of the Allegheny conference and the civic and public agencies cooperating with it is evident everywhere in Pittsburgh.

A summary of the achievements of the past few years is impressive. Pittsburgh, once known as the smoky city, is now one of the cleanest in the Nation. The disastrous floods of the past are really of the past. One-third of the downtown areas has been redeveloped. New highways, parkways, and bridges have been built. Land has been made available for the vital expansion of the steel industry and for the growth of educational and institutional uses.

For all of this, we are just getting started. For example, now underway is a $400,000,

3-year regional economic study. The money was made available to the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association in equal parts by the Ford Foundation and the Pittsburgh Regional Industrial Development Corp. (using Commonwealth of Pennsylvania industrial development funds).

Recently, the countywide smoke control ordinance was thoroughly revised and improved. The proposed new ordinance is the most up to date and the toughest anywhere in the world. Major planning studies of the downtown central business district and in the University of Pittsburgh-Carnegie Institute of Technology areas have been commissioned. The studies are jointly financed by private business and by the city government.

The Allegheny conference has just undertaken a thorough reevaluation of the city and county public and private planning resources. The conference has retained Philadelphia's development coordinator to head up the study. This, to me, is a fine example of interurban cooperation.

I have mentioned our willingness to use the available tools and to fashion new ones when the old ones are inadequate. This pragmatic approach is the essence of the American way of doing things and, for that matter, the business way of doing things.

In some cities, businessmen have opposed using the power of eminent domain for redevelopment purposes. In other communities, they have rejected the idea of Federal renewal subsidy. We have had no such reluctance in Pittsburgh.

Where a job is properly one for private enterprise, we urge private enterprise to do it. When public powers are needed, we use them. When public subsidy is required, we usually get it.

Recently, one of the Nation's leading business letters, read by hundreds of thousands of businessmen and industrialists, devoted an entire issue to urban renewal and housing. It expressed the businessman's stake admirably, and pointed out that housing and urban renewal are good business. They will have a profound effect on the national economy for many decades ahead.

The $85 million Gateway Center, which replaced the commercial slum at the apex of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, was made possible through the judicious use of eminent domain for land assembly purposes by the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh. Public subsidy, however, was not needed, and was not used. The Equitable Life Assurance Society paid the full cost of the project in acquiring the land. The same was true of the projects undertaken for the expansion of the Jones & Laughlin steel mills, the University of Pittsburgh, and Children's Hospital.

Our lower hill redevelopment project at the base of the Golden Triangle is a different story. Here, land values are lower, and clearance was only possible through Federal subsidy, and Federal subsidy was used.

Where necessary, our Pittsburgh projects have involved the use of city, county, State, and Federal funds. We have been proud to reinvest our own tax money in the future of our city, our county, our State, and our Nation.

This investment is paying off handsomely. In the 10 years since the Redevelopment Authority acquired its first parcel of land, nearly $200 million in private funds have been invested within the boundaries of eight project areas. Almost 90 percent of this new construction is taxable.

For example, with development yet uncompleted, the 23 acres of Gateway Center are producing almost $1 million more per year in taxes to the local taxing bodies than did the 59 acres at the point in 1946. Thirty-six acres became Point State Park, and are not taxed.

I will not take up your time by reviewing all of the many projects which have been completed in the past 10 years, or are underway in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County redevelopment programs. That part of the program completed so far in the city, however, shows the following results:

1. A total of 236 acres of blight and decay have been restored to new usefulness.

2. The economic position of the downtown has been greatly strengthened. Gateway Center and the Lower Hill redevelopment project inspired an additional $75 million in private investment in the adjacent Mellon Square park area alone.

3. Thousands of new job opportunities have been created, and thousands more preserved.

4. By this summer, 16,000 persons will be employed in Gateway's new office buildings, and annual payrolls there will exceed $100 million.

5. Thousands of skilled craftsmen and laborers have been employed on redevelopment job sites, and thousands more offsite to produce construction materials.

On the other side of the ledger, in eight Pittsburgh redevelopment areas, local public agencies have spent $11,700,000 in public funds. This adds up to $1.40 a year per local city resident, or less than the price of a general admission ticket to see our Pirates play at Forbes Field.

Another kind of tool has been used imaginatively in Allegheny County in a vital area of development—the preservation of open recreation space.

Two years ago, the three Mellon Foundations announced they had purchased about 3,600 acres of farm and woodland in various sections of Allegheny County, and at intervals would sell the land at cost to the county to provide six major regional parks.

This was a tremendously significant event, not only to our community, but to the entire Nation. For the first time in an urban center, a recreational land bank to serve the general public was established by private interests. In this way, land which eventually would have been sold at greatly increased prices for other uses, was reserved for future park use.

This action by the foundations most certainly forestalled the speculation which would have occurred if the county government had purchased the land directly from its owners. Now, with the land bank created, the county will be able to buy the sites as public funds are available.

Thus, a unique private-public partnership, exemplified constantly in the Pittsburgh Renaissance, has preserved a precious natural resource for the benefit of all the people.

In the past decade, the emphasis of renewal and revitalization in Pittsburgh has been industrial, commercial, and civic in nature. About 3 years ago, however, the Allegheny Conference addressed itself to the community's housing problem, and, to guide its course of action, a survey of local housing needs was undertaken.

The survey concluded that a nonprofit, representative citizens' organization with a full-time staff be formed to move effectively against the obstacles to housing progress.

Accordingly, ACTION-Housing, Inc., was established in August 1957. Its board of directors, of which I am proud to be chairman, represents an excellent cross section of community life, and demonstrates the willingness of Pittsburgh leaders to work in the interests of community growth and improvement.

ACTION-Housing, Inc., is preparing, in cooperation with other private, civic, and public agencies, a program of housing and urban renewal to eliminate the slums and rundown areas in Allegheny County.

I'd like to tell you about just one of ACTION-Housing's programs in which the community's business interests are playing a key role. I refer to the Pittsburgh Development Fund of ACTION-Housing, Inc., launched last September, and given impetus toward its goal of $2 million by grants totaling $350,000 from the three Mellon foundations.

The Pittsburgh Development Fund will create a revolving loan fund expected to exceed $2 million, through interest-bearing loans from local major corporations, industries, and organizations. I am happy to report that the fund is backed with substantial loans.

The basic purpose of the development fund is to provide intermediate equity capital—seed money—for an extensive program of privately financed, privately built, and privately operated sales and rental housing, as well as stimulate large-scale home modernization for moderate income families. Please note the emphasis on private participation.

The fund will serve to backstop local lending institutions and the homebuilding industry, and will be primarily a source of working capital that could not be obtained otherwise.

ACTION-Housing, Inc., was created and is working in the belief that our residential neighborhoods, both in the central cities and the surrounding surburbs, must keep pace with the development of our industry, commerce, and institutions. As Richard K. Mellon said at ACTION-Housing's recent annual meeting: "An urban center such as Pittsburgh does not achieve true greatness unless its people are well housed—regardless of how many new office towers, expressways, and industrial plants are built."

For more than 3,000 years, cities have cradled and nouriahed religion, science, industry, and the arts. They have been the developers of tradition and the source of invention. In the new urban age, our cities take on even greater significance.

Since 1860, America has changed from an overwhelmingly rural to an overwhelmingly urban Nation. Formerly, almost every American came from the farm or from farm folk. This will not be true for our children and grandchildren. They will be truly urban Americans. The way we shape our cities will shape their lives and their outlook.

This is a tremendous challenge for Toledo, for Pittsburgh, and for all the cities in America.

In developing and revitalizing our cities, we work in a great tradition. Yet, we are pioneers. This is both our responsibility and our privilege. New frontiers await us. The opportunities are unlimited.

Teenager of the Year, Margaret Anne Fauver, Silver Spring, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pride I call the attention of the Members of the House to the "Teenager of the Year, "Miss Margaret Anne Fauver of Silver Spring, Md. By coincidence her father, Clarke L. Fauver is a fellow alumnus and Phi Alpha Delta fraternity brother of mine from Georgetown University Law School.

She is one of my constituents, a nonvoting constituent who has written an essay titled, "Being a Part of the Group but Still an Individual."

In an age of conformists, it deserves wide circulation since the author, Margaret Anne Fauver, is a member of that too-often maligned part of our population called teenagers. We hear too much about the tiny minority of juvenile delinquents these days and not nearly enough about the vast majority of our young people who are good, honest, conscientious civic-minded citizens of their schools and of their communities.

The essay written by Miss Fauver, which has just come to my attention, backs up an imposing list of school, civic, and community activities in which this young lady is currently, and as I suppose teenagers say, frantically engaged. It enabled her to win the Peter Pan Teen-Age Foundation Scholarship Award. This award is worth $4,000 to Miss Fauver. She has just completed her freshman year at Ohio Wesleyan University and I daresay the scholarship award will be as welcome to her parents as I am sure it is to her. It is my understanding that Secretary Arthur S. Flemming will present Miss Fauver with the award.

This scholarship is made available, through a series of regional contests, by Mr. Henry M. Plehn, president of Peter Pan Foundations, Inc., who feels strongly that the teenage group are better citizens than most of us realize and then set out to do something about it. Educators in the Washington area and in Philadelphia, Dallas, Minneapolis, Miami, and Los Angeles, where similar contests were held, warmly endorsed the teenage foundation program. Judges for the contest included Ivy Baker Priest, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, the Honorable David Kerrick, Dr. Hurst Anderson, Sam Levenson, Dorothy Gordon, to name but a few.

Miss Fauver's essay is brief, but to the point. I suggest that you take a minute or two and read it. You will be the better for it and perhaps have a better understanding of our teenage citizens.

BEING A PART OF THE GROUP BUT STILL AN INDIVIDUAL

In this age of emphasis on mass education and assembly line production, it is difficult to remain individualistic. It requires both courage to resist the comforts of conformity and conviction that individuality is too valuable to be sacrificed to group dicta. Similarly, one must realize that contact with the ideas of others, a stimulus to personal development and group achievement, should not be foregone because of the habit of professional nonconformity.

Recognizing that group relationships are valuable, each individual must determine his function within the group. An evaluation of personal moral standards should be the foundation of this decision. From this the individual can discern when, for the benefit of the group, he should act in accordance with the group's majority. His understanding of values, therefore, becomes a frame of reference by which he may evaluate all situations. A knowledge of his own personal beliefs, of his responsibility to mankind, and of possible consequences for his actions can and should serve as a guide for determining his conduct.

The realization, then, of the problems that must be considered by an individual, makes it seem apparent that remaining an individual within a group can be beneficial to both parties. An evaluation of his standards will enable the individual to understand himself and, perhaps even more important, to contribute more to the group. Independence of thought and acceptance of responsibility for personal action will both contribute to the integrity of his character.

MARGARET ANNE FAUVER, WINNING ENTRY, PETER PAN TEENAGE FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP AWARD

1. CIVIC AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

American field service foreign exchange program: One of two students selected to represent high school and Silver Spring community in Americans abroad program during summer of 1958; spent 2 months in Finland living with two Helsinki families.

Acted as host for AFS students from other countries in the Washington area during 1958–59 school year.

Spoke on the student exchange program and its potential contribution to international relations at numerous school, church, and service club meetings.

Served on high school screening committee to select those eligible to participate in 1959 Americans abroad program.

Girl Scouting: Member of a local troop for past 10 years.

One of two troop representatives to the senior planning board of the National Capital Council, which plans and coordinates activities of senior high Scouts in the Washington area; vice president of senior planning board, 1956–57; president, 1957–58.

One of three patrol leaders responsible for 24 Girl Scouts from the Washington area attending the first national Girl Scout encampment in 1956.

Represented Maryland and the District of Columbia at the all-States encampment at Cody, Wyo., in 1957. The encampment included 104 girls from 43 States and 3 Territories.

Christ Congregational Church: Church member and member of youth fellowship; vice president of youth fellowship for past year.

One of two principal speakers before the congregation during special Youth Sunday service.

Volunteer Sunday School teacher for children at District of Columbia Junior Village for 1 year.

Teen-Talk—TV program: Panelist on several television programs in the Teen-Talk series over WRC–TV, discussing problems of immediate concern and interest to teenagers and the general public.

Metropolitan Area Youth Council: Represented Washington area Girl Scouts on this council comprised of delegates from various youth organizations of the community (2 years).

Delegate from the council to conference of the Health and Welfare Council of the Metropolitan area (2 years).

Delegate from the council to the first Youth Fitness Conference of the National Capital area.

2. SCHOLASITIC ACTIVITIES

Honorary societies and special awards: National Honor Society (elected in junior year); Monogram Society (for service to school); Quill and Scroll; Thespians; and Mu Alpha (national mathematics.)

Gold key winner, Washington Evening Star citywide writing contest; 4-year perfect attendance award.

Journalism: Editor in chief, high school annual, Silverlogue (senior year); literary editor, Silverlogue (junior year); reporter, high school newspaper, Silver Chips (sophomore year).

Dramatics: Production manager, annual show; stage manager for "All My Sons"; and property manager for "Starwagon."

Service organizations: Student council (chairman, activities committee, junior year); Library Club (treasurer); baccalaureate committee (cochairman); Foreign Exchange Club.

In addition to these extracurricular activities, I have been a student assistant to the college counselor during the past year. This has taken the place of 1 classroom hour.

3. GRADES, END OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEAR

A in English III (accelerated).
A in chemistry.
B in U.S. history (accelerated).
A in plane geometry.

Rank in class of 620 at end of previous year: 27th.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1960]

SUBURBANITE IS TEENAGER OF THE YEAR

Margaret Anne Fauver of Silver Spring, Md., was the recipient yesterday of the Peter Pan Teenage Foundation scholarship of $4,000, given on the basis of contributions to school and community, as well as academic standing.

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made the presentation to Margaret Anne at the HEW building.

With the scholarship goes the title of "Teenager of the Year."

Margaret Anne plans to enter Ohio Wesleyan University in the fall. Her father, Clarke Fauver, is assistant secretary of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board.

World Peace Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, recent developments in the instruments of warfare compel thinking men everywhere to seek effective means to maintain world peace. It is generally conceded that such means do not exist today. Peace rests precariously on mutual fears inspired by the "delicate balance of terror."

The enormity of the problem of achieving a sound basis for peace, however, has resulted in a dearth of well-thought-out proposals directed to that end. Too many of us in public life have felt that we have done our duty to mankind by paying lipservice to the ideals of peace without taking the trouble to come to grips with the concrete obstacles which stand in the way.

The comprehensive series of proposals set forth in the now famous book by Grenville Clark, Esq., and Prof. Louis B. Sohn, "World Peace Through World Law," invite and inspire hard thinking about the basic and all-important problems of establishing such "legislative, executive and judicial institutions as are necessary to maintain world order under enforcible world law."

The immense amount of detailed work in the Clark-Sohn book is its greatest virtue. At any given point at which the vital question of strengthening the war prevention authority of the United Nations is approached, this volume contains essential background data and carefully studied suggestions. It provides an in-

valuable starting point for the statesmen of the world who must soon attempt to extend the rule of law to those activities of nations which have a direct relation to the issues of war and peace, if civilization in the form in which we know it is to survive.

A second and revised edition of "World Peace Through World Law," first printed by the Harvard University Press in 1958 after 9 years of preparation, is about to be published. In the months ahead, there will be translations of the second edition into French, German, Russian, Spanish, Dutch, Norwegian, and Swedish with translations of the general introduction into Arabic, Chinese, Italian, Japanese, and Polish.

Grenville Clark, a New York attorney since 1906, received in 1959 the gold medal of the American Bar Association for service to American jurisprudence and has been engaged in the study of the problems of achieving world peace since 1939.

Louis B. Sohn was a legal officer in the United Nations Secretariat and since 1951 has been a professor at the Harvard Law School where he gives courses in United Nations law and problems of world order.

I heartily commend to my colleagues in both Houses of Congress and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this statement by Messrs. Clark and Sohn.

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that the cost of this insertion will be $972, covering 12 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the introduction to the second edition of "World Peace Through World Law" may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I state for the RECORD that the cost for the printing will be defrayed by myself and by the authors of the book.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

(By Grenville Clark)

This book sets forth a comprehensive and detailed plan for the maintenance of world peace in the form of a proposed revision of the United Nations Charter. The purpose is to contribute material for the worldwide discussions which must precede the adoption of universal and complete disarmament and the establishment of truly effective institutions for the prevention of war.

At the outset, it may be helpful to explain: first, the underlying conceptions of this plan for peace; and second, the main features of the plan whereby these conceptions would be carried out.

The fundamental premise of the book is identical with the pronouncement of the President of the United States on October 31, 1956: "There can be no peace without law." In this context the word "law" necessarily implies the law of a world authority, i.e., law which would be uniformly applicable to all nations and all individuals in the world and which would definitely forbid violence or the threat of it as a means for dealing with any international dispute. This world law must also be law in the sense of law which is capable of enforcement, as distinguished from a mere set of exhortations or injunctions which it is desirable to observe but for the enforcement of which there is no effective machinery.

The proposition "no peace without law" also embodies the conception that peace cannot be insured by a continued arms race, nor by an indefinite "balance of terror", nor by diplomatic maneuver, but only by universal and complete national disarmament together with the establishment of institutions corresponding in the world field to those which maintain law and order within local communities and nations.

A prime motive for this book is that the world is far more likely to make progress toward genuine peace, as distinguished from a precarious armed truce, when a detailed plan adequate to the purpose is available, so that the structure and functions of the requisite world institutions may be fully discussed on a worldwide basis. Consequently, this book comprises a set of definite and interrelated proposals to carry out complete and universal disarmanent and to strengthen the United Nations through the establishment of such legislative, executive, and judicial institutions as are necessary to maintain world order.

UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

The following are the basic principles by which Professor Sohn and I have been governed:

First. It is futile to expect genuine peace until there is put into effect an effective system of enforcible world law in the limited field of war prevention. This implies: (a) the complete disarmament, under effective controls, of each and every nation, and (b) the simultaneous adoption on a worldwide basis of the measures and institutions which the experience of centuries has shown to be essential for the maintenance of law and order, namely, clearly stated law against violence, courts to interpret and apply that law and police to enforce it. All else, we conceive, depends upon the acceptance of this approach.

Second. The world law against international violence must be explicitly stated in constitutional and statutory form. It must, under appropriate penalties, forbid the use of force by any nation against any other for any cause whatever, save only in self-defense; and must be applicable to all individuals as well as to all nations.

Third. World judicial tribunals to interpret and apply the world law against international violence must be established and maintained, and also organs of mediation and conciliation—so as to substitute peaceful means of adjudication and adjustment in place of violence, or the threat of it, as the means for dealing with all international disputes.

Fourth. A permanent world police force must be created and maintained which, while safeguarded with utmost care against misuse, would be fully adequate to forestall or suppress any violation of the world law against international violence.

Fifth. The complete disarmament of all the nations (rather than the mere "reduction" or "limitation" of armaments) is essential for any solid and lasting peace, this disarmament to be accomplished in a simultaneous and proportionate manner by carefully verified stages and subject to a well-organized system of inspection. It is now generally accepted that disarmament must be universal and enforceable. That it must also be complete is no less necessary, since: (a) In the nuclear age no mere reduction in the new means of mass destruction could be effective to remove fear and tension; and (b) if any substantial national armaments were to remain, even if only 10 percent of the armaments of 1960, it would be impracticable to maintain a sufficiently strong world police force to deal with any possible aggression or revolt against the authority of the world organization. We should face the fact that until there is complete disarmament of every nation without exception there can be no assurance of genuine peace.

Sixth. Effective world machinery must be created to mitigate the vast disparities in the economic condition of various regions of the world, the continuance of which tends to instability and conflict.

The following supplementary principles have also guided us:

Active participation in the world peace authority must be universal, or virtually so; and although a few nations may be permitted to decline active membership, any such nonmember nations must be equally bound by the obligation to abolish their Armed Forces and to abide by all the laws and regulations of the world organization with relation to the prevention of war. It follows that ratification of the constitutional document creating the world peace organization (whether in the form of a revised United Nations Charter or otherwise) must be by a preponderant majority of all the nations and people of the world.

The world law, in the limited field of war prevention to which it would be restricted, should apply to all individual persons in the world as well as to all the nations—to the end that in case of violations by individuals without the support of their governments, the world law could be invoked directly against them without the necessity of indicting a whole nation or group of nations.

The basic rights and duties of all nations in respect of the maintenance of peace should be clearly defined not in laws enacted by a world legislature but in the constitutional document itself. That document should also carefully set forth not only the structure but also the most important powers of the various world institutions established or authorized by it; and the constitutional document should also define the limits of those powers and provide specific safeguards to guarantee the observance of those limits and the protection of individual rights against abuse of power. By this method of "constitutional legislation" the nations and peoples would know in advance within close limits what obligations they would assume by acceptance of the new world system, and only a restricted field of discretion would be left to the legislative branch of the world authority.

The powers of the world organization should be restricted to matters directly related to the maintenance of peace. All other powers should be reserved to the nations and their peoples. This definition and reservation of powers is advisable not only to avoid opposition based upon fear of possible interference in the domestic affairs of the nations, but also because it is wise for this generation to limit itself to the single task of preventing international violence or the threat of it. If we can accomplish that, we should feel satisfied and could well leave to later generations any enlargement of the powers of the world organization that they might find desirable.

While any plan to prevent war through total disarmament and the substitution of world law for international violence must be fully adequate to the end in view, it must also be acceptable to this generation. To propose a plan lacking in the basic essentials for the prevention of war would be futile. On the other hand, a plan which, however ideal in conception, is so far ahead of the times as to raise insuperable opposition would be equally futile. Therefore, we have tried hard to strike a sound balance by setting forth a plan which, while really adequate to prevent war, would, at the same time, be so carefully safeguarded that it ought to be acceptable to all nations.

It is not out of the question to carry out universal and complete disarmament and to establish the necessary new world institutions through an entirely new world author-

ity, but it seems more normal and sensible to make the necessary revisions of the present United Nations Charter.

MAIN FEATURES OF THE WHOLE PLAN

In harmony with these underlying principles, the most important specific features of the proposed Charter revision may be summarized as follows:

(1) Membership. The plan contemplates that virtually the whole world shall accept permanent membership before the revised Charter comes into effect—the conception being that so drastic a change in the world's political structure should, in order to endure, be founded upon unanimous or nearly unanimous approval.

The assurance of assent by a great preponderance of the nations and peoples of the world would be accomplished by the revised articles 3 and 110 providing: (a) that every independent state in the world shall be eligible for membership and may join at will: (b) that the revised charter shall come into force only when ratified by five-sixths of all the nations of the world, the ratifying nations to have a combined population of at least five-sixths of the total world population and to include all the 12 nations which then have the largest populations. The assurance of permanent membership would be provided by the revised article 6 whereby no nation, once having ratified the revised charter, could either withdraw or be expelled.

The practical result would be that the plan would not even become operative until active and permanent support had been pledged by a great majority of all the nations, including as the 12 largest nations Brazil, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the U.S.S.R.

Since in early 1960 there were 99 nations generally recognized as independent states or likely to be so recognized within a few years thereafter, the number of nonratifying nations under the proposed ratification formula would not exceed 16, all of which would probably be nations with populations of less than 40 million. And since, as a practical matter, the average population of such nonratifying nations would probably not exceed 15 million, it is unlikely that the population of the maximum number of nonratifying nations would be more than 240 million, or less than 8 percent of the world's population, which we have estimated as of July 1965 at 3,172,156,000.

With so large a preponderance in the number and population of the ratifying nations, it is reasonable to suppose that within a few years after the ratification of the revised charter, there would be no nonmember nations whatever. For it seems clear that few, if any, nations would wish to stand out when at least five-sixths of all the nations of the world, having over 90 percent of its population, had agreed to the new plan for world peace.

The likelihood that there might not be a single nonmember nation is made the greater by the proposed requirement (under revised arts. 2 and 11) that everyone of the necessarily small minority of nonmember nations shall, nevertheless, be required to comply with all the prohibitions and obligations of the disarmament plan. This provision that every nation in the world shall completely disarm and shall comply with the plan for the substitution of world law for international violence is deemed fundamental, since if even one small nation were permitted to possess the new weapons of mass destruction, such fears and suspicions might remain as to prevent the adherence of others, and the entire plan might be frustrated.

In view of the proposed requirement that every nation would, irrespective of membership, be bound to observe the world law in the field of war prevention, and the further fact that any minority of nonmember nations would necessarily be small, it may be argued that it would be simpler and legitimate to impose compulsory membership upon all the nations without exception. The plan set forth in a preliminary draft of the present proposals issued in 1953 did in fact provide that once the revised charter had been ratified by a very large majority of the nations, all other nations should be deemed full and permanent members, even though they might have deliberately refused ratification. In deference, however, to the view that no nation should be forced to accept such affirmative obligations of membership as the duty to contribute financially, the present plan stops short of compelling membership by any nation, no matter how overwhelming the support for the revised charter.

Nevertheless, the practical result would be little different from that of universal compulsory membership since, as already noted: (a) the maximum possible number of nonratifying nations could not exceed one-sixth of all the nations and could have no more than a minor fraction of the world's population; and (b) even this small minority of nations, although exempt from certain positive duties of membership, would be bound equally with the member nations to comply with the world law prohibiting international violence and requiring complete disarmament. This practical result would be accomplished, however, without the element of coercion involved in requiring active membership from the relatively few nations which might choose not to ratify.

(2) The General Assembly. A radical revision is proposed as to the powers, composition, and method of voting of the General Assembly.

Although the plan sets forth in the charter itself all the basic provisions of the disarmament process and of other main features (such as the proposed world police force, the revenue system and the judicial system), it would still be true that in order to implement these basic provisions, the powers of the legislative and executive branches of the world organization must be considerable.

The plan calls for imposing the final responsibility for the enforcement of the disarmament process and the maintenance of peace upon the General Assembly itself, and gives the Assembly adequate powers to this end. These powers would, however, be strictly limited to matters directly related to the maintenance of peace. They would not include such matters as regulation of international trade, immigration and the like, or any right to interfere in the domestic affairs of the nations, save as expressly authorized by the revised charter in order to enforce disarmament or to prevent international violence where a situation which ordinarily might be deemed "domestic" has actually developed into a serious threat to world peace.

To ensure the observance of these limitations, the delegated powers would be enumerated and defined in the revised charter; while, as still further protection, there would be an explicit reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not thus delegated "by express language or clear implication". The delegated powers are defined in revised article 11 and in various other provisions of the revised charter, while the reservation of all nongranted powers is contained both in revised article 2 and in the proposed Bill of Rights (annex VIII).

As above mentioned, the principle is followed that all the main features of the whole plan shall be included in the revised charter itself as "constitutional legislation", having in mind that the nations will be more likely to accept the plan if all its principal provisions are clearly set forth in the constitutional document itself. The effect would be to bind the nations in advance not only to all the fundamentals but also to many important details, and thus to leave for the General Assembly a more limited legislative scope than might be supposed.

Since, however, the General Assembly, even with elaborate "constitutional legislation," would need to have some definite legislative powers, the plan calls for a revision of the system of representation in the Assembly. For it cannot be expected that the larger nations would consent to give the Assembly even very limited legislative powers under the present system whereby Albania, Costa Rica, Iceland, Liberia, etc., have an equal vote with the United States, the Soviet Union, India, the United Kingdom, etc.

The purpose is, by abolishing the present system of one vote for each member Nation, to substitute a more equitable system, and thus to make the nations more willing to confer upon the General Assembly the limited yet considerably increased powers that it would need.

The proposed plan of representation takes account of relative populations but is qualified by the important provisions that no nation, however large, shall have more than 30 representatives and that even the smallest nation shall have 1 representative. The upper limit of 30 would be imposed partly because weighted representation is not likely to be accepted by the smaller nations unless the differences in representation between the majority of the nations and the largest nations are kept within moderate limits, and also because without some such limitation, the General Assembly would be of so unwieldy a size as to be unable to transact business. At the other extreme the purpose is to ensure that even the very small nations shall have some voice.

The proposed formula divides the 99 nations, generally recognized in early 1960 as independent states or likely to be so recognized by 1965, into six categories according to relative populations, with representation as follows:

The 4 largest nations, 30 representatives each, 120.

The 8 next largest nations, 15 representatives each, 120.

The 20 next largest nations, 6 representatives each, 120.

The 30 next largest nations, 4 representatives each, 120.

The 34 next largest nations, 2 representatives each, 68.

The 3 smallest nations, 1 representative each, 3.

A total of 99 nations and 551 representatives.

It is proposed that the populations of colonial and semi-colonial areas (i.e., the nonself-governing territories and dependencies, including territories under trusteeship administration) shall not be counted in determining the representation of the independent states but that, in order to afford equal treatment to the estimated approximately 95 million people (in 1965) of these areas, they shall be entitled to representation in proportion to population on the same average basis as the people of the member nations. It is assumed that as of July 1965 this method would entitle these areas as a whole to 17 representatives. The General Assembly would allocate these representatives among the various territories or groups of territories, taking into account their relative populations.

Of the assumed 568 representatives, 551 would therefore represent the assumed 99 independent states, while the non-self-governing and trust territories would have 17 representatives.

The four most populous nations of the world—the People's Republic of China, India, the Soviet Union and the United States—would each have the maximum of 30 repre-

sentatives; and even the smallest nation (Iceland) would have 1 representative. The 568 representatives would represent a total estimated world population (as of July 1965) of 3,172,156,000, or an average of about 5,600,000 for each representative.

The effect would be that, with relation to population, the smaller nations would still have a disproportionately large voice, but not nearly as much so as under the present system of one vote for each member nation irrespective of population.

Over a period of years, the authors have studied many plans for determining representation by various formulas that would take account of such factors as relative literacy, relative wealth as measured by per capita income, etc. We have concluded, however, that the introduction of any such other factors would raise so many complications and involve such uncertain and invidious distinctions that it is wiser to hold to the less elaborate formula herein proposed.

We have also studied numerous suggestions for a bicameral world legislature in which the nations would have voting power in one house in proportion to their populations, but equal voting power in the other house irrespective of their size. Modifications of this plan in the shape of a system of double voting in a single house have also been studied. After weighing these alternatives, we conclude that the one-chamber solution herein proposed (together with representation which takes account of relative populations, but is modified by the proposed system of categories and the proposed maximum and minimum number of representatives) is not only simpler, but also is probably as fair an arrangement as any other. However, we hold no dogmatic views on this difficult subject, the essential point being that there must be some radical, yet equitable, change in the present system of representation in the General Assembly as a basis for conferring upon the Assembly certain essential, although carefully limited, powers of legislation which it does not now possess.

As to the method of selection of the representatives, it is proposed that a system of full popular election shall be gradually introduced. This would be done under a three-stage plan providing: (a) that in the first stage all the representatives would be chosen by the respective national legislatures of the member nations; (b) that in the second stage at least half the representatives would be chosen by popular vote of those persons qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the national legislature; and (c) that in the third stage all the representatives would be chosen by the same sort of popular vote. The first two stages would normally be of 12 years each (three 4-year terms of the General Assembly) but could each be extended by 8 years by a special vote of the Assembly. The popular election of all the representatives would, therefore, normally become mandatory 24 years after the ratification of the revised charter and in any case not later than 40 years after the revised charter comes into force.

With regard to the terms of service of the representatives, it is proposed that they shall serve for 4 years.

Concerning the procedure for voting in the General Assembly, it is proposed in place of the present method: (a) that a majority of all the representatives then in office must be present in order to constitute a quorum; (b) that, except as to certain "important" and "special" questions, decisions shall be made by a majority of the representatives present and voting; (c) that on these "important" questions which would be specifically defined, decisions shall be by a "special majority" consisting of a majority of all the representatives then in office, whether or not present and voting; and (d) that in respect of several "special" questions, also specifically defined, there shall be even larger special majorities which in one instance would require the affirmative vote of three-fourths of all the representatives in office including two-thirds of the representatives from those nations entitled to 15 or more representatives, i.e., the 12 largest nations.

Two full-time Standing Committees of the General Assembly would be constitutionally provided for, namely, a Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies and a Standing Committee on Budget and Finance. The former would be a watchdog committee to exercise legislative supervision over the process and maintenance of disarmament and over the United Nations Peace Force. The latter would have vital functions in submitting to the Assembly recommendations as to the amount and apportionment of each annual budget for all the activities of the strengthened United Nations.

With relation tot he powers of the revised General Assembly, a clear distinction would be made between legislative powers and powers of recommendation. The legislative powers would be strictly limited to matters directly related to the maintenance of peace, whereas the extensive powers of mere recommendation now possessed by the Assembly would be retained and even broadened. To this end, the Assembly's legislative authority would, as above mentioned, exclude any regulation of international trade, immigration and the like and any right to interfere in the domestic affairs of the nations, save only as strictly necessary for the enforcement of disarmament or, in exceptional circumstances, for the prevention of international violence.

On the other hand, as distinguished from the power to legislate, the General Assembly would have the right to make nonbinding recommendations on any subject which it deemed relevant to the maintenance of peace and the welfare of the world's people.

(3) The Executive Council. It is proposed to abolish the present Security Council and to substitute for it an Executive Council, composed of 17 Representatives elected by the General Assembly itself. This new and highly important organ would not only be chosen by the Assembly, but would also be responsible to and removable by the Assembly; and the Council would serve for the same 4-year terms as the Representatives in the Assembly.

Special provision would be made for representation of the larger nations, whereby the four largest nations (China, India, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.) would each be entitled at all times to have one of its Representatives on the Council; and four of the eight next largest nations (Brazil, France, West Germany, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom) would in rotation also be entitled to representation, with the proviso that two of these four shall always be from nations in Europe and the other two from nations outside Europe. The remaining nine members would be chosen by the Assembly from the Representatives of all the other member Nations and the non-self-governing and trust territories under a formula designed to provide fair representation for all the main regions of the world and to insure that every member Nation, without exception, shall in due course have a Representative on this all-important Council.

In contrast to the voting procedure of the present Security Council, whereby any one of the five nations entitled to permanent membership has a veto power in all nonprocedural matters, the decisions of the new Executive Council on important matters (as defined in par. 2 of revised art. 27) would be by a vote of 12 of the 17 representatives composing it, with the proviso that this majority shall include a majority of the 8 members of the Council from the 12 member Nations entitled to 15 or more Representatives in the Assembly and a majority of the 9 other members of the Council. All other decisions would be by a vote of any 12 members of the Council.

This Executive Council would constitute the executive arm of the strengthened United Nations, holding much the same relation to the General Assembly as that of the British Cabinet to the House of Commons. Subject to its responsibility to the Assembly, the new Council would have broad powers to supervise and direct the disarmament process and other aspects of the whole system for the maintenance of peace provided for in the revised charter.

The Executive Council would, for example, decide (subject to review by the General Assembly) as to whether each stage of the disarmament process has been satisfactorily completed and, once complete national disarmament has been achieved, would watch over its maintenance. Nevertheless, the Council would always remain subordinate to the Assembly, which would have final authority to make such crucial decisions as the possible postponement of any stage of the disarmament process, and the imposition of sanctions in case of any breach of the peace or serious violation by any nation of the authority of the United Nations.

(4) Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council. These two Councils would be continued, but with a somewhat larger and different composition than under the present charter designed to provide a wider and better-balanced representation on these Councils.

The Economic and Social Council, instead of its present membership of 18, would have a membership of 24 representatives elected by the General Assembly from among its own number for 4-year terms. They would be chosen pursuant to a formula whereby each of the 12 member nations having the largest gross national products would be entitled to have one of its representatives on the Council at all times, the other 12 members of the Council to be elected by the Assembly from among the representatives of all the remaining member nations and the non-self-governing or trust territories, with due regard to geographical distribution.

The present provisions for the composition of the Trusteeship Council would also be substantially changed. This Council would likewise consist entirely of representatives elected by the Assembly from among its own number for 4-year terms and would be chosen under a formula whereby its membership would include three groups of equal number: (a) a group of representatives from the member nations which are actually administering either trust territories or other non-self-governing territories; (b) a group of representatives from the member nations which have achieved independence since 1939; and (c) a group of representatives from all the other member nations, i.e., from all the member nations not covered by the two preceding categories.

Like the Executive Council these two other Councils would be directly responsible to the Assembly. Their responsibilities would be enlarged; and their usefulness would be enhanced by reason of the greatly increased funds which would be available to them under the proposed new revenue system.

(5) The disarmament process. Annex I contains a carefully framed plan for the elimination—not the mere "reduction" or "limitation"—of all national armaments.

It calls for a "transition period" of 1 year following the coming into force of the revised charter during which the first new General Assembly would be selected, the first Executive Council would be chosen by the Assembly, and the first Inspection Commission would be appointed by that Council, subject to confirmation by the Assembly. The plan then calls for a "preparatory stage"

of 2 years, during which an arms census would be taken, an inspection service would be organized, and other preparations would be made. Finally, it provides for an "actual disarmament stage" which would normally cover 10 years during which there would be a step-by-step proportionate reduction in all categories of all national armed forces and all armaments at the rate of 10 percent per annum. As below mentioned, this normal 10-year period could be reduced to 7 years by the General Assembly or could, on the other hand, be extended by the Assembly under certain circumstances.

The proposed Inspection Commission, the members of which would be appointed for 5-year terms by the Executive Council subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, would consist of 5 persons, none of whom could be a national of any of the 12 nations having 15 or more representatives in the General Assembly and no 2 of whom could be nationals of the same nation. The administrative head of the Inspection Service would be an Inspector-General, who would be appointed by the Inspection Commission for a 6-year term, subject to confirmation by the Executive Council, and would be removable by the Commission at will.

The Executive Council would have general supervision over the Inspection Commisison with authority to issue instructions to the Commission and to remove at will any member of the Commission.

Very careful safeguards would be provided to insure the competence and integrity of the personnel of the Inspection Service and their devotion to the purposes of the United Nations. These would include a provision limiting the number of nationals of any one nation among those performing duties of actual inspection to not more than 4 percent of the total number of inspectors; a requirement that all the personnel of the Service shall be recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible; a prohibition against their seeking or receiving instructions from any government or authority except the United Nations; and the requirement of a solemn declaration that they will perform their functions impartially and conscientiously. On the other hand, all the personnel of the Service would be assured "fully adequate" pay and allowances and retirement pensions free from all taxation.

As a still further safeguard, the Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies of the General Assembly would have the responsibility of watching over the proper performance by the Inspection Commisison of its duties and also over the proper exercise by the Executive Council of its general authority over the Commission with full power to investigate and report to the Assembly itself.

The proposed powers of the Inspection Service are carefully defined in Annex I, and the General Assembly would be empowered to adopt further regulations to ensure, on the one hand, the efficacy of the inspection system and, on the other hand, to protect nations and individuals against possible abuses of power. While Inspectors would be given unlimited access to establishments with especially dangerous potentials, periodic inspections of less dangerous activities would be restricted to a reasonable number each year. Any additional inspection of activities subject only to periodic inspection and of places not ordinarily subject to inspection could be conducted only on the basis of a special authorization issued by one of the United Nations regional courts which would be established as explained below. Such an authorization could be granted only upon a showing to the court of reasonable cause to believe or suspect that a prohibited activity is being conducted in the place sought to be inspected. Regular aerial surveys would be provided for, subject to the limitation that no more than three regular surveys of any particular territory could be conducted in any year. Special aerial surveys could also be made, but only upon court authorization after a showing to the court of reasonable cause.

The reduction process during each year of the "actual disarmament stage" would be verified by the Inspection Commission, which would report fully to the Executive Council as to whether the required proportionate reductions had been duly carried out by all the nations. The General Assembly, advised by the Council, would have power to suspend the disarmament process for 6 months at a time if not fully satisfied that it was being faithfully fulfilled. On the other hand, after the first 4 years, the Assembly would have the power to cut in half the remaining 6 years, so as to achieve universal and complete disarmament in 7 years from the beginning of the "actual disarmament stage."

This disarmament plan, should, however, be thought of as a 12-year plan if normally carried out without either delay or acceleration, i.e., the 2 years of the "preparatory stage" and the normal 10 years of the "actual disarmament stage." At the end of the latter period, no national military forces whatever would exist; and the only military force in the entire world (as distinguished from limited and lightly armed internal police forces) would be a world police force, to be called the United Nations Peace Force, which would be built up parallel with and in proportion to the disarmament process.

No plan for universal and complete disarmament is practicable, unless all nations are bound by it. It is apparent to all that if any one of the larger and stronger nations were exempted from the disarmament process, no such disarmament would be feasible. But it is equally true in this world of novel weapons of tremendous destructive power that even a small nation might become a menace to the peace of the world. The disarmament system must, therefore, cover every nation, whether a member of the United Nations or not; and the plan includes appropriate provisions to this end.

Under the above-mentioned ratification procedure (whereby the revised Charter would not come into force until ratified by five-sixths of all the nations, the ratifying nations to have at least five-sixths of the world's population and to include each of the 12 nations having the largest populations), it is possible, and even probable, that there would actually be no nonmember nations whatever; and in any event any such nonmember nations would be few in number and relatively small in size. In case, however, there should be a few nations which chose to refrain from active membership, it is essential that they shall nevertheless be expressly bound to refrain from violence on the same basis as the member nations and to settle all their disputes by peaceful means. Correspondingly also, all nonmember nations must be required to observe the disarmament provisions. It would therefore be provided that all nations "shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and the obligation to disarm would be imposed upon "every nation in the world." Moreover, every nonmember nation would be brought into a special relationship with the United Nations through a system of agreements whereby all nonmember nations would agree to comply with the disarmament provisions of Annex I and the laws, regulations, and decisions made thereunder.

The proposed disarmament plan depends also on its simultaneous execution by all nations. It is obvious that no nation would be willing or could be expected to disarm ahead of the others; and therefore all necessary safeguards must be established to ensure that no nation would be put in a disadvantageous position because other nations have not simultaneously carried out their part of the plan. Accordingly the Inspection Commission would be empowered not only to approve annual disarmament plans for every nation but also to supervise and to ensure their simultaneous execution.

Still further, the disarmament plan must make sure that all nations will disarm proportionately. The year-by-year diminution of military strength must be equal for all nations, since no nation can be expected to disarm by a larger percentage than others and since no nation should be deprived of a main source of its military strength while other nations still retain their principal sources of strength. Thus a nation strong in nuclear weapons should not be entirely deprived of them while other nations retain a large proportion of their preponderant land armies. And similarly, a nation could not reasonably be asked to abandon its ballistic missiles while another was permitted to retain its bombing planes. For these reasons a uniform percentage reduction year by year is provided for as the fairest and most acceptable method to achieve total national disarmament.

It would not, however, be sufficient merely to provide for uniform percentage reductions in the total military forces and armaments of the various nations, since a particular nation might, for example, simply demobilize a large number of foot soldiers while leaving the strength of its air force and navy unimpaired. Similarly, some other nation might limit a required numerical cut in its air force to maintenance personnel while keeping all its pilots in the service. A requirement with respect to the reduction of weapons might also be easily evaded if a nation were permitted to divide the reduction unequally between its fighter planes and long-range bombers, or between its fissionable and fusionable weapons. A really fair and safe method of reduction requires, therefore, that each nation shall reduce in an equal manner the personnel not only of each major service (land, sea, and air), but also of each major component thereof. Moreover, this principle of proportionate reductions would need to be applied uniformly to troops stationed in the home territory and abroad. For example, if in a given year the ground forces of a particular nation should consist of 500,000 men of whom 100,000 were stationed abroad, a 10 percent reduction of 50,000 in that year would have to be divided in such a way as to insure that 40,000 be discharged from the forces stationed in the home territory and 10,000 from those stationed abroad.

Fairness and safety require similar equal and proportionate reductions in each major category of weapons and in all facilities for the production of armaments. Reductions of the same proportionate size should be made, for instance, in each nation's capacity to produce various categories of weapons; for example, with respect to guided and ballistic missiles, separate cuts would be necessary in the capacity for the production of short-, medium-, and long-range missiles.

With these considerations in mind, the disarmament plan includes detailed provisions requiring that all personnel reductions be distributed proportionately not only among the personnel of the major military services but also among their principal components. Similar proportionate reductions would be required among the various categories of the armaments of the various services and components and in the various facilities for armament production. The annual reduction plans of every nation would be subject to approval and supervision by the Inspection Service, and a serious violation could result in the postponement of all further annual reductions, for periods of not more than 6 months at a time, until the violation was remedied.

The disarmament plan also includes provision for a United Nations Nuclear Energy Authority with dual functions: (a) to assist the Inspection Service in guarding against possible diversion of nuclear materials to any war-making purpose, and (b) to promote the worldwide use of nuclear materials and processes for peaceful purposes. To these ends, the Nuclear Energy Authority would have wide powers to acquire by purchase at a fair price all nuclear materials in the world, with the obligation to have them put to use at fair rentals for peaceful purposes in all parts of the world under arrangements that would apportion the materials fairly and safeguard them against seizure. It is contemplated that this new authority, having wider scope and membership than the International Atomic Energy Agency established in 1956, would take over the personnel and functions of that Agency.

As in the case of the Inspection Service, the Nuclear Energy Authority would be under the direction and control of a five-member Commission. This body would be called the Nuclear Energy Commission. Within its field this Commission would correspond to the Inspection Commission and would be subject to the same careful provisions as the Inspection Commission in respect of the eligibility of its members and the authority of the Executive Council to supervise its policies and to remove any member at will.

The administrative head of the Nuclear Energy Authority would be a General Manager appointed for a 6-year term by the Nuclear Energy Commission and removable by it at will. Safeguards corresponding to those provided in respect of the personnel of the Inspection Service would also be applicable to the personnel of the Nuclear Energy Authority, and the Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies of the General Assembly would have responsibilities in respect of this Nuclear Energy Authority corresponding to its responsibilities in respect of the Inspection Service.

A new feature of the disarmament plan, made necessary by the recent penetration of outer space and its potentialities for the future, is a proposed United Nations Outer Space Agency. The broad objectives sought are: (a) To insure that outer space is used only for peaceful purposes, and (b) to promote its exploration and use for the common benefit of all the people of this earth, rather than for the benefit of any nation or any part of mankind.

The Outer Space Agency would, subject to the overall authority of the General Assembly and the Executive Council, be under the "direction and control" of a United Nations Outer Space Commission. This Commission, like the Inspection Commission and the Nuclear Energy Commission, would be composed of five members appointed for 5-year terms by the Executive Council subject to confirmation by the General Assembly and would be removable at will by the Council.

Correspondingly also, the Outer Space Agency would have an administrative head who would be called the Managing Director.

Moreover, as to the personnel of the Outer Space Agency, there would be safeguarding provisions in all respects similar to the above-described provisions relative to the personnel of the Inspection Service and the Nuclear Energy Authority; and the Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies would have "watchdog" responsibilities identical with those relative to the Inspection Service and the Nuclear Energy Authority.

Provision is made for reporting any violations of the disarmament plan; for correcting such violations; for the prosecution of serious individual violators in regional courts of the United Nations; and for sanctions against nations themselves in the possible event of defiance or evasion by any government. As a still further safeguard, there would be the above-mentioned committee of the General Assembly (the Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies) with the function of keeping a sharp eye on all aspects of the disarmament process and of keeping the Assembly informed of any derelictions or defects.

It is a basic premise of this necessarily elaborate plan for universal and complete disarmament that, while the proposed system of inspection and control could not provide absolute assurance against the clandestine retention or manufacture of weapons, it could and would provide highly effective protection. It would be fallacious and a counsel of despair to reject the idea of the complete abolition of national armaments, including nuclear weapons, merely because no absolute or foolproof guarantee can be supplied that every ounce of dangerous war material has been accounted for and that no dangerous new weapon can ever be secretly made.

It is believed that the whole proposed system of inspection, including the inspection of all means of "delivery" of nuclear weapons, would, in practice, make it impossible for any group within a nation or any nation itself to assemble weapons that would constitute a serious danger. And it is also to be remembered that a powerful world police force would always be in the background for the very purpose of deterring or suppressing any rash attempt at international violence.

The guarantees of safety to be relied upon when all national armaments are abolished lie, therefore, in the combination of a comprehensive and highly organized inspection system with a coercive force of overwhelming power. Not exclusively on one or the other, but on the combined effect of both, the world could safely rely in the abandonment once and for all of all national military forces.

(6) A World Police Force. The plan is framed upon the assumption that not even the most solemn agreement and not even the most thorough inspection system, or both together, can be fully relied upon to insure that every nation will always carry out and maintain complete disarmament and refrain from violence under all circumstances. Moreover, it must be recognized that even with the complete elimination of all military forces there would necessarily remain substantial, although strictly limited and lightly armed, internal police forces and these police forces, supplemented by civilians armed with sporting rifles and fowling pieces, might conceivably constitute a serious threat to a neighboring country in the absence of a well-disciplined and heavily armed world police.

In short, our conception is that if police forces are necessary to maintain law and order even within a mature community or nation, similar forces will be required to guarantee the carrying out and maintenance of complete disarmament by each and every nation and to deter or suppress any attempted international violence. In consequence, detailed constitutional provision is made for a world police, to be organized and maintained by the strengthened United Nations and to be called the United Nations Peace Force. This world police force would be the only military force permitted anywhere in the world after the process of national disarmament has been completed. It would be built up during the above-described actual disarmament stage, so that as the last national military unit is disbanded the organization of the Peace Force would simultaneously be completed.

Annex II provides in detail for the organization and maintenance of the proposed United Nations Peace Force—for its recruitment and pay, its terms of service, its maximum and minimum strength, and for its training, equipment, disposition and functions. This Peace Force would consist of two components—a standing component and a Peace Force Reserve—both of which would, save in the most extreme emergency, be composed solely of volunteers.

The standing component would be a full-time force of professionals with a strength of between 200,000 and 600,000, as determined from year to year by the General Assembly. The proposed term of service for its enlisted personnel would be not less than 4 or more than 8 years, as determined by the General Assembly, with provision for the reenlistment of a limited number of especially well-qualified personnel.

In respect of the composition of the standing component, assurance would be provided through various specific limitations in annex II that it would be recruited mainly, although not exclusively from the smaller nations. These limitations would include: (a) A provision whereby the number of nationals of any nation (including any non-self-govering or trust territory under its administration) serving at any one time in the standing component shall not exceed 3 percent of its then existing total strength; (b) a provision that the number of nationals of any nation in any one of three main branches (land, sea, and air) of the standing component shall not exceed 3 percent of the then existing strength of such main branch; (c) a provision that the number of nationals of any nation serving at any one time in the officer corps of either of the three main branches of the standing component shall not exceed 3 percent of the then existing strength of the officer corps of such main branch; and (d) a provision that not less than 2 percent or more than 10 percent of the total strength of the standing component shall be nationals of the nations or nation constituting any 1 of 11 to 20 regions into which the whole world would be divided by the General Assembly pursuant to paragraph 9 of article 26 of annex I.

The units of the standing component would be stationed throughout the world in such a way that there would be no undue concentration in any particular nation or region, and, on the other hand, so as to facilitate prompt action for the maintenance of peace if and when required. Proposed specific provisions in this respect include: A direction that the standing component shall be stationed at military bases of the United Nations so distributed around the world as to facilitate its availability in case prompt action to prevent or suppress international violence is directed by the General Assembly (or in certain circumstances by the Executive Council); a provision that no such base shall be situated within the territory of any nation entitled to 15 or more representatives in the General Assembly, thus insuring that no United Nations military base would be located in any of the 12 largest nations; a provision that all the territory of the world outside that of the 12 largest nations shall be divided by the General Assembly into 11 to 20 regions for the special purpose of distributing elements of the standing component between such regions, with the proviso that not less than 5 percent or more than 10 percent of the total strength of the standing component shall be stationed in bases in any one of those regions, save only when the peace force has been duly called upon to take action.

In order to insure the greatest possible security for the standing component, provision would be made that its units be located to the greatest extent possible on islands or peninsulas, or in other easily defensible positions.

The mobility of the standing component would be of great importance, in order that its widely distributed units could be promptly brought together into a formidable force in the event of any serious threat of international violence or serious defiance of the

authority of the world organization. The equipment of the standing component should, therefore, include an ample number of large and swift aircraft for the long-distance transport of men and supplies, and in voting the annual budgets for the Peace Force the General Assembly would have authority to provide for this need.

As distinguished from the active or standing component, the Peace Force Reserve would have no organized units whatever, but would consist only of individuals partially trained and subject to call for service with the standing component in case of need. It would have a strength of between 600,000 and 1,200,000, as determined by the General Assembly. Its members would be recruited subject to careful provisions as to geographical distribution identical with those applicable to the standing component. The proposed term of service of its enlisted personnel would be for not less than 6 or more than 10 years, as determined by the General Assembly. They would receive a minimum amount of basic training during the first 3 years of their term of service and some further training during the remainder of their terms, but except for these training periods would remain in their home countries on a standby basis subject to call.

The officers of both components would be selected, trained, and promoted with a view to "ensuring an officer corps of the highest possible quality" with adequate opportunity for the selection as officer candidates of highly qualified men from the rank and file.

Specific provision would be made for adequate pay and allowances for the personnel of both components, all pay and other compensation (including retirement pensions) to be free from all taxation.

It is contemplated that the United Nations Peace Force shall be regularly provided with the most modern weapons and equipment, except that its possession or use of biological, chemical, or any other weapons adaptable to mass destruction, other than nuclear weapons, would be forbidden, special provision being made, as hereafter mentioned, for the use of nuclear weapons in extreme circumstances. The initial weapons and equipment of the Peace Force would come from the transfer of weapons and equipment discarded by national military forces during the process of complete disarmament. Subsequent supplies would be produced by the United Nations in its own production facilities through a separate agency to be established by the General Assembly and called the United Nations Military Supply and Research Agency. This Agency would engage in research relative to the development of new weapons and relative to methods of defense against the possible use by any nation of prohibited weapons clandestinely hidden or produced.

With regard to the use of nuclear weapons by the Peace Force, the solution proposed is that neither component shall normally be equipped with any kind of nuclear weapons, but that some such weapons shall be held in reserve in the custody of a civilian agency for use only under the most careful precautions. This agency would be the Nuclear Energy Authority which would be authorized to release any nuclear weapons for possible use by the Peace Force only by order of the General Assembly itself, and then only if the Assembly has declared that nuclear weapons (which might have been clandestinely hidden or clandestinely produced) have actually been used against some nation or against the United Nations, or that such use is imminently threatened. While it may be argued that nuclear weapons should be part of the regular equipment of a world police force so that it could immediately crush by ruthless action any defiance of the world law, this solution has been rejected as being no more consistent with the purpose of the Peace Force than the regular equipment of a city police force with weapons whereby thousands of citizens could be killed in suppressing a riot.

It is also realized that it can be persuasively argued that nuclear weapons should not be even potentially available to the Peace Force. On balance, however, it is believed wise to make it possible for the Peace Force to use nucelar weapons in extreme circumstances provided that, as called for by the above-described proposals such possible use is safeguarded with the utmost care.

The immediate direction of the Peace Force would be entrusted to a committee of five persons—to be called the Military Staff Committee—all of whom would have to be nationals of the smaller nations, i.e., of those nations entitled to less than 15 representatives in the General Assembly. Beyond this safeguard, however, the Military Staff Committee would always be under the close control of civilian authority, i.e., of the Executive Council. Still further, the General Assembly, through its Standing Committee on the Peace Enforcement Agencies, would exercise a general supervision over the work of the Military Staff Committee and over the Executive Council itself in respect of the organization and all the activities of the Peace Force. In short, the plan includes the utmost precautions for the subordination of the military direction of the Peace Force under all circumstances to civilian authority as represented by the Executive Council and the General Assembly.

While a world police force, well-equipped and strong enough to prevent or promptly to suppress any international violence is, we believe, indispensable, the danger that it might be perverted into a tool of world domination is fully recognized. It is with this danger clearly in mind that meticulous care has been taken to surround the proposed Peace Force with the above-mentioned careful limitations and safeguards, so as to make its subversion virtually impossible.

Even with these elaborate safeguards, it is realized that the danger of possible misuse of the Peace Force cannot be wholly eliminated any more than every conceivable danger of violation of the disarmament process can be eliminated. However, in order to achieve complete national disarmament and genuine peace, some risks must be taken. What we have attempted is to reduce these to the very minimum. On the one hand we have sought to provide for a world police so strong as to be capable of preserving peace in any foreseeable contingency. On the other hand, we propose such careful checks and limitations that there would be every possible assurance that the power of this world police would not be misused.

It will be seen that despite all the proposed safeguards this plan calls for a world police that would be a strong and effective fighting force in case of need. The idea of some people that a world peace force somewhat similar as to arms and functions to the United Nations Emergency Force of 1957–60 might suffice is, we believe, unsound and untenable. Even in a world in which all national military forces were abolished, there would, as above mentioned, necessarily remain internal police forces of substantial strength which would probably need to possess a considerable number of rifles and even a few machineguns. In addition there would remain literally millions of sporting rifles and revolvers in the hands of private persons and thousands of nonmilitary airplanes, large and small. Accordingly, it is conceivable that, even with total disarmament, an aroused nation with a strong grievance could marshal quite a formidable armed force even if no one in it possessed any weapon stronger than a rifle. And while it is true that any such force, even of a million men, could not withstand a well-armed contingent of the world police of even one twentieth its strength, that contingent in order to suppress the aggression promptly and with minimum injury would need to be a genuine fighting force, well equipped and highly disciplined.

Moreover, there would remain a lurking suspicion for some time at least that despite the most efficient world inspection system some nation or nations had contrived to hide or might produce secretly some forbidden weapons. In these circumstances it seems perfectly clear that in order to provide the necessary assurance to obtain general assent to universal and complete disarmament, it will be essential to provide a world police of such strength and armament as to be able quickly and certainly to prevent or suppress any international violence. We firmly believe that on no cheaper terms can universal and complete disarmament be achieved, while it is equally clear that without total disarmament, genuine peace is unattainable. We submit, in short, that a strong and well-armed police force is part of the indispensable price of peace and that the sooner the world faces up to this conclusion the better it will be for all peoples.

(7) The judicial and conciliation system. In accordance with the conception that the abolition of national armaments is indispensable to genuine peace, and that if such armaments are abolished other means must be simultaneously provided for the adjudication or settlement of international disputes and for "peaceful change," provision is made for a world system of conciliation and adjudication.

In proposing such a system, recognition is given to the existence of two main categories of international disputes, namely: (1) those disputes which are capable of adjudication through the application of legal principles, and (2) the equally or more important category of disputes which cannot be satisfactorily settled on the basis of applicable legal principles.

With respect to those international disputes which are susceptible of settlement upon legal principles, it is proposed to empower the General Assembly to direct the submission of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice whenever the Assembly finds that its continuance is likely to endanger international peace. In case of such submission, the Court would have compulsory jurisdiction to decide the case, even if one of the parties should refuse to come before the Court.

The International Court of Justice would also be given authority to decide questions relating to the interpretation of the revised Charter; and to decide disputes involving the constitutionality of laws enacted thereunder. Compulsory jurisdiction would also be conferred upon the Court in certain other respects as, for example, any dispute relating to the interpretation of treaties or other international agreements, or as to the validity of any such treaty or agreement alleged to conflict with the revised Charter.

In order to strength the independence and authority of the International Court of Justice in view of these enlarged powers, it is proposed that the tenure of its 15 judges shall be for life, instead of for 9-year terms as provided by the present statute of the Court, subject only to the possibility of dismissal if in the unanimous opinion of his colleagues, a judge is no longer able properly to perform his functions or, as now provided, has in their unanimous opinion "ceased to fulfill the required conditions" of his tenure. The judges of the Court would be elected, not by concurrent action of the General Assembly and the Security Council, as at persent, but by the General Assembly alone, from a list of candidates prepared by the Executive Council upon the

basis of nominations received from the members of the highest courts of justice of member nations, from national and international associations of international lawyers and from professors of international law. The Council would be required to present three candidates for each vacancy.

In respect of the enforcement of the judgments of the International Court of Justice, it is proposed that the General Assembly (or in certain special circumstances the Executive Council) could direct economic sanctions or, in the last resort, action by the United Nations Peace Force to ensure compliance. Any such action would, however, be limited, if at all possible, to air or naval demonstrations and would involve actual military operations against a noncomplying nation only if absolutely necessary.

With regard to the other main category of international disputes, i.e., those inevitable disputes which are not of an exclusively legal nature, it is proposed to establish a new tribunal of the highest possible prestige, to be known as the World Equity Tribunal. To this end it is proposed that the tribunal shall be composed of 15 persons elected by the General Assembly pursuant to safeguards and an elaborate procedure designed to ensure the choice of individuals whose reputation, experience and character would furnish the best assurance of impartiality and breadth of view. Thus no two of them could be nationals of the same nation, and it would be required that at least 10 of the 15 must have had more than 20 years of legal experience as judges, teachers of law or practicing lawyers. In addition, the General Assembly would be restricted in its choice to a list of persons nominated by the member nations upon the recommendation of a committee in each member nation which would have to include representatives of its principal judicial tribunals and legal associations, and of its leading academic, scientific, economic and religious organizations. Beyond this, the General Assembly would be required to pay due regard to the geographical distribution of the members of the tribunal, so as to ensure fair representation of all the principal regions of the world.

To insure the independence of the members of the World Equity Tribunal, they would be elected for life, subject only to the possibility of dismissal if, in the unanimous opinion of his colleagues, a member is no longer able property to perform his functions or has ceased to fulfill the required conditions of his tenure.

In ordinary circumstances this world equity tribunal could not make binding decisions, as distinguished from recommendations, except with the consent of the parties. But provision is made that if the General Assembly votes by a large special majority, i.e., by a three-fourths majority of all the representatives then in office (including two-thirds of all the representatives from the 12 largest nations), that the carrying out of the tribunal's recommendations is essential for the preservation of peace, the recommendations of the tribunal shall become enforceable by the same means as a judgment of the International Court of Justice.

The purpose of this important departure is to supplement other methods for settling nonlegal international disputes (such as negotiation, conciliation and agreed arbitration) by providing an impartial world agency of so high a stature that, under exceptional conditions involving world peace, its recommendations may be given the force of law.

Through the adoption of these proposals in respect of both legal and nonlegal international disputes, world institutions would at last exist whereby any nation could be compelled to submit any dispute dangerous to peace for a final and peaceful settlement; and the world would no longer be helpless, for lack of adequate machinery, to deal by peaceful means with any and all dangerous disputes between nations.

In order to provide means for the trial of individuals accused of violating the disarmament provisions of the revised charter or of other offenses against the charter or laws enacted by the General Assembly, and to provide safeguards against possible abuse of power by any organ or official of the United Nations, provision is also made for regional United Nations courts, inferior to the International Court of Justice, and for the review by the International Court of decisions of these regional courts.

The proposal is for not less than 20 or more than 40 such regional courts, to have jurisdiction in regions to be delineated by the General Assembly, each regional court to be composed of not less than three or more than nine judges. The judges of these courts would be appointed by the Executive Council from a list of qualified persons prepared by the International Court of Justice, with the provisos that not more than one-third of the judges of any such court could be nationals of the nations included in the region of the court's jurisdiction, and that no two judges of any such court could be nationals of the same nation. Their appointments (which would be subject to confirmation by the General Assembly) would be for life, subject only to dismissal for cause by a vote of two-thirds of all the judges of the International Court.

The regional United Nations courts, together with the International Court of Justice, would introduce a regime of genuine and enforceable world law in respect of all legal questions likely to endanger world peace, while the World Equity Tribunal would, as above mentioned, provide means for the authoritative and compulsory settlement of nonlegal situations seriously dangerous to peace.

In addition to these judicial agencies, it is proposed to establish a World Conciliation Board which could be voluntarily availed of by the nations, or to which the General Assembly could refer any international dispute or situation likely to threaten peace. The functions of this new Board would be strictly confined to mediation and conciliation; and, if it failed to bring the disputing nations to a voluntary settlement, resort could be had to the International Court of Justice or the World Equity Tribunal, as might be most suitable in view of the nature of the issues involved.

In order to achieve genuine peace we must have more than total and universal disarmament and more than an effective world police. We must also have world tribunals to which the nations can resort with confidence for the adjustment or decision of their disputes and which, subject to careful safeguards, will have clearly defined authority to deal with any dispute which is dangerous to peace even if a nation does not wish to submit to the jurisdiction of the appropriate tribunal.

(8) Enforcement and penalties. The plan envisages a variety of enforcement measures, including the prosecution in United Nations regional courts of individuals responsible for a violation of the disarmament provisions.

In order to aid the Inspection Service in the detection and prosecution of any such violators, it is proposed to have a civil police force of the United Nations with a strength not exceeding 10,000. This force would be under the general direction of an Attorney General of the United Nations, to be appointed by the Executive Council subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. The Attorney General, besides having supervision over the civil police force, would be responsible for making arrangements with national authorities for assistance in the apprehension of persons accused of offenses against the revised charter and the laws and regulations enacted thereunder and for the detention of such persons pending trial. Provision would also be made for Assistant Attorneys General of the United Nations who would be assigned to each regional court.

In case of a serious violation of the revised charter or any law or regulation enacted thereunder for which a national government is found to be directly or indirectly responsible, the General Assembly could order economic sanctions against the nation concerned. In extreme cases the Assembly (or the Executive Council in an emergency and subject to immediate review by the Assembly) would also have authority to order the United Nations peace force into action. Any such enforcement action would correspond to the above-mentioned action available for the enforcement of judgments of the International Court of Justice or of the recommendations of the World Equity Tribunal for the settlement of a dispute when the General Assembly has decided that a continuance of the dispute would be a serious danger to peace.

(9) World development. The plan further provides (revised articles 7 and 59 and annex IV) for the establishment of a World Development Authority, whose function would be to assist in the economic and social development of the underdeveloped areas of the world, primarily through grants-in-aid and interest-free loans. This Authority would be under the direction of a World Development Commission of five members to be chosen with due regard to geographical distribution by the Economic and Social Council, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly.

The World Development Commission would be under the general supervision of the Economic and Social Council which would have power to define broad objectives and priorities. Since that Council would be composed of 24 representatives of whom 12 would come from the member nations having the highest gross national products and 12 from among the representatives of the other member nations selected with due regard to geographical distribution, there would thus be reasonable assurance that account would be taken both of the views of those nations contributing large shares of United Nations revenue, and also of the nations most in need of the Authority's assistance.

This proposed World Development Authority could, if the General Assembly so decided, have very large sums at its disposal, since the Authority's funds would be allocated to it by the Assembly out of the general revenues of the United Nations. With the large resources which the Assembly could and should provide, the World Development Authority would have the means to aid the underdeveloped areas of the world to the extent necessary to remove the danger to world stability and peace caused by the immense economic disparity between those areas and the industrialized regions of the world.

While universal, enforceable and complete disarmament, together with adequate institutions and methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes, are certainly indispensable, no solid and stable peace can be assured by these means alone. There is also required a more positive approach through the amelioration of the worst economic ills of mankind. To this end, the new World Development Authority, together with the Nuclear Energy Authority, would serve as important arms of the strengthened United Nations.

(10) A United Nations Revenue System. It would obviously be futile to establish the proposed new world institutions called for by the plan (including the United Nations Peace Force, the Inspection Service, the

World Development Authority, the Nuclear Energy Authority, the Outer Space Agency, the World Equity Tribunal and the World Conciliation Board) unless a well-planned system is provided for their sufficient and reliable financial support. Such a system should also, of course, provide for the adequate support of the already existing organs and agencies of the United Nations which would be continued and, in some cases, would have enlarged functions and responsibilities. These include the revised General Assembly itself, the strengthened International Court of Justice, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the Secretariat and the various specialized agencies already affiliated with the United Nations.

The United Nations Peace Force, with an assumed strength for its standing componet of, say, 400,000 (midway between the proposed constitutional maximum of 600,000 and minimum of 200,000) and with an assumed strength for the Peace Force Reserve of, say, 900,000 (midway between the proposed constitutional maximum of 1,200,000 and minimum of 600,000) would alone require some $9 billion annually. The minimum annual amount required for the General Assembly and Executive Council, the judicial system, the Secretariat, the Inspection Service, the Nuclear Energy Authority, the Outer Space Agency and the other organs and agencies other than the World Development Authority may be estimated at $2 billion. To this should be added a large amount on the order of $25 billion which should be annually appropriated by the General Assembly for the proposed World Development Authority in order to make a real impression on the vast problem of mitigating the worst economic disparities between nations and regions.

Upon first impression, this assumed $25 billion figure for world development may appear high, but is in fact moderate if the purpose is to accomplish a substantial change in the living conditions of the more economically underdeveloped areas of the world. This is so because before the machinery for supplying any such amount can become operative, there will probably be an increase in world population to nearly 4 billion, by which time the number of people living in poverty relative to the standards of the industrialized nations will certainly be not less than 2 billion. Accordingly, the annual expenditure of $25 billion to improve the condition of these people would represent only about $12 per capita which is little enough to accomplish any substantial improvement in their living standards.

It is apparent, therefore, that the reasonable expenses of a world authority adequately equipped to deter or suppress any international violence, to administer a comprehensive system for the peaceful settlement of all disputes between nations and also to do something substantial for the economic betterment of the underdeveloped parts of the world, could easily run to $36 billion per annum. And while this amount would be less than one-half of the 1960–61 budget of a single nation—the United States—it would, nevertheless, be so large a sum that reliance for supplying it should not be placed on a system of yearly contributions by the separate governments of nearly 100 nations. Apart from a World Development Authority, the maintenance of a high level of efficiency and morale by the proposed Inspection Service, the Peace Force, the Nuclear Energy Authority, and the Outer Space Agency would be of crucial importance; and it would indeed be folly to set up these and other vital organs without reliable machinery for supplying the necessary funds. To this end, a carefully devised collaborative revenue system is proposed.

A chief feature of this system would be that each member Nation would assign in advance to the United Nations all or part of certain taxes designated by it and assessed under its national laws. Each nation would undertake the entire administrative function of collecting the taxes thus assigned to the United Nations, these taxes to be paid directly to a fiscal office of the United Nations in each member nation. In this way it would be unnecessary to create any considerable United Nations bureaucracy for this purpose.

Another important feature would be an overall limit on the maximum amount of revenue to be raised in any year; namely, 2 percent of the gross world product (total value of all goods produced and services rendered) as estimated from year to year by the above-mentioned Standing Committee on Budget and Finance of the General Assembly.

The General Assembly would adopt the annual United Nations budget covering all its activities, and would determine the amounts to be supplied by the taxpayers of each member nation for that budget. These amounts would be allotted on the basis of each member nation's estimated proportion of the estimated gross world product in that year subject to a uniform "per capita deduction" of not less than 50 or more than 90 percent of the estimated average per capita product of the 10 member nations having the lowest per capita national products, as determined by the Assembly. A further provision would limit the amount to be supplied by the people of any member nation in any one year to a sum not exceeding 2½ percent of that nation's estimated national product.

Taking 1980 as an example, and assuming that the gross world product for that year was estimated at $2,600 billion, the maximum United Nations revenue which could be raised would be $52 billion. And if for the 1980 fiscal year a budget of $16 billion less than the maximum, or $36 billion, was voted, it being then estimated that the United States had 30 percent of the gross world product, the amount which the taxpayers of the United States could be called upon to supply, allowing for the per capita deduction would be about $12.2 billion. This charge upon the taxpayers of the United States, while substantial, would still be less than one-third of the approximately $46 billion to be supplied by them in 1960–61 for military purposes alone. It follows that upon the completion of national disarmament, whereby this $46 billion item would be entirely eliminated, even the maximum possible charge for the budget of the strengthened United Nations would seem relatively small. The same would be true of any other nation with large military expenses.

In addition to the provisions for the raising of annual revenue, a United Nations borrowing power would also be provided for, with the limitation that the total United Nations debt outstanding in any year shall not (except in grave emergency declared by the General Assembly) exceed 5 percent of the estimated gross world product in that year.

A more detailed explanation of this revenue plan is set forth in annex V. It is believed that the plan would be effective to provide reliable and adequate revenues for the strengthened United Nations without involving the creation of a United Nations revenue-raising bureaucracy.

(11) Privileges and immunities. Annex VI relates to the privileges and immunities of the United Nations itself and of the greatly expanded personnel (including the United Nations Peace Force) which, under the revised Charter, would be in the service of the United Nations.

For the successful operation of an effective world organization to maintain peace, a body of genuinely international servants of high morale is clearly essential. To this end, it seems advisable to provide constitutionally and in some detail not only as to the privileges and immunities of the United Nations as an organization, but also as to the rights and privileges of all United Nations personnel and the limitations thereon.

(12) Bill of rights. Annex VII contains a proposed bill of rights having a twofold purpose: (a) to emphasize the limited scope of the strengthened United Nations by an explicit reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not delegated by express language or clear implication; and (b) to guarantee that the strengthened United Nations shall not in any manner violate certain basic rights of the individual, that is to say, of any person in the world.

The reason for the former is to make doubly sure that the authority of the United Nations shall not be enlarged by indirection, but shall be confined within the limits set forth in the revised charter.

The latter set of provisions would not extend to any attempted protection of the individual against the action of his own government. It may be argued that the time has come for a world organization to guarantee to every person in the world and against any authority whatever a few fundamental rights—such as exemption from slavery, freedom from torture and the right to be heard before criminal condemnation. We have not, however, thought it wise to attempt so vast a departure; and the proposed guarantees relate solely to possible infringements by the United Nations itself. Against such violations it does seem advisable and proper to have the explicit assurances which would be provided by annex VII.

The assurances thus provided would include: guarantees, in considerable detail, of the right of fair trial for any person accused of a violation of the revised charter or of any law or regulation enacted thereunder; a guarantee against double jeopardy; i.e., against being tried twice for the same alleged offense against the United Nations; and also a prohibition against any ex post facto law of the United Nations; i.e., against any law making criminal an act which was not criminal at the time the act occurred.

Provisions would also be included against excessive bail and any cruel or unusual punishment, including excessive fines; and the death penalty would be specifically prohibited. In addition, a remedy would be provided against unreasonable detention through a provision securing the right of any person detained for any alleged violation of the revised charter or of any law or regulation enacted thereunder to be brought wtihout undue delay before the appropriate United Nations tribunal to determine whether there is just cause for his detention.

Unreasonable searches and seizures would also be forbidden, subject to the proviso that this prohibition shall not prejudice searches and seizures clearly necessary or advisable for the enforcement of total disarmament.

Finally, it would be provided that the United Nations shall not restrict or interfere with freedom of conscience or religion; freedom of speech, press or expression in any other form; freedom of association and assembly; or freedom of petition.

The effort has been to provide protection for all the most fundamental individual rights which might conceivably be infringed upon by the United Nations without, however, going into undue detail. Necessarily, as in the case of any constitutional guarantees of the rights of the individual, there will be room for judicial interpretation and application of a United Nations Bill of Rights. This function would be performed by the International Court of Justice which, in the exercise of its proposed jurisdiction to interpret the revised charter and to declare void any law, regulation or decision conflicting with the revised charter as so interpreted, would gradually build up a body of world constitutional law relative to the

scope and application of the various provisions of the Bill of Rights.

(13) Ratification: The proposed requirements for ratification of the revised charter are (a) that ratification shall be by five-sixths of the world's nations, including all the 12 largest nations, the aggregate of the populations of the ratifying nations to equal at least five-sixths of the total world population; and (b) that each nation's ratification shall be by its own constitutional processes.

At first glance, the requirement that so very large a preponderance of the nations and people of the world shall be necessary for ratification may appear excessively difficult. But it must be remembered that it would be impossible to accomplish the main purposes of the whole plan—namely, total disarmament and the establishment of an effective system of world law—unless there is a preponderant acceptance throughout the world of the constitutional document which would provide for the necessary world institutions. In practice, this means that the 8 or 10 principal powers—especially the Soviet Union and the United States—would first need to agree. But once these powers (containing together a large majority of the world's people) had reached agreement on the essentials of a revised charter, there can be no doubt that virtually all the other nations would, as a practical matter, give their assent. Thus, the obviously desirable object of obtaining the unanimous or nearly unanimous assent of all the nations appears also to be a practical one—once the indispensable assent of the leading powers has been obtained.

(14) Amendment: The proposed requirements concerning the procedure for amendments to the revised charter are almost as strict as those provided for its ratification. Any future amendments would be submitted for ratification when adopted by a vote of two-thirds of all the representatives in the General Assembly, whether or not present or voting, or by a two-thirds vote of a General Conference held for that purpose. In order for an amendment to come into effect, ratification by four-fifths of the member nations would be required, including three-fourths of the 12 member nations entitled to 15 or more representatives in the Assembly.

It will be noted that while the proposed provisions for ratification of the revised charter would require that the ratifying nations shall include all the 12 nations having the largest populations, the provisions relating to the ratification of amendments would require the assent of only three-fourths of those 12 nations.

The reason for this difference is that in order to insure the necessary overwhelming support for the revised charter in its initial stage, it is considered essential to have the prior assent of literally all the world's largest nations—defined as the 12 nations with the largest populations. On the other hand, in the case of future amendments after the strengthened United Nations is functioning under the revised charter, it seems unduly severe to require absolutely unanimous approval by the 12 largest nations. Instead, it seems sufficient to require the assent of no more than a preponderant majority of those nations.

(15) Continued organs and agencies: It should be emphasized that, far from impairing the existing organs and agencies of the United Nations which, despite all obstacles, have accomplished important results, the intention is not only to preserve but also to strengthen them. Thus, the General Assembly would have much greater scope through having the final responsibility for the maintenance of peace, through the new system of representation and voting, and through the new, although limited, power to legislate.

The Security Council would, indeed, be abolished, but would be replaced by the vetoless Executive Council, chosen by and responsible to the General Assembly. The Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council would be continued, with important changes as to their composition and functions, and with much stronger financial support under the new revenue system. The International Court of Justice would be continued with greatly enlarged jurisdiction and greater authority. And as to various other organs, and such agencies as the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Labor Organization (ILO), and the World Health Organization (WHO), the revision would not only provide for their continuance but would also give opportunity for the enlargement of their activities and usefulness.

The intention is not to dispense with anything which has proved useful, but rather to revise, supplement, and strengthen the existing structure so that the United Nations will be fully and unquestionably equipped to accomplish its basic purpose—the maintenance of international peace.

WHETHER TO REVISE THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER OR TO CREATE A NEW WORLD ORGANIZATION

We have cast our proposals in the form of a proposed revision of the present United Nations Charter, retaining the structure of its 111 articles and supplementing those very articles, as revised, by seven annexes.

We have done this because it seems logical and reasonable to utilize an existing organization of such scope and experience as the United Nations; because the primary purpose of the United Nations has been from the beginning "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war"; because the name "United Nations" is very suitable to a world authority dedicated to the maintenance of world peace under effective world law; and because the creation of a new and separate world organization adequately equipped for the maintenance of peace would necessarily overshadow the present United Nations.

Nevertheless, we do not regard this question of method as one of principle, but merely of policy. It must be recognized that if the creation of adequate world institutions for the prevention of war is to be achieved through the medium of the United Nations, numerous amendments of the charter will be required which would together amount to a fundamental change in the structure and powers of the United Nations. And if it should develop that for technical or psychological reasons it would be more difficult to accomplish these amendments than to create a wholly new world organization to take over the peace maintenance functions of the United Nations, we wish to make it clear that we would not object to that alternative method. In other words, a thorough revision of the charter is merely, as we see it, the most reasonable means to the end in view and not an end in itself.

For example, it has been suggested that, while continuing the United Nations in nearly its present form, there could be separately created by universal, or nearly universal, treaty an entirely new world organization wholly restricted in its functions to those matters directly connected with the prevention of international violence. Such a world organization existing parallel with the United Nations might be called the World Peace Authority and, to be effective, would necessarily have to possess institutions and powers similar to those formulated in the proposed charter revision for the enforcement of total disarmament and of world law in the field of war prevention. In that case, the United Nations could continue as a forum for the exchange of views on all matters of international interest.

The existence of a new, separate and powerful world organization alongside the present United Nations would obviously be an awkward arrangement. And yet since it would be better to tolerate some awkwardness than to do nothing effective to achieve universal and complete disarmament and a genuine regime of enforcible world law, the idea should not be entirely dismissed.

We emphasize, also, that while an elaborate plan for universal and complete disarmament is included in the proposed revision of the charter (annex I), this does not imply that the revision of the charter must necessarily precede an agreement for total disarmament. It is quite conceivable that an agreement on the technical aspects of universal and complete disarmament will be reached first, and that a revision of the charter would come about later as the most logical means of insuring adequate supervision and enforcement of such a disarmament agreement.

What we wish to make crystal clear is that in casting our proposals in the form of a comprehensive revision of the present charter, we are not dogmatic about advancing this as the only available means to the desired end; and that if it develops that some other method is more feasible, we would be very ready to adopt it in order to reach the end in view.

THE PRACTICAL PROSPECTS

What are the practical prospects for the realization of genuine peace, through universal and complete disarmament and enforcible world law, not in some indefinite future but within some such period as 15 years, i.e., by 1975?

The question is crucial because the achievement of genuine peace will largely depend upon the persistent effort of many people and, unfortunately, only a small fraction of the human race seems capable of working persistently for a purpose, however desirable, that appears far off and uncertain. On the other hand, if convinced that the goal is attainable within a reasonably short time, they will work for it in greater numbers and with greater zeal, and by this very fact make it the more realizable.

I take a hopeful view on this question and will, in fact, venture a reasoned prediction as follows: (a) That within about 4 to 6 years (by 1965–67) a comprehensive plan for total and universal disarmament and for the necessary world institutions to make, interpret, and enforce world law in the field of war prevention will have been officially formulated and will have been submitted to all the nations for approval; and (b) that within 4 to 6 years thereafter (by 1969–71) such a plan will have been ratified by all or nearly all the nations, including all the major powers, and will have come into force.

If these things come to pass, it follows that by 1975 the process of universal and complete disarmament will be well on its way, that the new world security organization (whether in the form of a revised and greatly strengthened United Nations or an entirely new world organization) will be in actual operation and that a new era world history will have begun.

I now summarize my reasons for this prediction, mentioning first what I conceive to be the principal forces working against total disarmament and genuine peace.

The most important single adverse factor I suppose to be the reluctance of the average person to make any drastic change in his traditional form of behavior. As experience shows, he will, of course, try hard to save himself from destruction when he is not only in actual and imminent danger but also comprehends that danger. Short of these circumstances, however, his tendency is to procrastinate and hold to his old ways, often until it is too late.

This deep-seated trait of human nature is very evident at the beginning of the

1960's as a grave obstacle to genuine peace. This is so because nothing is more certain than that under the conditions of our nuclear age the realization of genuine peace will require a truly revolutionary change in human thinking and behavior, a change so drastic that human nature almost automatically resists it, no matter how clear the necessity may appear. As the historian, Arnold Toynbee, has put it, "We shall have a hard struggle with ourselves to save ourselves from ourselves."

For many centuries the units into which mankind has combined—family, tribe, town, city, national state—have been accustomed to assert or defend their interests, real or supposed, by violence or the threat of it, culminating during our advanced 20th century in the two greatest wars in history and, by 1960, in the maintenance of the most elaborate and destructive armed forces that the world has ever possessed. And yet, no matter how obvious it may be that, in order to achieve genuine peace, these forces must be abolished, along with the whole ancient method of international violence, it is foolish to ignore the strongly adverse influence of these habits and traditions and of certain special influences and vested interests created by them.

Of these special influences and interests, by far the most formidable, I judge, is that of the military profession which, in many nations, has sufficient influence to force their governments to resist rather than to aid the cause of total disarmament and the establishment of the world institutions that are essential to the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means. Unfortunate as it may be, it is necessary to accept the fact that, as of 1960, there is throughout most of the world what has been aptly called a "vested interest in armament" on the part of the military profession, which is a constant and powerful influence adverse to the new conceptions which can alone suffice to achieve genuine peace.

In appraising the weight of this pervading military influence, it is necessary to recognize its good faith in most cases. The typical professional soldier, sailor, airman, or missileman does not deprecate or oppose disarmament because he is any less humane or less civilized than the average civilian. He does so because his training and environment have irrevocably conditioned him to assume that his profession is indispensable. In consequence, it is simply too much to expect that the military profession as a whole will do otherwise than oppose or at least drag their feet in respect of all proposals for total disarmament and all that this implies. It follows that there will be no solution for the problem of world peace until the vested interest in armament of the military profession everywhere is firmly overruled.

A less important yet significant adverse vested interest is that of traditional diplomacy. It must be remembered that for centuries a principal occupation of the professional diplomat has been to deal in power politics, that is to say, in the making of alliances or in seeking to undermine counteralliances or in veiled or open threats of force as a means of advancing the real or supposed interests of this particular country. These habits of thought are almost as difficult to shake off as those of the professional military man; and, consequently, those who seek peace through total disarmament and enforceable world law will do well to discount the almost certain resistance of the professionals in many foreign offices in all parts of the world.

Another vested interest sometimes mentioned as an important obstacle to disarmament and peace is the presumed interest of many millions of armament workers in a continuance of their jobs and the corresponding interest of proprietors in their profits from armament contracts. But while the problem of readjustment to nonarmament work is certainly one that will call for attention and planning, this should not be regarded as a serious difficulty. What is often overlooked is that the process of disarmament would necessarily be a gradual one. At the outset there would almost surely be an interval of several years between the formulation of a comprehensive disarmament agreement and its coming into force through ratification by the respective nations, and this interval would serve as a warning period in which to plan for and partially carry out the shift of workers and materials to nonmilitary purposes. There would then undoubtedly follow a considerably longer period (10 years as proposed in this book) for the carrying out, stage by stage, of the process of actual disarmament, during which the conversion of the armament plants would be completed. Remembering also the immense tax burden which would be lessened year by year and the release of manpower and materials for such purposes as roads, hospitals, schools, urban renewal, and other pressing needs even in the most prosperous nations, it seems clear that this particular obstacle to disarmament and peace will prove to be a minor one.

Far more serious is the factor of mutual fears and recriminations which as of 1960 so poison the East-West atmosphere as to bring under suspicion in the West almost any proposal coming from the East and correspondingly in the East almost any proposal proceeding from the West. This state of affairs is unfortunately deeply rooted on both sides. It has been built up over a long period and "conditions" the thinking of millions of people—East and West—who on other subjects are capable of unbiased judgment. There is little use in seeking to assess the blame which both sides must share, and we must accept this mutually poisoned atmosphere as a fact of life which cannot be gotten rid of for a long time. This mutual fear and suspicion is indeed a most formidable barrier to peace and we should recognize that success in the accomplishment of total disarmament and the establishment of enforcible world law will not be because this barrier will soon disappear but because it will be pushed aside under the pressure of necessity.

Apart from the just-mentioned deeply rooted obstacles, there are several others which are only less important because they are likely to be more transitory. These include the exclusion of mainland China from world councils, a lack of sufficient understanding as to the necessity for complete, rather than partial, disarmament and a similar lack of understanding of the necessity for a comprehensive and interrelated plan rather than a piecemeal approach.

Taking together all the adverse factors—especially the strong tendency to resist any drastic change, the certain opposition of the military profession and of traditional diplomacy and the mutual fears and suspicions between East and West—we have a truly formidable group of obstacles. What are the favorable factors which are capable of offsetting or overcoming them?

Of these favorable factors the most important single one seems very clearly to be the steadily increasing risk of world catastrophe resulting from a continuance of the arms race and a continuing lack of effective world machinery to settle international disputes by peaceful means.

In specifying the increasing risk of world disaster, it is realized that the likelihood of all-out nuclear war may not increase at all and may even diminish during the 1960's because of a greater mutual understanding of its destructive consequences. But more than offsetting this factor is, I believe, the rapidly mounting potentialities of destruction if a large-scale nuclear war should, nevertheless, occur. For while it may be true that the chances of an all-out nuclear war may not increase during the 1960's, it is a certainty that the potential damage from such a war, if it should occur, will steadily increase from year to year. It follows that, taking the two factors together, the real risk will, in the absence of universal and complete disarmament under effective world law, be a steadily mounting one. A greater comprehension of this fact will be, I judge, the major influence in bringing about the formulation and acceptance of an agreement for total disarmament under enforcible world law.

Concerning this increase in the destructiveness of modern weapons, the most obvious development is the constantly increasing efficiency and accuracy of the so-called means of delivery of nuclear weapons. From year to year there has been progress in compressing more and more explosive power into less and less volume and weight, resulting in startling increases in the range and accuracy of the ballistic missiles designed to deliver nuclear warheads.

With regard to the explosive power of the nuclear weapons capable of accurate "delivery" from planes or by ballistic missiles, a report in 1959 of the Special Subcommittee on Radiation (the Holifield committee) of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the U.S. Congress is significant. This report postulates that 263 nuclear weapons with a total explosive power equivalent to 1450 megatons (1,450 million tons of TNT) could be landed on U.S. territory in a single attack; and the report therefore assumes that the average explosive power of each of these 263 weapons would be the equivalent of about 5.5 million tons of TNT. This means that the average explosive power of each such weapon would be 275 times that of the 20,000-ton bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945, and that each such weapon would have more than four times as much explosive power as all the bombs dropped by the Western Allies on Germany in World War II. It means also that the total explosive power of the weapons postulated by the Holifield committee as landed on U.S. territory in a single major attack would equal about 72,000 times the power of the Hiroshima bomb and over 1,000 times the power of all the bombs dropped on Germany in World War II.

Since it is difficult to grasp figures of this sort, it may be helpful to give an illustration in terms of mass. Let us imagine a solid column of TNT with a uniform size equal to that of the Washington Monument in Washington at its base, i.e., about 55 feet (16.8 meters) square. In order to comprise 1 million tons of TNT that column would need to be 6,416 feet (about 1,956 meters) high. And in order to comprise 5.5 million tons of TNT (the above-mentioned average strength of the 263 nuclear weapons postulated in the Holifield committee's report), there would need to be six columns of TNT each of which would be 55 feet (16.8 meters) square and nearly 5,900 feet (about 1,800 meters) high.

If we imagine these six immense columns of TNT set up and exploded in London or Paris or New York or Moscow, we can easily see that even so vast a city as any of these could be utterly destroyed.

Even more important is the installation of rocket-launching sites from which it would apparently be possible even in 1960 to "deliver" weapons of appalling power over ranges of up to 8,000 miles and within a mile or two of the target point. It seems clear, therefore, than even as this is written the capacity exists to land highly destructive missiles on New York or Chicago as well as on Moscow or Leningrad from sites thousands of miles distant and within 30 minutes from launching time. And if this could be done in 1960, what will be possible in 1965 after 5 years more of a continuing and even accelerating arms race?

Beyond this is the building of nuclear-powered submarines equipped to launch nuclear weapons from under water; the development of aircraft capable of launching nuclear weapons hundreds of miles from their targets; and, still further, the never-ceasing secret work on biological and chemical weapons.

Such facts as these are only beginning, it seems, to penetrate the general masses of the people in all nations; but it seems certain that their comprehension of the danger will increase from year to year with a corresponding increase of pressure on their governments. Their dominating motive will not, I judge, be fear in the ordinary sense but rather a growing exasperation over the rigidity and traditionalism which prevent the formulation of adequate plans to remove so obvious a manmade risk. Whatever the motive, however, it is impossible to believe that the peoples will be so apathetic and helpless that they will fail to apply a steadily increasing pressure on their governments to take the long-overdue action which is necessary to remove the growing danger.

Next in importance to the risk of appaling disaster from the increasing destructiveness of modern weapons and the increasing popular pressure on the governments to remove this risk is, I believe, an increasing impatience with the vast economic waste and burden of the arms race. In terms of money this burden as of 1960 amounts to not less than $100 billion per annum, while in terms of human energy it means the full-time employment in the armed forces of some 15 million men and of not less than 30 million civilians in the manufacture of arms and other military activities—or a total of at least 45 million persons.

In the United States the resulting cost of about $46 billion per annum in 1960–61 absorbs more than half of the total Federal budget and about 9 percent of the gross national product, while in the Soviet Union the proportion of the national product devoted to military purposes is even higher. In many other nations the cost, although proportionately smaller, is nevertheless a heavy drain on their economies which prevents or handicaps the carrying out of many badly needed improvements. Even in so affluent a country as the United States, the vast military expenditure holds back such urgent needs as the improvement of education and of medical care for lower-income people, urban renewal and the conservation of natural resources; and in nations less economically fortunate, like India, the adverse effects of military expenditure are naturally much greater. As the years have passed, there has been a growing consciousness that the existence of these burdens is incompatible with economic and social reforms urgently demanded by the peoples of many nations. In the 1960's, this consciousness will almost certainly become a more powerful force in favor of total disarmament.

Another helpful development should be a clearer realization from year to year that it is impossible to arrive at any important political settlements in the absence of an agreement for comprehensive disarmament. There has been much ill-considered talk to the effect that the settlement of various difficult political problems—such as the problem of Berlin and German reunification, the problem of Soviet dominance in Eastern Europe, the questions of Korean and Vietnam reunification and the Quemoy-Matsu situation—must precede, or at least be simultaneous with, any comprehensive disarmament. The commonsense of the matter is, however, that in an armed world it is most improbable that any of these difficult East-West issues can be settled—for the simple reason that it is virtually impossible to settle any hard controversy between opponents of equal strength and pride when the opposing parties are armed to the teeth and, therefore, bitterly suspicious of each other. All experience shows that before such opponents can settle any important issue, they must first agree to dispense with violence and cease their mutual threats and insults.

It has taken a long time to grasp this simple truth as applied to the crucial disputes between East and West; but in the 1960's it will become more and more apparent to most reasonable men and women that an agreement for universal and complete disarmament must be reached before these thorny East-West issues can be resolved.

Another favorable factor will be the almost certain abandonment during the 1960 decade of the exclusion of mainland China from the United Nations and from normal relations with the United States and many other nations. The bankruptcy of this policy, which has so greatly prejudiced adequate negotiations for peace, has long been apparent and it is hardly conceivable that it can much longer survive. When China, with its more than one-fifth of all the people of the earth, is admitted to full participation in world councils, an important barrier to the formulation of a comprehensive plan for peace will have been removed.

Still another encouraging sign is the increasing knowledge of the ways and means whereby genuine peace can be achieved. The persistent and rising desire since the end of World War II for the abolition of war has unfortunately been accompanied by considerable defeatism as to the feasibility of accomplishing this result. This defeatism has, however, been largely caused by an exaggerated view of the difficulty of the problem which has been due in turn to a lack of sufficient study and discussion of the concrete problems that are involved, i.e., the various interrelated questions as to the nature and form of the world institutions requisite for world order. At the start of the 1960's we can discern a marked change in this respect, in that a beginning has at last been made in a closer study of the specific problems—not only by private persons but even by public officials. There is a definite relation between the development of this study and progress toward the desired goal. This is true because the problems involved are by no means insoluble, and as more and more people begin to apprehend how these problems can be dealt with, the spirit of defeatism will naturally lessen and the better will be the prospect for the acceptance of an adequate plan for peace.

An important result of the more intense study just mentioned will inevitably be a more general understanding that total, rather than partial, disarmament will alone meet the situation. In 1960 it is almost universally recognized that, in order to induce acceptance of any important disarmament, a well-organized inspection system is essential, while only a minority as yet seems to understand that complete disarmament is equally indispensable. For this proposition there are three main reasons: (a) because experience has shown that it is virtually impossible to agree upon any plan of any consequence for merely partial disarmament, since one nation or another is almost certain to claim, and with some justification, that the particular proposed reduction would put it at a disadvantage; (b) because even if agreed upon any merely partial disarmament would not fulfill the purpose, since in the nuclear age the retention of even a small fraction of the armed forces of 1960 would be enough to keep in existence many pernicious fears and tensions between the nations; and (c) because, although an effective world police force is clearly indispensable as a condition for disarmament, there is a distinct practical limit upon the size and expense of such a force, so that if even as much as 10 percent of the national armed forces of 1960 were retained, it would be impossible to maintain a world police of sufficient strength to insure its capacity to deter or suppress any possible international violence. As the disarmament negotiations of the 1960's develop, it can safely be predicted that the validity of these reasons will be more and more recognized. And when it is generally accepted that total, rather than partial, disarmament is no less necessary than an effective inspection system, a long step forward will have been taken.

Along with a clearer understanding that nothing less than the abolition of all national armaments will suffice, there is badly needed a clearer realization of the necessity for a comprehensive rather than any piecemeal or partial plan. No intelligent person sets out to build an adequate house without a plan providing for all the elements necessary to make the structure fulfill its purpose. He knows from the start that foundation, sidewalls floors and roof must all be provided and that they must be so fitted together that, with each performing its necessary function, the house will stand. It is deplorable, therefore, that even in 1960 only a small minority seems to realize that the necessity for a complete initial plan applies also to the structure of peace; and that, if the structure is to stand, all the basic organs necessary for the maintenance of peace must be included in that plan. A more general realization of this truth will almost certainly come in the 1960's and will be a powerful force for world order.

When the various adverse factors are put in one scale and the various favorable factors in another scale and weighed against each other, my considered opinion is that the favorable factors clearly outweigh the adverse, and that we can reasonably look forward to a new world order based upon universal and complete disarmament and enforceable world law within some such period as 15 years.

Against any such optimistic view, it may be objected that it takes too little account of the factor of leadership. It may well be said: "Granted that the destructive power of modern weapons will constantly increase; granted that concern over the risks and the ultimate result will also increase; granted that there will be a wider understanding of the necessity for total, rather than partial disarmament and of the ways and means whereby complete disarmament under enforceable world law can be achieved; granted that the popular pressure for a termination of the arms race will intensify; where is the requisite leadership to come from for the formulation and acceptance of the necessary novel and elaborate plan?"

It must indeed be recognized that, even in spite of a strong and worldwide demand for a cessation of the arms race, nothing effective can be done in the absence of vigorous and persistent leadership for a specific and adequate plan. I am confident, however, that effective leadership will develop; although it will probably need to come, in my judgment from sources other than either the Soviet Union or the United States.

In the case of the Soviet Union, there is indeed every reason to suppose that for obvious reasons of self-interest, it will press persistently for the "general and complete" disarmament proposed by Chairman Khrushchev on September 18, 1959. The difficulty is, however, that because of the intense suspicion with which almost any Russian proposal is regarded in some quarters the leadership of the Soviet Union would be under such a constant handicap that the acceptance of Soviet leadership in unlikely.

With regard to the United States, a similar handicap will operate in view of the reciprocal suspicion with which almost any American proposal is regarded in some parts of the world. And beyond this, it is unfortunate, but true, I believe, that as of 1960 the United States cannot be expected to provide wholehearted leadership on behalf of total disarmament, as distinguished from acquiescence and ultimate support. For this there

are, I believe, basic reasons which include the relative geographical remoteness of the United States even in the nuclear age, and above all its relative lack of suffering from modern war in comparison with the Soviet Union, France, Britain, and several other nations of Western Europe. It is therefore, no accident, I believe, that the first proposals for universal and complete disarmament came, on the one hand, from the Soviet Union and, on the other, from the United Kingdom, both of which suffered so greatly in World War I and II and both of which would be subject to the most dire destruction in a possible world war III.

For these reasons I believe that the necessary leadership will proceed from the United Kingdom and Western Europe, however much in later stages it is supplemented by support from other nations.

For years I have believed that the question of complete disarmament and all that it implies would come to a head when the Soviet Union was able to install a large number of ballistic missile sites both in its own territory and in Eastern Europe from which nuclear missiles could be launched with accuracy against targets in the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and other nations of Western Europe. I have long been convinced that when this came about some, at least, of these nations would say in effect: "This arms race may be all very well for the superpowers, but our very life is threatened by it and we must now insist that the concept of complete disarmament under enforceable world law be taken seriously." This conviction has now been vindicated to some extent by the important proposals of the British Government of September 17, 1959, for "comprehensive disarmament by all powers under effective international control" whereby all armaments and military manpower would be reduced to "levels required for internal security purposes only."

With the constant "improvement" in the power and accuracy of ballistic missiles, it is obvious that in an all-out nuclear war the United Kingdom would be a prime target. It seems virtually certain, therefore, that with its large population in a small area the destructive effect of nuclear war on the United Kingdom would be truly appalling; and since this fact is now becoming generally appreciated, there is every reason to suppose that any British Government will feel obligated to persist in the effort for complete disarmament initiated in September 1959.

Apart from this strong motivation of the United Kingdom to strive persistently for total disarmament, the high degree of civilization and the maturity of the United Kingdom make it will equipped to assume this leadership. It could confidently rely upon the early support of nearly all the nations of the British Commonwealth (Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Malaya, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, etc.) so that before long the initial leadership of the United Kingdom would be thought of as that of the British Commonwealth, with all its authority and prestige.

As of early 1960, this British leadership seems to offer the best prospect. But this is not to say that it is the only promising one. Thus it is also to be hoped that a group of nations which are neutral or uncommitted as between the superpowers (such as Austria, Burma, Indonesia, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia) can be formed to supplement and support the British leadership if it develops, or to take its place should it falter or fail. Another useful possibility would be the formation of a worldwide group of smaller nations irrespective of their neutrality which, besides the smaller neutrals, could include such countries as Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Greece, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Rumania, and Thailand, and various of the smaller nations of Latin America and Africa.

Altogether in one or the other of these ways, or by a combination of them, I have confidence that the necessary leadership will be forthcoming. The role of the Soviet Union and the United States would then be not to lead the way, but to refrain from formulation and implementation of a great and sufficient plan. The same will be true of Communist China, which, in the end, will have an equally important role.

What the whole question comes down to in last analysis is whether the human race will show enough intelligence to enable it to make the required adjustment to the nuclear age. In 1960 the issue as to the future of mankind is whether the human race is sufficiently resourceful to formulate and accept world institutions which will once and for all abolish war and utilize the great new discoveries of science for peaceful uses alone. This issue will, however, depend not upon any inherent lack of intelligence but upon whether sufficient effort is made to make effective use of our present fund of intelligence. If the peoples are so apathetic as to permit the domination of military and old-style diplomatic thinking, they can expect nothing better than an indefinite continuance of the arms race and ultimate disaster. On the other hand, if the peoples make an even reasonable effort to comprehend the danger and the available means to remove it, it lies within their power to solve the problem and to institute an age of genuine peace under world law.

EVOLUTION AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSALS

This book is the work of two lawyers. One of them, the writer of this introduction, has been engaged in the practice of law in New York or in public affairs since 1906. The other, Mr. Sohn, is a generation younger, a scholar learned in the history of past efforts to achieve peace and now a professor of law at the Law School of Harvard University where his courses include "United Nations Law" and "Problems in the Development of World Order."

The detailed proposals of the book are the result of an evolution over a period of years. In my own case, they took tentative form in a proposed world constitution privately circulated in 1940; and 10 years later certain basic ideas of the proposals were expounded in my small book, "A Plan for Peace." In the case of Professor Sohn, who came to the United States from Poland as a young lawyer in 1939, the proposals reflect 20 years of thought and teaching on the subject and his experience as a legal officer of the United Nations.

Our collaboration began in October 1945 at a conference of private citizens as to "how best to remedy the weaknesses of the United Nations Charter," which some persons even then recognized as inadequate to ensure world peace; and our association has continued ever since.

During 1949, in response to various demands for a comprehensive set of proposals for charter revision, I resolved to undertake this arduous task and sought out Mr. Sohn who was then a lecturer at the Harvard Law School. He agreed; and the result of our collaboration was a joint document, issued in 1953, entitled "Peace Through Disarmament and Charter Revision," together with a "Supplement" thereto issued in 1956. Both of these documents were widely circulated for comment and criticism; and were then revised and combined in the book entitled "World Peace Through World Law," published by the Harvard University Press in March 1958. The present second edition embodies certain minor revisions without change, however, in the underlying principles or main features of the authors' proposals.

The title "World Peace Through World Law" reflects a change of emphasis, progressively arrived at, whereby universal and complete disarmament, however indispensable, is treated as one of several interrelated and equally indispensible elements of world order rather than as an all-inclusive solution. Our basic premise, however, has remained intact, namely, that if the world really wants peace, it must accept world institutions fully adequate to achieve universal and complete disarmament and to enforce world law within the limited field of war prevention. Far from being weakened by recent events, this fundamental conviction is stronger than ever.

As already stated, the purpose of this book is to provide material for the extensive discussions which will be required before truly effective world institutions for the maintenance of peace are accepted by the peoples of the world.

It is true that the authors have attempted to present a complete plan whereby genuine pace, in a disarmed world, would actually be secured. It is true also that we have confidence in our work which is the result of so many years of study and of searching criticism by hundreds of qualified persons in many nations. Nevertheless, it would indeed be presumptuous to assert that we have the final answers to the various thorny problems. We well know that better, or at least more acceptable, solutions may be hammered out in the process of debate. We do believe, however, that these detailed and specific proposals will serve to encourage others to discuss the many and difficult questions that are involved.

The need is not for more generalities in recognition of the necessity for world law. There are already enough of these. Rather, the need is for alternative detailed plans to furnish a basis for discussion; and our purpose has been to supply such a plan. If by so doing this book hastens even slightly the day when enforceable world law actually prevails between all nations, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

For modern man the prevention of war is not only the most important of problems; it is also one of the most difficult. During our work we have often thought of Professor Einstein's remark on this point. When asked why it is that when the mind of man has reached so far as to solve the secrets of the atom it has not been able to devise means to protect mankind from destruction by the new discoveries, he replied: "The answer is simple. It is because politics is more difficult than physics."

Nevertheless, our proposals are advanced in the firm conviction that genuine peace through total disarmament and enforceable world law is now a practical prospect which practical men can work for with reasonable hopes.

Senator McGee's "Senate Summary"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release entitled "Senate Summary," issued by the office of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. This particular release is dated June 15, 1960, and discusses, among other things, many phases of our foreign relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GALE MCGEE'S SENATE SUMMARY

Fellow Wyomingites, during the Memorial Day recess of the Senate, I was privileged to attend the Bilderberg Conference in Burgenstock, Switzerland. A colleague, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania, and I were the Members of the Senate attending. Members from the parliaments of the other NATO countries of Western Europe, diplomats, and leaders of business and industry were also present. Presiding over the series of meetings was H.R.H. Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. To assure frank and uninhibited discussion, the meetings were closed to the press, all comments were off the record, and no conclusions were formalized. The transportation costs, moreover, were paid by a private foundation rather than by the taxpayer. It was felt that only in these ways could men high in the governments of the world be encouraged to speak bluntly on the issues of the day.

Coming as it did in the wake of the collapse of the Paris summit meeting, our deliberations in Switzerland became, in fact, a sort of "pick-up-the-pieces" conference. While there were no group conclusions, it is permissible to share with you some of the individual and personal observations picked up in private conversations with persons from 10 or a dozen governments of the world.

Almost without exception there was agreement that the United States had stumbled badly in the early phases of the U–2 incident. Criticism of our handling of the U–2 seemed to center around three aspects: (1) the timing of the U–2 flight itself, (2) the President's decision to take full, personal responsibility, and (3) the handling of the news releases of the incident by Washington.

Mindful of the fact that there may have been deeply rooted intelligence reasons for a special U–2 flight as near the summit conference as the fateful flight of pilot Powers was, the thought prevailed, nonetheless, that the time was unfortunate and may even have been an unnecessary risk to have taken.

In regard to the second criticism, it was pointed out that the President's personal assumption of responsibility more than any other single development provoked the inexcusable and unfortunate tirade of Mr. Khrushchev against President Eisenhower. The consensus was that espionage is dirty business at best and necessary, but that the head of state can never afford to be personally identified with it. To do so calls into question the legal and ethical position of his government at the same time that it places in jeopardy the treaty relationship of his friends and allies. For example, it will now be increasingly difficult for Turkey, Pakistan, and Norway to permit our continued use of bases on their territory for our own purposes.

And criticism regarding the handling of the news releases on the incident in Washington centered on the obvious ineptness of the bureaucrats in the Capitol. It was clearly a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand was doing. Quite obviously there was no one minding the store at this critical moment. The Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, was in Turkey; the President was in Gettysburg; and in Washington there was a merry-go-round of conflicting statements coming out of the NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), the Department of State, and the White House.

What disturbed many of our friends was the thought that we in the United States were attempting to hide a clearcut mistake behind a facade of unity. The fear was expressed also that we were dangerously exploiting the loyalty of our allies.

It is only fair to say, however, that while our friends and allies were all shook up over our fumbling, the incident did not destroy their basic confidence in our leadership. Their one desperate hope seemed to be, however, that somehow we in the United States might learn from this experience. As I urged upon several of our critics, in the American system of government we are entitled to make mistakes; to do so is not fatal as it is in a dictatorship. But there is a corollary to that. We are also entitled to learn from those same mistakes.

The events preceding and following the Paris debacle have brought into focus two serious consequences.

One is the freezing of the public mind in America. Because of the unfortunate turn of events, the candidates for President in both parties face the danger of being straitjacketed by public opinion on matters affecting not only the Russians but great questions of peace all around the world. Some of them have already yielded to the temptation to run against Mr. Khrushchev instead of for a positive and constructive program for peace.

A second is the inclination to vote more and more military funds in the expectation that we will thus be correcting what went wrong. The harsh truth is that this may only aggravate the present worldwide condition of unrest and anti-Americanism. Nowhere around the globe can it be said that the United States has failed to project its military image. But there is real reason to believe that we have failed to project a more positive national profile. Recent riots in our own hemisphere, in Africa, and in Asia offer dramatic testimony. What we are against has been made abundantly clear; but what we are for has not gotten through.

Time presses America for a larger effort in nonmilitary fields overseas. Yet, the net effect of the impulse to increase military appropriations is to take funds away from the nonmilitary. While we cannot afford to slip back militarily, neither can we afford to neglect the other, more constructive side of the American image.

By way of a postscript to the discussions at the Bilderberg Conference, let it be noted that the international position of the United States has further deteriorated—dangerously so. In a matter of weeks American prestige has suffered a succession of body blows.

To the bungling of U–2; the Paris fiasco, and the withdrawal by the Kremlin of the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union, has now been added the humiliating withdrawal of a similar Japanese invitation; hostile mobs confronting the President in Okinawa; and a renewal by Communist China of bombardments of Quemoy and Matsu, deliberately timed to further embarrass our President.

That there will be still more incidents is a realistic prospect. Nor is there any reason to believe that the approaching Democratic and Republican Conventions may cause the Communists to suspend similar psychological attacks just for the month of July. This fact thrusts to the fore the question of whether the Congress dare be away from Washington even long enough to nominate Presidential favorities in July. If the world situation has slipped as badly as recent crises suggest, it is doubtful wisdom for the U.S. Senate at least to subordinate the Nation's foreign policy crisis to previous calendar commitments in Los Angeles and Chicago.

Without any question, greater unity—at home and abroad—has resulted from the incidents. But the harsh fact remains that we now stand united on a far lower level than we had a right to expect or to hope for had the U–2 affair not triggered the succession of incidents we have just experienced.

This brings us then back home where we in America have to decide for ourselves how important it is in a democracy to encourage constructive criticism rather than to excuse mistakes behind a facade of unity.

It is unfortunate that the U–2 incident and the others occurred in a Presidential election year. Criticism is now too often dismissed as being political when in all truth something basically went wrong in a most vital segment of our national security setup. For this reason, it is imperative that Republicans and Democrats alike unite as Americans in support of a sober, intelligent, objective assessment of this whole episode in the expectation that the next President, whomever he may be and from whichever party, may learn the lessons that desperately must be learned if we are to meet the risks of work leadership sucessfully.

To err is human, but to err repeatedly may no longer be one of our permissible luxuries. As one of the great statesmen of Europe put it, "You in America are on the spot. We all make mistakes," he said, "but your mistakes carry a special weight because of the gigantic role you play in the world. If my country makes a mistake, it matters very little to the rest of mankind. But you in America are like Atlas with the world on your shoulders. When you stumble, the whole world falls with you."

Kennedy as a Catholic: An American Answer to the Religious Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon State Senator Monroe Sweetland, candidate for secretary of state in Oregon, has written an eloquent letter, dated June 15, 1960, in response to a petition signed by 33 members or associates of the Stafford Baptist Church in Oregon.

Monroe Sweetland recognizes the sincere concern which prompted the petition. The result was that he went to some length to spell out his opinion.

Mr. Sweetland has been a long time supporter of the candidacy of Senator KENNEDY for the Democratic nomination for President. He believes that Senator KENNEDY's long record of public performance is the real test of qualification and sincerity. He believes, as I do, that there should be no religious qualification for the Presidency of the United States. He believes, as I do, that Senator KENNEDY's choice of church, is not, under American precepts, a legitimate issue.

Moreover, it would seem that the people of West Virginia, almost wholly Protestant in religion, demonstrated their agreement in the recent primary contest there between Senator KENNEDY and Senator HUMPHREY in that they voted overwhelmingly in support of Senator KENNEDY even though they knew very well that he was by religion a Catholic.

We are in mortal combat with dedicated enemies of all Christendom—

Senator Sweetland writes in his letter.

What arrogant folly it would be, 1,960 years after Christ, for Christians to allow sectarian

rivalry to deprive us of the best leadership—to be more at war with fellow Christians than with the evil forces which threaten us.

Under unanimous consent I am including the entire text of Senator Sweetland's letter:

OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, June 15, 1960.

DEAR FRIENDS OF STAFFORD BAPTIST CHURCH: Recently I received the petition signed by 33 members or associates of your Stafford Baptist Church in which you urged me to oppose for the Presidency any candidates who are members of the Catholic Church. This petition was addressed to me, I assume, because I am an elected delegate to the Democratic National Convention, pledged to Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY under the law after his decisive victory in the recent primary. Perhaps you also selected me as the object of your petition because I am your State senator, and a fellow Protestant.

I recognize the sincere concern which prompted this petition. Many of the current rash of tracts and letters attacking candidates for President or Vice President who happen to be members of the Catholic Church are abusive or even vulgar. They promptly end up in our wastebasket. Yours is not at all in that category, and I am going to some effort to spell out my opinion to you. I hope you will have the generosity and patience to read through this letter discussing the issue you raise.

You state vigorously your feeling that members of the Roman Catholic minority in the United States should be denied certain basic constitutional rights. Your argument recited some quotations from claims of Catholic writers and even of some Popes over the lives and opinions of individual Catholics. These may be matched, let me point out, by similar claims or demands by some spokesmen for almost every religious group powerful enough to dominate a nation—Lutherans, Moslems, Hindus, Eastern Orthodox, Episcopalians, Dutch Reformed, and even Cromwell's Protestants and our early New England Puritans. Minorities have been quashed under many faiths. Only eternal vigilance will prevent this happening at any time in human history.

In every State the people decide how far they wish to aid religion through public support. In Oregon, as you know, we give State support through tax exemption to your church and other houses of worship, but draw the line at parish houses, monastaries or manses. Catholics, like the rest of us, are not bound to vote one way on these issues, and are divided in their opinions. Senator KENNEDY, who is the particular target of your petition, has frequently opposed public funds to aid parochial education, has long opposed sending a U.S. representative to the Vatican, and has been harshly attacked in some conservative Catholic publications and circles for his opposition to moves which might lead to church-state union. You have a perfect right, of course, to oppose any candidate for what he advocates, but please do not attack a candidate for positions he does not advocate or endorse, even though contrary positions may be the official policy of some organization to which he belongs.

A long record of public performance is the real test of qualification and sincerity—and Senator KENNEDY has met these tests. If we accepted the thesis of your petition no Methodist could sit on the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, no Baptist Governor could permit men and women to be gassed for murders, no Quaker (like Mr. NIXON) could be entrusted to be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

In short, your petition asks me to assist in setting up a religious qualification for the Presidency of the United States. This I cannot approve. It is a concept so contrary to our American policy that I hope that you will also reject it upon further reflection and study.

Furthermore, may I urge that we Christians should be much more concerned over the conduct and point-of-view of elected officials toward humanity than over the denominational labels they may inherit or choose. Many will pray loudly in public places, like the Pharisees of old, without relating their professions to the welfare of their fellow men. But when American Christians review the record of a dedicated young man like JOHN F. KENNEDY, whose compassionate concern for the senior citizen, for the underprivileged Negro, for the poorest family on public welfare, and for the little people who need our help in the most remote parts of the world, we find a man who meets the test.

It seems to me we should all be very pleased to be able to pick a practicing Christian for President—one who has put his principles to work in many practical, humanitarian ways. Note, too, that here is a man who will not make his first tie with a Christian faith after getting into the Presidency.

When a Christian or a Jew of any denomination takes his oath on the Holy Bible to uphold the Constitution of the United States, including the principle of separation of Church and State, he should be held to it notwithstanding the historic positions of nearly all powerful sects and religions against the American policy. So it has been throughout our history as hosts of Senators and Congressman, Supreme Court Justices, Governors and Mayors who were members of the Catholic Church, have upheld their oaths with fidelity. Probably no tenet of the Catholic faith is more vigorously held than the sanctity of marriages and the evils of divorce. Yet judges of Catholic faith carry out our divorce laws in every State of the Union.

Oppose Senator Kennedy for many reasons and you are well within the bounds of fair criticism. Oppose him, if you wish, because of his bills for health insurance for the elderly; oppose him for his work against Mr. Hoffa of the Teamsters; oppose him because he is a Democrat; oppose him because he advocates the $1.25 minimum wage law; oppose him for his support of river development and a high dam at Hells Canyon—all these and many others are legitimate issues. His choice of church is not, under American precepts, a legitimate issue.

Think, too, how hypocritical we would look to the outside world if we deny to the world's largest body of Christians the right to the highest offices in our democratic nation. Jews and Protestants and Catholics and Quakers have suffered this discrimination in other lands. Are we Americans no better after all our claims to be the land of liberty and opportunity for all?

You have every right as Baptists, as I do as a Methodist, to try to persuade Catholics or other Protestants or non-Christians that they should accept our beliefs as a better way. But as Americans none of us has any right to suppress a minority or deny full citizenship to any man or woman or child under our flag, however much we disapprove or even detest their views. This certainly includes the right of an American of any faith to aspire to be President or Vice President of the United States.

The terms of your argument urging our non-Catholic majority to deny the Presidency to Catholics applies to all other public offices too. In various past elections, and again this year in my contest for Secretary of State, I have found myself pitted against candidates who are members of the Catholic and other minority churches. I hope to win this year as I have in most of my election races, but I would far rather lose than win on the negative and, I feel, un-American basis of religious or racial bias.

Knowing how I feel on the subject, a very large majority of Oregonians of my political affiliation (the majority party) has elected me to vote for them and Oregon at the Democratic National Convention. I will do everything I can to bring about the nomination and later the election of Senator KENNEDY, not because he is a Catholic, but because of the high principles which I think he exemplifies and because he can give our Nation dynamic world leadership at an hour of desperate need.

We are in mortal combat with dedicated enemies of all Christiandom. What arrogant folly it would be, 1,960 years after Christ, for Christians to allow sectarian rivalry to deprive us of the best leadership—to be more at war with fellow Christians than with the evil forces which threaten us.

Between now and November each of us must think this over for himself and herself. I do not claim to have all the answers, but this letter explains how I am answering it for myself.

Sincerely yours,

MONROE SWEETLAND.

MILWAUKIE.

Austria Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Post of June 20, 1960, written by Sylvia Porter:

AUSTRIA ACHIEVEMENT

(By Sylvia Porter)

The much-touted "Labor-Management Conference" at which industry and labor leaders would discuss fundamental problems away from the bargaining table and thereby help promote healthy price and wage stability in our land is apparently heading for a quiet death in infancy. The likelihood that a second summit meeting of industry and union leaders will be held "in the foreseeable future" is, according to informed sources, "very dim."

There was an initial meeting on May 19 in Washington. To it came the president of the National Association of Manufacturers and other top industry leaders, the president of the AFL–CIO and other top union officials. They talked in private for almost 3 hours and at the end, AFL–CIO chief George Meany said the discussion had been "completely amicable" and the next meeting would be held as soon as possible.

The support behind the initial conference was certainly high-level enough—ranging from President Eisenhower down. To avoid any taint of Government "pressures," though, the program called for only labor and management participants, no observers from Government or the "public."

Yet even this modest effort to reduce misinformation and misunderstandings about each other which could lead to a repetition of the prolonged steel strike of 1959 is to get nowhere.

Can any voluntary program of this sort ever produce results? Whether it can in our sprawling industrialized country with its giant corporations and powerful unions I wouldn't presume to guess but at this moment of disillusion about even a bit of progress, a report about what is being achieved in Austria appears worthwhile.

In the first several years following World War II, Austria's inflation was a devastating

20 to 30 percent a year but since 1957, it has chalked up the best record for price stability of any European nation—including traditionally stable Switzerland. Its wholesale price index has remained absolutely level in the 3-year period, its consumer price index has climbed only 2 percent. At the same time, the spectacular rise in the efficiency of its production has permitted significant wage increases and a shortening of the workweek.

A key reason for the impressive performance, international economists agree, is Austria's Price-Wage Commission, created March 20, 1957, to serve as an adviser to the Austrian Government and consisting of 12 key members from industry, labor, agriculture, and government.

The commission's key objective is to maintain economic stability by studying and weighing the economic justification of any proposed wage and price increases.

All intended price or wage hikes must be reported to the commission which exhaustively analyzes each request. A unanimous decision is necessary on the propriety of each request.

While the commission has no legal powers to enforce its decisions and submits its findings to those involved in the form of "recommendations," obviously the power of its recommendations and the force of public opinion are sufficiently strong not only to have restrained price increases but at times actually to have induced price cuts. As for wages, last year, it disapproved demands by the Teamsters Union and in many instances, sliced original demands for increases of 15 to 20 percent to 3 to 5 percent.

No one even pretends the commission is fully effective or foolproof. Probably it shouldn't be in any country aspiring even to a semblance of freedom. But it has been remarkably effective. Can't our industry and labor leaders find anything in the Austrian experience that might be of value to us?

Army Report Refutes FMC Critic's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith an editorial which appeared recently in the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury relative to the charges made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] that a contract recently awarded Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. was rigged:

ARMY REPORT REFUTES FMC CRITIC'S CHARGES

The Department of the Army has now kicked the last prop out from under an Ohio Congressman's charges that Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. was favored in bidding for an armored personnel carrier contract.

We trust the report, from Assistant Army Secretary Courtney Johnson, will silence Representative CHARLES VANIK, Democrat of Ohio, and his idiotic assertion that the bids were rigged so that FMC couldn't lose. VANIK's election-year tactics should deceive no one; an Army-owned tank plant is standing idle in his district. The setup, of course, is a natural for a vote-getting expedition.

However, the facts simply do not support VANIK's contention that the Army so wrote the contract specifications that FMC obtained the $34.4 million job when it could have been done cheaper in the Cleveland area.

As Secretary Johnson pointed out, if all the evaluation factors (the cost of tooling up, for instance) had been applied against FMC and none against the lowest bidder in the Cleveland area, FMC's proposal would still have been the lowest submitted to the Government.

Wisdom in a Troubled World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, "Wisdom in a Troubled World" is a very timely article, particularly in light of the collapse of summitry, personal diplomacy, and the tragedy of the Presidential mission to the Pacific. This article was written by David Lawrence and appeared in the U.S. News & World Report February 8, 1960.

By leave previously granted, I insert Mr. Lawrence's article in the RECORD:

WISDOM IN A TROUBLED WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

In many parts of the world, there is turmoil, friction, fear—or else restlessness, discontent, and a searching for the Utopia that is never found.

In France, there is a new crisis.

In Africa and Asia, seething masses of people clamor for a better life.

In the Middle East, deepseated enmities show no signs of being resolved.

In China, hundreds of millions have become the pawns of dictators, even as tens of millions in the Soviet Union find themselves victims of the mad passion of their rulers for world conquest. Unscrupulous leaders turn away from individual betterment to the pursuit of more and more power over their fellow men. Human slavery is on the increase.

In Latin America, the crisis deepens. Cuba, the unhappy victim of Communist infiltration, now openly defies her longtime friend—the United States.

Throughout Central and South America, Communist intrigue carries its subversion into governments, universities, trade unions, the press, and the church.

Amidst it all, the Soviet Union preaches hourly over the radio waves its own brand of hypocrisy. It claims to be for peace, for disarmament, for an abandonment of the use of nuclear weapons. But while its voice is the voice of Jacob, its hand is the hand of Esau.

Meanwhile, science is implored to make haste, to invent deadlier weapons.

International conferences seeking humane objectives proceed with external piety and inward distrust.

And what sort of spectacle does the United States itself present?

We see ambitious men belittling each other in a quest for political gain.

We see huge blocs, possessed of vast power over the economic life of our country, vying with each other in establishing their respective monopolies.

We see evidences of broken ethics in various fields.

We see a recrudescence of religious bigotry.

We see a contemptuous indifference to the lessons of history. Our boast is that this age—our age—is indeed the greatest of all. We ignore the Scriptural injunction: "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

What, indeed, do we gain by going to the moon when we have forsaken our duty to each other on this planet? Where, to be sure, is the true key to peace? Is it in the weapons we have forged and in the missiles we shall build to protect ourselves against the madman who may press the button of world destruction or who, even foregoing war, will attempt conquest by threat?

What have we learned through history—that only war and brute force will gain victories for the strong over the weak? Or have we learned something of the spirit of man himself and of the incalculable power of human beings who, when they concert their will, can brush dictators aside as mere pygmies?

The writings of the great philosophers of the republics of ancient Greece bring uncomfortable reminders of our own inadequacy. We today criticize an emphasis on luxuries and an addition to materialism. Yet we cry out for more and more subsidies to the individual and show less and less interest in the need for self-reliance. Unwittingly, we are building up the image of a totalitarian state in which the dependent citizen is taught to abide by the will of his omniscient masters.

What about the simple and elementary principles of human conduct that have brought happiness to many an individual and success to the pursuits of many an enterprising mind? Shall we regard as trite the doctrine of human love or the advocacy of a spirit of mutual helpfulness in all human relations?

We must have better communication—from group to group, from people to people. We must not give way to the egocentric illusion that other peoples have no wisdom to impart to us.

We must not look on history as the faded pages of some other generation's failures.

We must communicate to each other once more the wisdom of the ages—that friction among human beings is more often than not the product of selfishness and greed and that the need for cooperation between peoples is the greatest challenge of our times.

Science has its worthwhile objectives, but the constant effort to enlarge man's knowledge in any field of exploration must be put into proper perspective.

Shall we, ignoring the crises in human relations that beset us on earth, seek in outer space to gain an imaginary triumph in the competition for so-called "prestige"?

The answer comes from the books of faith. There can be no peace on earth until we have learned to respect the dignity of man and are willing to build on the foundation of human love the kind of world that the great teachers of mankind have portrayed to us from the time of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. These are the true lessons of mortal life.

Committee for Effective Use of the International Court by Repealing the Self-Judging Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my col-

leagues a statement of position issued by the Committee for Effective Use of the International Court by Repealing the Self-Judging Reservation. It is a good statement and it cogently summarizes the case for repeal of the self-judging reservation.

Apart from the value of the statement itself, I should like to point out to my colleagues the makeup of this new committee. The Honorable Learned Hand is honorary chairman. The other officers are: Robert Dechert, chairman; William T. Gossett, treasurer; H. Dawson Martin, assistant treasurer; and Terence H. Benbow, secretary. The committee sponsors are: Dillon Anderson, Houston, Tex.; Douglas Arant, Birmingham, Ala.; Eugene D. Bennett, San Francisco, Calif.; David K. E. Bruce, New Windsor, Md.; John G. Buchanan, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ben M. Cherrington, Denver, Colo.; James B. Conant, New York, N.Y.; Thomas K. Finletter, New York, N.Y.; Jefferson B. Fordham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Erwin N. Griswold, Cambridge, Mass.; Alfred M. Gruenther, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Elizabeth B. Heffelfinger, Wayzata, Minn.; Arthur N. Holcombe, Duxbury, Mass.; Edward C. King, Boulder, Colo.; Grayson L. Kirk, New York, N.Y.; Benjamin H. Kizer, Spokane, Wash.; Jacob M. Lashly, St. Louis, Mo.; Henry R. Luce, New York, N.Y.; William L. Marbury, Baltimore, Md.; John J. McCloy, New York, N.Y.; Mrs. Millicent C. McIntosh, New York, N.Y.; Robert D. Murphy, Corning, N.Y.; Howard C. Petersen, Philadelphia, Pa.; George N. Shuster, Stamford, Conn.; Joseph M. Snee, S.J., Washington, D.C.; Charles A. Sprague, Salem, Oreg.; Harrison Tweed, New York, N.Y.; Arthur K. Watson, New York, N.Y.; W. W. Waymack, Adel, Iowa; Bethuel M. Webster, New York, N.Y.; Joseph N. Welch, Harwichport, Mass.; Henry M. Wriston, New York, N.Y.

This list of distinguished persons—all leaders in their respective communities—is a powerful testimonial in support of the cause which they sponsor.

The statement of position follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION

At the very time the United States is trying to win and hold the respect of uncommitted nations outside the Iron Curtain, it is continuing its recorded distrust of the International Court of Justice. At the very time the United States is trying to foster the rule of law among nations as the ultimate substitute for the rule of force, it is continuing its self-judging limitation on its adherence to the Court. Our committee believes this limitation should be repealed.

The basic terms of adherence: Our country adherence to the Court was pursuant to a 1946 Senate resolution. The resolution repeated the provisions of the statute creating the Court (part of the United Nations Charter) under which any country may accept the Court's jurisdiction as compulsory in disputes meeting these requirements: the dispute must be with another state accepting the same obligation, it must be a legal dispute, and it must concern either the interpretation of a treaty, or a question of international law, or the existence of any fact which would constitute a breach of an international obligation, or the reparation to be made for such breach.

In addition the Senate resolution, as introduced and unanimously approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, provided that the adherence should not apply to disputes on matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. This principle is implicit in the nature of international law and in the text of the Court statute, and was already expressed in the United Nations Charter. It is just as important to other nations as to the United States. Its restatement in the resolution may have been unnecessary, but of itself would not have impaired our adherence to the Court in any way.

The self-judging reservation: During the debate on the Senate floor, however, this provision was amended by adding eight final words, so that, as filed, our adherence to the Court did not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America "as determined by the United States of America." In other words, for deciding whether a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States (and thus outside the jurisdiction of the Court), the United States substituted itself for the Court. By adding this self-judging reservation the United States reserved the power to prevent the Court from passing on the matter, and thus reserved to itself a complete veto as to what cases could be brought against it.

The boomerang: The existence of a self-judging reservation in the adherence of any plaintiff country creates a like right for the defendant country (even though the defendant's own adherence contained none), because of the statute's requirement that adhering nations accept the same obligation. Thus when France (which had a self-judging reservation) sued Norway (which did not), the Court held that Norway could deny jurisdiction simply by announcing that in Norway's opinion the dispute was within Norway's domestic jurisdiction. Two years later (1959) France withdrew its self-judging reservation.

This boomerang effect of the self-judging reservation is probably its most serious aspect from the viewpoint of immediate economics. Thus foreign countries, despite their adherence without a similar reservation, can prevent the Court's passing on the validity of their taking of U.S. citizens' property or on the adequacy of any compensation proffered. The United States and the citizens it protects, who have a larger stake in foreign investment than any other country, can thus be deprived of their day in an international court.

Our companions in distrust: After the United States filed its adherence to the Court with a self-judging reservation, seven other countries adopted such self-judging reservations. France and India later dropped theirs, leaving such reservations now in effect by Mexico, Liberia, Union of South Africa, Pakistan, the Sudan, and the United States. Including these, 38 nations have now accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

The Court is well constituted to earn respect. It has 15 judges, each elected for 9 years, with 5 elected every 3 years. No two can be nationals of the same state. They are nominated by members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and elected by the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council (without any veto power). The Court has conducted itself conservatively, and given no indication of a desire to extend its jurisdiction. We may terminate our adherence to the Court by 6 months' notice.

Speaking of the Court in his state of the Union message of January 8, 1960, President Eisenhower said: "There is pending before the Senate a resolution which would repeal our present self-judging reservation. I support that resolution and urge its prompt passage." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on this resolution (S. Res. 94), but deferred action.

Little to lose: This committee believes that the United States should withdraw its self-judging reservation, at once. The Court's compulsory jurisdiction would still not include disputes on matters essentially within our domestic jurisdiction, but the determination of whether a dispute involved such matters would be by the Court. Assuming that the United States would exercise the self-judging reservation only in good faith and not as an excuse to avoid defeat, our only risk in withdrawing the reservation would be that the Court in some future dispute would decide that the matter was not essentially within our domestic jurisdiction when we considered that it was. Based on the structure, history and prospects of the Court, this committee believes that any harm to the United States from the acceptance of such a risk is most unlikely.

Much to gain: The gains to the United States, however, from withdrawing the self-judging reservation, would be substantial and in the long run could be tremendous. With the reservation still on file, giving our country a veto power to prevent a decision of the Court, other countries are not prepared to assume that we will exercise the veto only in good faith. From their point of view our support for the Court is little better than that of the Iron Curtain countries, none of which has filed any adherence. We have put ourselves in the posture either of expecting to break out international obligations, or of being afraid to defend our conduct in court. We have prevented ourselves from showing the world the stark contrast between bona fide support of the Court, and the Iron Curtain countries' rejection of it.

If we Americans wish the governments of other countries to follow our lead in the arduous search for a way to the rule of law among nations, we must renounce the self-judging reservation. We must strike from the rolls our recorded distrust, and become a true adherent of the International Court of Justice.

Are You Tired of Traveling to the Old Familiar Places?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a brochure drawn up by a group affiliated with the American Friends Service Committee in New England. This group, over the past 2 years, has been working to improve relationships between our country and the People's Republic of China.

As you will see from the text, this is a different approach, although no less serious in intention than has been used in the past.

The authors of the brochure can be excused for not knowing that our Government has allowed six people to enter officially.

It is generally believed that the attempt to carry on a "containment by isolation" policy is completely successful, at least to the extent of preventing all such visits.

The text of the brochure follows:

ARE YOU TIRED OF TRAVELING TO THE OLD FAMILIAR PLACES?

Do you yearn for new ports and new vistas?

How about a trip to a country that has not been visited in 10 years.

In 10 years?—that is, not legally—by Americans.

Canadians have been there and Englishmen and Russians and Indians; but no Americans—officially, that is.

It is said to be an interesting country geographically, economically, culturally, even politically. Perhaps we should not have mentioned that last because our Government says it is bad—and who are we even to question what our Government tells us about far-away places?

Has our Government been there? No; governments never go where they're not recognized. It's not protocol. Nevertheless this faraway place keeps persisting in existing.

Our Government talks to their government in Poland, in Korea, in Switzerland, but not in our country—nor in theirs. Why? Because they're not acceptable politically. Are they really that bad? Is anything about them true? Or false? How do you know if you can't go and see for yourself?

But will their government let you in? Most likely. Will they let you out? Definitely. Will we let you back in again? Absolutely—we can't keep us out. Then where's the hitch? You lose your passport.

What? You heard right, our Government takes back your passport (after all, it's "theirs") and thereafter, you stay home.

Some Americans must think it's worth it, though, in fact, quite a few—43 young people went in 1957 and lost their 43 passports. Last summer there were quite a few other Americans over there, people who went over to look and see.

Did they lose their passports, too?

Nobody knows yet—they're not all back yet. But chances are they will. Do any of them ever come over here? Heavens, no. Why should we let them come here when we won't let us go there? It's not logic.

Would you like to go to see? (Without loss of passport?) Do you think some of them would like to come here to see? How much longer ignorance?

How much longer the head in the sand?

We waited 16 years to recognize their neighbor. We've already waited 10 years not to recognize them. Do we have only 6 more years to wait, then? Only 6 more years of ignorance? Maybe. Unless you and 99 other typical honest, representative citizens from our country went to their country and 100 of their typical honest, representative citizens came here by boat or a safe, nonnuclear intercontinental missile (fitted, you might say), with a peacehead.

What's to be gained? Information, perhaps understanding, ultimately even trade?

Between 200 million of us, and three times that number of them. Why, we have three times as much to gain and three times as much ignorance to lose. We used to be very mutually friendly with these people. And they with us. In other words:

Why don't we start now to go forward to where we used to be? If you believe this, too, join us.

Check one or all:

☐ I am interested in visiting China.

☐ I am interested in making it possible for others to visit China.

☐ I believe an equal number of Chinese should be permitted to visit the United States.

☐ I am willing to help raise money.

☐ I am willing to write to Congress, the State Department and the President.

☐ I want more information.

☐ I enclose $_____ for which send me _____ copies of this brochure (at 10 cents each).

Scotty Reston Writes of the President, Ingemar and Other Affairs of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times this morning:

TO INGEMAR JOHANSSON WITH LOVE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—Dear Ingemar: You asked me what you should say in your forthcoming TV report to the Swedish people about the recent regrettable incident with Mr. Floyd Patterson at the Polo Grounds in New York.

I have three suggestions. The best thing is to say nothing. The next best thing is to deny that you ever went to America. But if you have to make a report, I suggest that you follow the victory-through-defeat system used by President Eisenhower in his report on Japan, speaking—if you are now able to speak—as follows:

My friends:

I have just returned to Sweden from America, where almost everybody treated me very kindly. It has been a trip so marked by events that I shall try this evening to give you a simple background of fact against which these recent events can be viewed in perspective.

First, Swedish relations with the United States have been strengthened. I wish that every one of you could have accompanied Birgit and me to New York and thus witnessed for yourselves the outpouring of friendship and respect for Sweden and the Swedish way of life.

Second, the happiness created among the colored people of America as a result of my appearance there this time was not only heartwarming but surpassed by far their reaction to my last visit.

Finally, as the Marquis of Queensberry once said, it matters not in this life whether you win or lose, but how you play the game, especially when economic rewards are so agreeable.

Now, let's look at the background of this trip and the others I have taken in the interests of world understanding. For some years the world has been inclined to think only of the beauty of Swedish women.

Meanwhile, the heroism and warrior tradition of Swedish men had long been overlooked, not only by atheistic international communism, but even among the peoples of our sister democracies.

Accordingly, I have traveled tirelessly around the world, seeking lucrative personal contacts in my own people-to-people program, and belting old retreads regardless of race, creed, or color.

With the passage of time I began to receive urgent invitations to attend a heavyweight summit meeting in America. Many months ago I concluded that I should accept these invitations whenever the price was right. In this decision Birgit enthusiastically concurred.

Incidentally, I have never believed that victory and money were the only things in life, although, as the Americans say in their picturesque way, these things are not to be sneezed at. What matters is the international goodwill that results from bilateral reciprocal aggression before multitudes of well-heeled savages in the overdeveloped and undereducated areas of the globe.

Now as to the incident at the Polo Grounds, I have been assured that the people there were, in overwhelming majority, anxious to welcome me as a representative of a nation with which they wished to cooperate and have friendly relations.

It is true that the outrageous conduct of a violent and disorderly minority prevented me from achieving all of my objectives, and that Mr. Patterson displayed toward me, especially in the fifth round, a certain animus and even hostility, which temporarily interrupted my mission.

Nevertheless, if you could have heard the cheering that filled that great arena, when I finally regained consciousness, I think you would agree with me that a great many peace-loving Americans were actually overjoyed at my survival.

I shall never forget the look of relief on the face of Mr. Patterson at the end. He kept saying in a faraway voice: "Wake up, Ingemar. Wake up." It is in such moments a man realizes there is no defeat.

Now, a final personal word:

Sweden has nothing to regret. In the long history of human conflict no man has ever lost and regained the heavyweight championship of the world until now.

As I said to Birgit, this is our consolation: We have made it possible for Mr. Patterson to lose and regain a crown, and all I can hope is that he will do the same for me.

Thank you and—good night.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

The Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a series of six articles by the publisher, Eugene C. Pulliam, which appeared in his papers, the Indianapolis Star and the Arizona Republic, entitled "The Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy."

Of course, the power to tax is an essential element of any responsible government. You will recall that the lack of this power under the Articles of Confederation was disastrous. The proper title should be "The Abuse of the Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy." It is much like the axiom often referred to, "money is the root of all evil," when in truth it should be, "the love of money is the root of all evil." The distinction in both cases is apparent.

There is national interest in House Joint Resolution 23, which calls for the repeal of the personal income tax and provides for the disposition of the 2,500 Government corporations, which in their tax-free, rent-free status, compete with private industry. These tax-free corporations constitute the greatest tax loophole we have, and if they were privately owned, they would produce several billion dollars in taxes annually as well as eliminate the deficits which they each year charge to the Federal Government.

The following editorials deal with the provisions of House Joint Resolution 23, and should be carefully considered by every American:

THE POWER TO TAX IS THE POWER TO DESTROY

We believe:

1. It is not only desirable, but possible to abolish the personal income tax which is damaging the economic and moral fiber of the Nation.

2. This can be done without adding new taxes or reducing the amount of money spent on any essential military or civilian obligation of the Government.

3. That the first step toward abolishing personal income taxes is the removal from Government ownership all corporations and properties that now compete with private enterprise.

4. That the corporation income tax can be replaced with other forms of taxation less burdensome to incentive, initiative and economic progress and fairer to the entire country.

5. That these objectives can be achieved within 3 years if Congress starts this year.

(The enclosed series of editorials on income taxation is written in the belief that the progressive income tax is dangerous to the economic progress of the United States, is unethical and unfair to the people of the United States, and if it is not abolished, imperils the personal liberty of the American people. We believe these editorials demonstrate not only that abolition of the income tax must be done, but can be done—Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher.)

THE POWER TO DESTROY

"The power to tax involves the power to destroy." Chief Justice John Marshall, McCulloch vs. Maryland, March 6, 1819.

Extensive hearings have been held in Washington on reform of the income tax, the most extensive since 1913, when the tax was imposed. Six thick books of testimony have already been issued by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and more are coming. Most witnesses propose new exemptions to make the tax more "fair" to certain groups. Others propose, as does Chairman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, ending all exemptions and imposing uniform lower rates ranging from 12 percent to 55 percent. Many suggest closing "loopholes" in the law under which some taxpayers get special exemptions for old-age, sickness, investments, oil depletion, or dependents, or foundations and special interest organizations.

It seems to us that none of these proposals to reform the income tax law really gets to the root of the evils of income taxation. Everyone admits that progressive taxes with special exemptions create inequalities and special privileges. But nobody seems to realize that it is not the way in which income tax laws are written that makes these "loopholes." It is the very principle of income taxation itself which is unequal, undemocratic, punitive and unfair.

It is our contention that no progressive income tax can be fairly and equally applied, giving no special privilege or imposing no special punishment. It is our contention that no matter how Congress tries to adjust the interests of one badly treated group, it will end up merely by creating other badly treated groups or specially favored groups in the process.

It is also odd that most of the testimony does not seek to reduce the burden of taxation on the American people. Instead most witnesses try only to provide ways of distributing the tax burden in a different way. Chairman MILLS himself does not aim at reducing taxes. He aims only at redistributing them.

The income tax brought in $80 million in its first year, 1913. In 1960 it is expected to produce $40 billion in personal income tax collections, or 500 times as much as 1913. Corporation income taxes will produce $22,500 million, excise taxes $9 billion and other receipts $6,007 million. Thus the personal income tax has become the major revenue producer for the Government instead of a minor factor. Consequently the cry of most of those in Congress or out is, "How can we cut such an important tax? What will we do for revenue to run the Government?"

It is the purpose of this series of editorials to prove that the income tax cannot only be drastically cut—it can be abolished, and still there will be enough revenue to run the Government. It is our purpose to prove that the progressive income tax is destroying too much that is vital to American freedom and prosperity. It is destroying the ability and the incentive of individuals to raise capital to invest in new businesses employing more workers. It is destroying the people's faith in the fairness and morality of their Government. It is destroying the moral fiber of our people by creating inequities, by making Federal taxation arbitrary, unfair and outright dishonest. The complexity of the tax has made it impossible to be sure of making out a truly accurate return, thus destroying the confidence of the people in the Government's intent to treat them honestly.

Cameron Hawley, author of "Cash McCall," wrote in the Saturday Evening Post in 1946, "Bad laws produce bad men. Even good men, in a bad moral climate, are inclined to lose their ethical orientation * * * the very unfairness of the law becomes an accepted moral justification to break it, evade it or avoid it. When the law loses its respect for the individual, the individual loses his respect for the law." This has already happened in America.

The income tax is a bad law, a law unacceptable to honest people, a law that is immorally and unevenly applied. It is violated more and more every year, knowingly and unknowingly. Nobody is ever sure exactly what it means. In 1958 the Government published a book, "Your Federal Income Tax." It had 128 pages of explanation and index and still its authors admitted they did not give all of the answers on the income tax law.

All of the voluminous testimony before Congress makes it perfectly clear that, as Representative MILLS put it, "We have a tax system riddled with preferential benefits and falling on only a part of our economy. The heavy tax burden is on those who must carry more than their share. A fair and equitable tax system is not only desirable, but may well be an element in our national survival."

But a progressive income tax cannot be made equitable. It is the kind of tax that has built-in inequities, no matter how it is written. More than that it attacks the very fiber of our American way of life.

In 1910, Richard E. Byrd, Speaker of the Virginia House of Representatives, warned the Nation of the dangers that income taxation would bring to this country. "This amendment," he said, "will extend the Federal power so as to reach the citizen in the ordinary business of his life. A hand from Washington will be stretched out upon every man's business; the eye of the Federal inspector will be in every man's counting house.

"The law will, of necessity, have inquisitorial features, it will provide penalties. It will create a complicated machinery.

"An army of Federal inspectors, spies, and detectives will descend upon the States. They will compel men of business to show their books and disclose the secrets of their affairs. They will dictate forms of bookkeeping. They will require statements and affidavits. On the one hand the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer and on the other he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor."

All this has happened in America in the last 47 years. But it is even worse than Byrd predicted. For now, every home, every wage earner, every family is under the eye of the tax inspector. The bulk of income taxes are not paid by business. They are not paid by the rich. They are paid by the great forgot-

ten middle class of the United States who earn from $4,000 to $25,000 a year.

The progressive income tax is dangerous, unfair and punitive. It has given the Government the power to spend unchecked tremendous sums of the people's money. It violates the personal privacy and personal liberty of every American who pays it.

An alternative must be found. We believe an alternative can be found.

THE POWER TO DESTROY—II

In our first editorial of this series we pointed out that the main objection to drastic reduction or abolition of the income tax is that "the Government needs the revenue and cannot find a way to replace it." We believe the Government does not need the revenue and can find ways to replace it that are less burdensome on the American people.

The most dramatic proposal for abolishing the income tax and replacing the lost revenues comes from Congressman JAMES B. UTT of California. Last year he introduced the 23d amendment to the Constitution. It would do two things. First, it would mandate the disposal of all Federal corporations and properties that compete with private business. Second it would abolish the income tax. Congressman UTT believes that revenues from the liquidated Federal corporations would make any new or additional tax unnecessary. He inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis by Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom.

Mr. Stone points out that the House Government Operations Committee has estimated the book value of these 700 Federal corporations at $262 billion. If these properties (which comprise 20 percent of the Nation's industrial capacity) were sold to private investors, they would bring in an estimated $65 billion. If that much of the national debt were paid off with the proceeds, it would reduce the Federal budget by $2 billion in interest costs alone.

But there is much more to be saved. These 700 Federal corporations lost a staggering total of $19 billion in 1959. So even if the Government just gave them away, the taxpayers would be immediately saved $19 billion.

In addition, more than 1 million employees who work for these corporations are paid out of the U.S. Treasury, according to Stone's figures. They are paid an average of $4,300 million a year by the taxpayers of the country. All of this could also be saved.

Next, Mr. Stone figures that it takes at least $3 worth of free goods and services for every dollar of payroll provided for these 700 corporations. That totals $12,900 million which can be taken off the taxpayer's back.

Saved also would be the amortization costs of this portion of the national debt reduced by the $65 billion proceeds from the sale of Federal corporations. Figured at 40 years such costs are $1,625 million per year.

The total of all these savings made possible by sale of Government corporations is $59,825 million—a tremendous sum. Added to these savings to the taxpayers would be Federal corporation taxes paid to the Government by these 700 corporations after they become privately owned. The estimate is that they would pay an average of $5,100 million in new taxes. Add this sum to the amounts saved above and the total would be $44,925 million. That is more than is expected to be collected in 1960 by all personal income taxes put together ($40 billion).

So if these estimates are correct, the 22d amendment would make possible the complete abolition of the personal income tax and the Government would have nearly $5 billion extra in the till.

Now it is quite possible that the Government could not get $5 billion for its properties that compete with private business. But even if it got half that amount, there would still be gigantic savings to the taxpayers. It would still be possible to cut the income tax in half, or reduce it two-thirds, or impose another fairer, more easily collected and more equitable tax in its place. And not one single fundamental service of the Government would be affected—not social security, not welfare programs, not any necessary services, not even foreign aid!

Clearly it is not true that the income tax cannot be abolished because it is needed for revenue to support the Government. Just as clearly there are other means by which revenue can be raised so that income taxation can be eliminated with all of its evils, special privileges and punitive aspects. We will discuss some of these alternate tax plans in the next editorial.

THE POWER TO DESTROY—III

We have shown, in the second article of this series, that personal income taxes can be either greatly reduced or abolished. It could be done by divesting the Federal Government of the 700 properties and corporations that compete with private industry, returning them (20 percent of the Nation's industrial capacity) to private ownership.

It is also possible to abolish the income tax on corporations—which the people pay anyhow in the higher prices they pay for the goods and services they buy. Business has to lay the cost of its taxes on the consumer if it is going to make a profit, pay good wages, give stockholders a fair return and stay in business. What is the alternative to corporate income taxes?

There are several possibilities. In 1956, U.S. News & World Report published a study of the problem and outlined several types of tax that could replace income taxation with less trouble of collection and more even distribution of the taxload among the people.

For instance, they found that a 10 percent manufacturers sales tax, in 1956, would have produced $13 billion in revenue. A retail sales tax of 10 percent would have produced $21 billion which is almost as much as the entire tax expected to be collected from business and industry in 1960. If food and medicine were exempted from such a sales tax, $16 billion could still have been collected. In 1960 these taxes would all produce even greater tax revenues than in 1956.

A turnover tax on business operations would have raised $45 billion, or twice as much as corporate tax collections in 1960. That is even more than personal income tax collections bring in. A "spending tax" of 10 percent (a tax that is applied only on money people actually spend, and not on savings or investments) was estimated to produce $18 billion. That today could replace the entire corporation income tax.

So there is an alternative to income taxes. There are many ways in which Congress could abolish or drastically cut all taxes on income in the United States.

Nor is it correct to assume that if taxes are abolished or cut, the remaining tax structure would not produce as much or even greater tax revenues—even at much lower rates. It has happened before in this country. It would undoubtedly happen again. For billions of extra dollars would be released to the people to spend in their own way. When they spent their tax savings, they would set off a tremendous economic upsurge. New industries would spring up, old ones would be expanded to compete for the consumers' additional dollars. New investment capital would be available in huge amounts. Economists who worry about the slowdown in the economic growth of the United States in recent years could stop worrying. It is likely that if income taxes were cut by $40 billion—as they can be within just a few years—we would double our rate of economic growth—and thus produce much more tax revenue.

Something similar happened between 1925 and 1930. In 1925, income tax rates were 40 percent maximum with a $2,500 maximum personal exemption. Total Federal income tax collections were $2,584,140,000. (Just think. Today the citizens of Indiana pay almost as much as that to the Federal Government in income taxes.) By 1930, after the income tax rates had been gradually reduced, first to 24 percent with a $3,000 exemption and then to 20 percent with a $3,500 exemption, Federal income tax revenues had risen to $3,040,146,000. There was thus a 17 percent increase in Federal tax collections after the rates had been cut in half.

Large tax cuts on personal incomes and corporations are bound to stimulate business activity, increase incentives to earn more, to invest more and to spend more. As economic growth rises, tax revenues will also rise despite lower rates. It is demonstrably untrue that lower taxes must mean lower tax revenue. Certainly if $40 billion of the people's money were returned to them in the form of income tax reduction there could not help but be a terrific increase in industrial growth.

Great Britain, France and Germany have all discovered this simple economic truth, to their great advantage. It is time the United States rediscovered it.

So, we have demonstrated conclusively that personal income taxes can be abolished and corporate income taxes can be replaced. The argument that there is no alternative to income taxes simply does not stand up. We will discuss the reasons why it is vital to find an alternative to income taxation in our next editorial.

THE POWER TO DESTROY—IV

Why do we believe income taxes must be abolished? Well, let's just take some specific examples from the way it is applied and you will see why.

Back in 1958 a Gary (Ind.) schoolteacher bitterly complained because her salary was $3,550.50 instead of $3,550. Why didn't she want to be paid the extra 50 cents? Because when she made out her tax on the short form she discovered that extra 50 cents cost her an additional $10 in income taxes. She found she was in a higher tax bracket by just 50 cents. Now what is fair about that?

Between the years 1951 and 1956 convictions of income tax evaders increased from 261 to 631—more than doubled. Why? Because people are getting fed up with what they know are inequalities in the law. People are trying to escape paying what they believe to be an oppressive and unjust tax. A rich man can afford to pay his tax accountant enough money to keep him out of trouble. The average man, leafing through the 144 pages of the 1960 tax manual, has to do the job himself. Usually he winds up using the simplified form and thus cheats himself by not taking his legal deductions. Others who try to do that often end up by being called into the Internal Revenue office because they made either deliberate or inadvertent errors in the complex business of computing their taxes.

Do you know that people earning less than $7,000 a year will pay two-thirds of the $41 million in personal income taxes collected in 1960? People earning more than $7,000 will pay the other third despite their higher rates. Because income taxes have become the most important single tax of the Federal Government the average man is being forced to pay the huge bill Congress saddles on the American economy.

Congressman WILBUR MILLS recently pointed to a case of two men, Smith and Jones, both earning the same salaries, having the same family situation. Smith has

an income of $6,000 but his company gives him cut price lunches, health insurance, free medical checkups, life insurance a pension program, and an expense account which pays for part of his and his wife's meals and entertainment. The total value of these extras is $2,300—and it is all tax exempt. Yet his real income is $8,300.

Smith deducts from his taxable income $750 he pays in interest on his mortgage, $500 he pays in property taxes and $600 for a dependent aunt of his. He was sick for 5 weeks and the law says he can deduct up to $100 a week in the salary he was paid after the first week—so that is another $400 deduction. He has $200 income from tax exempt municipal bonds so he owes no tax on that. He contributes $300 a year to charity which is deductible.

Jones earns the same salary, $8,300. He also contributes $300 to charity. But he rents his home, so he cannot deduct mortgage interest. He pays no real estate property taxes so he cannot deduct them. He pays for his own meals, insurance, and retirement plan. He wasn't sick, so he has no deduction there. The extra $200 income he has comes from interest on savings and is therefore fully taxable. The aunt he supports is his wife's by marriage—no blood relation. Therefore he cannot take a deduction for her.

So what is the result?

Smith pays $210 income taxes on his $8,300.

Jones pays $1,090 income tax on his $8,300.

Why should Jones pay five times as much taxes as Smith? Their earnings and living situations are almost identical. Yet this is typical of the favoritism for special groups and the punishment for other groups that results from a progressive income tax.

Such a system is not fair. It is not equal. It is not democratic. It is not even honest.

A tax system that can produce such inequality is contrary to every democratic American principle we have come to believe in. And no wonder. A heavy progressive income tax is the second plank in the Communist Manifesto.

Not only does the personal income tax impose inequalities. So does the corporation income tax. Most American business pays income taxes on net earnings at rates up to 52 percent. The people who invest money in these businesses have to pay personal income taxes on the part of the remaining 48 percent that is distributed to them in the form of dividends. Thus people who invest in business have to pay two taxes on the same income—one corporation, the other personal. What is fair about that?

Then there are businesses that pay no taxes at all—or very little. Congressman NOAH MASON once wrote, in Reader's Digest, about the Farmer's Union Grain Terminal. In 1946 it had net earnings of $3,650,000. Thus one would think it would pay taxes of $1,400,000. But it paid no Federal income taxes. Why? Because it is a "cooperative."

The Red River Lumber Co., of Westwood, Calif., paid almost $1 million in Federal income taxes in 1943. In 1946 it paid none. Why? It was bought by the giant 'cooperative,' the California Fruit Growers exchange, which does $300 million business a year.

Is this fair? Who has to make up the difference in taxes which these big cooperatives do not pay? You do. The business you work for does. The businesses that compete with them do. Is there anything equitable about such a system? We do not see it.

We do not believe that any adjustments can be made in either the personal income tax or the corporation tax that can make these taxes fair. We do not believe that Congressman MILLS' plan simply to abolish all exemptions for everybody and retain the progressive income tax will be fair either. For everyone has a different personal situation just as every business is in a different competitive situation. And the progressive principle itself causes inequalities. It is meant to. That is why the Communists like it. For these reasons we believe the only way to provide fair and equal taxation is to abolish progressive income taxation and replace it with something else.

THE POWER TO DESTROY—V

How can the American people stop the ever-growing Government spending in Washington? Only by demanding that Congress reduce the taxes it imposes on them. The Congresses of the last 20 years have rarely reduced spending except by reducing taxes.

In 1960 the Federal Government will spend over $100 billion including the $20 billion for trust funds for highways, social security and the like. Together with State and local taxes, Government will take 30 percent of the Nation's income in 1960. The administration has been spending $8 billion in foreign aid and support programs every year. There is a Federal payroll of over $20 billion. And very little has been done to save the $7.5 billion Congress is wasting each year by not putting the saving recommendations of the Hoover Commission into effect.

These tremendous sums of money come from nowhere else but your pocket. By 30 percent your freedom to spend what you earn has already been taken away from you. The beginning of this fast growing expansion of Federal spending was in 1913, with the imposition of the income tax. The income tax has become since than a vast engine of burgeoning bureaucracy and an engine of Government stimulated inflation. It has made possible the Government establishment of tax-free businesses and industries that now comprise over 20 percent of the Nation's industrial capacity.

Every American citizen is in debt to the Government by $5,700. The average tax load on every American family is $2,400 a year in all forms of taxation. The national debt is $292 billion. I O U's for future payment of veterans and Government employees and other retirement programs are another $350 billion. The Federal Government is obligated to spend an additional $98 billion on roads, public works, and housing. The real total debt of your Government is thus around $750 billion—more than the entire national gross product and almost double the total wages and income of our people.

There is only one way to stop this growing debt, this heavier tax burden, this erosion of the people's right to spend what they earn and to be free from the prying eyes and heavy hand of the tax collector. That is to demand major surgery on the Nation's tax structure, not just minor changes that might well be soon changed right back. The income tax is a dangerous tax—as can be seen by its history. It has been made even worse by adding the withholding provision, which not only forces employers to do the Government's tax collecting for it—without compensation—but also seizes part of every worker's pay check before he even sees it.

Even another small cut in income taxes is not likely to stop the big flow of our tax dollars to Washington. In 1954 taxes were cut 10 percent. Yet in 1960 Government will collect almost $20,000,000,000 more in taxes than in 1954. The cost of the Federal Government has increased by $16 billion since the Korean war. The national debt has increased by $13 billion.

Government spending is virtually out of control. No real efforts have been made by Congress to cut either spending or taxes. A constant inflation has accompanied this massive Federal spending, cutting the value of our dollars, but not cutting the cost of our taxes. According to the Tax Foundation, a married man with $3,000 in income paid $269 Federal taxes in 1942 when the rates were about the same as today. In 1959 a man with the same income would pay the equivalent of $716 in taxes, when they are adjusted to the rise in consumer prices. Consumer prices have increased by 77 percent. But this man's taxes have increased by 166 percent. Inflation, caused by Government spending, has in fact become an additional tax on our incomes.

Not only does the income tax seize large chunks of our incomes, but also it causes us all extra expenses and extra effort just to figure out our taxes and try to avoid paying more than we owe. This is especially true of corporation income taxes. As Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt has written in "The Annals" of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, "The taxpayer, whether individual or corporate, is increasingly making his business and economic decisions in terms of minimizing his tax burden. This drains energy and ingenuity from constructive economic activity to the negative activities of tax avoidance. * * * Vast armies of high-salaried attorneys as well as business executives, devote a prodigious amount of time, energy, and resources to minimize the tax burden. A significant reduction or elimination of the corporate income tax would not only reduce this misallocation of resources, but would encourage industrial modernization and new investment which, in turn, would lead to lower real prices." Elimination of the personal income tax would, as we have pointed out, have the same effect.

"The cost of living today is three and one-half times as high as it was just after the turn of the century," says the Institute of Life Insurance. "By a striking coincidence, total Government spending has risen three and three-quarter times as fast as economic activity during this period (which coincided with the life of the income tax)." Not only has inflation resulted, but "considering today's tax burden and its impact on savings, capital formation and incentive, excessive growth of Government spending tends to become a drag on the growth of the economy rather than a stimulus."

Every attempt to make a major reduction in spending and taxing has failed—except in 1947 when the "do-nothing Congress" reduced both substantially. It is obvious that merely to try to change the income tax structure will neither stop Government spending or reduce taxes. Only a bold and all-out attack on the income tax aiming at its abolition can do this. This is the key to the whole problem.

THE POWER TO DESTROY—VI

It is indeed true that "the power to tax involves the power to destroy." But in our Republic the power to tax is a power granted to Congress by the people. It can be taken from Congress by the people. The people, with their votes, have the power to destroy politicians who abuse the power to tax.

We believe that we have demonstrated in this series of editorials that it is possible to abolish the personal income tax. We believe that we have shown that the income tax is an iniquitous and unfair tax that must be eliminated. Therefore, we believe the people should demand that Congress change the tax laws and relieve them of this vicious burden.

The 23d amendment, requiring the disposition of all Federal corporations competing with private industry and business and abolishing the income tax in 3 years, should be passed this coming session. Even if the sale of Government corporations does not raise as much money as estimated, there would still be tremendous yearly savings to the taxpayer by eliminating their losses and their payrolls. It is only good sense to believe that return of these huge amounts of money to the people in the form of tax reduction would so stimulate the economy that all necessary expenses of Government could be met by other forms of taxation.

We believe Congress should also work toward the replacement of income taxes on business with other forms of taxes. We would suggest a retail sales tax that exempts food and medicine (food is the biggest single item of the low income man's budget—except his taxes). Another possibility would be a spending tax which would be levied on the amount of money each taxpayer spent each year. Both of these taxes would be fair to all and discriminate against none. They would also be clearly labeled to the people so they would know exactly how much they are paying their government every day of the year. Nobody could then be fooled into thinking that he pays no taxes, when he surely does.

Sales taxes or taxes on spending are also anti-inflationary in contrast to the inflationary income tax. As Dr. John F. Due, professor of economics at the University of Illinois put it in an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, "Their anti-inflationary influence arises from their effect in reducing real purchasing power by raising commodity prices relative to factor incomes. Unlike other price increases, this type does not have a spiraling effect because it does not generate additional income. * * * They give some incentive to spend less and save more." (Which is the exact opposite of the income tax.)

Dr. Due believes an "expenditure" or savings tax would be best. Such a tax would be levied on the total spending each taxpayer did out of his yearly income. It could be simply figured by subtracting savings from income at the end of the year and paying taxes on the balance. Food or medicine could be exempted, of course. Also personal exemptions could be included for members of the family.

Such a tax, however, should not be progressive. The progressive principle leads to too much discrimination and inequality. At a 10 percent rate, for instance, with a $600 exemption, a single man spending $20,000 would pay $1,940. A single man spending $3,000 a year would pay $240, or much less if food were exempted.

Another source of taxation that has not been considered is taxation on imports. Traditionally tariffs have been levied in this country to protect domestic industries from competition abroad. Instead they should now be levied to raise revenues—and therefore rates should be set to encourage imports and thus produce more tariff revenue.

It is our belief that inheritance taxes should be either eliminated as a source of Federal revenue or limited to at least 25 percent. Heavy inheritance taxes discourage savings, and are thus inflationary. They make it difficult for the average person to provide for the future of his family after death. They encourage excessive spending since there is no reason to save for the future when the Government takes most of what you save when the future becomes the present.

All past experience, in this country and in others throughout the ages, has shown that when taxes on the people become burdensome and unfair, the nation's economy suffers, the people rebel, prosperity is destroyed and all too often freedom itself is lost. It has happened time and time again in nation after nation. Recent economic experience—in Germany, Britain, and France—has proved that when the tax burden is lightened and people are allowed to make more of their own decisions as to how their earnings are spent, production increases, industry expands, prosperity rises, inflation stops.

The people of the United States have a tremendous future ahead of them if they will just begin to demand an end to excessive spending and taxing by their Government. Congress must be made to understand that the time has come for them to start serving the people of the United States and not the insatiable bureaucracy that has swarmed like locusts into Washington.

Do you want an increase in your paycheck of from 15 to 20 percent weekly? Demand that your Congressman work to abolish the income tax and you will get it. Demand that Congress stop wasting your hard earned money. Taxes can be cut. But the job is up to you.

Textile Industry Must Turn to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the concern which the people of Georgia feel about the failure of the U.S. Tariff Commission to grant relief from unfair foreign competition to the American textile industry was eloquently expressed by the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle in its lead editorial of June 29 entitled "Textile Industry Gets No Relief." I concur fully in the Chronicle's conclusion that the industry must now look to Congress for help and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXTILE INDUSTRY GETS NO RELIEF

A U.S. Tariff Commission majority has dealt a staggering blow to the Nation's textile industry in its rejection of a National Cotton Council petition for limiting foreign cotton textile imports.

The four-member majority not only turned down the industry plea for quotas, or a tariff-quota combination, but ruled that import duties are not needed to offset the Government's cotton export fees.

In so doing, it failed to stem a swelling tide of textile imports that threatens to wreck the domestic textile industry and upset the cotton price support program in this Nation.

The gravity of the textile import problem is reflected in post-World War II export-import statistics. In 1947, U.S. textile exporters found a world market for $1.4 billion worth of textile manufactures, while imports amounted to only about one-fourth of this volume. This net textile export balance diminished until, by 1955, U.S. imports of textile products of $585 million had grown to 95 percent of our $615 million export trade. By 1958, a net textile import balance was firmly established, and in 1959, American imports totaled $837 million in contrast to exports of only $634 million.

Later statistics indicate that this trend is continuing, with imports of textile manufactures currently running some 140 percent of the U.S. export trade. And textile imports, if allowed to remain unrestricted, may be expected to cut even deeper into the American market in coming months. Not only do foreign manufacturers have the advantage of cheap labor and lower costs, but they buy cotton, including U.S. growths, at prices about 25 percent below those U.S. mills must pay.

The Japanese voluntary quota arrangement eased the problem to some degree in 1957, decreasing cotton cloth imports temporarily. But U.S. manufacturers cannot hope for any similar relief in the future, because imports are now pouring in, not only from the traditional Japanese and European competitors, but from an ever-widening circle of low-wage manufacturers based in Hong Kong, India, Korea, Pakistan, and Formosa.

Adding a deplorable note of irony is the fact that the United States, through the ICA, is financing the construction of many of these newer foreign mills that add to the woes of our own established textile manufacturers.

Viewed in the light of these facts, the Tariff Commission's action is indeed alarming. The United States must take some action to limit this low-cost foreign competition if the American textile industry—a basic element of the Nation's economy—is to continue to provide good jobs for millions of Americans and quality products for national and world consumption.

Having been denied by the Tariff Commission, the textile industry now must turn to Congress for action. As Senator STROM THURMOND said in commenting on the Commission decision, this case "proves the imperative need of Congress to take action in the next session to regain control of its constitutional authority over our trade program."

Platform of Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted by the 14th biennial State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York City on June 18, 1960.

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE 14TH BIENNIAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE, JUNE 18, 1960, AT THE HOTEL PICCADILLY, NEW YORK CITY

The 1960 presidential campaign once again brings our country to a crossroads. Once again the American people must choose between two concepts and philosophies of government. The decision which they will make in November will have profound effects not only upon our own destiny but upon that of all the world.

After more than 7 years of apathy and drifting by the Republican administration, the prestige of the United States is at its lowest ebb for the 20th century. This country has regressed from its position of preeminence in the areas of science, technology, social responsibility, and protection of fundamental freedoms among the family of nations.

The solidarity that marked the Western Alliance at the end of World War II, and through the early part of this decade has been strained by the failures and excesses of a foreign policy that at its best is merely makeshift, without any long-range program to which we can aspire and dedicate our efforts and toward which our allies would join in sincere and equal partnership.

Our party once again comes to the people with a platform and a candidate pledged to the public interest in principle and in administration. We will expose the Republican record of cynical opportunism and en-

trenched privilege. Dedicated to the assurance of full civil liberties for all of our citizens, our party cannot fail in leading the public to the inevitable repudiation of the Republican candidate, and its do-nothing, giveaway everything record.

The Republican Party and the Republican administration come to this campaign a bankrupt party, a divided party, and a party with a record of promises broken and unfilled. Its promises of civil liberties has been torn asunder like the Civil War over the principles of equal and sovereign rights for all its citizens. Its conception of the public interest becomes clear in the memories of Dixon-Yates, and the Mulligans, of Wenzell, of Mansure, of Talbot, of Al Serena, and Sherman Adams. Theirs is a sorry record of nonperformance, of broken promises, and duplicity of hypocrisy and thievery.

We are confident this November a new Democratic President will be returned to office with sufficient Democratic majorities in both Houses of the Congress to permit a halt to the paralysis and impotence of government, to the calculated plan of giving away enormous public assets, and to the appointment of public officials who oppose and seek to destroy the programs which they have been appointed to administer.

Our party has always been eager to let the people know where we stand on the vital issues that concern them. In that tradition, we of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York have always stated clearly and without equivocation our position and that of the candidates we support. We do so once again.

1. FEDERAL TAXES

We favor a complete overhaul of our entire structure. Our tax structure invites subterfuge and an erosion of our moral fiber. We need to eliminate the loopholes.

We urge the taxing powers, notably excises should be transferred to the States from the Federal Government permitting the States to regain these lost rights.

2 EDUCATION

We favor increasing the amount of Federal scholarships. We urge Federal assistance to States for school construction.

We favor greater autonomy for the Children's Bureau within the Department, and additional appropriations for the relief of children, widows, and the disabled.

We favor greater Federal contributions to combating the ravages of heart disease, cancer, veneral disease, and the other diseases that annually take their toll of life.

3. SOCIAL SECURITY

We favor allowing health and medical care of the aged, over 65, who are eligible under social security benefits, with the first $100 to be paid by the patient.

We urge the increase of the present maximum earnings from the present level of $4,800 to meet the changes in the cost of living. We favor the removal of the requirement that disability benefits begin at the age of 50, there should be no age for disability.

We favor the extension of social security to those segments of the population not already covered by it.

4. FOREIGN AID

We favor the continued economic aid to underdeveloped countries, but waste should be eliminated where possible.

5. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We advocate the reestablishment of a genuine bipartisan foreign policy in which responsible leaders of both major political parties will participate. We deplore the fact that under the present administration we have not had a bipartisan foreign policy, but that in fact we have had no foreign policy at all.

We must develop, with the assistance of the great abilities possessed by the leaders of both political parties and without domestic political motivation at home, a positive long-range foreign policy designed to preserve the peace ,to promote genuine friends and allies for democratic concepts among all the free nations of the world, and to create a powerful moral force for the defense of all nations and all individuals against the cancer of Communist imperialism and authoritarianism.

We believe that such a foreign policy must include in its fundamental precepts: a firm belief in the right of all nations to determine their own destinies and their own form of government, without interference from imperialists of any character;

A program of extending friendly cooperation in meeting their legitimate aims of independence and self-government to all of the young nations of Asia, Africa, and the Pacific, without sinister or selfish exploitation;

We support the principle of cessation of nuclear testing;

A firm resolution to maintain a strong national defense until assured of genuine disarmament, with enforcement of such disarmament placed in the hands of United Nations inspection forces;

A full support of the United Nations and its agencies in their endeavors.

6. CIVIL RIGHTS

We unconditionally support the principles enunciated in the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court outlawing segregation and other violations of civil rights.

We are opposed to segregation and discrimination in any form.

7. INFLATION

We favor vigorous enforcement of the antimonopoly laws and a review of tariff policies. The Government should try to live within its income where possible.

8. AGRICULTURE

We favor establishment of an international food agency to increase consumption of farm surpluses. We urge expansion of domestic consumption of farm products to assure an adequate diet for all. Finally, we hope for the free market to be restored as soon as feasible.

9. LABOR

We favor the enactment of the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management and Reporting Act. An increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. Broadening the coverage of the minimum wage program to include at least 10 million additional workers.

10. DEFENSE

We favor a complete reorganization and unification of all military services, with the elimination of duplication and waste.

11. PUBLIC HOUSING

We favor a more expanded public housing program. We urge liberalized programs for middle income and cooperative housing and a larger program for urban renewal.

12. PUBLIC POWER

We favor the immediate recall of the restrictions which have been placed by this Republican administration upon the administration of Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other public power developments.

We reassert our continued support of the TVA and the development of the Tennessee Valley.

13. CONSERVATION

We reiterate and restate our strong position for the protection and the preservation of our great natural resources—our forests, our soils, and our waters. Our great forest wilderness should be zealously guarded, protected, and preserved.

We favor a strong, well-defined program to effectuate and to supplement and improve the work now being done to save our soils.

We urge a forceful and continuing fight for clean air, a clean watercourse, and a clean shore.

Our national resources are invaluable and irreplaceable. They are priceless public possessions. We must not only inform ourselves but enlighten others as to the character, the uses, and the great values of these resources and the urging to preserve and protect them.

14. SMALL BUSINESS

We favor aid to small business and suggest greater credit be given to help them.

15. COMMUNISM

We abhor communism. We oppose Russian aggression abroad, and the arrogance of its leader. We believe that the surest method to expel successfully communism from the American scene is the white light of public disclosure. We believe that our Government should expose wherever possible the penetration of communism and Communists into the various channels of American life. A Communist cannot honestly take an oath of allegiance. We believe that Communists should be barred from employment in our schools, from employment by the Federal, State, and local governments, and from employment in such vital fields as transportation, communication, and atomic energy.

16. FEDERAL AID

We favor a Federal program of aid to the chronically depressed areas, to advise and help such areas in resolving their critical problems during transitional periods as a consequence of automation or for other reasons.

17. EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

We again urge, as its original sponsor, the extension of the right to vote to 18-year-olds. Now a law in Georgia and Kentucky.

18. NATIONAL SERVICES

We deplore the policy followed by the Republican administration of cutting down the services required by the individual citizen. We favor the immediate restoration of appropriations of the Weather Bureau so that it may again function efficiently and with adequate power. We urge the reorganization of the Post Office so as to provide efficient and frequent deliveries. We favor readjustment of the pay of postal employees so as to give them adequate compensation for their work.

19. ELECTORAL REFORM

We again favor the abolition of the electoral college and the substitution of a direct popular vote for President and Vice President, and the establishment of national presidential preference primaries.

20. SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

We favor self-government and the right to vote for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

We Learned All About Japan After Damage Had Been Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there has recently been a great deal of discussion about the meaning of the cancellation of President Eisenhower's recent trip to Japan. On Thursday morning, June 23, 1960, the Portland (Maine)

Press Herald carried an excellent editorial on this discussion which I would like, at this time, to have printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE LEARNED ALL ABOUT JAPAN AFTER DAMAGE HAD BEEN DONE

The feeling grows that somebody was sold a bill of goods in the matter of President Eisenhower's going to Japan—in fact, several somebodies. The list includes the President. It includes the Secretary of State. It includes the larger portion of the American press, this newspaper being no exception. And, in view of what the press was saying only days before the visit was scheduled and with Japanese student mobs virtually out of control, it includes most of the American people.

With variations, usually meant to shorten the limb out on which this host of people was inexorably climbing, the argument went that the President should go to Japan because he'd said he would, because an important peace treaty hung in the balance, and because Ike's benign presence infallibly engenders thoughts of peace.

We know now that, at best, this rationale was horribly oversimplified. The treaty has been technically ratified by Japan, probably soon will be by the United States through the agency of the Senate. But of what use, it is fair to ask, is a treaty when one of two signatories shows firm signs of wrenching away from its obligations before the ink is dry?

Most Americans had been led to believe—indeed, perhaps still believe—that cancellation of the trip and all the difficulties that flow from it, at home, in Japan, throughout the shrinking globe, are the work of mobs carefully directed, and frequently paid, by the agents of Moscow and Peiping. Yet we now learn that this is but part of what happened and by no means the prime cause.

We know now that one major factor in events was the as-yet-imperfect Japanese grasp of the democracy we ourselves insistently tried to teach them as we consciously broke the traditional molds of life and society in imperial Japan.

We know now how widespread is the pacificism which grips the Japanese who, although they have adopted much that is American, both good and bad, have not forgotten the lessons of their own militarist history, the catastrophe it brought to the islands, and above all the horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as they dissolved beneath two atomic bombs.

We know now that the U-2 incident, and its capacity to frighten allies whose sovereign territory was used to launch intelligence flights, had a heavy impact in Japan.

We know that there is no magic which can quickly convert a nation of the banzai charge and kamikaze planes into a Far East replica of the United States from which friendship is automatically returned.

We now know a good deal more about the crude tactics Premier Kishi used to ram through the controversial treaty. And we know as well how shot with holes was the advice received from our Embassy in Tokyo about the manner in which calmer Japanese heads would prevail and the certain efficacy of Japanese police.

All these things we know now, as the State Department might have known them all along. Yet we Americans on the one hand blandly accepted the explanation which pointed exclusively to the Communist bogey men and let it go at that. And on the other the State Department kept to its way until, the point for cancellation with minimum loss of prestige gone forever, the initiative passed to the Communists.

It is too late now to do anything about the past and it may be some time before similar circumstances again present themselves. For one thing Secretary of State Herter has said this country is through dealing in summitry and personal diplomacy. And for another we are well into the quadrennial suspension of our finest political skills and best instincts known as a presidential election. This means that although Moscow and Peiping will continue their policies without interruption ours are not likely to take firm shape again until another man is in the White House.

There is no help for this but if Americans in and out of the seats of authority could somehow use the time to become more sophisticated about international affairs it would be profitable indeed.

Perhaps the best expression of what is meant here is maturity of outlook, an attitude toward world events that, among other things, automatically suspects neat simplifications and instinctively rejects a division of all problems into black and white, good and bad, holy and unholy.

How our diplomacy is to do this is one question. How ordinary Americans are to do it is another. But done it must and can be. Nor is there any quetsion of taking glibly out of hindsight. All the factors which built up to the terrible defeat over Japan were available for assessing before the event. Yet after the event they have entered the public consciousness as eye-opening news.

In short Americans must learn to see what is there to be seen with the same clarity as our enemies. And to act in accord with what is true rather than what we would like to be true.

Summit Conferences Are Not Desirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Caldwell Hits Summit Conferences," published in the Tampa Tribune of June 29, 1960.

Former Governor Caldwell is a man of deep convictions. He always speaks his convictions vigorously and courageously. I am sure that all Senators will find his remarks challenging and intriguing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALDWELL HITS SUMMIT CONFERENCES

MIAMI BEACH, June 28.—Millard F. Caldwell, former Governor of Florida, said today U.S. diplomats "have had their pockets picked everytime they have met with the confidence men of the Kremlin."

"Sensible men would never think of sitting down with a family of rattlesnakes to discuss peaceful coexistence," Caldwell told the convention of Civitan International.

"If proof of those elementals is needed, we can cite the precedent of President Roosevelt losing his shirt in his conferences with Stalin and we can remember that President Eisenhower was consistently outmaneuvered and humiliated in the summit meeting debacles."

PRIMARY DANGER

Caldwell said the primary danger facing the Nation is not communism but "indifference of our citizenship."

"It is true that we read the evidence of Soviet superiority in the field of military science with some trepidation," he said.

"We evidence a general fluttering of concern as Washington usurps the rights of the States. We shrug with mild annoyance when the Supreme Court renders an unconstitutional decision. And we are irritated by the frustrations of American diplomacy in its retreat from Khrushchev.

RECONCILE SELVES

"But what do we do? We just timidly reconcile ourselves to disintegration, frustration, and failure."

Caldwell called the U.S. Supreme Court "a court composed of pseudosociologists which has spewed upon the Nation a series of unfortunate extrajudicial philosophical treatises."

He said the Court "has lost the respect and confidence of the people.

"That the state of our Union is precarious can no longer be a matter of doubt," Caldwell said. "That our domestic economy is balanced precipitously between depression and inflation is obvious. Our international relations have deteriorated almost beyond the point of return.

PROSPECTS NOT GOOD

"As a Nation we are without capable leadership and our prospects for improvement in the next election are not good.

"You and I, the private citizens of America, have neglected our responsibilities and shirked our duties. We are directly responsible."

Caldwell said both political parties "have become meddlers."

"The Paul Butlers and the Nixons, the Humphreys and the Rockefellers are stirring up sectionalism, racial strife, and class consciousness," he said.

CAPTAINED BY WEAKNESS

"The political parties are no longer concerned with the welfare of the country. Their only interest is in the next election. They are captained by weakness and motivated by the lust for power."

Caldwell told the Civitan delegates that "if your organization has any justification for its existence, it must be found in the realm of public service. It must be evidenced by the use of your collective intelligence, training, and knowledge in the task of solving some of the riddles of this generation."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).